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ABSTRACT

This thesis compares the relative plausibility of three contemporary Synoptic Gospel source critical hypotheses: the Two-Gospel Hypothesis (2GH), the Two-Document Hypothesis (2DH), and the Farrer Hypothesis (FH). The plausibility of each hypothesis is evaluated by the extent to which the implied redaction of miracle tradition is consistent with: (a) the evangelist’s synchronically detected apologetic aims; (b) the generic conventions of ancient biography; and (c) first century narrative rhetorical conventions based on the elements and virtues of narrative in Theon’s Progynasmata.

The method is first demonstrated for two authors approximately contemporary with the Gospel writers, namely Josephus (Antiquities of the Jews) and Plutarch (Lives). Their narrative re-presentation of known source material at both a macro-level (order and selection) and micro-level (adaptation of specific narratives) is shown to be influenced by their apologetic aims, generic conventions, and the elements and virtues of narrative.

Subsequent macro-analysis (order and selection) of Gospel miracle traditions indicates that implied changes are more plausibly explained by Markan priority (2DH and FH) than Markan posteriority (2GH). While the 2DH and FH display similar degrees of plausibility, the lack of evidence for Luke’s direct use of Matthew slightly favors the 2DH. The situation is similar for a
micro-analysis of three pericopes, namely the Gadarene demoniac (Mark 5:1-20; Matt 8:28–9:1; Luke 8:26-39), Jairus’ daughter and the hemorrhaging woman (Mark 5:21-43; Matt 9:18-26; Luke 8:40-56), and the Centurion’s servant (Matt 8:5-13; Luke 7:1-10). While the evidence is mixed, it cumulatively indicates that Markan priority (2DH and FH) more plausibly explains the implied redaction than does Markan posteriority (2GH). Micro-analysis yields insufficient evidence to suggest significantly greater or lesser plausibility of the 2DH or FH in relation to one another.

In essence this study reinforces the methodological value of utilizing ancient literary and rhetorical conventions in evaluating the relative plausibility of the implied redaction associated with specific Synoptic source hypotheses. More specifically the cumulative evidence from the present analysis of Gospel miracle traditions suggests the greater plausibility of Markan priority (2DH and FH) than Markan posteriority (2GH).
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Chapter 1: The Synoptic Problem and Miracle Tradition

1.1 Introduction

Over a century ago in 1904 Ernest DeWitt Burton made the following observation:

Ever since the days of Augustine and Jerome, not to say earlier, the mutual
resemblances of the first three gospels have been observed, and the problem thus
created for the biblical scholar has been discussed. Since 1794, when Eichhorn
proposed his theory accounting for the resemblances and divergences of the
synoptic gospels by deriving them all from a common document existing in
various recensions, the question has been vigorously discussed, and almost
numberless theories have been proposed for its solution.¹

Despite the passage of time this observation remains an apt description of the contemporary
state of the so-called Synoptic Problem (SP), which at heart is a source critical debate concerning
the possibilities of direct literary interdependence, lost written sources, and/or the role of oral
tradition (and/or eye witness testimony) in the production of the Synoptic Gospels. The specific
focus of this thesis will be to test the relative strengths and weaknesses of three contemporary
hypotheses of literary dependence,² namely the Two-Document Hypothesis (2DH), the Two-
Gospel Hypothesis (2GH) and the Farrer Hypothesis (FH).³ More specifically I will be testing
the relative redactional plausibility of these competing hypotheses through an examination of the

¹Ernest DeWitt Burton, Some Principles of Literary Criticism and Their Application to the Synoptic Problem, The
Decennial Publications 1/5 (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1904), 3.
²While the ‘independent’ theory (no literary relationship) continues to have voice in some quarters (e.g. Eta
majority of scholars agree on some level of literary dependence albeit frequently including hypothetical sources and
the influence of oral tradition or memory. On this see the discussion in Andrew Gregory (“What is Literary
Dependence?” in New Studies in the Synoptic Problem: Oxford Conference, April 2011: Essays in Honour of
Christopher M. Tuckett, ed. Paul Foster, Andrew Gregory, John S. Kloppenborg, and Joseph Verheyden, BETL 239
[Leuven; Paris; Walpole, MA: Uitgeverij Peeters, 2011], 87–114) along with literature cited at the beginning of
chapter 2.
³Each hypothesis is variously named in the literature (e.g., Griesbach, Two-Source and Farrer-Goulder for the 2GH,
2DH, and FH respectively). My choice of nomenclature accords with that adopted at the 2008 Oxford Conference on
the Synoptic Problem now published in P. Foster, A. Gregory, J. Verheyden, and J. S. Kloppenborg, eds., New
Studies in the Synoptic Problem: Oxford Conference, April 2011: Essays in Honour of Christopher M. Tuckett,
BETL 239 (Leuven; Paris; Walpole, MA: Uitgeverij Peeters, 2011).
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implied redaction of synoptic miracle tradition in light of ancient rhetorical conventions related to narrative. In order to situate this thesis within broader scholarly discussion, however, it will first be necessary to provide a brief overview of the history of SP debate.

1.2 History of Scholarship on the Synoptic Problem

1.2.1 Origins of the Modern Debate in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries

Insofar as pertinent comments about gospel origins occur both within the texts themselves (Luke 1:1-4) and the writings of the early church fathers (for example Papias, Origen, or Augustine) it is possible to trace SP discussions as far back as the first or second century C.E. More typically, however, SP historians begin with Post-Enlightenment historical critical German scholarship in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. A brief survey of this period will therefore serve to situate this thesis. Several factors from this era have been proposed as precipitators of the subsequent debate about Gospel origins. The first factor, according to John Kloppenborg, was not detached literary-critical inquisitiveness but heated theological controversy over the historical credibility of the Gospel accounts resulting directly from the posthumously published writings of Hermann Samuel Reimarus (1694-1768). The result was a “collapse of confidence in Protestant orthodoxy” whereby the “wedges that Reimarus had driven among the Gospels and between the Gospels and Jesus would prove impossible to extract ... .The response elicited by Reimarus has been programmatic for Synoptic studies in the succeeding two

---

4See especially David Laird Dungan, A History of the Synoptic Problem: The Canon, the Text, the Composition, and the Interpretation of the Gospels (New York; London; Toronto; Sydney; Auckland: Doubleday, 1999). While he takes Luke’s prologue (first century?) as the “proper place to begin all discussions” of the SP (p. 13), comments of the second century fathers (e.g., Papias) are perhaps a better place to begin.
centuries.” Hence, for example, the hypothesis of Johann Jakob Griesbach (1745-1812), namely that Mark is a conflation of Matthew and Luke, provided a clear apologetic response to Reimarus. It was Griesbach himself, however, who was primarily responsible for the second (more obviously material) cause of subsequent SP debate, namely the creation of the parallel column Gospel synopsis in 1774 along with a simultaneous rejection of the previously favored Gospel harmony. While the latter tended to highlight consistency and inter-connectedness among the Gospels leading to a “harmonious narrative,” the detailed comparison of parallel accounts facilitated by a Gospel synopsis highlights patterns of both similarities and differences in chronology, content, wording etc. In addition to these two factors David Dungan suggests that a new Post-Enlightenment understanding of history, namely as chronological progress, further fueled the desire to discover the historical (i.e. chronological) development behind the Gospel accounts. The end result of these three factors, as Burton rightly observes, is an “almost numberless” array of source hypotheses purporting to explain the observable data and solve the so-called SP. While this precludes a detailed survey of hypotheses, a brief overview will help situate this thesis.

The multitude of hypotheses that appeared during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries may be conveniently grouped under three categories (see figure 1.1): (a) ‘direct utilization’ (direct literary dependence); (b) ‘proto-gospel’ or ‘Urgospel’ (positing earlier, written, now lost, typically Aramaic sources); and (c) ‘oral tradition.’ Griesbach (in 1783) provides an example of the first category (‘direct utilization’) with his hypothesis that Matthew was written first, was

---

7Griesbach may have been influenced by Henry Owen (in England) but this does not change the fact that he is responding to Reimarus. Much the same can be said for Griesbach’s contemporaries such as Johann Gottfried Eichhorn and Johann Gottfried Herder. On this see Kloppenborg, *Excavating Q*, 280–82.
8In actual fact it appears that Jean Calvin was the first to produce a parallel column arrangement of the Gospels and that he was likewise disturbed by the harmonies, at least that of Osiander. On this and the issue of Gospel harmonization (in the wake of Augustine) and subsequent rejection of harmonies see, for example, Dungan (*History*, 302–9), Farmer (*Synoptic Problem*, 2-3), and Kloppenborg (*Excavating Q*, 272-82). Kloppenborg notes that about 150 harmonies existed by the year 1800 (p. 274, n. 8 citing Fabricius as a source) and supplies a quote indicating Griesbach’s explicit rejection of the harmonizing approach (p. 280).
10See Kloppenborg, *Excavating Q*, 282, where he notes the standardization of this taxonomy by the beginning of the 19th century. The diagrams for figure 1.1 are taken from ibid. pp. 277 and 281.
then directly utilized by Luke, following which both were conflated by Mark (figure 1.1a).\textsuperscript{11} While the so-called ‘Griesbach hypothesis’ (i.e. 2GH) was also advocated by F. C. Baur (1847) and the nineteenth century Tübingen school, an alternative direct utilization hypothesis is that of C. G. Wilke (1838), who argued for Markan priority, Luke’s use of Mark, and Matthew’s use of Mark and Luke.\textsuperscript{12} An example of the second category (‘proto-gospel’) is the hypothesis of Johann Benjamin Koppe (1782), who argued that Luke’s preface provided evidence that the canonical Gospels were based on earlier Greek and Hebrew narratives.\textsuperscript{13} ‘Urgospel’ hypotheses were also advocated, among others, by Gotthold Ephraim Lessing (1784), Johann Gottfried Eichhorn (1794), Herbert Marsh (1801) and Karl Lachmann (1835).\textsuperscript{14} The distinctive feature of such hypotheses is the assertion of an earlier (now lost) written document (or documents) which became the primary source for the later written canonical Gospels (see figure 1.1b). Johann Gottfried Herder (1796) provides perhaps the earliest example of the third category (‘oral tradition’ hypotheses) in which he argues for a primitive Urgospel (dated ca. 34–40 C.E.) as the source for Mark, Luke, and Aramaic Matthew (all prior to 70 C.E.) (see figure 1.1c). He differs from Lessing and Eichhorn, however, in that the Urgospel was understood to be oral.\textsuperscript{15}

This three-fold division is not absolutely insofar as many hypotheses combine elements from two or more categories such as Herder’s ‘oral tradition’ hypothesis including the direct influence of written Mark and Aramaic Matthew upon Luke, and of all three upon Greek Matthew (figure 1.1c). This is similarly so with Lessing’s proto-gospel hypothesis (which includes an oral tradition component) along with the more elaborate combination theories of Karl Credner in 1836 (combines primitive sources, oral Urgospel and direct utilization) and Heinrich Ewald in


\textsuperscript{12}For this information and the brief survey in the remainder of this paragraph I am here dependent upon the following: Kloppenborg, \textit{Excavating Q}, 267–328; Dungan, \textit{History}, 323–26; and Farmer, \textit{Synoptic Problem}, 1–35.

\textsuperscript{13}Dungan, \textit{History}, 323.


\textsuperscript{15}See Kloppenborg, \textit{Excavating Q}, 278–79.
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1848 (a 10 document hypothesis). The three categories nevertheless identify three essential features that can be used to describe any given hypothesis, whether in a more pure (e.g., Griesbach) or mixed (e.g., Herder) form, including those of the modern era.

1.2.2 Early Twentieth Century Developments

Despite the wide variety of hypotheses important German (Heinrich Julius Holtzmann) and Swiss (Paul Wernle) contributions from the late nineteenth and early twentieth century were part of an influential and growing trend toward favoring two basic tenets of the 2DH, namely Markan priority and the direct utilization of Mark (alongside an additional sayings source) by Matthew and Luke. Explicit support for this growing consensus came from a long standing seminar (between 1894 and 1910) conducted by a group of Oxford scholars under the leadership of William Sanday. When introducing the published series of essays arising from the seminar Sanday noted strong general support for the 2DH (i.e., Markan priority and Q) with only partial dissent in two essays (those of Willoughby Allen and J. Vernon Bartlet). The difference of opinion was so small, according to Sanday, that “the skepticism that exists in some quarters” that “the whole problem would never be brought to a conclusion” is no longer necessary. Despite the importance of the seminar, however, it was the subsequent publication of one particular member that proved especially influential in twentieth century English SP scholarship, namely Burnett Hillman Streeter’s *The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins, Treating of the Manuscript Tradition, Sources, Authorship, and Dates.* Alongside extensive discussions of textual

---

16 On these latter two see Kloppenborg, *Excavating Q*, 289 and 297.
17 For further discussion of the history and many more examples of SP hypotheses from this era see, for example, Kloppenborg, *Excavating Q*, 271–312 and Farmer, *Synoptic Problem*, 1–35.
19 In particular note the publications of Sir John C. Hawkins, *Horae Synopticae: Contributions to the Study of the Synoptic Problem* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1899) and W. Sanday, ed., *Studies in the Synoptic Problem* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1911). According to Farmer the seminar met nine times per year during this 16 year period and as such he calls it the “most sustained literary-critical project on record” (*Synoptic Problem*, 60).
21 Sanday, “Introductory,” xi-xii.
criticism, authorship, date and provenance, Streeter defends a four source hypothesis, essentially consisting of the 2DH with additional written sources (M and L) providing the special Matthean and Lukan material. While the theory of additional sources (M and L) has not been well received in subsequent scholarship, the basic 2DH tenets of Markan priority and Q have had a lasting influence. Streeter’s publication, according to William Farmer and David Dungan, represents the final nail in the coffin in a long line of political and theological resistance to the (otherwise superior) theory of Griesbach, a resistance based primarily on its association with the suspiciously regarded German scholar F. C. Baur. Quite apart from the validity of these particular historical judgments there is no questioning the overwhelming support for the 2DH during the early to mid-twentieth century. This is particularly true of German and English scholarship as seen, for example, in form and redaction critical works which invariably proceed on the assumption of the 2DH (or something close to it). The popularity of the 2DH is famously reflected in some over-confident assertions regarding its veracity. Hence while in 1910 Sanday could refer to Markan priority as the “most assured result” of the previous fifty to sixty years of critical evaluation, by 1955 Philip Vielhauer wrote that “source critical analysis of the

---


24Streeter’s volume, according to Farmer, “should be regarded as the final legacy of the Oxford Seminar” (*Synoptic Problem*, 63). According to Dungan it “silenced the opposition for decades” (*History*, 370). What Dungan appears to mean by this is not that there was a total absence of dissenters but that their voices were not heard.


26Even to this day it is probably the most popular hypothesis among New Testament scholars.


Gospels has in fact reached its goal in the Two-Source Theory,”\(^{29}\) and in 1968 Willi Marxsen confidently declared that the “Two-Source Theory has been so widely accepted by scholars that one feels inclined to abandon the term ‘theory.’”\(^{30}\)

### 1.2.3 Post WWII Developments and Challenges to the 2DH

Despite such confident assertions, however, the 2DH has never been completely free of dissenting voices some of which have gained significant momentum in the last fifty to sixty years.\(^{31}\) Hence, for example, Markan priority was challenged by Bishop Christopher Butler in his 1951 defense of the so-called ‘Augustinian hypothesis’ in which he posits direct literary dependence among the Gospels but according to their canonical order.\(^{32}\) According to Dungan, Butler’s exposé of Streeter’s faulty logic (especially in defending Markan priority by appeal to pericope order, which Butler famously labeled a “schoolboyish error”) represents a turning point in modern SP discussion associated with the abandonment of ‘Streetarian’ logic even among some 2DH proponents.\(^{33}\) While Butler’s hypothesis gained little support, however, the situation was different following William Farmer’s 1964 publication of *The Synoptic Problem: A Critical Analysis*. Having himself experienced something of a ‘conversion’ away from Markan priority (at least partly influenced by Butler), Farmer offers his own history and critique of the 2DH along with a renewed defense of the Griesbach Hypothesis (2GH). Farmer not only went on to publish many related articles and books but attracted a like-minded team of researchers.\(^{34}\) The

\(^{29}\)Cited in Dungan, *History*, 341.

\(^{30}\)Marxsen, *Introduction*, 118. For more examples of the same see Stoldt, *History*, 261.


\(^{32}\)I.e. Matthew is written first and is abbreviated in Mark. Luke then uses both Matthew and Mark. See Butler, *The Originality of St. Matthew: A Critique of the Two-Document Hypothesis* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1951). Note, however, Kloppenborg’s caution in speaking about an ‘Augustinian hypothesis’ insofar as Augustine himself may not have been speaking of literary dependence at all (*Excavating Q*, 38).

\(^{33}\)See Dungan, *History*, 370–71. In particular he cites the works of Frans Neirynck and Christopher Tuckett.

\(^{34}\)This group self identifies as the “International Institute for the Renewal of Gospel Studies” and “an international, ecumenical, research institute focussed on all aspects of Gospel studies.” From the 1970’s forward they generated
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most important contributions of this team, representing a collaborative effort over several decades, are two volumes defending first *Luke’s Use of Matthew* (1996)\(^{35}\) and then *Mark’s Use of Matthew and Luke* (2002).\(^{36}\) This has resulted in the 2GH being a leading contender in the contemporary SP debate.\(^{37}\)


\(^{35}\)McNicol et al., *Q Impasse*.

\(^{36}\)Peabody et al., *One Gospel*.

\(^{37}\)For other publications see the bibliography in the two volumes just cited.

\(^{38}\)Noting here the (apparently valid) complaints of Mark Goodacre about the general lack of recognition afforded the FH during the past 50 years (e.g., Goodacre, “A Monopoly on Marcan Priority? Fallacies at the Heart of Q,” in *Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers* [Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2000], 583–622).


exemplified in a recent series of essays edited by Goodacre and Nicholas Perrin. The result has been to position the so-called Farrer Hypothesis (FH) alongside the 2GH as a major contender in recent SP discussion.

While it should be noted that other voices have made significant contributions to the SP debate during the past fifty years, the 2GH and FH have provided the most consistent and sustained alternative to the 2DH which, despite dissenting voices, continues to have ardent supporters (albeit with less propensity to over-confidence and sometimes with modification in light of challenges) and is probably still the preferred hypothesis among the majority of New Testament scholars. The importance of these three hypotheses is evidenced not only by the

---

42Questioning Q: A Multidimensional Critique. This volume includes contributions from various scholars who call into question the Q hypothesis.
44Of particular note are the various versions of the so-called Multi-Stage hypothesis typically associated with French Roman Catholic scholars such as Léon Vagany (Le problème synoptique: un hypothèse de travail, Bibliothèque de théologie, série 3: Théologie biblique 1. [Tournai: Desclée, 1954]) and Marie-Émile Boismard (e.g., “The Two-Source Theory at an Impasse,” NTS 26 [1980]: 1–17). Indeed the latter was a key representative at the landmark 1984 Jerusalem conference on Synoptic Interrelations for which see the collected essays in David L. Dungan, ed., The Interrelations of the Gospels: A Symposium Led by M.-É. Boismard, W. R. Farmer, F. Neirynck. Jerusalem 1984., BETL 95 (Leuven: Leuven University Press and Peeters, 1990a). Also of note are alternatives to the FH (agreeing on Markan priority and denial of Q) in which Luke is placed second and Matthew comes last (directly utilizing Mark and Luke). For variations of the latter see the following: H. Philip West, “A Primitive Version of Luke in the Composition of Matthew,” NTS 14 (1967–68): 75–95; Ronald V. Huggins, “Matthean Posteriority: A Preliminary Proposal,” NovT 24, no. 1 (1992): 1–22; Erik Aurelius, “Gottesvolk und Außenseiter: Eine Geheime Beziehung Lukas - Mattathäus,” NTS 47 (2001): 428–41; and Martin Hengel, The Four Gospels and the One Gospel of Jesus (London: SCM Press, 2000), 169–207. While a variety of other theories could be mentioned here (including, for example, a Jerusalem school which argues for Lukan priority) none have gained the degree of support offered the 2GH or FH. The Multi-Stage hypothesis is a possible exception (given especially its prominent presence at the Jerusalem conference) but there seems to have been little ongoing support for the hypothesis of late.
many publications in support of them but also by their representation at major conferences related to the SP\textsuperscript{47} of which the most recent was the *Oxford Conference on the Synoptic Problem* (April 2008) whose published essays\textsuperscript{48} coincide with the centenary of William Sanday’s 1911 publication. The papers from this conference focused on reviewing the last one hundred years of debate paying particular attention to methodology with a view to discussing how the debate should proceed in the future. The primary hypotheses discussed were the 2GH, the FH and the 2DH. For these various reasons, along with the constraints of space, these three hypotheses have been selected for the comparison being undertaken in this thesis (see figure 1.2).\textsuperscript{49}

While being far from comprehensive,\textsuperscript{50} this brief outline of the history of SP research has highlighted the general contours of the debate in the past two hundred years thereby setting this thesis in its historical context and providing reasons for my selection of the three hypotheses under consideration (namely, the 2DH, 2GH, and FH).

\subsection*{1.3 Miracle Tradition and the Synoptic Problem: A Lacuna}

While the isolation of these three hypotheses provides a manageable focus, the wide range of potential issues relating to SP discussion requires some additional specificity.\textsuperscript{51} In this regard I

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item Testament scholarship in general a superficial perusal of commentaries and New Testament Introductions indicates the ongoing popularity of the 2DH.
\item For example, the Ampleforth Conferences of 1982 and 1983, the Jerusalem Symposium on “Interrelations of the Gospels” (1984), and the Göttingen Conference on “the Minor Agreements” (1991), each of which has given rise to published essays. For a list of these and other conferences see Dungan, *History*, 375–8. Notably the FH was not clearly represented at the 1984 conference where the three major players were the 2GH, the 2DH and Boismard’s Multi-Stage hypothesis. The latter, however, seems to have had far fewer (vocal) advocates in recent years and was not represented at the 2008 Oxford conference (on which see below).
\item I am not thereby suggesting they represent the ‘best’ hypotheses nor does that automatically or logically follow from their greater visibility in scholarly literature and conferences but insofar as my focus is to compare the relative plausibility of currently viable hypotheses they provide the most obvious candidates.
\item I have omitted, for example, the role of theological and political debate in favoring particular hypotheses such as Farmer’s claim that the 2DH dominance was almost entirely owing to historical and theological circumstances as opposed to any the literary-critical merit of the hypothesis itself. Such argumentation has been especially common among supporters of the 2GH but for arguments on both sides see, for example, the following: Farmer, *Synoptic Problem*; Dungan, *History*; Stoldt, *History*; Kloppenborg, *Excavating Q*; Tuckett, “19th Century”; Fuller, “Baur Versus Hilgenfeld”. Other omissions include unmentioned hypotheses, important authors, the role of the Gospel of John etc. Methodology in SP argumentation will be discussed in chapter 2.
\item The variety of issues pertaining to SP discussion is well illustrated by published papers from the 2008 Oxford Conference (Foster et al., eds., *New Studies*) of which examples are as follows: synopsis construction; the nature of
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
have chosen to examine the SP from the particular perspective of the miracle tradition which, in my estimation, represents a lacuna in SP research. Miracle narratives are inevitably considered in broadly based discussions of the SP\(^{52}\) and frequently appear in relation to particular issues such as the phenomenon of order;\(^{53}\) Minor Agreements,\(^{54}\) rhetoric,\(^{55}\) and ancient literary practices.\(^{56}\) They also appear in general discussions of directional dependence,\(^{57}\) redactional plausibility,\(^{58}\) and miracle related tradition.\(^{59}\) Indeed miracle tradition was the focus of discussion in contributions by Frans Neirynck (Matt 4:23–11:1) and Marie-Émile Boismard (Matt 14:13-14 par.; Mark 1:40-45 par.) at the landmark 1984 Jerusalem conference.\(^{60}\) Despite these important contributions, however, I am not aware of any systematic attempt to examine the SP exclusively from the perspective of miracle tradition\(^{61}\) and this despite large volumes of secondary literature on the latter, which for the most part assume rather than discuss (when mentioned) SP

---


\(^{54}\)E.g. 4 out of 12 Minor Agreements discussed by Michael Goulder involve miracle tradition (“On Putting Q to the Test,” *NTS* 24 [1978a]: 218–34, noting numbers 1, 2, 3, and 6).


\(^{60}\)The essays appear in Dungan (The *Interrelations of the Gospels*) as follows: Neirynck, “Matthew 4:23–5:2 and the Matthean Composition of 4:23–11:1” (pp. 23-46) and “Response to the Multi-Stage Hypothesis” (pp. 81-107); Boismard, “Introduction au premier récit de la multiplication des pains” (pp 244-53) and “La guérison du lépreux” (pp.254-58).

I propose, therefore, that given the extent of the Gospel miracle tradition along with the extensive analysis of it to date, it provides an under-explored but valuable lens through which to test our three different SP hypotheses.

1.4 The Conventions of Ancient Rhetoric in Relation to Narrative

While the identified lacuna in relation to a systematic treatment of Gospel miracle traditions in relation to the SP provides sufficient basis to proceed with this thesis, an equally vital consideration relates to the methodology that will be employed. The assumed inter-dependence among the Synoptic Gospels for each of our chosen hypotheses (2DH, 2GH, and FH) implies distinct redactional procedures for each of the evangelists, procedures that obviously differ depending which hypothesis is adopted. This makes it possible to assess the relative plausibility of the implied redactional procedures associated with our three hypotheses. In order to assess redactional plausibility, without being governed entirely by subjective bias, I plan to appeal to known ancient conventions of narrative reproduction and adaptation. In this regard I will appeal to ancient rhetorical handbooks along with the observable practices of ancient authors (in utilizing known sources) in order to discern rhetorical conventions that governed such narrative reproduction and adaptation. Insofar as we may reasonably assume that such conventions influenced the writing of the Synoptic Gospels the same conventions can be used to assess the relative plausibility of the implied redactional (adaptational) procedure of the evangelists in relation to each of our chosen hypotheses. This said it is nevertheless true that SP methodology has rightly been the subject of much scrutiny and debate in recent decades and, as such, this

thesis is as much concerned with methodology as with identifying any of the three hypotheses as more or less plausible that its counterparts. With this in mind, therefore, the following chapter will outline various issues related to SP methodology while also providing a more detailed defense and explanation of the approach being undertaken here.

1.5 Conclusion: The Starting Point for a Thesis

In conclusion it may be stated that the relationship between the Synoptic Gospels, in terms of their interdependence and/or common dependence upon oral and/or (lost) written sources, has generated much debate during the last two centuries. Despite the apparent hegemony of the 2DH, during the early part of the twentieth century, important alternative theories have gained significant momentum during the past fifty to sixty years. In particular the 2GH and FH have been highlighted as two primary contenders, each having plenty of support among the published literature. These three hypotheses (2DH, 2GH, and FH) have therefore been selected for comparison in this thesis, which will seek to assess their relative plausibility in relation to their implied redaction of the Gospel miracle traditions (an identified lacuna in SP research). The relative plausibility of the implied redactional procedures will be assessed on the basis of ancient rhetorical conventions as found in handbooks and as demonstrated in practice by ancient authors (namely Josephus and Plutarch). Before proceeding with the analysis, however, it is first necessary to provide the theoretical underpinnings for the methodology being adopted here. This will be the focus of the following chapter.
Figure 1.1: Synoptic Problem Solutions in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries

Figure 1.1a: Direct Utilization Hypothesis (Griesbach)

Figure 1.1b: Proto-Gospel Hypothesis (Eichhorn)

Figure 1.1c: Oral Gospel Hypothesis (Herder)
Figure 1.2: Three Contemporary Synoptic Hypotheses

Figure 1.2a: The Two-Gospel Hypothesis (2GH)

Figure 1.2b: The Farrer Hypothesis (FH)

Figure 1.2c: The Two-Document Hypothesis (2DH)
Chapter 2: Establishing a Methodology for Assessing Synoptic Hypotheses

2.1 Introductory Comments

Foundational to all SP discussion is an assumption of *literary* interdependence either directly among the Gospels or in relation to a common source. This assumption rests on at least two observations about the synoptic data:¹ First is the high level of verbatim agreement in the (Greek) wording of several parallel pericopes which, given the inherent flexibility of the Greek language, is inexplicable by any other hypothesis.² Second is the extensive agreement in

---

¹For example, see Kloppenborg (*Excavating Q*, 18), Kümmel (*Introduction*, 42–44), Burton (*Principles*, 12–14). Robert Stein adds two more reasons to those listed: (1) the presence of parallel parenthetical material such as “let the reader understand” (Mark 13:14 and Matt 24:15); (2) the mention of prior written documents in Luke’s prologue (*The Synoptic Problem: An Introduction* [Grand Rapids, MI.: Baker, 1987], 29–44).

²For example see Kloppenborg, *Excavating Q*, 18 who adduces the following examples: (a) Matt 12:43-45 (60 words) + Luke 11:24-26 (54 words) = 50 words identical; (b) Matt 21:12-13 (45 words) + Mark 11:15-17 (65 words) = 37 words identical; (c) Mark 13:30-32 (49 words) + Luke 21:32-33 (50 words) = 40 words identical. Such agreement is all the more remarkable for traditions that originated in Aramaic. While theories of independence have been proposed (e.g., Linnemann, *Is There a Synoptic Problem?: Biblical Criticism on Trial*, trans. R. Yarbrough, reprint, 1990 [Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, 2001], 18–73), the most serious challenge to ‘literary dependence’ comes from those who argue, to a greater or lesser degree, for the influence of oral tradition especially as an explanation for low verbal agreement. The distinction between ‘literary’ (high verbatim agreement) and ‘oral’ (low verbatim agreement) is seen, for example, in Hawkin’s (*Horae Synopticae*, 42–63) and Burton (*Principles*, 4–5), more recently in James Dunn (“Altering the Default Setting: Re-Envisaging the Early Transmission of the Jesus Tradition,” *NTS* 59 [2003]: 139–75; *Jesus Remembered* [Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2003]) and Terrence Mournet (*Oral Tradition and Literary Dependence: Variability and Stability in the Synoptic Tradition and Q*, WUNT II/195 [Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005]), and in recent SP argumentation (e.g., for Mark Goodacre’s suggestion that oral tradition helps to deal with a difficulty in Goulder’s presentation of the FH see his Goulder and the Gospels: *An Examination of a New Paradigm*, JSNTSup [Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996], 284–6). There are difficulties, however, with a facile appeal to oral tradition to explain cases of low verbal agreement. First, there is no agreed up on model of oral tradition for the transmission of Jesus tradition (for a summary of various models see, for example, Michael F. Bird, “The Formation of the Gospels in the Setting of Early Christianity: The Jesus Tradition as Corporate Memory,” *WTJ* 67 [2005]: 113–34). Second, low verbatim agreement does not require an appeal to oral tradition insofar as it can be equally well explained by appeal to a more literary-rhetorical model involving “re-oralization” and “composition in performance” (see Kloppenborg, “Variation in the Reproduction of the Double Tradition and an Oral Q?” *ETL* 83/1 [2007]: 53–80). Closely related to this is the rhetorical transformation of written sources in association with the ancient practice of aemulatio (see, for example, Kloppenborg, “The Reception of the Jesus Traditions in James,” in *The Catholic Epistles and the Tradition*, J. Schlosser, BETL, Vol. 176 [Leuven: Uitgeverij Peeters, 2004], 93–139), Third, appeals to oral tradition typically maintain a sharp distinction between oral and written influences upon the evangelists which fails to recognize the much closer relationship between oral/aural and written transmission of ancient traditions. In this regard Alan Kirk points to the importance of manuscript memorization in ancient scribal culture along with issues of rhetorical transformation of those traditions that are not “whimsical” or “random” but rather “strategic” (see Alan Kirk, “Memory, Scribal Media and the Synoptic Problem,” in *New Studies in the Synoptic Problem: Oxford Conference, April 2011: Essays in Honour of Christopher M. Tuckett*, ed. Paul Foster, Andrew Gregory, John S. Kloppenborg, and Joseph Verheyden, BETL 239 [Leuven; Paris; Walpole, MA: Uitgeverij Peeters, 2011], words cited from 467). These observations do not rule out the possibility (or even probability) that oral tradition played a role in the transmission and textualization of Jesus traditions in the Gospels. The point, however, is that oral tradition (whatever
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pericope order despite frequent lack of intrinsic reasons for that order.\(^3\) While the similarities are sufficient to imply dependence, however, it is the differences in content, wording and order that give rise to the SP debate as scholars seek to explain these patterns of similarity and difference.\(^4\)

Hence, for example, the data indicates that Mark and Luke commonly agree together (in wording) against Matthew, as do Matthew and Mark against Luke, but far less commonly do Matthew and Luke agree against Mark.\(^5\) Such differences could potentially be explained by theories of independent origin, accidental error, variability in sources (written or oral), or deliberate editorial changes and it is from the discussion of these various possibilities that the SP debate fundamentally arises.

---

\(^3\) Despite chronological order at a macro-level (e.g., birth, baptism, ministry, death etc.), other factors (e.g., topical) seem to govern the arrangement of intervening narrative and teaching material. Stein, for instance, sees the parables of Mark 4 as a collected summary rather than a chronological account (noting Mark 4:33-34) (Synoptic Problem, 34-37) and Kloppenborg sees “no necessary ... reason ... that the Call of Levi/Matthew should follow the healing of the paralytic. Yet it does in all three Synoptics” (Excavating Q, 18). While oral tradition may explain some of the parallels in wording and order, the extent of agreement makes this an implausible explanation for all the similarities. See also previous footnote.

\(^4\) Content is typically divided up into single (unique to one Gospel), double (shared by two Gospels only) and triple (shared by all three Gospels) tradition. While the details are obviously disputable an approximate summary of the data indicates that single tradition accounts for about 20 verses in Mark, 300 in Matthew and 500 in Luke. Double tradition figures amount to about 130 verses (Mark and Matthew), 21 verses (Mark and Luke) and 200 plus verses (Matthew and Luke). Triple tradition amounts to about 498 verses (77 pericopes) out of 661 verses (102 pericopes) in Mark. While differences in wording can be seen, for example, in the Gethsemane pericope where Luke’s account is quite at variance with the other two (Mark 14:32-42; Matt 26:36-46 and Luke 22:40-46), differences in order can be seen in the miracle stories of Matthew 8–9 when compared with Mark and Luke (see chapter 5 for a discussion of order). For brief but clear presentations of some of the differences in order see Kloppenborg, Excavating Q, 18–23 and Stein, Synoptic Problem, 35–36.

\(^5\) In essence this points to Mark as the ‘middle term’ but see below for a discussion of how this observation has played out in SP debate.
2.2 Survey and Evaluation of Methodology in SP Research

In his 1904 article Burton observed that despite “almost numberless” SP theories, “it may be doubted ... whether ... sufficient thought has been given to the formulation of the principles in accordance with which any solution of the problem must of necessity proceed.”\(^6\) Advances have no doubt been made but the problem remains thus requiring careful consideration of method\(^7\) and while the vast and complex array of argumentation precludes a detailed discussion, a brief summary and evaluation will provide the necessary prolegomena to the method of choice in this thesis. In general SP arguments may be either “holistic” or “atomistic” whereby, for example, the former considers broad structural and thematic matters while the latter engages in micro-analysis of individual pericopes.\(^8\) A summary of such arguments could be arranged according to the three hypotheses under consideration or, perhaps better, according to those arguments for and against (1) Markan priority and (2) the Q hypothesis.\(^9\) This, however, not only ignores arguments arising in relation to alternative solutions but, more importantly, overlooks the fact that there are underlying modes of argumentation common to mutually exclusive hypotheses thus failing to address the issue of common principles that Burton rightly identified. I will therefore organize my survey of methodology under the following four heads: (1) parsimony, as a guiding principle; (2) potential pit falls and problems; (3) internal considerations; and (4) external considerations.


\(^7\) It is noteworthy, for example, that in convening the 2008 Oxford Conference on the Synoptic Problem the primary aim was an evaluation of methodology over the past century in order to sharpen the focus of how research should proceed in the future (see, for example, the comments of Kloppenborg in the “Introduction,” Foster et al., eds., *New Studies*, 3). For a general discussion of method see also, for example, Humphrey Palmer, *The Logic of Gospel Criticism: An Account of the Methods and Arguments Used by Textual, Documentary, Source, and Form Critics of the New Testament* (London; Melbourne; Toronto: Macmillan, 1968) and Burton, *Principles*.

\(^8\) Both the terminology and concepts are taken from William O. Walker Jr., “The Son of Man Question and the Synoptic Problem,” in *New Synoptic Studies*, ed. William R. Farmer (Macon, Georgia: Mercer University Press, 1983), 261–301. ‘Holistic’ examples might include Goulder, *Luke* and Peabody et al., *One Gospel* both of which seek to provide a broad level defense of a particular hypothesis. Alternatively entire discussions arise in regard to specific aspects of the SP debate such as the Q hypothesis or Minor Agreements which may be at a macro- or micro-level (e.g., Goulder, “Two Significant Minor Agreements [Mat. 4:13 Par.; Mat 26:67–68 Par.],” *NovT* 45 [2003]: 365–73).

\(^9\) For a convenient collection of articles organized according to these two categories see Bellinzoni, ed., *The Two-Source Hypothesis: A Critical Appraisal*. 
2.2.1 Parsimony: A Guiding Principle in SP Argumentation?

According to Kloppenborg the “controlling logical principle for all Synoptic Problem-related investigations is the principle of parsimony or Ockham’s razor ... ‘causes should not be multiplied except by necessity.’”\(^{10}\) Thus Kloppenborg (as a 2DH proponent) critiques the complex hypothesis of Léon Vagany insofar as it explains all the Synoptic data but “is predicated on possible, but hardly necessary or even probable assumptions” and “ignores much simpler solutions.”\(^{11}\) Likewise Boismard’s solution, albeit “based more securely on ... internal evidence” (i.e. Synoptic data), involves positing explanations that are “possible but unnecessarily complex.”\(^{12}\) As an example Kloppenborg discusses Boismard’s solution to the phenomenon of “major doublets” with specific reference to the Markan miracle of the loaves (Mark 6:30-44 and 8:1-10 along with parallels). Boismard implies Markan conflation of “A” (Mark 6) and “B” (Mark 8) by Mark\(^{\text{int}}\) (‘int’ = intermediate) while also implying that Matthew’s doublet arises from his use of both “A” (via Matt\(^{\text{int}}\)) and Mark.\(^{\text{int}}\) As Kloppenborg points out, however, since the Matthean doublet “can be explained from Mark\(^{\text{int}}\) alone, there is no reason to posit an earlier version of Matthew.”\(^{13}\) The 2GH and FH proponents also appeal to parsimony in rejecting complex hypotheses with hypothetical sources.\(^{14}\) These two hypotheses, however, are equally

\(^{10}\)Excavating Q, 66 (emphasis added).
\(^{11}\)Excavating Q, 43–46 (quote from 46). Kloppenborg also critiques Vagany for making patristic statements his starting point rather than internal Synoptic data (ibid., 45).
\(^{12}\)See ibid., 46-50 for Kloppenborg’s discussion of Boismard (quotes from 46 and 50).
\(^{13}\)Ibid., 50. He also points out how Matt\(^{\text{int}}\) must have lacked the second account given that Luke (who was using Matt\(^{\text{int}}\) as his principal source) lacks it. This fails to explain the Lukan omission, however, given that proto-Luke had access to “B” (containing the second account) and final Luke had access to Mark\(^{\text{int}}\) (containing both accounts). If reasons can be posited for Luke’s great omission (Mark 6:45-8:26) from “B” or Mark\(^{\text{int}}\) then it is unnecessary to posit Matt\(^{\text{int}}\) for its omission. In essence Boismard’s positing of earlier sources to explain this doublet creates unnecessary complexity for a phenomenon that is as readily explicable by simpler solutions involving direct utilization. A more recent complex solution is suggested in Delbert Burkett, Rethinking the Gospel Sources: From Proto-Mark to Mark (New York: T & T Clark International, 2004). For critique and comments see Tuckett, “The Current State of the Synoptic Problem,” in New Studies in the Synoptic Problem: Oxford Conference, April 2011: Essays in Honour of Christopher M. Tuckett, ed. Paul Foster, Andrew Gregory, John S. Kloppenborg, and Joseph Verheyden, BETL 239 (Leuven; Paris; Walpole, MA: Uitgeverij Peeters, 2011), 10–18 and D. Neville, “The Phantom Returns: Delbert Burkett’s Rehabilitation of Proto-Mark,” ETL 84 (2008): 135–73.
\(^{14}\)Thus Farmer (2GH) states that “Only after the investigator has been unable to understand the relationship between Matthew, Mark, Luke without appealing to unknown sources is he justified in hypothesizing the existence of such sources, in order to explain phenomenon otherwise inexplicable”(Synoptic Problem, 209). Stoldt similarly dispenses with proto-Gospel hypotheses in favor of direct utilization (History, 1–23). Alternatively Goulder appeals to parsimony in defending the FH (Luke, 23–26) and says of Boismard’s Multi-Stage hypothesis that “lost editions are
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parsimonious (both involving simple direct utilization without appeal to hypothetical sources) yet mutually contradictory (one posits Markan priority and the other Markan posteriority). While parsimony, therefore, may be an important consideration in SP discussions, it is not the sole arbiter between competing solutions.\textsuperscript{15} Kloppenborg himself concludes his discussion of parsimony by stating that the best hypotheses “are those that are judged to offer the most economical and most plausible account of the largest number of data.”\textsuperscript{16} This recognizes the importance of plausibility alongside parsimony (economy) when evaluating competing hypotheses. Hence, for example, while parsimony alone favors direct utilization (e.g., 2GH and FH), these simple hypotheses imply sophisticated and “creative theologizing” on the part of the evangelists upon whose shoulders rests all of the creative reworking of their sources.\textsuperscript{17} While such creativity is possible, its plausibility requires demonstration.\textsuperscript{18} This is a matter of historical and literary plausibilities as opposed to mere parsimony. Parsimony, therefore, may well be the

\textsuperscript{15}In an important qualifier to his statements about parsimony Kloppenborg calls it “a virtue of explanatory logic” and “not a feature of historical or literary realities” (Excavating Q, 51). He goes on to say that, as such, “competing explanations ... are ... unlikely to represent precisely or fully the actual compositional processes of the gospels.” Thus even though he argues for the 2DH he says “it should not be confused with a description of ‘what happened.’ Hypotheses are heuristic models intended to aid comprehension and discovery; they do not replicate reality.” That said he still contends that “simple solutions are more desirable than complex solutions for the reason that the more variables a hypothesis includes, the greater the number of equivalent hypotheses at the same level of complexity, and the more difficult it is to demonstrate the superiority of any one hypothesis.” “This”, he says, “is precisely the logical difficulty with Boismard’s hypothesis: even if it were right it would be impossible to demonstrate its correctness” (ibid., 50-51).

\textsuperscript{16}Excavating Q, 54. Emphasis added.

\textsuperscript{17}Excavating Q, 53-54.

\textsuperscript{18}According to Kloppenborg such a view of the evangelists comes readily to the modern day creative scholarly mindset but requires justification as a plausible way of seeing the first century evangelists (Excavating Q, 53-54). Alternately he critiques the complex hypotheses for the opposite problem whereby the final editors are mere compilers and collectors engaged in “simple combining and arranging of preexisting sources and traditions.” This is a similarly unproven assumption in the realm of historical and literary plausibilities. Furthermore it lessens the heuristic value of the hypothesis in terms of speaking about the evangelist’s creative use of the text insofar as all such transformations are ultimately pushed back upon prior hypothetical stages. In essence the hypothesis of multiple stages and hypothetical documents is “a priori no less (or more) probable than the assumption of direct utilization” but this only “pushes back the question, ‘how did the differences arise?’ to a pre-gospel level” (ibid., 50).
‘controlling logical principle’ in SP discussions but historical and literary realities (as far as they can be detected) may indicate that the most plausible solution is not the most economical.  

2.2.2 Potential Pitfalls and Problems

In addition to the possibility of an overzealous application of parsimony a number of potential pitfalls arise in SP discussions, the first of which has to do with the researcher’s assumptions and presuppositions. Subjectivism and theological self-interest (especially related to questions about the historical Jesus) have frequently been identified as motivating factors overriding (purportedly more objective) literary critical observations. As Nicholas Perrin rightly points out, however, “it is naïve in the extreme to suppose that historians can proceed entirely apart from self-interest” whereby “intellectual honesty requires at least passing recognition of the fact that historical theories, like scientific theories in general, are sometimes convincing at a given point in time not because they possess inherent and overwhelming explanatory power, but because they are convenient.”

The extent, therefore, to which everyone proceeds with theological self-interest (presuppositions) not only precludes claims of ‘disinterested objectivity’ but also requires avoidance of straw man and *ad hominem* arguments that reject a hypothesis owing to the

---

19. Economy alone would immediately remove the 2DH from our chosen group of three hypotheses but would likewise leave us with a logical stalemate in comparing the equally economical 2GH and FH. This alone points to the need for more factors than economy.


perceived subjectivity or theological bias of its adherents. Insofar as informed opinion about the SP must take into account a large amount of data and make value judgments on a multitude of arguments objectivity is certainly an ideal to strive for. None, however, operates without bias or subjectivity at some level.

Additional pitfalls arise in relation to our presentation of synoptic data. Not only do problems arise in clearly establishing the data itself but its arrangement in the form of synopses has been claimed to favor certain hypotheses.26 While the claim that certain synopses are systematically...
biased is likely overstated, however, synopsis construction involves multiple decisions about data presentation and so the potential for built bias (especially at a micro-level) must be born in mind. Additional problems arise when data is presented from the perspective of a particular hypothesis (thereby assuming the conclusion that is to be proven) or as if it were an argument in itself when in reality the opposite conclusions could be drawn. Streeter exemplifies both the former, when he presents his “fundamental solution” from the perspective of Markan priority, and the latter, when he presents the percentage overlap between Matthew and Mark as if it were evidence for Markan priority when at most it indicates the fact of dependence but not its nature.


27 *Four Gospels*, 151–98.
(either direct or indirect through a common third document) or direction. Michael Goulder evidences similar circularity when he argues that Luke’s redistribution of Matthew’s Sermon on the Mount (a classic problem for the FH) results from his dislike of “long units.” As Kloppenborg points out, however, Goulder merely restates the problem by making an observation “about Luke’s aesthetic preferences” while presupposing what he seeks to conclude, namely that Luke used Matthew. Aesthetic judgments likewise play into observations about the data, such as when one Gospel is taken to have a superior structure to another without recourse to any external arbitrating reference by which the relative merits of differing literary structures may be judged. Such aesthetic arguments are clearly reversible as, for example, when Pierson Parker argues for Markan posteriority on the basis of, among other things, Mark’s uniquely negative view of the disciples. It is equally (if not more) plausible, however, to imagine that the negative views in Mark have been made more positive by Matthew and Luke. Additional pitfalls arise from the failure to countenance more than one viable alternative to a given

29 Streeter (Four Gospels, 159–60) points out that whereas Matthew has 90% of the content of Mark, the latter has only 56% of the content of the former with the implied logic that had Mark been copying Matthew it is inexplicable that he would leave out so much content. See critiques in the following: Joseph A. Fitzmyer, “The Priority of Mark and the ‘Q’ Source in Luke,” in To Advance the Gospel: New Testament Studies (New York: Crossroad, 1981), 5–6; Dungan, “Critique of the Main Arguments for Mark’s Priority as Formulated by B. H. Streeter,” in The Two-Source Hypothesis: A Critical Appraisal, ed. Arthur J. Bellinzo (Macon, Georgia: Mercer University Press, 1985), 144–45. Goodacre offers a similar critique in his review of McNicol et al., Q Impasse. He specifically critiques the “rhetorical strategy” of this book whereby it “sometimes simply delivers data - the evidence, it is thought, is so overwhelming, that it speaks for itself” - but in reality avoids disputation with opponents (“Beyond the Q Impasse,” esp. 36–40, emphasis added).

30 Cited in Kloppenborg, Excavating Q, 16.

31 Kloppenborg notes that plausibility would be increased if the tendency to shorten speeches was demonstrated to be a trait elsewhere in Luke-Acts, which is something Kloppenborg himself denies to be true (Excavating Q, 16). Goodacre critiques the 2GH proponents in a similar fashion (regarding circularity and assuming the conclusion to be proven) with respect to their presentation Luke’s use of Matthew (“Beyond the Q Impasse,” 40–42).

32 See for example Stoldt’s statement that “there can no doubt that the less perfect and less organized accounts ... are those of Matthew and Luke” so much so that they transformed the “well organized, consistent, ‘polished’ account of Mark into one that is disorganized, disjointed, poorly composed, and, in short, ‘rough’” (History, 158). Similar sentiments occur in relation to judging the relative good and bad quality of order in relation to Matthew-Luke double tradition (for example see the discussion in Goodacre, Against Q, 81–104).

33 Pierson Parker, “The Posteriority of Mark.”

34 Similarly Stoldt takes implied omissions from Mark by Matthew and Luke (upon the assumption of Markan priority) as evidence for the opposite, namely Markan posteriority (History, 1–23), meanwhile failing to acknowledge the difficulties that many others find in relation to the exact opposite phenomenon of explaining Markan omissions upon the assumption of Markan posteriority (e.g., Goodacre, Against Q, 28–43). In either case our judgments need to be more than merely aesthetic.
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hypothesis, such as when Markan posteriority is presented as the only viable alternative to the 2DH,\(^{35}\) or from appeals to *Brauchbarkeit* (usefulness or utility).\(^{36}\) It is unrealistic to suppose that such pitfalls can be completely avoided but an awareness of them can at least reduce their impact as we consciously seek to present data in a more neutral manner and utilize other external factors as arbitrators in the discussion.\(^{37}\)

2.2.3 Arguments Based on Internal Considerations

SP arguments in general may be based on either (1) internal (synoptic alone) or (2) external (e.g., patristic) data. Internal arguments may be conveniently sub-divided into those based on (1) statistics, (2) patterns of agreement and disagreement, and (3) redactional plausibility. Insofar as SP arguments are based on the synoptic data alone they are subject to all the pitfalls mentioned above but they cannot proceed without reference to internal data and, to that extent alone, a more careful consideration of internal arguments is required.

While Streeter’s faulty statistical argument for Markan priority (based on overlapping content) has already been noted, more complex statistical analyses have been used to

---

\(^{35}\)Goodacre, for example, critiques many 2GH and 2DH proponents for ignoring the FH as a viable alternative ("A Monopoly on Marcan Priority?"). Stoldt illustrates the problem when he equates the Markan hypothesis (i.e. Markan priority) with the 2DH and assumes that the problems posed by MAs provide key evidence for Markan posteriority (*History*, 1-23) when in fact (as per the FH) they related to the Q question but the not the issue of Markan priority or posteriority. It could be said that similar (faulty) assumptions are built into Farmer’s classic critique of the 2DH (*Synoptic Problem*). Such myopia is at some level excusable as a product of historical circumstance (where certain hypotheses are more favored at certain times) and the reality that not every possible solution can be considered in each discussion.

\(^{36}\)Hence, for example, Fitzmyer argues that while “we cannot hope for a definite and certain solution” (insofar as it has not been brought about by 150 years of scholarly discussion), one reason to favor the 2DH is its proven usefulness (e.g., in relation to redaction-critical studies of the Gospels) (“Priority of Mark”, esp. 3-5). While its usefulness cannot be denied, within the confines of the SP debate proper this is to put the cart before the horse.

\(^{37}\)The complete elimination of circularity and subjectivity is, therefore, probably an impossible (and perhaps undesirable) goal. Researchers nevertheless need to take steps to acknowledge subjectivity and reduce circularity as much as possible. In his critique of Goodacre, after acknowledging that aesthetic preferences inevitably find their way into SP discussion, Kloppenborg states: “I would not wish to claim that the Synoptic problem comes down to aesthetic preferences that cannot be further justified. On the contrary, I wish only to point out that there is an irreducible aesthetic component in Synoptic arguments.” At the same time he points out the problems of aesthetic preferences being invoked in support of mutually exclusive theses (such as Goodacre’s claim to superior structure in Luke versus the claim of others to superior structure in Matthew) and states that the fact “intelligent organization can be seen in both Matthew and Luke does not assist in deciding directions of dependence” (“On Dispensing with Q?: Goodacre on the Relation of Luke to Matthew,” *NTS* 49 [2003]: 210–36, esp. 231).
Chapter 2 Establishing a Methodology

demonstrate the major tenets of the 2DH\textsuperscript{38} and to debate the nature of Q.\textsuperscript{39} Another form of statistical argument, used in favor of Markan posteriority, appeals to linguistic statistics compiled by Eduard Zeller\textsuperscript{40} and C. S. Mann\textsuperscript{41} in which the line of argument may be summarized as follows: “where Gospel A uses a word several times and Gospel B uses the word only once or twice and \textit{only in contexts parallel to those of Gospel A}, one can conclude that B used A.”\textsuperscript{42}

Since Zeller’s statistics indicate 194 words supporting Markan dependence on Matthew and only 82 for the opposite (Mann’s figures are 82 and 17 respectively) this has been taken as conclusive evidence for Markan posteriority.\textsuperscript{43} The argument, however, is flawed in several ways.\textsuperscript{44} First, several words occurring once in Mark and twice in Matthew (or twice in Mark and three times in Matthew) are inappropriately labeled as \textit{characteristically} Matthean.\textsuperscript{45} A better indicator of direction of dependence would be the presence of \textit{parallel phrases} in two Gospels where the phrase is indisputably redactional for one thus implying it to be prior, especially if the phrase is untypical of the other.\textsuperscript{46} In fact the democratic weighing of numbers (Zeller’s 194 versus 82) is

\textsuperscript{38} See A. M. Honoré, “A Statistical Study of the Synoptic Problem,” \textit{NovT} 10 (1968): 95–147. In particular he claims to demonstrate the following: (1) Mark is the main link between Matthew and Luke; (2) Mark was used by both Matthew and Luke; (3) Matthew did not use Luke; (4) Luke did not use Matthew; (5) Matthew and Luke used sources other than Mark (i.e. Q); (6) Q was not a single document.


\textsuperscript{42} As stated by Robert Derrenbacker and Kloppenborg in “Self-Contradiction in the IQP? A Reply to Michael Goulder,” \textit{JBL} 120, no. 1 (2001): esp. 70.

\textsuperscript{43} See Peabody et al. (\textit{One Gospel}, 31) where these statistics are quoted and discussed.

\textsuperscript{44} See especially Derrenbacker and Kloppenborg, “Self-Contradiction”, 70-73.

\textsuperscript{45} Tuckett, “19th Century,” 57, n. 69.

\textsuperscript{46} Derrenbacker and Kloppenborg, “Self-Contradiction,” 71.
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itself problematic insofar as the extent to which Zeller’s vocabulary can be considered genuinely redactional (and thus pointing to direction of dependence) the figures produce “logically contradictory conclusions”\(^{47}\). Finally the possibility cannot be ruled out that vocabulary appearing just a few times in one Gospel was taken over and expanded in its successor Gospel.\(^{48}\) Regarding statistical arguments in general problems can arise from various sources: differing choices about which material to include in analysis;\(^{49}\) decisions about what counts for verbal agreement; or decisions about what percentage of agreement is indicative of direct literary relationship. In addition presuppositions are sometimes adopted without justification\(^{50}\) and there is an obvious ‘human element’ that is lost in such analyses.\(^{51}\) We may conclude that while statistical arguments cannot be ruled out and will probably continue to play a legitimate role in SP argumentation,\(^{52}\) they are not likely to produce an irrefutable solution and should be used with caution.

For arguments based on patterns of agreement and disagreement reversibility is again a problem as with Streeter’s argument for Markan priority based on pericope order (namely that while there are Matthew-Mark agreements against Luke and Luke-Mark agreements against

\(^{47}\) Derrenbacker and Kloppenborg, “Self-Contradiction,” 73. Goodacre in his critique of McNicol et al. likewise points to reversible evidence with respect to the same linguistic argument used as a “one-way indicator” of Luke’s use of Matthew. He argues that their approach is circular (ignoring evidence from Mark on the basis of assuming Markan posteriority) and actually goes both ways (arguing that there are as many Lukanisms as Matthaeanisms in the shared language of Matthew and Luke double tradition) (“Beyond the Q Impasse,” esp. 45–50).


\(^{49}\) Such is the case for example in the analyses of Mattila versus Carlson and Norlin (see above n. 39).

\(^{50}\) For example Mattila assumes “very compelling arguments” for independence of Matthew and Luke (“Negotiating the Clouds,” 129) without feeling the need to repeat them despite recent arguments from 2GH and FH proponents. Other examples include Roché’s assumption of Markan priority throughout his statistical study (“The Words of Jesus”) and the assumed independence of Matthew and Luke in Carlson and Norlin (“Statistics and Q,” 109).


\(^{52}\) For example in arguing for literary dependence the statistical overlap of vocabulary provides an important part of the overall argument. Likewise the observation by Rosché that sayings material is treated more conservatively than narrative (“The Words of Jesus,” 360–64) is one that has not been challenged even by those who critique him (e.g., Carlson and Norlin, “Once More,” 64 and Mattila, “Statistics and ‘Q’,” 314–15).
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Matthew, there are no Matthew-Luke agreements against Mark)\textsuperscript{53} classically dubbed the “Lachmann fallacy.”\textsuperscript{54} Alternatively 2GH proponents argue for Markan posteriority based on purported alternating agreement of Mark with his sources (Matthew and Luke) whereby he is said to move in a zigzag fashion between them.\textsuperscript{55} Markan priority, which requires the collaborative effort of Matthew and Luke to repeatedly desert Mark at the same point where the other takes him up, is therefore regarded as a completely improbable explanation of the data. To put this in terms of three documents (\(a, b,\) and \(c\) with \(a\) as the conflated document) we might say that if \(a\) contains alternating blocks of (differing) \(b\) material and \(c\) material, it would be extremely difficult to argue, conversely, that \(a\) was the source of \(b\) and \(c\). If that were the case one would have to suppose that \(b\) and \(c\) coincidentally took over from \(a\) what the other had not, thus separating out the content of \(a\) into two discrete and non-overlapping documents. Such a result, if \(b\) and \(c\) were working independently, would be incredible.\textsuperscript{56} In the case of the SP, however, documents \(b\) and \(c\) (Matthew and Luke) are not dissimilar and document \(a\) (Mark) does not simply alternate between them since there are many instances where both Matthew and Luke support the Markan order.\textsuperscript{57} The only legitimate conclusion, based on the unequal nature of the

\textsuperscript{53}See Streeter, Four Gospels, 161–2. E. P. Sanders actually challenges the data at this point claiming some cases of Matthew-Luke agreements against Mark (“The Argument from Order and the Relationship Between Matthew and Luke,” NTS 15 [1968–1909]: 249–61) although his exceptions have been challenged by others (see Kloppenborg, Excavating Q, 19, n. 5 citing the works of Neirynck and Fuller).

\textsuperscript{54}While Lachmann himself did not commit this fallacy (for a summary of his argument see N. H. Palmer, “Lachmann’s Argument”) the nomenclature comes from it being seen as a (misguided) extension of his own observations.

\textsuperscript{55}Based on Griesbach’s chart of synoptic relations as reproduced, for example, in the following: Bernard Orchard, “Demonstration”. This chart is also reproduced by Dungan (“Synoposes of the Future,” 457–92, esp. 481–2) and even more clearly in Hajo Uden Meijboom, A History and Critique of the Origin of the Marcan Hypothesis 1835–1866: A Contemporary Report Rediscovered, New Gospel Studies, Vol. 8 (Leuven; Macon, Ga.: Uitgeverij Peeter; Mercer University Press, 1991), 152–3. The zigzag argument is central to Farmer’s defense of Markan posteriority (Synoptic Problem, steps v and vi on pp. 211–215; “Modern Developments of Griesbach’s Hypothesis,” NTS 23 [1977]: 275–95) and continues to be prominent in Peabody et al. (One Gospel, 20–22).

\textsuperscript{56}On this see Kloppenborg (Excavating Q, 28) citing Burton (Principles, 8).

\textsuperscript{57}See Kloppenborg, Excavating Q, 28 with his further discussion on pp. 25-28 as well as the chart on pp. 24-25 where the patterns of agreement can be seen at a glance. A corollary argument of 2GH proponents identifies alternating agreement within individual pericopes (so Peabody et al., One Gospel, 23–26 and Longstaff, Evidence of Conflation ) but this is equally problematic insofar as the phenomenon can be explained equally well when the 2DH is assumed. Thus either Matthew or Luke could naturally be expected at any given moment to be closer to the wording of Mark, that this could switch at any given time, that they could be equally close at any other moment, and that all this could happen quite independently and coincidentally (on this see especially Tuckett, Revival, 49–51).

The advent of redaction criticism in the mid-twentieth century has resulted in greater credit being given to the evangelists as authors and shapers of tradition rather than mere collectors and copyists, as was typical of form criticism.\footnote{The classical pioneering works on the Synoptic Gospels are: Willi Marxsen, \textit{Mark the Evangelist: Studies on the Redaction History of the Gospel}, trans. Roy A. Harrisville (Nashville: Abingdon, 1969); Bornkamm, Barth, and Held, \textit{Tradition}; and Conzelmann, \textit{The Theology of St. Luke}.} While source critical hypotheses are necessarily assumed as a point of departure,\footnote{Most (including those in the previous footnote) have assumed some variation of the 2DH.} however, it is possible to argue for or against the plausibility of a particular source hypothesis on the basis of its implied redaction. Hence, for example, 2GH proponents speak of Markan overlay features\footnote{Peabody et al., \textit{One Gospel}, 35–45. See below n. 68 on Mark’s repeated use of πα&λεον.} and evidence of Markan redaction in the fragmentary preservation of Matthew’s Jewish style argumentation in both Luke and Mark.\footnote{Ibid, 45. They argue that on “a number of occasions ... Matthew presents material in a precisely organized and logical way” whereas “the parallel passages in Luke and/or Mark break up or reorder the material so that the internal logic of the unit is lost.” Such an argument, however, falls prey to the above noted problem of making judgments based on unproven and aesthetic evaluations about the so-called structural superiority of one Gospel over another.} Alternatively Markan priorists emphasize the implausibility of Mark’s implied redaction of Matthew and/or Luke\footnote{For a succinct and typical statement of the redactional implausibility of Markan posteriority see especially Goodacre, \textit{Against Q}, 28–40. For additional critiques of the redactional implausibility of the 2GH see also: Styler, “The Priority of Mark”; and Sherman F. Johnson, \textit{Griesbach Hypothesis}.} over against its opposite.\footnote{For example see the explanations (assuming the 2DH) for such phenomenon as Luke’s Great Omission (of Mark 6:45–8:26) by Hawkins, S Chand and Streeter (pp. 24–26, 63-74 and 172-79 in Sanday, \textit{Studies in the Synoptic Problem}). Peter Head (\textit{Christology}) argues for the greater redactional plausibility of the 2DH (over against the 2GH) in relation to issues of christology. According to Head a redactional argument must be made on positive (rather than negative) grounds but in my opinion (as will be pointed out below) redactional arguments should focus on demonstrating the greater or lesser relative redactional plausibility of competing hypotheses (which involves both positive and negative arguments).} The implausibility of Luke’s redaction of Matthew \footnote{At worst it is evidence of a “crank” (Streeter, \textit{Four Gospels}, 183) and at best it is idiosyncratic (Kloppenborg, \textit{Excavating Q}, 41).} (or vice versa) is likewise central to the Q hypothesis insofar as direct Matthew-Luke dependence provides an otherwise more parsimonious explanation of their shared double
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tradition.\textsuperscript{66} Meanwhile Q skeptics argue the very opposite.\textsuperscript{67} While the dangers of reversibility\textsuperscript{68} and subjectivity\textsuperscript{69} remain, the value of redaction criticism in SP discussion may be summarized as follows: (1) synchronic analysis may be used to evaluate the plausibility of implied redaction (see below);\textsuperscript{70} (2) improved Greek style (typically of Mark by Matthew and Luke) may be an indicator of a document being later;\textsuperscript{71} and (3) editorial fatigue (docile reproduction) is a potentially helpful means of identifying inconsistencies “generated by the evangelists making changes in the early part of the narrative that they are unable to sustain throughout.”\textsuperscript{72}

\textsuperscript{66}Typical arguments against Luke’s direct use of Matthew include: Luke’s ignorance of Matthew’s modifications of Mark in triple tradition; Luke’s lack of ‘M’ material; Luke’s illogical order on assumption that he knew Matthew (especially when it comes to his rearrangement of the Sermon on the Mount); alternating primitivity between Matthew and Luke (if Luke were later then we should expect his account to consistently appear secondary). On this see, for example, Fitzmyer, “Priority of Mark.” For a helpful summary and critique from the FH perspective see Goodacre, \textit{Against Q}, 46–80. For counter critiques see Kloppenborg (“On Dispensing with Q?”; \textit{Excavating Q}, 29–31) and Paul Foster (“Is It Possible to Dispense with Q?” \textit{NovT} 45 [2003]: 313–37).

\textsuperscript{67}From the 2GH perspective see McNicol et al., \textit{Q Impasse}. For the FH see Farrer (“On Dispensing with Q”), Goulder (“The Order of a Crank”; “Luke’s Compositional Options”) and Goodacre (\textit{Against Q}). For the view that Matthew used Luke see Huggins, “Matthean Prioritization.”

\textsuperscript{68}For example the repeated use of πα&\lambda;υ as cited as the “most striking structural evidence” of Markan overlay (Peabody et al., \textit{One Gospel}, 37). It is noted that despite the fifteen uses of πα&\lambda;υ as basic structuring device it is never reproduced in parallel sections of Matthew and Luke. From the standpoint of Markan priority, however, it may be that Matthew and Luke simply disliked πα&\lambda;υ as a structuring device. Indeed πα&\lambda;υ only occurs three times in Luke with two occurring in Matt- double tradition (Luke 6:43; 13:20), where the term is absent from Matthew’s parallel, and one in triple tradition (Luke 23:20), where it is shared with Mark alone. While at least one of the double tradition occurrences (6:43) may be explained on the basis that it occurs within a specific saying of Jesus, the occurrence in 23:20 is just as easily explained by Markan priority as posteriority. Meanwhile the general absence of the term in Luke (no occurrences in Acts) is a clear indicator that this was not a favored term as a structuring device or otherwise. The 2GH argument would be strengthened if Luke had used it as a structuring device in places other than those parallel to Mark.

\textsuperscript{69}Hence in Peabody et al. (\textit{One Gospel}, 45) it is argued that on “a number of occasions ... Matthew presents material in a precisely organized and logical way” whereas “the parallel passages in Luke and/or Mark break up or reorder the material so that the internal logic of the unit is lost.” This argument, however, falls prey to the above noted problem of making unproven aesthetic value judgments about the structural superiority of one Gospel. Likewise is the case for many structural judgments in relation to Matthew-Luke double tradition and the Q debate as noted above.

\textsuperscript{70}One example is Mark Goodacre’s appeal to narrative criticism as a means of assessing the plausibility of Luke’s purported rearrangement of Matthew’s Sermon on the Mount (\textit{Against Q}, 105–20).

\textsuperscript{71}The argument is common among Markan priorists (e.g., Kümmel, \textit{Introduction}, 60–61; Styler, “The Priority of Mark”; Goodacre, \textit{Against Q}, 34–36) but while it makes a priori sense, it has been critiqued by Sanders (\textit{Tendencies of the Synoptic Tradition}, SNTSMS 9 [Cambridge and London: Cambridge University Press, 1969]) who does not find the same tendency toward more polished Greek in later works thereby suggesting the need for more careful nuancing of such arguments. See, however, the comments of Kloppenborg, \textit{Excavating Q}, 41–42, esp. n. 38 and Richard Burridge, “The Gospels and Acts,” in \textit{Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period} 330 B.C.–A. D. 400, ed. Stanley E. Porter (Leiden: New York: Köln: Brill, 1997b), 525–7.

\textsuperscript{72}For example in the cleansing of the leper (Matt 8:1–4; Mark 1:40–45; Luke 5:12–16) the location in Matthew leads to an introductory verse in Matt 8:1 that is absent from Mark (“when they had come down from the mountain many crowds followed him”) yet later in the same pericope Matthew reproduces the Markan statement “see that you do
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2.2.4 Arguments Based on External Considerations

Further reduction in circularity is possible by appeal to external data or criteria albeit with varying degrees of persuasiveness. Less persuasive arguments include appeals to patristic evidence,\(^73\) for example, which not only involve second hand quotes (from Eusebius) but also evidence that is neither consistent nor clearly understood.\(^74\) Similar problems are encountered with appeals to historical provenance and purpose\(^75\) or the relative dating of the Gospels.\(^76\) Equally inconclusive is the argument against Q that simply highlights the lack of external evidence for its existence\(^77\) which, though not irrelevant, can hardly carry the day.\(^78\) While such arguments cannot be discounted completely, alternative appeals to external criteria are potentially more persuasive. Thomas Longstaff; for example, attempted to demonstrate that Mark’s purported method of conflating Matthew and Luke is in keeping with seven characteristics of conflation identified by an examination of Tatian’s *Diatessaron* along with the

---

\(^{73}\)This is common among 2GH defendants: e.g., Farmer (*Synoptic Problem*, 224–6) and Peabody et al. (*One Gospel*, 46–52).


\(^{76}\)Martin Hengel, for instance, argues that “historical and philological arguments” are far superior to “merely literary-critical hypotheses.” As such his analysis of the relative dating of the Gospels (Mark in 69/70; Luke in 75–80; and Matthew in 90–100) is the foundation of his proposed solution to the SP (Markan priority; Luke uses Mark and logia sources; Matthew uses Mark, Luke, and logia sources) (*The Four Gospels*, 169–207, esp. 170, 207). Goodacre (*Against Q*, 23–28) also uses relative dating in his defense of Markan priority by appealing to the knowledge or ignorance of the evangelists in relation to the events of 70 CE. The problems associated with precise dating of the Gospels always undermines such arguments.

\(^{77}\)So, for example, in Peabody et al. (*One Gospel*, 3) and Goulder (“Is Q a Juggernaut?” 669).

works of two medieval chroniclers. While Longstaff has been critiqued in the application of his arguments, the basic approach of appealing to external literary analogies is recognized by most as an important way forward in SP discussion. Other appeals to external analogies have included literary structures in the Tanak, midrash, Greco-Roman literary conventions, and ancient scribal practices. While the results are not undisputed, there is growing recognition that such an approach represents an important way forward.

80 E.g., Tuckett, Revival, 41–51. Regarding the 7 characteristics of conflation (see previous note) Tuckett points out that common vocabulary and content (#1) is common to all Synoptic theories and at best indicates the fact of literary dependence but not its direction. The careful comparison of sources and transitions at points of verbal agreement (#’s 2–4) are potentially less telling than Longstaff claims. Tuckett contends that the evidence does not support Longstaff’s second and third criteria as markers of conflation. Hence while agreeing that inserting words and sentences is characteristic of Tatian’s Diatessaron, he notes that this would be in keeping with Tatian’s overall aim to include every detail from his sources (at the same time he highlights ambiguity in relation to some of Longstaff’s examples owing to textual uncertainty in the Diatessaron). In relation to the medieval Chroniclers Tuckett argues for a paucity of evidence for these particular characteristics (#’s 2–4) such that they can hardly be called ‘characteristic’ of conflation. In regard to the zigzag pattern (within pericopes) Tuckett argues that the phenomenon is essentially pre-determined by the method itself. The final three characteristics all present the same problem, namely that none of the features listed is deemed as consistently present. The implied unpredictability itself counts against being able to identify standard criteria by which conflation is ruled in while other theories are ruled out. Longstaff may have presented some features that are present with conflation but, while perhaps affirming literary dependence, it is not clear that these features constitute special evidence for the direction of that dependence.

81 These analogies may be modern or ancient. One fascinating modern analogy used in relation to explaining Luke’s purported arrangement of the Sermon on the Mount invokes cinematic presentations of Jesus. On this see Goodacre (“The Synoptic Gospels and the Celluloid Christ: Solving the Synoptic Problem Through Film,” JSNT 80 [2000]: 31–43 and Against Q, 121–32) along with a critique by F. Gerald Downing (“Dissolving the Synoptic Problem Through Film?” JSNT 84 [2001]: 117–19) and subsequent response by Goodacre (“On Choosing and Using Appropriate Analogies: A Response to F. Gerald Downing,” JSNT 26/2 [2003]: 237–40). An example of an ancient analogy is John Drury’s attempt to explain Luke’s procedure in rewriting Mark and Matthew (assuming the FH) according to the canons of midrash (Tradition). Of the two approaches it is the ancient analogy that surely carries most weight.

82 In relation to Luke’s purported rewriting of Matthew, for example, Austin Farrer’s oft quoted article (“On Dispensing with Q”) appeals to the literary structure of Genesis-Joshua. In a more recent spate of articles Downing appeals to Greco-Roman literary conventions in defending the greater plausibility of the 2DH (e.g., “Redaction Criticism: Josephus’ Antiquities and the Synoptic Gospels [I],” JSOT 8 [1980a]: 46–65; “Redaction Criticism: Josephus’ Antiquities and the Synoptic Gospels [II],” JSOT 9 [1980b]: 29–48; “Compositional Conventions and the Synoptic Problem,” JBL 107 [1988]: 69–85) while Derrenbacker defends the 2DH with appeals to ancient scribal and compositional practices (Ancient Compositional Practices and the Synoptic Problem, BETL 186 [Leuven; Paris; Dudley, Ma: Leuven University Press/Uittgeverij Leuven, 2005]). See the previous footnote for an example of the application of midrash.

83 See, for example, the critiques of Downing by Ken Olson (“Unpicking”) and Goulder (“Luke’s Compositional Options”).
2.3 A Methodological Proposal

In light of the foregoing discussion I offer the following preliminary methodological conclusion: given the inherent logical possibility of all SP solutions, the plausibility of a given SP hypothesis is directly proportional to the plausibility of its implied redactional procedures.\(^{84}\) Insofar as competing hypotheses may advance plausible editorial explanations, however, circularity will not be reduced by merely demonstrating redactional plausibility, but rather by demonstrating greater or lesser relative redactional plausibility. It is for this reason that I have chosen to examine three competing hypotheses and to proceed by means of testing their relative redactional plausibility. Insofar as aesthetic preference inevitably influences our judgments about redactional plausibility (as per examples above) this calls for careful consideration of how best “to impose ... controls on the subjectivity of the critic.”\(^{85}\) As such I propose to utilize three points of control drawing on data both internal and external to the Synoptic Gospels.

2.3.1 Synchronic Reading of Miracle Tradition

The first of these controls will involve using a synchronic reading of Gospel miracle tradition\(^{86}\) with the following three assumptions: (1) the evangelists were competent and deliberate editors of their sources whereby we may reasonably expect to find evidence of their redactional interests;\(^{87}\) (2) these interests should be detectable upon a synchronic reading, which itself makes no source-critical assumptions; (3) the degree of overlap between editorial interests detected upon a synchronic reading and those implied by a redaction-critical reading (upon assumption of any given source hypothesis) will potentially count as evidence either for or

---

\(^{84}\) Or as Kloppenborg states it the “real point of disagreement” involves “which hypotheses imply plausible editorial procedures” (Excavating Q, 43).

\(^{85}\) Kloppenborg, Excavating Q, 17.

\(^{86}\) “Synchronic” is not here intended in any restricted sense (such as ‘narrative critical’) but rather includes general literary-critical and rhetorically informed readings of the text.

\(^{87}\) While allowing for some level of aberration (e.g., in Goodacre, “Fatigue”), assuming a fundamental lack of editorial intention jeopardizes any discussion of redactional plausibility (e.g., see the discussion in Head, Christology, 262).
Chapter 2 Establishing a Methodology

against that hypothesis.  The sheer quantity of miracle tradition in the synoptic Gospels makes it possible to isolate theological motifs specifically associated with this tradition thus making it particularly suitable for this methodological approach. In speaking of miracle tradition I have in mind the synoptic miracle stories (see table 2.1) along with summary statements and related traditions. Notably about seventy seven percent of the miracle stories are healings and exorcisms, which alone are mentioned in summary statements. While the extent of this tradition provides valuable data for a synchronic reading and will be important in considering arguments from order, it likewise precludes a detailed examination of more than a few representative pericopes (see below).

88 Discussions of redactional plausibility are obviously not new (e.g., Tuckett, “The Argument from Order,” esp. 207–11) but insofar as Tuckett’s argument works “unashamedly” within the presuppositions of Markan Priority (pp. 207-8) he exhibits the inevitable circularity of starting with the hypothesis he seeks to prove. Such circularity can be reduced by starting with a synchronic analysis such as a narrative critical reading (e.g., Charles Thomas Davis III, “Mark: The Petrine Gospel,” in New Synoptic Studies, ed. William R. Farmer [Macon, Georgia: Mercer University Press, 1983], 441–66; Goodacre, Against Q, 105–20; and Mark A. Matson, “Luke’s Rewriting of the Sermon on the Mount,” in Questioning Q: A Multidimensional Critique, ed. Mark Goodacre and Nicholas Perrin [Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press, 2004], 43–70). My intention, however, is not to provide definitive readings of Gospel miracle tradition so much as to work with what I consider the best representative synchronic readings. For sample bibliographies on miracle tradition see the following: Graham H. Twelftree, Miracle Worker; and Theissen, Miracle Stories.

90 These include twenty nine narratives comprising the following: 11 triple tradition; 1 (Mark/Luke), 4 (Mark/Matt), and 2 (Matt/Luke) double tradition; 2 (Mark), 3 (Matt), and 6 (Luke) single tradition. The numbers are approximate and could be challenging: e.g., the brevity of Luke 11:14 and 22:50-52 make them questionable as “narratives”; the problems associated with the classification and counting of so-called doublets (e.g., Matt 9:27-34), unusual tradition (e.g., Matt 17:24-27) and intercalations (e.g., Mark 5:21-43) - is it one story or two?.


92 In fact the very use of “miracle” is contentious, especially when speaking of healings, insofar as it is “etic” terminology (e.g. Elaine Wainwright, “The Matthean Jesus and the Healing of Women,” in The Gospel of Matthew in Current Study: Studies in Memory of William G. Thompson S. J., ed. David E. Aune [Grand Rapids, Michigan: W. B. Eerdmans, 2001], 75, n. 5).
2.3.2 Appeal to the Literary Genre of Ancient βίος

The second point of control involves an appeal to ancient analogies in respect to literary genre. According to Richard Burridge readers and authors enter into a “generic contract” in which there is an implied “system of expectations ... to guide the reader.” It can reasonably be expected, therefore, that genre conventions influenced the evangelists’ editorial decisions. The Gospels themselves, however, make no explicit generic claims and have been variously labeled as biography (or ‘biographical’), sui generis Kleiliteratur, aretalogy, and midrash. In recent years, however, there has been a growing acceptance of them as ancient βίος. While the term “ancient” highlights their lack of conformity to modern biographical conventions, βίος is taken

93 See R. A. Burridge, What Are the Gospels? A Comparison with Graeco-Roman Biography, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004), 24–52 for a general discussion and introduction to the issues of genre criticism and literary theory. The quotes are taken from p. 35 where Burridge is quoting Hirsch and Dubrow respectively.

94 Burridge himself highlights the possible implications of genre identification in relation to SP discussion (What Are the Gospels? 259) and not surprisingly such arguments have already played a role. Hence, for example, Philip Shuler questions Form critical conclusions about the sui generis nature of the Gospels based on prior assumptions of Markan priority (insofar as Mark looks least like an ancient βίος). He suggests that if Matthew and Luke are seen as prior then the association with ancient βίος would have been more tenable. Markan posteriority purportedly becomes more probable given the problem that Mark faced in conflating Matthew and Luke (referring to the work of Longstaff and Dungan) (“Genre Criticism and the Synoptic Problem,” in New Synoptic Studies, ed. William R. Farmer [Macon, Georgia: Mercer University Press, 1983], 467–80). A similar conclusion is reached in Peter W. Agnew, “The Two-Gospel Hypothesis and a Biographical Genre for the Gospels,” in New Synoptic Studies, ed. William R. Farmer (Macon, Georgia: Mercer University Press, 1983), 481–99. While the appeal to genre is laudable, the specific logic of their argument is questionable and has more to do with assumptions about the theologically mediating position of Mark than with implications arising from genre. Insofar as it is agreed that Matthew and Luke conform more closely to ancient βίος conventions, it would appear more plausible to suppose that they have improved upon perceived deficiencies in Mark than to suppose the opposite. Hence, for example, Kloppenborg notes that the addition of infancy narratives (in Matthew and Luke upon assumption of Markan priority) is understandable in light of the apparent function of such narratives in Greco-Roman biography, namely to enhance characterization of the adult hero. On the other hand the deliberate omission of the infancy narratives by a posterior Mark requires an explanation that is lacking in the literature (Excavating Q, 17).


96 Important early works include Charles H. Talbert, What is a Gospel? The Genre of the Canonical Gospels (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1977) and Shuler, Genre. The most comprehensive analysis to date (based on discussions of genre criticism and literary theory; genre criticisms and Greco-Roman biography; and generic features in the Greco-Roman biography) is that of Burridge (What Are the Gospels?) in which he makes a strong case for reading the Gospels generically as Greco-Roman βίος. He also includes useful discussion of criticisms and responses to the biographical hypothesis (e.g., pp. 86-92; 252-288). The overlap of generic features lies at the heart of his argument. These include opening features (title and prologue), subject (analysis of space allocation and verbal subjects), external features (e.g., structure and sequence, use of metre, and scale of the work), and internal features (e.g., tone, mood, attitude, values etc.). Having identified such features in chapter 5 he analyses Greco-Roman biography (chapters 6 and 7) and the Gospels (chapters 8 and 9) before drawing his conclusions about the generic identification of the latter.
from Plutarch’s designation (related to his own series of ‘biographical’ works) in *Alexander* 1.2 and while this was a flexible and mixed genre, its features are sufficiently distinct as to warrant the separate label that Plutarch assigns it. While Burridge sees several implications for our understanding of the Gospels, the most important in the present context is the recognition that these *generic* parallels occur in Greco-Roman rather than (say) rabbinic literature. More specifically he observes that “an awareness of genre and its conventions was widespread in the ancient world through elementary schooling, particularly in its use of rhetorical exercise and moralistic stories of heroes.”

### 2.3.3 Appeal to Conventions of Ancient Rhetoric

This particular observation of Burridge leads to the third point of control, namely the role of ancient education and rhetorical training in shaping the compositional practices of the evangelists. While the detailed nature of ancient education is disputed, it has been generally understood to progress according to three distinct levels, which in broad terms correspond to basic literacy skills (elementary), more sophisticated grammatical education (secondary), and

---

97 For this and other observations regarding genre criticism in relation to ancient Greco-Roman biography see Burridge, *What Are the Gospels?* 53–77. Burridge notes that Plutarch’s explicit (theoretical) distinction between βιος and ιστορία is not hard and fast. Rather Plutarch’s βιος stands on a spectrum between history and encomium though also overlapping with moral philosophy and influenced by rhetorical considerations. The term *biographia* does not occur until the 5th century CE.

98 The other implications relate to (1) seeing the Gospels as christological narrative, (2) understanding the Gospels in their social setting, and (3) seeing them as biographical and ethical narratives (Burridge, *What Are the Gospels?* 247–51 and esp. 288–307).

99 Though he warns that “theoretical statements, particularly those in author’s prefaces and in the later rhetoricians and grammarians, must always be tested against the actual practice of the writers themselves in their texts. Often this will reveal a failure to apply the theory strictly, and sometimes the greater the divergence from the theory, the greater the literary creativity of the author” (Burridge, *What Are the Gospels?* 66).

Chapter 2 Establishing a Methodology

rhetorical training (advanced).\textsuperscript{101} To the extent that the evangelists were influenced by ancient rhetorical conventions the rhetorical handbooks offer potentially useful tools for analyzing the Gospels.\textsuperscript{102} Taking this a step further Alex Damm, in a recent dissertation, utilized rhetorical insights to assess competing SP hypotheses by seeking to identify the “improving author” (where literary dependence exists, such as between Mark and Matthew) on the basis of which one more obviously followed rhetorical convention (upon assumption of a particular direction of dependence).\textsuperscript{103} Damm specifically utilizes the progymnasmata, a series of preliminary compositional and rhetorical exercises for which we have handbooks dating from as early as the first century CE (Theon).\textsuperscript{104} The progymnasmata are nevertheless mentioned as early as the third


\textsuperscript{104}We actually possess four extant copies dating from the late first to the fifth century CE. The earliest is that of Theon while the later ones are associated with Hermogenes, Aphthonius and Nicolaus. English translations along with introductions (and selections from a commentary on the Aphthonius’ progymnasmata attributed to John of Sardis) are contained in Kennedy, Progymnasmata: Greek Textbooks of Prose Composition and Rhetoric (Atlanta, Ga.: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003). For a reading of Gospel traditions using insights gained from progymnasmata see, for example, Mack and Robbins, Patterns of Persuasion along with Robbins, “Writing as Rhetorical Act in Plutarch and the Gospels,” in Persuasive Artistry: Studies in New Testament Rhetoric in Honor of George A. Kennedy, ed. Duane F. Watson, JSNTSup 50 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991), 142–68.
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or fourth centuries BCE in the rhetorical handbook *Rhetorica ad Alexandrum* (1436a 25).\(^{105}\) While the precise nature of the exercises is not spelled out in the latter and they are not discussed explicitly in other influential treatises,\(^ {106}\) Quintilian provides an important first century discussion of them.\(^ {107}\) Taken together with our earliest progymnasmata handbook (Theon) this strongly implies an established role for the progymnasmata by the late first century CE and likely much earlier. This is an important consideration if they are to be used in evaluating the synoptic evangelists which, like Damm, I also propose to do.

Despite variations Theon may be taken as typical in regard to content of the progymnasmata. Following his introductory remarks, he discusses the forms of chreia, fable, narrative, topos, echprasis (description), prosopopoeia (personification), encomium (along with invective), synecrisis (comparison), thesis, and law.\(^ {108}\) After defining each form he discusses exercises performed in relation to it (such as restatement, grammatical inflection, comment, contradiction, expansion and compression, addition, refutation, and confirmation etc.) as well as issues such as reading aloud and listening, paraphrase, elaboration, and contradiction. In light of space constraints and my focus on miracle tradition I have selected two of Theon’s forms for analyzing the Gospel traditions, namely those of “encomium” (ἐγκώμιον) and “narrative” (διήγημα).

### 2.3.3.1 The Conventions of Encomium

Theon defines encomium as “language revealing the greatness of virtuous actions and other good qualities belonging to a particular person,” while Hermogenes defines it as “an exposition

---


\(^{106}\) Such as in the rhetorical treatises associated with Aristotle or Cicero (including *Rhetorica ad Herrenium*). According to Kennedy, however, these later Latin works do contain allusions to the exercises (Kennedy, *Progymnasmata*, xi.).


\(^{108}\) Regarding variations see, for example, the summary chart of topics in the four extant progymnasmata in Kennedy, *Progymnasmata*, xiii.
of the good qualities of a person or thing, in general (e.g., of people/men), or individually (e.g., of Socrates). Invective is simply its opposite. Of particular importance here is the obvious connection between this progymnastic category and the βιος genre of the Gospels such that Philip Shuler even labeled the Gospels as “encomiastic” or “laudatory” biographies. He identified the following key characteristics (based on the works of Aristotle, Cicero, Theon and Hermogenes): (1) praise of the subject; (2) amplification of various positive and negative traits; (3) comparison of two individuals (e.g., Plutarch); and (4) various topoi (e.g., birth, heritage, hometown etc.). Shuler has been variously criticized for an overly rigid insistence on the label “laudatory” and the fact that his four characteristics are not limited to biography. Burridge even questions whether the genre of encomium biography exists and observes that the topic lists post date the Gospels. More recently, however, Michael Martin has partially defended Shuler by arguing that the progymnastic topic lists provided a “compositional template” for ancient βιος. He does not, however, seek to retain Shuler’s specific label of ‘encomiastic biography’ and acknowledges that the lists are not limited to ‘encomiastic’ works (they also apply to invective

109Kennedy, Progymnasmata, 50 and 81. It is also common to see aetiological comments (regarding the roots of the word) as well as a distinguishing of various types of encomium. Hence, for example, Theon differentiates praise of people (dead or alive) versus the praise of gods (ibid., 50) while Hermogenes and Aphthonius add the praise of things (ibid., 81, 108).


111Notably Shuler acknowledges much divergence in practice (Genre, 86).


113See Martin, “Progymnastic Topic Lists: A Compositional Template for Luke and Other Bioi?” NTS 54 (2008): 18 This assertion is contra Burridge who says that these lists (as they appear in Quintilian, Hermogenes, and Theon) “are designed for school use in rhetorical and encomiastic exercises, rather than for writing, and they are later than most of our works” (What Are the Gospels? 200). Martin observes that this is this contrary to Theon’s own explicit claim that the exercises are intended not only for “those who are going to practice rhetoric but also if one wishes to undertake the function of poets or historians or any other writers” (Theon, Exercises section 70 in Kennedy, Progymnasmata, 13).
and comparison for example). Rather the lists (based on progymnasmata and handbooks) are “neutral categories reflecting cultural notions of the essential components of personhood”\textsuperscript{114} which, Martin notes incidentally, bear “remarkable resemblance … in content and order” to Burridge’s topic lists derived from a descriptive analysis of various βίοι.\textsuperscript{115} Thus while Burridge correctly notes that the extant lists (of Quintilian, Theon, and Hermogenes etc.) post date the Gospels (though not by much), the late-first century date of Theon and Quintilian strongly implies a prior usage of something akin to the progymnasmata (as above). This conclusion is reinforced by Martin’s observations about their resemblance to the topic lists identified in Burridge as well as the fact that similar lists actually appear in much earlier rhetorical handbooks (those not explicitly discussing progymnasmata) suggesting a degree of stability to these categories of ‘personhood’ over several centuries.\textsuperscript{116} I, therefore, agree with Martin’s conclusion that the progymnastic encomiastic topic lists potentially “provide a great deal of insight into biographical composition.”\textsuperscript{117}

2.3.3.2 The Conventions of Narrative (διήγημα/διήγησις)

Insofar as my particular focus is miracle tradition Theon’s conventions of “narrative” (διήγημα) provide a second important evaluative tool. According to Theon “narrative (διήγημα) is language descriptive of things that have happened or as though they had happened.”\textsuperscript{118} While his subsequent discussion is somewhat ambiguous owing to his interchangeable use of two Greek terms, διήγημα (‘narrative’) and διήγησις (‘narration’), according to the later progymnasmata of Hermogenes, “a narrative (διήγημα) differs from a narration (διήγησις) a

\textsuperscript{114}Michael W. Martin, “Progymnastic Topic Lists,” 21, n. 17.
\textsuperscript{115}Additional topics and sub-topics (albeit with divergence among the theorists) are also reflected in the actual practice of writers, thus warning of divergence. See Michael W. Martin, “Progymnastic Topic Lists,” 23.
\textsuperscript{116}See table 2.2 for topic lists appearing in the Progymnasmata and table 2.3 for those appearing in rhetorical handbooks thus indicating the stability of such lists and concepts of personhood over several centuries.
\textsuperscript{118}Kennedy, \textit{Progymnasmata}, 28.
piece of poetry (ποίημα) differs from a poetical work (ποιήσις). A ποίημα and a διήγημα are concerned with one thing, a ποιήσις and a διήγησις with many.” 119 Theon proceeds to identify six key elements (στοιχεία) of a narration (διήγησις) as follows: 120

(1) Person (πρόσωπον): origin (γένος); nature; training; disposition; age; fortune; morality; action; speech; (manner of) death; and what followed death. Notably essentially the same topics are listed here as Theon provides under encomium thus indicating overlap between these categories/forms. As Martin noted above the topics clearly reflect cultural notions of the essential components of personhood;

(2) Action (πράγμα): Theon mentions several categories of action along with their opposite (great or small; dangerous or not dangerous; possible or impossible; easy or difficult; necessary or unnecessary; advantageous or disadvantageous; just or unjust; honorable or dishonorable);

(3) Time (χρόνος): past; present; future; chronological order (first, second, third etc.); appropriate to our times or ancient times; the dates people have set in public or private life; 121 whether in winter or spring, summer or autumn, during the night or by day, whether the action took place during a meeting of the assembly or during a procession of a festival; and whether at weddings or a reception of friends or in time of grief or any such circumstance of life;

(4) Place (τόπος): size, distance, near a city or town, whether the place was sacred or unhallowed, owned or someone else’s, deserted or inhabited, strong or insecure, flat or mountainous, dry or wet, barren or wooded, and all similar things;

(5) Manner (τρόπος): may be willing (by force, secretly or by deceit) or unwilling (by ignorance, accident, or necessity) (cf. Aristotle, Rhetoric, 1.10.7-8);

119 Hermogenes section 4 quoted from Kennedy, Progymnasmata, 75 (note I have substituted Greek characters for Kennedy’s transliterations). According to Hermogenes distinction the Iliad and the Odyssey are both ποιήσις while the “Making of the Shield” in Iliad 18 and the “Descent to the underworld” in Odyssey 11 are ποιήματα (ibid.) The same distinction is repeated in the later works of Aphthonius (ibid., 96) and Nicolaus although he notes that some distinguish διήγημα from διήγησις by noting that the former pertains to legal disputes and the latter to historical report of events (ibid., 136).

120 See Kennedy, Progymnasmata, 28–29. Hermogenes offers no such list. Essentially the same list is offered in Nicolaus but in slightly different order and with a possible seventh, namely “material” (e.g., the use of a sword or another weapon in an illegal manner) (ibid., 137). Aphthonius offers an identical list to Theon (ibid., 96-7).

121 According to Kennedy this refers to the “chronology of actions by the calendar, appointed times for public and private duties, including payment of debts, observance of sacrifices and the like” (Progymnasmata, 28, n. 105).
(6) **Cause** (αἰτία): to acquire good things, for the sake of escaping from evil; from friendship; because of a wife or for children or out of the passions (love, hate, envy, pity, inebriation, and the like).

According to Theon “a complete narration (διήγησις)” consists of all elements and if any one of them is lacking the narration is “deficient.”\(^\text{122}\) As such these elements may potentially be useful in judging direction of dependence between two narratives if one can be shown to be more or less ‘complete’ than the other.\(^\text{123}\) Given, however, the less than clear distinction of διήγησις and διήγησις (especially in Theon who represents our earliest extant account), flexibility needs to be born in mind insofar we are more likely to find all the elements in the whole of (say) Luke’s Gospel than in any one of its parts.\(^\text{124}\) Indeed examples from Theon include Homer’s *Odyssey*, Herodotus Book 3, the Plataeans and Thebans (from Thucydides 2.2-6), and Thucydides historical project as a whole.\(^\text{125}\) Alternatively Aphthonius’ solitary example is a short aetiological story of ‘the rose’ in which elements such as time and place are conspicuous by their absence.\(^\text{126}\)


\(^{123}\)According to Robbins the Gospels and Acts are “narrative compositions” that nevertheless comprise an “argumentative texture” that is best understood against the backdrop of Theon’s discussion of the six elements of narrative. He suggests that while chreia elaborations may be understood under the rubric of a “complete argument,” narratives may be understood under the rubric of a “complete situation.” The goal in either case is persuasion with the primary focus of narrative on Theon’s element of ‘person’ and then ‘action’ (“Narrative in Ancient Rhetoric and Rhetoric in Ancient Narrative,” in *SBLSP* 35 [Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996], 368–84). Similarly Malcolm Heath points out that the “basic components of any rhetorical situation are person and act,” noting the importance of Theon’s encomiastic topic lists in relation to basic rhetorical training (“Invention,” in *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period 330 B.C. – A. D. 400*, ed. Stanley E. Porter [Leiden: New York: Köln: Brill, 1997], 91–103, quote from 91). The rhetorical intention of ‘narrative’ is also suggested by Theon’s virtues of clarity, conciseness and credibility since such virtues assume what Robbins refers to as an ‘argumentative texture’ to narrative.

\(^{124}\)Interestingly of course, Luke’s Gospel is self described as a διήγησις (Luke 1:1). It should be noted here that the Gospel miracle tradition is not exactly homogenous insofar as some pericopes are perhaps better classified as chreia (rather than narrative), in particular those variously designated by form critics as ‘Apothegms’ (Bultmann, *History*), ‘Paradigms’ (Dibelius, *Tradition*), and ‘Pronouncement Stories’ (Taylor, *Formation*) such as Mark 2:1-12 or 3:1-6 (and parallels). I have therefore selected the least ‘chreia-like’ miracle pericopes for my analyses below.

\(^{125}\)See Kennedy, *Progymnasmata*, 33–35. The first, second and last of these are discussed specifically in relation to matters of order whereas the third is given as a specific example of a narrative (διήγησις) though even in this discussion Theon essentially draws attention to what is credible about the narrative and does not analyze it in terms of the six elements.

\(^{126}\)Kennedy, *Progymnasmata*, 97.
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In addition to the six ‘elements’ of narrative, Theon also identifies three key virtues (ἀρεταῖ). The first of these is clarity (σαφείᾳ) which, according to Theon comes from two sources. First, in relation to subject matter, a lack of clarity results from the following: departing from common understanding, narrating too many things, confusing time and order, repeating an event twice, inserting lengthy digressions, omitting material necessary for clarity, or making an allegorical account of disguised events. Second, in relation to style, clarity avoids inappropriate words (poeticisms, coined words, tropes, archaisms, foreign words, and homonyms) and amphiboly (e.g., confusion in relation to whether a word is divided or undivided), hyperbata (words out of normal order), digressive phrases mid-sentence, omission of words necessary for meaning and unclear use of grammatical cases.

Conciseness (συντομίᾳ), Theon’s second virtue, requires inclusion of the most important facts, omission of what is unnecessary, avoidance of combining too many things (or mixing them with other things), omission of what is assumed and avoidance of going too far back to explain things that seem to be incidental. Conciseness also considers word choice (e.g., avoiding synonyms, paraphrase, things that can be supplied by the hearer and complex words). At the same time “there is need for care, lest from the desire for conciseness one fall into an idiosyncrasy or obscurity without realizing it.”

The third virtue, narrative credibility (πιθανότητας), results from employing “styles that are natural for the speaker and suitable for the subjects and the places and the occasions: in the case of the subjects, those that are probable and follow from each other. One should briefly add the causes of things to the narration and say what is incredible in a believable way, and, simply put, it is suitable to aim at what is appropriate to the speaker and to the other elements of the narration in content and in style.”

127 For the following see Kennedy, Progymnasmata, 29–34.
128 In this instance Theon differentiates historical writing from narration (Kennedy, Progymnasmata, 32) which again highlights that these categories are not hard and fast here but depend on the nature of the writing under consideration.
129 Kennedy, Progymnasmata, 33.
130 Kennedy, Progymnasmata, 33. Theon here goes on to discuss the narrative of the Plataeans and Thebans in Thucydides 2.2-6 making various comments on its historical credibility.
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With the exception of Hermogenes, who makes no explicit mention of virtues in relation to narrative,\(^{131}\) the remaining progymnasmata all agree in listing clarity, conciseness (brevity) and credibility (persuasiveness) albeit Aphthonius adds Hellenism\(^{132}\) and Nicolaus adds charm and grandeur though acknowledges that “in the opinion of more exact writers there are only three virtues: clarity, brevity, persuasiveness.”\(^{133}\) Indeed the pervasiveness of these three virtues can be seen in that they are identified, for example, in *Rhetorica ad Herrenium* (1.9) and Cicero’s discussion of rhetorical narration (*De Inventione* 1.11 and 1.20.28-29 and 1.12.32).

### 2.3.3.3 Excursus on Order and Selection

While these conventions will be used to analyze specific narrative miracle traditions in chapter 6, in chapter 5 they will be applied to the evangelist’s selection and ordering of those traditions. Arguments based on the phenomenon of order date back to at least Griesbach with his observations on Mark’s alternating use of Matthew and Luke.\(^{134}\) The modern version of Griesbach (2GH) along with Streeter’s arguments from order (the so-called ‘Lachmann fallacy’) have already been found wanting in relation to reversibility, biased presentation of the data etc. (see above).\(^{135}\) What is needed, in addition to presenting the data in more neutral categories, is to provide plausible editorial reasons for why the evangelists selected and ordered the material as they did.\(^{136}\) According to Christopher Tuckett the “relative plausibilities of ... redaction” have

\(^{131}\) Though he does speak of the virtues of clarity and vividness in relation to ecphrasis (Kennedy, *Progymnasmata*, 86).

\(^{132}\) Kennedy, *Progymnasmata*, 97. He does not elaborate on any of the terms.

\(^{133}\) Kennedy, *Progymnasmata*, 137. He likewise offers very little interpretive comment on the virtues though says more than Aphthonius who merely lists them.

\(^{134}\) Griesbach, according to David Neville, was the first “to argue in anything like a comprehensive manner from the phenomenon of order” (Arguments from Order in Synoptic Source Criticism: A History and Critique, New Gospel Studies 7 [Leuven and Macon: Uitgeverij Peeters; Mercer University Press, 1994], 223). See also Orchard, “Demonstration.”


\(^{136}\) So, for example, in the following: Neville, *Arguments from Order*, 222–37; Tuckett, “The Argument from Order”; idem, “Arguments from Order”; Neirynck, “Two-Source Hypothesis,” 7–8; The importance of redaction to arguments from order is missed, for example, in the critique of Lowe (“Demise”) regarding arguments from order related to Markan priority.
always been considered in arguments from order albeit that “‘plausibility’ is ... impossible to quantify” whereby “any such form of argument is subjective and ... can never be final” since “there is always the possibility that what appears absurd to one person may be ... plausible” to another.137 While Tuckett’s candor is refreshing, it is my contention that the inevitable subjectivity related to evaluating plausibility can be lessened by appeal to additional evaluative criteria, specifically a synchronic reading of miracle tradition along with ancient genre and rhetorical conventions. While the former (synchronic reading) provides a grid by which to judge the plausibility of (implied) editorial selection and order on the basis of theological and apologetic motifs, the latter (ancient genre and rhetoric) provides grounds for indicating the importance of selection and order in antiquity along with conventions that guided such choices. It is no mere coincidence that “invention” (ἐὑρεσίας) and “arrangement” (ταχείας) comprise two of the five major divisions typically discussed in ancient rhetorical handbooks138 and that Theon in his progymnasmata clearly identifies the importance of order in relation to both encomium and narrative. Hence encomiastic categories have a certain inherently logical order (e.g., birth before deeds before death etc.) and in relation to the topics of good birth along with external and bodily goods Theon states that they should not be arranged “simply and in any random order.”139 Regarding the six elements and three virtues of narrative (as identified above) there is an implied need for attention to selection and order, particularly when it comes to the need for clarity, conciseness and credibility. It has already been noted that clarity and conciseness of subject matter is compromised by narrating too many things, inserting lengthy digressions, omitting

137“The Argument from Order,” 353–54. For Tuckett this is not a reason to avoid to such arguments as can be seen, for example, in his own argument from order in relation to Matthean miracles. Rather it is a cautionary note as to the limits of such arguments.
139Butts suggests “chronologically” (as per Kennedy, Progymnasmata, 51, n. 161).
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what is necessary, or combining too many things. Furthermore, Theon states that “one should also guard against confusing the times and order of events, as well as saying the same thing twice. For nothing else confuses thought more than this.”

One may, however, “weave narration into narration whenever we try to narrate two or three narrations at the same time.”

In relation to these matters Theon discusses five possible ways to rearrange a narrative: (1) Begin in the middle, go back to the start, then go to the end (e.g., Homer’s *Odyssey* and Thucydides); (2) Go from the end to the middle and then the beginning (e.g., Herodotus Book 3); (3) Go from middle, to end, to beginning; (4) From the end, to the beginning, to the middle; (5) From beginning, to end, to middle. His choice of examples (e.g., the *Odyssey* and Thucydides) is instructive as to what he considers narrative from a perspective of genre and especially length (he refers to one component of Thucydides but to the whole of the *Odyssey*) suggesting again a degree of flexibility in this regard. What is clear, however, is that selection and arrangement were important considerations in relation to speech and writing. While this does not necessarily imply chronology (as per the different ways a narrative could be arranged), it certainly involved consideration of clarity, conciseness and credibility, all of which impact the selection and ordering of material in a narrative.

It is possible of course for these virtues to compete such as when conciseness compromises clarity or credibility, whether in relation to selection and order of narrative units, or simply within one particular narrative unit. In such situations Theon advises that “one should aim at what is more pressing” such that “if the subject is of a difficult nature, one should go for clarity and credibility; if, on the other hand, the subject is simple and not complicated, aim at conciseness and credibility. One should always keep what is credible in the narration, for this is its most special feature.” In addition “one should narrate very briefly things that are going to distress the hearers” and “dwell at length on pleasant-sounding things.” What these comments

---

143 Kennedy, *Progymnasmata*, 29. See similar comments by Nicolaus (ibid. 137).
highlight is simply that the conventions were applied with flexibility and not rigidity, something that will need to be born in mind when analyzing ancient writings below.

2.3.3.4 Potential Objections to the Application of Ancient Rhetoric

The progymnasmata, therefore, not only elaborate upon what we might expect in relation to the content of ancient βίος but also provide conventions (in relation to selection, order and rewriting of narrative and encomiastic material) by which we can potentially evaluate the plausibility of the implied redaction of the Gospel writers upon the assumption of any given hypothesis. There are of course some potential objections to such a project. First it may be argued that ancient education was primarily focused on training orators not writers. Writing and speech proficiency, however, were not mutually exclusive categories in antiquity but were the product of the same education system. Indeed reading and imitating ancient authors (in written exercises) was central to the educational process and, as Theon himself states, “training in exercises is absolutely useful not only to those who are going to practice rhetoric but also if one wishes to undertake the function of poets or historians or any other writers.”

---

145 A failure to recognize this has lead to some questionable applications of rhetoric to New Testament literature such as a macro-analysis of Pauline letters according to components of rhetorical speeches, often producing contradictory and confusing results (compare for example: Duane F. Watson, “A Rhetorical Analysis of Philippians and Its Implications for the Unity Question,” NovT 30 [1988]: 57–88; and L. Gregory Bloomquist, The Function of Suffering in Philippians, JSNTSup 78 [Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993]). The structure of such letters, it seems to me, is better understood according to epistolary categories. Thus while rhetoric may be useful at the level of micro-level analysis, its application to the macro-structure of such letters involves a confusion of genres (agreeing with Jeffrey T. Reed, “Using Ancient Rhetorical Categories to Interpret Paul’s Letters: A Question of Genre,” in Rhetoric and the New Testament: Essays from the 1992 Heidelberg Conference, ed. Stanley E. Porter and Thomas H. Olbricht, JSNTSup 90 [Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993], 292–324).


148 Theon, Exercises, section 70 in Kennedy, Progymnasmata, 13. See also the early reference to progymnasmata in Rhetoric for Alexander (1436a 25) where it is stated “if we habituate and train ourselves to repeat them (apparently a
Chapter 2 Establishing a Methodology

Secondly it might be objected that the progymnasmata are theoretical texts that do not represent actual practice. This, however, can be countered if the conventions can be shown to influence the practice of ancient authors, which is precisely what Damm seeks to do by first analyzing sections of Josephus and Plutarch before looking at the Gospels themselves. I will likewise analyze selected examples from Josephus’ *Antiquities of the Jews* (chapter 3) and Plutarch’s *Lives* (chapter 4) in order to establish the degree to which we may reasonably state that their re-presentation of source material was influenced by the ancient rhetorical conventions of narrative and encomium. In particular I shall examine Josephus’ re-presentation of the Exodus (Ant 2.200-349), Elisha (Ant 9.28-185), and Jonah narratives (Ant 9.208-214) along with examples from Plutarch’s *Coriolanus* and *Camillus*. While some of these examples will include miracle tradition (e.g., Josephus on Elisha), the primary point of comparison is with the narrative form as discussed in the handbooks and progymnasmata.

Finally it may be objected that the synoptic evangelists did not receive formal rhetorical training whereby we cannot legitimately expect them to follow such convention. Education was certainly a privilege of the elite, especially at advanced levels. Insofar as the Gospels are

---

reference to previous writings) on the lines of our preparatory exercises (προγυμνάσματα), they will supply us with plenty of matter both in writing and speaking.” Martin states that the preliminary exercises “constituted the highest level of training for written composition in Greco-Roman education, as all subsequent training focused strictly on oratory.... In short, the forms taught in the progymnasmata functioned as nothing less than the building blocks of ancient Greek literature, beginning with the classics” (“Progymnastic Topic Lists,” 21).

149 Damm, “Rhetorical Approach”.

150 Insofar as they conform to the genre of ancient Βίοι (as above) the comments of ancient rhetoricians on encomium are pertinent to the rhetorical study of the Gospels. While Plutarch’s *Lives* likewise fit comfortably into this genre, Josephus is perhaps best read as ancient apologetic historiography (as per Greg Sterling, *Historiography and Self-Definition: Josephus, Luke-Acts and Apologetic Historiography* [Leiden; New York; Köln: E. J. Brill, 1992]). Nevertheless Josephus’ interest in characterization provides an obvious bridge to both Βίος and encomium as per the studies of Louis H. Feldman (e.g., *Josephus’s Interpretation of the Bible*, Hellenistic Culture and Society, Vol 27 [Berkeley and Los Angeles, Ca.: University of California Press, 1998a] - in addition to the various biographical presentations considered in this monograph, Feldman has written a series of articles on characterization in Josephus including, for example, “Josephus’ Portrait of Elisha,” *NovT* 36/1 [1994]: 1–28).

151 While ancient literacy levels has been generally estimated at about 10% (William V. Harris, *Ancient Literacy* [Cambridge, Mass., 1989]) estimates for Jewish Palestine are as low as 3-5% (Meir Bar-Ilan, “Illiteracy in the Land of Israel in the First Centuries C.E,” in *Essays in the Social Scientific Study of Judaism and Jewish Society. Volume II.*, ed. Simcha Fishbane and Stuart Schoenfeld [Hoboken, NJ: Ktav, 1992], 44–61; Catherine Hezser, *Jewish Literacy in Roman Palestine*, Texte und Studien Zum Antiken Judentum, 81 [Tübingen: Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 2001], 498; John S. Kloppenborg, “Variation,” 55). While such figures are obviously approximate and vary depending on how literacy is defined, it is clear that far fewer passed through advanced rhetorical training than received elementary education in reading and writing skills.
anonymous documents we can only infer the likelihood of the evangelists having received rhetorical training from the nature of the documents themselves. Based on his analysis of Luke’s Gospel Martin specifically concludes that the author “employs the lists with rhetorical skill comparable to the most educated of biographers” (e.g., Plutarch and Philo) and was likely, therefore, “a graduate of the progymnasmata.” Martin is far from a lone voice in his contention that the evangelists employ rhetorical skill in composing the Gospels and on this Burridge is in agreement. Indeed the very fact of their being composed in Greek implies at least a first or secondary level education. Furthermore the implied process of composition (at least for the three hypotheses under consideration) involves no mere copying but rewriting sources in a manner suggestive of more advanced rhetorical skill associated with the progymnasmatic exercises. Finally the virtues under consideration were essentially pervasive in ancient rhetoric which was a highly public activity thus allowing for significant contact between those more or less educated. Hence, despite some dissenting voices, persuasive

153 This is particularly so in his employment of synecesis in relation to his comparison of Jesus and John. See Michael W. Martin, “Progymnastic Topic Lists,” 41.
154 David Aune, for instance, notes that nearly all Greco-Roman writing was “under the strong influence of rhetoric” (The New Testament in Its Literary Environment, ed. Wayne A. Meeks, Library of Early Christianity [Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1987], 30–31). The influence of the progymnasmata and rhetoric upon the New Testament writings are detected in a series of publications by Vernon Robbins and Burton Mack (e.g., Robbins, “Rhetorical Act”; Robbins, “Narrative in Ancient Rhetoric”; Mack and Robbins, Patterns of Persuasion; Mack, Rhetoric). See also Kennedy (Rhetorical Criticism) and Downing (“A Bas les Aristos: The Relevance of Higher Literature for the Understanding of the Earliest Christian Writings,” NovT 30, no. 3 [1988]: 212–30) who argues that literary and cultural awareness was mediated from higher to lower educated classes such that “there is no sign of a culture-gap between the highly literate aristocracy and the masses” (p. 229).
155 E.g. in the following publications: Burridge, What Are the Gospels? 243–47; “Biography”; “The Gospels and Acts” (These latter two articles argue for the influence of rhetoric on ancient biography in general and then in relation to the Gospels and Acts in particular). Burridge is not convinced that the evangelists received “higher rhetorical training” but notes that “a general awareness of rhetoric and of literary training permeated much wider throughout society than just the formal training” (“The Gospels and Acts,” 510). Of the three synoptic evangelists he believes Mark to show the least signs of rhetorical training noting the tendency of both Matthew and Luke (assuming Markan priority) to improve Mark’s style and develop his model in a biographical and historiographical direction. These developments in Matthew and Luke imply some level of rhetorical training and ability (ibid, esp. 526, 530).
156 Burridge approvingly cites Malherbe in this regard who concluded that the quotations and allusions in the New Testament “help us to establish the lowest education level that can reasonably be assumed for the New Testament writers who use them, i.e. the upper levels of secondary-school instruction” (cited in What Are the Gospels? 245).
157 Theon’s narrative virtues are essentially related to one of the major considerations of ancient rhetoric, namely style (Greek ἀέρτος; Latin elocutio). The major virtues (δόξης) of style were correctness, clarity, ornamentation, and propriety (for a general discussion of these virtues see Rowe, “Style,” in Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the
reasons remain for concluding that the evangelists were influenced by the conventions of narrative and encomium as discussed above.

2.4 A Summary of Conventions Based on the Progymnasmata and Rhetorical Handbooks

We are now in a position to state succinctly the conventions that will be used to assess the relative redactional plausibility of the three competing synoptic hypotheses under consideration in this thesis, namely the 2GH, 2DH, and FH. In essence this involves three strands:

(a) **Narrative content**: this considers the influence of Theon’s six elements of narrative (person; action; time; place; manner; and cause) upon selection, order and rewriting at macro- and micro-levels. The element of person is further enlightened by consideration of the encomiastic topic lists which appear to influence the genre of βίος.

(b) **Narrative style**: this considers the influence of Theon’s three stylistic virtues (clarity, conciseness and credibility) upon selection, order and rewriting of narrative at both the macro- and micro-levels.

(c) **Narrative apologetic**: this considers a synchronic analysis of Synoptic miracle tradition as providing an important clue regarding the theological agenda that influenced choices of selection, order and rewriting within the synoptic miracle tradition.

Once these conventions have been tested in relation to Josephus and Plutarch (chapters 3 and 4) where we have a reasonable degree of confidence in identifying their sources, they will then be applied to testing the relative redactional plausibility of competing SP hypotheses in relation to their treatment of the Gospel miracle tradition. This will first be considered in relation to matters of selection and order (chapter 5) and then in relation to the rewriting of specific narrative pericopes (chapter 6). We will then be in a position to assess the greater or lesser
relative plausibility of our three SP hypotheses based on the plausibility of the implied redaction of miracle tradition.

Table 2.1: Synoptic Miracle Stories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Miracles</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Matthew</th>
<th>Luke</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Unclean spirit</td>
<td>Ex</td>
<td>1:21-28</td>
<td>4:31-37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Leper</td>
<td>Heal</td>
<td>1:40-45</td>
<td>8:1-4</td>
<td>5:12-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Shriveled hand</td>
<td>Heal</td>
<td>3:1-6</td>
<td>12:9-14</td>
<td>6:6-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Feeding 5000</td>
<td>Feed</td>
<td>6:30-44</td>
<td>14:13-21</td>
<td>9:10-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Walking on water</td>
<td>Sea</td>
<td>6:45-52</td>
<td>14:22-33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Canaanite woman</td>
<td>Ex</td>
<td>7:24-30</td>
<td>15:21-28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Deaf-mute</td>
<td>Heal</td>
<td>7:31-37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Feeding 4000</td>
<td>Feed</td>
<td>8:1-10</td>
<td>15:32-39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Blind healing</td>
<td>Heal</td>
<td>8:22-26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Fig Tree</td>
<td>Sign</td>
<td>11:12-14, 20-25</td>
<td>21:18-22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Centurion’s servant</td>
<td>Heal</td>
<td>8:5-13</td>
<td>7:1-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Two blind men</td>
<td>Heal</td>
<td>9:27-31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Mute</td>
<td>Ex</td>
<td>9:32-34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Coin in fish</td>
<td>Sign</td>
<td>17:24-27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Catch of fish</td>
<td>Sign</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5:1-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Widow’s son</td>
<td>Heal</td>
<td>7:11-17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Bent woman</td>
<td>Heal</td>
<td>13:10-17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Dropsical man</td>
<td>Heal</td>
<td>14:1-6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Ten lepers</td>
<td>Heal</td>
<td>17:11-19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Servant’s ear</td>
<td>Heal</td>
<td>22:50-51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1The (admittedly heuristic) classifications are as follows: exorcistic healing (Ex); non-exorcistic healing (Heal); and nature miracles (sea; feed; sign). Blank spaces indicate the absence of a parallel. For classic form-critical discussions see, for example Dibelius, Tradition, Bultmann, History, and Taylor, Formation.

2Verse 21 is a textual variant.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theon</th>
<th>Hermogenes (Encomium and Syncrisis)</th>
<th>Aphonius (Encomium; Invective; Syncrisis)</th>
<th>Nicolaus (Encomium; Invective; Syncrisis)</th>
<th>Composite</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) good birth (origin) - city, tribe, constitution - ancestors or other relatives</td>
<td>2. City</td>
<td>a) nation</td>
<td>a) nationality</td>
<td>a) nation and (noble?) birth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) education</td>
<td>3. Family</td>
<td>b) homeland</td>
<td>b) native city</td>
<td>b) parents, ancestors, tribe, relatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) friendship</td>
<td>4. Marvelous occurrences at birth (e.g. dreams; signs)</td>
<td>c) ancestors</td>
<td>c) Phenomena at birth (stars, visions, etc.)</td>
<td>c) Phenomena at birth (stars, visions, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) reputation</td>
<td>5. Nurture (e.g. Achilles nurtured on lion’s marrow)</td>
<td>d) parents</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Origin and (noble?) birth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) good children</td>
<td>7. Body (beauty; size; speed; strength)</td>
<td>4. Deeds (the ‘greatest heading’)</td>
<td>5. Deeds (virtues)</td>
<td>3. Deeds and virtues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) good death</td>
<td></td>
<td>a) body</td>
<td>a) body</td>
<td>a) body (health; strength; beauty; acuteness of sense; agility)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Bodily goods</td>
<td>8. Mind (= virtues) (just; temperate; wise; brave)</td>
<td>b) mind (= virtues)</td>
<td>b) mind (virtues)</td>
<td>b) mind/soul (virtues): justice; wisdom; temperance; courage; piety.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) health</td>
<td>9. Pursuits (vocation) and deeds</td>
<td>c) fortune (=externals)</td>
<td>c) fortune (externals)</td>
<td>c) fortune (externals): power; wealth; friends; children (number and beauty of); fame; fortune; length of life; military exploits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) strength</td>
<td></td>
<td>(power; wealth; friends)</td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Death</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) beauty</td>
<td>10. Externals (relatives; friends; possessions; servants; luck etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a) manner of death</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) acuteness of sense</td>
<td>11. Time (length of life)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b) greatness of one who killed the subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Ethical virtues (goods of the mind and the actions resulting from these)</td>
<td>12. Manner of death (e.g. dies fighting)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c) events after death</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13. Greatness of the one who killed the subject</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Comparison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14. Events after death (e.g. held games in honor)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Comparison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15. Comparison</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.3: Encomium Topic Lists (Rhetorical Handbooks)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Rhetorica ad Herennium 3.6-8</strong></th>
<th><strong>Quintilian, The Orator’s Education 3:7:11-7</strong></th>
<th><strong>Cicero, De Oratore 2.10.45-46</strong></th>
<th><strong>Cicero, De Oratore 2.84</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Introduction</strong></td>
<td>1. Before the person’s life:</td>
<td>1. Favors of fortune (external and physical):</td>
<td>List of qualities desirable in a person (given in context of a discussion of panegyrics):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) country</td>
<td>a) race</td>
<td>a) family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) parents</td>
<td>b) wealth</td>
<td>b) good looks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) ancestors</td>
<td>c) connections</td>
<td>c) bodily strength</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d) prophecies or omens</td>
<td>d) friendships</td>
<td>d) resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. External circumstances:</td>
<td>2. The person’s actual life:</td>
<td>e) power</td>
<td>e) riches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) descent</td>
<td>a) mind* (natural abilities; education; deeds and sayings)</td>
<td>f) good health</td>
<td>* Obviously this is not a complete list and concludes with “and the rest of external or personal gifts of fortune”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) education</td>
<td>b) body (beauty; strength; weakness; fortune)</td>
<td>g) beauty</td>
<td>Additional virtues listed include the following:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) wealth</td>
<td>c) external circumstances (wealth; power; influence)</td>
<td>h) vigour</td>
<td>- mercy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) kinds of power</td>
<td></td>
<td>i) talent</td>
<td>- justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) titles to fame</td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Conduct (moral excellencies):</td>
<td>- kindness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) citizenship</td>
<td></td>
<td>a) wisdom</td>
<td>- fidelity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) friendships</td>
<td></td>
<td>b) generosity</td>
<td>- courage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Physical attributes:</td>
<td></td>
<td>c) valor</td>
<td>- wisdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) agility</td>
<td></td>
<td>d) righteousness</td>
<td>- magnanimity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) strength</td>
<td></td>
<td>e) greatness of Soul</td>
<td>- intellect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) beauty</td>
<td></td>
<td>f) sense of duty</td>
<td>- eloquence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) health</td>
<td></td>
<td>g) gratitude</td>
<td>- bearing of adversity wisely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Qualities of character:</td>
<td></td>
<td>h) kindliness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) wisdom</td>
<td>3. After the person’s life (e.g. honors; decrees; statues etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) justice</td>
<td></td>
<td>*Under “mind” he offers alternative categories (virtues such as courage, justice, self control etc.).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) courage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) temperance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.3 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cicero, <em>De Partitio Oratoria</em> 20-21</th>
<th><em>Rhetorica Ad Alexandrum</em> 1440-1441</th>
<th>Cicero, <em>De Inventione</em> 2:53-54; 59</th>
<th>Composite</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) family</td>
<td>a) noble birth (genealogy)</td>
<td>a) wisdom</td>
<td>a) prophecies or omens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) fortune and estate</td>
<td>b) strength</td>
<td>b) justice</td>
<td>b) noble birth (genealogy and family of origin)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Goods of the body:</td>
<td>c) beauty</td>
<td>c) courage</td>
<td>c) citizenship (country)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) appearance</td>
<td>d) wealth</td>
<td>d) temperance</td>
<td>d) Wealth and power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) achievements</td>
<td>a) wisdom</td>
<td>a) health</td>
<td>f) associations and friendships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) prudence</td>
<td>b) justice</td>
<td>b) beauty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) intelligence</td>
<td>c) courage</td>
<td>c) strength</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) wisdom</td>
<td>d) creditable habits</td>
<td>d) speed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) temperance</td>
<td>3. Extraneous virtues:</td>
<td>4. Deeds and Virtues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) fortitude</td>
<td>a) public office</td>
<td>a) qualities of character:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) patience</td>
<td>b) money</td>
<td>wisdom; justice; courage;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) piety</td>
<td>c) connections by marriage</td>
<td>temperance; self control;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) goodness</td>
<td>d) high birth</td>
<td>generosity; valor; sense of duty;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j) friendliness</td>
<td>e) friends</td>
<td>gratitude; kindliness; mercy;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k) modesty</td>
<td>f) country</td>
<td>fidelity; magnanimity; eloquence;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB: this list is not entirely clear in Cicero and I have taken the liberty to rearrange it.</td>
<td>g) power etc.</td>
<td>bearing adversity wisely etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: See also Book 1:24 to 1:28 where he discusses various attributes of persons and actions.

b) noteworthy deeds and sayings

5. After a person’s life
a) positive legacy: statues; honors; decrees;
Chapter 3: Literary and Rhetorical Conventions in Josephus’ Antiquities of the Jews

3.1 Introduction

As a Jewish writer and an approximate contemporary of the evangelists writing in the aftermath of 70 C.E. Josephus provides an apt point of comparison to the Gospel writers, as demonstrated by the work of previous researchers. In this chapter I propose to examine his adaptations of the Exodus, Elisha and Jonah narratives in his Antiquities of the Jews. This will involve analyzing selection and order at the macro-level along with narrative transformation of individual pericopes at the micro-level. The analysis will pay particular attention to the influence of the rhetorical conventions of narrative and encomium as discussed in the previous chapter. In order to set the stage for this analysis, however, it is necessary to provide some introductory remarks on the literary and apologetic nature of the Antiquities.

3.2 The Nature and Function of Josephus’ Antiquities

Josephus’ Antiquities has been described as “a lengthy celebration and elaboration of the Jewish nation’s history, constitution, culture, and virtues” and is typically dated to the 3rd year of Domitian’s reign (93/94 C.E.). As the longest of his extant works, it recounts the story of the Jewish nation from creation up to the events preceding the war of 66 C.E. Structurally there are two major parts roughly corresponding to the periods of the first (Ant. 1–10) and second (Ant. 11–20) temples with chapter 10 possibly functioning as the central fulcrum.

---

1See, for example the articles by Downing comparing the redactional procedures of Josephus and the Gospel writers (“Redaction Criticism I”; and “Redaction Criticism II”), Greg Sterling’s comparison of the genres of Josephus and Luke-Acts (Historiography), and Alex Damm’s recent dissertation on rhetoric and the synoptic problem (“Rhetorical Approach”).
3See the discussion in Feldman (Flavius Josephus Judean Antiquities 1–4: Translation and Commentary [Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2004], xx-xxii) where he suggests tripartite divisions within each half and also endorses a chiastic structure with chapter 10 at the centre of a larger “ring composition.” Books 1-10 roughly correspond to the Hebrew scriptures with books 11-20 picking up where they leave off.
3.2.1 Josephus’ Sources for the Antiquities

Despite ongoing debate, Louis Feldman suggests that the “overwhelming majority of scholars” believe Josephus used a combination of Hebrew and Greek texts, possibly alongside an Aramaic Targum, as his primary sources for books 1–10 of the Antiquities. He implies by autobiographical statements about his education (Life 2) along with an explicit claim in the introduction to his Antiquities to have ‘translated’ from Hebrew (Ant. 1.5). According to Harold Attridge, however, it is the LXX that provides the clearest signs of being a source for Josephus insofar as the Antiquities contains parallel material (for example from 1 Esdras and 1 Maccabees) that is absent from all other extant ancient sources. Furthermore, Josephus makes explicit mention of the LXX as a precedent for his own work in Ant. 1.10-12 and devotes considerable space to the Letter of Aristeas. Indeed, the general high regard for the LXX in the Jewish Diaspora almost necessitates Josephus’ use of it. At the same time Josephus’ primary language was likely Aramaic and the paraphrasing latitude of a Targum is consistent with his narrative method, especially his freer style in Ant. 1–6.

Feldman concludes that Josephus’ primary source for the Pentateuch, which provides the context for the exodus narrative, was “either a Hebrew text, a targummic paraphrase in Aramaic,
or both.” At the same time he notes that the greater relative agreement in the Hebrew and Greek texts of the Pentateuch combined with Josephus’ freer style in Ant. 1-6 make it uncertain “whether he is using a Hebrew or a Greek text at any given point.” While he believes Josephus follows the Greek more often than the Hebrew in Genesis, he suggests the evidence is inconclusive for Exodus. Regarding Kings and Chronicles, the context for the Elisha narrative, Feldman believes that the LXX was most likely Josephus’ primary source. The source-critical question is complicated by the text critical reality that manuscripts available to Josephus differed from extant Hebrew and Greek manuscripts, which themselves evidence divergence. While these various potential problems require that we proceed with caution, it is nevertheless possible to obtain a general sense of how Josephus adapts his sources, at both the macro- and micro-levels, especially in Ant. 1–10 where extant Hebrew and Greek texts provide us something closely resembling those sources.

3.2.2 Rhetorical Conventions and Josephus’ Rewriting of his Sources

Josephus’ own claim about source utilization is clear: “this narrative will, therefore, in due course, set forth the precise details of what is in the Scriptures according to its proper order. For I promised that I would do this throughout this treatise, neither adding nor omitting anything” (Ant. 1.17). According to modern standards Josephus’ does not live up to his promise insofar as his account, when compared to extant Hebrew and Greek texts, demonstrates significant omissions, additions, rearrangement, conflation, filling out of gaps and resolving of apparent

---

12Feldman, Josephus’ Interpretation, 30.
13So, for example, Feldman, Josephus’ Interpretation, 23–24. See also Christopher Begg’s discussion of different versions of the LXX that may have been available to Josephus in his rewriting of the narrative of the death of Elisha, which will be considered below (“Joash and Elisha in Josephus, Ant. 9.177–185,” Ahr-Nahrain 32 [1994]: 28–46).
15Translation from Feldman, Judean Antiquities, 7. Similar claims are reiterated at Ant. 4.197, 8.56, 10.218, and 12.109 (see Attridge, Interpretation, 58).
contradictions.\textsuperscript{16} At least nine different proposals have been offered to explain the discrepancies:\textsuperscript{17} (1) Josephus did not actually modify the text; (2) he was prohibited from adding to the content of scripture but not from modifying the consonantal text; (3) he is lying; (4) the promise to ‘neither add nor omit’ refers specifically to a prohibition relating to Torah commandments (Deut 4:3 and 12:32); (5) he is not only referring to the written bible but also to Jewish oral tradition; (6) he has latitude as a human author to translate and interpret; (7) he is using a stock formula; (8) he was referring to a parallel attitude among ancient (Greek) interpreters of Homer (such as the Greek tragedians with whom he was familiar) who engaged in free interpretation; (9) the LXX and Philo understood “translate” in a different, much freer, sense than today with more literal translation being associated with the later Aquila (early second century C.E.).

Unless we posit that Josephus utilized a radically different text, the extent of the transformations rule out explanations (1) and (2). Meanwhile the ease with which he could be exposed makes reason (3) unlikely and the specificity of reason (4) goes beyond anything explicit in the text. While reason (5) perhaps has merit in explaining some changes, our inaccessibility to oral traditions from the period reduces its usefulness as a point of control. Moreover in \textit{Ant.} 1.17 Josephus seems to have \textit{written} scriptures in mind. The remaining reasons (numbers 6, 7, 8, and 9) are not necessarily mutually exclusive and may point toward a larger picture in which ancient authors felt no hesitation in “taking liberties - and often very considerable liberties - with their sacred texts.”\textsuperscript{18} Feldman sees the different words for ‘translation’ in Josephus along with indications that Cicero, for example, distinguished two different types of translation (word for word versus free style) as providing further support for

\textsuperscript{16}On this see, for example, Bond (“New Currents,” 166), Downing (“Redaction Criticism I”), and Feldman (“Rearrangement of Biblical Material in Josephus’ Antiquities, Book 1,” in \textit{SBLSP} 38 [Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1999], 246–62).

\textsuperscript{17}While I am indebted to Feldman (\textit{Josephus’ Interpretation}, 37–46) for the list, I have rearranged the order to correspond with my subsequent comments.

\textsuperscript{18}Feldman, \textit{Josephus’ Interpretation}, 659.
the basic contention of number (9), namely that Josephus worked with a notion of ‘translation’ that required him to be true to content but not exact wording (or external form).\textsuperscript{19}

Taken together with general observations about his redactional activity (above) and his own statement that Moses “left his writings in disarray” (\textit{Ant.} 4.197) it is clear that in modern terms “he conceived of his task as not merely translating but also interpreting the scriptures.”\textsuperscript{20} Accordingly Attridge sees such “substantial evidence of the creativity of Josephus himself” that \textit{Antiquities} cannot be taken as a “reproduction of sources but a careful reworking of them.”\textsuperscript{21}

While this has resulted in mixed reviews of his character and competence, there is a growing opinion that he was a competent historian\textsuperscript{22} with at least some level of exposure to rhetorical training, notwithstanding apparent deficiencies in his knowledge of Greek grammar and idiom.\textsuperscript{23}

Thus Feldman notes how he “sought to improve upon his sources” and “set forth the details of biblical history in accordance with their proper order (\kata\ta\tau\i\nu o\i\k\i\a\nu\tau\o\xi\i\nuv), using the military term \tau\o\xi\i\si\v (arrangement or order of troops, battle array or order of battle) as if he were in literature the general he had been in the field during the war.”\textsuperscript{24} Thus he replaces parataxis with hypotaxis,\textsuperscript{25} sets out speeches in conformity with the rhetorical conventions of his day (according to the earlier precedent of Thucydides),\textsuperscript{26} and romanticizes and dramatizes according to the influence of Greek tragedy\textsuperscript{27} as well as novel and novella.\textsuperscript{28} It is thus claimed that he

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{19}Feldman, \textit{Josephus’ Interpretation}, 44–46.
\item \textsuperscript{20}Feldman, \textit{Josephus’ Interpretation}, 46. Similarly so in Attridge, \textit{Interpretation}, 58.
\item \textsuperscript{21}\textit{Interpretation}, 37–38. Similarly Feldman notes that Josephus is frequently paraphrasing (rather than translating) thus making source identification more difficult (\textit{Josephus’ Interpretation}, 27).
\item \textsuperscript{22}See the helpful overview in Bond, who concludes that “most historians today would assert that, as long as he is used with caution, Josephus is still a historical source of unique rank” (“New Currents,” 177–8).
\item \textsuperscript{23}So Feldman (\textit{Judean Antiquities}, xxxcviii) who states that this makes his prose difficult to read.
\item \textsuperscript{24}\textit{Josephus’ Interpretation}, 163–64. Regarding Josephus’ stylistic changes in general and the overall Hellenistic influence on his writings see ibid., 163–220. Feldman elsewhere highlights Josephus’ ‘military-like’ rearrangement of biblical material and notes the similar use of \tau\o\xi\i\si\v along with \o\i\k\o\nu\o\mu\i\a (“arrangement”) in Pseudo-Longinus (\textit{On the Sublime} 1.4) (“Rearrangement,” 246–7). He notes that the latter term (\o\i\k\o\nu\o\mu\i\a) is also used of historical endeavours in Diodorus Siculus, Pseudo-Longinus and Quintilian (3.3.9 citing Hermagoras).
\item \textsuperscript{25}Feldman, \textit{Josephus’ Interpretation}, 164.
\item \textsuperscript{26}So Donna R. Runnalls, “The Rhetoric of Josephus,” in \textit{Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period 330 B.C. – A. D. 400}, ed. Stanley E. Porter (Leiden: New York: Köln: Brill, 1997), 737–54. She also argues that the prologues to both \textit{War} and \textit{Antiquities} are rhetorically fashioned in relation to Aristotles’ three artificial proofs of ethos, pathos and logos.
\item \textsuperscript{27}So Attridge (\textit{Interpretation}, 39–40), Feldman (\textit{Josephus’ Interpretation}, 179–88), and Bond (“New Currents,” 166).
\end{itemize}
appeals to his Greek-educated reader as he sought to “draw up the scriptures in an orderly and rhetorically pleasing fashion.”

3.2.3 Josephus’ Apologetic Interests

In terms of genre the Antiquities is probably best labeled apologetic historiography rather than βίος. This does not, however, negate all connection to βίος insofar as Feldman argues that, following one of his sources (Nicolaus of Damascus), Josephus produces a narrative in the peripatetic tradition that focuses on biblical heroes as no less deserving of praise than their Greek counterparts. This is demonstrated in the narrative space afforded these heroes and their character portrayal according to progymnastic categories of encomium. While this justifies the use of progymnastic encomiastic conventions in analyzing his narrative adaptations, Josephus’ apologetic aims clearly go beyond individual heroes. Thus, according to Gregory Sterling, he presents Judaism (1) to the Greek world in an attempt to overturn misconceptions, (2) to the Roman world in hope of regaining a favorable status in the wake of the war, and (3) to the Jewish world in a form that served as a basis for a reconstructed Judaism. That Antiquities

---

29Feldman, Josephus’ Interpretation, 171–9. In particular Feldman points to the influence upon Josephus of Homer, Hesiod, Aeschylus, Sophocles, Euripides, Ezekiel the Tragedian, Herodotus, Thucydides, Plato and Aristotle. This influence is also seen in Josephus’ tendency toward Atticism (Bond, “New Currents,” 166).
31See in particular Sterling, Historiography.
32Noting Against Apion 2.136 where Josephus states, “Our own famous men, who are entitled to rank with the highest, are familiar to readers of my Antiquities.” Among Feldman’s numerous articles on biographical portraits in Josephus see, for example, “Josephus’ Interpretation of Jonah,” AJSR 17 (1992): 1–29 and “Elisha”. For a broad overview of his ‘biographical’ approach along with several other specific examples see Josephus’ Interpretation, esp. 74–131 and the whole of Part II.
33Feldman, Josephus’ Interpretation, 74-131. Regarding the relative space afforded biblical heroes in Antiquities (compared with both the Hebrew and LXX) see pp. 75-82. Regarding categories included in the qualities of heroes see pp. 82-131. These include antiquity, genealogy, birth, precociousness (nurture and training), physical attractiveness (deeds of the body), wealth, leadership, and cardinal virtues (wisdom, courage and skill in battle, temperance and modesty, justice and truth, and piety). See discussion of encomiastic categories in chapter 2 along with lists in tables 2.2 and 2.3.
34Sterling, Historiography, 265–310. Feldman draws attention to a larger list of potential models or literary predecessors for Josephus’ Antiquities. This includes the Septuagint, various Jewish works (e.g., Jubilees, Genesis Apocryphon, targumim and Philo) as well as various non-Jewish works (for example Egyptian and Babylonian chronicles, Herodotus, and Thucydidies) (Josephus’ Interpretation, 14–23).
functions as an *apologia* for Judaism is generally beyond dispute and Dionysius’ *Roman Antiquities* is often identified as a his primary model. At the same time Feldman criticizes scholarship for overly general designations of Josephus’ intended audience (such as ‘the Roman government,’ ‘the Greco-Roman world,’ ‘gentile public opinion’ and ‘the Greek world at large’) noting that ancient book production did not occur in a vacuum. Rather he sees the primary audience as a small group of Josephus’ friends, fellow writers and wealthy supporters. He considers it difficult to imagine a general gentile readership, owing to insufficient interest, and instead posits a more specific gentile readership of those “deeply interested in Judaism.” This, he believes, is in keeping with both the prologue of the *Antiquities* and what we know of Roman interest in Judaism at the time. No matter the immediate audience, however, it is clear that Josephus seeks to answer “malicious critics” of the Jews who, for example, charged them with having produced “no great men.”

Several key themes have been highlighted in relation to Josephus’ overall apologetic aims in the *Antiquities*. The first of these is God’s ‘providence’ (πρόνοια) which Attridge defines as the “watchful, concerned forethought and consideration” by which God “exercises providential care for the world ... in rewarding of virtue and punishing of vice.” Accordingly the “history of

36So Attridge (*Interpretation*, 43, 47 62–66) and especially Feldman (*Josephus’ Interpretation*, 3–13) who sees the fusion of two Greek schools of historiography (Isocrates and Aristotle) in Josephus, something which he says is anticipated in Dionysius. From Isocrates came such things as fictitious speeches, digressions, moralizing, rhetorical and tragic hues, eulogistic biography etc. From Aristotle came a stress on scientific, empirical investigation and classification of types of lives along with emphasis on character for its own sake. Parallels with Dionysius include praise for the Jews (‘Romans’ in Dionysius), moralizing and psychologizing, stress on piety and the role of divine providence, parallel scenes, use of the title *Antiquities*, use of “myth” as a principal source, and a scope that ranged beyond politics to religious and private life.
37For this and the following see Feldman, *Judean Antiquities*, xiii-xx. For an example of generalizing the audience, see Attridge ( *Interpretation*, 17 and 26–27) who states that *Antiquities* “reworks Jewish tradition in categories derived from and comprehensible to a Greco-Roman public” and constitutes “an attempt to proclaim to the Greco-Roman world the significance and the meaning of Judaism.”
39Feldman, *Josephus’ Interpretation*, 132–33. According to Feldman (ibid. 133-60) Josephus’ argument, at heart, sought to (1) defend the historicity of the scriptures; (2) rehabilitate non-Jewish leaders (e.g., Pharaoh); (3) tone down the rhetoric of the Jewish refusal to intermarry; (4) appeal to political interest (highlighting the Jewish political constitution and the need to show respect to a ruling nation); (5) tone down the rhetoric of Jewish nationalism; and (6) omit material that might lead to charges of proselytism (about which the Romans were particularly sensitive).
40Attridge, *Interpretation*, 71–107, quotes from 71 and 106–7 respectively.
Israel is seen to be a collection of miraculous and prophetical evidence for the truth of that belief” whereby “God’s special care for Israel is seen to be simply a particular case of his general mode of relating to the world.” While others see him downplaying the role of God and simply tapping into popular philosophical notions of providence (πρόοντις), fortune (τύχη) and fate (εἰμαμένη), Helen Bond notes that “he never diminishes the overarching importance of belief in one God and Torah” and “never allows these (popular) concepts to replace God.”

Second, in both the title and fabric of the work (noting how he begins from creation) Josephus’ displays a concern “to demonstrate the great antiquity of the Judean people and their institutions.” While not regarded positively by all, Feldman suggests that ‘antiquity’ was at least a shared value among the elite and aristocratic and thus a point in common with Josephus’ audience. Third, Josephus, like Cicero, explores political constitution through his history by introducing the term theocracy and demonstrating a preference for aristocracy. He thereby presents the Judean constitution as an appealing political alternative. Fourth, he presents an alternative philosophy by depicting many of the biblical characters in philosophical terms, often with ties to contemporary stoicism. Feldman notes that philosophy was seen to affect all areas of life and had to do with a ‘way of living in the world’ thereby making it closely allied to politics. Finally, Josephus displays a tendency to moralize by drawing out the ethical implications of history through character evaluation with Moses held up as the positive ideal. Feldman sees a parallel to Josephus’ moralizing and biographical interests in Plutarch, who “often referred to his ... Parallel Lives as history,” the difference being that Josephus embedded his biographical vignettes within a “continuous historical framework.”

41 Attridge, Interpretation, 106-7.
43 Feldman, Judean Antiquities, xxiii. On this and the following three themes see Feldman (ibid. xxii-xxxiv) where he isolates these four themes from the many possibilities.
44 Josephus’ moralizing tendency is likewise pointed out (in addition to Feldman) by Attridge, who identifies it as the second key theme alongside providence (Interpretation, 21 and 109-44), and George MacRae (“Miracle in The Antiquities of Josephus,” in Miracles: Cambridge Studies in Their Philosophy and History, ed. C.F.D. Moule [London: A. R. Mowbray & Co Ltd., 1965], 130).
45 Feldman, Judean Antiquities, xxxiv. He notes that it was on account of Cicero that history writing became a vehicle of epideictic rhetoric thereby taking on a “decidedly moralistic hue” (ibid. xxxii-xxxiv). The influence of
3.2.4 Miracle and Prophecy in Josephus’ Antiquities

In addition to these thematic considerations, Josephus’ attitude toward miracle and prophecy are of particular interest in relation to the exodus, Elisha, and Jonah narratives. Miracles clearly have an important role in the Antiquities and yet Josephus’ attitude toward them is somewhat puzzling.\(^{46}\) Besides omitting many miracles,\(^ {47}\) especially in relation to the Elisha narrative,\(^ {48}\) he repeatedly invites readers to make up their own minds about the truthfulness of miraculous events, namely via a formula perhaps borrowed from Dionysius of Halicarnassus,\(^ {49}\) and offers rationalizations that apparently accommodate to gentile skepticism (or even express his own).\(^ {50}\)

As Eric Eve points out, however, *explanations* of Josephus’ ‘rationalizations’ frequently go beyond Josephus’ own explicit statements.\(^ {51}\) Hence the latter may “explain the miracle, but they do not explain it away” whereby “there is little to suggest that Josephus’s ‘rationalizations’ indicate any serious doubts about the veracity of the miracle stories he narrates. In all probability they are simply concessions to his Hellenistic readership.”\(^ {52}\) Indeed there are other indications of

---


\(^{48}\) Regarding the distribution of miracles in *Antiquities* see Eve (*Jewish Context*, 33–40) who notes that approximately ninety percent occur in the first 10 books and that they are clustered around prophetic figures. A reduction in miracles during this ‘post-biblical’ era is therefore in keeping with Josephus’ apparent belief in the cessation of prophecy during this same period (on which see below).

\(^{49}\) So, for example, Moehring, “Rationalization,” 376 and Attridge, *Interpretation*, 44. The formula occurs, for example in the following passages: *Ant.* 1.108; 2.348; 3.83, 268; 4.158; 8.262; 10.281; 17.354.

\(^{50}\) For examples see Moehring, who calls this “one of the most characteristic features of the literary method employed by Josephus” (“Rationalization”, 283), along with Feldman (*Josephus’ Interpretation*, 206–14) and Delling (“Josephus und das Wunderbare,” 305).

\(^{51}\) He particularly has in mind Moehring.

\(^{52}\) So Eve, *Jewish Context*, 26, 49–51. His comments apply to both the rationalizing formula (noted above) as well as apparently naturalistic explanations of certain miraculous events (e.g., in relation to the multiplication of quails in Numbers as per Moehring, “Rationalization,” 380–1). Similar observations are made by MacRae (“Miracle,” 142), Feldman (*Josephus’ Interpretation*, 209–10), and Begg, who identifies the resuscitation of the dead man who contacted Elisha’s body as evidence that one cannot speak of a “clear and consistent Tendenz in Josephus’ handling of miracles” (“Joash and Elisha,” 39).
a more positive attitude toward miracles such as citing archaeological proof for the remains of Noah’s ark (Ant. 1.91)\(^{53}\) and offering explanations of the miraculous that often include both rationalization and supernatural elements, such as when Moses sweetens the water.\(^{54}\) Miracles, then, can function as a manifestation of God’s Πρόφυσις, which (as noted above) may be simply a convenient (Stoic) term for the purpose of identification with his Greco-Roman reader(s),\(^{55}\) and provide occasions for ethical lessons.\(^{56}\) Josephus seems to have been “particularly concerned about the miraculous proof of prophetic power”\(^{57}\) whereby genuine prophets validate their calling and message both through the signs they perform and predictions of signs that God will perform.\(^{58}\) In this way miracles are closely related to the Πρόφυσις of God and the authentication of prophets.\(^{59}\)

Despite giving limited space to the ‘canonical’ prophets,\(^{60}\) Josephus’ knowledge of the prophetic books and special interest in prophecy is apparent from his introduction of the word

\(^{53}\)On this, and other examples, see Moehring, “Rationalization,” 376 and Delling, “Josephus und das Wunderbare,” 292.

\(^{54}\)See Delling (“Josephus und das Wunderbare,” 301–3 and 307–8) for this and other examples. Dennis Duling also detects a positive take on miracle (and/or magic and exorcism) in his article “The Eleazar Miracle and Solomon’s Magical Wisdom in Flavius Josephus’s Antiquitates Judaicae 8.42–49,” HTR 78/1–2 (1985): 1–25.

\(^{55}\)So Eve (Jewish Context, 46–49) but see also Moehring (“Rationalization,” 377) and Delling (“Josephus und das Wunderbare,” 307–8).

\(^{56}\)So, for example, Delling who notes that it is the piety of Daniel’s friends that prevents their being burned while it is the impiety of Daniel’s enemies that leads to their being consumed by the lions (“Josephus und das Wunderbare,” 299–300). Eve also notes this ethical element to Josephus miracles (Jewish Context, 42, 46).

\(^{57}\)So Moehring, “Rationalization,” 381–2, who highlights at least three instances of false prophets where claims to provides miracles result in failure.

\(^{58}\)So Delling, “Josephus und das Wunderbare,” 294–7. Moses is the chief example who in receiving his prophetic calling to return to Egypt was not only reassured by miraculous signs (staff turning into a serpent, his right hand turning white, and water turning blood red) but was told “to be assured that His mighty aid would be ever with him, and to use miracles to convince all men (said he) ‘that thou art sent by me and doest all at my command’” (Ant. 2.272–274; cf. Ant. 2.280). Similarly Samuel’s words will be confirmed by the sign of a winter storm (Ant. 6.91–94; cf. 1 Sam 12:17–18) and Jeremiah performs a sign at Hezekiah’s request (causing the shadow of sun to go back) to confirm his prophecy about the king’s recovery from illness (Ant. 10.24–29; cf. 2 Kgs 20:1–11).

\(^{59}\)MacRae states that for all Josephus’ miracles “it is God who is at work, even if he often works through a human agent” and that “miracles are primarily not so much παράσειον, as σημείον τού θεού προφητείας in which the δύναμις θεού alone is active” (“Miracle,” 134–6). So also Moehring who notes that it “is only because of God’s involvement in the history of the world and in miracles in particular that prophecy is possible at all” (“Rationalization,” 377) (e.g., Ant. 10:277–278). At the same time signs associated with the Egyptian priests (the staff and snakes incident) are identified as deceptions and distortions and thus not truly prophetic or miraculous acts (e.g., Moehring, “Rationalization,” 377 and Delling, “Josephus und das Wunderbare,” 297).

\(^{60}\)Perhaps owing to the fact that he is writing history or that he intended to deal with them in a later theological treatise (so Feldman, “Prophets and Prophecy in Josephus,” JTS 41 [1990]: 389). Both Feldman (ibid., 409) and Delling (“Die Biblische Prophetie bei Josephus,” in Josephus-Studien: Untersuchungen zu Josephus, dem Antiken Judentum und dem Neuen Testament, Festschrift Otto Michel, ed. Otto Betz [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht,
‘prophet’ or ‘prophecy’ into the biblical account on at least 169 occasions. Prophets must be divine (θεῖον) and excellent (ἀριστον) in both speech and person (Ant. 8.243) while attaining to the highest level of happiness (Ant. 6.56). Furthermore they are possessed by God in a manner that transcends reason (Ant. 6.223) thus making them capable of wondrous (θαυμαστά) and incredible (παράδοξα) deeds (Ant. 9.182). Three key prophetic functions seem to emerge in Josephus, namely that of: (1) a contemporary mediator between God and his people who utters the things of God; (2) an interpreter of the past who creates scriptures that record this past; and (3) a predictor of the future. It is the prophets then who are responsible for the holy scriptures such that “there is no discrepancy in what is written, their accuracy arising from the fact that their knowledge of ancient history was due to the inspiration which they received from God.” Ability to predict the future is a key indicator of the true prophet, in relation to which Josephus stresses the role of dreams, and no true prophet can be contradicted by another prophet. Examples of Josephus’ concern with predictive prophecy can be seen in his stressing the fulfillment of Elijah’s prophecies in general (Ant. 8.417-418) and, more specifically, Nahum’s prophecy about the downfall of Assyria and Nineveh (“I will blot thee out and no more shall lions go forth from thee to rule the world”) which is said by Josephus to come to pass after one

---

1974], 114) speak of Josephus’ integration of the biblical prophets (those with books named after them) into the historical narrative noting, for example, how Jonah becomes integrated into the account of 2 Kings on the basis of a reference to (an otherwise unidentified) Jonah in 2 Kgs 14:25 (see below).

61 So Feldman, who identifies at least eight reasons why Josephus could be expected to have a considerable knowledge of prophets (“Prophets and Prophecy,” 387–91).

62 On this see Feldman (“Prophets and Prophecy,” 393) along with Delling (“Die Biblische Prophetie,” 112–13), who speaks of God appearing to the prophets and speaking through them. Delling also speaks here of a close connection between prophet and miracles, such as in relation to Elijah (Ant. 9.182) and Elisha (Ant. 9.72, 74, 86, 175, 184), and notes in this regard the greater detail of the narrative of Elisha’s death with the associated miracle of resuscitation (Ant. 9.183; 2 Kgs 13:21).

63 See Feldman (“Prophets and Prophecy,” especially 394–97 but with elaboration in remainder of article) who also points out that Josephus (unlike the biblical account) does not highlight prophetic interest in social ethics (p. 395). See also Delling, “Die Biblische Prophetie,” 109.

64 So Feldman (“Prophets and Prophecy,” 397–98) with reference to Against Apion 1.37. He notes that the notion was equally true of all parts of scripture including the so-called historical books (e.g., Kings and Chronicles) such as to guarantee their accuracy.

65 On this see Feldman (“Prophets and Prophecy,” 407–10) where Daniel is given as an example of the importance of dreams (something held in common with Josephus’ own recounting of dreams in War 3.351-4 and Life 208-12) and where he discusses Josephus’ handling of apparent prophetic contradictions and concerns about false prophets, whose claims to prophesy (by divine inspiration) formed the backdrop to revolt against Rome.
Chapter 3 Literary and Rhetorical Conventions in Josephus

hundred and fifteen years (Ant. 9.239-242). In this sense there exists a relation between God’s προφητεία and prophecy, much as we have posited between miracles and προφητεία, and it is understandable that Josephus would highlight the prophetic character of biblical heroes, such as Moses, insofar as his non-Jewish readers would have “expected the great leaders of history to be associated with significant prophecies.” Notably for Josephus prophetic succession ceased during the reign of Artaxerxes I (465-424 B.C.E.) and as such the term προφητήτας is only used of canonical prophets albeit that John Hyrcanus is said to have had the gift of ‘prophecy’ (προφητεία) as well as kingship and priesthood (War 1.68-69 and Ant. 13.299-300). Despite a restricted use of the title “prophet,” Josephus nevertheless presents himself functionally as having much in common with the prophetic tradition, especially in relation to the prophet’s role as a historian and predictor of the future.

---

67 Thus in addition to his ability to persuade the masses, control his passions and exercise ability as a general he is identified as a prophet and one whose utterances were like the very voice of God (Ant. 4.329) (as per Feldman, “Prophets and Prophecy,” 395).
70 So Feldman (“Prophets and Prophecy,” 401–02) albeit noting that Josephus does not directly refer to Hyrcanus as a prophet (προφητήτας). While Josephus does use the title “prophet” in relation to both Theudas and the Egyptian, it is only insofar as they referred to themselves in this manner whereas Josephus clearly evaluates them as false prophets (Ant. 20.97, 169 and War 2.261). Besides these few exceptions (along with a reference to Cleodemus-Malchus) Feldman notes that Josephus essentially restricts his usage of προφητήτας (289x), προφητεία (38x), and προφητεύω (58x) to biblical prophets (ibid. 405). David Aune (“The Use of ΠΡΟΦΗΤΗΣ in Josephus,” JBL 101 [1982]: 419–21) argues for a greater significance of these exceptional uses of προφητήτας but the dominant trend observed by Feldman and others implies that Josephus was indeed reticent to use this term for ‘non-canonical’ figures.
71 So Feldman (“Prophets and Prophecy,” 397–400) who notes that “In stressing this kinship...Josephus was, in effect, arguing for his craft as a historian” (quote from 399).
72 Feldman observes how Josephus portrays himself as a prophet-like figure in all three senses noted above albeit never explicitly applying the title ‘prophet’ to himself (“Prophets and Prophecy,” 399, 400, 405). Likewise Blekinsopp notes that despite his conviction that prophecy had ceased, Josephus nevertheless “believed that God still made use of certain individuals as instruments for revealing the course of the future and guiding the destinies of people” and clearly placed himself into that category (“Prophecy and Priesthood,” 239, 256). See also Delling, “Die Biblische Prophetie,” 111–12, 119–21. Josephus also links prophecy to the priesthood insofar as God chose the holy city (Jerusalem) as the site of the temple ‘according to prophecy’ (διὰ προφητείας) and, furthermore, cessation of prophecy is connected with the destruction of the first temple (coincident with the cessation in function of the
The key theme to emerge here is that Josephus sees a connection between miracle and prophecy whereby the ‘prophet’ is one who mediates the πρόνοια of God both through authoritative accounts of the past and predictions of the future with miracles serving as authenticating signs and evidence of both divine activity and sanction.

3.2.5 Concluding Comments on Josephus’ Antiquities

In summary Josephus’ Antiquities is a narrative retelling of the history of the Jewish people from creation to the War of 66 C.E. In essence it is an apologetic historiography likely aimed at an immediate circle of gentile sympathizers and intended to highlight the antiquity of the Jewish people, the superiority of their legal constitutions and the value of their philosophy. In relation to this he stresses the providence (πρόνοια) of God in history (possibly employing a popular philosophical term) and the praiseworthy character of biblical heroes in accordance with Hellenistic ideals congenial to his readership. As I now turn to an analysis of specific narrative adaptations in the Antiquities the influence of these apologetic motifs will be considered alongside Josephus’ use of rhetorical and literary conventions of his day as per the progymnastic categories of narrative and encomium.

3.3 Rhetorical Adaptation of Sources in Josephus’ Exodus Account

Analyzing Josephus’ narrative adaptation of his sources obviously requires knowledge of the latter but as noted above this is a matter of dispute. Nevertheless it is reasonable to assume that extant Hebrew (Tanak) and Greek (LXX) texts provide a close enough approximation to his ‘scriptural’ sources that we can gain an adequate idea of his editorial procedures so as to evaluate them in light of the progymnastic narrative rhetorical conventions identified in chapter 2.

---

priests’ Urim and Thummim) (Feldman, Josephus’ Interpretation, 399). This is likewise in keeping with his own connections to the priesthood according to Feldman (“Prophets and Prophecy,” 421) and Blenkinsopp, who also highlights Josephus’ association of prophecy and priesthood with respect to John Hyrcanus (“Prophecy and Priesthood,” 250).

73 Noting Josephus is ‘freer’ in Ant. 1–5, the context of the exodus account, than later in Antiquities (so Cohen, “Josephus and Scripture” who argues that Josephus stays closer to the biblical text in Ant. 6–11 than in Ant. 1–5).
3.3.1 Order and Selection in Josephus’ Exodus Account

Beginning with Josephus’ exodus account (Ant. 2.200-349) I will analyze how he selects and orders his source material based on a comparison with the parallel account in Exod 1:1–15:19 (see table 3.1), which provides the immediate context for the ‘plagues’ narrative which will be examined in detail below. In support of the assumption that Josephus had something like the extant Hebrew and Greek accounts available to him there is significant overlap in both content and order. At the same time Josephus’ account evidences various additions, omissions, order changes, and narrative expansions and compressions (summarized in tables 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, and 3.5). A number of these changes can be explained on the basis of Theon’s narrative element of ‘person’ which, as noted in the previous chapter, corresponds closely to encomiastic interests (tables 2.2 and 2.3).

Thus various omissions (table 3.2) may result from the encomiastic motivation to avoid a negative portrayal of Moses such as: his murder of the Egyptian (Exod 2:11-15); his circumcision by Zipporah (Exod 4:24-26); his extended complaints to God (e.g., Exod 5:22–6:13); and God’s sending of Aaron (the implied reason of Exod 3:13-17 being to accommodate for a weakness in Moses). Alternatively Josephus adds elements (table 3.3) that portray Moses in a more positive light such as: the “sacred scribe” who predicted his birth; political success (bringing low the Egyptians and raising up the Israelites); and his excelling in virtues such as to obtain lasting honor (Ant. 2.205). The implied divine approval of Moses is enhanced by Amram’s prayer for national deliverance (Ant. 2.211) and God’s night vision response in which deliverance is promised through a son (Moses) (Ant. 2:211-216). The prayer itself appears to have been transferred from Exod 2:23-25, perhaps to provide encomiastic enhancement of

---

74 Despite variations at the micro-level the Hebrew (MT) and Greek (LXX) texts are essentially identical at the macro-level in regard to these sections under consideration. As per table 3.1 my analysis results in 13 sections in the Antiquities and 19 in the LXX/MT with 10 out of 13 sections in Antiquities overlapping with the biblical account.

75 While the primary focus of this analysis is Josephus’ selection and order, some of the more dramatic narrative transformations will also be highlighted insofar as they represent these same phenomena on a smaller scale. A more detailed micro-analysis will be reserved for the plagues narrative (below).

76 In Exodus the murder provides the reason for Moses’ flight to Midian (Exod 2:11-22) whereas in Josephus the flight results from jealousy of the Egyptian scribes and the king himself (Ant. 2.254-255).
Moses’ father (with obvious positive implications for the son), and divine approbation of Moses’ birth is further indicated by the ease of delivery (Ant. 2.218), thus preventing discovery, and protection afforded the child (Ant. 2.219-222). Likewise in Moses’ adoption by Pharaoh’s daughter (Thermuthis) we are told that, upon initially discovering the child, “she was greatly in love with it, on account of its largeness and beauty; for God had taken such great care in the formation of Moses, that he caused him to be thought worthy of bringing up” (Ant. 2.224-225). Furthermore she regarded him a “remarkable child” of “divine form” and “generous mind” (Ant. 2.232) whereupon she saved him from an attempt upon his life when he appeared before the king (once again showing divine favor and providence) (Ant. 2.234-236). He was “educated with great care” (Ant. 2.236), such as to be considered “superior to his age” in understanding, while also displaying bodily attributes of tallness and beauty (Ant. 2.230-231). All of these various modifications are explicable in relation to the encomiastic categories listed in tables 2.2 and 2.3.

Insofar as Josephus appears to pass over the genealogy of Exod 6:14-26 he omits an important encomiastic feature of Moses’ ancestry. In reality, however, he transfers the genealogy to a more appropriate placement within the narrative (Ant. 2.229), noting that in Exodus it comes as a late interruption when Moses is already fully grown and has returned to Egypt (see table 3.6 for a sense of this displacement). Josephus, on the other hand, inserts the genealogical notice in the narrative of Moses’ origins and upbringing specifically at the point of the naming and adoption by Thermuthis. In addition to making more logical sense this early placement of genealogical information is also in keeping with the standard order of encomiastic elements as per tables 2.2 and 2.3. The genealogy is also much briefer and focuses exclusively on Moses whereas in Exodus it is also the genealogy of Aaron. Josephus thus enhances narrative clarity and conciseness while also serving his encomiastic purpose of identifying Moses with a noble ancestry (especially in regard to Abraham, who is twice mentioned in Ant. 2.229, and Levi who

---

77In Exodus it is a general prayer (of the Israelites) for deliverance from suffering (slavery) in response to which God determines to act on account of his covenant with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob.
is identified with the priesthood). Finally Josephus adds Moses’ successful military campaign against the Ethiopians (on behalf of the Egyptians), a narrative exemplifying Moses’ deeds and virtues (Ant. 2.238-253) as per tables 2.2 and 2.3.

Encomiastic interests also help explain Josephus’ transformation of Moses’ encounter at the burning bush (§7 of table 3.1): Moses’ objections are weaker and more short lived than in Exodus (Ant. 2.270-272a; cf. Exod 4:1-17); his hand is only said to become “white” (not leprous); and a third sign (water to blood) is added. In Exodus the commissioning of Moses and revelation of the divine name (Exod 3:1-22) precede Moses’ objection and God’s concession to send Aaron (Exod 4:1-17). Josephus omits Aaron, includes a divine affirmation, and transfers the revelation of the divine name to a climactic position (Ant. 2.274-276). Not only do these changes add logical clarity and conciseness but they also enhance the encomiastic portrayal of Moses by lessening his objections and omitting any need for help from Aaron.

Besides omitting the (unnecessary) reaffirmation of Moses’ mission and the unseemly circumcision by Zipporah (Exod 4:21-26) Josephus retains the core narrative of Moses’ return to Egypt (Exod 4:18-31; Ant. 2.277-280; §8 in table 3.1). He nevertheless inserts a notice of the king’s death, the names of Moses’ sons Gershom and Eleazer (Ant. 2.277) thus picking up narrative details from Exod 2:21-25 (albeit switching their order), though notably he names both Gershom (“in a strange land”) and Eleazer (“by assistance of God he escaped the Egyptians”) where only the former is mentioned in Exodus thus further underlying Moses’ destiny and character in relation to his progeny.

---

Only 6 names are listed in Josephus (Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Levi, Caath, Amram) versus the longer lists in Exodus. At the same time while Exodus provides a lengthy list of family heads (Reuben, Simeon, Levi etc.) and their sons, Josephus extracts only the names relevant to Moses’ genealogy (Levi, Caath = Kohath in Exodus, and Amram) but adds the names of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. While the omissions add both conciseness and clarity (omitting unnecessary and potentially confusing detail), the additions fill out details missing in Exodus with encomiastically relevant names of important ancestors.

Explicit notice is given of both his wisdom (Ant. 2.244-246) and courage (Ant. 2.252). The latter is exemplified in Moses’ return to the king (Ant. 2.290-292) when he is undaunted either by the king’s refusal to listen, instead increasing the workload of the Israelites (Ant. 2.288-289a), or by the subsequent Israelite accusations (Ant. 2.289b). In particular I am thinking of the clearer logical progression from commission to objection to persuasion (with signs) to (Moses’) entreaty and (God’s) revelation of the divine name.

Josephus’ consistent omission of Aaron functions both to heighten the (positive) focus on Moses (encomium) and enhance conciseness through the omission of details.
Moses’ initial confrontation with Pharaoh takes up considerable space in the Exodus account including a series of visits to Pharaoh, extended interactions between God and Moses (as well as Moses and the Israelites), Moses’ (and Aaron’s) genealogical records, and the climactic signs performed before Pharaoh and his officials (Exod 5:1–7:13 = §§9-13 in table 3.1). Besides changing the genealogy (see above) and omitting Moses’ complaints (Exod 5:22–6:13), Josephus transforms the order by having Moses perform the signs first (Ant. 2.270-273) resulting in the king increasing the workload and the Israelites blaming Moses, who himself is undaunted and returns to confront the king again (Ant. 2.290-292). The result is a more concise and clear account, through omission (or transfer) of repetitious and extraneous detail, that once again transforms the Exodus narrative into a more positive portrayal of Moses (especially his courage) while also paving the way for the plagues (which come directly after this encounter).

Josephus omits the guiding pillars of cloud and fire (Exod 13:17-22) but adds details such as the Israelites stoning Moses when the Egyptians begin to pursue them again (Ant. 2.326-328). The latter contributes to an encomium of Moses as does Josephus’ expansion of Moses’ hortatory address (deliberative rhetoric) depicting him as a man of wisdom and a divine messenger (Ant. 2.329-333; Exod 14:13-14).

Theon’s narrative virtues of clarity and conciseness also help explain Josephus’ selection and ordering in the exodus account. Thus avoidance of unnecessary and repetitive details probably best explains Josephus’ omissions of the names of the sons of Israel (Exod 1:1-7), divine reaffirmation of Moses’ mission (Exod 4:21-23), Moses’ complaint and re-commissioning by God (Exod 5:22–6:13), and God’s speech to Moses (Exod 6:28–7:6). Toward the conclusion

---

82 While in Exodus the signs are the climax, in Josephus they have been moved into first place and the climax becomes Moses’ undaunted return to the king (Ant. 2.290-292) which sets the stage for the plagues.

83 The motivation for this omission is not immediately clear. While it may be the avoidance of unnecessary detail, it is a narrative that indicates God’s providential care and guidance (προνοία). It could be that he excludes it on the basis of a perceived lack of credibility but given his unabashed recounting of the plagues and addition of various signs to the narrative of escape across the Red Sea (see below) this seems an unlikely explanation.

84 In its place is a transitional statement that provides a bridge from the Genesis to the Exodus account (Ant. 2.200) thus clearly marking the beginning of the latter.

85 Exodus contains a short divine speech reaffirming Moses’ calling and purpose in Egypt. Josephus has just finished recounting Moses’ divine calling at the bush (Ant. 2.264-276) and clearly considered this an unnecessary repetition.

86 See also above in relation to encomiastic reasons.
of the Exodus account he likewise omits divine speeches (Exod 14:1-13, 15-18) and transforms the account of Israel’s departure (§§16-18 in table 3.1) by condensing the lengthy accounts about Passover and consecration of first born (Exod 12:1-27 and 12:43–13:16) into a brief notice and explanation (Ant. 2.311-313a)\(^88\) thereby avoiding a lengthy digression with unnecessary detail.\(^89\) When it comes to the exodus itself Josephus mentions the date (‘the month of Xanthicus 430 years after Abraham came to Canaan’), the number of Israelites (600,000) and the carrying of the Joseph’s bones out of Egypt\(^90\) (Ant. 2.315-319). In this way, perhaps in the interests of clarity and conciseness, he here finds a logical place to bring together details from diverse points in the Exodus narrative. He also adds clarity and conciseness by summarizing and reordering the details of Israel’s route (Exod 13:17-22) and the Egyptian’s change of mind (Exod 14:1-19) (as per §§16-19 in table 3.1).\(^91\) He enhances Moses’ piety by adding his prayer for deliverance in relation to crossing the Red Sea (Ant. 2.334-337; §19 in table 3.1) and underlines divine disfavor toward those who resist the πρόνοια of God by adding various signs that accompany the drowning of the Egyptians, such as thunder and lightning (Ant. 2.342-344). While his omission of the lengthy song of deliverance (Exod 15:1-19) is likely motivated by a concern for conciseness, his notice of it once again enhances Moses’ character in Hellenistic terms by claiming that he composed the song in hexameter verse (Ant. 2.346). Finally Josephus’ addition of an introduction (transitional sentence in Ant. 2.200) and conclusion (Ant. 2.347-349) not only clearly delineates the narrative limits but provides a reason for recounting the story\(^92\) (narrative cause) and enhances credibility by pointing to a similar story about Alexander.\(^93\)

It has thus been demonstrated how Theon’s narrative element of ‘person’ (related to encomium) and virtues of clarity, conciseness and credibility appear to have motivated a number

---

\(^{87}\)This section also includes yet another objection from Moses (Exod 6:30) and otherwise repeats detail elsewhere given (in relation to God’s commissioning of Moses) which Josephus has already summarized (Ant. 2.264-276).

\(^{88}\)He also mentions the feast of unleavened bread in Ant. 2.316-317.

\(^{89}\)The avoidance of lengthy digressions is a narrative virtue according to Theon (Kennedy, Progymnasmata, 30).

\(^{90}\)This may be seen as an act of piety.

\(^{91}\)The order is switched in Josephus who provides explicit reasons (narrative cause) for the route taken, namely Moses’ suspicion that the Egyptians might change their mind and concern about the Philistines (Ant. 2.320-323).

\(^{92}\)I.e. explaining how they came to leave Egypt (Ant. 2.200).

\(^{93}\)Once again he affirms that his account is in keeping with the sacred texts (Ant. 2.347-349).
of selection and order changes in Josephus’ narrative adaptation of Exod 1:1–15:19. These changes are clearly also in keeping with the identified apologetic interests of Josephus noted above in relation to identifying praiseworthy biblical characters in accordance with Hellenistic encomiastic ideals. In this case Moses is an ideal divinely appointed prophet and hero of Israel’s past who mediates the providence of God. In relation to Theon’s other narrative elements (place, time, action, manner and cause) he essentially retains without change the elements of place and time. He also retains the core action(s) albeit with omissions and additions as discussed above. Josephus makes changes to the manner and cause of actions such as when he transfers the prayer for deliverance from the Israelites (in general) to Amram (in particular). These types of changes will be explored more fully in relation to the plagues narrative below. What can be generally concluded is that the elements and virtues of narrative and encomium, along with the above identified apologetic interests in the Antiquities, played a role in Josephus’ editorial decisions relating to the macro-level selection and arrangement of material in the exodus narrative.

3.3.2 Narrative Adaptation in Josephus’ Account of the Ten Plagues

The plagues narrative, a smaller unit within the larger exodus narrative, provides an opportunity to analyze Josephus’ narrative adaptation on a smaller scale. The first thing to note is that while the Exodus plagues narrative is quite extensive (approximately Exod 7:14–12:32) and can be divided into several narrative units, Josephus significantly abbreviates the account (Ant. 2.293-314 with §293 functioning as an introductory comment). His major adaptations along with differences in word counts are summarized in tables 3.7 and 3.8.

Referring to plagues as ‘dreadful events’ (πάθη δεινά) (Ant. 2.293) Josephus recounts them in the same order as Exodus and using similar or identical language when referring to the river turning into blood, frogs, ulcers, hail, locusts and darkness. Alternatively he exchanges ‘lice’

---

94 As per the outline in §13 of table 3.1.
95 This contrasts to both Philo (who recounts them in the order 1, 2, 3, 7, 8, 9, 6, 4, 5, 10) and Biblical Antiquities (which recounts them in the order 1, 2, 4, 7, 5, 8, 3, 9, 10 and omits the 6th plague) (so Feldman, Judean Antiquities, 217).
(φθείρ) for ‘gnats’ (σκνύψ) while the Exodus plagues of ‘flies’ (κονόμυια) and ‘livestock’ (κτηνος) become a single plague of ‘various beasts’ (θηρίων παντοίων) (see table 3.8). In essence he retains the core of the account but in various other ways significantly transforms the narrative. First, he adds an introduction (Ant. 2.293) explaining the cause of the plagues, namely that the king disdained Moses’ words, and providing three reasons for his recounting of them: (1) no such plagues had been previously known; (2) they indicate the veracity of Moses’ prophetic words; and (3) they demonstrate the folly of offending the deity and provoking his wrath. These reasons correspond with three general tendencies that will be observed in Josephus’ transformation of the plagues narrative, namely to highlight their severity (reason 1) and to downplay human agency in place of divine agency (reason 3) while retaining the prophetic role of Moses (reason 2). Despite adding an introduction, however, Josephus’ account is less than one third the length of its Exodus counterpart, clearly in keeping with the narrative virtue of conciseness (see table 3.8 for word counts). It remains to be seen whether other narrative virtues are compromised in the process.

The first thing to note is Josephus’ tendency to rewrite the narrative in more ‘polished’ Greek style. This becomes apparent if we first compare the LXX with the Masoretic text insofar as the Greek is seen to be a somewhat ‘wooden translation.’ Taking the blood plague as representative there is a tendency to retain Hebrew syntax in relation to word order and short paratactic sentences (see table 3.9 for parallel text of Exod 7:14-25). Thus the frequent use of καί (typically translating the Hebrew particle waw) can be seen throughout the narrative but especially, for example, in verses 17 through 20 where it occurs 15x in a short narrative section that exemplifies parataxis. Even the Hebrew אֵֽיֵַּ֭ד is translated by καί in verse 24 despite the fact that the context would readily allow (and perhaps require) some other particle such as οὕτως.

96 While Aaron is essentially removed from the account, Moses retains prominence but more as the prophet who warns of the plagues than the agent who carries them out. This is in keeping with Josephus’ encomiastic interest in Moses along with his identified apologetic interests from above.

97 The brevity tends to increase as he proceeds (he is briefest with the hail and the locust) albeit the ninth plague (darkness) is the only one to exceed Exodus in length, presumably as a result of its climactic position. Notably the darkness is the only plague in which Josephus includes a dialogue between Pharaoh and Moses (contra the biblical account where such dialogue is more common).

98 Even the Hebrew אֵֽיֵַּ֭ד is translated by καί in verse 24 despite the fact that the context would readily allow (and perhaps require) some other particle such as οὕτως.
although the second waw ("and you shall take") is translated by ἵνα ("in order that...") while the final waw (which as per the NASB translation seems to require the contrast of "but behold...") is again translated by καί. While details do differ, such as the LXX’s addition of "your brother" (τὸ ἀδελφό) to Aaron in verse 19, the relative scarcity of such differences coupled with their apparently random occurrence is perhaps better explained by textual variation in the Hebrew Vorlage than by editorial decisions of the LXX translators.99

Despite retaining core essentials, namely the change of water to blood along with the undrinkable nature of the water and Pharaoh’s negative reaction in not permitting the people to depart,100 Josephus’ procedure in the same (blood) pericope is strikingly different (see parallel text in table 3.10). First he displays a greater tendency toward hypotaxis in both sections 294 and 295 with less use of καί and more varied use of alternative connectives such as “for” (γάρ) (§294), “but” (άλλα) (§294), “and/now” (δέ) (§295), and “therefore” (οὖν) (§295).101 He also exercises economy of words when, for example, he states “their river flowed blood-red” (five Greek words: ὁ...ποταμὸς αὐτοῖς αἷματώδης...ἐρρύη) versus the LXX “all the water in the river was turned into blood” (μετέβαλεν πᾶν τὸ ὕδωρ τὸ ἐν τῷ ποταμῷ εἰς αἷμα), or “being impossible to drink” (three Greek words: πίνεσθαι μὴ δυνάμενος) versus “the Egyptians were unable to drink water from the river” (οὐκ ἤδυναντο οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι πιέν ὕδωρ ἐκ τοῦ ποταμοῦ).102

99 There are no more such obvious examples in this particular passage but a number of others occur later in the plagues narrative where they are equally conspicuous. Examples include the following: the LXX adds "and from your dwelling" in Exod 8:7, omits "onto the land of Egypt" in 8:1, and changes the Hebrew “Lord our God” to simply “Lord” in 8:6.
100 Some of the key shared vocabulary includes πῶς, δύναμαι, ποταμός, and ἁμα (Josephus = αἷματώδης).
101 Josephus, however, still retains something of parataxis in these two verses with his use of καί as a connective in the middle of §294 (καί πηγὴν ἐτέραν ... - *and another source of water ... * ) as well as in the first sentence of §295 (καί μὴ δὲν τοῦ κατὰ φύσιν παρηλλαγμένος ... - *and was altered in no way from its natural state ... * ). Even more significant is his use of καί to introduce the final clause of §295 (τοῦ κοκκοῦ λοφίσκοντος ... - *when the disaster had ceased ... * ) when one would have expected a more contrastive particle such as ἄλλα or δέ. Sections 296 and 297 (the plague of frogs) shows somewhat less tendency toward parataxis and greater variation in connectives. What matters overall, however, is Josephus’ general tendency away from parataxis when compared with the LXX.
102 We might also note Josephus’ remarkable economy of words when, for example, ποταμός and ὕδωρ occur 13x and 7x respectively in the LXX but only once each in Josephus.
Chapter 3 Literary and Rhetorical Conventions in Josephus

Josephus’ striving for conciseness and clarity is exhibited in several other ways. Hence, for example, in Exod 7:14-25 Moses is commanded by God to go to Pharaoh at the river bank in the morning, with staff in hand, and announce the coming plague (vv.15-18). He is then to instruct Aaron to stretch out his staff over the waters to bring about the change into blood (v. 19). The account is noteworthy for its use of direct speech (vv.14-19) and its repetition of words and phrases especially in relation to its typical procedure of recounting instructions (vv.15-18) followed by recounting the actions themselves (vv.20-21) often utilizing the same language. Furthermore there are apparent discrepancies such as whether it is Moses’ (v.17) or Aaron’s staff (v.19) that will be used to strike the water. Josephus, avoiding direct speech and repetition as well as omitting mention of Aaron or any staff, simply states that ‘the river flowed blood-red at God’s command.’ The result is a more concise account in which the plague is a direct act of God without mention of human agency. Such narrative adaptations are consistently present in Josephus and are explicable on the basis of conciseness (avoiding direct speech and repetition) as well as an encomiastic interest in Moses (omission of Aaron).

Even the omission of Moses’ and his staff as agents in the plagues is consistent with his encomiastic reasons for recounting the plagues (Ant. 2.293), namely to show Moses as a true prophet and the plagues as (direct) divine punishment (reasons 2 and 3 above). Hence throughout the narrative Moses is primarily depicted as a leader and spokesperson of the

---

103 Three times we are told about the waters turning to blood’ (7:17, 19, and 20) and twice about the adverse affects of the plague in terms of dead fish, the foul smell and difficulty obtaining drinking water (7:18 and 21). Twice we are told the Egyptians will be unable to drink the river water (7:21 and 24) and that the blood will be “in all Egypt” is both predicted and reported in vv. 19 and 21.

104 The pattern of using direct speech to recount the plagues (first in instructions and then for the event itself) is common to each of the Exodus plague accounts and is consistently avoided by Josephus.

105 While Moses’ name recurs throughout Josephus’ narrative, Aaron (in contrast to the biblical account) is not once mentioned in Ant. 2.293-314.

106 As per table 3.11 the staff (of either Moses and/or Aaron) is mentioned in five out of ten Exodus plagues (blood, frogs, gnats, thunder/hail, and locusts). Josephus does not mention it again after Moses’ initial encounter with the Egyptian magicians (who also go unmentioned subsequently) which occurs prior to the plagues narrative (Ant. 2.287). God is given as the direct agent of the plagues in at least six instances. The verb (of which God is the subject) in the blood plague is κελεύσωντος (commanded/ordered). As per the motifs chart (table 3.11) God is noted as the direct agent (‘willingly’ is implied) in Josephus’ plagues of blood, frogs, lice, wild beasts, boils and first-born. He is also the implied agent in the hail and locust plagues. This contrasts with Exodus where there is an interplay of God as direct agent (e.g., flies and Livestock) and Moses/Aaron as agents on God’s behalf (e.g., blood and frogs).

107 I.e. Moses’ role of prophet is not diminished but the plagues themselves are direct acts of God.
Hebrews (e.g., *Ant.* 2.298, 299, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, and 314) but not the prime agent behind the plagues. In contrast to the LXX Moses is no longer sent by God to confront Pharaoh with each plague once again highlighting the divine origin and agency in relation to the plagues.

108 On the one occasion he is mentioned in relation to the plagues it is only to point out that Pharaoh was wrong in thinking that it was Moses and not God who was punishing him, thus again underlining divine agency (*Ant.* 2.302). In essence without any loss of clarity Josephus produces a more concise narrative in keeping with his theological and apologetic interests in relation to divine providence and human prophetic agents.

Josephus’ concern for brevity results in an apparent lessening of the effects of the plagues such as omitting the extent of the blood plague beyond the Nile (ʻto all the rivers, streams, pools and reservoirs throughout Egypt’ in Exod 7:19) along with its effects in terms of dead fish and foul-smelling undrinkable water (Exod 7:18, 21). For Josephus the water is said to flow “blood-red” (ᾳῠματῶδης) albeit this was no mere colour change: the Hebrew’s water supply underwent no change “in nature” (κατὰ φύσιν) but the Egyptians who drank the affected water were “seized with tortures and excruciating pain” (*Ant.* 2.294). In fact while the Exodus blood plague is an enormous inconvenience, Josephus makes no mention of any relief (such as from digging around the Nile in Exod 7:18, 21, 24) and is explicit in saying they had no other source of water while also noting that the Hebrew’s water source remained “sweet and drinkable” (γλυκὸς καὶ πότιμος). In reality then, and despite his brevity, Josephus actually heightens

---

108 In contrast to the LXX Moses is no longer sent by God to confront Pharaoh with each plague once again highlighting the divine origin and agency in relation to the plagues.

109 According to Feldman the omission of Moses as an agent in the miracles/plagues is to avoid making him “appear as a magician” (*Judean Antiquities*, 217, here citing Tiede). Given, however, the sign he has just performed with his staff (*Ant.* 2.286-287), it is not entirely clear that this was a particular concern for Josephus.

110 Feldman argues that ᾳῠματῶδης does not refer merely a colour change but to a change into blood (as per usage in Galen and Rufus) (*Judean Antiquities*, 217).

111 Which is also a more concise way of saying that all other water sources were effected as per the Exodus account (see above). In this way Josephus’ account potentially has greater clarity and avoids another apparent discrepancy in that Exodus seems to claim that all water sources were effected (esp. v.19) and yet has the Egyptians digging for (presumably unaffected) water in v. 24. Josephus thus agrees (more concisely) in saying that all water sources were effected (“another source of water they did not have” - *Ant*. 2.294) but offers no relief for the Egyptians.

112 This ‘distinction’ motif is present in five of the later LXX Exodus plagues but only here in Josephus where he adds it to the account (See table 3.11). The reasons for this are not entirely clear except that it here heightens the suffering of the Egyptians and is perhaps implied in the remaining plagues. In the LXX, on the other hand, it seems to function as much to highlight God’s ongoing concern for Israel as it does his punishment of the Egyptians. Feldman notes that a similar distinction is mentioned *Midrash Deut. Rabbah* 3.8 as well as Philo (*De Vita Moses* 1.26.144) (*Judean Antiquities*, 217).
the negative effects of the blood plague, a feature which turns out to be common in his recounting the various plagues. Hence, for example, while Exodus simply highlights the inconvenience and volume of frogs (Exod 8:3-4), Josephus has them devour the land, befoul their drinking water, produce a horrible slime, and ruin household articles in addition to creating a stench (Ant. 2.296-297). Similarly while Exodus emphasizes the extent (and implied inconvenience) of the gnats (Exod 8:16-19), Josephus’ (equivalent) lice “issue from their bodies,” are indestructible, and result in people perishing (Ant. 2.300-301). With Josephus’ wild beasts (Exodus: flies and livestock) the emphasis changes once again from the extent to the destructive nature of the calamity with people perishing (Ant. 2.303). Regarding the boils Josephus adds that “their intestines wasted away, and the greater part of the Egyptians perished” (Ant. 2.304). Josephus omits the ‘perishing’ motif, which interestingly is included for the first time in Exodus, from the hail and locust plagues thus emphasizing only the effect upon their crops (explicitly noting that it was spring time) and that the hail was unlike even that which falls in northern (colder) regions. In Exodus the darkness plague simply prevents people from leaving their dwellings for three days while in Josephus we again encounter the perishing motif

113The stench occurs later in Exodus when the plague abates and the frogs die (Exod 8:13-14).
114Thus it is said that “the miserable wretches miserably perished” (presumably a reference to the Egyptians) and the king was said to be “dreading the destruction of his people” (confirming that the plague was producing a death toll).
115Noting, for example, the repeated phrases about of the flies (upon you and your officials and your people and in your houses etc.) in Exodus 8:20-24.
116In the LXX account death is reported of the livestock but not the people (Exod 9:1-7). Similarities between Josephus and later Jewish literature (e.g., Wisdom of Solomon 11:18) has been noted in relation to the wild beasts albeit there is ambiguity regarding the final sentence of Josephus as to whether it reads “even though the people survived” or “all that escaped the ravages of these beasts were consumed by another plague” (on these issues see Feldman, Judean Antiquities, 219, nn. 791–3). In either case perishing remains part of the effect and to that extent it heightens the severity of the plague.
117At the same time he omits mention of dust and the effect upon animals along with the embarrassment of the magicians who were themselves covered in boils. Such may have been considered irrelevant details and thus Josephus was exercising conciseness.
118The LXX again emphasizes extent and mentions destruction of trees along with plants, animals and humans (Exod 9:22-25) albeit with a notation to the effect that animals and humans taken into shelter will not suffer death (Exod 9:19-21). In Exodus this ‘perishing’ motif is otherwise reserved for the climactic plague of the first born. Taken together the two plagues result in complete devastation of their crops (Ant. 2.306). That the hail was bigger than that which falls in polar regions is, according to Feldman, a redundant addition (Judean Antiquities, 220, nn. 800–01). This is not necessarily the case, however, insofar as Josephus (as with other plagues) is emphasizing the severity more than the extent. Even so, notwithstanding the occasional redundant addition, Josephus’ account remains remarkably concise in relation to the LXX.
along with eyesight and breathing problems (Ant. 2.308). Interestingly Josephus significantly lessens the drama of the first born plague, which in the biblical account is the climactic and most destructive in relation to human life (Exodus 11–12), by simply noting (almost as a footnote to his explanation of Passover) that “on that self same night destruction visited the first born of Egypt” (Ant. 2.313). The tendency of Josephus to heighten the effects of the plagues counters theories of rationalizing in relation to (punitive) miracles and is possibly motivated by a (Hellenistic) desire to dramatize especially given his third reason for recounting the plagues, namely to demonstrate the folly of offending the deity and provoking his wrath.

Josephus consistently omits the Egyptian magicians after Moses’ initial encounter with Pharaoh (Ant. 2.281-292) which, according to Feldman, heightens the miraculous by removing the suggestion that it could be duplicated. Insofar as the acts are punitive, however, Josephus perhaps saw the ability of the Egyptian magicians to duplicate them as irrelevant. What was needed, if anything, was to counter their effects. This ‘contest’, however, was already won in the previous pericope when Moses’ staff swallows theirs thus indicating that his “deeds of power ... so far surpass their magic and their art as things divine are remote from what is human” (Ant. 2.286). In subsequently omitting the magicians Josephus is not only more concise but simultaneously highlights their impotence.

Exodus eight times gives notice of Pharaoh’s hardness of heart and four times (frogs, flies, thunder/hail, and locusts) of his requests for prayer for relief from the calamity (to which Moses

---

120 Feldman notes how Josephus’ recounting of this plague differs from Philo (who explains it on the basis of an eclipse or cloud formation) in that he does not rationalize it (Judean Antiquities, 221, n. 812). He sees this as contrary to Josephus’ tendency elsewhere but (as noted above) it is not clear that Josephus had anything like a consistent rationalizing policy in relation to miracles.

121 As an example of this lessening Josephus omits the biblical statement that there was no house in Egypt that escaped the plague of the firstborn (Exod 12:30).

122 Judean Antiquities, 217, n. 774.

123 This occurs three times at the outset of specific plague narratives. In the case of the blood we are told that Pharaoh’s heart was hard (Exod 7:14) whereas in the locust narrative it is the Lord who says “I have hardened Pharaoh’s heart” (Exod 10:1), which is similar to the first born plague where it is stated that the “Lord hardened Pharaoh’s heart” despite the wonders of Moses and Aaron (Exod 11:10). The motif occurs five more times (blood, gnats, livestock, boils, darkness) where we are simply told that his heart was (or remained) hard in spite of the plagues. The references alternate between Pharaoh’s heart being hardened either by himself (Exod 7:22; 8:19; 9:7) or the Lord (9:12; 10:27). See table 3.11.
obliges) (see table 3.11). Each time he promises to relent and permit the people exit only to change his mind when relief comes. Josephus simplifies this elaborate mix of motifs in relation to the king (his preferred term for Pharaoh) and, perhaps in keeping with his view of the plagues as direct punishments from God, he omits mention of the king requesting prayer or of Moses actually praying. The notion of hardening is present but depicted somewhat differently. Thus the king initially permits departure in the first three plagues (blood, frogs, lice) but changes his mind once the calamity ceases (Ant. 2.294-302). In the case of the wild beasts (Ant. 2.303-304) the king was willing to permit wives and husbands to go without children whereas for the darkness plague the children may go but the livestock must be left behind (Ant. 2.307-308). He simply bids Moses be gone on occasion of the first born plague, hoping thereby to end the suffering of his people (Ant. 2.314), albeit (as with Exodus) later changing his mind (Ant. 2.320). In contrast to Exodus there is no mention of God hardening Pharaoh’s heart, rather the plagues are punishments on account of his unwillingness to be wise (Ant. 2.296 = frogs), his deceit (Ant. 2.300 = lice), and his supposing to impose upon God’s providence (Ant. 3.302-303 = wild beasts/lice), namely by refusing to permit the Hebrews to depart. The king is simply unwilling to yield to God (Ant. 2.304-305 = ulcers and boils) and in relation to the ‘darkness’

124 In each case Pharaoh is ready to give permission in response to the plague. The one exception is the plague of locusts where Pharaoh is ready to give permission in response to the mere threat of plague but then changes his mind on account of their wanting to take women and children etc. (Exod 10:3-11). Following the plague itself Pharaoh requests prayer but there is no further mention of his willingness to relent.

125 This ‘hardening of heart’ is again depicted variously as either by Pharaoh himself (7:15; 8:32, 34-35) or the Lord (10:20). This ‘subsequent’ hardening also occurs in the first born plague (Exod 14:5-10) although in that case there is no request for prayer but just a simple command for them to leave (Exod 12:31-32).

126 In the case of the lice permission was for men only with women and children to stay behind (Ant. 2.302), a motif paralleled in Exod 10:10-11 (locust plague).

127 Contrasting Exod 8:25-29 where the Israelites are permitted to go but “not very far.” There is no mention, however, of who was permitted to go or not go (such restrictions, as noted above, appear only in Exod 10:10-11). Josephus omits any mention of Moses’ statement that the Israelites’ sacrifices would be offensive to the Egyptians (thus part of the reason for why they need to travel out to the desert). According to Feldman this may reflect a desire to avoid something that might suggest Jewish intolerance (Judean Antiquities, 219, n. 794).

128 He did bid Moses to depart with the Hebrews during the frogs plague also but changed his mind after the plague ceased (Ant. 2.297-299).

129 According to Feldman Josephus’ reasons for the divine punishments brought upon Pharaoh are consistently Stoic (Pharaoh was ‘thinking to impose upon God’s providence’) thereby appealing to Stoic readers and clearly placing blame upon Pharaoh’s shoulders (Judean Antiquities, 219, nn. 789–90).

130 The same reason is implied in relation to the hail (Ant. 2.306).
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Josephus notes that the preceding calamities (κακῶν) should have sufficed to bring the king to his senses. Instead he preferred to resist God (Ant. 2.307) and remain unchanged, even after the plague, whereupon Moses confronts him (Ant. 2.309-310). Josephus, then, retains the notion of Pharaoh’s hardness and depicts the plagues as divine punishments for failing to obey God’s will in permitting the Hebrews to depart (Ant. 2.309) in keeping with his third reason (above) for recounting the plagues, namely as a warning to nations against disobeying God’s will insofar as punishment will result. At the same time he is more concise,\textsuperscript{131} emphasizes the king’s responsibility in relation to the hardening (namely by omitting the motif of divine hardening), and is perhaps more consistent (and therefore credible) in portraying a more gradual process for the hardening, namely through the king’s initial willingness to permit departure in relation to the earlier plagues.\textsuperscript{132}

3.3.2.1 Theon’s Narrative Conventions in Relation to the Plagues

It is possible to detect the influence of Theon’s narrative ‘elements’ and ‘virtues’ in relation to Josephus’ various adaptations of the biblical plagues narrative. In relation to the element of person the Exodus narrative has several important characters: God, Moses, Aaron, the Hebrew people, Pharaoh, the Egyptian magicians, and the Egyptian people. Josephus essentially omits Aaron and the magicians while retaining the Hebrew and Egyptian people in the background.\textsuperscript{133} The confrontation between God and Pharaoh takes centre stage while Moses is highlighted for

\textsuperscript{131} As a result of omitting details (e.g., Pharaoh’s requests for prayer) and lessening repetition.

\textsuperscript{132} Josephus’ Pharaoh, according to Feldman, is a more humane figure than his biblical counterpart insofar as he is more ready to act on account of the suffering of his own people such as with his response to the frogs plague (Judean Antiquities, 217, n. 774). He likewise notes that in describing Pharaoh’s depravity Josephus avoids the usual terms for wickedness and instead speaks of him having φαυλότητος which may best be understood as meaning “poorness” or “lack of judgment” (ibid. 218, n. 99 and nn. 786-8). He also notes omission of the “temporary confession” (repentance?) related to the hail plague (Exod 9:27-28) insofar as it might have reflected poorly on Pharaoh’s character (ibid. 220, n. 803) and that it is only by the time of the darkness plague that Pharaoh is said to have lost his reason (Ant. 2.307). He sees these various efforts as part of an overall tendency in Josephus to paint the Egyptian king in a more positive light (probably motivated by his writing for a gentile audience albeit with Jewish sympathies).

\textsuperscript{133} In essence (unlike Aaron and the magicians) they are necessary to the plot. They are not, however, the focal point.
his prophetic role. In all this Josephus provides a more focused encomium of God\textsuperscript{134} and his prophet Moses. He thereby remains consistent with his stated reasons for recounting the plagues (above) which in turn are consistent with his overall apologetic interest in God’s providence (here punishing disobedience) and prophecy (here highlighted in Moses). Aaron is simply redundant and his omission further highlights Josephus’ encomiastic focus on Moses in keeping with selection and order changes noted above.\textsuperscript{135}

In relation to the narrative element of action the Exodus plagues recount God’s faithfulness to his covenant and release of his oppressed people, especially in order that they might worship him (Exod 2:23-25; 3:12, 16-18; 5:1 etc.). Josephus retains the core of the action (the plagues themselves) but focuses the issues on what is advantageous/disadvantageous insofar as the actions are primarily punitive.\textsuperscript{136} The affect, therefore, is not a compromise in relation to actions but a narrative retelling that is more concise (as above) with a sharper (or at least different) focus.

Regarding the narrative element of time Josephus retains the chronological scheme and historical context of the LXX Exodus account. At the same time he omits reference to the “seven day” interval between the first two plagues (Exod 7:25) along with the fact that Moses went to confront Pharaoh in the “morning” (Exod 7:15). Other similar time references are elsewhere omitted\textsuperscript{137} with the single exception of the darkness plague where, in agreement with the LXX, it

\begin{footnote}{134}Highlights his providence, power and willingness to punish those who refuse to listen to his prophets. Pharaoh provides the negative example of one who provokes the deity to wrath (\textit{Ant.} 2.293) even if depicted in somewhat more positive terms than his Exodus counterpart.\end{footnote}

\begin{footnote}{135}This encomiastic emphasis is also evident in the darkness plague (Exod 10:24-29) where Pharaoh summons Moses but then orders him to leave (when they could not agree on the terms of the Israelite departure) with the threat of death should he appear again. Moses willingly departs. In Josephus it is Moses’ own initiative to go to Pharaoh and confront him with the question “how long will you disobey the will of God?” (\textit{Ant.} 2.309). The infuriated king threatens to behead him (should he ever appear again) to which Moses responds that the king himself will indeed implore them to leave his country and then departs (\textit{Ant.} 2.310). In effect these changes add dramatic flair (beheading versus simply killing) while heightening Moses’ courage (taking initiative and speaking boldly despite the threat of beheading) and prophetic status (the king will instruct them to leave). Feldman likewise notes Josephus’ heightening of Moses’ courage here (\textit{Judean Antiquities}, 221, n. 814).\end{footnote}

\begin{footnote}{136}Their punitive nature is not only inherent in his third reason for recounting the plagues, namely the warning to avoid actions that might offend the deity and result in punishment (\textit{Ant.} 2.293), but in Josephus’ tendency to highlight the negative affects of the plagues as noted above.\end{footnote}

\begin{footnote}{137}Examples include the following: “tomorrow” is the time when Pharaoh asks for release from the frogs (8:10); Moses is to confront Pharaoh in the “morning” with the flies and hail plagues (8:20; 9:13); the flies will depart\end{footnote}
is said to last three days\textsuperscript{138} (Exod 10:22; \textit{Ant}. 2.309). This could be seen as failure to pay attention to the time “element” of narrative although omissions frequently occur on account of his omitting direct speech (e.g., Moses being sent to Pharaoh in the “morning”) and one can readily understand how Josephus may have seen such references as generally redundant to the thrust of the narrative. Indeed, there is a sense in which Josephus creates a faster moving and more dramatic narrative in which conciseness has trumped slavish adherence to minor time references.\textsuperscript{139}

For Theon the narrative element of \textit{place} relates to geographical location (along with its significance) and terrain. Both Exodus and Josephus are clear about the events taking place in Egypt and both make mention of the ‘river’ (Nile would have been assumed by any reader) but beyond that there is little geographical specification.\textsuperscript{140} Given Josephus’ overall aims in recounting the story, however, there are no reasons to suggest that he should have added more geographic markers beyond the essential elements retained from the LXX account.

In relation to the \textit{manner} of actions Theon asks whether something was done willingly (by force, secretly or by deceit) or unwillingly (ignorance, accident or necessity). In both Exodus and Josephus the plagues are willing interventions of God directed against Pharaoh and the Egyptians. Josephus’ elimination of human agency in the plagues (namely that of Aaron and Moses) is not a compromise of the narrative element of \textit{manner} but a sharpening of the focus on the plagues as intentional, direct and willing (punitive) acts of God directed toward the Egyptian king (and nation) on account of his unwillingness to obey the divine will (e.g., \textit{Ant}. 2.309). Similarly Pharaoh’s response is highlighted as willing disobedience (albeit often with partial relenting).

\textsuperscript{138}“tomorrow” (8:29); and “tomorrow” and the “next day” are mentioned in relation to the livestock and hail plagues (9:5, 6, 18). Other plagues make no mention of time (e.g., the locusts in 10:1–20).
\textsuperscript{139}Josephus adds “and as many nights.”
\textsuperscript{140}According to Theon time references have to do with past, present, future, chronology, time of year and day etc. As such the time references in the Exodus account are indeed relevant. At the same time it is clear that not all stories are equal and some degree of flexibility pertains to the type of narrative being told. Interestingly, in this regard, Josephus adds one time reference of his own when he states that the hail occurred during springtime (\textit{Ant}. 2.305), a notice which perhaps highlights the drama by indicating that the annual crop was destroyed.
\textsuperscript{140}One exception is the mention of the land of Goshen as a place exempt from the flies plague (Exod 8:22).
Finally the narrative element of *cause* (relating to reasons for actions, such as to acquire good things, to escape evil, etc.) brings us to an important omission in the *Antiquities*, namely of the repeated Exodus refrain - “let my people go that they may worship me.” Despite being a (perhaps *the*) major motif in Exodus,\(^{141}\) Josephus omits it from his account (*Ant. 2.293-314*) with the one possible exception when cattle for sacrifice are mentioned in the darkness plague (*Ant 2.308*). Hence while the idea of Israelite departure is repeated several times,\(^{142}\) Josephus’ most explicit reference to the ‘worship’ motif occurs prior to the plagues during Moses’ second confrontation with Pharaoh when it is said that he must let the Hebrews depart in order that they may go to Sinai to sacrifice to God (*Ant 2.290-292*). Josephus immediately recounts, however, how Moses urges Pharaoh to heed the command lest he suffer “calamities” (τὰ δεινὰ). He then proceeds into his introductory statement about the plagues in which the king’s disdaining of Moses’ (prophetic) words are cited as the explicit cause of the plagues and the warning about dire consequences for provoking God’s wrath are given (*Ant. 2.293*). Once again Josephus has not so much omitted as shifted the focus of the *cause*, likely in keeping with his own apologetic interests.\(^{143}\)

If we turn from considering narrative ‘elements’ to ‘virtues’ Josephus’ *conciseness* over against the more ponderous Exodus narrative has already been well documented such as in relation to his omission of unnecessary detail, lengthy digressions (e.g., in relation to Passover), and repetitions. Equally important is that he accomplishes this without loss of *clarity* insofar as he retains core elements of the narrative (i.e. not omitting *necessary* detail) and does not confuse order or times. Indeed his introductory statement (*Ant. 2.293*) adds clarity by indicating the

---

\(^{141}\) The motif is present six out of ten biblical plagues (see table 3.11) but is carried over from earlier in the narrative (e.g., Exod 3:12, 18; 4:23; 5:1) and anticipates the lengthy description of the tabernacle and Israelite cultic life later in the Exodus account.

\(^{142}\) This is a recurring motif in Josephus’ plagues narrative (i.e. with the blood in *Ant 2.295*; the frogs in 2.298-299; the flies in 2.302; the wild beasts in 2.304; the hail/darkness in 2.307-309; and the first born in 2.314) but never with the corollary Exodus statement “in order that they may worship me.”

\(^{143}\) In depicting the plagues as divine punitive acts for disobedience Josephus may well have in mind those factional Jews of his own generation who have illegitimately rebelled against the God-ordained Roman rule thus resulting in the events of 66-70. Interestingly he omits mention in the locust plague that these things are to be told to future generations as a sign (Exod 10:2). This, however, likely involves omission of an unnecessary detail.
reasons for his recounting the narrative, to which he remains consistent throughout. Both *clarity* and *credibility* are enhanced by avoidance of certain discrepancies\(^{144}\) and it might be argued that *credibility* is enhanced by his more humane depiction of Pharaoh (as above) albeit that may be the result of his apologetic interests in relation to his gentile readership.

In summary, therefore, it has been demonstrated that many of Josephus’ adaptations of the Exodus plagues account can be explained with reference to the elements and virtues of narrative and encomium as described in Theon’s progymnasmata. We may now turn to a consideration of Josephus’ recounting of the Elisha narrative.

### 3.4 Rhetorical Adaptation of Sources in Josephus’ Account of Elisha

In considering issues of order and selection I will be examining the story of Elisha, the miracle working prophet of the northern kingdom, as it appears in Josephus’ *Ant.* 9.28-185 in relation to its parallel in the LXX 4 Kingdoms 2:1–13:25 (= Hebrew 2 Kings). Following this I will examine the narrative of Elisha’s death in more detail.

#### 3.4.1 Order and Selection in the Elisha Narrative

The parallel to *Ant.* 9.28-185 in 4 Kgdms 2:1–13:25 suggests that this was a primary source for Josephus albeit that elements from 2 Chr 21–24 appear to have been integrated in four out of the twenty three pericopes (see table 3.12 for this and following discussion).\(^{145}\) Josephus generally follows the macro-order of the LXX with the possible exception of some details in relation to the reign of Jehoash.\(^ {146}\) More striking, however, is the extent of Josephus’ omissions including several of Elisha’s miraculous acts: purifying the water (§2);\(^ {147}\) raising the dead son

---

\(^{144}\)For example in Exodus God threatens Pharaoh (through Moses) saying “if you refuse to let (my people) go, I will plague your whole country with frogs” (LXX Exod 7:27). The narrative then goes directly into the plague without any opportunity given for the refusal itself.

\(^{145}\)As noted above Josephus appears to be more conservative in his use of Kings-Chronicles than with material from the Pentateuch. Regarding the apparent influence of Chronicles it is noteworthy that the four pericopes where this can be detected are the only ones in this section that have parallels in Chronicles.

\(^{146}\)Notably in the narrative of Elisha’s death (§22 and §23 of Table 3.12) which will be discussed in detail below.

\(^{147}\)Feldman notes that the miracle is recorded in *War* 4.462-464 but “it is explained by natural means” insofar as Josephus retains the adding of salt but “emphasizes that the miracle resulted from Elisha’s prayers to God”
Chapter 3 Literary and Rhetorical Conventions in Josephus

§7; purifying the pot of stew (§8); feeding one hundred men (§9); healing Naaman’s leprosy (§10); and causing the ax head to float (§11). While the extent of omissions supports theories of Josephus’ skepticism toward the miraculous (as discussed above), he is noted to retain (without embarrassment) the stories of the widow’s oil (Ant. 9.47-50; §6) and the resuscitation of a dead body that contacts with Elisha’s corpse (Ant. 9.183; §23). Interestingly Josephus’ encomium of Elisha explicitly states that he performed “astounding and marvelous deeds” (θαυμαστὰ καὶ παράδοξα ἐργα) (Ant. 9.182) and just prior to the story of the widow’s oil he provides an introductory comment on Elisha, “whose acts (πράξεις) I wish to relate - for they are glorious (λαμπραῖ) and worthy of record - as we discover them in the sacred books (ἱεραὶ βιβλία)” (Ant. 9.46). Not only is the statement unusual in light of the subsequent omission of miracle stories but also because Josephus has previously introduced Elisha (Ant. 8:352-354; 9.28) and has just finished recounting the story of the war with Moab (§4) in which Elisha played an important role by prophesying that water supplies would not only satisfy their thirst but also serve to trick the Moabite army into thinking that they had slaughtered one another (Ant. 9.29-44). What then are we to make of Josephus’ selection and order?

("Elisha," 21). Feldman’s reasoning, however, is not clear. The account in War 4:459-475 expands significantly on the three verses of 4 Kgdms 2:19-22 (see Feldman’s own comments on this in ibid., 25) and the added note about Elisha’s prayers simply clarifies that it is God who is responsible for the miracle. The issue does not appear to be one of embarrassment (which Josephus readily deals with in other instances by simply omitting a narrative) but rather of emphasizing miracles as divine interventions in much the same way as he did the plagues.

148 All sectional references (e.g., §2) here and following refer to sectional divisions in table 3.12.

149 This is somewhat contra to Feldman (among others) who sees Josephus as rationalizing in relation to miracles.

Specific instances include the following: (1) In the miraculous provision of water in the stand-off against Moab (Ant. 9:29-44; 4 Kgdms 3:1-27) Josephus’ is said to rationalize through his addition of the command to dig trenches (9.35) and his statement that heavy rain in Idumea will be the source of the water (9.37). Such statements may add clarity and even credibility (a massive influx of water would require trenches to contain it) but hardly constitutes a thoroughgoing rationalization of the biblical account: (2) In relation to the poor widow (4 Kgdms 4:1-7) Josephus’ account (Ant. 9.47-50) shows signs of rationalizing by his use of φασί (‘they say’) to introduce the narrative as if “disclaiming responsibility for its history.” Furthermore the continual refilling of oil is given an explanation (absent in 4 Kingdoms) that it was God who kept on filling the jar. As noted above, however, ‘they say’ may be merely an accommodation to his audience, while the addition of an explicit identification of God as the agent who continually refills the jar is once again best explained not as a rationalizing but a highlighting of God as the direct agent of the miracle. On this and other purported rationalizations of miracles (or omission owing to embarrassment) see Feldman (“Elisha,” 20–24) along with the discussion above.

150 Elisha is the only prophet whose deeds are described as ‘glorious’ (λαμπραῖ; λαμπράς in Ant. 9.46 and 182 respectively) in Josephus (so Feldman, “Elisha,” 4–5).

151 He is first mentioned in association with his becoming a disciple of Elijah (Ant. 8.352-354) and then again in his being present at Elijah’s death (Ant. 9.28). The second would seem a particularly pertinent location to provide an
While the placement of his introductory statement is difficult to account for, the first thing that can be said about his selection of material is that it appears to be motivated primarily by an interest in Elisha’s political-prophetic role rather than his status as miracle worker. As such he retains pericopes that highlight this aspect of Elisha’s role, and adds statements, such as with Ben Hadad’s siege of Samaria, that “these things which had been foretold by Elisha came to pass in this manner” (Ant. 9.74). Notably none of the omitted miracles contains this motif suggesting that they may well have been omitted simply on the basis of conciseness and that the marvelous deeds Josephus wishes to highlight relate more to Elisha’s prophetic role than his (non-political?) wonders. It is not, therefore, a matter of Josephus’ avoiding or rationalizing the miraculous but rather focusing on Elisha’s ‘prophetic wonders’ which, of course, is consistent with his treatment of Moses discussed above.

In addition to various miracles Josephus also omits the episodes of the youths mauled by bears (§3) and the restoration of the land to the Shunammite woman (§14). While the former was introductory statement about Elisha, especially given that this is where the Elisha narrative appears to begin in Josephus. Indeed the only intervening material between this and the introductory statement of Ant. 9.46 is the war with Moab (Ant. 9.29-44) in which Elisha is a central character.

In particular §4, §12, §13, §15, §17 and §23 in table 3.12. Feldman also notes how Josephus highlights Elisha’s prophetic role observing that “on twenty-seven occasions (he) refers to Elisha as a prophet or uses the word ‘prophesied’ where it is missing in the Bible” (noting that the parallel change only occurs seventeen times in relation to Elijah despite that account being longer). He observes that, for Elijah, there is no explicit equivalent to the encomium of Elisha (Ant. 9.182-183) and, furthermore, that various other additions and omissions highlight Elisha’s power and fame as a prophet (e.g., he adds that when Elijah threw his mantle over Elisha the latter immediately begins to prophecy in Ant. 8.354; he omits the question of King Jehoram to Gehazi about relating the miracles of Elisha, in Ant. 9.87, insofar as such a request implies that the king had not heard of the miracles) (“Elisha,” 4–6).

A similar notice of fulfillment is given in the narrative of Elisha’s death (see below) and at Ant. 9.86 in relation to the siege of Samaria and the death of the captain of the guard. This notice is also present in the 4 Kingdoms account though is presented more concisely in Josephus.

Naaman’s healing is a possible exception (its positive attitude toward Gentiles makes it congenial to Josephus).

This does not account for his retaining the ‘widow’s oil’ which has no prophetic-political elements but may have been retained as a token example from the list of (non-political?) miracles.

Not only does he retain the widow’s oil and the resuscitation of a dead person (see above) but also miraculous elements within more obviously ‘political’ stories (e.g., §4, §12, §13, §15, §17 and §23 in table 3.12). Thus, for example, miraculous elements remain without rationalization in the prediction of water supply in the battle with Moab (Ant. 9.29-44) and the capturing and blinding of the Aramean army when they surround Elisha (Ant. 9.51-59).

Namely in heightening his prophetic role in the plagues where, in contrast to the LXX, God acts directly without human agency (see above). As with other heroes Feldman sees Josephus portraying Elisha in terms of cardinal virtues: wisdom (albeit less so than in other heroes); courage (e.g., thwarting the Syrian king’s attempt to capture him in 4 Kgdms 6:15-16 = Ant. 9.52-59); temperance (omitting episodes that suggest lack of restraint: e.g., the boys being mauled in 4 Kgdms 2:23-24 or anger at king Jehoram in 4 Kgdms 3:13); justice (he is explicitly described as δίκαιος in Ant. 9.182); and piety (e.g., he is one “with whom the Deity was so evidently present”). For more examples and explanation see Feldman, “Elisha,” 7–18.
likely omitted for encomiastic reasons, insofar as it portrays Elisha in poor light (see previous footnote), Josephus’ prior omission of the story about the raising of the Shunammite woman’s son (§7) means there is no longer a prior literary context for the ‘restoration of land’ narrative thus leading logically to its omission.

The remainder of Josephus’ narrative not only follows the order of 4 Kingdoms quite closely but makes only relatively minor changes at the level of detail. 158 Where details differ significantly from the Kings account it would appear that Josephus has been influenced by the parallel account in 2 Chronicles (in particular in §16, §17, §18, and §20), indicating that he was using at least two sources for this section of the Elisha narrative. 159 Other changes occur in the introduction to Elisha (§1) and the account of his death (§23). While the latter will be taken up below, the former is noteworthy in that Josephus provides a much briefer account that omits details such as Elisha’s request for a double portion of Elijah’s spirit, the parting of the Jordan by Elijah, and the declaration of the prophets that “the spirit of Elijah rests upon Elisha” (4 Kgdms 2:8-10, 15). It is difficult to account for these changes insofar this provides the natural point at which to introduce the praiseworthy status of Elisha as a prophet which, as noted above, Josephus delays until after the account of the war with Moab where he provides his own transition and introduction to Elisha (Ant. 9.45-46).

In summary it can be said that Josephus follows the LXX more closely in 4 Kingdoms than in Exodus albeit still engaging in significant macro-adaptation resulting in several omissions, a few additions and some material inserted from Chronicles. 160 In relation to the conventions of narrative a number of these changes are potentially explicable on encomiastic grounds insofar as he adds a transitional introduction (Ant. 9.45-46) and seems to focus on Elisha’s prophetic status

---

158 In comparison with Exodus at least.
159 §19 appears to be a unique insertion without parallel in Kings-Chronicles. A detailed study of these sections would be interesting in relation to the 2GH conflation theory. What can at least be said is that they appear as a unit within the larger narrative that otherwise lacks parallels in Chronicles.
160 While a micro-analysis of each pericope is beyond the bounds of this thesis, it may be observed generally that Josephus follows the LXX more closely in 4 Kingdoms than in Exodus (as discussed above). Changes, as such, are relatively minor in several sections (e.g., §4, §6, §12, §13, §15, §20 and §21 in table 3.12) and typically include (as with the Exodus) a tendency to reduce direct speech (e.g., in the widow’s oil) and general stylistic enhancements.
rather than simply his miracle working ability (which is equally, if not more, highlighted in the 4 Kingdoms account). This is similar to his procedure in relation to Moses (as noted above) and helps to explain the omission of multiple miracle stories which, at the same time, creates a more concise account. On the other hand his introductory statement about Elisha occurs somewhat late in the narrative (from a logical standpoint), namely where he takes over the mantle of Elijah (Ant. 9.28; 2 Kgdms 2:1-18), and he omits (without obvious reason) apparently important encomiastic material related to the transition from Elijah to Elisha (4 Kgdms 2:8-10, 15).

3.4.2 Narrative Adaptation in Josephus’ Account of Elisha’s Death

The narrative of Elisha’s death is recounted in Ant. 9.177-185 paralleling the LXX 4 Kgdms 13:10-25 (= Hebrew 2 Kings 13:10-25). Unlike the plagues narrative Josephus’ account (389 words) is almost identical in length to the Septuagint (398 words). Nevertheless the accounts differs in several ways of which the major ones can be quickly identified by observing their parallel outlines as set out in table 3.13.

Josephus makes a few omissions of which the first is the notation of 4 Kgdms 10:12 regarding additional acts of Joash recorded elsewhere. According to Christopher Begg this is typical of Josephus and is likely the result of “basing his own presentation on the authoritative bible itself, rather than its earlier sources”\(^{161}\). Given, however, that Josephus has no problem using “extra biblical” sources (as we saw in relation to materials added to the Exodus narrative) perhaps the narrative convention of brevity offers a better explanation here insofar as he omits an irrelevant detail. Second, Josephus omits mention of the oppression of Israel (during the days of Jehoahaz) by Hazael (king of Aram) and the Lord’s preserving them on account of his covenant with them (4 Kgdms 13:22-23). Begg notes how the biblical account is strained at this point in that these events (oppression) along with the death of Jehoahaz have already been recorded in 4 Kgdms.

13:3-7, 9. In omitting 4 Kgdms 13:22-23 Josephus avoids the repetition (he parallels the material of 4 Kgdms 13:3-7 in Ant. 9.174-176) thereby enhancing both conciseness and clarity.\footnote{According to a footnote in the Loeb translation of Ralph Marcus the mention of peace to Israel in Ant. 9.176 is taken by Josephus from 4 Kgdms 13:23 rather than 13:5 (Josephus, Antiquities IX-XI, 95, n. d). Begg points out that this may come from a different source insofar as the Lucianic version transfers 13:23 to a position just after 13:7. At the same time he thinks that Ant. 9:174-176 is just as easily explained as being dependent on 4 Kgdms 13:37 and that it is more likely that Josephus has simply passed over 13:23. See the discussion in Begg (“Joash and Elisha,” 39-40) as well as Christopher T. Begg and Paul Spilsbury, Flavius Josephus Translation and Commentary, ed. Mason, Steve (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2005), 171, n. 682.}

Josephus makes a minor addition to the account when he notes that Joas (Ἰωάσσωσ), the son of Joazos (Ἰωάζος) who takes over his reign in Israel, has the same name as the king of Israel. This evidently enhances clarity\footnote{Several factors that contribute to confusion here: (1) the king of Judah and the son who becomes king of Israel during the later part of his reign both share the same name (Joash); (2) there are variants for the name in the tradition (Joash versus Jehoahaz); (3) Josephus himself uses a different name than the LXX variants (Ἰώσσωσ in place of Ἰὼσσ) (he also uses Ἰωάζος in place of Ἰωάζιος for the father of Joas, king of Israel). Within his own account, however, Josephus remains consistent and his notation here provides a helpful clarifying remark. Begg makes note of a similar clarification in relation to two Jorams in Ant. 9.46, 94. For a discussion of these various issues see Begg and Spilsbury, Josephus Commentary, 169, nn. 661-2.} albeit confusion remains over the timing of the events.\footnote{Confusion arises in the 4 Kingdoms account from the fact that Jehoahaz (father of Joash) of Israel accedes to the throne in the 23rd year of Joash (of Judah) and is said to reign for 17 years (4 Kgdms 13:1). This implies that the rule of Joash (of Israel) begins in the 39th (or 40th) regnal year of Joash (of Judah) but according to 4 Kgdms 13:10 his reign begins in the 37th year. Josephus, however, changes the earlier notice to indicate that Joazos (Jehoahaz) accedes during the 21st year of Joas (Joash) of Judah. Even so the inconsistency remains in that this would imply the accession of his son in the 38th regnal year of the Joas (Joash) of Judah and yet in Ant. 9.177 he agrees with 4 Kgdms 13:10 in stating that Joas (of Israel) came to power in the 37th regnal year of Joas/Joash (of Judah). For further discussion see Begg, “Joash and Elisha,” 29-30.}

Josephus also adds the explicit statement that the king (Joas) left\footnote{Begg and Spilsbury translate it as the “king was relieved” (Josephus Commentary, 170, n. 674).} Elisha immediately after the arrows incident (Ant. 9.181). This is perhaps implied but certainly unstated in 4 Kgdms 13:19, which simply goes on to say “and Elisha died, and they buried him” (13:20). Josephus, however, states that it was “not long after this” (μητ’ οὐ πολὺ ...) that the prophet died whereby he clearly separates the events. Not only does this add an element of chronological specificity (in keeping with Theon’s narrative element of time) but also functions to set apart the next paragraph in Josephus, which constitutes his most significant narrative addition, namely his encomium of Elisha (Ant. 9.182). Here we are told that Elisha was ‘renowned for righteousness’ (ἐπὶ δικαιοσύνης διαβοήτως) and ‘one manifestly held in honor by God’ (φανερῶς...)}
This was on account of his performing ‘marvelous and wonderful deeds through his prophetic power’ (θαυμαστά γὰρ καὶ παράδοξα διὰ τῆς προφητείας ἐπεδείξατο ἔργα), deeds which were held in glorious memory by the Hebrews (μνήμης λαμπράς παρὰ τοῖς Ἑβραίοις ἀξιωθύντα). As a result he received a magnificent burial as was fitting to one so dear to God (ἐτυχε δὲ καὶ ταφῆς μεγαλοπρεποῦς καὶ οἴας εἰκὸς ἦν τὸν οὕτω θεοφιλῆ μεταλαβεῖν). Josephus intertwines this statement with the miraculous grave incident so that together they form an encomium of Elisha as per his concluding statement in Ant. 9.183 that “this much, then, concerning Elisha, both as to what he foretold in his lifetime and how after his death he still had divine power, we have now related.”

The highlighting of prophetic power and glorious deeds clearly parallels his introductory statement in Ant. 9.45-46. Elisha was undoubtedly worthy of honor.

The grave incident itself is transformed by Josephus insofar as 4 Kingdoms has an unnamed group (Israelites?) burying a man when they see a marauding band (μονοζωνοι) from Moab and decide, therefore, to cast the dead man into Elisha’s tomb. The man subsequently revives upon contact with Elisha’s corpse (4 Kgdms 13:20-21). While retaining the miraculous revivification, Josephus has a group of bandits (λῃστῶν τινῶν) cast the body into the grave, makes no mention of a marauding group from Moab, and omits that the man stood up on his feet after being revived. While the reasons for such changes are not immediately obvious, the last one may

---

167 Begg notes this as Josephus’ sole use of the expression but that it is reminiscent of his earlier statement (also an addition to the biblical account) that Adados (Ben Hadad) of Syria was “amazed ... at the prophet with whom God was so evidently present” (θαυμάσας ... τὸν προφήτην, ὃ τὸ θείον οὕτως ἐναργῶς παρῆν) in Ant. 9.60 (“Joash and Elisha,” 34, n. 34).

168 Begg notes this is the only place where θαυμαστὰ καὶ παράδοξα are collocated in Josephus (“Joash and Elisha,” 34, n. 34).

169 Begg notes the use of the adjective μεγαλοπρεπῆς (magnificent) three times elsewhere in Josephus’ Antiquities to describe burials (Abner at 7.21, Jehoshaphat at 9.44 and Josiah at 10.77) along with a general tendency to “accentuate the pomp surrounding burials of biblical heroes” (“Joash and Elisha,” 36, n. 39). The phrase “one dear to God” (θεοφιλῆς) occurs 11x in Josephus (ibid., 36, n. 40).

170 Together they form something of an inclusio albeit (as noted above) the story of Elisha begins prior to Ant. 9.45-46 and the concluding statement (regarding the fulfillment of his prophecies) comes immediately after this statement (Ant. 9.183) in Ant. 9.185.
be the result of conciseness (omission of unnecessary detail) and having ‘robbers’ do the throwing perhaps avoids the implied dishonor of having Israelites cast a body into Elisha’s tomb, thus suggesting encomiastic reasons. He also creates a tighter account chronologically by having the incident occur just at that time (τότε). Josephus is far from embarrassed by the story which he carefully interweaves into his encomium (Ant. 9.182-183) thereby highlighting the glorious deeds of Elisha’s life, his magnificent burial, and even this miraculous event occurring in association with his death. He perhaps also enhances credibility by having λῃστῶν τινῶν responsible for the casting of the dead man into the grave and in general provides a clearer and more concise narrative.

Josephus’ appraisal of Joash as “a good man and in no way like his father” (Ant. 9.178) essentially reverses the evaluation of 4 Kingdoms which states “he did evil in the sight to Lord not turning from all the sins of Jeroboam...” (13:11), which is all the more striking in that Josephus otherwise follows the LXX in its negative appraisal of Israel’s rulers.

The most obvious explanation for this reversal, according to Christopher Begg, is that subsequent interactions with Elisha suggest a very positive relationship between the two, such as when Elisha comforts the king in his lament (Ant. 9.180). Given that this narrative contains a climactic

---

171 Josephus shortens this specific account from 44 (LXX) to 21 words. At the same time the ‘standing’ motif may be seen as a miraculous proof and therefore worthy of inclusion.

172 Begg notes the opinion of Montgomery and Gehman, namely that the idea of annual Moabite marauders is an “absurdity,” and suggests this as a possible motive for Josephus’ change (“Joash and Elisha,” 36, n 41). What may appear absurd to the modern historian, however, may not have appeared absurd to Josephus. Furthermore he could have avoided the problem by simply omitting the reference to this as an annual activity. Given, however, that we have just been informed of Elisha’s magnificent burial it seems odd that anyone would cast a body into his tomb and thus it would be more fitting to associate this with a group of ‘bandits/robbers.’ Josephus’ use of the term λῃστής here is perhaps reflecting a political reality of his own day and thus adding a degree of credibility to the narrative as ‘bandits’ might well be associated with such a treacherous act.

173 By speaking of annual raids in spring the account in Kings provides more apparent chronological distance from the time of Elisha’s death (so Begg, “Joash and Elisha,” 37, n 42).

174 Reinforcing the claim Josephus’ discomfort with miracle is an unlikely cause for his omitting various miracle narratives (so also Begg, “Joash and Elisha,” 39). Begg and Spilsbury note that this concludes the mighty deeds of Elisha begun at Ant. 9.46 and that the phrase “divine power” (δύναμιν θείαν) is used elsewhere of Elisha (Ant. 9.46) and Micaiah (Ant. 8.408) (Josephus Commentary, 205, n. 681).

175 In keeping with encomiastic topics associated with a person’s death (tables 2.2 and 2.3).

176 Regarding MSS variations and latter rabbinic traditions that grew up around this story in terms of identifying the revived person see Begg, “Joash and Elisha,” 170–71.

177 For example see Josephus portrayal of Jehoahaz in the preceding narrative (Ant. 9.173).
and positive appraisal of Elisha, it was clearly ill fitting to depict him as having a positive relationship to an evil king.\textsuperscript{178} It would appear then that encomiastic motivations are at work both in retaining the story and reversing the appraisal of Joas.

Likewise interesting is Josephus’ transformation of Joas’ lament over Elisha’s impending death (\textit{Ant.} 9.179-180).\textsuperscript{179} Following the king’s declaration - “Father, the chariots of Israel and its horsemen”\textsuperscript{180} - the LXX moves immediately into the arrows incident. Josephus simplifies the address to “Father” and “armour” (‘\(\text{o}p\text{l}\text{o}n\)’)\textsuperscript{181} but provides an explanation of the appellative “armour” by saying that they had never had to use arms (‘\(\text{o}p\text{l}\text{o}i\text{\(\text{s}\)}\)’) because they had always overcome their enemies through the prophetic words of Elisha.\textsuperscript{182} As such Elisha’s departure would leave them unarmed before the Syrians and their allies\textsuperscript{183} and the king would be better off dying along with the prophet. While Josephus’ direct parallel to the thirty-word speech of the king (4 Kgdms 13:14) is once again more concise (eighteen words),\textsuperscript{184} his additional material results in the speech being expanded to seventy words. The narrative virtue of \textit{clarity} provides the most obvious reason for Josephus’ adding his explanation about ‘armour’ in that it explains both the obscure address and the reason for king’s weeping, namely that Elisha’s prophecies had

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item See Begg, “Joash and Elisha,” 30. A partial parallel is noted in Josephus’ judgment on Jehoahaz in \textit{Ant.} 9.173 albeit Jehoahaz is acknowledged by Josephus to have committed sins (Begg and Spilsbury, \textit{Josephus Commentary}, 169, n. 663).
\item Begg observes that Josephus omits the biblical specificity regarding the severity of Elisha’s illness (‘sick unto death’) by simply noting that he was old and had fallen sick (“Joash and Elisha,” 31). Taken with the next two sections of \textit{Antiquities} (9.179-180), however, it is clear that Elisha’s illness is unto death whereby Josephus’ omission of this explicit notation (§178; parallel 4 Kgdms 13:14) is best explained as narrative conciseness.
\item This follows the MT albeit that both nouns (chariot and horseman) are singular in the Greek while in Hebrew the first is singular and the second plural. Translation makes better sense when both are plural.
\item As is typical he also changes this from direct to indirect address (so also Begg, “Joash and Elisha,” 32, n. 18). This is indicated by his use of the infinitive despite the Loeb translation into direct speech.
\item According to Begg this is an exaggeration insofar as Josephus records earlier devastations under Syria (\textit{Ant.} 9.159, 174, 90-91) with only one incident of deliverance, namely from the Syrian army when it was blinded by God (\textit{Ant.} 9.56-57) (“Joash and Elisha,” 32, n. 19). It is notable, however, that in the immediately preceding narrative Jehoahaz is delivered from his enemies when he prays to God (\textit{Ant.} 9.175-176). Furthermore it is not necessary to read the notice as referring to the protection of Israel throughout the time of Elisha but may simply refer to Joas’ own particular reign during which he has been spared from enemies.
\item The referent (‘those under the Syrians’) is unclear but may refer to the 32 kings allied to Ben-Hadad in the time of Ahab in 3 Kgdms 20:1 (see Begg, “Joash and Elisha,” 33, n. 22 for discussion). The reference to the Syrians is also problematic in that there is a textual variant which reads “leaving him to the fully armed Syrians” as opposed to “leaving him unarmed before the Syrians” (see discussion in Begg, “Joash and Elisha,” 33, n. 21 and footnote ‘a’ on p. 97 of the Loeb edition: Josephus, \textit{Antiquities IX-XI}). The affect on my observations, however, is insignificant.
\item For example, by omitting “chariots.”
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
functioned as their primary military defense.\textsuperscript{185} Pathos is added by the expanded emotional appeal, along with Elisha’s response of comfort, while ethos is added in relation to the character of Elisha by further expanding on his prophetic success in relation to military battles. Josephus, therefore, appears to be influenced by encomiastic interests as well as the narrative virtues of conciseness (in relation to the first part only) and clarity.

The arrows incident also undergoes significant transformation by Josephus (see the parallel outlines in table 3.14). Josephus’ use of seventy five words is again more concise than the one hundred and thirty two used in the LXX. In part this is accomplished by changing direct into indirect speech and avoiding repetitive narrative\textsuperscript{186} but even more significant is the change from the LXX’s two incidents (shooting one arrow and striking the ground) into a single incident (shooting three arrows). Rather than simply eliminate the second incident (‘ground striking’), however, Josephus appears to combine the two so that the three times striking of the ground in the second LXX incident becomes three arrows being shot in Josephus. Likewise the limiting prophecy of the second LXX incident (‘you will defeat the Assyrians three times as per the number of times the ground was struck’) is transferred to the arrow shooting incident by Josephus who omits the first LXX prophecy of complete victory over the Arameans (4 Kgdms 13:17). Insofar as the two prophecies in 4 Kingdoms appear contradictory (‘you will completely destroy Aram...you will only defeat Aram three times but will not destroy it’) Josephus thus adds narrative clarity. At the same time he omits mention of Elisha being angry (4 Kgdms 13:19), in keeping with his more positive evaluation of Joas in relation to Elisha,\textsuperscript{187} and adds the notation about recovering the territory of his father.\textsuperscript{188} Conciseness, clarity and encomiastic interest,

\textsuperscript{185} This perhaps relates to Theon’s narrative element of “cause” (providing a reason for an action).
\textsuperscript{186} 4 Kgdms 13:15-17, for example, reads in the style of ‘he said ... he did ... he said ... he did etc.’ Josephus, on the other hand, condenses the instructional process into a couple of short sentences without any direct discourse (‘Elisha ... told him to take a bow ... etc.’) and replaces parataxis with hypotaxis. Josephus likewise avoids repetition of words and phrases (e.g., bow and arrows in 4 Kgdms 13:15) and eliminates unnecessary words/phrases (e.g., in the LXX the king is told to take up a bow and arrows whereas in Josephus he is only told to take up a bow, arrows being implied).
\textsuperscript{187} Avoiding a deathbed exchange that ends on a note of estrangement (so Begg, “Joash and Elisha,” 35, n. 28).
\textsuperscript{188} This is missing in the parallel 4 Kgdms 13:19 and was likely taken from 4 Kgdms 13:25 (par. Ant. 9.184-185) where the recovery of territory is said to fulfill Elisha’s prophecy (so Begg, “Joash and Elisha,” 35, n. 31).
therefore, once again explain Josephus’ narrative adaptations as does his apologetic interest in prophecy and prophets (Elisha).

At the conclusion of the narrative Josephus omits verses 22-23 (see above), explicitly notes that the king of Israel began a war against the Syrian king,\(^{189}\) that he had three victories (using the same language of Elisha’s earlier prophecy), and that these events were the fulfillment of Elisha’s prophecy.\(^{190}\) The last of these is not explicit in the LXX account and thus again highlights the encomiastic nature of Josephus’ adaptation. Finally Josephus concludes with a notation of the death of Joas which has been moved down from its earlier position in 4 Kgdms 13:13. In so doing he avoids chronological confusion insofar as the LXX account has Joash (Joas) die prior to his encounter with Elisha (perhaps suggesting it was a distinct narrative unit). This clearly enhances narrative clarity.\(^{191}\)

In summary, Josephus has reshaped the narrative of Elisha’s death in keeping with Theon’s narrative virtues of conciseness and clarity through various omissions, additions and transformations. In so doing he removes apparent chronological (death notice of king) and logical (arrows incident) inconsistencies, chooses language that will appeal to his audience (e.g., his use of Ληστής) and seems to be influenced by Theon’s six narrative elements. Thus he retains key events (action)\(^{192}\) as well as time and place indicators.\(^{193}\) While all the actions are

\(^{189}\)Josephus again has variants of the LXX names (see Begg and Spilsbury, Josephus Commentary, 171, n. 682).

\(^{190}\)So Begg (“Joash and Elisha,” 41). Josephus, as usual, avoids repetitions such as taking the “cities” in 4 Kgdms 13:25. See also Begg and Spilsbury, Josephus Commentary, 171 for comments on these changes.

\(^{191}\)It should be noted here that, as pointed out by Begg, among the differing versions of the LXX the Lucianic version agrees in placing the death notice later in the narrative as well as reversing the order of notices about the burial of Joash and the accession of his son Jeroboam to the throne. The Lucianic version also expands on v. 25 and has something of a parallel to the fulfillment notice when it states that “Joash thrice smote the Syrians at Aphek according to the word of the Lord.” It is impossible to know for sure whether Josephus’ changes result from independent editorial choices or simply reflect a different source (the Lucianic version or something similar). Having examined all the parallels Begg himself notes that “their cumulative evidence certainly does lend a certain plausibility to the surmise that, for his account of Joash and Elisha at any rate, Josephus did make use of a Biblical text akin to that found in our L(ucianic) MSS.” At the same time he notes that “each might be plausibly explained on the supposition of free editorial initiative by Josephus working with a text à la that of the MT.” For further discussion see Begg, “Joash and Elisha,” 31, 40–43 (quotes from p. 43). Finally it may be stated that even if Josephus utilized an alternative account it remains the case that he has expressed himself more clearly and concisely, and has chosen to go with the order that is logically and chronologically superior.

\(^{192}\)The one key action omitted is the striking of the ground but possible reasons for this have been discussed above.

\(^{193}\)He even adds the time reference that it was “not long afterward” that Elisha died (Ant. 9.183).
depicted as willing in both the LXX and Josephus, the latter is perhaps clearer in depicting causes such as in expanding the lament of Joash (over the impending death of Elisha) so as to provide a reason for the lament and his address of “armour” to Elisha (Ant. 9.179). Finally many of the changes in Josephus contribute positively to developing the character of both Joas (who is changed from a ‘wicked’ to a ‘good’ king) and Elisha, thus showing the influence of encomium and especially the narrative element of person. It is thus easy to see how Josephus’ narrative adaptation results in an account that fits with his overall apologetic aims to “refute contemporary Gentile claims that his people lacked figures of comparable worth to the Greek and Roman heroes.”

3.5 Rhetorical Adaptation of Sources in Josephus’ Account of Jonah

Finally we may turn to Josephus’ adaptation of the biblical story of Jonah. Josephus inserts his version of the Jonah narrative (Ant. 9.208-214 = LXX Jonah) a little later in his parallel to the LXX Kingdoms narrative in association with the account of Jeroboam II (Ant. 9.205-207, 215 = 4 Kgdms 14:23-29). This seems to have been inspired by the fact that the Kingdoms narrative mentions “Jonah the son of Amittai” (4 Kgdms 14:25; cf. Jonah 1:1), which Josephus seizes upon as an opportunity to provide a brief digression so as to give a full recounting of the events as he found them in the Hebrew books/scriptures (Ant. 9.208, 214). Despite its placement, the inserted story clearly parallels the LXX Jonah story but with significant narrative adaptation. The parallel text along with lists of shared content and omissions by Josephus are presented below in tables 3.15, 3.16 and 3.17.

That Josephus bases his account upon the LXX Jonah story is strongly suggested by many common details indicating a shared foundational story line: Jonah’s initial sending by God; his running from God and departing on a ship; the storm and subsequent casting overboard; his

194Begg sees two primary affects of Josephus’ adaptations: they contribute to Elisha’s encomium and eliminate the problem of his cordial relationship with a wicked king (by changing him to a “good” one). (“Joash and Elisha,” 46).
195Feldman refers to this as a deliberate digression (“Jonah,” 5).
being swallowed by a fish and subsequently vomited up on dry ground; and finally his proclamation in Nineveh (see table 3.16 which lists sixteen overlapping elements). At the same time Josephus’ engages in significant narrative adaptation. As with the plagues narrative Josephus is significantly more concise replacing one thousand and twenty six (Greek) words in the LXX with only three hundred and three of his own. This enhanced brevity occurs in spite of adding a narrative introduction [Ant. 9.208 - “Having promised to pass on an accurate (account) of the events, I thought it necessary also to recount whatever I found recorded in the Hebrew books concerning this prophet...”] and conclusion [“...now I have passed on the account of him as I found it recorded”] which are presumably designed to help situate the story in its new literary context. In part the conciseness results from rhetorical enhancement of style associated with replacing parataxis with hypotaxis, a general tendency toward more concise expression, and avoidance of unnecessary repetition of words or phrases. It is, however, his omissions that create the biggest difference between the accounts and contribute most of all to Josephus’ greater brevity. As can be seen from table 3.16 the majority of overlap occurs in the first chapter of Jonah from which a number of small omissions are made whereas almost the entirety of Jonah 2–4 is either omitted or severely abbreviated (see table 3.17). It is these latter changes that are clearly most dramatic especially Josephus’ omissions of the positive response of the Ninevites, God’s relenting (mercy), and subsequent exchanges between God and Jonah (numbers 12-16 in table 3.17). In the LXX account Jonah is fundamentally at fault while the

---

196 This can be seen for example in the parallels to Ant. 9.208 (arising of storm and threat to ship) and Ant. 9.210-211 (selection and questioning of Jonah).
197 Examples include the following: in LXX Jonah 1:4 nineteen words describing the onset of the storm are replaced with only nine words in Ant. 9.209 (ἐπιγενομένου ... τοῦ σκάφους; this includes a stylistic change from speaking about the threat of the ship breaking up to a threat of it sinking); in the selection of Jonah by lots and questioning of him (LXX Jonah 1:8-9) Josephus replaces 55 words with 24 (Ant. 9.211: κληροδοσίαν ... ἔθετο; in Jonah’s initial advice that they cast him into the sea (LXX Jonah 1:10-12) Josephus replaces 80 words with just 20 (Ant. 2.211: συνεβούλευσεν ... χειμώνας).
198 Examples include the following: Tarshish occurs three times in LXX Jonah 1:3 whereas the parallel Tarsus occurs once only in Ant. 9.208; Josephus’ equivalent (“from God”) to the twice repeated LXX phrase (“from the presence of God” in Jonah 1:3) only occurs once; the twice repeated “sea” (θάλασσα) in Jonah 1:4 is omitted from Ant. 9.209 where it is clearly implied; the equivalent to the three times LXX notation about the sea becoming calm (Jonah 1:11, 12, 15) occurs only once in Josephus’ (Ant. 9.213).
199 As well as making incredible his claim to have ‘recounted’ the story just as he found it (Ant. 9.214).
gentile city repents and God’s mercy toward them is highlighted. While Josephus retains Jonah as a reluctant prophet (he runs away as per Jonah 1), the effect of the omissions in Jonah 2–4 is to radically transform Jonah into a true prophet whose prophecy of doom comes to pass albeit somewhat later in the narrative. According to Feldman this results from Josephus’ interest in both prophecy and history. Hence his decision to retain the Jonah story (rather than simply omit it) relates to his interest in Nahum’s prophecies about the doom of Nineveh, which are explicitly noted to have come to pass (Ant. 9.239-242). In adapting the Jonah story (no repentance or mercy for the city) he therefore avoids contradiction with Nahum’s prophecies and depicts Jonah as a true rather than false prophet.\(^{200}\)

Begg and Spilsbury suggest two further reasons for Josephus’ dramatic adaptation of the biblical narrative: (a) Roman concerns about proselytizing and conversions to Judaism (hence the omission of Ninevite repentance and apparent conversion of the sailors);\(^{201}\) (b) the realization that gentile readers might be upset at reading of Jonah’s resentment at God’s sparing of a gentile city.\(^{202}\)

From the standpoint of Theon’s elements of narrative Josephus’ abbreviation results in loss of character development (person) in relation to the sailors and the Ninevites as well as transforming Jonah into a true prophet. Such changes, however, are explicable from the

\(^{200}\)See Feldman, “Jonah,” 11–14. The biblical Jonah is essentially open to the charge of being a false prophet on account of the Ninevites repentance (i.e. the doom Jonah predicted did not come to pass). Feldman notes that Josephus omits the biblical ‘40 days’ (Jonah 3:4) and speaks rather of a ‘a short time’ (Ant. 9.214) before Nineveh would be judged. He suggests that this subtle change also helps avoid the charge of false prophet in that 115 years would pass after the prophecies of Nahum before the judgment would befall the city (Ant. 9.239-242). This length of time is still somewhat difficult to reconcile with Josephus’ ‘short time’ but is certainly not a flat contradiction. Feldman highlights the close connection between prophecy and history in Josephus whereby there is a “kinship ... between prophet and historian” that in part at least serves apologetically for his own “craft as a historian” (ibid., 4-6). The focus on Jonah as a (true) prophet is further enhanced by Josephus’ terminology. While the LXX never explicitly refers to him as a prophet, Josephus four times refers to Jonah as a σάπφητες (Ant.9.208, 211, 212) and twice speaks of him ‘prophesying’ (προφητεύω) (Ant. 9.206, 207) (on this see Begg and Spilsbury, Josephus Commentary, 177, n. 766). It might also be noted that the designation “prophet of the greatest God” (προφητής τοῦ μεγίστου θεοῦ) is the same designation used of Elijah in Ant. 8.319.

\(^{201}\)The sailors’ conversion is implied in Jonah 1:14 (they pray to the Lord) and 1:16 (they are said to fear the Lord and offer sacrifices) (see Begg and Spilsbury, Josephus Commentary, 179, nn. 788, 799).

\(^{202}\)Begg and Spilsbury, Josephus Commentary, 179–80, n. 800. Feldman also detects a tendency to avoid Jewish nationalism and a deference toward Roman sensibilities about proselytism in Jonah’s description of himself as a “Hebrew by race (γῆνος)” (Ant. 9.211). While this contrasts the more overtly nationalistic biblical reference (“I am a Hebrew” in Jonah 1:9) (“Jonah,” 7, 16-17, 22), however, the LXX reads “I am a servant of the Lord (δοῦλος κυρίου)” (1:9) suggesting that Josephus is actually closer to the (more nationalistic) Hebrew.
standpoint of Josephus’ apologetic interests in relation to prophecy, history and his gentile audience (as above) and the resultant brevity is in keeping with what is essentially a digression within the Kingdoms narrative. In relation to the storm Josephus explicitly states that Jonah did not imitate any of the actions of the sailors in their offering of prayers (Ant. 9.209) thus contributing positively to his characterization as a true prophet.\footnote{This may be associated with the fact that the sailors in Josephus are making offerings to foreign deities thereby making it inappropriate for a Jewish prophet to participate (so Feldman, “Jonah,” 20).} Josephus’ apologetic interests likewise explain his omission of various narrative actions (e.g., major actions in Jonah 3–4).

When it comes to time and place he appears to enhance narrative credibility in at least two ways: (a) he provides a historical (‘chronological’) context by presenting it as a digression within the historical framework of the Kings-Chronicles narrative;\footnote{In the LXX (as with the MT) the Jonah story is free floating within the corpus of “The Twelve” without any clear chronological or historical. Only the chance reference to (the same?) “Jonah the son of Amittai” in 4 Kgdms 14:25 provides a potential historical reference point for the story which Josephus capitalizes upon.} (b) he subtly transforms the geographical references whereby the obscure biblical ‘Tarshish’ (LXX θαρσίς; Hebrew יָרִשׁ) becomes ‘Tarsus of Cilicia’ (εἰς ταρσοῦν ... τῆς Κιλικίας; Ant. 9.208)\footnote{Feldman notes that Josephus explicitly links Tarshish and Tarsus in Ant. 1.127 (table of nations) (“Jonah,” 6) and Begg and Spilsbury note another reference to Tarsus of Cilicia in War 7.238 (Josephus Commentary, 178, n. 775).} and the unspecified body of water in the biblical account is for Josephus the Euxine (Black) sea (Εὔξεινος; Ant. 9.213).\footnote{Feldman sees this Josephan digression as resulting from his interest in history and prophecy (in particular the prophecy against Nineveh) whereby the geographical notations are made more concrete and the story is situated in the political context of 2 Kings thereby transforming a ‘midrashic legend’ into a historical narrative that emphasizes Jonah’s role as prophet (“Jonah,” 5–7). Josephus introduced the legend “in order to give him an opportunity to predict the overthrow of Assyria which is located in precisely the area where the kingdom of Parthia, the great enemy of Rome, was situated” (ibid., 8).} The effect of the latter is to add geographical concreteness thereby enhancing historical credibility over against the (more parabolic?) biblical narrative. At the same time his specification of Tarsus (Jonah’s destination) and the Euxine Sea (Jonah’s place of deposit) creates inconsistencies in his narrative that are not readily resolved, in particular the greater proximity of Tarsus, than Joppa (Jonah’s point of departure), to Nineveh (the place from which Jonah is running).\footnote{As Ralph Marcus notes “Josephus apparently assumes that the Euxine (Black) Sea would be the nearest sea to Nineveh” (Antiquities IX-XI, 113, n. c; Marcus is cited approvingly in Feldman, “Jonah,” 6, n.15; a similar point is made by Begg and Spilsbury, Josephus Commentary, 179, n. 793). Nineveh is actually about 800km from both the Black Sea and the Mediterranean Sea albeit about 50km closer to the former (noting that Josephus refers to the
biblical account to run, be thrown overboard and subsequently proclaim to the Ninevites albeit
the biblical account of the latter (proclamation) suggests this was somewhat against his will in
light of the dialogue (between Jonah and God) in Jonah 3–4 and the manner in which the book
ends (Jonah’s anger). Josephus’ omission of these latter details leaves the impression that Jonah
was a more willing participant in proclamation although in Josephus’ case this ends only in
judgment (as above). In terms of narrative cause Josephus, on the one hand, is more explicit in
providing ‘fear’ as the cause of Jonah’s initial flight (Ant. 9.208) but, on the other hand, omits
the reason for the call to proclaim against Nineveh (‘its wickedness has come up before me’ in
Jonah 1:2).209

As for narrative virtues Josephus’ enhanced conciseness has already been noted and, in
addition to stylistic enhancements, plausible (apologetic) reasons have been suggested for
Josephus’ major omissions and adaptations especially in relation to Jonah 3–4. In relation to
narrative credibility Josephus gives his typical nod to potential skeptics when, in relating the fish
tale, he opens with the words “the story has it ... ”,210 which Feldman likens to the λέγωσι

208In the biblical account the reason for Jonah’s flight is actually given later in the narrative, namely he did not want
to see God’s compassion extended toward Nineveh in Jonah 4:2, but this would have been an inappropriate reason
for Josephus who wants to protect the character of this true prophet and avoid negative comments about gentiles.
209Josephus also clarifies the cause of the casting of lots by explicitly indicating that the sailors chose to do this on
account of the storm worsening despite their prayers and offerings (Ant. 9.210). In the LXX the decision to cast lots
simply follows upon the question and statement of the captain to Jonah (1:6-7) but no explicit reason for the action
is given. Similarly Josephus adds an explicit cause for the sailors prayers and offerings, namely that “they might
escape the sea” (Ant. 9.209: εἰ δισφύγοιν τὴν ἁλασσαν) albeit omitting notation of their fear (cf. Jonah 1:5).
210Merely λόγος in Greek but taken this way by Marcus (Antiquities IX-XI, 113) and Feldman (“Jonah,” 15).
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(‘they say’) formula in Herodotus.\textsuperscript{211} Josephus was nevertheless happy to retain the story and adds the detail that Jonah was “alive and unharmed in his body” (\textit{Ant.} 9.213), which functions only to highlight the miraculous.\textsuperscript{212} Feldman also notes how the MT account has Jonah offer a prayer of thanksgiving prior to his deliverance (Jonah 2:2-10 = English 2:1-9) which the LXX changes to an optative (making it a future wish) while the Targum similarly changes it to a future reference. Josephus, however, resolves the problem by turning it into a prayer of confession after he has been ejected (\textit{Ant.} 9.214).\textsuperscript{213} In this way his brief notation about prayer is not only more concise (nine Greek words replace Jonah 2) but also more credible and clear.\textsuperscript{214} At the same time he compromises clarity and credibility with his changes off geographical references (as above).

In sum Josephus is again seen to significantly adapt the biblical account in a manner that is largely explicable on the basis of his apologetic interests and the rhetorical conventions of narrative and encomium. Jonah is depicted as a reluctant prophet who subsequently rightly prophecies the downfall of Assyria, which will come to pass sometime later (\textit{Ant.} 9.239-242), and is thus transformed through this short digression into a more positive and exemplary character than his biblical counterpart.

3.6 Conclusions On Josephus’ Narrative Adaptation

In this chapter I have analyzed Josephus’ narrative re-presentation of the biblical accounts of Exodus, Elisha and Jonah. In general it has been shown that most of his narrative adaptations at both the macro- and micro-levels are explicable in terms of his apologetic interests as well as the

\textsuperscript{211}E.g. Herodotus 1.24 in the tale of Arion who was thrown overboard and rescued by a dolphin (Feldman, “Jonah,” 15).

\textsuperscript{212}Feldman suggests that Josephus retained the story “perhaps because it was so well known, while dissociating himself from necessarily believing it” (“Jonah,” 15). One could, however, say the same of the Ninevite repentance (namely that for those familiar with the story they would have been equally familiar with the second half) which is so central to the biblical account and yet Josephus has no problem omitting that. In sum, therefore, it is rather speculative to suggest that he retained the fish story on account of necessity.

\textsuperscript{213}Feldman, “Jonah,” 15.

\textsuperscript{214}Feldman also suggests that the transformation from a prayer of thanksgiving to one of “contrite repentance” would have raised Jonah’s “stature in the eyes of (Josephus’) readers” (“Jonah,” 21).
rhetorical conventions of narrative and encomium as identified in chapter 2. Specifically in
to the Exodus narrative it was demonstrated that while Josephus broadly followed the
biblical account, his many omissions (e.g., Moses’ murder of the Egyptian or having Aaron as a
helper) and additions (e.g., scribal prophecy about Moses’ birth; bodily traits; education; and
military success) were typically explicable on the basis of encomiastic interests related to his
general apologetic interest in ancient Jewish prophetic heroes (Moses being the paradigmatic
figure in this regard). The influences of narrative virtues were clear in relation to greater
conciseness along with changes that enhance clarity (e.g., change of genealogy; transformation
of burning bush; and initial encounter with Pharaoh). What was true at the macro-level of order
and selection was equally true at the micro-level analysis of the plagues narrative in which
Josephus again exemplified brevity (one third as long as the biblical narrative) with associated
stylistic improvements (e.g., hypotaxis in place of parataxis; avoiding unnecessary repetition;
and greater variation in use of conjunctions). The addition of an introductory paragraph along
with various other changes (e.g., heightened negative effect of plagues; omitting magicians; and
omitting hardening of Pharaoh’s heart) serve to enhance clarity in relation to apologetic aims and
cause (plagues as divine punitive actions) as well as heightening encomiastic interests (Moses’
exemplary prophetic status). In avoiding narrative tensions and depicting Pharaoh in more
human terms (as well as his more gradual decline into obstinacy) Josephus generally produces a
more concise, clear and credible account in keeping with Theon’s narrative rhetorical
conventions.

The situation is similar when it comes to the Elisha narrative where in relation to macro-
analysis of order and selection Josephus again exemplifies brevity although in this case he omits
much material that might have been considered encomiastic. Some of the omitted material
(several of Elisha’s miracles) is explicable in relation to Josephus’ focal interest in Elisha’s
political-prophetic role (as opposed to mere wonder worker) and some is obviously less desirable
from an encomiastic perspective (e.g., the youths mauled by bears). Other omissions are less
readily explicable (e.g., receiving a double portion of Elijah’s spirit) and his late placement of his introductory statement about Elisha also remains puzzling. On a micro-level Josephus’ narrative adaptation of Elisha’s death is of a similar length to the biblical account but displays a number of differences. Various omissions (e.g., additional acts of Joash) and additions (encomium of Elisha) are explicable as rhetorical enhancements (conciseness, clarity and encomium). Likewise the transformation of the grave incident (body raised) results in greater clarity, conciseness and is in keeping with the encomiastic category of ‘after death’ events. Josephus’ reversal of the negative biblical appraisal of Joas along with his transformation of Joas’ lament (explains ‘armour’; expanded emotional appeal etc.) clearly functions encomiastically in relation to Elisha. The arrows incident is retold in manner more concise and clear (removes the first, somewhat contradictory, prophetic notice) and omits Elisha’s anger (encomiastic). He concludes with a positive encomiastic notice about Elisha and switches the death notice of Joas to a more logical place (it occurs prior to the arrows incident in the biblical narrative). In essence despite a couple of questionable changes in relation to order and selection the overall impression is that the manner of Josephus’ narrative adaptation of the Elisha narrative is consistent with his own apologetic aims and the rhetorical conventions of narrative and encomium.

Finally Josephus’ re-presentation of the Jonah narrative once again enhances conciseness and inserts it as a digression of appropriate length into the historical Kings-Chronicles narrative. Major omissions along with various other adaptations transform the account from one of a recalcitrant biblical prophet (who exemplifies an unseemly ethnocentrism) into a story of a true prophet who, despite initial unwillingness, announces prophetic doom for Nineveh consistent with later historical events (as also prophesied by Nahum). While Josephus’ replacement of Tarshish with Tarsus and his explicit identification of the Euxine (Black) Sea appear to make the account the more historically plausible (along with its insertion into a historical narrative), the resultant geographical confusion somewhat reduces clarity. Despite this glitch in logic or accuracy the end result of Josephus’ adaptation of the Jonah account is nevertheless readily
explicable in relation to Theon’s narrative conventions of rhetoric and encomium along with
Josephus’ own apologetic aims (interest in God’s providence and prophecy as related to history).

In essence, therefore, Josephus’s many adaptations to the narratives analyzed in this chapter
are explicable (with few exceptions) on the basis of Theon’s rhetorical conventions of narrative
and encomium with particular emphasis on the narrative element of person along with the virtues
of conciseness, clarity and credibility. These adaptations are also explicable in relation to
Josephus’ overall apologetic aims in relation to history and prophecy noting that each of the
three characters (Moses, Elisha and Jonah) has been presented as an ideal prophetic hero. It
remains in the following chapter to consider the influence of these same rhetorical conventions in
relation to Plutarch’s narrative of his source material in the writing of his Lives.
Table 3.1: The Exodus Account in Parallel (Exod 1:1–15:19 and Josephus’ Ant. 2:200-349)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>§1. Names of the sons of Israel (1:1-7)</th>
<th>Josephus (all references to Antiquities book 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exodus (LXX and MT)</td>
<td>Introduction and transition (200)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§2. Israelite enslavement and abuse (1:8-22)</td>
<td>1. Egyptian enslavement of Israel (201-209)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) A new king enslaves the Israelites (1:8-14)</td>
<td>(a) Egyptians ill disposed to Israel and abuse them (201-4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Hebrew midwives outsmart the king (1:15-21)</td>
<td>(b) Scribe prophecies Moses’ birth and Egyptian demise (205)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Pharaoh commands death of Hebrew infants (1:22)</td>
<td>2. Pharaoh therefore issues following commands:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a) Death of Israelite male children by drowning (206a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) Egyptian midwives to watch over Hebrew midwives (206b-207a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c) Death penalty for whole families who disobeyed (207b-209)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>§3. Moses birth and upbringing (2:1-10)</th>
<th>Moses’ birth and upbringing (210-237):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Birth to Levite couple (2:1-2)</td>
<td>(a) Amram discovers his wife to be pregnant (210)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Placement in basket in the river (2:3-4)</td>
<td>(b) Amram prays to God on account of his pregnant wife (211)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Drawn from river and adopted by Pharaoh’s daughter (2:5-10)</td>
<td>(c) God appears to Amram in a night-time vision (212-216)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d) Easy birth followed by 3 months at home (217-218)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(e) Amram places Moses in a basket on the river (219-231)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(f) Pharaoh’s daughter finds the child and obtains a nurse (224-227)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(g) Thermuthis (Pharaoh’s daughter) names Moses; brief ancestry provided (228-229)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(h) Moses’ understanding and stature (230-31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(i) Thermuthis adopts him: Moses plays with his father’s crown and she saves him from attempted murder by scribe (232-36a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(j) Moses educated: he is the hope of Israel but Egyptians are suspicious (236b-237)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>§4. ---</th>
<th>Moses saves the Egyptians from the Ethiopians (238-253)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Plot to kill Moses after his murder of Egyptian (2:11-15a)</td>
<td>(a) King selects Moses to lead army against Ethiopians (238-242)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Moses flees to Midian and sits by well (2:15b)</td>
<td>(b) Moses carries out successful military campaign (243-250)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Moses rescues 7 sisters and marries Zipporah (2:16-22)</td>
<td>(c) Moses marries Tharbis (Ethiopian) (251-253)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>§5. Moses’ flight to Midian (2:11-22)</th>
<th>Moses’ Flight to Midian(^1) (254-263)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Plot to kill Moses after his murder of Egyptian (2:11-15a)</td>
<td>(a) Various plots to kill Moses (on account of jealousy) (254-256a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Moses flees to Midian and sits by well (2:15b)</td>
<td>(b) Moses flees to Midian and sits by well (256a-257)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Moses rescues 7 sisters and marries Zipporah (2:16-22)</td>
<td>(c) Moses rescues 7 sisters and receives one as a wife (258-263)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\)Note: Josephus omits Moses’ murder of the Egyptian and provides an expanded record of many other elements.
Table 3.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>§6. Israelites cry out to God who remembers them (2:23-25)</th>
<th>Moses at the burning bush (264-276):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>§7. Moses at the burning bush (3:1-4:17)</td>
<td>(a) God appears to Moses and commissions him (264-69)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) God appears to Moses and commissions him (3:1-12)</td>
<td>(b) Moses objects(^1) but God persuades (270-72a) and performs signs:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) God reveals divine name and promises deliverance (3:13-22)</td>
<td>i. Staff into serpent (272b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Moses objects about possible unbelief and God answers with signs and a promise:</td>
<td>ii. Hand becomes white (not leprous) (273a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Staff turns into snake (4:1-5)</td>
<td>iii. Water into blood red colour (273b)(^2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Leprous hand in cloak and promise about blood sign (4:6-9)</td>
<td>(c) God encourages and sends Moses (274)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Moses objects about lack of eloquence: God agrees to send Aaron as a mouthpiece (4:10-17)</td>
<td>(d) Moses entreats God in relation to his power and his name: God reveals his holy name (275-76)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| §8. Moses returns to Egypt (4:18-31) | Moses returns to Egypt (277-280) |
| (a) Jethro blesses Moses’ plans (4:18-20) | (a) Moses gets permission and leaves with wife and children (277-80) |
| (b) The Lord reaffirms Moses’ mission (4:21-23) | (b) Aaron meets Moses on God’s command (279a) |
| (c) Zipporah circumcises Moses (4:24-26) | (c) Moses and Aaron received favorably by Israelite chiefs (279b-80) |
| (d) Aaron sent to meet Moses (4:27-28) | |
| (e) Moses and Aaron received favorably by Israelites (4:29-31) | |

\(^1\)Moses’ objection in Josephus is much weaker than in the biblical account and is quickly put to rest by God. Furthermore there is no concession to send Aaron as a mouthpiece in Josephus’ account.

\(^2\)In Exod 4:8-9 Moses is simply instructed that if the first two signs should fail (when he is in Egypt) then he should perform the water into blood sign with water from the Nile. Josephus differs by actually having Moses perform the water into blood sign (in addition to the other two signs) as part of the burning bush encounter.
| Table 3.1 |
|-----------------|-----------------|
| (a) Moses and Aaron confront Pharaoh (5:1-5) | (a) Moses confronts the king and shows him signs (281-84a) |
| (b) Pharaoh increases the workload on the Israelites (5:6-14) | (b) The king is angry and gets priests to turn rods to snakes (284b-85) |
| (c) Israelites enquire of Pharaoh and confront Moses (5:15-21) | (c) Moses shows God’s power: his snake consumes those of priests’ (286-87) |
| (d) The king increases the workload (288-89a) | (d) The king increases the workload (288-89a) |
| (e) Israelites blame Moses for increased workload (289b) | (e) Israelites blame Moses for increased workload (289b) |
| (f) Moses returns undaunted to persuade the king (290-92) | |

| **§10. Moses appeals to God again (5:22 - 6:13)** | |
| (a) Moses complains to God (5:22-23) | (a) Moses complains to God (5:22-23) |
| (b) God reaffirms plans for Moses (6:1-8) | (b) God reaffirms plans for Moses (6:1-8) |
| (c) Moses tells Israelites but they refuse to listen (6:9) | (c) Moses tells Israelites but they refuse to listen (6:9) |
| (d) God re-commissions Moses but he objects (6:10-13) | (d) God re-commissions Moses but he objects (6:10-13) |

| **§11. Genealogical descent of Moses and Aaron (6:14-27)** | [compare to short genealogical notice in *Ant.* 2.229 above] |
| (gives Moses parents as Amram and Jochebed) | |

| (Moses’ age given as 86 years) | (Moses’ age given as 86 years) |

| **§13. Moses and Aaron undertake a series of visits to Pharaoh (7:8-13)** | (Moses’ age given as 86 years) |
| (a) Aaron’s rod becomes a snake (7:8-10) | (a) Aaron’s rod becomes a snake (7:8-10) |
| (b) Egyptian magicians do likewise (7:11-12a) | (b) Egyptian magicians do likewise (7:11-12a) |
| (c) **Aaron’s rod** swallows the magician’s rods (7:12b) | (c) **Aaron’s rod** swallows the magician’s rods (7:12b) |
| (d) **Pharaoh’s heart remains hard** (7:13) | (d) **Pharaoh’s heart remains hard** (7:13) |

| **§14. The plagues (7:14-10:29)** | The plagues (293-310) |
| (1) Water to blood: Egyptian magicians do same and Pharaoh’s heart remains hard (7:14-25) | (1) Water to blood: Egyptian magicians do same and Pharaoh’s heart remains hard (7:14-25) |
| (2) Frogs: Egyptians do same; Pharaoh relents and Moses prays but Pharaoh changes mind (8:1-15) | (2) Frogs: Egyptians do same; Pharaoh relents and Moses prays but Pharaoh changes mind (8:1-15) |
| (3) Gnats: magicians unable and say “this is the finger of God” but Pharaoh remains hard (8:16-19) | (3) Gnats: magicians unable and say “this is the finger of God” but Pharaoh remains hard (8:16-19) |
| (4) Flies: Pharaoh relents, Moses prays, Pharaoh changes his mind (8:20-32) | (4) Flies: Pharaoh relents, Moses prays, Pharaoh changes his mind (8:20-32) |
| (5) Livestock disease: Pharaoh’s heart is hard (9:1-7) | (5) Livestock diseases: land empty of husbandsmen (302b-303) |
| (6) Boils: magicians humiliated but Pharaoh is hard (9:8-12) | (6) Boils: magicians humiliated but Pharaoh is hard (9:8-12) |
| (7) Thunder and Hail: Pharaoh relents then hardens (9:13-35) | (7) Thunder and Hail: Pharaoh relents then hardens (9:13-35) |

[Josephus omits plague here]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>§15. The final plague of the firstborn (11:1–12:32)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Warning of final plague of firstborn (11:1–10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Instruction on the Passover and unleavened bread (12:1–28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Death of firstborn: Pharaoh summons Moses and Aaron and then sends them away to worship (12:29–32)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>§16. Israel departs from Egypt (12:33–42)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Israel plunders Egyptians (12:33–36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Israelites journey from <strong>Rameses to Succoth</strong> (12:37–42)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>§17. <strong>Instructions to Israel</strong> (12:43–13:16)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) God instructs Moses and Aaron regarding ordinances of Passover and consecration of firstborn (12:43–13:2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Moses instructs Israel on Passover remembrance (13:3–10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Moses instructs Israel on consecration of firstborn (13:11–16)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>§18. Israel takes roundabout route: bones of Joseph; <strong>pillars of fire and cloud</strong> (13:17–22)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The crossing of the Red Sea (14:1–31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) <strong>Moses prays to God for deliverance</strong> (334–37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Moses strikes sea: waters part and he passes in first (338–39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Egyptians decide to pursue them (340)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Hebrews pass through to other side (341)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) Egyptians try to follow but are drowned; <strong>other signs</strong> include thunder, lightening, darkness (342–44)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>§19. Moses’ song of deliverance (15:1–19)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hebrews celebrate with songs of deliverance (345–46)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>§20. <strong>Josephus provides afterword</strong> (347–49)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Accounting has been according to sacred history (347a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Parallel example from Alexander (347b–48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Following day: get weapons of Egyptians and travel to Sinai (349)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.1

Sigla for table 3.1:

→ : indicates strong parallel between accounts

— : indicates weaker parallel between accounts (some shared motifs but often one account has unique elements)

**Bold:** indicates elements unique in either Exodus or Josephus (including specific elements within parallel sections)
### Table 3.2: Josephus’ Omissions from the Exodus Account

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Omissions</th>
<th>References</th>
<th>Possible Reason(s) for Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Names of the sons of Israel (§1)(^1)</td>
<td>Exod 1:1-7</td>
<td>Conciseness: avoid unnecessary detail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God agrees to send Aaron (§7)</td>
<td>Exod 3:13-17</td>
<td>Encomiastic: avoid negative portrayal of Moses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yahweh reaffirms Moses’ mission (§8)</td>
<td>Exod 4:21-23</td>
<td>Conciseness: omission of unnecessary detail and repetition (Josephus has just provided a clear accounting of Moses’ call and does not need to repeat it).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zipporah circumcises Moses (§8)</td>
<td>Exod 4:24-26</td>
<td>Encomiastic: avoid negative portrayal of Moses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moses’ Genealogy (§11)</td>
<td>Exod 6:14-26</td>
<td>Encomiastic order: Josephus has much shorter account of Moses’ ancestry but includes it within the narrative of his birth and upbringing (Ant 2.229). Clarity: avoids unnecessary detail and avoids interruption to narrative flow thereby providing a more logical order.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pillar of cloud and fire (§19)</td>
<td>Exod 13:17-22</td>
<td>Credibility (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divine speeches (various sections)</td>
<td>e.g., Exod 14:1-3; 15-18</td>
<td>Conciseness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Section numbers (§§) correspond to those in table 3.1.
### Table 3.3: Josephus’ Additions to the Exodus Account

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additions</th>
<th>References</th>
<th>Possible Reason(s) for Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transitional sentence (§1)</td>
<td><em>Ant.</em> 2.200</td>
<td>Clarity: Transition and introduction to Exodus narrative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prophecy of birth (§2)</td>
<td><em>Ant.</em> 2.205</td>
<td>Encomiastic: heightens status of Moses (divine favor).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King’s decree of death for disobedient families (§2)</td>
<td><em>Ant.</em> 2.207-9</td>
<td>Heightens drama and tension in narrative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moses birth and upbringing (§3)</td>
<td><em>Ant.</em> 2.211-37</td>
<td>Encomiastic: prayer and night visions indicate divine favor; education, physical status and wisdom are positive encomiastic traits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Amram prays</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) God appears to Amram in night vision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Moses’ superior status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Moses appears before the king</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Moses’ education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moses saves the Egyptians from Ethiopians (military victory) (§4)</td>
<td><em>Ant.</em> 2.238-53</td>
<td>Encomiastic: Moses as the wise military general.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign of blood (spoken about in Exodus but actually performed at the burning bush in Josephus) (§7)</td>
<td><em>Ant.</em> 2.272-74</td>
<td>Encomiastic: Moses as God’s appointed messenger.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moses returns to persuade the king (§9)</td>
<td><em>Ant.</em> 2.290-92</td>
<td>Encomiastic: Moses is much bolder and less fearful than in the parallel biblical account (courage).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prayer of Moses (§19)</td>
<td><em>Ant.</em> 2.334-37</td>
<td>Apologetic and encomium: Moses’ character of piety; God depicted as deliverer (as with plagues brought about by God’s hand).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion – afterword (§21)</td>
<td><em>Ant.</em> 2.347-49</td>
<td>Clarity and credibility: provides fitting conclusion to account and appeals to parallel example of Alexander.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 Section numbers (§§) correspond to parallel table 3.1 (numbers given in parallel sections of Exodus)
### Table 3.4: Josephus’ Transformations of Order in Relation to the Exodus Account

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transformation (by Josephus)</th>
<th>References</th>
<th>Possible Reason(s) for Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moses at the burning bush (§7):</td>
<td>Exod 2:23-25, Ant. 2.264-76</td>
<td>Overall effect of changes is to lessen the negative portrayal of Moses (encomiastic) by lessening his objections as well as not having Aaron sent as a mouthpiece; the new structure also provides greater clarity and conciseness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Moses’ objection and signs moved up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Revealing of divine name moved down</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Adds sign of water to blood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Omits sending of Aaron</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Moses’ return to Egypt (§8): | Exod 4:18-31, Ant. 2.277-80 | Changes possibly motivated by clarity and conciseness. |
| Josephus transposes the death notice of the king (2.277) and the names of Moses’ children (2.277-8) to this position from earlier in the Exodus narrative | | |

| Moses’ confrontation with Pharaoh (§§9-13): | Exod 5:1-7:13, Ant. 2.281-92 | Clarity and conciseness: Josephus’ account is much shorter with enhanced logical flow and omits repetitions along with unnecessary material (see table 3.2); in essence the two confrontations of the biblical account are retained but Josephus makes the first about the signs and the second about Moses being undaunted; also moved are the signs of Egyptian magicians; in essence he makes one account out of two and omits intervening material. |
| in addition to various omissions noted in table 3.2 | | |
| Josephus makes the following changes: | | |
| a) Moves up signs, Egyptian magicians and rod swallowing incident | | |
| b) Moves down increased workload and blaming of Moses | | |

| Israel departs from Egypt (§§16-18): | Ant. 2.315-33 | Clarity and conciseness: Josephus makes several minor changes to order but essentially takes a much longer unit in the LXX and compresses it into a more succinct account with clearer logical flow; he thus omits unnecessary detail and provides clarity at the same time. |
| a) Feast of unleavened bread moved down | | |
| b) Bones of Joseph moved up | | |
| c) Number 600,000 moved to after mention of feast | | |
| d) Egyptians change their mind | | |
| e) Moses’ choice of route | | |

---

1 Sectional numbers (§§) correspond to table 3.1.
Table 3.5: Josephus’ Transformations of Pericopes in the Exodus Account

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transformation</th>
<th>References</th>
<th>Possible Reason(s) for Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hebrew midwives replaced with Egyptian midwives (§2)¹</td>
<td>Exod 1:15-21, Ant. 2.206b-7a</td>
<td>Possibly enhances clarity or credibility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moses’ birth and upbringing: various expansions and changes within the narrative (§3)</td>
<td>Exod 2:1-10, Ant. 2.210-37</td>
<td>Encomiastic: various changes add drama to narrative but also tie into encomiastic elements such as physical traits and etiology of name, which may point to divine favor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Naming individuals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Relative ease of birth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Amram hides Moses in reeds (expanded version)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Thermuthis attracted to Moses on account of his largeness and beauty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Naming of Moses expanded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moses’ flight to Midian (§5)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Encomiastic: provides a more positive reason for Moses’ flight.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Jealousy given as reason for flight (versus escape on account of murder)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Story of 7 sisters is changed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final plague of firstborn (§15): Josephus’ account is a severe compression of biblical account</td>
<td>Exod 11:1-12:32, Ant. 2.311-14</td>
<td>Clarity and conciseness: avoidance of unnecessary detail; avoid repetition; avoid lengthy digression; provides notes to inform Greek readers (re Passover as ongoing festival today).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel departs from Egypt (§§16-18)</td>
<td>Ant. 2.324-33</td>
<td>Encomium: Moses’ stature heightened by increased tension around potential stoning along with his engaging in exhortational speech (deliberative rhetoric).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Egyptians prepare to attack (Ant. 2.324-25)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Hebrews complain and stone Moses (Ant. 2.326-8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Moses addresses Hebrews with exhortational speech (Ant. 2.329-33)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Song of deliverance (§20)</td>
<td>Exod 15:1-19, Ant. 2.345-46</td>
<td>Conciseness and encomium: Josephus severely compresses but notes that song was written in hexameter verse.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Section numbers (§§) correspond to those in table 3.1.
Table 3.6: Josephus’ Placement of Moses’ Genealogy in Relation to Exodus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exodus (LXX and MT)</th>
<th>Josephus (Antiquities book 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>§1. Names of sons of Israel (1:1-7)</td>
<td>Introduction and transition (200)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§2. Egyptian enslavement and abuse of Israel (1:8-22)</td>
<td>Egyptian enslavement and abuse of Israel (201-9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§3. Moses birth and upbringing (2:1-10)</td>
<td>Moses’ birth and upbringing (210-237):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Birth to Levite couple (2:1-2)</td>
<td>(a) Amram discovers his wife is pregnant (210)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Placement in basket in the river (2:3-4)</td>
<td>(b) Amram prays to God on account of pregnant wife (211)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Drawn from river and adopted by Pharaoh’s daughter (2:5-10)</td>
<td>(c) God appears to Amram in night-time vision (212-16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f) Pharaoh’s daughter finds child and obtains nurse (224-227)</td>
<td>(d) Easy birth and 3 months at home (217-18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(g) Thermuthis (Pharaoh’s daughter) names Moses and brief ancestry provided (228-29)</td>
<td>(e) Amram places Moses in a basket on the river (219-223)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(h) Moses’ understanding and stature (230-31)</td>
<td>(i) Thermuthis adopts him: Moses plays with her father’s crown and she saves him from attempted murder by scribe (232-236a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(j) Moses educated: he is the hope of Israel but the Egyptians are suspicious (236b-237)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§4. ----</td>
<td>Moses saves the Egyptians from the Ethiopians (238-253)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§6. Israelites cry out to God (2:23-25)</td>
<td>Moses at the burning bush (264-76)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§7. Moses at the burning bush (3:1-4:17)</td>
<td>Moses returns to Egypt (277-80)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§8. Moses returns to Egypt (4:18-31)</td>
<td>Initial confrontation with Pharaoh (5:1-21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§10. Moses appeals to God again (5:22-6:13)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§11. Genealogy of Moses and Aaron (6:14-27)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§13. Moses and Aaron visit Pharaoh (7:8-13)</td>
<td>The plagues (293-310)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§14. The plagues (7:14–10:29)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sigla for table 3.6:
- - - indicates strong parallel between accounts
- - indicates weaker parallel between accounts (some shared motifs but often one account has unique elements):
**Bold:** indicates elements unique in either Exodus or Josephus (including specific elements within parallel sections)
Table 3.7: Summary of Josephus’ Narrative Adaptations of the Plagues Narrative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Narrative Adaptation</th>
<th>References</th>
<th>Possible Reason(s) for Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Josephus’ introduction: three reasons for narrating the plague narrative.</td>
<td><em>Ant.</em> 2.293</td>
<td>Clarity: Provides suitable introduction and reason for narrating plagues along with their significance. Encomium: Fulfillment of Moses’ prophecy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrative order and selection: Josephus keeps all plagues except one and does so in the same order.</td>
<td><em>Ant.</em> 2.293-314</td>
<td>Clarity and faithfulness to narrative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shortened account:</td>
<td><em>Ant.</em> 2.293-314</td>
<td>Conciseness and clarity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Concise account (one third the length of the LXX – see word counts below)</td>
<td>e.g., <em>Exod</em> 7:14-15 (blood)</td>
<td>Apologetic: plagues are depicted as direct divine interventions rather than actions of Moses (river turns red at God’s command).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Word counts imply pattern of increasing brevity until darkness plague (which is Josephus’ longest)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omit: instructions for Moses to speak to Pharaoh.</td>
<td>e.g., <em>Exod</em> 7:14-15 (blood)</td>
<td>Apologetic: staff plays no part in plagues (they are directly from God).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omit: command to Moses to take up his staff.</td>
<td>e.g., <em>Exod</em> 7:15 (blood)</td>
<td>Apologetic: staff plays no part in plagues (they are directly from God).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omit: Aaron downplayed or omitted from account.</td>
<td>e.g., <em>Exod</em> 7:19, 20 (blood)</td>
<td>Encomium and conciseness: Josephus focuses on encomiastic praise of Moses and therefore is not concerned to give Aaron any significant role.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omit: Command to let people go so that they may worship.</td>
<td>e.g., <em>Exod</em> 7:16 (blood)</td>
<td>Conciseness and apologetic: essentially omitted owing to different focus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plagues reduced in extent (e.g., blood – Josephus only mentions the Nile but not rivers, streams, reservoirs etc.)</td>
<td>e.g., <em>Exod</em> 7:14-25 (blood)</td>
<td>Conciseness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative effects of plague expanded</td>
<td><em>Exod</em> 7:14-25 (blood)</td>
<td>Dramatic enhancement and illustrating of his reason for recounting the plagues (to warn about divine punishment).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3.8: Word Counts and Terminology in the Plagues Narratives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plague</th>
<th>Josephus’ Antiquities</th>
<th>Exodus (LXX)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reference (Antiquities)</td>
<td>Word Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>2.293</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) River to Blood</td>
<td>2.294-95</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Frogs</td>
<td>2.296-99</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Lice</td>
<td>2.300-302a</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Flies</td>
<td>2.302b-303</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Livestock</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Ulcers/boils</td>
<td>2.304</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Hail</td>
<td>2.305</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Locust</td>
<td>2.306</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) Firstborn</td>
<td>2.311-14</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Totals**

|                | 977 | 3100 |
Table 3.9

Table 3.9: Comparison of LXX with Hebrew Text (Plague of Blood in Exod 7:14-25)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew Text (BHS) (Exodus)</th>
<th>LXX (Exodus)</th>
<th>NASB (Exodus)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Then the Lord said to Moses, 7:14</td>
<td>7:14 εἶπεν δὲ κύριος πρὸς</td>
<td>7:14 Then the Lord said to Moses, “Pharaoh's heart is stubborn; he refuses to let the people go.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Pharaoh's heart is stubborn; he refuses to let the people go. 15 “Go to Pharaoh in the morning as he is going out to the water, and station yourself to meet him on the bank of the Nile; and you shall take in your hand the staff that was turned into a serpent.</td>
<td>15 “Go to Pharaoh in the morning as he is going out to the water, and station yourself to meet him on the bank of the Nile; and you shall take in your hand the staff that was turned into a serpent.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 “And you will say to him, ‘The Lord, the God of the Hebrews, sent me to you, saying, “Let My people go, that they may serve Me in the wilderness. But behold, you have not listened until now.” 17 Thus says the Lord, “By this you shall know that I am the Lord: behold, I will strike the water that is in the Nile with the staff that is in my hand, and it shall be turned to blood.</td>
<td>16 “And you will say to him, ‘The Lord, the God of the Hebrews, sent me to you, saying, “Let My people go, that they may serve Me in the wilderness. But behold, you have not listened until now.” 17 Thus says the Lord, “By this you shall know that I am the Lord: behold, I will strike the water that is in the Nile with the staff that is in my hand, and it shall be turned to blood.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Then the Lord said to Moses, “Say to Aaron, ‘Take your staff and stretch out your hand over the waters of Egypt, over their rivers, over their streams, and over their pools, and over all their reservoirs of water, that they may become blood; and there shall be blood throughout all the land of Egypt, both in [vessels of] wood and in [vessels of] stone.’ ”

So Moses and Aaron did even as the Lord had commanded. And he lifted up the staff and struck the water that [was] in the Nile, in the sight of Pharaoh and in the sight of his servants, and all the water that [was] in the Nile was turned to blood.

And the fish that [were] in the Nile died, and the Nile became foul, so that the Egyptians could not drink water from the Nile. And the blood was through all the land of Egypt.

But the magicians of Egypt did the same with their secret arts; and Pharaoh’s heart was hardened, and he did not listen to them, as the Lord had said.
| 7:23 Then Pharaoh turned and went into his house with no concern even for this. |
| 23 ἐπιστραφεὶς δὲ Φαραώ εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸν ήικὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ οὐκ ἐπέστησεν τὸν νοῦν αὐτοῦ οὐδὲ ἐπὶ τοῦτο. |
| 7:24 So all the Egyptians dug around the Nile for water to drink, for they could not drink of the water of the Nile. |
| 24 οὕρωσαν δὲ πάντες οἱ Αἰγυπτιοὶ κύκλῳ τοῦ ποταμοῦ ὅστε πιεῖν ὕδωρ καὶ οὐκ ἠδύνατο πιεῖν ὕδωρ ἀπὸ τοῦ ποταμοῦ. |
| 7:25 And seven days passed after the Lord had struck the Nile. |
| 25 καὶ ἀνεπληρώθησαν ἐπὶ τὰ ἡμέρας μετὰ τὸ παθήσαι κύριον τοῦ ποταμοῦ. |

Table 3.9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23 ἐπιστραφεὶς δὲ Φαραὼ εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸν ήικὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ οὐκ ἐπέστησεν τὸν νοῦν αὐτοῦ οὐδὲ ἐπὶ τοῦτο.</td>
<td>Then Pharaoh turned and went into his house with no concern even for this.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 οὕρωσαν δὲ πάντες οἱ Αἰγυπτιοὶ κύκλῳ τοῦ ποταμοῦ ὅστε πιεῖν ὕδωρ καὶ οὐκ ἠδύνατο πιεῖν ὕδωρ ἀπὸ τοῦ ποταμοῦ.</td>
<td>So all the Egyptians dug around the Nile for water to drink, for they could not drink of the water of the Nile.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 καὶ ἀνεπληρώθησαν ἐπὶ τὰ ἡμέρας μετὰ τὸ παθήσαι κύριον τοῦ ποταμοῦ.</td>
<td>And seven days passed after the Lord had struck the Nile.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.10: Comparison of LXX with Josephus (Plague of Blood in Exod 7:14-25)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Josephus, <em>Antiquities</em>, Book 2 (author’s translation)</th>
<th>LXX (Exodus)</th>
<th>NASB (Exodus)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7:14 ἐσπεν δὲ κύριος πρὸς Μωυσῆν, βεβάρηται ἢ καρδία Φαραώ τοῦ µὴ ἔξαποστείλα τὸν λαὸν</td>
<td>7:14 “Then the Lord said to Moses, “Pharaoh’s heart is stubborn; he refuses to let the people go.”</td>
<td>7:14 Then the Lord said to Moses, “Pharaoh’s heart is stubborn; he refuses to let the people go.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 βάδισον πρὸς Φαραώ τὸ πρωί ἰδοὺ αὐτὸς ἐκπορεύεται ἐπὶ τὸ ῥέαρ καὶ στήσῃ συναντών αὐτῷ ἐπὶ τὸ χεῖλος τοῦ ποταμοῦ καὶ τὴν ράβδον τὴν στραφεῖσαν εἰς ὅφιν λήμψῃ ἐν τῇ χειρί σου</td>
<td>15 “Go to Pharaoh in the morning as he is going out to the water, and station yourself to meet him on the bank of the Nile; and you shall take in your hand the staff that was turned into a serpent.</td>
<td>15 “Go to Pharaoh in the morning as he is going out to the water, and station yourself to meet him on the bank of the Nile; and you shall take in your hand the staff that was turned into a serpent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 καὶ ἐρείς πρὸς αὐτὸν κύριος ὁ θεός τῶν Ἑβραίων ἀπέσταλκεν µε πρὸς σέ λέγων εξαποστείλων τον λαὸν µου ἵνα µοι λατρεύῃ ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ καὶ ἰδοὺ σε ἐν λήψῃς ἐν τῇ χειρί σου ἐφανερωθή</td>
<td>16 ‘And you will say to him, ‘The Lord, the God of the Hebrews, sent me to you, saying, “Let My people go, that they may serve Me in the wilderness. But behold, you have not listened until now.”’</td>
<td>16 “And you will say to him, ‘The Lord, the God of the Hebrews, sent me to you, saying, “Let My people go, that they may serve Me in the wilderness. But behold, you have not listened until now.”’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 ταῦτα λέγει κύριος ἐν τούτῳ γνώσῃ ὅτι ἐγὼ κύριος ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ τύπτω τὴν ράβδον τῇ ἐν τῇ χειρί σου ἐπὶ τὸ ῥέαρ τὸ ἐν τῷ ποταμῷ καὶ μεταβαλεῖ εἰς αἷμα</td>
<td>17 ‘Thus says the Lord, “By this you shall know that I am the Lord: behold, I will strike the water that is in the Nile with the staff that is in my hand, and it shall be turned to blood.</td>
<td>17 ‘Thus says the Lord, “By this you shall know that I am the Lord: behold, I will strike the water that is in the Nile with the staff that is in my hand, and it shall be turned to blood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 καὶ οἱ ιχθύες οἱ ἐν τῷ ποταμῷ τελευτήσουσιν καὶ ἐποξεῖσθε οἱ ποταμοί καὶ οὐ δυνησθούσιν οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι πιεῖν ῥέαρ ἀπὸ τοῦ ποταμοῦ</td>
<td>18 “And the fish that are in the Nile will die, and the Nile will become foul; and the Egyptians will find difficulty in drinking water from the Nile.”’</td>
<td>18 “And the fish that are in the Nile will die, and the Nile will become foul; and the Egyptians will find difficulty in drinking water from the Nile.”’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 ἐπιπεν δὲ κύριος πρὸς Μωυσῆν εἰπὼν Αὰρων τῷ ἀδελφῷ σου λαβὲ τὴν ράβδον σου καὶ ἐκτείνων τὴν χειρὰ σου ἐπὶ τὰ ῥέατα Αἰγύπτου καὶ ἐπὶ τοὺς ποταμοὺς αὐτῶν καὶ ἐπὶ τὰς διώρογας αὐτῶν καὶ ἐπὶ τὰς ἥλια αὐτῶν καὶ ἐπὶ πάν ὄντα συνεστηκός ωὸρ αὐτῶν καὶ ἐσται αἷμα καὶ ἐγένετο αἷμα ἐν πάσῃ γῇ Αἰγύπτου ἐν τοῖς</td>
<td>19 Then the Lord said to Moses, “Say to Aaron, ‘Take your staff and stretch out your hand over the waters of Egypt, over their rivers, over their streams, and over their pools, and over all their reservoirs of water, that they may become blood; and there shall be blood throughout all the land of Egypt,”’</td>
<td>19 Then the Lord said to Moses, “Say to Aaron, ‘Take your staff and stretch out your hand over the waters of Egypt, over their rivers, over their streams, and over their pools, and over all their reservoirs of water, that they may become blood; and there shall be blood throughout all the land of Egypt,”’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(For at God's command the river flood blood-red, being impossible to drink …)

(... and another source of water they did not have nor was it only a matter of colour change but even for those who tried it, it brought pain and great suffering.)

(295) ἢν δὲ τοιούτως μὲν Ἀἰγυπτίοις Ἐβραῖοις δὲ γλυκὺς καὶ πότιμος και μηδὲν τοῦ κατὰ φύσιν παρηλλαγμένος.
(295) .INTERPOLATION. (and while it was such to the Egyptians, to the Hebrews it was sweet and drinkable)

20 So Moses and Aaron did even as the Lord had commanded. And he lifted up the staff and struck the water that [was] in the Nile, in the sight of Pharaoh and in the sight of his servants, and all the water that [was] in the Nile was turned to blood.

21 And the fish that [were] in the Nile died, and the Nile became foul, so that the Egyptians could not drink water from the Nile. And the blood was through all the land of Egypt.

22 But the magicians of Egypt did the same with their secret arts; and Pharaoh's heart was hardened, and he did not listen to them, as the Lord had said.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Greek Text</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>ἐπιστραφεὶς δὲ Φαραὼ εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ καὶ οὐκ ἐπέστησεν τὸν νοῦν αὐτοῦ οὐδὲ ἐπὶ τοῦτο.</td>
<td>Then Pharaoh turned and went into his house with no concern even for this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>ὢρυξαν δὲ πάντες οἱ Αἰγυπτιοὶ κύκλῳ τοῦ ποταμοῦ ὦστε πεῖν ὕδαρ καὶ οὐκ ἠδύναντο πεῖν ὕδαρ ἀπὸ τοῦ ποταμοῦ.</td>
<td>So all the Egyptians dug around the Nile for water to drink, for they could not drink the water of the Nile.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>καὶ ἀνεπληρώθησαν ἕπτα ἡμέραι μετὰ τὸ πατάξαι κυρίον τοῦ ποταμοῦ.</td>
<td>And seven days passed after the Lord had struck the Nile.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(therefore, perplexed at the wonder and concerned about the Egyptians, the king permitted the Hebrews to depart; but when the disaster had ceased he again changed his mind and did not permit them to go.)
Table 3.11: Motifs in the Plagues Narratives (LXX Exod 7:14–12:32; Josephus, Ant., 2.293-314)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motif</th>
<th>Blood</th>
<th>Frogs</th>
<th>Gnats</th>
<th>Flies</th>
<th>Livestock</th>
<th>Boils</th>
<th>Thunder/Hail</th>
<th>Locust</th>
<th>Darkness</th>
<th>First-born</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>God says Ph hard</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God says “go to Ph.”</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Let my people go…worship</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moses’ staff</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aaron’s staff</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God as direct agent of plague</td>
<td>- Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differing treatment of Egypt and Israel</td>
<td>- Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egyptian magicians imitate</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph simply hard</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph asks for prayer</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moses prays</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Y'</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph ask Moses to go</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph promises to relent</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Y'</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph hardens again</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. Taken as equivalent to Josephus’ lice (Ant 2.300-302a)
2. Parallel to Josephus’ wild beasts (Ant. 2.302b-303/4) albeit elements of the biblical livestock present and could be true parallel (Josephus seems to merge them).
4. Moses says to the Pharaoh that the command of God is “to let the Hebrews go” (he does not say “my people” or for the purpose of worship).
5. God promises to send plague but it occurs as Moses stretches out his staff.
6. Here it is noted that Pharaoh would not relent albeit (as with the previous plague in Josephus) he was willing to permit women and children to go.
7. That is he “stretches out his hand” toward the city in response to Pharaoh’s request that he “pray.”
8. Pharaoh is ready to give permission but refuses when Moses insists that women and children be allowed to go.
9. Pharaoh gives permission but without livestock – since Moses refuses these conditions Pharaoh hardens his heart.
10. Josephus has Pharaoh partially relent (willing to permit Hebrews’ journey but without women and children. This exasperates God who sends another plague.
11. This occurs later in biblical narrative (Exodus 14)
12. Occurs later in narrative (Ant. 2.320)

Sigla for table 3.11: L = LXX (and MT); J = Josephus; Ph = Pharaoh; Y = yes; dash (-) = absent theme; F = fail; E = embarrassed; ? = perhaps implied.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew Bible and LXX (references to LXX 4 Kingdoms = 2 Kings in Hebrew/English)</th>
<th>Josephus (all references to <em>Antiquities</em> book 9)</th>
<th>Parallel in 2 Chronicles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>§1. Elijah ascends to heaven (2:1-18)</td>
<td>Elijah disappears and leaves Elisha his disciple (28) (note: Josephus records their initial meeting in <em>Ant.</em> 8.352-4; his parallel account here is much shorter and omits the narrative explanation of Kings involving the journey into desert etc.)</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Elisha follows Elijah to Bethel (1-3), Jericho (4-5), and Jordan (6-7), where he parts the water (8) (b) Elisha requests double portion of his spirit (9-10) (c) Elijah taken up into heaven (11-12) (c) Elisha returns with Elijah’s mantle and crosses Jordan (13-14) (d) Prophets go in search of Elijah while Elisha stays at Jericho (15-18)</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§2. Elisha purifies the water in Jericho (2:19-22)</td>
<td>Omit</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§3. Elisha curses jeering youths on the way to Bethel (and they are mauled by bears) prior to going to Mount Carmel and then Samaria (2:23-25)</td>
<td>Omit</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§4. War with Moab and Elisha’s prophetic word (3:1-27) (a) Jehoram reigns over Israel 12 years (he does evil) while Jehoshaphat reigns over Judea (1-3) (b) Kings of Israel, Judah and Edom march on king of Moab (who has rebelled) but they are without water (4-10) (c) Elisha is summoned and prophecies supply of water and victory (though chastises the king of Israel) (11-19) (d) Prophecies come true and Moab is handed over to Israel (tricked into thinking water is blood) (20-25) (e) King of Moab sacrifices his son (26-27)</td>
<td>War with Moab and Elisha’s prophetic word (29-44) (a) Joram goes to war against Moab with Jehoshaphat and the king of Edom (29-32) (b) Elisha is summoned and prophecies about supply of water (33-36) (c) Prophecies come true and Moab is handed over to Israel (tricked into thinking water is blood) (37-41) (d) King of Moab sacrifices his son (42-43) (e) Jehoshaphat returns in peace to Jerusalem and dies (44)</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
§5.--- **Transition and introduction to Elisha (45-46):** Jehoram (who succeeds Jehoshaphat, king of Judah) has the same name as the king of Israel (son of Ahab) who had Elisha with him when he left Moab [this provides a transition from the above narration of Jehoshaphat’s death and Josephus, having reintroduced Elisha, now declares his intent to “go over” his acts just as they are recorded in the sacred books, since they are particularly illustrious]  

§6. Elisha and the widows oil (4:1-7)  
(a) The request is made (1)  
(b) Elisha instructs her (2-4)  
(c) The widow carries out the actions and then sells all her oil (5-7)  

Elisha and the widow’s oil (47-50)  
(a) The request is made (47)  
(b) Elisha instructs her (48)  
(c) The widow sells her oil and discharges her debts (49-50)  

none

§7. **Elisha and the Shunammite woman (4:8-37)**  
(a) The woman provides a room for Elisha (8-10)  
(b) God provides a son for the woman (11-17)  
(c) The son dies while among the reapers and the woman goes in search of the Elisha (18-25)  
(d) Gehazi sent to lay his staff on the boy (26-31)  
(e) Elisha revives the boy (32-37)  

Omit

none

§8. **Elisha purifies the pot of stew (3:38-41)**  

Omit

none

§9. **Elisha feeds 100 men (4:42-44)**  

Omit

none

10. **Elisha cures Naaman’s leprosy (5:1-27)**  
(a) King of Aram sends Naaman to Israel’s king (1-5a)  
(b) King of Israel tears his clothes (5b-7)  
(c) Elisha summons Naaman who is cured after dipping in the Jordan (8-14)  
(d) Elisha refuses to receive Naaman gifts (15-19a)  
(e) Gehazi secretly obtains Naaman’s gifts but is punished with leprosy (19b-27)  

Omit

none

§11. **Elisha causes the ax head float (6:1-7)**  

Omit

none
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>§12. Elisha thwarts the Arameans (6:8-23)</th>
<th>Elisha thwarts the Arameans (51-59)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Elisha predicts and thwarts Aramean attacks (8-10)</td>
<td>(a) Elisha predicts and thwarts Aramean attacks (51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) King of Aram sends soldiers to capture Elisha (11-14)</td>
<td>(b) Benhadad sends army to surround city and capture Elisha (52-54a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Elisha leads them blind into Samaria before their being released and attacks die down (15-23)</td>
<td>(c) Elisha leads them blind to Samaria and then they are released back to Aram (54b-59)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§13. Ben Hadad (king of Aram) lays siege to Samaria (6:24–7:20)</td>
<td>Ben Hadad lays siege to Samaria (60-86)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Ben Hadad besieges Samaria: women eat baby; one complains to king who blames Elisha (6:24-31)</td>
<td>(a) <strong>Ben Hadad employs open attack rather than secret attempts</strong> (60) [Josephus here supplies a reason missing in 2 Kings and thus fills an otherwise awkward gap]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Elisha prophecies about end of siege (6:32–7:2)</td>
<td>(b) Ben Hadad makes expedition against Joram and lays siege to the city: woman entreats Joram re baby and he blames Elisha (61-67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Arameans flee and lepers discover empty camp, take booty and alert city of Samaria (7:3-15)</td>
<td>(c) Elisha prophecies about end of siege (68-73)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) People of Samaria plunder Aramean camp and captain of guard dies as Elisha prophesied (7:16-20)</td>
<td>(d) Lepers discover deserted Aramean camp and alert city of Samaria (74-84)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) People of Samaria plunder camp and captain of guard dies as Elisha prophesied (85-86)</td>
<td>(e) People of Samaria plunder camp and captain of guard dies as Elisha prophesied (85-86)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§14. The Shunammite woman’s land restored on account of Elisha (Gehazi talks to king at time) (8:1-6)</td>
<td>Omit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§15. Death of Ben Hadad, king of Aram (8:7-15)</td>
<td>The death of Ben Hadad (87-94)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Ben Hadad is sick and sends Hazael with gift to Elisha (7-9)</td>
<td>(a) Ben Hadad is sick and sends Hazael with gift to Elisha (87-89)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Elisha predicts his death and Hazael’s ascension to the throne (10-13)</td>
<td>(b) Elisha predicts his death and Hazael’s ascension to the throne (90-92)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Hazael murders Ben Hadad and takes over throne (14-15)</td>
<td>(c) Hazael murders Ben Hadad and takes over throne (93-94)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
§16. Jehoram, son of Jehoshaphat, reigns in Judah but
does evil (8:16-24) [Elisha not mentioned]  
(a) Jehoram reigns 8 years (begins age 30) (16-17)  
(b) He does evil but God spares him on account of  
    David (18-19)  
(c) Edom revolts against Judah (20-23)  
(d) Jehoram buried with ancestors (24)  

Jehoram reigns in Jerusalem (95-104)  
(a) Jehoram enthroned: slaughters friends/relatives (95a)  
(b) Jehoram marries Athaliah and does evil (95b-98)  
(c) Epistle announces Jehoram’s judgment (99-101)  
(d) Arabian attack and Jehoram dies of disease; people  
    abuse his body; denied royal burial; kingdom goes to  
    his son Ahaziah (102-104)  

2 Chr 21:2-10, 18-20

§17. Ahaziah king of Judah and Jehu King of Israel  
(9:1-10:36)  
(a) Ahaziah (Jehoram’s son) made king in Judah: he  
    does evil and along with Joram (son of Ahab in  
    Israel) wars against Hazael king of Aram (8:25-29)  
(b) Elisha sends prophet to anoint Jehu (son of  
    Jehoshaphat) as king over Israel (9:1-3)  
(c) Jehu anointed as king (9:4-10)  
(d) Jehu declared king his companions (9:11-13)  
(e) Jehu plots to overthrow Joram (9:14-16)  
(f) Jehu attacks and kills Joram (king of Israel) in  
    Jezreel (9:17-26)  
(g) Jehu kills king Ahaziah of Judah (who is with  
    Joram) (9:27-29)  
(h) Jehu has Jezebel murdered at Jezreel (fulfils  
    Elijah’s prophecy) (9:30-37)  
(i) Jehu slaughters Ahab’s descendants (fulfils  
    Elijah’s prophecy) (10:1-17)  
(j) Jehu slaughters the prophets of Baal (by deceit)  
    (10:18-30)  
(k) **Jehu does not follow the Lord with all his heart  
    and dies after 28 year reign in Israel** (10:31-36)  

Jehu King of Israel (105-139)  
(a) Introduction: Israel takes Ramoth (in Gilead) (king  
    injured but city left in hands of Jehu) (105)  
(b) Elisha sends one a disciple to anoint Jehu as king  
    (106)  
(c) Elisha’s disciple anoints Jehu and prophecies the  
    destruction Ahab’s house (107-109)  
(d) Jehu declared king by his captains (110-111)  
(e) Jehu plots to overthrow Joram (112-13)  
(f) Jehu attacks and kills Joram (king of Israel) (114-  
    20a)  
(g) Jehu kills Ahaziah (king of Judah) (120b-21)  
(h) Jehu murders Jezebel at Jezreel (122-24)  
(i) Jehu slaughters Ahab’s descendants (125-34a)  
(j) Jehu slaughters the prophets of Baal (134b-39)  

2 Chr 22:1-8  
(e), (f), and (g) parallel in  
2 Chr 22:7, 9  
i parallel in  
2 Chr 22:8

---

1While these accounts (§16) are paralleled in the LXX and Josephus, they differ significantly in their details and emphasis such that lines between them are quite blurred. Nevertheless they do occur at the same point in the narrative. Josephus more closely parallels the account of 2 Chronicles at this point.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Athaliah (mother of Ahaziah) seeks to destroy royal family once her son is dead but Jehosheba (Ahaziah’s sister) hides Jehoash² (1-3)</td>
<td>(a) Othlia seeks to destroy family line (of David) but Jehosheba hides Jehoash for 7 years (140-42)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Jehoiada the priest arranges with captain of guards to crown Jehoash as king (4-12)</td>
<td>(b) Jehoiada schemes with priests and captains: together they enthrone Jehoash as king (143-49)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Athaliah murdered and Jehoash begins reign at age 7 (13-16)</td>
<td>(c) Othlia is murdered by Jehoiada (150-52)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Jehoash begins reign and house of Baal is destroyed (17-21)</td>
<td>(d) Jehoash celebrated as king and destroys house of Baal (153-56)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§19.---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§19. Hazael king of Syria and Jehu king of Israel (159-160)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§20. The reign of Jehoash (12:1-21)</td>
<td>The reign of Jehoash (161-172)</td>
<td>(a) and (b) parallel in 2 Chr 24:1-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Opening comments on Jehoash (21:1-3)</td>
<td>(a) Jehoash restores the temple (161-65)</td>
<td>(c) and (d) parallel in 2 Chr 24:23-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) The temple is restored (12:4-16)</td>
<td>(b) Corruption of Jehoash after the death of priest Jehoiauda (166-69)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Hazael comes against Jehoash who appeases him with gifts (12:17-18)</td>
<td>(c) Hazael comes against Jerusalem (170-71a)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Jehoash is murdered by conspiracy (12:19-21)</td>
<td>(d) Death of Jehoash by conspiracy (171b-72)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§21. Jehoahaz, son of Jehu, reigns over Israel (13:1-9): Does evil and angers the Lord who repeatedly hands them over to Aram but Jehoahaz entreats the Lord who gives them a savior.</td>
<td>Jehoahaz, son of Jehu, reigns over Israel in Samaria (173-176)</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

²Variant spelling = Joash
³Josephus’ Othlia = LXX Athalia.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>§22. The reign of Jehoash, son of Jehoahaz in Israel (13:10-13): he reigned 16 years but did what was evil in the sight of the Lord (did not depart from the sins of Jeroboam)</th>
<th>The reign of Jehoash (Israel) and the death of Elisha (Ant. 177-185)</th>
<th>none</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>§23. The death of Elisha (13:14-25)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) King Joash (of Israel) visits Elisha who is sick and about to die (14-15)</td>
<td>(a) Jehoash reigns 16 years in Israel: he was a good man (177-78a)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Elisha instructs the king to shoot arrows and strike ground (16-18)</td>
<td>(b) Jehoash implores Elisha on account of his impending death (178b-80a)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Elisha angry because Joash only strikes ground once (19)</td>
<td>(c) Elisha rebukes Jehoash for only shooting 3 arrows (180b-81)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Elisha dies and is buried (20a)</td>
<td>(d) Elisha dies: short encomium (182)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) Dead man comes to life after his body touches the body of Elisha in his grave (20b-21)</td>
<td>(e) Concluding comments on Elisha: dead man revived after coming close to grave (183)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f) Israel and Aram (13:22-25)</td>
<td>(f) Jehoash defeats Syria in 3 battles (according to prophecy of Elisha) but then dies and kingdom passes to his son (184-85)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sigla for table 3.12:

→ : indicates strong parallel between accounts

— : indicates weaker parallel between accounts (some shared motifs but often one account has unique elements):

**Bold**: indicates elements unique in either Exodus or Josephus (including specific elements within parallel sections)
### Table 3.13: The Death of Elisha

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LXX (4 Kgdms 13:10-25)</th>
<th>Josephus (Ant. 9.177-185)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Joash is king of Israel (13:10-13)</td>
<td>1. Joash accedes to the throne (9.177-78a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Joash accedes to throne - rules 16 yrs (10)</td>
<td>(a) Joash accedes to throne - rules 16 yrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Joash does <em>evil</em> like fathers (11)</td>
<td>(b) Joash was a <em>good</em> man unlike father</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Remaining acts in kings annals (12)</td>
<td>(d) Prophecy: limited defeat of Syria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Joash dies and is buried in Samaria (13)</td>
<td>(e) The king departed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Elisha is sick at the point of death (14a)</td>
<td>(a) Elisha dies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Joash visits Elisha and laments his impending death (14b)</td>
<td>(b) Encomium of Elisha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Command to shoot an arrow (15-17a)</td>
<td>(c) Dead man revived</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Positive prophecy: defeat of Syria (17b)</td>
<td>(d) Concluding statement about Elisha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) Command to strike the ground (18)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f) Negative prophecy: limited defeat of Syria (19)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Elisha dies (20a)</td>
<td>(a) Hazael succeeded by Hadad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Elisha buried (20b)</td>
<td>(b) Joash defeats Hadad three times (recovers cities)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Dead man revived (20c-21)</td>
<td>(c) Battles fulfill prophecy of Elisha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Kings of Israel and Aram (13:22-25)</td>
<td>(d) Joash dies and is succeeded by his son</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Hazael (king of Aram) oppressed Israel but God protected them on account of his</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>covenant (22-23)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Hazael succeeded by Hadad (24)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Joash defeats Hadad three times (25)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3.14: The Death of Elisha (Arrows Incident)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LXX (4 Kgdm 13:15-19)</th>
<th>Josephus (Ant. 9.180-81)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15a. Elisha instructs king to take up a bow and arrows</td>
<td>180b. Elisha comforts the king and tells him to have a bow bought and to bend it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15b. The king takes up his bow and arrows</td>
<td>180c. When the king had made the bow ready, the prophet took hold of his hands...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16a. Elisha instructs the king to place his hand on the bow</td>
<td>180d. ...and bade him shoot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16b. The king places his hand on the bow</td>
<td>181a. The king let fly 3 arrows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16c. Elisha places his hand on the king’s hand</td>
<td>181b. Elisha pronounces judgment: the king would have destroyed Syria had he sent more arrows but as it is he will only:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17a. Elisha instructs him to open the east window</td>
<td>(a) defeat them 3x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17b. The king opens the window</td>
<td>(b) recover territory lost by his father</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17c. Elisha instructs the king to shoot</td>
<td>181c. The king departed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17d. The king shoots the arrow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17e. Elisha gives positive prophetic announcement: it is the <em>arrow of victory</em> over the Arameans (they will destroy the Arameans at Aphek)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18a. Elisha says take the arrows</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18b. The king takes the arrows</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18c. Elisha says strike the ground</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18d. The king strikes the ground 3x then stopped</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19a. Elisha is angry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19b. Elisha pronounces prophetic word of judgment (you should have struck 5 or 6x - now you will only defeat Arameans 3x)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3.15: Parallel Text of Jonah in Josephus (Ant. 9.208-214) and the LXX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek LXX Jonah (1026 words)</th>
<th>English Jonah (NASB)</th>
<th>Josephus, Ant. 9.208-14 (authors translation)</th>
<th>Greek Josephus (303 words)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1:1 καὶ ἐγένετο λόγος κυρίου πρὸς Ἰωνᾶν τὸν τοῦ Ἁμαθί λέγων 2 ἀνάστηθι καὶ πορεύθητι εἰς Νινεύη τὴν πόλιν τὴν μεγάλην καὶ κήρυξον ἐν αὐτῇ ὅτι ἀνέβη καὶ κραυγή τῆς κακίας αὐτῆς πρὸς με 3 καὶ ἀνέστη Ἰωνᾶς τοῦ φυγεῖν εἰς Θαρσίας ἐκ προσώπου κυρίου καὶ κατέβη εἰς Ἰοππήν καὶ εὐφέρει πλοῖον βαδίζον εἰς Θαρσίας καὶ ἔδωκεν τὸ ναῦλον αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐνέβη εἰς αὐτὸ τὸ πλέον μετὰ αὐτῶν εἰς Θαρσίας ἐκ προσώπου κυρίου 4 καὶ κύριος ἔξηγερεν πνεῦμα εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν καὶ ἐγένετο κλῦσις μέγας ἐν τῇ θάλασσῃ καὶ τὸ πλοῖον ἐκινδύνευεν συντρίβηναι | 1:1 The word of the Lord came to Jonah the son of Amittai saying, 2 “Arise, go to Nineveh the great city, and cry against it, for their wickedness has come up before Me.” 3 But Jonah rose up to flee to Tarshish from the presence of the Lord. So he went down to Joppa, found a ship which was going to Tarshish, paid the fare, and went down into it to go with them to Tarshish from the presence of the Lord. 4 And the Lord hurled a great wind on the sea and there was a great storm on the sea so that the ship was about to break up. | [208] Having promised to pass on an accurate (account) of events, I thought it necessary also to recount whatever I found recorded in the Hebrew books concerning this prophet. For he (this man) was ordered by God to go to the kingdom of Ninuvs and having arrived there to proclaim in the city that he will destroy (its) power/rule; being frightened he did not depart (there) but ran away from God to the city of Iope and finding a boat (and) embarking he sailed for Tarsus of Cilicia. | [208] Ἀναγκαῖον δὲ ἦγησαμην τὴν ἄκριβειαν τῶν πραγμάτων παραδώσειν ὑπερευχήμενος, ὥσα καὶ περὶ τούτου τοῦ προφήτου ἐυρον ἐν ταῖς Ἑβραίκαις βίβλοις ἀναγεγραμμένα διεξελθεὶν· κελευθεὶς γὰρ ὅταν ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ πορευθήσαται μὲν εἰς τὴν Νίνου βασιλείαν κηρύξει δ’ ἐκεῖ γενόμενον ἐν τῇ πόλει ὅτι τὴν ἀρχὴν ἀπολέσει, δείσας οὐκ ἄπιθεν, ἀλλ’ ἀποδιδόσκει τοῦ θεοῦ εἰς Ἰοππήν πόλιν καὶ πλοῖον εὐφέρε τῆς Ἱππον ἐμβας εἰς Ταρσὸν ἐπέλει τῆς Κιλικίας. | [209] Ἐπιγενομένου δὲ χειμῶνος σφοδροτάτου καὶ κινδυνεύοντος καταδύναι τοῦ σκάφους οἱ μὲν ναυταὶ καὶ οἱ κυβερνήται καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ ναύαγος εὐχας ἐποιοῦντο χαριστήριος, εἰ διαφύγοιεν τὴν θάλασσαν,
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<p>| 5 Then the sailors became afraid, and every man cried to his god, and they threw the cargo which was in the ship into the sea to lighten it for them. But Jonah had gone below into the hold of the ship, lain down, and fallen sound asleep. | 6 So the captain approached him and said, “How is it that you are sleeping? Get up, call on your god. Perhaps your god will be concerned about us so that we will not perish.” 7 And each man said to his mate, “Come, let us cast lots so we may learn on whose account this calamity [has struck] us.” So they cast lots and the lot fell on Jonah. 8 Then they said to him, “Tell us, now! On whose account this calamity [has struck] us? What is your occupation? And where do you come from? What is your country? From what people are you?” | But Jonah having wrapped (covered) himself was lying (there) and imitating nothing of what he saw the others doing. | ὁ δὲ Ἰωνᾶς συγκαλύψας αὐτὸν ἐβέβλητο μηδὲν ὧν τοὺς ἄλλους ἐσώρα ποιοῦτος μυστήριον. [210] Αὐξουτὸς δὲ ἔτι μᾶλλον τὸ κλῦμα καὶ βιαιοτέρας γενομένη ὑπὸ τῶν πνευμάτων τῆς βαλάσσης, ὑπονοοῦσαν, ὡς ενδεχεται τινα τῶν ἐμπλεόντων αἵτιν αὐτοῖς εἶναι τοῦ χείμωνος, συνεβέντο κλῆρος τούτον ὡστε ἂν ἦν μαθεῖν. [211] Κληροσαμένων σὺν ὁ προφήτης λαγχάνει, πυθανομένων δὲ ποῦν τε ἐννοεῖ καὶ τί μετέρχεται |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek Text</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9 καὶ ἐίπεν πρὸς αὐτοὺς δούλως κυρίου ἔγω εἰμι καὶ τὸν κυρίον θέων τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἔγω σέβομαι ὡς ἐποίησεν τὴν βάλασσαν καὶ τὴν ἐράν 10 καὶ ἐφοβήθησαν οἱ ἄνδρες φόβον μέγαν καὶ ἐίπαν πρὸς αὐτὸν τί τούτο ἐποίησας; διότι ἐγνώσαν οἱ ἄνδρες ὅτι ἐκ προσώπου κυρίου ἦν φεύγων ὅτι ἀπῆγγειλεν αὐτοῖς 11 καὶ ἐίπαν πρὸς αὐτὸν τί οἱ ποιῆσωμεν καὶ κοπάσει ἡ βάλασσα ἄφ ἡμῶν ὅτι ἡ βάλασσα ἐπορεύετο καὶ ἐξήγειρεν μᾶλλον κλύδωνα 12 καὶ ἐίπεν Ιάωας πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἀράτε με καὶ ἐμβάλετε με εἰς τὴν βάλασσαν καὶ κοπάσει ἡ βάλασσα ἄφ ἡμῶν διότι ἐγνώκα ἐγὼ ὅτι δε ἐμε ὁ κλύδων ὁ μέγας οὕτως ἐφ ὕμας ἐστιν 13 καὶ παρεβιάζοντο οἱ ἄνδρες τού ἐπιστρέψας πρὸς τὴν γῆν καὶ οὐκ ἴδοντο ὅτι ἡ βάλασσα ἐπορεύετο καὶ ἐξήγειρεν μᾶλλον ἐπ αὐτοὺς</td>
<td>He therefore advised them, if they wanted to escape the present danger, to cast him into the sea for he was the cause of storm (that had come upon) them. [9] And he said to them, “I am a Hebrew, and I fear the Lord God of heaven who made the sea and the dry land.” He therefore advised them, if they wanted to escape the present danger, to cast him into the sea for he was the cause of storm (that had come upon) them. [10] Then the men became extremely frightened and they said to him, “How could you do this?” For the men knew that he was fleeing from the presence of the Lord, because he had told them. [11] So they said to him, “What should we do to you that the sea may become calm for us?” - for the sea was becoming increasingly stormy. [12] And he said to them, “Pick me up and throw me into the sea. Then the sea will become calm for you, for I know that on account of me this great storm [has come] upon you.” [13] However, the men rowed [desperately] to return to land but they could not, for the sea was becoming [even] stormier against them.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
14 Then they called on the Lord and said, “We earnestly pray, O Lord, do not let us perish on account of this man’s life and do not put innocent blood on us; for Thou, O Lord, hast done as Thou hast pleased.”

15 So they picked up Jonah, threw him into the sea, and the sea stopped its raging.

16 Then the men feared the Lord greatly, and they offered a sacrifice to the Lord and made vows.

2:1 And the Lord appointed a great fish to swallow Jonah, and Jonah was in the stomach of the fish three days and three nights.

2:1 Then Jonah prayed to the Lord his God from the stomach of the fish,
3 and he said, “I called out of my distress to the Lord, And He answered me. I cried for help from the depth of Sheol; Thou didst hear my voice.

2 and he said, “I called out of my distress to the Lord, And He answered me. I cried for help from the depth of Sheol; Thou didst hear my voice.

3 “For Thou hadst cast me into the deep, Into the heart of the seas, And the current engulfed me. All Thy breakers and billows passed over me.

4 “So I said, 'I have been expelled from Thy sight. Nevertheless I will look again toward Thy holy temple.'

5 “Water encompassed me to the point of death. The great deep engulfed me, Weeds were wrapped around my head.

6 “I descended to the roots of the mountains. The earth with its bars [was] around me forever. But Thou hast brought up my life from the pit, O Lord my God.

7 “While I was fainting away, I remembered the Lord; And my prayer came to Thee, Into Thy holy temple.
| 9 | "Those who regard vain idols Forsake their faithfulness, | 3:1 Now the word of the Lord came to Jonah the second time, saying, | [214] Then having prayed his confession to God to grant pardon (or to yield up ) for (his) sins he departed to the city of Ninos and standing within earshot he proclaimed how, after a short (while), they would in a very short time cast off (forfeit/lose) their rule of Asia, |
| 10 | But I will sacrifice to Thee With the voice of thanksgiving. That which I have vowed I will pay. Salvation is from the Lord.” | 2 “Arise, go to Nineveh the great city and proclaim to it the proclamation which I am going to tell you.” | |
| 11 | Then the Lord commanded the fish, and it vomited Jonah up onto the dry land. | 3 So Jonah arose and went to Nineveh according to the word of the Lord. Now Nineveh was an exceedingly great city, a three days’ walk. | [214] ἐνθα τοῦ θεοῦ δειθείς συγγνώμην αὐτῷ παρασχεῖν τῶν ἡμαρτημένων ἀπῆλθεν εἰς τὴν Νίνον πόλιν καὶ σταθεῖς εἰς ἑπίκου ἐκήρυσσεν ως μετ’ ὀλίγου πάνιν χρόνον ἀποβαλοῦσι τὴν ἀρχὴν τῆς Ασίας, |
| 12 | (he) was cast up onto the (shore of) the Euxine Sea, alive and unharmed in body. | 4 Then Jonah began to go through the city one day’s walk; and he cried out and said, “Yet forty days and Nineveh will be overthrown.” | |
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| 9 φυλασσόμενοι μάταια καὶ ψευδή ἠλεος αὐτῶν ἐγκατέλι πον | 10 ἔγγο δὲ μετὰ φωνῆς αἰνεσεως καὶ ἐξωμολογήσεως θύσω σοι ὁσσα ἡμᾶς ἀποδοσας σοι σωτηρίου τῳ κυρίῳ | 11 καὶ προσετάγη τῳ κήπει καὶ ἐξέβαλεν τὸν ὴωναν ἐπὶ τὴν ξηρὰν | [214] ἔνθα τοῦ θεοῦ δεθείς συγγνώμην αὐτῷ παρασχεῖν τῶν ἡμαρτημένων ἀπῆλθεν εἰς τὴν Νίνον πόλιν καὶ σταθεῖς εἰς ἑπίκου ἐκήρυσσεν ως μετ’ ὀλίγου πάνιν χρόνον ἀποβαλοῦσι τὴν ἀρχὴν τῆς Ασίας, |
| 3:1 καὶ ἐγένετο λόγος κυρίου πρὸς ὴωναν ἐκ δευτέρου λέγων | 2 αὐστηθῆ καὶ πορεύθητι εἰς Νίνευ τὴν πόλιν τὴν μεγάλην καὶ κήρυξον ἐν αὐτῇ κατὰ τὸ κήρυγμα τὸ ἐμπροσθὸν ὁ ἐγὼ ἐλάλησα πρὸς σὲ | 3 καὶ ἀνέστη Ἰωνας καὶ ἐπορεύθη εἰς Νινευ καθὼς ἐλάλησεν κύριος ἢ δὲ Νινευ ἦν πόλις μεγάλη τῷ θεῷ ὁσεὶ πορείας ὁδὸν ἤμερῶν τριῶν | [214] ἐνθα τοῦ θεοῦ δεθείς συγγνώμην αὐτῷ παρασχεῖν τῶν ἡμαρτημένων ἀπῆλθεν εἰς τὴν Νίνον πόλιν καὶ σταθεῖς εἰς ἑπίκου ἐκήρυσσεν ως μετ’ ὀλίγου πάνιν χρόνον ἀποβαλοῦσι τὴν ἀρχὴν τῆς Ασίας, |
| 3:1 Now the word of the Lord came to Jonah the second time, saying, | 2 “Arise, go to Nineveh the great city and proclaim to it the proclamation which I am going to tell you.” | 3 So Jonah arose and went to Nineveh according to the word of the Lord. Now Nineveh was an exceedingly great city, a three days’ walk. | [214] ἐνθα τοῦ θεοῦ δεθείς συγγνώμην αὐτῷ παρασχεῖν τῶν ἡμαρτημένων ἀπῆλθεν εἰς τὴν Νίνον πόλιν καὶ σταθεῖς εἰς ἑπίκου ἐκήρυσσεν ως μετ’ ὀλίγου πάνιν χρόνον ἀποβαλοῦσι τὴν ἀρχὴν τῆς Ασίας, |
| 3:1 Now the word of the Lord came to Jonah the second time, saying, | 2 “Arise, go to Nineveh the great city and proclaim to it the proclamation which I am going to tell you.” | 3 So Jonah arose and went to Nineveh according to the word of the Lord. Now Nineveh was an exceedingly great city, a three days’ walk. | [214] ἐνθα τοῦ θεοῦ δεθείς συγγνώμην αὐτῷ παρασχεῖν τῶν ἡμαρτημένων ἀπῆλθεν εἰς τὴν Νίνον πόλιν καὶ σταθεῖς εἰς ἑπίκου ἐκήρυσσεν ως μετ’ ὀλίγου πάνιν χρόνον ἀποβαλοῦσι τὴν ἀρχὴν τῆς Ασίας, |
| 3:1 Now the word of the Lord came to Jonah the second time, saying, | 2 “Arise, go to Nineveh the great city and proclaim to it the proclamation which I am going to tell you.” | 3 So Jonah arose and went to Nineveh according to the word of the Lord. Now Nineveh was an exceedingly great city, a three days’ walk. | [214] ἐνθα τοῦ θεοῦ δεθείς συγγνώμην αὐτῷ παρασχεῖν τῶν ἡμαρτημένων ἀπῆλθεν εἰς τὴν Νίνον πόλιν καὶ σταθεῖς εἰς ἑπίκου ἐκήρυσσεν ως μετ’ ὀλίγου πάνιν χρόνον ἀποβαλοῦσι τὴν ἀρχὴν τῆς Ασίας, |
believed in God; and they called a fast and put on sackcloth from the greatest to the least of them.

6 When the word reached the king of Nineveh, he arose from his throne, laid aside his robe from him, covered [himself] with sackcloth, and sat on the ashes.

7 And he issued a proclamation and it said, “In Nineveh by the decree of the king and his nobles: Do not let man, beast, herd, or flock taste a thing. Do not let them eat or drink water.

8 “But both man and beast must be covered with sackcloth; and let men call on God earnestly that each may turn from his wicked way and from the violence which is in his hands.

9 “Who knows, God may turn and relent, and withdraw His burning anger so that we shall not perish?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3.15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Table 3.15</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>believed in God; and they called a fast and put on sackcloth from the greatest to the least of them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 When the word reached the king of Nineveh, he arose from his throne, laid aside his robe from him, covered [himself] with sackcloth, and sat on the ashes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 And he issued a proclamation and it said, “In Nineveh by the decree of the king and his nobles: Do not let man, beast, herd, or flock taste a thing. Do not let them eat or drink water.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 “But both man and beast must be covered with sackcloth; and let men call on God earnestly that each may turn from his wicked way and from the violence which is in his hands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 “Who knows, God may turn and relent, and withdraw His burning anger so that we shall not perish?”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.15

10 When God saw their deeds, that they turned from their wicked way, then God relented concerning the calamity which He had declared He would bring upon them. And He did not do [it.]
4:1 But it greatly displeased Jonah, and he became angry.
2 And he prayed to the Lord and said, “Please Lord, was not this what I said while I was still in my [own] country? Therefore, in order to forestall this I fled to Tarshish, for I knew that Thou art a gracious and compassionate God, slow to anger and abundant in lovingkindness, and one who relents concerning calamity.
3 “Therefore now, O Lord, please take my life from me, for death is better to me than life.”
4 And the Lord said, “Do you have good reason to be angry?”
5 Then Jonah went out from the city and sat east of it. There he made a shelter for himself and sat under it in the shade until he could see what would happen in the city.

See below for Josephus’ (parallel) conclusion in Ant.
6 So the Lord God appointed a plant and it grew up over Jonah to be a shade over his head to deliver him from his discomfort. And Jonah was extremely happy about the plant.

7 But God appointed a worm when dawn came the next day, and it attacked the plant and it withered.

8 And it came about when the sun came up that God appointed a scorching east wind, and the sun beat down on Jonah's head so that he became faint and begged with all his soul to die, saying, “Death is better to me than life.”

9 Then God said to Jonah, “Do you have good reason to be angry about the plant?” And he said, “I have good reason to be angry, even to death.”

10 Then the Lord said, “You had compassion on the plant for which you did not work, and [which] you did not cause to grow, which came up...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3.15</th>
<th>overnight and perished overnight. 11 “And should I not have compassion on Nineveh, the great city in which there are more than 120,000 persons who do not know [the difference] between their right and left hand, as well as many animals?” and having disclosed these things he departed. Now I have passed on the account of him as I found it recorded.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

See parallel above in LXX Jonah 4:5

There are more than 120,000 persons who do not know [the difference] between their right and left hand, as well as many animals.

Moreover, he departed. Now I have passed on the account of him as I found it recorded.
### Table 3.16: Similarities between Josephus and the LXX in the Jonah Narrative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shared Feature</th>
<th>References in LXX</th>
<th>References in Josephus’ Antiquities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Jonah is ordered by God to go to Nineveh and proclaim a message of impending judgment</td>
<td>Jonah 1:1-2</td>
<td>9.208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Jonah runs from God and departs on a ship headed from Joppa to Tarshish/Tarsus</td>
<td>Jonah 1:3</td>
<td>9.208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. A storm arises that threatens the welfare of the ship</td>
<td>Jonah 1:4</td>
<td>9.209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The ship’s crew make supplications in hope of escaping the danger posed by the sea</td>
<td>Jonah 1:5</td>
<td>9.209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Jonah is lying down and not making petition to his God</td>
<td>Jonah 1:5-6</td>
<td>9.209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The sailors suspect someone on board is responsible and cast lots which fall upon Jonah</td>
<td>Jonah 1:7</td>
<td>9.210-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The sailors question Jonah about his home and occupation</td>
<td>Jonah 1:8</td>
<td>9.211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Jonah identifies himself as a Hebrew and associates himself with (the) God (of the Hebrews)</td>
<td>Jonah 1:9</td>
<td>9.211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Jonah admits being the cause of the storm and advises the sailors to cast him overboard</td>
<td>Jonah 1:11-12</td>
<td>9.211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Initial reluctance of the sailors to throw Jonah overboard</td>
<td>Jonah 1:13</td>
<td>9.212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. The storm worsens following the sailors’ reluctance to cast Jonah overboard</td>
<td>Jonah 1:13</td>
<td>9.212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. The sailors cast Jonah overboard and the storm abates</td>
<td>Jonah 1:15</td>
<td>9.212-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Jonah is swallowed by a large fish for 3 days and 3 nights</td>
<td>Jonah 2:1</td>
<td>9.213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(English 1:17)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Jonah is vomited up by the fish onto dry land</td>
<td>Jonah 2:11</td>
<td>9.213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(English 2:10)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Jonah prays to God (in the fish in the LXX but after the fish in Josephus)</td>
<td>Jonah 2:2-10</td>
<td>9.214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(English 2:1-9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.17: Josephus’ Omissions from the LXX Jonah Narrative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element of LXX Jonah Omitted from Josephus</th>
<th>LXX References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. God is not given as the explicit subject (causing the storm)</td>
<td>Jonah 1:4 (cf. <em>Ant</em>. 9.208)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The sailors throw cargo into the sea to lighten the ship’s load</td>
<td>Jonah 1:5 (cf. <em>Ant</em>. 9.209)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The captain’s initial questioning of Jonah when he is found asleep</td>
<td>Jonah 1:6 (cf. <em>Ant</em>. 9.210)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The sailors are afraid</td>
<td>Twice in Jonah 1:5, 10 (cf. later mention in <em>Ant</em>. 9.209)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Direct conversation between Jonah and the sailors</td>
<td>Jonah 1:10-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The sailors desperately row for land ignoring the advice of Jonah to throw him into the sea</td>
<td>Jonah 1:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The sailors feared God and offered sacrifices</td>
<td>Jonah 1:16 (cf. <em>Ant</em>. 9.209, 212)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Jonah’s prayer from inside the fish (Josephus makes mention of Jonah praying after he is vomited up by the fish)</td>
<td>Jonah 2:2-10 = English 2:1-9 (cf. <em>Ant</em>. 9.214)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Nineveh’s great size and Jonah’s one day walk into the city prior to proclaiming his message</td>
<td>Jonah 3:3-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. The Ninevites’ positive response to Jonah’s message</td>
<td>Jonah 3:5-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. God’s decision to relent on account of the Ninevites’ repentance</td>
<td>Jonah 3:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Jonah’s anger and prayer to God (‘take my life’)</td>
<td>Jonah 4:1-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. God’s question to Jonah (‘do you have a reason to be angry?’)</td>
<td>Jonah 4:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Jonah’s various interactions with God outside the city (shelter, plant, further anger and final word to Jonah)</td>
<td>Jonah 4:5-11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 4: Literary and Rhetorical Conventions in Plutarch’s Lives

4.1 Introduction

As an educated Greek living between approximately 45 and 120 C.E., Plutarch provides a second contemporary author with whom the method of the Gospel writers may be compared.1 While little is known of his family, it appears he was born in the Greek town of Chaeronea, studied philosophy in Athens, travelled to Rome at least twice, and even gained Roman citizenship. The majority of his life, however, was spent as a priest in both Chaeronea and Delphi.2 His extant literary remains, among the most extensive of any ancient author, include a series of approximately seventy eight miscellaneous philosophical essays (the so-called Moralia)3 and forty-eight extant Lives, a series of biographical portraits on prominent Greek and Roman heroes.4 It is the Lives that will be utilized in this chapter. Their potential for shedding light upon Synoptic relations lies not only in their shared language (Greek), common βίος genre,5 and prose narrative style, but also in the possibility of comparing Plutarch’s finished product with his sources. While only two specific works will be examined in detail, namely the Coriolanus and the Camillus,6 it will nevertheless prove helpful to provide some general introductory remarks about Plutarch’s Lives.

---

2For a general introduction including these and other biographical details see Russell, Plutarch, 1–18.
3This amounts to 16 volumes in the Loeb series although some are considered later pseudepigraphical works. See Russell, Plutarch, 18.
4This involves another eleven volumes in the Loeb series with all but four of the Lives (Aratus, Artaxerxes, Galba, and Otho) written as parallels (a Greek paired with a Roman). Formal comparisons appended in all but four of twenty two pairs.
5It is noteworthy that the generic designation of βίος is taken from the opening lines of Plutarch’s Alexander where he states “οὔτε γὰρ ἱστορίας γράφομεν, ἀλλὰ βίους ...” (1.2). See below, however, regarding a more porous distinction between history and βίος in Plutarch.
6Both are Romans with their respective Greek parallels being Alcibiades and Themistocles.
4.2 Introduction to Plutarch’s Lives

4.2.1 Dating of Plutarch’s Lives

While theoretically the Lives may be dated as early as the mid sixties C.E. (assuming Plutarch’s birth around 45 C.E.), it is generally agreed that Plutarch wrote them later in life with most, if not all, post-dating the mid-nineties C.E. and continuing up to the time of his death. While the relative order of the Lives is implied by several cross-references, unfortunately such notices are frequently contradictory. This difficulty may be mitigated by positing the publication of certain pairs in groups and it is on this basis C. P. Jones offers his suggested order. While his precise conclusions about dating and order remain estimations at best, his general conclusion, that the Lives (along with about fifteen of the Moralia) are dated to the period between 96 and 116 C.E., is generally accepted.

---

7 See, for example, the discussion in Jones, “Chronology.” The dating coincides with the reigns of Nerva (96-98) and Trajan (98-117) and assumes a certain reluctance to write during the reign of Domitian (81-96). On this see ibid., 73 and Joseph Geiger, “Nepos and Plutarch: From Latin to Greek Political Biography,” Illinois Classical Studies 13.2 (1988): 245–56, esp. 245-47.

8 E.g. the reference in Cato Minor 22.4 (“as it is written concerning Cicero ...”) implies that Cicero was written first.

9 E.g. Dion 58.10 cites the Timoleon while Timoleon 13.10 and 33.4 cite the Dion. For additional examples see Jones, “Chronology,” 66.

10 Jones distinguishes between two categories of more or less assured dating according to which he dates Camillus around 96 C.E. (and therefore among the earliest of the published Lives) and Coriolanus to some time before 116 C.E. (see Jones, “Chronology,” 68–69). D. A. Russell similarly concludes that neither the absolute nor relative chronology “can be determined with certainty, though there are certain fixed points. They are clearly a work of late maturity: if we date them under Trajan we shall hardly go wrong” (“On Reading Plutarch’s Lives,” in Essays on Plutarch’s Lives, ed. Barbara Scardigli [1995], 76). For a word of caution regarding Jones’s precise dating (but not the general time frame) see Geiger, “Plutarch’s Parallel Lives: The Choice of Heroes,” in Essays on Plutarch’s Lives, ed. Barbara Scardigli (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981), 169. Christopher Pelling is likewise cautionary regarding precise dating schemes and considers the theory of simultaneous preparation of several Lives as a “convenient solution” to the cross-reference problem (“Plutarch’s Method of Work in the Roman Lives,” JHS 99 [1979]: 74–96, esp. 80-81). Despite being estimations, however, within the context of this project I require neither a precise absolute nor relative date for the Lives since the sources being used for comparison (Dionysius and Livy) were written at least a century or so earlier. Regarding the possible factors that affected Plutarch’s choice of heroes see, for example, Geiger “Choice” and Cornelius Nepos and Ancient Political Biography, Historia Einzelschriften 47 (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 1985), 47.
4.2.2 The Sources of Plutarch’s Lives

It is clear that in composing his *Lives* Plutarch utilized a variety of sources including, for example, the Roman histories of Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Livy and Polybius. It is generally agreed that he read widely in Greek and Latin literature whereby, according to D. A. Russell, his “relation to his sources is complex and varied. He wrote from a retentive memory of vast reading.... This holds for the *Lives* as well as for the *Moralia.*” This is evidenced by the vast number of quotes in his extant works albeit frequently occurring without demarcation or explicit identification of sources. This vast amalgam, combined with the reality that many of his sources are no longer extant, makes it difficult to “find a passage of any length which clearly comes from (a single extant) ‘source.’” This problem is compounded by Plutarch’s adaptation of sources (see below) whereby verbal similarity, a key indicator of literary dependence, is obscured. The evidence for narrative adaptation, however, is taken from precisely those instances where we have the greatest confidence in identifying Plutarch’s sources or where he is adapting something that appears elsewhere in his own writing. Indeed our study of the rhetorical handbooks, progymnasmata and Josephus has already led us to expect such narrative adaptation

---

12It is agreed, however, that he learned Latin late in life and never came close to the same level of competency as he experienced in his native Greek. On his “competent but not infallible knowledge” of Latin see Russell, *Plutarch*, 54 along with the discussion in Jones, *Plutarch and Rome* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971), 81–83.
13Russell, *Plutarch*, 116 (see also p.33).
14Russell states that there are approximately seven thousand such quotes albeit not all from first hand knowledge of his sources (some may come from other writers or notes made available through his assistants) (*Plutarch*, 47; regarding lack of firsthand knowledge of some sources see also Jones, *Plutarch and Rome*, 85). Plutarch, according to Brad Cook, “drew upon (his) vast store of readings and recollections. Quotations from this amalgam of memory and notes are in the thousands” (“Plutarch’s Use of λεγέται· narrative design and source in *Alexander,*” *GRBS* 42, no. 4 [2001]: 329–60, esp. 331). Cook notes the frequent lack of source demarcation and discusses the numerous nameless references in Plutarch’s Greek *Lives* as well as the potential reasons for why Plutarch would have named some sources (e.g., recent reading; rereading thorough notes; superb memory; desire for authentication or the gaining of the reader’s confidence).
17See, for example, the discussion of Plutarch’s narrative adaptation in Damm, “Rhetorical Approach” and Robbins, “Rhetorical Act.”
whereby a lack of significant verbal agreement cannot be taken as decisive evidence against a particular source theory. While this calls for caution in identifying sources on a micro-level, where verbal agreement and explicit source identification is absent, it is my opinion that the macro-identification of primary sources for several of the Lives retains sufficient plausibility to validate the analysis in this chapter.\footnote{This is because the macro-identification of sources goes beyond simple verbal agreement at the micro-level and includes such things as explicit references to sources and agreements in macro-level order and selection of material. This will be evident in the discussion of the Coriolanus and the Camillus below.} It is in precisely these instances, therefore, that we get closest to seeing the habits of narrative adaptation that we seek to uncover.\footnote{An important corollary to this is the theory that Plutarch proceeded with a primary source (despite his wide range of reading) whereby an overall comparison with that source will likely furnish the strongest evidence of his narrative adaptation habits. Regarding his use of a primary source Pelling writes that his “curious fidelity to a single source for individual episodes is most easily understood if we make a simple assumption: that, following this initial wide reading, an author would generally choose just one work to have before his eyes when he composed, and this work would provide the basis of his narrative ... such a procedure seems less perverse (to the modern view that is) in view of the physical difficulties of working with papyrus rolls” (“Plutarch’s Method,” 92). At the same time he notes Plutarch’s reliance upon his memory, especially when utilizing a non-chronological source (e.g., Cicero). Imprecision does not so much evidence ignorance of his source as reliance upon (imprecise) memory in lieu of embracing the sheer physical (and time consuming) effort of trying to compare parallel accounts in separate manuscripts (ibid., 93). In general Pelling understands Plutarch as proceeding according to three stages of composition: (a) preliminary reading over a wide range of sources; (b) production of ὑπομνήματα; and (c) writing of the finished version. Plutarch would also have had a slave (or freedman) to help in the process. His diligence, however, should not be exaggerated insofar as we frequently find evidence of hasty production. Furthermore Plutarch may well have used different methods for different Lives (ibid., 95-96). Pelling suggests that the procedure followed by Plutarch is generally in keeping with that laid out in Lucian’s, How to Write History (Plutarch: Life of Anthony [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988], 31–33).}

### 4.2.3 Plutarch’s Divergence from his Sources

Consideration of narrative adaptation raises the broader issue of Plutarch’s divergence from his sources and the various explanations offered to explain this phenomenon. First, it must be noted that not all divergence appears to be deliberate. Hence, for example, when Plutarch confuses the names of Coriolanus’ mother and wife, this is better explained by memory lapse than by deliberate alteration, especially given the scholarly consensus that Dionysius of Halicarnassus is Plutarch’s primary source for the Coriolanus.\footnote{Notably Dionysius (Rom. Ant. 8.39–41) and Livy (History 2.40) agree that Veturia is Coriolanus’ mother and Volumnia his wife. In Plutarch, however, Volumnia is the mother and Vergilia the wife (Cor. 32–33). On this and other probable memory lapses see both Russell (“Coriolanus,” 22) and Peter (Die Quellen, 11–12) who both point to the significant role of memory in Plutarch’s use of his sources.} More frequently, however,
Plutarch engages in deliberate adaptation such as transparent critical evaluation of his sources, especially when they disagree. Brad Cook identifies the following criteria by which Plutarch evaluates his sources: logical consistency; probability; relative proximity to the original event; authorial intent (motives) or character; and majority opinion. Occasionally, however, he provides no stated criterion for evaluating a source and is also willing to admit when he is unable to resolve conflicts in the traditions available to him. In addition to explicit critical evaluation Plutarch employs a variety of "compositional devices" when deliberately adapting his sources. Christopher Pelling identifies at least the following six:

1. **Conflation**: for example, at *Caesar* 7.7 Plutarch combines three senatorial debates (on the Catilinarians) into one.

2. **Chronological compression**: this involves the "portrayal of distinct events as being closely linked in time," especially when linked causally or thematically. For example Cato’s proposal to surrender Caesar to the Germans (in *Cato* 51) is delayed until the outbreak of civil war “where it can conveniently be linked with Cato’s further attacks on Caesar’s command” (noting that *Caesar* 22.4-5 has it in the appropriate chronological position 5 years earlier in 55 B.C.E.).

---

21 For an example of relative proximity to the original Cook cites *Dion* 31.3 where Plutarch expressly rejects Timaeus’ claim, that Dion’s son was named Aretaeus, in favor of Timonides claim that he was named Hipparinus. The reason Plutarch provides is that, as a friend and fellow soldier of Dion, Timonides is better to be trusted. For this and other examples of Plutarch’s arbitration between differing sources see Cook, “Use of λέγεται,” 335–42. On the critical evaluation of sources see also Alan Wardman who notes the different approaches of Plutarch to more mythical accounts (e.g., Romulus, Theseus, or the speaking statue of *Cor.* 38) (*Plutarch’s Lives* [London: Paul Elek, 1974], 161–2, 5).

22 The example in Cook (“Use of λέγεται,” 341) is Plutarch’s rejection of the report that Demosthenes composed the epigram, which would appear later on his statue, just moments before his death. Plutarch simply evaluates this as “utter nonsense” (*Demosthenes* 30.5).

23 Cook (ibid., 341) offers an example from *Solon* 19 where Plutarch, having identified an apparent contradiction regarding whether or not Solon was the founder of the Areopagus, calls upon his readers to examine the matter for themselves. Cook draws the interesting conclusion that since Plutarch is “so frank about the challenges and difficulties of assessing sources, when he simply, openly, and clearly, without qualification reports information from a source ... we should accept the text as presenting the truth, as Plutarch understands it” (ibid., 341-2).

24 The list and examples (among others) are taken from Pelling (“Plutarch’s Adaptation”, esp. 127-31) and to a lesser extent Russell (“Coriolanus”). While some of the examples might arguably be non-deliberate (mistakes), the lists in Pelling and Russell (which could not doubt be multiplied) are sufficient to indicate that these various compositional devices occur deliberately.

25 Pelling, “Plutarch’s Adaptation,” 127. Another example involves the combination of details from the battles of Regillus and the Naevian meadow in *Cor.* 3 (ibid., n. 3 citing Russell).

(3) **Chronological displacement**: this involves reorganizing the narrative “in a more elegant or pleasing manner” such as to enhance logic or smooth out transitions. For example, *Pompey* 62.1 relates the story of Metellus’ refusal to allow Caesar to open the treasury whereupon Caesar threatens his life. This occurs prior to Caesar’s pursuit of Pompey to Brundisium (*Pompey* 62.2 being explicit on chronology) whereas in *Caesar* 35 it is given in its correct chronological placement, namely after Pompey sailed from Brundisium and Caesar had returned to Rome. Pelling believes that Plutarch organized the material in *Pompey* around his central character.²⁷

(4) **Transfer of an item from one character to another**: this typically involves the suppression of the role of a complicating character. Thus, for example, in *Anthony* 5.10 Anthony and Cassius make speeches to Caesar’s army prior to crossing the Rubicon whereas at *Caesar* 31.3 it is Caesar himself who incites the troops.²⁸

(5) **Expansion (or creation) of material otherwise inadequate**: this typically involves the fabrication of circumstantial detail such as the account of Coriolanus’ early years (*Cor. 1–2*).²⁹

(6) **Fabrication of a context**: this involves finding a context for a disparate piece of tradition not in his main source, as for example, with the mention of an initial reversal and the hanging sword in Caesar’s battle with Veringetorix (*Caesar* 26).³⁰

### 4.2.4 The Influence of the βίος Genre on Plutarch’s Adaptation of his Sources

While the reality of Plutarch’s divergence from his sources is essentially beyond dispute, explanations of the phenomenon require more careful consideration. In relation, for example, to his conflation of the three senatorial debates (example given above) Pelling suggests that

---

²⁷“Plutarch’s Adaptation,” 128.
²⁸Pelling, “Plutarch’s Adaptation,” 129.
²⁹Russell, “Coriolanus,” 23. For more on this see below.
³⁰Pelling, “Plutarch’s Adaptation,” 130.
³¹The only other alternative is to explain all divergence on the basis of lost sources. Not only is this highly implausible but would still require the explanation of why he chose to go with the lost source over against (for example) Dionysius when we otherwise have good reason to believe that Dionysius was his primary source.
Plutarch was simply avoiding tedium.\[^{32}\] In the absence of another good alternative this seems reasonable enough but as Pelling himself goes on to point out Plutarch “was, after all, concerned with Caesar’s role, and that was confined to the final session.”\[^{33}\] This statement actually points beyond ‘tedium’ to what is probably a more foundational reason for many of his narrative adaptations, namely that, as Plutarch himself states, he is writing βίοι not ἱστορίας (Alexander 1.2). The Lives are not simply historical catalogues of past events but are intended rather to show the “signs of the soul” (τὰ τῆς ψυχῆς σημεῖα) (Alexander 1.3).\[^{34}\] As such we may reasonably claim that Plutarch’s biographical focus on Caesar provides at least an additional (if not more plausible) explanation of Plutarch’s procedure at this point than simply the ‘avoidance of tedium.’\[^{35}\]

Closely related to the βίος genre is the frequent observation, that Plutarch has an overarching concern with morality such that vice and virtue become dominant factors in his shaping of the Lives.\[^{36}\] Hence, according to Russell, Plutarch understands people as having inherited tendencies toward vice which can be curbed by the proper use of education and environment - “how the heroes of history succeeded or failed in this is a main subject of the lives.”\[^{37}\] Such progress in

\[^{32}\]Pelling, “Plutarch’s Adaptation,” 127.
\[^{33}\]Pelling, “Plutarch’s Adaptation,” 127.
\[^{34}\]Russell distinguishes Plutarch’s βίος from history in that he has little room for historical composition (speeches, battles, geographical excurses), that he epitomizes or expands as needed, and that he is not bound by chronology. He suggests that βίος is distinguished by two primary types of modification, namely (1) the attribution of motives and (2) the attribution of public or communal action to the hero’s own initiative (“Reading Plutarch’s Lives,” 87). Elsewhere he differentiates ancient (e.g., Plutarch) from modern biography insofar as the former is more concerned with character (versus chronology), praise and blame (answering the question: ‘what sort of person was he or she?’), and on the individual as an individual (as opposed to decisive characters of history) (Plutarch, 102–3, 124, 130). See below, however, regarding a somewhat closer link between βίος and history than Russell here seems to allow.
\[^{35}\]The same can be said, at least in part, for the remaining categories and examples of “compositional devices” listed above. This is least obvious in relation to fabrication of a context although even there the impulse to include disparate tradition was likely motivated by biographical concerns.
\[^{36}\]Plutarch himself states; “Since it is difficult, or rather perhaps impossible, to display a man’s life as pure and blameless, we should fill out the truth to give a likeness where the good points lie, but regard errors and follies with which emotion or political necessity sullies a career as deficiencies in some virtue rather than displays of viciousness, and therefore not make any special effort to draw attention to them in the record. Our attitude should be one of modest shame on behalf of human nature, which never produces unmixed good or a character of undisputed excellence” (Cimon 2:4-5 as cited in Russell, Plutarch, 62). Russell suggests that the “truths of morality” weigh heavily in Plutarch’s critical engagement with sources (on this and the moral aims of the Lives see ibid., 84-99).
\[^{37}\]Plutarch, 87. According to Wardman, Plutarch sees life as the sum of character/nature and fortune whereby one might speak of “character-events” and “fortune-events” (e.g., the embassy of Roman women sent to Coriolanus). The most characteristic feature of Plutarch’s approach to fortune is that one must make the right use of it (Plutarch's
morality is a matter of both theory and practice and in this respect Plutarch regarded the Greek education as offering a key contribution “to a world governed by the potentially destructive force of Roman armies” and hence the “highest praise comes not from conquest and power, but from beneficence.”

In this respect the Lives are not intended merely for information or leisure but rather for providing a “repertoire of exempla for public men of Plutarch’s own day.” Plutarch says as much in his introduction to the Pericles where, having stated that the telling of virtuous actions immediately produces a desire “to emulate those who wrought them,” he declares explicitly that this provides the motive for his perseverance in writing the Lives (Pericles 1-2).

Similarly so the in opening paragraph of the Timoleon he states “I began the writing of my Lives for the sake of others, but I find that I am continuing the work and delighting in it now for my own sake also, using history as a mirror and endeavouring in a manner to fashion and adorn my life in conformity with the virtues therein depicted ... I receive and welcome each subject of my history ... and select from his career what is most important and most beautiful to know. ‘And Oh! what greater joy than this canst though obtain,’ and more efficacious for moral improvement?” (Timoleon, Introduction 1-4). Taken together with Plutarch’s obvious interest in moral philosophy it becomes clear that his Lives were intended as a kind of mirror for his contemporaries, “an aid to the good life or the attainment of virtue,” albeit with the proviso that his target audience, no doubt, belong to the political and literary elite.

---

38 Russell, Plutarch, 31, 88-98 (quote from 98).
40 On Plutarch as a philosophical Platonist ethically rooted in Aristotle’s Nichomachean Ethics see the discussions in Russell who notes the more deterministic moral viewpoint of ancient writers in relation to a person’s fundamental moral disposition (Plutarch, 63–83 and “Reading Plutarch’s Lives,” 81–85). Similarly Wardman speaks of Plutarch’s notion of a somewhat “fixed character” from birth requiring an explanation for any ‘out of character’ actions (especially a change from bad to good) (Plutarch’s Lives, 132–39).
41 So Wardman who describes the Lives as “moral philosophy in another genre,” (Plutarch’s Lives, 18–19, 37). Regarding the moral (ἰδιότης) aims of the Lives see also Pelling (“Plutarch’s Adaptation,” 135–9) and Jones (Plutarch and Rome, 103–9). The latter stresses the imitative aim of the Lives and asserts that this eclipses any supposed “diplomatic” purposes (i.e. defending the Greeks to the Romans or vice versa) insofar as such a political bridge was not required in Plutarch’s day (unlike for his predecessor Dionysius).
Despite the explicit and implicit interest in biography and character (person), the generic lines between ancient history and biography should not be drawn too sharply insofar as character evaluation was not alien to historians (such as Polybius or Dionysius) and Plutarch himself speaks of Ἰστορία in relation to the biographers’ task (Theseus 1.5). Similarly, Pelling asserts that Plutarch’s ‘political’ βίοι differed from both encomium and biographical novels (such as Xenophon) in that he was “unexpectedly truthful” and avoided the fictional elaboration (especially of matters pertaining to childhood) that was common to those genres. The significance of these observations is not to eradicate the distinction between βίος and Ἰστορία as much as to recognize that Plutarch’s βίος was a flexible genre with affinities to at least history, encomium, and moral philosophy. It seems, therefore, that as a historian Plutarch sought a plausible recounting of past events with a fairly typical focus on military and political events. As a writer of βίοι, however, his Lives focus on particular individuals whereby he can

---

(1988): 275–95. According to Stadter’s analysis of the proems the implied audience of the Lives was “male, upper-class, and leisured ... distrustful of the populace ... supportive of the Roman order” and “politically active” (p. 292). In relation to this Wardman draws attention to the explicit dedication of the Lives to Q. Sosius Senecio who was consul in 99 and 107 C.E. and was considered a close adviser of Trajan (Plutarch’s Lives, 39–40). For such people the Lives contain both positive and negative examples: one should endure exile “in the spirit of Camillus or Metellus (Cam. 12.4 and Mar. 29) rather than show the anger of a Coriolanus (Cor. 21) or the despair of a Cicero” (ibid., 44). Plutarch’s ideal politician (‘politicus’) acts on choice/reason (προσέρεσις) rather than passion (Coriolanus being a negative example), has ambitious (φιλοτιμία) albeit tempered by ‘love of good’ (φιλόκαλος), and acts with justice (δικαιοσύνη) (ibid., 105-32). The ‘politicus’ must have both ability and virtue (ἀρετή) resulting from both nature and training. Key qualities are the following: (1) free parents on both sides; (2) a family record of service to the state (3) a moderate way of life; (4) ability as a speaker; and (5) courage. “Envy” (φθόνος), on the other hand, presents a major obstacle that is overcome by rising above all others or showing one’s ordinariness in relation to others. These virtues are lived out in relation to wealth, religion, war and city politics (ibid., 49-104). Wardman sees Plutarch as sympathetic to Plato’s philosopher king (power in the hands of the philosopher) with Lycurgus and Numa as positive examples and Coriolanus as the classic negative example (a great general but a failure in politics) (ibid., 197-220).  

43 So Wardman, Plutarch’s Lives, 5–6. He also notes Plutarch’s use of digression in common with other historians.  

44 “Truth and Fiction in Plutarch’s Lives,” in Antonine Literature, ed. D. A. Russell (Oxford; New York: Clarendon Press; Oxford University Press, 1990), 19–52, esp. 27. Pelling here responds to Momigliano’s assertion that the borderline between truth and fiction was thinner in history than biography. Pelling sees a closer connection of Plutarch’s βίοι to history but retains a distinction and explores the degree to which Plutarch engages in fiction.  

45 So Burridge, What Are the Gospels? 62–64. Wardman, however, sees a difference between Plutarch’s biography and history: the former focuses on a statesman’s character (ἵστος) and the latter on political circumstances and events. Plutarch thus abbreviates the historian’s (e.g., Dionysius) events and speeches (“Plutarch’s Methods in the Lives,” CQ 21 [1971]: 256–57).  

46 Pelling says Plutarch is reluctant to fill historical gaps in his sources, especially in relation to childhood and death, though is willing to fabricate something inferred from later events (“Truth and Fiction,” 36–38). Pelling says this is “not fiction or invention but creative reconstruction” whereby Plutarch never falsifies anything “central to a particular Life... It is simply that the boundary between truth and falsehood was less important than that between acceptable and unacceptable fabrication” (ibid., 42-43). Cor. 1–2 (missing in Dionysius and Livy) is a classic
be highly selective in relation to events that do not bear directly upon his chosen subject.\textsuperscript{47}

Finally, as a moral philosopher, his \textit{Lives} engage in critical evaluations of their subjects who are held out as either positive examples to be emulated or negative ones to be avoided.\textsuperscript{48} This combination, therefore, of historical, biographical and philosophical interest potentially helps to explain a more restricted use of “fictional elaboration” (as per Pelling above) while nevertheless engaging in rewriting through elaboration, reordering, differing emphases, and revision of details.\textsuperscript{49}

\subsection*{4.2.5 The Influence of Rhetoric on Plutarch’s Adaptation of his Sources}

While consideration of the \textit{βιος} genre (along with philosophical and political interests) goes a long way toward explaining Plutarch’s divergence from his sources, a more complete picture demands that we also pay attention to the conventions of ancient rhetoric. As Pelling rightly notes rhetoric is not limited to oratory but includes literature\textsuperscript{50} and Russell, who detects this at the level of Plutarch’s Greek syntax, states that we have to “remember that the philosopher and

\begin{small}
\textsuperscript{47}E.g. Wardman sees Plutarch’s use of “minor events, sayings, and jests” (\textit{Alexander 1.2}) in place of lengthy battle scenes and speeches as a “sort of protest against military history” (such as in Dionysius or Thucydides) and a biographical device for attaining brevity ("Plutarch’s Methods,” 254–56).

\textsuperscript{48}On the interface of \textit{iστορία} and \textit{βιος} see also Jones (\textit{Plutarch and Rome}, 88–102) who sees the latter genre as flexible yet distinct from the former noting how Plutarch “more than once decides matters of fact by reference to character.” He discusses the following examples: Plutarch’s favorable treatment of Romulus, the beginning of Rome’s intervention in Greece, and the decline of the Republic (Gracci to Anthony). Jones sees “a general bias in Rome’s favor” but not without “room for criticism and condemnation” (p. 88). Plutarch is generally favorable toward historical figures and is more ready “to detect and criticize malice than favoritism in his authorities,” thus avoiding the pessimism and malice of historians like Herodotus, and yet is not simply seeking Roman favor (unlike Dionysius) (ibid., 88). On Plutarch’s criticism of Herodotus and malice in history see also Wardman, \textit{Plutarch’s Lives}, 189–96.

\textsuperscript{49}Pelling, “Truth and Fiction,” 35.

\textsuperscript{50}Pelling claims a literary text is “always a piece of rhetoric” engaged in the “craft of persuasion” and Plutarch’s adaptations in writing the \textit{Lives} should be seen in this light (\textit{Literary Texts}, 1–2). Nevertheless when Plutarch draws upon Thucydides in the \textit{Nicias}, for example, while his “retouchings are pervasive,” it is surprising how much “could still be inspired by Thucydides original” (ibid., 47-48).
\end{small}
the historian are also presenting a case and not putting down the facts without regard to the audience.” Plutarch, he concludes, is “the conscious artist, deploying a full repertoire of rhetorical techniques and controlling an exceptionally rich and allusive language.” The fact of his being an educated Greek and a friend of Roman elites immediately implies rhetorical (as well as philosophical) training, an assertion that is born out in various studies. Hence, for example, Vernon Robbins detects rhetorical compositional skills at work in Plutarch’s adaptation of parallel accounts within the Lives whereby he brings “clarity and persuasiveness to the (narrative) argument at hand.” Others have pointed to the rhetorical category of encomium as providing a framework for Plutarchian biography especially in relation to the opening chapters. The Lives have also been analyzed in terms of the progymnastic rhetorical categories of chreia and synkresis (comparison). The latter was a well recognized rhetorical form that clearly leaves its imprint upon the Lives both in terms of their arrangement into pairs as well as Plutarch’s appending of a formal ‘comparison’ in all but four of those pairs. Such an approach requires

51 Plutarch, 163.
52 Plutarch, 163. Earlier he calls him “a self conscious artist in an elaborate manner, meticulous in his periodic structures, his studied word-patterns, his avoidance of hiatus, his carefully chosen vocabulary ... a beneficiary of the changes instituted by the Greek Augustans: witness his varied syntax and sophisticated word-order” (ibid., 21).
53 Russell notes that Plutarch’s Advice on the Public Life, while no rhetorical handbook, nevertheless displays his knowledge of the subject in his practical advice on tactics and style of speech (Plutarch, 97). Wardman makes similar observations and notes that most of Plutarch’s heroes are distinguished orators. Nevertheless rhetorical ability was clearly subordinated to the good of the state and not an end in itself (e.g., Coriolanus is a skillful orator but fails to exercise his skill for the good of the state) (Plutarch’s Lives, 221–6).
54 “Rhetorical Act”, esp. 158.
55 Russell suggests that rhetorical encomium provides the primary framework for the Lives albeit that the common topics (such as family, education, personal appearance, public and military debuts etc.) are not so much arranged chronologically but rather by subject matter with a focus on moral evaluation (Plutarch, 104, 115). Pelling likewise makes note of six common elements found in the opening chapters (family; appearance; character; way of life; education; and style of speech) (“Rhetoric, Paideia, and Psychology in Plutarch’s Lives,” in Plutarch and History: Eighteen Studies [Swansea; London: The Classical Press of Wales; Duckworth, 2002], 339–47, esp. 339). See also Stadter, “Proems,” 287–90.
57 While Plutarch, as Russell rightly points out (Plutarch, 109–14), may not have been an innovator in this regard (a similar procedure appears in the earlier Nepos), this does not take away from its foundational basis in rhetoric. For additional comments on Plutarch’s formal synkresis and, in particular, the debate about whether they are rather poorly constructed additions or sophisticated epilogues inviting the listener to reassess what he or she has heard see
Chapter 4 Literary and Rhetorical Conventions in Plutarch

neither strict chronology58 nor an exclusive focus on good examples59 but is integral to the fact that Plutarch’s focus is on exemplary characters.60 Given the extent to which Plutarch appears to have been influenced by rhetorical (progymnastic) categories of encomium, chreia, and \textit{synkresis}, we can reasonably expect that he was similarly influenced by Theon’s six elements and three virtues of narrative. It is to these that particular attention will be paid in the following analysis of the \textit{Coriolanus} and the \textit{Camillus}.

4.2.6 Conclusion to the Introduction to Plutarch’s \textit{Lives}

The general picture of Plutarch that has emerged from the above survey is that of an educated Greek on friendly terms with powerful and educated Romans. As a philosopher his particular interest in the moral character of leaders finds expression in a series of biographical \textit{Lives} depicting both positive and negative exempla selected from Greek and Romans heroes of his past. Biographical interest was clearly a major factor in influencing his selection and adaptation of source material but this in turn has been influenced by his rhetorical training and awareness of conventions related to encomium, chreia and \textit{synkresis}. It is the first of these (encomium) along with the elements and virtues of narrative61 that will provide the rhetorical framework by which

\begin{itemize}
  \item Regarding chronology Russell argues that the \textit{Lives} are written according to a framework of moral evaluation whereby it is “character and subject, rather than date” that determines structure (\textit{Plutarch}, 88, 104, 115, 118–22). At the same time Wardman sees a narrative with “chronological core” and not a simple lists of traits and anecdotes such as in Suetonius (\textit{Plutarch’s Lives}, 16, 146–7).
  \item Coriolanus again provides the classic negative example of one who received an inadequate education resulting in failure to control negative passions. Skillful battlefield rhetoric is useless in the public forum where clever improvisation is called for (Wardman, \textit{Plutarch’s Lives}, 340–2; see also above n. 42).
  \item Plutarch’s negative examples might suggests that encomium is a “distant forbear of Plutarchian biography” but, as Wardman notes, a good deal of encomium is still present (\textit{Plutarch’s Lives}, 10). I would add that whether Plutarch engages in praise or blame, it is the categories of encomium that inform his choices. As Wardman puts it Plutarch shares with the encomiast a concern for “putting the history of events into the perspective of the individual and both (the biographer and encomiast) assume that the record of the actions is a guide to what they see as character. Particular actions are made to disclose particular virtues” (ibid., 15).
  \item Without specific reference to Theon’s narrative virtues Wardman does point out that the quality of brevity is the one that appeals most to Plutarch (\textit{Plutarch’s Lives}, 227–8). This will be evident in the analysis below.
\end{itemize}
Plutarch’s adaptation of narrative will be analyzed in the *Lives* of the *Coriolanus* and the *Camillus*.

### 4.3 Introduction to Plutarch’s *Coriolanus*

According to our extant accounts of his life Gaius Marcius Coriolanus\(^{62}\) belongs to the aristocratic patrician class and is a member of the Roman senate during early 5\(^{\text{th}}\) century B.C.E. Beside the account in Dionysius (*Roman Antiquities*, Books 6 to 8), which we have already identified as the primary source for Plutarch,\(^{63}\) Coriolanus’ story is also told by Livy (*History of Rome*, Book 2) and as such his version will also be used as a secondary point of comparison in the analysis below. Despite his undoubted military prowess, it has already been noted that Coriolanus functions for Plutarch as a negative rather than positive example.\(^{64}\) As noted above, however, this not only remains in keeping with Plutarch’s biographical and moralistic aims but also is not inconsistent with his utilization of the rhetorical (progymnastic) categories and conventions of narrative and encomium. This will be born out in the analysis below.

#### 4.3.1 Analysis of Order and Selection in the *Coriolanus*

These rhetorical conventions are evident in various ways when it comes to matters of selection and order on a macro-level. The parallel order in Dionysius, Plutarch and Livy is set out in table 4.1, which will form the basis for the following discussion along with the lists of

---

62 The name Coriolanus was given to him (in addition to the other two) when he successfully captured the city of Corioli (*Rom. Ant. 6.94; Cor. 11*). I will variously refer to him as Marcius and Coriolanus.

63 E.g. see Peter (*Die Quellen*, 7–17), Russell (“Reading Plutarch’s *Lives*,” 87 and “Coriolanus”, e.g., 21 where he makes note of the “exact and frequent” echoes between the two texts), and Jones (*Plutarch and Rome*, 84–85). Notably in the *Comparison of Alcibiades and Coriolanus* (2.4) Dionysius is explicitly cited as a source in relation to Marcius’ stirring up war between the Volscians and the Romans after his exile. According to Russell the *Coriolanus* uniquely exposes Plutarch’s methods on account of both similarities and differences with Dionysius’ account (“Coriolanus,” 21). He identifies at least five different ways in which the differences are manifest: (1) approximately twenty percent of alien (added) material; (2) differing historical judgments, such as in Marcius’ actions to provoke war between the Volscians and the Romans; (3) accidental errors (e.g., naming of the women); (4) changes of style/wording; and (5) differing demands of ἄλογος versus ἱστορία (ibid., 21-22).

64 *Alcibiades, Demetrius and Anthony* provide added negative examples among the *Lives* (so Russell, *Plutarch*, 108).
omissions, additions, and order transformations in tables 4.2, 4.3, and 4.4 [see below noting that sectional divisions cited in the latter three tables (§§) refer to those in table 4.1]. Initial consideration indicates relatively few additions or order changes and, despite the large number of omissions, there is significant overlap in the order of events in Dionysius and Plutarch (as well as Livy). Given Plutarch’s evident exercise of freedom in matters of order (see discussion of order transformation below), this overlap provides a strong indicator that Dionysius was his source. At less than twenty five percent of the length, however, Plutarch’s account is significantly shorter than that of Dionysius as is evidenced by his frequent and sometimes extensive omissions (table 4.2). One of the most obvious reasons for these omissions is the narrative element of ‘person.’ Thus Plutarch is quick to omit events not directly related to his main character, such as Cominius’ capture of the Volscian cities of Longula and Polusca (Dionysius, Rom. Ant. 6.91) just prior to the siege and capture of Corioli. Plutarch simply skips over these earlier successes of Cominius in order to get to the accounts of Corioli and the subsequent victory over the Volscians who “were coming from outside” (Cor. 8–9) insofar as Marcius plays a key role in both of these latter events. The bios genre and its encomiastic focus on the narrative element of ‘person’ help explain many such omissions.

The element of person likewise provides a plausible motive for at least five of the seven additions by Plutarch (table 4.3) not least in the first of these, namely the recounting of Coriolanus’ origins, boyhood and initial military honors (Cor. 1–4). Insofar as this information is missing from any of our extant earlier accounts this would appear to be an instance where

65 This represents a rough approximation based on the Loeb editions in which Plutarch’s Coriolanus amounts to approximately 100 pages while Dionysius’ account extends from Book 6.92 (his first mention of Marcius) to 8.62 (Marcius’ death) amounting to approximately 430 pages.

66 As per table 4.2, in addition to omission (1), this can be seen as a possible reason in at least the following omissions: (2), (3), (4), (5), (11), (12), (13), and (21). Omission number (19), Marcius’ initial response to his mother, might also fit this category although strictly speaking this is not a straightforward omission as much as Plutarch has replaced the response with Marcius’ silence [see addition (6) in table 4.3]. This change may be motivated by the element of person insofar as it reflects even more negatively on Marcius in his being reduced to silence by the women (rather than making a plea for them to join him in exile). In either case Marcius fails (the women in Dionysius are unmoved by his plea) but being reduced to speechlessness is perhaps the worse of the two.

67 The one exception is addition (4). Regarding addition (6) see above comments (n. 67). Regarding various other smaller expansions (typically in stories shared with Dionysius) see Russell, “Coriolanus,” 25.
Plutarch engages in Pelling’s so-called ‘creative reconstruction’ based on later inferences. These chapters highlight his military prowess in relation to boyhood activities (combat and wrestling), great strength, and early military honor while yet a ‘stripling’ (μειρόκιον) (Cor. 2–3). Yet he was prevented from becoming wholly “worthy and excellent” due to his “lack of discipline” whereby, despite “great undertakings” on account of his “force and vigor of intelligence,” he nevertheless “indulged a vehement temper and ... unwavering pertinacity” that “made him a difficult and unsuitable associate for others” (Cor. 1).

Despite the obvious moralistic overtones of Plutarch’s commentary on Marcius’ early years, which set the stage for his subsequent rise and fall, the encomiastic elements of origin and nurture (see tables 2.2 and 2.3) clearly inform Plutarch’s ‘creative’ addition at this point. Similar interests can be detected behind Plutarch’s added material about Marcius’ initial political favor with the populace (Cor. 14) and his comments on divine inspiration (Cor. 32.2b-7), additions (3) and (5) in table 4.3. The former is obviously encomiastic, indicating why Marcius rose to success and greatness. The latter, however, is a digression on divine inspiration and the influence of the gods in human affairs and is less obviously related to the element of ‘person.’ Nevertheless its position in the narrative just prior to the ‘inspiration’ of Valeria at the altar of Capitolinus, which leads to the final and successful embassy of women (Cor. 33–36), serves to indicate divine initiative behind

---

69 Russell sees two possible motives for Plutarch’s expansion of Coriolanus’ upbringing: he wants to reflect the abundant information he had for the parallel upbringing in Alcibiades and to warn “against certain defects in education.” He sees in Cor. 1 consisting of non-Dionysian facts about the family and commonplaces on orphans (his status as an orphan implied by Veturia’s speech in Rom. Ant. 8.51). The idea of great natures producing evil along with good is a Platonic theme (Republic 491) appearing elsewhere in Plutarch’s introductions to Demetrius and Alcibiades. He sees Cor. 2 (on the hero’s military education) as commonplace and notes no direct source for his boyhood activities such as wrestling which he sees as a “speculative expansion ... this is what the boyhood of such a man must have been like” (citing a similar fictional expansion in Romulus 6). He sees the latter part of chapter 2 as an expansion regarding Coriolanus’ courage and skill with echoes in the later narrative (Cor. 9.9). The military exploits in Cor. 3 likely come from Coriolanus’ speech to Minuci (Dionysius, Rom. Ant. 8.29). On these various observations see Russell, “Coriolanus,” 23 (similarly so in Peter, Die Quellen, 17).

70 Plutarch clearly seeks to highlight both sides of Marcius’ character. On the one hand the loss of his father “need not prevent him from becoming worthy and excellent” but, on the other hand, if such a life lacks discipline then “it is apt to produce much that is worthless along with its better fruits” (Cor. 1.2).

71 As Russell points out Coriolanus’ standing for consulship is not ‘creation ex nihilo’ but expands on a later comment of Dionysius (Rom. Ant. 7.21.2) (“Coriolanus,” 25).

72 Peter suggests that this digression picks up on the comment of Dionysius (Rom. Ant. 8.39.2) that “Valeria ... moved by some divine inspiration, took her stand upon the topmost step ...” (Die Quellen, 9).
the women’s actions (noting especially Cor. 33.2) and implies a certain divine intervention in Marcius’ downfall. In this way the digression, which is suitably short according to Theon’s narrative virtue of clarity,73 functions in relation to the element of ‘person’ by pronouncing a negative judgment on the central character. The case may be similar in relation to Plutarch’s digression on speaking statues (Cor. 38).74 This is not obviously related to the narrative element of person but, not unlike the digression on divine inspiration, provides a generally positive assessment of the Roman celebration and erection of a new temple in Cor. 37, which again functions somewhat indirectly to affirm the negative judgment on Coriolanus insofar as the celebration is related to his downfall.75 Finally the element of person appears to motivate Plutarch’s digression on names, addition (2) in table 4.3. In this case, however, it functions positively insofar as Plutarch highlights the encomiastic function of certain given surnames. This is obviously the case with “Coriolanus,” a name that highlights the military exploits of the central character.76

---

73 I.e. so as not to require a reminder of what was said before once the narrative is taken up again (Kennedy, Progymnasmata, 30).
74 Addition number (7) in table 4.3.
75 In this instance, however, Plutarch is clearly more critical of the claimed portents. Hence he declares it ‘altogether impossible’ (παντά πασι ἀμήχανος) that a statue would speak in a manner so clear, abundant and precise. His naturalistic explanation of such phenomena seems to uphold the integrity of the deity (‘they might communicate by such naturalistic means’) and people’s faith in the deity - “where history forces our assent” we may well be dealing with “an experience different from that of sensation” and which “arises in the imaginative part of the soul and persuades men to think it sensation” (Cor. 38.3). In this way he tentatively and diplomatically upholds the divine witness of the speaking statues although the digression ultimately has more to do with Plutarch addressing perceived debates among his readers than enhancing his characterization of Marcius.
76 The need for this digression is less obvious since we may reasonably assume familiarity with the significance of given names for Plutarch’s educated audience in which case the virtue of brevity would lead him to omit the explanation. The addition is therefore puzzling. While, however, we can only speculate about the reason for the addition (e.g., assumed ignorance for part of his audience or emphasis of a known phenomenon etc.), its highlighting of the encomiastic function of names is clear enough (similarly so in Russell, “Coriolanus,” 24). Furthermore, as with his digression on divine providence (Cor. 33), it is short enough to accord with the virtue of clarity. Regarding Plutarch’s digressions on cognomina, inspiration, and speaking statues (Cor. 11, 32, 38) Russell states that these are typical of Plutarch (“Coriolanus”, 21) citing parallels in Romulus 28, Numa 4, Publicola 15, and Camillus 19. Russell includes these digressions under what he calls “expansions” of Dionysius and notes the presence of several other “antiquarian digressions” in the Coriolanus such as the wearing of the oak crown (Cor. 3), explanations of why candidates (for consulship) did not wear tunics (Cor. 14), and the notation about the Romans ‘girding up their togas and making unwritten wills’ in preparation for battle (Cor. 9.3). Insofar several of these have parallels in Dionysius, whereby the expansion is within a shared story, they have not been included here as pericope ‘additions.’ Regarding these and other ‘antiquarian additions’ see Russell (“Coriolanus,” 23 [esp. n. 17], 24, and 25 [n. 23]).
In addition to the narrative element of *person* (and the categories encomium) Plutarch’s omissions in the *Coriolanus* are frequently explicable on the basis of the rhetorical virtue of conciseness. At one level omissions by their very nature are suggestive of brevity and, therefore, when the material under consideration is likewise irrelevant to the central character it may be difficult to distinguish the motive of brevity from that of ‘person.’\(^{77}\) As can be seen from table 4.2, however, there are a number of places where brevity appears to have trumped ‘person,’ namely those instances where the omitted material is clearly relevant to the Plutarch’s central character.\(^{78}\) In these cases it appears that Plutarch’s specific interest in Βίος does not require him to reproduce all the detail of Dionysius’ history. Rather his concern for conciseness results in a tendency to omit speeches such as Minucius’ defense of both the senate and Marcius to the Roman populace in *Rom. Ant.* 8.28–32.\(^{79}\) Insofar as this material is not completely irrelevant to the main character, however, Plutarch does not necessarily omit it in its entirety but may subsume it within his narrative as, for example, with his allusion to the speech of Minucius (without mention of his name) in a brief summary statement (*Cor.* 17.3b-4).\(^{80}\) A more interesting case arises in relation to a particular omission [number (20) in table 4.2] in which Dionysius provides a summary appraisal, both positive and negative, of Marcius’ character (*Rom. Ant.* 8.60–62.1). This seemingly inappropriate omission, given that it evidently relates to the element of person, becomes readily explicable in light of at least two factors. First, Plutarch has been engaging in character evaluation throughout his narrative with explicit summary comments offered, for example, in both his opening paragraph (*Cor.* 1–4) and the appended formal *synkresis* of Alcibiades and Coriolanus. Second, Plutarch’s evaluation disagrees with that of Dionysius insofar as the latter, for example, offers a positive evaluation of Marcius’ political

---

\(^{77}\) As is the case for the omissions listed above as being motivated by the narrative element of ‘person’ (see n. 67 and its preceding paragraph).

\(^{78}\) In particular numbers (6), (7), (8), (9?), (10), (14), (15), (16), (17), and (18).

\(^{79}\) Omission (6) in table 4.2.

\(^{80}\) The situation is similar, for example, with omission (8), in which the various senatorial speeches of Dionysius’ *Rom. Ant.* 7.38–56 are subsumed under a brief summary in *Cor.* 19.2-3.
abilities. In this regard the omission seems prompted as much by person (a different evaluation) as by brevity and perhaps even clarity or genre (a different ordering of material). Whichever the case, however, it is explicable on rhetorical grounds.

We might summarize, in relation to categories of person and conciseness, by noting that Plutarch provides material for each of the five categories of ‘person’ according to the composite list of encomiastic topics in tables 2.2 and 2.3 (origin; nurture; deeds and virtues/vices; death; comparison). While sometimes this involves him in additions (origin; nurture; comparison), at other times he has more than enough material available and thus engages in omission or summarizing for the sake of brevity.

When it comes to Theon’s narrative virtue of clarity we have already noted that Plutarch maintains his digressions (on names and divine inspiration) within acceptable limits and it is this virtue that appears to provide the primary reason for the transformations of order listed in

---

81 On the differing views regarding Marcius’ political abilities compare *Rom. Ant.* 8.60 with *Cor.* 1 as well as the opening paragraph of the *synkresis*.

82 At the same time, as noted both above and below, his character sketch differs from Dionysius. According to Russell the latter depicts Coriolanus in Aristotelian language as *ἀκριδοδίκιος* (precise as to one’s rights), which is the opposite of ἐπεικής (tolerant; reasonable). Plutarch, however, sketches his character in terms of his πάθη (passions) and notes two foundational problems: (1) the key to Coriolanus’ character is his inclination to anger (ὄργη) which springs from his φιλοστιμία (love of honor; ambition) (*Comparison 5*); (2) these failings were due to a defective education (*Cor. 1.4-5; 15.4-5*). See Russell (“Coriolanus,” 27) along with similar comments in Stadter (“Proems,” 289) and Pelling (“Rhetoric,” 340–46). Wardman also points out his negative magnificence/pride (ὄγκος) and envy (φθονός) albeit displaying an honorable attitude toward wealth when he turns down the offer of booty following the capture of Corioili (*Plutarch’s Lives*, 65, 70, 85).

83 In addition to omissions and summary statements the following chapters in Plutarch summarize Dionysius’ more protracted material: *Cor.* 5–7; 26; 28; 33; 36.1b-3 (refer to parallels in table 4.1). On Plutarch’s tendency to abbreviate see also Russell’s comments on the embassy of women (*Cor.* 34–36; *Rom. Ant.* 8.44–54) pointing out how the mother’s speech (*Cor. 35.2-9*) “is marked by a tautness and steady elevation quite different from anything in Dionysius” (“Coriolanus,” 25–26). Hence while Dionysius modelled his speeches on Attic orators, Plutarch’s possess *σεμνότης* (dignity; majesty; gravity; solemnity) and conciseness which “faintly recalls Latin historians.” He also suggests that the climax parallels Dionysius but is “much better expressed” whereby Plutarch’s νεικός ἐντυχεί μὲν τῇ πατρείδι νικη, ἐμὲ δ’ ὀλεθρίου (‘you have conquered, a victory which means good fortune for my home country, but death to me’ in *Cor. 36.4*) is said to be “neat and forceful” over against the “muddled and ineffective antithesis of Dionysius” (νικές ... ὥκε ἐντυχεί νικήν ὧτε σεαυτή ὄψ’ ἐμοὶ τὶν μὲν γὰρ πατρείδι σέσωκας, ἐμὲ δὲ τὸν ἐνεμήθη καὶ φιλοστρογυν ὑών ἀπολόλεκας - ‘you have conquered ... a victory which is good fortune neither for you nor for me; for you have saved your country but you have ruined your dutiful and affectionate son’ in *Rom. Ant.* 8.54.1). While it may be somewhat dramatic to label Dionysius as “muddled and ineffective,” it is nevertheless striking that Plutarch manages to say in nine words what takes Dionysius twenty three.

84 I.e. additions (2) and (5) in table 4.3.
Plutarch moves the incident down (in relation to Dionysius) whereby it is reported after Marcius has gone over to the Volsclians and joined forces with Tullus in order to exact revenge upon the Romans in response to his exile (Cor. 22). The effect is to heighten the drama and enhance clarity by having Marcius’ plans of revenge and his alliance with Tullus follow immediately upon his exile (at which point his rage and resentment have been explicitly noted) and thus avoid the lengthy digression of Dionysius at this point in his narrative. Plutarch not only transfers the digression to a later point, thus providing greater clarity in order, but also appropriately shortens it in keeping with the virtues of both clarity and conciseness.

Plutarch likewise enhances clarity when he re-orders the series of events that lead up to Marcius being declared sole general of the Volsclians, namely order change (3) in table 4.4. As with Dionysius, Plutarch’s Marcius has already been appointed general alongside the Volsclian Tullus and has led successful raids into Roman territory (Cor. 27 and Rom. Ant. 8.11–12). What follows is a series of successful raids on various Roman and Latin cities (e.g., Circei, Tolerium etc.) that are recounted at some length in Dionysius with reports about Roman reactions and Volsclian admiration inserted into the middle (Rom. Ant. 8.13–20). Plutarch, however, draws together these lists of raids into a single succinct summary statement (Cor. 28), omits the comment on Roman reactions, and postpones mention of Volsclian admiration until after the notice about the taking of cities (Cor. 29.1). In addition to being more concise this turns the Volsclian declaration about Marcius becoming their ‘one and only general’ (ἴνα στρατηγόν καὶ...
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\(\mu\omega\nu\nu\) into an appropriately climactic statement of his various military successes. This position, over against inserting it into the middle of the narrative, potentially heightens rhetorical impact.\(^{88}\)

Such a change enhances clarity by improving logical flow so as to indicate more clearly the cause of Marcius’ rise to power among the Volscians.

Plutarch does something similar when it comes to Marcius’ withdrawal from Rome following the women’s embassy [order change number (4) in table 4.4]. In book 8 of Dionysius’ Roman Antiquities he has Marcius address the Volscian troops so as to inform them of his decision to break camp (54.5b) then digresses to the scenes of rejoicing in Rome (55–56) before reporting that Marcius leads the troops back to Antium (57.1-2). Plutarch delays the scenes of rejoicing in Rome (Cor. 37–38) until after the troops depart (Cor. 36.4-5) then picks up Marcius’ story again once he actually arrives in Antium, whereupon he immediately starts into the narrative of Tullus’ opposition to Marcius (Cor. 39.1). Finally we can point to Plutarch’s transfer of the notice about the extra corn shipment from Syracuse (in Sicily) [order change number (1) in table 4.4] which he moves down from before to after the rejection of Marcius for consul (Cor. 16; Rom. Ant. 7.21). In its new position Marcius’ anti-plebeian speech to the senate (in relation to grain distribution) in Cor. 16 is made credible.\(^{89}\) This does not necessarily improve upon the credibility of Dionysius’ account, where debates about grain distribution and the rejection of Marcius for consulship likewise precede Marcius’ anti-plebeian speech, but logical clarity is nevertheless somewhat enhanced.

Admittedly, with the exception of the vision of Latinus, these order changes are more accurately described as the transfer of details rather than whole pericopes. They nevertheless point toward Plutarch’s striving for clarity and perhaps a heightened dramatic tension\(^{90}\) as when

\(^{88}\)It might also be said that in stating that the Volscians declared him their “sole and only general whom they would recognize as their leader” (Cor. 29.1) Plutarch perhaps goes further than Dionysius’ statement that “they continued to admire and celebrate (Marcius) as the ablest of all men in warfare and a general without an equal” (Rom. Ant. 8.17.1). In either case Tullus’ jealousy and subsequent (successful) plot to kill Marcius is made more understandable though this is perhaps shown with greater clarity in Plutarch.

\(^{89}\)This is a critical speech insofar it precipitates the series of events that lead up to Marcius’ trial and exile.

\(^{90}\)This same motif of dramatic tension is perhaps present in addition (4) (table 4.3), where Plutarch introduces the malcontent and jealous Volscians (led by Tullus) earlier in the narrative than Dionysius (see Rom. Ant. 8.57).
Marcius’ plans of revenge follow immediately upon his exile in order change number (2) (table 4.4). While it may be impossible to determine the extent to which memory lapse was a factor in such changes, the observations about heightened clarity nevertheless stand.\textsuperscript{91}

Finally, with respect to Theon’s narrative virtue of credibility, the omission of the various trial speeches from Dionysius’ \textit{Rom. Ant.} 7.60–63 may perhaps be motivated primarily by Plutarch’s desire for brevity and avoidance of lengthy speeches. It is noteworthy, however, that in Dionysius the entire senate is reduced to silence in light of the charges related to war spoils, which was unexpectedly added as part of their charge against Marcius that he was pursuing tyranny (\textit{Rom. Ant.} 7.64). This is a seemingly implausible scenario in which the plebeian tribunes have outwitted and silenced the entire senate with all its competent rhetoricians. For Plutarch, however, it is only Marcius who is explicitly derailed by this deceitful switch in the charges (from that of usurpation to accusations about his anti-plebeian speech in the senate and his wrongful handling of war spoils) and even then, while he is noted not to have a ready answer, he nevertheless attempts a defense but was “clamorously interrupted” and thereby overpowered (\textit{Cor.} 20.2-4). While such changes are perhaps better labeled as an abbreviation or transformation, they nevertheless tend toward greater credibility while at the same time displaying Marcius’ ineptness in political confrontations with the plebeians.

My comments so far have focused on how Plutarch compares to Dionysius, whose \textit{Roman Antiquities} has been assumed as a primary source. To what extent, however, does Livy’s account factor into this picture and provide explanations for Plutarch’s transformations of Dionysius? A review of tables 4.1, 4.2, and 4.3 points to the following general conclusions:

\textsuperscript{91}As per number (1) in table 4.4 memory lapse is noted as a possible cause for the transfer of the notice about grain during the food shortage. It might, of course, equally apply to the other changes in order unless we assume that Plutarch has Dionysius open before him. (Regarding memory lapses in Plutarch’s reproduction of Dionysius see, for example, Russell, “Coriolanus”, esp. 21). It is equally possible that some of the order changes were inspired by Livy: e.g., number (2) where they clearly agree on placing the Latinus story after Marcius’ plotting with Tullus in Antium. Whichever the case (memory lapse, influence of Livy, or Plutarch’s editing) the resultant order tends toward clarity and heightened drama.
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(1) Livy frequently omits or at least has a severely abbreviated form of material that Plutarch shares with Dionysius (e.g., *Cor.* 13, 15, 17, 18, and 19) (table 4.1);

(2) From the list of twenty omissions by Plutarch (from Dionysius) all but two are likewise omitted by Livy, namely numbers (1) and (2) in table 4.2;

(3) Livy adds no unique material of his own (i.e. material otherwise absent from both Dionysius and Plutarch) outside of Tullus’ speech to incite war (*History* 2.38) and Marcius’ initial resistance to the women’s embassy until someone points out the identity of the women (*History* 2.40.4) (see §4 and §5 in table 4.1);

(4) None of Plutarch’s additions (table 4.3) is paralleled in Livy;

(5) Livy differs significantly from the common witness of Plutarch and Dionysius on at least two occasions: first, in that Marcius fails to appear for his trial and is condemned to exile in his absence (*History* 2.35.6 and parallels); second, in that Marcius is said to have lived to an old age (*History* 2.40.11-12) (see §3 and §7 in table 4.1).  

(6) When Plutarch changes Dionysius’ order he essentially agrees with Livy: in the case of numbers (1), (3) and (4) in table 4.4 these agreements essentially result from Livy’s abbreviated form; in the case of number (2), Latinus’ vision, Livy’s order is definitively different from Dionysius and is paralleled in Plutarch.

These various observations point strongly in the direction of the common consensus that Dionysius provides the primary source for Plutarch (at least in comparison to Livy). First, insofar as Livy clearly represents an abbreviated form of both Dionysius and Plutarch, it makes

---

92 In relation to the second of these Livy does make mention of varying accounts of Marcius’ death but prefers the account of Fabius (that he died in old age) on the basis of its antiquity.

93 In this I agree with Russell’s statement that none of Plutarch’s adaptations requires the assumption of a secondary source but rather “there is a high probability that the differences from Dionysius ... give a useful indication of the degree of originality and freedom which Plutarch allowed himself” (“Coriolanus,” 28). For similar comments see Jones, *Plutarch and Rome*, 84–85.
better sense to see Plutarch as essentially abbreviating Dionysius rather than expanding Livy.\footnote{This conclusion is based on the fact that in those sections where Livy provides no parallel Plutarch nevertheless consistently tends toward abbreviating Dionysius. Furthermore this same tendency (of Plutarch) will be seen in relation to both Dionysius and Livy when we come to examine the \textit{Camillus} below.} This is further supported by the fact that none of Plutarch’s additions is present in Livy and neither of Livy’s unique additions is present in Plutarch. Finally, it is supported by the fact that Plutarch shows no awareness of Livy’s unique account of Marcius’ trial and death. The primary counter evidence is that Livy and Plutarch agree together (against Dionysius) in relation to various order changes of which the most significant is the transposition to a later point in the narrative of the story about Latinus’ vision. Even with this change, however, Plutarch agrees with Livy in moving it down in the order but disagrees with him in that he places it slightly earlier in the narrative than Livy (i.e. prior to Marcius’ and Tullus’ use of deceit to provoke war as per §4 in table 4.1). This change by Plutarch is just as easily (and perhaps better) explained on the basis of his independent editorial choice, or even as reminiscence of Livy, but certainly does not point toward Livy as his primary source.

In relation to matters of order and selection we may conclude that Plutarch tends especially to makes choices based on the narrative element of ‘person’ which, as noted above, closely relates to the encomiastic topic lists of tables 2.2 and 2.3.\footnote{Many other changes of detail (unrelated to the issue of macro-order and selection) could no doubt be pointed out in this regard: e.g., Marcius’ heightened reaction of rage and resentment in relation to exile (\textit{Cor.} 21). Likewise when Marcius begins raiding the Romans (once in exile), Dionysius has him first consult the Volscians whereas Plutarch has him simply go ahead with the raids (as well as omitting the raids of Tullus that are in Dionysius) (\textit{Cor.} 27). In either case Plutarch changes details so as to focus on his central character.} Furthermore he shows a strong tendency toward being guided by the narrative virtue of conciseness and to a lesser degree the virtues of clarity and credibility. To this extent I conclude that the narrative conventions of the Theon’s progymnasmata appear to have influenced Plutarch’s adaptation of Dionysius in relation to order and selection of material in the \textit{Coriolanus}. 

In relation to matters of order and select...
4.3.2 Narrative Adaptation in the Coriolanus: The Capture of Corioli (Dionysius, Rom. Ant. 6.92; Plutarch, Cor. 8–9.1; Livy, History 2.33.5-9)

The narrative of the capture of Corioli provides an opportunity to explore how Theon’s narrative elements and virtues have influenced Plutarch on a micro-level (for the following discussion refer to the parallel Greek and English text in table 4.5). Coming on the heels of some preliminary comments regarding Marcius’ military honors (Cor. 3–4) and initial indications of his (ultimately self-defeating) political opposition to the plebeians (Cor. 7–8), the capture of Corioli exemplifies Marcius’ military prowess and appropriately leads to his receiving the cognomen ‘Coriolanus.’

In regard to stylistic improvements, such as were evident in Josephus’ narrative adaptation, it is clear that Dionysius’ Greek is more sophisticated than that of the LXX whereby Plutarch’s ‘improvements’ are less obvious. When we consider Theon’s elements and virtues of narrative, however, improving tendencies can nevertheless be detected. This is especially evident in relation to the virtue of conciseness, which has already been shown as a strong component in relation to Plutarch’s macro-order and selection. Hence the approximate overall Greek word count is reduced from 460 in Dionysius’ to 303 in Plutarch. This conciseness is sometimes accomplished by what appears to be the omission of unnecessary detail such as the first eleven words of Rom. Ant. 6.92.1, which simply indicate that Cominius had left a portion of his army at Polusca, or the short encomium on Marcius in Rom. Ant. 6.92.3 (approximately sixty words). While the latter has obvious relevance to the narrative element of person, Plutarch can readily

---

96Including his first military honors ‘while yet a stripling’ (Cor. 3.1) and the notation that he returned from none of the many Roman wars in those days “without laurels and rewards of valour” (Cor. 4.2).
97The ironic interplay of military might and political failure are highlighted by Plutarch in Marcius’ concluding sentiments at the end of chapter 7 where, in the wake of senate concessions to the plebeians, he exhorts the senators “not to fall behind the common people in contending for their country’s welfare, but to show that they were superior to them in valour rather than in political power.” Marcius will indeed demonstrate such military valour and the capture of Corioli is a defining moment in that regard. Like the proverbial bull in the china shop, however, such raw displays of power and fiery temper will count against him when negotiating his way through later political trials.
98Though see Russell’s comments on style where it is claimed that Plutarch shows more grandeur and elevation than Dionysius in relation to speeches (“Coriolanus,” 22).
99Bearing in mind the accounts of the capture of Longula and Polusca were among Plutarch’s omissions (table 4.2).
omit these comments insofar as he has already provided his introductory remarks on Marcius in his opening chapters (Cor. 1–2). The one other significant omission, from the latter part of Rom. Ant. 6.92.1, relates to the initial demonstration of the strength and resistance by the Coriolani in the face of Cominius’ preliminary attack upon the walls (thirty eight words beginning ἔθνα…). While readily explicable in relation to the virtue of conciseness, this particular omission is somewhat less compatible with the narrative element of person. Admittedly Marcius has not yet entered the narrative and it is Cominius who suffers the military loss, whereby this could easily be seen as irrelevant information, but insofar as Plutarch clearly seeks to highlight the military prowess of Marcius in relation to this and other narratives, the initial success of the Coriolani against Cominius would help serve the element of person in relation to his characterization of Marcius’ military prowess. At this point it would appear, therefore, that conciseness has trumped ‘person’ in Plutarch’s retelling of these events. Notably, however, Plutarch does retain the later mention of the initial success of the men of Corioli against the Roman forces led by Larcius, whom Cominius had left in charge of the siege (Cor. 8.2). This immediately precipitates the successful capture of the city by Marcius whose military success is thereby positively contrasted with that of Larcius (Cor. 8.3). Thus in balance it can be argued that Plutarch does in fact retain the contrast, which serves to highlight Marcius’ military prowess, while at the same time providing a more concise account.

In addition to these omissions Plutarch elsewhere tends toward conciseness through abbreviated retelling of the narrative. A typical example occurs in Cor. 8.1, the notice of Cominius’ siege of Corioli, where Plutarch uses six Greek words (ταύτην ὀψὶν τοῦ ὑπάτου Κομινίου περιστρατοπεδεύσαντος - ‘therefore when Cominius’ consul had besieged this place…’) to recount Dionysius’ sixteen in Rom. Ant. 6.92.2 (κριοῦς τε καὶ γέρρα καὶ κλίμακας

100 Notably in Dionysius this is the first mention of Marcius whereby his summary encomiastic comments, highlighting his noble lineage and character, are quite appropriate. Indeed to the extent that Plutarch has his own comments on Marcius’ lineage and character (Cor. 1–2) it might be argued that he has not so much omitted this material as simply transferred it to a new location. This, however, is no simple transfer insofar as Plutarch’s own introductory comments are not only significantly expanded (e.g., giving greater detail about the house of Marcii) but also highlight his mixed evaluation of Marcius in contrast to what is exclusively positive in Dionysius.
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evtrēπισάμενος παρεσκευάζετο μὲν ως ἀπάση τῇ δυνάμει πειρασόμενος τῆς πόλεως -
‘having prepared battering rams and stakes and ladders he made ready so as attempt against the
city...’). While Plutarch is clearly less graphic, the omissions are irrelevant to his characterization
of Marcius and the result is greater conciseness. A second example involves the initial success of
the Coriolani in sallying out against the Romans when Larcius is left in charge of the siege.
Dionysius’ uses seventy words (Rom. Ant. 6.92.3-4 from Λάρκιος ἔξαγαγὼν το κατὰ
πρανούς χωρίου ἐνέκλιναν) to describe Larcius’ attacks upon the city, the confidence of the
Coriolani (thinking about the rescue on its way from the Antiates/Volsci coming from outside),
and the sallying out of the Coriolani with initial success against the Romans (despite losses on
both sides). Plutarch reduces this to a mere eighteen words (Cor. 8.2b from καταφρονήσαντες
οἱ το τοὺς Ἄρμασίους) in which he simply states that the Coriolani sallied out on account of
their despising the residual Roman forces left to besiege the city and that they initially prevailed
upon the Romans. Despite changing the cause of their actions (despising the Romans versus
hoping in the rescue from new troops),101 the essence of the account (that the Coriolani sallied
out and initially prevailed upon the Romans) is retained in Plutarch’s more concise retelling. It is
this scene that sets the stage for Marcius’ heroic action in Cor. 8.3-6.

Despite these observations, however, Plutarch is not consistently more concise and sometimes
produces an account of the same length or even longer than that of Dionysius. Hence, for
example, when recounting how Cominius divides his armies and leaves Titus Larcius in
command over the siege of Corioli (Rom. Ant. 6.92.2b; Cor. 8.1b-2a) Plutarch is slightly
longer102 owing, in part at least, to the addition of a brief encomiastic statement about Titus
Larcius as being “a man most honorable among the Romans” (ἀνδρα Ἄρμασίου ἐν τοῖς

101 The reason for this change is not immediately apparent and not obviously motivated by Theon’s narrative
elements or virtues with perhaps the exception of credibility. Possibly Plutarch, having explicitly indicated (like
Dionysius) that Cominius divided his forces so as to engage those coming from outside, thought it more credible to
indicate the motive for the Coriolani (in sallying out against the remaining Romans) as their despising the remnant
and thinking they could gain a victory rather than hoping in rescue (which may now be thwarted by the Romans).
102 41 words in Dionysius (from ἀκούσας δ’ ὅτι το ἑπιούντας διεσείτο) versus 46 words in Plutarch (from οἱ
λοιποὶ Οὐσολούσκοι το πολιορκία απέλπιε).
He also replaces Dionysius’ “Antiates” with “Volscians” (when referring to those who are coming to assist the city of Corioli), is more specific in identifying the type of assistance they plan to provide (by noting that they will thereby attack the Romans from both sides), and identifies their motive for assisting against the Romans as ‘fear’ (δείσαντες) rather than kinship (κατὰ τὸ συγγενὲς) (*Rom. Ant. 6.92.2*). While Larcius is only a secondary character, it remains possible to see Plutarch’s brief encomiastic statement about him as motivated by the narrative element of person. This is not only true for Larcius himself but also insofar as Marcius’ military prowess in capturing Corioli is further enhanced by its implied positive contrast with this honorable Roman general who essentially failed to repel the Coriolani forces that were sallying out of the city. The change from “Antiates” to “Volscians” potentially adds clarity, namely for those less familiar with the history (who may not immediately recognize that Antiates were part of the Volscians), as does the explicit statement about their intentions to attack the Romans from both sides, albeit that such changes might be best explained as resulting from Plutarch’s re-writing the account primarily on the basis of his less than perfect recall of his source.

Plutarch’s account of Marcius’ actions in capturing the city is likewise slightly longer than Dionysius’ version (*Cor. 8.3-6; Rom. Ant. 6.92.4b-6*). When the outline of their accounts are placed in parallel (table 4.6) it can readily be seen that while the core of the plot is unchanged (Marcius leads a band of Romans in chasing the Coriolani back into their city where he then overcomes all resistance), the details differ. In this instance a number of those changes are readily explicable on the (encomiastic) basis of the narrative element of person. Hence while

---

103 As noted above, however, Dionysius’ reference to their kinship indicates the same thing.
104 While above observations (on order and selection) indicated Dionysius as Plutarch’s main source for the *Coriolanus*, the precise manner in which Plutarch utilizes his sources remains somewhat mysterious. The various possibilities include at least the following: (a) continuous direct visual utilization of a manuscript (which may itself have variations in relation to our extant text of Dionysius); (b) alternation between direct utilization of a manuscript and reliance upon memory; (c) complete reliance upon memory. In addition to these three alternatives we could add variations in relation to what extent other sources (such as Livy) factored into the process. With this particular pericope the verbal overlap is almost non-existent (the most obvious exception being Plutarch’s συμβοηθῶν - βοηθῶν in Dionysius, meaning ‘to assist’) which suggests Plutarch is working more from memory at this point.
105 219 words in Plutarch versus 203 words in Dionysius.
Plutarch agrees with Dionysius that Marcius, together with a few men (σὺν ὄλιγοις),\textsuperscript{106} was able to stave off the attacking force exiting the city, Dionysius simply goes on to note that Marcius then struck down many whereby the remainder fled toward the city (\textit{Rom. Ant. 6.92.4}). Plutarch, however, adds the detail that, having halted the attack of the enemy, Coriolanus then “called out to the Romans with a loud shout” (ἀνεκαλεῖτο μεγάλῃ βοᾷ τούς Ρωμαίοις) which not only resulted in many Romans gathering around him but also in the withdrawal of the enemy on account of ‘fear’ (δείσαυτες) (\textit{Cor. 8.3}). Furthermore this addition becomes the occasion for Plutarch adding a specific encomiastic notation whereby Marcius is said to fit Cato’s description of one who ‘is worthy’ (ἵξίου) of being called a soldier insofar as he not only proves fearful to the enemy in ‘hand to hand combat’ (χειρὶ καὶ πλήγη) but is also fearful in his ‘appearance’ (ἄψει προσώπου) and the ‘raising of his voice’ (τόνῳ φωνῆς). Further encomiastic changes occur at the conclusion of the narrative where Dionysius simply recounts the final victory of the Romans and the surrender of the Coriolani (\textit{Rom. Ant. 6.92.6}). Plutarch’s retelling is more concise in the specific recounting of the surrender and plundering\textsuperscript{107} but adds an encomiastic detail when, about Marcius, it is said that “he fought an unbelievable battle by deeds of hand, swiftness of feet and daring deeds of soul, and overwhelmed all whom he attacked” (\textit{Cor. 8.6}). Overall, therefore, in relation to person it can be seen that while Plutarch omits the initial encomium of Marcius in Dionysius’ \textit{Rom. Ant. 6.92.3} (an omission which, as noted above, is explicable in light of his own encomiastic comments in \textit{Cor. 1–2}), he has added at least two encomiastic notations of his own that taken together highlight Marcius’ military prowess and specifically his role in this battle. This is also seen, for example, when Plutarch notes that upon Marcius’ entrance into the city “not many were willing to follow” (οὐ πολλῶν δὲ βουλομένων

\textsuperscript{106}This same prepositional phrase occurs in both writers (to describe the small group of soldiers with Marcius) as do the verbs ἵστημι and ἐπιφέρω (albeit in different forms) within this same context (\textit{Rom. Ant. 6.92.4}; \textit{Cor. 8.3}). Another point of verbal overlap is Marcius’ ‘rushing in along with those fleeing’ (συνεισέπτετε τοῖς φεύγουσιν in \textit{Cor. 8.4} and συνεισέπτετε τοῖς φεύγουσιν in \textit{Rom. Ant. 6.92.5}). Additional verbal overlaps appear in the final statements about capturing and plundering the city: thus in \textit{Cor. 9.1} (\textit{Rom. Ant. 6.92.6} τῆς πόλεως ἀλούσις; (‘the capture of the city’) parallels ἀλούσις τῆς πόλεως as do the words ἀρπαγαίης/ἀρπαγήν and χρημάτων in the same section. The various key verbal overlaps are bolded in table 4.5.

\textsuperscript{107}This includes omission of such details in Dionysius as the women of the city assisting in the battle against Marcius by throwing down roof tiles.
thus contrasting directly with the “many others” (ἄλλων συνχων) who rushed in with him in Dionysius’ account (Rom. Ant. 6.92.5). The overall effect is a heightened encomium of Marcius related to this crowning military achievement, which represents the positive side of his characterization in Plutarch.

If we turn to Theon’s other elements of narrative we have already seen that in relation to action (πράγμα) Plutarch has retained the core elements of the narrative: the besieging of the Volscian city Corioli; other Volscians (Antiates) coming from elsewhere to aid the city against the Romans; Cominius dividing the forces and leaving Larcius in charge of the siege of Corioli; the initial success of the Coriolani in sallying out against the Romans; the success of Marcius and his “few men” in resisting the Coriolani, forcing them back into the city, and finally successfully entering and capturing the city. The narrative, however, has been reshaped in such a way that omissions, abbreviations and expansions are all explicable on the grounds of conciseness and/or the element of person (as above). The effect of these encomiastic comments and changes along with the obvious contrast implied with Larcius (who was being defeated by those coming out from the city) is such as to highlight the nature of Marcius’ actions as being great (μέγα), dangerous (κινδυνώδες) and difficult (δύσχερός). At the same time they are clearly advantageous (συμφέρον) and honorable (ενδοξοῦν) such that in the next two chapters Plutarch carefully rehearses the honors afforded Marcius by Cominius the consul (Cor. 10–11). In all of this he does not necessarily go beyond Dionysius, who, for example, likewise includes the

---

108 Plutarch’s earlier statement (agreeing with Dionysius’ wording) was that Marcius resisted the enemy with a few men (σων ὀλιγοίς) following which he gave a loud shout that brought fear to the enemy and renewed courage to the Romans whereby many Romans gathered around him (Cor. 8.3). This agrees with Dionysius who has many fleeing Romans turn back and rejoin the battle albeit he notes that they turned back on account of their shame (Rom. Ant. 6.92.4-5). Plutarch omits the notation about shame and notes a second Roman retreat as missiles were hurled from the walls (cf. Dionysius’ notation about the women throwing down roof tiles). In stark contrast Marcius (and the few that followed) saw an opportunity to breach the city. Plutarch’s addition of this second Roman retreat again highlights Marcius’ military bravery and daring.

109 The qualities (of action) in this and the previous sentence are from Theon’s progymnasmata (Kennedy, Progymnasmata, 28).

110 Thus Cominius is said to rehearse his praiseworthy exploits (αὐτοῦ θαυμαστῶν ἐπαινοῦ) and upon Marcius’ refusal to except a tenth of the booty (though he does accept the horse offered), regarding which Plutarch offers his own encomiastic comments, he gives him the gift of his new surname (‘Coriolanus’).
account of Cominius’ honoring Marcius (Rom. Ant. 6.94). He does, however, seem to heighten the encomiastic element in relation to this defining moment of Marcius’ military prowess. This is suggested by the addition of encomiastic elements already noted in relation to Marcius’ capture of Corioli and especially in his explicit added notation highlighting the ‘great,’ ‘dangerous,’ and ‘difficult’ nature of these deeds (Cor. 8.6). It is also suggested by the fact that, contrary to his more typical practice, Plutarch’s account of Marcius being honored by Cominius expands upon the parallel in Dionysius.111

When it comes to the manner (τρόπος) of Marcius’ actions they are clearly depicted, according to Theon’s categories, as being done willingly or by force (not secretly or deceitfully).112 In this Plutarch is no different from Dionysius but when it comes to the cause (σίτια) of the actions he does show some variance.113 Hence for Dionysius the actions against Corioli come on the heels of political change in Rome whereby senators have been forced to make concessions to the plebeians (who had seceded from the city) in relation to relief from debts and the election of plebeian tribunes (Rom. Ant. 6.49–90). In Dionysius’ account Menenius’ initial speech to the senate in relation to the plebeian secession (6.49–56) makes mention of Roman territory being overrun by enemies (6.50) thereby including it among the good reasons to seek resolution of the secession by accommodating to their wishes. Once resolution comes in relation to Roman political problems114 attention turns to the enemy’s threat and an army is sent out under the command of Postumus Cominius (6.91) thus leading to the events of Corioli (6.92). Hence the immediate cause of Marcius’ actions at Corioli relate to the war waged on the Volscians by the Romans under the military leadership of Cominius and in direct response to enemy plundering of Roman lands. In Plutarch, as with Dionysius, the

111 What is about 1.5 pages in Dionysius (Rom. Ant. 6.94) amounts to almost 3 pages in Plutarch (Cor. 10–11). This, of course, includes Plutarch’s digression on the significance of names but, as noted above, this is something of an encomiastic addition in itself and serves therefore as part of the heightening encomiastic effect of this narrative. 112 Kennedy, Progymnasmata, 28–29. 113 For another example of Plutarch varying the cause of actions see the Russell’s’ comments on the senators’ refusal to give in to the popular demand to recall Coriolanus from exile (“Coriolanus,” 26). 114 In spite of the opposition and warnings of the Appius Claudius (Rom. Ant. 6.59–64, 88) who argued for a much harder line in relation to the plebeian demands.
immediate cause of the war was that “the enemy, not unaware of the popular confusion, burst in and ravaged the country” but insofar as the senate and plebeians were at odds it meant that “when the consuls summoned those of military age to arms, no one responded” (Cor. 5.3). In this succinct manner Plutarch thereby captures the essence of Dionysius’ reason for the war with the Volscians (namely that they had ravaged Roman territory) while also pointing out the need for quick resolution of the plebeian problem (on account of needing to raise an army). In this Plutarch clearly exhibits the narrative virtue of conciseness not only in this particular statement but by succinctly capturing in three chapters (Cor. 5–7) what Dionysius relates in approximately fifty (Rom. Ant. 6.41–90).115 Not content, however, with merely abbreviating Plutarch introduces other important changes to the narrative. Notably, in the first place, he omits mention of Appius Claudius, who in Dionysius’ account provides the chief opposition to the plebeian demands during the senatorial debates (as above). Instead, only Marcius is explicitly mentioned among the “others” (senators) who opposed the plebeians (Cor. 5.4). Likewise when resolution of plebeian secession comes it is again Marcius (not Appius Claudius) who is “displeased” at the increase of the people’s power “at the expense of the aristocracy” (Cor. 7; cf. Rom. Ant. 6.88). Insofar Dionysius’ first mention of Marcius occurs later in the narrative, namely in relation to the capture of Corioli itself (Rom. Ant. 6.92), this clearly provides an example of Pelling’s ‘compositional device’ of transferring an item from one character to another (see above). Clearly such a transfer is based upon Plutarch’s interest in the person of Marcius but is also not completely unfounded in the narrative of his source.116 Finally, in addition to focusing the plebeian opposition of the aristocrats primarily onto Marcius and thereby setting the stage for their later showdown, Plutarch also adds an exhortation of Marcius to his fellow patricians, namely that they are “not to fall behind the common people in contending for the country’s welfare, but to show that they were superior to them in valour rather than in political power” (Cor. 7.2). With this comment Plutarch provides an additional cause/reason (αἰτία) for Marcius’

115 As per table 4.1.
116 For example, see especially Rom. Ant. 7.21–24 where Marcius openly and strongly opposes the idea of concessions for the plebeians.
military actions in relation to Corioli. He is not merely exhibiting military prowess, consonant with his earlier honors in this same regard (Cor. 3–4), but is also leading the way in his own advice and living out his own political animosities on the battlefield. Plutarch’s adaptation of Dionysius’ narrative at this point, therefore, not only captures the cause of the war (the enemy’s ravaging of Roman territory) in a more succinct manner but also transfers the plebeian political opposition from Appius Claudius to Marcius and provides additional personal reason for Marcius’ actions in capturing Corioli, namely to score political points against the plebeians by showing greater valour in battle. The changes are thereby in keeping with Theon’s narrative elements of person and cause as well as the virtue of conciseness.

In relation to the element of place (τὸπος) Plutarch clearly retains the basic location of Dionysius’ account (Corioli) and agrees with him in identifying the city as noteworthy among the Volscians (Rom. Ant. 6.92.1 and Cor. 8.1). In accordance with Theon’s description of place it might be expected that Plutarch would have gone further in describing the terrain around the city insofar as that would have enhanced the readers understanding of the physical dynamics of the battle and might therefore have served encomiastic purposes in relation to Marcius. In this omission he only differs slightly from Dionysius thereby indicating that conciseness was clearly more important to him than details of place in this instance.

Regarding the element of time (χρόνος) Plutarch omits Dionysius’ statement “on the next day,” indicating when Cominius started using battering rams against the walls of Corioli, as well as the reference to the two actions occurring on the same day, namely the capture of Corioli and the subsequent Roman victory over the Volscians who were approaching from outside (Rom. Ant. 6.92.2-3). Regarding the first of these Plutarch’s omission is understandable insofar as he had omitted the previous day’s activities (namely the initial prevailing of Corioli against

---

117 The irony being that, despite accomplishing this aim, he still goes on to lose out in the political battles that ensue.
118 Though the language differs in that Dionysius refers to the city as “very noteworthy and a mother city” (ἐπιφανής σφόδρα καὶ ὀστερὰ ἀν μητρόπολιν) while Plutarch refers to it as having “greatest honor” (ἀξίωμα μέγιστον).
119 In this regard Dionysius is explicit in stating that the city had walls (e.g., 6.92.1) and that when the Corioli initially sallied out against the Romans (under Larcius) the latter were forced “downhill” (6.92.4). While Plutarch is likewise explicit about the existence of walls (e.g., Cor. 8.4), he makes no mention of an incline.
Cominius in *Rom. Ant.* 6.92.1) and, as regards the second, the “same day” is clearly implied (albeit not explicitly stated) in Plutarch’s continuous narrative of the two battles (*Cor.* 8–9). He likewise agrees with Dionysius in giving a clear time reference for the subsequent account (the honoring of Marcius by Cominius) “on the following day” (*Cor.* 10.1; *Rom. Ant.* 6.94.1).120

In relation to the *virtues* of narrative Plutarch’s general tendency toward conciseness has already been noted. The possible motive of enhanced clarity has also been suggested in relation to a couple of changes (see above) and enhanced credibility has been suggested as the possible motive in at least one instance.121 On the other hand Plutarch perhaps stretches credibility when, in heightening the actions of Marcius in entering and capturing the city, he has only *a few* go with him.122 If so it is clearly in the interest of the element of person whereby he perhaps introduces a degree of hyperbole into his account so as highlight the military prowess of Marcius. There are no other obvious instances of his having either enhanced or compromised credibility.

Finally the accounts of both Plutarch and Dionysius may be compared with that of Livy (*History* 2.33.5–9) whose account is more concise than both counterparts (see table 4.7 for parallel English text).123 Thus he gives only a brief encomiastic comment about Marcius at the outset (33.5)124 and reports the actions of Marcius (both in resisting the out-coming Volscians and gaining entry into the city) in a single concise statement.125 Likewise, when it comes to capturing the city, Livy adds the detail (absent from both Dionysius and Plutarch) that Marcius

---

120Dionysius gives periodic time notices orienting his readers chronologically in relation to his historical narrative (e.g., *Rom. Ant.* 1.8, 31, 62, 71; 6.1 etc.). Plutarch provides no such markers but does give a general orientation to his narrative by indicating that the house of Marcii included predecessors such as Ancus Marcius (the grandson of Numa and successor to Tullus Hostilius), both Publius and Quintius Marcius, and Censorius. He does not, however, explicitly state how far removed Marcius was from these men. This may be the result of his writing *biocoi* rather than history or from assuming a basic chronological knowledge of Roman history among his educated readers.
121See n. 101 above.
122This contrasts to the great slaughter on both sides in Dionysius which, along with his not having a second Roman retreat as does Plutarch, implies that a much larger number of Romans entered the city.
123In English translation Livy has approximately 280 words versus 660 words in Dionysius and 460 words in Plutarch.
124He is referred to as “a youth with an active mind and ready hand, who afterwards gained the surname of Coriolanus.” This parallels Dionysius *Rom. Ant.* 6.92.3 (omitted from Plutarch) but is much briefer.
125Compare Livy, *History* 2.33.7 with its parallels in table 4.7.
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threw a firebrand upon the buildings overhanging the walls whereupon the townspeople raised a shout of alarm. This action brought new courage to the Romans but confusion and fear to the inhabitants of the city leading to the concluding statement that “the men of Antium were routed, and Corioli was won” (*History*, 2.33.8). With regard to these various details it is clear that Plutarch agrees more closely with the account of Dionysius’ and does not take over any additional details from Livy (such as the firebrand).126 The overwhelming impression is that Dionysius forms the primary source for Plutarch and that Livy’s account had no significant influence upon him.127

In conclusion, Plutarch’s account of the capture of Corioli plausibly reads as a narrative adaptation of Dionysius’ account told in such a way as make it simultaneously more *concise* and yet highlighting the military prowess of Marcius in typical encomiastic fashion in keeping with the narrative element of *person*. This is likewise detected in relation the narrative elements of *action*, *manner* and *cause*. Rhetorical changes in relation to *time*, *place* and the virtues of both *clarity* and *credibility* do not factor significantly.

4.4 Introduction to Plutarch’s *Camillus*

Furius Camillus is another Roman noble from a period about one hundred years after Coriolanus. According to Plutarch’s account of his life Camillus was not only a successful military general (like Coriolanus) but also a shrewd politician (unlike Coriolanus) and, as such, his example functions more positively. Plutarch’s positive assessment of this hero is indicated immediately in his opening chapter where he extols Camillus’ many great successes, his five

---

126 The one possible exception is in recounting about the additional Volscians who were coming from outside to assist the besieged city (*Rom. Ant*. 6.92.2; *Cor*. 8.1-2; Livy, *History* 2.33.6). It was noted above that Plutarch speaks of the Volscian plan to attack the Romans from both sides and that this was less explicit in Dionysius. Livy, like Plutarch, is explicit about the simultaneous attack upon the Romans. To the extent that such is implied in Dionysius, however, little weight can be given to this as a direct influence of Livy upon Plutarch.

127 This is further implied by the fact that for Livy to be the primary source then Plutarch has not only significantly expanded the account but has changed details (such as the fire brand) so as to agree with Dionysius. While such is possible, it is far more plausible to see Plutarch as an abbreviation and adaptation of Dionysius according to his own peculiar interests. Livy does not seem to have entered the picture here.
times being chosen as dictator, four times celebrated in triumph, and his being “styled a Second Founder of Rome” (Cam. 1.1-2). The fact of his having never been consul is then explained in terms of the political conditions of his time (the people striving against consuls and preferring to elect military tribunes as commanders) and political shrewdness (“he would not consent to become consul over a reluctant people” albeit that “during his career the city tolerated consular elections many times”) (Cam. 1.3). Plutarch completes this opening chapter by extolling the political abilities of Camillus in that he always exercised his authority “in common with others” and thereby acted on the basis of ‘moderation’ (μετριότης) and ‘ability/prudence’ (φρονησις). He then goes on to note how Camillus was the first of his clan to achieve fame beginning after the great battle with the Aequians and Volscians (Cam. 2.1). There are no qualifiers or negative appraisals, such as in relation to Coriolanus’ deficient education, thereby making it clear that Camillus functions primarily for Plutarch as a positive role model.

Earlier parallel accounts in both Dionysius (Rom. Ant., Books 12–14) and Livy (History, Book 5) will again provide the primary points of comparison for Plutarch’s narrative. In this regard it is noteworthy that Plutarch makes explicit reference to Livy in relation to his reports of Camillus laying his hand upon the image of the goddess Juno and praying to her (Cam. 6.2), while there are no such explicit references to Dionysius. While this naturally suggests Livy as the primary source, Hermann Peter points out that Plutarch is not accurate in his citation of Livy at this point. He goes on to discuss three points at which Plutarch has falsely understood the Latin of Livy and suggests that such ‘errors’ may have arisen from his use of Livy’s source or (more likely) his use of another Greek author (who himself had used Livy as a source). While Peter admits to a number of points of agreement between Plutarch and Livy in details, on the

---

128 Die Quellen, 18. Livy, according to Plutarch, states that Camillus places his hand upon the goddess and prays and beseeches her but that it was according to certain bystanders that the statue gave an answer in saying that she was ready and willing to go along with them. Peter points out that in Livy there is no touch (ἁπτομενον) or prayer (ευχηθαι) of Camillus, nor is he even present. His own citation of Livy, however, omits History 5.22.7 in which Camillus’ prayers and subsequent dedication of the statue of Juno are mentioned. While it seems likely, as per the conclusion of Peter, that Plutarch is citing from memory rather than a text physically before him, the dissonance is not as severe as Peter claims.

129 Peter, Die Quellen, 19.
basis of these prior observations and various other differences he nevertheless concludes that Livy was not likely the primary source for Plutarch and suggests instead that it was Dionysius who again served this function. These arguments, however, along with Plutarch’s alleged inaccurate recollection of Livy (see n. 129), are not as decisive as Peter seems to suggest. While for the purpose of this project it is not necessary to reach a definitive conclusion on Plutarch’s purported ‘primary’ source, the weaknesses in Peter’s arguments and my own analysis below point most clearly to Livy as fulfilling this role.

4.4.1 Analysis of Order and Selection in the Camillus

As expected when we compare an outline of Plutarch’s Camillus to the accounts in both Dionysius (table 4.8) and Livy (table 4.10) there are, among other differences, a number of

130 Regarding this conclusion see Peter (Die Quellen, 23–27) who plots out the various parallel passages and notes how Plutarch even takes over an error of Dionysius (Rom. Ant. 6.95), namely that after peace was reached with the Latin cities an additional day was added to the Latin festival (cf. Cam. 2). He then explains some apparent exceptions to his hypothesis. He admits that Plutarch uses Livy in chapter 28 insofar as he agrees with Livy that 1000 pounds of gold was given to the Gauls (25 Talents in Dionysius). He nevertheless states that only this detail has been taken over from Livy with the remainder of the narrative wholly from Dionysius who is his chief source.

131 For example, Peter’s statement that Cam. 42 takes over the error of Rom. Ant. 6.95 (about adding an extra day to the Latin festival) fails to mention that it was a ‘fourth’ day added in Plutarch (versus a ‘third’ Dionysius) or that these notices occur in different historical contexts (at the conclusion of the Camillus in Plutarch but associated with Coriolanus, one hundred years earlier, in Dionysius). Hence while possibly taken over (inaccurately) from Dionysius, such an observation suggests he does so on the basis of memory rather than direct (visual) utilization. Likewise in Cam. 28 (par. Dionysius, Rom. Ant. 13.11 and Livy, History 5.48), where Plutarch is said to only have taken over the detail about 1000 pounds of gold from Livy (25 Talents in Dionysius) with the remaining narrative coming from Dionysius, Plutarch’s narrative is (untypically) longer than Dionysius (Rom. Ant. 13.8.4-9) and in this agrees with Livy albeit Peter notes that Dionysius only exists in fragments and may have been originally longer (Die Quellen, 23). This is evidenced in details shared with Livy but missing from Dionysius: e.g., the suffering of the Gauls that, together with the suffering of the besieged Romans, leads both sides to seek a peaceful agreement (hence the payment of gold); and the fact that it is Sulpicius (military tribune) and Brennus (the Gallic chief) that meet to make the agreement. It is true that only Plutarch and Dionysius explicitly state that the Romans consented to the payment of the tribute (in Livy Camillus arrives and brings deliverance before an agreement has been reached). Nevertheless in Dionysius the Romans submitted on account of their ignorance of what was going on elsewhere with Camillus (Rom. Ant. 13.9.2) whereas in Plutarch there is explicit disagreement among the Romans as to whether they should submit and their eventual consent was on account of necessity (ἀναγγέλατο). In addition to this only Livy and Plutarch go on to narrate the subsequent arrival of Camillus and his defeat of the Gauls (Cam. 29; History 5.49). Other details, such as Brennus adding his sword to the weigh scales when the Romans complained of the unjust set up, are shared among all three accounts. Such observations imply the opposite conclusion to Peter, namely that Plutarch is more dependent on Livy than Dionysius.

132 Another possibility is that Plutarch utilizes both Dionysius and Livy as primary sources but conflates them. Downing, for example, argues for this in the particular instance of the Alban Lake episode and Camillus’ siege of Veii (“Compositional Conventions,” especially pp. 76–82).
additions (table 4.9), omissions (table 4.11) and order transformations (table 4.12) which can be explored in relation to our chosen rhetorical conventions of narrative. Beginning with additions and expansions it is clear from comparison of the parallel outline in Dionysius’ *Roman Antiquities* (table 4.8) that Plutarch has provided a significantly expanded account of the life of Camillus. Table 4.9 lists fourteen distinct additions in Plutarch’s account most of which can be readily explained on the basis of the narrative element of person. Hence, for example, the opening paragraph in *Cam. 1.1–2.2* is typically encomiastic and extols the military and political successes of his chosen hero. Interestingly Plutarch says little about Camillus’ origin and what he does say is essentially negative, namely that the house of Furii was of no great importance at the time (Οὐπω ... οὖσας μεγάλης ἐπιφανείας). Furthermore he says nothing of his education or upbringing and goes out of his way to point out that he was never once made consul (*Cam. 1.1*). This stands in stark contrast to the *Coriolanus* where the distinction of the house of Marcii is explicitly stated and Marcius’ early nurture and training are highlighted (*Cor. 1–2*). It is true, as stated already, that the opening of the *Coriolanus* functions as much negatively as positively (his education was deficient) and Marcius ultimately ends up as a negative example. Given that these opening comments on Marcius’ education appear to have been created by Plutarch based on later inferences (see above), it seems reasonable to expect that he would create an appropriately positive opening account of Camillus’ education given his function as a positive example. The more stark opening account in *Camillus*, however, may have more to do with limits on Plutarch’s willingness to create material for which he has no available source,

---

133 It should be noted that some of these additions stand adjacent to one another, albeit as apparently distinct literary units (e.g., numbers 1 and 2), while others are clustered together within a larger narrative unit (especially numbers 6 to 10 which are all part of a narrative recounting the retribution that comes upon the Romans owing to their treatment of Camillus). It is nevertheless true that most of the additions are separated in Plutarch by some kind of intervening material (e.g., between numbers 7, 8, and 9) and hence my numbering system. In addition several of the listed additions actually contain a number of distinct units within themselves (especially numbers 8, 12, and 13). Despite these difficulties along with challenge of identifying exactly what constitutes a unit within the narrative, the actual “number” of additions is less important than the general sense that Plutarch added much to the narrative (as seen by considering tables 4.8 and 4.9 together).

134 Notably Livy records that Camillus was among the tribunes with consular authority in 403 B.C.E. (*History*, 5.1) but according to the Loeb editor this was likely an error on Livy’s part (see editors note in Livy, *The History of Rome, Books 5–7*, trans. B. O. Foster, Loeb Classical Library [Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1924–2002], 2–3, n. 1.).
especially as regards education. Similarly the lack of prior nobility associated with the house of Furii is perhaps just an acknowledgement of reality but one that Plutarch nevertheless turns to his advantage by noting that Camillus was thereby the first to achieve fame (δόξα) in his family and hence it was the explicit result of his “own efforts” (αὑτοῦ) and ability especially in regard to his military and political successes. Finally the fact that he never became consul is mentioned only to explain this apparent anomaly as resulting from wise reluctance on Camillus’ behalf in relation to the political climate of his day (Cor. 1.3), thus making it an encomiastic comment.

Other additions are clearly encomiastic such as the political success of rebuilding the city in the aftermath of the Gallic invasion (Cor. 30–32), the various military successes that follow (Cam. 33–38), and the final political success whereby he leads the Senate in its decision to appoint a consul from among the plebeians and thereby placate the wrath of the people thus resulting in great grief when he eventually died from a later plague (Cor. 42–43) (see additions 12, 13, 14 in table 4.9). In each of these additions it is therefore clear that the material contributes encomiastically to Plutarch’s portrait of Camillus. Plutarch makes a further addition in his introduction to the siege of Veii (addition number 2 in table 4.9) where the city is described as a “barrier and bulwark of Tuscany” that, despite being crushed in great battles, was nevertheless well supplied and strong in the face of the Roman siege such that things were “no less laborious and difficult for the besiegers” (Cam. 2.4). In one sense this is not so much an addition as a transformation of order whereby Dionysius’ short notice about Veii, it being in no way inferior to Rome (Rom. Ant. 12.15), has been moved up from a later place in the narrative to become its head. This not only enhances narrative clarity by appropriately describing the city of Veii at the

---

135 It is good to bear in mind that even when he appears to be engaging in this kind of creative writing (as in the opening chapters of Coriolanus) we can never be sure of what additional (lost) sources were available to him. Alternatively it may be that he engages in such creativity sparingly and only when he finds it most necessary for the development and evaluation of his character.

136 While the Senate as a whole plays a key role in averting seditious speeches against Camillus during this period (Cam. 31), Camillus’ handling of the situation (especially in dealing with the Senate) eventually results in the city being rebuilt. To this extent, despite popular discontent, he is clearly a more successful politician than was Marcius.
outset, rather than as a somewhat awkward aside later in the account, but also enhances the person of Camillus indirectly (insofar as he was the one to eventually lead the way in the capture of the city) by highlighting the city’s wealth, military strength, and well stocked nature thus making it apparently impenetrable.\footnote{The primary reason I have labeled it an addition is owing to the very different nature of the encomium of Veii whereby Plutarch focuses on its wealth, refinement, provisions and military might while Dionysius only speaks of the fertile and healthy environment in which Veii is situated. As such it may be better described as both an order change and a transformation of content. In relation to Cam. 2.3-6 as a whole, however, it is noteworthy that while Plutarch potentially picks up the encomium of Veii from Dionysius, there are various details that he appears to pick from Livy. In particular this includes the wars with the Capenates and Falerii, the burdensome taxes (History, 5.10), and Roman political tension resulting from the lengthy siege (History, 5.1-2.12). It might therefore be more accurate to describe this brief introduction to the siege of Veii as involving transformation of order and abbreviation/conflation of details picked up from both Dionysius and Livy.}

Encomiastic motives are less obvious for the additions that relate Camillus’ troubles following a forgotten vow and the subsequent series of events that lead up to his exile (additions 2, 3, and 4 in table 4.9) as well as most of the additions related to the Gaul’s besieging of Rome (additions 6 to 11). Regarding the first set of additions Camillus is said to be guilty of wanton extravagance (\textit{Cam.} 7.1) and lying about a vow (\textit{Cam.} 7.5). These faults, along with his opposition to those attempting to divide the city (\textit{Cam.} 7.2-4 and 11), eventually result in his exile (\textit{Cam.} 12) and have negative implications for Camillus’ character. While Plutarch has not shied away from shortcomings in his hero, however, these additions nevertheless result in contributing to the encomium of Camillus. Hence, in stark contrast to Coriolanus, Camillus \textit{chooses his own exile} (albeit in anger) and, rather than determine to take revenge himself, prays to the gods that the Romans might speedily repent (\textit{ταχὺ ἐρχομένους μετανοήσαι}). While the subsequent events in which the Romans are defeated and besieged by the Gauls do not directly involve Camillus (who is in exile), they nevertheless contribute encomiastically to the chosen hero. Hence Plutarch explicitly states that the suffering of the Romans at the hands of the Gauls is a matter of justice and retribution in the wake of Camillus’ exile and imprecations (\textit{Cam.} 13.2). The climactic vindication comes in the fact that Camillus himself is not only restored as dictator by the besieged Romans but returns as deliverer to the city that rejected him (\textit{Cam.} 29).
Insofar as the basic plot is present in Dionysius in a much abbreviated form it is tempting to conclude that the multiple additions in Plutarch’s Camillus represent a clear departure from his tendency toward conciseness so evident in the *Coriolanus*.  

It is precisely at this point, however, that we need to pay closer attention to a comparison of Plutarch with Livy (table 4.10). It becomes immediately clear that nearly all of Plutarch’s ‘additions’ to Dionysius have parallels in Livy (as per table 4.9) such that if Livy is taken as Plutarch’s primary source they are no longer ‘additions’ but simply material he retains (for the same encomiastic reasons noted above). This leaves only three genuine ‘additions’: his general introduction (*Cam. 1.1–2.2*); the retribution upon the Romans at the hands of the Gauls (*Cam. 13.2*); and his digression regarding the day of Allia (*Cam. 19*). The first of these additions is readily explicable in encomiastic terms (as above) and in relation to the need for an introductory statement for his *bi/oj* (as with the opening chapters of the *Coriolanus*). The second one represents a minor but important addition to Livy identifying the Gallic defeat of Rome as retribution (by the gods) upon the Romans following their mistreatment of Camillus and, thereby, contributing to Plutarch’s encomium of the latter. It is only with the third of these additions (digression on the day of Allia) that there is no obvious reason for Plutarch’s change. This is not unlike the digressions we saw in the *Coriolanus* (see table 4.3) although here there is no obvious encomiastic reason for the addition and it may be that Plutarch has simply included it because he perceived it as something of interest to his readers. As with the similar instances of digression in the *Coriolanus*, however, Plutarch once again keeps it sufficiently short so as to avoid violating Theon’s virtue of clarity.

If we move to a consideration of omissions we see a similar but opposite phenomenon to that which we have just seen in relation to additions, namely that there are very few omissions

---

138 Including Camillus’ exile, prayer for vengeance, resultant capture by the Gauls, and subsequent victorious return (*Rom. Ant. 13.5–6*).
139 Plutarch, when compared to Dionysius, had 20 omissions and 7 additions in the *Coriolanus* whereas the *Camillus* has 4 omissions and 14 additions (see tables 4.2, 4.3, 4.9 and 4.11).
140 These constitute additions number 1, 6, and part of 8 in table 4.9.
relative to Dionysius’ *Roman Antiquities* but many relative to Livy’s *History*. As with the opposite phenomenon in relation to additions (many relative to Dionysius and few relative to Livy) this makes sense and is consistent with what we saw in relation to the *Coriolanus* (where brevity was an important virtue) only if Livy is taken to be the primary source for Plutarch. In considering the actual omissions the list in table 4.11 indicates that most are explicable in relation to the narrative element of person along with the virtues of clarity and conciseness, as was the case with the *Coriolanus*. Hence Plutarch frequently omits information that he deems irrelevant to his βιος and simultaneously accomplishes clarity and conciseness by omitting what is unnecessary and superfluous. Conciseness is also accomplished by not going too far back in time, which is particularly relevant for omission number (1) whereby political details from the time prior to the life of his hero are deemed irrelevant.

There are exceptions in table 4.11 where omissions occur in relation to information that is not irrelevant to a βιος of Camillus. In particular this is the case for numbers (6), (9), and (14) which (respectively) recount his writing of a letter to the Senate, his raids on the Falerrian countryside, and various political and military successes. Such omissions are best explained on the basis of clarity and conciseness whereby Plutarch is clearly not constrained to include all the details of Camillus’ life that he discovers in his source(s). Rather he selects and shapes an appropriate number of examples to demonstrate his overall thesis regarding the military and political prowess of his hero. As such when it comes to raids on the Falerrian countryside (omission

---

141As per table 4.11 Plutarch has only four omissions from Dionysius of which two are paralleled in Livy whereas seventeen (out of nineteen) are omissions from Livy. As noted above in relation to additions, there are challenges in identifying the exact number of omissions insofar as one omission may contain several short episodes (e.g., numbers 1 and 14) while others may be seen as omission of detail within a story (e.g., number 6). Precision in this regard is illusive and less important than obtaining a clear grasp of the nature and extent of omitted material in general.

142Namely what initially looks like a narrative expansion (of Dionysius), potentially violating brevity, turns out to be narrative compression (of Livy). In the two cases where Plutarch omits something from Dionysius that does not have a parallel in Livy (number 3 and 19 in table 4.11) each is readily explained on the basis of clarity, conciseness and person (as with most omissions - see below).

143This appears to be the case with most omissions in table 4.11. The exceptions (numbers 6, 7, 9, and 14) will be discussed below.

144It could be argued that such details are essential to context but I suspect this is a modern notion. In relation to Plutarch I believe he assumed a basic knowledge of the historical context of his *Lives* (insofar as providing such seems to be quite irrelevant for him). A cursory look at the introductions to various *Lives* confirms this.
number 9) Camillus’ military success has already been noted (such as in the siege of Veii) and the primary focus of the account becomes the just manner in which he deals with the treacherous school teacher. Preliminary military successes are therefore irrelevant. Likewise the various military and political activities in Livy 6.4–10 (omission number 14) come at a stage in the narrative where Camillus’ ability in these arenas is well established. Further illustrations, therefore, are superfluous and can be omitted on the basis of conciseness and clarity. Regarding Camillus’ letter to the Senate (omission number 6) this is essentially a digression within the episode recounting the conquering of Veii. In omitting this detail Plutarch heightens the drama by maintaining the intensity of the account and in essence, therefore, appears to be omitting an unnecessary detail (hence greater clarity and conciseness). Finally in regard to omission number (7) in table 4.11 it could be said that the Roman rejoicing over the Veii victory serves to heighten the military prowess of Camillus. Insofar as it does not directly mention Camillus it may simply have been deemed another unnecessary detail to be omitted on the basis of clarity and conciseness. Alternatively it could be read as a deliberate omission insofar as Plutarch is focusing at this point in the narrative on the political woes of Camillus (in the aftermath of the Veii defeat) whereby such rejoicing goes against what he seeks to highlight. In that respect it may well have been omitted in relation to the narrative element of person but in such a way as to heighten Camillus’ troubles.

Very similar to the phenomenon of omission is that of abbreviation. When Dionysius is taken as the primary source then Plutarch not only makes numerous additions (as above) but also expands parallel narratives thus demonstrating no clear and consistent tendency toward abbreviation (as he did in relation to the Coriolanus). When Plutarch is taken as primarily dependent upon Livy, however, an explanation for this apparently aberrant phenomenon is readily at hand. Not only can the multiple additions be explained with reference to Livy (as above) but the two strongest examples of expansion in Plutarch are actually abbreviations of...
Indeed multiple examples of abbreviation begin to appear of which several of the more dramatic ones are listed in table 4.12. In contrast there is only one clear example of expansion in relation to Livy, namely when Camillus defeats the Gauls (History, 6.42.4-8, Cam. 40–41). The net result, when Livy is taken as the primary source, is once again that the narrative virtues of clarity and conciseness exercise a strong influence upon Plutarch’s utilization of sources.

If we turn finally to transformations of order several differences can be detected in relation to both Dionysius and Livy (table 4.13). In relation to those sections of Dionysius that Plutarch recounts in a different order most can be accounted for (at least in part) on the basis of clarity. The first of these, namely the encomium of Veii as the bulwark of Tuscany and the introduction to the siege (Cam. 2.3-5; cf. Rom. Ant. 12.15), has already been discussed above. Regarding the switching of the two notices about Camillus becoming dictator and his capture of Veii (number 3 in table 4.13) Plutarch’s order, which gives notice of Camillus becoming dictator first, makes both chronological and logical sense and hence enhances clarity. This is even more evident in relation to the transfer of Juno to Rome (from Veii) (number 4 in table 4.13) whereupon the statue is said to have spoken. While Dionysius recounts this after the siege of Falerii (Rom. Ant. 13.3), Plutarch provides it a more suitable narrative context, namely that of Camillus’ prayers immediately after Veii has been captured (Cam. 5). Such is less obviously the case when Plutarch changes the order of Camillus’ fine and exile (number 5 in table 4.13). While Dionysius has him fined prior to his self determined exile (Rom. Ant. 12.5), in Plutarch the exile

---

146 Namely in Cam. 5 and 36 as per the previous footnote. Both examples occur in table 4.12.
147 The table indicates the number of pages taken up by each account in the Loeb editions. Insofar as they are writing in different languages a straight word count is not necessarily an accurate representation of comparative length. In speaking of the number of pages I am obviously providing a rough approximation. The number of alleged expansions and the degree of differences between the accounts are of sufficient magnitude, however, that rough approximations are sufficient for the purpose of demonstrating Plutarch’s tendency to abbreviate in relation Livy. Regarding the first of these listed abbreviations this has also been listed under additions (table 4.9) but as per comments above on this particular passage it is perhaps better read as an abbreviation and conflation of details taken over from both Dionysius and Livy.
148 This amounts to three pages in Plutarch versus a single page in Livy. Notably, however, a much longer account (approximately four pages) occurs in Dionysius (Rom. Ant. 14.8–10) most of which is a speech by Camillus.
149 Includes numbers 1 to 6 in the top half of table 4.13.
150 It has already been noted that this introductory notice in Plutarch conflates details from Dionysius and Livy. Insofar as a more logical order enhances clarity the transfer of this encomiastic statement from its later position in the narrative to the introduction of the entire Veii episode would appear to be related to this virtue.
comes first and the fines are applied in his absence (Cam. 12–13). It may be that Plutarch’s change is encomiastic insofar as Camillus is no longer seen to avoid the fine but rather is simply ignorant of it and in that sense is more readily compliant and less obstinate than was Coriolanus. Notably in each of these last three cases Plutarch’s order agrees with that of Livy and as such it may be that he is simply following this source rather than transforming the order of Dionysius. Nevertheless to the extent that he has any awareness of Dionysius’ account his choice to follow Livy can be understood in terms of clarity.

In relation to the digression on the Gaul’s taste for wine (number 6 in table 4.13) Plutarch chooses to place the digression at the introduction of his account about the Gaul’s successful invasion of Rome (Cam. 15) rather than at the end (cf. Dionysius, Rom. Ant. 13.10–11). This mirrors the kind of order change seen in relation to the encomium of Veii mentioned above (number 1 in table 4.13) and likewise seems to enhance clarity. Plutarch again follows Livy more closely in this, noting that he also relates these digressions nearer to the start of the account about the Gauls successful invasion of Rome (History, 5.33–35), albeit he abbreviates Livy’s narrative.151

In relation to Pontius Cominius’ secret journey into Rome and Camillus’ re-institution as dictator (number 7 in table 4.13) Plutarch switches the order of Dionysius whereby Camillus’ re-appointment as dictator comes first rather than second (cf. Cam. 24–26 and Rom. Ant. 13.6–7). This results in a very different reason being given for Cominius’ secret passage into Rome. In Dionysius he informs the Romans of the Gaul’s flight whereas in Plutarch he seeks Senate re-election of Camillus as dictator. In this Plutarch again agrees with the order of Livy though he differs in one important detail, namely that whereas it is the Romans who seek Senate approval (for Camillus’ return as dictator) in Livy, Plutarch has Camillus himself seek this prior to his being willing to act. The net effect is encomiastic enhancement of Camillus’ character insofar as

151 As per omission number 10 in table 4.11.
he is unwilling to act without Senate approval and hence the narrative element of person provides good reason for the changes observed here.

One change to Dionysius’ order that is not paralleled in Livy involves the calamity of Alban Lake (numbers 2 and 8 in table 4.13). In both Dionysius (Rom. Ant. 12.10–12) and Livy (History 5.15–17) the Romans send for the Delphic oracle immediately upon hearing about the overflow of the Alban Lake. Plutarch, however, delays this until after the episode (shared with both Dionysius and Livy) of the captured citizen of Veii who reveals the secret of the Alban Lake whereupon the Romans perform sacrifices to divert the water (having obtained the oracle from Delphi) (Cam. 3–4). While the details as such are similar, the net result is a more concise and clear account.

In his retelling of Camillus’ troubles after the siege of Veii Plutarch transforms the account so as to enhance clarity, conciseness and focus upon the person of Camillus (number 9 in table 4.13). The omission of Roman rejoicing and the election of new tribunes has already been mentioned (numbers 7 and 8 in table 4.11) and the account as a whole amounts to about three pages in Plutarch versus six pages in Livy. Plutarch goes further in this episode, however, by significantly reordering its various components. The story is essentially one of political trouble that comes in the wake of victory over Veii. The problems include the wanton extravagance of Camillus in his victory celebration (parading through the city on white horses), Camillus’ taking back part of the soldier’s spoils in order to fulfill a forgotten vow to Apollo, and political divisions over a proposed colonization of Veii by half of the Roman Plebeians (who want half of Senate to go with them but the Senate opposes this idea). While Camillus features strongly in Livy, Plutarch’s omissions (mentioned above) serve to heighten this focus. In addition he reorders the account so as to essentially make it into a list of three reasons why Camillus lost favor

---

152 Referred to in Plutarch as ‘noble restraint’ (ἐὐλαβείας καὶ καλοκαγαθίας) (Cam. 24.3).
153 Key to this is the delayed mention of the Delphic oracle until the end of the narrative whereby it is only mentioned once and provides a fitting conclusion since the message received leads to their performing the sacrifices that divert the water. Regarding conciseness the account is 4 pages in Livy, 3 pages in Dionysius and only 2 pages in Plutarch.
154 These again are approximate representations of Camillus 7-8 and History 5.23–25 and 28.
with the populous, namely: (1) his wanton extravagance; (2) his opposition to the laws of colonization; and (3) his vow to the Delphian god (Cam. 7). The effect of Plutarch’s explicit list is once again to heighten the focus on Camillus (i.e. this is not merely a story of divisions between plebeians and senators but rather a recounting of the reasons why the plebeians are displeased with Camillus). Furthermore, when compared to Livy, the second and third items in the list are switched for reasons not hard to detect insofar as Plutarch moves directly from these into recounting how the Senate dealt with the issue of his forgotten vow, namely by having the soldiers return one tenth of the booty and then sending a golden bowl to Delphi (including the story of their encounter with pirates and later release). In Livy the problem of the vow (5.23.8-12) is separated from the account of the tithe to Apollos (golden bowl) (5.25.7-10) which is likewise separated from the pirate incident (5.28.2-5). In Plutarch he appropriately draws all these components together by recounting the resolution immediately after the problem. This necessitated making the ‘vow’ problem the last in his list (hence the switch) and also explains why he would refer to this as the “strongest and most apparent reason why the multitude hated (Camillus)” (Cam. 7.4). This enhances both conciseness and clarity by keeping related material together and providing clear reasons why Camillus found disfavor among the Plebeians. While this obviously casts Camillus in negative light, it is only in relation to his ‘vow’ that Plutarch states that the Roman populace had “a plausible, though not very just ground of complaint” (Cam. 7.4-5). Taken together with the lack of booty following the siege of Falerri\(^{155}\) and his continued opposition to the proposals about dividing the city (colonizing) this results in his self-exile (Cam. 12). In Plutarch’s retelling, which includes omissions number 7 to 10 in table 4.11, the effect is a clear focus on explaining why Camillus came to find such disfavor with the Plebeians so as to result in his exile. The manner in which Plutarch recounts these matters is not only more concise and clear but makes it plain that Camillus himself was essentially in the right (notwithstanding the legitimate complaint in relation to the vow), something made abundantly

\(^{155}\)In this case it is clearly not related to any rash vow of Camillus but rather his just action in relation to the treacherous school teacher which resulted in the city’s voluntary surrender. On this story see below.
clear when it comes to retribution upon the city following Camillus’ prayers (Cam. 12–29). Within this latter section Plutarch has another instance of re-ordering Livy when he relates Camillus’ self exile and prayer prior to the portent of the voice heard by Marcus Caedicius (warning of the Gaul’s attack) (number 10 in table 4.13). By so doing Plutarch makes both the portents and the actuality of the Gallic attack into a direct outcome of Camillus’ prayers to the gods whereas in Livy the portent of the voice comes before Camillus’ exile. This not only adds clarity (namely the portent comes as an announcement of retribution in response to Roman unjust treatment of Camillus) but obviously heightens the element of person by making it clear that it was not merely unjust actions in general that brought about such retribution but their injustice toward Camillus and his prayers for divine vengeance. It also highlights clear narrative causes for what happens in relation to the Gallic invasions. Thus the element of person (βίος focus) along with the virtues of clarity and conciseness appear front and centre in this retelling of Livy by Plutarch. Regarding these three order changes in relation to Livy (numbers 8 to 10 in table 4.13) it is clear that the first two cannot be explained on the basis of Dionysius, who agrees with Livy regarding the first and has no parallel for the second. It may be a different matter in relation to the third change (number 10 in table 4.13), where Plutarch agrees with Dionysius in placing the portent of the Gaul’s attack after the exile of Camillus, but even here Plutarch differs from Dionysius in both order and content (e.g., order change number 6 in table 4.13; additions 6 to 9 in table 4.9).156

In general therefore an examination of additions, omissions and order changes suggests that Plutarch preferred Livy over Dionysius as a primary source although changes in relation to either can be explained generally with reference to the narrative elements and virtues of person, clarity and conciseness. Furthermore while Livy may be the primary source, Dionysius cannot be ruled out as a secondary source.157

156 In comparison to the Coriolanus it may be recalled that there were only four transformations of order and in all instances Plutarch agreed with Livy.
157 This recognizes that he may be working with both sources at once or primarily from memory of the two or any other reasonable variation.
4.4.2 Narrative Adaptation in Plutarch’s Camillus: The Siege of Falerri

Moving from a macro-level to a micro-level analysis I will now examine the narrative of the siege of Falerri and the treacherous school teacher (Dionysius Rom. Ant. 13.1–2, Cam. 9–10; Livy 5.26–27). The basic plot involves Camillus as military tribune leading the Romans in a siege against the city of Falerii whereupon the city was led to surrender by an unexpected means. Specifically the city’s school teacher deceived the boys under his charge and led them into the Roman camp so as to deliver the city up to the Romans. Camillus, however, has him flogged and sent back on account of his treachery whereupon the city decides to surrender in response to his honorable actions. The parallel accounts in Dionysius, Plutarch and Livy are given in tables 4.14 and 4.15, while the basic plot line of the three different accounts is laid out for comparison in table 4.16.

A quick comparison of the three accounts can be done by examining the various elements of the plot in table 4.16 which divides the narrative into five major sections. It can readily be seen that, as with the previous discussion of macro-order and selection, Plutarch’s narrative is closer to Livy than Dionysius. Hence when Plutarch is compared with Dionysius his account is almost twice as long (495 words versus 265 words in Greek) owing to a number of expansions. This is especially the case in relation to the introduction and conclusion of the narrative (§1 and §5 in table 4.16) which together account for 203 of the extra 230 Greek words in Plutarch.158 The difference between the accounts, however, is not simply a matter of expansion, as if Plutarch simply preferred a longer narrative in defiance of the virtue of conciseness (contrary to his consistent procedure in relation to the Coriolanus). Rather, while there is a mixture of additions to (numbers 1, 2, 10, 11, 16, 19, 23, 24, and 25 in table 4.16) and expansions of (numbers 7 and 22 in table 4.16) Dionysius’ narrative, there are places where Plutarch abbreviates (number 13 in table 4.16), omits (numbers 14, 15, 17, 21 in table 4.16), or simply presents with a similar word...

---

158 The various additions can be seen in table 4.16 (numbers 1, 2, 10, 11, 16, 19, 23, 24, 25). In the introduction (Cam. 9.1–10.1a) Plutarch has 132 words in place in place of Dionysius’ 5 words (Rom. Ant. 13.1.1a) and in the conclusion he has 95 words (Cam. 10.6-7) in place of 19 (Rom. Ant. 13.2.3c).
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count (numbers 12 and 18 in table 4.16). Hence while the net effect is a significantly expanded account, this is the result of a wide variety of editorial adaptations. As with our discussion of macro-order and selection, however, many of these changes can be explained not only on the basis of the elements (especially encomiastic reasons related to person) and virtues (especially conciseness and clarity) of narrative when Plutarch is compared with Dionysius, but also when Plutarch is compared with Livy. Insofar as Livy is written in Latin it is harder to make a direct comparison in relation to style or word count although with the latter the differences are readily apparent in English translation where Plutarch’s account (approximately 712 words) is less than two thirds the length of Livy’s (approximately 1153 words). Where parallel elements are compared (in table 4.16) Plutarch’s account tends to be shorter (numbers 2, 11, 16, 24 and 25) or of similar length (numbers 1, 12, 13, 18) albeit occasionally longer (numbers 7 and 8, 22 and 23). There are two additions relative to Livy (numbers 10 and 19 = 102 words in English)\(^\text{159}\) and five omissions (numbers 3, 4, 5, 6, 20 = 264 words in English). When comparing all three (Dionysius, Plutarch and Livy) it is evident that Plutarch makes more additions to Dionysius\(^\text{160}\) of which several are shared with Livy (numbers 1, 2, 11, 16, 23, 24, 25). None of Plutarch’s omissions from Dionysius (numbers 14, 15, 17, 21) or Livy (numbers 3, 4, 5, 6, 20) is shared with one another and, as has already been shown, while the omissions from Livy outweigh the additions, the reverse is true in relation to Dionysius.\(^\text{161}\) The general impression, as already stated, is that Plutarch’s account of the siege presents a concise retelling of Livy but an expanded retelling of Dionysius. Given the greater degree of overlap with Livy and the tendency toward conciseness in relation to the Coriolanus (in addition to comments above regarding macro-order and selection) it seems far more likely that Livy is the primary source for Plutarch’s narrative. Additional details of the narrative will therefore be discussed from this standpoint by considering

\(^{159}\)Addition number 19 is perhaps better read as a parallel to Livy (describing the return of the teacher into Falerii).

\(^{160}\)Nine additions to Dionysius (approximately 290 words in Greek) versus two to Livy (approximately 78 words in Greek; 102 words in English).

\(^{161}\)Omissions from Livy are 264 English words versus 102 English words of addition. In relation to Dionysius Plutarch adds approximately 290 Greek words and omits approximately 109 Greek words.
the influence of Theon’s narrative elements and virtues in relation to the various sections of the Falerri siege as outline in table 4.16.

Beginning with the “Introduction to the Siege” (§1) it has already been noted that Plutarch expands Dionysius but abbreviates Livy. The expansion (of Dionysius) is no mere addition of details (e.g., the election of Camillus as military tribune along with five others) but includes the explicit indication that the war with the Faliskans was the ostensible cause for his election insofar as such “an emergency was thought to demand a leader with ... dignity and reputation” (Cam. 9.1) since Falerri was such a “strong city and well equipped with all the munitions of war” (Cam. 9.2). In this respect the action is depicted as both ‘necessary’ and ‘difficult’ and one that is carried out in a manner that is ‘willingly’ and ‘by force.’ The action is further ‘advantageous’ politically in that it provides a distraction for men who would otherwise become prey to seditious leaders at home in Rome and in that sense is somewhat carried out by deceit. Such differences are clearly accounted for, at least in part, by looking to Livy as Plutarch’s primary source albeit he tells the story more succinctly through various abbreviations and omissions (e.g., omission of names of other elected tribunes). Among the most interesting of omissions are the details of skirmishes and Roman victories over the Faliskans prior to the siege (numbers 3 to 6 in table 4.16), especially since Camillus plays such a key role in this military success. The omission of such encomiastic material by Plutarch is best explained on the basis of the virtue of conciseness (omission of unnecessary detail). At the same time he heightens the encomium of Camillus by omitting the names the other elected military tribunes and by subtly changing the statement about the political advantages of the war (as a deliberate distraction from political troubles at home) such that it becomes the intention of Camillus rather than the Senate in general.

162 Plutarch notes how the war came at an ‘opportune time’ when the people were being urged to pass a law about dividing the city, something that the Senate (including Camillus) resisted. Hence the advantage of the war is explicitly stated as turning the thoughts of citizens to other matters such that they would forget about their political ambitions at home (Cam. 9.1-2).

163 Although Plutarch does not offer any negative comments on the action but rather seems to regard it as an honorable political strategy, a “fitting and sovereign remedy which the Romans used, like good physicians, thereby expelling from the body politic its troublesome distempers” (Cam. 9.2).
Furthermore the statement about the need for a leader with “dignity and reputation” (*Cam. 9.1*) is not found in Livy. This section also includes one of two elements added by Plutarch to both Dionysius and Livy, namely the statement about Faliskan confidence in the face of the siege such that they go about the city dressed in the garb of peace (*Cam. 10.1*). This merely adds to the dramatic effect of the teacher’s actions in that the city was not feeling the pressure of military might but was about to be overcome on account of treachery within. The overall effect of Plutarch’s editorial changes is therefore to provide a more concise account and yet with the details retained there is a heightening of encomiastic elements (narrative element of *person*) with respect to Camillus. This includes a clarification of *cause* insofar as the *action* occurs not only from necessity of war but also for political advantage at home. This is stated with somewhat greater clarity in Plutarch and is more clearly associated with Camillus himself, hence making it encomiastic.¹⁶⁵

In section §2 of table 4.16 (“Teacher Delivers Boys of City to Camillus”) we see another element in Plutarch that is shared with Livy alone, namely the description of the Faliskan practice of having a common teacher (number 11 in table 4.16). The brief digression may have been felt necessary by Plutarch in addressing his audience¹⁶⁶ but is nevertheless told more succinctly (48 English words in place of 68 in Livy) without any loss of important detail. The remaining two elements of this section (numbers 12 and 13 in table 4.16) are of similar length and content in Plutarch and Livy albeit Plutarch adds the statement that the teacher admits to seeking favor with Camillus in place of his rightful duties (*Cam. 10.3*).¹⁶⁷ The primary difference in Dionysius involves a statement up front about the possible motives of the teacher, who either

---

¹⁶⁴ Noting that in Livy it is simply stated that the war was a pretext “but what they really wanted was a man who would combat the lavishness of the tribunes.”

¹⁶⁵ It is also noteworthy that for Livy the events at Falerri are said to occur on account of ‘Fortune’ (*History* 5.26.10). Plutarch’s omission of this detail might also be construed as once again heightening the encomiastic focus though even in Livy it is clear that the role of ‘Fortune’ is to provide an opportunity for Camillus to display “the magnanimity already familiar from his exploits in war” (5.26.10).

¹⁶⁶ Perhaps as an explanation for why only a single teacher was used but also highlighting commonality between Romans and Greeks.

¹⁶⁷ This essentially makes explicit what is otherwise implicit in Livy’s account.
despairs over the fate of the city or seeks personal gain (Rom. Ant. 13.1.1b). The latter is repeated at the conclusion as part of a slightly longer recounting of the nature and purpose of the speech made by the teacher to Camillus (Rom. Ant. 13.1.2b-3). While Dionysius clearly highlights the ‘willing’ nature of the action\textsuperscript{168} and is more explicit in indicating motive, Plutarch’s account is clearly more succinct and potentially adds clarity to the motive by focusing on personal gain, which obviously highlights the treacherous nature of the act (perhaps more so than if the motive were fear).\textsuperscript{169} This also may function encomiastically for Camillus in providing a reason for the punishment and highlighting his own honorable character in clear contrast to that of the teacher.

In general, therefore, Plutarch recounts this section with somewhat heightened clarity and conciseness, both in relation to Dionysius and Livy, and in a manner that indicates the cause (or motive) of the teacher’s treacherous actions more clearly.

Section §3 in table 4.16 (“Camillus Responds to Teacher’s Treachery”) involves Plutarch again following Livy more closely than Dionysius. First he agrees with Livy by omitting the episode in Dionysius where Camillus sends word to the Senate to obtain instruction on what to do with the treacherous teacher (numbers 14 and 15 in table 4.16). Instead Camillus acts autonomously and immediately delivers a speech of condemnation against the teacher (number16 in table 4.16). Camillus’ ability to make a right judgment without recourse to the Senate depicts him as decisive in matters of justice whereby the omission of this detail from Dionysius indicates a relatively enhanced encomium of Camillus in both Plutarch and Livy. At the same time Plutarch enhances conciseness by shortening the speech of Camillus in relation to Livy,\textsuperscript{170} while yet retaining the essence of it, namely that Camillus will not take advantage of

\textsuperscript{168}I.e. “having long planned” to do this (Rom. Ant. 13.1.2b).
\textsuperscript{169}In this regard Dionysius’ account contains some ambiguity in his initial presentation of two possible causes (fear and personal gain), as if either was possible, but then seeming to choose one (personal gain) over the other at the conclusion of his account (without offering reasons for his choice). Plutarch, on the other hand is less explicit in his statement that the teacher sought personal gain, simply indicating that he had chosen favor with Camillus in place of duties as a teacher, but nevertheless recounts things more concisely (e.g., avoiding repetition in relation to the motive of personal gain) and with greater clarity (by avoiding the ambiguity over motives that is present in Dionysius, namely by not mentioning ‘fear’).
\textsuperscript{170}148 English words in Livy becomes 81 English words in Plutarch. There is no such speech in Dionysius.
such a treacherous act but will conquer the city according to the right and just laws of war.\footnote{Plutarch’s Camillus is said to address the speech to “those present” while in Livy it appears more as a direct address to the teacher. There is no obvious significance, however, with respect to this difference.}

Upon receiving word from the Senate (‘to do whatever seemed best to him’) Dionysius has Camillus lead the teacher before the city walls so as to make known his treacherous act (number 17 in table 4.16). Plutarch again follows Livy by omitting this detail\footnote{In reality the revelation of the teacher’s act occurs later in Plutarch’s account as he is being escorted back into the city naked and scourged by the children (Cam. 10.5).} and moving directly to the next episode in Dionysius, namely the punishment of the teacher in which he is stripped and beaten with rods by the very children he had deceptively led out of the city (number 18 in table 4.16). The punishment is retold with much the same detail and without any significant abbreviation or expansion by Plutarch.\footnote{Regarding the details all three accounts agree that the traitor had his hands tied behind his back and was led into the city while being scourged with rods by the boys. Plutarch and Livy add the detail that he was stripped of his clothing. This is explicit in Livy (5.29.9) and initially implicit in Plutarch’s parallel statement that Camillus ordered the teacher’s clothes to be torn in pieces (Cam. 10.4). It is then made explicit in Plutarch’s next paragraph where the children are said to bring the teacher ‘naked’ into the city. Plutarch alone speaks of ‘whips’ (in addition to rods) being given to the boys. As to the length of the account it amounts to 27 and 29 Greek words in Dionysius and Plutarch respectively; it amounts to 39 and 43 English words in Livy and Plutarch respectively.}

In §4 of table 4.16 (“Faliskan Response to the Teacher”) Plutarch differs from both Dionysius and Livy. In Dionysius the boys are welcomed back and the Faliskans are said to punish the teacher themselves “in a manner worthy of his evil intention” (Rom. Ant. 13.2.3). Livy omits mention of any punishment of the teacher by the Faliskans but speaks of their holding a Senate meeting in which their sentiments are changed so as to desire peace with the Romans on account of their revulsion at the behavior of the teacher (History 5.10). Plutarch omits mention of both the Faliskan punishment and the Senate meeting preferring an extended description of the Faliskan’s perception of the teacher’s treachery and their witnessing his return at the hands of the children (who are mistreating him) (Cam. 10.5). Despite the differences, however, he is once again closer to Livy who also speaks of a gathering of people to witness the return of the teacher. Whereas Livy’s account focuses on the Senate deliberations, however, Plutarch focuses on the spectacle of the returning teacher. In one sense this provides what was earlier omitted from ...
Dionysius, namely Camillus’ act of escorting the teacher before the city to make known his treachery (13.2.2b) but Plutarch here agrees with Livy in having this revelation occur after the teacher is stripped and handed over to the children for punishment. The differences in Plutarch are not clearly motivated by Theon’s narrative elements or virtues of clarity and conciseness. The only significant additional detail is the statement that the boys who were leading the teacher back into the city referred to Camillus as “savior and father and god” (*Cam.* 10.5), clearly an encomiastic addition. This, however, leads naturally into the final section of the narrative which focuses on the Faliskan response to Camillus and the Romans.

In this final section (§5) of table 4.16 (“The Faliskan Response to Camillus and Rome - Surrender”) we again see Plutarch offering a significantly expanded version of Dionysius’ simple statement that “the Faliskans handed over their city to Camillus” (*Rom. Ant.* 13.2.3c). He instead parallels the longer version of Livy that speaks of (1) why the Falerians decide to surrender (namely the righteousness of Camillus and the Romans), (2) their envoys to Camillus who are subsequently sent to the Roman Senate to give themselves up in surrender, and finally (3) their payment of tribute to the Romans as part of the terms of peace (Livy, *History* 5.27.11-15; *Cam.* 10.6-7). At the same time Plutarch differs from Livy insofar as the decision of the Falerians to surrender occurs in Livy because of the “honesty of the Romans and the justice of their general” (*History* 5.27.11) on account of which they send envoys to Camillus seeking permission to go the Senate (for the purpose of seeking terms of surrender). In Plutarch the surrender follows immediately upon the declaration of the returning boys, namely their calling Camillus ‘savior, father and god,’ whereupon it is stated that both the parents and the remaining citizens together “fell into astonishment and longing for the righteousness of Camillus” as a result of which they send envoys to him, who in turn sends the envoys onto Rome. Despite obvious similarities there are subtle differences in that Plutarch focuses the Falerian praise entirely upon Camillus and has

---

174His account is of similar length to the parallel in Livy.
175Dionysius, who omits this detail, earlier had Camillus send to the Roman Senate for advice about what to do with the treacherous teacher (numbers 14 and 15 in table 4.16).
their envoys entrust themselves to Camillus who then sends them to the Roman Senate. When it comes to the speech of the envoys in the Roman Senate Plutarch not only replaces direct speech with indirect but retells it more concisely without losing sight of the essential message, namely that the Falerians surrender on account of seeing greater righteousness in the Romans than themselves. Finally while Camillus is merely “thanked” by both sides in Livy, Plutarch has the Senate hand its decision back to him whereupon he becomes responsible for settling the terms of peace (receiving payment from the Falerri but also establishing peace with the Faliskans). These various changes not only produce a more concise account but clearly focus encomiastically upon Camillus, as opposed to the Romans in general (as per Livy), which is once again in keeping with his encomiastic interest. In essence, therefore, the cause of the Falerian surrender in Plutarch is more clearly related to Camillus than to Roman morals in general.

If we turn attention to Theon’s narrative element of time it is seen that Dionysius has little or no specific time markers albeit that he tells a broadly chronological account, both in general and specifically in this narrative. Plutarch gives a few additional time markers insofar as the war with the Faliskans is said to occur at an “opportune time” (ἐν καιρῷ), Camillus is said to have invaded their territory “after his appointment” (aorist participle) as dictator (Cam. 9.1-2), and the school teacher is said to lead the boys out “every day” (ἡμέρας ἕκαστη) thus giving a sense of habitual activity (Cam. 10.2). The idea that a long siege was expected is expressly indicated in Cam. 9.2 (Camillus knows that capturing the city would demand no “slight effort or short time”), although this obviously changes with the actions of the teacher. Plutarch recounts the remainder of the narrative without additional time indicators thus giving the impression of events

176 Over against Livy where the envoys go to Camillus to seek permission to go to the Senate.
177 The speech in Livy is about 127 words in English; the equivalent report of the speech in Plutarch is 45 words.
178 Insofar as this differs from Livy it has an interesting parallel in Dionysius’ earlier statements that the Senate referred the decision about the teacher back to Camillus, an episode omitted from both Plutarch and Livy (numbers 14 and 15 in table 4.16).
179 The terms Falerrians and Faliskans are used somewhat interchangeably in these accounts but according to this final sentence in Plutarch they apparently refer to two different groups of people: the first apparently speaks of those living in the city of Falerri while the latter refers to those living in the larger region of Falisci.
180 Only the second of these (‘after his appointment’), however, is a true chronological marker.
happening in immediate succession. This is narrated, however, in a straightforward chronological fashion as with Dionysius.\(^{181}\) Turning attention to Livy we find a number of time markers including the fact that Camillus was elected at the time of voting for military tribunes (\textit{History} 5.26.1) and that the tribunes made no move against the Faliskans “at the outset of the year ... until” Camillus was elected (26.3). He has Camillus break camp “in the dead of night” and show himself at the “earliest dawn” in order to defeat the enemy camp outside the city (26.6-8).\(^{182}\) He also makes explicit note that “time wore on” such that it began to seem that the struggle “would be as long drawn out as at Veii, had not Fortune, at one stroke, given the Roman general an opportunity to display the magnanimity ... and an early victory” (26.9-10). Livy, as with Plutarch, gives the clear impression that the teacher lead the boys out daily, when he is said to lead them “farther away one day than usual” (27.3-4), and has no delay in Camillus’ action (i.e. sending to the Senate for advice). The remainder of the story is told in simple chronological fashion without explicit time makers. Hence while Plutarch has more explicit time markers than Dionysius, he has less than Livy although several of these occur in sections he omits. In essence, however, there are no significant editorial changes in relation to time markers and each of the accounts are essentially told in basic chronological order.\(^{183}\)

A similar picture emerges when we consider Theon’s narrative element of place in that Livy tends to be the more detailed of the three. All agree that Camillus besieges Falerii, a walled city with gates belonging to the Faliskans, and sets up camp in the vicinity (\textit{Rom. Ant.} 12.1.1-2; \textit{Cam.} 9.1-2 and 10.1-2; \textit{History} 5.26.4 and 8).\(^{184}\) Plutarch makes a brief additional comment about the

\(^{181}\)An apparent exception occurs in \textit{Cam.} 10.6 where, according to the Loeb translation, the Faliskans acted “in haste” when sending envoys to Camillus. These ‘time’ words, however, are not present in the Greek text but are an interpretive addition to the translation.

\(^{182}\)Timing seems to be an important element in relation to making it a surprise attack resulting in defeat for the Faliskans and retreat into their city (with many lives lost in the process).

\(^{183}\)It does need to be born in mind, however, that for both Dionysius and Livy the account occurs within a larger (chronological) historical narrative history of Rome whereas Plutarch is recounting the ‘life’ of an individual. In this respect Plutarch gives almost no time makers at the outset of his narrative but rather proceeds on the assumption that his audience will be familiar with the ‘time’ setting of Camillus’ life (\textit{Cam.} 1).

\(^{184}\)Dionysius also makes mention of citadels (13.2). Plutarch is not explicit about the Roman camp but such is clearly implied when he speaks of besieging the city and Roman guards.
city being “well equipped with all the munitions of war” (Cam. 9.2) though something of this nature might be implied in Dionysius’ comments by the teacher that he was master of neither citadels, nor gates, nor weapons (Rom. Ant. 13.10.2). This is not made explicit in Livy albeit perhaps implied in his comments about how the siege could have become long and drawn out were it not for ‘Fortune.’

Livy, however, is alone in making mention of details about the Faliskan countryside in relation to its farm houses, its rough and broken ground, and roads that were either narrow or steep (History 5.26.4-5). Such details, however, occur in part of the narrative omitted by both Plutarch and Dionysius, namely the battles and skirmishes in the Faliskan countryside prior to the besieging of the city itself (numbers 3 to 6 in table 4.16). In essence Plutarch makes no significant changes to details of place other than omission of details about the Faliskan countryside but, insofar as he chose to omit this entire section of Livy (presumably on grounds of conciseness), these details ceased to be relevant to his own narrative.

In all of the above it is clear that Plutarch’s account of the siege of Falerri is better understood as an abbreviation of Livy than as an expansion of Dionysius. His many editorial changes can be understood in light of the narrative virtues of clarity and conciseness alongside Theon’s narrative elements, especially those of person and cause. There are no obvious instances where the virtue of credibility has motivated a narrative adaptation and the elements of time and place have no significant impact upon Plutarch’s retelling. The evidence is sufficient, nonetheless, to indicate the influence of Theon’s narrative virtues and elements upon Plutarch’s retelling of this story.

4.5 General Conclusions Regarding Narrative Transformation in Josephus and Plutarch

In this chapter I have examined Plutarch’s narrative adaptation of sources (namely Dionysius of Halicarnassus and Livy) in relation to his Coriolanus and Camillus. More specifically I have examined his choices in relation to order and selection at a macro-level (for each Life) as well as

185In this regard Livy mentions abundant supplies of food and raids by the townsfolk but does not explicitly mention the military strength of the Falerri (History 5.26.9-10).
examining his adaptation at a micro-level (the capture of Corioli and the siege of Falerri). While both narratives are paralleled in Dionysius and Livy the evidence suggests that Plutarch worked with a primary source (in keeping with ‘one source at a time’) with only a few possible influences from his secondary source. In this regard Dionysius appears to have been the primary source for the *Coriolanus* while Livy is the primary source for the *Camillus*. With this in mind the macro-analysis of order and selection demonstrated that Plutarch’s choices are typically explicable, with few exceptions, on the basis of Theon’s narrative elements (especially that of *person*, which relates to encomium) and virtues (especially *conciseness* and *clarity*). This conclusion was further supported by the micro-analysis in which *person, clarity* and *conciseness* were frequently identified as motives for Plutarch’s adaptations. In some instances the adaptations were explicable on the basis of the narrative elements of *action, cause, and manner* but this typically related back to *person*. The elements of *time and place* along with the virtue of *credibility* were not clearly identified as motives for his adaptations. The adaptations were in keeping with observations made in the introduction to this chapter in relation to Plutarch’s interest in history (generally faithful to his sources), biography (encomiastic element of person was a major factor influence in his adaptations) and moral philosophy (characters were portrayed deliberately as positive or negative examples).

These findings are essentially in keeping with those of the previous chapter which examined the narrative adaptations in Josephus’ *Antiquities*. Taken together they indicate that these two writers, who are contemporary to the synoptic evangelists, adapted their source material in a manner that was influenced by the rhetorical conventions of narrative as discussed in Theon’s progymnasmata. In particular their choices at both macro- and micro-levels appear to have been most influenced by the element of *person* (relating to the various encomiastic topics listed in tables 2.2 and 2.3) and the virtues of *clarity* and *conciseness*. With few exceptions the influence of the other narrative elements (along with the virtue of credibility) was less obvious. Both writers make changes that are generally consistent with their identified apologetic interests. The
net result is that on the basis of analogy to these two first century writers we may now proceed to analyze narrative adaptations in the synoptic Gospels on the basis that the evangelists’ choices were likewise influenced by the same narrative elements and virtues. This will be the subject matter of the following two chapters in relation to Gospel miracle traditions beginning with a macro-analysis of order and selection (chapter 5) followed by a micro-analysis of three specific Gospel pericopes (chapter 6). In both cases the rhetorical conventions of narrative will be used to compare the relative strengths and weaknesses (i.e. relative redactional plausibility) of our three chosen SP hypotheses, namely the 2DH, 2GH and FH.
Table 4.1: The Life of Coriolanus: Plutarch, Dionysius and Livy in Parallel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>§1. Upbringing and Background</th>
<th>Plutarch, Coriolanus</th>
<th>Livy (History, Book 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Plebs secede from city and make demands (6.41–6.90)</td>
<td>1. Genealogy: house of Marci (1.1-4)</td>
<td>Revolt of plebs (32–33.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Senate speeches (6.41–69):</td>
<td>• Raised by mother (father died early)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Menenius and Valerius speak in favor of plebs</td>
<td>• Positive traits: great accomplishments (manly valour)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Appius Claudius speaks against plebs</td>
<td>• Negative traits: vehement temper</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Senate has divided response to speeches</td>
<td>2. Childhood (2): learns combat and weapons early; wrestling; strength of body</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Further dispute but agree to send envoys</td>
<td>3. Marcius’ military honors (3–4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Senate sends envoys to seceders (6.70–90)</td>
<td>• First Campaign: receives civic crown (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Brutus persuades Sicinius to be stubborn</td>
<td>• Multiple military honors (4.1-2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Senator Valerius addresses seceders</td>
<td>• Chief end of his glory: his mother (4.3-4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sicinius and Brutus respond</td>
<td>4. Power struggle between senate and common people (5-7): Marcius among those who oppose any increase of power for the people but proposes aristocracy show themselves superior in battle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• People weep and senator Larcius responds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sicinius rejects envoys</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Menenius speaks for envoys</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reach agreement including election of tribunes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| §2. Capture of Corioli: Marcius Receives Name Coriolanus | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------|
| 1. Cominius marches on Volscians: takes cities of Longula and Polusca (6.91) | 1. Cominius attacks Corioli but divides forces (he goes against Volscians coming from outside and leaves Titius Lartius in charge at Corioli) (8.1-2) | Cominius captures various cities (33.4-5) Cominius besieges Corioli (33.5-6) (division of forces not mentioned) Marcinius captures Corioli (33.7-8) (omits mention of divided forces and second war) |
| 2. Cominius marches on Corioli and divides army on account of Antiates (leaves Titius Lartius in charge of city) (6.92.1-2) | 2. Marcius captures Corioli (8.3-6) |  |
| 3. Marcius captures Corioli (6.92.3-6) | 3. Marcius goes to aid of Cominius and helps secure victory against Antiates (6.93) |  |
| 4. Marcius goes to aid of Cominius and helps secure victory against Volscians (9) | |  |
Table 4.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Cominius honors Marcius: accepts horse but refuses other booty (admired for attitude to wealth); receives name Coriolanus (6.94.1-2b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>New temple dedicated in Rome (6.94.3b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Peace treaties with Latin cities (6.95.1-3a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Latin festival extended by a day to celebrate reconciliation of senate and populace (6.95.3b-4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Death and honorable burial of Menenius Agrippa (ex-consul) (6.96)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

§3. Popular Dissensions in Rome: Marcius Key Figure in Resisting Populace

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Corn shortage in Rome (result of earlier secession of populace): senate sends embassies to buy corn from other cities (7.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Embassies to Volscians and Cumae seen as spies (7.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Digression on tyranny of Aristodemus in Cumae: rise and fall (7.3-11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Roman embassy (for food) to Cumae fails and food shortage continues (7.12.1-3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Volscian attack foiled by pestilence: Velitrae surrenders to Romans (7.12.4-5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Romans send out colony to Velitrae but plebeians upset over forced colonization (7.13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Populace resists colonization (Sicinius and Brutus) (7.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Senate meets next day to discuss the problem: various opinions given (7.15.1-3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Consuls call meeting but are resisted by tribunes: power struggle ensues (7.15.4-7.16.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Brutus (tribune) addresses assembly of patricians and people (7.16.4-5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Cominius honors Marcius: accepts horse but refuses other booty (admired for attitude to wealth); receives name Coriolanus (10–11.1)  
5. Excursus on names (11.2-4)  
Marcius honored (33.9) (much briefer)  
Death of Menenius Agrippa (33.10-11)  
Corn shortage in Rome but grain obtained from Tuscans (34.1-6)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td><strong>Popular assembly next day</strong>: Sicinius speaks against patricians and people pass new law (7.17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td><strong>General hostility continues between consuls/senate and tribunes/people</strong> (7.18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td><strong>Consuls seek to send armed forces out of city but plebeians resist</strong> (7.19.1-2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Marcius leads successful raid with armed patricians and some plebeians (7.19.3-5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>New consuls appointed: corn gained from Sicily but patricians debate how to distribute to plebeians (7.20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Marcius rejected by people for consul (7.21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Marcius speaks against plebeians in senate; calls for their suppression (7.22–24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Divided reaction in Senate to Marcius’ speech: tribunes react vehemently (7.25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Tribunes exit senate, denounce Marcius to populace and seek to seize him for trial but patricians prevent them (7.26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Tribunes and populace gather next day in forum and inveigh against patricians and especially Marcius (7.27.1-2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Patricians hold counsel and agree to placate the populace in the forum (7.27.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td><strong>Minucius (consul) addresses populace</strong>: defends senate and Marcius (7.28–32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Sicinius (tribune) commends consuls but insists Marcius be tried (7.33–34.1-2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Marcius responds in arrogance (7.34.3-5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Tumult: Sicinius calls for Marcius’ death and</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
patricians resist attempts to seize him (7.35)

26. Junius Brutus (demagogue) advises Sicinius against force but to seek trial (7.36.1-2)

27. Sicinius agrees and dismisses the populace with promise of trial (7.36.3-4)

28. Senate deliberate: sell corn cheap to gain favor then ward off trial of Marcius but tribunes resist so consuls declare expedition to delay trial but war ends up too short (7.37)

29. Sicinius sets trial date but consuls resist (7.38.1-2)

30. Consuls address leaders of people seeking to pass their own preliminary decree (7.38.3-4)

31. Sicinius impatient but agrees to preliminary decree upon advice of Decius (tribune) (7.39)

32. Decius addresses senate: incites them against Marcius and urges for a trial (7.40–46)

33. Decius concludes; other tribunes agree and senators begin to deliberate (7.47)

34. Appius Claudius (senator) speaks against demands of Decius and plebeians (7.48–53)

35. Manius Valerius (senator) speaks in favor of plebeians: calls for fair trial; admonishes Marcius to humility; expounds on ideal government (7.54–56)

36. Marcius speaks and agrees to be tried for tyranny (given approval of Valerius’ speech and clarification of charge) (7.57–58:1)

37. Senators happy with outcome: likelihood of Marcius defending himself (7.58.2-3)

38. Trial date set by tribunes/populace (7.58.4)

resists attempts to seize him (18.4-7)

14. Sicinius requests trial (18.8)

15. Senate undertakes military campaign to delay but it was short lived; Senate deliberates on Marcius but is divided (19)

16. Marcius agrees to be tried for tyranny (given senate division and clarification of charge) (20.1)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.1</th>
<th>17. Trial date arrives: tribunes insist on tribal voting (20.2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>39. Trial date arrives: initial dispute about voting methods and tribunes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>win out in calling for vote of whole assembly (7.59)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. <strong>Minucius (consul) speaks first</strong>: defends Marcius (7.60)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. <strong>Sicinius requests votes of plebeians</strong> (7.61.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Minucius requires that only charge of tyranny be brought forward (7.61.2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Sicinius sets forth charge and other tribunes speak (7.61.3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. <strong>Marcius defends himself and gains favorable response of plebeians</strong> (7.62)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Decius speaks against Marcius and raises charge of war spoils (7.63)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Sentiment of populace changed (by Decius’ speech): Marcius/consuls</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>silenced (7.64.1-5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Tribes vote 12 to 9 against Marcius in favor of perpetual banishment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7.64.6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. <strong>Digression</strong>: historical moment of increased power for plebs (versus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>senate) (7.65–66)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Populace happy about trial but patricians dejected (blame Valerius)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7.67.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. Marcius accepts fate without lament, exhorts family to bear misfortunes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with firmness, and leaves without word of where he is going (7.67)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. New senators; various prodigies occur with differing opinions on cause</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7.68.1-2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. Titus Latinius tells vision to senate (7.68.3-6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. Senators response: guess at message and then tie it to mistreatment of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>slave at festival (according to vision of Titus Latinius) (7.69)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcius fails to appear for trial (35.6a)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connects to number 3 in §4 of <em>Coriolanus</em> below</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connects to number 4 in §4 of <em>Coriolanus</em> below</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 4.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 54. **Digression**: festival and its Greek origins (7.70–73.5a)  
55. Penalty imposed on slave owner (for mistreating slave at festival) and festival procession repeated to honor gods (7.73.5b) |

| Marcius condemned in his absence (35.6b) |

### §4. Marcius Joins with Volscians to get Revenge on Romans

1. **New consuls and war that nearly destroys commonwealth** (8.1.1)
2. Marcius plans revenge on Romans (8.1.2a)
3. Marcius goes to Tullus Attius (Volscian) in Antium and is well received (8.1.2b–8.2.1)

Connects to 53 and 55 in §3 of *Rom.Ant.*

Connects to 51 and 52 in §3 of *Rom. Ant.*

4. Tullus and Coriolanus plot war on Romans: Marcius insists on first inducing Romans to break the treaty (so as to be just war) (8.2.2-5)
5. Tullus agrees to deception: men sent to games with alleged plot to overthrow city (8.3)
6. Volscians ejected from Roman games (as per plan) and incited by Tullus to wage war (8.4)
7. **Marcius addresses Volscians**: defends himself against Romans, pledges allegiance to Volscians and advises on war (8.5–8)
8. Volscians ambassadors to Rome request return of cities and lands (8.9)
9. Roman senate replies: refuse conditions and threaten victory in any war (8.10)
10. Volscians declare war and appoint Tullus and Marcius as generals (8.11.1)

5. Marcius and Tullus plan war: unable to persuade chiefs of Antium (owing to peace treaty) until Romans provide good reason for war by expelling Volscians from city during the games (perhaps a deceitful stratagem of Marcius himself); Tullus goads the Volscians to proclaim war; they send embassy to demand back territory from Romans but Romans refuse and make war threats; Tullus calls assembly and they vote for war (26)

6. Marcius called in and appointed as a general alongside Tullus (27:1)

1. Marcius plans revenge on Romans (21.4)
2. Marcius goes to Tullus (of Antium) and is well received despite being arch enemy (22)
3. Prodigies in Rome and vision report of Titus Latinius (24.1-3)
4. Vision tied to mistreatment of slave during procession and master is punished (24.4-25)

1. Marcius goes to Volsci and plans revenge with Tullius (35:7-8a)

Marcius and Tullius use deceit to provoke war (35:8b)

**Roman games repeated on account of slave being scourged** (dream vision of Latinius) (36)

Volscians carry out deceptive plan at games to provoke war (37)

**Tullius gives speech to incite war** (38)

Tullius and Marcius chosen as generals (39:1)
11. Marcius proposes he and Tullus begin plundering while armies are prepared (8.11.2)
12. Plundering of Roman and Latin territories by Marcius and Tullus (differing treatment of plebeians and patricians intended to further fuel mistrust) (8.12)
13. Volscians assemble army and divide between Tullus (in city) and Marcius (in field) (8.13)
15. **Rome unsettled by news of Circeii:** patricians and populace blame one another (8.14.3-4)
16. **Roman senate denies aid to Latin allies but raises an army to guard city:** not all allies comply and some join Volscians resulting in powerful army under Marcius (8.15-16)
17. Volscians hopes bolstered: celebrate to gods and admire Marcius (8.17.1-2)
18. Marcius successfully attacks Latin cities:
   - Tolerienses (8.17.3-6)
   - City of Bola (8.18)
   - City of Labici (8.19.1-2)
   - Cities of Pedum, Corbio, and Corioli (8.19.3-5)
   - City of Bollivae (8.20)
19. General surrender of cities except Lavinium which Marcius besieges (8.21.1-2)
20. Roman populace vote to return Marcius but patricians oppose (motive uncertain) (8.21.3-5)
21. Marcius leaves Lavinium and marches on Rome (8.22.1)

7. Marcius leads raids on Roman lands: supply much booty but also increase mistrust/hostility between populace and patricians by differing treatment of their lands/property (27.2-4)
8. Volscians assemble army and divide between Tullus (in city) and Marcius (in field): Marcius takes Circeii (Roman city) along with other Latin cities (Tolerium, Lavinicum, Pedum, and Bola) which he enslaves and plunders (28)
9. Volscians admire Marcius and declare him their sole general (29.1)
10. Rome upset over siege of Lavinium: populace seek to repeal Marcius’ banishment but senate refuse (motive uncertain) (29.2-4)
11. Marcius hears of Roman decision: leaves siege of Lavinium and marches against Rome (30.1a)
12. Marcius leads army against Rome (39:6)
13. **Marcius raids populace around Rome** (39:7)
22. Confusion in Rome: senate sends embassy (5 elder members and friends of Marcius) seeking reconciliation and friendship (8.22.2-5)
23. Minucius addresses Marcius: argues on no just cause against senate (or women and children) and offers a return to the city (8.23–28)
24. Marcius replies to Minucius: acknowledges friendship of senate but refuses to withhold hostility to rest of Romans; thus refuses advice and gives 30 days for Romans to meet Volscian demands (of returning land and equal citizenship rights) (8.29–35)
25. Marcius dismisses embassy and captures 7 more Latin cities (8.36.1-3a)
26. Romans deliberate and refuse demands (8.36.3b-4)
27. Senate sends new embassy of 10 ex-consuls to Marcius (8.37.1)
28. Marcius rebuffs the new envoys: sends them back to come up with answer in 3 days (8.37.2)
29. Senators decide to guard city but not send out fighting force (8.37:3)
30. Senate sends larger more dignified embassy (8.38.1)
31. Marcius refuses embassy again and threatens immediate war (8.38.2)
32. Romans give up hope and prepare for siege (8.38.3)
33. Senate agrees to repeal Marcius’ banishment: ambassadors sent to Marcius (30.1b-3)
34. Marcius gives 30 days for Romans to meet Volscian demands (restoration of cities) (30.4-5)
35. Malcontents and jealous (including Tullus) among Volscians complain about Marcius’ withdrawal (31.1-2)
36. Marcius captures 7 more Roman allied cities (31.3)
37. Romans send another embassy (31.4)
38. Marcius sends back embassy without changing his demands (31.5)
39. New embassy of priests and dignitaries (32.1)
40. Marcius rejects demands and threatens war (32.2a)
41. Romans remain in city and prepare for attack (putting hopes in ‘fortune’) (32.2b-3a)
42. Marcius rejects two Roman embassies (39:9-12)
### §5. The Plot of the Roman Women

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roman women plan (inspiration of Valeria) to appeal to Marcius through his family (8.39)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women pray to gods and go to house of Marcius’ mother and family (8.40.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valeria pleads with Veturia (Marcius’ mother) to appeal to Marcius (8.40.2-5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veturia responds: notes Marcius’ disowning of family and anticipates his objections (8.41-42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman women continue entreating Veturia until she agrees to go (8.43.1-2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women report to senate: senate deliberates and decide to send the women (8.43.3-7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women go out with Veturia to Marcius (8.44.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcius initially astonished at women’s actions and goes out to them (8.44.2-4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother greets him (with tears): Marcius’ softens heart and responds with kindness to family and permits his mother to speak (8.45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veturia (mother) makes initial appeal (8.46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcius interrupts: gives initial objections and bids to send the mother join him (8.47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veturia speaks again: lengthy appeal for peace and for Marcius to withdraw attack and concludes by embracing his feet (8.48–54.1a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcius embraces mother and concedes her victory but unhappiness will result (8.54.1b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcius deliberates with family and agrees to withdraw Volscians and seek peace (8.54.2-5a)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Digression

- Divination on divine inspiration (as in Homer) and influence of gods in human affairs (32.3b-7)
- Women serving at altar of Jupiter Capitolinus: Valeria (sister of Publicola) seized by inspiration and leads women to house of Marcius’ mother (Volumnia) (33.1-2)
- Valeria and women plead case with Volumnia (mother) claiming divine guidance (33.3-4)
- Volumnia responds and agrees to go (33.5-6)

| Women’s envoy led by wife and mother (and 2 sons) (40:1-3) |
| Marcius resists until someone points out identity of women (40:4) |
| Marcius runs to them in emotion (40:5) |
| Mother rebukes and seeks peace (40:6-9) |
| Marcius embraces family then relents and withdraws (40:10) |
### Table 4.1

#### §6. Aftermath of Women’s Embassy to Marcius

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Page References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Romans celebrate: women honored and new temple erected with Valeria as priestess</td>
<td>8.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Statue speaks twice to honor women</td>
<td>8.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Marcius leads army home: troops happy with respite from war and spoils</td>
<td>8.57.1-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Faction of envious men (led by Tullus) plot Marcius’ death: they demand his resignation and an account of his actions</td>
<td>8.57.2-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Marcius objects to order (wants to give account first and step down if required by all)</td>
<td>8.58.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Tullus opposes (owing to Marcius’ oratory ability): they daily argue till Tullus sets date for trial</td>
<td>8.58.2-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Marcius stoned by Tullus faction before he can deliver defense speech</td>
<td>8.59.1a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### §7. Aftermath of Marcius’ Death

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Page References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Marcius supporters indignant and give him honorable burial (like kings and commanders) and erect monument</td>
<td>8.59.1b-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. <strong>Encomium of Marcius</strong>: virtues in relation to justice and public affairs</td>
<td>8.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. <strong>Flaws in Marcius</strong>: not mild or cheerful; harsh and severe; stern and extreme in justice</td>
<td>8.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. <strong>Volscians mourn Marcius’ death</strong>: short excursus on life after death for good men</td>
<td>8.62.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Marcius given honorable burial by Volscians</td>
<td>39:5a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1. Livy notes that Marcius is said to have perished under the weight of resentment but then goes on to note various versions of the story – the oldest one (and only one he relates) is that Marcius is said to have lived on to old age (according to Fabius) | 40.11-12
5. Romans mourn Marcius’ death: wives mourn up to *one full year* and his memory is still praised up to the present time (8.62.2-3a)
6. Thus ends the danger to the Romans from the Volscians (8.62.3b)
7. Roman army disgraced in expedition (8.63)
8. New Consuls: send embassy to Hernicans; results in war with Roman victory (8.64-66)
9. Romans defeat Volscians and Tullus dies (8.67)

| Table 4.1 |
|------------------|------------------|
| 5. Romans mourn Marcius’ death: wives mourn up to *one full year* and his memory is still praised up to the present time (8.62.2-3a) | 2. Romans permit women to mourn (*for 10 months*) but no other action taken (39.5b) |
| 6. Thus ends the danger to the Romans from the Volscians (8.62.3b) | |
| 7. Roman army disgraced in expedition (8.63) | |
| 8. New Consuls: send embassy to Hernicans; results in war with Roman victory (8.64-66) | |
| 9. Romans defeat Volscians and Tullus dies (8.67) | 3. Volscians suffer in wake of Marcius’ death and Tullus is slain in battle with Romans (39.6) |

Sigla for table 4.1:

- : indicates strong parallel between accounts
- : indicates weaker parallel between accounts

**Bold**: indicates elements unique in either Plutarch or Dionysius/Livy (i.e. material unique to either or shared by both but not in Plutarch)
## Table 4.2: Plutarch’s Omissions in the *Coriolanus*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Omissions</th>
<th>Dionysius <em>Rom. Ant.</em></th>
<th>Livy Book 2</th>
<th>Possible reason(s) for Omission</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Cominius attacks the Volscians (§2)</td>
<td>6.91</td>
<td>33.4-5</td>
<td>Brevity and person: details irrelevant to bios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) New temple, peace treaties, and extended Latin festival (§2)</td>
<td>6.94.3b–6.95</td>
<td>omit</td>
<td>Brevity and person: irrelevant to bios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Death of Menenius (§2)</td>
<td>6.96</td>
<td>33.10-11</td>
<td>Person: irrelevant to bios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Embassies to Volscians, digression on tyranny, embassy for food, and Volscian attack foiled (§3)</td>
<td>7.2–7.12</td>
<td>Omit</td>
<td>Brevity and person: irrelevant to bios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Various discussions of senate and people regarding proposed colonization of Velitrae (§3)</td>
<td>7.15–7.19.2</td>
<td>Omit</td>
<td>Brevity and person: irrelevant to bios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Minucius (consul) defends senate and Marcius to populace (§3)</td>
<td>7.28–7.32</td>
<td>Omit</td>
<td>Brevity: tendency to shorten or avoid speeches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) Junius Brutus advises Sicinius (§3)</td>
<td>7.36.1-2</td>
<td>Omit</td>
<td>As above (number 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) Debate about Marcius’ trial (§3)</td>
<td>7.38–7.56</td>
<td>Omit</td>
<td>As above (number 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9) Senators happy about Marcius trial (believe he will defend himself) and tribunes seek trial date (§3)</td>
<td>7.58.2-4</td>
<td>Omit</td>
<td>Brevity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10) Various trial speeches (§3)</td>
<td>7.60–7.62</td>
<td>Omit</td>
<td>Brevity and credibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11) Digression: historic moment of increased power for plebs (§3)</td>
<td>7.65–7.66</td>
<td>Omit</td>
<td>Brevity and person: irrelevant to bios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12) Digression on festival (§3)</td>
<td>7.70–7.73.5a</td>
<td>Omit</td>
<td>As above (number 11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(13) New consuls (§4)</td>
<td>8.1.1</td>
<td>Omit</td>
<td>As above (number 11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(14) Marcius summoned to address Volscians (§4)</td>
<td>8.5–8.8</td>
<td>Omit</td>
<td>Brevity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(15) Roman reaction to Volscian raids led by Marcius (§4)</td>
<td>8.14–8.16</td>
<td>Omit</td>
<td>Brevity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(16) Romans deliberate and refuse to give into Marcius’ demands (§4)</td>
<td>8.36.3b-4</td>
<td>Omit</td>
<td>Brevity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(17) Roman senators guard city but do not send out fighting force (§4)</td>
<td>8.37.3</td>
<td>Omit</td>
<td>Brevity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(18) Veturia entreated and women suggest plan to Senate (§5)</td>
<td>8.43</td>
<td>Omit</td>
<td>Brevity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(19) Marcius’ initial response to mother (§5)</td>
<td>8.47</td>
<td>Omit</td>
<td>Person: replaced with silence - see addition (6) in table 4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(20) Comment on Marcius: encomium; flaws; Volscians’ mourning; comments after death (§6)</td>
<td>8.60–8.66</td>
<td>Omit</td>
<td>Brevity and person: character evaluation already included and differs from Dionysius</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 Note that Plutarch does include the short section on Roman mourning in *Cor.* 62.2-3a.
### Table 4.3: Plutarch’s Additions to Dionysius (and Livy) in the *Coriolanus*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additions</th>
<th>Plutarch <em>Coriolanus</em></th>
<th>Possible reason(s) for Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Encomiastic material at beginning of his <em>Life</em> (§1)</td>
<td>1–4</td>
<td>Person: typical of encomiastic categories (see tables 2.2 and 2.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Excursus on names (§2)</td>
<td>11.2-4</td>
<td>Person: digression is short and therefore in keeping with clarity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Marcius stands for consulship and gains initial favor (§3)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Volscian malcontents complain about Marcius’ withdrawal from Rome (§4)</td>
<td>31.1-2</td>
<td>Dramatic tension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Digression on divine inspiration and influence of the gods in human affairs (§5)</td>
<td>32.3b-7</td>
<td>Person: digression is short and therefore in keeping with clarity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Initial silence following first part of Volumnia’s speech (§5)</td>
<td>36.1a</td>
<td>Person: see omission (20) in table 4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) Digression on the plausibility of speaking statues (§6)</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Person: invective?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4.4: Plutarch’s Transformations of Order in the *Coriolanus*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transformation</th>
<th>Plutarch <em>Coriolanus</em></th>
<th>Possible Reason(s) for Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Grain comes to Rome during food shortage (§3)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Clarity or memory lapse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Prodigies in Rome and mistreatment of slave at festival (§4)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Clarity and dramatic tension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Volscian army admires Marcius and declares him sole general (§4)</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>Clarity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Marcius withdraws Volscian troops from Rome (§5)</td>
<td>36.4b-5</td>
<td>Clarity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.5: The Capture of Corioli (Parallel Text in Plutarch and Dionysius)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dionysius, Rom. Ant. 6.92</th>
<th>Greek (460 words)</th>
<th>Plutarch, Cor. 8</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(92.1) And having left a small portion of his army at this place as a guard, taking the forces on the next day he led them to Corioli, a very noteworthy city and a mother city of the Volscians so to speak; there also a strong force had gathered and the wall(s) were not easy to capture and the necessary things for war had been prepared by those inside from a long time ago. But having undertaken battle with the walls until late afternoon he was driven off by those opposing him, having lost many of his own (forces).</td>
<td>(92.1) Καταλύσαν δὲ κἂν τάτη βραχείαν τῆς στρατίας μοίραν ἕνεκα φυλακῆς, τῇ κατόπιν ἡμέρα τὴν δυναμὶν ἀναλαβὼν προῆγεν ἐπὶ Κοριόλαν, πόλιν ἐπιφάνης φόδρα καὶ ὀσπὲρ ἄν μητρόπολιν τῶν Οὐολούσκων ἐνθά καὶ δυναμὶς ἢν συνελεύσειν καρτερὰ καὶ τὸ τείχος οὐ ῥάδιον ἅλωναι τα τε πρὸς τὸν πόλεμον ἑπιτήδεια παρεσκευασμένα τοῖς ἐνδοὺ ἐκ πολλοῦ, ἐπιχειρήσας δὲ τῇ τειχομαχίᾳ μέχρι δείλης ὀψίς αποκρούεται πρὸς τῶν ἐναντίων πολλοὺς τῶν οἰκείων ἀπολέσεως.</td>
<td>(8.1) Ἔν δὲ τῷ Ὑολούσκους ἔθειε, πρὸς οὓς ἐπολέμουν, ἡ Κοριολανῶν πόλις ἀξίωμα μέγιστον ἐίχε.</td>
<td>(8.1) Now among the nation of the Volscians, with whom they were at war, the city of Corioli had the greatest honor (rank).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Then on the next day, having prepared battering rams and stakes and ladders he prepared to as to attempt (against) the city will (his) forces, but after hearing that the Antiates were about to come with a large force to assist the Coriolani, on account of their kinship, and those who</td>
<td>(2) Τῇ δ' ἔξης ἡμέρας κριόν λε γέρα καὶ κλίμακας εὐτρεπίσασθαι παρεσκευάζετο μὲν ὡς ἀπάσῃ τῇ δυνάμῃ πειρασμένος τῆς πόλεως, ἀκόουσας δὲ ὅτι πολλὴ χεῖρι μέλλουσιν Ἀντιάται βοηθεῖν τοῖς Κοριολανοῖς κατὰ τὸ συγγενὲς καὶ εἰσίν οἱ πεμβέντες ἐν οὐδῷ ἡπόρντες</td>
<td>(8.1) Καταλύσαν δὲ κἂν τάτη βραχείαν τῆς στρατιάς μοίραν ἐνδοὺ τῆς φυλακῆς, τῇ κατόπιν ἡμέρᾳ τὴν δυνάμιν ἀναλαβὼν προῆγεν ἐπὶ Κοριόλαν, πόλιν ἐπιφάνης φόδρα καὶ ὀσπὲρ ἄν μητρόπολιν τῶν Οὐολούσκων ἐνθά καὶ δυναμὶς ἢν συνελεύσειν καρτερὰ καὶ τὸ τείχος οὐ ῥάδιον ἅλωναι τα τε πρὸς τὸν πόλεμον ἑπιτήδεια παρεσκευασμένα τοῖς ἐνδοὺ ἐκ πολλοῦ, ἐπιχειρήσας δὲ τῇ τειχομαχίᾳ μέχρι δείλης ὀψίς αποκρούεται πρὸς τῶν ἐναντίων πολλοὺς τῶν οἰκείων ἀπολέσεως.</td>
<td>(8.1) Now among the nation of the Volscians, with whom they were at war, the city of Corioli had the greatest honor (rank).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(8.1) Εἶν δὲ τῷ Ὑολούσκους ἔθειε, πρὸς οὓς ἐπολέμουν, ἡ Κοριολανῶν πόλις ἀξίωμα μέγιστον ἐίχε.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.5

had been sent were already on the road, having divided his army he determined to fight against the walls with half of it, leaving Titus Larcius over it/them, and intended with the remainder to hinder those coming against (them).

(3) And the two actions occurred on the same day and the Romans were victorious because all of them fought with zeal and one man had displayed excellence beyond belief and (produced) deeds greater beyond description; a man from the race of the patricians and not of obscure fathers and he was called Marcius and was a man who daily life was self-controlled and full of the spirit of a free person (full of a free spirit).

Now the manner of both battles was as follows: Larcius having led out (his) army in the day attacked the walls of Corioli and made assaults against many places but the Coriolani thinking very much about the rescue by the Antiatites, which they believed would reach them after not

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ΜΕΡΙΣΑΣ ΤΟΥ ΕΑΥΤΟΥ ΣΤΡΑΤΟΝ ΤΟΥ ΜΕΝ ΟΗΜΕΙΣΙ ΤΕΙΧΟΜΑΧΕΩΝ ΕΓΩΝΟ ΤΙΤΟΝ ΛΑΡΚΙΟΝ ΕΠΙ ΑΥΤΟΥ ΚΑΤΑΛΙΠΩΝ, ΤΩ ΔΕ ΛΟΙΠΟ ΚΩΛΥΕΙΝ ΤΟΥΣ ΕΠΙΟΝΤΑΣ ΔΙΕΝΟΕΙΤΟ.</td>
<td>(3) He divided his army and left Titus Larcius over it/them, and intended with the remainder to hinder those coming against (them).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) ΚΑΙ ΓΙΝΟΝΤΑΙ ΔΥΟ ΤΗΣ ΑΥΤΗΣ ΗΜΕΡΑΣ ΑΓΩΝΕΣ. ΡΟΜΑΙΟΙ ΔΕ ΕΝΙΚΩΝ ΑΠΑΝΤΩΝ ΜΕΝ ΠΡΟΘΥΜΩΝ ΑΓΩΝΙΣΑΜΕΝΩΝ, ΕΝΟΣ ΔΕ ΑΝΔΡΟΣ ΑΠΙΣΤΟΥ ΑΡΕΤΗΝ ΚΑΙ ΠΑΝΤΟΣ ΛΟΓΟΥ ΚΡΕΙΤΤΟΝΑΣ ΑΠΟΔΕΙΞΑΜΕΝΟΥ, ΠΡΑΞΕΙΣ, ΟΣ ΗΝ ΜΕΝ ΕΚ ΤΟΥ ΓΕΝΟΥΣ ΤΩΝ ΠΑΤΡΙΚΙΩΝ ΚΑΙ ΟΥΚ ΑΣΗΜΩΝ ΠΑΤΕΡΩΝ, ΕΚΑΛΕΙΤΟ ΔΕ ΓΑΙΟΣ ΜΑΡΚΙΟΣ, ΣΩΦΡΩΝ ΔΕ ΤΟΥ ΚΑΘ’ ΗΜΕΡΑΝ ΒΙΟΝ ΑΝΗΡ ΚΑΙ ΦΡΟΝΗΜΑΤΟΣ ΕΛΕΥΘΕΡΟΥ ΜΕΣΤΟΣ. ΕΓΕΝΕΤΟ ΔΕ Ο ΤΡΟΠΟΣ ΤΗΣ ΕΚΑΤΕΡΑΣ ΜΑΧΗΣ ΤΟΙΟΟΔΕ Ο ΜΕΝ ΛΑΡΚΙΟΣ ΕΞΑΓΑΓΟΝ ΤΗΝ ΣΤΡΑΤΙΑΝ ΑΜ’ ΗΜΕΡΑ ΠΡΟΩΝΤΗΣΙΣ ΤΟΥΣ ΤΕΙΧΕΣΙ ΤΗΣ ΚΟΡΙΟΛΑΣ ΚΑΙ ΚΑΤΑ ΠΟΛΛΟΥΣ ΤΟΠΟΥΣ ΕΠΟΙΕΙΤΟ ΤΑΣ ΠΡΟΒΟΛΑΣ; ΟΙ ΔΕ ΚΟΡΙΟΛΑΝΟΙ ΜΕΓΑ ΦΡΟΝΟΥΝΤΕΣ ΕΠΙ ΤΗ ΠΑΡΑ ΤΩΝ ΑΝΤΙΑΤΩΝ ΒΟΗΘΕΙΑ, ΗΝ ΟΥ ΔΙΑ ΜΑΚΡΟΥ ΑΦΙΣΙ.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) ΓΕΠΙ ΔΕ Ο ΚΟΜΙΝΙΟΣ ΔΙΕΛΩΝ ΤΗΝ ΔΥΝΑΜΗΝ ΑΥΤΟΣ ΜΕΝ ΑΠΗΝΤΑ ΤΟΙΣ ΕΞΩΒΕΝ ΕΠΙΟΥΣΙ ΤΩΝ ΟΥΣΟΛΟΥΣΚΩΝ, ΛΑΡΚΙΟΝ ΔΕ ΤΙΤΟΝ, ΑΝΔΡΑ ΡΟΜΑΙΩΝ ΕΝ ΤΟΙΣ ΑΡΙΣΤΟΙΟΙ, ΕΠΙ ΤΗΣ ΠΟΛΙΟΡΚΙΑΣ ΑΠΕΛΙΠΕ, (2) When Cominius had divided his forces, he (himself) went forth to those Volscians were coming from outside and left Titus Larcius, a man among the most excellent of the Romans, over the siege.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
long, after opening all the gates rushed all together against the enemies.

(4) But the Romans received their first attack and delivered many blows to those who advanced close by, then as many more attacked they gave way being forced down the inclined place (hill). Marcius about whom I spoke before, after seeing this, stood with a few (men) and received the close arrayed attack of the enemies.

Then after striking down many of them, such that the remainder gave way and fled toward the city, he followed continually slaying those in hand to hand combat and calling out to those of his own who were fleeing to turn back (rally) and to take courage and follow him.

(5) And those who were ashamed on account of (his) action turned back again and pressed those who were
against them while striking and pursuing them. Then after a little while each one having routed those fighting in close combat, they pressed hard (against) the walls and Marcius venturing now with more daring advanced forward more and having come to their gates rushed in along with those who were fleeing to the wall and when many others rushed in with him a great slaughter occurred on both sides in many part of the city, some of the fighting in the midst of narrow streets and some around the houses that were being seized.

(6) And even the women assisted the fight/work for those inside (inhabitants) by throwing down tiles on the enemy from the rooftops and gates. And there, despite seeing Romans turning back from the pursuit as many missiles were being hurled from the wall, and while not one them dared to think of rushing with those fleeing into the city which was full of men of war and weapons; yet having taken a stand he exhorted and encouraged them, crying out that the city had been opened by fortune to those pursuing rather than those fleeing.

(5) And while not many were willing to follow, having pushed his way through the enemy he leapt at the gates and rushed in (with them) no one daring at first to withstand or resist (him) but then as they (the citizens of the city) saw there was only a few all together inside (the city) they rallied together and fought against them.

(6) Being surrounded in that place by friend and enemies it is said he fought an unbelievable battle by deeds of hand, swiftness of feet and
in this way each one in strength and power zealously defended their native city. They did not, however, hold out for much time against these dangers (perils) but they were compelled to give themselves up to those who had conquered them and with the city having been captured in this manner the other Romans turned to the seizure of the things hemmed in and they continued for a long time pursuing the spoils on account of their being many possessions and slaves in the place.

(9.1) Οὕτω δὲ τῆς πόλεως ἀλούσης καὶ τῶν πλεῖστων ἐν ἀρπαγῇ ὦντων καὶ διαφορήσει χρημάτων,...

daring deeds of soul, and overwhelmed all whom he attacked so as to force some to the remotest parts (of the city) while other renounced and threw down their weapons so as to hand over with much safety to Larcius who led in the Romans from outside.
Table 4.6: Marcius Captures Corioli (Parallel Outline)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Marcius along with a few men receives the attacks of enemy (4b)</td>
<td>(a) Marcius along with a few men halts the enemy and calls upon the remaining Romans to join the attack (8.3a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Marcius strikes down many and the remaining enemy flee toward the city; Marcius pursues while calling out to those (Romans) who were fleeing to turn and follow him (4c)</td>
<td>(b) Encomium of Marcius: likened to Cato’s ideal soldier; noted for actions, voice and looks (8.3b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Fleeing Romans turn back and together with Marcius they push back the enemy toward to walls (5a)</td>
<td>(c) Many gathered around and the enemy withdrew in fear (8.3c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Marcius and others rush into city with the enemy and a great slaughter ensues (on both sides) with some fighting in the streets and some in the houses (5b)</td>
<td>(d) Marcius pursues them as far as the gates (8.4a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) The women assist the citizens in fighting and defending the city (6a)</td>
<td>(e) Upon reaching the gates many Romans turned back on account of missiles from the city (8.4b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f) The citizens could not hold up but were compelled to give up their city (6b)</td>
<td>(f) Marcius appeals to Romans saying that the city has been given to them (8.4c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(g) Remaining Romans enter the city and plunder it (6c)</td>
<td>(g) Marcius, along with a few Romans, enters the city alongside the enemy with none daring to resist him at first (8.5a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(h) Citizens of Corioli begin to resist when they see small numbers of Romans (8.5b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(i) Marcius defeats enemy and hands over city to Larcius (8.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(j) Romans plunder the city (9.1a)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.7: The Capture of Corioli (Parallel Text in Plutarch, Dionysius and Livy)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dionysius, Rom. Ant. 6 (663 words)</th>
<th>Plutarch, Cor. 8 (464 words)</th>
<th>Livy, History, Book 2 (280 words)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(92.1) And having left a small portion of his army at this place as a guard, taking the forces on the next day he led them to Corioli, a very noteworthy city and a mother city of the Volscians so to speak; there also a strong force had gathered and the wall(s) were not easy to capture and the necessary things for war had been prepared by those inside from a long time ago. But having undertaken battle with the walls until late afternoon he was driven off by those opposing him, having lost many of his own (forces).</td>
<td>(8.1) Now among the nation of the Volscians, with whom they were at war, the city of Corioli had the greatest honor (rank).</td>
<td>(33.5) Thence he proceeded to take Polusca, another Volscian town, after which he directed a strong attack against Corioli.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Then on the next day, having prepared battering rams and stakes and ladders he prepared to as to attempt (against) the city will (his) forces, but after hearing that the Antiates were about to come with a large force to assist the Coriolani, on account of their kinship, and those who had been sent were already on the road, having divided his army he determined to fight against the walls with half of it, leaving Titus Larcius over it/them, and intended with the remainder to hinder those coming against (them).</td>
<td>Therefore when Cominius the consul had besieged this (place/city) the remainder of the Volscians, out of fear, were coming to assist against the Romans from all sides so as to make battle near the city and attack them from both sides.</td>
<td>There was in the camp at that time among the young nobles Gnaeus Marcius, a youth of active mind and ready hand, who afterwards gained the surname of Coriolanus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) And the two actions occurred on the same day and the Romans were victorious because all of them fought with zeal and one man had displayed excellence beyond belief and (produced) deeds greater beyond description; a man from the race of the patricians and not of</td>
<td></td>
<td>(6) The Romans were laying siege to Corioli and were intent upon the townspeople shut up within the walls, with no thought of danger from any attack which might be impending from without, when they found themselves suddenly assailed by a Volscian army from Antium,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
obscure fathers and he was called Marcius and was a man who daily life was self-controlled and full of the spirit of a free person (full of a free spirit). Now the manner of both battles was as follows:
Larcius having led out (his) army in the day attacked the walls of Corioli and made assaults against many places but the Coriolani thinking very much about the rescue by the Antiates, which they believed would reach them after not long, after opening all the gates rushed all together against the enemies.

(4) But the Romans received their first attack and delivered many blows to those who advanced close by, then as many more attacked they gave way being forced down the inclined place (hill).

Marcius about whom I spoke before, after seeing this, stood with a few (men) and received the close arrayed attack of the enemies.

Then after striking down many of them, such that the remainder gave way and fled toward the city, he followed continually slaying those in hand to hand combat and calling out to those of his own who were fleeing to turn back (rally) and to take courage and follow him.

(5) And those who were ashamed on account of (his) action turned back again and pressed those who were against them while striking and pursuing them. Then after a little while each

The men of Corioli, despising those left behind, sallied out (against them) and as they fought they were at first prevailing and pursuing the Romans into (their) camp.
(3) Just then Marcius, having run out with a small number and having above all slain those who had come close, and having halted the remainder of those attacking, called up on the Romans with a loud shout/cry. For, just as Cato deemed worthy of a soldier, he was fearful for the enemy to encounter and hard to withstand, not only on account of his hand and strike, but also the raising of (his) voice and the appearance of (his) face. And while many gathered and united around him the enemies withdrew on account of fear.
(4) But he was not pleased and instead at last he pursued and drove those fleeing in headlong flight as far as the gates. And there, despite seeing Romans turning and simultaneously by the besieged, who made a sortie from the town. It happened that Marcius was on guard.

(7) Taking a picked body of men he not only repelled the sally,
Table 4.7

one having routed those fighting in close combat, they pressed hard (against) the walls and Marcius venturing now with more daring advanced forward more and having come to their gates rushed in along with those who were fleeing to the wall and when many others rushed in with him a great slaughter occurred on both sides in many part of the city, some of the fighting in the midst of narrow streets and some around the houses that were being seized.

back from the pursuit as many missiles were being hurled from the wall, and while not one them dared to think of rushing with those fleeing into the city which was full of men of war and weapons; yet having taken a stand he exhorted and encouraged them, crying out that the city had been opened by fortune to those pursuing rather than those fleeing. (5) And while not many were willing to follow, having pushed his way through the enemy he leapt at the gates and rushed in (with them) no one daring at first to withstand or resist (him) but then as they (the citizens of the city) saw there was only a few all together inside (the city) they rallied together and fought against them.

(6) And even the women assisted the fight/work for those inside (inhabitants) by throwing down tiles on the enemy from the rooftops and by in this way each in strength and power zealously defended their native city. They did not, however, hold out for much time against these dangers (perils) but they were compelled to give themselves up to those who had conquered them and with the city having been captured in this manner the other Romans turned to the seizure of the things hemmed in and they continued for a long time pursuing the spoils on account of their being may possessions and slaves in the place.

(6) Being surrounded in that place by friend and enemies it is said he fought an unbelievable battle by deeds of hand, swiftness of feet and daring deeds of soul, and overwhelmed all whom he attacked so as to force some to the remotest parts (of the city) while other renounced and threw down their weapons so as to hand over with much safety to Lartius who led in the Romans from outside.

(9.1) And while the city had been captured in this way and

but boldly forced his way through the open gate, and having spread carnage through the adjacent part of the town, caught up a firebrand on the spur of the moment, (8) and threw it upon the buildings which overhung the walls. Thereupon the townspeople raised a shout, mingled with such a wailing of women and children as is generally heard at the first alarm. This brought new courage to the Romans and covered the Volsci with confusion – as was natural when the city which they had come to relieve was taken.

(9) Thus the men of Antium were routed, and Corioli was won.

So completely did the glory of Marcus overshadow the consul’s fame, that, were it not for the record on a bronze column of the treaty with the Latins which was struck by Spurius Cassius alone, in the absence of his colleague, men would have forgotten that Postumus Cominius had waged war on the Volsci.
**Table 4.8: Camillus Parallels in Plutarch and Dionysius**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>§1 Introduction and Background (Rom. Ant. 12.1–9; Cam. 1.1–2.2)</th>
<th>Plutarch, Camillus</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Maelius’ tyrannical plot defeated (12.1–4)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Consulship of Cornelius Cossus and Titus Quintus</strong>: drought; war; failed plots against commonwealth; severe snow storm. (12.5–9)</td>
<td><strong>Introduction</strong>: Camillus as leader (never consul but was censor – would not consent to be consul; first to have fame in his family; lead with moderation and ability) (1.1–2.2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>§2 Roman Siege of Veii (in Tuscany) (Rom. Ant. 12.10–11; Cam. 2.3–6)</th>
<th>Plutarch, Camillus</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Albany lakes overflows (12.10.1)</strong></td>
<td>1. Introduction: Veii is bulwark of Tuscany (2.3-5)</td>
<td>Parallel to Rom. Ant. 12.15 is slim: Plutarch focuses on military defenses; Dionysius focuses on fertility; both note that Veii is “not inferior to Rome.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Romans envoys to Delphi (12.10.2)</strong></td>
<td><strong>2. Camillus wars with Falerians and Capenates</strong> (2.6)</td>
<td>Plutarch compresses account of Delphi oracle into one.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Tribunes extract information from prisoner (12.12.1)</strong></td>
<td><strong>4. Roman deceives (and captures) citizen of Veii who reveals secret of Alban Lake (Veii cannot be captured until lake driven back) (4.1-3)</strong></td>
<td>Plutarch offers more graphic detail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. Message from Delphi: Veii safe while water overflows - Romans plan to divert water (12.12.2-3)</strong></td>
<td><strong>5. Senate obtains oracle from Delphi: perform sacrifices and seek to divert water (4.4-5)</strong></td>
<td>Story later in Dionysius (after treacherous school teacher)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7. Veii Captured (12.13.4)</strong></td>
<td><strong>7. Camillus attacks walls while others go through mines into temple of Juno and take city (possibly mythical) (5.3-4)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8. Camillus (dictator during capture) congratulates himself (12.14.1)</strong></td>
<td><strong>8. City plundered and Camillus prays to Jupiter then stumbles (indicates good fortune) (5.5-7)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10. Veii not inferior to Rome (12.15)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11. Camillus sacrifices and prays according to tradition, then stumbles (interpreted positively) (12.16)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### §3 Camillus’ Troubles Over Forgotten Vow: Incurs Enmity of Roman Citizens (Cam. 7–8)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cause of Camillus’ troubles:</th>
<th>Unique section in Plutarch with no parallel in Dionysius. Various parallels to Livy but differently ordered (see table 4.9)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Wanton extravagance: vain and pompous celebration after capture of Veii (7.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Opposing/delaying laws for dividing city (between Rome and captured city) (7.2-4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) His vow concerning the spoils of Veii – annoyed soldiers (Camillus lies about matter) (7.5):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Senate votes to have soldiers bring a tenth of booty to treasury: causes upset and Camillus gives absurd excuse for forgotten vow (8.1-2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Soldiers bring tithe and senate decides to send golden bowl to Delphi: women contribute gold (owing to shortage) and are rewarded (8.3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Story of voyage and taken as pirates by Liparians (later released and honors given to their general Timestheus for helping them) (8.4-5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### §4 Siege of Falerri and its Aftermath (Rom. Ant. 13.1–11; Cam. 9–29)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Story occurs above in Plutarch (who moves it up to the end of story of Veii).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Siege of Falerii and the treacherous schoolmaster (13.1–2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Camillus vows to Queen Juno of Veii to set up statue in Rome: statue speaks twice to those transporting it (13.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Pestilence and problems for Rome (13.4–11):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Pestilence hits Rome (13.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Tribunes attack Camillus and fine him 100,000 asses (13.5.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Camillus leaves city and prays to gods for vengeance (13.5.2-3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. Prayers are heard and Gauls capture most of city (except capitol); Romans at Veii ask Camillus to return as commander</td>
<td>(b) <strong>Two signs</strong>: death of Julius the censor and voice warns Marcus Caedicius to expect Gauls (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c) Gaul’s invade on account of gaining taste for wine (story of Arron the Tuscan) (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d) Gaul’s take over Tuscan country (16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(e) Gauls besiege Clusium and Clusians appeal to Romans who send envoys but Gauls reject them (17.1-4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(f) Romans convince Clusium to fight but Gauls choose to march on Rome denouncing Fabii Quintus for posing as ambassador then making war (17.5-6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(g) Senate refers matter of Fabii to populace who appoint him military tribune – Gauls therefore march in wrath against Romans (18.1-3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(h) Romans go out to meet Gauls in battle but are defeated and many flee to Veii (18.4-7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(i) <strong>Digression</strong>: the day of Allia (day of defeat in battle) and other ‘unlucky days’ (19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(j) Gauls celebrate: some Romans leave city while others entrench themselves in the capitol (20.1-2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(k) <strong>Vestal virgins escape</strong> with fire of Vesta and other sacred things – assisted by Lucius Albinius (20.3–21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(l) Brennus (king of Gauls) brings army into city and slaughters Romans (who are not fortified) (22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(m) Gauls divide: some march on Ardea where Camillus in exile – Camillus convinces Ardeans to resist and leads successful routing of Gauls’ camp (23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n) Romans at Veii request Camillus to return as their general: he refuses unless legally elected (24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(o) Pontius Cominius makes secret journey in/out of Rome (climbs Capitoline hill by night) and gains senate election of Camillus (25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(p) Camillus made dictator second time and joins forces at Veii as their general (26.1a)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Plutarch reverses the order of Dionysius who gives the story of Arron first then tells about his introducing them to wine. Story occurs later in Dionysius (*Rom. Ant.* 13.10–11).

Also parallel to *Cam.* 26.2–27.3 below

In Dionysius’ account Cominius informs of Gauls’ flight while in Camillus he seeks election of Camillus as dictator; the geese story is parallel to *Cam.* 27.1-3 (below).
| 7. Manlius leads successful resistance while lead sentry is executed for failure to notice attack (13.8.1-4a) | (q) Gauls in Rome discover tracks of Pontius and seek to attack by same route at midnight but Romans are warned by sacred geese (26.2–27.3) | Parallel to *Rom. Ant.* 13.7 (above) |
| 8. Romans agree to pay ransom money for their city (13.8.4b-9) | (r) Manlius leads successful defense of capitol while captain of guards executed (27.4-5) | Parallel to *Rom. Ant.* 13.8.1-4a (above) |
| 9. Digression: reason for Gauls coming into Italy (on account of its wine – story of Arron the Tuscan) (13.10–11) | (s) **Suffering of Gauls** (disease in camp) (28.1-2) | |
| | (t) Besieged Romans offer tribute to have Gauls depart: Gauls agree but tamper with scales (28.3-5) | |
| | (u) **Camillus comes to rescue of Romans** and slaughter enemy (29) | Parallel to Cam. 15 (above) |

### §5 Aftermath of Expulsion of Gauls: Camillus Faces Resitance but Oversees Rebuilding of City (*Cam.* 30–32)

| 1. Camillus celebrates: sacrifices made and temples restored (plus new temple to Rumour and Voice) (30) | Section unparalleled in Dionysius but has several parallels to Livy. |
| 2. Multitude overwhelmed at devastated state of city: speeches against Camillus (31.1-2) | |
| 3. Senators ask Camillus to remain as dictator (31.3) | |
| 4. Signs from heaven (31.4) | |
| 5. Senators remonstrate with people but also have compassion on them (31.5) | |
| 6. Camillus calls for restoration of city which occurs within a year (32) | |

### §6 Further Military Exploits of Camillus (*Rom. Ant.* 14.1–13; *Cam.* 33–41)

| 1. **The country of the Celts** (14.1–2) | Plutarch notes that the first story (women’s rouse) is ‘more fabulous’ while the route by Camillus is told by most. |
| 2. **Marcus Furius**: great warrior (14.3) | Plutarch’s account is significantly expanded. |
| 3. Manlius executed on account of his attempt at tyranny (14.4) | |
| 4. **Titus Quintius captures 9 cities** (14.5) | |
| 5. **Camillus successfully defeats** Praenestines and Volscians (37.1-4) | |
| 1. **New war owing to invasion** by Aequians, Volscians, Latins, and Tuscanians (lay siege to Sutrium): they seek help from Rome; Camillus made dictator for third time (33.1) | |
| 2. **Defeat of enemy camp**: rouse of the women (33.2-7) and the routing by Camillus (34) | |
| 3. **Camillus attacks enemy** and recaptures Sutrium (35) | |
| 4. Camillus leads in trial and execution of Manlius on account of his seeking tyranny (36) | |
### Table 4.8

| 5. Magnanimity of the Romans (14.6) | 6. Defeat of Tuscans in city of Satricum (37.5) |
| 6. Sulpicius: man of military distinction (14.7) | 7. Tuscan revolt headed off by Camillus (38) |
| 7. Gauls plunder the Alban district of the Romans (8) | 8. Dissension in the city: Plebeians seek to have one of consuls from among themselves — Camillus reluctantly made dictator again but then resigns office (39.1-4) |
| 8. Camillus assembles men and incites them to boldness (9) | 9. Alternative dictator appointed and law enacted restricting patrician land ownership but consular election issue remains (39.5 to 40.1) |
| 9. Romans defeat Gauls in battle and meet every peril in noble fashion (10) | 10. Renewed threat from Gauls: Camillus made dictator for fifth time (40.2-4) |
| 10. Portent of ground opening up (11) | 11. Camillus defeats Gauls (41) |
| 11. Lucinius Stolo found guilty (12) | 12. Marcus besieges Privernum (13) |

#### §7 Camillus' Final Days (Rom. Ant. 15.1; Cam. 42-43)

| 1. (42) Camillus Final days: populace come to take Camillus by force but Senate agrees to allow one of consuls to be elected from populace and thus Camillus made a hero (42) | Plutarch longer longer than Livy and closer to Dionysius here |
| 2. Camillus dies and his loss grieved (43) |

---

**Sigla for table 4.8:**

- **→**: indicates strong parallel between accounts
- **—**: indicates weaker parallel between accounts
- **Bold**: indicates elements unique in either Plutarch or Dionysius
Table 4.9: Plutarch’s Additions to Dionysius’ Account of the *Camillus*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plutarch’s Additions to Dionysius</th>
<th>Livy(^1)</th>
<th>Possible reason(s) for Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Introduction to Camillus (<em>Cam. 1.1–2.2</em>)</td>
<td>5.1–5.2.12 and 5.10</td>
<td>Person: encomiastic extolling of military and political exploits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Introduction to the siege of Veii (<em>Cam. 2.3–6</em>)</td>
<td>5.23–5.25</td>
<td>Person: encomiastic extolling of military and political exploits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Camillus’ troubles over his forgotten vow (<em>Cam. 7–8</em>)</td>
<td>5.26.1-3</td>
<td>Person: provides insight into central character</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Faliscan war and Camillus made dictator (<em>Cam. 9.1</em>)</td>
<td>5.29–5.30.3</td>
<td>Person: Plutarch has Camillus denounced (which prepares for subsequent exile) whereas Livy has him honored</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Justice and retribution upon the Romans (<em>Cam. 13.2</em>)</td>
<td>5.32.6-7</td>
<td>Person: focus on central person (retribution exonerates Camillus) (possible parallel in Rom. Ant. 13.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Two signs: the death of Julius and a voice warns Marcius (<em>Cam. 14</em>)</td>
<td>5.33–5.39</td>
<td>Person: this is part of retribution (above) (note: digression on day of Allia and unlucky days is missing from Livy and is therefore an addition to both sources by Plutarch)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) Gaul’s divide and some march upon Ardea (<em>Cam. 23</em>)</td>
<td>5.43.5–5.45.3</td>
<td>Person: Ardea is the location of Camillus (who defeats Gauls – military exploits)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) Suffering of the Gauls (<em>Cam. 28.1–2</em>)</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>Person: goes with above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9) Camillus comes to rescue the Romans (<em>Cam. 29</em>)</td>
<td>5.49.1-7</td>
<td>Person: encomiastic extolling of military exploits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10) Aftermath of expulsion of Gauls (<em>Cam. 30–32</em>)</td>
<td>5.49.8–5.55</td>
<td>Person: encomiastic extolling of military exploits (note that while <em>Cam. 31.3-5</em> appears to be omitted from Livy it turns out to be an abbreviation and transformation of <em>History</em> 5.51–5.54)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11) Further military exploits (<em>Cam. 33–41</em>)</td>
<td>6. 2–6.42</td>
<td>Lengthy section with much added to Dionysius but mostly paralleled in Livy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12) Camillus’ final days and death (<em>Cam. 42–43</em>)</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>As above details omitted from Dionysius are paralleled in Livy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\)References to Livy are all taken from his *History* and indicate pericopes omitted from Dionysius but present in Livy. Where there is no reference to Livy the pericope has been omitted from both Dionysius and Livy. There are no pericopes omitted from Livy that are present in Dionysius.

\(^2\)Encomium of Veii is somewhat paralleled in *Rom. Ant.* 12.16 but is missing from Livy who has other parallel material to Plutarch.
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Table 4.10: Camillus Parallels in Plutarch and Livy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Livy, <em>History of Rome</em>, Book 5</th>
<th>Plutarch, <em>Camillus</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>§1 Introduction and Background <em>(Cam. 1.1–2.2)</em></td>
<td>Introduction: Camillus as a leader (1.1–2.2)¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>§2 Roman War with Vientes and Siege of Veii (in Tuscany) <em>(History 5.1–22; Cam. 2.3–6)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Romans plan to maintain siege over winter: plebeian tribunes upset (403 B.C.E.)² (5.1–5.2.12)</td>
<td>1. Introduction: Veii is bulwark of Tuscany (2.3-5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Appius Cladius (senator) speaks to plebs in defense of war (5.2.13–5.6)</td>
<td>2. Camillus wars with Falerians and Capenates (2.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. News of Veii siege works being burned turns tide in Rome: equestrians then plebs offer themselves for military service (5.7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Anxur neglected (owing to war with Veii) and captured (402 B.C.E.) (5.8.1-3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Disputes between commanders (Sergius and Verginius) at Veii result in heavy Roman defeat (5.8.4-13)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Senate elects new military tribunes (5.9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Various wars but taxation causes tension in Rome (401 B.C.E.) (5.10)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Gnaeus Trebonius complains about loss of tribunical power (5.11.1-3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Sergius and Verginius tried and fined (400 B.C.E.) (5.11.4–5.12.2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Romans regain camp at Veii (5.12.3-6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Trouble in Rome leads to election of plebeian as military tribune (399 B.C.E.) (5.12.7-13)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Anxur recaptured but severe winter (consult Sibylline Books) – war continues at Veii (5.13)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. New military tribunes chosen (398 B.C.E.) (5.14)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Portent of the Alban lake and the soothsayer of Veii: Romans send for Delphic oracle (5.15.1-6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Roman soldier captures soothsayer who interprets Alban Lake portent to senate (though senate awaits Delphic oracle) (5.15.7-12)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. New military tribunes: Tarquinienses take advantage of Roman troubles and raid their territory but are defeated (397 B.C.E.) (5.16.1-7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Compare to outline in table 4.8 which contains some details that have been omitted here (where their repetition is not necessary).
²Taken from Loeb edition.

Connects to Livy, *History* 5.15.7-12 below
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17. Delphic oracle agrees with soothsayer (who is then honored) – root of problem with improper celebration of Latin festival (5.16.8–5.17.5)
18. Etruscans consider seeking an end to the siege of Veii (5.17.6-10)
19. Publius Calvus refuses office of military tribune: office given to his son (396 B.C.E.) (5.18.1-6)
20. Romans ambushed and defeated by Faliscans and Capenates causing panic and women seek gods (5.18.7-12)
21. Latin festival repeated, Alban Lake drained, and Camillus brings new hope and victories (over Faliscans and Capenates) as dictator (5.19.1-8)
22. Camillus besieges Veii and digs mine into enemy’s citadel (5.19.9-11)
23. Camillus writes to senate about impending victory: all who want a share in the spoils are permitted to go (5.20)
24. Camillus prays and charges city while others dig up through mine (possibly mythical) (5.21.1-9)
25. City plundered, Camillus prays and stumbles (bad omen) (5.21.10-17)
26. Veii enslaved and Juno transferred to Rome (statue speaks) (5.22)

§3 Aftermath of War with Veii: Camillus’ Troubles Over Forgotten Vow (History 5.23–25; Cam. 7–8)

1. Rome rejoices over victory at Veii (5.23.1-3)
2. Camillus returns on chariot pulled by white horses and resigns dictatorship: seen as irreverent (5.23.4-9)
3. Problem of Camillus’ vow (gift to Apollo of tenth of spoils) since he already distributed spoils to men: resolution reached with voluntary payment of spoils by soldiers but Camillus alienated as result (5.23.8-12)
5. Political problems over proposed Roman colonization of Volscian frontier: plebs willing if half senate goes but senate opposes (5.24.4-11)
6. Political divisions over proposed colonization: Camillus harangues the people regarding their lack of tithe (5.25.1-6)
7. Tithe made to Apollo: women give jewelry and golden bowl sent to Delphi (5.25.7-10)
8. People subsequently inflamed against Camillus for reducing the spoils of Veii to naught (5.25.11-13)

6. Camillus made dictator in tenth year of siege: chooses master of horse and makes vows to gods then invades and conquers Faliscans (and Capenates) (5.1-2)
7. Camillus attacks walls while others go through mines into temple of Juno and take city (5.3-4) (possibly mythical)
8. City plundered and Camillus prays to Jupiter then stumbles (indicates good fortune) (5.5-7)
9. Camillus decides to transfer image of Juno to Rome: statue said to speak (plausibility?) (6)

Cause of Camillus’ troubles:
(a) Wanton extravagance: vain and pompous celebration after capture of Veii (7.1)
(b) Opposing/delaying laws for dividing city (between Rome and captured city) (7.2-4)
(c) His vow concerning the spoils of Veii – annoyed soldiers (Camillus lies about matter) (7.5):

- Senate votes to have soldiers bring a tenth of booty to treasury: causes upset and Camillus gives absurd excuse for his forgotten vow (8.1-2)
- Soldiers bring tithe and senate decides to send golden bowl to Delphi: women contribute gold (owing to shortage) and are rewarded (8.3)
- Story of voyage and being taken by pirates (later released and honored given to their general)

Stories in 2 and 3 occur later in Livy, History 5.28.2-5 below)
### §4 Siege of Falerri and its Aftermath *(History 26.1–49.7; Cam. 9–29)*

1. **Camillus elected tribune to combat lavishness of plebeian tribunes (394 B.C.E.)** *(5.26.1-3)*
2. **Camillus attacks Faliscans:** ravages countryside and camp *(5.26.4-8)*
3. **Camillus besieges Falerri:** continues till Fortune intervenes *(5.26.9-10)*
4. Siege of Falerii and the treacherous school teacher *(5.27)*
5. Camillus returns to Rome in honor *(5.28.1)*
6. Golden bowl sent to Delphi: men caught by pirates and delivered by Timasitheus *(5.28.2-5)*
7. **War with Aequi:** Romans ambushed but eventual win *(5.28.6-13)*
8. Disagreement over colonization of Veii: Camillus denounces populace *(393 B.C.E.)* *(5.29)*
9. Camillus opposes people in speeches to senate *(5.30.1-3)*
10. **Senate pleads with people and law rejected;** senate apportions land to plebs as reward *(5.30.4-8)*
11. **Election of consuls and dedication of temple to Queen Juno (392 B.C.E.):** *(5.31.1-3)*
12. **Various wars and famine:** Camillus appointed interrex *(5.31.4-9)*
13. **Romans defeat Volscians and Sappinates (391 B.C.E.):** *(5.32.1-5)*
14. **Portent ignored:** voice heard by Marcus Caedicius warning of Gaul’s attack *(5.32.6-7)*
15. Romans had exiled Camillus (who could have saved them from the Gauls) and fined him 15,000 asses *(5.32.8-9)*
16. Envoys from Clusium announce arrival of Gauls (who were enticed by Arruns of Clusium) *(5.33.1-4)*
17. **Prior invasion of Gauls noted** *(5.33.5-6)*
18. **Extent of Roman domination** *(5.33.7-11)*
19. Migration of Gauls over Alps into Italy *(5.34–5.35.3)*
20. Clusium envoys request Roman help: Roman envoys to Gauls *(5.35.4-6)*
21. Gauls reject Roman envoys *(390 B.C.E.)* *(5.36.1-5)*
22. Battle between Clusium and Gauls but Gauls call it off and threaten war with Rome denouncing Fabii Quintius for deceitful behavior *(posing as ambassador then making war)* *(5.36.6-11)*

1. Faliscan War enables leading Romans to avoid confrontation with populace *(tribunes seeking law for division of city): Camillus made dictator *(9.1)*
2. Siege of Falerii and treacherous school teacher *(9.2–10)*
3. Soldiers denounce Camillus *(on account of no booty) and tribunes seek law about division of city: Camillus opposes and is object of wrath *(11)*
4. Camillus chooses self exile on account of false charges: prays to gods that Romans will repent *(12)*
5. Citizens fine him 15,000 asses in his absence *(13.1)*
6. Justice upon Romans for actions against Camillus *(13.2–29):*
   a. Retribution: dire season for Rome *(13.2)*
   b. Two signs: death of Julius the censor and voice warns Marcus Caedicius to expect Gauls *(14)*
   c. Gaul’s invade on account of gaining taste for wine *(story of Arron the Tuscan)* *(15)*
   d. Gaul’s take over Tuscan country *(16)*
   e. Gauls besiege Clusium: city appeals to Romans who send envoys but Gauls reject them *(17.1–4)*
   f. Clusium agrees to fight but Gauls march on Rome denouncing Fabii Quintius’ deceit *(7.5-6)*

---

**Note:** while Plutarch has Camillus denounced in Livy he is honored.

**Plutarch has Camillus choose his own exile (to avoid dishonor). This is less explicit in Livy.**
| 23. Tribunes who precipitated calamity act rashly (5.37.1-3) | (g) Populace appoint Fabii as military tribune: Gauls march in wrath against Rome (18.1-3) |
| 24. Gauls march on Rome: Romans meet them at Allia but are defeated (some escape to Veii) (5.37.4–5.38.10) | (h) Romans meet Gauls in battle but are defeated and many flee to Veii (18.4-7) |
| 25. Gauls March on Rome next day and find gates open (5.39.1-4) | (i) Digression: day of Allia (day of defeat in battle) and other ‘unlucky days’ (19) |
| 26. Roman panic in city: young and able bodied enter citadel; others flee to Janiculum; others simply remain in city (5.39.4–5.40.6) | (j) Gauls celebrate: some Romans leave city while others entrench themselves in capitol; others stay in forum and prepare to die (20.1-2) |
| 27. Holy objects and virgins removed from the city – assisted by Lucius Albinus (5.39.7-10) | (k) Vestal virgins escape assisted by Lucius Albinus (20.3-21.2a) |
| 28. Old men remain in Rome and prepare to die (5.41.1-3) | (l) Gauls enter city: unprotected Romans slaughtered but attack on citadel fails (22) |
| 29. Gauls enter city, slaughter Romans (who are not fortified) (5.41.4-10) | (m) Gauls divide: some in Rome while plunder for provisions; latter attack Ardea where Camillus (in exile) leads successful counter attack (23) |
| 30. Gauls fail to breach Citadel but besiege those inside (5.43.1-4) | (n) Romans at Veii request Camillus to return as general: he refuses unless legally elected (24) |
| 31. Gauls divide: some in Rome while others plunder other regions (for provisions); plunderers march on Ardea where Camillus (in exile) convinces Ardeans to resist and leads successful rout (5.43.5–5.45.3) | (o) Pontius Cominius’ secret journey in/out of Rome (Capitoline hill): senate elects Camillus (25) |
| 32. Areas surrounding Veii ravaged by Etruscans: Romans in Veii lead successful battles against Etruscans (5.45.4-8) | (p) Camillus made dictator second time and joins forces at Veii as their general (26.1a) |
| 33. Young Romans openly leaves capitol during siege and performs religious ceremony in full view of Gauls (5.46.1-3) | (q) Gauls discover Pontius’ tracks and attack by same route but Romans warned geese (26.2-27.3) |
| 34. Romans gain strength at Veii but lack a military general and send for Camillus but not until senate consents (5.46.4-7) | (r) Manlius defends capitol while captain of guards executed (27.4-5) |
| 35. Pontius Cominius’ secret journey into Rome: senate appointment Camillus as dictator (5.46.8-11) | (s) Suffering of Gauls (disease in camp) (28.1-2) |
| 36. Gauls discover tracks of Pontius and seek to attack by same route at midnight but Romans are warned by sacred geese (5.47.1-4a) | (t) Besieged Romans offer tribute to have Gauls depart: Gauls agree but tamper with scales (28.3-5) |
| 37. Manlius leads successful defense of capitol but captain of guards executed (5.47.4b-11) | (u) Camillus comes to rescue of Romans and slaughters enemy (29) |
| 38. Famine of Gauls and Romans; Gauls diseased; Romans offer truce and agree to pay price in gold but Gauls tamper with scales (5.48) | Plutarch much briefer |
### §5 Aftermath of Expulsion of Gauls: Camillus Faces Resistance but Rebuilds City (*History* 5.49.8–5.55 Cam. 30–32)

1. Camillus returns to Rome in honor as savior: shrines restored and propitiation to ‘voice’ (that warned of Gaul’s attack), tribunes try to persuade people to move to Veii (owing to devastation in Rome) (5.49.8–5.50.8)
2. Camillus addresses assembly and delivers (lengthy) speech about why people should stay in Rome (5.51–5.54)
3. Camillus’ speech effective and people agree to rebuild Rome (5.55)

---

### §6 Further Military Exploits of Camillus (*History* 6.1–42; Cam. 33–41)

1. **Comments on history writing** (sources clear) (389 B.C.E.) (6.1.1-3)
2. **Camillus remains dictator**: Fabius dies before undergoing trial (6.1.4-7)
3. **Interregnum**: questions of religious observance (6.1.8-11)
4. Threat of war from Volscians, Latins and Etrurians: Camillus made dictator again (6.2.1-6)
5. Division of army into three: Camillus goes against Volsci (fire into camp) who are forced to surrender (6.2.7-11)
6. Camillus recaptures Sutrium from Erutria (6.3)
7. **Camillus returns triumphantly to Rome**: bowls inscribed with his name (388 B.C.E.) (6.4.1-3)
8. **Political activities**: new aliens and new buildings (6.4.4-12)
9. **Plebeian tribunes seek new agrarian laws and new tribes** (387 B.C.E.) (6.5)
10. **Camillus as governor**: war with Antium; people praise Camillus and promise loyalty (386 B.C.E.) (6.6)
11. **Camillus addresses demoralized army** (6.7)
12. **Camillus leads army in defeat of Volsci** (who surrender) (6.8)
13. **Camillus seeks senate approval to attack Antium** (Volscian capital): attention diverted by Etruscan assault on Nepete and Sutrium (6.9.1-6)
14. **Camillus recaptures Sutrium** (6.9.7-12)
15. **Camillus recaptures Nepete and traitors executed** (6.10)

---

1. Camillus celebrates: sacrifices and temples restored (plus new temple to Rumour + Voice) (30)
2. Multitude overwhelmed at devastated city: speeches against Camillus (31.1-2)
3. **Senators request Camillus** remain dictator (31.3)
4. **Signs from heaven** (31.4)
5. **Senators remonstrate with people but also have compassion on them** (31.5)
6. Camillus calls for restoration of city which occurs within a year (32)

---

Notably Livy omits Plutarch’s “more fabulous” account about the rouse of the women;
<p>| 16. Schism due to Marcus Manlius: courts plebs (385 B.C.E.) (6.11) |
| 17. <strong>Dictator appointed for war with Volscians</strong>: Volscians defeated (6.12–6.13) |
| 18. Manlius further courts favor of plebs with revolutionary designs (6.14) |
| 19. <strong>Manlius summoned to appear before dictator</strong> (6.15.1-7) |
| 20. <strong>Manlius replies to charges</strong> (6.15.8-13) |
| 21. Dictator has Manlius arrested but only aggravates people (6.16) |
| 22. Senate releases Manlius owing to agitation among people (6.17.1-6) |
| 23. <strong>Latin and Hernici seek release of captives but refused</strong> (6.17.7-8) |
| 24. New elections of consular tribunes: initial peace followed by further incitements toward revolt by Manlius (384 B.C.E.) (6.18) |
| 25. Senate proposes trial of Manlius to incite plebs against him (6.19) |
| 26. Manlius indicted and offers speech in his own defense (6.20.1-9) |
| 27. Manlius found guilty and flung from same rock where he gained fame for rescue (6.20.10-12) |
| 28. <strong>Additional markers of ignominy</strong> (for Manlius) (6.20.13-16) |
| 29. Pestilence and food shortage leads to new threats of war including Praenestine disloyalty (383 B.C.E.) (6.21) |
| 30. Camillus defeats Praenestini (382-381 B.C.E.) (6.22.1-5) |
| 31. War with Volsci: Romans engage battle (contra advice of Camillus as co-leader) (6.22.6-23) |
| 32. Romans initially defeated (Furius admits failure) but then Camillus leads successful attack (6.23–6.24) |
| 33. Rome declares war on Tusculum (owing to Tusculum prisoners among Volscians) and Camillus asked to head campaign (6.25.1-6) |
| 34. War averted when Tusculans seek peace terms with Camillus and he sends to Roman senate (6.25.7-26) |
| 35. <strong>Camillus steps down</strong>: new tribunes elected but election of censors causes plebeian unrest; wars provide distraction (380 B.C.E.) (26.7.1-8) |
| 36. <strong>Praenestini seize opportunity</strong> (political unrest) to march on Rome: army readies for attack but Praenestini withdraw (6.27.9–6.28.4) |
| 37. <strong>Praenestini camp at Alli and plunder surrounding area</strong>: Romans defeat and Praenestini retreat to their city then surrender (6.28.5-29) |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#:</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>New military tribunes and war with Volsci (379 B.C.E.)</td>
<td>6.30</td>
<td>(6.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>Political strife (debt) and war with invading Volsci (once concessions made on debt) (378 B.C.E.)</td>
<td>6.31</td>
<td>(6.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>Debts increase; Romans defeat Volsci at Satrium (372 B.C.E.)</td>
<td>6.32</td>
<td>(6.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>Quarrel between Antiates and Latins: Antiates surrender to Romans but Latins burn Satrium and capture Tusculum before defeat (6.33)</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>(6.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>Political strife in Rome: Fabius Ambustus (patrician) was friend of plebs (his daughter married one) and seeks greater plebeian power (6.34)</td>
<td>6.34</td>
<td>(6.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>Gaius Licinius and Lucius Sextius made tribunes of plebs and seek plebeian interests alone (re: debt; land limits; and election of plebs as military tribunes) (375-71 B.C.E.)</td>
<td>6.35</td>
<td>(6.3-6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>Patricians alarmed and seek to block bills but plebeian tribunes obstruct election of military tribunes</td>
<td>6.35</td>
<td>(6.3-10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>Velitrae colonists invade Roman territory and besiege Tusculum: military tribunes elected and Velitrae defeated (370-69 B.C.E.)</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td>(6.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>Political battle at home resumes: increased plebeian power supported by military tribune Fabius Ambustus; vote on new bill (mixed 10 member board) deferred till after army returns from besieging Velitrae (6.36.7-37)</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td>(6.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>Camillus appointed dictator in face of rising pressure to pass new bills: he opposes plebeian tribunes who respond with contempt; Camillus resigns office and Publius Manlius made dictator (368 B.C.E.)</td>
<td>6.38</td>
<td>(6.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>Manlius makes Gaius Licinius as master of the horse and both Licinius and Sextius seek re-election as tribunes (6.39)</td>
<td>6.39</td>
<td>(6.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>Crassus (senator) speaks against Plebeian tribunes and appeals to plebs to reject their proposals (6.4-6.41)</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>(6.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>Sextius and Licinius re-elected with new mixed board (5 plebs and 5 patricians) (367 B.C.E.)</td>
<td>6.41</td>
<td>(6.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.</td>
<td>External peace interrupted by war: Camillus made dictator for fifth time and defeats Gauls (6.42.4-8)</td>
<td>6.42</td>
<td>(6.3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These three issues are thematic for the remainder of book 6 when Sextius becomes the first plebeian to be consul.

8. Dissension in the city: Plebeians (as lead by Gaius Licinius Stolo) seek to have consul elected from among themselves – Camillus reluctantly made dictator again but then resigns office (39.1-4)
9. Alternative dictator appointed and law enacted restricting patrician land ownership but consular election issue remains (39.5 to 40.1)
10. Renewed threat from Gauls: Camillus made dictator for 5th time (40.2-4)
11. Camillus defeats Gauls (41)
Table 4.10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>52. Sextius becomes first plebeian to be elected consul (on concession that patricians elect a praetor to administer justice): senate celebrates compromise with Great Games (6.42.9-14)</th>
<th>§7 Camillus’ Final Days (<em>History</em> 7.1–3; <em>Cam.</em> 42-43)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. New political realities: Plebeian consul (Lucius Sextius) but patricians defer actions to avoid his involvement (366-65 B.C.E.) (7.1.1-6)</td>
<td>1. Camillus Final days: populace come to take Camillus by force but Senate agrees to allow one of consuls to be elected from populace; Camillus is hero and temple to Concord built according to vow of Camillus; vote to add day to Latin festival (42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Pestilence kills many including Camillus: praise encomium (7.1.7-10)</td>
<td>2. Camillus dies and his loss grieved (43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Scenic entertainments introduced (7.2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Entertainments fail to appease gods: ceremony of dictator driving nail reenacted (with Manlius as dictator) (7.3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sigla for table 4.10:

- : indicates strong parallel between accounts
- : indicates weaker parallel between accounts
- Bold : indicates unique material (to either Livy or Plutarch)

Plutarch much brief in notice and does not include Livy’s encomium; likely relates to difference of Bios versus history

Details of accounts are quite different but both agree on Lucius Sextus becoming first plebeian consul
### Table 4.11: Plutarch’s Omissions from the *Camillus*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plutarch’s Omissions</th>
<th>Dionysius Rom. Ant.</th>
<th>Livy History</th>
<th>Possible reason(s) for Omission</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Maelius’ tyrannical plot and the consulship of Cossus and Quintius</td>
<td>12.1–12.9</td>
<td>4.13–16, 19, 30, 39, 44.</td>
<td>Clarity (omit unnecessary detail), conciseness (do not go too far back) and Person (irrelevant to <em>bios</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) War with Vientes (various campaigns and political events surrounding the war and the siege)</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.1–5.13</td>
<td>Clarity, conciseness and Person: much information omitted but some retained (namely what is relevant to <em>bios</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Tribunes extract information from prisoner</td>
<td>12.12.1</td>
<td>5.1; 5.13</td>
<td>Clarity, conciseness and Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) New military tribunes</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.16.1-7</td>
<td>Clarity, conciseness and Person (irrelevant to <em>bios</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Lifting of siege denied and Roman defeat of Faliscans and Capenates</td>
<td>12.13.1-3</td>
<td>5.17.6–18.12</td>
<td>Clarity, conciseness and Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Camillus writes to senate</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>Conciseness (whole section is shortened)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) Rome rejoices over victory at Veii</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.23.1-3</td>
<td>Person: heightens extravagance of Camillus in celebration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) New tribunes</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.24.1</td>
<td>Clarity, conciseness and Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9) Camillus marches on Falerii and ravages countryside</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.26.4-8</td>
<td>Clarity and conciseness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10) Wars and passing of the law about land</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.28.6-13; 5.30.4-32</td>
<td>Clarity, conciseness, credibility, and person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11) Prior invasion of Gauls and extent of Roman domination</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.33.5-11</td>
<td>Clarity, conciseness and Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12) Romans defeat Etruscans in Veii and young Roman leaves capitol during siege to perform religious ceremony</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.45.4–5.46.3</td>
<td>Clarity, conciseness and Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(13) Introductory comments</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>Clarity, conciseness and Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(14) Various activities of Camillus</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.4-10</td>
<td>Clarity and conciseness (chooses representative selection of military and political actions)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4.11 Continued

| (15) Dictator appointed + Latins and Hernicii seek release of captives | 6.12-13, 6.17.7-8 | Clarity, conciseness and person (irrelevant): minor omissions amid lengthy section of Livy that is highly abbreviated in Plutarch |
| (16) Markers of ignominy in Manlius | 6.20.13-16 | Clarity, conciseness and person |
| (17) Various political activities in Rome | 6.27-6.34 | Clarity, conciseness and person |
| (18) Various political and military activities in Rome | 6.35.7–6.37; 6.40–6.42.3 | Clarity, conciseness and person |
| (19) Various pericopes | Books 14 and 15 | Clarity, conciseness and person (note: this is only an omission from Dionysius; he appears here to be following Livy) |

### Table 4.12 Examples of Plutarch’s Abbreviations in the *Camillus*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviated Narrative</th>
<th>Plutarch</th>
<th>Livy, <em>History</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Introduction to the siege of Veii and Camillus at war with the Falerians and Capenates</td>
<td><em>Cam.</em> 2.3-6 (1 page)</td>
<td>5.1–5.10 (approx. 35 pages)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) The capture of Veii</td>
<td><em>Cam.</em> 5 (2 pages)</td>
<td>5.19 and 5.21 (4 pages)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Roman defeat of the Gauls</td>
<td><em>Cam.</em> 18.4-7 (1 page)</td>
<td>5.37.4–5.38.10 (2.5 pages)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Gauls enter Rome and slaughter Romans</td>
<td><em>Cam.</em> 22 (2 pages)</td>
<td>5.41.4–5.43.4 (3.5 pages)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Trial and execution of Manlius</td>
<td><em>Cam.</em> 36 (2 pages)</td>
<td>6.11–6.20 (19 pages)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Camillus defeats Praenestines</td>
<td><em>Cam.</em> 37.1-4 (1 page)</td>
<td>6.22–6.24 (6 pages)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) Tuscan revolt headed off by Camillus</td>
<td><em>Cam.</em> 38 (1.5 pages)</td>
<td>6.25 (3 pages)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.13: Plutarch’s Transformations of Order in the *Camillus*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transformation of Order</th>
<th>Reference in <em>Camillus</em></th>
<th>Possible Reason(s) for Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Veii as a bulwark of Tuscany</td>
<td>2.3-5</td>
<td>Clarity (omitted in Livy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Calamity of Alban Lake</td>
<td>3–4</td>
<td>Clarity and conciseness (Plutarch disagrees with Livy also – see below)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Camillus made dictator and captures Veii</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Clarity (Plutarch agrees with Livy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Camillus transfers image of Juno to Rome</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Clarity (Plutarch agrees with Livy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Camillus’ exile versus his fine</td>
<td>12–13</td>
<td>Person (Plutarch agrees with Livy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Digression on Gaul’s taste for wine</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Clarity (Plutarch agrees with Livy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) Pontius Cominius’ secret journey and Camillus’ return as dictator</td>
<td>24–26</td>
<td>Person (Plutarch agrees with Livy)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparison with Livy, *History*

| (8) Calamity of the Alban Lake | 3–4 | Clarity and conciseness (as above) |
| (9) Camillus’ troubles over forgotten vows | 7–8 | Clarity, conciseness and person |
| (10) Siege of Falerii and the aftermath of Camillus’ exile | 11–29 | Clarity, conciseness, person and cause |
### Table 4.14

**Siege of Falerri and the Treacherous School Teacher: Parallel Text in Plutarch and Dionysius**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dionysius, <em>Rom. Ant. 13</em></th>
<th>Plutarch, <em>Cam. 9–10</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>English</strong></td>
<td><strong>Greek (495 words)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Greek (265 words)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1.1) While Camillus was besieging the city of the Falerri, the tribunes of the people urged the passage of the law for the division of the city, but the war with the Faliscans came on opportunely and gave the leading men occasion to hold such elective assemblies as they wished, and to appoint Camillus military tribune, with five others. The emergency was thought to demand a leader with the dignity and reputation which experience alone could give.

---

1This provides the word count for the entire narrative. Words counts for individual sections occur at the end of each section (likewise for Plutarch).
one of the Faliscans, either despairing (the fate) of the city or chasing after personal gains, having deceived the boys of the most prominent families – for he was a teacher of letters – led (the boys) out of the city so as to walk around and exercise. For the Falerians, like the Greeks, used a common teacher desiring their boys to be brought and herded together right from the start.

(10.2) This teacher, then, plotting against the Falerri by means of their boys, led them out each day beyond the walls, (albeit) close by at first, then led them back inside once they had exercised. And leading them out from there little by little he accustomed them so as to be confident that the city was free from danger and finally

(10.1) And so the Falerians, believing themselves to be strongly fortified in every direction disregarded the siege such that, with the exception of those guarding the walls, the others went about the city in (their normal) garments; and their boys went back and forth to school and were lead by their teacher along the walls so as to walk about and exercise. For the Faliscans, either despairing (the fate) of the city or chasing after personal gains, having deceived the boys of the most prominent families – for he was a teacher of letters – led (the boys) out of the city so as to walk around and exercise. For the Falerians, like the Greeks, used a common teacher desiring their boys to be brought and herded together right from the start.
about before the walls and view the Roman camp. (1.2) Then after leading them a short distance further from the city he brought them to the Roman outpost and handed (them) over to those who had come running out. Having been brought by them to Camillus he spoke of having planned yet long ago to hand over the city to the Romans but being not a master of either citadels or gates or weapons he had discovered this plan, (namely) to place the sons of the most noble (citizens) under (their) control, having assumed that their fathers, embracing the inescapable necessity of obtaining salvation for their children, would quickly hand over (their) city to the Romans. (1.3) Indeed he was saying these things in great hopes of taking

| Table 4.14 |
|-----------------|-----------------|
| having all of them (with him) he pushed in to the Roman guards and handed (them) over, demanding to be led to Camillus. |
| (10.3) And after being brought and set in the midst (of them) he said he was an instructor and teacher, but had chosen favor with him (Camillus) instead of these (right) duties, so as to come to him bringing the city by means of its boys. |

(10.3) άχθεις δε και καταστάς είς μέσον ἔλεγε παρατήρης μὲν εἶναι καὶ διδάσκαλος, τὴν δὲ προς ἐκεῖνον χάριν ἀντὶ τούτων ἐλόμενος τῶν δικαίων, ἤκειν αὐτῷ τὴν πόλιν ἐν τοῖς παισὶ κομίζων.

(1.3) ό μὲν δὴ ταύτ’ ἔλεγε πολλὰς ἐλπίδας ἔχων θαυμαστούς τινὰς

(1.2) ἦσασμεν. (40 words) (1.2) ὑπαγόμενοι δὲ κατὰ μικρὸν αὐτοὺς προσωτέρω τῆς πόλεως ἐπὶ φυλακτηρίου Ἦσασμεν ἀγεὶ καὶ τοῖς ἐκδραμοῦσι παραδίδοσιν. υφ’ ὃν ἄχθεις ἐπὶ τὸν Καμίλλον ἐθη βεβουλεύθαι μὲν ἐτὶ πάλαι τὴν πόλιν ὑπὸ Ἦσασμεν ποίησαι, οὐδένος δὲ κύριος ὃν ὡς ἄκρας ὡς πυλῶν ὑπὸ ὁπλῶν τοῦτον ἐξευρηκέναι τὸν τρόπον, ὑποχείριος ποιῆσαι τοὺς υἱέως τῶν ἐυγενεστάτως, ἀφικνὸν ἀνάγκην ὑπολαβὼν τοὺς πατέρας αὐτῶν καταλήψεσαι τῆς σωτηρίας τῶν τεκνῶν περιεχόμενους τάχιον παραδόουσι Ἦσασμεν τὴν πόλιν. (69 words)

(10.3) Αὐτὸς τὸν παρεδόκησεν, ἁγείνε κελεύσας πρὸς τὸν Καμίλλον. (54 words)

(1.2) υπαγόμενοι δὲ κατὰ μικρὸν αὐτοὺς προσωτέρω τῆς πόλεως ἐπὶ φυλακτηρίου Ἦσασμεν ἀγεὶ καὶ τοῖς ἐκδραμοῦσι παραδίδοσιν. υφ’ ὃν ἄχθεις ἐπὶ τὸν Καμίλλον ἐθη βεβουλεύθαι μὲν ἐτὶ πάλαι τὴν πόλιν ὑπὸ Ἦσασμεν ποίησαι, οὐδένος δὲ κύριος ὃν ὡς ἄκρας ὡς πυλῶν ὑπὸ ὁπλῶν τοῦτον ἐξευρηκέναι τὸν τρόπον, ὑποχείριος ποιῆσαι τοὺς υἱέως τῶν ἐυγενεστάτως.
away some marvelous rewards for his treachery.

(2.1) But after handing over the school teacher and the children to a guard Camillus sent (word) in writing to the senate about that things that had happened and asked what he ought to do.

(2.2) and when the senate prevailed upon him to do whatever seemed best to him, after escorting the school master out of the camp and having ordered the general’s tribunal to be placed not far from the gates; (and) when a large crowd had gathered both upon the walls and upon the gates, he first made known to the Faliskans the manner in which the school teacher dared to commit an outrage.

εξοίσεθαι μιθούς τῆς προδοσίας. (14 words)
(2.1) 'Ο δὲ Κάμιλλος εἰς φυλακὴν παραδίδουσι τὸν γραμματίστην καὶ τοὺς παιδίας ἐπιστῆλε τῇ βουλῇ δία γραμμάτων τὰ γενόμενα καὶ τὶ χρῆ ποιεῖν ήρετο. (23 words)
(2.2) ἐπιρεῖσαντος δὲ αὐτῷ τοῦ συνεδρίου πράττειν ὃ τι ἄν αὐτῷ φαίνηται κράτιστον, προσαγαγών ἐκ τοῦ στρατοπέδου τὸν γραμματίστην ἁμα τοῖς παισὶ καὶ τὸ μακρὸν ἀπὸ τῶν πυλῶν τὸ στρατηγικὸν ἔμμα προστάζει τεθηκαί, πολλὸν συνήθομον ὀχλοῦ, τοῦ μεν ἐπὶ τὰ τείχη, τοῦ δὲ ἐπὶ τῶν πύλας, πρῶτον μὲν ἐδήλωσε τοῖς Φαλίσκοις οἷα ὁ γραμματίστης εἰς αὐτοὺς ἐτόλμησε παρανομεῖν ἔπειτα περικαταρρήσει τὴν ἕσθήτα τοῦ ἀνδρὸς ἐκέλευσε τοῖς ὑπηρέταις καὶ ἔσανεν τὸ σώμα μάστιξε πάνω πολλαῖς. (73 words)

δεινὸν οὖν ἀκούσαντι τὸ ἔργον ἐφάνη Καμίλλῳ καὶ πρὸς τοὺς παρόντας εἰπὼν, ὡς χαλεπὸν μὲν ἔστι πόλεμος καὶ διὰ πολλῆς ἀδικίας καὶ βιαῖων περαινόμενος ἔργων, (55 words)
(10.4) εἰσὶ δὲ καὶ πολέμων ὅμως τινὲς νόμοι τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς ἀνδραῖς, καὶ τὸ νικῶν οὐκ ὀὕτω διωκτέον, ὡστε μὴ φεύγειν τὰς ἐκ κακῶν καὶ ἀσεβῶν ἐργῶν χάριτας (ἀρετῆ γὰρ οἰκεῖα τὸν μέγαν στρατηγὸν, οὐκ ἀλλοτρία διαβρύνοτα κακία χρῆσαι στρατεύειν).

Upon hearing this, the deed appeared monstrous indeed to Camillus and speaking to those present (he said) “how indeed war is grievous and is accomplished with much injustice and violent acts.

(10.4) But even though of wars none the less there are certain laws for good men such as not to so conquer the pursued as to not flee the favors (that come) from base and impious acts; for by his own excellence the great general serves boldly- not needing another’s baseness.”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(2.3) ὥς δὲ ταύτης ἀλλὰ ἔχει τῆς τιμωρίας, ῥάβδους τοῖς παισίν ἀναδόθη ἀπέχειν αὐτὸν ἑκέλουσιν εἰς τὴν πόλιν δεδεμένου τῷ χείρε ὁπίσω παιντᾷ τε καὶ πάντα πρόπον αἰκίζομένου.</td>
<td>He ordered his servants to tear in pieces the garments of the man and to lead (tie) his hands behind (his back) and to give rods and whips to the boys so that they might drive the traitor into the city while chastising him.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2.3) κομίσαμενοι δὲ τοὺς παιδὰς οἱ Φαλίσκοι καὶ τὸν γραμματίστην ἄξιός τῆς κακῆς διανοίας τιμωρηθοῦσαν παρέδοσαν τῷ Καμίλλῳ τὴν πόλιν.</td>
<td>(10.6) The result was that not only the parents of the boys but even the rest of citizens upon seeing what was happening fell into astonishment and longing for the righteousness of Camillus and after gathering for an assembly the elders sent to him entrusting themselves, (and) these ones Camillus sent Rome.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10.5) Ἀρτί δὲ τῶν Φαλερίων ἠσθιμένων τὴν τοῦ διδασκάλου προδοσίαν καὶ τὴν μὲν πόλιν, οἷον εἰκός, ἐπὶ συμφορὰ τηλικάυτη βρήκου κατέχοντος, ἄνδρῶν δ’ ὦμοι καὶ γυναικῶν ἐπὶ τὰ τείχη καὶ τὰς πύλας σωμ ὑδενὶ λογισμῷ φερομένων, προσήγουν οἱ παιδὲς τοῦ διδασκάλου γυμνοὺς καὶ δεδεμένους προπλακίζοντες, τὸν δὲ Κάμιλλον σωτήρα καὶ πατέρα καὶ θεόν ἀνακαλουόντες.</td>
<td>(53 words)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10.6) οὕστε μὴ μόνον τοὺς γονεῦσι τῶν παιδῶν ἄλλα καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις πολίταις ταὐθ’ ὀροσάς βαιμά τε καὶ πόθου εἰμπελέοι τῆς τοῦ Καμίλλου δικαιοσύνης. καὶ συναδρομόντες εἰς ἐκκλησίαι πρέαβεις ἐπεμψαν ἑκεῖνο τὰ καθ’ ἐαυτοὺς ἐπιτρέποντες, οὓς ὁ Καμίλλος ἀπέστειλεν εἰς Ἔρωμην.</td>
<td>(40 words)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Then after receiving back the boys and punishing the school teacher in a manner worthy of his evil intention, the Faliskans handed over their city to Camillus.</td>
<td>(46 words)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10.7) ἐν δὲ τῇ βουλῇ καταστάντες εἶπον, ὅτι Ῥωμαῖοι τῆς νίκης τῆς δικαιοσύνης προτιμᾶντες ἐδίδαξαν αὐτούς τὴν ἡτταν ἀγαπήσαντες πρὸ τῆς ἔλευθερίας, οὐ τοσοῦτον τῇ δυνάμει λείπεσθαι δοκοῦντας, ὅσον ἠττᾶσθαι τῆς ἁρετῆς ὀμολογοῦντας, ἀποδούσης δὲ τῆς βουλῆς πάλιν ἐκεῖνῳ τὸ κριναί καὶ διαίτησαί ταύτα, χρήματα λαβῶν παρὰ τῶν Φαλερίων καὶ φιλίαν πρὸς ἁπαντὰς Φαλίσκους θέμενος ἀνεχώρησεν. (55 words)</td>
<td>(10.7) And having stood in the senate they said that the Romans by preferring righteousness over victory had taught them to love/desire defeat before freedom, not so much thinking (themselves) to be lacking in power as much as confessing (themselves) to be inferior (defeated) in virtue. Then when the senate again gave back the judgment and arbitration of these things to him (Camillus), after receiving payment from the Falerians and establishing friendship with all the Faliskans he withdrew.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.15: The Siege of Falerri and the Treacherous School Teacher: Parallel text in Plutarch and Livy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plutarch, <em>Camillus</em> 9-10 (712 words)$^1$</th>
<th>Livy, <em>History</em> 5 (1153 words)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(9.1) Once more the tribunes of the people urged the passage of the law for the division of the city, but the war with the Faliskans came on opportunely and gave the leading men occasion to hold such elective assemblies as they wished, and to appoint Camillus military tribune, with five others. The emergency was thought to demand a leader with the dignity and reputation which experience alone could give. (69 words)</td>
<td>(26.1) At the voting for military tribunes, the senators with much ado obtained the election of Marcus Furius Camillus. The need of a commander for the wars was their pretext, but what they really wanted was a man who would combat the lavishness of the tribunes. (2) With Camillus were elected to that office, Lucius Furius Medullinus (for the sixth time), Gaius Aemilius, Lucius Valerius Publicola, Spurius Postumius, and (for the second time) Publius Cornelius. (3) At the outset of the year the tribunes of the commons made no move, until Marcus Furius Camillus should march against the Faliscans, for to him this war had been committed. Then came delays, and men’s enthusiasm waned, while Camillus, the opponent whom they chiefly feared, won fresh renown in the Faliscan country. (4) For though at first the enemy kept within their walls, deeming this their safest course, he compelled them, by ravaging their fields and burning their farm-houses, to come out of their city. (5) Still, they were afraid to advance very far, and pitched their camp about a mile from the town, trusting that it was quite safe, without other reason than the difficulty of approaching it; for the ground about it was rough and broken, and the roads were either narrow or steep. (6) But Camillus, employing a prisoner taken in that very region for his guide, broke camp in the dead of night, and showed himself at earliest dawn in a considerably superior position. (7) The Romans, divided into three shifts, began to build a rampart, the soldiers who were not working standing by in readiness to fight. There, when the enemy sought to hinder the work, he defeated and routed them; and so great was the was the panic that came over the Faliscans, that they fled in disorder past their</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^1$All references to word counts refer to English words in translation. Those appearing throughout the text refer to word counts in preceding section. The translations are taken from the Loeb editions.
(2) After the people had ratified the election, Camillus, at the head of his army, invaded the territory of the Faliscans and laid siege to Falerri, a strong city, and well equipped with all the munitions or war. It was not that he thought its capture would demand slight effort or short time, but he wished to turn the thoughts of the citizens to other matters and keep them busy therein, that they might not be able to stay at home and become the prey of seditious leaders. This was a fitting and sovereign remedy which the Romans used, like good physicians, thereby expelling from the body politic its troublesome distempers. (110 words)

(10. 1) And so the Falerians, believing themselves to be strongly fortified in every direction disregarded the siege such that, with the exception of those guarding the walls, the others went about the city in (their normal) garments; and their boys went back and forth to school and were lead by their teacher along the walls so as to walk about and exercise. For the Falerians, like the Greeks, used a common teacher desiring their boys to be brought and herded together right from the start. (84 words)

(9) Then came a blockade of the town, and the construction of siege works; and sometimes, when opportunity offered, the townsfolk would raid the Roman outposts and skirmishes would ensue. Time wore on, without bringing hope to either side; the besieged had corn and other supplies, which they had laid up beforehand in greater abundance than the besiegers; (57 words)

(10) and it began to seem as though the struggle would be as long drawn out as at Veii, had not Fortune, at one stroke, given the Roman general an opportunity to display the magnanimity already familiar from his exploits in war, and an early victory. (46 words)

(27.1) It was customary amongst the Faliscans to employ the same person as teacher and attendant to their children, and they used to entrust a number of lads at the same time to the care of one man, a practice which still obtains in Greece. The children of the chief men, as is commonly the case, were under the tuition of one who was regarded as their foremost scholar. (68 words)

(2) This man had in time of peace got into the way of leading the boys out in front of the city for play and exercise, and during the war camp, which was the nearer refuge, and made for the town; (8) and many were slain or wounded, before, in their terror, they could rush in through the gates. The camp was taken, the booty was paid over to the quaestors. This incensed the troops, but they were overborne by the strictness of the discipline, and admired, while they detested, their general’s probity. (365 words)
first, then led them back inside once they had exercised. And leading them out from their little by little he accustomed them so as to be confident that the city was free from danger and finally having all of them (with him) he pushed in to the Roman guards and handed (them) over, demanding to be led to Camillus. (83 words)

(3) And after being brought and set in the midst (of them) he said he was an instructor and teacher, but had chosen favor with him (Camillus) instead of these (right) duties, so as to come to him bringing the city by means of its boys. (45 words)

Upon hearing this, the deed appeared monstrous indeed to Camillus and speaking to those present (he said) “how indeed war is grievous and is accomplished with much injustice and violent acts. (4) But even though of wars none the less there are certain laws for good men such as not to so conquer the pursued as to not flee the favors (that come) from base and impious acts; for by his own excellence the great general serves boldly- not needing another’s baseness.” (82 words)

He ordered his servants to tear in pieces the garments of the man and to lead (tie) his hands behind (his back) and to give rods and whips to the boys so that they might drive the traitor into the city while chastising him. (44 words)

(5) And just then when the Falerians perceived the treachery of the teacher and while a dirge was taking over the city on account of such great misfortune (as was fitting), while men and women alike were being brought onto the walls and gates without thought, the children were bringing made no change to his routine, but would draw sometimes a shorter, sometimes a longer distance from the gate, with this and that game and story, until being farther away one day than usual, he seized the opportunity to bring them amongst the enemy’s outposts, and then into the Roman camp, to the headquarters of Camillus. (85 words)

(3) He then followed up his villainous act with an even more villainous speech, (4) saying that he had given Falerri into the hands of the Romans, having delivered up to them the children of those whose fathers were in power there. (41 words)

(5) On hearing this Camillus answered: “Neither the people nor the captain to whom you are come, you scoundrel, with your scoundrel’s gift, is like yourself. (6) Between us and the Faliscans is no fellowship founded on men’s covenant; but the fellowship which nature has implanted in both sides is there and will abide. There are rights of war as well as of peace, and we have learnt to use them justly no less than bravely. (7) We bear no weapons against those tender years which find mercy even in the storming of a city, but against those who are armed themselves, who, without wrong or provocation at our hands, attacked the Roman camp at Veii. (8) Those people you have done your best to conquer by an unheard-of crime. I shall conquer them, as I conquered Veii, in the Roman way, by dint of courage, toil, and arms.” (148 words)

(9) He then had the fellow stripped, his hands bound behind his back, and gave him up to the boys to lead back to Falerri, providing them with rods to scourge the traitor as they drove him into the town. (39 words)

(10) To behold this spectacle, there was at first a great gathering together of the people, and presently the magistrates called a meeting of the senate about the strange affair, and men underwent such a revulsion of feeling, that those who a short time before, in the fury of
their hate and resentment would almost have preferred the doom of Veii to the peace of Capena, were now calling for peace, with the voice of an entire city. (11) The honesty of the Romans, and the justice of their general, were praised in the market-place and senate-house, and, with the consent of all, envoys proceeded to Camillus in his camp, and thence, by his permission, to the Roman Senate, to surrender Falerri. (121 words)

(12) Being introduced into the Curia they are said to have spoken as follows: “Conscript Fathers, you and your general have won a victory over us which no one, whether God or man, could begrudge you, and we give ourselves into your hands, believing (than which nothing can be more honorable to a victor) that we shall be better off under your government than under our own laws. (13) The outcome of this was has afforded the human race two wholesome precedents: you have set fair dealing in war above immediate victory; and we, challenged by your fair-dealing, have freely granted you that victory. (14) We are under you sway; send men to receive our arms and hostages, and our city, the gates of which stand open. (15) Neither shall you be disappointed in our fidelity now we in your rule.” Camillus was thanked both by his enemies and by his fellow citizens. The Faliscans were commanded to pay the soldiers for that year, that the Roman People might be exempted from the war tax. Peace being granted, the Roman army was led home. (183 words)
### Table 4.16: Siege of Falerri Parallel Plot Outline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plot Elements (actions)</th>
<th>Dionysius (Rom. Ant. 13)</th>
<th>Plutarch (Camillus 9)</th>
<th>Livy (History 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>§1 Introduction to Siege</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Election of Camillus as military tribune along with 5 others</td>
<td>9.1 (action is willing by force or deceit to avoid passing law)</td>
<td>26.1-2 (action is willing by force or deceit to avoid passing law)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Camillus marches against Faliskans in war</td>
<td>9.2a (willing action)</td>
<td>26.3 (willing action)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Camillus raids the Faliscan countryside taunting the enemy out of its gates</td>
<td>26.4 (willing action by Camillus; “compels” enemy out of city)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Faliskans encamp about a mile out of the city</td>
<td>26.5 (willing action)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Camillus routs the enemy camp and they flee back into city</td>
<td>26.6-7 (enemy flee by necessity)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Romans take booty but Camillus hands over to quaestors (unpopular with troops)</td>
<td>26.8 (willing action)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) Camillus besieges Falerri but they are well supplied for a lengthy siege</td>
<td>1.1a (no comment on action) 9.2b (willing action to divert attention)</td>
<td>26.9 (willing action implied)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) Faliskans raid Roman camp periodically</td>
<td>26.9 (willing action implied)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9) Potentially long siege avoided by opportunity of Fortune for the Romans</td>
<td>26.10 (editorial comment)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10) Faliskans go about city in garments of peace</td>
<td>10.1a (unwilling action based on ignorance)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>§2 Teacher Delivers Boys of City to Camillus</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11) Faliskans employ a common teacher who takes boys on trips outside of city</td>
<td>10.1b (willing action to employ teacher; unwilling action by ignorance permits him outside walls)</td>
<td>27.1 (willing action implied)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12) Teacher deliberately leads boys into Roman camp and delivers them to Camillus</td>
<td>1.1b-2a (willing action by deceit) 10.2 (willing action by deceit)</td>
<td>27.2 (willing action by deceit)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4.16 Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(13) Teacher delivers speech to Camillus about his plans to deliver the city by means of the boys</th>
<th>1.2b-3 (willing action by request)</th>
<th>10.3a (willing action by request)</th>
<th>27.3-4 (willing action)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### §3 Camillus Responds to Teacher’s Treachery

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(14) Camillus sends to senate asking what to do</th>
<th>2.1 (willing request)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(15) Senate instructs him to do what seems best to him</td>
<td>2.2a (willing action implied)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(16) Camillus speaks about the treachery and declares he will not gain victory by such means as this (different addressees in Plutarch and Livy)</td>
<td>10.3b-4a (willing action: addresses by standers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(17) Camillus escorts teacher before city and makes known his treacherous act</td>
<td>2.2b (willing action)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(18) Camillus has teacher stripped, hands tied and whipped (by boys) as he is led back into city</td>
<td>2.3a (willing action)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### §4 Faliskan Response to Teacher

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(19) Faliskans observe teacher being escorted back into city and are amazed at Camillus</th>
<th>10.5 (willing action)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(20) Faliskans hold senate meeting</td>
<td>27.10 (willing action)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(21) Faliskans punish teacher</td>
<td>2.3b (willing action as deserved)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### §5 Faliskan Response to Camillus and Rome (Surrender)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(22) Faliskans decide to surrender city to Romans</th>
<th>2.3c (willing is implied)</th>
<th>10.6 (willing action implied)</th>
<th>27.11 (willing action implied)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(23) Envoys sent to Camillus to seek terms of surrender</td>
<td>10.6 (willing action implied)</td>
<td>27.11 (willing action implied)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(24) Faliskan envoys deliver speech to Roman senate</td>
<td>10.7 (willing action implied)</td>
<td>27.12-15 (willing action implied)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(25) Faliskans pay tribute and their surrender is accepted</td>
<td>10.7 (unwilling or willing action by necessity)</td>
<td>27.15 (unwilling or willing action by necessity)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 5: Order and Selection in the Synoptic Gospel’s Miracle Tradition

5.1 General Introduction

Our examination of narrative adaptation in Josephus and Plutarch has demonstrated the high probability that Theon’s rhetorical conventions of narrative influenced the manner in which they rewrote their sources. In this and the following chapter these same narrative conventions will be used to assess the relative redactional plausibility of our three competing Synoptic source hypotheses (2GH, 2DH, and FH) in relation to Gospel miracle traditions. Insofar as these traditions have themselves generated a vast amount of secondary literature, a representative sample of this literature will be used in relation to a synchronic analysis aimed at isolating the major theological and apologetic motifs associated with the miracle traditions in each of the Synoptic Gospels. Following this analysis in the first part of the chapter these motifs will be used in conjunction with the rhetorical conventions of narrative to assess the relative redactional plausibility of our three competing SP hypotheses in relation to macro issues of order and selection. Chapter six will then analyze three specific miracle narratives using the same criteria.

5.1.1 Miracles: A General Introduction

The English term ‘miracle’ is not only difficult to define within current philosophical debate but is derivative of the Latin term *miraculum* which cannot readily stand in place of NT

---


2Typically, in the wake of David Hume, this involves debate about how miracles should be defined in relation to so-called natural laws. Regarding this discussion and additional secondary literature see, for example, the following: Michael Peterson, William Hasker, Bruce Reichenbach, and David Basinger, *Reason & Religious Belief: An
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terminology for Jesus’ wondrous activity of healing, exorcism and the like. Indeed the variety of NT terminology alerts us to the fact that no single term can be applied in a blanket manner. A related difficulty involves distinctions between miracle, medicine and magic. Howard Clark Kee, for example, sharply differentiates these categories as follows: “If a technique is effective in overcoming a hostile force, then the action is magical. If it is viewed as the intervention of the gods or goddesses, then it is miraculous. If it is a facilitating of the natural function of the body, then it is medical.” Such distinctions, however, ignore ancient pejorative use of such terminology whereby, for instance, ‘magic’ becomes a convenient term for religious or miraculous deviance when in reality there is no “thoroughly convincing way of distinguishing magic from religion.” Such terminology therefore taps into ancient polemics as much as clear definitional distinctions, and within any given ancient narrative there is likely to be an admixture of components whereby nothing constitutes pure miracle/religion or pure magic. Such labels in effect say more about the perspective of the observer than the activity being described. Charles Hedrick identifies the problem of thinking about Jesus’ activity in relation to the modern concept of “miracle” as a “momentary suspension of natural law by a supernatural force, usually conceived as God.” He contends that no such concept of ‘miracle’ existed in antiquity where, instead, “popular imagination conceived of nature as permeated by supernatural forces ... both benevolent and malevolent” (“Miracles in Mark: A Study in Markan Theology and Its Implications for Modern Religious Thought,” Perspectives in Religious Studies 34/3 [2007]: 297). While Hedrick’s definition of the modern concept of miracle might itself be open to question (see previous footnote and literature cited there), his contention that we avoid uncritical transfer of modern notions of miracle back into first century texts is valid.


Charles Hedrick identifies the problem of thinking about Jesus’ activity in relation to the modern concept of “miracle” as a “momentary suspension of natural law by a supernatural force, usually conceived as God.” He contends that no such concept of ‘miracle’ existed in antiquity where, instead, “popular imagination conceived of nature as permeated by supernatural forces ... both benevolent and malevolent” (“Miracles in Mark: A Study in Markan Theology and Its Implications for Modern Religious Thought,” Perspectives in Religious Studies 34/3 [2007]: 297). While Hedrick’s definition of the modern concept of miracle might itself be open to question (see previous footnote and literature cited there), his contention that we avoid uncritical transfer of modern notions of miracle back into first century texts is valid.

See representative discussions of Synoptic miracle terminology in Birger Gerhardsson (The Mighty Acts of Jesus According to Matthew, Robert Dewsnap, Scriptura Minor [Lund: Gleerup, 1979], 11–19) and C. F. D. Moule (Miracles: Cambridge Studies in Their Philosophy and History [London: Mowbray, 1965], 235–8) who identify the following key terms: τέρας, σημείον, θαυμάσιον, παράδοξον, ἔργα, and δυνάμεις. The last of these is the most common designation for Jesus’ wondrous activity in the Synoptic Gospels (e.g., Matt 7:22; 11:20, 21, 23; 13:54, 58; Mark 6:2, 5; 9:39; Luke 10:13; 19:37) but is absent from John who prefers σημεῖα (e.g., John 2:11, 18, 23; 3:2; 4:54).

Kee, Medicine, 4.


Aune (“Magic,” 1523–39), for example, sees the following parallels to ancient ‘magic’ in the Synoptic accounts of Jesus’ ‘miracles’: foreign words of command (e.g., Ταλίθα Cumi in Mark 5:41); laying on of hands; magical fluid; and the use of saliva. He actually opts to redefine magic in terms of social deviance and, therefore, considers Jesus’ wonders as ‘magical’ (since he was socially deviant). At the same time he hesitates to label Jesus as a ‘magician’ since his magical activity is subsumed under the broader category of “messianic prophet” (ibid., 1539). The
Hedrick rightly points out that ancients generally agreed on seeing the world as “permeated by supernatural forces” but worldviews nevertheless differed and sometimes clashed. Thus while it may be problematic to differentiate miracle and magic in antiquity, we can certainly consider the apologetic aims of those who wrote about such wondrous activity and the significance they attached to it. It is from this perspective that I approach Jesus’ wondrous activity in the Synoptic Gospels, seeking to discern the theological and apologetic aim(s) of the evangelists. My frequent use of ‘miracle’ terminology (below) is, therefore, not intended to differentiate Jesus’ activity from ‘magic’ (or ‘medicine’). Rather it is a choice of convenience and one which is subservient to my larger goal of identifying the apologetic aim(s) of each evangelist in recording such activity. With these qualifications in mind we can proceed to a synchronic reading of the Synoptic miracle tradition.

5.1.1.1 Miracle Traditions in Mark: A Synchronic Analysis

It has already been noted that, to the extent it is deemed relevant, most analyses of Gospel miracle traditions during the past century have assumed some variation of the 2DH. While
sources for Markan miracle tradition are discussed, the assumption of Markan priority generally results in studies valuable for a synchronic reading. Nevertheless Markan miracles provide their own interpretive challenges related secondarily to such matters as the θείος ἀνήρ concept, the Messianic Secret, and the role of the disciples. Regarding the first of these, it has been suggested by various scholars that the Hellenistic θείος ἀνήρ tradition provides the primary context for understanding both the literary genre and Christology of Mark. This opinion dates back to at least Rudolf Bultmann though has been advocated by others and is typically associated with the Religionsgeschichte approach which sees the abundance of miracles and the use of the θείος θεοῦ title as evidence that Mark is portraying Jesus as a Hellenistic miracle working θείος ἀνήρ. While the dominant view in the early twentieth century (Wrede to

---


13In contrast, for example, to Held’s redaction-critical study of Matthew (“Miracle Stories”) which, owing to his assumption of Markan priority, should be used judiciously for synchronically reading Matthew’s miracle tradition.

14Regarding Mark’s purported christological use of the θείος ἀνήρ concept see summary discussions in Morton Smith (“Prolegomena to a Discussion of Aretalogies. Divine Men, the Gospels and Jesus,” JBL 89 [1971]: 174–99), David Tiede (The Charismatic Figure as Miracle Worker, SBLDS 1 [Missoula, Montana: Society of Biblical Literature for the Seminar on the Gospels, 1972]), Carl Holladay (Theios Aner in Hellenistic Judaism: A Critical of the Use of This Category in New Testament Christology [Missoula, Montana: Scholars Press, 1977], 18–43), and Edwin Broadhead (Teaching with Authority: Miracles and Christology in the Gospel of Mark, JSNTSup 74 [Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992], 16–21). For a discussion of literary genre see chapter 2 and the literature cited there.


Marxsen) saw Mark positively embracing θείος ἀνήρ Christology (e.g., Bultmann), it has subsequently been read as a negative foil against which Mark correctly constructs his own cross-centered Christology.\(^\text{17}\) Theodore Weeden, for example, detected in Mark a thoroughgoing polemic against an intrusive θείος ἀνήρ factional group within his community, a group that Mark narratively identifies with Jesus’ disciples who, despite good beginnings, are ultimately vilified without rehabilitation on account of their triumphalistic view of miracles.\(^\text{18}\) Weeden (along with others) has been criticized on at least two fronts.

First, despite its popularity, the θείος ἀνήρ hypothesis has itself been criticized for at least the following reasons: (1) inherent ambiguity in the term θείος ἀνήρ, insofar as it is not consistently associated with miracle workers for example, suggests it cannot serve as fixed concept for assessing Markan Christology;\(^\text{19}\) (2) similarly, ‘miracle-working divine men’ do not constitute a fixed type in antiquity;\(^\text{20}\) (3) despite obvious parallels to Greco-Roman miracle workers, the

\(^\text{17}\)So Jack Dean Kingsbury, “The ‘Divine Man’ as the Key to Mark’s Christology - the End of an Era?” *Int* 35 (1981): 244–47 and Hedrick, “Miracles in Mark”. For a list of scholars seeing ‘corrective Christology’ in Mark see Broadhead, *Teaching*, 17–21. His comments may be summarized as follows: ‘corrective Christology’ is implied in Martin Dibelius (1935) but explicit in Johannes Schreiber (1961: Mark transforms θείος ἀνήρ traditions through a *theologia crucis*). Similar hypotheses appear in Ulrich Luz (1965: Mark retains θείος ἀνήρ but interprets it in light of cross), Eduard Schweizer (1970: Mark counters θείος ἀνήρ by linking Jesus’ miracles to faith and the cross), Paul Achtemeier (1972: Mark takes over two miracle cycles with θείος ἀνήρ and Eucharistic theology but critiques and recasts them so as to heighten the themes of suffering, discipleship, and Jesus as teacher), Ludger Schenke (1974: Mark recognizes Jesus as Son of God and risen Lord but sees the revelation of Jesus’ sonship in his crucifixion rather than his miracles), Leander Keck (1965: Mark has both Palestinian miracles, associated with Jesus, and Hellenistic ones, associated with θείος ἀνήρ theology, and tends toward correction of the latter), Karl Kertelge (1970: Mark, like Paul, relativizes miracles in relation to resurrection as a source of faith), Norman Perrin (1974: Mark combats θείος ἀνήρ Christology with a cross centered Son of Man Christology), Dietrich-Alex Kock (1975: miracles are positive in Mark but under the authority of Jesus’ teaching which leads ultimately to the cross), and Gottfried Schille (1967: general tendency in early Christianity toward critical reinterpretation of miracle traditions).


differences (in the Gospels) call into question any simple notion of direct dependence;\textsuperscript{21} (4) parallels with Jewish figures must also be considered and these are not necessarily as strongly influenced by the θείος ὄνηρ concept (e.g., in Philo and Josephus) as has been argued.\textsuperscript{22} Such criticisms appropriately respond to over enthusiastic attempts to make this somewhat ambiguous concept (θείος ὄνηρ) the primary category for understanding Mark’s Christology. Nevertheless the objections should not be overstated so as to posit a purely Jewish milieu for Jesus’ miracles devoid of Hellenistic influence.\textsuperscript{23} Miracle reports were common to both Jewish and Greco-Roman antiquity and the Gospel miracles should be read in light of both.

Second, and more importantly for this study, many disagree with Weeden’s fundamentally negative reading of Markan miracles.\textsuperscript{24} Weeden’s hypothesis, according to Edwin Broadhead, is circular (moving “from text to reconstructed tradition and Sitz im Leben, then back to the text again”) and operates with the unproven presupposition that reconstructed tradition provides the key to interpreting of Mark.\textsuperscript{25} Indeed upon a strictly synchronic reading several reasons emerge for seeing a basically positive orientation toward Jesus’ wonder working activity in Mark. First, the extent of Markan miracle tradition implies a positive attitude toward miracles. Mark includes eighteen miracle stories (see table 2.1) comprising approximately twenty five percent of his narrative, proportionally more than either Synoptic counterpart (about eleven percent each in

\textsuperscript{21}Ibid., 192-96.
\textsuperscript{22}Ibid., 196-98. For these and other arguments see also the following: Holladay, Theios Aner, 233–42; Otto Betz, “The Concept of the So-Called ‘Divine Man’ in Mark’s Christology,” in Studies in the New Testament and Early Christian Literature, ed. David E. Aune (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1972), 229–40; Tiede, Charismatic Figure; Blackburn, Theios Anèr; Kingsbury, “‘Divine Man’”; Broadhead, Teaching, 210–13; Burridge, What Are the Gospels? 16–19; and Twelftree, Miracle Worker, 93. In addition Morton Smith notes several (German) authors from the 1950’s who opposed the connection drawn between Jesus and the Hellenistic θείος ὄνηρ (e.g., Bieneck; Preisker; Maurer; Jeremias; Grundman) albeit dismissing their arguments (“Prolegomena,” 192–94).
\textsuperscript{23}The thoroughgoing Hellenistic influence on the whole of the ancient Mediterranean world is so widely accepted in recent scholarship that it hardly needs stating. For a classic statement see Martin Hengel, Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in Their Encounter in Palestine During the Early Hellenistic Period. 2 Volumes. (London; Philadelphia: SCM Press Ltd, 1974).
\textsuperscript{24}Noting (as with Bultmann and others) that not all who see the θείος ὄνηρ concept in Mark view the miracles as negatively as Weeden. Insofar as Jesus shows an increasing reluctance to perform miracles as the Gospel proceeds, however, William Countryman also sees them being deliberately devalued in relation to faith (“How Many Baskets Full? Mark 8:14–21 and the Value of Miracles in Mark,” CBQ 47 [October 1985]: 643–55) and Theissen notes similar negative opinions about Markan miracles in the writings of G. Klein and K. Kertelge (Miracle Stories, 294).
\textsuperscript{25}Broadhead, Teaching, 213.
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Matthew and Luke). This is reinforced by the repeated mention of miracles in summary statements especially in the first half of the Gospel (1:32-34, 39; 3:7-12; 6:53-56) where miracles predominate (all but three miracle narratives occur in Mark 1–8). It is further reinforced by several additional references to miracles in which Jesus defends his own and another’s exorcistic activity (3:22-30; 9:38-41) and, furthermore, commissions his disciples to perform healings and exorcisms alongside proclamation (3:14-15; 6:6-13). Such extensive integration of miracle tradition seems unlikely if Mark wants to portray miracles in a fundamentally negative light.

Second, despite this extensive integration of miracle tradition, there are no explicit negative evaluations of miracles within the Markan narrative. Indeed Jesus’ explicit defense of ‘another’ exorcist in relation to the complaints of his own disciples appears in the second half of the Gospel (9:38-41), precisely where the denunciation of miracle theology is said to be focused.

The healing of the demon possessed boy (9:14-29) and Bartimeaus (10:46-52) also occur in the latter half of the Gospel, but are recounted without any sense that miracles are now being devalued. Furthermore, when explicit criticism is offered about the disciples it relates to their failure in understanding (e.g., 8:14-21), their unwillingness to embrace the cross (8:31-38), and their jostling over positions of priority (10:35-45), but not in relation to their thinking about miracles. Jesus’ refusal to provide a sign is a possible exception (8:11-13) but this is not directed

---

26 Theissen states “if Mark wanted to warn against belief in miracles, it is hard to see why he should emphasize Jesus’ miraculous activity in redactional summaries” (Miracle Stories, 294). While the observation assumes Markan priority, it remains true for 2GH proponents that Mark has taken over such summaries from Matthew and Luke (though, as noted below, he ignores several healing references in Matthean summaries). On the function of these summaries, as rhetorical devices for creating “the illusion that such occurrences (miracles) were happening frequently over wide geographical areas,” see Hedrick, “Miracles in Mark,” 299.

27 Other pericopes where miracles are mentioned include 6:1-6, 14-16, 8:14-21. Other possible references include 8:11-13 and 13:21-23.

28 In relation to the extent of Markan miracles Theissen asks “Can Mark really have told sixteen miracle stories solely in order to warn against belief in miracles?” (Miracle Stories, 294). The same point is made by Twelftree (Miracle Worker, 96), Broadhead (Teaching, 211–12), and Frank Matera, who contends that Markan miracles are the “engine that enables the plot to move forward” (“‘He Saved Others; He Cannot Save Himself’: A Literary-Critical Perspective on the Markan Miracles,” Int 47 [January 1993]: 25).

29 While it is true that the disciples fail to cast out the demon from the boy (9:18), Jesus does not respond by denouncing miracle activity but rather by pointing to the faithlessness of this generation and, more specifically (in private conversation with the disciples), to the need for prayer in such cases (9:28-29).
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at the disciples and appears to be addressing a different issue than either healing or exorcism. Third, miracles appear to have a positive role in Mark’s theological agenda. This role has been variously identified in relation to such themes as the in-breaking kingdom, Jesus’ messianic identity, Jesus’ authority and power over evil, and Jesus’ teaching on faith and discipleship (see further below). Fourth, miracles are nevertheless relativized in light of the cross. Central to Weeden’s hypothesis is the narrative-theological shift that occurs after Mark 8:27-30 whereupon Jesus’ messiahship becomes linked directly to the cross, suffering and servanthood (e.g., 8:31; 9:31-32; 10:32-34, 45). Discipleship is reinterpreted in light of these motifs (e.g., 8:34-38; 10:28-31, 38-39, 43-44; 13:9-13) and Weeden, understandably, perceives an implied critique of miracles insofar as eighty percent of Markan miracle tradition occurs prior to Mark 8:30. Our three prior observations (extent of miracles, lack of explicit critique, and positive theological value), however, suggest that, to the extent miracle tradition is implicated in the narrative-theological shift occurring after Mark 8:27-30, this is better explained as a relativizing of the significance of miracles (in light of the cross) than as a denunciation of them in toto.

Miracles may well be subordinated to the cross in Markan theology but they are not subordinated

---

30 The request itself comes not from disciples or miracle suppliants but from Jesus’ opponents, namely the Pharisees about whom we have already been warned of their plot to destroy Jesus in 3:6. Jesus’ categorical refusal, therefore, implies more about his judgment on this generation (for failing to believe) than about any negative thinking regarding miracles. Hence, regardless of the actual referent for the σημεῖον ἀπό τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, Jesus’ refusal is specific to the situation and the identity of those requesting the ‘sign.’ Mark’s terminology further reinforces this: thus σημεῖον, which occurs five times by itself (in 8:11, 12; 13:4, 22) and once alongside τέρας (13:22), is used only negatively; the more usual term for ‘miracles,’ namely ὁδὸς ἰδέων (‘deeds of power’), occurs ten times (5:30; 6:2, 5, 14; 9:1, 39; 12:24; 13:25) and without the negative connotations of either σημεῖον or τέρας; finally, the passage itself occurs within the context of miracles performed for the benefit of the disciples and others (e.g., 8:1-10, 22-26) yet, while the disciples are criticized for their failure to understand (8:14-21), there are no indications that the miracles themselves are inherently problematic. For a discussion of the terminology in Mark 8:11-13 see the following: M. Eugene Boring, Mark: A Commentary (Louisville; London: Westminster John Knox Press, 2006), 192, 222–3; R. T. France, The Gospel According to Mark: A Commentary on the Greek Text, NIGTC (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 2002), 311–2; John R. Donahue and Daniel J. Harrington, The Gospel of Mark, Sacra Pagina 2 (Collegeville, Minnesota: Liturgical Press, 2002). For a dismissal of this passage as proof of a negative view of miracles in Mark see also Theissen (Miracle Stories, 296) and Twelftree (Miracle Worker, 92).


32 Twelftree, Miracle Worker, 93–95.


35 See especially Weeden, Mark, chapter 2.
into oblivion. While these observations are sufficient to establish Mark’s positive attitude toward miracles, further elaboration is required to arrive at a baseline synchronic reading of Markan miracle tradition. In this regard we may identify the following motifs:

(1) **Miracle tradition plays a positive role in relation to the identity of Jesus as Messiah:**

following the programmatic announcement of Mark 1:14-15 and Jesus’ initial calling of disciples (Mark 1:16-20), his first recorded act is that of teaching in the synagogue at Capernaum on the Sabbath (1:21). The subsequent narrative, however, does not recount the content of his teaching (despite being informed of people’s response of amazement to it in 1:22 and 27) but, instead, relates Jesus’ exorcism of an unclean spirit which, in the process, confesses “I know who you are, the holy one of God” (1:24).37 This picks up on the identity question raised earlier (1:1, 7-8 and 11) and which seemingly provides the backdrop to the first eight chapters.38 While opinions on Jesus’ identity are offered by various characters,39 Peter’s confession (Mark 8:27-30) is clearly climactic. In this regard it may be claimed that consideration of Mark’s narrative structure and distribution of miracle tradition implies that miracles contribute positively to this identity question. Attempts to explain Markan structure have variously appealed to the following:40 (1) topography/geography41; (2) the outline of Acts 10:37-4142; (3) theological

---

36The subordination of miracles to the cross is generally acknowledged among those who see a positive role for Markan miracles. See, for example, the following: Mariña, “Markan Account of Miracles”; Sherman E. Johnson, “Greek and Jewish Heroes: Fourth Maccabees and the Gospel of Mark,” in Early Christian Literature and the Classical Intellectual Tradition, ed. William R. Schoedel and Robert L. Wilken (Paris: Éditions Beachesne, 1979), 155–75; Kee, Medicine, 85.

37As noted in Twelftree (Miracle Worker, 94–95) who also points to the identification of Jesus within subsequent miracle tradition as ‘Son of the Most High’ (5:7), ‘Son of God’ (3:11), and ‘Son of David’ (10:47–48).

38The question of Jesus’ identity occurs somewhat explicitly in the questions of the synagogue on-lookers (1:27), opponents (2:7), and disciples (4:41). It is implied throughout the narrative, however, in relation to Jesus’ healing activity (e.g., 2:1-12; 3:1-6; 7:31-37), his power over the forces of nature (4:35-41; 6:45-52), the questions and accusations of others (e.g., 2:18, 23-24; 3:22), and his rejection in his home town (6:1-6). Related questions are also raised in regard to his authority to forgive sins (2:1-12) as well as his authority over the Sabbath (3:2) (on which see Twelftree, Miracle Worker, 94–95).

39Specifically he is identified as: (1) Elijah or one of the prophets (the people in 6:15; 8:28); (2) John the Baptist redivivus (Herod in 6:16); and (3) Mary’s son, the carpenter (the people of Jesus’ home town in 6:1-6). He is also identified as having gone out of his mind (3:20-21) and even being demonized (3:22). The demons, however, come closest to the mark in openly identifying him as the Son of God (1:24; 3:11; 5:7; cf. 1:1, 11; 9:7; 12:6; 15:39).


41Advocates of geographical structure are various but do not all agree in their divisions. Hence, for example, while Vincent Taylor sees five major units in Mark 1–13 (The Gospel According to St. Mark: The Greek Text with
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themes;\(^{43}\) (4) \textit{Sitz im Leben} of the recipients;\(^{44}\) (5) literary analysis;\(^{45}\) (6) rhetorical analysis;\(^{46}\) (7) the influence of orality;\(^{47}\) and (8) a model of ‘divine tragedy.’\(^{48}\) While there is disagreement on

\textit{Introduction, Notes and Indexes} [London; New York: Macmillan & Co Ltd; St Martin’s Press, 1957], 107–11), Charles Hedrick identifies eleven (“What is a Gospel? Geography, Time and Narrative Structure,” \textit{Perspectives in Religious Studies} 10/3 [1983]: 255–68). Alternatively France sees three main acts, though not necessarily resulting from any conscious choice of the evangelist, and is skeptical about our ability to discern precise structure beyond this broad outline (\textit{Mark}, 11–15). Willi Marxen’s redaction critical analysis also highlights geography as a structuring device with theological purpose: he discerns Galilee (Mark 1–9) and Jerusalem (Mark 11–16) “epochs” with Mark 10 as a transition (\textit{Mark the Evangelist}, 54–116, esp. 56). Robert Gundry has criticized such approaches insofar as geographical movement frequently occurs within pericopes and on a macro scale lacks consistency. Hence, for example, when journeying to Jerusalem (8:27–11:10) Jesus goes to Caesarea (8:22, 27), up and down a mountain (9:2, 9) and into a house (9:28) - all outside Galilee - then back through Galilee to Capernaum (9:30, 33) before heading to Jerusalem (\textit{Mark}: A Commentary on His Apology for the Cross [Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1993], 1047). Larsen likewise notes the problem of using geography to determine sub-structure within larger narrative units citing, for example, the problem in Mark 6 where Jesus instructs his disciples to go ahead to Bethsaida (6:45) only to have them arrive at Gennesaret a few verses later (6:53) (“Structure,” 144).

This proposal is famously associated with C. H. Dodd (“The Framework of the Gospel Narrative,” \textit{ExpTim} 43 [1932]: 398–400) but has received little support in subsequent scholarship.

Larsen cites a number of attempts to discern Markan structure in relation to the following: Christology (C. Myers and R. V. Peace); Jesus’ interaction with his disciples (Schweizer and Perrin, Robbins, and Gnilka); the Way (Heil); and the Exodus theme (Watts) (“Structure,” 145–8).

Larsen notes attempts to understand Mark’s structure in relation to Passover Liturgy (Bowman), the Christian liturgical calendar (Carrington) and Mark’s use of a boat source but notes strong criticisms from various others (“Structure,” 148–9).


Larsen notes the following attempt of Standaert’s to organize the structure of Mark according to the five classic divisions of rhetoric: \textit{exordium} 1:1–13; \textit{narratio} 1:14–6:13; \textit{probatio} 6:14–10:52; \textit{refutatio} 11:1–15:47; \textit{conclusio} 16:1–8 (see “Structure,” 153).

According to Dewey, for example, Mark is not sequential or linear but is “an interwoven tapestry or fugue made up of multiple overlapping structures and sequences” (“Mark as Interwoven Tapestry: Forecasts and Echoes for a Listening Audience,” \textit{CBQ} 53 [1991]: 224). In particular she notes specific transitional sections (Mark 1:14–15, 3:6, 7:12; 8:22–26; 8:27–30; 10:46; 14:1), which are typically taken as structural dividing points, that have “multiple verbal and content connections, repetitions and anticipations, echoing backwards and forwards in the narrative” (ibid., 226). In this way Mark is better understood as befitting an oral model of composition (ibid., 234–5; see also Dewey, “Oral Methods of Structuring Narrative in Mark,” \textit{Interpretation} 43/1 [1989]: 32–44)). Elsewhere Dewey argues for the importance of concentric structuring devices in Mark with her own detailed analysis focusing on Mark 2:1–3:6 (\textit{Markan Public Debate: Literary Technique, Concentric Structure and Theology in Mark} 2:1–3:6, \textit{SBLDS} 48 [Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1980]; “The Literary Structure of the Controversy Stories in Mark 2:1–3:6”). A
the details and some oppose the notion of intentional structure all together\textsuperscript{49} most agree to at least one or two major divisions occurring at Mark 8:22 (or 8:27) and Mark 10:45 (or 10:52).\textsuperscript{50} With this in mind seventeen of Mark’s eighteen miracle stories (ninety four percent) occur within the first two sections (the withered fig tree is the exception) while fifteen (eighty three percent) are prior to Peter’s confession (8:27-30).\textsuperscript{51} Assuming, therefore, that Mark does not deliberately devalue miracles (as above) their preponderance in this opening section, with its climax at Peter’s confession, implies that they play a positive role in regard to establishing Jesus’ identity as a Messiah.\textsuperscript{52} A discussion of messiahship in Mark overlaps with the infamous problem of Mark’s Messianic Secret which has been a matter of debate since the publication of William Wrede’s \textit{Das Messiasgeheimnis in den Evangelien; zugleich ein Beitrag zum Verständnis des Markusevangeliums} (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck, 1901).\textsuperscript{53} The various literary features of the ‘secret’ include: injunctions to silence (e.g., 1:23-24, 34; 43-45; 3:11-12; 5:43; 7:36; 8:26),

\textsuperscript{49}Stephen Smith, for example, sees the following basic structure based on comparison with Aristotle’s ‘Poetics’ and actual dramas (especially Oedipus Rex): \textit{complication} (Mark 1:14–8:26), \textit{recognition} (8:27-30), and \textit{dénouement} (8:31–16:8). Elements of Aristotelian plot structure are also seen in relation to a \textit{prologue} (Mark 1:1-13), \textit{epilogue} (Mark 16:1-8), and intervening episodes (Mark 1:14–15:47) (“A Divine Tragedy: Some Observations on the Dramatic Structure of Mark’s Gospel,” \textit{NovT} 37/3 (1995): 209–31).

\textsuperscript{50}E.g. Nineham sees no “single and entirely coherent master-plan” and scholars who seek to identify one are “looking for something that is not there and attributing to the evangelist a higher degree of self conscious purpose than he in fact possessed” (quoted in Larsen, “Structure,” 140). Similarly Gundry considers Mark as a “loose disposition of materials” (quoted in Larsen, “Structure,” 141).

\textsuperscript{51}That is fourteen (seventy eight percent) if the first section is taken to end at 8:21.

\textsuperscript{52}Others who see a positive Christological role for Markan miracles include the following: Twelftree (\textit{Miracle Worker}, 95); Broadhead (\textit{Teaching}, 207–10); Achtemeier (“Person and Deed,” \textit{Int} 16 [1962]: 169–76; “And He Followed Him”; \textit{Miracles and Discipleship in Mark} 10:46–52, \textit{Semeia} 11 [1978]: 115–45); and Robbins (“\textit{Bartimaeus}”). These last two authors, however, disagree on whether the Son of David title should be understood positively or negatively (Robbins argues for a positive transition from Son of Man Christology in 8:27–10:45 to Son of David Christology in 10:46–12:44; alternatively Achtemeier sees Mark downplaying the Son of David theme). Regarding the distribution of the miracle stories themselves there is some disagreement. Hence while Fuller sees five groups of miracles in Mark 1–8 (\textit{Interpreting}, 65–75; identified as 1:21-34; 1:40–3:6; 3:7-12; 4:35–5:43; 6:5; 6:30–8:26), Matera sees four groups in Mark 1–14 (“‘He Saved Others’”; groups include 1:21–3:35; 4:35–5:43; 6:34–8:26; Mark 9–14) and Broadhead sees five groups within the same limits as Matera (\textit{Teaching}, 201–4; Mark 1:1–3:6; 3:7–6:6; 6:6b–8:26; 8:27–10:52; 11:1–13:37). This, however, does not alter the observations about their preponderance in Mark 1–8.

which are sometimes quite implausible (5:43); Jesus’ avoidance of crowds (e.g., 1:35; 7:24; 9:30-31); Jesus’ private instruction to the disciples (e.g., 4:10-13, 34; 7:17-23; 9:28-32; 10:32-34; 13:3-37); and the disciples’ lack of comprehension (7:18; 8:17-21, 31). According to Wrede these phenomena are best explained as part of a literary-theological apologetic insofar as Mark 9:9 indicates that messianic claims about Jesus did not arise historically until after the resurrection. They were purportedly introduced by the early church so as to avoid accusations that messianic claims had no direct connection to Jesus himself. David Aune identifies two basic approaches to the messianic secret motif in the wake of Wrede: (1) the historical (the secrecy phenomena goes back in some way to the historical Jesus) and (2) the literary (Jesus himself was silent about being messiah and was only proclaimed so by the early church as part of its post resurrection kerygma). 54 Among those taking the latter approach some are in basic agreement with Wrede (e.g., Bultmann) while others have differentiated the Wundergeheimnis (miracle-secret) and Messiasgeheimnis (messianic-secret) with the former being the product of a Hellenistic θεῖος ἀνήρ concept (referring to the Jesus of history) and the latter referring to a post Easter kerygmatic Jesus (Ulrich Luz). 55 While deciding between these options is not critical to the present study, the secrecy motif is frequently associated with miracle tradition suggesting to some that Mark does not intend miracles to be seen as contributing to Jesus’ messianic identity. 56 This, however, likely overstates the case given the importance of miracles to Mark and the climactic profession of Peter in Mark 8:27-30. In accord with my comments above it seems more


55 Aune, “Messianic Secret” (see pp. 2-8 for a summary and critique of Wrede).

56 For example Charles Hedrick states that “Mark does not want Jesus’ mighty deeds to become public proof of Jesus’ true identity.” The first reason he offers in support of this is that “Mark portrays Jesus as trying to keep his identity secret” adding that Mark’s Jesus refuses to give a sign (8:11-13), that the mighty deeds do not lead to faith, and that Mark basically “rejected the idea of a wonder-working messiah (8:27-36).” Hedrick concludes that “the mighty deeds are better understood in a strategic sense in connection with the cosmic struggle between his force, empowered by God’s spirit, and the demonic forces that control the world” (“Miracles in Mark,” 307).
likely that silencing commands (whether historical or not) are intended in Mark to show a reticence toward a messianic confession that is based *solely* upon miracles. Rather messiahship must be understood in light of Jesus’ passion whereby miracles are only part of the witness.\(^{57}\)

(2) *Miracles provide evidence of the in-breaking kingdom of God.* This connection, especially in relation to Jesus’ triumph over evil powers, is detected by several scholars\(^{58}\) and is strongly implied in the opening statement about Jesus’ public ministry in Mark 1:14-15, which highlights the coming of the kingdom in relation to Jesus’ proclamation. The first public ‘proclamation’ recorded, however, involves the exorcism of an unclean spirit (1:21-28)\(^{59}\) and, as noted above, Mark’s first eight chapters generally emphasize miracles more than teaching. Jesus’ triumph over evil is explicit in the Beelzebul controversy, which speaks of defeating and plundering Satan’s kingdom (3:20-30),\(^{60}\) and is further demonstrated in the remaining exorcisms (especially 5:1-20 and 9:14-29) and his control over hostile forces of nature (4:35-41).

(3) *Miracles relate positively to Jesus’ teaching and may sometimes have a parabolic type function.* While miracle tradition may dominate, Mark 1–8 is far from devoid of teaching tradition (e.g., 2:15-28; 3:20-35; 4:1-34; 6:7-13; and 7:1-23) and in some ways the teaching motif is highlighted.\(^{61}\) While at first sight there appears to be a tension between miracle and

---

\(^{57}\) If miracles were irrelevant to messiahship then one wonders why they are narrated at all whereas in light of the broader context they are best taken as providing important indications of Jesus’ messiahship. This position is similar to that of James D. G. Dunn, “Messianic Secret.”

\(^{58}\) For example, see the following: Mariña, “Markan Account of Miracles”; Reginald H. Fuller, *Interpreting*, 69–72; Mann, *Mark*, 139–42; Hedrick, “Miracles in Mark,” 305–6; Kee, *Miracle*, 159–70; Matera, “‘He Saved Others’,” 24.

\(^{59}\) According to Mann the “healing works of Jesus are ... an outward and sacramental sign of a dawning but invisible reign of God” and insofar as healing (e.g., Mark 3:2 among others) takes place on the Sabbath it indicates that Jesus’ miracles are “new creation-activity” (*Mark*, 141).

\(^{60}\) Kee suggests that the battle with Satan is also highlighted in the opening section (1:2-13) immediately prior to the announcement about the kingdom message (1:14-15) and the initial indication of Jesus’ defeat of evil (1:21-28) (*Miracle*, 159–61).

\(^{61}\) France, for example, notes the high percentage of teaching vocabulary, the frequency of pronouncement stories, and the overall percentage of teaching material (he claims that about fifty percent of Mark “is devoted to presenting Jesus’ teaching”) (“Mark and the Teaching of Jesus,” in *Gospel Perspectives: Studies of History and Tradition in the Four Gospels*, ed. R. T. France and David Wenham, Gospel Perspectives Vol. 1 [Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1980], 101–36). While the specific percentage of teaching material is debatable, France rightly identifies the importance of the teaching motif in Mark. Some statistics in relation to teaching vocabulary are as follows: Mark uses διδάσκαλον 15x of Jesus’ activity (cf. 9x in Matthew and 15x in Luke), διδάσκολον 10x as a vocative address to Jesus (cf. 6x in Matthew and 11x in Luke), and διδοξασθή 5x of Jesus’ activity (cf. 5x in Matthew and 1x in Luke).
teaching activity, the mixing of these elements may well be intentional whereby miracles are meant to be understood positively in relation to Jesus’ teaching. While the connection may be a simple matter of miracles providing authentication for Jesus’ teaching authority, several scholars consider Markan miracles themselves as part of that teaching. From this standpoint when Jesus is said to go throughout Galilee “proclaiming the message in their synagogues and casting out demons” (1:39) this may, at some level, be one and the same activity. It is certainly the case that miracles and teaching are frequently connected (1:21, 22, 27, 38-39; 2:2) and that miracles appear to function as object lessons in relation to Jesus’ authority over evil spirits (1:21-28), his authority to forgive sins (2:1-12), and in his confrontations with the religious authorities (3:1-6). In this regard the message of the miracles is neither uniform nor consistently addressing the same audience. Hence on the one hand Jesus demonstrates his authority in the synagogue in relation to exorcism (1:21-28), while on other occasions he provocatively (in front of the religious leaders) associates his healing power with authority to forgive sins (2:1-12) and deliberately performs a controversial Sabbath healing (3:1-6). Other healings occur privately with the disciples (1:29-31) and still others in Gentile territory (5:1-20). The storm stilling (4:35-51), walking on the water (6:45-52) and two feeding miracles (6:30-44; 8:1-10; 8:14-21) are more akin to object lessons for the disciples. The healing of the demon possessed boy provides

62For example, Jesus’ activity in the opening exorcistic narrative is three times described as ‘teaching’ (1:21, 22, 27) and yet no teaching content appears within the narrative. Further, despite being repeatedly told about Jesus’ teaching and proclamation (1:21, 38-39; 2:2, 13; 4:2; 6:2, 6), the activity that precedes or follows such statements just as often relates to miracles as to teaching.

63So, for example, in the following: France, “Mark and Teaching,” 109–10; Kolenkow, “Miracle and Prophecy,” 1493–4; Broadhead; Teaching, 208–9; Fisher, “Miracles of Mark.”

64So France (“Mark and Teaching,” 110), Twelftree (Miracle Worker, 98), and Matera (“‘He Saved Others’,” 24). Miracles seen this way are said to have a parabolic type function that has been related to boundary crossing (McVann, “Boundary Jumping”), purity laws (John E. Phelan, “The Function of Mark’s Miracles,” Covenant Quarterly 48 [August 1990]: 3–14), and Jesus’ conquest over evil powers (e.g., Twelftree, Miracle Worker, 98).

65In this regard it is not surprising that Mark 2:1-12 and 3:1-6 are classified by Dibelius as a ‘paradigms’ (Tradition, 43) and by Bultmann as ‘apophthegmatic controversy dialogues’ (History, 12, 14–16).

66Additional conflict in relation to miracle tradition occurs possibly in the leper story (1:44) but more certainly in the Beelzebul pericope (3:20-30) and the reactions to Jesus’ in both his home town (6:1-6) and the region of Gerasa (5:17). The motif is noted, for example, by Twelftree (Miracle Worker, 97–98), Matera (“‘He Saved Others’,” 24), Fuller (Interpreting, 71–72), and Broadhead (Teaching, 208). Somewhat similar is Robbins’ contention that Jesus’ miracles in Mark 4–11 are “thaumaturgic (counter-)cultural rhetoric” (“Interpreting Miracle Culture and Parable Culture in Mark 4–11,” Svensk Exegetisk Årsbok 59 [1994]: 59–81).
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opportunity for instructing the disciples (9:14-29)\(^\text{67}\) and the blindness healings (specifically 8:22-26 and 10:46-52) have been read as deliberately ironic in relation to the disciples’ blindness (see comments below). While diversity exists in the message and audience, therefore, it remains the case that Markan miracles have a certain parabolic function. This brings us finally to the question of miracles and discipleship.

(4) Miracles are related positively to faith and discipleship in Mark. Despite the fact that Jesus’ miracles in Mark are performed before a wide audience and are received in a variety of ways,\(^\text{68}\) the disciples are present throughout\(^\text{69}\) and sometimes receive explicit instruction in relation to miraculous activity (e.g., 8:14-21; 9:29). While repenting and believing (μετανοεῖτε καὶ πιστεύετε) are clearly identified as ideal responses to Jesus’ kingdom proclamation (1:14-15), faith language occurs frequently within Markan miracle tradition\(^\text{70}\) and Bartimaeus is often understood taken as the ideal disciple in regard to his ‘faith’ and his ‘following’ after Jesus in 10:52.\(^\text{71}\) While Bartimaeus and various other minor characters within the miracle tradition are

\(^{67}\) Although the object lesson drawn from the incident (‘this kind can only come out through prayer’) does not relate directly to what occurs in narrative itself.

\(^{68}\) Twelftree (Miracle Worker, 100) notes the following range of reactions: amazement (1:27; 5:20, 42); questioning of Jesus’ identity (1:27; 6:2-3); service (1:31); disbelieving questioning (2:6-7); conspiracy to destroy Jesus (3:6); recognition of Jesus’ identity (3:11); fear (5:11); desire for Jesus to depart (5:17); desire to be with Jesus (5:18); proclaiming (5:20); unbelief (6:6); conclusion that John had come back to life (6:16); incomprehension (6:52; 8:21); popularity (6:54-55); and astonishment (7:37).

\(^{69}\) Sometimes explicitly (e.g., 1:29-31; 4:35-41) but oftentimes more implicitly (e.g., they are not mentioned in 3:1-6 but at 3:7 Jesus departs “with his disciples” thus implying their presence in the previous story).

\(^{70}\) The noun πίστις occurs five times in Mark and always in association with miracle tradition (2:5; 4:40; 5:34; 10:52; 11:23-24). Twelftree suggests that faith is implicit in various other situations (e.g., the leper in 1:40; bystanders in 7:32; 2:3-5 and 8:22) and is not clearly absent from any healing story (excluding exorcisms) in terms of trust expressed in Jesus before, during or after the healing (Miracle Worker, 99–100). There is, however, dispute about the exact nature of the relationship of faith to miracle. Hence Countryman sees miracles devalued in favor of faith (“How Many Baskets Full?”), while Fuller (based on Mark 6:5) suggests faith must precede miracles (Interpreting, 73). Matera sees miracles as opportunities for faith and trust, especially for minor characters (“‘He Saved Others,’” 24). Twelftree suggests that miracles “illustrate the benefits of faith and are a summons to faith” (Miracle Worker, 99–100). Gail Smith thinks that miracles are simply part of the faith world but do not inspire faith (“Jewish, Christian, and Pagan Views of Miracle Under the Flavian Emperors,” in Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers, Kent Harold Richards [Chico, California: Scholars Press, 1981], 341–49). Hedrick examines the variable role of faith in nature miracles (no mention), exorcisms (mentioned once in Mark 9:14-29), and healings (mentioned explicitly three times and implicitly once) and concludes, based on Mark 6:1-6, that faith seems to be a “necessary prerequisite for any powerful deed” of Jesus (“Miracles in Mark,” 300–03, quote from 303).

\(^{71}\) So, for example, in Twelftree, Miracle Worker, 99–100; Achtemeier, “‘And He Followed’”; Robbins, “Bartimaeus”; Reginald H. Fuller, Interpreting, 74.
frequently seen to respond in favorable ways to Jesus,\textsuperscript{72} however, the disciples themselves are depicted in a more negative light and are sometimes thought to be written out of the picture all together.\textsuperscript{73} Such a categorical vilification, however, seems to overstate the case and fails to take into account several positive aspects of Mark’s portrayal of the disciples\textsuperscript{74} that should at leastleave the matter as open ended\textsuperscript{75} or perhaps go even further in envisaging a future rehabilitation

\textsuperscript{72}For example Matera notes the favorable responses of the leper, the paralytic, the Gerasene demoniac, the woman with hemorrhaging, Jairus, the inhabitants of Gennesaret, the Syrophoenician woman, the deaf man, the blind man of Bethsaida, and finally Bartimaeus himself who “epitomizes the kind of faith required of a disciple” (“‘He Saved Others’,” 22, 24). See similar comments in Broadhead, \textit{Teaching}, 200.

\textsuperscript{73}The disciples’ role is enigmatic insofar as they are frequently criticized for lack of faith and understanding in Mark 1–8 (e.g., 4:13, 40–41; 6:37, 52; 8:14–21). Despite Peter’s climactic confession (8:27–30), he is nevertheless rebuked for his lack of understanding (8:33) and the disciples’ failures are further catalogued in relation to exorcism (9:18), misunderstanding Jesus and his mission (9:32), and various other matters (9:33–37, 38–41; 10:13–16, 35–45). In the Passion Narrative the disciples are criticized in relation to the anointing (14:3–9) and their falling asleep in Gethsemane (14:32–42). Judas betrays Jesus (14:1–11, 43–49) and all desert him (14:50) while Peter more specifically denies him (14:26–31, 66–72; cf. 8:38). In contrast to the women and Joseph of Arimathea the disciples are absent at the crucifixion and burial (15:40–47) as well as the empty tomb (16:1–8). Insofar as Mark alone (among the Gospels) concludes (16:8) without explicitly rehabilitating the disciples some have concluded that they are deliberately vilified (e.g., Joseph B. Tyson, “The Blindness of the Disciples in Mark,” \textit{JBL} 80 [1961]: 261–68; Weeden, \textit{Mark}; Leif E. Vaage, “An Other Home: Discipleship in Mark as Domestic Asceticism,” \textit{CBQ} 71 [2009]: 741–61). Broadhead notes that “only in a few instances do the miracle stories demonstrate a positive function for the disciples” (e.g., in feeding stories) with the result that “Mark creates no human ideal disciple” but, rather, “the narrative syntax creates an ideal from various minor characters... Thus the early Christian community learns to follow Jesus not through the example of the disciples, but through the fringe elements of the miracle stories” (Broadhead, \textit{Teaching}, 205–6). Similarly Vaage says the “Twelve (are) shown ultimately to be a dismal failure” whereby Mark provides an alternative discipleship model based on ‘domestic asceticism’ as demonstrated through the various unfamiliar and exemplary disciples of whom Bartimaeus is the crowning example (“Discipleship,” 752). (see following three notes also).

\textsuperscript{74}Hence Jesus deliberately calls specific disciples (1:16–20; 2:13–17; 3:13–18) who remain with him until their desertion in Gethsemane. They accompany him in ministry and critical moments (e.g., 1:21–39; 3:7; 5:37; 6:1; 9:2–13; 11:1–19), and are explicitly commissioned for the same ministry (3:14; 6:7–13). Jesus frequently instructs them in private (e.g., 4:10–20; 7:17–22; 8:34–9:1; 9:33–10:12; 10:35–45; 11:20–25; 12:41–44; 13:1–37; 14:12–25), defends their behavior to outsiders (2:23–28; 7:1–20), and never explicitly distances himself from them in contrast to his own family and hometown (3:31–35; 6:1–5). Despite their failures in understanding they nevertheless provide (through Peter) the climactic confession about Jesus’ messianic identity (8:27–30) and (again through Peter) are affirmed for their sacrifices made in relation to following Jesus (10:28–31). Finally, despite the lack of explicit rehabilitation, at least two textual markers indicate that the evangelist envisages a positive outcome for the disciples (14:28 and especially 16:7). Tannehill critiques Weeden for inadequate recognition of these positive aspects of Mark’s portrayal (“The Disciples in Mark: The Function of a Narrative Role,” in \textit{The Interpretation of Mark}, ed. William Telford [Philadelphia; London: Fortress Press; SPCK, 1995], 134–57).

\textsuperscript{75}According to Tannehill (“Disciples”), for example, Mark anticipates that his readers will identify with the disciples. Their negative portrayal is therefore intended awaken “his readers to their failures as disciples and call them to repentance” (p. 140). He notes that mention of their blindness (8:14–21) is framed by two (blind) healing stories (7:31–37 and 8:22–26). Meanwhile Bartimaeus provides a third story (which also frames the middle section) showing the true nature of discipleship (pp. 146–7). Thus 8:31–10:45 addresses two problems: (a) the possibility of persecution and martyrdom (8:34–38) and (b) the desire for status and domination (9:33–7; 10:35–45). Mark inserts Jesus’ teaching in between the passion predictions and the reader must choose between the attitudes of Jesus and those of the disciples (pp. 148–9). Climactic failure is not followed by explicit rehabilitation although the hope of restoration in 14:27–28 and 16:7 deliberately leaves the fate of the disciples open ended so as to invite the reader to
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for the disciples. 76 While I incline toward seeing this more positive outcome for the disciples, resolution of this matter does not take away from the fact that miracles are portrayed in Mark as having a positive role in relation to teaching and discipleship all of which is part of the call to repent and believe insofar as the kingdom is near at hand (1:14-15). 77

In sum, it has been argued that Markan miracles have a positive role to play in relation to the identity of Jesus as messiah, his announcement of the kingdom of God, his teaching, and his call to discipleship and faith. While a triumphalistic notion of miracles is clearly criticized (in light of the cross), this does not so much function to deny the positive value of miracles as much as provide an important corrective to false notions of discipleship. 78

---

76 According to Ernest Best Mark’s negative portrayal of the disciples has no identifiable center, contrasting with the more sharply defined attacks upon religious leaders, and other groups (e.g., the crowds) are not portrayed in a more obviously positive light (“The Role of the Disciples in Mark,” NTS 23 [1977]: 377–401, esp. 390-95). According to Leif Vaage, however, the envisaged future restoration (Mark 14:28 and 16:7) is not about reinstatement but completes their “categorical demotion” noting that the disciples depended “entirely on the testimony of others for any knowledge they might have regarding the saving events of Jesus’ death and postmortem assumption.... It may well be that the evangelist actually had no choice but to acknowledge them here” (“Discipleship,” 746). It is not clear, however, why Mark (assuming his negative intentions) should feel so constrained to make mention of the disciples at this point nor why 16:7 should be read as completing their “categorical demotion.” Indeed, the positive implications of 14:28 and 16:7 are difficult to explain if the disciples have been deliberately written out of the story. Joel Williams (“Discipleship and the Minor Characters in Mark’s Gospel,” BSac 153 [1996]: 342) and Andrew Lincoln (“The Promise and the Failure: Mark 16:7,8,” JBL 108/2 [1989]: 283–300) agree in seeing a deliberate juxtaposition of positive and negative statements (promise and failure) at 16:7 and 8 whereby 16:7 is taken along with 14:28 to point to an anticipated future resurrection appearance. In sum, the following points deserve more careful consideration regarding the Mark’s depiction of the disciples: (1) they are portrayed in a mixed manner and not wholly negatively (see previous two notes); (2) while they function as a (negative) foil for Jesus’ teaching on discipleship (e.g., 8:31–10:45), Jesus never explicitly abandons them (noting his prediction of their desertion occurs in 14:27 and is immediately followed by the first restoration notice in 14:28); (3) to the extent Mark intentionally vilifies the disciples, he likewise vilifies his own (internally identified) chief witnesses to Jesus tradition (noting their private instruction); (4) the Markan characters most obviously beyond rehabilitation are the religious leaders who consistently oppose Jesus unto his death (e.g., 3:6, 20-30; 7:1-22; 8:15; 11:15-19; 11:27-12:27; 14:1-2, 10-11) and are explicitly denounced (e.g., 12:38-40); (5) while marginal characters are often portrayed positively (so Vaage, “Discipleship,” 751–2; Tannehill, “Disciples,” 151–3; Broadhead, Teaching, 200), even the best examples of this mixed group (e.g., Bartimeaus and the woman who anoints Jesus) are never developed beyond their brief single mention. Thus while they perhaps contribute positively to the notion of discipleship (see especially Williams, “Discipleship”), it appears that the Twelve (despite their failures) are in no way displaced by this group.

77 On the connection of miracles and discipleship see the following: Reginald H. Fuller, Interpreting, 73–74; Broadhead, Teaching, 216; Matera, “‘He Saved Others,’” 24; Twelftree, Miracle Worker, 99–100.

78 So Johnson who sees both Jesus’ identity and miracles falling under the shadow of the cross (“Greek and Jewish Heroes”). Johnson, who sees Mark employing Hellenistic aretalogy motifs within the boundaries of Jewish
5.1.1.2 Miracle Traditions in Matthew: A Synchronic Analysis

Matthean miracle stories have generated less discussion than their Markan counterparts and are more uniformly understood as being viewed positively by the evangelist. Insofar as most studies assume the 2DH\(^{79}\) this potentially biases their results in favor of this hypothesis, which needs to be borne in mind when engaging a synchronic evaluation of Matthean miracle tradition. Constituting only eleven percent of his narrative, miracle stories are less dominant than in Mark (twenty five percent) but with twenty such stories (ten healings; four exorcisms; and six nature miracles), eight summary statements that mention healing and/or exorcism\(^{80}\) along with several other miracle related pericopes,\(^{81}\) it is clear that miracles are important to Matthew. While his first summary statement mentions teaching, healing and exorcism (4:23-25; compare Mark 1:39), he differs from Mark in that he first records a large block of teaching material (5:1–7:29) before reproducing a narrative series of ten miracles (8:1–9:38; taking the ruler’s daughter and the hemorrhaging woman as two miracles in 9:18-26). The significance of this may be demonstrated in relation to Matthew’s narrative structure which has been variously explained according to the following proposals: (1) *Five major teaching blocks*: this is a common way to understand Matthew’s structure\(^{82}\) as demarcated by the repeated formula καὶ ἐγένετο ὁτὲ ἐτέλεσεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τοὺς λόγους τούτους (‘and when Jesus had finished saying these things...’) at 7:28-

---

\(^{79}\)The classic redaction critical study is that of Held, “Miracle Stories.”


29; 11:1; 13:53; 19:1 and 26:1). The five ‘sermons’ are interspersed with narrative blocks;

(2) **Three main sections:** an alternative structure, proposed by Jack Kingsbury and David Bauer, sees the repeated phrase “from that time on Jesus began...” (‘ Απὸ τότε ἠρξατο ὁ Ἰησοῦς ... at 4:17 and 16:21) as dividing the Gospel into three major blocks (1:1–4:16; 4:17–16:20; 16:21–28:20). According to Kingsbury the plot develops around the theme of conflict which is anticipated in 1:1–4:16 (the person of Jesus the Messiah), escalates in 4:17–16:20 (the proclamation of Jesus the Messiah), and reaches a climax in 16:21–28:20 (the suffering, death and resurrection of Jesus the Messiah);

(3) **Geographical framework:** others have suggested a geographical framework for the plot;

(4) **Chiastic structure:** others have detected a large scale chiastic structure typically positing narrative and discourse segments arranged symmetrically.

---

83There is slight variation in the wording insofar as all agree in their beginning (καὶ ἐγένετο ὁ Ἰησοῦς) but differ in their conclusion: “these words” (τοὺς λόγους τούτου) in 7:28 and 19:1; “all these words” (πάντας τοὺς λόγους τούτου) in 26:1; “instructing” (διατάσας) in 11:1; and “these parables” (τὰς παραβολὰς ταῦτα) in 13:53. Additional support for seeing this as a structuring device is suggested by an analysis of the openings of these discourses (T.J. Keegan, “Introductory Formulae for Matthean Discourses,” CBQ 44 [1982]: 415–30).

84For example Allison (“Structure,” 1204) proposes the following basic structural outline of Narrative (N) and Discourse (D): N (1–4), D (5–7), N (8–9), D (10), N (11–12), D (13), N (14–17), D (18), N (19–23), D (24–25), N (26–28).

85This section is said to focus on ministry to Israel with preliminary conflict in 4:17–11:1 and increasing tension in 11:2–16:20.

86See the following: Kingsbury, *Matthew: Structure, Christology, Kingdom* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1989), 1–39; idem, “The Plot of Matthew’s Story,” *Int* 46 (1992): 347–56; and D. R. Bauer, *The Structure of Matthew’s Gospel: A Study in Literary Design*, JSNTSup 31 (Sheffield: JSOT, 1988). Edgar Krentz also sees structural unity in 1:1–4:16 with 4:17 and 16:21 as major structural dividers (“The Extent of Matthew’s Prologue: Toward the Structure of the First Gospel,” *JBL* 83 [1964]: 401–14). Critics of this structural approach contend, however, that: it places too much weight on two occurrences of the key phrase (4:17; 16:21); απὸ τότε occurs again at 26:16 but is clearly not structural; Matt 4:17 displays connections with 4:12-16 that make a clear structural break at this point unlikely; similarly Matt 16:21 is closely linked with the preceding narrative; in essence this ‘plot structure’ does nothing more than give Matthew a beginning, middle and end. For these criticisms and more see the following: Dale C. Allison, “Structure,” 1203; Donald Senior, *What Are They Saying About the Matthew?* (Paulist Press: New York, 1983), 25; David L. Barr, “The Drama of Matthew’s Gospel”.

87For example, A. H. McNeile (cited in D. A. Carson, Douglas J. Moo, and Leon Morris, *An Introduction to the New Testament* [Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan, 1992], 61) proposes the following: (1) prologue and preparation for ministry (1:1–4:11); Galilee (4:12–13:58); northern locales (14:1–16:12); toward Jerusalem (16:13–20:34); Jerusalem (21:1–25:46); passion and resurrection (26–28). France proposes a modified geographical framework with divisions at 1:1 (introduction), 4:12 (Galilee), 16:21 (Galilee to Jerusalem), 21:1 (Jerusalem - confrontation), 26:1 (Jerusalem - rejection), and 28:16 (Galilee) (*The Gospel of Matthew*, NICNT [Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 2007], 2–5). Such approaches, however, tend to toward thematic arrangement (e.g., the difference between Jerusalem confrontation and rejection is thematic not geographical), over-simplification of geographical movement (e.g., there is an excursion outside of Galilee in 8:28; Tyre, Sidon and Caesarea Philippi in 15:21-28 and 16:13-20 are in the opposite direction from Jerusalem), and are not necessarily based on literary markers (e.g., see comments above on whether 16:21 is truly a literary-structural marker).
around chapter 13;\textsuperscript{88} (5) \textit{Alternative proposals:} other proposals typically seek to account for perceived weaknesses in the above structural proposals but usually end up as thematic or plot type outlines.\textsuperscript{89} My sympathies lie primarily with those structural outlines that take their cue from the five great discourses,\textsuperscript{90} which (as suggested above) highlights the specific narrative section in Matt 8:1–9:38 as a presentation of the Messiah’s deeds in follow up to his teaching (Matt 5–7). Not only do these chapters contain the largest collection of miracle stories in the Gospel, they also display the greatest difference in pericope order when compared with Mark and Luke. This will be explored further below.

According to Held’s ground-breaking redaction-critical study Matthew’s miracles are, in form, more like \textit{chreia} than miracle stories.\textsuperscript{91} The retention, however, of key miracle story elements suggests this is perhaps an overstatement.\textsuperscript{92} The miracle narratives nevertheless perform an important theological function for Matthew as is evident from the frequency with which Jesus’ miraculous activity is mentioned outside of the narratives themselves.\textsuperscript{93}

---

\textsuperscript{88}Examples include: C. H. Lohr, “Oral Techniques in the Gospel of Matthew,” \textit{CBQ} 23 (1961): 403–35; P. F. Ellis, \textit{Matthew: His Mind and His Message} (Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1974); Gary W. Derickson, “Matthew’s Chiastic Structure and Its Dispensational Implications,” \textit{Bibliotheca Sacra} 163 (2006): 423–37; and H. J. Bernard Combrink, “The Structure of the Gospel of Matthew as Narrative,” \textit{TynBul} 34 (1983): 61–91. The last of these (Combrink) also sees a plot analysis with movement from setting (1:1–4:17) to complication (4:18–25:46) and finally resolution (26:1–28:20). Such overarching chiasms are problematic, however, in relation to the forced parallels between certain sections. Hence, for example, the authors cited above line up Matt 8–9 with either Matt 19–22 (Lohr and Ellis) or 19–23 (Derickson) or 21–22 (Combrink). Whichever of these precise pairings we take, however, the alignment of Matthew’s miracle chapters (8–9) with Matt 19–23 is not obvious and seems somewhat artificial.


\textsuperscript{90}Such as offered in Allison, “Structure.”

\textsuperscript{91}So Held, “Miracle Stories,” 241–46. His own term is ‘paradigm’ by which he means conversations with illustrative and didactic interest.

\textsuperscript{92}See, for example, the critique of Held in John Paul Heil, “Significant Aspects of Healing Miracles in Matthew,” \textit{CBQ} 41 (1979): 274–87. This is perhaps one occasion where Held’s assumption of Markan priority fundamentally effects his reading of Matthew.

\textsuperscript{93}E.g. eight summary statements (4:23-25; 8:16-17; 9:35; 12:15-21; 14:34-36; 15:29-31; 19:1-2; 21:14) refer to healing and/or exorcism but not nature miracles. Not only are these summaries more frequent than his synoptic counterparts (four in Mark and four or five in Luke) but they extend all the way from his initial statement about Jesus’ ministry (4:23-25) to his approach to Jerusalem (19:1-2) and even his activity in the temple (21:14), these latter two being unique to Matthew. Other texts referring to Jesus’ healing and/or exorcistic activity include the following: 11:2-6 (Jesus’ reply to John the Baptist); 11:20-24 (woes on cities where he performed διώκειτε); 12:24-
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Observations on these various strands of Matthean miracle tradition leads to the following general comments about its theological and apologetic purpose:94 (1) Jesus’ miracles in Matthew function, alongside his teaching, to provide validation for his status as Messiah. Matthew, according to Heinz Held, highlights Christology in relation to miracles stories95 and, while his study assumes Markan priority, the connection is supported by a synchronic analysis. It is generally agreed, for example, that Matthew deliberately connects Jesus’ miraculous activity with the messianic title ‘Son of David.’ Thus while his opening chapter establishes the messianic connections,96 the title it is not mentioned again until 9:27 where it is explicitly applied to Jesus by two blind men seeking healing. Subsequent usage repeatedly connects the title to Jesus in the context of his healing and exorcistic activity97 albeit the connection is implicit rather than

---

94These comments are primarily concerned with healing and exorcism miracles which not only form the bulk of Matthew’s miracle narratives (14 out of 20) but are the only ones mentioned in summaries (see previous footnote).

95“Miracle Stories,” 246–75.

96The υἱός Δαυιδ title is here explicitly and implicitly associated with Jesus alongside the title of Χριστὸς (1:1, 6, 16-17, 20, 25). The same title is twice applied to Jesus during his apparently messianic style entry into Jerusalem (Matt 21:1-17) and appears in the somewhat more cryptic (but explicitly messianic) disputation of Matt 22:41-46. Regarding specific difficulties in this latter text (Jesus seemingly denial of υἱός Δαυιδ as a messianic title) James Gibbs suggests that, despite Matthew’s previously positive portrayal of Jesus as the “Messianic Son of David after the flesh,” in the end he “emphatically lays aside the title ... as inadequate in the face of recognition of Jesus as the Son of God” (“Purpose and Pattern in Matthew’s Use of the Title ‘Son of David’,” NTS 10 [1963–1904]: 460–61, quotes from 464). While it is true, however, that there is no further occurrence of the title subsequent to Matt 22:41-46, the cryptic ambiguity of the pericope makes it unlikely that Matthew is rejecting υἱός Δαυιδ as a messianic title. It may be that he wishes to qualify the title (e.g., as Son of God as well as Son of David he is greater than David himself or his messianic program is extends beyond an earthly united kingdom) but it seems improbable that he seeks to overturn his various earlier explicit references (especially noting that many of these are unique to Matthew while the Matt 22 pericope is shared with both Mark and Luke) (similarly so in John Nolland, The Gospel According to Matthew: A Commentary on the Greek Text, NIGTC [Grand Rapids, Mi; Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2005]. 916–7 and France, Matthew, 848–9).

Messianic overtones are also suggested in Matthean summary statements, which are evidently redactional no matter which source hypothesis we adopt. While the first two (4:23-25 and 9:35) form an *inclusio* around Jesus’ kingdom teaching (Matt 5–7) and healing (Matt 8–9), the summary at 8:16-17 explicitly indicates that Jesus’ healing activity should be understood as a fulfillment of Isaianic expectations (Isa 53:4).99 Meanwhile Jesus’ response to John’s question (asked explicitly in relation to the messiah and whether Jesus is the ἐρχόμενος) points directly to his teaching and healing activity (11:2-6) as proof of his identity.100 Jesus’ healing activity is

---

98Messianic overtones are also suggested in Matthean summary statements, which are evidently redactional no matter which source hypothesis we adopt. While the first two (4:23-25 and 9:35) form an *inclusio* around Jesus’ kingdom teaching (Matt 5–7) and healing (Matt 8–9), the summary at 8:16-17 explicitly indicates that Jesus’ healing activity should be understood as a fulfillment of Isaianic expectations (Isa 53:4). Meanwhile Jesus’ response to John’s question (asked explicitly in relation to the messiah and whether Jesus is the ἐρχόμενος) points directly to his teaching and healing activity (11:2-6) as proof of his identity.

99Novakovic notes that the various activities noted in these verses (blind receiving sight, lame walking, lepers cleansed, deaf hearing, dead raised, poor receiving good news) are not direct scriptural quotations but echoes of various Isaianic texts (e.g., 26:19; 29:18; 35:5-6; and 61:1) (*Messiah*, 119). She further notes that this is the only text that “establishes a direct relationship between healing miracles and Jesus’ messianic identity” by its reference to the activities of Jesus as “deeds of the Messiah” (τὰ ἔργα τοῦ Χριστοῦ), which (according to her) Matthew has added.

100Novakovic points out that the various activities noted in these verses (blind receiving sight, lame walking, lepers cleansed, deaf hearing, dead raised, poor receiving good news) are not direct scriptural quotations but echoes of various Isaianic texts (e.g., 26:19; 29:18; 35:5-6; and 61:1) (*Messiah*, 119). She further notes that this is the only text that “establishes a direct relationship between healing miracles and Jesus’ messianic identity” by its reference to the activities of Jesus as “deeds of the Messiah” (τὰ ἔργα τοῦ Χριστοῦ), which (according to her) Matthew has added.
said explicitly to fulfill Isa 42:1-4 in Matt 12:15-21 (noting Matthew’s standard citation formula) again highlighting the connection between Jesus’ healing and scriptural fulfillment. While Matthew’s summary at 14:13-14 does not explicitly relate to messianic expectations, it leads into two stories that climax with a pronouncement by the disciples that Jesus is the ‘Son of God’ (14:33). This is likewise the case for the summary at 14:34-36, which perhaps can be seen as forming something of an *inclusio* with the earlier summary in 14:13-14. The summary at 15:29-31 reflects that of 11:5 with reference to healing of the lame, the maimed, the blind and the dumb. There is no explicit fulfillment formula or scriptural citation but the allusions to Isa 35:5-6 are clear enough. Finally in Matt 19:1-2 Jesus cures the crowd and in 21:14 he heals the blind and the lame in the temple. In general we may summarize as follows: (1) after Matt 4:23-25 and 9:35 the summary statements refer only to healing (not teaching) thus showing a particular stress on healing that is not always realized; (2) two summary statements (8:16-17 and 12:15-21) make direct reference to Jesus’ healing activity as fulfillment of Isaianic prophecies while two others (11:2-6; 15:29-31) allude to the same prophetic book. Thus Novakovic concludes that Matthew seeks deliberately to provide a scriptural basis for seeing Jesus’ healing activity as rooted in messianic claims. We may conclude that Matthean summary statements, along with

to the Q material (ibid., 152). She further notes that the activities listed in Matt 11:2-6 directly relate to the preceding chapters in Matthew. Thus while the good news relates to the teaching of Matt 5–7, the various miracles reflect the narrative of Matt 8–9: the blind are healed (9:27-31); the lame walk (9:2-8); lepers are cleansed (8:1-4); the deaf are healed (9:32-34); the dead are raised (9:18-26) (ibid., 152).

101 See the discussion in Novakovic, Messiah, 133–53: she argues against the notion that Isa 42:1-4 does not fit the Matthean context and after a thorough analysis of these verses concludes that Matt 12:15-21 “contains a skillfully constructed argument with a demonstrable scriptural proof that Jesus’ healings properly belong to the realm of his messianic duties” (p. 151).

102 So, for example, in Novakovic, Messiah, 119–20.

103 I owe the observation to Novakovic, Messiah, 120.

104 Noting that both are introduced with Matthew’s stereotypical citation formula and are taken from Deutero-Isaiah’s servant songs thus implying that Matthew employs them messianically (Novakovic, Messiah, 124).

105 So Novakovic, Messiah, 120.

106 Novakovic, Messiah, 123. She further suggests that Matthew did not first conclude that Jesus was the Isaianic Servant or Herald and only then that he was the Royal Messiah who healed. Rather he applied the Isaianic passages to Jesus because he believed him to be the Messiah “whose entire career represents the fulfillment of ancient prophecies” (they just happened to be prophecies that came from the Isaianic Servant songs) (ibid., 183). The healing summaries are a key to Matthew’s theology insofar as they are redactional (185-90).
titles used by miracle recipients, point to Jesus’ miracles as fulfilling Jewish scriptures such as to indicate a direct connection between Jesus as messiah, Son of David, and healer.

Besides ‘Son of David’ various other titles are applied to Jesus within the miracle tradition and therefore deserve mention. These are as follows: 107 (a) The title of Χριστός is applied to Jesus from the outset (Matt 1:1, 16, 17, 18; 2:4) and is the subject matter of John’s question in Matt 11:2 108 where it is explicitly linked to Jesus’ wonder working (11:4–6). It is also central to Peter’s confession (16:16, 20) but otherwise occurs mainly in the Jerusalem section (22:42; 23:10; 24:5, 23; 26:63, 68; 27:17, 22) and without obvious relation to miracle tradition; 109 (b) The ‘Son of Man’ title (ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου) occurs twenty eight times in Matthew with a fairly even spread after the fist usage in Matt 8:20. It always occurs on the lips of Jesus as a self designation and only once within miracle tradition (9:6) thus indicating that this was not an important connection for Matthew; 110 (c) Κύριος occurs eighty one times in Matthew but ranges widely from being a clear designation for God (e.g., 1:20, 22, 24), who is to be worshiped (4:7, 11), to being a term for an human master (e.g., 6:24; 10:24–25; 13:27; 18:21, 25; 24:46; 25:11). Its frequent application to Jesus, therefore, is probably flexible and should not be taken as always having an elevated (Christological) sense. 112 The title occurs in relation to miracles as a positive form of address by suppliants (leper in 8:2; centurion in 8:6, 8; blind men in 9:28; Canaanite woman in 15:22, 25, 27; father of the demonized boy in 17:15; and two blind men in 20:30, 31, 33) and disciples (storm stilling in 8:25; walking on water in 14:28, 30) but not enemies or adversaries. 113 While the disciples’ usage may border on exaltation, 114 the use by

---

107 Here I am influenced by the discussion of Gerhardsson (Mighty Acts, 82–92).
108 He heard what the Χριστός was doing and asked if Jesus’ was the ὁ Ἰδρχωκεννος (Matt 11:3), presumably equating these two terms.
109 A possible exception warns of ‘signs’ by false ‘messiahs’ (Matt 4:24:23) but the connection is tangential at best.
110 As Gerhardsson notes “the motif of the Son of man is combined only in a secondary and weak manner with the traditions of Jesus’ concrete healings” (Mighty Acts, 84).
111 Most references to God are clustered in the opening chapters albeit others occur later (e.g., Matt 21:9, 42; 22:37).
112 On this see Gerhardsson, Mighty Acts, 85.
113 So Gerhardsson, Mighty Acts, 85.
114 Another example of a more exalted use occurs in Mat 22:41–46.
suppiants is likely an expression of polite request;\textsuperscript{115} (d) Υἱὸς θεοῦ as a title for Jesus is implied in various places (e.g., 1:18, 20; 3:16-17; 11:25, 27; 16:17; 17:5) and used explicitly nine times in relation to his temptation (4:3,6), the Gadarene demoniac (8:29), his disciples’ confession (14:33; 16:16), his trial (26:63), mockers at the cross (27:40, 43), and the centurion’s confession (27:54). Despite its overall importance, however, it has a very limited presence in miracle tradition (namely 8:29 and 14:33).\textsuperscript{116}

Others see a relationship between Jesus’ healing activity and his depiction as the new Moses\textsuperscript{117} but expressed through Isaianic prophecies in terms of a prophet of word and deed.\textsuperscript{118} Others stress the connection between Jesus and the Isaianic servant (based on the explicit citations of 8:16-17 and 12:15-21)\textsuperscript{119} or with the Isaianic expectations in general that point to Jesus as rejected Messiah and healer.\textsuperscript{120} Jesus is typically understood as being depicted as Messiah of word (Matt 5–7) and deed (Matt 8–9).\textsuperscript{121} Still others have argued that Matthew here stresses Jesus as Son of God so that whatever he says in relation to the Isaianic Servant has been applied to Jesus as Son of God.\textsuperscript{122}

\textsuperscript{115}So Gerhardsson, \textit{Mighty Acts}, 86.

\textsuperscript{116}According to Gerhardsson this is the most important Christological title in Matthew (\textit{Mighty Acts}, 88). He further suggests that the title may be implied in the storm stilling (“what sort of person is this?” in 8:23-27) and the incident with the coin (17:24-27), which speaks of the exempted sons (of God?) (ibid., 90), but this is somewhat speculative. According to Kingsbury this is the preeminent Christological title for Jesus in Matt 8–9 where he detects themes of Christology (8:1-17), discipleship (8:18-34), separation of Jesus and his followers from Israel (9:1-17), and faith (9:18-34) (“Observations on the ‘Miracle Chapters’ of Matthew 8–9,” \textit{CBQ} 40 [1978]: 564–66). He stresses that here “Jesus is presented as discharging in Israel a ministry of healing and gathering or refusing followers along the way, as addressing himself to questions concerning discipleship” (ibid., 568). Not only is the thematic breakdown of Matt 8–9 up for question (see below), however, but it is not obvious how these observations indicate privilege for the Son of God title.

\textsuperscript{117}E.g. Reginald H. Fuller, \textit{Interpreting}, 78 who notes how the ten signs in Egypt followed by the giving of law are echoed in Jesus’ sermon (Matt 5–7) followed by ten miracles (Matt 8–9). Regarding Matthew’s evident Moses typology see the following: Allison, \textit{New Moses}; Baxter, “Mosaic Imagery.”

\textsuperscript{118}So, for example, Twelftree (\textit{Miracle Worker}, 140–41) but questioned in Kingsbury (“Observations,” 563).


\textsuperscript{121}So Gerhardsson (\textit{Mighty Acts}, 39) and Twelftree (\textit{Miracle Worker}, 140–41) but with cautions against oversimplification.

\textsuperscript{122}Kingsbury argues that Matthew does not develop a Servant-Christology and only once uses “servant” (παῖς) in a quote from Isa 12:18. Everything stated about the ‘Servant’ in this summary (12:18-21) is said of the ‘Son’ elsewhere. Furthermore, in 3:17 and 17:5 Matthew again quotes the Servant Song of Isa 41:1-4 but combines it with Ps 2:7 thereby elevating the Son of God motif over the Servant motif (“Observations,” 565).
The net result is that the most frequently used titles in relation to Matthean miracle tradition are ‘Lord’ and ‘Son of David.’ The latter one, however, is more exclusively associated with miracles\textsuperscript{123} and more clearly connects them to Jesus’ messiahship. While the Χριστός title itself is used in relation to Jesus’ miracles on only one occasion (Matt 11:2-6), the connections between Son of David and Messiah (as above) lead to the conclusion that his miracles in Matthew, at least in part, function to validate Jesus’ title of ‘Messiah, Son of David.’

(2) Miracles are intended to foster discipleship and instruct disciples. The relationship between faith and discipleship has been a key finding of redaction critical studies\textsuperscript{124} but insofar as such studies assume Markan priority we need to pay closer attention to a synchronic reading. The disciples themselves are not recipients of any of the fourteen healing-exorcism miracles and are present explicitly only four times (raising of girl and hemorrhaging woman in 9:18-26; Canaanite woman in 15:21-28; demon possessed boy in 17:14-21) though their presence may be implied elsewhere.\textsuperscript{125} Alternatively the ‘faith’ theme is highlighted insofar the noun form (πίστις) appears eight times in Matthew of which the first six are in healing-exorcism narratives where it is frequently the explicit cause of the person’s restoration (8:10; 9:2, 22, 29; 15:28; 17:20).\textsuperscript{126} The verb form (πιστεύω) occurs eleven times, twice in the context of healing (centurion in 8:13; two blind men in 9:28), once in relation to a nature miracle and its associated lesson on prayer (fig tree in 21:22), and the remainder in non-miracle related tradition.\textsuperscript{127} There are five occurrences of the distinctively Matthean ‘little faith’ (ὀλιγόπιστοί and ὀλιγοπιστία)

\textsuperscript{123}I.e. ‘Lord’ occurs more frequently outside of the miracle tradition.
\textsuperscript{124}E.g. Held, “ Miracle Stories” and Reginald H. Fuller, Interpreting, 77–82.
\textsuperscript{125}This is especially so in the healing of Simon Peter’s mother in law (8:14-15) insofar as it takes place at Simon Peter’s house. Their presence may be implied elsewhere but is certainly not stressed. This somewhat contrasts to the crowds, which are explicitly mentioned in the opening miracle scene (8:1), the raising of dead girl (9:23), the demon possessed boy (17:14), the healing of the blind men (20:29, 31), and in various expressions of miracle related amazement (9:8, 33; 12:23). Despite this the crowds are generally treated neutrally, although they are excluded from the raising of the girl (9:23-24) and are said to deter the blind men from calling upon Jesus (20:31). While their characterization shifts in Matthew (on which see W. Carter, “The Crowds in Matthew,” CBQ 55 [1993]: 54–67), their explicit presence in miracle narratives nevertheless underscores the lack attention given to the disciples.
\textsuperscript{126}Only in the last instance does ‘faith’ occur as a post-miracle comment by Jesus to his disciples in private. The other two occurrences are in the context of a nature miracle (namely the fig tree in 21:18-22 where, as with 17:20, Jesus again exhorts faith in the context of miracle) and the denunciation of the religious leaders (23:23).
\textsuperscript{127}Namely in reference to the little ones who believe in Jesus in 18:6, the statements about John in 21:32, the warning about not believing false messiahs in 24:23, 26, and by the mockers at cross in 27:42.
of which two explicitly occur within nature miracles (storm stilling in 8:26; walking on water in 14:31), one in a discussion related to another nature miracle (feeding in 16:8), and one in the context of a healing-exorcism (demonized boy in 17:20). Turning to discipleship language we find ἀκολουθέω occurs twenty five times with all but one referring to people following Jesus. While not all references clearly intend ‘discipleship,’ several have this in view (8:19, 22; 10:38; 16:24). Those following (or potentially following) include Jesus’ disciples (4:20, 22; 8:23; twice in 9:9; 19:27, 28; 26:58), the crowds (4:25; 8:1; 12:15; 14:13; 19:2; 20:29; 21:9), non-specific persons (8:10), the two blind men (9:27), the rich young ruler (19:21), the healed blind men (20:34), and the women who had followed Jesus (27:55). All occurrences are positive (except the rich young ruler) and, unlike Mark, there is no ambiguity about the disciples’ rehabilitation (Matt 28:1-20). The references occur frequently in miracle tradition (8:1, 23; 9:19; 12:15; 14:13; 19:2; 20:29, 34) with at least five referring to the crowds and these almost exclusively in relation to healing-exorcism traditions. The one reference to the disciples relates to the storm stilling (8:23) and indeed the disciples, though obscured in relation to healing-exorcism, are the primary witnesses of the nature miracles.

The general impression is that Matthew connects miracles, faith, and discipleship (‘following Jesus’) in a positive way. This is born out, for instance, in the interweaving of discipleship material (e.g., 8:18-22; 9:9-17) and the frequent mention of faith in Matthew’s miracle

---

128 The fifth occurrence is in the Sermon on the Mount (6:30). The only other Synoptic usage occurs in Luke 12:28 which parallels Matt 6:30. The term is applied exclusively to the disciples.
129 The one exception involves Jesus himself following the synagogue ruler in 9:19.
130 When Peter follows Jesus at a distance in Matt 26:58 the discipleship motif is likely not intended.
131 Namely 8:1; 12:15; 14:13; 19:2; 20:29. Of these the first and the last simply note the presence of the crowds (indeed in the last occurrence the crowds seek to deter the blind men from interrupting Jesus) but the middle three specifically note Jesus’ healing of the crowds.
132 Either in healing stories or summary statements. Matt 14:13 is one exception where the notation occurs in the introduction to the feeding of the five thousand but even here the presence of the crowd is first associated with their receiving healing (14:14).
133 They are explicitly the only ones present for the two sea miracles (8:23-27; 14:22-33), the coin miracle (17:24-27), and the fig tree (21:18-22). The crowds are present in the two feeding miracles (14:13-21 and 15:32-39) but their reaction is not explicitly stated. The disciples, on the other hand, play a more significant role in these miracles and their reactions are explicitly discussed (16:5-12).
134 So, for example, in Fuller (Interpreting, 77–82), Held (“Miracle Stories”) and Gerhardsson (Mighty Acts).
The disciples themselves are then sent out to minister in the same miraculous manner (9:35-10:42). Some qualifying statements, however, are necessary. In relation to healing-exorcism narratives, for example, the disciples are background characters (as above). While these narratives are sometimes taken as highlighting personal encounter with Jesus, this is more difficult to sustain on a synchronic reading. Matthew frequently reports faith preceding healing miracles but nowhere explicitly mentions faith resulting from them. Furthermore while miracle recipients often display faith in coming to Jesus, the language of ‘following’ (ἀκολουθέω) only rarely applies to miracle recipients, the most notable being the case of the blind-healing doublets. In the first of these the blind men are said to follow Jesus prior to the cure (9:27) but then disregard his subsequent command when they go out and spread the news of what he has done (9:30-31). In the second instance the blind men are said to follow Jesus after receiving back their sight (20:34) thereby providing the clearest possible example of discipleship resulting directly from a healing miracle. Given the variable usage of ἀκολουθέω (as above), however, we should not overemphasize its significance at Matt 20:34. Furthermore in healing-exorcism miracles as a whole responses of miracle recipients are rarely recorded by Matthew.

\[\text{135} \text{Various scholars detect faith and discipleship as thematic motifs in Matt 8–9 (e.g., Held, “Miracle Stories”; Kee, Miracle, 183–90; Gerhardsson, Mighty Acts; Kingsbury, “Observations”; Stewart-Sykes, “Miracle Chapters”; Twelftree, Miracle Worker, 123, 141–2). Sometimes more specific delineation occurs whereby, for example, discipleship is seen as the central motif of 8:18–9:17 (noting the traditions in 8:18-22 and 9:9-17) with faith as thematic in 9:18-31 (e.g., Thompson, “Reflections,” 371–84, who is following Held). Thompson sees the ruler, the hemorrhaging woman and the two blind men (9:18-31) as exhibiting the faith that was first announced in relation to the centurion and the paralytic (8:10, 13; 9:2) although the absence of explicit faith language in relation to the ruler and its presence in these earlier stories weakens the case for seeing ‘faith’ as the exclusive organizing principle for 9:18-31. Ulrich Luz is less convinced of such explicit thematic divisions in Matthew 8–9 and suggests a deliberate interweaving of themes albeit with discipleship as the core motif throughout. Specifically he sees in the healing activity of Jesus, Israel’s Messiah, that conflict arises producing a division within Israel from which the new community of the Messiah comes into being (“The Miracle Stories of Matthew 8–9,” in Studies in Matthew, trans. Rosemary Stelle [Grand Rapids, Michigan: W. B. Eerdmans, 2005], 231).}

\[\text{136} \text{Noting their authority over unclean spirits and instructions to perform various cures in 10:1 and 10:8.}

\[\text{137} \text{The observation is made by Kingsbury (“Observations,” 570–71) who is essentially following Held (“Miracle Stories”) but both are assuming Markan priority.}

\[\text{138} \text{So, for example, in Twelftree (Miracle Worker, 141–2) and Thompson (“Reflections”).}

\[\text{139} \text{This is true of the following narratives: the leper (8:1-4); the centurion or his servant (8:5-13); the Gadarene demoniacs (8:28–9:1); the hemorrhaging woman and the girl raised (9:18-26); the mute demoniac (9:32-34); the man with the shiveled hand (12:9-14); the blind mute (12:22-24); the Canaanite woman’s daughter (15:21-28); and the demonized boy (17:14-21).}
when noted are not always positive, and in no cases do these characters reappear later in the narrative. The nature miracles are a different matter whereby the disciples are the key characters (beside Jesus) and miracles themselves are frequently understood to be object lessons in faith and discipleship.

In conclusion it may be stated that the primary significance of miracles for Matthew is that they function to validate Jesus’ messiahship, especially as the Son of David. The evidence for a direct connection of miracle tradition to the motifs of faith and discipleship is mixed but clearly the miracles are viewed positively in Matthew and the disciples are exhorted to learn faith lessons from them.

5.1.1.3 Miracle Traditions in Luke: A Synchronic Analysis

Luke’s miracle tradition, as with Matthew, has received less attention than Mark and studies tend to assume Markan priority albeit with some exceptions. Luke nevertheless contains

---

140 Responses are mentioned in the following: Peter’s mother in law is said to have ‘served him’ (8:15); the paralytic is simply said to have stood up and gone home (9:7); the two blind men disregard Jesus’ command to be silent (9:30-31); the two blind men coming out of Jericho are said to follow Jesus (20:34). Clearly only the first the last can be considered positive responses.

141 It might be further stated that positive responses are noted in relation to the disciples (8:27; 14:33) and the crowds (9:8; 33; 12:23; 15:31) while negative ones come from the townspeople (8:34) and the Pharisees (9:34; 12:14, 24). Given, however, the somewhat variable presentation of the crowds in Matthew (Carter, “Crowds”) it is not clear that they are intended as models of discipleship.

142 The storm stilling (8:23-27), for instance, has been understood as highlighting the discipleship motif: so classically in Günther Bornkamm (“The Stilling of the Storm in Matthew,” in Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew, Günther Bornkamm, Gerhard Barth, and Heinz Joachim Held, The New Testament Library [Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1963], 52–57) but see also Held (“Miracle Stories,” 203–4), Thompson (“Reflections,” 373–4), Gerhardsson (Mighty Acts, 52–67), and Twelftree (Miracle Worker, 112–14, 142–3). Twelftree notes that Matthew’s statements about the disciples’ ‘little faith’ are often given in the context of nature miracles whereby it could be said that “the function of the non-therapeutic miracles is to teach followers ... to have faith, rather than the ‘little faith,’ in Jesus’ ability to care for his followers in difficult life situations” (ibid., 143). Fuller extends the same theme to Matt 14:13–15:39 suggesting that Matthew portrays “Jesus as the Lord of his church, empowering and authorizing his disciples to follow him and to be the ministerial agents of his continuing ministry” (Interpreting, 79–80).

143 Noting the ‘you of little faith,’ as well as the faith lessons drawn out from demonized boy (17:20) and the fig tree (21:18-22). It might be further suggested that the faith of the miracle recipients is not so much highlighted in relation to them as potential disciples but for the benefit of the witnesses (the Twelve?).

about twenty miracle stories constituting approximately eleven percent of his narrative including four exorcisms, thirteen healing narratives, two nature miracles and a sign miracle (see table 2.1). These include eleven triple tradition miracles, one Mark-Luke double tradition, two Matthew-Luke double tradition, and seven unique to Luke. Luke has three summary statements referring directly to miracles and several other miracle related pericopes. Synchronic analysis of Lukanan miracle tradition is aided by the presence of a further approximately eighteen miracles and eight miracle related summary statements in the book of Acts (see table 5.1).

While many motifs have been associated with Lukanan miracles, perhaps the clearest synchronic

---


148 I.e. about 127 verses out 1149. This is significantly lower than Mark but as with Matthew (also 11%) this does not result from his having less miracle stories per se but from having a greater proportion of teaching and other material.

149 As per table 2.1 I am counting Jairus’ daughter and bleeding woman as two stories albeit they form one continuous (intercalated) narrative in each of the Gospels.

149a Namely 4:40-41; 6:17-19 and 8:1-2. The latter of these is sometimes listed as a distinct miracle story but the one specific exorcism mentioned (Mary Magdalene) appears as part of general summary statement about Jesus’ proclamation and the people that accompanied him.

149b These include Luke 4:16-30, 7:18-23; 9:1-6, 10-11, 49-50; 10:1-2, 13-16, 17-20; 11:14-23, 24-26, 29-32; 13:31-33; 24:19. In general I have selected tradition (miracles, summaries and related tradition) that relates to the miracles performed by Jesus but we could broaden our list of miracle related tradition if we included such things as angelophanies and Zechariah’s (punitive?) silencing in the birth narratives (Luke 1–2) or the resurrection of Jesus in Luke 24.

150 Based on this table these miracle sequences are as follows: six healing miracles (two of which involve raising the dead), three punitive miracles, three prison liberations, one exorcism and five other (nature?) miracles. Some are potentially disputable as ‘miracles’ or are at least difficult to classify (e.g., epiphanies and transportations) but are included for the sake of completeness. The healing miracles are evenly distributed throughout the narrative and are carried out by the apostles. Summary statements (mentioning miracles) and miraculous activity carried out by non-Christians is also tabulated in table 5.1. The list of miracle tradition in Acts is my own though borrows from Adams (“Miracles”) and Raymond Gen (“Divine Infliction”). For an additional list and general introduction to critical issues in relation to miracles in Acts see Neirynck, “The Miracle Stories in the Acts of the Apostles,” in Evangelica: Gospel Studies - Études d’Évangile Collected Essays, ed. F. Van Segbroeck, BETL 60 (Leuven: Peeters; Leuven University Press, 1982), 835–80. In particular Neirynck reviews the history of scholarly discussion in relation issues of Peter-Paul and Jesus-Peter/Paul parallels, source criticism, form criticism, and Lukan redaction.

151 For example Luke is said to deliberately balance teaching and miracle activity (Achtemeier, “Lucan Perspective”), to heighten exorcism (Twelftree, Miracle Worker, 175–8), and to be penetrated by magic (Hull, Hellenistic Magic, 87–115). Miracles are said to be a means of validating the miracle worker (ibid., 181-83), eliciting faith of recipients (Achtemeier, “Lucan Perspective”), and signifying appointment to a divinely ordained task (Adams,
Chapter 5 Selection and Order in Gospel Miracle Tradition

Evidence exists for miracles as validation involving divine approval of both message and messenger. Thus miracles are noted in Jesus’ inaugural mandate (4:18), dominate his initial ministry (4:31–5:19) and are explicitly given as validating evidence in response to John’s question (7:18-23), which itself comes on the heels of two miracle stories (7:1-17). While the question of Jesus’ identity is raised by the disciples in relation to the storm stilling (8:25), the demons make positive identifications on two occasions (‘Holy one of God’ in Luke 4:34; ‘Son of the most high God’ in 8:28) and various other titles of Jesus occur in relation to miracle stories.

Miracles frequently elicit positive responses of amazement, fear or praise of God (e.g., 4:36-37; 5:25-26; 7:16-17; 8:25; 9:43; 11:14; 13:13, 17; 17:14-15; 18:43) and reports of Jesus’ miracles spread in a positive manner (Luke 4:37; 5:39; 7:17). The Book of Acts supports this synchronic emphasis on validation insofar Jesus is said to be “attested” (ἀποδείκνυμι) by God through miracles, signs and wonders (Acts 2:22). Notably the first post-Pentecost narrative is a healing miracle (Acts 3:1-10), which not only validates the apostolic message but is part of a larger complex of (validating) apostolic miraculous activity.

See for example Achtemeier (“Lucan Perspective,” 552–3) who is followed by Raymond Gen (“Divine Infliction”), Adams (“Miracles,” 237–8) and Twelftree (Miracle Worker, 173–5). The following section borrows heavily from my earlier article: Reid, “Miracle Stories”.

These include the following: master (ἐπίστάτης) (by Peter in 5:5 and 8:45; twice by disciples in 8:24; by the lepers in 17:12); Lord (κύριος) (by Peter in 5:8; by the leper in 5:12; by the centurion in 7:6; by the narrator in 7:13; 13:15; by the blind man in 18:41); Son of Man (υἱὸς τοῦ ἄνθρωποῦ) (by Jesus himself in 5:24); prophet (προφήτης) (by the onlookers in 7:16); teacher (διδάσκαλος) (by the father of possessed boy in 9:38); Son of David (twice by blind man in 18:38-39).

The same idea is implied in Acts 10:38 where it is said that Jesus went about doing miracles “because (ὅτι) God was with him.”

Peter’s speech in 3:11-26 proceeds on the basis that the healing miracle of 3:1-10 provides validation of their message (note especially vv. 12 and 16). The same incident continues to be discussed in 4:1-22 (Peter and John before the Sanhedrin) where Peter (in direct response to the question of v. 7) makes it clear that the healing occurred ‘by the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth’ (4:8-10). It is then referred to as a ‘notable sign’ (γνωστόν σημεῖον) by the council members in their subsequent discussion. Acts 3:1-10 also has formal parallels to Paul’s first miracle at Lystra (Acts 14:8-10) suggesting the importance of these initial acts by the apostles (Frans Neirynck, “Miracle in Acts,” 871).

The apostles perform various ‘signs and wonders’ (σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα) including healings and exorcisms (Acts 2:43; 5:12-16; 6:8; 8:4-13; 14:3 and 15:12). These are specifically said to result in people being added to their number (5:12-16) and, in the case of Philip, the healing-exorcism signs performed in Samaria resulted in his outstaging Simon the magician who, along with others, began to follow him (Acts 8:4-13). We may also note the increase in followers resulting from Peter’s healing of Aeneas (9:34-35) and Dorcas (9:39-42). Regarding Paul and Barnabas we are told that the Lord ‘bore witness’ (μαρτυρέω) to his word by enabling ‘signs and wonders’ to be
amazement (θάμβος; ἐκ πλήσσω), praise (αἰνέω; μεγαλύνω), and joy (χαρά) are again common in relation to the miraculous activity in Acts (2:43; 3:8-11; 4:21; 5:11; 8:8; 13:12; 16:25-34; 19:17), and validation of the message and messengers is implied in the divinely enabled prison escapes (5:17-21; 12:3-37; 16:25-34) and other unusual phenomena. It has also been suggested that Luke “attempts to balance Jesus’ miraculous activity and his teaching in such a way as to give them equal weight.” Several observations lend support to this: Jesus’ inaugural sermon refers to both teaching and healing activity (4:18-27); teaching provides the explicit context for several of Jesus’ miracles and not least his first one (4:31-37; 5:1-11, 17-26; 6:6; 9:11; 13:10); Luke 13:10-17 is a specific example of a narrative in which Jesus’ miracle and teaching ministry are balanced; Luke arranges material in blocks so as to bracket the Sermon on the Plain with miraculous accounts (6:17-19 and 7:1-10) and intersperse both teaching (e.g., 5:28–6:5; 6:20-50; 7:18-50; 8:4-21; 9:1-6, 18-27, 44-50) and miracles (e.g., 5:1-26; 6:6-11, 17-19; 7:1-17; 8:1-3, 22-56; 9:10-17, 37-43) throughout; summary performed by them (14:3). The validating function of such ‘signs and wonders’ is implied in the summary statement of Acts 15:12 (Paul and Barnabas before the Jerusalem council) with its indirect reference back to Acts 13:12. Paul also performs many miracles (δυνάμεις), including exorcisms, while in Ephesus (19:11-12). Alternatively the sons of Sceva tried to replicate his activity but were soundly beaten by a man with an evil spirit with the result that the Ephesian residents were awestruck, praised God and became believers (19:17). Many burned magic books and the word of Lord spread rapidly (19:18–20). Finally Paul not only survived a snake bit (28:1-6), for which he was hailed as a god, but also performed many subsequent healings on Malta and was honored as a result (28:7-8). This kind of validating ‘sign’ activity clearly places the apostles in continuity with Moses (Acts 7:22 and 36).

When Paul heals the lame man at Lystra the crowd are so positive that they treat him and Barnabas as gods (14:8–18). While they are subsequently persuaded to stone Paul by the Jews of Antioch and Iconium (4:19–20), this nevertheless speaks again of the validating function of miracles. The case is similar on Malta where the people honored Paul on account of miracles (28:1-10).

So Adams (“Miracles,” 262–3) who also points to vindicating nature of visions in relation to Stephen (7:55) and Paul (18:9-11; 23:11) albeit these are not apparently public manifestations. She also points to vindication in relation to the sons of Sceva (19:15), Paul’s recovery from the snake bit (28:3-10), and his foreknowledge of weather conditions (27:10, 24).

The quote is from Achtemeier (“Lucan Perspective”, 550-51, quote from 550) who assumes Markan priority and argues from that standpoint. He is followed, however, by Adams (“Miracles”), Twelftree (Miracle Worker, 178–81), and Joel Green (“Jesus and a Daughter of Abraham [Luke 13:10–17]: Test Case for a Lukian Perspective on Jesus’ Miracles," CBQ 51/4 [1989]: 645–6), who notes that the arguments also stand up synchronically. The various supporting reasons listed are taken from these references.


On this see, especially, Green, “Daughter of Abraham” This is also true of other miracle stories that are similar to controversy narratives (e.g., Luke 5:17-26; 6:6-11; 11:14-23; 14:1-6). Likewise the storm stilling provides an implied lesson in faith (8:22-25).

statements connect both teaching and healing activity (e.g., 4:40-41, 42-44; 7:22); 163 Jesus’ instruction to the twelve includes authority in relation to both teaching and healing (9:1-6); and Jesus is described in Luke 24:19 as ‘a prophet mighty in deed and word.’ The hypothesis is reinforced by the Book of Acts which refers back to what Jesus did and taught (1:1), presents a similar interspersing of miracle (e.g., 3:1-10; 5:1-11, 17-21; 9:32-43; 13:4-12; 14:8-18; 16:16-24) and teaching (e.g., 2:1-36; 3:11-26; 4:1-22; 7:1-53; 8:14-25; 13:13-52) activity, and connects them both in summary statements (e.g., 10:36-38). 164 While this evidence for the deliberate interweaving of miracle and teaching tradition is certainly extensive, however, consideration of the distribution of miracles within Luke’s narrative suggests a modification to the hypothesis. The structural breakdown of Luke is debated but most agree to at least four major divisions approximately delineated as follows: 165 (a) introduction to Jesus (1:1–4:13); 166 (b) Galilean

---

163 Luke 4:40-41 and 44 are two distinct summaries in which the former speaks of healing and the latter of teaching. Their juxtaposition, however, in the middle of a section dealing with teaching and miracle reinforces the notion of balance being suggested here. Similarly at Luke 5:15 it is said that people come to Jesus both to hear him (teaching) and be cured (healing) (as per Green, “Daughter of Abraham,” 646) which is likewise the case at 6:17-19 (people come to hear and be healed). A similar connection is made at 9:11.

164 See also Chart II in Adams (“Miracles,” 261–2) which lists texts where proclamation is paired with miracles (2:14-42 + 43; 3:1-11 + 12-26; 6:8 + 10; 8:4 + 6-8; 13:5 + 6-12; 14:1,3; 14:6-7 + 8-10; 16:13-15 + 16-18; 19:1-10 + 11-12; 20:7-8 + 10-12). At the same time she lists miracles that are not paired with teaching (5:1-11, 12-16; 9:32-43; 23:1-10) and proclamation that is not paired with miracles (13:13-41; 17:1-3, 11-12, 16-34; 18:5-6). For a sense of the deliberate parallels between Jesus and figures of Acts see Adams (“Miracles,” 238–40) and the charts of Jesus-Peter and Jesus-Paul parallels on pp. 260-61. In essence Jesus’ disciples continue the same basic pattern of their master in relation to proclamation and miracle (cf. Luke 9:1-6; 10:1-12). Adams (ibid., 266-7) discerns a deliberate structural parallel in the Luke-Acts’ narratives of several individuals (she gives examples of Jesus, Peter, Stephen and Paul) as follows: miraculous vocation > ministry (preaching and miracles) > division (conversion or hostility) > persecution > miraculous vindication. While this suggestion is interesting the parallels are, however, unconvincing at points (e.g., no specific miracles of Stephen are reported; Paul is repeatedly persecuted and vindicated but Adam’s chart only notes one such instance as a parallel to Jesus’ crucifixion and resurrection).

165 Some see more divisions but invariably these are simply sub-divisions within these major ones. Others disagree on where to place the dividing markers in the text. Examples of these variations are noted in the footnotes that follow.

ministry (4:14–9:50);\textsuperscript{167} (c) the ‘central section’ (9:51–19:27);\textsuperscript{168} and (d) the Jerusalem section (19:28–24:53).\textsuperscript{169} Jesus’ miracles are most densely clustered in the Galilean section (4:14–9:50) which contains fourteen of Luke’s twenty miracle narratives (70%) and all of his relevant summary statements. Only five miracles (25%) occur in the ‘central section’ (Luke 9:51–19:27), which has a higher concentration of teaching material, and a single brief healing (5%) is narrated in the Jerusalem narrative (22:50–51). While Luke may indeed provide a balanced presentation of Jesus’ miracles and teaching, therefore, he is also noted to cluster miracles into the early

\textsuperscript{167}A reference to Jesus’ proclamation in Judean synagogues (4:44) and the short diversion into Gerasa (8:26–39), referring to this as the Galilean section remains reasonable (as per the announcement at 4:14–15, the fact that most of the activity occurs in Galilee, and the obvious departure toward Jerusalem at 9:51). As with the opening section, however, the precise limits are not entirely agreed upon. While differences of opinion on where the section begins are noted above (see previous note), Luke 9:50 is typically taken as the end (e.g., Joel B. Green, \textit{Luke}, 25–27; Brown, \textit{Introduction}, 226; Kümmel, \textit{Introduction}, 125; Bock, \textit{Luke}, 22–23; Marshall, \textit{Luke}) though 9:62 has been suggested (Staley, "Narrative Structure"). Though I agree in starting the new division at 9:51 (clear literary turning point in relation to Jerusalem), the difference is negligible for the purposes of this thesis. The placement of a major division at 7:16b by McNicol et al. (\textit{Q Impasse}, 111), insofar as this announces the section’s theme (namely Jesus’ identity as a prophet), is clearly idiosyncratic. This not only disrupts the integrity of the pericope (7:11–17) but even of the verse itself, noting that 7:16 is not even recognized as a minor division within the Galilean section by others (e.g., Kümmel, \textit{Introduction}, 126; Joel B. Green, \textit{Luke}, 26; Brown, \textit{Introduction}, 226).


(Galilean) phase. Noting a similar phenomenon in Acts,\(^{170}\) it is probably best explained by our initial observation about Lukan miracles as validating signs whereby their significance is emphasized at the beginning of a new stage in redemptive history.\(^{171}\) A synchronic reading of Lukan miracles therefore indicates their primary role as validating signs in relation to Jesus, the early church (especially apostles), and the message they both proclaim.\(^{172}\)

Closely related to the validation theme are the various punitive miracles of Luke-Acts.\(^{173}\) While their specific negative function in relation to the inflicted person is debated,\(^{174}\) they nevertheless function positively in validating God and his messengers. This is argued by Raymond Gen in relation to reactions evoked by such ‘miracles’ and the resultant spread of the

---

\(^{170}\)Seventy seven percent (14/18) of miracles occur in the first sixteen chapters with Acts 3:1-10 (healing) as an obvious instance of validation (e.g., it is the subject of Peter’s sermon in 3:11-26 and precipitates ongoing dispute and amazement in 4:1-22) [For a discussion of the paradigmatic significance of Acts 3:1-10 see Ham, “Acts 3, 1–10: The Healing of the Temple Beggar as Lucan Theology,” Bib 67, no. 3 (1986): 305–19]. While validation is notably present in relation to other miracles (e.g., 9:32-35 and 36-43), none receives the same amount of attention. Likewise while Paul is noted for miracles (14:3-18; 15:12; 28:9), there is a greater focus on his message whereby exorcism and healing are rarely mentioned after Acts 16 (notable exceptions are Acts 19:11-20; 20:7-12; 28:7-8; there are also other types of miraculous activity such as in 28:1-6). This is further supported by the distribution of miracle related summary statements with seventy five percent occurring in the first 14 chapters (2:43; 5:12; 5:15-16; 6:8; 8:4-13; 14:3; cf. 19:10-12; 28:9). Likewise while Peter, Paul, Stephen and Philip are all said to perform signs and wonders, there are no miracles recorded for the later appearing Apollos, who is only noted for his eloquence and dynamic teaching (19:24-28).


\(^{172}\)Closely related to the validation theme is the fact that miracles fulfill prophecy (Luke 4:18; 7:18-23).


\(^{174}\)For a brief summary of opinions see Gen, “Divine Infliction,” 8–16, who notes that most scholars see them as either acts of divine judgment or anti-pagan polemic, although some see Paul’s blinding as a ‘natural’ consequence and others see the muting of Zechariah as a divine sign. Pervo sees the “punitive miracles” of Acts as providential punishments (Acts, 52–53).
word. Exorcisms have a similarly positive and negative function insofar as they validate God, his kingdom and his messengers through power encounters in which the kingdom of Satan is defeated. Acts’ polemic against magicians is related to the same theme.

Specifically he notes reactions of amazement and fear (e.g., Luke 1:65; Acts 5:5, 11) which are closely tied to miracles in general (e.g., Luke 5:26; 7:16; Acts 2:43). He thus sees a common purpose of promoting the kingdom and attracting new followers as pertaining to both positive and negative miracles. Regarding the kingdom promotion and attraction of new followers he notes Acts 12:24 (following Herod’s death), the positive summary after Ananias and Saphira (Acts 12-16), and Paul’s transformation into a proclaimer of the message after his punitive blinding (Acts 9:1-22) (see Gen, “Divine Infliction,” 16–19). I would add that Paul’s blinding of Elymas the magician functions to precipitate belief in the proconsul Sergius Paulus (Acts 13:12).

So, for example, in Kee (Miracle, 202–5), Green (“Daughter of Abraham”) and Twelftree (Miracle Worker, 175–8) with the latter arguing as follows: Luke introduces Jesus’ ministry in terms of proclamation and healing (4:18, 41) but also exorcism (4:31-41), noting that the summary of 4:40-44 brings all three aspects together; Luke recasts healing stories as exorcisms (e.g., Peter’s mother in law) and exorcisms as healings (e.g., 6:18 where those with unclean spirits are ‘cured/healed’) thus blurring the distinction and implying that “all sickness” has a “demonic and cosmic dimension”; inserted comments maintain the importance of exorcism (7:21; 13:32); while Mark does not mention exorcism after the so-called strange exorcist (Mark 9:38-41; Luke 9:49-50), Luke sustains the emphasis through his Beelzebul pericope (11:14-23), the story of the unclean spirit (11:24-26), and the crippled woman (13:10-17). Twelftree further suggests that while Lukan exorcisms represent the defeat and destruction of Satan’s reign, apparently this is only the first stage: thus demons do not go to their final destruction (in the abyss) in 8:31-32 (Gerasene demonic); Satan is active in the lives of the disciples (Judas in 22:3; Peter in 22:31) and Ananias’ (Acts 5:3); and Paul’s ministry is said to involve delivering Gentiles from the power of Satan (Acts 26:18). Hobert Farrell sees miracles and kingdom proclamation connected in the five healings of Luke’s central section albeit teaching material predominates (which may or may not be connected to the kingdom) (“Luke’s Central Section”). While, however, the connection is evident in the Beelzebul pericope, which flows from the preceding exorcism (11:14-23), the kingdom teaching which follows the healing of lepers (Luke 17:11-19) is not obviously associated with the miracle story itself. Cosmic and eschatological defeat of demons are also detected by Dennis Hamm in the healing of the bent woman (“The Bent Woman”) and, in Acts 3:1-10, he detects a parable of the “role of the apostles in the end-time people of God ... they mediate the power of God and they speak with the authority of the Prophet-like-Moses” (“Acts 3, 1–10”).

Based on the following Luke has been labeled as a “tradition penetrated by magic”: he provides a more vivid physical presentation of (1) angels and (2) demons (compared to Matthew); and his conception of δύναμις as a “mana-like charge of divine potency” highlights the sense of magical power (Hull, Hellenistic Magic, 87–115, quote from 104). Others have criticized Hull for the following reasons (e.g., Achatemeier, “Lucan Perspective,” 556–58; Adams, “Miracles,” 241–47; Kee, Miracle, 211–17; Twelftree, Miracle Worker, 171–2): (1) some instances of Lukan redaction (assuming Markan priority) contradict the hypothesis (e.g., omission of foreign phrases in 8:40-55; cf. Mark 5:41); (2) “manipulation” of the supernatural world is absent from Luke (Adams), whose worldview is “fundamentally religious” (Kee); (3) Luke explicitly polemizes against magic and magicians (above references). As per my earlier discussion of miracle and magic, however, sharp distinctions cannot be established. While Luke’s polemic may not objectively distinguish miracle and magic, however, it does clearly illustrate his apologetic and validating purposes in recounting such wondrous activity. As regards δύναμις as a “mana-like” substance Robert Menzies agrees with Hull in seeing this as distinct from the Holy Spirit, whose primary function in Luke–Acts is related to revelatory acts (“Spirit and Power in Luke-Acts: A Response to Max Turner,” JSNT 49 [1993]: 11–20). Others, however, argue for a closer connection between the Holy Spirit and Jesus’ miraculous δύναμις (e.g., Turner, “Spirit”; Kee, Miracle, 203–4; Twelftree, Miracle Worker, 167–71; ). Luke 4:18 is a key text and, despite Menzies claim that Luke here expunges the ‘miraculous,’ the association of Jesus’ anointing (by the Spirit) with the healing (sight to blind) seems likely intended. Furthermore the collocation of δύναμις and πνεύμα in Luke 1:35 and Acts 10:38 are indicators of the two being closely associated in Luke’s mind (see further in Twelftree, Miracle Worker, 168–9 and Turner, “Spirit”).
A further function of miracles in Luke-Acts is to invoke a positive response to God and his messengers. Hence while they sometimes precipitate negative reactions, positive responses are common place: witnesses frequently praise God (e.g., Luke 5:25; 7:16; 9:43; 13:13; 17:18; 18:43; Acts 3:10) or respond with fear/awe (φόβος, φοβέω, or εἰμφοβος) (Luke 5:26; 7:16; 8:35, 37; 24:5; Acts 2:43; 5:11) or wonder (θάμβος) (Acts 3:10); Jesus’ ability to perform miracles is both demonstrated (Luke 4:31-34) and reported (Luke 4:23) before any disciples are called; the first disciples follow Jesus on account of a miracle (Luke 5:1-11) and the second call narrative (Levi in Luke 5:27-32) likewise follows a miracle; certain women who follow Jesus are noted to be past recipients of healing-exorcism (Luke 8:2-3); Jesus’ deeds (including ‘acts of power’ - δυνάμεις) are cited as grounds for positive responses (including joyful praise) (Luke 10:23; 19:37); repentance and praise is an appropriate response to Jesus’ deeds of power (Luke 10:13; 17:15-18); a positive relationship between healing and following Jesus is often seen as most exemplified in relation to the blind man healed near Jericho (18:35-43), but can also be seen in Peter’s mother in law (who begins “to serve them” in Luke 4:39) and the lame man healed by Peter (Acts 3:1-10, especially verse 8); Acts also includes various other positive responses to miracles (healings in Acts 9:35, 42; prison escape in 16:25-34);

178 For example Luke 6:11; 8:37; 11:15 (see also Luke 13:11-17; 14:1-6). Adams (“Miracles,” 264–5) notes the following examples of opposition to miracle working in Acts: 4:1-3 (Peter John arrested after healing the lame man); 5:17-18 (reputation for healing results in apostle’s imprisonment); 5:33 (Sadducees have ‘urge to kill’ after hearing of miraculous prison release); 6:8-15 (Hellenistic Jews seek to defame Stephen on account of his signs and wonders); 7:57-58 (the stoning of Stephen); and 16:16-24 (exorcism of girl results in imprisonment and beating - noting that this is the only explicitly recorded exorcism in Acts). Adams also notes miracles that are met with idolatry (14:8-18; 28:1-6). The reality of a divided response is highlighted in the notice at Acts 14:4 where (immediately following the notice about signs and wonders in 14:3) we are told that the residents of the city were divided in their responses to Paul and Barnabas.

179 On the following see Achtemeier (“Lucan Perspective”), Adams (“Miracles”), Twelftree (Miracle Worker, 183-6), Gen (“Divine Infliction”), Talbert (Reading Luke: A Literary and Theological Commentary on the Third Gospel [New York: Crossroad Publishing, 1988], 241–6), and Green (Luke, 198–9). The combination of negative and positive reactions suggests a divisive effect of miracles (Acts 14:3-4) with no guarantee of a positive response. The possibility for personal transformation (related to miracles) is noted by Kee as a motif shared with Isis and Asclepius cults (Miracle, 219). At the same time faith, for Luke, also precedes healing (e.g., Luke 5:20; 7:9; 8:48, 50; 17:19; 18:42; Acts 14:9) and Jesus rebukes his disciples for lack of faith in relation to a nature miracle (8:25).

180 Additional examples from Acts include possibly the following: 2:1-43 (especially v. 43); 5:12-14; 8:4-13; 13:9-12; 14:8-18 (though see reversal in 14:19-20); 19:17-20; 20:7-12; 28:1-10. Obviously the notion of positive responses to miracles relates closely to the theme of validation but is distinct in that it focuses on responses involving believing/following. Such a following is absent or questionable in some of the above list (14:8-18; 20:7-12; 28:1-10) despite the seeming positive response to such acts.
We may summarize by saying that miracles in Luke-Acts play an essential role in the unfolding of redemptive history by validating the divinely appointed miracle worker and his or her message including the defeat of anti-God powers (e.g., in exorcisms and punitive miracles). Furthermore they are especially concentrated at key turning points and while they clearly elicit a divided response, they frequently result in praise and/or belief (and potential discipleship) among recipients and observers.

5.2 Order and Selection of Gospel Miracle Traditions

Having arrived at a synchronic reading for each Gospel we may now consider the relative merits of our competing Synoptic hypotheses in relation to the issue of order and selection of miracle tradition. Relative redactional plausibility will be judged on the basis of both the rhetorical conventions of narrative and the theological and apologetic function of miracles in each of the Synoptic Gospels as discussed above.

5.2.1 Order and Selection According to the 2GH

(a) 2GH Markan conflation of Matthew and Luke

Upon assumption of the 2GH Mark selects sixteen out of twenty seven miracle stories from his sources and adds two of his own (7:31-37; 8:22-26) (see table 5.2). Insofar as he omits a high percentage of other narrative (e.g., from Matt 1–4 and Luke 1–4) and sayings (e.g., Matt 5–7 and Luke 9–19) material the result (despite the eleven omissions) is a high concentration of miracle stories with a good cross section of healing (seven), exorcism (five) and nature (six) miracles. While his overall shorter account may be taken as an example of conciseness (as per

---

181 He takes over fifteen from Matthew and twelve from Luke of which eleven are triple tradition, one is shared with Luke alone (1:21-28) and four are shared with Matthew alone (14:22-33; 15:21-28; 15:32-39; 21:18-22). These figures assume Jairus’ daughter and hemorrhaging women as two miracles. Some see Mark 7:31-37 as a narrative expansion of Matt 15:29-32 which would slightly change the stats.

182 As noted above Mark has the highest percentage of miracle tradition among the three Synoptic Gospels.
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Theon), this narrative virtue is contravened in Mark’s consistent tendency to adopt the longer Lukan account of individual miracle stories (see table 5.3 for word counts).\(^{183}\) The 2GH Mark takes over several (miracle related) summary statements (see table 5.4) of which the closest to Matthean wording is Mark 6:53-56. Understandably this occurs in a section missing from Luke (Mark 6:45–8:22) where the 2GH Mark is necessarily following Matthew.\(^{184}\) The initial summary statements in Mark 1:32-34 (parallel Matt 8:16-17 and Luke 4:40-41) and 1:39 (parallel Matt 4:23; Luke 4:44), however, share details with both Matthew and Luke which, according to Peabody et al., provides clear evidence of Markan conflation\(^{185}\) albeit necessarily requiring Mark to break up Matt 4:23-25: the last two verses are taken up in Mark’s third summary statement (Mark 3:7-12) along with elements or echoes of Matt 12:15-21.\(^{186}\) The content of Mark 3:7-12, however, can largely be explained on the basis of the Lukan parallel (6:17-19) albeit that Mark is more closely following Matthean order at this point (see below). In each of these instances the 2GH Mark is pictured by Peabody et al. as engaging in micro-conflation: minor details are taken from (apparently) disconnected places so as to break up Matthean summaries (e.g., 4:23-25). While this provides a possible explanation of the data, it is not clearly shown to be more plausible than alternative hypotheses (which will be considered below). Indeed it is difficult to imagine Mark engaging in such micro-conflation other than by simply recalling certain Matthean details from memory as he works primarily with Luke (to whom he generally appears closer in his summaries with the exception of Mark 6:53-56).\(^{187}\) Mark also contains summary statements that fail to take over the mention of miracles from Matthean counterparts. For example Matt 9:35-36 appears to be paralleled in Mark 6:6b and

---

\(^{183}\) This tendency is not necessarily a problem if good reasons can be provided for Mark’s procedure. This, however, requires a more detailed analysis of individual pericopes and will be taken up in relation to specific stories in the following chapter.

\(^{184}\) Mark closely follows Matthew in wording and content though is longer (Matthew 46 words; Mark 72 words). Both focus on healing (with no mention of teaching) and both mention healing in relation to touching garments.\(^{185}\) _One Gospel_, 91, 97.

\(^{186}\) The Lukan parallel is 6:17-19.

\(^{187}\) A similar conflation is suggested by Peabody et al. (_One Gospel_, 86–87, 155) in relation to Mark 1:28 (conflation of Matt 4:23-24 and Luke 4:37) but is similarly problematic in that Mark is clearly following Luke for this pericope. The only detail he has feasibly taken over from Matthew is geographical (Galilee) but this appears somewhat weak.
6:34, which not only divides up the verse into different contexts but fails to take over the healing motif from Matthew.\textsuperscript{188} This is inconsistent with Mark’s overall emphasis on miracles noted above.

Despite his interest in miracle tradition the 2GH Mark omits eleven miracle stories including three Matthean, six Lukan and two double tradition.\textsuperscript{189} Insofar as he cannot be expected to take over all miracle stories the omission of surplus stories is not unreasonable and may even be considered a matter of conciseness. Nevertheless some 2GH Markan omissions relate favorably to synchronically identified motifs of Markan miracle tradition such as the positive relation of miracles to teaching (sometimes taking on a parabolic quality), faith, and discipleship. Specifically his omission of Luke 5:1-11 is puzzling given that: it occurs early in the narrative (where Mark has the greatest concentration of miracles); it fits with other nature type miracles, which are generally directed toward the disciples (e.g., stilling storm; feeding 4000 and 5000; and walking on water); and it functions paradigmatically as an object lesson in discipleship.\textsuperscript{190} Given Mark’s tendency to retain longer narratives it is also surprising that he omits Peter walking on the water (Matt 14:28-31; cf. Mark 6:45-52) insofar as this provides an object lesson in faith as well as a confession of Jesus as the Son of God (related to validation). The faith theme is present in other Markan omissions such as the centurion (Matt 8:5-13; parallel Luke 7:1-10), the blind men (Matt 9:27-31), and the leper (Luke 17:11-19). Furthermore, some omitted stories

\textsuperscript{188} Mark mentions only teaching (in both verses). According to Peabody et al. Mark had passed over Matt 9:35 because he was following Luke at the time (Luke 4:16–6:11; parallel Mark 1:21–3:5) but having made the link back to Matt 4:25 at Mark 3:7-8 he may have easily noted the virtual doublet of Matt 9:35 which then became his source for Mark 6:6b (\textit{One Gospel}, 155–6).

\textsuperscript{189} These are: Matthean (Matt 9:27-31, 32-34 and 17:24-27), Lukan (Luke 5:1-11; 7:11-17; 13:10-17; 14:1-6; 17:11-19; 22:50-51) and double tradition (Matt 8:5-13 and 12:22-24 and parallels). Given this number of omissions it is somewhat misleading to state that Mark has “an almost totally inclusive collection of miracle stories from Matthew and Luke” (Peabody et al., \textit{One Gospel}, 44).

\textsuperscript{190} Noting Mark’s preference for the non-miraculous call story (Mark 1:16-20), Peabody et al. simply explain that “he had already chosen to narrate Matthew’s version” (Matt 4:18-22). This, however, fails to explain the reason for the omission especially when it is simultaneously claimed that he is primarily following Luke 4:31–6:31 (in Mark 1:21–3:5), precisely where Luke’s miraculous call story appears (Peabody et al., \textit{One Gospel}, 88). Interestingly the same authors see echoes of Luke 5:3 in Mark 4:1-2 (ibid., 125) suggesting that he has not completely passed over this Lukan narrative.
(Luke 13:10-17; 14:1-6)\(^{191}\) clearly blend teaching and miracle in a manner reminiscent of miracle-controversy stories that Mark has included (e.g., Mark 2:1-12; 3:1-6).\(^{192}\) Finally, despite taking over the Beelzebul pericope from his two sources, 2GH Mark is once again uncharacteristically brief\(^{193}\) and omits the miracle story that both his sources use to introduce the controversy (Matt 12:22-24; Luke 11:14). The 2GH Mark takes over all the Lukan summary statements (noting that these are parallels not additions to Matthew) with the possible exception of Luke 8:1-3 (which is perhaps paralleled in Mark 6:6b, 34; par. Matt 9:35-38) but omits either one or two Matthean miracle summary statements (Matt 15:29-31; 21:14)\(^{194}\) and changes a third into a summary statement about Jesus’ teaching only (Matt 19:1-2; cf. Mark 10:1). Such omissions are potentially explicable in relation to Mark’s focus on miracle stories in his first eight chapters, albeit Mark 10:1 follows closely on the healing of the demonized boy and another exorcist (9:14-28, 38-41) and has Bartimaeus to follow (10:46-52). The change in Mark 10:1 is also not readily explicable in relation narrative clarity, conciseness (Mark has twelve words in place of Matthew’s nine yet adds nothing of substance) or person (Mark’s primary identification of Jesus as a miracle worker begs the question as to why he would change this summary). When it comes to miracle related tradition the 2GH Mark omits several sections from Matthew-Luke double tradition (Matt 11:2-6, 20-24; 12:38-42, 43-45 and parallels) as well passages unique to Matthew (27:51-54; 28:1-10)\(^{195}\) and Luke (Luke 10:1-12; 13:31-33; 24:19) (see table 5.5).\(^{196}\) None of the omissions is particularly problematic except Jesus’ response to John (Matt 11:2-6; Luke 7:18-23) which clearly relates to the validating function of Jesus’ miracles in respect to his identity as messiah. Not only does this correspond to one of our identified Markan miracle motifs


\(^{192}\)Perhaps Mark sought to avoid unnecessary repetition (brevity) though the opposite tendency occurs, for example, in relation to the repeated feeding miracles (6:30-44; 8:1-10).

\(^{193}\)At 141 words he less than fifty percent the length of Matthew (309 words) and significantly shorter than Luke (168 words).

\(^{194}\)It is possible that the first of these summaries (Matt 15:29-31) has been converted into an actual miracle story by Mark (7:31-37) on which see below.

\(^{195}\)These passages are less obviously related to miracle tradition but have been included on the basis of apocalyptic type signs.

\(^{196}\)The last of these is simply a reference to Jesus being mighty in word and deed.
but 2GH Mark has otherwise included traditions about John that are less directly related to miracles (Mark 1:2-8; 6:14-29). In sum while the 2GH Mark cannot be expected to take over all miracle tradition from his sources (as with Josephus and especially in relation to Elisha) and certain omissions are explicable on the basis of conciseness, some of the omissions are more clearly problematic (especially, for example, Matt 11:2-6; Luke 5:1-11; 11:14) in that they would have served Mark’s thematic concerns in relation to miracle tradition.

When it comes to additions the 2GH Mark has two distinct miracle stories but no extra summary statements or miracle related tradition. The first addition (Mark 7:31-37) is potentially a Markan expansion of an otherwise omitted summary statement in Matt 15:29-31 and the second (Mark 8:22-26) reports a two stage healing of a blind man implying that Mark has passed over other blind healing stories (Matt 9:27-31) in favor of this one. Neither addition is particularly remarkable except for the fact that they are often seen to be structurally significant to Mark’s narrative in that they potentially form an inclusio with one another and, furthermore, Mark 8:22-26 is often seen to form an inclusio with Mark 10:46-52. In both cases the miracle stories can be understood to have a parabolic type function such as with the two stage healing in Mark 8:22-26 being emblematic of the two stage enlightenment of the disciples in Mark 8:27-33.

---

197 Hence begging the question as to why he would include the pericope about John’s death (in significant detail) while completely omitting this important reference to miracles and their validating function. The remaining omissions are potentially explicable on the basis of conciseness or irrelevance although the woes on the cities (Matt 11:20-24; Luke 10:13-16) fits with Mark’s inclusion of Jesus’ rejection in his home town (Mark 6:5-6).

198 This is contrary to the claim of Thomas Longstaff that “there is little need to pay attention to the reasons” for Markan omissions (“Crisis and Christology: The Theology of Mark,” in New Synoptic Studies, ed. William R. Farmer [Macon, Georgia: Mercer University Press, 1983], 373–92). Other miracle stories that the 2GH Mark omits (but less obviously going against Markan miracle motifs) include Matt 9:32-34; 17:24-27 and Luke 7:11-17; 22:50-51.


200 So according to Peabody et al. who suggest that together they provide “counterpoints to the profound misunderstanding of the disciples depicted in 8:1-21” (One Gospel, 179–80).

201 So, for example, Peabody et al. (ibid.) and Twelftree (Miracle Worker, 89).

202 As suggested to me personally by John Kloppenborg.
When it comes to the order of miracle stories the 2GH Mark clearly prefers Luke’s arrangement prior to Mark 6:30-44 (see table 5.2). This is in keeping with the notion of preferring one source at a time and with Mark’s interest in miracles (albeit interspersed with teaching) in chapters 1–8. Upon reaching the conclusion of the first feeding miracle at Luke 9:17 the 2GH Mark inserts a series of miracles taken directly from Matt 14:22–15:31 together with his own single tradition miracles (Mark 7:31-37 and 8:22-26). In essence, therefore, the 2GH Mark makes no substantial order changes to miracle stories and where his sources disagree he follows first one (Luke) then the other (Matthew) for large blocks. When it comes to summary statements Mark 6:53-56 occurs in the same order as Matthew (between walking on the water and the dispute over the traditions of the elders), which makes sense in that Matthew is necessarily his source at this point (owing to Luke’s ‘Great Omission’). Mark has three other miracle related summary statements of which the first two (1:32-34 and 39) occur in parallel placement to Luke (Luke 4:40-41 and 44) thus differing from Matthew, which is in keeping with his following Luke’s order more closely at this point, yet curiously his summary at Mark 1:39 is closer to Matthean wording in mentioning Galilee (as opposed to Judea in Luke 4:44) along with both proclamation and exorcism (Luke mentions only proclamation while Matthew has both proclamation and healing). This represents a curious phenomenon in which the 2GH Mark apparently follows Luke but produces a summary closer to Matthean wording. When it comes to Mark 3:7-12 the following indicates how the 2GH Mark has disagreed with both his sources on the placement of this pericope:

**Matthew:** healing (12:9-14) ⇒ summary (12:15-21) ⇒ Beelzebul (12:22ff.)


---

203 While Matthew delays miracles until chapters 8 and 9, Luke (as noted above) intersperses miracle and teaching from the outset of Jesus’ (Galilean) ministry.

204 Mark’s order is the reverse of Matthew in that Mark 1:32-34 is best paralleled to Matt 8:16-17 while Mark 1:39 is best paralleled to Matt 4:23-25.

205 Though Mark’s wording is closer to Luke in the shared expression κηρύσσων εἰς τὰς συναγωγὰς versus Matthew’s διδάσκων ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς.
Chapter 5 Selection and Order in Gospel Miracle Tradition

**Mark**: healing (3:1-6) ⇒ summary (3:7-12) ⇒ call twelve (3:13-19) ⇒ Beelzebul (3:20ff.)

While Mark agrees with Matthew in placing the summary immediately after the healing, he disagrees with him by inserting the call of the twelve prior to the Beelzebul incident.\(^{206}\)

Alternately he agrees with Luke in the juxtaposition of the summary and the call of the twelve but has them in reverse order.\(^{207}\) The Markan summary itself parallels the same single Lukan summary that appears in this context (6:17-19) but in relation to Matthew it comes closest to the second half of an earlier summary at Matt 4:24-25 rather than the Matt 12:15-21.\(^{208}\) The details, in respect to place names for instance, display a mix of triple agreement (Judea and Jerusalem though Mark agrees with Luke against Matthew in putting Judea first), Matthew-Mark agreement against Luke (Galilee and ‘beyond the Jordan’), and Mark-Luke agreement against Matthew (Tyre and Sidon). This involves the 2GH Mark in a curious procedure of taking up details from a combination of summary statements in various locations among his sources (Luke 6:17-19; Matt 4:24-25 and 12:15-21) at the end of a section where he has been most obviously following Luke’s order and will continue to do so for the following pericope (call of the twelve).\(^{209}\)

According to Peabody et al. the 2GH Mark’s procedure was inspired by the following: Luke’s prior conflation of Matt 12:15 and 4:24-25; the fact that Luke 6:17-19 introduces the Sermon on the Plain thus reminding him of Matthew’s introduction at 4:24-25; and the fact that Mark saw contextual and linguistic parallels between Matt 12:15-21 and 4:24-25 (especially in the phrases καὶ ἥκολούθησαν αὐτῷ ὀχλοὶ πολλοί and καὶ ἐθεράπευσεν)

---

\(^{206}\)In Matthew this occurred earlier (Matt 10:1-4).

\(^{207}\)Luke’s order change (assuming Markan priority) can be explained by his desire to place the summary closer to his Sermon (6:20-49). The potential reason for Mark’s order change is less obvious and is best explained in reference to Matthew. His content, however, is best explained in reference to Luke. According to both Meijboom (*History and Critique*, 152-3) and Peabody et al. (*One Gospel*, 111-123) Mark switches from following primarily Luke to Matthew at the point of the summary statement. Meijboom has Mark go back to Luke for the call of the twelve but then following Matthew from Beelzebul forward. Peabody et all are similar but have Mark following both sources in the call of twelve and with greater influence of Matthew in Beelzebul and the following pericope (Mark 3:31-35).\(^{208}\)

The earlier part of the first Matthean summary (Matt 4:23) was taken up in relation to Mark 1:39 above while all that is taken over from Matt 12:15-21 is the idea of the crowds who follow Jesus (which is already present in Matt 4:24-25).

\(^{209}\)Hence in Meijboom’s chart (*History and Critique*, 152-3) the 2GH Mark is said to follow Luke from 1:21 to 3:19 with the sole exception of this summary statement where he switches back to Matthew.
Such a complex conflationary theory in relation to a single summary statement is certainly possible but seems implausible insofar as it involves Mark moving back and forth between three summary statements in his two documents such as to pick up relatively minor details from Matthew (e.g., ἀκολουθεῖν) and Luke (e.g., πολὺ πλήθος) while ignoring, for example, the whole of Matthew’s citation formula (Matt 12:17-21).

The 2GH Mark makes further interesting decisions in relation to the remaining miracle related tradition. First he agrees with Matthew in having the Beelzebul pericope follow the withered hand and summary statement (as above) while Luke delays it until his central section (Luke 11:15-23). Thus Peabody et al. see the call of the twelve (Mark 3:13-19) as a conflation of Matthew and Luke but with Mark primarily dependent on Matthew at Mark 3:22-30. For the rejection at Nazareth (Mark 6:1-6) the 2GH Mark agrees with Matthew, his closest parallel (Matt 13:53-58), by having it occur after the parables discourse (Mark 4:1-34). He disagrees with Matthew, however, by placing a series of intervening miracle narratives first (Mark 4:35–5:43), the order of which agrees more closely with Luke. According to Peabody et al. Mark has here returned to Matthew (from where he had left off after the parables) in order to give a “retrospective passage looking back on the whole of Mark 3:20–5:43” and highlighting the “theme of blindness and unbelief all around Jesus” whereby he “is able to summarize the previous two major literary units by means of these two retrospective questions” (namely about Jesus’ wisdom and power).

---

210 Peabody et al., *One Gospel*, 111–12. These authors see Mark 3:7 as picking up ἰκολούθησαι (25x in Matt; 18x in Mark; 17x in Luke but not in this context) and ἀνεχώρησαν (1x in Mark; 10x in Matthew; none in Luke) from these two Matthean summaries, noting that the high frequency of the latter in Matthew combined with the single occurrence in Mark (not in Luke) suggest that Mark is borrowing the term from Matthew. They see the geographical details as picked up from both Matthew and Luke (ibid., 155).

211 A general weakness in Peabody et al. (*One Gospel*) is the tendency to simply state what Mark has done without providing explanations for why he has done it. Further, they generally do not engage in a comparison of hypotheses by considering, for example, how the same data might best be explained from the standpoint of Markan priority.

212 Meijboom has Mark following Luke for the call and Matthew for Beelzebul (*History and Critique*, 152-3).

213 Matthew has them in the same order but has the paralytic (9:2-8) inserted between the Gadarene demoniac and the ruler’s daughter. Luke, however, agrees with Mark’s order which places the paralytic earlier (Luke 5:12-16; 8:22-48) (see table 5.2).

214 Peabody et al., *One Gospel*, 150.
arise from the previous section, it is noteworthy that ‘blindness and unbelief’ have not been thematic of the miracles in Mark 4:35–5:43\(^{215}\) and that these miracles have occurred away from Jesus’ home town (the scene of the rejection). Mark’s *mission of the twelve* (6:7-13) follows directly on the (Nazareth) rejection passage but in this agrees with the order of Luke\(^{216}\) who appears to be the primary source at this point.\(^{217}\) The overall result is that the 2GH Mark is seen to alternate between Matthew and Luke at both macro- (order) and micro- (conflation of details) levels, a pattern that continues with *Herod’s question* (6:14-16), which follows directly on the mission of the twelve, and *another exorcist* (Mark 9:38-41).\(^{218219}\) While the zigzag procedure of macro- and micro-conflation is not impossible, it is not something discussed or suggested in relation to the rhetoric of narrative.\(^{220}\) More importantly, however, the complexity of the procedure, involving careful comparison and conflation of two documents,\(^{221}\) requires strong reasons for why Mark would proceed in this manner but these reasons are far from evident.\(^{222}\)

In summary the implied selection and addition of miracle related tradition by the 2GH Mark appears plausible and is consistent with Markan miracle motifs (namely a positive role in relation to Jesus’ identity; evidence of the in-breaking kingdom; and a positive relationship to teaching, faith and discipleship). While the overall result is a more concise account (i.e. Mark is the

---

\(^{215}\)They are more thematic of the miracles in Mark 6:45–8:26.

\(^{216}\)In Luke it follows directly after Jairus’ daughter as it would in Mark except for the intervening rejection story which Luke has earlier. Matthew, however, places the mission account earlier at 10:1-14.

\(^{217}\)So Meijboom (*History and Critique*, 152-3) as well as Peabody et al. (*One Gospel*, 154) who see him primarily following Luke but also consulting Matthew for details.

\(^{218}\)The macro-level zigzag in Mark 3:1–6:32 is readily seen in Meijboom (*History and Critique*, 152-3). Peabody et all (*One Gospel*) seem to differ in some of the details (e.g., on p. 118, unlike Meijboom, they have Mark following Matthew in Mark 4:21-25) but basically retain the same pattern at a macro-level and offer numerous examples of micro-conflation (pp. 119-52).

\(^{219}\)Perhaps the one exception to this is what Theon refers to in relation to interweaving of narration into narration (or narration into fable) (Kennedy, *Progymnasmata*, 25, 39) though it is not at all obvious that he is there talking about anything like the conflation that is implied in the 2GH.


\(^{222}\)Peabody et al. tend to point out the phenomenon as *if it were the reason* but this amounts to nothing more than simply stating the phenomena itself.
shortest Gospel), however, the 2GH Mark consistently prefers the longer Lukan version of miracle narratives (table 5.3) and typically expands even upon those. Insofar as the 2GH Mark cannot be expected to retain all miracle tradition his various omissions are understandable and in keeping with the narrative virtue of conciseness. Nevertheless some omissions are puzzling insofar as they would have been obvious choices in relation to his miracle motifs: e.g., Luke 5:1-11 (discipleship), Luke 11:14 (miracle attached to Beelzebul), and Matt 11:2-6 (validation). In relation to the order of miracle stories the 2GH Mark follows first Matthew then Luke in large blocks, a procedure consistent with the ‘one source at a time convention’ typical of ancient authors. At the same time his adaptation of miracle summaries and miracle related tradition implies a complex conflationary procedure at both macro- and micro-levels (e.g., for Mark 3:7-12). While such an approach is not impossible, its greater complexity requires that we posit sound explanations for the 2GH Markan choices. Such explanations are essentially absent in work of Peabody et al. and, based on the above analysis, cannot clearly be associated with Markan miracle motifs or the rhetorical conventions of narrative and encomium. The absence of such explanations counts against the plausibility of the 2GH.

(b) 2GH Lukan use of Matthew

Examination of selection and order in relation to the 2GH also requires consideration of the corollary hypothesis to Markan conflation, namely Luke’s purported use of Matthew alone as a (written) source, which is defended in detail in the study of Allan McNicol et al.. Our synchronic reading established that Lukan miracles provide validation of message and messenger, are especially concentrated at key turning points in the narrative of redemptive history, and frequently (but not always) invoke a positive faith response. Luke’s selection of thirteen Matthean miracle stories is consistent with his interest in miracles and, insofar as most

---

223 One Gospel.
224 The theory obviously allows for additional source material in relation to non-Matthean material in Luke but this does not have a significant impact upon the hypothesis and its potential strengths and weaknesses which primarily relate to the manner in which Luke is implied to have utilized Matthew.
225 Q Impasse.
(eight) come from Matt 8–9, this agrees with his tendency to concentrate miracles at the outset of Jesus’ ministry (see table 5.6 below). More interesting is the manner of Luke’s reproduction whereby only two accounts are of approximately equal length (Luke 9:10-17; 18:35-43) while the remainder vary between being 1.1 and 2.0 times the length of Matthew (table 5.3). Sometimes the 2GH Luke radically rewrites a pericope (e.g., the Gadarene demoniacs or Jairus’ daughter and the hemorrhaging woman in Luke 8:26-56, regarding which see chapter 6 below) while at other times he is much closer to Matthew, his source (e.g., Feeding of the 5000 in Luke 9:10-7).

In relation to these observations not only is there a general tendency for the 2GH Luke to expand upon Matthew but the extent of expansion reflects what is present in Mark albeit to a lesser degree (i.e. Mark is typically longer). Assuming Markan priority this is readily explained by the tendency of Matthew, and to a lesser extent Luke, to reproduce Mark more concisely. More implausibly, according to the 2GH, Luke first expands upon Matthew and then Mark expands upon both Matthew and Luke. While not impossible, this contravenes Theon’s narrative virtues (especially that of conciseness) and contrasts the tendencies observed in both Josephus and Plutarch. This will be explored further in the pericopes of chapter six.

The 2GH Luke takes over at least four miracle related summary statements from Matthew’s eight but significantly alters them (table 5.4). As noted above Matthew has two inclusio summaries (Matt 4:23-25; 9:35) with a third inserted in his miracle chapters indicating Jesus’ healing activity as fulfilling Isaianic prophecy (Matt 8:16-17). While Luke 4:40-41 parallels the latter in position, it only partially agrees in content (healings occurring at nightfall after the mother-in-law story) but omits mention of the prophetic fulfillment which would have related well to Luke’s validation theme. The resultant summary is nevertheless longer (52 words in place of Matthew’s 36) and therefore less concise on account of his replacing the fulfillment citation with a statement about Jesus’ silencing demons. A few verses later the 2GH Luke has a second summary (Luke 4:44) which picks up on Matt 4:23 (proclamation in the synagogues).

---

226 The two longest are the Gadarene demoniac (2x) and Jairus’ daughter with the bleeding woman (2.1x).
227 As per McNicol et al., Q Impasse, 129 and 136.
though abbreviates (9 words in place of 27) and changes the location from Galilee to Judea. The rest of Matt 4:24-25 appears in Luke 6:17-19 which also blends in elements from Matt 12:15-21 though omitting many of the details from both.\textsuperscript{228} Most significantly, in contrast to his earlier summary at 4:44, Luke highlights Jesus’ healing-exorcism activity (omitted from Luke 4:44) and omits (or least downplays) his teaching.\textsuperscript{229} Finally in 8:1-3 Luke picks up on Matt 9:35 with mention of proclamation and healing albeit he is more specific in relation to who was healed (various women including, for example, Mary Magdalene). Luke also has a summary at the outset of his Galilean section (Luke 4:14-16) but as with Luke 4:44 it only mentions proclamation and not miracles-exorcism. McNicol et al. claim that Luke 4:14-16 is a conflation of Matt 4:12-13, 4:23-25, and 9:26\textsuperscript{230} but in contrast to the latter two references Luke tends to highlight either teaching or healing but does not blend the two\textsuperscript{231} which goes against his tendency to balance teaching and healing ministry.\textsuperscript{232} The general Lukan tendency, therefore, is to break up and blend Matthean summaries in ways quite different from his source.\textsuperscript{233} Though not impossible, the apparent complexity of the procedure (combining elements from disparate places in Matthew) counts against its plausibility, especially given that the result is not an obvious improvement upon Matthew in relation to Luke’s miracle motifs.\textsuperscript{234} Turning to miracle related tradition the 2GH Luke takes over nine out of eleven Matthean units but, unlike with the miracle stories themselves, he does not consistently expand upon them (table 5.5). Indeed

\textsuperscript{228} According to McNicol et al. Luke 6:11-20 is a conflation of Matt 4:23–5:1; 12:14-15 and 9:35–10:4. It is difficult to compare the total word count given that Luke is a blend of various Matthean summaries (\textit{Q Impasse}, 100).

\textsuperscript{229} There is no direct mention of Jesus teaching but Luke 8:17 states that the people came “to hear him” (ἀκούσαι οὗτού).

\textsuperscript{230} \textit{Q Impasse}, 82. This judgment is based on vocabulary similarities between the passages.

\textsuperscript{231} Luke 8:1-3 is a clear exception. Luke 6:17-19 is a possible exception.

\textsuperscript{232} As noted above this pattern was disputed as a total picture for Luke but was acknowledged as present during the Galilean section (Luke 4–9) which is where all these summary statements occur.


\textsuperscript{234} Indeed (as above) he seems to compromise those interests by omitting citation formulas that have a potentially validating effect and by separating rather than blending the mention of teaching and healing-exorcism activity.
Matthew is longer in all cases except for the response to John (Luke 7:18-23; Matt 11:2-6; Luke is 1.6 times longer) and Herod’s statement (Luke 9:7-9; Matt 14:1-2; Luke is 1.5 times longer). The net result is a somewhat inconsistent approach insofar as the 2GH Luke tends to expand Matthean miracle stories but abbreviate miracle related tradition. In relation to triple tradition miracle stories where the 2GH Luke expands on Matthew he is frequently closer to the Markan word count. Interestingly in triple tradition miracle related pericopes when the 2GH Luke highly abbreviates Matthew on at least two occasions (mission of 12 and Beelzebul) he is again closer to Markan word counts. The inconsistency of the 2GH Lukan procedure is better explained by Markan priority (either 2DH or FH) where the varying pericope length in Luke (with respect to Matthew) results from following Mark.

The 2GH Luke omits seven out of twenty Matthean miracle stories including one healing, two exorcisms, and four nature miracles (see table 5.6). The two blind men (Matt 9:27-31) and the mute-possessed man (Matt 9:32-34) are the only two omitted from Matt 8–9 and, according to McNicol et al., Luke does so in order to use them later in combination with their Matthean doublets (Matt 20:29-34; parallel Luke 18:35-43; Matt 12:22; parallel Luke 11:14). This is problematic for the 2GH, however, in that both stories were well suited to Luke’s Galilean section where recovery of sight for the blind is an expectation announced in the programmatic statement of Luke 4:16-20 (especially verse 18). Even more importantly in relation to his response to John (Luke 7:18-23) Jesus is said to have just performed miracles of healing, exorcism and restoration of sight (v. 21). Jesus’ himself then mentions about the blind receiving

---

235 The extent of Luke’s abbreviation varies but Matthew is longer by the following amounts: 2.4 times (mission of twelve); 1.8 times (Beelzebul); 1.5 times (woes on cities); 1.3 times (sign of Jonah); and 1.2 times (unclean spirits). The mission of the twelve is equal in length. See table 5.5.

236 His treatment of summary statements is harder to discern in relation to expansion versus abbreviation owing to his tendency to conflate details from disparate Matthean summaries (as noted above).

237 This is true, for example, in relation to the following narratives: mother in law, leper, paralytic, shriveled hand, Gadarene, Jairus daughter with the hemorrhaging woman, and Bartimaeus. For the statistics see table 5.3.

238 For word count comparisons see table 5.5.

239 Markan priorists, however, face the opposite problem of Matthew treating Mark inconsistently by sometimes abbreviating and other times expanding.

240 *Q Impasse*, 131,176, 239–40.
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sight and adds the following miracles: the lame walking; lepers cleansed (cf. 4:27); deaf hearing; and the dead raised (7:22). The miracle stories of Luke’s early Galilean section (4:31–7:15), prior to Jesus’ response to John, illustrate every category except the blind and mute healings. Indeed the one example of a dead person being raised (7:11-17) is a unique Lukan addition and was probably inserted to provide an illustration for the list in Luke 7:22. This relates to the identified Lukan concern with validation thereby making the omission (or at least postponement) of these two healing narratives (Matt 9:27-34) puzzling and problematic for the 2GH.

The next four omissions occur within a lengthy narrative section of Matthew (Matt 13:54–17:27) and include the walk on water (14:22-33), the Canaanite woman (15:21-28), the feeding of the four thousand (15:32-39), and the coin in the fishes mouth (17:24-27). While there is potential for the validation theme here, especially in relation to the water and feeding miracles, the 2GH Luke cannot be expected to take over everything of interest and, furthermore, the feeding miracle may have been seen as an unnecessary repetition (cf. Luke 9:10-17). As such neither these omissions nor that of fig tree (Matt 21:18-22) are particularly troublesome for the 2GH. Slightly more troublesome is the omission of five Matthean summary statements that make mention of miracles (Matt 9:35; 14:34-36; 15:29-31; 19:1; 21:14-16) along with two pieces of miracle related tradition (Matt 24:23-25 and 27:51-54). In particular the omission of

---

241 The net result is that recovery of sight for the blind is mentioned three times (4:18; 7:21, 22).
242 Lame walk (5:17-26); leper healed (5:12-16; cf. 17:11-19); diseases cured (4:38-39; 6:16-11; 7:1-10); evil spirits exorcised (4:31-37; cf. 8:26-39; 9:37-43); and dead raised (7:11-17; cf. 8:40-56).
243 So indeed for McNicol et al., Q Impasse, 108–9.
244 It should noted that, on assumption of Markan priority, Luke passes over Mark’s deaf mute (7:31-37) and blind healing (8:22-6) stories in much the same manner albeit as part of Luke’s Great Omission (on which see below).
245 The first three of these omissions are part of Luke’s Great Omission from in Mark 6:45–8:26 (assuming Markan priority). The problem (see further below) is less acute for the 2GH in that Matthew’s parallel (Matt 14:22–16:12) occurs later in the text than Mark and at the junction where Luke is about to transition into his central section. This said it is noteworthy that he moves up the story of the demonized boy (Matt 17:14-21) to the end of his Galilean section (Luke 9:37-43) and in so doing passes over the various miracles noted here.
246 This story is likewise omitted from either Mark (2DH) or Mark and Matthew (FH) upon assumption of Markan priority theories.
247 Perhaps the most interesting is the omission of Matt 14:34-36 in that it makes mention of people touching Jesus’ cloak. Luke mentions people touching Jesus (not his cloak) in 6:17-19, which is typically paralleled to Matt 4:23-25 and 12 15-21 (as above). No mention is made of a possible connection to Matt 14:34-36 in McNicol et al. despite their conflation theory in relation to Luke 6:17-19 (Q Impasse, 100–02).
248 While Aland prints Luke 9:51 as a parallel to Matt 19:1-2 (Synopsis Quattuor, §17), there are significant differences between the two and Luke, in contrast to Matthew, makes no mention of miracles.
summary statements is surprising given the number of miracle related summaries in Acts 249 although they are noted to occur predominantly after his Galilean section (where his interest in miracles is greatest in the Gospel).

Luke adds seven miracle stories to Matthew (see table 5.6) which are evenly distributed throughout his narrative and are not particularly problematic for the 2GH. Indeed his transformation of the Matthean call story (4:18-22) into a miraculous catch of fish (Luke 5:1-11; cf. John 21:1-11) highlights Luke’s positive role for miracles in relation to discipleship. Also, as noted above, his addition of the widow’s son (7:11-15) provides an appropriate illustration of raising the dead just prior to Jesus’ response to John. Such changes are not unique to the 2GH but also occur in Markan priority hypotheses (in relation to Luke’s use of Mark with or without Matthew). What is unique to the 2GH, however, is Luke’s addition of the initial exorcism (Luke 4:31-37). 250 While the reason for its placement up front is not immediately obvious, it does constitute the only exorcism prior to the above noted summary in 7:21-23 (Jesus’ response to John) which includes exorcism. 251 Insofar as they do not create any particular problems for the 2GH, neither the remaining additional miracle stories (13:11-17; 14:1-6; 17:11-19; 22:50-51) nor the four additional pieces of miracle related tradition (9:49-50; 10:1-12; 13:31-33; 24:19) need any special comment. There are no additional summary statements. 252

As can be seen from a quick glance at table 5.6 it is in relation to order that the 2GH Luke makes some of his most significant changes to Matthew thereby creating some difficulties for the hypothesis. First, Matthew’s leper story is moved from pole position down to a point after his call story (Matt 8:1-4; Luke 5:12-16); yet insofar as Luke has just mentioned a leprosy healing (4:27 in relation to Naaman, which is unique to Luke) it would have suited him to follow

249 E.g. Acts 2:43; 5:12, 15-16; 6:8; 8:4-13; 14:3; 19:10-12; 29:9. See also table 5.1.
250 The story is shared with Mark 1:21-28 but is a Lukan addition when Markan posteriority is assumed. According to McNicol et al. the story grows out of Matt 7:28-29 (which also mentions teaching with authority and not like the scribes) as well as having echoes of Matt 4:13 in Luke 4:31a (Q Impasse, 88–89).
251 There are two more exorcism stories in the Galilean section of Luke (8:26-39 and 9:37-43) but both occur after the summary in 7:21-23.
252 Although two of the units I have counted as additional miracle related tradition could perhaps count better as summaries (24:19; 13:31-33).
Matthew’s placement. McNicol et al. suggest that Luke moves the story because Matthew does not have it taking place in Capernaum (where Jesus is now situated according to Luke’s narrative plan) and deliberately places it first in a series of controversy stories. Controversy, however, is not particularly evident in the leper story itself and while it is true that Matthew does not situate the story in Capernaum (Jesus has just come down from the mountain and encounters the leper prior to his entering Capernaum as per Matt 8:1-2, 5 ), Luke does not follow Matthew anyhow. Rather he simply has Jesus encounter the leper in ‘one of the cities’ (Luke 5:12) indicating that specific geographical location was not an important factor for him. Alternately the mother-in-law story (Luke 4:38-39; Matt 8:14-15) has been moved up to a position above the centurion and the leper. According to McNicol et al. the story provides an explanation for Peter’s positive response to Jesus in Luke 5:1-11. Alternatively the centurion story moves down (Luke 7:1-10; Matt 8:5-13) since it clashes with Luke’s central purpose of describing the process by which disciples are called. While such reasons are certainly possible, plausibility seems relatively low in that it would have made better sense for Luke to have had no intervening material between the mother-in-law story and the catch of fish and to place both stories up front prior to the exorcism of 4:31-37 and the intervening material of Luke 4:42-44, material which implies that the disciples are already following Jesus. The paralytic (Luke 5:17-27; Matt 9:2-8) is likewise moved up by Luke with the corollary that the storm stilling, the Gerasene demoniac, and Jairus’ daughter (Luke 8:22-48) are moved down to after the response to John (7:18-23). Neither a consideration of Luke’s structure and miracle motifs nor Theon’s conventions of

253 Perhaps Luke is wanting to highlight God’s dealings with the Gentiles (in lieu of Israel’s failure) and, therefore, places in first position the exorcism in a (Jewish) synagogue (symbolic of the problems in Israel?). Such a theme, however, is less obvious in Luke than Acts and is not clearly something that Luke highlights at this point.
254 Q Impasse, 90, 95.
255 See McNicol et al., Q Impasse, 90.
256 These particular problems of Lukan order are shared by Markan priorists, particularly the placement of Luke 5:1-11.
257 Matthew has all four stories together in the following order: storm > demoniac > paralytic > ruler’s daughter (Matt 8:22–9:26). There is additional intervening material between the paralytic and the ruler’s daughter (call of tax collector and question about fasting in Matt 9:9-17) that Luke retains (Luke 5:27-39) after the paralytic story.
narrative provide clear reasons for the 2GH Luke’s procedure at this point.\textsuperscript{258} The withered hand (Luke 6:6-11) is likewise moved up relative to Matt 12:9-14, along with its preceding story about plucking grain (Luke 6:1-5), to a position just after the complex of the Paralytic, the call of Levi and the question about fasting (Luke 5:17-39). This supports the claim of McNicol et al. that Luke is collecting controversy stories at this point notwithstanding that the leper story does not quite fit the category. Finally it may be noted that the blind-mute (Luke 11:14; Matt 12:22-24), which is clearly attached to the Beelzebul controversy in both Matthew and Luke, has been moved down relative to the feeding of the five thousand (Luke 9:10-17) and the demonized boy (Luke 9:37-43). The reasons for these changes are not obvious.

It has already been noted that the 2GH Mark combines elements from Matthean summary statements which may be summarized as follows: Luke 4:14-15 (conflation of Matt 4:12-13; 4:23-24; 9:26); Luke 4:40-41 (Matt 8:16-17); Luke 4:44 (Matt 4:23); Luke 6:17-19 (Matt 4:25 and 12:15-21); and Luke 8:1-3 (Matt 9:35). The result is not only a disparate blending of details from various places in Matthew but essentially a disregard for Matthean order. This is especially noteworthy in relation to Matthew’s structural use of summaries in 4:23-25, 8:16-17 and 9:35 as noted above. Matthean summary structure would have suited Luke well (given his blend of teaching and miracle during the early part of his Gospel) as would his ordering of miracle related tradition. The 2GH Luke, however, ignores them both and there are no compelling reasons to explain this.\textsuperscript{259}

In summarizing Luke’s procedure in relation to Luke 8:22-56 McNicol et al. claim that “this kind of precise, pericope by pericope utilization of the material in Matthew in widely separated

\textsuperscript{258} According to McNicol et al. Luke has situated the paralytic after the leper insofar as it takes up the controversy theme of that section (\textit{Q Impasse}, 96–7) but, as noted above, it is not clear that the leper story relates to controversy. Regarding the other three miracles (storm stilling, demoniac and Jairus’ daughter) McNicol et al. admit no obvious reason for the move down but conjecture that Luke returns to Matt 8–9 in order to present “further evidence of Jesus’ power and authority” before proceeding to the sending of the twelve (Luke 9:1-6). This is not a compelling explanation for Luke’s procedure.

\textsuperscript{259} E.g. (as per table 5.6): he moves up the response to John while moving down woes on the cities; the return of the unclean spirits is placed in a different relative order to Beelzebul and the sign of Jonah; and the statement of Herod on Jesus is moved up to follow upon the mission of the twelve.
contexts of Luke’s order supports the hypothesis of Luke’s direct literary dependence upon the canonical Gospel of Matthew, not a source like Q.” While the phenomenon may be agreed upon (i.e. significant reordering of Matthew), in the absence of sound reasons for why Luke proceeds in this manner the opposite conclusion is suggested. While possible reasons have been suggested for some of Luke’s decisions, none is compelling in relation to the rhetoric of narrative or Lukian miracle motifs thus undermining rather than enhancing the plausibility of the 2GH.

Insofar as both Matthew and Luke utilize miracle tradition for validation purposes and insofar as this is especially true of Luke’s Galilean section (Luke 4–9) and Matthew’s initial miracle collection (Matt 8–9), it would have made sense for Luke to follow Matthew’s order at this point. Possible exceptions include Luke 5:1-11 (catch of fish), which he could have inserted prior to the collection (perhaps along with 4:38-39), and Luke 7:11-15 (raising widow’s son), which he could have inserted as an example of the dead being raised (though in Matt 8–9 the ruler’s daughter serves this function). Such a collection would have illustrated all Luke needed for his validating statement in Luke 7:18-23 (Jesus’ response to John) without the need for complex reordering.

McNicol et al. make the general claim to have provided “a demonstration that Luke might have used Matthew” and state that “it will be difficult to argue that the data in Luke can be explained any other way than that Luke was thoroughly conversant with canonical Matthew and made it the basis of his Gospel.” The authors nevertheless acknowledge that the 2GH Luke deviates significantly from his source as he moved in a “cyclic progression through Matthew

---

260 See McNicol et al., Q Impasse, 130.
261 Q Impasse, 319. Emphasis original.
262 In relation to the birth narratives, for instance, Matthew-Luke parallels are listed as a justification for direct influence, yet it is admitted that Luke is “vastly different from Matthew” (McNicol et al., Q Impasse, 47–48). Similarly in the Galilean section (Luke 3–9) they state that Luke “began following closely both the order and content of Matthew” but “did not simplistically adopt the order of Matthew’s pericopes from Matt 3 to 18” (ibid., 14). In his central section (Luke 10–18) Luke is said to “stopped following Matthew’s narrative order in successive divisions ... and created a large paranetic section of his own” (ibid., 19). Finally when it comes to the Jerusalem section (Luke 19–24) Luke is said to have followed the general sequence of Matthew but “revised each unit internally” (ibid., 20).
... to create his own chronologically-oriented narrative.” This involved a five part sweep through Matthew picking up different details each time. In all of this Luke “was guided by a number of considerations ... but the most important of all was his determination to write a narrative that was ‘accurate,’” namely one with “an appropriate chronological order for a literary work.” Finally it is stated that Luke was “quite at home in a Hellenistic environment” and thoroughly influenced by Hellenistic literary conventions. While this last claim is likewise assumed in the present study, various factors suggest that it challenges rather than enhances the plausibility of the hypothesis. It is not clear, for example, that “chronology” was a chief concern of Hellenistic writers with whom Luke may be compared or that is was a major guiding factor for Luke himself. The procedure of the 2GH Luke described above appears somewhat

263 McNicol et al., Q Impasse, 21.
264 Ibid., 15-17, 21 along with the chart on pp. 16-17. This claim, however, is not entirely without problems insofar as three out of the five cycles have exceptions to the supposed orderly progression through Matthew (as per the critique of Goodacre, “Beyond the Q Impasse”, esp. 43). Given that Luke has already had to weave his way through Matthew five times such exceptions appear less like acceptable anomalies to an otherwise plausible theory and more like the tip of the iceberg that amounts to much greater problems for the hypothesis. Furthermore, as Goodacre points out, most of these so-called ‘cyclic progressions’ can be straightforwardly explained by appeal to the 2DH whereupon Luke is simply following the order of Mark.
265 McNicol et al., Q Impasse, 15 (emphasis original).
266 McNicol et al., Q Impasse, 41. See also pp. 48, 51, 54, 68. In relation to Luke’s Hellenistic reworking of the Last Supper and crucifixion see p. 20 and on the notion that the central section (Luke 10–18) is retold according to the typical Hellenistic motif of the wandering teacher see pp. 151-53.
267 It was not clearly a chief concern in either Plutarch or Josephus for example. In Theon the chief virtues are clarity, conciseness and credibility but none requires strict chronology. Neither is chronology mentioned in relation to the narrative element of time and, furthermore, Theon speaks of rearranging narrative in at least five ways (assuming a sixth basic form that goes from beginning to middle to end) as follows: (1) begin in the middle, go back to the beginning and then jump to the end; (2) begin at the end then run backwards to the middle and beginning; (3) from middle to end and back to beginning; (4) from end to beginning to middle; (5) from beginning to end to middle (see Kennedy, Progymnasmata, 28–35). Such a discussion assumes that logical and rhetorical order took precedence over chronological order. It may be that rhetoricians like Theon would approach ‘historical’ writing in a different manner but to the extent that Luke fits within the bios genre I suspect that strict chronological order was not of great importance to him.
268 This contention of McNicol et al. draws heavily upon the assumption that καθεξής in Luke 1:3 refers to “chronological order” (Q Impasse, 25). Within the New Testament writings the word only occurs in Luke-Acts (Luke 8:1; Acts 3:24; 11:4; 18:23) and while at least one case seems to have a clear chronological sense to it (Acts 11:4) this is not always the case. Standard Greek lexicons certainly suggest that while it may refer to time it is equally likely to refer to logical order (e.g., Walter Bauer, A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature, 3rd Edition. Revised and edited by Frederick William Danker [Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2000], 490 and Henry George Liddell and Robert Scott, A Greek-English Lexicon, Revised and augmented by Henry Stuart Jones [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996], 742, 852). That Luke is not concerned with precise chronology is further supported, for example, by his switching the order of the temptation accounts. Also in his central section the journey motif functions as a literary convention for an apparently non-chronological arrangement of material (noting that, as with Mark and Matthew, Luke only retains one Jerusalem visit of Jesus while John’s several visits are more historically plausible). McNicol et al. appear to agree with this when describing
idiosyncratic in relation to order and selection of Matthean material. In addition, for example, to problematic omissions (e.g., the blind and mute healing stories of Matt 9:27-34) his rhetorically counter-intuitive tendency to expand rather than abbreviate miracle stories is not readily explained by rhetorical conventions of narrative or miracle motifs. Nor is his re-ordering of miracle tradition, including his complete reworking of summary statements, readily explicable. This stands in contrast to the more conservative Luke of the Markan priority hypotheses\(^{269}\) and hence while the 2GH Lukan implied redaction is certainly possible, the general paucity of convincing explanations for why he proceeds as he does speaks against the plausibility of the hypothesis that Luke used Matthew as his primary source.\(^{270}\) In essence, despite the claim that 2GH Luke has “largely followed Matthew’s order,”\(^{271}\) the reality (with the exception of the Jerusalem section) is almost the opposite and there are no compelling reasons to explain his procedure according to either rhetorical convention or miracle motifs.

In summary the 2GH Lukan selection and addition of miracle tradition is generally plausible and in keeping with his miracle motifs related to validation and a positive response to miracles (e.g., praise, wonder, discipleship etc.). At the same time the 2GH Lukan tendency to expand miracle stories contravenes the narrative virtue of conciseness. This is not only inconsistent with his approach to miracle related tradition (where he is more likely to compress) but also implies the following in relation to miracle narratives: the 2GH Luke first expands upon Matthew before

\(^{269}\)Luke’s transformations of Matthew’s order and selection comprises something of a unique challenge for the 2GH. Insofar as the FH assumes Markan priority the primary problems for that hypothesis relate to Luke’s reordering of the Matthew’s teaching material, especially Matt 5–7 (on which see, for example, Matson, “Luke’s Rewriting”). His deviations in relation Matthean miracle tradition are entirely explicable with reference to Mark (the sole exception being the summary statement at Luke 6:17-19). The 2DH Luke is even more conservative since he not only agrees with Markan order but also with that of Q. The problems are not avoided, however, since the order changes remain but are now made by Matthew in relation to Mark (the plausibility of which will be discussed below).

\(^{270}\)While McNicol et al (\textit{Q Impasse}) provide a thorough description of how the 2GH Luke must have preceded, a general weakness of the study involves the paucity of explanations for why he does so. Likewise while frequently critiquing the 2DH (the only real alternative considered), they rarely seek to offer plausible explanations of the data from alternative perspectives, which is required if they intend to demonstrate the greater plausibility of the 2GH.

\(^{271}\)McNicol et al., \textit{Q Impasse}, 14.
Mark then expands upon both. Given the importance of the narrative virtue of conciseness for both of our contemporary authors examined above (Josephus and Plutarch) the Markan priority hypotheses more plausibly posits that Mark is more concisely recounted by both Matthew and Luke. While several 2GH Lukan omissions are unproblematic, the blind and mute healings of Matt 9:27-34 are a surprising omission from Luke’s early Galilean section (4:31–7:15), their being moved to a later point in his Gospel. Not only are these the only miracles omitted from Matthew 8–9 but they would have provided key examples for the otherwise complete list of miracles in Jesus’ response to John the Baptist (Luke 7:18-23). The 2GH Lukan omission of various Matthean summary statements is also puzzling given both his general interest in miracles and the frequency of miracle related summary statements in Acts. These various omissions are all the more puzzling given their obvious relation to the clear Lukan miracle motif of validation. Finally, the 2GH Luke engages in significant re-ordering of Matthean miracle narratives and while the various changes are not impossible, the lack of obvious explanations (related to miracle motifs or conventions of narrative) implies an idiosyncratic procedure that lacks plausibility (noting that it was implied in our study of Josephus and Plutarch that they did not engage in significant order changes without good reason). The 2GH Luke shows a similar disregard for Matthew’s order in relation to summary statements and miracle related tradition without obvious explanation. Furthermore, he engages in disparate blending of details from Matthew’s summary statements without obvious rhetorical or apologetic gains thereby making the procedure appear implausible. In essence the procedure of the 2GH Luke is clearly possible and at times quite plausible (e.g., in selection and addition) but at various points appears implausible in relation to changes being inexplicable in relation to Luke’s identified miracle motifs and the previously identified rhetorical conventions of narrative.
5.2.2 Order and Selection According to the 2DH

(a) 2DH Matthean use of Mark and Q

Turning attention to the 2DH Matthew we note that in keeping with his interest in miracle tradition he takes over eighty three per cent of Markan miracle stories (fifteen out of eighteen) albeit with a clear tendency to abbreviate (see table 5.7 for 2DH Matthean order and selection). He likewise retains of all of Mark’s miracle related summary statements (1:32-34, 39; 3:7-10; 6:53-56) although significantly rewrites them by combining elements from different Markan summaries (e.g., Matt 4:23-25 based on Mark 1:39 and 3:7-10) and adding elements such as fulfillment formulas (e.g., in Matt 8:16-17, which is based on Mark 1:32-34; and in Matt 12:15-21, which is based on elements in Mark 3:7-12). Furthermore he introduces the miracle motif to several non-miracle related Markan summary statements such as Matt 9:35-38 (parallel Mark 6:6b and 34). The creation of this summary implies something of an awkward procedure for the 2DH Matthew. It is noteworthy, however, that while v. 6 of Mark mentions only teaching, Matthew’s loose parallel mentions both proclamation and healing. Likewise at Matt 14:14 (introduction to the feeding of the 5000), where Matthew again parallels Mark 6:34, he changes Mark’s reference about Jesus’ teaching into a statement about healing the sick. Finally at Matt 19:1-2 the Markan summary statement about Jesus’ teaching (Mark 10:1) is again changed into a statement about healing. On at least one occasion the 2DH Matthew follows Mark more closely in a summary, namely at Matt 14:34-36 (cf. Mark 6:53-56). In relation to relative word counts the 2DH Matthew is not entirely consistent in that he can be briefer (as is typical in relation to

272Abbreviation is a well recognized trait in relation to the 2DH Matthew (e.g., in Held, “Miracle Stories”). The following figures indicate the relative length of Matthew compared with Mark: Leper (0.6x); mother in law (0.7x); storm stilling (0.6x); Gadarene (0.4x); paralytic (0.6x); Jairus and bleeding woman (0.35x); withered hand (0.95x); feed 5000 (0.7x); feed 4000 (0.9x); demonized boy (0.5x); and Bartimeaus (0.6x). The two exceptions (where Matthew is longer) are the Canaanite woman (1.1x) and the walk on water (1.4x). In the latter case the extra length results from the addition of Peter walking on the water. If this were extracted then Matthew would again be shorter than Mark (0.7x or 0.9x depending on whether the final verses are included). For these results see table 5.3.

273These are paralleled, for example, in both Aland (Synopsis Quattuor, §98) and Throckmorton (Gospel Parallels: A Comparison of the Synoptic Gospels [Nashville; Atlanta; London; Vancouver: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1992], §58).
narratives) or longer than his source. Matthew retains eight out of nine Markan miracle related pericopes, four times being briefer, three times longer, and once being of equal length (see table 5.5). Expansion is obviously less typical and therefore requires explanation. In at least two cases Matthew’s expanded version of Mark may be explained with reference to Mark-Q overlap. First, in the Beelzebul pericope (Matt 12:22-37; Mark 3:22-30; Luke 11:14-23) Matthew is more than double the length of Mark (309 words in place of 141) but the additions can be accounted for by Lukan parallels (Q tradition according to 2DH proponents). Second, in the demand for a sign (Matt 16:1-4; Mark 8:11-13) the changes (exception clause) and additions (weather signs and sign of Jonah) in Matthew likewise reflect Luke/Q parallels (Luke 11:29-32; cf. Matt 12:38-42). This leaves Matthew’s expansion of the mission discourse which in part may be explained with reference to Q (e.g., Matt 10:15-16) but is generally his own work. Insofar as it is one of Matthew’s extended discourses, however, an expanded version of Mark is perhaps understandable. Two other 2DH Matthean alterations are worth noting. First, in the appointment of the twelve (Matt 10:1-4; par Mark 3:13-18) the 2DH Matthew omits Mark’s mention of authority to proclaim (κηρύσσω), agrees in mentioning exorcism, but adds a

---

274 For a summary of the statistics see table 5.4. For occasions where Matthew is shorter see, for example, the following: Matt 14:34-36 (par. Mark 6:53-56) where Matt has 44 words in place of Mark’s 72; Matt 8:16-17 is 36 words in place of Mark’s 46 (1:32-34) despite introducing the citation formula; Matt 14:14 is 14 words in place of 21 (Mark 6:34) though in this case the omitted statement about the crowd being like sheep without a shepherd occurs earlier in Matt 9:36. For an occasion where Matthew is longer see Matt 19:1-2 (32 words in place of 25 in Mark 10:1). Other comparisons are of less value owing to the fact that the 2DH Matthew parallels disparate texts in Mark (e.g., Matt 4:23-25 has parallels to both Mark 1:39 and 3:7-10).

275 The following figures indicate the relative length of Matthew compared to Mark: appointment of twelve (0.8x); rejection at Nazareth (0.8x); Herod’s question (0.6x); and apocalyptic discourse (0.9x).

276 Following numbers show relative length of Matthew compared to Mark: Beelzebul (2.1x); mission of twelve (2.1x); demand for a sign (1.5x).

277 Yeast of Pharisees in Matt 16:5-12 (par. Mark 8:14-21).


279 Though this can obviously be explained with reference to Matthew’s knowledge of Luke or vice versa (as with the FH). Not only does he agree with Luke in adding a healing story up front (Matt 12:22-23; Luke 11:14) but the remaining additional material (e.g., Matt 12:27-28,30,33-35) is also paralleled in Luke. Notably Luke’s version is significantly shorter than Matthew (168 words) but this is readily explained by the fact that Luke’s parallels to Matt 12:32, 33-35 occur in a different context (Luke 12:10; 6:43-45).
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reference to healing diseases. This again highlights miracle over against teaching although proclamation of the good news appears in the mission charge a few verses later (Matt 10:7)\textsuperscript{280} along with a further command to heal and exorcise (Matt 10:8). Second, in the rejection at Nazareth Matthew is noted to change Mark’s “he could do no deeds of power there...” (Mark 6:5) into “he did not do many deeds of power there...” (Matt 13:53). While this is typically seen as a deliberate softening of the stronger Markan statement suggesting Jesus’ \textit{inability},\textsuperscript{281} it also makes sense to see the 2DH Matthew as abbreviating once again.\textsuperscript{282} Matthew takes over all of the Q miracle tradition including two miracle stories (Q 7:1-10; 11:14)\textsuperscript{283} and several miracle related traditions.\textsuperscript{284} In general his penchant for miracle tradition is in keeping with his positive attitude toward miracles and his liking of speech/dialogue in relation to miracles suggests good reason for his taking over Q 7:1-10 (with a significant speech/dialogue component) and 11:14 (attached to a controversy).

When it comes to omissions the 2DH Matthew passes over three Markan miracles of which the first is his opening exorcism (Mark 1:21-28). This might potentially be linked to Matthew’s purported discomfort with exorcism\textsuperscript{285} but such a tendency is less evident on a synchronic reading of Matthew (as above) and, even upon assumption of Markan priority, Matthew retains all three of the remaining Markan exorcisms (the Gadarene demoniac, the Canaanite woman, and

\textsuperscript{280}It is missing in the Markan parallel at Mark 6:6b-7.
\textsuperscript{281}See for example Hull, \textit{Hellenistic Magic}, 140.
\textsuperscript{282}So, for example, Daniel J. Harrington, \textit{Matthew}, Sacra Pagina 1 (Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1991), 211. Notably Mark, despite his apparently absolute statement that Jesus could not do any miracles, goes on to provide an exception clause indicating that he did heal some. Matthew’s simple statement that he only did a few deeds of power is both more succinct and clear.
\textsuperscript{283}The paucity of miracle stories potentially poses a problem for the Q hypothesis in that healings and exorcisms are frequently assumed as regular activities of Jesus and his disciples (e.g., Q 7:22-23; 10:2-12, 13; 11:15) and yet the narrative contains only a single example of each.
\textsuperscript{284}These include John’s inquiry (7:18-20, 22-23), the mission speech (10:2-12), woes on Galilean towns (10:13-15), the Beelzebul accusation (11:14-23), the return of the evil spirit (11:24-26), and the sign of Jonah (11:16, 29-32).
\textsuperscript{285}It is explicitly linked to this by Hull who notes that, unlike the story of the Canaanite woman (another exorcism), there is “no specially valuable point of Christian teaching which Matthew would have obtained from this story” (\textit{Hellenistic Magic}, 137–8). He further notes that Matthew preferred the Gadarene pericope insofar as sufficient story remained (to make it worthwhile of inclusion) once the elements of exorcistic technique had been omitted. Twelftree also highlights Matthew’s downplaying of exorcism (\textit{Miracle Worker}, 143).
the demonized boy) as well as adding one of his own (Matt 9:32-34).\textsuperscript{286} The 2DH Matthew also omits the healing stories of Mark 7:31-37 (deaf-mute) and 8:22-26 (blind man of Bethsaida). Reasons have been variously posited as Matthew’s dislike of magical elements,\textsuperscript{287} his avoidance of apparently difficult cures,\textsuperscript{288} and the fact that he found no point of departure within either narrative for theological interpretation.\textsuperscript{289} Alternatively Matthew is said to have condensed or absorbed the stories elsewhere albeit typically for the same reasons.\textsuperscript{290} While the precise reasons for omission are a matter of speculation and it is quite possible that Matthew has taken up the stories in a condensed form, the end result is that relatively few (three out of eighteen) of Mark’s miracles have been omitted (noting the 2GH Mark omits eleven out of twenty seven). For this and the following reasons it may be concluded that the 2DH Matthean omissions are not particularly problematic for Markan priority hypotheses: Matthew cannot be expected to take over all such stories; he already has examples of the types omitted (exorcisms and healings); and the omitted stories are not of critical importance to the Matthean miracle motifs of validation and discipleship. As such the stories may be considered superfluous and their omission taken as a positive indication of narrative conciseness.\textsuperscript{291} When it comes to other miracle tradition the 2DH

\textsuperscript{286}He also makes mention of exorcisms in summary statements (e.g., 4:24; 8:16) albeit healing is far more common. A positive attitude toward exorcism is also implied in miracle related tradition such as the Beelzebul pericope (Matt 12:22-37) and the fact the Jesus commissions his disciples to engage in exorcism (10:1, 8; cf. 17:16 19-20). France suggests that, with the exception of the Gadarene demoniac and the demonized boy, Matthew’s exorcisms are recorded for the sake of the surrounding controversy or dialogue (Matthew, 338).

\textsuperscript{287}As per J. Wellhausen cited in Held (“Miracle Stories,” 207).

\textsuperscript{288}E.g. Taylor, Mark, 352 and especially 369.

\textsuperscript{289}This is the contention of Held who sees Matthew’s redactional activity as always highlighting thematic concerns in the Markan narrative, in particular those of Christology, faith and discipleship (“Miracle Stories,” 207–11). Thus, for example, the Gadarene exorcism is said to focus on the Christological statement of Matt 8:29 (modifying Mark 5:7) while the hemorrhaging woman is about ‘saving faith’ (Matt 9:22; cf. Mark 5:34). Since no such nuggets were available in these two stories Matthew simply passed them over. Held considers this more plausible than the explanation of Wellhausen (omitted owing to magical elements) insofar as Matthew was free to rewrite the story with those elements expunged much as he omits stylistic elements elsewhere (e.g., with the stories of Mark 5:1-43).

\textsuperscript{290}The summary statement in Matt 15:29-31 is often seen as a condensation of Mark 7:31-37. This is made especially plausible insofar as it parallels the Markan narrative within a section that otherwise follows Mark (see e.g., Twelftree, Miracle Worker, 134). Similarly Hull dismisses Held’s critique of Wellhausen (see previous note) by positing that Matthew does not omit the stories but has retained them in a form that has expunged the magical elements (Mark 7:31-37 in Matt 15:29-31; Mark 8:22-26 in Matt 20:30-34) (Hellenistic Magic, 138).

\textsuperscript{291}In this regard the 2DH Matthew differs from the 2GH Luke (discussed above) where omitted stories were necessary to a full demonstration of the fulfillment language in Luke 7:21-22. When it comes to the parallel statement in Matt 11:2-5 it can be seen that Matthew has already provided examples of all the miracles listed. This assumes that the story of the ruler’s daughter in 9:18-26 involves a raising from the dead which in fact is
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Matthew omits no Markan summary statements and only one miracle related pericope, namely the story of another exorcist (Mark 9:38-41). While the latter omission may be tied to Matthew’s dislike of exorcism, this tendency has already been questioned. Furthermore, the story is noted to occur in a section where Matthew follows Mark’s order more conservatively (namely after Matt 14:1). Had he retained the story in the same order, however, it would have been inserted between vv. 5 and 6 of Matthew 18, which of course is in the midst of a major discourse (18:1-35) thus providing a plausible reason for omission.  

While omitting little the 2DH Matthew adds some unique miracle tradition including two healing-exorcisms (9:27-31, 32-34), a nature-sign miracle (17:24-27) and signs at Jesus’ death (27:51-54). He adds at least one summary statement referring to Jesus’ healing activity (21:14) in addition to the various changes noted above that highlight Jesus’ miracle activity in relation to summary statements. Matt 15:29-31 can be seen as an additional summary statement or (what is perhaps more likely) a re-writing of a Mark 7:31-37 in summary form (as above). While none of the additions is particularly troublesome for the 2DH, most interesting is the blind and deaf-mute healing-exorcism stories in Matt 9:27-34. These are frequently taken as Matthean doublets (9:27-31 paired with 20:29-34; 9:32-34 paired with 12:22-24) and their addition has been explained on the basis of needing to complete the miracle cycles of Matthew 8–9 as well their picking up thematically on the miracles contained in those two chapters. While the source critical question may be disputed, there is perhaps a better explanation for Matthew’s addition of these stories at this point, namely in relation to Jesus’ answer to John’s question in Matt 11:2–6. Jesus’ answer claims to describe what he has been doing up to this point (‘go and tell what you hear and

---

292The story would clearly interrupt the flow of Matthew’s discourse in Matt 18 (as it does somewhat the narrative in Mark 9) and there is no obvious reason why Matthew would want to retain it (i.e. by moving it to another location).
293For, for example, in Twelftree, Miracle Worker, 119–21 and Gibbs, “Purpose and Pattern,” 453–6.
294So Twelftree, Miracle Worker, 119–21.
295It is possible that Matthew is working with independent tradition or that he has adapted the stories from Mark 7:31-37 and Mark 8:22-26. Also Mark 10:46-52 is close to Matt 9:27-31 but this also serves as the parallel for Matt 20:29-34 and as such would therefore fit with the doublet theory.
Chapter 5 Selection and Order in Gospel Miracle Tradition

...and indeed each of the miracles listed has been illustrated in the previous narrative: blind receiving sight (9:27-31); lame walking (9:1-8); lepers cleansed (8:1-4); the deaf hear (9:32-34); and the dead are raised (9:18-26). Notably Matt 9:27-34 provides the only illustrations for blind and deaf healings and as such their addition is explicable in relation to the validation motif.

Difficulties do arise for the 2DH, however, when we turn to the matter of order changes. For the most part Matthew is a fairly conservative editor of Mark in relation to order and selection but while he is noted to follow Mark’s order closely in Matt 14:1–28:8 (= Mark 6:14–16:8), a number of order (and selection) differences (relative to Mark) appear in the first half of his Gospel. The 2DH Matthew begins by significantly rewriting Mark’s opening through the addition of non-Markan material (e.g., Matt 1–2 and 5–7) along with expansion of Mark-Q overlap material (e.g., John’s baptism ministry and Jesus’ temptation in Matthew 3–4). These additions, however, are not especially problematic and may even be desirable. The situation is different, however, when it comes to explaining 2DH Matthew’s transformation of Markan miracle tradition in Matthew 8–9. In addition to omitting Mark’s opening exorcism story (Mark...

---


297 It is generally estimated that Matthew takes over between ninety and ninety-five percent of Mark (i.e. between 600 and 630 of the 661 verses in Mark) depending on what counts for a genuine parallel (see, for example, E. P. Sanders and Margaret Davies, Studying the Synoptic Gospels [London; Philadelphia: SCM Press; Trinity Press International, 1989], 62; Burton, Principles, 15–16). The extent of this overlap is readily seen in Alan Barr’s color-coded diagrammatic presentation (A Diagram of Synoptic Relationships, Second ed., reprint, 1938 [Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1995]). Matthean displacements of Markan order appear to be confined to Mark 1:39–6:13 and amount to 2 summaries (4:23–5:2; 9:35), 4 miracles (8:1–4, 23–34; 9:18–26), and the mission of the 12 (10:1-16) (approximately following Frans Neirynck, “Two-Source Hypothesis,” 21; see also Kloppenborg, Excavating Q, 20–21 who notes that the only changes to Markan order after Matt 14:1 [= Mark 6:14] are within pericopes). While this points to a conservative editorial procedure with respect to selection and ordering of Markan material by Matthew, it is striking how much miracle tradition is implicated in the changes: among the very few whole pericopes omitted four relate directly to miracles (Mark 1:21-28; 7:31-37; 8:22-26; 9:38-41); and all of the transformations of order noted above are related to miracles (Matt 8–9) and miracle related tradition (summaries and mission discourse). That this is not a consistent procedure in relation to miracle tradition as shown by the fact that its Markan order is undisturbed in Matt 14–28.

298 For example, additional material concerning birth and origin is a well attested category of encomium (see tables 2.2 and 2.3) and something that was evident in Josephus’ adaptation of the Exodus account (in relation to Moses).
1:21-28), inserting two Q pericopes (Matt 8:5-10, 18-22),\(^{299}\) and adding two miracle stories (9:27-34) he also displaces at least three pericopes from their Markan order: Matt 8:1-4; 9:2-8; and 12:9-14.\(^{300}\) Given his otherwise conservative approach to Markan order the changes are all the more significant in calling forth an explanation. As a 2DH advocate Christopher Tuckett considers it overly simplistic to explain Matthew’s changes on the basis of his desire to create three (miracle story) cycles with Jesus presented as messiah of word (5–7) and deed (8–9).\(^{301}\) Alternatively he explains the changes with reference to structurally discerned themes of scriptural fulfillment (8:1-17), discipleship (8:18–9:17), and faith (9:18-31).\(^{302}\) He is criticized, however, by Alistair Stewart-Sykes insofar as the pericope of the Gadarene demoniacs does not fit the discipleship theme and the omission of Mark 1:21-28 along with the inclusion of controversy stories is left unexplained.\(^{303}\) Agreeing with Tuckett’s Markan priority hypothesis,

\(^{299}\) According to Davies and Allison, Matthew’s insertion of this “Q” story (Q 7:1-10 = Matt 8:5-13) relates to his desire to stress Jesus’ great authority and his inserting it in place of Mark 2:1-12 (paralytic), which is moved further down, was influenced by the placement of both stories in Capernaum \(\text{(Matthew, 17).}\)

\(^{300}\) On omissions and additions see above. It should be noted here that accurately describing these order changes is itself problematic (agreeing with Tuckett, “Arguments from Order,” 197–200) since we might, for example, alternately describe 2DH Matthew as displacing four pericopes: either (a) Matt 8:14-15, 23-27, 28-34; 9:18-26 or (b) Matt 8:1-4, 23-27, 28-34; 9:18-26 (Stewart-Sykes, “Miracle Chapters,” cites only this option).

\(^{301}\) “Arguments from Order,” 208 citing the example of Kümmel and Schniewind. While it is generally agreed that Matt 4:23-25 and 9:35 form an \textit{inclusio} around the structurally distinct Sermon (Matt 5–7) and miracle chapters (Matt 8–9) (e.g., Burger, “Jesu Taten,” 281; Held, “Miracle Stories,” 246–49), there have been various attempts to explain structure \textit{within} Matt 8–9 (on which see following note).

\(^{302}\) “Arguments from Order,” 207–11. Tuckett agrees with Neirynck in placing the Sermon on the Mount between Mark 1:21-22 (versus Huck at 1:39) thereby showing that Mark 1:40-45 (and not Mark 1:29-34) has been repositioned (to Matt 8:1-4). Its new position immediately after the Sermon is purportedly in keeping with Matthew’s thematic interest in law fulfillment (cf. Matt 5:17). In relation to the structural thematic breakdown of Matt 8–9 Tuckett is in basic agreement with Held (“Miracle Stories,” see especially comments on pp. 171, 179, 241, and 246-53) except that the latter identifies Christology as the theme of the 8:1-17. Thompson provides a similar structural and thematic breakdown with Matt 8:1-17 seen as specifically highlighting the theme of Jesus as the Servant of Yahweh. He adds, however, that Matt 9:32-34 is a concluding remark on the differing reactions of the crowd (positive) and the Pharisees (negative) (“Reflections”). Alternatively Christoph Burger (“Jesu Taten”) and Jack Kingsbury (“Observations”) have argued for a \textit{fourfold thematic structure} as follows: Christology (8:1-17); discipleship (8:18-34); Jesus’ followers and separation from Israel (9:1-17); and faith (9:18-34). Given, however, the lack of thematic unity within individual units along with the fact that the themes cross over between units (e.g., faith as motif in 8:5-13), Davies and Allison prefer a triadic (literary) structure in which the evangelist’s “love of the triad” results in three sets of miracles (8:1-15; 8:23–9:8; 9:18-34) with two narrative interludes (8:16-22; 9:9-17) \(\text{(Matthew, 3–4; so also Twelftree, \textit{Miracle Worker}, 104–5; Wainwright, “Matthean Jesus,” 82; idem, \textit{Towards a Feminist Critical Reading of the Gospel According to Matthew}, BZNW 60 [Berlin; New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1991], 80; and France, \textit{Matthew}, 299–302).}\) As an organizing principle this requires that we only count nine miracles (taking Matt 9:18-26 as one story) rather than ten (such as, for example, in Burger, “Jesu Taten,” 275).

\(^{303}\) For these and the following comments see “Miracle Chapters,” 55–65, esp. 58–62. Notably Tuckett himself criticizes Burger and Kingsbury for similar reasons in “Arguments from Order,” 218.
however, Stewart-Sykes alternatively seeks to defend Matthew’s order changes by appealing to narrative-criticism with “reactions to Jesus” (e.g., criticism by Pharisees; amazement of crowds; and faith of those healed) taken as the organizing principle of Matt 4:23–9:35.  

Taken together with an interest in Jesus’ authority (e.g., the scriptural quotation of 8:17 anticipates an answer to the question in 8:27) this focus is said to explain the presence of controversy stories, abbreviation of Markan units, and the order changes of Matt 8–9 (e.g., the altered position of the Gadarene demoniacs illustrates fear and rejection by Gentiles thus deliberately contrasting with the centurion in the previous cycle). He provides an important caveat in relation to controversy stories, however, namely that full blown conflict over law is delayed until Matthew 12 thus providing a reason to (re)position the leper to first place (agreeing with Tuckett) and perhaps explaining the omission of Mark 1:21-28. Stewart-Sykes’ proposals, however, are not without problems. First, his claim that the disruption in order “is not very great” is, at best, questionable in light of the omissions, additions and order changes noted above. Second, while the purported postponement of ‘conflict’ until Matthew 12 explains the transposition of Mark 3:1-6, it does not explain the deletion of Mark 1:21-28 where a focus on the crowd’s amazement (inclusio in vv. 21 and 28) is consistent with Stewart-Sykes’ proposed thematic centre of ‘reactions to Jesus.’ Third, Matthew’s apparent search for additional miracles to make up his final triad, whereby he purportedly creates doublets in 9:27-34, is surprising in light of

---

304 Luz makes a similar appeal to narrative criticism for understanding the structure in Matt 8–9 (“Matthew 8–9,” 224–26, 231). Agreeing with those who reject neat thematic divisions (despite endorsing the fourfold structure Burger and Kingsbury - on which see n. 302 above) he proposes they are part of a larger story in which Israel’s messiah provokes division among the people resulting in simultaneous rejection by some while forming a new community with others. Discipleship, therefore, is not one theme among many but the central motif of the new community. Similar such synchronic approaches have been common in recent decades; e.g., Bauer, Structure; Kingsbury, Matthew as Story (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988); idem, “Plot”; Matera, “Plot”; and Elaine Mary Wainwright, Feminist Reading of Matthew.

305 “’Miracle Chapters’,” 55.

306 Although Matthew has no problem including the controversy stories in 9:2-17.

307 Regarding Matthean doublets here see Twelftree (Miracle Worker, 119–21) and Luz (Matthew 8–20: A Commentary, ed. Helmet Koester, trans. James E. Crouch, Hermeneia [Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001], 46–47). Regarding a triadic structure see above n. 302 and literature cited there. While I agree with Tuckett (above) that triadic structuring alone is inadequate to explain Matthew’s order changes, that does not deny Matthew’s use of such a device (which fits with a synchronic reading) but only that Markan priority defenders must go beyond this observation in explaining Matthew’s editorial activity.
his omission of three Markan miracles.\textsuperscript{308} Fourth, while the leper (Matt 8:1-4) may have been moved to pole position on account of its positive take on the law, this theme is not redactionally added to the pericope nor is it taken up elsewhere in Matt 8–9 thereby reducing the force of this observation. Even more problematic is the omission of the leper’s response which runs counter to Matthew’s purported focal interest in reactions to Jesus.\textsuperscript{309} Reactions are likewise omitted in relation to the Gadarene demoniacs (cf. Mark 5:18-20) and the raising of Jairus’ daughter (cf. Mark 5:42).\textsuperscript{310} An alternative narrative-critical reading understands Matthew’s plot as an unfolding conflict between Jesus and the religious authorities whereby Matt 4:17–11:1 “tells of Jesus’ proferring salvation to Israel through a ministry of teaching, preaching, and healing” in which there is a preliminary foreshadowing of a conflict that will become more fully developed in 11:2–16:20 before climaxing in the passion.\textsuperscript{311} Despite some obvious exceptions\textsuperscript{312} this

\textsuperscript{308}Typical explanations point to Matthew’s dislike of exorcism and/or magic (e.g., Duling, “The Therapeutic Son of David,” 392–410, esp. 392–99; Hull, \textit{Hellenistic Magic}, 116–41; Twelftree, \textit{Miracle Worker}, 143). This, however, assumes Markan Priority whereas Matthew’s purported dislike for exorcism is more difficult to substantiate synchronically insofar his percentage of exorcisms (4/20 one of which is a doublet) compares favorably to Mark (4/18) and their frequent mention elsewhere (4:23-34; 8:16; 10:1; 12:22-32, 43-45) gives no clear signs of distaste (omission of explicit reference to exorcism in other healing summaries - 9:35; 14:34-36; 15:29-31; 19:1-2; 21:14 - is at least paralleled in Mark 6:53-56). If Markan Priority is assumed, then Matthew’s standard abbreviating approach would have given him a clear alternative to deletion, namely to simply delete the unsavory “magical” elements. He need only edit out the offensive material much as Hull claims for other miracle pericopae (ibid., 133-137) or Twelftree in relation to Matt 15.29-31 (= Mark 7,31-37) (ibid., 134). Regarding omissions from Mark it may also be claimed that Mark 7:31-37 is taken up in Matt 15 (e.g., Twelftree, \textit{Miracle Worker}, 134–5) and cannot therefore be included in the count.

\textsuperscript{309}While it may be tempting to explain this on the grounds that Matthew is avoiding an unsavory (disobedient) response, this creates a contradictory redactional policy at 9:31 where (if it is a doublet of Matt 20:29-34) the theme has been deliberately added (being notably absent from the parallel in Mark 11:46-52).

\textsuperscript{310}Indeed it appears that miracles in Matt 8–9 frequently elicit no recorded response (8:1-4, 5-13; 9:18-26, 27-31) and when responses appear they are typically (assuming Markan priority) taken over from Mark (8:15, 34; 9:8). One redactional change in favor of Stewart-Sykes occurs with Peter’s mother-in-law where she is said to serve “him” (Matt 8:15) versus “them” (Mark 1:39) thereby highlighting her reaction to Jesus. There is also a clear response in Matt 9:33-34 (crowds amazed; Pharisees accuse). Taken together these observations call into question not only Stewart-Sykes’ explanation of Matthew’s purported reordering of Mark but even his narrative-critical reading of structure in Matt 8–9.

\textsuperscript{311}Kingsbury, “Plot,” 347, 349–50 (similarly Matera, “Plot,” 245). Kingsbury provides three reasons in defense of the delayed conflict theory: there is as yet no explicit threat to destroy Jesus; the controversy stories that are present (9:1-17) are not “acutely confrontational”; the conflicts in these chapters are not yet explicitly concerning the Mosaic law. While Jesus may be depicted variously as Davidic messiah (Matera, “Plot,” 245) or the Isaianic “Servant of the Lord” (Gerhardsson, \textit{Mighty Acts}, 20–37) it is commonly agreed that he is the exclusive healer to Israel, especially in Matthew 8–9 (e.g., Kingsbury, “Plot,” 349). While Gerhardsson argues this on the basis of Matthean summary statements, Matera (“Plot,” 246-247) points to the apostolic commission (Matt 10:1-46, esp. vv. 5-6).

\textsuperscript{312}Jesus’ ministry is not exclusively to Israel (e.g., 8:5-13).
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provides a synchronic reading of Matt 8–9 preferable to that of Stewart-Sykes whereby Jesus is depicted primarily as the healer of Israel whose eventual rejection is foreshadowed in the controversy stories of 9:1-8, 32-34. The transposition of Mark 3:1-6 to its later position in Matt 12:9-14 is in keeping with the postponement of more acutely confrontational material (noting that it contains the first mention of a death plot). With this in mind the paralytic (9:2-8) may have been moved down (relative to the storm stilling and Gadarene demoniacs) insofar as this facilitated the second triad of miracles while also keeping together three Markan controversy stories (Matt 9:2-17). Thus we have two understandable transpositions of the Markan narrative. While Matt 9:18-26 retains its Markan position, the need for doublets at 9:27-34 remains potentially problematic although, as noted above, they contribute to the triadic structure and provide important illustrations of blind and deaf-mute healings in anticipation of Matt 11:2-6.

The changes associated with Matt 8:1-15 are more troublesome. Assuming Matthew’s structural interest in triads along with his thematic interest in Jesus as Israel’s healer Mark 1:21-45 provides an appropriate candidate for his opening triad and yet he omits the seemingly ‘Jewish’ exorcism in Mark 1:21-29 (noting the synagogue setting) in favor of a Gentile story and switches the order of the remaining two (Mark 1:29-31, 40-45) without obvious reason.313

In sum, we may conclude that difficulties remain in providing a plausible explanation for the 2DH order and selection process in Matthew 8–9.314 It should be born in mind, however, that the challenge of explaining these changes is essentially shared by FH proponents (who agree on Markan priority) and is experienced in a different way by 2GH proponents who are required to

313 Admittedly the presence of summary information and the short pericope on prayer in Mark 1:32-39 breaks the triadic sequence in Mark. The inclusion of a Gentile story (8:5-13), however, is particularly problematic in light of the synchronic reading under consideration. Matera’s contention that he simply foreshadows “the outcome of the plot” (i.e. Gentile faith) is somewhat weak in light of his appeal to Matt 10:5-6 regarding the exclusivity of the mission to Israel (“Plot,” 247). While the presence of such aberration should probably be expected on any given explanation of Matthew’s structure, the greater significance here follows upon assuming Markan Priority insofar as the replacement of Mark 1:21-28 with Matt 8:5-13 is highlighted as all the more deliberate.

314 Alternatively we might dispel the whole problem as one of ‘editorial fatigue’ whereby Matthew simply tired of rearranging Mark (Robert H. Gundry, Matthew: A Commentary on His Handbook for a Mixed Church Under Persecution [Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1994], 10). According to J. B. Tyson the 2DH Matthew and Luke utilized Markan order in about 59% of material taken over from Mark but in material taken from Q they only agree on sequence in about 11-12% of material (“Sequential Parallelism in the Synoptic Gospels,” 297). This suggests something of an idiosyncratic approach to order in the 2DH.
explain Luke’s reordering of the same Matthean material without reference to Mark (see above). What matters, therefore, is not which hypothesis is trouble free but which one is more or less plausible and on this count the Matthean rearrangement of Mark appears more plausible than its 2GH counterpart (Luke’s rearrangement of Matthew).

Beyond Matthew 8–9 the remaining miracles shared with either Mark or Q (only Matt 12:22-24) are not subject to order changes. Summary statements, on the other hand, undergo a few order changes insofar as Matt 4:23-25 corresponds to Mark 1:39 and 3:7-10 while Matt 8:16-17 represents the earlier summary in Mark 1:32-34. As noted above the 2DH Matthew follows Mark more closely after the summaries at Matt 14:13-14 and 34-36. Insofar as his greatest creativity in relation to reworking Markan order occurs in chapters 1 to 8, Matthew’s adaptations of Markan summary statements (in relation to Matt 4:23-25; 8:16-17; 9:35) clearly relates to his larger structural purposes discussed above. At the same time Matt 8:16-17 is noted to occur in the same relative position as its Markan counterpart (Mark 1:32-34; following on the healing of the mother in law) whereby the greatest divergence occurs in relation to the summaries at Matt 4:23-25 and 9:35. As noted above, however, these latter two summaries provide a clear structural inclusio for blocks of teaching (Matt 5–7) and narrative (Matt 8–9) thereby making more understandable the Matthean changes at this point.

When it comes to miracle related tradition Matthew changes Mark’s order in relation to the appointment and mission of the twelve (Matt 10:1-14; Mark 3:13-19 and 6:6-13), although his drawing these traditions together at the outset of his missions discourse (a major structural unit) is not particularly problematic for the 2DH. He also changes the order of the rejection at Nazareth (Matt 13:53-58; Mark 6:1-6) although this essentially results from the order changes in relation to Matt 8–9. Matthew retains Markan order in the remaining miracle related tradition

---

315 Mt 12:9-14 is an exception but has already been discussed as was it moved down from Matt 8-9.
316 Once the intervening miracles are accounted for in Mark 4:35-5:43 (which are all taken up in Matthew 8–9) then Matthew agrees with Mark in placing the rejection narrative after the parables and thus he picks up his last remaining piece of tradition from Mark 1:1–6:13 prior to when he follows Mark more closely (beginning at Matt 14:1).
and likewise for Q with the exception of switching two juxtaposed pericopes, namely the return of the evil spirit (12:43-45) and the sign of Jonah (12:38-42). This is not particularly troublesome for the 2DH insofar as the ‘return of the evil spirit’ is now placed in a somewhat climactic position as a commentary upon the wickedness of ‘this generation.’

In summary the 2DH Matthew’s selection of a high percentage of Markan miracle tradition is in keeping with his synchronically demonstrated interest in miracles and especially his motif of validation. While his procedure is sometimes awkward (combining disparate summaries) this occurs to a lesser degree than, for example, in relation to the 2GH Mark or Luke. Furthermore his changes related to summaries result in a consistent emphasis on both healing and teaching along with *inclusio* summaries in 4:23-25 and 9:35 that play an important structural role. There are no troubling omissions (three miracle stories; no summaries; one miracle related pericope) and his two additions (Matt 9:27-34) serve an important validating purpose in relation to the list of example miracles related to John the Baptist in Matt 11:2-6. The greatest problem for the 2DH Matthew occurs in relation to his reordering of miracle stories in Matt 8–9 where attempts to explain his procedure by 2DH proponents (in particular Tuckett and Steward-Sykes) lacked persuasiveness. While the synchronic reading of Kingsbury was better able to explain some of the order changes, problems still remained in relation to the following: e.g., his choice of the Centurion’s servant over Mark’s initial exorcism (Mark 1:21-29) and his reversal of the miracle order in relation to the mother in law and the leper (Mark 1:29-31, 40-45). The problem lessens in magnitude when it is recognized to occur within a section where Matthew most clearly reorganizes and adds to his Markan source (namely with additions of opening material and initial teaching material in Matt 1–4 and 5–7) in a manner that is understandable from an encomiastic perspective.  

Finally the 2DH order problem in Matt 8–9 is shared with the FH (both agreeing on Markan priority) and is experienced in reverse by the 2GH in relation to the 2GH Lukan reordering of Matthew. In this regard the difficulties of the latter (discussed above) appear to

---

317 Much of the material added in Matt 1–4, for instance, is in keeping with encomiastic topic lists in tables 2.2 and 2.3.
outweigh the former whereby the Markan priority hypotheses more plausibly explain the changes. Other 2DH order changes in relation to summaries and miracle related tradition are not especially problematic.

(b) 2DH Lukan use of Mark and Q

Turning attention to the 2DH Luke he is noted to select twelve out of eighteen Markan miracles\(^{318}\) along with the only two Q miracles (see table 5.8). What was a general tendency of the 2GH Luke to expand upon Matthean miracle stories, however, is explicable for the 2DH Luke in relation to Mark. Hence an approximate comparison of word counts indicates a similar length in eight miracle stories shared by Mark and Luke along with greater brevity of Luke in the remainder (table 5.3).\(^{319}\) The 2DH Luke, therefore, shows a general tendency toward conciseness (in relation to Mark), albeit to a lesser extent than the 2DH Matthew, which is more rhetorically plausible than the 2GH Lukan tendency to expand miracle stories.

A similar picture emerges in relation to summary statements insofar as the 2DH Luke retains three out of four Markan miracle related summaries with the word count being slightly longer in one and significantly shorter in the other two (table 5.4).\(^{320}\) In general Luke’s summaries are closer in content to Mark than to Matthew\(^{321}\) thereby implying less radical rewriting than for the 2GH Luke. The 2DH Luke also takes over several miracle related traditions from Mark and Q\(^{322}\) and while the rejection at Nazareth is radically reworked (Luke 4:16-20; cf. Mark 6:1-6a), the

---

318 This counts Jairus’ daughter and the woman as two stories and contrasts with Matthew who took over 15 out 18 Markan miracles.
319 On five occasions Luke is slightly shorter (unclean spirit 0.95x; mother in law 0.9x; stilling storm 0.8x; Gadarene demoniac 0.9x; Bartimeaus 0.9x) and on three occasions he is of equal length or slightly longer (leper 1.0x; paralytic 1.1x; shriveled hand 1.2x). The three occasions where Luke is significantly shorter are as follows: Jarius and bleeding woman 0.7x; feeding of the five thousand 0.7x; the demonized boy 0.5x.
321 Hence, for example, Luke 4:40-41 follows Mark (over against Matthew) in speaking of Jesus’ silencing of the demons (Matt 8:17 instead has a citation formula); Luke 4:44 and 6:17-19 are two distinct summaries that generally reflect the content of two parallel summaries in Mark (1:39 and 3:7-10 respectively) whereas the parallel in Matthew occurs in a different context and is a single summary (4:23-25).
322 As per table 5.5 these include seven from Mark (mission of the twelve; twelve appointed; the rejection at Nazareth; Herod’s thoughts on Jesus; the introduction to the feeding of the five thousand; the yeast of the Pharisees; and another exorcist), four from Q (the response to John; the woes on the cities; the return of the unclean spirit; and the sign of Jonah) and one Mark-Q overlap (Beelzebul).
remainder are generally represented in a similar manner and tend toward either similar length or an abbreviated version. In relation to the Q passages Luke tends to be shorter than his Matthean counterpart with only one exception. None of this, however, is particularly problematic for the 2DH.

Things get more interesting for the 2DH Luke when we consider omissions of miracle tradition. In particular Luke’s so called Great Omission (Mark 6:45–8:26) includes five Markan miracles (walk on water, the Syrophoenecian woman, the deaf mute, the feeding of 4000, and the blind man of Bethsaida). Various explanations have been offered in relation to this. First, it has been suggested that the omitted section was absent from the manuscript available to Luke either because it belonged to a later version of Mark or because he possessed a mutilated copy. In the absence of textual evidence, however, these amount to arguments from silence and appear like convenient ways to escape the problem. Alternatively a theory of accidental omission suggests that Luke passed from the earlier feeding in Mark 6:42-44 to the later one in 8:19-21 or from the name of Bethsaida in Mark 6:45 to the same name in 8:22 (something akin to homoioteleuton). Given the extent of the omission, however, the theory is equally speculative and not particularly convincing. Sensing the inherent problems of such hypotheses others have sought to explain the omission as a deliberate editorial decision. John Hawkins, for example, suggests that Luke omits pericopes on account of their purportedly ‘magical’ nature (Mark 7:31-37; 8:22-6), his dislike for doublets or repeated material (Mark 6:45-52, 53-56; 8:1-10, 11-12),

---

323 As per table 5.5 the relative lengths of Luke’s accounts compared to Mark are 1.0x (Herod), 0.9x (mission of twelve), 0.8x (twelve appointed), and 0.7 (or 0.5)x (another exorcist). The yeast of the Pharisees is reduced to a single line and is thus 0.25x the length of Mark. The one occasion where Luke is longer than Mark (1.2x for Beelzebul) is a Mark-Q overlap passage.

324 The shorter versions include the woes (0.7x), the return of the unclean spirits (0.8x), and the sign of Jonah (0.8x). The one longer version is the response to John (1.6x).

325 This ‘deutero-Mark’ theory is attributed to A. Wright by John Hawkins (“Limitations,” 63).

326 A theory strongly endorsed by B. H. Streeter (Four Gospels, 175–9).

327 Hawkins also criticizes the deutero-Mark hypothesis on the basis of similarity in style between Mark 6:45–8:26 and the rest of the Gospel, thus suggesting the same author for both (as opposed to Mark 6:45–8:26 being a later interpolation) (“Limitations,” 63–66). In essence it is problematic when such an interpolation theory is based on something omitted from another Gospel (Luke) as opposed to prima facia literary evidence in Mark itself.

328 John Hawkins refers to this as a “more than possible solution” (“Limitations,” 66) albeit going on to provide reasons for Luke’s deliberate omission (on which see below).
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his limiting of anti-Pharisaic material (Mark 7:1-23), and it’s unlikely attraction for his gentile readers (Mark 7:24-30, which is also a doublet with the gentile centurion). John Drury has also suggested that, since Luke wishes to postpone any mention of a Gentile mission until his second volume (Acts), he omits Mark 6:45-8:26 on account of its ‘circular tour’ of Gentile territory. Such reasons may be bolstered by the claim that Luke sought to conserve space in light of the physical limitations of manuscripts. While the 2DH Luke obviously enhances brevity by this omission, however, many of these reasons lack persuasiveness: Luke’s willingness to adapt his source material could easily have resulted in his removing any purportedly unseemly ‘magical’ elements; the notion that he dislikes doublets is contradicted by contrary examples (e.g., two missions and two leper healings both of which are unique to him) albeit that avoidance of such would be in keeping with the rhetorical convention of conciseness; finally, regarding the postponement of the Gentile mission it is noted that not everything in the omission occurs within Gentile territory and, furthermore, Luke happily includes other Gentile friendly material (e.g., 7:1-10) and has Jesus elsewhere travel into Gentile territory in relation to miracle stories (e.g., Luke 8:26-39). While the omission clearly has the rhetorical advantage of enhancing brevity, the lack of any compelling reason for selecting this particular block suggests a somewhat clumsy procedure whereby the 2DH Luke apparently arbitrarily omits a chunk of material as a convenient way to keep himself within the limits of his manuscript. In addition to this we may note the following reasons for why Luke may have wanted to include this material:

---

329 More recently it has been argued that Luke omits these verses on account of their contradicting his view of Jewish law and that furthermore he transposes the entire section into Acts 10:1-11:18 (see as having thematic parallels to Mark 6:45-8:26) (Michael Pettem, “Luke’s Great Omission and His View of the Law,” NTS 42 [1996]: 35–54). Despite the ingenuity of the hypothesis, however, Luke could readily have altered Mark 7:1-23 so as fit better with his own understanding (as does Matthew) and, besides, this hardly provides a reason for omitting the entire section from Mark 6:45-8:26 as Pettem claims.


331 Tradition, 97–102. Drury also points to Luke’s avoidance of doublets as with Hawkins.


333 While some of geography in relation to Mark 6 is confused (Jesus and his disciples leave for Bethsaida in 6:45 but arrive in Gennesaret in 6:53) the general impression of Mark 6:53–7:23 is that it occurs within Galilee. Likewise Dalmanutha (or Magdala) in Mark 8:10 likely refers to a Galilean town which provides the geographical context for Mark 8:11-21.
appearance of these miracles in the early phase of Jesus’ ministry fits with his validation theme and the prominence of miracles in his Galilean section; the lack of mute or blind healings prior to this makes Mark 7:31-37 (mute) and 8:22-26 (blind) perfect candidates for inclusion (even if a little editing is required) especially insofar as they would provide for a complete set of examples to match the validating claim in Luke 7:21-22.\(^3\) The net result is that Luke’s Great Omission remains a problem for the 2DH.\(^3\) The remaining Lukan omission of a Markan miracle, namely the fig tree incident (Mark 11:12-25), is not overly problematic albeit the story is again congenial to Luke’s validation motif\(^3\) and, furthermore, Luke is not averse to punitive miracles (e.g., Luke 1:20; Acts 5:1-11; 13:4-12). In relation to summary statements and miracle related tradition the 2DH Luke omits only the summary of Mark 6:53-56, which is part of the Great Omission discussed above, along with the mention of signs and omens in relation to false prophets in Mark 13:21-23, an omission which is not particularly problematic for the 2DH.

Turning to additions we find that the 2DH Luke introduces six new miracle stories absent from Mark and Q.\(^3\) None is obviously problematic for the 2DH and the transformation of the Markan call story (Mark 1:16-20) into a miraculous occurrence (Luke 5:1-11) fits with Luke’s validating motif in relation to miracles as well as his linking of faith and miracle. The 2DH Luke adds no new miracle-related summary statements with the exception of Luke 8:1-3. This may possibly be based on Mark 6:6b but clearly the specific reference to various healed women is a Lukan addition albeit unproblematic for the 2DH insofar as it fits with Luke’s well known thematic interest in women. Regarding miracle related tradition the 2DH Luke adds the mission of the seventy (10:1-12) and their return (10:17-20) along with Jesus’ response to Herod (13:31-

\(^3\)On which see above in relation to the 2GH Luke’s use of Matthew.

\(^3\)Albeit not for this hypothesis alone. It is slightly less problematic for the 2GH where it involves a Lukan omission from Matthew but one that is less radical since Matthew himself does not have the mute or blind healings of Mark 7:31-37 and 8:22-26. When it comes to the FH the omission is at least as problematic as the 2DH and perhaps more so in that it now involves omission of something that was in both his sources. On this see below.

\(^3\)Here in relation to Jesus’ authority in bringing judgment upon the temple, something Luke clearly alludes to in other places such as 19:41-44 and 21:20-24.

\(^3\)These include the catch of fish (5:1-11), the widow’s son (7:11-15), the bent woman (13:10-17), the man with dropsy (14:1-6), the ten lepers (17:11-19), and the servant’s ear (22:50-51).
33) and the statement that he was a prophet mighty in word and deed (24:19). Other than the fact that they involve the creation of doublets, thereby being contrary to the rhetorical convention of brevity (which encourages the avoidance of repeated material), these additions are not problematic for the 2DH.

When it comes to order the 2DH Luke is again more conservative than the 2GH Luke. The differences (when compared with Matthew) are now explicable on the basis of Luke’s use of Mark and Q. The only miracle story that differs in relation to order, therefore, is the catch of fish (Luke 5:1-11) which is placed later in the narrative than its non-miraculous Markan counterpart (Mark 1:16-20). The new placement is somewhat puzzling in light of the prior mention of Simon and his mother in law at Luke 4:38 and the fact that he has already been proclaiming in the synagogues of Judea in Luke 4:44. That these things would happen prior to his first call of disciples is somewhat puzzling although the 2DH Luke gives some indications that such changes in order were deliberate: he mentions only Simon in 4:38 (omitting Andrew, James and John as in Mark 1:29); those who seek Jesus in 4:42 are the crowds rather than ‘Simon and his companions’ (as in Mark 1:36) and Jesus responds directly to them with “I must proclaim...” (versus “let us go...” in Mark 1:38). This implies a deliberate delay of the call story (5:1-11) perhaps to give the impression that Jesus was an established teacher prior to his seeking out of individual followers and thus enhancing the credibility of the notion that the fisherman would have chosen to follow him. Whether or not this explains the 2DH Lukan procedure at this juncture, however, it is clear that the order changes are less problematic for the 2DH than for the 2GH.

The 2DH Luke follows the Markan order for the first two summary statements (4:40-41, 44) but switches the order at Luke 6:17-19. This can possibly be explained by his desire to place the summary statement closer to his ‘Sermon’ (Luke 6:20-49) albeit that his statement in 6:19 mentions healing but not teaching/proclaiming. When it comes to miracle related tradition he

---

338 Luke’s order is as follow: grain on Sabbath ⇒ withered hand ⇒ call of twelve ⇒ summary. This switches the order of the last two relative to Mark (grain on Sabbath ⇒ withered hand ⇒ summary ⇒ call of twelve).
likewise follows Mark’s order with only minor exceptions. The first of these is the rejection narrative (Luke 4:16-20; cf. Mark 6:1-6) which is significantly rewritten and apparently deliberately positioned as the opening scene of Jesus’ public ministry. He also places the Beelzebul pericope (Luke 11:14-23) much later than its Markan counterpart (Mark 3:20-30) but at this point may be influenced by Q insofar as this is a Mark-Q overlap passage. He makes no alteration to the order of Q.

In summary the 2DH Luke is a more conservative editor of his Markan and Q sources, in relation to order and selection, than his 2GH counterpart. In keeping with the rhetorical convention of narrative he tends toward brevity albeit far less so than the 2DH Matthew and occasionally expanding upon his Markan source. His order changes are relatively minor and plausible explanations are possible. His additions are likewise plausible albeit creating some doublets which goes against the rhetorical convention of brevity. Most problematic is the Lukan Great Omission of the material in Mark 6:45–8:22. While this creates a more concise account, the suggested explanations for Luke’s procedure at this point lack plausibility. These explanations include manuscript differences, accidental omission, and deliberate redaction. While the latter holds out greatest hope, the reasons typically given are not consistent with Luke’s procedure elsewhere (e.g., omitting doublets and avoiding gentile friendly material) and involves omitting two miracles that would have provided a complete set of examples for his list in Luke 7:21-22. Insofar as the Great Omission is inherent to Markan priority the problem is shared with the FH. It is less troublesome for the 2GH but the additional order and selection problems associated with that hypothesis have already been highlighted and, on balance, the Markan priority hypotheses appear more plausible than Luke’s use of Matthew alone.

339 It involves a smaller omission owing to the fact that some of the material from Mark 6:45–8:22 is missing from Matthew’s account (see above).
5.2.3 Order and Selection According to the FH

(a) FH Matthean use of Mark

Finally we turn attention to the implied order and selection procedure of the FH, beginning with Matthew’s use of Mark. Insofar as both hypotheses assume Markan priority the analysis of the FH differs little from our above analysis of the 2DH Matthew’s use of Mark. The key difference relates to their use of non-Markan material. While the 2DH sees this material coming from both Q and special Matthean traditions, the FH proponents simply remove Q from the equation. This has a relatively minor impact upon miracle traditions in that the so-called ‘Q’ material includes only two miracle stories (Matt 8:5-13; 12:22), five pieces of miracle related tradition (11:2-6, 20-24; 12:22-37, 38-42, and 43-45), and no summary statements. None of these additions is particularly troublesome for the FH and are open to the same variety of source theories as applies to Matthean single tradition upon assumption of the 2DH. The one possible exception is the Beelzebul pericope in which Matthew significantly expands upon Mark such that he more than doubles the length of the account (309x words in place of 141x). This goes against his more typical tendency to abbreviate Mark but the same phenomenon has already been noted in relation to the missions discourse (Matt 10:1, 5-14; Matt is 2.1x longer than Mark) and the demand for a sign (Matt 16:1-4; 1.5x longer than Mark). It cannot, therefore, be taken as an absolute criteria that Matthew always abbreviates just because he does so most of the time. In essence the adoption of the FH does not create any significant additional problems in relation to Matthew’s purported use of Markan or non-Markan miracle tradition beyond those already noted above in relation to the 2DH.

---

340For a discussion of the trends over the past century in relation to the hypothetical M source see Foster, “M Source”. Foster notes how earlier theories of a single coherent written source for Matthean single tradition (as per Streeter and others who followed him) has lost favor in light of both Matthean redaction-critical studies and new theories about Q. He notes that the general trend at present is to identify Matthean single tradition variously with Matthean redaction, a different version of Q, and other disparate pre-Gospel traditions (either written and/or oral).
341Noting that 12:22-37 (Beelzebul) is a Mark-Q overlap.
342As per Foster in previous footnote.
343It is probably for this reason that this component of the hypothesis receives relatively little attention among FH proponents. Hence while it is, for example, the focus of a book by Michael Goulder (Midrash and Lection in
(b) FH Lukán use of Matthew

The situation changes, however, when we turn to the 2DH Lukán Q material which, on account of their rejection of the Q hypothesis, FH proponents explain as tradition taken over directly from Matthew. While attention generally focuses on Luke’s purported use of Matthew’s Sermon on the Mount, our focus here is miracle tradition. Insofar as the FH Luke uses both Matthew (in common with the 2GH) and Mark (in common with the 2DH) he lies somewhere on the spectrum between the more conservative 2DH Luke and the more creative 2GH Luke. In relation to selection the FH Luke retains 12/18 Markan and 13/20 Matthean miracles. His frequent expansions of Matthean miracle stories, as implied by the 2GH (see above), are now explicable by his purported use of Mark (as with the 2DH). Where he only has Matthew available (7:1-10; 11:14) he is slightly longer (1.1x and 1.2x respectively) but this is consistent with his implied tendency of generally preferring the longer version of Mark and sometimes even expanding upon him (Luke 5:17-26 and 6:6-11 which are, respectively, 1.1x and 1.2x longer than Mark). In this respect, therefore, the FH Luke is not fundamentally different from the 2DH Luke.

The FH Luke, like his 2DH counterpart, takes over three out four Markan summaries (omitting only Mark 6:53-56, part of the ‘Great Omission’), each of which have Matthean parallels (see table 5.4). It has already been noted above that Luke tends to be closer to Mark in both the content and order of these summary statements but, insofar as they are not considered part of Q, the question of potential Matthean influence upon Luke (e.g., in relation to MAs) is important especially in relation to the relative plausibilities of the 2DH and FH. According to Goulder Luke 4:40-41 contains linguistic echoes of Matthew in his use of ὁσθενοῦντος νόσοις (Matt 8:17 has ὁσθενείας and νόσους) and ἔθεράπευν (Matt 8:16 has the aorist

---

Matthew), much more attention tends to be given to his later work on Luke (Luke) as reflected, for example, in Goodacre’s treatment of Goulder (Goulder and the Gospels).

344See, for example, the following: Goodacre, Against Q, 81–132; and Matson, “Luke’s Rewriting.”


346See above discussion under 2DH. For this and following refer also to table 5.3.
When, however, it is considered that Mark has νόσοις (agreeing with Luke against Matthew in case) and ἑθεράπευσεν (agreeing with Matthew against Luke in the aorist tense-form) (see Mark 1:32) then the only real echo of Matthew (that cannot be explained with reference to Mark) is the use of ἀσθενοῦστος, a verbal equivalent to Matthew’s ἀσθενείας. Given, however, that this is a summary about healing the possible independent use of this (sickness related) term by Luke is not especially surprising and does not require a theory of dependence upon Matthew (in addition to Mark).348 The situation is similar in relation to Luke 4:44 (parallel Matt 4:23 and Mark 1:39) where Luke shares the phrase κηρύσσων εἰς τάς συναγωγάς with Mark over against Matthew’s διδάσκων ἐν τοῖς συναγωγοῖς and disagrees with them both in giving the location as Judea rather than Galilee.349 Finally the summary statement at Luke 6:17-19 displays several possible echoes of Matthew including the following:350

(1) ὀχλος πολὺς (Luke 6:17) and ὀχλοι πολλοί (Matt 4:25): this parallel may be equally well explained by independent redaction of the twice recurring Markan phrase πολὺ πλήθος (Mark 3:7, 8).351

(2) μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ (Luke 6:17) and τῶν δώδεκα μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ (Matt 10:1): while Matt 10:1 occurs just prior to the naming of the twelve, the Lukan parallel occurs just after this incident and just prior to his Sermon on the Plain. A very similar phrase occurs in the more

---

347 *Luke*, 313. The same purported linguistic echoes of Matthew are suggested in McNicol et al., *Q Impasse*, 90.

348 Luke uses the verb (ἀσθενεῖα) only here versus three occurrences in Matthew (10:8; 25:36, 39) and one in Mark (6:56). The noun (ἀσθενεῖα) occurs only here in Matthew but four times in Luke (5:15; 8:2; 13:11, 12) and not at all in Mark. The adjective (ἀσθενής) occurs three times in Matthew (25:43; 44; 26:41), twice in Luke (9:2; 10:9) and once in Mark (14:38). The relative frequency with which Luke uses this word group hardly requires that he is dependent on Matthew for a similar usage here (highlighting ‘similar’ since it truly is an echo and not a clear copycat usage either in its form or its placement within the unit of tradition).

349 Though ‘Judea’ is a textual variant with Galilee being the alternative. According to McNicol et al. the reading chosen in the UBS may simply reflect a harmonistic echo of Matt 4:25 with Galilee being more original in Luke (*Q Impasse*, 93–94). Neither reading, however, has a significant effect upon the questions being addressed here.

350 Notably Goulder lists only the first of these purported Matthean echoes (ὀχλος πολὺς) in his discussion of this passage (*Luke*, 344). The remainder of the list comes from 2GH proponents albeit still relevant to our discussion here (McNicol et al., *Q Impasse*, 101–2).

351 Mark only uses πλήθος twice and Luke only eight times (none in Matthew). This contrasts sharply with a high usage of ὀχλος in all three Gospels (Matthew 50x; Mark 38x; Luke 42x). Thus the introduction of this term here would have been quite natural for Luke in referring to large group of people.
obviously parallel text of Mark 3:7 (μετὰ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ) that can just as easily explain the Lukan wording.

(3) τοῦ λαοῦ (Luke 6:17) and ἐν τῷ λαῷ (Matt 4:23): in this case there is no obvious connection to anything Markan but the usage by Matthew and Luke is also different in that the former refers to Jesus’ healing activity ‘among the people’ while the latter refers to the large crowd ‘of people’ located on the plain where Jesus is situated after choosing his disciples. Given the frequency of this word in both Gospels the echo could easily have occurred by coincidence.352

(4) ἀπὸ ... τῆς ἱουδαίας καὶ ἱερουσαλήμ (Luke 6:17) and ἀπὸ ... καὶ ἱεροσολύμων καὶ ἱουδαίας (Matt 4:25): in this case Luke more closely resembles the Markan parallel of ἀπὸ τῆς ἱουδαίας καὶ ἀπὸ ἱεροσολυμῶν (Mark 3:7, 8) with his use of the definite article and the same word order.

(5) ἡλθον ἀκούσαι αὐτοῦ (Luke 6:18) and ἡ ἀκοή αὐτοῦ (Matt 4:24): not only is this a weak parallel but a much closer one exists in Mark 3:8 (ἀκούοντες ... ἠλθον).

(6) νόσου (Luke 6:18) and νόσοις - νόσου (Matt 4:23, 24; 9:35; 10:1): the connection here is again weak in that Luke does not take over the stereotypical formula of Matt 4:23, 9:35 and 10:1 (θεραπεύων πάσαν νόσου καὶ πάσαν μαλακίαν) but only the single vocabulary item of νόσος which is a common word for sickness occurring five times each in Matthew and Luke (only once in Mark at 1:34).

(7) πνευμάτων ἄκαθάρτων ἐθεραπεύοντο (Luke 6:18) and πνευμάτων ἄκαθάρτων (Matt 10:1) and ἐθερά πευσεν (Matt 4:24; θεραπεύων in 4:23 and 9:35; θεραπεύειν in 10:1): In relation to ‘unclean spirits’ the link is weak (between Luke 6:18 and Matt 10:1) insofar as it involves Luke drawing on a different context (which he could easily also have done in relation to

352λαός occurs 14x in Matthew, 2x in Mark and 37x in Luke.
Mark). Regarding θεραπεύω the link is weak in that the word is again common in relation to healing and also occurs in Mark 3:10.

(8) πάντας (Luke 6:19 and Matt 12:15): this is a weak parallel in that it requires drawing upon an entirely different context in Matthew (albeit a summary statement) for a highly common word.

In essence none of these parallels involves reproducing entire phrases or even precise wording within the same context. Given that most if not all can be explained with reference to Mark or simply Luke’s independent use of common wording (as per the context) these various verbal echoes do not provide any strong evidence that Luke was directly influenced by Matthew in his composition of these summary statements.

The FH Luke takes up eight out of nine miracle related pericopes from Mark and ten out of twelve from Matthew of which four are shared with Matthew alone. In respect to this latter group Luke is longer than Matthew on one occasion (1.6x in Luke 7:18-23) and shorter on the other three (0.7x in 10:12-15; 0.8x in 11:24-26; 0.8x in 11:29-32). None of this is particularly remarkable.

Turning our attention to omissions we note that FH Luke passes over nine miracle stories, five of which relate to the ‘Great Omission.’ This Lukan omission essentially presents the same challenges here as it did for the 2DH Luke (see above) although it is perhaps more problematic for the FH Luke who now omits this material from both his sources. In this regard theories of a deutero-Mark, a mutilated manuscript or accidental omission are all the more improbable (since this would have to apply to Matthean manuscripts as well as Markan ones) although the mute and blind healings of Mark 7:31-37 and 8:22-26 (which were considered above as two of the more problematic omissions to explain) are both absent from Matthew. In addition to what was said above in relation to the 2DH Luke it may be noted that even if avoidance of obvious

---

353Omissions include four from Matt-Mark double tradition (Mark 6,45-52; 7,24-30; 8,1-10; 11,12-25), two unique to Mark (7,31-37; 8,22-26) and three unique to Matthew (9,27-31, 32-34; 17,24-27) (see table 2.1).
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doublets is admitted (e.g., feeding 4000), the presence of Luke-friendly themes among the omitted material proves puzzling: e.g., lessons on discipleship associated with the nature miracle of Mark 6:45-53 (cf. Matt 14:22-33) fits with his preferred call story in Luke 5:1-11; Mark 7:24-30 is consistent with a purported interest in exorcism and women; and responses of faith, praise and wonder occur in Matt 14:33; 15:28; and Mark 7:37. Luke’s Great Omission is thus problematic for all Markan priorists and perhaps more so for the FH proponents.

While the mute and blind healings of Mark 7:31-37 and 8:22-26 are likewise omitted by Matthew, the FH Luke also chooses to omit the blind and mute doublet healings in Matt 9:27-34. While this is a problematic omission for all hypotheses in that these are precisely the examples of healing stories that are missing from his account when he gets to Jesus’ answer to John in Luke 7:21-22, the difficulties are compounded for the FH Luke insofar as he passes over examples in both his sources noting also that Matthew includes a parallel to Luke 7:21-22. The omission of the fig tree incident likewise involves the FH Luke passing over something that was available in both his sources (Mark 11:12-25; Matt 21:18-22). In this latter case there are no compelling reasons for him to include the story although he is certainly not averse to punitive miracles (e.g., Luke 1:20; Acts 5:1-11; 13:4-12). Omission of Matthew’s coin in the fish (Matt 17:24-27) is not problematic.

The FH Luke omits only one Markan summary (as noted above) but several Matthean ones (9:35; 14:34-36; 15:29-31; 19:1-2; 21:14). Insofar as two of these occur in the Great Omission

354 As argued, for example, by Twelftree in relation to Luke’s implied redaction of Mark (Miracle Worker, 175–8).
355 The implied editorial inconsistency associated with the omissions is further highlighted by Luke’s several unique additions. Goulder labels several of these as “substitutions” (e.g., 7:11-17; 13:11-13; 14:1-4; 17:11-19) motivated, at least in part, by Luke’s desire not to miss any of the miracle tradition in Matt 8–9 (despite having already taken up the Markan versions). He even goes so far as to see echoes of Matt 9:27-31 in Luke 7:21 (Luke, 381–87, 565, 645, 406). This approach, however, only intensifies the problem. On the one hand it implies a conservative editorial tendency that does not want to exclude material from his sources. On the other hand the “substitutions” imply a very creative use of tradition that not only stands at odds with his otherwise conservative tendencies (e.g., Mark 1:21-28 par. Luke 4:31-37) but is all the more puzzling when he blatantly passes over the miracles of the Great Omission. While some of the difficulties may be alleviated by pointing to the unique nature of the tradition and the use to which Luke puts it (e.g., Luke 13:11-13 and 14:1-4 are both integral to controversy stories), the FH is probably better served at this point by appeal to Lukan Sondergut than creative rewriting (e.g., see discussion in Goodacre, “A World Without Q”).
356 See above discussions of omissions for 2GH and 2DH.
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(14:34-36; 15:29-31) I have already commented above. The remaining omissions are somewhat surprising in light of his apparent liking of summary statements in Acts (see above on the 2GH Luke’s use of Matthew) and his general tendency to take over Mark’s summary statements (outside of the Great omission). The omissions of miracle related tradition (Mark 13:21-23; par. Matt 24:23-24 and Matt 27:51-54) are not particularly problematic for the FH Luke and differ little from the 2DH Luke (except that Matt 27:51-54 was not available for the 2DH Luke).

When it comes to additions the FH Luke introduces six unique miracles of his own, each of which have been discussed above in relation to the 2DH Luke and 2GH Luke.\textsuperscript{357} It has already been noted that none is particularly problematic on any hypothesis except perhaps when considered in relation to Lukan omissions, especially of the mute and blind healings (as noted above) which are not compensated for in any of the additions. The FH Luke adds no new summary statements but does add three miracle related traditions: the mission of the seventy and their return (10:1-12, 17-20), the response to Herod (13:31-33), and the notation that Jesus was a prophet mighty in word and deed (24:29). None of these is problematic for the FH Luke.

When it comes to matters of order the FH Luke is very similar to the 2DH Luke in that his order of miracle stories essentially follows Mark. The shared hypothesis of Markan priority avoids the 2GH problem of having to explain Luke’s re-ordering of Matthew. We do need to ask, however, why Luke chose Mark’s order over that of Matthew. In this regard it may be hypothesized that Luke’s desire to balance/intersperse teaching and miracle material in his Galilean section meant that he preferred the Markan order.\textsuperscript{358} In this respect the 2DH and FH

\textsuperscript{357}The additions are Luke 5:1-11; 7:11-17; 13:10-17; 14:1-6; 17:11-19; 22:50-51. The clearest difference between the hypotheses at this point is that Luke 4:31-37 is counted an extra addition upon assumption of the 2GH (it is taken from Mark 1:21-28 upon assumption of Markan priority). These statistics potentially undergo significant alteration if, for example, we accept Goulder’s contention that Luke’s unique miracles are essentially re-presentations of Mark-Matt tradition rather than Lukan Sondergut. See, for example, his treatment of the Widow’s son in Luke 7 (Luke, 381–7).

\textsuperscript{358}Regarding the order changes in Matt 8–9 Goulder simply states that “Luke takes the view that the order and detail are better preserved in Mark; and which of us will disagree with him?” (Luke, 312). My observations lend support to this otherwise subjective statement. Interestingly in relation to Luke 5:1-11 Goulder claims that Luke is “following Matthew’s sequence” (Luke, 313) at that point. At best, however, this is an oversimplification insofar as his explanation appears to be based on aligning Matt 4:13b-17 with Mark 1:21-29. This ignores the fact that Matthew reproduces the material of Mark 1:29 and following (he omits Mark 1:21-28) in his later miracle chapters (Matt 8–9).
appear somewhat more plausible in relation to the implied order changes which are difficult to explain on the basis of Luke following Matthew alone.\textsuperscript{359} In relation to summary statements the FH Luke follows Markan order with the exception of Luke 6:17-19 (on which see above) which, to the extent that it reflects Matt 4:23-25, may betray Matthean influence, namely in placing the summary just prior to his Sermon (Mark 6:20-49; par Matthew 5–7). As noted above, however, the Lukan summary statements (including 6:17-19) are much closer to Mark than Matthew in relation to content. When it comes to miracle related tradition the FH Luke retains Matthew’s order for all the additional pericopes (response to John, woes on cities, and Beelzebul) except for the last two (return of evil spirit and sign of Jonah) which he switches (Luke has the return first). As with Matthew both stories fall within a complex of stories dealing with opposition to Jesus and his pronouncement of judgment upon those opposing him. The differing order is as follows:

\begin{itemize}
\item \textit{Luke}: Lord’s prayer $\Rightarrow$ Beelzebul $\Rightarrow$ return of evil spirit $\Rightarrow$ true blessedness $\Rightarrow$ sign of Jonah $\Rightarrow$ light into body $\Rightarrow$ Jesus denounces the Pharisees and lawyers.
\item \textit{Matthew}: Summary statement $\Rightarrow$ Beelzebul $\Rightarrow$ a tree and its fruit $\Rightarrow$ sign of Jonah $\Rightarrow$ return of evil spirit $\Rightarrow$ true kindred of Jesus.
\end{itemize}

Both schemes seem to make sense in themselves although Luke’s belongs to the Central Section which is notoriously difficult to plot out structurally (see above). Matthew, on assumption of the 2DH, changes the order of Q while Luke retains it. Alternatively, assuming the FH, the order changes are Luke’s doing but neither scenario seems particularly problematic.

In summary the FH Luke’s use of Matthew and Mark does not create particular problems in relation to miracle stories with the primary exception of the Great Omission, a problem shared with the 2DH but perhaps slightly more problematic for the FH. Order problems associated with

\footnote{\textsuperscript{359} The analogous problem for Markan priorists is Matthew’s order changes in Matthew 8–9 as discussed above. While clearly presenting a problem to Markan priorists, however, the difficulties of Luke’s implied re-ordering of Matthew do seem to be greater.}

the 2GH disappear on account of Luke having Mark available to him and in relation to summary statements Luke clearly (again) follows Mark more closely. To this extent the FH is again more plausible than the 2GH which requires a radical revision of Matthew in relation to order and content of summary statements. The FH Luke’s omission of several additional summary statements in Matthew remains, however, something of a problem for the FH in comparison to the 2DH (noting that Q lacks such summaries). In addition to this there are no clear evidences of Matthean influence upon Lukan summary statements (e.g., in parallel phrases or terms occurring in the same Lukan context but absent from Mark) although there is one possible instance where Matthean order influenced Luke (Luke 6:17-19). In general, therefore, the evidence seems slim for Luke to have been influenced by Matthew in relation to miracle related summary statements. Finally, regarding miracle related tradition the FH Luke looks very similar to the 2DH Luke except that now he is taking over the material directly from Matthew which involves him in some degree of conflation and order change but nothing particularly troublesome for the hypothesis.

5.3 Conclusions in Relation to Order and Selection

In general the Markan priority hypotheses seem to display greater plausibility in relation to matters of order and selection. Particularly troublesome for the 2GH are the matters of order and selection in relation to Luke’s use of Matthew. A comparison of the 2DH and FH shows less degree of divergence in plausibility but the evidence slightly favors the 2DH. The following chapter will test these hypotheses further by engaging in a more detailed examination of three specific pericopes.
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## Table 5.1: Miracle Tradition in Acts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Miracles in Acts</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The ascension</td>
<td>Nature: transportation?</td>
<td>1:2-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Peter heals the lame man at the temple gate</td>
<td>Healing</td>
<td>3:1-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The death of Ananias and Saphira</td>
<td>Punitive</td>
<td>5:1-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Peter heals Aneas</td>
<td>Healing</td>
<td>9:32-35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Peter heals Tabitha/Dorcas</td>
<td>Healing (dead raised)</td>
<td>9:36-43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Peter delivered from prison</td>
<td>Nature: prison liberation</td>
<td>12:3-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Angel of the Lord strikes down Herod</td>
<td>Punitive</td>
<td>12:19-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Paul blinds Elymas/Bar Jesus the magician: proconsul believes and is astonished</td>
<td>Punitive</td>
<td>13:4-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Paul heals a lame man at Lystra</td>
<td>Healing</td>
<td>14:8-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Paul exorcises fortune-telling slave girl</td>
<td>Exorcism</td>
<td>16:16-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Paul raises Eutychus from the dead</td>
<td>Healing (dead raised)</td>
<td>20:7-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. The Lord appears to Paul</td>
<td>Nature: epiphany</td>
<td>23:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Paul shakes of a viper and is unharmed</td>
<td>Nature: protection</td>
<td>28:1-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Paul heals Publius’ father (fever and dysentery)</td>
<td>Healing</td>
<td>28:7-8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Summary Statements in Acts

1. Everyone awed by many signs and wonders of apostles | 2:43 |
2. Many signs and wonders done among people through the apostles | 5:12 |
3. Sick and demonized healed (including by being placed in Peter’s shadow) | 5:15-16 |
4. Stephen (full of grace and power) performs great wonders and signs | 6:8 |
5. Philip performs signs and miracles: Simon and others amazed | 8:4-13 |
6. Paul and Barnabas perform signs and wonders at Iconium | 14:3 |
7. Miracles through Paul including healings and exorcisms from handkerchiefs | 19:10-12 |
8. Paul heals many on Malta | 28:9 |

## Miraculous/Magical Activity by Non-Christians in Acts

1. Simon Magus: practices magic; amazes people (no specific acts mentioned) | 8:9-13 |
2. Elymas/Bar-Jesus: false prophet and magician (no specific acts mentioned) | 13:4-12 |
3. Slave girl (spirit of divination) earns money for masters by fortune telling | 16:16-18 |
4. Seven sons of Sceva (itinerant Jewish exorcists) conduct exorcisms in the name of Jesus and Paul but are overpowered and beaten by the demon | 19:11-17 |
5. Many who practiced magic collect and burn their books publicly | 19:18-20 |
### Table 5.2: Mark’s Conflation of Matthew and Luke (2GH)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Matthew</th>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Luke</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:1-4 Leper</td>
<td>1:21-28 Unclean spirit</td>
<td>4:31-37 Unclean spirit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:5-13 Centurion</td>
<td>1:29-31 Mother in law</td>
<td>4:38-39 Mother in law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:14-15 Mother in law</td>
<td>1:40-45 Leper</td>
<td>5:1-11 Catch of fish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:23-27 Storm stilling</td>
<td>2:1-12 Paralytic</td>
<td>5:12-16 Leper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:28-9:1 Gadarene</td>
<td>3:1-6 Withered hand</td>
<td>5:17-26 Paralytic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:2-8 Paralytic</td>
<td>4:35-41 Storm stilling</td>
<td>6:6-11 Withered hand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:18-26 Ruler’s daughter and woman</td>
<td>5:1-20 Gerasene</td>
<td>7:1-10 Centurion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:27-31 Two Blind men</td>
<td>5:21-43 Jairus’ daughter and woman</td>
<td>7:11-17 Widow’s son</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:32-34 Mute/possessed</td>
<td>6:30-44 Feed 5000</td>
<td>8:22-25 Storm stilling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:9-14 Withered hand</td>
<td>6:45-52 Walk on water</td>
<td>8:26-39 Gerasene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:22 Blind mute</td>
<td>7:24-30 Canaanite woman</td>
<td>8:40-56 Jairus’ daughter and woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:13-21 Feed 5000</td>
<td>7:31-37 Deaf and mute</td>
<td>9:10-17 Feed 5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:22-33 Walk on water</td>
<td>8:1-10 Feed 4000</td>
<td>9:37-43 Demonized boy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:21-28 Canaanite woman</td>
<td>8:22-26 Blind man of Bethsaida</td>
<td>11:14 Mute demon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:29-31 Summary</td>
<td>9:14-29 Demonized boy</td>
<td>13:10-17 Bent woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:32-39 Feed 4000</td>
<td>10:46-52 Bartimaeus</td>
<td>14:1-6 Man with dropsy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:14-21 Demonized boy</td>
<td>11:12-14, 20-25 Fig tree</td>
<td>17:11-19 Ten lepers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:24-27 Coin in fish</td>
<td></td>
<td>18:35-43 Bartimeaus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20:29-34 Two blind men</td>
<td></td>
<td>22:50-51 High priest’s servant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21:18-22 Fig tree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sigla for table 5.2:**

**Bold:** single tradition

**Italics:** double tradition (Matt-Luke double tradition is unconnected by arrows)
### Table 5.3: Miracle Story Word Counts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Miracles</th>
<th>Matthew</th>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Luke</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Unclean spirit</td>
<td>1:21-28 (124x)</td>
<td>4:31-37 (119x)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[1.05xLuke]</td>
<td>[0.95xMark]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Mother in law</td>
<td>8:14-15 (30x)</td>
<td>1:29-31 (44x)</td>
<td>4:38-39 (38x)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.7xMark]</td>
<td>[1.5xMatt] [1.2xLuke]</td>
<td>[0.9xMark] [1.3xMatt]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Leper</td>
<td>8:1-4 (62x)</td>
<td>1:40-45 (99x)</td>
<td>5:12-16 (97x)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.6xMark]</td>
<td>[1.6xMatt] [1xLuke]</td>
<td>[1xMark] [1.6xMatt]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.6xMark]</td>
<td>[1.7xMatt] [0.9xLuke]</td>
<td>[1.1xMark] [1.8xMatt]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Shrivelled hand</td>
<td>12:9-14 (90x)</td>
<td>3:1-6 (95x)</td>
<td>6:6-11 (115x)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.95xMark]</td>
<td>[1.05xMatt] [0.8xLuke]</td>
<td>[1.2xMark] [1.3xMatt]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Stilling storm</td>
<td>8:23-27 (73x)</td>
<td>4:35-41 (118x)</td>
<td>8:22-25 (94x)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.6xMark]</td>
<td>[1.6xMatt] [1.3xLuke]</td>
<td>[0.8xMark] [1.3xMatt]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Gadarene demoniac(s)</td>
<td>8:28-9:1 (146x)</td>
<td>5:1-20 (325x)</td>
<td>8:26-39 (293x)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.4xMark]</td>
<td>[2.3xMatt] [1.1xLuke]</td>
<td>[0.9xMark] [2xMatt]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Jairus’ daughter and bleeding woman</td>
<td>9:18-26 (138x)</td>
<td>5:21-43 (374x)</td>
<td>8:40-56 (287x)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.35xMark]</td>
<td>[2.7Matt] [1.23xLuke]</td>
<td>[0.7xMark] [2.1xMatt]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Feeding 5000</td>
<td>14:13-21 (158x)</td>
<td>6:30-44 (237x)</td>
<td>9:10-17 (164x)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.7xMark]</td>
<td>[1.5xMatt] [1.4xLuke]</td>
<td>[0.7xMark] [1.0xMatt]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Walking on water</td>
<td>14:22-33 (188x)</td>
<td>6:45-52 (139x)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[1.4xMark]</td>
<td>[0.7xMatt]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Canaanite woman</td>
<td>15:21-28 (139x)</td>
<td>7:24-30 (129x)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[1.1xMark]</td>
<td>[0.9xMatt]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Feeding 4000</td>
<td>15:32-39 (129x)</td>
<td>8:1-10 (146x)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.9xMark]</td>
<td>[1.1xMatt]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Demonized boy</td>
<td>17:14-20 (133x)</td>
<td>9:14-29 (270x)</td>
<td>9:37-43 (136x)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.5xMark]</td>
<td>[2.0xMatt]</td>
<td>[0.5xMark] [1.0xMatt]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.6xMark]</td>
<td>[1.6xMatt] [1.1xLuke]</td>
<td>[0.9xMark] [1.4xMatt]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Fig Tree</td>
<td>21:18-22 (97x)</td>
<td>11:12-14, 20-25 (156x)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.6xMark]</td>
<td>[1.6xMatt]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Centurion’s servant</td>
<td>8:5-13 (167x)</td>
<td></td>
<td>7:1-10 (187x)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.9xLuke]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[1.1xMatt]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Blind-mute</td>
<td>12:22 (16x)</td>
<td></td>
<td>11:14 (20x)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.8xLuke]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[1.2xMatt]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Blank spaces occur where given story is missing from that Gospel. Numbers in parentheses are words counts (e.g. the Unclean Spirit is 124x words in Mark). Numbers in square brackets represent relative lengths of stories [e.g. the Unclean Spirit is 1.05x longer in Mark than Luke] which are typically rounded off to one decimal place unless it is deemed relevant to see such minor differences.

2 Word count is 144x if v. 21 (textual variant) is included.
### Table 5.4: Synoptic Summary Statements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parallel Summary Statements</th>
<th>Matthew</th>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Luke</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4:12-17 (81x) [T]</td>
<td>1:14-15 (35x) [T]</td>
<td>4:14-15 (31x) [T]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:23-25 (75x) [THE]</td>
<td>1:39 (15x) [TE]</td>
<td>4:44 (8x) [T]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3:7-10 (74x) [H]</td>
<td>6:17-19 (62x) [THE]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:16-17 (36x) [HE]</td>
<td>1:32-34 (46x) [HE]</td>
<td>4:40-41 (52x) [HE]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:35 (28x) [TH]</td>
<td>6:6b (6x) [T]</td>
<td>8:1-3 (62x) [THE]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:15-21 (93x) [TH]</td>
<td>3:7-12 (103x) [HE]</td>
<td>6:17-19 (62x) [HE]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:34-36 (44x) [H]</td>
<td>6:53-56 (72x) [H]</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:29-31 (63x) [H]</td>
<td>(7:31-37) (115x) [H]</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21:14 (12x) [H]</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sigla for above chart:
- Number in parentheses = word count
- T = Teaching mentioned in summary
- H = Healing mentioned in summary
- E = Exorcism mentioned in summary

### Table 5.5: Synoptic Miracle Related Tradition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tradition</th>
<th>Matthew</th>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Luke</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mission of 12</td>
<td>10:1, 5-14 (230x)</td>
<td>6:6b-13 (106x)</td>
<td>9:1-6 (93x)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[2.1xMark]</td>
<td>[0.46xMatt]</td>
<td>[0.9xMark]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[2.5xLuke]</td>
<td>[1.1xLuke]</td>
<td>[0.4xMatt]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twelve appointed</td>
<td>10:1-4 (76x)</td>
<td>3:13-19 (94x)</td>
<td>7:12-16 (76x)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.8xMark]</td>
<td>[1.2xMatt]</td>
<td>[0.8xMark]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[1.0xLuke]</td>
<td>[1.3xLuke]</td>
<td>[1.0xLuke]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response to John</td>
<td>11:2-6 (63x)</td>
<td>7:18-23 (103x)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.6xLuke]</td>
<td>[1.6xMatt]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woes on cities</td>
<td>11:20-24 (94x)</td>
<td>10:12-15 (63x)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[1.5xLuke]</td>
<td>[0.7xMatt]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beelzebul</td>
<td>12:22-37 (309x)</td>
<td>3:22-30 (141x)</td>
<td>11: 14-23 (168x)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[2.1xMark]</td>
<td>[0.45xMatt]</td>
<td>[1.2xMark]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[1.8xLuke]</td>
<td>[0.8xLuke]</td>
<td>[0.5xMatt]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1As with table 5.3 the word counts and relative lengths of pericopes are given (where relevant) in parentheses and square brackets respectively. Empty spaces indicate the pericope is missing from the relevant Gospel.
### (Table 5.5 Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Luke</th>
<th>Matthew</th>
<th>Mark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unclean spirits return</td>
<td>12:43-45 (67x) [1.2xLuke]</td>
<td>11:24-26 (55x) [0.8xMatt]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign of Jonah</td>
<td>12:38-42 (121x) [1.3xLuke]</td>
<td>11:29-32 (96x) [0.8xMatt]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rejection at Nazareth</td>
<td>13:53-58 (107x) [0.8xMark]</td>
<td>6:1-6a (131x) [1.2xMatt]</td>
<td>4:16-30 [---](^2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herod on Jesus</td>
<td>14:1-2 (34x) [0.6xMark]</td>
<td>6:14-16 (55x) [0.6xMatt][1.0xLuke]</td>
<td>9:7-9 (52x) [1.0xMark][1.2xMatt]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeding 5000 introduction</td>
<td>14:13-14 (37x) [0.77xMark]</td>
<td>6:32-34 (48x) [1.29xMatt] [1.5xLuke]</td>
<td>9:10b-11 (32x)(^3) [0.66xMark] [0.86xMatt]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand for sign</td>
<td>16:1-4 (71x) [1.5xMark]</td>
<td>8:11-13 (47x) [0.66xMatt]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yeast of the Pharisees</td>
<td>16:5-12 (109x) [1xMark]</td>
<td>8:14-21 (106x) [1xMatt][4xLuke]</td>
<td>12:1 (27x) [0.25xMark][0.25xMark]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Another exorcist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9:38-41 (73 or 51x) [1.9x of 1.3xLuke]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apocalyptic Discourse ('signs and wonders')</td>
<td>24:23-25 (34x) [0.9xMark]</td>
<td>13:21-23 (37x) [1.1xMatt]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Death and resurrection ('apocalyptic signs')</td>
<td>27:51-54</td>
<td>28:1-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission of 70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10:1-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Return of 70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10:17-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response of Herod</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13:31-33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resurrection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24:19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^2\) The very different nature of Luke’s account makes comparison of word counts and length somewhat irrelevant in this instance.

\(^3\) I have chosen to count only the text that is clearly parallel in all three Gospels resulting in the omission of Mark 6:30-31 and Luke 9:10a (up to ἐποίησαν).
### Table 5.6: Luke’s Use of Matthew Alone (2GH)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Matthew</th>
<th>Luke</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4:23-25 Summary statement</td>
<td>4:31-37 Unclean spirit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:1-4 Leper</td>
<td>4:38-39 Mother in law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:5-13 Centurion</td>
<td>4:40-41 Summary statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:14-15 Mother in law</td>
<td>4:44 Summary statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:16-17 Summary statement</td>
<td>5:1-11 Catch of fish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:23-27 Storm stilling</td>
<td>5:12-16 Leper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:28-9:1 Gadarene demoniacs</td>
<td>5:17-26 Paralytic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:2-8 Paralytic</td>
<td>6:6-11 Withered hand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:18-26 Ruler and woman</td>
<td>6:17-19 Summary statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9:27-31 Two Blind men</strong></td>
<td><strong>7:1-10 Centurion</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9:32-34 Mute/possessed</strong></td>
<td><strong>7:11-17 Widow’s son</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11:2-6 Response to John</strong></td>
<td><strong>8:1-3 Summary statement</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11:20-24 Woes on cities)</td>
<td><strong>8:22-25 Storm stilling</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:9-14 Withered hand</td>
<td><strong>8:26-39 Gerasene demoniac</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:15-21 Summary statement</td>
<td><strong>8:40-56 Jairus/woman</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:22 Blind/mute</td>
<td><strong>9:1-6 Mission of twelve</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12:25-37 Beelzebul)</td>
<td>(9:7-9 Herod on Jesus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12:38-42 Sign of Jonah)</td>
<td>9:10-17 Feed 5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12:43-45 Return of unclean spirits)</td>
<td>9:37-43 Demonized boy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:13-21 Feed 5000</td>
<td><strong>(10:13-16 Woes on cities)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>14:22-33 Walk water</strong></td>
<td><strong>(10:17-20 Return of seventy)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:21-28 Canaanite woman</td>
<td>11:14 Mute demon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:29-31 Summary statement</td>
<td>(11:15-23 Beelzebul)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:32-39 Feed 4000</td>
<td>(11:24-26 Return of unclean spirit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(16:5-12 Yeast of the Pharisees)</td>
<td>(11:29-32 Sign of Jonah)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:14-21 Demonized boy</td>
<td>(12:1 Yeast of Pharisees)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>17:24-27 Coin in fish</strong></td>
<td><strong>13:10-17 Bent woman</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20:29-34 Two blind men</td>
<td><strong>14:1-6 Man with dropsy</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21:14 Summary statement</td>
<td><strong>17:11-19 Ten lepers</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21:18-22 Fig tree</td>
<td>18:35-43 Bartimeaus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(24:23-25 Apocalyptic discourse)</td>
<td><strong>22:50-51 High priest’s servant</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sigla for table 5.6:

**Bold**: tradition not shared between Matthew and Luke

(material in parentheses): miracle related tradition
### Table 5.7: Matthew’s Use of Mark and Q (2DH)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Matthew</th>
<th>Q (miracles and related tradition)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:21-28 Unclean spirit</td>
<td>8:1-4 Leper</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:29-31 Mother in law</td>
<td>8:5-13 Centurion</td>
<td>7:1-10 Centurion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:1-12 Paralytic</td>
<td>8:23-27 Storm stilling</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:1-6 Withered hand</td>
<td>8:28–9:1 Gadarenes</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:35-41 Storm stilling</td>
<td>9:2-8 Paralytic</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:1-20 Gadarene demoniac</td>
<td>9:18-26 Ruler and the woman</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:21-43 Jairus and the woman</td>
<td>9:27-31 Two blind men</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:30-44 Feed 5000</td>
<td>10:46-52 Blind Bartimaeus</td>
<td>10:13-15 Woes on Galilean towns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:45-52 Walk on water</td>
<td>11:14-29 Demonized boy</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:24-30 Canaanite woman</td>
<td>12:1-10 Feed 4000</td>
<td>11:16, 29-32 Sign of Jonah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:31-37 Deaf and mute</td>
<td>14:22-33 Walk water</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:1-10 Feed 4000</td>
<td>15:21-28 Canaanite woman</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:22-26 Blind man of Bethsaida</td>
<td>15:32-39 Feed 4000</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:14-29 Demonized boy</td>
<td>17:1-21 Demonized boy</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:46-52 Blind Bartimaeus</td>
<td>17:24-27 Coin in fish</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:12-14, 20-25 Fig tree</td>
<td>20:29-34 Two blind men</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sigla for table 5.7:**

**Bold:** tradition not shared between Mark and Luke (also absent from Q)

**Italics:** tradition shared between Luke and Q
Table 5.8: Luke’s Use of Mark and Q (2DH)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Luke</th>
<th>Q (miracles and related tradition)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:21-28 Unclean spirit</td>
<td>4:31-37 Unclean spirit</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:29-31 Mother in law</td>
<td>4:38-39 Mother in law</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:40-45 Leper</td>
<td>5:1-11 Catch of fish</td>
<td>7:1-10 Centurion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:1-12 Paralytic</td>
<td>5:12-16 Leper</td>
<td>7:11-17 Widow’s son</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:1-6 Withered hand</td>
<td>5:17-26 Paralytic</td>
<td>7:18-20, 22-23 Jesus’ response to John: blind see etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:1-20 Gadarene demon</td>
<td>7:1-10 Centurion</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:21-43 Jairus and the woman</td>
<td>7:11-17 Widow’s son</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:30-44 Feed 5000</td>
<td>8:22-25 Storm stilling</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:45-52 Walk on water</td>
<td>8:26-39 Gadarene</td>
<td>11:24-26 Beelzebul controversy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:31-37 Deaf and mute</td>
<td>9:10-17 Feed 5000</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:1-10 Feed 4000</td>
<td>9:37-43 Demonized boy</td>
<td>11:16, 29-32 Sign of Jonah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:22-26 Blind man of Bethsaida</td>
<td>10:13-15 Woes on Galilean towns</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:14-29 Demonized boy</td>
<td>11:14 Mute demon</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:46-52 Blind Bartimaeus</td>
<td>11:15-23 Beelzebul</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:12-14, 20-25 Fig tree</td>
<td>11:24-26 Return of evil spirit</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11:16, 29-32 Sign of Jonah</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13:10-17 Bent woman</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14:1-6 Man with dropsy +</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17:11-19 Ten lepers</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18:35-43 Bartimeaus</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22:50-51 High priest’s servant</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sigla for table 5.8:

**Bold**: tradition not shared between Mark and Luke (also absent from Q)

**Italics**: tradition shared between Luke and Q
Chapter 6: Rhetorical Transformation of Miracle Tradition Pericopes

6.1 Introduction

Having examined our three Synoptic hypotheses from the standpoint of order and selection, this chapter will now examine their relative redactional plausibility in relation to three miracle pericopes. Specifically I will examine two triple tradition stories (the Gerasene demoniac and Jairus’ daughter in Mark 5:1-43 and parallels) along with one Matthew-Luke double tradition story (the centurion’s servant in Matt 8:5-13; Luke 7:1-10). While the former provide good examples of narrative, in that they are less like chreia than other miracle stories,¹ the latter is the most substantial of only two miracle narratives in the ‘Q’ tradition.² As in chapter five the relative redactional plausibility of our three chosen hypotheses will be assessed in light of the rhetorical conventions of narrative and the miracle motifs of each evangelist.

6.2 The Gadarene/Gerasene Demoniac(s) (Mark 5:1-20; Matt 8:28–9:1; Luke 8:26-39)

The Gadarene/Gerasene Demoniac(s) narrative (Mark 5:1-20; Matt 8:28–9:1; Luke 8:26-39) is one of the longest Synoptic miracle stories (325 words in Mark, 293 in Luke, and 146 in Matthew)³ and has received much attention from a form-critical⁴ and tradition-history⁵

---

¹Their classification as ‘miracle stories,’ ‘tales’ and ‘exorcisms’ (see below) differentiates them, for example, from the Paralytic (Mark 2:1-12 and par.) or the man with the withered hand (Mark 3:1-6 and par.) which, owing to their focus on Jesus’ authoritative pronouncements, are variously categorized as ‘apophthegmatic controversy dialogues’ (Bultmann, History, 11–16), ‘pronouncement stories’ (Taylor, Formation, 63–64) and ‘Paradigms’ (Dibelius, Tradition, 43).
²It is classified as a ‘biographical apophthegm’ by Bultmann (History, 38) but as a “story about Jesus” by Taylor (Formation, 120) and a “tale” by Dibelius (Tradition, 244).
³It is the longest in Luke, the second longest in Mark (after Jairus’ daughter at 374 words) but only the fourth longest in Matthew (following, in order: walking on water = 188; centurion’s servant = 167; and feeding 5000 = 158). If Matt 9:1 is included in the following pericope then (at 135 words) it would also be shorter than the Canaanite woman (139 words) and the ruler’s daughter (138 words). For these and other word counts see Table 5.3.
⁴For Bultmann it was a ‘miracle story of healing’ with all the characteristics of exorcism and likely a Christian adaptation from an oral folk story (History, 210, 220-21, 223-24, 231). Taylor agrees it is a ‘miracle story’ but sees the vivid details (e.g., Mark 5:3-5) as an indication of eye-witness testimony. For him oral transmission results in abbreviation albeit that Q tradition is expanded by Matthew and Luke (e.g., Centurion’s Servant) (Formation, 120, 24, 183–4). Dibelius classifies it as a “tale” which is alien to the Gospel narratives and contrary to Jesus’ mission thereby suggesting an original Jewish exorcism story in which the fate of the (gentile) swine is of no concern (Tradition, 71–77, 89, 101). Fuller sees it as based on “generalized memory with the addition of popular oriental
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standpoint albeit typically assuming Markan priority. While the focus of this dissertation is source-critical evaluation, these studies nevertheless highlight narrative tensions (typically taken to indicate traditional layers) that will be helpful to consider from a redaction-critical perspective (see table 6.1 for parallel text).

6.2.1 The 2GH and the Gadarene/Gerasene Demoniac(s)

(a) Luke’s use of Matthew

The tendency of the 2GH Luke to expand Matthean miracle accounts was noted in the previous chapter and, insofar as it is twice the length of Matthew (293 words in place of 146), Luke’s account of the Gerasene demoniac is the second largest of those expansions (following

features" (Interpreting, 34–35, 54–55). Others simply classify it as an exorcism (e.g., Bock, Luke, 769; Theissen, Miracle Stories, 321; Latourell, Miracles, 112).

For tradition-historical analyses see, for example, the following: Rudolf Pesch, “The Markan Version of the Healing of the Gerasene Demoniac,” Ecumenical Review 23 [1971]: 349–76; idem, Die Markusevangelium I. Teil: Einleitung und Kommentar zu Kap. 1:1–8:26 [Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1976], 282–95; F. Annen, Heil für die Heiden: Zur Bedeutung und Geschichte der Tradition vom besessenen Gerasener, FTS 20 (Frankfurt: J. Nekht, 1976); Jostein Ædna, “The Encounter of Jesus with the Gerasene Demoniac,” in Authenticating the Words of Jesus, ed. Bruce Chilton and Craig A. Evans (Leiden; Boston; Köln: Brill, 1999), 279–301; Robert Guelich, Mark 1–8:26, WBC (Waco, Texas: Word, 1989), 272–3; Helmet Merklein, “Die Heilung des Besessenen von Gerasa (Mk 5:1–20): Ein Fallsbeispiel für die tiefenspsychologische Deutung E. Drewermanns und die historisch-kritisch Exegese,” in The Four Gospels 1992: Festschrift Frans Neirynck. Vol. 1., ed. F. Van Segbroeck, C. M. Tuckett, G. Van Belle, and J. Verheyden, BETL 100 (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1992), 1024–25; John F. Craghan, “The Gerasene Demoniac,” CBQ 30 (1968): 522–36; Karl Kertelge, Die Wunder Jesu im Markusevangelium: Eine redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung (Munich: Kösel, 1970), 101–10. While these analyses all assume Markan priority, there is little agreement on the extent of Markan redaction or the manner in which the text developed in its pre-Markan stages although Merklein suggests that the various hypotheses can be organized into two main groups: (1) those favoring two basic layers of pre-Markan and Markan tradition (e.g., Annen; Gnilka, Luhrmann, Schmithals) and (2) those favoring three or four layers in the tradition (e.g., Schweizer, Guelich, Pesch, and Ernst) (“Die Heilung,” 1024–25). Others express significant skepticism regarding the possibility of reconstructing a detailed or accurate tradition history (e.g., Davies and Allison, Matthew, 77; Collins, Mark: A Commentary, Hermeneia [Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007], 266; Boring, Mark, 149–50). The value of these analyses is the identification of various tensions and awkward junctures in the text that are typically used for isolating layers of tradition (see following note).

On which see, for example, Pesch (“Gerasene Demoniae”; Markusevangelium, 282), Guelich (Mark, 272–3), Helmet Merklein (“Die Heilung,” 1022) and René Latourell (Miracles, 112). Examples include the following: (a) tensions and doublts within the story (e.g., change from plural ‘they come’ to single ‘met him’ in Mark 5:1–2; proximity of Gerasa to the sea implied in 5:1, 13, 18; two different encounters implied in 5:2, 6; the exorcism command in 5:8 appears like an afterthought; apparent redundancy or afterthought of 5:16; double request of demoniac for concession in 5:10, 12; double report about healing in 5:14, 16); (b) differing vocabulary (such as for tombs and unclean spirits); and (c) midrashic motifs in 5:3–5. The same issues will obviously have a bearing upon redactional plausibility and will therefore be noted below when appropriate.
Jairus’ daughter and the hemorrhaging woman). While the 2GH Luke takes over thirty six percent (fifty four words)\(^7\) of Matthew’s wording, making up eighteen percent of his own account, verbatim agreement between individual verses varies from as high as sixty (Luke 8:33) to as low as three (Luke 8:27) percent (see table 6.2). While two Lukan verses are shorter than their Matthean parallels (Luke 8:32, 33), he typically expands (as high as two hundred percent in Luke 8:35) and makes several significant additions (8:29-31, 36, 38-39) resulting in an account that ‘considerably alters and expands’ Matthew.\(^8\) While high levels of verbatim agreement typically point to direct dependence, most of the common wording is paralleled in Mark thereby making it equally explicable as taken over from Mark (assuming Markan priority).\(^9\) Verbatim agreement alone, therefore, is insufficient to indicate Luke’s direct use of Matthew alone thus making it necessary to examine other implications of the proposed 2GH Lukan redaction of Matthew. I will begin with the various Lukan expansions which, in light of Theon’s narrative virtue of conciseness, require plausible rhetorical explanations.\(^10\)

The first major addition\(^11\) is a sixty-six word description of (8:29) and dialogue with (8:30-31) the demoniac, which is perhaps motivated by the narrative element of person insofar as it depicts the character of the demoniac and, albeit to a lesser extent, Jesus. According to McNicol et al. the expansion provides a rationale for the ‘otherwise unmotivated’ challenge in Luke 8:28 (par. Matt 8:29)\(^12\) where Jesus commands the spirit to depart (Luke 8:29). It therefore relates to the narrative element of cause albeit Matthew’s description of the demoniacs as ‘so fierce that no one was able pass by that way’ (Matt 8:28) implies that the confrontation was caused by the

\(^7\)Including words where form differs (e.g., ὑπήντησαν and ὑπήνησαν in Matt 8:28 and Luke 8:27 respectively).

\(^8\)So McNicol et al., Q Impasse, 129.

\(^9\)Almost all Matthew-Luke wording agreement (as in table 6.2) is explicable as Lukan dependence on Mark. The primary exception is the three word phrase ἐμπότις ἐστὶν πλαίον in Luke 8:37 (par. Matt 9:1) which is absent from Mark (see below for further discussion of this MA in relation to the FH).

\(^10\)Taking Mark’s account as a source then Luke slightly abbreviates (90% of Mark’s 325 words) but upon assumption of Markan priority he obviously expands significantly upon Matthew. The expansions in Luke 8:27 and the addition of Luke 8:29-31 are paralleled in Mark.

\(^11\)2GH Luke makes no major omissions from Matthew though see below for minor omissions and editorial changes.

\(^12\)Q Impasse, 129. They state that the addition conforms to a “stock element in Hellenistic healing accounts” but offer no examples to back up the claim.
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demons blocking Jesus’ path. Insofar as this provides the prior cause for the confrontation, however, and not just a reason for the demoniac’s reaction to Jesus (Luke 8:29), it is a surprising omission for the 2GH Luke. This section also includes the naming motif (‘legion’ in 8:30-31) which is claimed by McNicol et al. to be a “brilliant, but secondary touch.”13 While they are not explicit about why this is so, commentators (on both Luke and Mark) typically identify the following possible explanations (not all mutually exclusive) for this motif: (1) it symbolizes the large number of pigs (and/or demons);14 (2) it has political overtones in relation Roman domination (symbolically pointing to their future expulsion);15 (3) naming was an important

13 Q Impasse, 129.
15 Theissen, noting λέγοντως is a Latin loan word (legio), sees a deliberate allusion to Roman occupation with the exorcism and subsequent livestock destruction being symbolic of anticipated liberation (Miracle Stories, 255; similarly so in Jean Starobinski, “An Essay in Literary Analysis: Mark 5:1–20,” Ecumenical Review 23 [1971]: 388). In support of this are the following observations (taken from Boring, Mark, 151 and Collins, Mark, 269–70): (a) Caesar’s Tenth legion, situated at Cyrrhus in north west Syria from 17–66 C.E., had an image of a boar on its standards and seals; (b) during the Jewish revolt Vespasian sent troops under the command of Lucius Annius on a punitive raid of Gerasa (burning the city and devastating surrounding villages); (c) ‘herd’ (ὄξυλη) may not be the most appropriate term for pigs but was used for military units; (d) “he permitted” (ἐπέτρεψεν) in v. 13 could be translated as “he dismissed” with military overtones; (f) they “rushed” (ἐξορμήσεν could be translated as they “charged,” again with military overtones; (g) the demons’ plea not to be expelled from the region may reflect Roman unwillingness to leave Palestine (though in Luke the plea is not to be sent into the abyss). While Boring concludes that Mark’s lack of anti-Roman sentiment prevents the story being reduced to an “allegory of liberation” (preferring to read ‘legion’ as primarily referring to the large number of demons, as per the previous note), he nevertheless concludes that “it could hardly have been read in Mark’s time without political overtones” (Mark, 151). Collins agrees on Mark’s lack of anti-Roman sentiment (e.g., 15:39) and says early readers would primarily see a battle between Jesus and Satan, but similarly thinks that cultural and political overtones are unavoidable leading to a logical link of the kingdom of Satan with Rome and the healing activity of Jesus with restored Israel (Mark, 269–70). Wendy Cotter similarly suggests that the demons’ love for pigs may be a reference to Romans whereby “there is a good excuse to recognize political satire inserted into the earlier and simpler exorcism story” (Miracles, 121–2). Other seeing political overtones include: Marcus, Mark 1–8: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary, AB 27 (New York: Doubleday, 2000), 351; Pesch, Markusevangelium, 286. Given Luke is even less anti-Roman, the potential military motif makes it an unlikely addition by him (to Matthew) and its retention (from Mark), perhaps without military or political overtones, seems more plausible. Regarding skepticism about the anti-Roman motif in Luke see the following: Tannehill, Luke, 146; Nolland, Luke 1–9:20, 409, though on p. 414 he says the name
motif in exorcisms by which the exorcist gained control;\(^{16}\) and (4) it indicates the extent of Jesus’ power.\(^{17}\) While 2GH Luke agrees with Matthew in having the demon immediately (and unaided) identify Jesus by name (‘son of God’ in Luke 8:28; Matt 8:29), this addition suggests that Jesus himself asks for the demon’s name only after his initial exorcism command failed (implying it is an ‘exorcistic technique’). The larger context (in all three accounts), however, makes it clear that Jesus is in control, noting that prior to the addition of ‘legion’ the demon begs not to be tormented (Luke 8:28). This suggests that the 2GH Lukan addition appears more like a concession of Jesus than an attempt to gain control through an exorcistic technique. Since Luke is also unlikely to have added anti-Roman overtones, he most likely adds the ‘legion’ motif to highlight either the number of pigs or the extent of Jesus’ power (or both). Further to the naming motif in verse 31 the 2GH Luke provides a reason (narrative cause) for the demon’s request to be sent into the pigs, namely that they do not want to be sent ‘into the abyss’ (again alluding to Jesus’ power). These features potentially tie into the Lukan validation motif in relation to Jesus’ miracles whereby these additions are understandable for the 2GH Luke.

\(^{16}\)According to Twelftree asking for a name and commanding a demon to leave were typical first century exorcistic techniques (Miracle Worker, 72). While some agree on highlighting naming as a exorcistic technique for gaining control over demons (e.g., Collins, Mark, 269–70; Gundry, Mark, 250–51; Fitzmyer, Luke, 738; Taylor, Mark, 281), others note the absence elsewhere in the Gospels of Jesus using naming as part of an exorcism formula (France, Mark, 229; Bock, Luke, 774; Nolland, Luke 1–9:20, 409, Marshall, Luke, 338) and that Jesus’ control over the demon has already been accomplished within this narrative (Guelich, Mark, 280–81; Nolland, Luke 1–9:20, 409). Boring sees an attempted reverse exorcism in Mark 5:7–8 with the demons failing to overpower Jesus despite knowing his name (Mark, 15–51). Gundry sees the name exchange as revealing demonic plurality (‘legion’), which explains Jesus’ initial failed command as not owing to ignorance of the name (“his power needs no such trick of the trade”) but his having only commanded a single unclean spirit (Mark, 250–51)). Marshall (Luke, 338–9) and Nolland (Luke 1–9:20, 409) note the theory of Jeremias, that the Aramaic ligyono could indicate a reference to a single “soldier,” but reject it as unlikely.\(^{17}\)This is commonly suggested among Markan commentators and links to the first mentioned reason (number of demons/pigs): Guelich notes uncertainty about whether ‘legion’ represented an actual name (there is no evidence for this) or is simply a collective noun. He suggests, however, that this is a moot point insofar as the primary function was to underline the man’s domination whereby his submission to Jesus then highlights the power of the latter, something that is highlighted throughout the narrative (Mark, 280–81, 88). Similarly so Kertelge sees the demoniac’s prostration and the townspeople’s fear as functioning narratively to illustrate Jesus’ deeds of power (Mark 6:2) (Die Wunder, 106, 108; similarly so in D. E. Nineham, The Gospel of St. Mark [London: A. & C. Black, 1968]; Pesch, Markusevangelium, 286; Marcus, Mark, 351; and Dibelius, Tradition, 87–89).
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The reaction of the townspeople (Luke 8:35-37) constitutes a second major addition whereupon Matthew’s twenty words (Matt 9:34 basically says the whole town came out to meet Jesus and ask him to leave) are expanded to fifty-six by added demonstrations of the cure (man sitting, clothed, and in his right mind at Jesus’ feet) and notations of the townspeople’s fear (ἐφοβήθησαν in v. 35 and φόβῳ μεγάλῳ συνείχοντο in v. 37). While this evidently contributes to validation,18 the ‘fear’ also functions as a narrative cause for their request that Jesus depart,19 and the healed demoniac’s position “at the feet of Jesus” (8:35) is possibly a characteristic Lukan discipleship phrase (cf. 8:41; 10:39; 17:16)20 thus tying into a Lukan miracle motif. The third major addition (Luke 8:37a-39) involves the conversation between Jesus and the healed demoniac (he begs to go with Jesus but is refused). Having taken over ἔμβος εἰς πλοίον21 from Matt 9:1 Luke adds the interchange in verses 38-39 almost as an afterthought and clearly in tension with Jesus having already returned home (ὑπέστρεψεν in Luke 8:37b).

Nevertheless the addition relates to the Lukan motifs of validation (the story is to be broadcast) and discipleship (the healed demoniac dutifully obeys). In essence, therefore, these three major additions by the 2GH Luke can be explained in relation to the narrative element of person and

---

18McNicol et al. claim Luke’s conclusion is more fitting and in keeping with standard elements of miracle stories (Q Impasse, 129). Bultmann (History, 225–6) points to the following Markan elements (each shared with Luke) as providing “demonstration” for the cure/exorcism: a disturbance upon departure (pigs in Mark 5:13; Luke 8:33); the healed person is dismissed (Mark 5:19; Luke 8:38-39); the people react in fear (Mark 5:15; Luke 8:35, 37). Dibelius likewise highlights the concluding ‘fear’ motif as typical of validation in ‘Tales’ (Tradition, 80–81, 87–88). Twelftree notes a possible echo of Isa 65:4 (which speaks of those sitting in tombs, spending the night in secret places, and eating swine’s flesh) suggesting the defeat of gentile gods in preparation for Jesus’ gentile ministry (Miracle Worker, 72).

19The cause of the fear itself, however, is explicit in neither Luke nor Mark thus leading to two primary proposals (noting some authors see both): (1) fear of further economic loss (as with the pigs) (e.g., France, Mark, 231–2; Kertelge, Die Wunder, 103; Guelich, Mark, 284); (2) Jesus’ manifestation of divine power (e.g., Twelftree, Miracle Worker, 72; Collins, Mark, 273; Fitzmyer, Luke, 740; Green, Luke, 341; Nolland, Luke 1–9:20, 412; Pesch, “Gerasene Demoniac,” 359; Kertelge, Die Wunder, 103). Agreeing with the second of these Dibelius says Jesus is depicted “not as a benign Savior who helps, but as the strange miracle man who terrifies” (Tradition, 87). Collins notes that just as the locals had tried to control the demoniac they now try to control or ward off the supra-human power of Jesus by asking him to leave their region (Collins, Mark, 273). Others are non-committal on the cause of the fear (e.g., Marshall, Luke, 341; Bock, Luke, 779) or see both of the above (Van der Loos, Miracles, 393). Alternatively Marcus suggests that the fear is rooted in the townspeople’s association of Jesus’ exorcism with the work of the devil as with the scribes accusation in 3:22-30 (Mark, 346). While the text is silent on this matter, the latter reason seems most speculative of all.

20So McNicol et al., Q Impasse, 129. Notably the phrase “παρὰ τοῦ ἰησοῦ” is missing from Mark.

21This constitutes perhaps the most significant positive MA (over against ἔμβασιν τοῦ αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸ πλοίον in Mark 5:18) on which see discussion below.
the motifs of validation and discipleship/faith. Despite this redactional plausibility, however, no
obvious advantage is gained over Markan priority hypotheses insofar as the same three elements
are present in Mark and could easily have been taken over from him for the same reasons that the
2GH Luke added them.²² Potentially problematic for the 2GH is Luke’s omission of Matthew’s
initial cause of the confrontation (the demons block Jesus’ path). Furthermore, while the
additions can be rhetorically justified with reference to the element of person along with the
motifs of validation and faith/discipleship, this does not necessarily require the extent of
expansion seen here (which contravenes the virtue of brevity). Interestingly Luke’s account is
slightly shorter than Mark’s (see below) implying for the 2GH that they both violated the virtue
of brevity (Luke first expanded Matthew then Mark expanded both Matthew and Luke) whereas
the reverse is true for Markan priority hypotheses (both Matthew and Luke abbreviate Mark).
²³

The 2GH Luke makes various other changes to Matthew some of which deserve comment in
relation to rhetorical transformation. One potentially significant change involves the infamous
textual variant in verse 26 relating to the narrative element of place.²⁴ Lukan manuscripts offer at
least three possibilities: Γερασηνων, Γεργησηνων and Γαδαρηνων (Gerasenes, Gergesenes, and
Gadarenes). Since Gadara was approximately 10 km south east of the lake (albeit perhaps
with territory extending up to the shoreline) and Gerasa was a further 40 km in the same

²²Exceptions include the addition of “at the feet of Jesus” and his change from “out of region” to “into the abyss” in
relation to the demon’s request. Neither one, however, is a problem for Markan priority. Likewise the MA of ἐμβας ἐ
πλοιον (Luke 8:37; Matt 9:1) is no problem for the FH (Luke has access to Matthew) nor even for the 2DH
since it is not a complete departure from the Markan version (ἐμβαςυντος συτου ἐν το πλοιον in 5:18) and
could well have arisen from independent redaction. See further below.
²³This highlights a key difference between the FH and 2GH. According to the latter Matthew is the sole (or primary)
source for Luke requiring that all his deviations be explained as Lukan redaction. For the FH, however, many of the
Luke’s deviations are explicable with reference to Mark.
²⁴Also in v. 26 the 2GH Luke changes ἔλθοντος συτου into κατέπλευσαν, which is a hapax legomenon and refers
to making a transition from the high seas to a coastal landing point [see Walter Bauer, A Greek-English Lexicon of
the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature, 524 (hereafter BDAG) and Liddell and Scott, Lexicon,
906]. Nolland (assuming Markan priority) refers to it as a “more colorful” term than the simple ἔρχομαι (in both
Mark and Matthew) (Luke 1–9:20, 406). Luke also changes ‘to the other side’ (ἐν το πέραν) into ‘which is
opposite Galilee’ (ἡτισ ἐστιν ουτιπέρο της Γαληλαια). This is not only more geographically precise but perhaps
emphasizes the gentile nature of the destination. The appearance of another hapax legomenon (συντίπερα) possibly
indicates greater literary flare and “pretentious use of language” (Nolland, ibid.). At the same time the 2GH Luke
introduces a discrepancy into the text whereby κατέπλευσαν is plural (‘they arrived’) whereas from v. 2 forward the
focus is on Jesus in the singular. See also discussion of Mark 5:1 below.
direction both locations (though more so Gerasa) negatively impact credibility insofar as the events of the narrative are portrayed as happening at the lakeside. Alternatively Gergesa provides an eastern lakeside location but is the less well known of the three and is typically thought to have been added later to alleviate problems created by the other two. The manuscript evidence is relatively balanced in Luke although Gerasa and Gergesa tend to be the favored choices. In Matthew the manuscript evidence favors Gadara and Gergesa over Gerasa albeit Gadara is typically most favored. Following the UBS editorial committee McNicol et al. suggest that

28 So Goulder who argues that Luke’s otherwise well attested knowledge of geography suggests this place since it was purportedly located on the lake (as per Origen) (Luke, 422). Bovon opts for this reading (cited in Bock, Luke, 782) based on local tradition and etymology. Baarda (“Gadarenes,” 181) tentatively supports it but notes that Origen played a key role in its popularity and the gradual suppression of the Geresa readings (in Mark and Luke) concluding that “even if Origen was not the first to introduce the name Geresenes, he does turn out to be the great promoter” (ibid., 185-188, quote from 188). Whether the Geresa reading actually pre-dates Origen is disputed (see e.g., Bock, Luke, 782) though Fitzmyer (despite preferring Gerasenes in Luke) suggests it does (Luke, 736–7).
29 Various explanations for the textual changes have been offered including the following: (a) confusing transliteration into Greek of the name of a non-Hellenistic lakeside city (no clear evidence remains for this) (Cranfield, The Gospel According to St. Mark [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1959], 176); (b) the name was added at a stage and place that lacked awareness of the geographical difficulties (Kertelge, Die Wunder, 107); (c) the story has grown in a manner that makes the location no longer suitable (Pesch, “Gerasene Demoniac,” 353); (d) an Early corruption now lost to us (Bock, Luke, 783 cites as possible but unlikely in that it involves misreading three letters in Greek); (e) Bock suggests several other possible explanations such as local customs (not known to us) for referring to regions, another Geresa that we are ignorant about, and that the man was from one locale but the event took place in another (Luke, 783). According to Nolland no solution has been offered that “is obviously to be preferred” (Luke 1–9.20, 407).
30 Key Matthean witnesses are as follows: (1) Gadara: B C Θ 1010 253 syr geo Diatesseron Epiphanius; (2) Gerasa: Ψ W j f 13 157 180 205 656 579 700 892 1006 1071 1243 1292 1342 1424 1505 Byz cop arm eth geo slav Diatessaron Origen Eusebius Apollinaris Hesychius; (3) Gerasa: vg syr Hilary Ambrose Chromatus. The UBS favors Gadara (‘C’ rating) and Baarda notes (since Westcott and Hort) a general preference for Gadara despite the “majority of ... Caesarean and Byzantine texts” in support of Geresa (“Gadarenes,” 181, 194). Those favoring Gadara include the following: Bock, Luke, 768, 82–83; Nolland, Luke 1–9.20, 406–7; France, Matthew, 340; idem, Mark, 226; Harrington, Matthew, 120; Luz, Matthew, 23; Collins, Mark, 263. Davies and Allison also seem to favor Gadara but offer possible support for Geresa as the original location (Matthew, 79). Alternatively Geresa is favored in Nolland, Matthew, 374. He argues on basis of agreement with Mark and Luke and the likelihood that Gadara was a “conjectural correction” owing to the geographical difficulty afforded by Geresa. The Gadara reading was preferred by subsequent copyists and thus became normative for Matthew. While Geresa has strong external
“Luke has modified Matthew’s little-known (but probably accurate) place name ‘Gadara’ to ‘Gerasa’ (= Heb. Jerash), even though this involved him in a geographical incongruity.” This clearly counts against the plausibility of the 2GH given the greater distance of Gerasa from the lake. Alternatively Michael Goulder takes Gergesa as the Lukan original whereby Luke now ‘improves’ upon Matthew (assuming Gadara in Matthew) by deliberately choosing a lakeside location. While other options are possible, the (external) manuscript evidence is relatively even and precludes firm judgments. While the conclusion can only be tentative, therefore, the internal evidence nevertheless favors the more difficult reading (Gadara in Matthew and Gerasa in Luke) thus leaving us with the geographical incongruity acknowledged by McNicol et al.

In verse 27 the 2GH Luke (29 words) expands Matt 8:28b (19 words) beginning with the redundant addition of ἔξελθοντι δὲ ὄπωτῳ ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν, which is implied but unstated in Matthew. The possessed man approaches Jesus from “out of the city” rather than “out of the tombs” which is clearly problematic if the city is either Gadara or Gerasa. The 2GH Luke adds statements about his nakedness (cf. Luke 8:35 where he is fully clothed) and his dwelling among the tombs (perhaps transferred from earlier in Matthew) as opposed to a house. This replaces Matthew’s statement about the demoniacs being fierce and blocking ‘the way’ (narrative cause) whereby Luke enhances the element of person (description of demoniac) but relinquishes

support the primary reason for preferring Gadara is the combination of manuscript evidence (stronger than Gerasa) and internal reading (more likely corrected to Gergesa than the other way around).

31 Q Impasse, 129. They note that Gerasa was a “large and famous trading center.” It might be alternately argued that in the case of either Gadara or Gerasa what is meant is simply the region of the Decapolis as a whole (so Keener, The Gospel of Matthew: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009], 282) but this begs the question of why specific cities are named rather than just noting the region (as in Mark 5:20).

32 If Luke deliberately changed Matthew then we could reasonably expect either some narrative changes to account for the geographical difficulty created or omission of the incident that causes the problem (the drowning). Alternatively Luke may have been ignorant of the geography but that seems contra to his greater specificity about “opposite Galilee” and also begs the question of why he would then make the change at all.

33 Luke, 422. See also n. 28 above.

34 E.g. Matthew has Gergesa or Gerasa as original and Luke has Gadara. The various possible combinations are quite numerous. The weakest manuscript evidence is for Matthew having Gerasa (as above) and thus makes this an unlikely option.

35 In each case this represents the location furthest from the lake for reasons already given. I have ruled out Gerasa in the case of Matthew on the basis of external evidence (see previous note). This leaves aside prior source critical considerations (such as with Noland’s arguments above for the original Gerasa in Matthew).

36 Unless we take “out of the city” to mean from the direction of the city. But even this seems problematic if Gerasa is the city in question.
conciseness and narrative cause. Finally, Luke changes Matthew’s ‘two demoniacs’ into a ‘a certain person who had a demon.’ The reasons for this are not obvious but are potentially problematic no matter which hypothesis is under consideration.\(^{37}\)

Luke 8:28 parallels Matt 8:29 sharing ten words (four different forms and one order change) which amount to 38% of Luke (total 26 words) and 58% of Matthew (total 17 words). While some changes appear stylistic\(^{38}\) and others necessary,\(^{39}\) the addition of “seeing Jesus ... he fell down before him ... with a loud voice” adds vividness. This is likewise the case for the change of Matthew’s question (“have you come to torment us before the time?”) into a more direct plea (“I beg of you, do not torment me”). Given the disciples prior failure to recognize Jesus (Luke 8:25), McNicol et al. see deliberate irony in the addition of “Jesus ... the most high” to Matthew’s “son of God,”\(^{40}\) although the irony is not absent from Matt 8:29. In essence Luke perhaps enhances vividness and the element of person\(^{41}\) but once again is less concise and his changes reflect Mark. In verse 32 the 2GH Luke shares eight words in the same order (36% of Luke’s 22 words; 28% of Matthew’s 29 words)\(^{42}\) with only one different form.\(^{43}\) He changes the location of the pigs from “at a distance” (μακράν) to “on the mountain,” perhaps giving the impression of greater proximity as well as preparing for their rush down the “steep bank” (κρημνοῦ), which he will soon take over from Matthew. He omits the demons as the explicit subject of the παρακάλεσθαι and replaces Matthew’s direct speech (εἰ ἐκβάλλεις ... χορήγων) with a more

\(^{37}\) According to McNicol et al. Luke makes the change for “simple narrative reasons” but the precise nature of those reasons is not spelled out (\textit{Q Impasse}, 129). The problem, however, is equally perplexing from the standpoint of Markan priority (see below). Luke’s expression (ἀνὴρ τις ... ἔχων δαιμόνια) is less concise than Matthew (δύο δαιμονίζομενοι) while it is different but not less concise than Mark (ἀνθρώπος ἐν πνεύματι ἀκαθάρτῳ).

\(^{38}\) He replaces λέγουσας with εἶπεν and ἐκραξάν with ἀνακράζας. The latter change perhaps enhances narrative drama if the compound verb (addition of ἀνα-) is taken as having an intensifying effect (Liddell and Scott, \textit{Lexicon}, 98). The compound form (ἀνακράζω) only appears in Mark (2x in 1:23 and 6:49) and Luke (3x in 4:33; 8:28; 23:18) among the synoptics with the simple form (κράζω) being more frequent though not in Luke (12x Matt; 11x Mark; 3x Luke).

\(^{39}\) The pronouns used of the demons are necessarily made singular by Luke (ἡμῖν and ἡμᾶς changed to ἐμοί and με).

\(^{40}\) \textit{Q Impasse}, 129. They note that τοῦ θεοῦ is missing from manuscript D but the variant is not considered worthy of mention in the UBS.

\(^{41}\) Jesus’ status is elevated by the demoniac’s prostration, the added titles and the more direct plea (‘I beg of you ... ’).

\(^{42}\) Counting Matt 8:30-32a (ending at ὑπῆργε) as the parallel.

\(^{43}\) Namely the aorist for the imperfect of παρακάλεσθαι.
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succinct indirect speech (ἴνα ... εἰςελθεῖν). While indirect speech perhaps lessens vividness, Luke is noticeably more concise at this particular point though once again most of the differences are explicable in relation to Mark.  

The highest verbatim agreement occurs in Luke 8:33 with 14 shared words (60% of Luke’s 23 words; 58% of Matthew’s 24 words), only once varying in order and form. While various minor changes enhance conciseness (e.g., omission of ἰδοῦ and πᾶσα as well as replacing ἀπεθάνου ἐν τοῖς ὑδασίν with ἀπεπνίγη), others detract from it (addition of τὰ δαιμόνια ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου). The change of ἀπῆλθον to εἰσῆλθον is stylistic, while θάλασσαν to λίμνην may involve the use of more technically correct terminology. Verse 34 is similar with 9 shared words (56% of Luke’s 16 words; 60% of Matthew’s 15 words in v. 33), one order change and no different forms. Luke omits the content of herders’ report (πάντα καὶ τὰ τῶν δαιμονιζομένων) and the seemingly redundant ἀπελκόντες but adds “seeing ... what had happened” (ἰδόντες ... τὸ γεγονός) and καὶ εἰς τοὺς ἄγροὺς (‘and in the fields’). Taken together these two verses (Luke 8:33-34) have an identical word count to Matthew and display a high level of verbal agreement (including word order and form) albeit with alternating tendencies of compression and expansion. The changes are not obvious rhetorical enhancements (in relation to narrative elements, virtues, or miracle motifs) and are explicable (in part at least) on the basis of Markan priority in relation to: the high verbal agreement; the addition of an explicit subject

44 Though Mark has “from a distance” earlier in the narrative and has direct speech for the demons (albeit differing from Matthew’s wording).
45 Taking Matt 8:32 as the parallel (beginning at οί δὲ ... ). In relation to order Luke places the conjunction δὲ after rather than before the verb (as in Matthew) but this simply results from his omission of the article (οἱ). The variant form is Luke’s ἐξελθόντα (versus Matthew’s ἐξελθόντες) made necessary by Matthew’s plurality of demoniacs.
46 According to BDAG (pp. 442 and 596) λίμνη best suits an inland (freshwater) pool or lake while θάλασσα better suits the sea (especially Mediterranean) and is typically not used of a lake until the Gospels (so Elizabeth Struthers Malbon, “The Jesus of Mark and the Sea of Galilee,” JBL 103/3 [1984]: 363–4). Fitzmyer considers Luke’s term better suited to Gennesaret (Luke, 739) and Struthers Malbon says it is “more precise” (“Sea of Galilee,” 363–4; similarly so France, Mark, 95).
48 Perhaps a replacement for the omitted herders’ report.
49 Typically this occurs in speech material of Jesus (thus Roschē, “The Words of Jesus”) which is not the case here. It is quite understandable that this would occur between two of the evangelists but less plausible where three are involved. This presents the greatest challenge for the 2DH insofar as Matthew and Luke have independently chosen to retain high verbal agreement at this point whereas for the other two hypotheses the high verbal agreement of the third evangelist (Mark for the 2GH and Luke for the FH) occurs on account of following both predecessors.
(τὰ δαιμόνια) for ἔξελθόντα in verse 33 (though the Markan parallel is τὰ πνεῦματα τὰ ἀκάθαρτα); the addition of καὶ εἰς τοὺς ἀγροὺς in verse 34; and possibly even the change to ἀπεπνίγη in verse 33 (ἐπνίγοντο in Mark 5:13). Exceptions include the use of δὲ rather than καὶ at the beginning of each verse, which are both MAs but readily explicable as independent redaction (see below).

In summary, from the perspective of Theon’s narrative element of person, the 2GH Lukan additions enhance the demoniac’s characterization before (vv. 8:27b, 29-31) and after (vv. 8:35, 38-39) the healing. Jesus character is also enhanced through additional conversations with the demon(s) (8:30-31), the townspeople (8:35-37), and the healed man (8:37-39). While retaining all Matthew’s actions, the 2GH Lukan conclusion (8:37-39) adds the conversation with and subsequent actions of the healed man. In addition to person this also relates to validation of Jesus and his message. Luke’s omission of Matthew’s reason for the initial confrontation (the demoniacs were blocking Jesus’ path in Matt 8:28) not only obscures cause but also manner (the demoniacs actions are more willing in Matthew than Luke, where they are passive). Alternatively Luke’s additions clarify the reasons for the following: the demon’s request to be sent into the pigs, namely to avoid being sent into the abyss (Luke 8:31); and the people’s request that Jesus leave their region, namely that ‘they were afraid’ (Luke 8:35) albeit the cause of the fear is not made explicit. The manner of these actions is the same in each case: Jesus acts willingly and the demons out of necessity. Generally, therefore, the 2GH Luke clarifies the causes of actions except in the case of the initial confrontation. There are no essential differences in the narrative element of time other than Luke’s additions having the effect of slowing down

50 Jesus crosses lake and confronts (or is confronted by) a demoniac (or demoniacs) in the region of Gadara/Gerasa; he expels the demons into a herd of pigs (which subsequently drown); and he is reported to the locals who then ask him to leave their territory (which he does).
51 The other additions (description of demoniac and longer conversation in vv. 29-31; reaction of the townspeople in vv. 35-37) are not entirely new actions but expansions of something already present in Matthew.
52 In Luke 8:27 Jesus is simply said to meet the demoniac “out of the city” presumably meaning that either he was a ‘resident of’ or (at the time) ‘was coming out of’ the city. The explicit notation that he lived among the tombs does not necessarily discount the former in that it could refer to his original home.
53 This is perhaps also reflected in the change from the question in Matt 8:29 (‘have you come to torment us?’) to the begging request in Luke 8:28 (‘I beg you, do not torment me’).
the pace.\footnote{Both have the story occurring after the storm stilling and appear to place it upon the same day. Outside of this there are no explicit time indicators in either Matthew or Luke.} In regard to the narrative element of place Luke creates an incongruity with his change from Gadara to Gerasa although the textual uncertainty requires that this is only a tentative conclusion. Luke’s change of “at a distance” to “on the hillside” (8:32) prepares for the pigs’ rush down the steep bank (see Luke 8:33; Matt 8:32) and, finally, his change from \(\theta\acute{\alpha}λασσ\alpha\) (sea) to \(\lambda\acute{\i}\mu\nu\eta\) (lake) involves using more technically accurate terminology. In relation to narrative virtues the 2GH Luke is less \emph{concise} and while some expansions are explicable in relation to the narrative element of person (as above), others are redundant. Luke potentially reduces \emph{clarity} with his omission of the initial cause of the confrontation but adds it in relation to clarifying other causes (as above). His addition of the demoniac’s name possibly adds clarity and while his added conversation in 8:38-39 enhances the element of person, he presents the conversation as occurring \emph{after} Jesus has returned home (\(\upsilon\pi\acute{\i}\sigma\tau\rho\varepsilon\psi\upsilon\) in v. 37), obviously detracting from clarity and credibility. While the implied procedure is not implausible, many of the differences in Luke’s account (compared to Matthew) are explicable on the assumption of Markan priority thereby affording no clear advantage for the 2GH over Markan priority hypotheses. This will be an important consideration in relation to relative plausibility (see conclusions below).

\textbf{(b) Mark’s use of Matthew and Luke}

As we turn attention to the purported Markan conflation of Matthew and Luke it is immediately obvious that the 2GH Mark prefers the longer Lukan account and even expands upon it (325 words in place of 293 in Luke and 146 in Matthew). At the same time various Matthean details are preferred thereby implying a procedure of micro-conflation.\footnote{According to Peabody \emph{et al.} Mark is heavily dependent upon the Lukan wording (taking Luke as his primary source for this story) but nevertheless incorporates Matthean terminology \textit{(One Gospel}, 140).} Mark 5:1 (12 words) parallels Matt 8:28a (11 words up to \(\Gamma\alpha\delta\alpha\rho\eta\nu\omega\nu\)), from which he takes over 9 words (75\% of Mark; 81\% of Matthew), and Luke 8:26 (12 words), from which he takes over 6 words (50\% of Mark and Luke) (for these and following stats see table 6.3). These all occur in the same
order and form (with the exception of ἑλθοῦν = ἑλθόντος in Matt 8:28).\(^{56}\) His use of ἐρχομαι (versus κατέπλευσαν) and εἰς τὸ πέραν (versus ‘which is opposite Galilee’) indicates a preference for Matthean wording\(^{57}\) though he adds the redundant τῆς θαλάσσης and prefers the Lukan plural for the initial verb (ἥλθον and κατέπλευσαν versus the singular ἑλθόντος in Matthew) albeit creating something of a disjunction with the singular αὕτω in verse 2 (also in Luke).\(^{58}\) He also agrees with the more problematic Lukan Γερασηνῶν (versus Matthean Γαδαρηνῶν) albeit (as above) the textual difficulties require a tentative judgment.\(^{59}\) Thus while all three accounts are approximately equal in length (either 11 or 12 words), Mark is closest to Matthew but with an added redundancy (τῆς θαλάσσης) and an awkward change from singular

\(^{56}\) There is a textual variant here with some manuscripts having the singular ἥλθεν (‘he came’) though the plural is likely more original based on strong textual support and Markan style (so Collins, Mark, 263 and Taylor, Mark, 278 both disagreeing with Heinrich Greeven who took the singular as more original and the plural as resulting from the influence of Luke 8:26). Guelich adds that the singular was likely later and resulting from the influence of Matt 8:28 or the singular genitive absolute in Mark 5:2a (Mark, 275).

\(^{57}\) According to Gundry (citing Neirynck) Mark’s two successive εἰς phrases typify Markan duality (cf. 1:39; 11:1, 11) with the second member usually giving greater specificity to the first (Mark, 248). In this instance the 2GH Mark is simply following Matthew.

\(^{58}\) According to Pesch the change from plural to singular is jarring and as such he attributes it to the pre-Markan editor who linked the story to the previous episode on the lake where the disciples were present (“Gerasene Demonic,,” 355–6). He therefore assumes the singular ἥλθεν as more original but it seems more likely that this is a later harmonization with Matthew (see two previous notes). At the same time the jarring nature of the change should not be overstated. The change to singular in v. 2 may involve a deliberate shift of focus on Jesus whereby the disciples are not excluded but simply shifted into the background.

\(^{59}\) Markan manuscript evidence may be summarized as follows: (1) Γερασηνῶν: Ρ* B D 2427\(^{\text{iv}}\) it vg cop Juvencus; (2) Γαδαρηνῶν: Α C f\(^{13}\) 157 180 1006 1010 1243 1342 1505 Byz syr Diatesseron and various lectionaries; (3) Γεργαρηνῶν: W Λ Δ Θ j\(^{2}\) 28 33 250 565 579 700 892 1241 1424 syr cop arm geo slav Diatesseron Origen Hesychius; (4) Γερασηστρηνῶν: W syr. While the last option is poorly attested and likely a later corruption (so Boring, Mark, 148–9), Gundry (Mark, 255–7) favors Gergesa since it is easier to believe that Mark (or “a pre-Marcan traditioner”) knew the topography and correctly mentioned Gergesa (closer to the lake) than that later scribes (“scattered about the ... empire”) would have known the topography and corrected Mark’s Gerasenes. He says this is further supported by the obscurity of Gergesa. The majority of scholars, however, favor Gerasa as more original typically citing strong external support and lectio difficilior (e.g., Bock, Luke, 768, 83; France, Matthew, 340; Harrington, Matthew, 120; Luz, Matthew, 23; Collins, Mark, 264; France, Mark, 226; Guelich, Mark, 275; Ædna, “Encounter,” 294–95; Pesch, “Gerasene Demonic,” 352–3; John P. Meier, A Marginal Jew: Rethinking the Historical Jesus; Volume 2: Mentor, Message and Miracles, ABRL [New York: Doubleday, 1994], 651; Lane, Mark, 181 n.6; Marcus, Mark, 341–2; Taylor, Mark, 278; Boring, Mark, 148–9). It is also commonly suggested that Gerasa was the location of the original exorcism story to which the sea motif and pig drowning was only later added (e.g., Guelich, Mark, 276–7; Ædna, “Encounter,” 294–98; Pesch, “Gerasene Demonic,” esp. 353, 367-71) though Collins suggests the opposite, namely that Gerasa was a late addition (clarifying an earlier less specific notation about a city in the Decapolis as per Mark 5:20) by someone unaware of its distance from the sea (Mark, 266). From the standpoint of the 2GH it makes more sense that Mark would have taken over the Matthean Gadara (given that he is following Matthew’s wording here) or changed it to a more logical location (Gergesa) but (source critical assumptions aside) Gerasa is the favored reading thus creating a credibility problem for Markan posteriority.
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(‘he came’) to plural (‘they came’) in light of the singular (‘met him’) in the next verse. The greater similarity to Matthew is also odd insofar as he is his purportedly following Luke as a primary source at this point.  

In verse 2 the 2GH Mark (16 words) parallels both Matt 8:28b (8 words from ὑπήνυτησαν up to ἔχερξέομενοι), from which he takes over 5 words (31% of Mark; 62% of Matthew) in the same order and with one different form, and Luke 8:27a (14 words), from which he takes over 4 words (25% of Mark; 28% of Luke) likewise in the same order and with two different forms. While only his use of ὑπαντάω agrees with both sources he otherwise takes “out of the tombs” from Matthew and the ‘boat disembarking’ phrase from Luke albeit employing different wording (ἐκ τοῦ πλοίου in Mark but ἔπι τῆς γῆς in Luke). In addition to alternating between his sources Mark also creates his own wording over against both sources such as with ἄνθρωπος ἐν πνεύματι ἀκαθάρτω, versus Matthew’s two δαιμονιζόμενοι and Luke’s ἄνηρ τις … ἔχων δαίμονια. While agreeing with Luke’s single demoniac, he prefers the less concise πνεύματι ἀκαθάρτω to Luke’s δαίμονια. His addition of εὐθύς perhaps portrays vividness but in general his changes are not obvious rhetorical enhancements and are less concise (twice as long as Matthew and fourteen percent longer than Luke).

Using fifty seven words to describe the state of the demoniac in verses 3-5 the 2GH Mark entirely replaces Matthew’s parallel (11 words in 8:28c χαλέποι … ἐκείνης) without verbal

---

60 According to Peabody et al. (One Gospel, 136, 140) whose sectional headings indicate Luke as the primary source for this pericope and the previous one (storm stilling). So also Meijboom, History and Critique, 152-53.
61 ὑπήνυτησαν is singular in Mark on account of his singular demoniac.
62 ἔξελθόντος συντού is genitive in place of Luke’s dative.
63 Peabody et al. note Mark’s careful attention to detail (over against Matthew) in having Jesus disembark from boats (cf. Mark 4:36; 6:45, 54) (One Gospel, 141) but this could just as easily (and perhaps better) be understood as Markan redundancy that unnecessarily contravenes the virtue of conciseness.
64 Gundry notes that ‘unclean spirit’ occurs 11x in Mark and here links up with the ritual uncleanness of the tombs as it will later with the pigs (vv. 11-13). He further suggests that Markan word order places emphasis on the dwelling among the tombs (Mark, 248).
65 This is claimed by Peabody et al. as an example of Markan terminology over against the common testimony of Matthew and Luke (One Gospel, 141) though it should be noted that Luke uses the noun form and Matthew the verb. While this makes sense from the standpoint of the 2GH, it is equally explicable as a stylistic preference of Matthew and Luke upon assumption of Markan priority.
66 According to Pesch it “creates tension” (“Gerasene Demoniac,” 356). Notably εὐθύς is omitted in some manuscripts (B W it syr arm) (so Lane, Mark, 179, n.1; Cranfield, Mark, 176).
overlap. He significantly elaborates (54% longer) upon Luke (37 words in Luke 8:27b from καὶ and 29b from πολλοῖς) while taking over a mere six words (10% of Mark; 16% of Luke; namely ἐν τοῖς μυήσασιν ... πέδας καὶ ἀλύσεως, though reversing the order of the second half). Thus while sharing the Lukan chain motif, his thirty-one word description is less concise (15 words in Luke). It may be that the 2GH Mark intentionally highlights Jesus’ powerful authority (relating to the narrative element of person) or some other miracle motif (e.g., the inbreaking kingdom) by elaborating upon the description of the demoniac (adding ‘day and night in the tombs/mountains’ and ‘howling and bruising/cutting himself’). At the same time he omits the man’s nakedness and his being driven into the desert, the first of which is surprising given his later agreement with Luke in describing the healed demoniac as clothed (Mark 5:15; 5:20).

67 For example the phrase πέδας καὶ ἀλύσεως is repeated in Mark in reverse order (τὰς ἀλύσεις καὶ τὰς πέδας), a redundancy that is accentuated for the 2GH. Merklein suggests that the sequence of (met him) ἐκ τῶν μυήσων (v. 2) and (dwelling) ἐν τοῖς μυήσασιν (v. 3) is clumsy (“Die Heilung,” 1022).

68 Gundry (assuming Markan priority) sees an emphasis on the demoniac’s power (making Jesus’ exorcism all the more impressive) through the series of negatives (οὐδὲ ... οὐκέτι ... οὐδεὶς), the forward position of πολλάκις (many times), and the chiastic arrangement of τὰς ἀλύσεις and τὰς πέδας with their respective infinitives (v. 4) (Mark, 248–9; similarly so in Cotter, Miracles, 121–2; Marcus, Mark, 350; and Pesch, “Gerasene Demoniac,” 360). Others see Mark emphasizing ‘Jewish impurity,’ which is perhaps contradicted by the prior presence of unclean spirits in the Capernaum synagogue (Mark 1:23, 26, 27) (Collins, Mark, 267) but is supported by two other factors: the demoniac lives among the tombs and among/nearby pigs (so Boring, Mark, 150; see also Kee, Medicine, 78–79; and Pesch, “Gerasene Demoniac,” 356). The multiple mention of tombs (vv. 2, 3, 5) perhaps implies the demon is a spirit of the dead (so Cotter, Miracles, 121–2 and Collins, Mark, 267) and it has also been suggested that the man has typical characteristics of insanity as defined by contemporary Jews (running about at night; spending the night in the cemetery; destroying what one has been given; and tearing one’s garments) (Guelich, Mark, 278; Pesch, “Gerasene Demoniac,” 356; and Lane, Mark, 182). Direct literary influence of LXX Isa 65 and Ps 67:7 are often posited in relation to Mark 5:3–5 (e.g., Guelich, Mark, 277; Pesch, “Gerasene Demoniac,” 361; J. Duncan M. Derrett, “Legend and Event: The Gerasene Demoniac: An Inquest Into History and Liturgical Projection,” in StudBib, JSNTSS 2, ed. E. A. Livingstone (1978), 64; Crghan, “Gerasene,” 529–30; Merklein, “Die Heilung,” 1026; Latourelle, Miracles, 116; Marcus, Mark, 348). This is typically based on the following verbal and thematic links: the gentile motif (they sacrifice on the hills in Isa 65: 7; 11); the use of μυήσας (versus μυήσων in v. 2) picks up on Isa 65:4; dwelling and spending the night among tombs (Isa 65:4); eating swine flesh (Isa 65:4); and liberation of the fettered (πεσάθιμένους), the furiously angry (παραπαθείαν), and dwellers among the tombs (τῶν κατοικίων τοῖς ἐν τάφοι) (LXX Ps 67:7). See Gundry (Mark, 258–9), however, for reasons to question the notion of derivation from the LXX. It is also noted that the passage contains as many as five Markan hapax legomena (κατοικίων, ἀλύσις, πέδη, διασπασθεῖσα, διαμίσθε) (Guelich, Mark, 277). While these factors are frequently associated with a later stage development of the story (e.g., Crghan, “Gerasene,” 528–30), it is equally plausible that they are simply stylistic variations (so Collins, Mark, 267) even if based on the LXX. Either way the thematic connections to Isa 65 highlights the Gentile theme and likelihood that the possessed man is Jewish (Guelich, Mark, 278 and 288; similarly so Merklein, “Die Heilung,” 1026, 28, 31, who also notes the possibility of this theme in relation to the name ‘legion’ - on which see above). Speaking generally about these verses Dibelius sees them as an example of the narrative art of Tales (Tradition, 76–77), while Taylor (assuming a tendency toward abbreviation in oral transmission) sees their roughness as evidence of eye witness testimony (Formation, 122–5). In all this the destitute state of the man is demonstrated home (Marcus, Mark, 350).
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Luke 8:35). In gathering the information from two separate places in Luke (8:27b and 29b) he perhaps adds clarity although, from a Markan priority perspective, Luke might have deliberately postponed 8:29b so as to provide a reason for Jesus’ confrontation with the demoniac (noting γάρ), which is less obvious in Mark who simply has the demon come running “from afar” (ἀπὸ μακρόθεν) and prostrate himself for no stated reason (see below). Despite omitting the man’s nakedness, the result is less concise albeit adding dramatic details (howling and bruising/cutting activity) and perhaps heightening Jesus’ power (narrative element of person) in the process.

In verses 6-769 (prostration and initial request of demoniac) Mark’s 32 words expand upon both Matt 8:29 (17 words) and Luke 8:28 (26 words). He shares 12 with the former (37% of Mark; 70% of Matthew), including one order change and five different forms, and 21 with the latter (66% of Mark; 80% of Luke), including one different form but no order changes. He is generally closer to Luke (noting Matthew has no equivalent to Mark 5:6) and agrees with Luke in having the demon beg for mercy (‘do not torment me’) in place of Matthew’s question (‘have you come to torment us?’). Only κρατάζεται is shared with Matthew (ἐκρατάζειν) against Luke (other Matthean parallels are explicable with reference to Luke) though even here Luke’s compound form (ἀνακρατάζεται) is not dissimilar (Mark may have changed it independently). The 2GH Markan addition of the demoniac ‘running from afar’ is potentially problematic from the standpoint of narrative cause and consistency. In all three accounts the demons readily acknowledge themselves to be in a losing battle when they immediately address Jesus as ‘Son of God’ and ask whether he has come to torment (βασανίζω) them (Mark 5:7 and par.). It might, therefore, be expected that the demons would seek to avoid Jesus rather than running ‘from afar’ to confront/meet him. With this in mind the 2GH Markan addition of ἀπὸ μακρόθεν ἔδραμεν in verse 6 (giving the impression that the demons went out of their way to confront Jesus) appears less plausible than its omission (assuming Markan priority) by both Matthew (who has them

---

69There is a textual variant in v. 6: (1) σύν τῷ (N D W et al.) versus (2) σύν τῷ (A B C L et al.). Collins notes that NA 26 adopts the first while Greven and Westcott/Hort adopt the second. She thinks the first more likely as the dative was a preference for προσκυνεῖν in Koine Greek (versus the accusative in Attic Greek) and its later imitators (citing BADG) (Mark, 264).
blocking the path Jesus plans to take) and Luke (who gives a similar impression to Matthew albeit implicitly) and appears to obscure or omit the narrative cause of the confrontation. This 2GH Markan addition also creates an inconsistency (contra narrative clarity and credibility) by having Jesus meet the demoniac twice (Mark 5:2 and 6), a difficulty that is (more plausibly) understood from the standpoint of Markan priority as being removed by both Matthew and Luke. The 2GH Mark also changes Luke’s προσέπεσεν (Luke 8:28) to προσεκύνησεν, giving the sense that the demon does obeisance, but then in an opposite vein changes Luke’s δέομαι (8:28) to an ὀρκίζω formula, which heightens the sense of resistance and opposition. In

---

70 Mark 5:8 (par. Luke 8:29a) implies that Jesus addresses the demon first. While this works somewhat for the Lukan narrative (as noted above) Mark’s “ran from afar and prostrated himself and cried out ...” gives the distinct impression that the demon spoke first. According to Peabody et al. this is one of seven instances where people run to Jesus in Mark. Since only one of these is paralleled in either Matthew or Luke (Mark 15:36; Matt 27:48) this is better explained by 2GH Markan addition than consistent and deliberate omission by Matthew and Luke (One Gospel, 142). They do not, however, list the other instances in Mark and the one cited example (Mark 15:36) is hardly parallel to the demoniacs of Mark 5 (there are only two occurrences of τρέχω in Mark, namely at 5:6 and 15:36).

71 This is typically taken as one of the signs of separate pre-Markan layers (e.g., Pesch, “Gerasene Demoniac,” 351, 56-57, 71) though others think the tension is overstated whereby the initial meeting (v. 2) is later unpacked (v. 6) in typical Semitic style (Nolland, Luke 1:9-20, 404; similarly so in Lane, Mark, 182, Cranfield, Mark, 177, and Gundry, Mark, 258). Collins argues that such repetition is typical of writers who digress “in order to return to the original train of thought” (Mark, 267) and Gundry sees it as Markan duality where the second mention adds specificity to the first and the running shows the power of Jesus’ presence even from a distance (albeit the demon runs to confront and rid of Jesus and not to escape) (Mark, 249). France sees the discrepancy arising from oral retelling (Mark, 228). While these various explanations are possible (though it is not clear, pace Gundry, that the demons confront Jesus), the narrative tension nevertheless remains and, upon assumption of the 2GH, has been explicitly introduced into the narrative.

72 Gundry says the spirit does obeisance in recognition of Jesus’ divine majesty though notes that his use of “‘Most High’ reflects the polytheism of the demoniac and of the pagan territory in which the story takes place” (Mark, 250). Collins also sees reverential submission but notes the change to resistance and an attempt to gain control over Jesus in v. 7 (Mark, 268). She sees the title as unattested in Jewish literature but likely understood by Mark’s readers as equivalent to “son of Zeus” (based on inscriptions from 22-23 C.E. relating to temple cult of Zeus in Gerasa) (ibid.). Guelich is reluctant to see reverential submission and suggests the ‘bowing’ simply contrasts the description of the man as uncontrollable (vv. 3-5) thereby highlighting Jesus’ power (Mark, 278). France, similarly, suggests a parallel to the only other use of use of προσκυνέω in Mark (15:19 where soldiers engage in mock worship of Jesus) whereby the usage here is more akin to his use of προσπειττω at Mark 3:11 (Mark, 228; similarly so Lane, Mark, 179 n. 2 and Cranfield, Mark, 177). These latter observations are reasonable from the standpoint of Markan priority although a sense of mockery (as with the soldiers) stands in contrast to the (reluctant?) submission of v. 7 and following. It is more problematic for the 2GH Mark who deliberately passes over the Lukan προσπειττω and is well aware of Matthew’s frequent use of προσκυνέω in a reverential sense.

73 The tension between προσεκύνησεν and the demon’s subsequent defensive reaction is noted, for example, by Pesch (“Gerasene Demoniac,” 357). In the NT ὀρκίζω occurs only here and at Acts 19:13 where it clearly carries the connotation of ‘command,’ which is the basic sense given to the word in BDAG, 723. It also appears as a textual variant of ἐξορκίζω at Matt 26:63 where it refers to the high priest putting Jesus under oath (the reverse happens at Acts 19:13 where ἐξορκίζω appears as a variant of ὀρκίζω). Likewise it appears as a variant of ἐνορκίζω in 1 Thess 5:27 where Paul ‘commands’ them to read his letter to the whole church. Collins understands ὀρκίζω (to make one swear, bind by an oath, ‘adjure’) as synonymous with ὀρκόω, which was typically used by an exorcist in
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essence the 2GH Mark is closest to Luke but is once again less concise. His addition of the demoniac ‘running from afar’ creates an inconsistency as does (to a lesser extent) his change from Luke’s προσέπεσεν to προσεκύνησεν.

While verses 8-10 lack a Matthean parallel, the 2GH Mark is slightly more concise than Luke (37 words in place of 40)\(^74\) and together they share 22 words (59% of Mark; 55% of Luke; 10 different forms and one order change). While most of Mark’s changes are explicable on the basis of style (e.g., the addition of πολλά\(^75\) and the replacement of ἐπιτάσσω with ἁποστέλλω in v. 10) or brevity (e.g., omission of ὅ Ἰησοῦς and ἔστιν in v. 9), his replacement of “into the abyss” with “out of the region” in verse 10 may reflect political overtones associated with Roman rule especially given his agreement with Luke in using the title ‘Legion’ (although the change in the opposite direction is not particularly problematic either - see below).\(^76\) More

---

\(^74\) Discounting the section πολλά(... ἔρήμους in Luke 8:29 since that was considered parallel to Mark 5:3-5.

\(^75\) According to Guelich this adverb heightens the subservient role of the demons as does the use of the imperfect tense (which is shared with Luke) (Mark, 281).

\(^76\) Collins notes a spelling variant for ‘legion’ in the Markan manuscripts: (1) ἔργισσω (N* B* C (D) L et al.); (2) ἔργισσαν (N² A B² W et al.). She says the two spellings are equally represented in antiquity (citing BADG) (Collins, Mark, 264). According to Peabody et al. ‘legion’ is one of twenty three Latin loanwords in Mark of which only nine are paralleled in Matthew and/or Luke. They also highlight possible instances of Latin phraseology in Mark, none of
problematic for the 2GH is Mark’s somewhat confusing use of singular and plural in verses 9-10 where he is less clear than Luke.\(^7^7\) While both agree in beginning with the singular ‘he said’ (λέγει in Mark 5:9; ἔιπεν in Luke 8:30) the name (‘legion’) is explained in both Gospels as resulting from the plurality of demons. At this point Luke switches to plural forms: “they begged him” (παρεκάλουν and παρεκάλεσαν in 8:30, 32) in order that he might send “them” (αὕτοῖς) into the pigs. Alternatively the Markan parallel mixes singular (παρεκάλει in 5:10)\(^7^8\) with plural forms (ἐσμεν, αὕτα and παρεκάλεσαν in 5:9, 10, 12).\(^7^9\) While both accounts contain an awkward transition from singular to plural at this junction, therefore, this is more plausibly understood as Lukan improvement (assuming Markan priority) than a change in the direction of less clarity by the 2GH Mark.\(^8^0\) In verses 11-12 Mark’s 23 words expand upon Luke 8:32a (19 words up to εἰσέλθειν), with whom he shares 13 words (56% of Mark; 79% of Luke; one different form; one order change), but slightly compresses Matt 8:30-31 (25 words), with whom

which is paralleled in the other Synoptics thus suggesting a Latin speaking provenance for Mark (One Gospel, 142–3). This is of little relevance to the question of Markan priority/posteriority, however, since Matthean and Lukan omission of Markan Latinisms is equally plausible. For additional comments on the significance of ‘legion’ and its possible political overtones see above. Pesch says the Markan demons seek not to be driven into the “wilderness” (as their true home) and the sea is an OT symbol of the abyss thus suggesting that they have been sent to their eschatological home (“Gerasene Demonic,” 365; similarly so Starobinski, “Literary Analysis,” 385). If so the change of the Lukan ‘abyss’ to ‘out of the region’ is puzzling but we cannot be sure that this is what Mark has in mind. Luke, according to Van der Loos refers to Hades (Miracles, 389).\(^7^7\) Pesch thinks the repeated (Markan) shift from singular to plural indicates Jesus’ intention to destroy Satan’s whole host and free the land from (Gentile) impurity (Markusevangelium, 289). It is not clear, however, why this requires a shift in number. Taylor suggests the shift reflects the “uncoordinated impulses and evil forces” experienced by the possessed man (Mark, 281), which is possible but certainly not demanded. Gundry says that revealing the demons’ plurality prior to v. 9 would have spoiled the dramatic build up of the story and he explains the number changes as resulting from having either the man (singular) or the demons (plural) speak (Mark, 258, 261). It is difficult, however, to see ‘my name is legion’ (v. 9) and παρακάλει (v. 10) as referring to the man given that their plurality has now been revealed (‘for we are many’ in v. 9b) and that v. 12 has the same verb for begging in the plural (παρακάλεσαν). In essence the literary awkwardness remains with Luke displaying greater clarity.

\(^7^8\) France says it is unclear whether the subject of παρακαλεί is the man or the demons but even if the former he is speaking for the demons (Mark, 229–30).

\(^7^9\) There is a textual variant in v. 10 as follows: (1) αὐτά (B C D Θ) - neuter to agree with πνεῦμα in vv. 2 and 8 and with plural demons; (2) αὐτοὺς (D f\(^{33}\)) - may be a correction conforming the pronoun to the masculine plural πολλοί in v. 9; (3) αὐτοῦ (N L 2427 et al.) - likely resulted from a change based on opinion that only one spirit was involved. Collins argues for αὐτά as earliest (Mark, 264) and certainly it has strong external support and is also lectio difficilior. Even if taken as singular, however, the awkward mix of plural and singular remains with the switch to the plural παρεκάλεσαν in v. 12. This last verse contains another textual variant with παρακάλεσαν εἶπον (W f\(^{35}\) et al.) being a variant to παρεκάλεσαν αὐτοῦ λέγοντες (N B C et al.) but the difference is only stylistic and the latter is more likely original (so Collins, Mark, 265).

\(^8^0\) At the same time Luke is noted to have a plurality of demons (δαιμόνια) in 8:27 but reverts to a singular ‘unclean spirit’ in 8:29 whereas Mark consistently has only a single unclean spirit prior to the naming in v. 9.
he shares 12 words (52% of Mark; 48% of Matthew; 3 different forms; same order). The 2GH Mark alternates between details shared with Luke (e.g., ἐκεῖ and the location on the mountain in v. 11; the ἵνα clause at the end of v. 12) and Matthew (ἀὐτὸν λέγοντες and direct speech of the demons in v. 12). Compared to Luke the changes are primarily stylistic (e.g., πρὸς τῷ ὄρει in place of ἐν τῷ ὄρει, which also switches position), while compared to Matthew the differences are stylistic (e.g., μεγάλῃ rather than πολλῶν in v. 11 and πέμψον in place of ἀπόστειλον in v. 12) but also tend toward conciseness (e.g., omit ο[…] δοκούντος and replace ε[… τὴν ὁγέλῃ τῶν χοίρων with ε[…] τοὺς χοίρους in v. 12). None of this is particularly problematic for the 2GH with the exception of the once again implied micro-conflation procedure, especially given that in this instance there is no obvious rhetorical advantage over against following just one source.

Indeed, in one specific instance this leads to an obvious redundancy: in his statement ‘send us into the pigs, that we might go into them’, the first half (πέψων ἡμᾶς ε[…] τοὺς χοίρους) parallels Matthew and the second half (ἵνα ε[…] σύντοις ε[…] ἐσέλθωμεν) parallels Luke. While in each case there is significant stylistic variation and indeed greater brevity compared to his respective sources, the end result creates a redundancy in the second half (‘that we might go into them’) that could easily have been avoided by simply following one source.

In verse 13 Mark’s 30 words are a slight expansion upon Matt 8:32 (28 words), with which he shares 17 words (56% of Mark; 60% of Matthew; same order; one different form), and a

---

81 Seven of the shared words are common to all three.
82 Gundry suggests that in Mark the mountain location harks back to v. 5 and looks forward to v. 13. He also notes that πρὸς occurs commonly in Mark for indicating presence/proximity (2:2; 5:11; 6:3; 9:19; 11:4; 14:49, 54) (Mark, 253, 62).
83 The first half replaces 10 words in Matthew (from ε[…] ἐκβάλλεις to χοίρων in Matt 8:31) with just 5 words; the second half replaces 6 words in Luke (ἵνα to ε[…] ἐσέλθωμεν in Luke 8:32) with just 4 words.
84 Taylor says v. 12 is “almost intolerably redundant” while Matthew and Luke (assuming Markan priority) avoid the redundancy in different ways (Mark, 282; others noting the redundancy include Merklein, “Die Heilung,” 1022 and Cranfield, Mark, 179). According to Gundry this is an example of Markan duality and chiasm (Mark, 252). While the latter is not obvious here, the duality may be present but is more plausibly understood as Markan (or pre-Markan) than as the deliberate micro-conflation (noting the resultant redundancy without obvious rhetorical advantage). It would have been most concise for Mark simply to have followed Luke. Collins contrasts Jesus’ desire to send the demons away (ἀποτομῆσι) with the demons’ desire to be ‘sent into’ (ἐπέτρεψεν) a physical body noting that such terminology and actions were common in Greco Roman spells and incantations (Mark, 271). Given the potential relevance to all three Gospels, however, this last point has little relevance to our source-critical question.
85 Collins (Mark, 265) comments on the following textual variants in this verse: (1) some MSS (A f3 et al.) add ε[…] Ἰησοῦς after ἐπέτρεψεν σὺντοίς which emphasizes the role of Jesus in the miracle; (2) other MSS (D Θ
moderate expansion upon Luke 8:32b-33 (19 words from καὶ ἐπέτρεψεν), with which he shares 18 words (60% of Mark; 95% of Luke; same order and same forms). Insofar as 13 words are shared by all three (same order and only one different form, namely ἐξελθόντες/ἐξελθόντα) this represents a high percentage triple tradition verbal agreement. At the same time, as with the previous two verses, the 2GH Mark again alternates between first Luke (e.g., ἐπέτρεψεν σὺν τοῖς and εἰσῆλθον; omission of ἵδου and πᾶσα), then Matthew (choice of θάλασσαν versus λίμνη), Luke again (taking ἐπνιγόντο as synonymous to ἀπεπνιγμη over against the Matthean ἀπέθανον), and finally Matthew (ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ presumably inspired by the Matthean ἐν τοῖς ὑδάσει). His choice (against both sources) to number the pigs (‘about 2000’) possibly enhances narrative vividness but also potentially compromises credibility. Mark is also noted to take over the less accurate Matthean term (θάλασσα) for the lake (versus the Lukan λίμνη) (see n. 46 above). Otherwise the 2GH Markan changes are primarily stylistic albeit resulting in a less concise account. In verse 14, Mark’s 21 words slightly expand upon Matt 8:33-34a (15 words

565 *et al.* change ἐπέτρεψεν (he permitted) to ἐπεμψεν (he sent) showing Jesus as more in control. Neither variant is noted in Nestle-Aland 26th edition and are not considered as original here.

566 While Matthew’s verb is more common, Gundry suggests Mark’s imperfect (‘was drowning’) draws it out for prolonged attention (Mark, 252). Neither observation impacts our source critical question.

57 Peabody *et al.* see “an example of Mark adding specific numbers” (cf. Mark 14:30, 72) (*One Gospel*, 143) but do not explain why he does so or why it is more plausible than the reverse (omission by Matthew and Luke). The number of pigs (2000) is potentially problematic, however, for narrative credibility in that it is (1) bigger than the normal herd seize (about 100-300) yet (2) smaller than a typical Roman legion (about 6000 soldiers) (so Gundry, *Mark*, 252; though Marcus, *Mark*, 344–5, gives the latter number as 5000 and notes that legion size varied with an average of 3600 men). From a tradition-historical standpoint the pig motif is often seen as a late addition resulting in a geographical problem (Gerasa is a two day journey from the lake) (e.g., Ádna, “Encounter,” 297–8; Pesch, “Gerasene Demoniaca,” 368; Craghan, “Gerasene,” 526; Meier, *Marginal Jew*, 651, 65). Historical plausibility is also questioned on the basis that panicked pigs usually scatter (versus stampeding in groups) and that pigs can swim (e.g., Meier, *Marginal Jew*, 666 n.21; though, as rightly noted in Gundry, *Mark*, 262, swimming capability does not preclude drowning). Since all three Gospels agree on the panicked pigs and their drowning the question has little relevance to source critical evaluations. The omission of the number (by 2DH Matthew and Luke), however, is perhaps more plausible (than its addition by the 2GH Mark) owing to the credibility noted above.

58 Ethical issues pertaining to the livestock destruction are sometimes raised: e.g., Marshall, *Lake*, 336; Bock, *Lake*, 777 (pig destruction likened to OT animal sacrifice); Keener, *Gospel of Matthew*, 287 (people’s deliverance more important than pigs); and Latourelle, *Miracles*, 117 (it is inconsistent with Jesus’ ethics and, therefore, a later addition to the story). For the evangelists (who seem unconcerned with such questions), however, the drowning functions primarily as proof of exorcism (e.g., Bonner, “The Technique of Exorcism,” HTR 36, no. 1 [1943]: 39–40; Collins, *Mark*, 272; France, *Mark*, 230–1; idem. *Matthew*, 342; Pesch, “Gerasene Demoniaca,” 358; Kertelge, *Die Wunder*, 103). Parallels appear in Josephus (Ant. 8.48), Philostratus (*Life of Apollonius* 4.20), and a Babylonian text implying exorcism of demons into pigs (cited in Pesch, “Gerasene Demoniaca,” 366; Craghan, “Gerasene,” 531; Nineham, *Mark*, 151). Related to this is the suggestion that ὄρμησαν “denotes violent movement uncontrolled by human reason” (Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 739; Pesch, “Gerasene Demoniaca,” 367). Perhaps the Markan Jesus outwits the
Chapter 6 Rhetorical Transformation of Miracle Tradition Pericopes

up to δισμονήζωνων, with 9 words shared (42% of Mark; 60% of Matthew; same forms; one different order), but equal the length of Luke 8:34, with 15 words shared (71% of each; same order and forms). His preference for Luke is indicated by his omission of ἀπέλθοντες (Matt 8:33), his inclusion of “and in the countryside” (καὶ εἰς τοὺς ἄγροις; missing in Matthew), and his preference for ἱδεῖν ... τὸ γεγονός (Luke 8:35a). His change of ἔξηλθον to ἠλθον is stylistic but his omission of ἰδόντες ... τὸ γεγονός (Luke 8:34a) enhances conciseness by avoiding a Lukan repetition. At the same time he compromises conciseness by expanding the final Lukan phrase (adding τῷ ἔστιν). The net result is not especially problematic for any hypothesis and has the 2GH Mark essentially following just once source (Luke) rather than engaging in micro-conflation.

In verses 15–17 Mark’s 41 words significantly expand upon Matt 8:34b (14 words from εἰς), with which he shares 8 words (19% of Mark; 57% of Matthew; same order; 3 different forms), but condense Luke 8:35b–37a (51 words from καὶ ἠλθον to συνειχόντο), with which he shares 21 words (51% of Mark; 41% of Luke; same order; 3 different forms). The 2GH Mark clearly prefers the additional Lukan miracle proofs relating to the motifs of validation and kingdom

demons (they want to remain in the region and do not foresee their destruction) or simply sends them to their proper dwelling in the abyss (Sheol), in keeping with Jesus battling Satan (cf. Mark 1:9–11, 15; 3:23–30) (so Collins, Mark, 272), or to their appropriate watery abode (Davies and Allison, Matthew, 84). Possibly in view is the notion of pigs as gentile sacrificial animals (Pesch, “Gerasae Demoniacs,” 366; Derrett, “Legend,” 68) whose destruction would not concern Jews (Tannehill, Luke, 146; they are unclean in Lev 11:7 and Deut 14:8) and possibly even humor them (Harrington, Matthew, 120–21). Indeed Pesch thinks the pigs demise symbolizes “the destruction of a pagan disorder” (“Gerasae Demoniacs,” 361; similarly Adna, “Encounter,” 290–94) and others agree that a confrontation with Gentile uncleanness is central to Mark at least (Derrett, “Legend,” 64; Kertelge, Die Wunder, 109; Guelich, Mark, 282–3; Van der Loos, Miracles, 389), perhaps even clearing the way for Christian mission (Pesch, Markusevangelium, 289–90). For a summary of explanations about the pigs motif see Van der Loos, Miracles, 389–93. In the final analysis the drowning likely functions primarily as proof of exorcism and since this is likely the same for all three evangelists it does not significantly impact our source critical question.

89 Eight words are shared by all three.

90 The only possible agreement with Matthew (against Luke) is Mark’s use of καὶ in the last clause of v. 14 (δὲ in Luke). Collins notes ἄνηγγειλαν (W Δ f3 et al.) is a variant of the Markan ἄνηγγείλασαν (Mark, 265). This would create stylistic variation from Luke and Matthew (and would create an MA) but is likely not original.

91 Only καὶ ... ἀπὸ ... σὺτῶν are shared by all three but even here Luke differs in the object of the preposition (omitting ‘the region”).

92 Additional to the drowning of v. 13, which presumably formed the content of the report in v. 14, Mark and Luke describe the restored man in detail. According to Pesch “the visible proof of the cure does not presuppose the lengthy account of the severity of the disease” in Mark 5:3–5 and “a shorter account would have been an adequate counterpart” to the proof in v. 15 (“Gerasae Demoniac,” 361). Illustrative of the tension is Mark’s failure to mention the demoniac’s nakedness in vv. 3–5 (cf. Luke 8:27) while agreeing with Luke’s mention of his being
demonstration. While he clearly prefers Lukan wording in verse 15,93 in verse 17 παρακαλεῖν94 and τῶν ὀριων follow Matthew whereas ἐπιλθεῖν follows Luke. This once more demonstrates micro-conflation within a single triple tradition verse but again the changes are primarily stylistic. Compared to Luke (his primary source in these verses) the 2GH Mark is more concise although his omission of ‘at the feet of Jesus’ (describing the healed demoniac in Luke 8:35) potentially passes over a detail related to the discipleship motif. His omissions of the explicit subject in Luke 8:37 (‘all the people of the surrounding country of the Gerasenes’) along with Luke’s second notation about the people’s fear95 (ὅτι φοβοῦ μεγάλῳ συνείχοντο) can be understood as avoiding redundancy. At the same time the 2GH Mark adds some redundancies of his own (e.g., “the one who had had legion” and “concerning the pigs”)96 and is less clear in relation to his use of tense.97 Nevertheless the end result is more concise.

In verses 18-2098 Mark’s 56 words replace a mere 11 words in Matt 9:1,99 of which 4 are shared (9% of Mark; 45% of Matthew; same order; 2 different forms), and expand slightly upon

---

93 A minor textual variant in v. 15 involves a spelling variation whereby some MSS (N1 A B C W et al.) have λεγείν in place of λεγών; other MSS (D lat sy bo) lack the entire participial clause probably seeking to improve Mark’s “pleonastic style (Collins, Mark, 265).

94 Some MSS (D Q 565 et al.) attest παρεκκαλεῖν (imperfect) in place of παρακαλεῖν (infinitive) but this is likely a (later scribal) stylistic improvement (Collins, Mark, 265).

95 Gundry sees the townsfolk’s fear (Mark 5:15) as reverential (as with the disciples at 4:41). The second report (v. 16) further confirms the events but is likely given by a different group (perhaps the Twelve and those who have come with Jesus) and stresses the reliability of the story (Mark, 253). See also above n. 19 on people’s fear.

96 The redundancies are noted in Merklein (“Die Heilung,” 1022) though Gundry sees the addition of “concerning the pigs” as providing the reason for the townsfolk’s request that Jesus depart (Mark, 254, 64). Pesch (“Gerasenes Demoniac”, 362) sees this addition as blurring the focus on numinous awe by raising the economic question (‘did the herdsmen fear further loss?’). The cause of the fear, however, remains implicit at most (see n. 19 above). Gundry sees awkwardness in the parallel πῶς-clause (‘how it came about for ...’) and περί-phrase (‘concerning the pigs’) suggesting it results from Mark’s desire to emphasize the ‘how’ of the exorcism (Mark, 264).

97 Some note Mark’s use the (present) tense in vv. 15 (τὸν δαιμονιζόμενον) and 16 (τῶν δαιμονιζόμενων) when the past would be better suited since the demons have already been expelled (France, Mark, 231; Merklein, “Die Heilung,” 1022). France suggests Mark’s present δαιμονιζόμενος reflects the way in which he was known to his compatriots (Mark, 231); so also Lane, Mark, 180 n.3 and Cranfield, Mark, 180) while Gundry sees an emphatic historical present (Mark, 253). Notably, however, Mark uses the aorist (ὁ δαιμονισθηκός) in v. 18 and Luke uses past tense throughout (8:35-36). Thus Mark’s procedure (assuming the 2GH) is somewhat inconsistent and puzzling.

98 Variants of ἀπάγγειλον (N B C et al.) in v. 19 include διάγγειλον (D W t2 florid et al.) and ἀνάγγειλον (A L 0132 33*) but the differences are stylistic (Collins, Mark, 265) and do not affect our discussion. In the same verse variants of ὁ κύριος σοι (N B C et al.) include σοι ὁ κύριος (A L W et al.) and σοι ὁ θεός (D 1241) but, as Collins suggests, these are likely later scribal harmonizations to Luke 8:39 (σοι ... ὁ θεός) (Mark, 265).
the 47 words of Luke 8:37b-39 (beginning at σὺντὸς δὲ ἐμβάσκειν), with which 23 are shared (41% of Mark; 48% of Luke; 1 order change; 6 different forms).\footnote{This may be taken as parallel to Mark 5:21 with which it also shares διασπεράω.} The 2GH Mark again prefers Luke\footnote{Only (ἐμβαίνω) ἐὰς πλοιῶν is shared among all three although in form it is an MA.} and (contra the previous verse) is generally less concise\footnote{While καὶ (v. 18) might be taken as Matthean influence (Matt 9:1), this is hardly necessary for such a common word especially considering that the substance of vv. 18-20 is missing from Matthew.} though adds narrative clarity and credibility with his present participle (ἐμβαίνοντας) in place of Luke’s aorist (ἐμβάσκειν).

Taken temporally Mark has the healed man petition Jesus “while” he is getting into the boat rather than “after” he had embarked and returned to the other side (ὑπέστρεψεν in Luke). Furthermore, the 2GH Mark has the man proclaim in the ‘Decapolis’ rather than ‘in the whole city’ (Luke 8:39) which, if taken as Gerasa, is 50 kilometers away.\footnote{The Decapolis is little mentioned in ancient literature and the references in the Gospels (Matt 4:25; Mark 5:20; 7:31) are apparently the earliest. While it has been labeled as a ‘league’ or ‘confederacy’ in the past, there is no direct evidence for this in ancient literature, inscriptions or coinage. It is best thought of as a geographical region attached to the province of Syria that originally contained ten cities albeit the number varied at different times. On this see S. Thomas Parker, “The Decapolis Reviewed,” JBL 94 (1975): 437–41.} The difficulties associated with this are thereby lessened (in the 2GH Mark) by the broader geographical sweep of his proclamation. At the same time it creates a disjunction (absent from Luke) with the explicit instruction of Jesus that he return to ‘his house’ (ὁίκον σου) and ‘people/family’ (τούς σοὺς) (Mark 5:19).\footnote{The disjunction is noted by Merklein, “Die Heilung,” 1022. This is not necessarily a problem for the 2GH Mark noting the possibly parallel but more obviously flagrant disjunction between Jesus’ instruction to the leper and leper’s subsequent actions (Mark 1:43-45). The phrase τούς σοὺς is unique to the NT and can be taken as either ‘your family’ or ‘the people of your area’ though Guelich suggests that the broad nature of the command (‘announce to them’) implies the more general designation (Mark, 285).} Nevertheless the geographical difficulties associated with the city are less acute at this point than earlier in the narrative where the herders report “in the city” (Mark 5:14 and par.). With the latter the impression is given that the herders go and return on the same day whereas the statement about the man’s proclamation, coming at the conclusion of the narrative, need not be taken in the same way.\footnote{According to Peabody et al. (One Gospel, 141) Mark here anticipates the later Gentile mission (cf. 13:10; 14:9) in the Decapolis (so also France, Mark, 233; Guelich, Mark, 286; and Kertelge, Die Wunder, 107). At the same time Jesus’ denial of the man’s request is surprising (cf. Mark 3:14) and various explanations have been offered: (1) Mark deliberately links ‘proclamation’ (besides this man in 5:20 κηρύσσει is used of Jesus at Mark 1:14, 38) and ‘being with Jesus’ (Twelftree, Miracle Worker, 72); (2) Mark deliberately emphasizes Jesus’ authority through the strong}
problem for the 2GH but, given Luke’s validation motif, is a surprising omission for the Markan priority Luke.\textsuperscript{106}

Summarizing in relation to Theon’s narrative elements the 2GH Markan preference for the longer Lukan version reflects a similar interest in \textit{person} that we saw in relation to the 2GH Luke. He retains all Luke’s \textit{actions} along with narrative elements of \textit{manner} and \textit{cause} though obscures the latter when he has the demoniac ‘run from afar’ in verse 6, an addition that not only sits awkwardly with verse 2 (Jesus had already met the demon) but also obscures the cause of the encounter (why would the demon run to Jesus?). 2GH Mark retains Luke’s \textit{time} markers with one minor addition in verse 5 about the demoniac’s behavior occurring ‘day and night.’ The 2GH Mark potentially creates a problem, however, with the impression that they arrive ‘in the region of the Gerasenes’ during the day time. As Robert Guelich points out Mark, at the beginning of the preceding pericope (storm stilling), has them set out on their crossing during the evening (Mark 4:35) and yet the typical time for such a voyage was only about two hours. He suggests the tension arises from the combination of two stories that once existed as separate tradition.\textsuperscript{107}

While all three agree on placing the story immediately after the storm stilling, however, both Matthew (8:23) and Luke (8:22) omit the Markan reference to ‘evening’ (Mark 4:35). Given the potential problems associated with this time reference, its removal by Matthew and Luke

\begin{itemize}
\item[\textsuperscript{106}]Collins suggests that the wonder expressed here is not a response to the miracle itself but to the man’s proclamation (Mark, 273). Peabody \textit{et al.} (\textit{One Gospel}, 143–4) compare this with references to fear/awe/amazement in Mark 1:27; 9:15; 10:24, 32; 12:17; 15:5, 44; 16:5, 6. Only two of these, however, relate to miracles stories. The problem, however, remains for Markan priority.
\item[\textsuperscript{107}]Guelich, \textit{Mark}, 277.
\end{itemize}
(assuming Markan priority) seems more plausible than its addition (against both sources) by the 2GH Mark. Regarding the element of place the potential problems associated with Mark’s probable agreement with the Lukan location (Gerasa) have already been noted. The 2GH Mark agrees with the Lukan hillside location of the pigs (thus preparing for their rush down the steep bank) but differs in the area where the healed man proclaims (‘in the Decapolis’ versus ‘in the city’). While this latter change broadens the area involved and ties in to Markan miracle motifs (Jesus’ identity and the in-breaking kingdom), it is not clearly a rhetorical enhancement of Luke’s version which is more consistent with the mention of the ‘city’ in the preceding narrative. When it comes to narrative virtues the 2GH Mark generally compromises conciseness albeit occasionally he is more succinct.\(^{108}\) While some additions enhance the element of person (e.g., Mark 5:3-5), there is little if any substantive addition to the Lukan account and none of the additions clearly adds clarity or credibility. While the 2GH Mark obscures clarity by having the demoniac run ‘from afar,’ he enhances it by having the healed man implore Jesus prior to his return (contra Luke). Finally the implied micro-conflation of the 2GH Mark involves an awkward procedure for an ancient author that is not readily attested to.\(^ {109}\) To the extent that it occurs, therefore, we can reasonably expect that reasons for micro-conflation would extend beyond mere stylistic variation. None of the implied instances of 2GH Markan micro-conflation identified above, however, demonstrate clear rhetorical enhancements of his sources in relation to the rhetoric of narrative under consideration.

### 6.2.2 The 2DH and the Gadarene/Gerasene Demoniac(s)

According to the 2DH the story was taken over independently from Mark by both Matthew and Luke. Each of these procedures will now be examined beginning with Matthew’s purported use of Mark.

\(^{108}\) As for example in vv. 8-10 and 15-17 discussed above.

\(^{109}\) Regarding this generally accepted axiom along with the notion that ancient authors tended to prefer ‘one source at a time’ see authors cited in chapter 5 (n. 221).
(a) Matthew’s use of Mark

It has already been noted that Matthew’s narrative amounts to only 44% of Mark (146 words in place of 325) thus exemplifying the narrative virtue of conciseness. In this regard he follows the basic outline of Mark with considerable agreement in wording but several omissions and much summarizing. In addition to omitting minor details there are a couple of major omissions beginning with Jesus’ dialogue with the demoniac (Mark 5:8-10). He thus omits the original exorcism command (Mark 5:8), the naming of the demon(s), their identification as many, and their request not to be sent out of the region (Mark 5:9-10). This potentially takes away from the characterization of Jesus and the demons (narrative element of person). At the same time by simply having the demons continue to address Jesus (following a short aside comment about the location of the pigs in v. 30) and concluding with Jesus command (“go!” in v. 32), Matthew potentially avoids unwanted details or lack of clarity in Mark, who has Jesus ordering the demons to exit (5:8) and then asking for their name (5:9). He also heightens the

---

110Verse 28 of Matthew shares 14 words (46% of Matthew; 50% of Mark; same order; 2 different forms) with Mark; v. 29 shares 10 words (70% of Matthew; 54% of Mark; 1 order change; 6 different forms); v. 30 shares 5 words (55% of Matthew; 50% of Mark; same order and forms); v. 31 shares 10 words (62% of Matthew; 76% of Mark; same order; 3 different forms); v. 32 shares 17 words (60% of Matthew; 56% of Mark; same order; 1 different form); v. 33 shares 8 words (53% of Matthew; 38% of Mark; 1 order change; same forms); v. 34 shares 8 words (40% of Matthew; 19% of Mark; same order; 3 different forms). For similar information presented from the standpoint of Markan versification see table 6.3.

111While Davies and Allison see Matthew’s compression resulting from a desire to highlight Christology and extract motifs of ritual exorcism (Matthew, 77), Luz believes a “clear redactional tendency is not obvious” (Matthew, 23).

112These include, for example, the following: τίς θαλάσσης; και ... ἐκ τοῦ πλοίου in v. 28; φωνῇ μεγάλῃ; τοῦ ψυμτοῦ in v. 29; ναὶ εἰς σέ τοὺς ἀπολλοῦμεν in v. 31; τὰ πνεύματα τὰ ἀκάθαρτα; ὦς δισχιλιοί in v. 32; σύτοις and καὶ εἰς τοὺς ἄγρυνσι in v. 33. Some of these may be considered redundancies (e.g., τίς θαλάσσης; σύτοις) while others take away from dramatic effect (e.g., φωνῇ μεγάλῃ) or perhaps even characterization (e.g., ὦς δισχιλιοί). The omission of “most high” from Mark’s demonic address to Jesus (Matt 8:29; Mark 5:7) relates to Christology although according to Twelftree the omission may be motivated by its Septuagintal use where it is a Gentile designation for God thus explaining Matthew’s avoidance of the term throughout his Gospel (Miracle Worker, 115).

113The reverse order for Mark 5:7 and 5:8 seems more logical (ask the name and then expel). Also the implied ineffectual nature of the exorcistic command (5:8) is at odds with the demon’s servile nature (5:6-7) (so Guelich, Mark, 280). Thus Pesch (“Gerasene Demoniacs,” 358) sees Mark 5:8 as an awkward afterthought evidencing prior narrative stratification although it may simply reflect Mark’s oral nature whereby the “storyteller sometimes has to fill in information parenthetically” (so Collins, Mark, 268). At the same time ἐλεγεν γὰρ suggests that it serves to introduce the question about the demon’s name and request for leniency which provides the reason for demon’s adjuration in Mark 5:7b (Guelich, Mark, 280; Pesch, “Gerasene Demoniacs,” 358 ;idem., Markusevangelium, 288). It remains plausible to see Matthew both abbreviating and avoiding potential lack of clarity albeit the exorcistic command to expel the demon (apopompe) is considered by Pesch (following Bultmann) to be a formal characteristics of such stories (“Gerasene Demoniacs,” 354).
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sense of immediate obedience, making Jesus an easy victor, and thereby enhancing characterization despite his brevity.\(^{114}\) The second major omission involves Mark’s concluding dialogue (Mark 5:18-20) which enhances the characterization of the healed man and validates Jesus through the people’s marvelling and positive reports being spread (cf. Matt 9:26, 31, 33). While it is possible that the 2DH Matthew saw Mark 5:18-20 as redundant in light of the fact that the events have already been reported in the city (Matt 9:33; par. Mark 5:14), the omission remains puzzling in light of Matthew’s miracle motifs of validation and discipleship.\(^{115}\) In addition to these major omissions the 2DH Matthew also contains a couple of major summaries beginning with the Markan description of the demoniac where sixty seven words (Mark 5:2-6) are reduced to eleven (Matt 8:28b from \(\chi αλεπης\) onward), none of which is taken from his source. While this involves obvious loss of characterization (element of person) of the possessed man, clarity is gained in respect to the cause of the confrontation, namely that the demoniacs

---

\(^{114}\) Davies and Allison see Mark 5:10 as a redundancy and Mark 5:8-10 as containing magical exorcistic practices (obtaining name) that Matthew wants to avoid (Matthew, 82; so also France, Matthew, 338). Matthew may also be avoiding Markan political overtones in relation to legion (see above). Matthew’s omission of Mark 5:8 avoids the Markan narrative cause for the confrontation (Jesus commands the demon to exit) but he has already provided a cause (demons block Jesus path) that is absent from Mark. While Mark’s ‘legion’ also potentially functions to heighten Jesus’ power, Matthew does this in his own way through the demons’ immediate obedience.

\(^{115}\) None of the following explanations are particularly convincing: (1) while passing over Markan motifs of demonstration (of cure) and discipleship (Mark 5:15, 18-20), the fact the crowd meets Jesus as ‘Son of God’ (cf. Matt 8:29) is intended to highlight Christology (Twelftree, Miracle Worker, 115) [this seems overly speculative given the Son of God motif is only mentioned in Matt 8:29 where it directly parallels Mark]; (2) Matthew retains the discipleship theme by showing its risks and dangers thus pointing back to the warning of 8:20 about Son of Man having no place to lay his head (Burger, “Jesu Taten,” 285) [the connection seems tentative and speculative at best]; (3) Matthew retains the core story (“basic compositional structure”) dropping only the dramatizations (Theissen, Miracle Stories, 176) and “descriptive non-essentials” (Held, “Miracle Stories,” 172) [this is perhaps so in relation to the exorcism itself but the argument is less compelling in relation to 5:18-20 which fits Held’s identified motif of a central dialogue]; (4) Matthew is more interested in power than mission (France, Matthew, 343; Harrington, Matthew, 121) [this is difficult to maintain in the light of Jesus’ deliberate itinerant ministry, his call for labourers (9:38), and mission directives (10:1-5; 28:16-20)]; (5) Matthew is simply delaying the time of the Gentile mission (Luz, Matthew, 24; Pesch, “Gerasene Demoniac,” 375) [this is more plausible than the previous explanation but somewhat begs the question of why Matthew includes the story in the first place; furthermore, the gentile mission motif has already been introduced with centurion’s servant in Matt 8:5-13]; (6) Matthew was simply abbreviating (so Keener, Gospel of Matthew, 288) [this is a given on the assumption of the 2DH but does not explain why he abbreviates]. In essence the 2DH Matthean omission remains puzzling and all the more so if, as Pesch (following Bultmann) claims, the onlooker’s amazement (Mark 5:15, 20) and spread of the exorcist’s fame (Mark 5:14a, 18-20) are formal characteristics of exorcism stories (“Gerasene Demoniac,” 354). Guelich (Mark, 284) notes a possible connection to discipleship in the Markan expression ‘that he might be with him’ (Mark 5:18; par. Luke 8:38; cf. Mark 3:14 in relation to the Twelve) albeit the man is not permitted to follow whereby mission trumps discipleship in this instance.
were blocking Jesus’ path to the city (as noted above). Transferring Mark’s “from afar” (μακρόθεν) to the pigs in verse 30 further enhances clarity since situating the pigs at a distance is less problematic than having the possessed men at a distance (see below). The second major summary involves the people coming from the surrounding region to see what has happened (Matt 8:34; par. Mark 5:15-17). The 2DH Matthew simply reports on their coming to see Jesus and asking him to leave their region. While his omission of Mark 5:16 (eyewitness reports) potentially avoids a redundancy, since Matt 9:34 (par. Mark 5:14) already told of the report being taken to the city, the description of the healed man (dressed, in his right mind etc. in Mark 5:15) involves the element of person (characterization) and validation (proof of exorcism).

Furthermore, his omission of the fear motif (Mark 5:15) compromises narrative cause insofar as it functions to explain their request for Jesus to leave their region. Thus in general these omissions and abbreviations exemplify the greater conciseness of the 2DH Matthew and indicate that he sometimes enhances clarity. On the other hand he variously omits elements of person (several), cause (‘fear motif’), and miracle motifs (validation and discipleship).

2DH Matthew’s multiplication of demons (from one to two) involves a less dramatic transformation. The reason for the change, however, is far from obvious with explanations including the following: (1) Matthew had access to independent tradition; (2) he was accounting for the plurality of demons implied by Mark’s ‘legion’; (3) he compensated for his

---

116 It has been suggested that Matthew is not interested in the demoniac’s experience, instead heightening the focus on Jesus and the townspeople (Davies and Allison, Matthew, 80–81), perhaps because they “do not attract reader sympathy” (Nolland, Matthew, 374–75) or function merely to mirror the power of the Son of God (Luz, Matthew, 25). These explanations are plausible albeit somewhat speculative and, furthermore, both the demon’s power and prostration (Mark 5:2-6) serve positively in relation to Jesus’ characterization. Unlike the discipleship motif of Mark 5:18-20, however, Matthew does retain the demoniacs as a “public menace, making the area impassable” (Nolland, Matthew, 374–75) and clearly has them subordinate to Jesus in Matt 8:29 forward. With this in mind Matthew’s rhetorical desire for brevity may be sufficient to explain his abbreviation at this point.

117 Despite omitting the ‘mountain’ motif which, as noted above, prepares for the pig’s rush down the steep bank.

118 See above n. 19 on the fear motif. While the cause of the fear is not stated in Mark, it nevertheless provides the only explicit reason (‘narrative cause’) for the Jesus’ rejection. If the 2DH Matthew disliked ambiguity about the cause of the fear, he could have clarified it as he did the initial cause of the confrontation. His omission, therefore, remains puzzling. His use of the same verb for the townspeople and the demons (παρακαλέω) possibly implies an “unflattering commonality” between them (so Nolland, Matthew, 378) but in this he simply follows Mark.

119 The list is based on the following: Davies and Allison, Matthew, 80; France, Matthew, 339–40; Keener, Gospel of Matthew, 282. Opinion is divided on whether this represents a genuine contradiction (implying a mistake or deliberate redaction by Matthew) or whether it is possible to harmonize the accounts (Bock, Luke, 768).
omission of Mark 1:21–28 (similarly so with his doubling of blind men in compensation for omitting Mark 8:22–26); (4) he had a memory lapse; (5) he was influenced by the forensic need for two witnesses (OT legal principle according to Num 35:30; Deut 17:6; 19:15) - noting that the incident gives rise to testimony about Jesus as the Son of God (Matt 8:29); (6) he wanted the number of people healed in Matthew 8–9 to add up to twelve; (7) he had a fondness for doubling that was common in ancient narratives; (8) two suppliants are able to shout louder than one; (9) Jesus’ healing power is magnified by the doubling; (10) harmonistic explanations claiming the actual presence of two men with Mark and Luke choosing only to mention one. According to Davies and Allison none of the proposed solutions is impossible but none is “obviously probable” either. Consideration of narrative elements and virtues does not offer much help in this case. It may be possible to differentiate among the suggestions insofar as we can point to possible analogies in ancient literature and other connections within Matthew suggesting that the validation theme might be at work in relation to the importance of two witnesses. This latter hypothesis is defended by James Gibbs, who notes that Matthew never has less than two human witnesses when Jesus is acclaimed either the Son of God (by demoniacs) or Son of David (by blind men) in accordance with Jewish legal requirements. The doubling remains a puzzle but this is perhaps the most plausible reason from those in the above list.

---

120 Matthew, 80. Similarly so in Van der Loos (Miracles, 384) and France (Matthew, 340) although the latter says a literary explanation is preferable to historical harmonizing.

121 In relation to ancient analogies (number 7 on the list) it is Bultmann’s theory (assuming the 2DH) that the number two was important in folk literature. He also points to doubling in relation to Luke’s two angels at the tomb (24:4) and two messengers from John (7:19) (History, 314–7). Other Matthean doublets include: two blind men at 20:30–34 and 9:27–31; two donkeys at 21:1–7; possibly at 12:22 where the Lukan deaf demoniac (Luke 11:14) becomes blind and deaf; and two witnesses at 26:60. According to Nolland this is intended to indicate that the incidents were not ‘one-offs’ but part of a larger pattern (Matthew, 375). Whatever the reason the frequency suggests a deliberate strategy for the 2DH Matthew.

122 Peter’s confession at Caesarea Philippi (Matt 16:16) is an exception (see Gibbs, “Purpose and Pattern,” 456–7). Twelftree (Miracle Worker, 114–15) also finds this the most convincing suggestion while Keener (Gospel of Matthew, 282) objects on the basis that Matthew does not consistently double up his characters. He sees Matthew compensating for other omissions (Mark 1:23-26 in this case) in a manner typical for his day but offers no specific examples.

123 The remainder are essentially either arguments from silence (e.g., number 1), attempts to explain incongruence in the accounts (e.g., number 10), guesswork in the absence of anything better (e.g., numbers 4 and 9), or a combination of these. The problem, however, is equally puzzling for 2GH where Luke (followed by Mark) reduces Matthew’s two demons to one without obvious explanation.
Various less substantial changes are also worth noting. The 2DH Matthew tends toward greater conciseness when he replaces Mark’s paratactic style,\textsuperscript{124} omits unnecessary or redundant words,\textsuperscript{125} or uses more succinct forms.\textsuperscript{126} Other changes are necessitated by his doubling up of the demoniacs\textsuperscript{127} while still others appear stylistically motivated.\textsuperscript{128} The change of Matt 8:29\textsuperscript{129} from a direct plea (‘I beg of you by God - do not torment us’) into a question (‘have you come to torment us before the time?’) softens the tone (from demand to request)\textsuperscript{130} and adds the element of time (προ’ καιροῦ), presumably a reference to judgment.\textsuperscript{131} This coheres with a general

\textsuperscript{124}E.g. Mark 5:1-2 has the following structure: καί + finite verb (ἔλθον) + καί + participle (ἐξελθόντος) + finite verb (ὑπήρτησαν). Matthew changes the two paratactic sentences into a single subordinate sentence: καί + participle (ἐλθόντος) + finite verb (ὕπηρτησαν). In essence Matthew omits the entire Markan phrase ‘and after he got out of the boat’ which is implied and therefore redundant. Elsewhere Matthew replaces καί with δὲ (vv. 31 and 33).

\textsuperscript{125}E.g. τῆς θαλάσσης (Mark 5:1; par. Matt 8:28); ίνα εἰς αὐτοὺς εἰσέλθωμεν (Mark 5:12; par. Matt 8:31). The latter is referred to as tautologous by Davies and Allison (Matthew, 83–4).

\textsuperscript{126}E.g. replacement of the ἐνθρόνος ἐν πνεύματι ἀκαθάρτῳ with the simple participle δαιμονίζομεν (Matt 8:28), which Mark himself uses later in the narrative (Mark 5:15, 16, 18). The 2DH Matthew is not completely averse to the longer phrase (πνεῦμα ἀκαθάρτος) since he does use it elsewhere albeit taken over from Mark (Matt 10:1) or Q (Matt 12:43). The longer phrase, however, is more common in Mark (1:23, 26, 27; 3:11, 30; 5:2, 8, 23; 6:7; 7:25; 9:25) and Luke (4:33, 36; 6:18; 8:29; 9:42; 11:24; Acts 5:16; 8:7).

\textsuperscript{127}E.g. the plurals ὑπήρτησαν (v. 28) and ἤμισυ (v. 29).

\textsuperscript{128}E.g. πολλῶν (Matt 9:30) replaces μεγάλη (Mark 5:11) and modifies the number of the pigs (many) rather than the herd (large); the replacement of “they drowned” (ἐπνίγοντο) in Mark 5:13 with “they died” (ἀπέθανον) in Matt 9:32; replacement of ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ with ἐν τοῖς ὕδασιν in Matt 9:32. Matthew has already used θάλασσαν in this same verse whereby and the stylistic avoidance of repetition may be rhetorically motivated and seems more plausible than the reverse; Matthew changes ἀπελθεῖν (Mark 5:17) to ὁποῖος μεταβῆ (‘to depart’) in v. 34.

\textsuperscript{129}Some manuscripts add Ἡρσοῦ (C W � Feast 0242d f 13 etc.) likely to harmonize with Mark (Nolland, Matthew, 373).

\textsuperscript{130}In Matthew, according to Davies and Allison, one is permitted to ask Jesus questions but “one should never dream of telling him what to do” (Matthew, 81–82; similarly Twelftree, Miracle Worker, 115). While the latter part of the verse is possibly a statement (‘you have come to torment us before the time’) rather than a question (so Twelftree, Miracle Worker, 115), this does not significantly change the sense. In relation to this the Markan ὄρκιζω appears to carry the connotation of ‘command’ (see n. 73 above). The same word appears as a variant of ἔξορκίζω at Matt 26:63, indicating that Matthew is not shy of using such terminology for hostile address to Jesus, but is nevertheless omitted in the demon’s address here. The subsequent ‘begging’ (παρεκάλοντων) by the demons in v. 31 (par. Mark 5:12), therefore, suggests a more subservient than defiant tone albeit παρεκάλοντο is paralleled in Mark 5:12 (παρεκάλεσαν). Held sees Matthew combining terms from Mark 1:24 (‘coming’) and 5:7 (‘torment’) thus avoiding any sense of demonic “counter-magic” and giving a Christological focus: Jesus brings their final destruction (“Miracle Stories,” 173–75). France notes this is the only time Matthew takes over demonic confessions of Jesus’ exalted status (cf. Mark 1:24, 34; 3:11-12; 5:7) and that his plural verbs most naturally refer to the two men (rather than the demons) albeit conveying the demon’s thoughts (Matthew, 341). Matthew’s φωνή μεγάλη is possibly a redundancy (Davies and Allison, Matthew, 81) and Matthew’s change to the participle of ‘saying’ (λέγοντες) is stylistic.

\textsuperscript{131}While ἡσυχίζω likely refers to torture (Bock, Luke, 772) and is agreed upon in all three accounts, Matthew’s addition of πρὸ καιροῦ appears to introduce an eschatological/apocalyptic judgment motif such as in Enoch 55:4 and T. Levi 18:12 (so Theissen, Miracle Stories, 281; Cotter, Miracles, 122; France, Matthew, 341; Nolland, Matthew, 375–6; Keener, Gospel of Matthew, 281; Marcus, Mark, 344; and Marshall, Luke, 339) albeit this is the only place the motif is associated with Gospel miracle stories (so Theissen, Miracle Stories, 281). At the same time punishment is not merely reserved for the future eschaton (Marshall, Luke, 339; Held, “Miracle Stories,” 269) and,
tendency to heighten Jesus’ authority over the demons in this interchange whereby at verse 31 “send us into the pigs” (Mark 5:12) becomes “if you cast us out, then send us into the herd of pigs.” The same thing happens at verse 32 where Mark’s indirect speech of Jesus to the demons, “he permitted them” (ἐπέτρεψεν in 5:12), becomes a much stronger direct command - “go!” (ὑπάγετε).

In relationship to these various changes it is more plausible to see the 2DH Matthew highlighting Jesus’ authority and the subservience of the demons (related to the motif of validation) than to see the 2GH Mark doing the reverse. This is especially so given that Mark himself is otherwise seen to highlight Jesus’ authority in relation to exorcism (e.g., Mark 1:22, 28).

In verse 30 Matthew has the pigs feeding “at a distance” (μικράν) rather than “on a mountain” (Mark 5:11). He appears to have taken the motif from Mark 5:6 (ἀπὸ μικρὸθεν), where it refers to the demoniac’s position with respect to Jesus, and in so doing increases clarity in that the demoniacs who might otherwise avoid Jesus do not come running from a distance (as per Mark) but are simply blocking Jesus’ path (see above). At the same time his omission of the mountain motif is puzzling given that it prepares for the rush of the pigs down the steep bank.

according to Luz, the eschatological judgment should not be over-emphasized in that καιρός does not appear to be a Matthean technical term for the eschaton whereby πρὸς καιρὸν could simply mean ‘prematurely’ (Luz, Matthew, 24) (although ‘prematurely’ implies an underlying reference to the eschaton). Van der Loos notes that on the lips of a pagan this expression could be rooted in popular beliefs about finding no peace after death albeit admitting that the evangelist may have edited the verse to be more Jewish (Miracles, 387–8).

Again the Markan demand is turned into a question. At the beginning of the verse Matthew changes the verb from aorist to imperfect (παρεκάλουν) and adds an explicit subject (δαίμον). The latter word is a hapax legomenon in NT though is noted to occur in the LXX (Isa 65:11) and is common in the wider Greco-Roman world as a reference to supernatural beings and thus perhaps a reason for Matthew’s usage here (so Nolland, Matthew, 376).

Davies and Allison see Matthew as “bent upon stressing Jesus’ authority” (Matthew, 84).

Alternatively Twelftree sees Mark’s depiction of the battle between Jesus and the demoniac as “reduced to a civil conversation” in Matthew in which “there is no hint that the demons have disobeyed Jesus’ initial command to come out of the man.” Furthermore, Matthew reduces ‘Jesus’ words and exorcistic technique to a single command ‘go’” (Miracle Worker, 114). It is, however, the very elimination of ‘battle’ that heightens the sense of Jesus’ authority and while the interchange is certainly simplified (more concise), that does not necessarily mean it is ‘civil.’ The very nature of the interchange (about torment and exorcism), the retention of τί ήμιν καὶ σοί, and the change to a (sharp?) direct command of Jesus (‘go!’) suggests otherwise.

Commentators offer various reasons for Matthew’s change: he seeks to distance Jesus from unclean pigs and keep ὀροφά free from negative association (Davies and Allison, Matthew, 82); he is sensitive to the distance of Gadara from the lake (Harrington, Matthew, 120–1); and the pig herders would not want to be close to the ‘fierce demoniacs’ (Nolland, Matthew, 376). These are somewhat speculative but none takes away from the observation that Matthew has enhanced clarity.
This is less significant, however, than the problems already noted in relation to Mark’s demons being at a distance and, as such, the overall effect is a less obscure account in Matthew. Another change by the 2DH Matthew involves three times adding ἴδοὺ to introduce: the demons initial confession of Jesus’ sonship (8:29); the result of the pigs rushing down the steep bank (8:32); and the result of the ‘whole city’ coming out to meet Jesus (8:34). This is perhaps intended to highlight the content that follows and as such is not especially problematic for the 2DH.\textsuperscript{136}

Summarizing in relation to Theon’s elements of narrative we note that the 2DH Matthew abbreviates Mark’s characterization (person) of the demoniac(s) (e.g., Mark 5:3-5) and the townspeople (see above). Jesus also has less to say, but is perhaps depicted with greater authority (enhancing validation) in relation to the demons. Despite his brevity the 2DH Matthew retains the core elements of action except for the final conversation with the healed demoniac (Mark 5:18-20). The manner of the Jesus’ actions are willing while the demoniac(s) act under compulsion in both Matthew and Mark although they appear more defiant in Mark than Matthew (noting the ὀρκίζω formula in Mark 5:7 which is omitted in Matt 8:29). Both Matthew and Mark have the demons and the townspeople ‘begging’ (παρακάλεω) Jesus in relation to entering the pigs (demons) and leaving their region (the townspeople). In relation to the element of cause Matthew clarifies the reason for the confrontation (demons block Jesus’ path) but reduces clarity in omitting the fear of the townspeople (this is why they ask Jesus to leave their region albeit the reason for their fear is unstated). In relation to time the 2DH Matthew agrees with Mark in placing the story chronologically after the storm stilling though, as noted above, his omission of the reference to ‘evening’ in Mark 4:35 potentially enhances clarity. While Matthew’s narrative moves quicker (owing to his brevity), no significant time elements are omitted.\textsuperscript{137} In regard to place the possible 2DH Matthean change from Gerasa to Gadara (see above on textual variant) adds clarity and credibility owing to the greater proximity of Gadara to the lake. The 2DH

\textsuperscript{136}So, for example, in Twelftree, \textit{Miracle Worker}, 115 and Nolland, \textit{Matthew}, 375.

\textsuperscript{137}The only explicit omission of a time marker is the ‘day and night’ suffering of the Markan demoniac in Mark 5:5 but this is more a reference to prolonged suffering than a chronological marker in the narrative.
Matthew almost omits the mountain motif from Mark (Mark 5:5, 11) but this is probably not of great significance.\textsuperscript{138} The 2DH Matthew exemplifies the narrative virtue of \textit{conciseness} albeit at the expense of person (characterization) and, more importantly, the motifs of validation and discipleship (in particular by the omission of the final interchange between Jesus and healed man).\textsuperscript{139} \textit{Clarity} is enhanced by having the pigs (rather than the demons) come ‘from afar’ but is obscured by omitting the cause (‘fear’) of the townspeople’s reaction. If Matthew has indeed changed the geographical location (from Gerasa to Gadara) he has enhanced \textit{credibility}.

\textsuperscript{138}The motif remains in relation to the pigs rushing down the steep bank into the water (Matt 8:32 and par.) and while it might have prepared for this action of the pigs, this was not necessary for logical coherence.

\textsuperscript{139}According to John Hull the 2DH Matthew is not simply avoiding novelistic tendencies and even adds his own (e.g., the demon’s blocking Jesus’ path and being referred to as \textit{χαλκοὺς λίμνης} in Matt 8:28b). Instead Matthew avoids the following exorcistic ‘magical’ elements: identification of the exorcist (omits “most high” in 8:29); softening of the Markan oath formula (omits \textit{ὅρκισμα} in 8:29); and Jesus’ exorcising words and the demon’s name (‘legion’). As a result the story “practically ceases to be an exorcism” (\textit{Hellenistic Magic}, 131–2; for the traits of exorcistic technique Hull is partly dependent on Bonner, “The Technique of Exorcism”). The following, however, may be noted: Matt 8:28b is not so much an addition (of a novelistic element) as an abbreviation of Mark 5:3-5; despite omitting ‘most high’ Matthew retains the address ‘son of God’ suggesting that if he had any problem it was not with the fact that Jesus’ was given a title but the nature of that title; finally, the exorcism motif is retained in the language of ‘demonization’ (δαιμονίζω in vv. 28 and 33), the notion of casting out (ικβάλλω in 8:31), the command “go” (υπόγειεί in 8:32, and the fact that the pigs are ‘invaded’ and caused to drown (this relates to proof and is the third of Bonner’s list of exorcistic elements). Given the 2DH Matthean tendency to abbreviate (of less obviously ‘magical’ narratives) the general excision of details here is better explained by the virtue of \textit{conciseness} along with other suggestions above.
(b) Luke’s use of Mark

While the extent and nature of verbatim agreement between Luke and Mark has already been noted above, word counts indicate that Luke is generally more concise (293 words in place of 325 words) (table 6.2). He is, however, not nearly as brief as Matthew and when individual verses are compared he is shorter on seven occasions (8:28, 29, 32, 33, 36, 38-39) but has equal length on three (8:26, 31, 37b) and is longer on five (8:27, 30, 34, 35, 37a). While the 2DH Luke lacks the major omissions and summarizing (of Mark) associated with the 2DH Matthew, perhaps the greatest transformation involves Mark 5:3-5 where Mark’s 50 word description of the demoniac is reduced to 37 words in Luke\(^{140}\) and is transformed such that only εν τοῖς μνήμοσιν (27b) and ἀλύσεσιν καὶ πέδαις (29b) are shared terminology, though the latter phrase is in reverse order.\(^{141}\) While Luke agrees with the repeated binding and escaping, he omits the ‘howling and bruising/cutting’ motifs and instead adds that the demon frequently drove the man into the desert. While the reason for the last change is not obvious, the 2DH Luke is clearly more concise and avoids various repeated phrases in Mark, presumably on account of redundancy.\(^{142}\) He also transfers most of his description to later in the narrative (Luke 8:29b) though the reasons for this are not obvious. The change has been explained on the basis of Luke’s interest in magic/demonology but this is not obviously the case.\(^{143}\) It has also been described as an example of “unnecessary and unsuccessful editing” making for an “awkward and lengthy parenthesis.”\(^{144}\)

\(^{140}\)Taking the parallel sections for Mark 5:3-5 as Luke 8:27b (from καὶ χρόνοι ... ) and 29b (from πολλοῖς γὰρ ...).

\(^{141}\)Luke’s various imperfects may be iterative which, together with πολλοῖς χρόνοις (‘for a long time’ or ‘on many occasions’), highlight the prolonged nature of the suffering (Marshall, Luke, 338). The failure of various restraints enhances this negative picture and highlights the power of the demon(s) (Bock, Luke, 773) as does, possibly, Luke’s use of συνάρπαζεν (‘to take hold of forcibly’ BDAG, 966; ‘seize with violence’ in Marshall, Luke, 338). While there is stylistic difference, however, the net result is not significantly different from the picture in Mark 5:3-5.

\(^{142}\)These include πέδαις καὶ ἀλύσεσιν (twice in v. 4 with ἀλύσις also in v. 3) and εν τοῖς μνήμοσιν which itself occurs twice (v. 3 and 5) and is synonymous with ἐν τῶν μνημείον in v. 2.

\(^{143}\)According to Hull the Lukan tradition is “penetrated by Magic” so that his delay of the demoniac’s description makes it part of the diabolical diagnosis as opposed to being merely a matter of “human interest” as in Mark. Luke’s interest in demonology is further evidenced by a more explicit explanation of ‘legion’ (‘because many demons had entered him’ in place of ‘because we are many’) along with his identification of ‘abyss’ rather than ‘out of the country’ (Hellenistic Magic, 100). It is not clear, however, that the Markan description results from “merely human interest” or that Mark is any less interested in demons.

\(^{144}\)So Drury, Tradition, 95–96. This, however, fails to acknowledge both the significance of Luke’s explanatory γάρ and his greater overall conciseness in relation to Mark. Similarly Johnson states that Luke’s changes do not improve
Alternatively the Markan flashback (Mark 5:8) has itself been described as awkward\(^ {145}\) whereby Luke 8:29b may be read as providing a reason for Jesus’ exorcistic command in Luke 8:29a thereby reducing the awkwardness and enhancing clarity.\(^ {146}\) Hence while the awkward transition to Luke 8:29a (par. Mark 5:8) remains, Luke’s changes nevertheless tend toward greater conciseness and clarity.

In relation to 2DH Lukan expansions we may begin with verse 27 where he uses twenty nine words in place of Mark’s twenty three (Mark 5:2-3a). The expansion results from using ἀνήπτυς in place of ἀναρχαστός and, especially, from the addition of “and he had not worn clothes for a long time” (καὶ χρόνῳ ἰκανῷ ὅυκ ἐνεδύσατο).\(^ {147}\) While the first is likely stylistic,\(^ {148}\) the second prepares for the later remark that the healed man was clothed (8:35; par. Mark 5:15) and thus forms part of several narrative anticipations in Luke.\(^ {149}\) Other changes are essentially stylistic: the genitive into a dative;\(^ {150}\) exiting “onto the ground” rather than “from the boat”; omitting the characteristic Markan εὐθὺς;\(^ {151}\) changing καὶ to δε;\(^ {152}\) “having demons” in place of Mark and even miss out on Mark’s emphasis on the tombs (Luke, 137). This also fails to appreciate Luke’s greater overall conciseness and does not make clear why Luke ought to share Mark’s emphasis on the tombs.

---

\(^ {145}\)See above n. 113.

\(^ {146}\)Similarly Marshall suggests Luke’s indirect speech (29a) is a stylistic improvement while his delay of details about the demoniac’s condition highlights Jesus’ compassionate basis for the command (Luke, 335, 37–38).

\(^ {147}\)A variant of καὶ χρόνῳ ἰκανῷ is ἐκ χρόνων ἰκανων καὶ (“for considerable periods, and”). The former is favored by Fitzmyer (Luke, 737), Marshall (Luke, 337), and Bock (Luke, 784) based on external evidence and Lukan style.

\(^ {148}\)Nolland says ἀνήρ τις is a Lukan preference (Luke 1–9:20, 407) though he is noted to use ἀναρχαστός later in the narrative (8:29, 33, 35 - only the first of these is paralleled Mark). He reverts to ἀνήρ at 8:38.

\(^ {149}\)On this see Green, Luke, 336; Johnson, Luke, 139; Marshall, Luke, 337; and Bock, Luke, 771. The anticipations include the following: had many demons (v. 27) vs. demons gone (v. 35); wore no clothes (v. 27) vs. was clothed (v. 35); lived among tombs and not at home (v. 27) vs. returned home (v. 39); fell down before Jesus and shouted (v. 28) vs. sitting at Jesus’ feet (v. 35); seized by the demon and out of control (v. 29) vs. in his right mind (v. 35).

While Green sees a careful rhetorical balancing (Luke, 336), Johnson sees Lukan “narrative improvements” upon the awkwardly written Mark (Luke, 139). It should be noted that Mark does have equivalents for several of these pairs but not the clothing (Luke 8:27) or sitting at Jesus’ feet (Luke 8:35). Regarding this as an indicator of Markan priority see also the comments of Fuller (citing Saunier), “Baur Versus Hilgenfeld,” 362.


\(^ {151}\)Εὐθὺς occurs 40/41x in Mark though only here in this narrative. It occurs 5x in Matthew and 1x in Luke.

\(^ {152}\)The same change occurs in 8:28, 30 (twice), 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, and 38.
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“with an unclean spirit”;\(^ {153}\) and finally “... and he did not stay in a house but among the tombs” (9 Greek words) replaces “... who had his dwelling among the tombs ...” (7 Greek words). One additional change involves the description of the man as meeting Jesus ἐκ τῆς πόλεως rather than ἐκ τῶν μνημείων. This is perhaps stylistic but may deliberately associate the man with the city which will later be disturbed on his account, noting that Luke later has the man proclaim “in the city” (8:39) rather than “in the Decapolis” (Mark 5:20).\(^ {154}\) Thus Luke potentially adds clarity by connecting the man more directly with the city and enhances conciseness by avoiding the repetition of “out of the tombs.”\(^ {155}\)

Luke also expands verse 30 (19 words in place of 15 in Mark 5:9) primarily through the addition of ὁ Ἰησοῦς ... ἔστιν and his slightly longer expression explaining the name of the demons (‘legion’),\(^ {156}\) where he replaces Mark’s direct speech with an explanatory comment. These and other changes are primarily stylistic\(^ {157}\) albeit the result is a less concise and lacks substance.\(^ {158}\) An expansion at verse 34 involves the insertion of ἴδοντες ... τὸ γεγονός ... indicating explicitly that those caring for the pigs had witnessed what happened, although this is clearly implied in Mark and is not therefore required for clarity. In relation to verse 35 Luke makes some stylistic changes,\(^ {159}\) minor omissions (τί ἔστιν; κοθήμενον) and expansions, such as when replacing τὸν δαιμονιζόμεν ... τὸν ἐσχήκοτα λεγίωνα with τὸν ἀνθρώπον ἄφ’ οὗ τὰ δαιμόνια ἐξῆλθεν albeit the changes are primarily stylistic.\(^ {160}\) He also adds παρὰ τούς πόδας

\(^{153}\)Nolland suggests that Luke may already be adverting to the plurality of demons (Luke 1–9:20, 407) although he clearly reverts to the singular in 8:29.

\(^{154}\)Nolland suggests that “from the city” denotes the man’s place of origin (versus the place from which he now travels) and that Luke adds it to compensate for his omission of the Markan “from the tombs” (Luke 1–9:20, 407). This is possible but far from certain. As noted above (n. 149) it may simply be part of Luke’s narrative anticipations.

\(^{155}\)Mark goes on to repeat “among the tombs” in vv. 3 and 5 whereas Luke only has it in 27b.

\(^{156}\)See above discussion in relation to the 2GH Luke. The only difference for the 2DH Luke is that he retains the motif from Mark rather than adding it himself.

\(^{157}\)Namely changing the imperfect (ἐπρώττετα) and present (λέγει) tenses to aorist (ἐπρώττεσθαι; ἔτεινεν).

\(^{158}\)The addition of Jesus as the explicit subject of ἐπρώττεσθαι may potentially be labeled a redundancy but the break in the narrative produced by the intervening material in Luke 8:29b (from Mark 5:3-5) has perhaps made this necessary.

\(^{159}\)E.g. ἠλθὼν to ἔξηλθον; ἔρχονται to ἠλθὸν; θεωροῦσιν τὸ εὕρον.

\(^{160}\)It has been suggested that Luke’s use of ἐξερέσωμαι avoids Mark’s double use of the simple form (Nolland, Luke 1–9:20, 412) and that his “more elegant phrase” describing the new state of the possessed man avoids Mark’s “extremely awkward description” (Marshall, Luke, 340). The changes nevertheless appear essentially stylistic and are not obvious rhetorical enhancements (e.g., of clarity).
τοῦ Ἰσσοῦ, describing the state of the delivered man, which perhaps heightens the discipleship motif as well as the honor accorded Jesus.\textsuperscript{161} The net result involves slight expansion (30 words replace the 27 in Mark 5:14b-15). Finally in verse 37a (up to συνείχοντο) Luke expands upon Mark 5:17 (17 words replace 9 words) primarily by his addition of an explicit verbal subject (“the whole multitude of the region of the Gerasenes”) and the notation “that they were greatly afraid.” This not only compromises conciseness\textsuperscript{162} but (redundantly?) repeats the fear motif from the previous verse. The latter is perhaps intended to emphasize the cause of the townspeople’s rejection of Jesus although, as with Mark, the reason for the ‘fear’ remains unstated.\textsuperscript{163}

In verse 37b Luke is identical in length to Mark (6 words) but changes the latter’s genitive absolute (ἐμβαίνοντος αὐτοῦ) into an aorist nominative participle (αὐτοῦ ... ἐμβαίνει) and adds the finite verb ὑπέστρεψεν (‘he returned’). Taken as ‘returned (home)’ (or to ‘the other side of the lake’) the 2DH Luke clearly compromises clarity by having Jesus return home before the man addresses him (which he immediately does in v. 38).\textsuperscript{164} The initial δὲ in verse 38 is best taken as adversative (‘but’) indicating that the man was beseeching Jesus even though he was


\textsuperscript{162}Albeit in other ways he is more concise (e.g., ἤρώτησαν replaces ἤρξασθο παρακαλεῖν; τῶν ὁρίων omitted).

\textsuperscript{163}See above (n. 19) on the possible causes of fear.

\textsuperscript{164}Dictionary entries for ὑπέστρεψαν provide two basic options: “turn back/away/about” and “return” (BDAG, 1041; Liddell and Scott, \textit{Lexicon}, 1896). Taking the first option it is possible to read Luke as saying that ‘Jesus turned around and then the man begged him ....’ While this would alleviate the tension in the Lukan narrative, however, it is highly improbable. The word occurs 32x in Luke-Acts but is absent from Mark and Matthew. It primarily refers to a return journey to a geographical location (e.g., Luke 1:56; 2:20; 7:10; Acts 1:12) and only in Luke 17:15 (leper who turns back) and Acts 13:34 (Jesus raised from the dead no longer to ‘return’ to corruption) does the context permit (but not demand) something more akin to ‘turn back.’ Regarding its usage in Luke 8:37 it is notably repeated in vv. 38 and 40, both with the obvious meaning of ‘returning home’ (explicitly so in v. 38). While Drury (\textit{Tradition}, 96) sees a simple contradiction, others have sought alternate explanations: Green (\textit{Luke}, 341) detects a dramatic technique similar to Jesus’ baptism account whereby “he is able to clear the stage of all distractions by introducing a minor anachrony into the narrative”; similarly Nolland (\textit{Luke} 1–9:20, 412) sees a parallel in Luke having John arrested prior to Jesus’ baptism, a literary technique intended to mark a new departure in the narrative (Jesus’ return to Jewish Palestine parallels the man’s return to his own people); and Bock (\textit{Luke}, 780) states “the difference (versus Mark) is not one of substance but merely reflects editorial selection concerning sequence.” While Bock may be right (no difference in core substance), the chronological difficulty remains and has indeed been created by the 2DH Luke. The parallels to John’s arrest (Green and Nolland) do not seem very helpful in that Luke 3:21 begins a new pericope and its wording suggests a retrospective account whereas ὑπέστρεψαν in Luke 8:37 interrupts the flow \textit{within} a pericope and is not clearly retrospective. The result is not more but less clarity.
departing (or had departed as per Luke). In the other cases where Luke has the same word count as Mark (v. 26 each has 12 words; v. 31 each has 11 words) most alternations are stylistic although more substantial is the change from “that he might not send them out of the region” into “that he might not command them to depart into the abyss.” This likely reflects Lukan demonology, namely by stressing Jesus’ authority and power over the demons in relation to final judgment in a manner that is more specific than in Mark.

2DH Luke otherwise tends toward greater conciseness beginning in verse 28 where he is eighteen percent shorter than Mark (26 words in place of 32 words). While some changes are stylistic, like the 2DH Matthew he omits the Markan “ἀπὸ μακρόθεν ἔδραμεν” thereby adding clarity since Jesus has already met (ὑποντάω) the demoniac (Mark 5:2; Matt 8:28; Luke 8:27). His change of the Markan ὄρκιζω formula (Mark 5:7) to δέομαι lessens the sense of

165While Mark moves awkwardly between singular and plural, Luke more consistently uses plurals (beginning in v. 27 and consistently from v. 33 onward) (Nolland, Luke 1–9:20, 409–10). See also comments above.
166In v. 26 ἠλθον becomes κατέπλευσαν which, according to Nolland, is a more colourful term (denoting transition from the high seas to a coastal landing point) (Luke 1–9:20, 406). In the same verse Luke replaces εἰς τὸ πέραν τῆς θαλάσσης with ἤθελεν ἀντιπέρα τῆς Γαλιλαίας (he also omits εἰς τὸ πέραν in his parallel to Mark 4:35; so Nolland, Luke 1–9:20, 406). Fitzmyer suggests that Luke seeks to keep the episode within the broad scope of Jesus’ “Galilean” ministry albeit foreshadowing his later interest in Gentiles (especially in Acts) (Luke, 737). Alternatively Marshall suggests that Luke’s changes are for the benefit of his “non-Palestinian readers” (Luke, 337) while Nolland (contra Fitzmyer) sees the gentile context being highlighted and the changes exemplifying Luke’s “more pretentious use of language” (Luke 1–9:20, 406). While the relationship to the gentiles is not clear, the changes are clearly stylistic with a further such change at v. 31 where Luke omits πολλά (which obviously provides emphasis in Mark).
167This is the only Lukan occurrence of ἀβυσσός but elsewhere it refers to the abode of the dead (Ps 107:26; Rom 10:7) or the final place of imprisonment and/or punishment of Satan and the demons (Rev 20:3) (so, for example, in Fitzmyer, Luke, 739; Johnson, Luke, 137; Tannehill, Luke, 146; Bock, Luke, 755; and Nolland, Luke 1–9:20, 410). Green (Luke, 340) notes other Jewish references to ἀβυσσός as a place of punishment (I Enoch 10:4-6; 18:11-16; Jub. 5:6-10) and Bock (Luke, 775) notes various parallel NT terms (ἀδής in Luke 10:15; 16:23; γέεννα in Luke 12:5; ταρταρόσω in 2 Pet 2:4). In the LXX ἄβυσσός frequently translates the Hebrew תֵהוֹם (Tehom; Gen 1:2; 7:11; Job 41:32 [41:24 in MT]; Ps 71:20), the watery deep of the cosmic sea under the earth (symbol of chaos and disorder conquered by the creator) (Fitzmyer, Luke, 739; Bock, Luke, 775). Thus the Lukan ἄβυσσός most likely refers to a place of “final defeat and imprisonment in the ‘unfathomable deep’” perhaps in keeping with a Lukan notion of Jesus’ ministry being the first of a two stage defeat of Satan (Twelftree, Miracle Worker, 156). As such the notion of punishment is clearer in Luke than Mark (so Dibelius, Tradition, 88) and Jesus’ authority over the demonic world is stressed (Bock, Luke, 775). Mark’s ‘out of the region’ possibly has Roman political overtones (see above) which Luke wanted to avoid. The story is told from a Jewish perspective and places “no value on the swine and is not concerned about the owners loss” (Tannehill, Luke, 146).
168κρατάς: τὸ ἀνακρατάς; λέγει τῷ ἔτειν.
169Nolland says Luke’s omission of ‘running from afar’ and ‘immediately’ (Mark 5:2) creates clarity and a smoother transition from v.27 (initial description) to v. 28 (meeting) (Luke 1–9:20, 407). See also comments above.
Jesus being ordered by the demon while replacing προσεκύνησεν with προσέπεσεν avoids demonic ‘reverence’ toward Jesus. Both changes reflect the 2DH Matthew and (as discussed above) appear more plausible for Markan priority than posteriority. While the changes toward conciseness in relation to verse 29b (description of demoniac) are noted above, in verse 29a Luke also changes Mark’s ἔλεγεν (‘was saying’) to παρῆγγειλεν (‘ordered’) which perhaps reinforces Jesus’ authority over the demons in keeping with changes just noted for verse 28. His change from direct to indirect speech in this same verse is likely stylistically motivated.

In verse 32 Luke is fifteen percent shorter (22 words in place of 26) essentially resulting from a change of Mark’s direct speech (by the demons in 5:12b) into indirect speech. This, along with other changes, is essentially stylistic. In verse 33 the 2DH Luke is fourteen percent shorter (23 words in place of 27) than Mark 5:13b (from the second καὶ) owing to more succinct terminology (τὰ δαιμόνια in place of τὰ πνεύματα τὰ ἀκόμαρτα) and omission of details (ὁς δισχίλιοι and ἐν τῇ θάλασσαν) that were presumably considered irrelevant or even problematic. Hence, despite adding the somewhat irrelevant phrase ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου in

---


171 Only three occurrences of προσκυνέω in Luke relate to worship and reverence directed toward either God (4:7, 8) or Jesus (24:52). Three uses of προσπίπτω each involve someone falling down before Jesus (Peter in 5:8; the demoniac in 8:28 = προσκυνέω in Mark 5:6; the hemorrhaging woman in 8:47 = προσπίπτω in Mark 5:33). While Fitzmyer renders προσπίπτω as ‘lunge’ (Luke, 738), something like “falls down before” seems better (agreeing with Nolland, Luke 1–9:20, 409). Nevertheless the result is a more dramatic account in Luke with changes apparently calculated to avoid any sense of demonic reverence toward Jesus (Fitzmyer, Luke, 738).

172 While the imperfect of παρηγγέλλω exists as a variant most consider the aorist as more original although it is variously understood as inceptive (‘he was about to command’) (Fitzmyer, Luke, 738), an “unfulfilled or incomplete action” (Marshall, Luke, 338), or as a pluperfect aorist (‘he had commanded’) (Nolland, Luke 1–9:20, 408). According to Twelftree παρήγγειλεν has military associations thereby giving the impression that Jesus was exercising demons in light of his being under authority and perhaps thereby harrowing back to the story of the centurion’s slave (Luke 7:8) (Miracle Worker, 156).

173 Marshall (Luke, 338) sees stylistic improvement but that it is not obviously the case.

174 E.g. ἰκανῶν replaces μεγάλη and modifies ‘pigs’ rather than ‘herd’ (similar to the 2DH Matthew except the latter uses πόλλας), which Nolland sees as a deliberate change from ‘great herd’ to a more modest ‘herd of quite a lot’ (Luke 1–9:20, 410); ἐν replaces πρὸς before the mountain and the whole prepositional phrase is moved further down in the sentence; and λέγουσις is removed on account of Luke’s changes to indirect speech. Nolland suggests that Luke’s “feeding on (ἐν) the mountain” better prepares for the plunge than does Mark’s “there by (πρὸς) the mountain” and that sending demons into animals is well attested in Hellenistic demonology (citing Annen, Heil, 152 in Luke 1–9:20, 410). He also notes the change from command (πείρασον) to permission (ἐπιτρέψῃ) (Luke 1–9:20, 410) though Marshall suggests that ἐπιτρέπεισον simply anticipates its use at the end of the verse (Luke, 339).

175 While ‘in the sea/lake’ is clearly an irrelevant repetition in Mark, the number of pigs might be deemed more relevant. 2DH Luke agrees with Mark (against Matthew) about the name (‘legion’) and hence the large number
relation to the pigs exit, Luke is more concise. His change from θάλασσαν to λίμνη likely introduces a more technically accurate term\textsuperscript{176} while the change to the compound verb (ἀπεπνίγη) is likely stylistic.\textsuperscript{177} In verse 36 Luke is thirty percent shorter (9 words in place of 13) essentially resulting from his omission of the unnecessary detail “and concerning the pigs” (καὶ περὶ τῶν χοίρων) at the end of Mark 5:16.\textsuperscript{178} It is not simply reported how it ‘came about’ (ἐγένετο) for the possessed man but how he was ‘healed’ (ἐσώθη), which possibly reflects Lukan interest in salvation but is not obviously related to miracle motifs.\textsuperscript{179} He also changes Mark’s ‘they reported’ (διηγήσαντο) into ‘they proclaimed’ (ἀπῆγγειλαν) but insofar as the reverse change appears in verse 39 (in relation to Jesus’ command for the healed man ‘to proclaim/report’ about what had happened to him) this is puzzling for any hypothesis.\textsuperscript{180} Finally the 2DH Luke is eighteen percent shorter in relation to the concluding conversation of verses 38

\textsuperscript{176} According to Fitzmyer Luke’s term better suits Gennesaret (Luke, 739).

\textsuperscript{177} According to Nolland (Luke 1–9:20, 411) Luke’s compound verb is more idiomatic for drowning but in essence the difference remains stylistic. While the reason for the pigs reaction is left unexplained (Bock, Luke, 776), it likely provides positive proof of exorcism. The ultimate state of the demons (once the pigs drown) is left unstated leading to at least three possibilities (Nolland, Luke 1–9:20, 411): (1) they are destroyed in the abyss after all (Jesus gets the better of them). According to Hull (Hellenistic Magic, 100) the water is to be understood as a “demon-destroying force” (T. Sol. 5:11: 11:6) (so also Marshall, Luke, 340). For Nolland, however, this works best for conflation of Mark and Luke but ‘lake’ does not generally function mythologically in Luke; (2) the demons take revenge on Jesus by ensuring his lack of favor with residents (Nolland suggests this is perhaps defensible in Mark but impossible in Luke); and (3) the demons unleash the same destructive powers on pigs that they unleashed on the man (Nolland sees this as most likely). In essence we can do little more than speculate since none of the evangelists is explicit on these matters. See also n. 88 above.

\textsuperscript{178} Johnson calls this an admirable summary of Mark’s “rambling paraphrasis” in Mark 5:16 (Luke, 138–9) but that seems an overly harsh judgment on Mark.

\textsuperscript{179} The verb σώζω is commonly associated with healing in all three Synoptic Gospels (e.g., Matt 9:21, 22; Mark 5:23, 28, 34; 6:56; Luke 8:48, 50) and according to several commentators relates to a special Lukan interest in “salvation” (Twelftree, Miracle Worker, 156; Nolland, Luke 1–9:20, 412; Fitzmyer, Luke, 740; and Marshall, Luke, 340) and especially related to the Gentile world (Green, Luke, 336) though this is not clearly a Lukan miracle motif. Whatever else is meant by Lukan ‘salvation,’ however, it clearly involves physical healing and release from demons (Marshall, Luke, 340; Bock, Luke, 778).

\textsuperscript{180} Bock describes it as “an odd variation to say the least” (Luke, 778) though according to Marshall “it looks as though (Luke) prefers ἀπαγγέλλω for the secular pronunciation and διηγέομαι for Christian narration” (Luke, 340; so also Nolland, Luke 1–9:20, 413). Luke’s usage of these two words, however, makes it difficult to sustain a clear distinction. While ἀπαγγέλλω is more common (26x in Luke-Acts vs. 5x for διηγέομαι), Lukan usage is certainly not confined to ‘non-believing’ reports. For example ἀπαγγέλλω is used of John’s disciples reporting about Jesus’ deeds (7:20), what Jesus subsequently tells them to report on (7:22), and most strikingly of the women’s report about Jesus empty tomb to the disciples in 24:9 (other uses of ἀπαγγέλλω includes 8:20, 34, 36, 47; 9:36; 13:1; 14:21; 18:37 and various in Acts). Alternately the apostles ‘describe’ (διηγομαι) their activity (upon return from mission) to Jesus in Luke 9:10 (other uses of διηγομαι include Acts 8:33; 9:27; 12:17).
and 39 (41 words in place of 50) which parallels Mark 5:18b-20.\(^{181}\) Initially (v. 38) Luke is less succinct, replacing the 8 words of Mark 5:18b (παρέκλησεν ... ἦ) with 13 words, but without adding substance. In verse 39 he is more concise but omits the Markan notation that “everyone was amazed” thus going against his validation theme which, as noted above, is frequently represented by positive reactions to Jesus’ miracles.\(^{182}\) Alternatively the omission may be motivated by the fact that earlier in the narrative the people of the region have explicitly rejected Jesus (v. 37) whereby the omission was seen to enhance clarity and credibility.\(^{183}\) That Luke has the healed man proclaim more narrowly in the ‘city’ rather than ‘the Decapolis’ is not readily explicable in relation to narrative rhetoric or miracle motifs.\(^{184}\) Other changes involve either style\(^{185}\) or omission of unnecessary detail.\(^{186}\)

In relation to the elements of narrative the 2DH Luke generally retains more details related to the element of person than his 2DH Matthean counterpart, especially in retaining the final conversation of Luke 8:38-39. In relation to Mark he tends to highlight Jesus’ authority as per the changes noted above (especially in vv. 28 and 29). He retains all of Mark’s actions without significant change in relation to their manner. The 2DH Luke clarifies the element of cause in relation to this initial encounter by omitting “ran from afar” (as did the 2DH Matthew) and changes the reason for the demon’s request to go into the pigs (namely to avoid the abyss) though this does not add a cause so much as replace the one in Mark (desire not to leave the territory). Finally the 2DH Luke heightens the emphasis on the people’s ‘fear’ (by repeating the motif), which is the cause of their rejecting Jesus, but (like Mark) he omits the reason for the

\(^{181}\)These verses have been read as a later addition relating the story to a Decapolis mission but others regard them as pre-Markan (Marshall, *Luke*, 336). Marshall calls the story “a paradigm of what conversion involves” insofar as the man is sent with the task of proclamation (*Luke*, 341).

\(^{182}\)Pesch (following Bultmann) says praise is a formal characteristics of exorcisms (“Gerasene Demoniacs,” 354).

\(^{183}\)So Nolland (*Luke* 1–9:20, 413). Alternatively it might be argued that Mark has two different groups of people in mind in 5:17 and 20, or that he envisages a change whereby “misapprehension gives way to amazement” (so Craghan, “Gerasene,” 527).


\(^{185}\)E.g. ἀπέλυσεν for ἀφῄκεν; λέγων for λέγει αὐτῷ; ὑπόστρεψε for ὑπάσχε; θεός for κύριος; and διηγοῦ for ἀπαγγείλων.

\(^{186}\)E.g. πρὸς τοὺς σοὺς and καὶ ἠλέησεν σε.
fear. The 2DH Luke retains all of Mark’s *time* notices with the minor exception of ‘day and night’ (Mark 5:5). At the same time, like the 2DH Matthew, he agrees with Mark in placing the story chronologically after the storm stilling although in omitting the reference to ‘evening’ in Mark 4:35 potentially enhances clarity. Regarding the element of *place* he agrees on the location of Gerasa (notwithstanding the textual uncertainty) thus retaining the geographical difficulties associated with that location. “Out of the tombs” in Mark 5:2 becomes “out of the city” which is problematic for Gerasa (given its distance from the lake) but not if the reference simply refers to the demoniac’s place of origin (rather than his specific location when Jesus appears), which seems reasonable given that Luke goes on to note his home among the tombs (v. 27). He omits the demoniac’s whereabouts “among the mountains” (Mark 5:5) but adds that he was often driven into the desert (8:29). He agrees with Mark that the pigs are located on a mountain (8:32) and rush down a steep bank (8:33) but has them go into a λίμνη rather than the θάλασσαν (Mark 5:13). He agrees with Mark that the report of the events went out into the city and countryside (8:34) but is more specific in noting that people from the “whole surrounding region of the Gerasenes” came out to see Jesus as a result (8:37). Finally he has the man proclaim “in the city” (8:39) rather than the “Decapolis” (Mark 5:20). None of these changes is particularly problematic for the 2DH Luke but the same can be said in reverse.

Regarding narrative virtues the 2DH Luke is generally more concise than Mark but not nearly as much as the 2DH Matthew and sometimes is longer, albeit plausible reasons can be provided for some of these additions. He *clarifies* the cause of the initial encounter (omitting the demoniac running from afar) and his omission of people’s amazement (Mark 5:20) is perhaps more consistent with their initial rejection of Jesus (Luke 8:37) albeit avoiding a typical Lukan miracle motif (validation). He heightens the emphasis on the people’s fear but, like Mark, leaves the

---

187 As was likewise the case for the 2DH Matthew. In essence, however, the phrase highlights the ongoing (‘continual’) nature of the man’s suffering and is not a reference to a specific point in time or period of time.  
188 The change to λίμνη is perhaps one change that suggests an improvement that is better understood as indicating Markan priority. At the same time having the healed demoniac proclaim in the city reintroduces the problem of the distance of Gerasa from the lake.
cause of the fear unstated. Having Jesus return home prior to the final conversation (υπέστρεψεν added in v. 37) creates a chronological inconsistency that reduces clarity and credibility.

6.2.3 The FH and the Gadarene/Gerasene Demonic(s)

Finally we may consider the narrative from the standpoint of the FH according to which the story was first taken over from Mark by Matthew and then from both Mark and Matthew by Luke. Matthew’s use of Mark is shared with the 2DH and has already been discussed above. It remains, therefore, to consider the implications of Luke’s purported use of Matthew upon the assumption of Markan priority insofar as this sets apart the FH (Luke has Mark and Matthew) from both the 2DH (Luke has only Mark) and 2GH (Luke has only Matthew). The above discussion has also already indicated that Luke’s details are closer to Mark than Matthew whereby much of the Matthew-Luke overlap is explicable with reference to Mark. This is potentially problematic for the FH in that Luke has chosen the less concise account (noting brevity as a narrative virtue) but this simply opens up the broader question of whether Luke’s narrative (assuming Markan priority) is better explained as independent redaction of Mark or as redaction influenced by Matthew. This may be detected either negatively (things we might expect Luke to take over from Matthew but does not) or positively (things added by Luke to Mark that are best explained as coming from Matthew). The latter, the so called MAs, are central to any argument for Luke’s purported use of Matthew (both for the 2GH and FH).189 While it

should be remembered that such agreements are not always ‘minor,’ insofar as the Matthew-Luke double tradition is better described as a series of ‘major agreements,’ most triple tradition pericopes (including the present one) do not fit that category. MAs are of various kinds including those of common omission, addition, and transformation (relative to Mark). Generally, assuming conciseness as a virtue, we can reasonably expect that the 2DH Luke will independently tend to abbreviate Mark (especially omitting redundancies) in ways that overlap with the 2DH Matthew. Agreements in transformations and especially additions, however, are less likely to occur independently but ultimately each case needs to be judged on its own merits. With this in mind let us consider MAs in the pericope under consideration.

First, there are no agreements in additions, which is hardly surprising given the extent of Matthean abbreviation whereby he essentially adds nothing to Mark. The agreement to omit the number of pigs (Ὧς δις ἀγέλοι in Mark 5:13) occurs in a context of high verbatim triple agreement but is also explicable as independent redaction and does not therefore provide strong evidence for Luke’s use of Matthew. Luke also agrees with Matthew in avoiding ὄρκιζω (Mark 5:7) although, as noted above, this potentially results from a desire to lessen the sense of Jesus being ordered by the demons and can, therefore, also be understood as independent redaction (especially given that the end result in Matthew and Luke is quite different). Another agreement in transformation includes two instances of καί being changed to δέ (Luke 8:33, 34; par. Matt 8:32, 33), which are readily understood as independent stylistic changes. Perhaps the most significant MA, however, involves the occurrence of the phrase ὀμβατι ἐποιευν in Luke Boring, “The Synoptic Problem, ‘Minor’ Agreements, and the Beelzebul Pericope,” in The Four Gospels 1992: Festschrift Frans Neirynck. Vol. 1., ed. F. Van Segbroeck, C. M. Tuckett, G. Van Belle, and J. Verheyden, BETL 100 (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1992), 587–619; idem, “The ‘Minor Agreements’ and Their Bearing on the Synoptic Problem,” in New Studies in the Synoptic Problem: Oxford Conference, April 2011: Essays in Honour of Christopher M. Tuckett, ed. Paul Foster, Andrew Gregory, John S. Kloppenborg, and Joseph Verheyden, BETL 239 (Leuven; Paris; Walpole, MA: Uitgeverij Peeters, 2011), 227–51; Friedrichsen, “The Minor Agreements of Matthew and Luke Against Mark: Critical Observations on R. B. Vinson’s Statistical Analysis.”

The major agreements include all of what is considered ‘Q’ and ‘Mark-Q overlap’ such as the extended temptation narrative and the Sermon on the Mount. For the contention that there is a ‘continuum’ of agreements between Matthew and Luke against Mark see Goodacre, Against Q, 152–69.

For the specific challenges associated with identifying MAs see Boring, “Minor Agreements.”

See nn. 87 and 175 above.

Matthew omits ὄρκιζω whereas Luke replaces it with δέομαι.
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8:37 which is paralleled in Matt 9:1 and stands over against ἐμβαίνωντος αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸ πλοῖον in Mark 5:18. This relates to the above noted phenomenon whereby Luke has Jesus return home prior to his discussion with the healed man thereby creating a chronological inconsistency. According to Goulder it is this very lapse of logic, along with the MA, that betrays Luke’s knowledge of Matthew at this point. This reasoning is hardly convincing, however, given that Mark is clearly Luke’s primary source for the response of the townspeople (vv. 35-37) and the conversation with the healed man (vv. 38-39). Furthermore the preference for ἐμβάς εἰς πλοῖον (over against the Markan ἐμβαίνωντος αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸ πλοῖον) involves a relatively minor stylistic change that can just as easily be explained by independent redaction as by the influence of Matthew. The inconsistency related to Luke’s addition of ὑπέστρεψεν is clearly not directly influenced by Matthew who has διεπέρασεν at this same point and omits the entire conversation with the healed man. In essence the Lukan inconsistency remains problematic for Markan priority but does not clearly point to Luke’s knowledge of Matthew. Goulder identifies two more potential MAs in this passage. First, Luke’s ὑπήντησεν (8:27) agrees with Matt 8:28 over against ἀπήντησεν, which appears as a textual variant in Mark 5:2. Not only is this textually uncertain, however, but even if accepted the common agreement of Matthew and Luke against Mark involves relatively minor and understandable stylistic change. Second, Luke’s ἀγέλη χοίρων ἱκανῶν (8:32) is somewhat closer to Matt 8:30 (ἀγέλη χοίρων πολλῶν) than Mark 5:11 (ἀγέλη χοίρων μεγάλη). This possibly comes about in connection with omitting the

194 According to Goulder this is the most striking MA in the pericope though he notes that the general lack of MAs is in part owing to Matthew’s brevity (Luke, 422).
196 There is almost no verbal overlap with Matthew even when he agrees with Mark (e.g., παρακαλέσαν in Matt 8:34 with παρακαλεῖν in Mark 5:17 versus ἤρωτησεν in Luke 8:37) and Matthew obviously omits the interchange between Jesus and the healed man.
198 Despite being unidentified in the NA 26 text the variant reading of ἀπήντησεν (Markan MSS: A W 33*) is favored as more original by Collins (Mark, 264), who is agreeing with Greeven. The judgment is based on the fact that the same verb occurs later in Mark 14:13 (not in Matthew and only in Luke 17:12 as a variant) whereas ὑπάντησε (Markan MSS: B C D et al.) does not occur elsewhere in Mark (cf. Matt 28:9; Luke 14:31; 17:12). Collins (assuming Markan priority) believes Matthew and Luke have independently changed the verb.
number of the pigs (‘about 2000’) and taken together may reflect Matthean influence but independent redaction seems equally plausible.

While these various MAs and Matthean echoes in Luke represent possible evidence for Luke’s use of Matthew, we must also consider those instances where Luke passed over Matthean material that we might otherwise expect him to take up. In particular he is noted to agree with Mark against Matthew in the Gerasa location albeit Matthew’s location (Gadara) is closer to the lake and therefore more credible (notwithstanding the thorny textual problem). Likewise, despite significantly transforming the Markan account of the demoniac in Mark 5:3-5, Luke does not betray any knowledge of the Matthean notation about the demoniac blocking Jesus’ path (Matt 8:28) albeit that this adds a degree of clarity regarding the cause of the confrontation. In several places the FH Luke ignores both his sources: “which is opposite Galilee” versus “to the other side” (Luke 8:26);\(^1\) omit “out of the tombs” (Mark 5:2; Matt 8:28); omit λέγοντες (Mark 5:12; Matt 8:31); change of demons’ direct speech into indirect (Luke 8:32); change of θάλασσαν into λίμνη (Luke 8:33); and omit τῶν ὀρίων (Mark 5:17; Matt 8:34). None of these changes, however, is particularly problematic and some may even be desirable (e.g., θάλασσαν into λίμνη).

Thinking about the FH Luke from the standpoint of Theon’s narrative elements it is clear that he primarily follows Mark whereby the above comments about the 2DH Lukan use of Mark are relevant here and need not be repeated in detail. In essence he follows Mark in relation to person and action as well as place and manner. Regarding time and cause his omission of “run from afar” (Luke 8:28) in relation to the demoniac is a change that is possibly motivated by a knowledge of Matthew who likewise omits this motif.\(^2\) Regarding narrative virtues the FH

---

\(^1\)Speaking from a literary critical perspective Green (Luke, 335) notes that this is Jesus’ first excursion into Gentile territory (albeit he has encountered Gentiles previously in 6:17 and 7:1-10) and, therefore, the designation “which is opposite Galilee” is a way of signalling this important boundary crossing. If so then it provides a potential reason for FH Luke disagreeing with his sources. If the title “most high God” is typically Gentile (see above n. 73) this further indicates Luke’s intentional highlighting of Gentile motifs here.

\(^2\)This could possibly be counted as an additional MA of omission although in the case of Matthew the entire verse (Mark 5:6) is omitted whereas Luke retains the verse and transforms it (including omitting this phrase).
Luke clearly sides with the longer and less concise Markan narrative albeit plausibly motivated by Mark’s concluding conversation (Mark 5:18-20) taken up in Luke 8:38-39. With the possible exception of the omission of having the demoniac run from afar there is no clear evidence that Matthew has influenced Lukan clarity and/or credibility.

In summary it may be said that there is relatively little evidence of Matthean influence upon the Lukan account once Markan priority is assumed. This need not be a problem for the FH in that Luke may simply be understood as using Mark as his primary source in relation to this pericope, which fits better with the ancient procedure of one source at a time. Indeed if Matthew-Luke agreements against Mark were significantly increased (without loss of Mark-Luke agreements against Matthew) then we would move toward a similar scenario that exists for the 2GH Mark, namely the FH Luke would look like a micro-conflation of Matthew and Mark, a procedure that (as noted above) is questionable. In this respect the triple tradition MAs potentially demonstrate Matthean influence based on Luke’s general awareness of Matthew despite working directly from Mark as his primary source. Such influence is most plausible in relation to distinctive elements of the story, which are likely to stand out in memory, and less so for (minor) stylistic changes such as καί to δὲ or the phrase ἐμὸν ἐξ ἐριζ ἡ πλοῖον in Luke 8:37 (par. Matt 9:1). Such distinctive elements include the omission of the numbering of pigs (‘about 2000’), the demon blocking the path, and the identification of the place as the region of the Gerasenes. Insofar as the first of these agrees with Matthew (against Mark) and latter two with Mark (against Matthew) it perhaps slightly favors the 2DH although it should be born in the mind that Gerasenes is a problematic textual variant.
6.3 Jairus’ Daughter and the Hemorrhaging Woman (Mark 5:21-43; Matt 9:18-26; Luke 8:40-56)

The story of Jairus’ daughter and the hemorrhaging woman (Mark 5:21-43; Matt 9:18-26; Luke 8:40-56) provides our second triple tradition miracle narrative to be examined. Along with the Gadarene demoniac it is one of the longest Synoptic miracle narratives \(^{201}\) (374 words in Mark, 287 in Luke, and 138 in Matthew) and provides one of the clearest examples of narrative intercalation. \(^{202}\) The many differences among the accounts provide a basis for considering our question of rhetorical adaptation in relation to our three chosen hypotheses.

6.3.1 The 2GH: Jairus’ Daughter and the Hemorrhaging Woman

While a study of tradition history raises the interesting question of when these two stories came together,\(^ {203}\) more important for the present study are the implied redactional changes

---

\(^{201}\) Bultmann (History, 214) and Taylor (Formation, 120) classify it as a ‘healing miracle,’ while Dibelius classifies it as a Tale (Tradition, 71).

\(^{202}\) See brief discussion of intercalation in chapter 5 (under discussion of Markan structuring devices). In relation to the present narrative there are many points of contact between the two stories (catalogued in table 6.4) suggesting they should be read together. Green sees Luke’s intercalated narrative highlighting faith and showing an affinity to Luke 7:11-17 with both representing deeds of the Messiah (7:22) (Luke, 343–44). Boring (assuming Markan priority and Markan intercalation) sees Mark highlighting irony through both contrast (Jairus is wealthy/respected; the woman is a poor afflicted female and excluded from synagogue) and similarity (both Jairus and the woman approach Jesus with faith and overcome an impurity barrier). He also notes contrasts and parallels of the two women (unclean and unable to be touched; both become life givers - able to have children; girl is of marriageable age; number 12; both delivered on same day; verb ἑκάστου used of both) (Mark, 157–8). Robbins suggests the insertion of the woman’s story functions to create a time lapse (accentuating the actual death of Jairus’ daughter) and present the woman’s healing as anticipating the girl’s raising (“The Woman Who Touched Jesus’ Garment: Socio-Rhetorical Analysis of the Synoptic Accounts,” NTS 33 [1987]: 502). France is less convinced of the overlap and thinks the intercalation is pre-Markan (“from the tradition”) stating that “it is not at all obvious what thematic connection is achieved by this particular ‘sandwich’” (except the point of their both being women). He nevertheless acknowledges the parallel of twelve years and the possible connection to uncleanness (which also relates it to the previous story of the Gerasene Demoniac) and the following controversy over impurity laws in Mark 7) (Mark, 234–5). Similarly Hedrick suggests that the (Markan) method of intercalation “has protected the integrity of each story as an independent unit” such that the “horizons of the stories are merely contiguous, not overlapping” (“Miracle Stories as Literary Compositions: The Case of Jairus’s Daughter,” Perspectives in Religious Studies 20/3 [1993]: 219, n.8).

\(^{203}\) When exactly the intercalation occurred is debated among scholars. Among advocates of Markan priority opinions differ as to whether the two stories were: (1) originally (historically) coincident (e.g., Marshall, Luke, 341; Bock, Luke, 785–7; Cranfield, Mark, 182; Gundry, Mark, 268); (2) intercalated at a later date but prior to their inclusion in Mark perhaps, for example (so Fuller), to explain Jesus’ delay and the reason why the girl was dead upon his arrival (e.g., Dibelius, Tradition, 219; Bultmann, History, 214; Fuller, Interpreting, 55; Twelftree, Miracle Worker, 73; Kertelge, Die Wunder, 110; and Fitzmyer, Luke, 742–3, who sees Markan redaction only in the command to silence in 5:43a); (3) intercalated by Mark himself (e.g., Achtemeier, “Toward the Isolation of Pre-
associated with our three hypotheses. In this regard I will begin with Luke’s implied use of Matthew and then Mark’s implied conflation of Matthew and Luke.

**a) Luke’s use of Matthew**

The 2GH Luke both relocates and significantly expands the account to more than twice the length of Matthew (287 words replace 138) albeit the changes involve abbreviation and other adaptations which will need to be explored in relation to each major section (see tables 6.5 and 6.6). First, the 2GH Luke essentially replaces the Matthean transitional verse (“while Jesus was saying these things to them ...” Matt 9:18a) with his statement about Jesus returning across the lake and a crowd waiting for him (Luke 8:40). The end result is significantly longer (15 words replace 4) with none of Matthew’s wording taken over. In part this results from giving the story a new setting in the narrative (after the Gerasene demoniac) and from the addition of the crowd motif. This addition is explicable insofar as the crowd plays an important role in relation to the hemorrhaging woman (e.g., Luke 8:42, 45) and ties into the validation theme insofar as the woman’s ‘confession’ occurs “in front of all the people” (ἐνώπιον παντὸς τοῦ λαοῦ) (8:47), albeit the reverse occurs in relation to the girl’s raising (see below on Luke 8:56; Matt 9:26).
In relation to the ruler’s request (Luke 8:41-42a; Matt 9:18b) Luke shares only 4 words with Matthew (17% of Matthew; 10% of Luke) while expanding his account significantly (38 words in place of 23) beginning with his replacement of the simple Matthean designation of ‘one of the rulers’ (ἀρχων ἐξ) with his ten word description, “ἀνὴρ ὄνομα Ἰαίρος καὶ οὗτος ἀρχων τῆς συναγωγῆς ὑπῆρξεν, which identifies the name (Jairus) and the nature of his responsibility (a synagogue ruler). Matthew’s three word description of the ruler’s prostration before Jesus (ἔλθων προσκυνεῖ αὑτῷ) is expanded to eight (ἤλθεν ... καὶ πεσὼν παρὰ τοῦ πόδας [του] Ἰησοῦ ...) and the simple designation of ‘my daughter’ (ἡ θυγάτηρ μου; 3 words) is expanded to ‘his only daughter, about twelve years old ...’ (θυγάτηρ μονογενής ἡν αὐτῷ ὡς ἐτῶν δώδεκα; 7 words). Finally the two word request ‘to come’ (λέγων ... ἔλθων) is expanded to 7 words in Luke (παρεκάλει αὐτὸν ἔσελθειν εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ). While the net result is less concise and none of these 2GH Lukan expansions is clearly related to Lukan miracle motifs, the expanded description of the ruler and his daughter could perhaps be justified on the basis of the narrative element of person. In addition to this the notation about age provides a link between the two stories. The Lukan addition of “to his house” specifies location (narrative element of place) to which the ruler is to come although this is implied in Matt 9:18 and is made explicit in 9:23 (par. Luke 8:51) thereby making it somewhat redundant here. Despite generally expanding his source the 2GH Luke omits the concluding request, “lay your hand upon her and she will live” (Matt 9:18b), which not only identifies the manner of action (seeks willing consent and placement of hands) but also the cause of the request (namely that the girl may be healed). The omission, however, is equally problematic for Markan priority hypotheses insofar as Mark 5:23 contains a parallel to the omitted Matthean phrase. Additional 2GH Lukan changes include replacing direct speech with indirect speech, changing λέγων to παρεκάλει, and “she has just died” (ἀρτι ἐτελεύτησεν) to “she was dying” (αὕτη ἀπέθνησεν). The last change potentially

---

209 It was noted above that the Markan priority Luke replaces προσκύνησεν with προσέπεσεν in Luke 8:28 (par. Mark 5:7; no parallel in Matthew). Here the 2GH Luke replaces Matthew’s προσκύνει with πεσὼν albeit the context here is clearly more positive. Notably Mark has a direct parallel to the Lukan phrase (5:22).
lessens the sense of the ruler’s initial faith in that Matthew has him seeking Jesus despite the girl having already died (Luke has the girl die later when the delegation comes from the ruler’s house in 8:49). \textsuperscript{210} In sum the 2GH Lukan account of the request is very much ‘in other words’ (only 10% of Matthean wording is adopted) and is less concise than Matthew (65% longer) though has possible rhetorical enhancements in relation to the element of \textit{person} and the addition of 12 years of age. Most of the additions are paralleled in Mark (the primary exception being Luke 8:42a) and, therefore, are at least equally plausibly explained from the standpoint of Markan priority. Given that several of the expansions are not readily explicable rhetorically this favors the hypothesis of Luke using Mark rather than Matthew. \textsuperscript{211} Luke’s Omission of the concluding request in Matt 9:18 (‘lay your hand upon her and she will live’) remains problematic for all hypotheses given the Markan parallel (5:23).

The narrative now shifts to the hemorrhaging woman (Luke 8:42b-48) where the 2GH Luke (119 words) is more than twice the length of Matthew (58 words) (see table 6.6) albeit taking over thirty three percent Matthew’s wording (19 words), consisting a few words in Luke 8:43 (par. Matt 9:20a) and some longer phrases in Luke 8:44a and 48 (par. Matt 9:20b and 22). Much of the shared wording is common to Mark (and therefore explicable by Markan priority). There is, however, an eight word MA in Luke 8:44 (προσελθοῦσα ... αὐτοῦ) although five of those words are shared with Mark. While obviously implying Lukan use of Matthew, the extent of 2GH Lukan rewriting of Matthew up to this point in the narrative begs the question as to why he suddenly chooses to follow Matthew’s wording at this point, a procedure which seems somewhat idiosyncratic. \textsuperscript{212} The 2GH Luke makes several expansions of (or additions to) the hemorrhaging woman beginning in 8:43b where he adds 11 Greek words describing the despairing state of the woman (‘who had spent all her life on physicians but was unable to be healed by anyone’). This

\textsuperscript{210} The subsequent exhortation for the ruler to believe (Luke 8:50) also lessens the sense of the ruler’s faith. In Matthew there is no delegation and no equivalent exhortation to belief.

\textsuperscript{211} Luke is also noted be more concise than Mark (see figures in table 6.6) thus adding further credibility to the Markan priority hypothesis (see below on the 2DH Lukan use of Mark).

\textsuperscript{212} The presence of MAs of course does not automatically favor the 2GH since the FH also argues for Luke’s knowledge of Matthew. This MA will therefore be discussed further below.
potentially functions encomiastically (element of *person* and validation motif) in relation to Jesus’ power by highlighting the difficulty of the cure and showing Jesus’ superiority over the physicians.\(^{213}\)

A second addition in Luke 8:44b-47 (69 words) involves the notation of the woman’s healing and the interchange between Jesus, the disciples, and the woman. Matthew has no mention of healing prior to Jesus’ word (‘your faith has made you well’) and states that “the woman was healed from that hour” (Matt 9:22) thereby giving the impression that she was not healed until *after* Jesus gave the word. Luke, however, is explicit about an immediate (παραξρήμα) healing prior to any word from Jesus (8:44b and 47) and replaces Matthew’s statement about the woman being healed from that hour with “go in peace” (8:48b). The effect is to give Jesus a more passive role in the healing albeit recognizing that power (δύναμίς)\(^{214}\) has gone out from him leading to the question ‘who touched me?’ (8:46). Thus Luke changes the *manner* or *cause* of the healing from a word of Jesus (in Matthew) to the power inherent in Jesus’ garments. While he agrees with Matthew’s statement ‘your faith has healed you’ (Luke 8:48; Matt 9:22), his changes stress faith in the ‘touching’ (of Jesus’ garment) rather than faith in the ‘person’ of Jesus (implicit in Matthew).\(^{215}\)

At the same time Luke’s addition of the crowd motif (see above) heightens Jesus’ supernatural powers of observation insofar as the absence of the crowd in Matthew makes the woman’s touch less inconspicuous. Luke also adds an explicit note of validation by having the woman confess “before the people” (8:47). In essence, therefore,

\(^{213}\)Notably ἵστροις προσαναλύωσα δολον τον βίου is a textual variant which either appears in a different form (with συνῆς appearing after βίον) or is omitted all together. The manuscript evidence is fairly strong for inclusion though it is absent from \(\text{p}^\text{5}\) and B. The UBS committee include it with a “C” rating. While it might be taken as a harmonization to Mark, the wording is quite different. The evidence, therefore, favors keeping the reading although even without it 2GH Luke still enhances the miracle with his statement that none were able to heal her (Luke 8:43).

\(^{214}\)While Twelftree (*Miracle Worker*, 157) sees the eschatological power of the Spirit in relation to healing (cf. Luke 4:14), Hull (*Hellenistic Magic*, 87–115, especially 105, 107, 109-110) sees magical “mana-like charge of divine potency” (ibid., 105), a power that can pass “from one person to another” (ibid., 107). Thus the woman in Luke’s story has no personal interest in Jesus and the power that flows from him is not of his own willing but is magically present in him and his garment (109-110). Hull likewise sees magical elements in Mark but says Matthew has eliminated them. What precisely Luke has in mind does not significantly affect our analysis here though interestingly (assuming Markan priority as do Twelftree and Hull) Matt 9:21 retains mention of the woman’s motive (she will be healed if she touches Jesus’ garment) while Luke omits it. See further discussion below.

\(^{215}\)Notably, however, 2GH Luke omits Matt 9:21 (see below) which explicitly notes the woman’s belief she would be healed “if only I touch his garment” indicating a connection between touching and healing in Matthew also.
the 2GH Luke is less concise and lessens Jesus’ role in relation to the healing but heightens his powers of observation and enhances validation.

Despite a tendency to expand the 2GH Luke nevertheless omits details from Matthew beginning with the mention of the disciples accompanying Jesus (Matt 9:19). The Lukan parallel (8:42b) shares no words with Matthew and replaces the disciples with the crowds that ‘press in’ (συνέπνευσαν) although the presence of the disciples is implied by Peter’s speech (8:45) and the later mention of ‘the three’ (Peter, James and John) when he returns to the narrative of Jairus’ daughter (8:51). Given the significance of the crowd motif for validation the change is an understandable way of highlighting Jesus’ supernatural knowledge. Luke also omits Matt 9:21 which provides the reason for the woman’s actions: “for she was saying to herself: if only I touch his garment I will be healed.” As with the omission of the ruler’s request for Jesus to touch his daughter (Matt 9:18b) this relates to narrative cause albeit the reason (her desire to be healed) is clearly implied in Luke whereby his change may be taken as an instance of conciseness.216

Other 2GH Lukan transformations of Matthew include replacing αἵμαρροσῶσα δώδεκα ἔτη (‘bleeding for twelve years’) with the less concise οὕσα ἐν ῥῦσει αἵματος ἀπὸ ἔτων δώδεκα (‘being in flow of blood for twelve years’) (7 words replace 3) in Luke 8:43. While the change is somewhat odd in relation to Matthew, it is explicable with reference to Mark. Alternatively Luke 8:48 (Jesus pronounces about the woman’s faith) is more succinct than its parallel in Matt 9:22 (13 words in place of 23) in part by omitting details made irrelevant by his addition of Luke 8:44b-47, namely that Jesus turned to see her (στραφεῖς καὶ ἴδὼν αὐτὴν) and that she was

216Robbins agrees that the woman’s ‘inner dialogue’ provides the motive or reason for her action which could have been understood variously (simplemindedness; boldness; faith; hope; courage; despair) but is clearly interpreted by Jesus as ‘faith.’ He sees a logical syllogism resulting from this motivation supplied in Matt 9:21: (a) major premise (an act of faith is able to make a person well); (b) minor premise (touching Jesus’ garment is an act of faith); (c) conclusion (therefore, the woman was made well) (“Woman,” 506–7). To the extent that such a neat syllogism is intended here, Luke has clearly broken the pattern. Nevertheless the reason for her action (that she sought healing by touching his garment) is not only implied by the fact that the healing is immediately recorded but also by the report about the woman’s previous failed attempts to obtain healing (Luke 8:43). Luke also explicitly states that the woman explained why she touched Jesus (Luke 8:47) albeit the reason itself (that she sought healing) is only implicit.
healed ‘from that hour.’\textsuperscript{217} In place of the note about healing Luke inserts “go in peace” which adds to the sense of wholeness associated with the healing.\textsuperscript{218} His omissions of θάρσει (‘take courage’) and the change from the vocative (θύγατερ) to the nominative (θυγάτηρ) are potentially stylistic and tend toward conciseness although the reason for the latter change (vocative to nominative) is not obvious. Again the differences are explicable with reference to Mark.

In the final section of the pericope, which resumes the story of the ruler’s daughter (Luke 8:49-56), the 2GH Luke (115 words) is again twice as long as Matthew (57 words). They share 17 words (30\% of Matthew’s; 15\% of Luke) consisting mostly of a few short phrases.\textsuperscript{219} Luke again makes various additions beginning with the delegation and response of Jesus in Luke 8:49-50. The delegation announcing the girl’s death (Luke 8:49) is obviously less concise than Matthew, who reported the death at the outset (Matt 9:18; cf. Luke 8:42 where ‘she was dying’), but adds dramatic tension insofar as the delay associated with the woman’s healing results in the girl’s death. Jesus’ exhortation (μὴ φοβοῦ μόνον πίστευσον, καὶ σωθήσεται in Luke 8:50) ties into the Lukan miracle motifs of validation and faith whereby miracles are intended to produce a positive response.\textsuperscript{220} Second, the 2GH Luke adds specific mention of the disciples (Peter, John, and James) who, along with the girl’s parents, are permitted to enter the house with Jesus. This contrasts his earlier omission from Matt 9:19 (see above) but while the disciples remain redundant characters in Matthew, they are key witnesses in Luke, which again ties into validation and faith/discipleship. Third, Luke adds an explicit reason for the laughter of the mourners, namely that “they knew she had died” (8:53b). This is perhaps implied in Matthew although the

\textsuperscript{217}Luke already mentioned the healing (8:44b) though never explicitly stated that Jesus turned around, presumably on account of it being implied and therefore unnecessary.

\textsuperscript{218}According to Twelftree this is a common farewell in Judaism (Judg 18:6; 1 Sam 1:17; 2 Sam 15:9; 1 Kgs 22:17; Acts 16:36; Jas 2:16) and takes on the meaning of having received healing as well as salvation (\textit{Miracle Worker}, 157, 388 n. 62).

\textsuperscript{219}Ε.γ. εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν; οὐ γὰρ ἀπέθανεν ... ἀλλὰ καθεύδει καὶ κατεγέλων αὐτοῦ; κρατήσας/ἐκράτησεν τῆς χειρὸς αὐτῆς.

\textsuperscript{220}Luke implies a contrast between Jairus (he needs exhorting to faith) and the woman (she simply acts in faith) that is not present in Matthew since the daughter is already dead.
2GH Luke may have felt the need to clarify the previous statement of Jesus that the girl was ‘not dead but sleeping’ (ό̑υ … ἀ πέθανεν ἀλλὰ καθεύδει) (Matt 9:24; Luke 8:53b). The Lukan testimony of ‘professional mourners’ indicates that Jesus statement is not pointing to a case of mistaken death but rather implies a metaphorical meaning (i.e. ‘her current state of death is only temporary and not final’) hence clarifying the nature of the miracle as a revivification. Fourth, Luke transforms and expands the healing notice whereby having first changed Matthew’s indirect speech (‘he grasped her hand and the girl was raised’ in 9:25) into direct speech (“having grasped her hand he called to her saying ‘girl, arise’”) in Luke 8:54) he then adds “her spirit returned and she arose immediately and he instructed them to give her something to eat”

---

221 The phrase (ό̑υ … ἀ πέθανεν ἀλλὰ καθεύδει) also occurs in Mark 5:39 and its meaning is debated. While καθεύδω normally refers to sleep and ‘sleep’ is a regular (biblical) metaphor for death, κοιμάμαι is the more usual verb for this metaphorical usage in the LXX and NT (so France, Mark, 239; see also comments of Hedrick, “Jairus’s Daughter,” 229 on sleep and resurrection terminology). Indeed, if καθεύδω is taken as ‘dead’ then Jesus is in effect saying “not dead, but dead,” which clearly makes little sense. Furthermore, Jesus seemingly sets aside the statement about her death (Mark 5:35-36; par. Luke 8:49-50), explicitly denies her death (Mark 5:39; par. Luke 8:52; Matt 9:24), and then speaks of her healing in terms of ‘getting up’ rather than coming to life (Mark 5:42; par. Luke 8:55) (France, Mark, 234 and 239). The possibility exists, therefore, that καθεύδω refers to some kind of trance or coma and that Jesus is correcting a misdiagnosis (so, for example, in Taylor, Mark, 285–6 although the ambiguity only exists for him in Mark’s version; in Matthew and Luke she is clearly dead). Davies and Allison, citing others who consider this option, note that it “can never be dismissed out of hand” (Matthew, 131–2) and Carl Amfriy suggests that the girl is not intended as an example of resurrection (unlike Lazarus) but of one who is ‘dead while she is alive’ (cf. 1 Tim 5:6) (“The Daughter of Jairus,” Bibliotheca Sacra 105 [1948]: 56–58). Despite these observations, however, most commentators consider that girl is depicted as dead with the following reasons being typical (Davies and Allison, Matthew, 131–2; France, Mark, 239; idem., Matthew, 361, 364; Bock, Luke, 801–2; Fitzmyer, Luke, 749; Johnson, Luke, 142; Nolland, Luke 1–9:20, 421; idem., Matthew, 398; Luz, Matthew, 43; Green, Luke, 351; Pesch, Markusevangelium, 308): (1) Jesus could not have known without seeing the girl; (2) John 11:11-14 offers a parallel where Jesus’ initial statement that ‘Lazarus is sleeping’ (κοιμάμαι) is later clarified with the statement that ‘he is dead’ (ἀποθνήσκω); (3) this provides the only example in Matthew of Jesus’ raising a dead person, which becomes important for Jesus’ answer to John’s question (Matt 11:5) (Davies and Allison, Matthew, 131–2); (4) the presence of mourners (Mark 5:38; Matt 9:23; Luke 8:52) who, in Luke at least, beat their breasts (ἐκσπέρνουσι) (cf. Luke 23:27) (e.g., Bock, Luke, 801–2; Fitzmyer, Luke, 749; Johnson, Luke, 142); (5) the scornful laughter (Mark 5:40; par. Luke 8:53; Matt 9:24) (France) to which Luke adds “knowing that she was dead” (e.g., Fitzmyer, Luke, 749; Nolland, Luke 1–9:20, 421); (6) Matthew provides a death notice up front (Matt 9:18) that is not challenged by Jesus (France). Insofar as some arguments apply only to Matthew and Luke the ambiguity remains greatest in Mark (so, for example, in Hedrick, “Jairus’s Daughter,” 229–30, who suggests the ambiguity may be deliberate; so also Lane, Mark, 196–7; Latourelle, Miracles, 123; Taylor, Mark, 295). Nevertheless the notice of death (Mark 5:35) and presence of mourners along with the language of raising (ἐγέρθη in Mark 5:41) remain fairly strong indicators that Mark depicts the girl as dead (or as Collins, Mark, 285, states: “the narrative rhetoric of the story ... makes clear that the girl is really dead”). This requires, however, that in all three cases καθεύδω refers neither to sleep (e.g., coma) or death in the normal sense (which leads to the statement ‘she is not dead but dead’) but rather to some kind of temporary state of death (so France, Mark, 239; Luz, Matthew, 43; Nolland, Matthew, 398; Green, Luke, 351; Bock, Luke, 801–2; Fitzmyer, Luke, 749; Nolland, Luke 1–9:20, 421), perhaps with eschatological victory over death in view (Boring, Mark, 162; Kertelge, Die Wunder, 116; Pesch, Markusevangelium, 308–9; Gundry, Mark, 273–4).
Chapter 6 Rhetorical Transformation of Miracle Tradition Pericopes

(Luke 8:55). Despite being less concise the additional ‘miracle proofs’ relate to the validation motif as does the addition of the parents’ ‘amazement’ (ἐξεστησαν in 8:56). Luke’s change of τὸ κοράσιον to ἡ παῖς (8:54) is probably stylistic.222

The 2GH Luke makes no significant omissions from Matthew but other transformations deserve mention. The notation about the ‘flute players and the disturbed crowd’ (Matt 9:23b: τοὺς αὐλητάς καὶ τὸν ὀχλὸν θορυβούμενον) is reworded slightly more concisely into ‘all were weeping and mourning for her’ (Luke 8:52a: ἐκλαίον ... πόντες καὶ ἐκοπτόντο τοῦ αὐτήν) but changes in the rest of the verse (Luke 8:52) are stylistic in nature223 rather than narrative rhetorical enhancements. The 2GH Luke, however, makes a more substantial change at the conclusion of the pericope when he reverses Matthew’s notation about the report spreading (Matt 9:26) into a command for secrecy (Luke 8:56). This not only creates a credibility problem (how do you hide a revivification especially given the Lukan crowd motif?) but goes against the Lukan validation motif which, in contrast to Matthew, the 2GH Luke has notably just highlighted in relation to the woman’s public confession (Luke 8:47) and his conclusion to the Gerasene demoniac story (see above on Luke 8:38-39). While the incongruity remains in either case it is more plausible to imagine Luke taking it over from Mark than to see him creating it contrary to Matthew (and then being followed by the 2GH Mark).224

In summary the 2GH Luke enhances the narrative element of person in the following ways: the ‘ruler’ is named (Jairus) and his office identified (‘ruler of the synagogue’); the woman’s

222 Κοράσιον appears 3x in Matthew (9:24, 25; 14:11) all with Markan parallels employing the same term (Mark 5:41, 42; 6:28 x2). The only other Synoptic occurrence is in Mark 6:22. Luke clearly prefers παῖς (on which see discussion below in relation to the centurion’s servant).

223 The parallels are Matt 9:24 and Luke 8:52b. The changes include: ὁ δὲ ἐὶ πεῦ for ἔλεγεν; the addition of μὴ κλαίετε in place of ἀνασχορεῖτε; and the omission of τὸ κοράσιον. The end result is that Luke replaces 17 words in Matthew (from καὶ ἰδὼν τὸ καθεῦδει) with 16 of his own.

224 According to McNicol et al. Luke’s change results from the fact that this particular miracle anticipates Jesus’ resurrection. Like the transfiguration (Luke 9:28) this is “too sacred an event to be spread abroad at the present stage in Jesus’ ministry” (Q Impasse, 129–31). Such ‘anticipation,’ however, is only likely to be seen in hindsight (post resurrection) since there is nothing intrinsic to the girl’s revivification that would lead anyone to expect Jesus’ resurrection. Within Luke the revivification is simply one of many miracles that provide validation of Jesus (Luke 7:21) and indeed news about a prior revivification has already been spread abroad (7:17). It remains more plausible to see Luke agreeing with Mark (despite the incongruity) and Matthew changing Mark into something more credible (as per Markan priority hypotheses).
failed healing attempts and public confession are added (Luke 8:43b, 47); the disciples’ presence is more explicit in both healings (8:45, 51); and Jesus more explicitly demonstrates his supernatural knowledge (in relation to the woman’s touch) on account of Luke’s emphasis on the crowd’s presence. The 2GH Luke retains the essential narrative elements of action (ruler requests healing; Jesus heals hemorrhaging woman on route; Jesus heals daughter) though heightens the difficulty of the woman’s healing through his more explicit reference to previously failed attempts at healing (8:43b). The manner and cause of the actions are similar in both except Luke omits the explicit purpose of the ruler’s request (‘that you may lay hands on her and she will be healed’ in Matt 9:18) and the woman’s rationale for her action (“for she thought ‘if only I touch his garment I will be healed’” in Matt 9:21). The woman’s healing is immediate in Luke 8:44b (versus Matthew’s apparent delay) and therefore more obviously related to her touch though both attribute it to faith (Luke 8:48; Matt 9:22) and Matt 9:21 (omitted by Luke) highlights the touch motif. Luke’s chronology (element of time) essentially follows Matthew although his extra details (e.g., 8:45-47) introduce a narrative delay that heightens tension by seemingly resulting in the girl’s death (announced by the delegation in Luke versus dead from the beginning in Matthew). The 2GH Luke makes no significant changes in relation to the element of place except perhaps being less clear about Jesus’ precise location. In Matthew Jesus is in his ‘home town’ (9:1), which is Capernaum according to Matt 4:13. In Luke Jesus has just returned from the eastern lakeside presumably arriving in the Capernaum area but this is not explicit. While both evangelists agree that the woman is healed on route to the ruler’s house (where the daughter is healed), they are not explicit about the distance travelled albeit the narrative implies a relatively short distance in both cases. In relation to narrative virtues Luke is less concise albeit enhancing dramatic tension and the narrative element of person.227 There are

225Noting that there is no change of scene from the immediately preceding pericope (Matt 9:1-17). In part the differences arise from the new placement of the story by the 2GH Luke (immediately after the Gerasene demoniac).
226Prior geographical notices have Jesus in Capernaum (7:1) and Nain (7:11) but then in the “cities and villages” (Luke 8:1). The precise location of these places is not given although the boat journey of Luke 8:22 suggests that he was on the east side of the lake prior to this.
227According to Peabody et al. this results from Luke’s “interest in stories about women” (One Gospel, 146) though in McNicol et al. they suggest that (on the eve of his commissioning of the twelve) Luke wished to accentuate Jesus’
no obvious instances where the 2GH Luke enhances either clarity or credibility but he does compromise these narrative virtues by changing the Matthean report notice (Matt 9:26) into a secrecy command (Luke 8:56). Finally, it may be noted that the 2GH Luke does not proceed in a consistent manner in relation to Matthew’s wording: he sometimes copies Matthew verbatim (e.g., 8:44) but at other times completely transforms his wording (e.g., 8:43). This is not necessarily a problem in and of itself except there are no obvious reasons for why Luke proceeds in this manner in any given instance and, furthermore, the differences may be explained with reference to Mark.

(b) Mark’s use of Matthew and Luke

In addition to following Luke in positioning the story after the Gerasene demoniac the 2GH Mark likewise prefers his longer account even expanding it to 374 words and thereby making him 30% longer than Luke (287 words) and 163% longer than Matthew (138 words). Insofar as this contravenes conciseness the 2GH Markan procedure requires a plausible explanation. This will be discussed for each section of the narrative (as per the divisions in table 6.5) beginning with the transitional verse in Mark 5:21 (par. Luke 8:40; Matt 9:18a). Here Mark follows Luke

“power and authority,” which he does through “frequent use of verisimilitude and novelistic expansions” of Matthew whereby the “theme of faith as a response to the great demonstrations of power is stressed” (Q Impasse, 130). It is not necessarily clear, however, that the expansions highlight Jesus’ power and authority and a case could be made for opposite in that the Lukan Jesus needs to ask who touched him (expansion in 8:45-47) whereas the Matthean Jesus knows without having to ask (Matt 9:22). Similarly the Lukan account has instantaneous healing (associated with the touch) while the Matthean account has healing only after Jesus’ word (Matt 9:22).

The one possible exception being in relation to Jesus’ statement to the woman about her faith (‘your faith has saved you’) which would more likely be better preserved (as shown by triple tradition agreement).

According to Peabody et al. “Mark has carefully conflated ... Matthew and Luke while, at the same time, considerably expanding them. These stories provide excellent examples of how Mark’s version ... is usually the longest ... even though Mark’s Gospel is shorter than either Matthew or Luke” (One Gospel, 145). This observation clearly describes the data (from the 2GH perspective) but does not explain why the 2GH Mark proceeded in this manner. While not assuming the 2GH, Robbins sees Mark’s story as an expanded chreia (“Woman,” 507–8; see also Kennedy, Progymnasmata, 21–22). This better opens up the possibility of rhetorical expansion (versus compression) although the pericope is better understood as a narrative than a chreia and Theon does not give examples of ‘expanded’ narratives (albeit the categories are not airtight compartments).

Hedrick offers an interesting alternative structural breakdown for the Markan narrative of Jairus’ daughter according to ‘periods’ (περιόδοι) and ‘clauses’ (κόλασαι) as defined in Aristotle’s Rhetoric (3.9.1-10) (“Jairus’ Daughter,” 219–20). Not only might some of his divisions be disputed (partly relating to the ambiguity of what exactly constitutes a period), however, but he also treats the story in isolation from the hemorrhaging woman.
alone for both the ‘sea crossing’ and the crowd motif but this is not surprising given their agreement against Matthew in situating the story after the Gerasene demoniac. Nevertheless Mark significantly rewrites Luke 8:40 so as to be 40% longer and only sharing 4 words. At least three changes are stylistic but less concise: καί for δέ; διαπεράσαντος … εἰς τὸ πέρον in place of ἐν … τῷ ὑποστρέφειν; and the crowd συνήχθη … ἐπ αὐτόν in place of ἀπεδέξατο σὺτὸν. Mark also adds the modifiers πάλιν and πολὺς along with the phase ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ each of which is somewhat redundant, especially the latter. Finally Mark replaces Luke’s explanatory (γῦρο) phrase about the crowd (“for they were all waiting for him”) with the statement that “he was alongside the sea.” Mark’s phrase is the more redundant one in that he (Jesus) was obviously alongside the sea (having just crossed over it) and the lakeside location plays no further role in the narrative. In essence Mark is less concise with changes that involve style or added redundancies with the last of these (“he was alongside the sea”) replacing an explanatory statement in Luke as to why Jesus was met by a crowd.

---

232 Mt 9:18 has neither the sea crossing nor the crowd motif and shares no words with either Mark or Luke. Boring notes indicators that the story has returned to Jewish territory (synagogue; purity rules; use of Aramaic) (Mark, 158).

233 The phrase ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ is a variant: omitted in e.g., P33 D Θ f¹ 28 565 700; present in e.g., N A C L 90132 0134 f¹). Internally it was more likely omitted as redundant (Collins, Mark, 274) or as assimilation to Luke 8:40 (Guelich, Mark, 290) than added. There is occasional absence of πάλιν and εἰς τὸ πέρον producing various MS permutations but none affecting the sense of Jesus returning across the lake (France, Mark, 233; Collins, Mark, 274 citing Turner, retains πάλιν εἰς τὸ πέρον and suggests the variants arose from later misunderstanding of the idiomatic use of πάλιν to mean ‘back’; similarly Taylor, Mark, 286, who agrees but places πάλιν after πέρον). According to Peabody et al. πάλιν used “in a retrospective manner” is typically Markan at the beginning of a story (One Gospel, 146) but this does not favor Markan posteriority unless it can be shown that elimination (by Luke or Matthew) is less probable than addition by Mark. Luke’s elimination does not compromise clarity regarding Jesus’ movement back and forth across the lake (compare Luke 8:22, 26, 40 with Mark 4:35; 5:1, 20) and Matthew’s omission is explicable as part of his re-positioning of the story later in the narrative albeit he retains the same movement back and forth across the lake (Matt 8:23, 28; 9:1). The repeated journeys do not require πάλιν and its omission (by Matthew and Luke) on account of brevity is just as plausible (if not more so) than its addition by 2GH Mark. The phrase εἰς τὸ πέρον along with other terms (e.g., πλοίον and θάλασσα in 5:21; πίστις at 5:34; falling down before Jesus) is repeated from previous Markan miracles (on this see Kertelge, Die Wunder, 112 and Guelich, Mark, 293–4) and Hedrick calls πολύλα (Mark 5:34) a “linguistic intensifier” (“Jairus’s Daughter,” 225). While this possibly explains 2GH Markan changes, it does not determine direction of dependence.

234 Unlike the previous story (pig-drowning) the lakeside location is not integral to either healing. Peabody et al. (One Gospel, 146) note that “by the sea” (Mark 5:21) accords with Markan style but they do not explain why he changes Luke at this point. The precise location is unclear in all three Gospels (see above comments on 2GH Luke). Mark presumably has them arrive in Capernaum, Jesus’ regular lakeside base (Mark 1:21; 2:1) (so France, Mark, 235).

235 Granted Luke does not explain why the crowd was waiting though the basic implication is that Jesus’ was growing in popularity owing to his wondrous activities.
In the request of Jairus (Mark 5:22-23; Luke 8:41-42a; Matt 9:18b) Mark initially (5:22) prefers the longer Lukan account (Luke 8:41) though restates it more succinctly (15 words in place of 20) and without loss of detail.\(^{237}\) Thus while some changes are stylistic,\(^{238}\) he states Jairus’ position (synagogue ruler) more succinctly\(^{239}\) and omits ἰδοὺ. In Mark 5:23 he initially continues with Luke’s παρακάλεω but switches to Matthew’s direct speech after λέγων. He disagrees with both in changing θυγάτηρ to θυγάτριον before stating that Jairus’ daughter ἔσχάτως ἔχει, which agrees with Luke (against Matthew) that she is not yet dead but is more awkward than the simple Lukan imperfect ἀπέθνησεν.\(^{240}\) He concludes by following Matthew’s request that Jesus “come and lay (his) hands upon (her) so that she may be healed and

---

\(^{237}\)Key details include naming the official (Jairus), his position (synagogue ruler) and his falling at Jesus’ feet. While some Markan MSS omit ὅνωμαι ἰάριος (D it), this is more likely accidental or assimilation to Matthew than assimilation (by addition) to the Lukan ὅνωμα ἰάριος (so France, Mark, 233; Guelich, Mark, 290–1; Collins, Mark, 274)) albeit some MSS do parallel Luke’s formula (W Θ 565 700) likely resulting from later assimilation (Collins, Mark, 274; Taylor, Mark, 287). The reading ὅνωμαι ἰάριος has strong external support (e.g., \( p^4 \) \( A B C L N \Delta \Pi \Sigma \Phi \)). Other variants in v. 23 include the imperfect παρεκάλει (e.g., B W Θ) or present participle παρακάλου (e.g., D) in place of the more likely παρακαλεῖ (e.g., A C L) (so Collins, Mark, 274 contra Taylor, Mark, 288). Collins notes πολλά is omitted in D and other MSS but sees a later stylistic change (Mark, 274).\(^{238}\)E.g., ἐρχεται in place of ἠλθεν; ὅνωμαι ἰάριος in place of ὅνωμα ἰάριος; πιπτει in place of πεσόν.\(^{239}\)Namely ἔις τῶν ἄρχισυναγώγων replaces ὀνομα άρχων τίς συναγωγῆς ὑπήρχεν. Peabody et al. (One Gospel, 146) say Mark conflates the Matthean ἔις and the Lukan ‘of the ruler’s of the synagogue, by the name of Jairus,’ but it is not clear why Mark looks to Matthew for a somewhat redundant singular word. The Markan ἄρχισυναγώγος was likely a lay official (perhaps one of several) overseeing the building, worship and general administration (Boring, Mark, 158; Pesch, Markusevangelium, 300; and Guelich, Mark, 295). This, along with his daughter having a separate room, implies a person of wealth though notably he is the first Jewish leader portrayed positively in Mark (cf. 12:28-34; 15:42-57; Jesus’ previous experience in the Capernaum synagogue resulted in a death plot in 3:6) (Boring, Mark, 158; Collins, Mark, 279; Marcus, Mark, 362). Twelftree sees him disregarding his social standing “to adopt the same faith as the leper (1:40), the demonized (5:6) and the Gentile woman (7:25)”\(^{\text{b}}\) by falling at Jesus’ feet to request his daughter’s healing. He sees faith implicit throughout but explicit in Jesus’ admonition to believe (5:36) and Jairus’ use of σῶζω and ζησή (5:23) indicating trust in Jesus’ ability to “mediate divine life and power” (cf. 12:27).” Jairus’ faith is tested by interruption and delay (5:24b-34), news of his daughter’s death (5:35a), mourners (5:38) and doubting laughter (5:39), but is vindicated by his daughter’s rising (5:42) (Miracle Worker, 73–74; similarly so Hedrick, “Jairus’s Daughter,” 225). Some see deliberate correspondence between Jairus’ name (Hebrew יֵשׁוֹעַ, variant יִשְׁוֹעַ, meaning ‘God will awaken’ cf. 1 Chr 20:5) and resurrection (Pesch, Markusevangelium, 299–300; Guelich, Mark, 295; Marcus, Mark, 356) although Mark’s tendency to translate Aramaic terms (cf. Mark 5:41) suggests readers would not have picked up on such nuances (Gundry, Mark, 267).\(^{240}\)France (Mark, 236) says ἔσχάτως ἔχει is colloquial for near death and Collins notes similar language in an inscription from about 200 B.C.E. honoring a physician (Anaxippos) on the Island of Cos (Mark, 279). According to Peabody et al. (One Gospel, 147), when faced with the inconsistency between Matthew and Luke, 2GH Mark chose to “awkwardly” say that the girl ἔσχάτως ἔχει (‘is at an end’). The argument, however, is reversible (Matthew and Luke sought to clarify the awkward terminology of Mark) and Mark clearly tips his hand in favor of Luke by following him in the later detail about the report of death (5:35). While Markan conflation is possible, it not obviously more plausible.
“live” albeit with stylistic variation (the initial “οὐ” clause is rather awkward)²⁴¹ and with the addition of σοφή.²⁴² Rhetorically the 2GH Mark retains everything related to the narrative elements of person (preferring Luke’s details and Matthew’s direct speech),²⁴³ action (coming, prostration, request), manner (willingly and desperately), and cause (he seeks Jesus in order that he would come and heal: explicit in Matthew but only implied in Luke). Time and place are not specified in any of the Gospels except Luke’s notation that the request was for Jesus to come ‘to his house’ (8:41). Mark omits this albeit implied and subsequently explicit in Mark 5:38. In relation to narrative virtues Mark is less concise than Matthew (56% longer) but slightly more concise than Luke (5% shorter) (see table 6.6) albeit part of Luke’s extra wording comes from his notation of the girl’s age (ὁδὲ ἐτῶν δύοδέκατα), which Mark reserves for later (5:42). He does not differ in relation to clarity or credibility except perhaps in his more vague ἐσχάτως ἔχει (as above). 2GH Mark’s implied micro-conflation, however, counts against plausibility in this instance.²⁴⁴

The 2GH Mark now transitions (Mark 5:24) to the story of the hemorrhaging woman (Mark 5:24-34; Matt 9:19-22; Luke 8:42b-48) beginning with Jesus departing after Jairus while a crowd follows (ἤκολουθεὶ) and presses upon (συνέθλιβον) him. While the use of ἤκολουθεὶ parallels Matthew (ἤκολουθησεν) while Matthew had Jesus following the ruler. The ‘pressing crowd’ motif comes from Luke albeit changing ὄχλος to the

---
²⁴¹Taylor sees either ellipsis (of παρακαλέω or θέλω) or (more probably) imperative use of ὅνα with the subjunctive (Mark, 288; so also Guelich, Mark, 291). Parallels to the laying on hands (in Mark and Matthew) occur in the LXX account of Naaman (2 Kg 5:11) and elsewhere (Guelich, Mark, 295–6; Theissen, Miracle Stories, 92).
²⁴²Matthew has ζητεῖ where Mark has both σοφή and ζήση. Insofar as the verbs have different meanings Taylor says this “is not quite redundancy” (Mark, 288; so also Marcus, Mark, 357) but this is not obviously so (Guelich, Mark, 296, for instance, see hendiadys). Peabody et al. (One Gospel, 147) see Mark conflating Matt 9:18 (ζητεῖται) and Luke 8:50 (σοφθησεται) into his own formulation (σοφή καὶ ζήση) but do not explain why this is more plausible than its alternative (Matthew and Luke simplify Mark).
²⁴³Despite greater details of ‘person’ in Mark (vs. Matthew especially), Hedrick nevertheless sees underdeveloped characters (“shadowy stick figures”) typical of Markan miracles (“Jairus’s Daughter,” 224).
²⁴⁴The problem of micro-conflation is illustrated as follows: 2GH Mark begins v. 22 following Luke (καὶ), then Matthew (ἐίς τῶν ...), Luke again at ὠνόματι, Matthew at λέγων, Luke at μου ἐσχάτως, and finally Matthew at the first “οὐ.” Such alternation on account of primarily stylistic differences is less plausible than Markan priority.
singular and using a different verb for pressing (συνέθλιβον in place of συνεπνιγον).  

The changes are stylistic but less concise (Mark uses 12 words in place of 10 in Matthew and 9 in Luke). In describing the woman (Mark 5:25-26) the 2GH Mark prefers Luke’s less concise expression for bleeding (οὐσα ἐν ῥυσι· versus άιμορροούσα) but Matthew’s more concise accusative number (δῶδεκα ἑττι· versus ἀπὸ ἑττῶν δῶδεκα in Luke).  

Again the changes are largely stylistic. He takes over Luke’s description of failed treatment (omitted in Matthew) but is less concise (21 words in Mark 5:26 replace 11 words in Luke 8:43b - from ἡττις onward) and shares only the term ἰατρῷων (ἰατροῖς in Luke).  

The changes, however, are not entirely stylistic in that he explicitly mentions suffering (παθοῦσα) at the hands of the doctors and

245 Neither word is common in the Gospels with συνεπνιγο occurring only 5x (Matt 13:22; Mark 4:7, 19; Luke 8:14, 42) and συνεθλιβο only twice (Mark 5:24, 31).

246 Annette Weissenrieder sees twelve years as highlighting the severity of the disease noting that in the Corpus Hippocraticum “an exact record of the length of an illness was a great relevance” (“The Plague of Uncleanliness? The Ancient Illness Construct ‘Issue of Blood’ in Luke 8:43–48,” in The Social Setting of Jesus and the Gospels, ed. Wolfgang Stegeman, Bruce J. Malina, and Gerd Theissen [Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2002], 216–7). Stuart Love agrees albeit (unlike Weissenrieder) understanding the text primarily in terms of Israelite purity laws (“Jesus Heals the Hemorrhaging Woman,” in The Social Setting of Jesus and the Gospels, ed. Wolfgang Stegeman, Bruce J. Malina, and Gerd Theissen [Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2002], 91, 97). He notes that Matthew alone omits ‘twelve’ despite liking its symbolic nature (e.g., 10:1, 2, 5; 11:1; 14:20; 19:28; 26:53) thus suggesting that “the number has significance only in reference to the (bleeding) woman” (ibid., 91, 97). This may be so but the omission remains curious in light of the parallels between the two stories (cf. table 6.4).

247 Noting ἰατροῖς … ᾧσιν is variant in Luke (as above). Variants also exist for the Markan τὰ παρ’ ἑυτής πάντα (i.e. τὰ ἑυτῆς πάντα and τὰ παρ’ ἑυτῆς πάντα) but they are likely secondary stylistic corrections (Collins, Mark, 275).

248 While the nature of the bleeding is not explicit (Boring, Mark, 159; France, Mark, 236–7; Lane, Mark, 191), it is typically taken as menstrual (e.g., Nineham, Mark, 157; Meier, Marginal Jew, 709; Latourelle, Miracles, 128; Collins, Mark, 280; Derrett, “Mark’s Technique: The Haemorrhaging Woman and Jairus’ Daughter,” Bib 63 [1982]: 475–8; Pesch, Markusevangelium, 301; Marcus, Mark, 357–8) and Kee detects parallels (along with Mark 2:1-2; par. Luke 5:17-26) to an entry in Rufus’ Journal about a woman with paralysis and uterine bleeding that grew worse after failed medical treatments (Medicine, 50–51, 78–79). Traditionally the bleeding is associated with Levitical ritual uncleanness (e.g., Lev 15 and Num 5:1-4) resulting in social and religious isolation (e.g., Twelftree, Miracle Worker, 74; France, Mark, 236–7; Marshall, Luke, 344; Bock, Luke, 793; Fitzmyer, Luke, 746; Johnson, Luke, 141, 43; Nolland, Luke 1–9:20, 419; Lane, Mark, 192; Guelich, Mark, 296; Keener, Gospel of Matthew, 301–2; Pesch, Markusevangelium, 301; Marcus, Mark, 357–8), especially in relation to the temple (Tannehill, Luke, 148–9), with the 12 years underlining the perpetual nature of her status (Green, Luke, 346). Her actions, therefore, are purity breaches (e.g., Theissen, Miracle Stories, 134; Love, “Hemorrhaging Woman”; Boring, Mark, 159) and her healing is as much social and religious as physical, noting the fourfold use of ‘touch’ in Luke (Green, Luke, 347, n. 103; Tannehill, Luke, 148–9). Not surprisingly the story has frequently been re-contextualized in relation to feminist liberation (e.g., Marla Selvidge, Woman, Cult and Miracle Recital: A Redactional Critical Investigation on Mark 5:24–34 [London: Associated University Press, 1990]; Hisako Kinukawa, “The Story of the Hemorrhaging Woman [Mark 5:25–34] Read from a Japanese Feminist Perspective,” Biblical Interpretation 2.3 [1994]: 283–93) albeit purity has been challenged as the primary context for Mark’s narrative noting no explicit interest in purity regulations (despite Mark 7:1-23) and the Galilee setting (distance from the temple) (Mary Rose D’Angelo, “Gender and Power in the Gospel of Mark: The Daughter of Jairus and the Woman with the Flow of Blood,” in Miracles in Jewish and Christian Antiquity, ed. John C. Cavadini [Notre Dame, In: University of Notre Dame Press, 1999], 83–
the fact that she actually grew worse (Actualizar μᾶλλον εἰς τὸ χείρον ἐλθοῦσα). Such details potentially heighten the drama and emphasize Jesus’ healing power. Mark alone notes that she sought out Jesus because ‘she had heard about him’ (Mark 5:27), disagrees with both sources in using the non-compound version of ἐρχόμεαι (ἐλθοῦσα in place of προσελθοῦσα), adds that she was ἐν τῷ όχλῳ, and omits ‘the hem’ (τοῦ κρασπέδου).

Given Mark’s penchant for...
detail the omission of ‘the hem’ is unusual while the addition of ‘in the crowd’ is somewhat redundant given its prior mention in 5:24 albeit perhaps heightening the subversive nature of her actions and preparing for the surprise revelation in verses 29-33. Despite Matthean parallels to Mark 5:27 the 2GH Mark was likely following Luke at this point (based on parallels to Mark 5:24-26) but at Mark 5:28 he switches to Matthew (no Lukan parallel) to take up the narrative explanation for her actions (‘thinking she would be healed if she touched his garments’).

In doing he stays close to Matthew’s wording though makes a few stylistic changes with the net result of being slightly more concise (10 words in place of 11). He then returns to Luke to pick up the 2GH Lukan addition describing the woman’s healing and subsequent exposure by Jesus (Mark 5:29-33; Luke 8:44b-47) but is less concise: 81 words in place 69 (Mark 17% longer); 20 words the same (3 different forms; 2 order changes) amounting to 24% of Mark and 28% of Luke. Besides many stylistic changes the 2GH Mark adds that the woman knew ‘in her body’ that she had been healed (29b), albeit implied in Luke and perhaps therefore redundant. He also moves up the statement about Jesus’ awareness of power going out from him to a position.

---

6:56; par Matt 14:36). Others agree on seeing ‘magical’ elements here (e.g., Kee, Miracle, 170, 215; Meier, Marginal Jew, 709) while others associate them with the woman rather than Jesus, who is unperturbed by such ‘unorthodox’ procedures (e.g., France, Mark, 236; similarly so Boring, Mark, 160; Lane, Mark, 192–3, who sees Jesus seeking out the woman precisely to correct her magical beliefs; and Cranfield, Mark, 185). Difficulties distinguishing ‘miracle’ and ‘magic’ have already been noted whereby the labels are not helpful unless clearly shown as polemical (e.g., Luke’s apparent polemic against ‘magicians’ in Acts). Others see ‘faith in Jesus’ as the focus rather than the exchange of power (Twelftree, Miracle Worker, 75) but while this is not absent, it is hard to deny the centrality of touch and associated power exchange (e.g., Haber, “A Woman’s Touch,” esp. 184–90; Shelly Rambo, “Trauma and Faith: Reading the Narrative of the Hemorrhaging Woman,” International Journal of Practical Theology 13.2 [2009]: esp. 245–6; so also Theissen, Miracle Stories, 91–2, who speaks of ‘mana-like’ fluid being transferred; and Collins, Mark, 282, who sees a possible parallel in Plutarch’s Life of Sulla). It is thus difficult to discern significant difference among the three accounts despite Mark’s omission of τού κροσπέδου since he still retains the ‘touching of Jesus’ garment along with the explicit statement that ‘power went from Jesus’ upon contact (Mark 5:27, 30). See further n. 298 below.

Boring sees the sense of the imperfect (ἐλέησεν in Mark and Matthew) as pluperfect (‘had been saying’) (Mark, 156).

Eight words are shared (two different forms; same order): 72% of Matthew; 80% of Mark.

Primarily by omitting Matthew’s ἐν ἑαυτῇ and μόνον.

Ε.γ. ἐνθίσε in place of παραχρῆμα; πηγή in place of ύδωρ; ἐλεήσε in place ἔπειν; ἀμα τῶν ἰματίων in place of ἀφόμενος μου; and προσέπεσαν in place of προσπεσσα. Peabody et al. note the changes but offer no explanation for why they are better explained by Markan posteriority (One Gospel, 147–8). Terminology overlap of Mark 5:29 and Lev 12–15 (potentially highlighting the purification motif) are noted in Pesch (Markusevangelium, 303) and Guelich (Mark, 297): e.g., ‘the well of her blood’ (ἡ πηγὴ τοῦ ἰματος αὕτης) in Lev 12:7.
immediately after the healing although in its later Lukan position (8:46) it provides an appropriate response to Peter’s statement (“master the crowds are surrounding and pressing you” 8:46), which disputed the validity of Jesus’ question (“who touched me?”) in light of the crowds.257 Mark has the “disciples” (rather than Peter) question Jesus258 and, despite adding “fearing” (φοβηθείσσα) and “knowing what had happened to her” (εἴδοει ὁ γέγονεν αὐτῇ),259 Mark 5:33 is more concise than Luke 8:47 (20 words in place of 26) primarily because he restates the woman’s closing remarks more concisely (‘she told him the whole truth’ replaces ‘she reported in front of all the people the reason why she touched him and how she was healed immediately’).260 Nevertheless the net result (in Mark 5:29-33) is less concise than Luke without any obvious rhetorical enhancement. Finally in verse 34 the 2GH Mark reproduces Luke 8:48 almost verbatim taking over 92% of Lukan words (12 out of 13), highlighting her being healed on account of faith,261 and changing only the Lukan πορεύου τοῦπαγε (“go”).262 He adds,

--

257Robbins sees Mark highlighting the narrative’s “inner perception” (vs. “inner logic”) by juxtaposing Jesus’ perception of the healing with that of the woman and by repeating εὑρετός in Mark 29-30 (“Woman,” 508). While there are parallels to the idea of healing power resident in people or objects (Collins, Mark, 282–3), the nature of Jesus’ power (δυνάμις) is debated and remains unspecified in Mark (Guelich, Mark, 298).

258Gundry sees the first Markan καὶ in v. 31 as adversative (Mark, 281), which is a reasonable inference from Markan priority but somewhat odd for the 2GH Mark who has changed Luke’s δέ.

259Some MSS clarify the cause of her fear and trembling as διὸ πεποίηκε λάθερα (‘because of what she had done secretly’) but this is presumably a clarifying scribal addition. Variants also exist for συντίμη in v. 33 (ἐπ’ συντίμη and ἐπ’ συντίμη) but these are likely later stylistic improvements (see Collins, Mark, 275). The cause of her fear is debated and is not explicit in the text. Various possibilities exist: guilt, shame/embarrassment, fear that Jesus would be angry, and reverence (Van Der Loos, Miracles, 517; Collins, Mark, 284). Guelich (Mark, 298) argues for ‘reverence’ based on parallels in Mark 4:41 and 5:15 but in this story it remains ambiguous (Collins, Mark, 284; Taylor, Mark, 292).

260Robbins detects four clauses in Mark 5:33 (the woman came in fear and trembling; knowing what had been done to her; and fell down before him; and told him the whole truth) deliberately balancing four clauses describing her suffering in 5:26 (she suffered much under many physicians; and had spent all that she had; and had not benefitted; but rather became worse) (“Woman,” 509). Problematic for this is the fact that Mark 5:25-26 forms one long sentence with a series of adverbial participles prior to the main verb (‘she touched’). While the four clauses that Robbins identifies are taken from the middle of this sentence, he skips over the first (‘she had been bleeding for twelve years’) and the last two (‘having heard about Jesus’ and ‘having approached him from behind in the crowd’). Furthermore, while Robbins’ four clauses in Mark 5:33 are built around adverbial participles, those in 5:33 include two participial clauses and three finite verbs. These syntactic differences seriously compromise Robbins’ suggestion. Gundry thinks the adversative δέ (after the repeated use of καὶ beginning in v. 21) and the forward position of ἦ γενει emphatically opposes the woman’s reactions to Jesus’ question and searching (Mark, 271). While he assumes Markan priority, the observation potentially highlights a 2GH Markan rhetorical enhancement relative to Luke (where δέ is more consistently used). He notes no reaction of the crowds to the miracle (perhaps because they did not witness it) (Mark, 282) but this does not detract from the public nature of the miracle (validation).

261While Mark highlights touch more than Matthew (e.g., see Robbins, “Rhetorical Act,” 164–5), Twelftree (Miracle Worker, 73–76) notes the following ways he implicitly and explicitly highlights faith (cf. restricted miracles related
however, a further 7 words ("and be healed from your affliction") presumably rewording Matthew’s “and she was healed from that hour” (only the preposition ἀπὸ is shared). This is unusual given the 2GH Mark (like Luke) had previously recorded the healing (5:29) thus making it less plausible (reduced clarity) as a 2GH Markan transformation than is implied for Markan priority: Matthew omits the first mention of healing and associates it exclusively with Jesus’ word in 9:22b; Luke has the earlier healing notice and retains “go in peace” but omits the word of healing in 8:48.263 Summarizing, from a rhetorical standpoint, the 2GH Mark (in Mark 5:24-34) shows no obvious enhancement of the narrative person (with the possible exception of
to unbelief in Mark 6:1-6): (a) Jairus’ correctly ‘perceives’ (ἰδὼν 5:22) Jesus’ identity, prostrates himself despite his high social position, and is exorted to ‘believe’ (5:36) despite news of his daughter’s death and the mourner’s derisive laughter (5:38-39); (b) Jesus is no mere miracle worker but “healer and savior” (σῴζω and ἔλεος in 5:23); (c) the woman’s faith is implicit in her actions (seeking Jesus) and explicit in Jesus commendation (5:34). Haber also sees the Markan Jesus exercising (divine) healing power accessible by faith albeit mediated through touch (“A Woman’s Touch,” esp. 184–90) and others see Mark 5:34 as a deliberately correcting ‘magical’ connotations (e.g., Meier, Marginal Jew, 709; Latourelle, Miracles, 128; H. Van der Loos, Miracles, 517; Guelich, Mark, 299). France sees the Markan πίστις as practical conviction about Jesus’ healing ἔξουσία (cf. Mark 2:3; 4:40; 5:36; 9:23-24; 11:22-24) (Mark, 238). Theissen sees ‘boundary crossing faith’ in Mark (overcoming hurdles), ‘petitionary faith’ in Matthew (no longer stresses hurdles), and ‘grateful faith’ in Luke (movement from lying to giving thanks) (Miracle Stories, 133–36). As for her healing Boring sees σῴζω as a key word here (5:23, 28, 34) and elsewhere (11x in Mark 3:4; 6:56; 8:35; 10:26, 52; 13:13, 20; 15:30, 31) with the possible translation of ‘made well’ or ‘healed’ but a richer connotation of deliverance from anything that threatens life (cf. 10:17, 25, 26), a connotation he detects here (Mark, 156). Robbins sees both words (πίστευε and σῴζω) as traditional ‘non-Christian’ Greco-Roman healing terms thus enhancing communication into that milieu noting all three accounts retain both terms (Mark 5:34 and par.) (“Woman,” 504).

France notes that Jesus’ address of θυγάτηρ occurs only here in the Gospels with a nearest parallel being the address of τέκνον to the paralytic in Mark 2:5. Reassurance is the aim in both cases and especially here in light of Jesus’ brusque response and challenge in v. 30 readdressing of priority: Matthew omits the first mention of healing and associates it exclusively with Jesus

263MK 5:34 is the only occurrence of the phrase καὶ ἵσθι ὑγίης ἀπὸ τῆς μοστίγως in the NT. According to Theissen Mark awkwardly inserts it “as though the woman had not already been healed” (Miracle Stories, 92, 176) but Haber (“A Woman’s Touch,” 184–5) sees a parallel to Jesus’ instruction to the leper (‘go show yourself to the priest and offer for you cleansing’ in 1:44; cf. Lev 15:28-30) albeit the ‘cleansing instruction’ is only implicit here and there is little else to connect the texts. France sees physical and social restoration but with ὑγίης highlighting the former while ὑπάγει εἰς εἰρήνην (cf. Jdg. 18:6; 1 Sam 1:17; 2 Sam 15:9) confers shalom (Mark, 238; similarly so Taylor, Mark, 293). Robbins sees Mark combining a standard Jewish blessing (‘go in peace’) with a Hellenistic valediction (σεσυντο πέμψαμεν ἵν’ ὑγιεῖσίν - ‘take care of yourself so that you remain healthy’) (“Woman,” 510) although the latter is insufficiently close make a strong case. Perhaps Mark refers to further (future) healing (so Rambo, “Trauma and Faith,” 249) but this argues from silence. Alternatively the reality and/or permanence of the healing is being affirmed (Lane, Mark, 194; Meier, Marginal Jew, 709; Marcus, Mark, 361; Guelich, Mark, 300). The tension between verses 29 and 34 remains, however, and is expressed with greater clarity in both Matthew and Luke.
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highlighting the woman’s bodily knowledge of her healing) or *action* (he has more actions than Matthew but adds nothing to Luke). He agrees with Luke in the *manner* of the healing (highlighting the woman’s touch) but sides with Matthew (against Luke) in highlighting the *cause* of the woman’s actions (hope of healing) in 5:28. He makes no changes in relation to *time* and *place* though none of the Gospels provides details for either of these narrative elements. The 2GH Mark is less *concise* than both sources despite no clear instance of enhanced *clarity* or *credibility*. His addition of Jesus’ healing word (5:34b; par. Matt 9:22b) potentially compromises clarity and moving up the notice about Jesus’ awareness of power going out from himself reduces clarity in relation to Luke where it functions to answer Peter’s question (Luke 8:45-46).

His alternation between sources is less idiosyncratic in this section though taking up δόκεια ἔτη from Matthew in verse 25 is somewhat odd as is his choice to revert to Matthew at 5:34b (statement about the woman’s healing) as noted above.

Returning to the raising of Jairus’ daughter (Mark 5:35-43; Matt 9:23-26; Luke 8:49-56) the Markan narrative agrees with Luke (against Matthew) in having the delegation report on the girl’s death (Mark 5:35-36). 2GH Mark is only 10% longer than Luke (33 words replace 30) and shares 21 words (64% of Mark; 70% of Luke; 4 different forms; 1 order change) whereby the differences are relatively subtle including a plural delegation in place of Luke’s singular and various stylistic changes. Mark nevertheless adds redundancies (τὸν λόγον λαλούμενον ... τὸ ἀρχισυναγωγῶν in v. 36) and omits Luke’s καὶ σωθήσεται (8:50) which clarifies the

264 See table 6.6 where he is 38% longer than Luke (165 words replace 119) and 185% longer than Matthew (58 words).

265 E.g. ἀπό replaces παρά; ὀπέθανεν replaces τέθηκεν; λέγει replaces ἀπεκρίθη; and παρακούσας replaces ἀκούσας. The last one is a Markan textual variant with ἀκούσας (ℵ² A C D K Θ 0216 ℓ 28 et al.) being an alternative to παρακούσας (ℵ² B L W Δ 892* 2427 it). Παρακούσας is likely original based on external evidence and lection difficilior (in addition to ‘overhear’ it can be read as ‘ignore’ or ‘disobey’ thus inviting scribal emendation) (so Boring, Mark, 156; France, Mark, 233–34; Collins, Mark, 275; also Guelich, Mark, 291, though he thinks both ‘overhear’ and ‘ignore’ are intended in Mark’s παρακούσας; Marcus, Mark, 362, says ‘ignore’ is best attested in the LXX and elsewhere in the NT). Mark also changes Luke’s aorist imperative to present (‘only believe’) in v. 36 possibly warranting the translation ‘stop being afraid; just keep on believing’ though the distinction of the aorist and present “cannot ... be pressed” (Boring, Mark, 156) and the difference is best taken as stylistic.

266 It might be argued that Mark has clarified to whom the admonition is directed (namely Jairus, the ‘synagogue ruler,’ and not the delegation). While the clarity is helpful in Luke (where the delegation is a singular τις, who
reason for Jesus’ admonition to believe. He also changes Luke’s admonition (“do not trouble the teacher any longer”) into a question, “why are you still troubling the teacher?” Given Jairus is hearing about the death for the first time, however, the Lukan admonition is more credible: he is obviously still troubling the teacher because he has not yet heard the news. The 2GH Mark continues following Luke in verse 37 (no Matthean parallel) with Jesus’ selection of only three disciples to accompany him (Peter, James, and John) albeit in different order (Luke 8:51 has Peter, John and James) and adding that John was “the brother of James,” a redundancy in light of Mark 1:19.

While Luke explicitly includes ‘the mother and father’ among those permitted entry, Mark delays this until verse 40 after the mourners are cast out. In Mark 5:38 they enter the house. This is delayed from its earlier position in Luke 8:51 and shows closer affinity to Matthew in his use of κοί, his specifying of the house as that of τοῦ ἀρχισυναγώγου (τοῦ ἀρχοντος in Matt 9:23), and his statement that Jesus “sees a disturbance.” At the same time the 2GH Mark takes up the Lukan language of weeping and adds his own “wailing loudly” (ἀλαλάζοντας πολλά). This again involves micro-conflation without obvious rhetorical

could therefore be the recipient of Jesus’ words), it is unnecessary in Mark where the delegation is plural (thus making clear that the singular imperatives of v. 36 are directed at Jairus).

Theissen detects a “resigned and skeptical” tone to the question (Miracle Stories, 56) but this implied at most. Gundry sees various elements in Mark’s transitional verse underscoring the hopelessness of the news (abrupt asyndetic change of v. 35; interruption while Jesus is still speaking; historical present of ἔρχονται; the question ‘why are you still troubling the teacher?’; repetition of ἐτι; and the placement of subject ἤ θυγάτηρ σου before its verb) (Mark, 272). While most features are shared with Luke, those that are not are better understood as Lukan improvements: namely Luke’s imperative in place of a question (which makes the second ἐτι redundant) and the placement of the subject (the verb first in Luke is equally, if not more, emphatic in highlighting hopelessness).

The reason for the limitation to three is not stated though France speculates that it may relate to the room size (Mark, 239). The same three appear at the transfiguration (Mark 9:2) and Gethsemane (14:33). They were previously mentioned along with Andrew (1:16-20 and 13:3) and, as Boring notes, they will be key future witnesses in later church (Mark, 161). Peabody et al. agree on the wider pattern in Mark (cf. Mark 1:29-31; 9:2-8; 13:3; 14:32-42) but they offer no explanation for the differences (One Gospel, 146). Gundry, Mark, 273, (as a Markan priorist) suggests the disciples and parents provide the requisite number of witnesses (cf. Deut 19:15) although the 2GH Mark simply takes over the detail from Luke. He also notes that the article in front of Peter is likely anaphoric (referring back to 1:16-20 and 13:3) and, as Boring notes, they will be key future witnesses in later church (Mark, 161). Peabody et al. agree on the wider pattern in Mark (cf. Mark 1:29-31; 9:2-8; 13:3; 14:32-42) but they offer no explanation for the differences (One Gospel, 146). Gundry, Mark, 273, (as a Markan priorist) suggests the disciples and parents provide the requisite number of witnesses (cf. Deut 19:15) although the 2GH Mark simply takes over the detail from Luke. He also notes that the article in front of Peter is likely anaphoric (referring back to 1:16-20) and suggests that Mark adds “the brother James” to distinguish this John from the Baptist (ibid., 282-3). Given the clear reference to 1:16-20, however, such a qualifier nevertheless remains redundant. A textual variant exist for μετ’ αὐτοῦ (i.e. αὐτός) but the difference is essentially stylistic (Collins, Mark, 275).

Other changes in v. 37 are primarily stylistic: οὐδὲν μετ’ αὐτοῦ συνακολούθησα in place of εἰσέλθειν τίνα συν αὐτῷ; and καὶ in place of δέ.

θεωρεῖ δορυφόρον in Mark 5:38; ἑδὼν ... θορυβούμενον in Matt 9:23; no clear parallel in Luke.

κλαίοντας ... κλαίετε in Mark 5:38-39; ἐκλαίον ... κλαίετε in Luke 8:52-53; no parallel in Matthew.

He obviously omitted elements from both his sources: e.g., τούς σύλητος from Matt 9:23; ἐκόπτοντο from Luke 8:52.
enhancement. In verse 39 he again (as in v. 35) changes Luke’s imperative (μὴ κλαίετε - “stop weeping!”) into a question (“why are you causing a commotion and weeping?”) thereby disagreeing with Matt 9:24 (ἀνοχωρεῖτε - “go out!”). The following statement is closely paralleled in all three (‘she is not dead but sleeping’)274 but Mark agrees with Matthew (against Luke) in making the subject explicit (τὸ παιδίον in Mark; τὸ κορόσιον in Matthew) though disagrees with both in word order (οὐ/οὐκ) and in his omission of γόρ. The latter provides a causal link in Matthew and Luke albeit implied in Mark whereby the omission could be taken as an instance of conciseness. In verse 40 all agree that “they were laughing at (Jesus)”275 to which Luke appends a reason, “knowing that she was dead” (8:53), which Mark replaces with Jesus casting out the mourners276 and taking along the parents and “those with him” (presumably those mentioned in v. 37) as they proceed into the place where the girl is located. While the note about the parents comes from Luke 8:51 (absent from Matthew), the ‘casting out’ is from Matt 9:25a (albeit worded differently) and is absent in Luke. This is significant in that it prepares for the secrecy command in Mark 5:43 which is taken from Luke 8:56 (against Matthew). In Luke the absence of the earlier expulsion gives the impression that the mourners are present for the revivification (note especially the transition from Luke 8:53 to 54) and the secrecy command.

The 2GH Mark perhaps adds a credibility and clarity by his explicit prior expulsion of mourners although it might be taken oppositely that Luke includes all the witnesses in the secrecy command (knowing that it could not be kept secret from the mourners). In the raising of the girl in verse 41 the 2GH Mark is again less concise (18 words vs. 9 in Matthew and 11 in Luke) and

274 See above n. 221 on the girl’s state.
275 While there appears to be skepticism and mockery (Theissen, Miracle Stories, 56; Hedrick, “Jairus’s Daughter,” 225; Lane, Mark, 971; Pesch, Markusevangelium, 309), it is not clear who exactly is laughing (parents, disciples, mourners?) (France, Mark, 239–40). Within the narrative it appears the laugh is not at Jesus’ claim to raise the dead but his “foolish miss-diagnosis” of the girl’s state (Boring, Mark, 162; Gundry, Mark, 283).
276 Boring notes ἔκβαλλω can mean “send away” or “dismiss” but other Markan usages have the sense of “expel” or “cast out” (15x elsewhere in Mark) (Mark, 156). While ὁ δὲ exists as a variant for αὐτός δὲ, the latter is likely original and intended as emphatic but was later changed for stylistic reasons (Collins, Mark, 275). Gundry draws attention to the emphatic “he himself” use of the pronoun as calling attention to Jesus’ authority (Mark, 274).
alternates between sources: e.g., τὸ κοράσιον\textsuperscript{277} from Matthew; imperative ὑγείεις as direct speech and κρατήσας from Luke (Matthew has ἠγέρθη and ἐκράτησεν). Mark’s greater length primarily results from adding the original Aramaic of Jesus’ words (ταλίθα κοῦμ, ὦ ἐστιν μεθέρμησεν οὖν...), a slightly puzzling addition given the 2GH assumption that Mark is writing to a Roman audience.\textsuperscript{278} If Mark is prior then the Aramaic phrase may simply be an indication of his more primitive tradition and (especially in writing to Rome) it is understandable that he would provide a translation. When Mark is made posterior to Matthew and Luke, however, then it is strange that he would add the phrase given his Roman gentile audience (unless he sees some rhetorical advantage to including this ‘eastern’ word).\textsuperscript{279} 2GH Mark subsequently follows Luke (against Matthew) for the conclusion of the story (Mark 5:42-43) with its demonstration of the cure and silencing command.\textsuperscript{280} While sharing some of Luke’s wording (καὶ ἀνέστη ... ἔξεστησαν ... δοθῆναι αὐτῇ φορεῖν), he differs in both order and detail. This can be seen as follows (parallel content in italics):

Luke: spirit returns ⇒ she arose ⇒ feeding ⇒ amazed ⇒ silence command

\textsuperscript{277}Boring notes that this is a diminutive of the common classical Greek κόρη (‘young woman’) which does not occur in the NT and is used in LXX only in metaphorical sense for the pupil (‘apple’) of the eye. Mark also has κοράσιον at 6:22, 28 (daughter of Herod) (Mark, 156).

\textsuperscript{278}Peabody et al., One Gospel, 55–63.

\textsuperscript{279}Despite textual variants (ταλίθα κουμ; ραββί θαβίτα κουμ), perhaps resulting from scribal unfamiliarity with Aramaic, the most likely original is ταλίθα κουμ (so Boring, Mark, 156; France, Mark, 234; Collins, Mark, 275). While Theissen sees a magical element (also at Mark 7:35) demonstrating “the superior power of eastern words of healing” (Miracle Stories, 254; so also Dibelius, Tradition, 84–85 and Pesch, Markusevangelium, 309–10), not all are agreed and the phrase is variously interpreted: (a) the words are an original utterance of Jesus or simply preservation of a ‘non-magical’ healing word (Lane, Mark, 198; Cranfield, Mark, 190; Van Der Loos, Miracles, 571; Taylor, Mark, 296–7; Guelich, Mark, 302); (b) the phrase calls “attention to ... magical possibilities” only to “expose the secret and destroy the magic power of the word by offering a translation” and thereby affirming Jesus’ power as “miracle and not magic” (Haber, “A Woman’s Touch,” 188); (c) it is a simple Aramaic phrase used to wake someone from sleep which, when Mark translates it, removes the story from the world of magic and focuses on Jesus’ authority over death (Boring, Mark, 162; similarly Fuller, Interpreting, 56–7 and France, Mark, 240); (d) based on Aristotle’s Poetics the phrase heightens dramatic effect either by giving “distinctiveness to the narrative” or perhaps suggesting “realism” (Hedrick, “Jairus’s Daughter,” 223–4); (e) the phrase highlights Jesus’ power but not ‘magical’ power unlike the untranslatable phrases of magical papyri (Gundry, Mark, 274–5). While agreeing the phrase is ‘magical,’ Peabody et al. note that when Mark adds foreign words he “always attempts to translate them for the benefit of his (predominantly Gentile?) readers” (One Gospel, 148–9). They consider this equally plausible to Markan priority, which may be favored on the basis of primitiveness. The 2GH Mark, however, does not add such ‘magical’ wording to other miracle narratives (Mark 7:31-37 has no Synoptic parallel to compare) and from the standpoint of brevity omission by Matthew and Luke is more plausible.

\textsuperscript{280}These are all absent from Matthew with the exception of his statement about the report going out which in itself is opposite to both Mark and Luke.
Mark: she arose and walked ⇒ she was 12 ⇒ amazed ⇒ silence command ⇒ feeding

While some of the differences are stylistic or matters of preference (e.g., addition of walking and omission of spirit returning), the net result is less concise (29 words in place of 26)\(^{281}\) and the Lukan placement of the feeding shows greater clarity in putting all the ‘proofs’ prior to the amazement and the silencing command whereas in Mark the feeding is more of an afterthought.\(^{282}\) Also Luke’s earlier placement of the girl’s age (Luke 8:42) is more fitting insofar as it describes the girl but is not part of the ‘miracle proofs.’

Considering the entire section (Mark 5:35-43) in terms of narrative elements there are no obvious enhancements of person, time, or place by the 2GH Mark. He adds no actions to his

\(^{281}\)”Mark’s greater length, however, could be accounted for by his notation about the girl’s age (moved down from earlier in Luke). Peabody et al. (One Gospel, 149) state that Mark’s change from παρίγγειλεν (Luke 8:56) to διεστέλλατο is typical of Markan style noting that the only NT occurrences of διεστέλλομαι are in Mark (5:43; 7:36; 8:15; 9:9), Acts (15:24) and Hebrews (12:20). They surmise that consistent omission by Matthew and Luke is less plausible than addition by 2GH Mark, a point that is possibly reinforced by Luke’s use of the term in Acts 15:24 although at least two of the other Markan references occur within Luke’s Great Omission. Mark’s use of εὐθύς in these two verses (along with πολλά in 5:23) is seen by Hedrick as an example of “linguistic intensifiers” (“Jairus’s Daughter,” 225). The second εὐθύς in v. 42 is a textual variant: present in \(\text{N B C L A} \ 33 \ 892\); omitted in \(\text{p}^{45} \ \text{A W} \ \Theta \ 0133\) \(f^{13}\). Despite Taylor’s claim that is should be omitted (Mark, 297), Mark’s propensity for using it along with its awkward placement here suggest it was likely original (Guelich, Mark, 291; Collins, Mark, 276; Gundry, Mark, 276).

\(^{282}\)”According to France the Markan feeding command represents a return to the banality of ordinary life following Jesus’ dramatic conquest over death (Mark, 240) but more commonly it is understood as a ‘miracle proof.’ According to Hull, for example, diet and exercise prescription were commonplace among healers (e.g., Apollonius and Asclepius) but Jesus is not normally portrayed this way and while this incident is an apparent exception, the primary role of the eating is proof of cure (Hellenistic Magic, 75). Bultmann (History, 215) lists eating along with other typical miracle proofs in the story: length of time of sickness (5:25); failure of doctors (5:26); physical contact (5:27-32); instantaneous cure (5:29, 42); girl’s raising emphasized by delay and laughter (5:38-40a); dismissal of the crowd (5:40); magic word (5:41); and the girl’s age. When ‘eating’ is included among miracle proofs, then Luke’s order makes more logical sense (greater clarity). Boring agrees that walking and eating are miracle proofs and notes that the girl’s raising also points beyond itself to Jesus’ resurrection (Mark, 163; similarly so Gundry, Mark, 275) although French notes that while ἠγιασμένοι and ἡνίκα are used for resurrection in the NT, they are common verbs and could hardly be avoided in the story thereby making connections to resurrection typology less certain (Mark, 240). The placement of the ‘eating’ command after the secrecy nevertheless seems awkward (agreeing with Meier, Marginal Jew, 780) although Collins suggests that it forms a literary bridge to the following story about the multiplication of loaves (Mark, 286). Derrett understands the girl’s condition as a “catatonic schizophrenia” resulting from her fear of impending betrothal (she is twelve years old). He accordingly sees wedding symbolism throughout the passage (e.g., grasping of the right hand is a “universal symbol of marriage”) whereby the eating refers to the wedding feast and the silencing command can now be understood in terms of avoiding a plague of catatonic stupors in the neighbourhood. This is part of reading Mark’s story against a larger OT background of marriage metaphors in relation Yahweh and his people (“Mark’s Technique,” 481–504). Despite his ingenuity, however, this approach involves reading much into the text. Pesch agrees in seeing walking and eating as miracle proofs and notes comparisons with Elijah-Elisha in which Jesus is seen as even greater (Markusevangelium, 298, 309–11).
sources (albeit agreeing with Luke against Matthew in having a delegation) and makes no obvious changes to the *manner* of the actions or their *cause* except perhaps in the omission of γάρ in 5:39 although, as noted above, this may simply enhance conciseness. Overall Mark is less concise than both sources (152 words in place of 115 in Luke and 57 in Matthew) and shows greater affinity for Luke (60 words shared; 52% of Luke) than Matthew (19 words shared; 33% of Matthew) albeit showing the same tendency to alternate between them. It is not clear, however, that his greater length enhances narrative *clarity* or *credibility* except perhaps in his addition of the expulsion command (5:40) over against Luke but even this can be read in the opposite way (as above). He sides with Luke against Matthew, however, in retaining the awkward silence command ²⁸³ and further reduces clarity in his ordering of ‘miracle proofs’ in 5:42-43. To a lesser extent his question in verse 35 (‘why are you still troubling the teacher?’) is less clear than Luke’s simple statement (“do not trouble the teacher any longer”). Mark is frequently taken as having a more primitive (and less rhetorically sophisticated) style in relation to parataxis and other stylistic differences.²⁸⁴ With these observations in mind (along with those

²⁸³ Peabody *et al*. make no comment on the awkwardness of this particular silencing command (*One Gospel*, 149) but various other commentators do so (typically from a Markan priority perspective). France notes how it has less chance of success but says no more (*Mark*, 240). Boring says the command is historically difficult but makes sense in relation to Mark’s Christology where “the ministry of Jesus was indeed an epiphany of God’s power, but this must remain secret for the present, for it could only be perceived after and in terms of his own death and resurrection” (*Mark*, 163; similarly so in Twelftree, *Miracle Worker*, 74). Given, however, that Mark is not consistent in relation to secrecy (e.g., Hedrick, “Jairus’s Daughter,” 230–1) his choice to include it here is particularly puzzling (according to Bultmann, *History*, 214, Mark added it into the story despite the fact that “it does not fit its context”). The possibility that this is simply “part of the agenda of the implied author” (so Hedrick, “Jairus’s Daughter,” 230) or that Mark realizes the problem but interprets the narrative in light of Jesus’ resurrection, which at this point must remain a secret (so Kertelge, *Die Wunder*, 119–20), does not remove the difficulty. Taking the silencing imperative as historical, Lane notes that the parents could not keep the secret indefinitely but that the primary purpose was to withhold the information until Jesus had departed or to keep silent as to the nature of the cure (rather than its fact) (*Mark*, 198–99; similarly so in Cranfield, *Mark*, 191, and Gundry, *Mark*, 276–7). Yet another alternative is that those excluded are to be left with the impression that the girl was indeed only sleeping and not dead insofar as “the crowd was not yet ready for the revelation of the messiahship of Jesus” (Latourelle, *Miracles*, 124). Such subtleties, however, go beyond the narrative and are somewhat speculative.

²⁸⁴ This is noted by Hedrick in relation to Mark’s use of κόντα in preference to ἐδείκτηκεν as well as noting his preference for the historic present (‘Jairus’s Daughter,’ 222). The historic present is often taken as a sign of primitivity (not common in Hellenistic Greek) albeit frequent in Josephus (so Hawkins, *Horae Synopticae*, 113–19). Alternatively it might be said that the historical present adds vividness and emphasis (e.g., in relation to Mark 5:40–42) (so Hedrick, “Jairus’s Daughter,” 224; and Gundry, *Mark*, 274).
made above in relation to the 2GH Luke) it is more plausible to think of Matthew and Luke abbreviating Mark than Luke first expanding upon Matthew then Mark expanding upon both.

6.3.2 The 2DH: Jairus’ Daughter and the Hemorrhaging Woman

The account will be now be examined from the standpoint of redactional plausibility of Matthew’s and then Luke’s independent use of Mark according to the 2DH.

(a) Matthew’s use of Mark

As a result of various omissions and abbreviations the 2DH Matthean account (138 words) is only 36% as long as Mark (374 words) (see table 6.6 for statistics) albeit retaining the basic intercalation structure. Beginning with the transition statement in Matt 9:18a a mere four words replace the twenty one of Mark 5:21 (with no verbal overlap). In part, at least, this results from the new context (Jesus is already in his home town of Capernaum based on Matt 9:1) making the sea crossing and Markan location “alongside the sea” unnecessary. More specifically we have been informed that Jesus was ‘at table’ in a house (Matt 9:10) prior to the request of Matt 9:18 (narrative element of place). Insofar as the crowd (οχλος) motif (cf. Mark 5:21, 24, 27, 30, 31) relates to miracle validation (the Markan crowd witness the woman’s healing) it is 285 Luz thinks Matthew’s abbreviation breaks the connection between the stories insofar as the woman no longer causes a delay, the news of dying is no longer relevant, and the girl’s death is thus reported up front (Matthew, 40). Alternatively Nolland thinks Matthew’s use of Ιαβου (with each new actor) links the two stories (Matthew, 394). While some of Mark’s narrative links are omitted (falling before Jesus, twelve years, and fear) many are retained (e.g., daughter language; touching; and possible impurity links; see table 6.4) along with the basic intercalation structure. Matthew is frequently understood to emphasize faith for the following typical reasons: (1) the woman’s healing is subservient to the statement about her ‘healing faith’ in 9:22 (Twelftree, Miracle Worker, 119; Held, “Miracle Stories,” 179–80; Harrington, Matthew, 123 ); (2) the woman’s healing was ‘from that hour’ (Davies and Allison, Matthew, 130); (3) Matthean omissions (e.g., Mark 5:29-33) turn the woman’s story into a paradigm of faith (Luz, Matthew, 42); (4) omission of typical motifs from the raising of the girl (e.g., magical word; demonstration of healing by eating) and the fact the she is dead from the outset requires greater faith from the father (Held, “Miracle Stories,” 215–19; Burger, “Jesu Taten,” 286–7); (5) faith is emphasized in the following healing narrative (9:27-34, esp. v. 29) (Burger, “Jesu Taten,” 286–7); and (6) Matthew began highlighting faith in 8:10 (Nolland, Matthew, 397). While faith does appear to play an important role, however, much of this paralleled in Mark.

286 The house is presumably in Capernaum (cf. 9:1). In light of the genitive absolute (‘while he was saying these things’) several commentators see a (geographic) connection to the previous story in 9:14-17 (e.g., Davies and Allison, Matthew, 125; Twelftree, Miracle Worker, 118; France, Matthew, 362) and Nolland even sees Matt 9:18-26 as an illustration of new wine (Matthew, 394; though this is doubted by France, Matthew, 362).
strange that 2DH Matthew omits it here only to introduce it later (Matt 9:23, 25), where it is absent from the Markan parallel, especially given that he highlights the validation motif by reversing the Markan secrecy command (Matt 9:26). This may, however, relate to Matthew’s specific location in a house (9:10) whereby the crowd motif no longer fits. Rather than omit it in toto, however, he transfers it to later in the story whereby the validation theme is not lost and the account is more credible than Mark (owing to reversal of the secrecy command). In relation to time the 2DH Matthean chronology differs insofar as he places the intervening material of Matt 9:1-17 immediately after the Gadarene episode. The transitional formula (“while he was speaking”), therefore, is clearly a literary device and not a chronological marker. The net result is brevity without obvious compromise of clarity, credibility, or narrative elements.

The ruler’s request (Matt 9:18b; par. Mark 5:22-23) is likewise much briefer (23 words replace 36 words in Mark 5:22-23) resulting from more concise wording: for example, replacing Mark’s five word description of prostration (πίπτει ... πόδας αὐτοῦ) with two words (προσκυνεῖ αὐτῷ)287 or his twenty one words of request (Mark 5:23) with seventeen (λέγων ... ζήσαται). He also omits the ruler’s name (Jairus) and position (ruler of the synagogue)288 along with the Markan αὐξάνει and changes the status of the girl from ‘near death’ to ‘just died.’ Other changes are primarily stylistic289 though some expansions are noted.290 While the initial

---

287 Twelftree (citing BDAG) says προσκυνεῖω denotes prostrating before a worthy or royal in contrast to the Markan πίπτει (“fall”) (Miracle Worker, 118). Nolland sees similarity to the leper in 8:1-4 (Matthew, 394). In addition to UBS text of v. 18 (εἰς ἐλθὼν in 33* d f) the following variants occur: (a) εἰς προσέλατε (N B lat); (b) τις προσελατε (L f13 al g); (b) προσελατε (N* pc); (d) τις εἶλα (f pc k); (e) ΕΙΣΕΛΑΤΕ (N2 C D NW Θ pc); (f) εἰσελατε (f1 700 al). Luz opts for standard text based on external evidence and fact that postpositive εἰς (in the sense of τις) is unusual for Matthew along with fact that other variant MSS obviously read it this way (Matthew, 40).

288 Ἀν ᾧ ἱεράκην (unlike the Markan ἱεράκην ἀγαθός) might simply be a ‘municipal’ or ‘civil’ (as opposed to ‘synagogue’) official (Davies and Allison, Matthew, 125; Luz, Matthew, 40). Matthew may have deliberately introduced ambiguity owing to tension between his community and the synagogue (so Luz, Matthew, 41; Harrington, Matthew, 131) although he has no problem with Jesus’ ministering in the synagogues according to key summary statements either side of this narrative (4:23; 9:35). The change is not particularly problematic for any hypothesis.

289 Εὐχαριστήσει (v. 18) replaces ἀλλα ἐλθόν ἐπίθεται. Davies and Allison (Matthew, 126) say Matthew’s Greek (ἀλλα ... συνήπθη) is closer to LXX usage than Mark 5:23 (noting the following parallel constructions to ἐπιτίθεμι + ἄνθρωπος) to Exod 29:10, 15, 19; Lev 1:4, 11; Num 27:18). Harrington (Matthew, 131) says the gesture relates to the transfer of “physical and spiritual health and wholeness” (citing the Genesis Apocryphon 20:28-29 relating to Abraham) and France (Matthew, 362) notes a “surprising disregard for the taboo on touching a dead body.”
ominations relate to the element of person, σωθή, could be considered a redundancy. The change to ‘just died’ prepares for Matthew’s later omission of the delegation (Mark 5:35) thus enhancing conciseness and possibly heightening the faith of the ruler albeit at the expense of narrative drama. The overall result is greater conciseness without loss of clarity or credibility. At the same time there are changes and omissions of narrative elements primarily related to details about Jairus’ person.

When it comes to the woman (vv. 19 to 22; par. Mark 5:24-34) Matthew retains the core narrative (woman with twelve year hemorrhage touches Jesus from behind and is healed) but exemplifies conciseness by replacing Mark’s 165 words with just 58. This results from omitting Mark’s extended description of the woman’s suffering (5:26) and, especially, the lengthy description (81 words in Mark) of the healing and subsequent dialogue between Jesus and the healed woman in Mark 5:29-33. This involves the omission of significant elements of characterization related to the woman (her long suffering and public confession in Mark 5:26 and 33) and Jesus (his awareness that power went out from him and his determination to identify the reason for it) albeit perhaps highlighting the faith (emphasized over touch) of the former and the supernatural insight of the latter (he doesn’t need to ask who touched him). The omission also

---

290 Such as σου added to χειρα and ἐπ’ σωθή in place of σωθή. The end result is nevertheless more concise.
291 So Davies and Allison, Matthew, 127. Luz thinks the thrice repeated σωθή in Matt 9:21-22 is catchword highlighting a broader salvation theme (beyond mere physical healing) (Matthew, 40–42; so also Harrington, Matthew, 131). Fuller calls it a “Christian interpretation” highlighting personal encounter, faith and discipleship (Interpreting, 56–7). Notably, however, the Markan parallel shares two of these occurrences of σωθή (Mark 5:28, 34) and the elimination of the occurrence here is surprising if it is a catchword. According to Twelftree the father’s expression of faith “becomes unmistakable” with use of the future (ζήσηται) in place of the two Markan aorists (Miracle Worker, 118) but this is not obviously so given Mark’s purpose clauses (Ἰνα twice in 5:23). Hence while the two Markan verbs (σωθή και ζήση) may have been considered a redundancy by the 2DH Matthew (see n. 242 above), it is not clear that his changes heighten the ‘faith’ motif.
292 Notably in Matthew the woman’s healing is not protracted whereby there is not the same sense of delay as in Mark. Davies and Allison see Matthew changing a “vulgar Markan expression” (ἐγκαταπεσεν εἰσεκέ) into ‘just died’) which either prepares for or is necessitated by his later omission of the Markan delegation (Mark 5:35-37) (Matthew, 126; so also Harrington, Matthew, 131; see above n. 240). This potentially emphasizes the ruler’s faith as belief in Jesus’ ability to raise the dead (versus merely heal the sick) (Luz, Matthew, 41).
293 There are no details in relation to time or place and Matthew retains the key actions (the ruler’s request) but lessens the drama in relation to the manner of action (e.g., changing Mark’s ‘fell down at his feet’ into ‘kneel before’ and omitting the modifier πολλά in relation to Jairus’ request in Mark 5:22-23). The cause of the ruler’s action (that his daughter might healed) is retained.
294 Matthew still has Jesus ‘turn around’ but in place of Mark’s question has him immediately identify the woman. This is perhaps made possible by Matthew omitting the crowd but raises the question of how such a woman was
potentially impacts the characterization of the disciples (their perplexity at Jesus’ question) despite his explicit mention of their presence in verse 19 (cf. Mark 5:24 where only the crowd is mentioned). In addition the 2DH Matthew omits Mark’s mention of the woman’s healing (Mark 5:29) which he delays until after Jesus’ speaks (see below). Furthermore, he consistently eliminates the crowd (cf. Mark 5:24, 27, 30, 31), which potentially helps to explain his changes in verse 19 (one word shared = 10% of Matthew; different form and applied to different person) where Jesus (and his disciples) follow ἐκλογοθήσεως ‘him’ (the ruler) versus Mark’s account where Jesus ‘departs after (the ruler)’ and the ‘crowd’ follows ‘him’ (Jesus) (Mark 5:24). The 2DH Matthew is much closer to Markan wording in vv. 20 (9 words shared = 64% of Matthew; same order and form), 21 (8 words shared = 72% of Matthew; same order; 2 different forms), and 22 (10 words shared = 43% of Matthew; same order; 1 different form) with relatively minor stylistic changes (e.g., προσελθούσα for ἐλθούσα in 9:20) and additions (e.g., ἵδοὺ in v. 20; ἐν ἐσυτῇ and μόνον in v. 21). He describes the woman’s bleeding more concisely but adds τοῦ κρασπεδοῦ in 9:20. The changes in Matt 9:22 are slightly greater in that he first

able to get close in the first place (more understandable within the Markan crowd). According to Davies and Allison (Matthew, 130) Matthew’s radical compression serves to underscore Jesus’ supernatural knowledge (no need to ask who touched him; commends women without being told what had happened to her; no record of power going out).

Davies and Allison note this as the only place in Matthew where Jesus ‘follows’ ἐκλογοθήσεως somebody else (Matthew, 127). Twelftree’s statement, therefore, that the disciples here “once again ... follow Jesus” is not quite accurate and, as he himself points out, they are later written out of the account when the story returns to the ruler’s daughter in Matt 9:23–26 (Miracle Worker, 118–19).

Matthew’s additional μόνον possibly highlights Jesus’ power (cf. Matt 8:8 below) (Davies and Allison, Matthew, 129; Nolland, Matthew, 396) or perhaps the theme of faith (versus touch) in light of 9:22 (Twelftree, Miracle Worker, 119). The ‘faith’ phrase, however, occurs in all three accounts and the grammatical position of μόνον could just as easily be read as highlighting the element of touch (‘if only I touch ...’) despite claims that Matthew down plays this motif.

Mark’s ὅσα ἐν ῥοίσι σώματος (cf. LXX Lev 15:19, 25; 20:18) becomes simply σώματος which is hapax legomenon in the NT but occurs in Hippocrates and Lev 15:33 (so Davies and Allison, Matthew, 128). As with discussion of the Markan term (n. 248 above) it is frequently taken as menstrual bleeding producing ritual uncleanness (e.g., Lev 15:19-24; Ezek 36:17; CD 4:12-5:17; 11QTemple 48:15-17; Josephus, Wars 5.227 and Against Apion 2.103-4) and social isolation (e.g., Davies and Allison, Matthew, 128; Luz, Matthew, 42; Harrington, Matthew, 131; Nolland, Matthew, 396). It is generally recognized that the site of bleeding is unstated, uncleanness is not explicit, her touch does not elicit indignation, and there is no mention of any required sacrifice (cf. Matt 8:4). Menstrual bleeding, however, remains the most popular choice (Davies and Allison, Matthew, 128; Nolland, Matthew, 396; France, Matthew, 262–3). While the 2DH Matthew is more concise, there are no indications that he has a different ailment in view or that he either heightens or lessens any possible connections to ritual impurity or social isolation. What seems to matter most is Jesus’ power to heal and the woman’s faith (9:22).

While some sees the tassels indicating Jesus as a pious Jew (cf. Num 15:38-40; Deut 22:12) (Luz, Matthew, 42; Twelftree, Miracle Worker, 118–19), Manfred Hutter says ‘touching the garment hem’ was a common ancient
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summarizes Mark 5:30-32 in a succinct seven word statement (“then Jesus turned and saw her”) and then adds a word about the woman being healed “from that hour.” While it is possible to see this last change as making the healing explicitly dependent upon Jesus’ word, it can also be read as Matthew smoothing out a Markan inconsistency, namely his double announcement of healing (5:29 and 34), and thus adding clarity. In sum the 2DH Matthew omits details pertaining to the narrative element of person (as above) but makes no changes in relation to time (except the narrative moves more quickly by virtue of his omissions) or place. While the primary actions are retained (she approaches Jesus, touches his garment, and is healed as a result; he speaks a word of blessing), Matthew omits the dialogue and public confession. Matthew’s delayed notification about the woman’s healing, avoiding Mark’s double

Mesopotamian motif in (especially religious) texts where its symbolic significance is that of precatory gesture toward God or people essentially meaning “to ask imploringly.” He concludes that the magical elements in Mark (and Luke), are changed in Matthew to focus on faith and a gesture of intense asking (“Ein altorientalischer Bittgestus in Mt 9:20–22,” ZNW 75 [1984]: 133–35). Similarly Hull (Hellenistic Magic, 136–7) sees the elimination of magical elements in Matthew both generally and here specifically (e.g., the bleeding woman healed by Jesus word rather than touch; omission of Aramaic words from girl’s raising in Mark 5:41) (Hellenistic Magic, 116–45, esp. 136–7). While approvingly citing Hutter and Hull, Luz notes that Matthew does not eliminate the most magical element of all (namely the touch itself) albeit heightening faith (Matthew, 42; so also Harrington, Matthew, 131; France, Matthew, 363; and Nolland, Matthew, 396). Given the difficulties of assessing and labelling so-called ‘magical elements’ the most that can be said is that 2DH Matthew abbreviates Mark (e.g., omits Mark 5:29-33), perhaps intentionally heightening Jesus’ supernatural powers of observation, but that the touching remains (without obvious embarrassment) and faith is taken over (not added) to the account (see further n. 252 above).

Nolland (Matthew, 397) says Matthew’s healing is assumed to occur at the moment of contact (which is how “from that hour” in 9:22 should be read). This may be implied by the statement ‘your faith has healed/saved you’ occurring prior to ‘from that hour’ but it is nevertheless true that delaying the explicit healing notice until after Jesus speaks potentially implies that healing only occurs in response to Jesus’ explicit word (so Robbins, “Woman,” 507, agreeing with Held). This is similarly so in Robbins, “Rhetorical Act,” 163–4, where he detects the following syllogism in Matthew: major premise (an act of faith makes a person well; minor premise (woman’s touch is an act of faith); conclusion (therefore woman is made well). This sees this as an example of Matthew’s “simplification” through abbreviation depicting a Jesus who “does not ask questions, does not discuss ... he makes summary, firm decisions” (Miracle Stories, 176, 78). Matthew is frequently understood to be highlighting ‘faith’ and/or ‘salvation’ as exemplified in this verse but the themes are equally present in the Mark 5:34 (see discussion in n. 285 above).

In essence the 2DH Luke does the same thing by having Jesus only say “go in peace” (omitting mention of healing) in 8:48. According to Robbins (“Woman,” 505) this is the last in a series of deliberate Matthean ‘chain-link repetitions’ intended to undergird logical progression (especially noting the repetition of the phrase ‘made well’ - σωζω repeated three times in Matt 9:21-22). Notably only the last of these is clearly Matthean (Mark uses ἵδη γεγίνεται rather than σωζω) though the three-fold repetition of σωζω in such a short space in Matthew is certainly striking.

According to Fuller these and other details omitted from the Markan story constitute “conventional features” of ancient miracle stories. For the hemorrhaging woman these include: the woman’s suffering (length of illness; failure of doctors), touching the garment, and healing power flowing like manna. For Jairus’ daughter they include: crowd scorns miracle worker, miracle performed in private, use of ‘magical phrase’ (Talitha cumi), and the amazement of the crowd (Interpreting, 56–7).
announcement (as above), relates to *manner*. Matthew agrees with Mark’s *cause* of the woman’s actions (desire for healing in Matt 9:21; Mark 5:28) and the primary explicit *cause* of her healing (‘faith’ in Matt 9:22; Mark 5:34). This is all related more *concisely* and with enhanced *clarity* (*manner* of the healing) albeit omitting elements of *person*. There are no obvious changes in relation to credibility.

Finally when he relates the healing of the ruler’s daughter (Matt 9:23-26; Mark 5:35-43) Matthew again abbreviates Mark’s 152 words into a mere 57. First, he omits the Markan delegation (reporting the girl’s death) which is made unnecessary by Matthew’s choice to report the girl as dead from the outset (Matt 9:18).\(^{302}\) He also omits mention of the exclusive group permitted to enter with Jesus (the disciples and the girl’s parents)\(^{303}\) though includes the expulsion of the crowd (9:25a). Stylistically he lessens Mark’s parataxis in 5:38-40a (7x καὶ vs. 4x καὶ in the Matthean parallel and a more obvious use of adverbial participles to create subordinate clauses) and changes the description of the mourners in verse 23.\(^{304}\) He also changes the Markan question (‘why are you causing a disturbance and weeping?’) into an imperative statement (‘depart’) and then makes verse 24b an explanation for the imperative by the insertion of γάρ (as with Luke) with a more concise result.\(^{305}\) The healing itself is stated more concisely

---

\(^{302}\) With it are omitted Jesus’ words to the ruler about the need for faith (a Matthean miracle motif) albeit the implied faith of the ruler is greater in Matthew in that he seeks Jesus while already knowing his daughter is dead.

\(^{303}\) In this he perhaps tones down the characterization of the disciples who have no role in either of these stories despite their explicit mention in Matt 9:19.

\(^{304}\) Davies and Allison note that *aulōntēs* (‘clarinet-player’) occurs twice in the NT (here and Rev 18:22) and not once in the LXX but was connected with mourning (Josephus, *Wars* 3.437; *m. Ketub* 4.4; *m. Šabb* 23.4). They claim there would have been a mixture of “professional mourners and friends offering food and consolation.” The role of the professional mourners was (1) to wail and make lamentation; (2) to compose funeral poems and dirges (Matthew, 130–31). Others note the indispensable presence of ‘professional’ mourners at both Jewish and Greek funerals (Luz, *Matthew*, 43; France, *Matthew*, 365; Nolland, *Matthew*, 397–8; Keener, *Gospel of Matthew*, 304–5) and their presence here is often seen as a confirmation that, within the narrative at least, the girl is dead (Harrington, *Matthew*, 131–2; Twelftree, *Miracle Worker*, 119) although Matthew has been explicit about that from the beginning (9:18). Other changes in v. 23 (vs. Mark 5:38) are essentially stylistic and include the following: replacing the historical presents with aorist participles; adding the name Jesus; and changing όικος into όικία (so Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 130–31). Gundry sees ambiguity in the Markan mourners who are never explicitly designated as a crowd and could therefore be understood as family members. In contrast Matthew’s addition of flutists and explicit mention of a crowd is more strongly suggestive of professional mourners in keeping with Matthew presenting the girl as dead from the onset. Since the girl has only just died in Mark there may not have been sufficient time for professional mourners to have gathered (*Mark*, 283).

\(^{305}\) Matthew, according to Davies and Allison (*Matthew*, 131), tends to keep Jesus from asking questions and the question in Mark 5:39 is redundant on account of Matt 9:23 where it is essentially replaced with the command to
(8 words in place of 17 in v. 25)\textsuperscript{306} and perhaps most interesting of all he reverses the Markan secrecy command stating that the report spread about (Matt 9:26).\textsuperscript{307} Given the problems already noted in relation to the Markan secrecy this final change clearly enhances \textit{clarity} and \textit{credibility} as well as tying into validation (it is the only example of raising the dead prior to the summary statement of Matt 11:5).\textsuperscript{308} At the same time the 2DH Matthew omits ‘miracle proofs’ from Mark (the girl walking and being fed) along with expressions of amazement, each of which relate to validation. In all of this Matthew continues to omit narrative elements of \textit{person} (e.g., disciples; parents; the girl’s age) albeit retaining most \textit{actions} (key exceptions include the delegation and the proofs). The \textit{manner} of the action is unchanged (willingly by Jesus) but the \textit{cause} is somewhat changed by Matthew’s reversal of the secrecy motif whereby Jesus’ miracle working power is intended to be proclaimed (validation motif) and not simply for private consumption. \textit{Time} and \textit{place} elements are unchanged. The end result is once again greater \textit{conciseness} without loss of clarity or credibility but omission of elements of person and action.

(b) Luke’s use of Mark

While the 2GH Luke (287 words) significantly expands (2.1x as long) Matthew (138 words), the situation is reversed for the 2DH Luke whose account is only 76% as long as Mark (374

\textsuperscript{306}According to Davies and Allison the Markan Aramaic phrase is omitted on account of its ‘magical’ connotations (Matthew, 132–3). Twelftree disagrees and claims that Matthew simply wants nothing besides Jesus to be seen as effecting the healing (Miracle Worker, 119) although it is not clear how this substantially differs from the opinion of Davies and Allison. While it is possible that Matthew seeks to avoid the notion of ‘technique’ in relation to miracle, it is equally plausible that he simply omits the phrase on account of brevity.

\textsuperscript{307}Luz suggests that Matthew is here influenced by either Mark 1:28 or the concluding sentence a deutero-Markan recension of Mark 5:21-34 (Matthew, 40–41). At the same time he later notes that Matthew has no use for the Markan secrecy motif here and that his own report of spreading fits with the narrative thread of Matt 8–9 and the multiplication of Jesus’ miracles among people (Matt 9:26, 31, 33, 35) (ibid., 43). Variants of σωτήρ (f\textsuperscript{13} lat syr) in Matt 9:26 include σωτήρ (N C Θ f\textsuperscript{1} 33 205 etc) and σωτόν (D 1424) but these likely arose from the lack of explicit antecedent to σωτήρ (so Nolland, Matthew, 393).

\textsuperscript{308}So Twelftree (Miracle Worker, 119) noting the relationship to Matt 11:5 and 23 along with echoes of Isa 35:5-6.
words). Also different is the extent of verbal overlap whereby the 2DH Luke takes over a higher percentage of Markan vocabulary (121 words shared: 42% of Luke; 32% of Mark) than does the 2GH Luke of Matthew (40 shared words: 13% of Luke; 28% of Matthew).

While brevity is a key virtue, we must consider the range of alterations made by the 2DH Luke in relation to Mark in order to assess the greater or lesser plausibility of Markan priority in relation to Markan posteriority.

In a more succinct transitional statement the 2DH Luke replaces 21 words (Mark 5:21) with 15 words (Luke 8:40) by removing potential redundancies (‘in the boat’; ‘to the other side’; ‘he was alongside the sea’) while retaining the essential actions (Jesus crosses back over the lake and is met by a crowd). When it comes, however, to the ruler’s request (Luke 8:41-42a; Mark 5:22-23) Luke (38 words) shares 9 words (3 different forms; same order) with Mark (36 words) but is five percent longer (see table 6.6). The increased length results partly from the following: addition of ἵδου; an expanded description of the synagogue ruler (Jairus), where ten words


310 See table 6.6. The higher absolute number of shared words is to be expected given the much longer accounts of both Mark and Luke (vs. Matthew) but more significant is the higher relative number of words taken over from Mark (32% assuming Markan priority) than from Matthew (28% assuming the 2GH). According to Marshall the 2DH Luke makes few alterations to Mark, which are “almost entirely abbreviations and stylistic improvements” (Luke, 342). The following are typical thematic interests identified with 2DH Lukan redaction (Marshall, Luke, 342; Bock, Luke, 785–90; Luke Timothy Johnson, Luke, 143; Fitzmyer, Luke, 743–44): (1) Jesus’ power over disease and death; (2) faith in relation healing/salvation (magical or not?); (3) compassion; (4) secrecy; (5) restoration to community life (not just physical healing). Fitzmyer also sees a relationship to the raising of the widow’s son (Luke 7:11-17), which together with Jairus’ daughter foreshadows the resurrection (Luke, 744). Held sees Luke bringing his narrative closer to Hellenistic miracle stories (e.g., suddenness of miracle; incurability by physicians; healed person announces the miracle to others) thereby heightening its miraculous character (unlike Matthew) (“Miracle Stories,” 180–81). Robbins thinks there is no basis for knowing whether Matthew used Mark or vice versa but that Luke’s version is more clearly a “refinement and retooling” of Mark (“Woman,” 503).

311 While ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν … (majority of MSS) is a textual variant for ἐν δὲ … (𝔓⁵ B f¹ pc), the latter is likely original (so Marshall, Luke, 342). Stylistically Luke is typically judged superior to Mark on account of the latter’s “illogical” (Marshall, Luke, 342) or “clumsy” (Fitzmyer, Luke, 745) genitive absolute. While the normal classical usage avoided having the noun/pronoun of the genitive absolute reappear in the sentence, the NT has many exceptions (mainly in Matthew) (so Blass and Debrunner, Greek Grammar, 218). Furthermore, we should probably be careful of judging NT authors by classical standards or norms.

312 Bultmann considers ὀνόματι Ἰάκτηρος as a secondary addition to Mark (from Luke where it is original) owing to its omission in both D and Matthew (History, 215). Others note the same possibility (Nineham, Mark, 180, and Cranfield, Mark, 183) and Taylor is sympathetic to view point (Mark, 287) despite reasonably strong external evidence (W Θ 565 700) that leads most to regard it as original in Mark (e.g., Marshall, Luke, 343; Bock, Luke, 791–2, 802; Fitzmyer, Luke, 745). Nolland (citing Pesch) notes the possibility that the name is symbolic
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(aυρη ... συναγωγής in Luke 8:41) replace five (εἰς ... ἴατος in Mark 22:5); addition of “to his house” in 8:41; addition of the girl’s age (ὡς ἐτῶν δύοδέκατον); and addition of the modifier μονογενής (‘only’) to ‘his daughter.’ The only substantive addition to Mark is the qualifier μονογενής, which likely enhances pathos.  

The detail about the girl’s age is transferred from a latter place in Mark (5:42) to what appears to be a more logical position.  

Despite the expansions Luke is only 2 words longer than Mark on account of omitting the actual details of Jairus’ request (ἐπιθυμήσας ... ζήσῃ in Mark 5:23), which in Mark enhances specificity and cause (beyond simply ‘come!’), and Mark’s καὶ ἰδοὺν αὐτόν (Mark 5:22), which may be taken as a redundancy. Other changes are essentially stylistic: e.g., change from direct to indirect speech; [τοῦ Ἱησοῦ in place of αὐτόν; θυγάτηρ in place of θυγάτηριον; and was dying (ἀπέθνησεν) in place of ‘was near death’ (ἐσχάτως ἔχει). Despite replacing Mark’s historic present (πίπτει) with a participle (πέσον) he nevertheless basically follows Mark’s paratactic style.  

While some of the stylistic changes might be termed ‘improvements’ (e.g., θυγάτηρ and ἀπέθνησεν), the end result is slightly less concise without any significant additions (except 


While the detail obviously links the two stories in Mark and Luke (table 6.4), it is claimed that Luke’s position is more logical (e.g., Goulder, Luke, 426; Marshall, Luke, 343; Fitzmyer, Luke, 745–5). This is a reasonable claim in that Luke juxtaposes the two references to twelve years (8:42 and 43) whereas Mark separates them (Mark 5:25, 42) with the second coming as something of an interruption to the various ‘proofs.’ While it may be too much to claim that Mark’s position is illogical, Luke’s position does enhance clarity.  

Nolland sees high level “reformulation” to produce “more sophisticated syntax” in 8:41 albeit “with little change of meaning” (Luke 1–9:20, 419). This, however, is not obviously the case in that, for instance, he introduces an additional clause (καὶ ὄντος ... ὑπήρξεν) simply indicating Jairus’ position as synagogue ruler, something Mark does more succinctly in his initial subject (‘one of the synagogue rulers’). Nolland sees Luke stressing Jairus’ dignity (vs. Mark 5:22) and says his imperfect (παρεκάλει) “signals uncertainty about the outcome” (Luke 1–9:20, 419). It is not clear, however, that Luke enhances Jairus’ dignity and the imperfect is simply shared with Mark.  
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μονογενής) or clarifications (except relocating the girl’s age) and an omission (details of Jairus’ request) that potentially relates to the narrative element of cause.317

When it comes to the hemorrhaging woman (Luke 8:42b-48; Mark 5:24-34) Luke is 27% shorter than Mark (119 words in place of 165) and shares a total of 48 words (6 different forms; 2 order changes). He is not, however, consistently more concise in that the woman’s confession in Luke 8:47 (26 words) expands Mark 5:33 (20 words) by having her report ‘why’ she touched Jesus and ‘how’ she was immediately healed ‘before all the people’ (ἐνωπίων παντός τοῦ λαοῦ). This, however, enhances the motif of validation and the virtue of clarity.318 Luke otherwise tends toward greater brevity in relation to word counts in general319 along with his omission of Mark 5:28 and Jesus’ concluding statement “be healed ...” (Mark 5:34; par. Luke 8:48).320 While the first one enhances brevity, it also potentially omits a narrative element of cause (in Mark 5:28 the woman states the reason for her action).321 The second adds clarity (and perhaps credibility) in that her healing has been noted explicitly already (Luke 8:44b; 47b; cf.

---

317 According to Marshall it is taken for granted that Jesus will heed the request and thus Luke moves on in his narrative (Luke, 344). This perhaps explains the omission in part (Luke assumes the intent of the Jairus’ request) though he is noted to omit a key Lukan word in the process (σωθῆ in Mark 5:23).

318 While Johnson (Luke, 142) sees Luke 8:47 as having an unusual word order and being uncharacteristically wordier than Mark 5:33, the Markan statement that ‘she told him the whole truth,’ which is the best way to make sense of the later report of her having died (Luke 8:29; par. Mark 5:35).

319 Noting the following: v. 42b (9 words in place of 12); v. 43 (20 words in place of 29); v. 44a (8 words in place 17); vv. 45-46 (35 words in place of 44); and v. 48 (13 words in place of 20). Notably the phrase ἵπποισθεν προσανάλωσα ὁ λός ὁ βίος is a variant in Luke 8:43 with fairly strong external support for (א ב ו L ψ Q B D) but conforming to Lukan style and succinctly summarizing Mark 5:26. This leads some to argue in favor of inclusion (Goulder, Luke, 426; Bock, Luke, 806–7; UBS committee with ‘C’ rating) while others are uncertain (Marshall, Luke, 344; Fitzmyer, Luke, 746; Johnson, Luke, 141). Bock notes various alternative readings of Luke 8:44 but none with the strength of external support for the UBS text (א ב C L P W δ Θ Ξ Βυζ Lect most Syriac many it Vulgate and Coptic) (Luke, 807).

320 Luke also changes the Markan ἔπανοιγμενε into the purportedly more Septuagintal τοπέφενεν suggesting a sense of ‘living in peace’ rather than simply ‘departing in peace’ (so Twelftree, Miracle Worker, 157, 388 n. 62).

321 This is similar to the omission of Jairus’ full request noted above. In either case it might be argued that the reason for their actions is implied in Luke (especially in light of the subsequent narrative) whereby he allows brevity to trump cause. On this omission see also above in relation to the 2GH Lukan use of Matthew.
Mark 5:29) thereby making Mark’s statement somewhat illogical.\(^{322}\) Luke rewrites the central section (8:45-46) more succinctly (35 words in place of 44). In addition to various minor omissions and stylistic differences\(^{323}\) 2DH Luke changes “the disciples” into “Peter” in verse 45\(^{324}\) and transfers the position of the Jesus’ statement (about power going out from him)\(^{325}\) to a later place whereby it becomes the reason given for Jesus’ question (“who touched me?”) in response to Peter’s statement about the crowds. While Jesus’ awareness is mentioned in Mark 5:30a, Luke’s re-location to a later position adds clarity (no response is given to the disciples’ question in Mark) and may even enhance the elements of person and validation by highlighting Jesus’ supernatural knowledge.\(^{326}\)

---

322Theissen notes the Markan lack of logic both here (double mention of healing) and with the secrecy command at Mark 5:42 (a dead raising can hardly be kept secret once mourners have assembled) and takes it as evidence of his oral style. Luke’s more literary nature leads to a more coherent narrative with inconsistencies weeded out (Miracle Stories, 193). This is true of the first instance but not the secrecy command, which Luke essentially retains (see below). In v. 44 Luke’s change from Mark’s ἠγαπάω τοίς ἱππημένων (regarding the flow of blood drying up) possibly involves use of technical medical terminology (so Marshall, Luke, 345).

323E.g., omit εἰσῆλθεν; omit Jesus turning round before asking his question (Mark 5:30); ἔλεγεν becomes ἠπεί; ὄψατο becomes όψαμένος; and ‘my garment’ becomes ‘me’ (Luke 8:45).

324Some Lukan MSS add “and those with him” to “Peter” (ιησου B some Syr one Coptic) but the uncontested singular verb (ἡπείν) and differing forms of the addition suggest it is a later scribal harmonization to Mark 5:31 (so Bock, Luke, 807; Marshall, Luke, 345; and Fitzmyer, Luke, 747). Other MSS add “and you say, who touched me?” (καὶ λέγεις, Τίς ὁ όψαμένος μου) to Peter’s comments but good external support (ιησου B L f1 syr Cop) and lectio breviior suggest the longer reading is a later scribal harmonization to Mark 5:31 (Bock, Luke, 807; Fitzmyer, Luke, 747).

325The source of the Lukan Jesus’ power is much debated with commentators divided between those detecting a reference to the Holy Spirit (e.g., Green, Luke, 348), God’s power more generally (e.g., Bock, Luke, 794, 96, 98; Marshall, Luke, 345), and a ‘magical mana’ (e.g., Drury, Tradition, 181; Kee, Medicine, 118–9; Theissen, Miracle Stories, 91). If (within the narrative) the latter is in the mind of the woman, it is possible that it stands ‘corrected’ by Jesus’ clear statement about faith as the prime cause of her healing (Marshall, Luke, 345; Bock, Luke, 794, 96, 98; Latourelle, Miracles, 129). While this specific text is insufficiently clear to make a precise judgment, other Lukan references (1:35; 4:14, 36; 5:17; 6:19; 9:1) seem to favor God in some way being the source of Jesus’ power (so Bock, ibid.).

326So Theissen, Miracle Stories, 135 who notes that Luke’s (and Mark’s) initial question (“who touched me?” in Luke 8:45; Mark 5:30) becomes a statement in Luke 8:46 (“someone touched me”) rather than a repeated question (as in Mark 5:31). He suggests that Luke thereby displays Jesus’ miraculous knowledge more clearly such that the woman cannot remain hidden. The following changes lend further support to this observation: (a) at the beginning of Luke 8:47 the woman comes ‘trembling’ on account of knowing that ‘she could not remain hidden’ (in Mark 5:33 she simply comes forward on account of ‘knowing what had happened to herself’); (b) Luke omits Jesus looking around to see who had ‘done this’ (Mark 5:32) and adds that “everyone was denying it” (in response to Jesus’ question in 8:45). These things heighten the sense of Jesus’ self-confidence in proceeding to the statement “someone touched me” (Luke 8:46). Robbins makes similar claims noting that the whole story is told so as to focus on the woman’s public proclamation of Jesus’ powers (“Woman,” 513), which relates to validation. He detects a rhetorical syllogism provided this time by Jesus (cf. n. 216) as follows: (a) I possess power which issues forth when people touch me; (b) I perceive that power has gone forth; (c) therefore, some has touched me. At the same time he notes that Jesus graciously deflects excessive praise (“your faith has healed you”) in a manner in keeping with Hellenistic
Finally we come to the actual raising of Jairus’ daughter (Luke 8:49-56; Mark 5:35-43) where Luke (115 words) is again significantly (24%) shorter than Mark (152 words). With 60 shared words (12 different forms; 3 order changes) the percentage of overlap (52% of Luke; 39% of Mark) is clearly the highest of the three main sections of this story. His greater brevity results from more concise rewording without major additions or omissions. The transition (Luke 8:49-50) is only slightly more succinct (30 words in place of 33) and displays high verbatim agreement with mainly stylistic changes though adding the statement καὶ σώθησαι (8:50) and changing Mark’s question (“why are you still troubling the teacher?”) into an imperative (“do not trouble the teacher any longer”) (8:49). While the addition of καὶ σώθησαι adds clarity by specifying the content of belief called for in Mark 5:36, the change to the imperative in 8:49 adds clarity in that Jairus is yet unaware of his daughter’s death in either Mark or Luke sensibilities as expressed in Plutarch (ibid.). It may be that 2DH Luke also lessens the implied Markan critique of the disciples by making Peter’s address less harsh (Luke 8:45) in comparison to the Markan parallel (so Marshall, Luke, 345 and Drury, Tradition, 96). The one possible exception is the omission of the Aramaic phrase in Mark 5:41 (ταλίθα κομ ... ) but insofar as Luke retains the translated Greek phrase I have chosen to take this as summarizing rather than omission. As above this amounts to 21 shared words (4 different forms; 1 different order): 63% of Mark; 70% of Luke. E.g. “a certain one comes” (ἐρχέται οὗ) replaces “they come” (ἐρχονται); παρά replaces ἀπό; τέθηκεν replaces ἀπέθανεν; and ἄκουσας replaces παρακούσας. More substantial is the replacement of an eight word Markan phrase (παρακούσας ... ἀρχισυναγώγῳ in Mark 5:36) with a simpler three word statement (ἄκουσας ἀπεκρίθη σὺτῷ in Luke 8:50). Marshall claims Mark’s τὸν λόγον ἀλοίπων is clumsy while παρακούσας is ambiguous (can mean ‘to overhear’ or ‘to ignore’). He thinks the repositioning of the verb for dying (τέθηκεν) into first place adds emphasis in terms of the finality of the event (Luke, 346). On the ambiguity of παρακούσας see also Cranfield, Mark, 187. Bock (Luke, 799–800) thinks that Luke stresses death’s finality more than Mark through his use of the perfect tense and Fitzmyer sees Luke this as an improvement upon Mark’s Greek (Luke, 748). While some MSS have μὴ in place of μικάτι (p27 N B D sy* sa), most prefer the latter reading as original (e.g., Marshall, Luke, 346; Fitzmyer, Luke, 748) with Bock suggesting it is lectio difficilior on account of being the only occurrence of μικάτι in Luke-Acts (Luke, 800 and 808). The choice makes little difference in relation to Luke’s purported use of Mark.

While the content of Mark’s imperative is frequently assumed to be a climactic call to ‘faith in Jesus as one who raises the dead’ (e.g., Kertelge, Die Wunder, 117; Lane, Mark, 195–6), Hedrick rightly notes that Mark’s statement (‘Do not be frightened; only believe’) is nevertheless ambiguous: does Jesus deny the messengers report or call for ‘faith’ in himself? (“Jairus’s Daughter,” 227). While these are not the only options (e.g., Jesus is calling for faith that the girl can be raised from the dead), the ambiguity is clearly lessened by the 2GH Lukan addition which narrows the focus of belief to the ultimate result for the girl (she will be made well). While σώζω likely includes at least physical healing, it may also point to God’s eschatological salvation (so Twelftree, Miracle Worker, 157) albeit Luke omitted an earlier Markan reference to σώζω (see above). The change from a present (πιστεύει) to an aorist(πιστεύου) imperative possibly suggests more urgency (Bock, Luke, 800) or even a new kind of faith (Nolland, Luke 1–9:20, 421) but more likely is just stylistic variation.
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(contra Matthew) whereby Mark’s “why?” question is less clear. Jesus’ approach to the house (Luke 8:51-53; Mark 5:37-40) is more concise in Luke (48 words replace 50 words although 8 words in Luke 8:51 - ‘and the father and the mother of the child’ - are transferred up from their later location in Mark 5:40). This results from minor omissions of Markan redundancies (e.g., τόν ἀδελφὸν Ἰακώβου in Mark 5:37; τοῦ ἀρχισυναγώγου in Mark 5:38; τὸ παιδίον in Mark 5:39) and various stylistic changes that frequently enhance either clarity or conciseness: (a) the transfer of the notation about the father and mother from Mark 5:40 to Luke 8:51 draws together more succinctly into one place the specific people Jesus permits to enter; (b) the phrase “and having come to the house he permitted none to enter except” (Luke 8:51a) not only replaces paratactic style with subordination but is also more succinct than Mark’s “he permitted none to go along with him ... and they came to the house ... ” (Mark 5:37-38); (c) Luke’s description of the mourners replaces 8 words (καὶ ... πολλά in Mark 5:38) with 6 words (ἐκλαίων ... αὐτήν) in 8:52a; and (d) finally, Luke changes Jesus’ question (“why are you causing a disturbance and weeping?”) into a simple imperative statement, “stop weeping,” in 8:52b (replaces 4 words with 2). Luke’s addition of the phrase “because they knew she was dead” not only provides a cause for the (mourner’s?) laughter but also underscores that the girl is indeed dead and not just mistaken as dead (mourners know how to identify a dead person). This underscores the irony Jesus’ statement ‘she is not dead but sleeping’ (οὔ ... ἀπέθανεν ἀλλὰ καθεύδει) and more clearly highlights its likely figurative meaning. Finally the 2DH Luke changes Mark’s συνακολουθῆσαι to ἐσελθεῖν (8:51), ἐρχονται in Mark 5:38 to ἐλθῶν in Luke 8:51, omits ἐσελθῶν from Mark 5:39, and omits “and they entered into where the girl was” in

332 Agreeing with Hedrick, “Jairus’s Daughter,” 226, who says it would have made better sense for the Markan messengers to have said ‘you need trouble the teacher no further’ (using οὐκέτι; as in Luke’s μηκέτι σκόλλε).  
333 Green says that v. 51 implies a short distance to Jairus’ house (Luke, 346) but this is an argument from silence and is not a point of difference among the accounts.  
335 This adds clarity to the ambiguity inherent in Mark (and Matthew) on which see above n. 221.
Mark 5:40. The effect of these changes is as follows: Mark has Jesus select the disciples (5:37), come to the house (5:38), enter (5:39), see the mourners and cast them out (5:39-40a), and then proceed to enter where the girl was (implying she was in a separate area of the house) taking along the parents and ‘those with him’ (5:40b). Alternatively Luke has Jesus come to the house and enter along with parents and disciples only (8:51), address the mourning and weeping (8:52), and then raise the girl but without the second verb of entering and without the phrase about ‘entering into where the girl was’ (8:53-54). The Lukan Jesus, therefore, enters the house at 8:51 and, despite commanding the mourners to cease weeping, does not cast them out or enter into a different area of the house in order to raise the girl. The impression given is that the raising takes place in view of the mourners. While such changes enhance brevity, it is potentially at the expense of clarity insofar as the impression is created that the father and mother need to enter the house while the mourners are already inside (understandable for the father, who was with Jesus, but less so for the mother, who one expects would have remained in the house with the mourners). Even more problematic is that the 2DH Luke (unlike Matthew) retains the Markan

336 According to Marshall the narrative implies the mourners were outside the house and forbade entrance but he thinks it more likely that (as in Mark) they were denied access to the room where the child was located (Luke, 347). Bock, on the other hand, sees the mourners excluded in Luke 8:51 (Luke, 801–02). Both observations, however, involve arguments from silence and ignore the following: Luke lacks an explicit expulsion notice (deliberately omitted by the 2DH Luke from Mark 5:40); the mourners are not mentioned until Luke 8:52 after the party has entered the house; and Luke lacks any explicit mention of entering into a second room where the girl is located. Green, alternatively, suggests that the account is organized dramatically rather than chronologically so as to focus on two discourses, namely (a) Jesus’ response to the crowd/mourners (8:52-53) and (b) his response to the girl, her parents and the three disciples (8:54-56) (Luke, 350–51). Nolland similarly suggests that vv. 52-53 occur logically prior to v. 51 recognizing that if not (“and Luke does not especially encourage such a reading”) the mourners are left to witness the raising (Luke 1–9:20, 421). It is not clear, however, how this chronological displacement enhances ‘dramatic effect’ (he could have simply narrated Jesus’ words to the mourners first and then have Jesus enter with the select few without any obvious loss of drama) and there is nothing explicit or implicit in a synchronic reading of the text that encourages us to think of vv. 52-53 as preceding v. 51. If Luke intends this then clarity is certainly compromised.

337 Mark gives the impression that the mother is already inside the house insofar as she is first mentioned when they go into the room where the child is located (Mark 5:40). In Luke, however, she enters the house with Jesus, the disciples and her husband (who had been to seek Jesus) in 8:51. According to Bock it presses Luke’s language too far to expect complete coherence in relation to the mother in that Luke is simply summarizing Mark’s greater detail (Luke, 800–01). It nevertheless remains that the 2DH Luke is more concise than Mark but has apparently compromised clarity. The identity of the mourners is also a point of debate here. This is not made explicit in any of our accounts and could refer to professional mourners (e.g., Lane, Mark, 196; Nineham, Mark, 161; Van Der Loos, Miracles, 568), family members (Cranfield, Mark, 188; Meier, Marginal Jew, 779), a mixture of both, or simply those explicitly present (disciples and parents) although the latter seems unlikely in light of the scornful laughter.
Chapter 6 Rhetorical Transformation of Miracle Tradition Pericopes

secrecy motif in 8:56 and yet has not (unlike Mark) had the mourners cast out whereby the raising becomes an even more public event. Alternatively Luke may have deliberately had the mourners witness the raising (contra Mark) whereby the secrecy command is addressed to them along with the disciples and the parents. Taken this way what appears to be an absurd command in Mark is perhaps given a degree of clarity and credibility in Luke whereby Jesus seeks to control the spread of the report by limiting it to those who are aware of the girl’s death and have witnessed her raising. While this may be taken as a move in the direction of credibility, the 2DH Matthean choice to omit the command and have the report spread abroad remains the most credible. Luke’s retelling of the actual raising (Luke 8:54; Mark 5:41) is again more succinct (11 words in place of 18) by omission the foreign phrase along with minor stylistic changes and omissions.

In concluding the story (Luke 8:55-56; Mark 5:42-43) the similarities and differences between Luke and Mark have been noted above in relation to the 2GH Mark. What needs highlighting here is that the 2DH Luke omits the walking motif, moves the age notation up (to 8:42), and adds mention of the girl’s spirit returning. Luke also makes the

338 The 2DH Luke perhaps adds clarity to the silencing command when replacing the less certain ‘this’ (τοῦτο), that no-one should know in Mark 5:43, with the less ambiguous ‘the thing which happened’ (τὸ γεγονὸς) (so Hedrick, “Jairus’s Daughter,” 227).

339 Fitzmyer (Luke, 750), recognizing the problem created by retaining the Markan secrecy, suggests the possible influence of Luke 8:10 (secrets of the kingdom are not yet revealed) but this text explicitly relates to parables and not obviously to miracles (cf. Luke 8:38-39 where Jesus tells the healed demoniac to go proclaim what has been done for him). Alternatively perhaps “scoffers are to be left to believe that (Jesus) was right after all to suggest that the girl was not dead but sleeping” (so Schürmann cited in Nolland, Luke 1–9:20, 416) but this is obviously an argument from silence and not one that seems to be invited by the text. A better alternative is that those weeping and wailing in Luke 8:52-53 are taken as family members and/or even those who entered with Jesus in 8:51. This eliminates mourners from the Lukian pericope in toto and likewise creates a more credible narrative in relation to the silencing command. It nevertheless creates problems in relation to the (apparently) scornful laughter in 8:53 (see n. 337 above).


341 This is typically explained as a 2DH Lukian omission on account of his Gentile/Greek audience who would be unacquainted with Aramaic (e.g., Bock, Luke, 803; Fitzmyer, Luke, 749) although the same could be said of Mark who clearly feels the need to supply a translation. The 2DH Lukian omission could just as easily be explained as enhancement of brevity.

342 E.g. τοῦ παιδίου replaces αὐτής; ἡ παῖς replaces τὸ κοράσιον; ἐφόνησεν replaces λέγει; and omit σοι λέγω.

343 Nolland sees the influence of 1 Kg 17:21-22 in relation to the returning spirit (Luke 1–9:20, 422).
feeding command prior to the amazement and the silencing command. As noted above, in relation to the 2GH Mark, several of the changes can be considered stylistic although the earlier placement of the feeding motif perhaps shows greater clarity in that the ‘proofs’ are all stated before the amazement (which is climactic) and silencing command (which is more akin to a postscript). In essence the Lukian account is slightly more concise (26 words replace 29 words) and moderately enhances clarity.

Considering the narrative as a whole, from the perspective of Theon’s narrative elements it may be said that 2DH Luke makes no significant changes in relation to person, action, or manner of action when compared to Mark. He likewise retains Markan time elements (e.g., follows on from the Gerasene demoniac) albeit there are no specific time indicators within the story other than the implied sense that the events happened in the order given and within a given day. In relation to place the 2DH Luke omits “alongside the sea” (Mark 5:21) but this is clearly implied in Luke 8:40. He agrees with Mark in having the daughter healed in Jairus’ home but does not agree with the Markan implication that Jesus first entered the house (5:39) and then entered a separate part of the house where the girl was located (5:40b). The potential reasons for this have been suggested above in relation to enhanced clarity. Regarding the cause of actions 2DH Luke notably omits the explicit request of Jairus (for Jesus to lay hands ...) in Mark 5:23 (as noted above) but enhances clarity by relocating the reason for Jesus’ question about the woman (“who touched me?”) so as to become a response to Peter. As regards narrative virtues Luke is generally more concise (Luke 8:42b-43 is the primary exception) and potentially adds clarity in his expansion of the woman’s confession (8:47), his omission of the Jesus’ final statement to the woman (‘be healed of your affliction’), his change from the Markan question (“why are you still troubling the teacher?”) to an imperative (“do not trouble the teacher any longer”) (Luke 8:49; Mark 5:35), and his moving up of the feeding notice. Alternatively his omission of the expulsion

---

344 The food motif may be intended to underline that we are not dealing with a ghostly apparition (Nolland, Luke 1–9:20, 422; Bock, Luke, 803–4).
345 Although the three words could be accounted for quite simply by his having moved up the (three word) notation about the age of the girl whereby he is no more concise at this point.
of the mourners (and the movement into “where the girl was”) compromises clarity (insofar as he maintains the secrecy command) although even this change may be taken as an enhancement of clarity (and perhaps credibility) by including the mourners among the witnesses of the girl’s raising (thus including them in the scope of the secrecy command). The secrecy command nevertheless remains puzzling with the Matthean account being most credible by simply omitting it. In essence while the 2DH Luke has followed Mark more closely than his 2DH Matthean counterpart, he is nevertheless more concise and potentially adds clarity at various points while also tending toward better Greek style.

6.3.3 The FH: Jairus’ Daughter and the Hemorrhaging Woman

Finally we come to an examination of this pericope from the standpoint of the FH according to which the story was first taken over from Mark by Matthew and then from both by Luke. The first of these scenarios (Matthew’s use of Mark) has already been discussed in relation to the 2DH and needs no further comment. While Luke’s purported use of Mark has also been discussed in relation to the 2DH, it remains to consider the possibility that he used Matthew in addition to Mark, a feature which sets the FH apart from the 2DH. Unlike the 2GH, the FH Luke’s expanded narrative (in relation to Matthew) is primarily explained by Markan priority whereby the added details (e.g., delayed death of the girl and the delegation bringing news of her death), disagreement in details (e.g., secrecy command), and the literary/chronological position (after the Gadarene demoniac) simply reflect Luke’s preference for the Markan account. In this respect Mark is Luke’s primary source for this narrative in relation to both the 2DH and FH (over against the 2GH). What remains to be explored is whether there are clear indications of Matthean influence upon Luke or whether the differences are best understood as resulting from

346 Notwithstanding all the stylistic changes it has been shown above, assuming Markan priority (2DH), that Luke adds no significant actions to Mark (unlike the 2GH Luke in relation to Matthew) and has greater verbal overlap to Mark than Matthew.
independent redaction of Mark. An important consideration in this regard will be the presence of MAs as a possible indicator of Luke’s direct knowledge of Matthew.347

Beginning with the transition statement (Luke 8:40; par. Mark 5:21; Matt 9:18a) the Lukan context is clearly closer to Mark insofar as they both have the story following directly upon the Gadarene demoniac while Matthew’s account follows the question about fasting (Matt 9:14-17). This results in essentially no verbal overlap between Matthew and Luke348 and no other obvious MAs. When it comes to the ruler’s request (Luke 8:41-42a; Mark 5:22-23) Lukan wording and content continues closer to Mark but a couple of MAs appear. Beginning in Luke 8:41 there is an addition of ἴδού (Matt 9:18; cf. Mark 5:22) a word that occurs commonly in Matthew (62x) and Luke (57x; 23x in Acts) but not Mark (7x) and is typically used to gain attention (e.g., introducing something new) or give emphasis.349 It occurs twice in this Matthean narrative (9:18 and 20) but only once in Luke (8:41) paralleling Matthew’s first occurrence, which introduces the story, but not his second, which introduces the hemorrhaging woman (9:20).350 Given the frequency of the word in Luke, its appearance here is just as readily explained by independent stylistic variation as by direct influence of Matthew. The second MA (also in Luke 8:41; par. Matt 9:18) involves the common usage of ἀρχων over against Mark’s ἀρχισυναγωγός. Matthew never uses ἀρχισυναγωγός though uses ἀρχων five times (9:18, 23, 34; 12:24; 20:25) and hence his change here is understandable. Luke on other hand uses ἀρχων nineteen times (8x in Luke; 11x in Acts)351 but also uses ἀρχισυναγωγός five times including once later

---

347While it possible to explain away some of the MAs with reference to alternative versions of Mark (e.g., deuteromark or Ur-Mark) or the influence of oral tradition (see, for example, Luz, Matthew, 40-41), I have not allowed such expedients in relation to difficulties arising for the 2GH or FH and thus adopt the same policy for the 2DH. The MAs in this passage will, therefore, be considered as either better explained by Luke’s use of Matthew or as independent Lukan redaction.
348The only exception is αὐτοῦ/αὐτόν but Luke’s usage clearly parallels Mark more closely.
349So BDAG, 468.
350Here Luke instead follows Mark’s simple καὶ γυνῆ (Luke 8:43; Mark 5:25).
351Goulder notes that Luke never uses ἀρχων τῆς συναγωγῆς elsewhere and individual uses of ἀρχων refer to local leaders of the Jewish community (e.g., Luke 14:1; 18:18; Acts 14:5), national leaders (3x in Luke; 8x in Acts) or Roman magistrates (Luke 12:58; Acts 16:19; cf. Acts 4:26). He concludes that Luke’s use of ἀρχων has thus been influenced by Matthew at this point (Luke, 424). Stylistic variation of Mark remains, however, a strong possibility given his addition of the qualifier τῆς συναγωγῆς and the fact that he reverts to the Markan ἀρχισυναγωγός at v. 49.
in this story (8:49; 13:14; Acts 13:15; 18:8, 17). The variability of Luke’s usage suggests that his change at 8:41 is again just as readily explained by independent stylistic variation as by direct dependence upon Matthew. This is especially suggested by the fact that Luke (unlike Matthew) adds the qualifier τῆς συναγωγῆς to ἀρχῶν. Furthermore the true parallel to the Matthean ἀρχῶν is the Lukan ἀνήρ with ἀρχῶν appearing later in the narrative as part of an explanatory subordinate phrase. The overall sense, therefore, is that these two MAs just as likely arise from independent redaction as from Luke’s direct use of Matthew. Another MA appears, however, in Luke 8:42 with the common use of θυγάτηρ (Matt 9:18) over against the Markan diminutive θυγάτριον (Mark 5:23). The latter word only occurs twice in the New Testament, both in Mark (5:23; 7:25), while θυγάτηρ occurs with much higher frequency among the Synoptic authors (5x Mark; 8x Matthew; 12x Luke-Acts) and in Greek literature in general. Such statistics suggest that an independent change (from θυγάτριον to θυγάτηρ) by Matthew and Luke is again equally as plausible as direct Matthean influence upon Luke. In summary Luke clearly follows Mark more closely in Luke 8:41-42a and the three identified MAs are just as readily explained as independent redaction (in line with Luke’s overall redactional procedure in this passage, namely taking over some Markan wording but making several changes along the way) as by direct influence of Matthew.

---

352Mark only uses ἀρχῶν once (3:22).


354Mark himself reverts to θυγάτηρ at v. 35 when referring to the daughter. He also uses it in Jesus’ address to the hemorrhaging woman in 5:34. Interestingly he has Jesus address the girl as τὸ κοράσιον (occurs 3x in Matt; 5x in Mark; not in Luke) whereupon Luke goes his own way in using ἡ παῖς (Luke 8:54). This reinforces the notion of independent redaction of the Markan terms by Matthew and Luke whereby they coincidentally agree in the change at Luke 8:42.

355Peabody et al. (One Gospel, 145) list “she died” (Matt 9:18; Luke 8:42) as another MA (what they refer to as a Markan alteration of the common text) against the Markan ἐσχάτως ἔχει (Mark 5:23) (Luz, Matthew, 41, also lists this among possible MAs). While Matthew has the aorist ἐπέθνησεν (along with ἀρτι and thus meaning ‘has just now died’), however, Luke simply has the imperfect ἀπήθνησεν (‘she was dying’) thus implying she has not yet died (noting that Luke also agrees with Mark in the later death report at Luke 8:49 - cf. Mark 5:35). Indeed the ‘was dying’ translation of Luke 8:42 is explicitly defended by Peabody et al., just a few pages later (ibid., 147). Thus it is
When it comes to the hemorrhaging woman (Luke 8:42b-48; Matt 9:19-22; Mark 5:24-34) the FH Luke continues to follow Mark as a primary source. This is especially evident by the additional section in Luke 8:44b-47 (par. Mark 5:29-33; omitted from Matthew). While there is close overlap in wording between Luke 8:43, 48 and their Matthean parallels,\(^356\) this is all explicable on the basis of the Markan text which likewise parallels Luke and sometimes even agrees with Luke against Matthew (e.g., omission of the Matthean ἰδού in Mark 5:25) as well as vice versa (e.g., preference for the Matthean δῶδεκα ἔτη rather than the Lukan ἐτῶν δῶδεκα in Mark 5:25). This verbal overlap with Matthew is therefore better explained by Luke’s use of Mark given that Mark is his primary source at this point.\(^357\) More interesting, however, is the eight word Matthew-Luke verbatim agreement (προσελθοῦσα ... αὐτοῦ) in Luke 8:44a (par. Matt 9:20b). It should be noted, however, that while this is an MA, five of these words occur in Mark in the same order (ὁπίσωθεν ἥψατο τοῦ ἱματίου αὐτοῦ). Matthew and Luke agree against Mark in changing the verb (just prior to ὁπίσωθεν) from the simple ἐλθοῦσα to the compound προσελθοῦσα and in adding τοῦ κρασπέδου (‘the hem’) as a modifier of τοῦ ἱματίου αὐτοῦ (‘of his garment’). They also agree in omitting “in the crowd.” The change of verbs involves a favorite of Matthew (51x) which occurs less often in Luke-Acts (10x) and even less so in Mark (5x) but is plausible as an independent stylistic variation perhaps resulting from a desire to emphasize the woman’s movement as an approach toward Jesus. Common omission of “in the crowd” is not especially problematic by itself but, given the other agreements in wording, is striking. Even more unusual is the use of κρασπέδου which only occurs three times in Matthew (9:20; 14:36; 23:5) and once each in Mark (6:56; par. Matt 14:36) and Luke (8:44; par. Matt 9:20) thus suggesting Matthean influence more strongly than previous MAs.\(^358\) Given, however,

---

\(^{356}\) καὶ γυνὴ ... ἐτῶν δῶδεκα in 8:43 (cf. Matt 9:20) and ἐπεσε ... ῥυγάτηρ ... σέσωκεν σε in 8:48 (cf. Matt 9:22).

\(^{357}\) I say better explained insofar as an appeal to Matthew as a source here implies that the FH Luke switched between using Mark and Matthew despite the fact that he nowhere agrees with Matthew against Mark (while does agree with Mark against Matthew).

\(^{358}\) The term (τοῦ κρασπέδου) is omitted from some Lukan MSS (e.g., D it Marcion) suggesting the possibility of later scribal addition (implied in Streeter, *Four Gospels*, 313) but later scribal omission seems more likely (Marshall, *Luke*, 344–5; Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 746; Goulder, *Luke*, 425). According to McNicol *et al.* κρασπέδου is a distinctively
that Luke clearly has Mark as a primary source at this point it is odd that he would suddenly switch to following Matthew for the details of this short phrase. His addition of τοῦ κρατήρου, however, could be taken as reminiscence of the Matthean text since (unlike other MAs) it is more difficult to explain as mere stylistic change.

Finally, when it comes to the raising of the ruler’s daughter (Luke 8:49-56; Matt 9:23-26; Mark 5:35-43), the FH continues to follow Mark as a primary source whereby nothing of substance (in terms of plot or action) requires recourse to Matthew. In addition to triple verbatim agreement (e.g., ἀπέθανεν ἄλλα καθεύδει in Luke 8:52; καὶ κατεγέλων σώτοῦ in Luke 8:53) there are several more MAs. First is the change to σύνης after χειρός in Luke 8:54 (cf. Matt 9:25; Mark 5:41) in place of Mark’s τοῦ παιδίου. This is most plausibly explained as independent stylistic improvement given both the nature of the change (enhancing brevity) and the fact that Luke otherwise agrees with Mark against Matthew in his use of κρατῆρα (vs. ἐκράτησε) and direct speech, which also results in his using ἐγείρε (versus ἐγέρθη). A second MA occurs in the relation to ἐλθον δὲ εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν (Luke 8:51; cf. Matt 9:23) where Luke agrees with Matthew in the use of ἐλθὼν (vs. ἐρχόμενοι) as well as the feminine noun οἰκία (vs. οἶκος). The first of these changes (aorist participle to replace present indicative) is understandable as independent stylistic variation though the FH Luke is noted to agree with Matthew against Mark in relation to having Jesus enter into the house only once (ἐισέλθειν in 8:52) and omitting the Markan “and they entered into where the girl was” (Mark 5:40b). He nevertheless differs from Matthew (and Mark) in omitting the expulsion of the mourners (Mark 5:40; Matt 9:25) and maintaining the Markan secrecy command as well as having ἐισέλθειν in

---

Jewish term and an example of unusual phraseology taken over from Matthew by Luke (Q Impasse, 130–1). While they refer to it as “one-way” evidence of Luke’s literary dependence on Matthew, that overstates the case in relation to the 2DH and clearly provides no advantage over the FH which obviously agrees that the Lukan phrase is taken over from Matthew. Goulder himself notes the following possible explanations (citing Schmid) for why Luke (and Matthew) have independently added the phrase (Luke, 424–5): (1) for accuracy; (2) to heighten the woman’s reverent diffidence (in Luke’s case); (3) from knowledge of Mark 6:56 (which Luke omits) (so also Nolland, Luke 1–9:20, 419, and Davies and Allison, Matthew, 129); or (4) from recollection of the word in Num 15:38 (LXX). He dismisses most but accepts that number (3) is possible. Nevertheless he notes that the combination of MAs in this passage make the case stronger for Luke’s knowledge of Matthew. Fitzmyer considers this the only significant MA in the pericope (“the rest are coincidences”) but does not draw out and discuss that significance (Luke, 743).
verse 51 where Matthew delays the entering (εἰσελθόν) until verse 25 after the mourners have been sent away. The second change (ὁικία for δικος) involves an interesting reversal in relation to the usage of these words in Luke and Mark. The Synoptic statistics for δικος (Matthew 11x; Mark 13x; Luke 32x; Acts 23x) and ὁικία (Matthew 25x; Mark 17x; Luke 24x; Acts 12x) indicate a Markan (slight) and Matthean preference for the feminine form versus a Lukan (slight) preference for the masculine form. It is thus interesting that Luke would here change the Markan masculine form into a feminine. Nevertheless the fairly high frequency of both forms throughout the Synoptics and Acts indicates that independent stylistic variation is plausible. A final MA in this section involves the insertion of γὰρ prior to ἀπέθανεν in verse 52b (cf. Matt 9:24; Mark 5:39) whereby “she is not dead but sleeping” becomes more specifically a reason for the imperative. The γὰρ is perhaps felt to be needed on account of the imperative, which itself represents a common agreement against Mark (who has a question: “why are you causing a commotion and weeping?”) albeit the nature of the imperative differs (“stop weeping” in Luke; “go away!” in Matthew). It is not unreasonable to see this as independent redaction.

It may be generally concluded that there is no obvious influence of Matthew upon Luke in relation to the basic elements of narrative (person, action, time, place, manner and cause) although the last of these (cause) may be a possible exception in relation the addition of γὰρ just noted in Luke 8:52. The basic sense is that Luke has used Mark as a source and that most of the changes can be accounted for by his independent redaction without appeal to Matthew. In relation to narrative virtues none of the MAs appears to be motivated by conciseness (the addition of τοῦ κρασπέδου goes against it). The addition of γὰρ in Luke 8:52 perhaps appears to increase clarity but in reality the Markan account does not obviously lack clarity - it is just

359 In the parallel to Luke 8:51 Matthew only has Jesus “come to” (ἐλθόν) the house (Matt 9:23). This implies the mourners are outside the house for Matthew who has them sent away before Jesus enters and addresses the girl in v. 25. For Luke, however, (as noted above) he has Jesus ‘come’ and ‘enter’ in v. 51 and thus gives the impression that the mourners are inside the house. They are not sent out/away prior to the girl being raised.

360 Peabody et al. (One Gospel, 145) note Matthew and Luke’s use of φήμη (‘report’ in Matt 9:26; Luke 4:14b) over against Mark’s ἀκοή (Mark 1:28) but these obviously refer to very different contexts and as such are not MAs.
different. The addition of τοῦ κρασπέδου, while it lessens conciseness, might be said to add clarity but not obviously so. Luke interestingly chooses to go his own way at the conclusion of the narrative where he agrees with Mark (against Matthew) in retaining the secrecy command but disagrees with Mark (and Matthew) in having the mourners apparently present during the raising. In this he apparently seeks to add clarity to a Markan ambiguity while ignoring Matthew’s more credible solution (‘the report goes out’). The net result is that FH Luke has Mark as a primary source and the majority of the MAs are equally plausibly explained as independent redaction based on issues of style, conciseness, and clarity. Where he could have been further influenced by Matthew, especially in relation to clarity/credibility and conciseness, he has chosen not to be.
6.4 The Centurion’s Servant (Matt 8:5-13; Luke 7:1-10)

Our final pericope involves the larger of two Q miracle narratives thus enabling a more direct comparison of the 2DH Q hypothesis with the FH hypothesis of Luke’s use of Matthew. Among traditional form critics while Vincent Taylor includes it among “miracle stories,” others have classified it as a biographical apophthegm or pronouncement story though it is probably best understood as a mixed form. The pericope has attracted various source critical hypotheses though the present analysis will focus on the three under

---

361 On miracles in relation to Q see, for example, the discussion in Ronald A. Piper, “Jesus and the Conflict of Powers in Q: Two Q Miracle Stories,” in The Sayings Source Q and the Historical Jesus, ed. A. Lindemann, BETL CLVIII (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2001), 317–49. He notes the extent to which miracle motifs penetrate the Q material beyond the two explicit miracle narratives and suggests that there is a development in Q whereby the miracle narratives serve a larger purpose of providing an apologia for the thaumaturgical activities of Jesus and indeed the Q community in face of accusations of demonic influence.

362 For a general introduction to the discussion see for example the Fitzmyer, Luke, 647–53.

363 Though he states that it may have been a pronouncement story “at one time during the oral period” (Formation, 75–6). Theissen includes it among ‘healings’ (Miracle Stories, 321).

364 So Bultmann who sees it and the Canaanite woman (Matt 15:21-28) as variants of another (common) story which was expanded by the church (History, 38–39). Held also sees connections to the Canaanite woman (faith; gentiles; distance healing; and dialogue more than narrative) with faith as the central theme, noting that Matthew’s miracles are typically apophthegmatic in character owing to the centrality of conversation (“Miracle Stories,” 193, 243; similar comments in France, “Exegesis in Practice: Two Samples,” in New Testament Interpretation: Essays on Principles and Method, ed. I. Howard Marshall [Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1977], 254–5). Similarly Luz (commenting on Matthew’s version) sees a combination apophthegm-miracle story highlighting the sayings in Matt 8:10-12 with the healing as secondary. He notes the twice appearing catchword κύριε (reappearing from the previous story) and the frequency of the πιστέ- root (vv. 10, 13) which frames the decisive logion in vv. 11-12 (Matthew, 8). Luke on the other hand, according to Held, focuses on the “person of the centurion” rather than faith (“Miracle Stories,” 195–6).


366 Kloppenborg, for instance, thinks the story first circulated orally (prior to incorporation into Q) as an apology for Gentile inclusivity but was then apophthegmatized and sayings were attached to it (The Formation of Q: Trajectories in Ancient Wisdom Collections, Studies in Antiquity & Christianity [Harrisburg, Pa: Trinity Press International, 1987], 38, 88, 118–21, 168; Excavating Q, 141, 202). Others agree in acknowledging the importance of sayings (especially in relation to faith) and see it as a mixed form (miracle and pronouncement/apophthegm) (e.g., Twelftree, Miracle Worker, 153; Cotter, Miracles, 56; France, “Exegesis,” 254; Luz, Matthew, 8; David R. Catchpole, “The Centurion’s Faith and Its Function in Q,” in The Four Gospels 1992: Festschrift Frans Neirynck. Vol. 1, ed. F. Van Segbroeck, C. M. Tuckett, G. Van Belle, and J. Verheyden, BETL 100 [Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1992], 518; Meier, Marginal Jew, 763–4, n. 178).
consideration. Likewise the question of the relationship to John will not be given direct consideration and need only be mentioned in passing. While the disagreement about the original content and wording of Q is more relevant, I will base my analysis on the reconstructed text of the International Q Project as published in the critical edition. The analysis of this

367 Not all who favor the Q hypothesis agree on the original wording of the Q version and others think there is a lost common source behind this story and the parallel in John 4. Representative supporters of differing source hypotheses (not all of which are mutually exclusive) are as follows: (1) Some variant of the Q hypothesis (Fitzmyer, Luke, 647–53; Bultmann, History, 328; Marshall, Luke, 277; Davies and Allison, Matthew, 17; Luz, Matthew, 8; Latourell, Miracles, 132); (2) Lost common source behind Synoptics and John (Goulder, Luke, 379; Fitzmyer, Luke, 648–9; Meier, Marginal Jew, 724); (3) John dependent on Synoptics (Goulder, Luke, 379; against are Davies and Allison, Matthew, 17–18 and Meier, Marginal Jew, 724–5); (4) An S-version (Sondergut) combined with Q (U. Wegner, Der Hauptmann von Kafrarnaum, WUNT 2/14 [Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1985]); (5) Luke derived from Matthew (Goulder, Luke, 379; Enslin, “Luke and Matthew,” 2377; McNicol et al., Q Impasse, 107–8; Drury, Tradition, 98; H. Benedict Green, “Credibility,” 131–55, esp. 138); (6) A possible variant of Jairus’ daughter (Fuller, Interpreting, 37, n. 1); (7) A variant on Mark 7:24–31 (Bultmann as in n. 364 but opposed by Davies and Allison, Matthew, 18 citing arguments of Wegner); (8) Oral tradition rather than a unitary version of Q (France, “Exegesis,” 254); (9) Matthew created the story based on Mark 2:1-12 and other Markan miracles (E. Wendling, “Synoptische Studien: II. Der Hauptmann von Kapernaum,” ZNW 9 [1908]: 96–109 – as cited in Meier); and (10) Matthew knew and used Luke whereby the two stories of Mark 8:5–13 and 15:21–28 are seen as deliberate parallels to the pair mentioned in Luke 4:25–27 (Aurelius, “Gottesvolk und Außenseiter”).

368 In addition to the previous differing opinions are held in terms of the relation of the Synoptic account to John: (a) Two independent stories based on differences in accounts (Bock, Luke, 631–2; France, Matthew, 278, 309, though he considers it possible that a single incident underlies both the Synoptics and John); (b) same incident/story underlies all accounts but John uses the tradition independently (Fitzmyer, Luke, 648; also Davies and Allison, Matthew, 17–18, but they are open to the possibility of two independent stories/incidents); (c) Noncommittal (Nolland, Luke 1–9:20, 314); and (d) John is secondary (Luz, Matthew, 9).

pericope will proceed in a slightly different manner than the previous two on account of there being no Markan parallel. As such Luke’s purported direct utilization of Matthew is unaffected by Markan priority or posteriority and can therefore be considered together in relation to the 2GH and FH. I will then proceed to analyze Matthew and Luke’s independent use of Q (Mark’s purported use of Matthew and Luke only raises the question of Markan omission which has already been dealt with in chapter 5). For parallel text and comparative word counts see tables 6.7 and 6.8.

6.4.1 The 2GH (and FH): Luke’s use of Matthew in the Centurion’s Servant

According to McNicol et al. (2GH) the transitional statement in Luke 7:1a loosely echoes (without verbal overlap) Matthew’s transition at 7:28a whereby Luke rewrites Matthew in his “own idiom.” At the same time they suggest shared terminology here and in Luke 4:31-32 (conclusion of inaugural sermon) with a “redactional section” of Matthew (7:28-29) suggesting that it constitutes “strong evidence for Luke’s direct use of canonical (Matthew).” The lack of explicit verbal overlap to these Matthean sections in Luke 7:1, however, presents a problem for this claim and the shared terminology in Luke 4:31-32 (e.g., καὶ ἐξεπλήσσοντο ἐπὶ τὴν διδαχὴν αὐτοῦ) is likewise shared with Mark (cf. Matt 7:28-29; Mark 1:22) and could just as easily have been taken from him. Goulder (FH) agrees that Luke 7:1 rewrites Matthew in Luke’s “own idiom” but he highlights his more polished Greek (ἐπειδὴ and πληρῶ) and suggests that Luke omits “for he taught with authority” on account of having already used it at Luke 4:36. As

uncertain (e.g., Harrington, Matthew, 114). Space clearly does not permit entering into what is essentially a debate among 2DH proponents and hence my choice to stay with the text of the IQP in Robinson, Hoffman, and Kloppenborg, The Critical Edition of Q: A Synopsis, Including the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, Mark and Thomas with English, German and French Translations of Q and Thomas. Once this Q text is adopted debate remains as to whether the Lukan embassy is the result of Lukan redaction (e.g., Gagnon, “Statistical Analysis”) or a Lukan special source (Wegner, Hauptmann) but the result of this has little or no impact upon our present study in that in either case Luke has chosen to add the delegation.

McNicol et al., Q Impasse, 107–08.

Goulder, Luke, 376. Bock says that only here in the NT is ἐπειδῆ used with a temporal sense of “after” (Luke, 635).
reasonable as these observations may be, however, they still do not escape the fact that Luke 4:36 is better explained on the basis of Mark 1:27 (with which it is a direct parallel within a particular narrative context) or that Luke may be rewriting Q with more polished Greek whereby it cannot be used as an indicator of greater plausibility for the FH over against the 2DH. Greater verbal overlap clearly exists between Luke and Q at this point, which potentially favors the 2DH but this highlights a particular problem of comparing the 2DH and FH where no Markan parallel exists. The reconstruction of Q is obviously based upon the extant texts of Matthew and Luke and by default will maximize verbal overlap where possible but, when it is recognized that some of the greatest verbal divergence tends to occur in introductions and conclusions to pericopes (e.g., as with the previous two narratives assessed above), the notion of Luke’s dependence on Matthew cannot be so easily ruled out and it becomes difficult to arbitrate between our two options.

The miracle story itself begins with Jesus’ entry into Capernaum and the request of the centurion (Luke 7:1b-6a; Matt 8:5-7). While it is agreed that the request comes from a centurion (εκατόνταρχος), Luke (67 words) significantly expands (123% longer) upon Matthew (30

---

372Goulder does not provide justification for his claims about the “polished” and “grand” style of ἐπειδὴ and πληρῶ.

373Luke’s εκατόνταρχος (cf. Luke 12:16) is the genitive of ἐκατονταρχής (Luke 7:6; 23:47; 13x in Acts) in contrast to Matthew’s variant spelling (ἐκατόνταρχος) both of which were equivalent to the Latinism κεντυρίων (centurio) (so Marshall, Luke, 276). According to Davies and Allison such an officer, who typically had charge over a ‘Roman’ century (cohort of 100 foot soldiers), could be a regular (promoted) soldier but was often a magistrate or lower member of the equestrian order. Responsibilities included field command and supervision of capital penalties (Matthew, 18–19; see discussion also in Meier, Marginal Jew, 720–21). They note the surprisingly positive treatment of centurions in the NT (e.g., Mark 15:39; Acts 10; 27:1) and see Matthew’s centurion as a gentile who foreshadows the evangelization of the nations (28:16-20) and provides a paradigm for faith (Matt 8:10, 13) (ibid.). While ethnicity is not explicit in either Matthew or Luke, Christoph Burchard says Matthew and his (Syrian) readers likely equate ‘centurions’ with Rome or its vassals and not, therefore, Jews. He examines ἐκατόνταρχος and related terms (ἐκατονταρχής, ἐκατονταρχία, κεντυρίων and the Latin centurio) in the LXX, Pseudepigrapha, Philo, Josephus, Apostolic Fathers, and the NT and notes the following: in Jewish literature from the Maccabean period forward there are no references to Jewish ἐκατοντάρχος; and the twenty NT occurrences beside Matt 8 are all Roman officials. (“Zu Matthäus 8:5–13,” ZNW 84 [1993]: 278–80). Others see the Matthean centurion as Gentile but probably not Roman (Harrington, Matthew, 113; Meier, Marginal Jew, 721). Alternatively Catchpole argues for a Jewish ἐκατονταρχος based on the ethnically neutral nature of the term and the focus on Christology rather than Jew/Gentile distinctions as the reason for the centurion’s unworthiness (“Centurion’s Faith,” 527, 39–40). The Lukan centurion is usually taken as a (God fearing?) Gentile based on Luke 7:5, 9 (Green, Luke, 285; Marshall, Luke, 276, 79; Johnson, Luke, 117; Bock, Luke, 635–6; Nolland, Luke 1–9:20, 316; Latourelle, Miracles, 133). There are no explicit indications he was a proselyte (Marshall, Luke, 279) but he appears to be a person of high repute (Bock, Luke, 635–6) and perhaps worked in ‘customs’ (goods in and out of Galilee) (so Nolland in Luke 1–
words) while also altering the story such as to take over no more than five words, three of which are in different forms (εἰσῆλθεν; ἡκατοντάρχου; παρεκάλουν in Luke; εἰσελθόντος; ἡκατοντάρχου; παρακαλῶν in Matthew). In 7:1b the 2GH Luke recasts Matthew’s genitive absolute (εἰσελθόντος ... αὐτοῦ) into a finite verb (εἰσῆλθεν), essentially a stylistic change, and retains the place into which Jesus enters, namely Capernaum.\(^\text{374}\) Subsequent to this Matthew’s direct encounter between the centurion and Jesus is replaced by an embassy of Jewish elders (Luke 7:3). The reason for Luke’s change is not immediately obvious albeit various suggestions have been made: (1) Luke seeks to keep Gentiles off center stage prior to the great gentile mission of Acts;\(^\text{375}\) (2) Luke displays an interest in Gentiles and his retelling of the story reflects his account of Cornelius in Acts 10;\(^\text{376}\) and (3) Luke is highlighting the extent of the centurion’s faith in Jesus as indicated by the elders’ good words about him in 7:4-5.\(^\text{377}\) While the first two reasons are clearly contradictory, Luke’s awkward expansion into two embassies does seem rather cumbersome in relation to a desire to delay the gentile mission (see further below). A

9:20, 316 and Matthew, 354). While there is no record of a Roman legion posted in Galilee at the time, many see the centurion associated with Herod Antipas’ auxiliary troops which were drawn from the non-Jewish population of surrounding areas such as Phoenicia and Syria (Marshall, Luke, 276; Nolland, Luke 1–9:20, 316; idem, Matthew, 354; Luz, Matthew, 9–10; France, Matthew, 311; Meier, Marginal Jew, 721). Comparisons are sometimes made with Naaman in 2 Kings and, especially, Cornelius in Acts 10 (e.g., Johnson, Luke, 117).

\(^\text{374}\)Green notes that Jesus seems to enter Capernaum alone (singular verb) thus indicating the narrow focus on the person of Jesus (Luke, 283).


\(^\text{376}\)Clearly this stands in tension/contradiction with the first reason (previous note) but is suggested by Goulder, Luke, 376–8, who highlights various parallels between the two stories (e.g., sending an embassy of Jewish elders; both centurions are God-fearing and have ‘unimpeachable testimony from the Jews’; and Lukan sensitivity to Jewish scruples about entering Gentile houses). Fitzmyer, from a 2DH perspective, makes similar observations regarding how Luke has transformed Q, which he assumes closer to Matthew at this point (Luke, 650).

\(^\text{377}\)So McNicol et al., Q Impasse, 108. Similarly Twelftree (from a 2DH perspective) says the delegation does not add good works to the faith of the centurion but heightens the focus on his authority and thus on the authority of Jesus which in turn reflects on the “main point of the story for Luke - the faith of the centurion.” This faith is further highlighted by having Jesus state that it is “not even in Israel” (rather than ‘from no one in Israel’) that such faith has been found in 7:9 (cf. Matt 8:10). Such faith is all the more extraordinary on account of his being a Gentile and is further stressed in that Jesus needs “only speak the word” (7:7) (Miracle Worker, 153). Others agree on seeing faith (for all people) as a central theme often alongside Jesus’ authority (e.g., Marshall, Luke, 276; Bock, Luke, 631, 34; Tannehill, Luke, 123–4). Some see parallels to Naaman’s healing in 2 Kings 5 (e.g., well respected foreign officer; intercession of Jews; no direct meeting; and distance healing) although Naaman’s pride contrasts the centurion’s humility (Green, Luke, 283–5; Tannehill, Luke, 123–4). Bock says the elders may refer to synagogue or civil leaders but the latter is probably meant by πρεσβυτέρους which is somewhat equivalent to γέρουσια in the LXX (Luke, 636).
similar situation arises in relation to Luke’s replacement of παῖς with δοῦλος in verses 2, 3 (cf. Matt 8:5), and 10 (cf. Matt 8:13) albeit he agrees with Matthew in having ὁ παῖς μου in verse 7 (cf. Matt 8:8) and both have δοῦλος in relation to Luke 7:8 (cf. Matt 8:9). Goulder argues that Luke was in fact motivated by Matthew’s use of δοῦλος at 8:9 indicating that he clearly chose to take Matthew’s παῖς as a ‘servant/slave’ rather than a ‘son.’ It is not certain, however, that Matthew intends ‘son’ in which case Luke’s change to δοῦλος is merely stylistic variation.

---

378 For Goulder Matthew clearly follows John 4:46 where παῖς means ‘son.’ Luke has ‘interpreted’ this as ‘slave/servant’ albeit allowing the Matthean παῖς to “slip back in” in Luke 7:7b (Luke, 376, 78). Enslin agrees that this is a Lukian interpretation of what he calls the “ambiguous” Matthean παῖς and suggests that his reversion to παῖς at 7:7 is intended to indicate “the affection of the officer for this particular servant” (“Luke and Matthew,” 2377). Bultmann refers to this as a Lukian error (History, 38, n. 4) but it is not clear why it should be presumed an error rather than deliberate redaction. It seems generally beyond dispute that Luke refers to a ‘servant/slave’ (e.g., see also Green, Luke, 287; Marshall, Luke, 279; Bock, Luke, 636; Meier, Marginal Jew, 723).

379 Opinion is divided with three main options. (1) παῖς refers to ‘house slave’; while ‘son’ fits John 4:51, NT usage more typically refers to a ‘servant’ or ‘youngster’ (Davies and Allison, Matthew, 20–21). It rarely translates bein in the LXX but more typically ebed with παῖς μου always referring to a servant (ibid.; also Nolland, Matthew, 354 who says the translation ‘lad’ catches something of the affectionate link sometimes attending servant/master relationships). France says a παῖς was a soldier “detailed to act as personal aide to the commanding officer” but accepts the possible meaning of personal ‘servant/slave’ based on NT usage (Matthew, 312). In his earlier work he argued for παῖς as ‘servant’ in both Matthew and Luke based on NT usage (24x; 1x means son in John 4:51; 8x means ‘child’; 4x ‘servant’ of a person; 8x ‘servant’ of God) (France, “Exegesis,” 256). (2) παῖς as son: Matthew uses δοῦλος for slave, has previously has used παῖς for ‘child’ (2:16), and clearly uses it for ‘son’ in the related story of Matt 17:14–21 (Luz, Matthew, 10). Others who favor ‘son’ include the following: Bultmann, History, 38, n. 4; Goulder (previous note); Catchpole, “Centurion’s Faith,” 523; Martin, “The Pericope of the Healing of the ‘Centurion’s’ Servant/Son (Matt 8:5–13)”; Some Exegetical Notes,” in Unity and Diversity in New Testament Theology: Essays in Honor of George E. Ladd, ed. Robert A. Guelich (1978), 15. (3) Intentional ambiguity; Twelftree notes a possible double meaning whereby παῖς suggests someone who is more a ‘son’ of the kingdom than those sons (υἱοὶ) who will be thrown into outer darkness, which is the point of the story (Matt 8:12) (Miracle Worker, 109). Certainly there is ambiguity as to what Matthew intends here. Interestingly his δοῦλος in v. 9 refers to the centurion’s slave/servant but this is not clearly the same individual as the παῖς elsewhere in the narrative. At the same time he speaks of the ‘sons’ (υἱοὶ παῖς διέξ) of the kingdom in v. 12. Despite ambiguity the general NT and LXX usage tends to favor ‘servant’ but this is not clearly the same individual as the παῖς elsewhere in the narrative. The three occurrences here (vv. 6, 8, 13) παῖς occurs 5 more times in Matthew with the following probable meanings: slaughtered ‘child/children’ (2:16); demonized ‘boy’ (17:18); ‘children’ singing in temple (21:15); (Isaianic) ‘servant’ (12:18); and ‘slaves/servants’ of Herod (14:2). The words occurs 15x in Luke-Acts with the following meanings (except for 7:7): ‘servant Israel’ (LXX quote) (Luke 1:54); ‘servant David’ (Luke 1:69; Acts 4:25); the ‘boy’ Jesus (Luke 2:43); the ‘servant’ Jesus (Acts 3:13, 26; 4:27, 30); Jairus’ ‘child’ (daughter) (Luke 8:51, 54); demon possessed (‘boy’ (Luke 9:42); ‘slaves’ (Luke 12:45; 15:26); and the ‘young man’ Eutychus (Acts 20:12). Elsewhere in the NT it appears only the parallel story of John (4:51). Gagnon (from a 2DH standpoint) sees the differing use of παῖς and δοῦλος as typical of Lukian stylistic variation ("Statistical Analysis," 716). Catchpole also draws attention to the use of the related παῖς for ‘one’s own child in the Jairus’ story and the Syro-Phoenician woman (Mark 5:39-41; Luke 8:51, 54; Mark 7:30) and suggests that the appeal of the parent (not the master) is a standard feature of these related traditions (“Centurion’s Faith,” 523). According to Meier (Marginal Jew, 723–4) Matthew reflects the more original but ambiguous παῖς which possibly reflects an earlier ambiguity in Aramaic (talya’, which could mean son or slave) but which has been interpreted differently in John (‘son’) and Luke (‘slave’), noting that only παῖς is common to all
Chapter 6 Rhetorical Transformation of Miracle Tradition Pericopes

Luke also changes the description of the plight of the ‘servant/boy’ (Luke 7:2) from that of “lying at home paralyzed, terribly sick” (βέβληται ἐν τῇ οίκῃ παραλυτικὸς, δεινῶς βασανιζόμενος) to ‘being unwell and about to die’ (κακῶς ἔχων ἰμέλλεν τελευτᾶν) with nothing of Matthew’s wording taken over. Goulder sees this as a “further bold step” in FH Luke’s redaction whereby his “meaning ‘interprets’ Matthew” but “his wording echoes Mark,” referring to similar wording in Jairus’ request (Mark 5:23). He thus reprints the parallel text as follows (I have added the underlining to indicate verbal overlap):

Mark 5:23 παρακαλεῖ αὐτὸν πολλὰ λέγων ὅτι ... ἐσχάτως ἔχει, ἵνα ἐλθὼν ἐπιθῆς ... ἵνα σωθῇ ....

Luke 7:2-3 κακῶς ἔχων ἰμέλλεν τελευτᾶν ... ὡς ἐλθὼν διασῴζῃ ... παρεκάλουν αὐτὸν σπουδαίως λέγοντες ὅτι....

The FH Luke’s implied procedure, however, is very odd in that he takes up Markan language from a separate story in order to flavor this single sentence in a narrative where he has only Matthew as a source, which he later follows with great fidelity (vv. 7-9). Furthermore, the parallels are not particularly strong, especially when it is considered that Luke will later take up Mark 5:23 in his own account of Jairus’ daughter (8:41-42) and in doing so has even less parallels to Markan language than Goulder proposes for him here. It seems more reasonable to see the FH Luke independently adapting Matthew much as he does with Jairus’ description of his daughter in Luke 8:42. Such has to be the case for the 2GH Luke where Mark is unavailable for consultation. In addition to changing Matthew’s description of the sickness Luke also adds that the centurion’s servant was “valuable” (ἐντιμος) to his master (7:2), a change that enhances the

---

382 There are five words of overlap but only one in the same form (ἔλθων), another differing in terms of being a compound (διασῴζω) version of its Markan parallel (σῴζω), and another (παρεκάλουν) being paralleled in Matt 8:5.
383 On this see above analysis of that passage.
narrative element of person. None of this, however, is obviously more or less plausible than the implied changes in relation to Q (which essentially mirror those of the 2GH and FH Luke with the exception of the κακώς ἐχεις phrase in Q which is closer to Luke than Matthew).

Luke makes a further addition to Matthew when the appeal of the embassy is made explicit and adds a further reason for Jesus to respond favorably, namely that the centurion is worthy of aid because he “loves our people and built our synagogue” (Luke 7:4-5). The addition not only contributes to the element of person but also that of cause insofar as it provides a reason for the request and for why Jesus should respond favorably to it. Finally Luke changes verse 6a (cf. Matt 8:7) by omitting Jesus’ direct speech, in which he promises to heal (θεραπεύσω) the ‘servant,’ and simply states that Jesus “went with them.” The overall result in relation to the centurion’s request is that Luke is considerably less concise than Matthew (156% longer with 64 words in place of 30) and essentially rewrites the entire segment with only 5 borrowed words and many additions/changes. While the reason for the delegation (vs. direct contact) is uncertain and perhaps is modelled after Cornelius in Acts 10, it does enable those making the request to speak words of praise about this (presumably) gentile centurion thereby giving a reason for Jesus to act favorably. The additions and changes, therefore, add clarity to the status of the sick person (‘servant’ not ‘son’) and build upon the character of both the ‘servant’ (he is valuable to his master) and the centurion (he loves the Jewish people and built their synagogue). In this way the changes are not merely redundant but enhance the narrative elements of person and cause. This said, however, the addition of the embassy is a common feature of the 2GH, 2DH (he adds it to

---

384 At the same time it is somewhat difficult to know the force of ἐντιμος (favored, honored, esteemed, valuable?) in Luke 7:7. Does it refer to economic value and/or something more akin to friendship (Green, Luke, 287; Marshall, Luke, 279; Bock, Luke, 636)?

Q), and the FH and therefore does not significantly impact our discussion of the three hypotheses.

Next we come to the centurion’s speech about Jesus and his objection to having Jesus physically come to the house (Luke 7:6b-8; Matt 8:8-9). The FH (and 2GH) Luke again expands upon Matthew albeit to a lesser degree (37% longer; 74 words in place of 54) and with much higher verbal overlap (64% of Luke; 88% of Matthew). The primary differences between the two results from the fact that Luke still has the centurion at a distance whereby the objection to Jesus’ coming to his house must be delivered through friends sent as a second delegation when Jesus is not far away (Luke 7:6b). As Goulder acknowledges, however, this results in a Lukan inconsistency. The centurion (through delegations), who had previously asked Jesus “to come” (ἐλθῶν in v. 3) to his house, now objects to his coming thereby reducing clarity and credibility. The ambiguity created by the objection to Jesus’ coming could have been avoided by leaving things open ended (as in Matt 8:6) or by making the initial request one for a distance healing (which is what eventually happens in Luke 7:7). The problem, however, equally impacts all three hypotheses insofar as ὁ πώς ἐλθὼν διασώση (“in order that he come and heal ... “) in v. 3 is a Lukan addition to either Matthew (2GH and FH) or Q (2DH). When it comes to the speech itself (beginning Κύριε in 7:6c) Luke makes a few minor changes in his addition of μὴ

---

48 words are common with 2 different forms and only one order change.

Catchpole summarizes the difficulties associated with the delegations (“Centurion’s Faith,” 530–31): (1) the first delegation (asking Jesus to come) is inconsistent with the subsequent delegation that asks him not to come; (2) the second delegation assumes awareness of the success of the first in persuading Jesus to come (readers know this but not the centurion); (3) the reason for the change of mind (‘come ... do not come’) is not stated; (4) the words of the centurion are given in first person (as if he were the speaker); and (5) the delegations presume a considerable journey but this is inconsistent with the Capernaum location. Various explanations for these difficulties have been offered: (1) the centurion realizes that the first delegation did not represent him appropriately (i.e. they represented him from the standpoint of patronage) and so he sends friends who will carry out his wishes more accurately (Green, Luke, 288); (2) the centurion thought that by telling Jesus not to come it might be perceived that he was embarrassed to have Jesus appear at his home and, therefore, having made the initial request he then tells Jesus that the effort to heal need not be bothersome (Bock, Luke, 634); and (3) having sent for Jesus the centurion realizes there may be a problem - a Jewish holy man would be defiled in coming into a gentile house - and thus sends the second delegation to indicate that he is not worthy to have Jesus come into his house (Tannehill, Luke, 125). Such reasons, however, are speculative (rightly Green, Luke, 288) and the difficulty remains thereby leading most to see an awkward Lukan insertion (e.g., Marshall, Luke, 277; Nolland, Luke 1–9:20, 317). Catchpole himself sees it as sufficient to explain the additions on the basis of Lukan theological concerns and traits picked up from Acts 10–11 and Mark 5:21-43 (see below) (“Centurion’s Faith,” 528–32).
In the remainder of verse 7 Luke follows Matthew in eight consecutive words with the exception of omitting μόνον and changing ἵσομαι from a future to an aorist imperative. The changes are even more minor in relation to verse 8 where Luke agrees with Matthean wording (same forms) and order for 31 consecutive words, the one exception being the addition of τασσόμενος (‘being set/placed’). The remarkably high verbal agreement that results is somewhat puzzling considering there was such a low level of agreement earlier in the narrative. The problem, however, is shared by all hypotheses.

Two reasons are typically given for the objection: (1) gentle hesitancy about Jews entering their homes owing to Jewish qualms about ritual impurity (e.g., Tannehill, Luke, 125); (2) the centurion sees himself personally unworthy in relation to Jesus’ person (Bock, Luke, 640; Catchpole, “Centurion’s Faith,” 529–30; Van der Loos, Miracles, 536–7). Nolland sees both reasons though with a greater emphasis on the second (Luke 1–9:20, 317, 19). While the first of these reasons is clearly not explicit in the text, the second is more so but the reason for why he felt unworthy is left unstated. Derrett suggest that the centurion’s hesitance relates to fear that Jesus’ power will be diminished when under the shade of his roof (“Centurion,” 179) but this seems rather speculative.

Luke, 378. Enslin sees Luke’s changes at this point as heightening the “reverence and humility of the centurion” (“Luke and Matthew,” 2377). Similarly so in Van der Loos (Miracles) who sees the addition of “wherefore I thought myself unworthy to come to you” (7:7a) as accenting the unworthiness of the centurion. Nevertheless the sentiment repeats what was stated at the end of v. 6 (“I am not worthy that you come under my roof”) and is therefore somewhat redundant.

According to Fitzmyer this addition “clearly implies the centurion’s subordination to superior officers and then his delegated authority over others.” He notes the implication that Jesus too was under some kind of authority (Luke, 652). Catchpole agrees the addition is a “redactional clarification” reinforcing the subordination of the centurion (“Centurion’s Faith,” 533). Martin sees Luke as increasing confusion by his addition of τασσόμενος (assuming that the Greek “under authority” is a mistranslation of an underlying Aramaic phrase - see next note) (The ‘Centurion’s’ Servant/Son,” 15).

The centurion’s speech has generated much debate primarily owing to the implication that Jesus too is ‘under authority’ (ὑπό ἐξουσίαν). While some Syriac translations have the centurion “in” (rather than “under”) authority
Luke continues to follow Matthew closely in the initial part of Jesus’ response (Luke 7:9; Matt 8:10) where 17 words are shared (2 different forms; 2 order changes) accounting for 73% of Luke (23 words) and 85% of Matthew (20 words). Luke is slightly less concise with his addition of ταύτα and αὐτὸν along with στροφείς and the specification of the ‘crowd’ (ὀχλὸς), which constitutes those who are following Jesus and to whom the speech is addressed.395 Besides this Luke omits ὁμήν, changes παρ’ ὦδενι to ὦδε, and changes the order of the final phrase so as to place “in Israel” before “such faith.”396 The changes are essentially stylistic albeit less concise. Given, however, the importance of Jesus’ words it seems strange that Luke makes more changes

395 In Matt 8:10 Jesus simply address “those following” (τοῖς ὀχλολυθοῦσιν).
396 While faith is typically acknowledged as a central motif (see n. 377 above), it is one equally stressed by Matthew and Luke (noting the similarity of Jesus’ speech in each). Theissen sees it as boundary crossing faith whereby the centurion acts out of awareness of a barrier between himself (a gentile) and Jesus. He sees hindrance and faith as common motifs in distance healings (cf. Mark 7:24-30) (Miracle Stories, 76, 113, 137). Bock see a focus on faith in Jesus’ power (Bock, Luke, 642; similarly Van der Loos, Miracles, 540) and Green sees an implied critique of Israel’s faithlessness (Luke, 288) although Nolland doubts the latter (Luke 1–9:20, 318). Catchpole agrees on the central motif of faith but understands the centurion to be a Jew whereby it is differing levels of faith within Israel that is being highlighted (“Centurion’s Faith,” 540). While the nature of the faith may be debated, however, the differences between Matthew and Luke (and Q) are minimal and therefore have little impact on our source critical question. In this regard Catchpole suggests that the “difference between Matthew and Luke has been greatly exaggerated” in relation to Matt 8:10 and Luke 7:9 (“Centurion’s Faith,” 538). Alternatively Martin suggests that Luke highlights the centurion’s sense of unworthiness (while Matthew highlights his faith) with the key phrase being διό οὖδὲ . . . ἔλθεν in Luke 7:7a (“The ‘Centurion’s Servant/Son,” 16). While it may be that Luke highlights the centurion’s unworthiness, however, it is not clear that this trumps the faith theme.

(noted in Nolland, Luke 1–9:20, 317), this is very unlikely original since “under” is both better attested and more difficult thereby making “in” readily explicable as a later scribal correction (so France, Exegetis, 258–9 and Hooke, “Jesus and the Centurion: Matthew VIIIi. 5–10,” ExpTim 69 [1957–58]: 79–80). Martin suggests an underlying Aramaic phrase (‘having authority’) that has been mistranslated by the Greek author of Q (“The ‘Centurion’s’ Servant/Son,” 15) but this makes assumptions about an underlying Aramaic version of Q that is not well supported (Kloppenborg, Excavating Q, 72–80). Others see concession in the centurion’s words, “although I am a man under authority I have soldiers under me and if I say . . .” (e.g., Catchpole, “Centurion’s Faith,” 535; Jeremias and Schürmann cited in Marshall, Luke, 282), but this is not obvious from the text. Catchpole (“Centurion’s Faith,” 534–7) adds various other arguments for understanding the centurion’s words as referring to Jesus’ authority “as Lord and Son of man” (e.g., his understanding of ικανός as referring to the exalted position of Jesus) but more commonly the centurion is understood as seeing himself and Jesus as under authority albeit also with delegated authority (e.g., Marshall, Luke, 281–2; similarly Piper, “Q Miracle Stories,” 324). This is often understood as a minore ad maior (lesser to greater) comparison whereby the centurion likens his own authority (under another but in charge of others) to that of Jesus. If he is obeyed militarily then how much more will the spiritual forces have to obey Jesus’ word (Bock, Luke, 641–2; Fitzmyer, Luke, 652–3; Marshall, Luke, 281–2; Tannehill, Luke, 125; Nolland, Luke 1–9:20, 317; Green, Luke, 288; Derrett, “Centurion,” 176–7; Hooke, “Centurion”); Van der Loos, Miracles, 538; Keener, Gospel of Matthew, 267–8). In a similar vein J.A.G. Haslam suggests the centurion was not so much ‘under orders’ as ‘under commission,’ meaning he was entrusted to carry out his work but not in the sense of being micro-managed (on the basis of the assumed nature of the posting in Capernaum that would have required a degree of freedom) (“The Centurion at Capernaum: Luke 7:1–10,” ExpTim 96 [1985]: 109–10). The extent of verbatim agreement between Matthew and Luke (and, therefore, Q) indicates that neither one felt any need to change or clarify their source whichever of the three source hypotheses we choose.
here than he does to the words of the centurion.\(^{397}\) Nevertheless the verbal agreement remains remarkably high in light of the changes made in Luke 7:1-6a. None of our three hypotheses, however, escapes the seeming inconsistency of Luke’s approach. Luke subsequently chooses to omit the remainder of Jesus’ speech in Matt 8:11-12 (a ‘saying’ about people coming from the east and the west) inserting it later on in his ‘central section’ (13:28-30). According to Goulder “Luke wisely sees the inappositeness of such a comment now, and postpones it to a more proper context” but he offers no supporting reasons\(^{398}\) and nor are they obvious.\(^{399}\) It seems more plausible to see Luke choosing a different location for a Q saying than relocating this Matthean saying especially given no other parallel instances of him relocating miracle story sayings of Jesus.

When it comes to the narrative conclusion (Luke 7:10; Matt 8:13) Luke agrees with Matthew in reporting that the healing has taken place but does so in very different wording (only καί is shared).\(^{400}\) This is reminiscent of the opening of the story though to some extent Luke’s conclusion must necessarily differ since (unlike Matthew) Luke’s centurion never actually meets Jesus and, therefore, he simply notes that the delegation returned home. Nevertheless when Matthew’s wording would have been suitable he still chooses his own: thus he replaces ἵσθι with ὑγιαίνωντα and πᾶς with δοῦλος.\(^{401}\) While this approach is similar to the opening of the story, it differs in that he is now considerably more concise than Matthew (11 words replace 20).

\(^{397}\)Faithfulness to Jesus words is generally higher than to other aspects of narrative. So, for example, in Dibelius (Tradition, 33) who gives Matt 8:10 (par. Luke 7:9) as an example. On this see also Rosché, “The Words of Jesus.”

\(^{398}\)Luke, 379.

\(^{399}\)Theissen sees Matthew stressing the need to overcome (Jewish) resistance to Gentile mission (cf. Matt 15:21-28) whereby he inserts logia both here and at Matt 15:21-28 (Miracle Stories, 254). McNicol et al. note Luke’s transfer of the saying to the later context, highlighting at that point his use of the typically Matthean “weeping and gnashing of teeth” as well as his addition of “north and south” (to Matthew’s “east and west”), noting that it is indicative of Luke’s missionary concern. They do not, however, offer any explanation for Luke’s transfer (Q Impasse, 108, 206). Alternatively Bock sees the two sayings (i.e. Luke 13:28-29 and Matt 8:11-13) as distinct (Luke, 643) but this seems unlikely once anyone of our source theories is adopted.

\(^{400}\)Healing occurs without any explicit word from Jesus and, according to Bock, foreshadows Jesus’ ministry to the nations (Luke, 644). Green suggests the narration of the healing validates the centurion’s insight and faith (Luke, 288).

\(^{401}\)Variants of δοῦλον (\(\text{\textdagger}\) B L W \(\text{\textdagger}\) 157 etc.) include ἀθεούντα (but inserts δοῦλοι before ἐύρων in D it) and ἀθεούντα δοῦλον (A C Δ Θ \(\psi\) \(\text{\textdagger}\) 28 33 180 etc.). The reading in the text (δοῦλον) receives an A rating in UBS.
In essence the gist is retained (the healing is narrated) but the wording differs considerably and he omits Jesus’ word of healing (‘go and it will be done for you according to your faith’ in Matt 8:13) albeit the result is more concise. These observations, however, offer no clear advantage for any of our hypotheses.

Considering the story from the perspective of Theon’s narrative elements the 2GH/FH Luke elaborates upon the person of the centurion through the words spoken about him by both the narrator (‘he values his servant’) and the initial embassy (‘he loves our nation and built our synagogue’). The fact that he sends ‘Jewish’ elders underlines his positive relation to Israel and by retaining the speeches of both the centurion (7:7-8) and Jesus (7:9) Luke highlights a positive view of Jesus and the centurion’s faith (as evaluated by Jesus). Thus in what he chooses to retain and add Luke highlights the positive characterization of this particular gentile. As for the sick person it is possible that Luke changes his identity from ‘son’ to ‘slave’ but, as noted above, it is not certain that Matthew intends παιδίς to be understood as ‘son.’ Jesus’ characterization is essentially unchanged by Luke albeit he transfers verses 11-12 of Matthew to a later place (Luke 13:28-29). Finally Luke is noted to add the Jewish elders (first embassy) and the friends of the centurion (second embassy). The first play a role in relation to the character of the centurion (as above) while the second are necessary on account of the Centurion remaining at a distance. They essentially become the mouthpiece for the centurion without offering their own opinion (unlike the Jewish elders in Luke 7:4-5).

As regards narrative action the 2GH/FH Luke has clearly added the double embassy (in place of direct encounter in Matthew) but otherwise follows Matthew’s basic plot line (request → Jesus

---

402 McNicol et al. note that ὑποστρέψας εἰς τὸν ὅλον is characteristically Lukan (ὑποστρέφω occurs 32x in Luke-Acts but never in Matthew or Mark) (Q Impasse, 108). The point, however, is not relevant to indicating a greater plausibility for the 2GH over against other hypotheses. Dibelius sees differences between the introductions and conclusions as an indication that they are “invented” by Matthew and Luke thus evidencing a general lack of narrative interest in Q material (assumed as a source for both). This contrasts the high verbatim agreement for the central sayings material (Luke 7:7-9; Matt 8:8-10). He sees a parallel in Matt 15:21-28 suggesting both stories began as sayings that were elaborated into paradigms by the evangelists (Tradition, 244–5, 61). The observation requires modification for any one of our three hypotheses (the FH and 2GH Luke has Matthew’s introduction and conclusion before him; the 2DH Luke has the Q version, which also has an introduction) but the point about fidelity to sayings material nevertheless stands.
agrees to come ⇒ centurion objects ⇒ Jesus commends centurion’s faith ⇒ servant is healed) although he never actually has Jesus speak the word of healing. The manner of the actions is similar in terms of being willing albeit the Lukan embassy involves a different means of request than the direct request of Matthew. Luke, however, provides more information on the cause of the action (why Jesus should heal) when noting the value of the servant and the praise of the elders (about the centurion’s love of the nation and building their synagogue). When it comes to the reason for Jesus’ action Luke implies a connection between the centurion’s faith and the healing that has taken place (7:9-10) but is not as explicit as Matt 8:13 (‘it will be done ... according to your belief’). 403

When it comes to the element of time Luke’s narrative is slightly more drawn out on account of the two embassies. Otherwise there are no changes in any explicit time markers with the exception of the Matthew’s final statement that the servant was healed “in that hour” (8:13). This may be implied in Luke but is more explicit in Matthew thus highlighting the connection between the centurion’s faith, Jesus word to the centurion, and the healing that accompanies it at that precise time. As regards place both are agreed that the episode occurs in Capernaum (Luke 7:1; Matt 8:5) albeit the precise location of the centurion’s house (presumably in Capernaum) is never explicitly stated nor is the distance Jesus must travel to get there. Luke adds a distance notation when he states that “Jesus was not far from the house” (7:6) indicating that for him Jesus makes some headway in travelling toward the house prior to the arrival of the second embassy. This obviously differs from Matthew insofar as Jesus makes no headway before the centurion objects to his coming. Both agree that the healing occurs at a distance.

In relation to narrative virtues Luke is obviously less concise in that his account is 11% longer (187 words in place of 167) despite his omission (transfer to a later place) of Matt 8:11-12. This results from his expansions in verses 2-7 although in verse 10 he is actually more concise. The

403 More literally “as you have believed” (ὡς ἔπιστεψας). While this may not have the same force as, for example, κατά with the accusative, the sense of ὡς is clearly intended to make a direct link between the centurion’s faith and Jesus’ command that indicates healing has occurred. Thus ‘according to’ is a reasonable translation.
additions are potentially justifiable as developments in relation to person but there is some loss of clarity related to the second embassy which appears rather awkwardly in verse 6 when Jesus is not far from the house. Since the second embassy only serves to protest Jesus actually coming, and instead request a distance healing, the Lukan account would have gained both clarity and conciseness, and to a lesser extent credibility, by having the initial embassy make these requests. While loss of clarity and conciseness count against the plausibility of his purported direct use of Matthew (2GH and FH), however, the 2DH essentially suffers the same difficulty in relation to the Luke’s purported use of Q.

6.4.2 The 2DH and the Centurion’s Servant

I will now examine the 2DH Matthew and Luke’s purported independent use of Q noting that this is the second longest of Matthew’s miracle stories (167 words), the fourth longest of Luke’s (187 words) (see table 5.3), and one of only two in Q itself. 404

(a) Matthew’s use of Q

Matthew’s version (167 words) is 67% longer than Q (100 words) although when Matt 8:11-12 are removed (since they occur later in Q) then, at 124 words, Matthew is only 24% longer. Nevertheless this represents considerable lengthening given his otherwise fairly consistent tendency to abbreviate Markan miracle narratives (table 5.3). 2DH Matthew agrees with Q in placing the story after the ‘Sermon’ but inserts a Markan miracle (the leper) in between them (8:1-4). 405

---

404 The other is the healing at the beginning of the Beelzebul pericope (Luke 11:14 and par.). According to Kee the central question for Q is not whether miracles occur but for what end. The primary clue appears is Jesus’ answer to John (Luke 7:18-23) whereby each phrase of Luke 7:22 derives from the Prophets and especially Isaiah (29:18-19; 35:5-6; 61:1). Thus the immediate effect of the miracle is personal but its frame of meaning is cosmic and eschatological. The Centurion’s servant (referring to Luke 7:1-10) also shows that Jesus’ wonder working goes beyond the bounds of Israel (Miracle, 157–9, 205–6). For others the paucity of miracles in Q is seen as problematic for the entire Q hypothesis (e.g., Hengel, The Four Gospels, 182, 84).

405 In a brief discussion of order changes Catchpole notes how Matthew delays the paralytic until later (Matt 9:1-8) but that there is an “underlying tradition historical relationship between the two stories, even if not one of direct literary dependence,” a relationship that enables Matthew to move details “to and fro” between the stories. He posits
In verses 5–7 Matthew (30 words) is 36% longer than Q (22 words) albeit sharing 19 words whereby he takes over 86% of Q (in the same order with only one change of form) (Matt 8:5) and Q wording makes up 63% of his narrative. Besides one small stylistic change Matthew adds the vocative κύριε to the centurion’s address to Jesus and transforms the description of illness from “he is sick” (κακῶς ἔχει) to the more elaborate “he is laid up in the house paralyzed terribly distressed” (Matt 8:6) thus expanding two Greek words to seven. This is unusual given his abbreviating tendencies especially in regard to descriptions of illness or ailment (as with both the Gadarene demoniac and the hemorrhaging woman above) and goes against the plausibility of the 2DH at this point. Matthew has identical wording to Q in verse 7.

Based on Matthew’s tendency to abbreviate Markan narratives, assuming Markan priority, Davies and Allison suggest pre-Lukan version of Luke 7:2–5 (Matthew, 19–20). As noted above, however, this analysis will proceed on the basis of the critical text of Q.

This involves the one change of form whereby Matthew’s genitive absolute (εἰσελθόντος ...) replaces Q’s finite verb (εἰσῆλθεν) (Matt 8:5). Davies and Allison see this as a Matthean redactional feature (cf. 8:1; 17:22, 24; 24:3; 27:19) (Matthew, 18). According to Enslin εἰσελθόντος δὲ αὐτοῦ ἐίς Καφαρναοῦμ in Matt 8:5 is simply taken over from Mark 1:21 (εἰσορθοῦσαί τι εἰς Καφαρναοῦμ) (“Luke and Matthew,” 2376–7) but that is not obviously the case.

Davies and Allison discuss Matthean usage and note that it is never part of a title but always used positively and typically by miracle suppliants (such as here) or disciples (e.g., 8:25; 14:28–30). They suggest that it likely connects to Jesus “majestic ἐξουσία but that it would be hazardous to say more” (Matthew, 20). France suggests it likely means more than “sir” (polite address), given the recognition of Jesus’ authority by the centurion in vv. 8-9, but that it is likely not indicative of any higher christology (“Exegesis,” 255).

Twelftree says Matthew heightens the severity of the illness along with the magnitude of Jesus’ healing (Miracle Worker, 109). Davies and Allison claim that Matthew tends to specify sicknesses and that this formulation may be influenced by Mark 2:1–12 (which follows the leper story in Mark). They also suggest that Matthew adds ‘in the house’ since otherwise we would not know that the healing was at a distance (Matthew, 21). Luz, however, says the narrator is not interested in medical precision but only in relating the severity of the condition (Matthew, 10) and according to Nolland Matthew emphasizes the suffering over against Luke’s emphasis on the prospect of death (Matthew, 354). Catchpole agrees that δείνως βάσιν ἐξέβλεπεν denotes great intensity of illness and that βάσιλεῖ (here βασιλεία) is rare in relation to a sick person in the Synoptic Gospels although both other occurrences are Matthean redaction of Mark upon assumption of Markan priority (Matt 8:14 and 9:2; cf. Mark 1:29 and 2:3) (“Centurion’s Faith,” 524). Gagnon (“Shape,” 136–37) sees Matthew intentionally echoing themes (faith; christological authority; conflict with Israel’s leaders) in Mark’s ‘paralytic story’ (Mark 2:1-12) but this seems rather speculative on the basis of the single world παραλυτικός. Despite his claim that Matthew elsewhere embellishes details of suffering in miracle recipients, none of the examples chosen (Matt 8:28; 12:22; 15:22; 17:15, 18) are particularly convincing and the Gadarene demoniac appears to be quite the opposite (Matt 8:22) as noted above. According to Meier the reasons for Matthew’s insertion of παραλυτικός are not clear (he seems to see the Lukan
When it comes to the centurion’s speech to Jesus (Matt 8:8-9; Q 7:6b-8) Matthew takes up all 53 of the words in Q in the same order and with only one change of form (future ἵκος ἑσταταὶ

and Johannine accounts as more original where the son/slave is near death but with an unspecified illness) (Marginal Jew, 685, 733, n. 30, 764, n. 179). In general we may conclude that a heightened emphasis on suffering is not an obvious tendency of the 2DH Matthew in relation to miracle recipients and both the Gadarene demoniac and hemorrhaging woman narratives (above) clearly suggested the opposite.

411It is debated whether Jesus (a) makes a statement (‘I will come ...’) or (b) asks a question (‘shall I come ...?’). While the UBS/NA text leaves out the question mark, the critical edition of Q includes it. Most favor Matthew as a question (e.g., Davies and Allison, Matthew, 22; Harrington, Matthew, 123–24; Luz, Matthew, 10; Nolland, Matthew, 354–5; France, Matthew, 310; Held, “Miracle Stories,” 194–5; Gagnon, “Shape,” 136, n. 15; Enslin, “Luke and Matthew,” 2377; Martin, “The ‘Centurion’s’ Servant/Son,” 15; Van der Loos, Miracles, 533) and various reasons are offered: (a) the story is similar to the Canaanite woman and her initial request is met with hesitation (Matt 15:21-28) involving the issues of racial tension (Jesus may even be testing the centurion’s faith much as he seems to with the Canaanite woman and thus his amazed response in 8:10-12); (b) hesitation accords with the view that Jesus came for the lost sheep of Israel (Matt 10:6; 15:24); (c) Jesus’ reaction in John was not unambiguously positive (John 4:46-54); (d) the εὑρα at the beginning of the sentence seems emphatic which draws out the surprising nature of the request (‘should I ...?’) but would be strange if only a statement (‘I myself will come to heal’); (e) we might expect that Jesus (as a law abiding Jew in Matthew) was hesitant to enter a Gentile residence; (f) the centurion’s reply in v. 8 implies that Jesus’ remark should be taken as an “annoyed” or “astonished” question relating to the fact that a Jew cannot enter a Gentile house (cf. Acts 10:28). Others, however, give various reasons against this being an indignant question (e.g., Catchpole, “Centurion’s Faith,” 526–7; Hooke, “Centurion”; Meier, Marginal Jew, 765–7): (a) the idea of coming is only introduced by Jesus himself and is not mentioned by the centurion in Matt 8:5-6; (b) there is no explicit mention of the Jew-Gentile problem (unlike in the parallel Canaanite woman of Mark 7:24-30; Matt 15:21-28); (c) the use of εὑρα is not as unnecessary and striking as it first appears (noting parallel uses in Matt 10:16; 12:28; and 23:34); (d) there is no need for a statement of why Jesus does not come other than that provided explicitly by the centurion himself (unworthiness and Jesus’ authority) - the idea of reluctance to enter a Gentile house is nowhere explicit; (e) the leper (Matt 8:1–4), not the Canaanite woman, provides the immediate literary context and there Jesus readily breaks with Mosaic tradition by touching him; (f) if Matthew wanted to make 8:7 an indignant question then he could have made the point more clearly by beginning the question with the negative μὴ indicating that the speaker expects a negative answer.

According to Davies and Allison if Matt 8:7 is a question then the centurion’s speech in 8:8 “proves himself and clarifies his request” but if it is a statement then the speech “becomes a declaration of either surprise or gratitude.” They suggest that in either case the focus is on faith as the “victor”(Davies and Allison, Matthew, 22). Similarly Held sees Jesus conquered by Gentile faith both here and in Matt 15:21-28 (“Miracle Stories,” 194–5). Two basic reasons are offered for why the centurion resists Jesus’ coming: (a) Jew-Gentile distinctions that prevent Jews entering gentile houses (so Nolland, Matthew, 355; France, Matthew, 311, 314; Held, “Miracle Stories,” 194–5); (b) Jesus’ reputation whereby the centurion feels personally unworthy as suggested by the authority language and his use of ἵκος (worthiness) (e.g., France, “Exegesis,” 258; Nolland, Matthew, 355). While France seems to have changed his opinion from his earlier (“Exegesis,” 258) to later (Matthew, 311, 314) writings, it is possible to hold both views (so Nolland). The text is silent on the matter although the Jew-Gentile issue seems to be more likely of the two (especially if 7:7 is taken as a question) (France, Matthew, 311). When it comes to Matt 8:9, except for Luke’s addition of τοσοῦτος, both evangelists reproduce Q verbatim whereby the problem in Luke 7:8 recurs: Jesus is likened (“for I also” - καὶ γὰρ ἐγώ ...) to one “under authority” (ὑπὸ ἐξουσίαν) yet in Matthew Jesus is one who ἔχει authority (e.g., 7:29; 9:8; 11:27; 28:18) (Burchard, “Zu Matthäus 8:5–13,” 281–85). Typically (as with Luke) it is understood as a ‘lesser to greater’ argument: “If even I, a minor officer, can give commands, how much more can you!” (Luz, Matthew, 10; so also Davies and Allison, Matthew, 23–25; Harrington, Matthew, 124). Likewise some see concession in ἔχουν (“although I am a man under authority I have soldier under whom I can command ...) (Davies and Allison, Matthew, 23–25; Luz, Matthew, 10) but this seems awkward in light of “for I also” (καὶ γὰρ ἐγώ ...) albeit this could be taken as “for I indeed ...” or “for even I too” (France, “Exegesis,” 258–9). While Burchard notes the possibility of reading “with” rather than “under” authority, this is an improbable reading for ὑπό. Alternatively he says ἔχουν could be linked to ὑπὸ ἐξουσίαν (‘having soldiers under me under authority’) but suggests it is pleonastic, incompatible with Luke 7:8, and syntactically problematic in relation to εἴμι
in place of the imperative ἵσθι·τε). He adds only one word of his own (μόνον) whereby he is a mere 2% longer but with 98% of his narrative essentially identical to Q. This indicates a highly conservative 2DH Matthew, more so than in any of the sections that we examined above in relation to Mark, especially when it is considered that we are dealing with speech of someone other than Jesus. Thus to the extent that Q can be accurately reconstructed this clearly is a strong indicator of inter-dependence but involves counter tendencies in the 2DH Matthew that are not readily explicable.

For Jesus’ speech to the centurion (Matt 8:10-12) Matthew continues to follow Q closely in verse 10 (statement about the centurion’s faith) where he is 11% longer (20 words replace 18) but sharing as many as 17 words (same forms; one order change). Thus 94% of Q is taken up and constitutes 85% of Matthew with minimal changes. These include the addition of the three words (ἀμήν; παρ’ οὐδενί) and one order change whereby “in Israel” and “such faith” are switched. This again implies a highly conservative 2DH Matthew although the greatest divergence occurs in the relation to the words of Jesus (ἀμήν ... εὐρον in 8:10b). This is puzzling given his high fidelity to Q in both the centurion’s speech (8:8-9) and the introduction to Jesus’ speech (8:10a) where, in the space of 62 words, Matthew’s only change was to add μόνον. Thus while the changes to Jesus’ speech in 8:10b are relatively minor, they are inconsistent with Matthew’s procedure in the preceding two verses as well as the general tendency toward greater fidelity in preserving the words of Jesus. In relation to the changes themselves the addition of ἀμήν is

where ἄνθρωπος is the predicate nominative which ἔχων further modifies (Burchard, “Zu Matthäus 8:5–13,” 281–85). Alternatively the problem may be overstated given that elsewhere Jesus’ authority in Matthew is derivative (11:27; 28:18) (so, for example, in Nolland, Matthew, 355–56 and France, Matthew, 314–5). This is certainly reinforced by centurion’s examples of the soldiers and slaves ‘under him’ regardless of how the first part of v. 9 is read. As per the above discussion of Luke 7:8 this makes little difference to differing plausibilities of the three source hypotheses under consideration in that each one involves almost no adaptation of sources.

412 The added μόνον may emphasize the centurion’s faith and confidence in Jesus (e.g., Martin, “The ‘Centurion’s’ Servant/Son,” 16).

413 A variant occurs in relation to παρ’ οὐδενί τοσοῦτον πίστιν ἐν τῷ Ἰσραήλ εὗρον (B W syg cop et al. -with some variation). This appears elsewhere as οὐδενί ἐν τῷ Ἰσραήλ τοσοῦτον πίστιν εὗρον (= Luke 7:9) (中华人民 Δ Θ 0233 0250 f15 157 180 et al.) which is likely an assimilation to Luke 7:9 albeit having somewhat stronger external support (Bock, Luke, 645; the first reading is given a ‘B’ rating in the UBS/NA text).

414 “In Israel” may refer to an ethnic unit or (more likely) a geographical entity (‘the land of Israel’) (so Davies and Allison, Matthew, 24–25).
understandable as a Matthean emphasis but the change of οὐδὲ to παρ’ οὐδενί is less concise and therefore more puzzling. While all are agreed that faith is an important motif in all three versions of the story, this seems to have been highlighted by the 2DH Matthew, especially through his addition of μόνον, ἄμην and his statement about belief in verse 13 (‘as you have believed let it be done to you’). Matthew adds verses 11-12 from a different (later) context in Q (13:28-29) clearly seeing here an opportunity to place this more general saying upon Jesus’ lips. Boring suggests it is “relatively easy to account for Matthew’s insertion of this saying ... but difficult to explain Luke’s removal of it.” While he does not elaborate on what Matthew’s reasons were, Robert Gagnon sees it as an early confession of the Great Commission justifying the community decision to ‘make disciples of all nations.’ This, however, makes assumptions about the Gentile nature of the centurion and the placement of the saying (and the pericope) remains somewhat puzzling for the 2DH Matthew in light of the fact that Jesus’ mission remains

415 This is certainly common in Matthew (31x) and less so in Mark (13x) and Luke (6x).
416 Though see comment of France in next footnote suggesting this indicates greater condemnation toward Israel.
417 Faith might be defined as “the unconditional confidence in Jesus’ power to help” (Luz, Matthew, 10) although the present context perhaps adds the notion of Jesus as savior to the gentiles (universal mission; cf. Matt 15:21-28) (so Burchard, “Zu Matthäus 8:5–13,” 285–6). The centurion’s faith is clearly highlighted by Jesus ‘marvelling’ (ἐθαύμασεν), a verb more typically describing reactions to Jesus (Matt 8:27; 9:33; 15:31; 21:20; 22:22; 27:14; the only other place it is used of Jesus is Mark 6:6 in relation to people’s unbelief) (France, Matthew, 316; idem., “Exegesis,” 259–60; Davies and Allison, Matthew, 24–25; Nolland, Matthew, 356; Twelftree, Miracle Worker, 109–10). While Jesus’ ‘marvelling’ is common to Q and Luke, 2DH Matthew’s additions of μόνον (8:8) and ἄμην (8:10) highlights the centurion’s faith in a manner that goes beyond his source (Twelftree, Miracle Worker, 109–10). Faith is further reinforced by the climactic statement of v. 13 (‘as you have believed let it be done for you’) (France, “Exegesis,” 259–60; idem, Matthew, 320; Twelftree, Miracle Worker, 109–10; Nolland, Matthew, 358), is paralleled in other Matthewian statements (e.g., Matt 9:22b, 29; 15:28; 17:18b) (Held, “Miracle Stories,” 193–4), and is perhaps intended as a model for all believers (Harrington, Matthew, 114; Luz, Matthew, 12). The explicit contrast with Israel need not necessarily imply ‘no faith’ in Israel but rather that Jesus has not found ‘this kind’ of faith (Nolland, Matthew, 356). France, however, suggests Matthew is less complimentary toward Israel than Luke, for whom this is a story of a “good and humble man” rather than (in Matthew) a ‘paradigm for the extension of the gospel of Israel’s Messiah to include also those who have no natural claim to him” (France, Matthew, 310). In this regard he further suggests that Matthew’s παρ’ οὐδενί (“with no-one in Israel have I found ... ”) is more condemnatory of unbelief in Israel than is Luke’s οὐδὲ (“not even in Israel have I found ... ”) (France, “Exegesis,” 259–60). The contrast is said to pave the way for the speech of vv. 11-12 (ibid., also Luz, Matthew, 10).
419 “Shape,” 138 n. 22. Similarly so in Hengel, The Four Gospels, 841.
420 This is likely but questioned by some (e.g., Catchpole, “Centurion’s Faith”).
restricted to Jews at this point (cf. Matt 10:5-6).\textsuperscript{421} It is nevertheless true that the story (along with the woman in Matt 15:21-28) points to Jesus’ anticipation of a gentile mission and helps to relieve the tension inherent between Matt 10:5-6 and Matt 28:16-20.

Finally Matthew adds a conclusion regarding a word of Jesus to the centurion and a notation that the παῦλος was healed in that hour (Matt 8:13). This provides an understandable conclusion (apparently missing from Q) to the story indicating that the healing does indeed take place and does so from a distance.\textsuperscript{422}

As regards narrative elements the 2DH Matthew slightly elaborates in relation to person with his addition of verse 13, which also adds a narrative action (the healing actually occurs) and heightens the cause of the healing in terms of faith. Faith is mentioned in verse 10 of Matthew (taken over from Q 7:9) but is reinforced through the addition of μόνον (v. 8) and ὄμην (v. 10) and Jesus’ comments in verse 13 (ὡς ἐπίστευσας ...). Matthew makes no changes to the elements of manner or place but adds one small notation about time when he mentions the healing having taken place “in that hour” (8:13), which functions to highlight the connection

\textsuperscript{421}Typically an allusion is seen to the prophetic motif of the eschatological in gathering and messianic banquet (Isa 2:2-4; 19:18-25; 25:6; 45:22; 66:18-21; Jer 3:17; Zech 2:11-12; 8:7-8, 20-23; Ps 107:3; Bar 4:36) (so Harrington, Matthew, 114; Davies and Allison, Matthew, 25-28; Nolland, Matthew, 357–8; Burchard, “Zu Matthäus 8:5–13,” 286–7). While usually referring to Diaspora Jews, If Matthew’s centurion is a Gentile then he is reversing the traditional theme (Gentiles replace Jews rather than being excluded or simply being included with them) (Luz, Matthew, 9; Keener, Gospel of Matthew, 270; Held, “Miracle Stories,” 196–7 who sees the comments directed to Matthew’s church). Kloppenborg sees an originally “independent apophthegmatized miracle story” perhaps with a Sitz im Leben involving controversy over Gentile admission into the church whereby it provided “useful ammunition in support of the Gentile mission.” Matthew’s insertion of these verses (8:11-12) “only strengthens what is already implicit ... in Q” and forms part of a series of texts (Q 7:1-10, 18-23, 24-28, 31-35) addressing the unresponsiveness of “this generation” (Formation of Q, 117–21). Indeed v. 12 appears to add a word of judgment for Israel (cf. Zeph 3:8) albeit several commentators believe Matthew is not here consigning ‘all Israel’ to perdition but is rather intending a contrast within Israel between ‘privileged and unprivileged’ (Davies and Allison, Matthew, 25–28; Harrington, Matthew, 114; Nolland, Matthew, 357–8; France, Matthew, 316–19). Thus France suggests that Matthew is addressing the issue of how Israel relates to the new community which is made up of people from all nations (Jews and Gentiles) (Matt 28:19; cf. Matt 15:21-39) and is based on faith rather than ethnic identity. Thus faith is the entrance requirement not only for Gentiles but also Jews (divides privileged and unprivileged Jews) (France, Matthew, 310, 316–19; idem, “Exegesis,” 260–63; similarly Burchard, “Zu Matthäus 8:5–13,” 286–7). Christoph Burger agrees that Gentile inclusion (with Israel) as thematic and sees Matthew deliberately grouping it with the leper (8:1-4) and mother in law (8:14-15) to show Jesus breaking barriers related to the Jewish community (“Jesu Taten,” 281 and 284). The theme, however, is not explicit within the narratives or the fulfillment citation at Matt 8:17 and can probably be applied to most (if not all) of Matthew’s healing-exorcism narratives.

\textsuperscript{422}According to Davies and Allison “if Q had a conclusion ... it cannot now be reconstructed” in that both the Matthean and Lukan constructions are ‘redactional’ (Matthew, 31).
between Jesus’ word (at a distance) and the healing. When it comes to narrative virtues 2DH Matthew goes against his more normal tendency (in relation to Mark) by elaborating upon the Q story (24% longer after the removal of Matt 8:11-12) and, unlike any significant elaboration in relation to Mark (e.g., Peter walking on the water in Matt 14:28-33), the elaboration of this pericope involves the description of illness and the conclusion. While the description of the illness adds nothing of clarity, the conclusion in verse 13 highlights the faith motif. The speech of verses 11-12, however, are a somewhat awkward intrusion. While it functions to heighten Gentile inclusion (through faith) and judgment on Israel, this theme sits somewhat awkwardly at this point in Matthew’s narrative where Jews are the primary focus of Jesus’ mission (cf. Matt 10:5-6).

(b) Luke’s use of Q

According to Fitzmyer this story is part Luke’s “little interpolation into Marcan material and order” which, like Matthew, comes on the heels of his great sermon (Luke 6:20-49). He also suggests that it begins a series of episodes “highlighting the reception of Jesus by various persons or groups” concluding with the women followers at Luke 8:1-3. Certainly, according to the 2DH, it forms part of a block of Q and special Lukan material (Luke 6:20–8:3) that is placed in between two blocks of mostly Markan material (Luke 4:31–6:19; 8:4–9:50) and in that respect involves far less disruption to Markan order than does Matthew’s placement of the same story. When it comes to the narrative itself the 2DH Luke is 86% longer than Q (186 words replace 100). This is greater than any other 2DH Lukan expansion but is quite comparable to some 2GH Lukan expansions (of Matthew) including especially the Gadarene demoniac and Jairus’ daughter (see table 5.3). In the transitional verse (Luke 7:1a; Q 7:1a) the Lukan version is 57% longer (11 words replace 7) with only one shared word (ἐπιληφόμενον) but essentially no

---

423 The Q narrative has no conclusion whereas Mark typically has a conclusion but it is more likely to be shortened than lengthened by Matthew.
425 See previous chapter for further comments in relation to order and selection.
change of substance. Hence 2DH Luke is stylistically different but less concise and without addition of clarity, credibility, or narrative elements.

The centurion’s request (Luke 7:1b-6a; Q 7:1b-3) significantly expands upon the much shorter Q version which is closer to Matthew’s wording, albeit briefer, and agrees in omitting the embassy. 426 This involves introducing the Jewish embassy who speak for the centurion and offer praise about him (Luke 7:3-5). According to Fitzmyer the focus is not on his worthiness (according to the praise of vv. 4-5) but on his ‘faith’ (πίστις in 7:9) whereby the delegation (along with the addition of the second party of friends in Luke 7:6b) serves to build narrative suspense for the pronouncement of Jesus. 427 There are, however, no other clear instances of the 2DH Luke engaging in such significant alterations of miracle stories so as to highlight the motif of faith. 428 The nature of the additions themselves are clearly encomiastic though not so much focused on faith as on reasons why Jesus should pay attention to this particular Gentile. The various problems associated with this addition have already been discussed above in relation to the 2GH/FH Lukan use of Matthew and are essentially no different in relation to 2DH Lukan use of Q. In this sense there are problems for all hypotheses but things are perhaps slightly more troublesome for the 2DH in that the Lukan changes to Q are more extreme than those to Matthew in relation to conciseness. The additions are also contrary to both the FH and 2DH Lukan approach to Mark though not a problem for the 2GH. 429

426 Luke is 204% longer (67 words replace 22) with only 6 words shared (9% of Luke; 27% of Q).
428 The same motif is highlighted in the hemorrhaging woman but there Luke is simply reproducing Mark.
429 In his discussion of the delegations Catchpole argues that they are a Lukan redactional addition to Q based on Lukan theological concerns (salvation history of Israel in relation to christology and Jesus) and traditions seen elsewhere in Acts 10–11 (e.g., centurion approaches man of God with attention drawn to entering his home and prominence given to faith) and Mark 5:21–43 (man in authority with a sick child appeals for help) he concludes that nothing in Luke 7:3–6 “lacks a counterpart” in these two passages (“Centurion’s Faith,” 531–32). Gagnon also sees a parallel to Acts 10–11 and Lukan redactional motifs: (1) the first delegation enables Luke’s community to combat criticisms from “Jews who complained to pagan authorities of an anti-Semitic campaign from Christians” (a delegation of Jewish elders indicates quite the opposite) and from “Jewish Christians critical of routine, close contact with law-free Gentile Christians”; (2) the second delegation relates to Lukan subversion of patron-client relations thus encouraging a spirit of humility for wealthier members of community (“Luke’s Motivation”; “Statistical Analysis,” 730–1). Other proposals regarding the reason for Luke’s added embassies are listed in Judge (“Luke 7:1–10,” 480–87): midrashic interpretation of Ahaziah’s embassies to Elijah in 2 Kings 1; Luke desires a story of an exemplary Gentile; justification for the expanding mission to Gentiles; highlighting of the personal virtue
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When it comes to the Centurion’s speech (Luke 7:6b-8; Q 7:6b-8) Luke is now only 39% longer and has much greater verbal overlap (48 words: 64% of Luke; 90% of Q; same forms and only one order change). Given that Q is closer to Matthew the 2DH Lukan changes essentially mirror those of the 2GH and FH Luke. In particular this involves the additions in verses 6 (ηδη ... αυτω and μη σκυλλου) and 7 (διο ... έλπθειν) which, as noted above, relate primarily to the fact the Luke has included a second embassy of friends although the addition in verse 7 is somewhat redundant in light of what has been stated in verse 6b (both highlighting the centurion’s unworthiness). The 2DH Luke, as with the 2GH and FH, also adds τασσομενοι to verse 8 albeit the reason for the addition is not clear. There is an order change of μου in verse 6b whereby it is placed after the noun it modifies rather than before the preposition (as in Matthew and Q) but this is essentially stylistic and again is shared by all three hypotheses.430

When it comes to Jesus’ speech (Luke 7:9; Q 7:9) the 2DH Luke again expands upon Q by 27% (23 words in place of 18) but has 18 shared words (2 different forms; same order). This involves adding various words to Q (ταυτα; αυτον; στραφεις; αυτω δχλω) that make him less concise but without enhancing narrative elements, virtues or Lukan miracle motifs.431 As above the same basic issues are faced by all three hypotheses in relation to this verse. Finally the

430 The pronoun μου occurs in 67 verses in Matthew often more than once and most frequently as a possessive pronoun but typically following the noun it qualifies (exceptions occur at 12:50; 16:18; 17:15). Thus it is more normal for Matthew to place the pronoun after the noun. Luke has 78 verses with μου again most often as a possessive pronoun and typically occurring after the noun but with some exceptions (7:44, 45; 10:29; 12:18; 14:23, 24, 26, 27, 33; 19:23 - notably the ones in chapter 14 all occur in a Q context). A similar construction occurs with υμο + noun + μου at Matt 11:27 (par. Luke 10:22) where both Luke and Matthew agree in placing the pronoun after the noun. In essence it seems unusual to place the pronoun before the preposition and thus it seems that such is more likely original. The general import is that the placement of the pronoun prior to the preposition is likely original with Q implying that Luke has changed it. This provides no advantage over the 2GH or FH where Luke changes Matthew, who on any hypothesis may be simply taken as following his source.

431 Davies and Allison comment on Luke’s “and turning, he said to the crowd following him ... ”: they note that στρεφο may not be Lukian and while he likes participles set in between articles and substantives, ‘the crowd following him’ is a construction that he uses only here (Matthew, 24).
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2DH Luke (like the 2DH Matthew) adds his own conclusion to the Q narrative in Luke 7:10. As with Matthew, the 2DH Lukan addition makes sense in terms of bringing the narrative to a clear conclusion. Given the absence of a conclusion in Q the differences between the Matthean and Lukan account make sense in that neither has an original to go by. While Matthew has highlighted faith, Luke simply records the fact of the healing (miracle proofs). Luke could perhaps have been expected to take over Matthew’s notation about faith (‘as you have believed’) and his statement that healing was ‘from that hour.’

When it comes to consideration of narrative elements the 2DH Luke is much like the FH and 2GH Luke in that he makes significant additions in relation to person through his expansions in verses 2-5. He likewise adds the characters of the Jewish elders and embassy of friends while the character of Jesus is much the same. Similarly he retains all the actions of Q but adds the embassies and clarifies cause in relation to the request through the notation about the worthiness of the servant and the centurion himself. There are no significant changes in relation to time, place or manner of actions. In relation to narrative virtues the 2DH Luke is clearly less concise than his source (86% longer) with some additions adding to the element of person (e.g., 2-5) but others being more redundant (e.g., 7a). It is not evident that the additions have added clarity and the two embassies create something of a lack of clarity in that Jesus is first requested to come (7:3) and then not to come (7:6-8). These challenges are felt most acutely by the Markan priority hypotheses insofar as Luke goes against his observable tendencies in relation to Mark.

6.4.3 The FH and the Centurion’s Servants

When it comes to the FH the healing of the centurion’s servant/son is a story that was absent from Mark but added in by Matthew as part of the various additional traditions available to him. While the FH Matthean procedure in relation to order and selection has been addressed in

432 Though see n. 422 above.
chapter 5, the precise form of the tradition available to Matthew is beyond knowing.\(^{433}\) Once assimilated into Matthew the story is then taken over by the FH Luke and, insofar as there is no Markan parallel, Matthew becomes the only source for Luke’s version. In this regard (unlike the Gerasene demoniac and Jairus’ daughter) the analysis of the FH Luke’s use of Matthew is no different from the analysis of the 2GH Luke’s use of Matthew (as discussed above). What can be noted, however, is that on any hypothesis Luke engages in a significant degree of expansion and adaptation (e.g., addition of embassies and conclusion) while at the same time displaying high conservative tendencies (e.g., the high verbal overlap in 7:7-9). While such a procedure is difficult to explain in itself, it is most congenial to the 2GH Lukan procedure where Mark can no longer be employed to explain the Lukan changes to Matthew. According to Goulder this pericope is one of the most embarrassing for the Q hypothesis owing to the presence of the following ‘Matthean phrases’: καὶ ἐγένετο ὅτε ἔτέλεσεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τῶν λόγων τούτων ... (Matt 7:28; 11:1; 13:53; 19:1; 26:1); κύριε for a non-disciple (Matt 8:2; 9:28; 15:22, 25; 17:15; 20:30, 31, 33; Mark 7:28; Luke 5:12 = Matt 8:2; 10:40); ἀμὴν λέγω ἡμῖν; and ἡ ὠρα ἐκεῖνη (Matt 9:22; 15:28; 17:18; 18:1; 26:55).\(^{434}\) It is not clear, however, why the presence of Matthean words or phrases should in any way function to exclude the Q hypothesis since clearly such phrases could be the result of Matthean ‘redaction’ of Q, a pattern that can be supported in relation to Matthew’s use of Mark (which Goulder accepts). It is probably more important to ask whether such clearly Matthean phrases have made their way into Luke, which would be somewhat harder to explain for the 2DH than for the FH. In this respect, however, Luke 7:1a (ἐπειδὴ ἐπλήρωσεν πάντα τὰ ῥήματα αὐτοῦ εἰς τὰς ἀκοὰς τοῦ λαοῦ) borrows nothing of Matthew’s wording from Matt 7:28. Also Luke omits the characteristic ἀμὴν from ἀμὴν λέγω ἡμῖν though adds it in Luke 4:24 where it is absent from parallels in both Mark and Matthew. Finally while the phrase about the hour (ἡ ὠρα ἐκεῖνη) is missing from Luke’s account, κύριε is paralleled and is likewise added to the leper story at Luke 5:12 where it is a minor agreement.

\(^{433}\) We could perhaps speculate as to the nature of this tradition based on Matthew’s redactional procedures elsewhere but this obviously involves assuming a source hypothesis (such as Markan priority).

This, however, amounts to slim evidence for the FH making it unclear how any advantage is gained over the 2DH at this point since it is not problematic to imagine these verbal overlaps occurring in Q.

### 6.5 Conclusions Regarding Micro-Analysis of Synoptic Miracle Pericopes

The evidence for and against our chosen Synoptic hypotheses in relation to the three narratives examined above has been summarized and tabulated in table 6.9. Not only does the evidence go in both directions but the various pros and cons do not obviously carry equal weight. Hence, for example, both the 2DH Lukan addition of a discipleship motif in 8:35 (“at the feet of Jesus”) and omission of “ran from a distance” in 8:2 can be taken as positive evidence if favor of the hypothesis. While the second of these changes clearly enhances clarity in relation to Mark, the first might be disputed as to whether it actually reflects a discipleship motif and therefore does not carry the same amount of weight. Meanwhile the compromised clarity of having Jesus return home prior to the conversation with the healed man in Luke 8:37b might be considered of more weight against the 2DH Lukan hypothesis than either (or both) of the positive contributions above. In this respect the evidence in table 6.9 must be weighed and not simply counted. The following summary will attempt to do this.\(^{435}\)

Beginning with the Gadarene demoniac in favor of the 2GH it is noted that Luke expands Matthew with details related to the narrative elements of person (e.g., demoniac) and cause (‘fear’ of townspeople and ‘abyss’) albeit with some redundancies. While the validation motif may explain the addition the name ‘legion’ and the expanded reaction of the townspeople, the addition of “at Jesus’ feet” relates to the discipleship and the change from θάλασσαν to λίμνη involves using more technical language. Perhaps the most significant change is the addition of the conversation between Jesus and the healed demoniac (Luke 8:37-39) as it pertains to both

---

\(^{435}\)For the most part I omit comments on the ‘uncertain evidence’ which I take as that which does not clearly speak for or against the hypothesis under consideration.
validation and discipleship. Alternatively, against the 2GH, is the fact that Luke omits the cause of the confrontation in Matt 8:28 (demons block Jesus’ path) and changes the place name from Gadara to Gerasa (albeit textually uncertainty). He violates clarity by having Jesus depart prior to the healed man addressing him (Luke 8:37b) and brevity by expanding Matthew to almost double its length (albeit occasionally more brief as in 8:32). Some expansions are rhetorically plausible (as above) but could nevertheless have been added in a more succinct manner. The considerable variation in extent of verbal agreement (between 3 and 60%) indicates an inconsistent approach which is all the more significant given the differences at the level of individual verses are not readily explicable rhetorically. The implausibility of the 2GH is further highlighted when compared with our two alternative hypotheses insofar as the various 2GH Lukan expansions (of Matthew) are essentially paralleled in Mark thereby making their presence in Luke equally explicable on the basis on Markan priority. Furthermore, the problem of the 2GH Luke violating conciseness essentially disappears when Mark becomes Luke’s source and when the 2GH Lukan additions to Matthew are rhetorically plausible (as above), the same reasons explain why the Markan priority Luke retains the details. The advantage for Markan priority, however, is that Luke retains the details while also enhancing conciseness and with less sharp variation in compression versus expansion as well as verbatim agreement. While Jesus’ premature departure remains problematic (and perhaps slightly worse in that he now contradicts Mark), these various observations suggest greater plausibility for the Markan priority hypotheses in relation to Luke’s implied redaction of this narrative.

Regarding the 2GH Markan conflation of Matthew and Luke it is first noted that he prefers the longer Lukan version. While violating conciseness, however, the reasons for including extra details are similar to the 2GH Lukan expansion of Matthew: especially person and validation as well as narrative vividness (as above and in table 6.9). The 2GH Mark also enhances clarity by having the healed demoniac speak to Jesus ‘while getting into the boat’ (rather than after he left as in Luke) and enhances validation with the addition of “all were amazed” (Mark 5:18-20).
While he occasionally enhances brevity, however, his final version expands Luke (who had already expanded Matthew) with very few additions being obvious rhetorical enhancements and some redundancies (e.g., Mark 5:12). While other infelicities and omissions are noted in table 6.9 (‘evidence against Markan conflation’), particularly noteworthy are the confusing shift between singular and plural (Mark 5:8-10) and the notation that the demons ‘run from afar’ (Mark 5:6). While the first is less clear than its Lukan parallel, the second disagrees with both Matthew and Luke while creating a self contradiction (demoniac meets Jesus twice in Mark) and avoids Matthew’s clearer cause of the confrontation (demons block Jesus’ path). The 2GH Mark also sides with Luke’s less clear location (Gerasa) and frequently engages in micro-conflation. While the latter cannot be ruled out in toto, the mechanical difficulties entailed (that is, the manipulation of the text) is such that an approach of ‘one source at a time’ not only seems more plausible but is better attested in antiquity. To argue for the plausibility of 2GH Markan micro-conflation, therefore, requires convincing rhetorical reasons for why he proceeded in this manner but such were not apparent in this study. Hence while some evidence favors Markan posteriority, the difficulties associated with 2GH Markan conflation makes this less plausible than either Markan priority hypothesis.

Turning to the 2DH Matthew he clearly enhances both conciseness (146 words in place 325) and clarity (and sometimes credibility): e.g., cause of encounter; transfer ‘from afar’ to pigs; change to Gadara; and omission of ‘evening’ in Matt 8:23 (see further table 6.9). His stylistic changes are frequently rhetorical enhancements and he heightens the demons’ subservience (relates to Jesus’ person). At the same time he omits details of person, cause (‘fear of townspeople’), and especially validation and discipleship (miracle proofs and concluding dialogue). The 2DH Lukan use of Mark agrees with Matthew in being more concise but not consistently so and not the same extent. Various changes enhance clarity (omit ‘ran from afar’; omit ‘evening’ in Luke 8:22; nakedness), person/validation (e.g., change Markan ὄρκὶζω formula), and discipleship (‘at Jesus feet’). At the same time he sometimes compromises
conciseness, violates clarity (Jesus returns home prior to conversation with healed man), and omits the (typically Lukan) amazement motif from Mark 5:20. While some Matthean omissions are significant and these last two Lukan changes are problematic, however, Markan priority remains more plausible in light of the difficulties noted above for the 2GH.

While the FH Matthew is no different from the 2DH Matthew, the FH Luke differs from the 2GH Luke (who only has Matthew) and the 2DH Luke (who only has Mark). The far greater overlap with Mark makes it clear that this was the FH Luke’s primary source. While various MAs raise the possibility that Luke knew and used Matthew as an additional source, each one identified for this pericope was equally plausibly explained as independent redaction. Furthermore, the FH Luke omits Matthean rhetorical enhancements to Mark (e.g., change to Gadara and notation about the demons blocking Jesus’ path). This evidence is not especially conclusive for or against the FH Luke in relation to the 2DH Luke.

Turning to the account of Jairus’ daughter the 2GH Luke has significant verbal overlap with Matthew and several changes are rhetorically plausible: enhancements of person (e.g., the ruler and the woman), validation and/or faith/discipleship (e.g., crowd motif in relation to woman; exhortation to Jairus in 8:50; addition of three disciples in 8:51; miracle proofs and amazement), and clarity (notation about mourners - ‘they knew she had died’ in Luke 8:53). Alternatively while occasionally enhancing conciseness (e.g., Luke 8:44), he generally expands Matthew (287 words in place 138). While some expansions are rhetorically plausible (as above), others are less so (e.g., the woman’s bleeding in Luke 8:43) resulting in an overall tendency to compromise conciseness. The 2GH Luke also omits elements cause (reasons for the requests of the woman and Jairus) and compromises clarity/credibility when reversing Matthew’s report into a secrecy command (Luke 8:56) (also relates to validation). When considered in isolation the evidence appears relatively balanced. Many of the 2GH Lukan changes, however, are equally well explained as details taken over from Mark once Markan priority is assumed. This is true for all of the 2GH Lukan rhetorical enhancements with the sole exception of providing a reason for the
mourner’s laughter (see table 6.9). It likewise explains most of the verbal overlap (MAs are the exceptions though these are equally plausibly explained by the FH) as well as Luke’s violations of conciseness and credibility noted above. Markan priority more plausibly sees Matthew enhancing conciseness and credibility with Luke simply takes over what is in Mark. Furthermore, inconsistent levels of verbatim agreement between Matthew and Luke (e.g., in Luke 8:43 and 44) lack rhetorical explanation are more readily explained by Lukan dependence on Mark (whose wording typically explains Luke’s divergence from Matthew). The omission of reasons for the requests (ruler and woman in Matt 9:18 and 21) cannot be explained with reference to Mark and is equally problematic for all hypotheses (though perhaps slightly more troublesome for the FH in light of Luke omitting it from both sources). Other changes are stylistic and unproblematic for any hypothesis. In weighing this evidence I conclude that Markan priority more plausibly explains Luke’s relationship to (and especially divergence from) Matthew.

The data in table 6.9 indicates limited evidence favoring 2GH Markan conflation of Matthew and Luke: the more elaborate description of the woman’s suffering (Mark 5:25-26) heightens drama and relates to the element of person and perhaps validation (Jesus’ healing power emphasized); Mark 5:28 relates to cause (why the woman asked) and is slightly more concise than its only parallel in Matthew; and Mark 5:33 is more concise than its only parallel (Luke 8:47). These are slim pickings, however, compared to the longer and more impressive list of evidence against Markan priority from which the following may be highlighted: a general tendency to expand (violates conciseness) but often through redundancies and without obvious rhetorical enhancement; frequent micro-conflation within individual verses but without obvious rhetorical enhancement; addition of ‘be healed from your affliction’ (Mark 5:34) involves micro-conflation that results in loss of clarity (healing has already occurred) relative to his sources;

436E.g. Luke’s use of ἀνοίγατο for Jairus in 8:41. On one occasion at least Luke adds clarity (explaining that the mourners knew the girl to be dead in 8:53) that is missing from both Matthew and Luke. This is not a problem for any hypothesis.
change of imperative (in Luke) to question in Mark 5:35 reduces clarity; addition of Aramaic phrase in Mark 5:41 is more problematic for Markan priority than posteriority; and the order changes in Mark 5:42-43 compromise clarity relative to Luke.

The 2DH Matthew is again more concise (138 words in place of 374) and tends toward stylistic improvement (e.g., subordination replacing parataxis). Frequently the conciseness occurs without loss of clarity, credibility, narrative elements or miracle motifs. The primary exception is the frequent omission of details related to person. He also omits miracle proofs and Mark’s statement of amazement (Mark 5:42-43), both relating to validation. His change from ‘crowd’ to ‘disciples’ in Matt 9:19 possibly compromises clarity (he later omits the disciples) but his change to the statement about the woman’s healing (Matt 9:22; Mark 5:34) eliminates a Markan contradiction/tension and his reversal of the Markan secrecy command likewise enhances clarity, credibility and validation. The 2DH Luke also enhances brevity (287 words in place of 374) but to a lesser extent than Matthew. He especially retains Markan details of person and has only a few potential changes related to cause (omits Mark 5:28 and part of 5:23) and clarity (parents enter house after mourners). In addition to greater conciseness (generally without compromise in relation to narrative rhetoric) several changes enhance clarity and validation: e.g., adding the phrase ‘because they knew she was dead’ in 8:53; moving the feeding command to earlier; and omission of the Markan statement about healing in 5:34 (see complete list in table 6.9).

While these observations suggest greater plausibility for the 2DH than the 2GH, many of the arguments are equally favorable to the FH in that they arise from the common assumption of Markan priority. What differentiates the FH from the 2DH is the claim that Luke utilizes Matthew alongside Mark. While the MAs provide the primary positive evidence in this regard, many of these deemed to be equally plausible as arising independent redaction of Mark by Matthew and Luke. The eight word MA in Luke 8:44a was least amenable to this explanation. Against the FH is the fact that Luke possibly seeks to avoid the problems of the Markan secrecy
command by having the mourners present for the raising but then omits the clearer and more credible Matthean solution (omits/reverses the secrecy command) to the problem. In essence the evidence is not strong in either direction and, therefore, while Markan priority is more plausible than Markan posteriority, neither the 2DH nor FH is obviously more plausible than the other.

When it comes to the pericope of Centurion’s servant our analysis differed in that there is no longer a Markan parallel whereby Matthew and Luke were compared with each other and with the reconstructed Q text of the IQP. Much of the evidence for the 2GH and FH (either for or against Luke’s purported use of Matthew) is of ‘uncertain’ value since it essentially looks the same for all three hypotheses (e.g., the problem of Luke’s added embassy) (see list in table 6.9). At the same time Luke’s omission of Matt 8:11-12 and his transformation of the opening transitional statement (Luke 7:1a) are perhaps more plausibly explained by the Q hypothesis (2DH). Similarly Luke’s omission of ‘as you have believed’ and ‘from that hour’ are slightly problematic for the 2GH and FH. While violating conciseness, Luke’s general tendency to expand Matthew is somewhat in keeping with the FH Luke (who typically prefers Mark’s longer version) but much more so the 2GH Luke who regularly expands Matthews (as in previous two pericopes).

The ‘uncertain evidence’ is much less for the 2DH Matthew consisting essentially of two understandable narrative rhetorical enhancements of Q (both in v. 13). This offers no advantage over the 2GH and FH hypotheses insofar as it is equally plausible that the same elements were either present in or rhetorically added to Matthew’s (non Q) source. Indeed there is no clear evidence in favor of Matthew’s use of Q that cannot be equally plausibly explained from the standpoint of the 2GH or FH. Alternatively there is considerable evidence against Matthew’s use of Q which may be summarized as follows (see list in table 6.9): a general tendency to expand (violates conciseness and goes against the 2DH Matthean tendency elsewhere); expanded description of illness (inconsistent with 2DH tendency in previous two pericopes); high verbal overlap with centurion’s speech (inconsistent with 2DH Matthean tendency elsewhere); and an
awkward insertion of the speech in Matt 8:11-12 (does not seem to fit the context). The 2DH Luke expands upon Q to an even greater degree (86% longer) of which most understandable is the added conclusion (Luke 7:10) appropriately providing something missing in Q. While explicable as rhetorical enhancement of Matthew (assuming either the 2GH or FH), Luke would then be omitting two rhetorically pleasing Matthean phrases (‘as you believed’; ‘from that hour’) in relation to faith and validation. While other additions (e.g., the embassies) enhance person (especially the centurion), they compromise conciseness and clarity in a manner inconsistent with 2DH Lukan procedure noted above (see also table 5.3). While the problem is shared with the 2GH and FH, it is most plausibly explained by the former in that the 2GH Luke regularly expands Matthew in a similar manner. Hence, while the 2GH Luke violates rhetorical conventions of his day, his implied procedure in this pericope is at least consistent with his implied procedure elsewhere (e.g., with previous two pericopes).

Finally we come to the FH Luke who retains all the problems associated with expansion (of Matthew) in a manner that is inconsistent with his procedure elsewhere in relation to Mark (as with the 2DH Luke). While it has been suggested that there is no clear evidence of Matthean redactional phrases appearing in Luke, a couple of phrases from Matt 8:13 (‘as you believed;’ ‘from that hour’) are surprisingly omitted from Luke 7:10. In essence the evidence is slim in either direction with respect to the FH and 2DH.

In essence our analysis of this pericope indicates an idiosyncratic procedure for both the 2DH and FH Luke in relation to their source (Q for the 2DH and Matthew for the FH). The same is true for the 2DH Matthew in relation to Q, a problem escaped by the FH since Matthew’s source at this point is not available for comparison. The 2GH Lukan transformation of Matthew is more in keeping with his procedure elsewhere but, as noted above (in relation to his adaptation of the previous two pericopes under consideration), this procedure is idiosyncratic and problematic in relation to the rhetorical conventions of his day. To this extent these observations are insufficient to overturn the judgments made at the conclusion of chapter 5 and above in relation to the two
previous pericopes analyzed. It thus remains the case that the Markan priority hypotheses are the more plausible in relation to the overall evidence presented in this chapter. Judging between the 2DH\textsuperscript{437} and FH is more difficult with neither having a clear advantage in relation to the three pericopes considered in this chapter.

\textsuperscript{437} Obviously the 2DH can gain some further traction by expanding/changing the nature of Q so as to eliminate some of the difficulties encountered in relation to this pericope. The merits or otherwise of doing this so as to bolster support for the 2DH is not considered here.
Table 6.1: The Gadarene/Gerasene Demoniac(s) (Parallel Text)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28 Καὶ ἐλθόντος αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸ πέραν εἰς τὴν χώραν τῶν Γαδαρηνῶν ὑπήντησαν αὐτῷ δύο δαιμονιζόμενοι ἐκ τῶν μυθείων ἐξερχόμενοι, χάλεποι λίθος, ὡστε μὴ ἵσχυει τινὰ παρελθεῖν διὰ τῆς ὄδου ἐκείνης.</td>
<td>1 Καὶ ἠλθὼν εἰς τὸ πέραν τῆς βαλάσσας εἰς τὴν χώραν τῶν Γερασήνων.</td>
<td>26 Καὶ κατέπλευσαν εἰς τὴν χώραν τῶν Γερασήνων, ἦτις ἦσσειν αὐτῷ ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Καὶ ἐξελθόντος αὐτοῦ ἐκ τοῦ πλοίου εὐθὺς ὑπήντησαν αὐτῷ ἐκ τῶν μυθείων ἀνθρώπος ἐν πνεύματι ἀκαθάρτῳ,</td>
<td>2 καὶ οὗτοι ὢν ἐκ τοῦ πλοίου εὐθὺς ὑπήντησαν αὐτῷ ἐκ τῶν μυθείων, ἀνθρώπος ἐν πνεύματι ἀκαθάρτῳ.</td>
<td>27 ἐξελθόντι δὲ αὐτῷ ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν ὑπήντησαν ὅπερ τις ἐκ τῆς πόλεως ἔχων δαιμόνια.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 ὡς τὴν κατοίκησιν ἔχειν ἐν τοῖς μυθείσιν, καὶ οúde ἀλλοῦ ὅπου οὐδεὶς ἐδύνατο αὐτὸν δῆσαι 4 διὰ τοῦ αὐτοῦ πολλάκις πέδας καὶ ἀλλοῦς διέσεθαι καὶ διεσπάσθαι ὑπὸ αὐτοῦ τὰς ἀλύσεις καὶ τὰς πέδας συντρίβθαι, καὶ οὐδές ὅρμιον αὐτὸν δαμάσαι 5 καὶ διὰ πάντος νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέραν ἐν τοῖς μυθείσιν καὶ ἐν τοῖς ὀρεσιν ἦν κρόζων καὶ κατακόπτων ἐαυτὸν λίθος.</td>
<td></td>
<td>καὶ χρόνῳ ἰκανῷ οὐκ ἔνεδυσα τις ἰμάτιον καὶ ἐν οἰκίᾳ οὐκ ἤμεν ἀλλὰ ἐν τοῖς μυθείσιν.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 καὶ ιδὼν τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἀπὸ μακρὸθεν ἔδραμεν καὶ προσεκύνησαν αὐτῷ 7 καὶ κράζεις φωνῇ μεγάλῃ λέγεις: τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοί, ἦς οὗ τῷ θεῷ τοῦ ψιτείτω, ὅρκιζω σὲ τὸν θεόν, μὴ με βασανίσῃ.</td>
<td>6 καὶ ἴδοιν τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἀνακράζας προσέπεσεν αὐτῷ καὶ φωνῇ μεγάλῃ ἔπειν· τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοί, ἦς οὗ τῷ θεῷ τοῦ ψιτείτω; δομαί σου, μὴ με βασανίσῃ.</td>
<td>28 ἴδοιν δὲ τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἀνακράζας προσέπεσεν αὐτῷ καὶ φωνῇ μεγάλῃ ἔπειν· τί ἐμοί καὶ σοί, ἦς οὗ τῷ θεῷ τοῦ ψιτείτω; δομαί σου, μὴ με βασανίσῃ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 καὶ ἴδοιν ἐκράζεσθε λέγουτε: τί ἠμίν καὶ σοί, ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ; ἠλθεῖς ὡδε πρὸ καιροῦ βασανίσαι ημᾶς;</td>
<td>29 καὶ ἴδοιν ἐκράζεσθε λέγουτε: τί ἠμίν καὶ σοί, ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ;</td>
<td>29 παρήγγειλεν γαρ τῷ πνεύματι τῷ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Matt 9:1 functions as something of hinge verse (without which the word count is 135x) that is paralleled in Mark 5:21 and Luke 8:40. The text of these latter two verses is included in this table but not in the word counts for Mark and Luke (as per table 5.3). The difference in relative word counts is negligible in that both Mark and Luke remain significantly longer than Matthew.
30 ἡν δὲ μακρὰν ἀπ’ αὐτῶν ἀγέλη χοίρων πολλῶν βοσκομένη.
31 οἱ δὲ δαίμονες παρεκάλουν αὐτῶν λέγοντες·
εἰ ἐκβάλλεις ἡμᾶς,
ἀποστείλου ἡμᾶς εἰς τὴν ἀγέλην τῶν χοίρων.
32 καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· ὑπάγετε. οἱ δὲ εξελθόντες
ἀπῆλθον εἰς τοὺς χοίρους:
καὶ ἰδοὺ ὠρμησαν πᾶσα ἡ ἀγέλη κατὰ τοῦ κρημνοῦ εἰς τὴν θαλάσσαν καὶ ἀπέθανον ἐν τοῖς ύδασιν.
33 οἱ δὲ βόσκοντες ἔφυγον, καὶ ἀπελθόντες
8 ἔλεγεν γὰρ αὐτῶν· ἔξελθε τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἀκάθαρτον ἐκ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.
9 καὶ ἐπηρώτα αὐτῶν:
τί ὀνομά σοι;
καὶ λέγει αὐτῶι:
λεγίων ὀνομά μοι, ὦτι πολλοὶ ἔσμεν.
10 καὶ παρεκάλει αὐτῶν πολλὰ ἵνα μὴ αὐτὰ ἀποστείλῃ ἡμῖν τῆς χώρας.
11 ἡν δὲ ἐκεῖ πρὸς τῷ ὁρεῖ ἀγέλη χοίρων μεγάλη βοσκομένη·
12 καὶ παρεκάλεσαν αὐτῶν λέγοντες·
πέμψον ἡμᾶς εἰς τοὺς χοίρους,
ἵνα εἰς αὐτοὺς εἰσέλθωμεν.
13 καὶ ἐπέτρεψεν αὐτοῖς,
καὶ ἐξελθόντα τὰ πνεῦμα τὰ τὸ ἀκάθαρτα
eἰσήλθον εἰς τοὺς χοίρους,
καὶ ὠρμησαν ἡ ἀγέλη κατὰ τοῦ κρημνοῦ εἰς τὴν θαλάσσαν,
ὡς δισχίλιοι,
καὶ ἐπνίγοντο ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ.
14 Καὶ οἱ βόσκοντες αὐτοῖς
ακαθάρτω εξελθέναι ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.
πολλοὶς γὰρ χρόνοις συνηρτάκει αὐτὸν καὶ ἐδεσμεύτω ἀλλάσασιν καὶ πέδαις φυλασσόμενος καὶ διαρρήσασιν τὰ δεμα ἡλαυντὸ ὑπὸ τοῦ δαιμονίου εἰς τὰς ἐρήμους.
30 ἐπηρώτησαν δὲ αὐτὸν ὁ Ἰησοῦς·
tί σοι ὀνομά ἔστιν;
ο δὲ εἶπεν·
λεγίων, ὦτι εἰσήλθεν δαιμόνια πολλὰ εἰς αὐτὸν.
31 καὶ παρεκάλουν αὐτὸν ἵνα μὴ ἐπιτάξῃ αὐτοῖς εἰς τὴν ἀβύσσον ἀπελθεῖν.
32 ἡν δὲ ἐκεῖ ἀγέλη χοίρων ἰκανῶν βοσκομένη ἐν τῷ ὁρεῖ·
cαὶ παρεκάλεσαν αὐτὸν
34 ἐξελθόντα δὲ τὰ δαιμόνια
ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου εἰσήλθον εἰς τοὺς χοίρους,
cαὶ ὠρμησαν ἡ ἀγέλη κατὰ τοῦ κρημνοῦ εἰς τὴν λίμνην
καὶ ἀπεπνίγη.
34 ἐξελθόντα δὲ οἱ βόσκοντες τὸ γεγονὸς ἔφυγον καὶ ἀπήγγειλαν.
Table 6.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>εἰς τὴν πόλιν ἀπῆγγειλαν ἄφθονον καὶ ἀπῆγγειλαν εἰς τὴν πόλιν καὶ εἰς τοὺς ἁγροὺς.</td>
<td>εἰς τὴν πόλιν καὶ εἰς τοὺς ἁγροὺς.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καὶ ἤλθον ἰδεῖν τι ἑστίν τὸ γεγονός καὶ ἠρευναται πρὸς τὸν Ἰησοῦν καὶ θεωροῦν τὸν δαιμονιζομένον καθημένον ἰματισμένον καὶ σωφρονύντα, τὸν ἀποχήκοτα τὸν λεγόμενα, καὶ ἔφοβηθήσαν.</td>
<td>καὶ εἶδαν τὸν τραχεύμενον τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἀφ' ὧν τὰ δαιμόνια ἐξῆλθεν ἰματισμένον καὶ σωφρονύντα παρὰ τοὺς πόδας τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, καὶ ἔφοβηθήσαν.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καὶ ἔδαφος τοῦ ἰδούτην ἐλθεῖν καὶ ἔπεσε σε.</td>
<td>τὸ ναὸς τὸν τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, καὶ ἔφοβηθήσαν.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 Εἴς τὴν πόλιν καὶ ἔπεσε σε.</td>
<td>36 ἀπῆγγειλαν δὲ αὐτοῖς οἱ ἰδόντες πῶς ἔσωθεν ὁ δαιμονισθεὶς.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

καὶ ἱδόντες αὐτὸν παρεκάλεσαν ὅπως μεταβῇ ἀπὸ τῶν ὀρίων αὐτῶν. | καὶ ἠρώτησαν αὐτὸν ἀπὸ τὸν πλῆθος τῆς περιχώρου τῶν Γερασείων ἀπελθεῖν ἄπταντώ. | καὶ ἠρώτησαν αὐτὸν ἀπὸ τὸν πλῆθος τῆς περιχώρου τῶν Γερασείων ἀπελθεῖν ἄπταντώ. |

[9:1 Καὶ ἐμβάσας εἰς πλοῖον διεπέρασεν καὶ ἠλθεν εἰς τὴν ἱδίαν πόλιν. | 15 καὶ ἐρχοῦτα πρὸς τὸν Ἰησοῦν καὶ θεωροῦν τὸν δαιμονιζομένον καθιμένον ἰματισμένον καὶ σωφρονύντα, τὸν ἀποχήκοτα τὸν λεγόμενα, καὶ ἔφοβηθήσαν. | 17 καὶ ἠρέματο παρακαλεῖν αὐτὸν ἀπελθεῖν ἀπὸ τῶν ὀρίων αὐτῶν. | 18 Καὶ ἔμβαινοντος αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸ πλοῖον παρεκάλει αὐτὸν ὁ δαιμονισθεῖς ἵνα μετ αὐτοῦ ἦ. |
| καὶ οὐκ ἄφηκεν αὐτὸν, ἀλλὰ λέγει αὐτῷ· ὑπαγε ἐἰς τὸν ὅδον σου πρὸς τοὺς σους καὶ ἀπάγηγειν αὐτοῖς ὅσα οἱ κύριοι σοι πεποίηκαν καὶ ἠλήσαν σε. | 19 καὶ οὐκ ἄφηκεν αὐτὸν, ἀλλὰ λέγει αὐτῷ· ποῦ ἐρχαίτεν τῶν ὄχλων πολὺς ἐπ αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἔπαιρσεν τὸν αὐτὸν. |
| καὶ ἠτέλθεν καὶ ἠλθεν ἐπὶ τὴν πόλιν κηρύσσασαν ὅσα ἐποίησαν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς. | καὶ ἀπήλθεν καὶ ἠλθεν ἐπὶ τὴν πόλιν κηρύσσασαν ὅσα ἐποίησαν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς. | καὶ ἠτέλθεν καὶ ἠλθεν ἐπὶ τὴν πόλιν κηρύσσασαν ὅσα ἐποίησαν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς. |

[40 Ἐν δὲ τῷ ὑπόστρεφειν τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἀπεδέξατο αὐτὸν ὁ χῶλος· ἦσαν γὰρ πάντες προσδοκῶντες αὐτὸν]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Table 6.1</strong></th>
<th><strong>English Translation (NRSV)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:28 When he came to the other side, to the country of the Gadarenes, two demoniacs coming out of the tombs met him. They were so fierce that no one could pass that way.</td>
<td>5:1 They came to the other side of the sea, to the country of the Gerasenes. 2 And when he had stepped out of the boat, immediately a man out of the tombs with an unclean spirit met him. 3 He lived among the tombs; and no one could restrain him any more, even with a chain; 4 for he had often been restrained with shackles and chains, but the chains he wrenched apart, and the shackles he broke in pieces; and no one had the strength to subdue him. 5 Night and day among the tombs and on the mountains he was always howling and bruising himself with stones. 6 When he saw Jesus from a distance, he ran and bowed down before him; 7 and he shouted at the top of his voice, “What have you to do with me, Jesus, Son of the Most High God? I adjure you by God, do not torment me.” For he had said to him, “Come out of the man, you unclean spirit!”” 9 Then Jesus asked him, “What is your name?” He replied, “My name is Legion; for we are many.” 10 He begged him earnestly not to send them out of the country. 11 Now there on the hillside a great herd of swine was feeding; 28 When he saw Jesus, he fell down before him and shouted at the top of his voice, “What have you to do with me, Jesus, Son of the Most High God? I beg you, do not torment me” 29 for Jesus had commanded the unclean spirit to come out of the man. (For many times it had seized him; he was kept under guard and bound with chains and shackles, but he would break the bonds and be driven by the demon into the wilds.) 30 Jesus then asked him, “What is your name?” He said, “Legion”; for many demons had entered him. 31 They begged him not to order them to go back into the abyss. 32 Now there on the hillside a large herd of swine was feeding; and the demons begged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Suddenly they shouted, “What have you to do with us, Son of God? Have you come here to torment us before the time?”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Now a large herd of swine was feeding at some distance from them.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
31 The demons begged him, “If you cast us out, send us into the herd of swine.” 32 And he said to them, “Go!” So they came out and entered the swine; and suddenly, the whole herd rushed down the steep bank into the sea and perished in the water.
33 The swineherds ran off, and on going into the town, they told the whole story about what had happened to the demoniacs.
34 Then the whole town came out to meet Jesus;

and when they saw him, they begged him to leave their neighborhood.

9:1 And after getting into a boat he crossed the sea and came to his own town.

12 and the unclean spirits begged him, “Send us into the swine; let us enter them.”
13 So he gave them permission. And the unclean spirits came out and entered the swine; and the herd, numbering about two thousand, rushed down the steep bank into the sea, and were drowned in the sea.
14 The swineherds ran off and told it in the city and in the country. Then people came to see what it was that had happened.
15 They came to Jesus and saw the demoniac sitting there, clothed and in his right mind, the very man who had had the legion; and they were afraid.
16 Those who had seen what had happened to the demoniac and to the swine reported it.

17 Then they began to beg Jesus to leave their neighborhood.
18 As he was getting into the boat, the man who had been possessed by demons begged him that he might be with him.
19 But Jesus refused, and said to him, “Go home to your friends, and tell them how much the Lord has done for you, and what mercy he has shown you.”
20 And he went away and began to proclaim in the Decapolis how much Jesus had done for him; and everyone was amazed.

Jesus to let them enter these. So he gave them permission.
33 Then the demons came out of the man and entered the swine, and the herd rushed down the steep bank into the lake and was drowned.

34 When the swineherds saw what had happened, they ran off and told it in the city and in the country.
35 Then people came out to see what had happened, and when they came to Jesus, they found the man from whom the demons had gone sitting at the feet of Jesus, clothed and in his right mind. And they were afraid.
36 Those who had seen it told them how the one who had been possessed by demons had been healed.
37 Then all the people of the surrounding country of the Gerasenes asked Jesus to leave them; for they were seized with great fear. So he got into the boat and returned.
38 The man from whom the demons had gone begged that he might be with him; but Jesus sent him away, saying,
39 “Return to your home, and declare how much God has done for you.” So he went away, proclaiming throughout the city how much Jesus had done for him.
40 Now when Jesus returned, the crowd welcomed him, for they were all waiting for him.
Table 6.2: Gadarene Demoniac(s) Word Counts (1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Luke 8:26</td>
<td>5 words shared (1x different form; same order)</td>
<td>6 words shared (same forms; same order)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt 8:28a</td>
<td>42% of Luke (12 words)</td>
<td>50% of Luke and Mark (12 words each)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark 5:1</td>
<td>45% of Matthew (11 words)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Luke is 10% longer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 8:27</td>
<td>1 word shared (different form)</td>
<td>7 words shared (2x different forms; same order)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt 8:28b</td>
<td>3% of Luke (29 words)</td>
<td>24% of Luke (29 words)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark 5:2-3a</td>
<td>5% of Matthew (19 words)</td>
<td>30% of Mark (23 words)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Luke is 52% longer</td>
<td>Luke is 26% longer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 8:28</td>
<td>10 words are shared (4x different forms; 1x order change)</td>
<td>21 words shared (1x different form; same order)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt 8:29</td>
<td>38% of Luke (26 words)</td>
<td>80% of Luke (26 words)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark 5:6-7</td>
<td>58% of Matthew (17 words)</td>
<td>65% of Mark (32 words)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Luke is 53% longer</td>
<td>Luke is 18% shorter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 8:29</td>
<td>Luke adds 32 words to Matthew</td>
<td>11 words shared (5x different forms; 2x order changes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark 5:3b-5, 8</td>
<td></td>
<td>34% of Luke (32 words)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18% of Mark (61 words)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Luke is 47% shorter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 8:30</td>
<td>Luke adds 19 words to Matthew</td>
<td>8 words shared (3x different forms; 1x order change)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark 5:9</td>
<td></td>
<td>42% of Luke (19 words)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>53% of Mark (15 words)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Luke is 26% longer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 8:31</td>
<td>Luke adds 11 words to Matthew</td>
<td>6 words shared (2x different forms; same order)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark 5:10</td>
<td></td>
<td>54% of Luke and Mark (11 words each)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 8:32</td>
<td>8 words shared (same forms; 1x order change)</td>
<td>16 words shared (1x different form; 1x order change)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt 8:30-32a</td>
<td>36% of Luke (22 words)</td>
<td>72% of Luke (22 words)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(up to ὑπάγετε)</td>
<td>28% of Matt (29 words)</td>
<td>61% of Mark (26 words)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark 5:11-13a</td>
<td>Luke is 25% shorter</td>
<td>Luke is 15% shorter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 8:33</td>
<td>14 words shared (1x different form; same order)</td>
<td>15 words shared (same forms and order)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt 8:32b</td>
<td>60% of Luke (23x words);</td>
<td>65% of Luke (23 words)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark 5:13b</td>
<td>58% of Matthew (24x words)</td>
<td>55% of Mark (27 words)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(from the 2nd</td>
<td></td>
<td>Luke is 14% shorter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καὶ)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 8:34</td>
<td>Matt 8:33</td>
<td>Mark 5:14a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 words shared (same forms; 1x order change)</td>
<td>12 words shared (same forms and order)</td>
<td>50% of Luke (16 words)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53% of Matthew (15 words)</td>
<td>75% of Luke (16 words)</td>
<td>Luke is 6% longer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke is 6% longer</td>
<td>85% of Mark (14 words)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 8:35</td>
<td>Matt 8:34a</td>
<td>Mark 5:14b-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 words shared (2x different forms; same order)</td>
<td>15 words shared (1x different form; same order)</td>
<td>6% of Luke (30 words)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20% of Matthew (10 words)</td>
<td>50% of Luke (30 words)</td>
<td>Luke is 200% longer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke is 200% longer</td>
<td>55% of Mark (27 words)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 8:36</td>
<td>Mark 5:16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke adds 9 words to Matthew</td>
<td>6 words shared (2x different forms; same order)</td>
<td>67% of Luke (9 words)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46% of Matthew (13 words)</td>
<td>Luke is 30% shorter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 8:37a</td>
<td>Matt 8:34b</td>
<td>Mark 5:17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 words shared (same form and order)</td>
<td>3 words shared (same form and order)</td>
<td>18% of Luke (17 words)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30% of Matthew (10 words)</td>
<td>17% of Luke (17 words)</td>
<td>Luke is 130% longer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke is 130% longer</td>
<td>33% of Mark (9 words)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 8:37b</td>
<td>Matt 9:1</td>
<td>Mark 5:18a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 words shared (same form and order)</td>
<td>4 words shared (2x different forms; 1x order change)</td>
<td>50% of Luke (6 words)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27% of Matthew (11 words)</td>
<td>67% of Luke and Mark (6 words each)</td>
<td>Luke is 45% longer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke adds 41 words to Matthew</td>
<td>19 words shared (5x different forms; 1x order change)</td>
<td>46% of Luke (41 words)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38% of Mark (50 words)</td>
<td>Luke is 18% shorter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6.3: Gadarene Demonic(s) Word Counts (2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Refs</th>
<th>Mark versus Matthew</th>
<th>Mark versus Luke</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mark 5:1 Matt 8:28a Luke 8:26</td>
<td>9 words shared (1x different form; same order) 75% of Mark (12 words) 81% of Matthew (11 words) Mark is 10% longer</td>
<td>6 words shared (same form and order) 50% of Mark and Luke (12 words each)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark 5:2 Matt 8:28b Luke 8:27a</td>
<td>5 words shared (1x different form; same order) 31% of Mark (16 words) 62% of Matthew (8 words) Mark is 100% longer</td>
<td>4 words shared (2x different forms; same order) 25% of Mark (16 words) 28% of Luke (14 words) Mark is 14% longer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark 5:3-5 Matt 8:28c Luke 8:27b, 29b</td>
<td>No shared vocabulary Mark (57 words) is 527% longer than Matthew (11 words)</td>
<td>6 words shared (same forms; 1x order change) 10% of Mark (57 words) 16% of Luke (37 words) Mark is 54% longer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark 5:6-7 Matt 8:29 Luke 8:28</td>
<td>12 words shared (5x different forms; 1x order change) 37% of Mark (32 words) 70% of Matthew (17 words) Mark is 88% longer</td>
<td>21 words shared (1x different form; same order) 66% of Mark (32 words) 80% of Luke (26 words) Mark is 23% longer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark 5:8-10 Luke 8:29-31 (discounting Luke 8:29b)</td>
<td>No parallel</td>
<td>22 words shared (10x different forms; 1x order change) 59% of Mark (37 words) 55% of Luke (40 words) Mark is 7% shorter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark 5:11-12 Matt 8:30-31 Luke 8:32a</td>
<td>12 shared words (3x different forms; same order) 52% of Mark (23 words) 48% of Matthew (25 words) Mark is 8% shorter</td>
<td>13 words shared (1x different form; 1x order change) 56% of Mark (23 words) 79% of Luke (19 words) Mark is 21% longer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark 5:13 Matt 8:32 Luke 8:32b-33</td>
<td>17 words shared (1x different form; same order) 56% of Mark (30 words) 60% of Matthew (28 words) Mark is 7% longer</td>
<td>18 words shared (same forms; same order) 60% of Mark (30 words) 95% of Luke (19 words) Mark is 58% longer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark 5:14 Matt 8:33-34a Luke 8:34</td>
<td>9 words shared (same forms; 1x order change) 42% of Mark (21 words) 60% of Matthew (15 words) Mark is 27% longer</td>
<td>15 words shared (same order and forms) 71% of Mark and Luke (each have 21 words)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark 5:15-17 Matt 8:34b Luke 8:35b-37a</td>
<td>8 words shared (3x different forms; same order) 19% of Mark (41 words) 57% of Matthew (14 words) Mark is 292% longer</td>
<td>21 words shared (3x different forms; same order) 51% of Mark (41 words) 41% of Luke (51 words) Mark is 20% shorter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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(Table 6.3 Continued)

| Mark 5:18-20 | 4 words shared (2x different forms; same order) | 23 words shared (6x different forms; 1x order change) |
| Matt 9:1 | 9% of Mark (56 words) | 41% of Mark (56 words) |
| Luke 8:37b-39 | 45% of Matthew (11 words) | 48% of Luke (47 words) |
| Mark is 510% longer | | Mark is 19% longer |

Table 6.4: Narrative Links between Jairus’ Daughter and the Hemorrhaging Woman

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Narrative Links</th>
<th>Matthew</th>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Luke</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Daughter</td>
<td>Woman</td>
<td>Daughter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Falling before Jesus</td>
<td>v. 18</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>v. 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Mention of ‘daughter’</td>
<td>v. 18</td>
<td>v. 22</td>
<td>vv. 23, 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Twelve years</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>v. 20</td>
<td>v. 42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Desperate circumstances</td>
<td>v. 18</td>
<td>v. 20</td>
<td>vv. 23, 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Fact and immediacy of healing</td>
<td>v. 25</td>
<td>v. 22</td>
<td>v. 42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Touching motif</td>
<td>v. 25</td>
<td>v. 20</td>
<td>v. 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. (Possible) impurity (blood flow; corpse)</td>
<td>v. 25</td>
<td>v. 20</td>
<td>v. 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Fear</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>v. 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Explicit connection of faith and salvation</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>v. 22</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Table 6.5: Jairus’ Daughter and the Hemorrhaging Woman (Parallel Text)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transitional Verse</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Ταύτα αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος αὐτοῖς,</td>
<td>21 Καὶ διαπεράσαντος τοῦ Ἰησοῦ [ἐν τῷ πλοῖῳ] πάλιν εἰς τὸ πέραν συνήχθη ὁ χλὸς πολὺς ἐπὶ αὐτὸν, καὶ ἢν παρὰ τὴν βάλασσαν.</td>
<td>40 Ἔν δὲ τῷ ὑποστρέφειν τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἀπεδέχατο αὐτὸν ὁ όχλος· ἦσαν γὰρ πάντες προσδόκαντες αὐτὸν.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jairus/ruler Makes Request of Jesus</strong></td>
<td><strong>Healing of Hemorrhaging Woman</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἰδοὺ ἄρχων εἰς ἐλθὼν προσεκύνει αὐτῷ</td>
<td>19 καὶ ἔγερθε σὺ ὁ Ἰησὸς ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ καὶ οἱ μαθηταί αὐτοῦ.</td>
<td>41 καὶ ἴδον ἠλθεῖν ἀνήρ ὁ ὄνομα Λάριος καὶ οὗτος ἄρχων τῆς συναγωγῆς ὠπῆρχεν, καὶ πεσὼν παρὰ τοὺς πόδας τοῦ Ἰησοῦ παρεκάλει αὐτὸν εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὸν ὄικον αὐτοῦ, 42 ὅτι θυγάτηρ μουγγενής ἦν αὐτῶς ἐς ἑτῶς δώδεκα καὶ αὐτὴ ἀπέθανεν.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λέγων ὅτι Ἡ θυγάτηρ μου ἄρτι ἐτελεύτησεν· άλλα ἔλθων ἐπίθες τὴν χείρα σου ἐπ' αὐτὴν, καὶ ζήσεται.</td>
<td>20 Καὶ ἑγὼ γυνὴ αἰμορροοῦσα δώδεκα ἐτῆς προσέβουσα ὅπισθεν ἦματο τοῦ κρασπέδου τοῦ ἴματίου αὐτοῦ.</td>
<td>24 καὶ ἀπῆλθεν μετ' αὐτοῦ καὶ ἦκολούθη αὐτῷ ὁ χλὸς πολὺς καὶ συνεθλίβον αὐτοῦ.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 21 Καὶ ἔρχεται εἰς τῶν ἄρχων ἀρξισυγαγώγων. ὄνοματι Λάριος, καὶ ἰδὼν αὐτὸν πίπτει πρὸς τὸν πόδαν αὐτοῦ | 22 Καὶ ἔρχεται εἰς τῶν ἄρχων ἀρχισυγαγώγων· ὄνοματι Λάριος, καὶ ἰδὼν αὐτὸν πίπτει πρὸς τὸν πόδαν αὐτοῦ | 25 Καὶ γυνὴ ὄσα ἐν ῥύσει ἁίματος δώδεκα ἐτῆς ἐπὶ πολλὰ παθοῦσα ὑπὸ πολλῶν ἰατρῶν καὶ διαπνήσασα τὰ πάρ αὐτῆς πάντα καὶ μηδὲν ὁφελήθεισα ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον εἰς τὸ χείραν ἔλθουσα, 27 ἀκούσας περὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, ἔλθουσα ἐν τῷ χλῳ ὅπισθεν ἦματο τοῦ ἴματίου αὐτοῦ. | 44 προσέβουσα ὅπισθεν ἦματο τοῦ κρασπέδου τοῦ ἴματίου αὐτοῦ | 487
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>21 ἔλεγεν γὰρ ἐν ἑαυτῇ· Ἡ ἁμαρτία τοῦ ἴματός αὐτοῦ σωθήσομαι.</th>
<th>28 ἔλεγεν γὰρ ὅτι ὃ ἂν ἄψωμαι καὶ τῶν ἴματίων αὐτοῦ σωθήσομαι.</th>
<th>καὶ παραχρῆμα ἔστη ἡ ρύσις τοῦ ἴματος αὐτῆς.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29 καὶ εὐθὺς ἔξηρανθη ἡ πηγή τοῦ ἴματος αὐτῆς καὶ ἐγνά τῷ σώματι ὅτι ἵσται ἀπὸ τῆς μάστιγος.</td>
<td>30 καὶ εὐθὺς ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐπίγνυσ ἐν ἑαυτῷ τὴν ἐξ αὐτῶν δυναμὶν ἐξελθόνας ἐπιστραφεῖς ἐν τῷ ὠραλῷ ἔλεγεν· Τίς μοι ἦσαν τῶν ἴματίων;</td>
<td>45 καὶ ἤπειρό ὁ Ἰησοῦς·</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 καὶ ἔλεγον αὐτῷ· ὁλοκληρώσετε τὸν ὠραλὸν συνελθόντα σε καὶ λέγεις· τίς μοι ἦσαν; 32 καὶ περιβλέπετο ὅτι ἐν τῷ τούτῳ ποιήσασαν.</td>
<td>33 ἐς ἔγνη φοβηθεῖσα καὶ τρέμουσα, εἴδοσα ὅ γέγονεν αὐτῇ, ἤλθεν καὶ προσέπεσεν αὐτῷ καὶ ἤπειρον αὐτῷ πᾶσαν τὴν ἀλήθειαν.</td>
<td>Τίς ὁ ἄψαμενος μου;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 ὁ δὲ ἦσαν ἠσπίστησαν καὶ ἠθέτησαν τίποτε σου εἰς αὐτόν λόγωσαν σε καὶ ἠθέτησαν τίποτε σου.</td>
<td>35 ἔτι αὐτοῦ λαλῶντος ἐρχομένου ἀπὸ τοῦ ἄρχισυναγώγου λέγοντες ὅτι ἡ θυγάτηρ σου ἀπεβηνεν· τί ἔτι σκύλλεις τοῦ διδάσκαλου;</td>
<td>ἀρνομένων δὲ πάντων ἤπειρον ὁ Πέτρος· ἐπιστάτα, οἱ ὁχλοὶ συνέχουσιν σε καὶ ἀποθελίουσιν.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 ὁ δὲ ἦσαν ἠσπίστησαν καὶ ἠθέτησαν τίποτε σου εἰς αὐτόν λόγωσαν σε καὶ ἠθέτησαν τίποτε σου.</td>
<td>37 ἔτι αὐτοῦ λαλῶντος ἐρχομένου ἀπὸ τοῦ ἄρχισυναγώγου λέγοντες ὅτι τέθηκεν ἡ θυγάτηρ σου· μηκέτι σκύλλεις τοῦ διδάσκαλου.</td>
<td>46 ὁ δὲ ἦσαν ἠσπίστησαν καὶ ἠθέτησαν τίποτε σου εἰς αὐτόν λόγωσαν σε καὶ ἠθέτησαν τίποτε σου.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Healing of Jairus’/Ruler’s Daughter

<p>| 35 ἔτι αὐτοῦ λαλῶντος ἐρχομένου ἀπὸ τοῦ ἄρχισυναγώγου λέγοντες ὅτι ἡ θυγάτηρ σου ἀπεβηνεν· τί ἔτι σκύλλεις τοῦ διδάσκαλου; | 36 ὁ δὲ ἦσας ἠσπίστησαν καὶ ἠθέτησαν τίποτε σου εἰς αὐτόν λόγωσαν σε καὶ ἠθέτησαν τίποτε σου. | 49 ἔτι αὐτοῦ λαλῶντος ἐρχομένου ἀπὸ τοῦ ἄρχισυναγώγου λέγοντες ὅτι τέθηκεν ἡ θυγάτηρ σου· μηκέτι σκύλλεις τοῦ διδάσκαλου. |
| 37 ὁ δὲ ἦσας ἠσπίστησαν καὶ ἠθέτησαν τίποτε σου εἰς αὐτόν λόγωσαν σε καὶ ἠθέτησαν τίποτε σου. | 48 ὁ δὲ ἦσας ἠσπίστησαν καὶ ἠθέτησαν τίποτε σου εἰς αὐτόν λόγωσαν σε καὶ ἠθέτησαν τίποτε σου. | 50 ὁ δὲ ἦσας ἠσπίστησαν καὶ ἠθέτησαν τίποτε σου εἰς αὐτόν λόγωσαν σε καὶ ἠθέτησαν τίποτε σου. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>English Translation (NRSV)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23 Καὶ ἐλθὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν τοῦ ἀρχόντος καὶ ἰδὼν τοὺς αὐλητὰς καὶ τὸν όχλον θορυβοῦμενον 24 ἔλεγεν· ἀναχωρεῖτε, οὐ γὰρ ἀπέθανεν τὸ κοράσιον ἀλλὰ καθεύδει.</td>
<td>While he was saying these things to them,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 ὅτε δὲ ἐξεβλήθη ὁ όχλος εἰσέλθων εκράτησεν τὴς χειρὸς αὐτῆς, καὶ ηγέρθη τὸ κοράσιον.</td>
<td>21 When Jesus had crossed again in the boat to the other side, a great crowd gathered around him; and he was by the sea.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ἡ φήμη αὐτῆς ἐις ὅλην τὴν γῆν ἐκείνην.</td>
<td>40 Now when Jesus returned, the crowd welcomed him, for they were all waiting for him.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 καὶ οὐκ ἀφῆκεν οὕδενα μετ' αὐτοῦ συνακολουθήσας εἰ μὴ τὸν Πέτρον καὶ Ἰάκωβον καὶ Ἰωάννην τὸν ἀδελφὸν Ἰακώβου.</td>
<td>38 καὶ ἐρχόμεται εἰς τὸν οἴκον τοῦ ἁρχισυγαγόγου, καὶ θεωρεῖ θορυβὸν καὶ κλαίοντας καὶ ἀλαλάζοντας πολλά, 39 καὶ εἰσελθὼν λέγει αὐτοῖς· τί θορυβεῖσθε καὶ κλαίετε; τὸ παιδίον οὐκ ἀπέθανεν ἀλλὰ καθεύδει.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 καὶ κατεγέλων αὐτοῦ, αὐτὸς δὲ ἐκβάλων πάντας παραλαμβάνει τὸν πατέρα τοῦ παιδίου καὶ τὴν μητέρα καὶ τοὺς μετ' αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰσπορεύεται ὅπου ἦν τὸ παιδίον.</td>
<td>41 καὶ κράτησας τῆς χειρὸς τοῦ παιδίου λέγει αὐτῇ· Ταλίθα κοῦμ, ὦ ἐστιν μεθηρησμένον· τὸ κοράσιον, σοὶ λέγω, ἐγείρε.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 καὶ ἐνθὺς ἀνέστη τὸ κοράσιον καὶ περιεπάτησε ἡ γὰρ ἐτῶν δώδεκα. καὶ ἐξέστησαν [ἐνθὺς] ἐκτάσεις μεγάλης. 43 καὶ διεστείλατο αὐτοῖς πολλὰ ὑπὸ μηδεις γνοὶ τούτο, καὶ εἶπεν δοθήναι αὐτῇ φαγεῖν.</td>
<td>44 καὶ ἐνθὺς ἀνέστησαν τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτῆς καὶ ἀνέστη παραχρήμα καὶ διεστείλατο αὐτῇ δοθῆναι φαγεῖν. 45 καὶ ἐξετησαν οἱ γυναῖκες αὐτῆς· ὦ δὲ παρῆγγειλεν αὐτοῖς μηδεὶς εἶπεν τὸ γεγονός.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 6.5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English Translation (NRSV)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Matthew 9:18-26</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitional Verse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jairus/ruler Makes Request of Jesus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>suddenly a leader of the synagogue came in and knelt before him, saying, “My daughter has just died; but come and lay your hand on her, and she will live.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Then one of the leaders of the synagogue named Jairus came and, when he saw him, fell at his feet 23 and begged him repeatedly, “My little daughter is at the point of death. Come and lay your hands on her, so that she may be made well, and live.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19 And Jesus got up and followed him, with his disciples. 20 Then suddenly a woman who had been suffering from hemorrhages for twelve years came up behind him and touched the fringe of his cloak, 21 for she said to herself, “If I only touch his cloak, I will be made well.”

24 So he went with him. And a large crowd followed him and pressed in on him. 25 Now there was a woman who had been suffering from hemorrhages for twelve years. 26 She had endured much under many physicians, and had spent all that she had; and she was no better, but rather grew worse. 27 She had heard about Jesus, and came up behind him in the crowd and touched his cloak, 28 for she said, “If I but touch his clothes, I will be made well.” 29 Immediately her hemorrhage stopped; and she felt in her body that she was healed of her disease. 30 Immediately aware that power had gone forth from him, Jesus turned about in the crowd and said, “Who touched my clothes?” 31 And his disciples said to him, “You see the crowd pressing in on you; how can you say, ‘Who touched me?’” 32 He looked all around to see who had done it. 33 As he went, the crowds pressed in on him. 43 Now there was a woman who had been suffering from hemorrhages for twelve years; and though she had spent all she had on physicians, no one could cure her. 44 She came up behind him and touched the fringe of his clothes, and immediately her hemorrhage stopped. 45 Then Jesus asked, “Who touched me?” When all denied it, Peter said, “Master, the crowds surround you and press in on you.” 46 But Jesus said, “Someone touched me; for I noticed that power had gone out from me.”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>22 Jesus turned, and seeing her he said, “Take heart, daughter; your faith has made you well.” And instantly the woman was made well.</th>
<th>33 But the woman, knowing what had happened to her, came in fear and trembling, fell down before him, and told him the whole truth.</th>
<th>47 When the woman saw that she could not remain hidden, she came trembling; and falling down before him, she declared in the presence of all the people why she had touched him, and how she had been immediately healed.</th>
<th>48 He said to her, “Daughter, your faith has made you well; go in peace.”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Healing of Jairus’/Ruler’s Daughter</strong></td>
<td>34 He said to her, “Daughter, your faith has made you well; go in peace, and be healed of your disease.”</td>
<td>49 While he was still speaking, someone came from the leader's house to say, “Your daughter is dead; do not trouble the teacher any longer.”</td>
<td>50 When Jesus heard this, he replied, “Do not fear. Only believe, and she will be saved.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 When Jesus came to the leader's house and saw the flute players and the crowd making a commotion,</td>
<td>47 When the woman saw that she could not remain hidden, she came trembling; and falling down before him, she declared in the presence of all the people why she had touched him, and how she had been immediately healed.</td>
<td>51 When he came to the house, he did not allow anyone to enter with him, except Peter, John, and James, and the child's father and mother.</td>
<td>52 They were all weeping and wailing for her; but he said, “Do not weep; for she is not dead but sleeping.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 he said, “Go away; for the girl is not dead but sleeping.” And they laughed at him. 25 But when the crowd had been put outside, he went in and took her by the hand, and the girl got up.</td>
<td>47 When the woman saw that she could not remain hidden, she came trembling; and falling down before him, she declared in the presence of all the people why she had touched him, and how she had been immediately healed.</td>
<td>53 And they laughed at him, knowing that she was dead.</td>
<td>54 But he took her by the hand and called out, “Child, get up!”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 While he was still speaking, some people came from the leader's house to say, “Your daughter is dead. Why trouble the teacher any further?”</td>
<td>48 He said to her, “Daughter, your faith has made you well; go in peace.”</td>
<td>55 Her spirit returned, and she got up at once. Then he directed them to give her something</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 And the report of this spread throughout that district.</td>
<td>At this they were overcome with amazement. 43 He strictly ordered them that no one should know this, and told them to give her something to eat.</td>
<td>56 Her parents were astounded; but he ordered them to tell no one what had happened.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table 6.6: Jairus’ Daughter Word Counts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transition</strong></td>
<td>No words shared</td>
<td>4 words shared (2x different forms; 1x order change)</td>
<td>No words shared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 8:40 (15x)</td>
<td>Luke is 375% longer</td>
<td>19% of Mark; 27% of Luke</td>
<td>Matthew is 80% shorter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt 9:18a (4x)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Luke is 28% shorter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark 5:21 (21x)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mark is 40% longer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Request</strong></td>
<td>4 words shared (same form and order)</td>
<td>9 words shared (3x different forms; same order)</td>
<td>11 words shared (4x different forms; 1x order change)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 8:41-42a (38x)</td>
<td>10% of Luke</td>
<td>23% of Luke</td>
<td>47% of Matthew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt 9:18b (23x)</td>
<td>17% of Matthew</td>
<td>34% of Mark</td>
<td>42% of Mark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark 5:22-23 (36x)</td>
<td>Luke is 65% longer</td>
<td>Luke is 5% longer</td>
<td>Matthew is 36% shorter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mark is 5% shorter</td>
<td>Mark is 56% longer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woman healed</td>
<td>19 words shared (2x different forms; 1x order change)</td>
<td>48 words shared (6x different forms; 2x order changes)</td>
<td>28 shared words (4x different forms; same order)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt 9:19-22 (58x)</td>
<td>33% of Matthew</td>
<td>29% of Mark</td>
<td>16% of Mark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark 5:24-34 (165x)</td>
<td>Luke is 100% longer</td>
<td>Luke is 27% shorter</td>
<td>Matthew is 129% shorter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woman healed</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mark is 38% longer</td>
<td>Mark is 184% longer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Girl raised</strong></td>
<td>17 words shared (2x different forms; same order)</td>
<td>60 words shared (12x different forms; 3x order changes)</td>
<td>19 words shared (5x different forms; 1x order change)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 8:49-56 (115x)</td>
<td>15% of Luke</td>
<td>52% of Luke</td>
<td>33% of Matthew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt 9:23-26 (57x)</td>
<td>30% of Matthew</td>
<td>39% of Mark</td>
<td>12% of Mark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark 5:35-43 (152x)</td>
<td>Luke is 100% longer</td>
<td>Luke is 24% shorter</td>
<td>Matthew is 62% shorter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew 8:5-13 (167x)</td>
<td>Q 7:1-10</td>
<td>Luke 7:1-10 (186x)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transition</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:28a Καὶ ἐγένετο ὅτε ἔτελεσεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τοὺς λόγους...</td>
<td>7:1 [καὶ ἐγένετο ὅτε] ἐπλήρωσεν τοὺς λόγους τοὺτος,</td>
<td>1 'Επειδή ἐπλήρωσεν πάντα τὰ ρήματα αὐτοῦ εἰς τὰς ἀκοὰς τοῦ λαοῦ.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:3 &lt;&gt; ἡλθὲν αὐτῷ ἐκατόνταρχος</td>
<td>7:3 &lt;&gt; ἡλθὲν αὐτῷ ἐκατόνταρχος[ὁς]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request of Centurion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Εἰσελθόντος δὲ αὐτοῦ εἰς Καφαρναοῦμ προσήλθεν αὐτῷ ἐκατόνταρχος</td>
<td>εἰσῆλθεν εἰς Καφαρναοῦμ.</td>
<td>εἰσῆλθεν εἰς Καφαρναοῦμ.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>παρακαλῶν αὐτὸν 6 καὶ λέγων: Κύριε, ο παῖς μου βεβληται ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ παραλυτικός, δεινῶς βασανιζόμενος.</td>
<td>παρακαλῶν αὐτὸν [καὶ λέγων'] ὁ παῖς [μου κακῶς ἔχει].</td>
<td>3 ἀκούσας δὲ περὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἀπέστειλεν πρὸς αὐτὸν πρεσβυτέρους τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἐρατῶν αὐτόν ὅπως ἐλθὼν διασώσῃ τὸν δούλον αὐτοῦ.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ: Ἔγώ ἐλθὼν θεραπεύσω αὐτόν.</td>
<td>καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ: ἔγὼ ἐλθὼν θεραπεύσω[ὁ] αὐτὸν;</td>
<td>4 οἱ δὲ παραγενόμενοι πρὸς τὸν Ἰησοῦν παρεκάλουν αὐτὸν ἀποδιδάσκωτας λέγοντες ὅτι ἀξίος ἦστιν ὁ παρέξε ποντο τούτο.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech of Centurion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ ἐκατόνταρχος ἔφη: Κύριε, οὐκ εἰμὶ ικανὸς ἵνα μου ὑπὸ τὴν στέγην εἰσέλθῃς,</td>
<td>7:6b-c καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ ἐκατόνταρχος ἔφη: Κύριε, οὐκ εἰμὶ ικανὸς ἵνα μου ὑπὸ τὴν στέγην εἰσέλθης,</td>
<td>ἣδη δὲ αὐτοῦ οὐ μακρὰν ἀπέχοντος ἀπὸ τῆς οἰκίας ἐπέμεινεν φίλους ὁ ἐκατόνταρχος λέγων αὐτῷ: Κύριε, μὴ σκυλλον, οὐ γὰρ ικανὸς εἰμὶ ἵνα ὑπὸ τὴν στέγην μου εἰσέλθης. 7 διὸ οὐδὲ ἐμαυτὸν ἥξισα σὺς σε ἐλθείν.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6.7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speech of Jesus</strong></td>
<td><strong>English Translation (NRSV)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 άκουσάς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐθαύμασεν καὶ εἶπεν τοῖς ἀκολουθούσιν:</td>
<td>8:5 When he entered Capernaum, a centurion came to him, appealing to him</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀμὴν λέγω ἦμιν, παρὸς ὄψεί τοσαυτὴν πίστιν ἐν τῷ Ἰσραήλ εὖρον.</td>
<td>3 There came to him a centurion exhorting these sayings, he entered Capernaum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 λέγω δὲ ἦμιν ὅτι πόλλοι ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν καὶ δυσμῶν ἔξωσαν καὶ ἀνακληθήσονται μετὰ Ἀβρααμ καὶ Ἰσαακ καὶ Ἰακωβ ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τῶν οὐρανῶν,</td>
<td>2 A centurion there had a slave whom he entered Capernaum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 οὐ δὲ υἱὸς τῆς βασιλείας ἐκβληθήσονται εἰς τὸ σκότος τὸ ἐξώστερον ἐκεῖ ἐσται ὁ κλαυθμὸς καὶ ὁ βρυγμὸς τῶν ὀδὸντων.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6 and saying, "Lord, my servant is lying at home paralyzed, in terrible distress."

7 And he said to him, "I will come and cure him."

8 The centurion answered, "Lord, I am not worthy to have you come under my roof; but only speak the word, and my servant will be healed.

9 For I also am a man under authority, with soldiers under me; and I say to one, 'Go,' and he goes, and to another, 'Come,' and he comes, and to my slave, "Do this,' and the slave does it."

10 When Jesus heard him, he was amazed and said to those who followed him, "Truly I tell you, in no one in Israel have I found such faith. 11 I tell you, many will come from east and west and will eat with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven, 12 while the heirs of the kingdom will be thrown into the outer darkness, where there will be weeping and gnashing of teeth."

13 And to the centurion Jesus said, "Go; let it be done for you according to your faith." And the servant was healed in that hour.
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| 6b-c And in reply the centurion said:     | valued highly, and who was ill and close to death. |
| Master, I am not worthy for you to come under my roof;  | 3 When he heard about Jesus, he sent some Jewish elders to him, asking him to come and heal his slave. |
| 7 But say a word, and [let] my boy [be] healed.  | 4 When they came to Jesus, they appealed to him earnestly, saying, "He is worthy of having you do this for him, 5 for he loves our people, and it is he who built our synagogue for us." |
| 8 For I also am a man under authority,  | 6 And Jesus went with them, but when he was not far from the house, the centurion sent friends to say to him, "Lord, do not trouble yourself, for I am not worthy to have you come under my roof; 7 therefore I did not presume to come to you. But only speak the word, and let my servant be healed. |
| with soldiers under me; and I say to one, 'Go,' and he goes, and to another, 'Come,' and he comes, and to my slave, "Do this,' and the slave does <it>.  | 8 For I also am a man set under authority, with soldiers under me; and I say to one, 'Go,' and he goes, and to another, 'Come,' and he comes, and to my slave, "Do this,' and the slave does it."
| 9 But Jesus, on hearing, was amazed, and said to those who followed: I tell you, not even in Israel have I found such faith.  | 9 When Jesus heard this he was amazed at him, and turning to the crowd that followed him, he said, "I tell you, not even in Israel have I found such faith."
| 10 When those who had been sent returned to the house, they found the slave in good health. |
## Table 6.8: Centurion’s Servant Word Counts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transition</strong></td>
<td>No words shared</td>
<td>5 words shared (same form and order)</td>
<td>1 word shared (same form)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt 7:28 (8x)</td>
<td></td>
<td>71% of Q</td>
<td>14% of Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 7:1a (7x)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Matthew is 20% longer</td>
<td>Luke is 57% longer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Centurion’s Request</strong></td>
<td>5 words shared (3x different forms; same order)</td>
<td>19 words shared (1x different form; same order)</td>
<td>6 words shared (2x different forms; 1x order change)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 7:1a-6a (67x)</td>
<td>7% of Luke</td>
<td>63% of Matthew</td>
<td>9% of Luke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt 8:5-7 (30x)</td>
<td>16% of Matthew</td>
<td>86% of Q</td>
<td>27% of Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 7:3 (22x)</td>
<td>Luke is 123% longer</td>
<td>Matthew is 36% longer</td>
<td>Luke 204% longer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Centurion’s Speech</strong></td>
<td>48 words are shared (2x different forms; 1x order change)</td>
<td>53 words shared (1x different form; same order)</td>
<td>48 shared words (same forms; same order)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 7:6b-8 (74x)</td>
<td>64% of Luke</td>
<td>98% of Matthew</td>
<td>64% of Luke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt 8:8-9 (54x)</td>
<td>88% of Matthew</td>
<td>100% of Q</td>
<td>90% of Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 7:6b-8 (53x)</td>
<td>Luke is 37% longer</td>
<td>Matthew is 1% longer</td>
<td>Luke is 39% longer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jesus’ speech</strong></td>
<td>17 words shared (2x different forms; 2x order changes)</td>
<td>17 words shared (same forms; 1x order change)</td>
<td>18 words shared (2x different forms; same order)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 7:9 (23x)</td>
<td>73% of Luke</td>
<td>27% of Matthew (85% of v. 10)</td>
<td>78% of Luke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt 8:10-12 (63x)</td>
<td>26% of Matthew (85% of v. 10)</td>
<td>94% of Q</td>
<td>100% of Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q 79 (18x)</td>
<td>Matthew is 173% longer</td>
<td>Matthew is 250% longer</td>
<td>Luke is 27% longer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conclusion</strong></td>
<td>1 word shared (καί)</td>
<td>Absent from Q</td>
<td>Absent from Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 7:10 (11x)</td>
<td>Matthew is 81% longer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt 8:13 (20x)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence in favor of Luke’s use of Matthew:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Generally enhances details of person (though with some redundancies);</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Adds ‘Legion’ (Luke 8:30): perhaps highlights Jesus’ power/authority (validation);</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Adds demonic desire to avoid abyss (Luke 8:31): cause of request; Jesus’ power (person);</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Change pigs’ location from ‘far off’ to ‘mountain’ (Luke 8:32): perhaps enhances clarity but less concise than Matthew (changes reflect Mark);</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Adds/expands townspeople’s reaction and miracle proofs (Luke 8:35-37): validation;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) Adds ‘fear’ as explicit cause of townspeople’s rejection of Jesus: narrative cause;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9) Change from θόλαςσαν to λίμνην (Luke 8:33): more technically accurate terminology;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence against Luke’s use of Matthew:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Expands Matthean narrative to double the length: violates conciseness;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Luke shorter than Mark: for 2GH both Luke and Mark violate brevity (versus assuming 2DH where both Matthew and Luke enhance brevity);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Alternates between compression and expansion (e.g. Luke 8:33-34): inconsistent approach without obvious rhetorical gains/explanation;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) High variation verbal agreement (between 3% and 60%): inconsistent approach without obvious rhetorical gains/explanation;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Expansions/changes are typically paralleled in Mark: equally explicable by Markan priority and favors latter when changes are not rhetorical enhancements;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Omits cause of confrontation in Matt 8:28 (demons block Jesus’ path): narrative cause and manner (more willing in Matthew);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) Jesus departs prior to address by healed demoniac (Luke 8:37b): violates clarity/credibility;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) Change from Gadara to Gerasa: compromises clarity/credibility (but textually uncertain).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Uncertain evidence:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Change from two demoniacs to one: no clear reason in either direction;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Enhances narrative drama (e.g. 8:28): less concise and reflects Mark but enhances person;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Possessed man approaches Jesus from ‘out of city’ rather than ‘out of tombs’: possibly compromises clarity owing to Lukan location of Gerasa but may refer to man’s origin;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) No changes to element of time.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence in favor of Markan conflation:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Added details perhaps enhance narrative vividness (e.g. εὐθὺς in 5:2);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Prefers Luke’s version for added details of person (e.g. description of the demoniac);</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Table 6.9: Summary of Adaptations in Miracle Narratives**

(A) Gadarene/Gerasene Demoniac (Mark 5:1-20; Matt 8:26-9:1; Luke 8:26-39)

**2GH: Luke’s Use of Matthew without Mark**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence in favor of Luke’s use of Matthew:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Generally enhances details of person (though with some redundancies);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Adds ‘Legion’ (Luke 8:30): perhaps highlights Jesus’ power/authority (validation);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Adds demonic desire to avoid abyss (Luke 8:31): cause of request; Jesus’ power (person);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Change pigs’ location from ‘far off’ to ‘mountain’ (Luke 8:32): perhaps enhances clarity but less concise than Matthew (changes reflect Mark);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Adds/expands townspeople’s reaction and miracle proofs (Luke 8:35-37): validation;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) Adds ‘fear’ as explicit cause of townspeople’s rejection of Jesus: narrative cause;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9) Change from θόλαςσαν to λίμνην (Luke 8:33): more technically accurate terminology;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence against Luke’s use of Matthew:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Expands Matthean narrative to double the length: violates conciseness;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Luke shorter than Mark: for 2GH both Luke and Mark violate brevity (versus assuming 2DH where both Matthew and Luke enhance brevity);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Alternates between compression and expansion (e.g. Luke 8:33-34): inconsistent approach without obvious rhetorical gains/explanation;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) High variation verbal agreement (between 3% and 60%): inconsistent approach without obvious rhetorical gains/explanation;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Expansions/changes are typically paralleled in Mark: equally explicable by Markan priority and favors latter when changes are not rhetorical enhancements;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Omits cause of confrontation in Matt 8:28 (demons block Jesus’ path): narrative cause and manner (more willing in Matthew);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) Jesus departs prior to address by healed demoniac (Luke 8:37b): violates clarity/credibility;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) Change from Gadara to Gerasa: compromises clarity/credibility (but textually uncertain).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Uncertain evidence:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Change from two demoniacs to one: no clear reason in either direction;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Enhances narrative drama (e.g. 8:28): less concise and reflects Mark but enhances person;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Possessed man approaches Jesus from ‘out of city’ rather than ‘out of tombs’: possibly compromises clarity owing to Lukan location of Gerasa but may refer to man’s origin;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) No changes to element of time.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2GH: Mark’s conflation of Matthew and Luke**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence in favor of Markan conflation:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Added details perhaps enhance narrative vividness (e.g. εὐθὺς in 5:2);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Prefers Luke’s version for added details of person (e.g. description of the demoniac);</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(3) Sometimes enhances brevity by more concise wording (Mark 5:8-10, 15-17) or avoiding redundancy (e.g. subject in Luke 8:37; par. Mark 5:17) but typically less concise;
(4) Retains Lukan miracle proofs (e.g. Mark 5:15-17): validation and in-breaking kingdom;
(6) Mark adds that ‘all were amazed’ (5:20): validation.

Evidence against Markan conflation:
(1) Prefers longer Lukan version and further expands it by 10%: violates conciseness;
(2) Typically expands individual verses (Mark 5:1, 2, 3-5, 6-7; note above exceptions) without obvious rhetorical enhancement (except sometimes person): violates conciseness;
(3) Frequent micro-conflation with stylistic difference but no obvious rhetorical enhancement (Mark 5:1, 2, 3-5, 6-7, 11-12, 13, 15-17): contrary to ‘one source at a time’ approach (e.g. in Mark 5:14);
(4) Micro-conflation creates redundancies (e.g. 5:12 ‘send us into the pigs that we might go into them’; see also 5:1, 15-17): violates conciseness without rhetorical enhancement;
(5) Closer to Matthew in Mark 5:1 (without obvious rhetorical enhancement) despite purportedly following Luke at this point;
(6) Agrees (against Matthew) with Lukan Gerasa (albeit textually uncertain): may compromise clarity and credibility;
(7) Mark 5:3-5 omits nakedness (contra Luke) despite later mention of clothing (Mark 5:15);
(8) Has demons ‘run from afar’ (contra sources) to meet Jesus (Mark 5:6): violates credibility and clarity (contradicts v. 2); obscures cause of confrontation;
(9) Change from προσεπέσεν (Luke 8:28) to προσεκόνησεν (Mark 5:6): may compromise clarity by implying reverence, especially when followed by change from Luke’s δέομαι to an ὑπόκειμαι formula (gives the opposite impression);
(10) Shift from singular and plural (5:8-10) more confusing than Luke: compromises clarity;
(11) Time reference to evening (for storm stilling in 4:35) compromises clarity in relation to time of arrival in 5:1 (day or night?);
(12) Omits ‘at Jesus’ feet’ (Mark 5:15; par. Luke 8:35): may relate to discipleship motif.

Uncertain evidence:
(1) Mark alone numbers pigs (Mark 5:13): enhances vividness or compromises clarity;
(2) Replace Lukan ‘out of the region’ with ‘into the abyss’ in Mark 5:10: can be plausibly explained in either direction;
(3) Preference for the Matthean θάλασσα versus (more accurate?) Lukan λίμνη (Mark 5:13): may relate to clarity or credibility;
(4) Healed man proclaims ‘in the Decapolis’ versus Lukan ‘in the whole city’ (Mark 5:19-20; par. Luke 8:39): enhances clarity in relation to awkwardness of ‘city’ but creates disjunction with Jesus’ command to ‘go to his house and family.’

2DH: Matthew’s use of Mark

Evidence in favor of Matthew’s use of Mark:
(1) Overall tendency to abbreviate (146 words in place 325): enhances conciseness;
(2) Change from Gerasa to Gadara (textual variant): possibly enhances clarity/credibility;
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(3) Description of demoniac (Matt 8:28b; Mark 5:2-6): compromises person but enhances conciseness and clarifies cause of encounter (demoniacs block path);
(4) Transfers ‘from afar’ to pigs (versus demoniacs) (Matt 8:30; par. Mark 5:6, 11): clarity;
(5) Various stylistic changes are either neutral or rhetorical enhancements: e.g. replacing parataxis with subordination; omits redundant words; more succinct forms; adding ἰδού;
(6) Heightens Jesus’ authority relative to subservience of demons (e.g. softer tone of demons and their fear of judgment; permission for demons to depart becomes command - “go!”) (Matt 8:29, 31, 32): enhances Jesus’ person;
(7) Omits ‘evening’ in Matt 8:23 (par. Mark 4:35): may enhance clarity in relation to time.

Evidence against Matthew’s use of Mark:

(1) Tends to omit details of person (e.g. description of demoniac in Mark 5:2-3);
(2) Omits concluding dialogue with healed man (Mark 5:18-20): validation and discipleship;
(3) Report of people from area (Matt 8:34; par. Mark 5:15-17): Matthew enhances conciseness but omits elements of person (description of healed man), cause (omits ‘fear’ as reason for expelling Jesus from their region), and validation (miracle proofs).

Uncertain evidence:

(1) Omits Jesus’ dialogue with demoniac (Mark 5:8-10): omits element of person but enhances conciseness and possibly enhances clarity (more simplified dialogue);
(2) Change from one to two demoniacs: puzzling in either direction;
(3) Omits mountain motif in Matt 8:30 (replaced with pigs ‘at a distance’): possibly lessens clarity since mountain motif recurs with pigs when they rush down the bank.

2DH: Luke’s use of Mark

Evidence in favor of Luke’s use of Mark:

(1) Tends toward conciseness (293 words replace 325 words) but less so than 2DH Matthew: details retained typically relate to person;
(2) Abbreviations: sometimes avoids redundancies and tends toward conciseness (e.g. description of demoniac in 8:27 and 29; par. Mark 5:3-5; 8:28, 29, 32, 33, 36, 38-39);
(3) Adds nakedness and changes ‘out of tombs’ to ‘out of city’ (Luke 8:27): enhances clarity as well as narrative anticipation and narrative flow/consistency;
(4) Adds “at the feet of Jesus” (8:35): discipleship motif and honor accorded Jesus;
(5) Omits ‘ran from a distance’ (Luke 8:28; par. Mark 5:6): enhances clarity (as above for 2DH Matthew) and cause of confrontation;
(6) Changes ὅρκιζω formula, replaces προσεκύνησεν with προσέπεσεν (Luke 8:28; par. Mark 5:6-7), and changes ἔλεγεν to παρῆγγειλεν (8:29): likely heightens reverence toward Jesus (person and validation);
(7) Changes θάλασσαν to λίμνη (Luke 8:33): more technically accurate (clarity?)

Evidence against Luke’s use of Mark:

(1) Some additions/changes redundant and less concise without obvious rhetorical enhancement (e.g. details in Luke 8:27; 8:30, 34, 37a);
(2) Jesus returns home prior to conversation with healed man (contra to Mark) (Luke 8:37b): compromises clarity and credibility;
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(3) Omits response of ‘amazement’ (Luke 8:19; par. Mark 5:20): contra Lukans validation motif although (Markan) report contrary to earlier claim that the people sent Jesus away.

**Uncertain evidence:**

1. Retains Mark’s Gerasa (unproblematic for 2DH Luke who is unaware of Matthew’s Gadara);
2. Transfers part of demoniac description (Mark 5:3-5) to later (Luke 8:29b): enhances conciseness and maybe clarity (provides reason for Jesus’ exorcistic command but seen by others to compromise clarity);
3. Stylistic changes neither enhancing nor compromising clarity or conciseness (8:26, 31);
4. Change to “out of the abyss” (8:31): plausibly explained by Lukans demonology but is not more obviously plausible than a change in the opposite direction (see above);
5. Repeats ‘fear’ motif of people from region (8:35, 37): possibly emphasizes motif but compromises conciseness (redundancy); the cause of the fear is unstated (like Mark).

**FH: Luke’s use of Matthew alongside Mark**

**Evidence in favor of Luke’s use of Matthew alongside Mark:** while the various MAs of omission and transformation suggest Luke’s use of Matthew alongside Mark, most (if not all) are equally plausibly explained as independent redaction (see below) thus resulting in no strong evidence for Luke’s knowledge of Matthew in this pericope.

**Evidence against Luke’s use of Matthew alongside Mark:**

1. Luke omits Matthean changes to Mark (on assumption of Markan priority) that would have been potential rhetorical enhancements: (a) choice of Gerasa location versus the more credible Matthean Gadara (clarity and credibility); (b) Matthean notation about demoniacs blocking Jesus’ path in Matt 8:28 (narrative element of cause).

**Uncertain evidence:**

1. Luke follows less concise Markan narrative although importance of the final conversation along with elements of person provide plausible reasons for his doing so;
2. No MAs of addition but not surprising given brevity of Matthew’s account;
3. MA: omit number of pigs (‘about 2000’): plausible independent redaction;
4. MA: avoidance of Markan ὀρκίζω formula: plausible independent redaction;
5. MAs: two times common change of κοί to δέ: plausible independent redaction;
6. MA: agreement with Matthean εἰμβασιν εἰς πλοῖον (Luke 8:37): plausibly explained as independent redaction despite the Lukan inconsistency in relation to Mark whereby Jesus returns prior to conversation with healed man;
7. MA: Luke’s ἀγέλη χοίρων ἱκανῶν (8:32) is close to Matthew: plausible independent redaction;
8. MA: omission of ‘from from afar’ (Mark 5:6 in relation to demoniac): plausible independent redaction.
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(B) Daughter and Hemorrhaging woman (Mark 5:21-43; Matt 9:18-26; Luke 8:40-56)

2GH: Luke’s Use of Matthew (without Mark)

Evidence in favor of Luke’s use of Matthew:

1. Additions enhance person (e.g. ruler’s name and office; woman’s failed attempts at healing etc.) (typically parallel in Mark);
3. Expands description of woman’s despairing state and heightens difficulty of healing by notation about previous failed attempts at healing (Luke 8:43b): highlights Jesus’ power (enhances person and validation though reverse is not necessarily a problem) (parallel in Mark);
4. Frequent wording agreements and MA (e.g. Luke 8:44) (applies equally well to the FH);
5. Jesus’ word to woman is briefer (8:48): enhances conciseness (parallel in Mark);
6. Adds Jesus’ exhortation to Jairus (8:50): faith and validation (parallel in Mark);
7. Adds specific mention of disciples (‘the three’) in Luke 8:51: validation and faith/discipleship (parallel in Mark);
8. Adds explicit reason for the mourner’s laughter (‘they knew she had died’ in Luke 8:53): less concise but clarifies the girl’s state as actual (versus mistaken) death;
9. Transforms and expands the healing notice specifically adding miracle proofs and notice of amazement (8:54-56): less concise but enhances validation (parallel in Mark).

Evidence against Luke’s use of Matthew:

1. Tendency to expand (287 words in place of 138): violates conciseness but enhances person and dramatic tension;
2. Omits reason for woman’s request (‘she thought she might be healed’ in Matt 9:21): relates to cause and manner (equally problematic for Markan priority);
3. Verbal agreements with Matthew are inconsistent: e.g. verbatim copying (e.g. 8:44) appears immediately after radical rewording (8:43) without obvious rhetorical reason; such differences are frequently explicable with reference to Mark and less inconsistent upon assumption of Markan priority;
4. Luke-Matthew verbal agreements frequently agree with Mark (triple agreement) thus are equally well (and sometimes better) explained by Markan priority (e.g. Luke 8:42-48);
5. Luke 8:43 expands Matthew’s term for the woman’s bleeding without obvious rhetorical enhancement: violates conciseness (parallel in Mark);

Uncertain evidence:

1. Expands ruler’s request (Luke 8:41-42a): violates conciseness and makes stylistic changes but possibly enhances rhetoric (person) and connects stories (12 years);
2. Adds specific location (“to his house”) to ruler’s request (Luke 8:41): specifies element of place but same is implied in Matt 9:18 and made explicit in Matt 9:23;
3. Omits cause of the ruler’s request (‘and she will live’ in Matt 9:18): relates to narrative cause but equally problematic for Markan priority (Luke omits from Mark);
4. Adds interchange with disciples and woman’s healing immediate (8:44-47): manner of
the healing may lessen Jesus’ power (healing depends on Jesus’ word in Matthew) but added crowd implies opposite (Jesus knows what happens despite crowd); Luke adds validation (confession ‘before the people’) but is less concise (parallel in Mark);

(5) Woman’s healing immediate and more obviously relates to touch (Luke 8:44; Matt 9:22) though Matthew also highlights touch (9:21) and both highlight faith (Markan parallel);

(6) Replaces ‘disciples’ (Matt 9:19) with ‘the crowds’ (Luke 8:42b): unexpected given later role of the disciples but understandable given importance of Lukan crowd motif;

(7) Omits reason (cause) for woman’s request (‘she thought she would be healed if only she touched him’ in Matt 9:21): cause implied in Luke and perhaps omitted for conciseness; same problem arises for Markan priority (Luke omits Mark 5:28);

(8) Adds delegation announcing the girl’s death (Luke 8:49): less concise but adds dramatic tension (parallel in Mark);

(9) Notation about flute players (Luke 8:52): more concise but essentially stylistic change;

(10) Location not explicit (but may be implied) in Luke (versus ‘Capernaum’ in Matt 9:1).

### 2GH: Mark’s conflation of Matthew and Luke

#### Evidence in favor of Markan conflation:

(1) Description of woman’s suffering (Mark 5:25-26) may enhance drama and notion of Jesus’ power (grew worse despite physician involvement): validation and person;

(2) Mark 5:28 is taken over from Matthew (no Lukan parallel): slightly more concise (10 words in place of 11) and relates to element of cause;

(3) Mark 5:33 is more concise than Luke 8:47 (only parallel) albeit occurring within a larger section (5:29-33) that is less concise than Luke (see below).

#### Evidence against Markan conflation

(1) Tends to expand (374 words in place of 287 in Luke and 138 in Matthew) without obvious rhetorical enhancement: violates conciseness;

(2) Markan stylistic features such as parataxis, historical presents, and other awkward stylistic features (e.g. ἐξέρχητος ἐξεί and the initial ἔνα clause in Mark 5:22-23): more plausibly understood as rhetorical enhancements (of Mark) by Matthew and Luke;

(3) Transitional statement (Mark 5:21): less concise, introduces redundancies, and omits Lukan explanatory phrase (about why Jesus was met by a crowd);

(4) Frequent micro-conflation (Mark 5:22-23, 24, 25, 34, 38, 40, and 41): often less concise and without obvious rhetorical enhancement;

(5) Omitting “hem of his garment” (Mark 5:27): disagrees with the common witness of both sources and goes against 2GH Markan tendency to add details;

(6) Woman’s healing and exposure by Jesus (Mark 5:29-33): less concise than (only) Lukan parallel without obvious rhetorical enhancement;

(7) Moves up the statement about power ‘going out’ from Jesus (Mark 5:30) from a later position in Luke (8:46) where it provides reason for Jesus’ question: as a Lukan change to Mark it enhances clarity while the opposite is implied for the 2GH Mark;

(8) Adds ‘be healed from your affliction’ (Mark 5:34): involves micro-conflation (phrase from Matthew but is otherwise following Luke more closely at this point); violates conciseness (relative to Luke) and clarity (healing occurred earlier – this is not problematic in Matthew or Luke but is introduced by 2GH Mark against both sources);

(9) Mark 5:35 changes the Lukan imperative (‘do not trouble …’ ) into a question (‘why are
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still troubling …?’): reduces clarity (Jairus is only just learning about daughter’s death);

(10) Mark 5:36 omits Luke’s καί σωθήσεται (8:50), which clarifies the reason for requesting that Jesus come: clarity and cause;

(11) Adds ‘the brother of James’ in Mark 5:37: redundant and perhaps reduces clarity/conciseness by delaying parents’ permission to enter (Luke combines with disciples’ permission);

(12) Raising of Jairus’ daughter (Mark 5:35-43): less concise than (longer) Luke (main source) with stylistic changes and redundancies (e.g. adds ‘the brother of James’);

(13) Adds Aramaic phrase (Mark 5:41); puzzling if written to Roman audience;


Uncertain evidence:

(1) Omits γῆρα in Mark 5:39 (against both sources): provides causal link but link is implied and therefore perhaps enhances conciseness;

(2) Expulsion of mourners (Mark 5:40) prior to the secrecy command (Mark 5:43): may add clarity relative to Luke (who alone shares secrecy command) but Luke’s omission of the expulsion heightens clarity by including mourners in the secrecy command;

(4) Markan conclusion: includes Lukan miracle proofs (validation) but also secrecy command (violates clarity and credibility).

2DH: Matthew’s use of Mark

Evidence in favor of Matthew’s use of Mark:

(1) More concise (138 words versus 374) albeit with mixed reasons: omits elements of person but also omits redundancies; tends to replace parataxis with subordination;

(2) Matt 9:18a (transition) is more concise (and fitted to his own literary context) but without obvious loss of clarity, credibility or rhetorical elements of narrative;

(3) Matt 9:22 changes the Markan ‘and be healed from your affliction’ (Mark 5:34) into ‘and the woman was healed from that hour.’ Along with earlier omission of healing notation (Mark 5:29) this enhances clarity and avoids Markan contradiction/tension;

(4) Matt 9:26 reverses Markan secrecy: enhances clarity, credibility and validation.

Evidence against Matthew’s use of Mark:

(1) Change from ‘crowd’ to ‘disciples’ (Matt 9:19) is inconsistent with omitting disciples in woman’s healing (cf. Mark 5:31) and girl’s raising (cf. Mark 5:37): may violate clarity;

(2) Omits miracle proofs and amazement (cf. Mark 5:42-43): validation.

Uncertain evidence:

(1) Matthew omits crowd in woman’s healing (Mark 5:21, 24, 27, 30, and 31) despite adding later to daughter’s healing (9:23, 25) and reversing the secrecy command: potentially violates validation but perhaps omits on account of implied location in house (Matt 9:10);

(2) Ruler’s request (Matt 9:18b) is more concise (omits redundancies; more succinct restatement) without reducing clarity or credibility but omits elements of person;

(3) Healing of woman exemplifies conciseness (Matt 9:19-22 has 58 words in place of 165 in Mark) but omits elements of characterization, especially of the woman, Jesus (albeit perhaps highlighting his supernatural knowledge), and the disciples;
(4) Raising of the girl exemplifies conciseness (Matt 9:23-26) but omits elements of person.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2DH: Luke’s use of Mark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evidence in favor of Luke’s use of Mark:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Luke is more concise (287 words in place of 374);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Higher percentage verbal overlap with Mark (42% of Luke) than Matthew (13% of Luke): possibly points to greater likelihood of Mark as a source;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Various sections more concise without rhetorical loss (Luke 8:40; 8:42b-48 and 49-56);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Luke 8:47 expands the woman’s confession in Mark 5:33 but indicates why the woman touched Jesus and how she was healed before all the people: enhances clarity and validation;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Omits concluding statement in Mark 5:34 (‘and be healed … ’): enhances clarity and credibility in that healing had already been noted earlier;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Transfers Jesus’ statement about power going out from him to after Peter’s question (Luke 8:46): enhances clarity (Mark offers no response to the disciples’ question); may enhance person and validation (highlights Jesus’ supernatural knowledge);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) Luke 8:49-50 adds καὶ σωθήσεται (indicates content of belief) and changes question to imperative (Jairus is only just learning of his daughter’s death making Mark’s ‘why’ question seem odd): both changes enhance clarity;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) Luke 8:51 transfers notation about father and mother to earlier in narrative (along with disciples): enhances clarity and conciseness;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9) Luke 8:53 adds the phrase ‘because they knew she was dead’ making more explicit that the girl was dead (not mistaken as dead): enhances clarity and indicates that Jesus’ statement (‘she is not dead but sleeping’) is figurative;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10) Earlier placement of the feeding command (Luke 8:55-56): enhances clarity by placing all the ‘proofs’ prior to amazement and silencing command;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Evidence against Luke’s use of Mark: |
| (1) Omits reason for Jairus’ request in Mark 5:23 (‘that he lays hands … ’): narrative cause; |
| (2) Omits Mark 5:28 which offers the reason for the woman’s action: narrative cause; |
| (3) Impression that mourners are in house before parents (Luke 8:49-56): reduces clarity. |

| Uncertain evidence: |
| (1) Transforms Jairus’ request (Luke 8:41-42a): less concise and omits cause of request but contains stylistic improvements and transfers ‘age’ of girl to more logical position; |
| (2) No explicit casting out of mourners in Luke implying their presence for the healing and the silencing command (Luke 8:51-56): potentially reduces clarity but Luke retells with greater conciseness and may deliberately retain mourners as witnesses so as include them in the secrecy command (enhancing clarity and credibility); |
| (3) Keeps Markan secrecy (Luke 8:56): compromises clarity/credibility but same as Mark. |

| FH: Matthew’s use of Mark alone |
| See above under 2DH (observations apply to both) |

| FH: Luke’s use of Matthew alongside Mark |
| **Evidence in favor of Luke’s use of Matthew alongside Mark:** |
| (1) Lukan expansions and transformations of Matthew (2GH) are explicable based on Mark in relation to whom Luke is more concise and demonstrates various rhetorical
improvements (see above for 2DH Lukan use of Mark): suggests greater plausibility for
FH than 2GH Lukan use of Matthew;
(2) MA: 8 word agreement in Luke 8:44a (noting common addition of τοῦ κρασπέδου).

Evidence against Luke’s use of Matthew alongside Mark:
(1) Much verbal overlap between Matthew and Luke explicable as taken over from Mark
with whom Luke shares a higher percentage of verbal overlap;
(2) Luke may avoid problem of Markan secrecy command by having mourners present (see
above) but ignores clearer and more credible Matthean solution (omits/reverses secrecy).

Uncertain evidence:
independent redaction;
(2) MA: use of ἀρχων over against Mark’s ἀρχισυναγώγος (Luke 8:41): explicable as
independent redaction;
(3) MA: use θυγάτηρ (Luke 8:42) over against the Markan diminutive θυγάτριον (Mark
5:23): explicable as independent redaction;
(4) MA: Luke 8:54 change to σὺν (versus Markan τοῦ παιδίου) after χειρός: best
explained as independent redaction;
(5) MA: use of ἐλθὼν (versus ἐρχόμενοι) in Luke 8:51: explicable as independent
redaction;
(6) MA: use of the feminine noun οἰκία (versus masculine ὀίκος) in 8:51: explicable as
independent redaction;
(7) MA: insertion of γάρ in Luke 8:52 along with imperative (versus question in Mark):
explicable as independent redaction;
(3) MAs in general: none motivated by conciseness; possibly motivated by clarity in relation
to γάρ in 8:52 and τοῦ κρασπέδου in 8:44a.
(C) The Centurion’s Servant (Matt 8:5-13; Luke 7:1-10; Q 7:1-10)

**2GH: Luke’s Use of Matthew**

Evidence in favor of Luke’s use of Matthew:

1. Luke expands Matthew: violates conciseness but more consistent with implied procedure of 2GH Luke (e.g. above two stories) than 2DH or FH Luke (in relation to Mark).

Evidence against Luke’s use of Matthew:

1. Luke 7:1a: possibly rewrites Matthew but lacks verbal overlap (which does exist with Q);
2. Omits Matt 8:11-12 and inserts later in Gospel: slightly more plausible as Lukan relocation of Q saying than Matthean miracle saying;
3. Omits Matthew’s final statement about the servant being healed “as you have believed” and “in that hour” (relates to element of time and underscores faith in healing).

Uncertain evidence:

1. Added Lukan embassies (Luke 7:3-6) create narrative tension/contradiction: same problem for all three hypotheses;
2. Luke replaces παῖς with δουλός: probably stylistic and occurs for all hypotheses;
4. Luke adds encomiastic notation about centurion (Luke 7:4-5): enhances narrative person and cause (same for all three hypotheses);
5. Centurion’s request (Luke 7:1b-6a): less concise (64 words in place of 23) with only 5 borrowed words and many additions/changes but situation similar for Q hypotheses;
6. Second Lukan delegation creates narrative inconsistency by having the centurion first request that Jesus come and then change his mind without explanation: compromises clarity and credibility but equally problematic for all three hypotheses;
7. High verbal overlap in Luke 7:7-8 inconsistent with the low verbal overlap earlier in the narrative: problem shared by all three hypotheses;
8. Luke 7:9 has high verbal agreement with few essentially stylistic changes to Jesus’ speech in Matt 8:10: changes are minor albeit surprising in light of more conservative approach to speech of centurion than that of Jesus; problem shared by all hypotheses;
9. Luke’s conclusion (7:10) understandable as concise rewriting of Matthew but this offers no advantage to any hypotheses;
10. Luke is overall longer (11%) than Matthew despite omitting Matt 8:11-12 (violates conciseness) and compromises clarity with his two embassies (especially in relation to the change of mind over Jesus’ coming) but problem same for all three hypotheses.

**2GH: Mark’s conflation of Matthew and Luke**

Pericope omitted in Mark (see discussion of order and selection in chapter 5)

**2DH: Matthew’s use of Q**

Evidence in favor of Matthew’s use of Q: nothing of note.

Evidence against Matthew’s use of Q:

1. Matthew is at least 24% longer than Q: violates conciseness and 2DH Matthean tendency to abbreviate Markan miracle narratives;
(2) Expands description of the illness (Matt 8:6): violates conciseness and 2DH Matthean tendency to abbreviate similar notices (as in previous two pericopes);
(3) Centurion’s speech (Matt 8:8-9) indicates higher verbal overlap than typical of 2DH Matthew in relation to Mark (also higher than verbal overlap in the subsequent speech of Jesus in Matt 8:10): implies inconsistency in 2DH Matthew not readily explained;
(4) Change of οὐδέ to πορεύονται οὐδενί (Matt 8:10): less concise but no obvious rhetorical gains;
(5) Inserts Matt 8:11-12: inconsistent with initial emphasis on Jewish mission (saying absent in parallel Q pericope but plausibly present in Matthew’s 2GH or FH source).

Uncertain evidence:
(1) 2DH Matthew highlights ‘faith’ in relation to this healing (miracle motif): emphasized by adding “at that hour” in v. 13 (true for 2DH Matthew but no clear advantage over rivals);
(2) Matthew’s conclusion (8:13) is understandable rhetorical enhancement of Q (person, action, cause, and faith): equally plausible addition for all three hypotheses.

### 2DH: Luke’s use of Q

**Evidence in favor of Luke’s use of Q:**
1. Lukan conclusion (7:10): understandable rhetorical enhancement of Q (no conclusion) but omits Lukan friendly elements in Matthew (‘as you have believed’; ‘from that hour’).

**Evidence against Luke’s use of Q:**
1. 2DH Luke expands Q by 86%: violates conciseness; not typical of 2DH Luke in relation to Mark but is consistent with the 2GH Luke in relation to Matthew;
2. Luke 7:1a (transition verse) is longer but without rhetorical enhancement and only stylistic changes: violates conciseness;
3. The addition of embassies enhances person but violates conciseness and clarity: problematic for all hypotheses but more so for Markan priority in that 2GH Lukan expansions of Matthean miracles are commonplace while the FH and 2DH Luke do not adapt Mark in this same manner.

Uncertain evidence:
1. Minimal changes to speeches of centurion (Luke 8:6b-8) and Jesus (Luke 8:9) are essentially stylistic: changes are same for all hypotheses;
2. Enhancement of person through additions of embassies: changes same for all hypotheses.

### FH: Luke’s use of Matthew alongside Mark

**Evidence in favor of Luke’s use of Matthew: nothing of note.**

**Evidence against Luke’s use of Matthew:**
1. Lukan conclusion (7:10): understandable rhetorical enhancement of Q (no conclusion) but omits Lukan friendly elements in Matthew (‘as you have believed’; ‘from that hour’).

Uncertain evidence:
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7.1 Introduction

This thesis seeks to contribute to the ongoing discussion among New Testament scholars related to the so-called Synoptic Problem. Rather than defend a particular hypothesis I have utilized a methodology that compares the relative redactional plausibility of competing hypotheses in relation to ancient rhetorical conventions of narrative. Chapter one comprised a brief historical survey of SP debate and identified three contemporary SP hypotheses most strongly supported in published literature over the past fifty to sixty years, namely the 2DH, the 2GH and the FH. Synoptic miracle tradition was selected as the material focus for the analysis insofar as a lacuna exists in relation to systematic treatments of the SP from this particular perspective. Insofar as methodology is a vital part of any SP discussion chapter two provided a brief survey of pitfalls and problem areas associated with various methodological approaches. In light of the inherent logical possibility of all SP hypotheses, it was noted that the plausibility of any given hypothesis is directly proportional to the plausibility of the redactional procedures implied by that hypothesis. Given the possibility, however, of identifying plausible redactional procedures for mutually contradictory hypotheses, it is necessary to assess the relative plausibility of these implied redactional procedures in relation to one another. A complicating factor arises, however, in the extent to which modern aesthetic judgments influence our evaluation of redactional plausibility in relation to ancient texts.

While pure objectivity is beyond our grasp, the inevitable influence of our modern aesthetic preferences can be tempered by appropriate external criteria. Specifically in this regard I proposed three points of control. The first involved a synchronic reading of Gospel miracle traditions based on the assumption that the evangelists were competent and deliberate editors of their sources who could be expected to leave evidence of their redactional (theological and apologetic) interests. Such interests should be evident upon a synchronic reading which makes no source critical assumptions. Once identified, the degree of overlap between these
synchronically detected editorial interests (miracle motifs) and the interests detected by a redaction-critical reading (upon assumption of any given hypothesis) provides evidence either for or against a particular hypothesis. A second point of control was suggested in relation to the ancient literary genre of βίος which arguably provides the best analogy for the Synoptic Gospels and, therefore, provides a template by which to assess the implied redactional choices of the synoptic evangelists. The basic assumption is that changes in a direction toward greater conformity with the ancient βίος genre are more plausible than changes in the opposite direction. Finally, a third point of control is provided by the conventions of ancient education and rhetorical training. More specifically, appeal was made to the conventions of narrative and encomium as described in Theon’s Progymnasmata, a first century handbook of compositional and rhetorical exercises. Such handbooks (of which Theon’s is our earliest extant copy) provides outlines of elementary and intermediate level training in Greek composition and rhetoric. In relation to ‘narrative’ Theon identifies the following six ‘elements’: person, action, time, place, manner and cause. The element of person is further elaborated in various encomiastic topic lists found in the extant progymnasmata and rhetorical handbooks. The major categories of person, according to such lists, are as follows: origin; nurture and training; deeds and virtues; and death (see tables 2.2 and 2.3). Finally, in addition to the elements of narrative, Theon also identifies three key virtues: clarity, conciseness and credibility.

While we cannot be certain of the extent to which the Synoptic evangelists received formal rhetorical training, there are sufficient grounds for assuming at least a basic rhetorical awareness and training for anyone who was capable of composing in Greek. Furthermore, prior rhetorical analysis of the Gospels supports the hypothesis that ancient rhetorical theory influenced the manner of their composition. With this in mind I proposed to assess the relative redactional plausibility of our three competing hypotheses (2DH, 2GH, and FH) by analyzing the relative plausibility their implied redactional changes in relation to narrative content (the influence of Theon’s elements of narrative and encomium), narrative style (the influence of Theon’s three
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narrative virtues), and narrative apologetic (based on a synchronic reading of Gospel miracle tradition). Given that the progymnasmata and rhetorical handbooks are written by teachers and theoreticians of rhetoric, however, we cannot be certain that the principles outlined within them actually affected the general methods of Greek composition during the first century C.E. With this in mind I chose, therefore, to begin by testing the validity of the proposed method in relation to the work of two authors (Josephus and Plutarch) contemporary with the evangelists. This was done by analyzing their narrative adaptation of known sources in order to see if it was in keeping with their apologetic aims and the identified rhetorical conventions of narrative and encomium. This was the subject matter of chapters three and four.

7.2 Rhetorical Conventions in the Narrative Adaptations of Josephus and Plutarch

In Chapter three I analyzed Josephus’ adaptation and re-presentation of three biblical narratives (Moses in the Exodus, Elisha and Jonah) in his Antiquities of the Jews. It was demonstrated that many changes at both the macro- (order and selection) and micro- (specific pericopes) levels were explicable in relation to Josephus’ apologetic aims related to the motifs of God’s providence, history, and prophetic heroes of Israel’s past. His changes frequently enhanced the narrative element of person either by omission of negative elements (e.g., Moses’ murder of the Egyptian; bears mauling youths at Elisha’s command; and Jonah’s persistent anger) or addition/enhancement of positive elements (e.g., Moses’ education and political success; the grave incident in Elisha; and Jonah depicted as a true prophet) in keeping with the standard encomiastic topic lists set out in tables 2.2 and 2.3. The net result was that each of the three narrative characters exemplified the positive role of prophets in relation to history and God’s providence. While changes in relation to other narrative elements were detected (e.g., the cause of the plagues clarified in relation to divine punishment), it was the element of person that most clearly explained the majority of Josephus’ changes. In relation to narrative virtues Josephus exemplified conciseness through explicable omissions and stylistic improvements that,
not infrequently, enhanced *clarity* and *credibility*. Hence, despite some obvious exceptions (e.g., the change from Tarshish to Tarsus in the Jonah narrative, compromising *clarity* and *credibility*), the majority of Josephus’ narrative adaptations were explicable in relation to his apologetic interests along with Theon’s elements and virtues of narrative and encomium.

Similar conclusions were reached in chapter four in relation to Plutarch’s narrative adaptations of his sources (Dionysius and Livy) in two of his *Lives*, namely the *Coriolanus* and the *Camillus*. Once again his various omissions, additions and transformations at both the macro- (order and selection in the *Life* as a whole) and micro- (narrative adaptation in the capture of Corioli and the siege of Falerri) levels were explicable most frequently in relation to the narrative element of *person* alongside the virtues of *conciseness* and *clarity*. There were far fewer instances where Theon’s other elements (*action, cause, manner, time, and place*) appeared to be the primary motive for changes. This was likewise the case for the virtue of *credibility* although this may relate to the nature of the source material and Plutarch’s (relatively positive) judgments about it. Plutarch’s adaptations were also intelligible from the standpoint of his apologetic interests regarding history, biography (encomiastic) and moral philosophy (*Coriolanus* provides a negative example and *Camillus* a positive one). The evidence strongly suggested that while both Dionysius and Livy provide accounts of Coriolanus and Camillus, Plutarch’s primary source differed for each: i.e. Dionysius for the *Coriolanus* and Livy for the *Camillus*. In either case, however, his closer adherence to his primary source supports the notion that ‘one source at a time’ was typical of ancient practice.

Hence, the analysis of Josephus and Plutarch supported the methodological proposal of chapter two that, in their adaptation and re-presentation of narrative and biographical source material, first century authors were influenced by Theon’s rhetorical conventions of narrative and encomium. This is detected most clearly for the narrative element of *person* (and related topics of encomium) and virtues of *conciseness, clarity* and *credibility* (especially the first two).
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7.3 Rhetorical Conventions in the Narrative Adaptations of Synoptic Miracle Traditions

On the basis of these conclusions I proceeded to analyze the Gospel miracle tradition in chapters five and six in order to assess the greater or lesser plausibility of our three chosen SP hypotheses in relation to the implied redactional changes at macro- (selection and order) and micro- (individual pericopes) levels. Plausibility was assessed in relation to miracle motifs and rhetorical conventions of narrative and encomium.

7.3.1 Macro-Analysis: Order and Selection of Miracle Tradition

Chapter five addressed the issue of order and selection in the Synoptic Gospels. First I carried out a synchronic analysis of Gospel miracle traditions in order to identify the primary thematic or apologetic motifs associated with those traditions in each Gospel. Markan miracle tradition was noted to have a positive role in validating Jesus as messiah and providing evidence of the in-breaking kingdom of God. Markan miracles are closely related to teaching, sometimes even having a parabolic type function, and generally relate positively to faith and discipleship. Matthean miracles were also noted to function positively (alongside teaching) in validating Jesus as messiah. A particularly strong association was identified between the messianic ‘Son of David’ title and Jesus’ miraculous activity, which was true to a lesser degree for the title of ‘Lord’ (κύριος). Matthew presents a generally positive correlation between miracles, faith and discipleship but such connections are strongest in relation to nature miracles and less obvious for healings and exorcisms. Lukan miracles also have a validating function in relation to divine approval of both message and messenger. There is a careful balancing of miracle and teaching tradition in both the Gospel and Acts albeit especially associated with key turning points in the narrative of redemptive history (namely the beginning of Jesus’ ministry in Galilee and the beginning of the church in Acts). Lukan miracles also frequently evoke positive responses of praise, wonder, faith and discipleship albeit the response is mixed and punitive miracles are more common (especially in Acts). These conclusions, along with the rhetoric of narrative, were used
to assess the relative plausibility of the implied order and selection of Gospel miracle traditions from the perspective of our three hypotheses.

As the shortest Gospel the 2GH Mark exemplifies narrative brevity and, in selection of miracle tradition, is consistent with synchronically detected Markan miracle motifs. At the same time the 2GH Mark consistently prefers the longer Lukan miracle narratives and frequently expands upon them, thus contravening brevity. Omissions of miracle tradition are generally plausible and in keeping with brevity albeit some are puzzling insofar as they relate positively to Markan miracle motifs: especially Luke 5:1-11 (discipleship), Luke 11:14 (miracle attached to Beelzebul), and Matt 11:2-6 (validation). The 2GH Markan order of miracle stories follows first Matthew then Luke in large blocks, a procedure consistent with the ‘one source at a time’ convention. The adaptation of miracle summaries and miracle related tradition, however, implies a complex conflationary procedure at both the macro- and micro-levels (e.g., for Mark 3:7-12). While not impossible, this requires sound explanations for the 2GH Markan choices. Such explanations are largely absent in work of Peabody et al., \(^1\) which constitutes the most comprehensive and recent attempt to defend and explain the 2GH Markan procedure, and are not found in relation to Markan miracle motifs or rhetorical conventions of narrative and encomium.

The implied 2GH Lukan procedure of selection and addition is plausible in relation to Lukan miracle motifs of validation and positive responses to miracles (praise, wonder, discipleship etc.). The 2GH Lukan tendency to expand miracle stories, however, contravenes the narrative virtue of conciseness. This is inconsistent with his approach to miracle related tradition (a tendency to compress) and also implies the following implausible sequence: 2GH Luke first expanded Matthean narratives followed by the 2GH Mark who expanded upon both Luke and Matthew. Given the importance of conciseness for both Josephus and Plutarch the Markan priority hypotheses more plausibly imply that Matthew and Luke both rewrite Mark more concisely. While several 2GH Lukan omissions are unproblematic, the blind and mute healings

\(^{1}\)In particular One Gospel.
of Matt 9:27-34 are surprisingly passed over in Luke’s Galilean section (4:31–7:15) and held off to a later point in his Gospel. These are the only miracles omitted from Matthew 8–9 and would have provided two key (missing) examples of miracles for his otherwise complete list in Jesus’ response to John (Luke 7:18-23), which clearly relates to validation. The 2GH Lukan omission of several Matthean summary statements is also puzzling given the frequency of miracle related summaries in Acts.

Finally, the 2GH Lukan re-ordering of Matthean miracle tradition lacks an obvious explanation (related to miracle motifs or conventions of narrative) and implies an idiosyncratic procedure that lacks plausibility when compared, for example, with the order changes observed in Josephus and Plutarch. Furthermore there is a disparate blending of details from Matthean summaries without obvious rhetorical or apologetic gains thereby rendering the implied procedure implausible. In essence the 2GH Lukan procedure is possible and at times plausible (e.g., in selection and addition) but more frequently appears implausible and at odds with Lukan miracle motifs and rhetorical conventions. The implausibility is apparent in relation to omissions, order changes, violation of brevity (tendency to expand), and disparate blending of details from disconnected Matthean summary statements.

Turning to Markan priority hypotheses, the 2DH Matthean selection of eighty three percent of Markan miracle tradition is in keeping with his synchronically demonstrated interest in miracles (especially in relation to validation). The occasional implied awkwardness in his procedure (combining disparate summaries) is less obvious than for the 2GH Mark or Luke and results in summaries that emphasize both healing and teaching while also providing a structural inclusio for a major unit within his Gospel (Matt 4:23-25 and 9:35). There are no troubling omissions (three miracle stories; no summaries; one miracle related pericope) and his two additions (Matt 9:27-34) serve an important validating purpose by completing the list of examples for the miracles listed in Matt 11:2-6 (response to John). Most problematic for the 2DH Matthew is the implied reordering of miracle stories in Matthew 8–9. While attempts to defend his procedure by
2DH proponents are unconvincing (in particular those of Tuckett and Stewart-Sykes), Kingsbury’s synchronic reading helps explain some of these order changes. Problems remain, however, in explaining his choice of the Centurion’s servant over Mark’s initial exorcism (Mark 1:21-29) and his reversing the order of the mother in law and the leper (Mark 1:29-31, 40-45). The problems are eased slightly when it is recognized that the changes occur in a section of Matthew where he most clearly reorganizes and adds to his Markan source in a manner that is intelligible from an encomiastic perspective (namely with additions of opening material and initial teaching content in Matthew 1–4 and 5–7).\(^2\) The order problem in Matthew 8–9 is shared with the FH (since both agree on Markan priority) and occurs in reverse manner for the 2GH in relation to Luke’s reordering of Matthew. Weighing up the relative difficulties of these order changes (in Matthew 8–9) with those identified above for the 2GH Luke, however, suggests greater plausibility for Markan priority. Furthermore, additional 2DH order changes of summaries and miracle related tradition are not deemed problematic.

The order and selection of Markan and Q miracle tradition by the 2DH Luke implies a more conservative editorial procedure than for the 2GH Luke in relation to Matthew. While the 2DH Luke tends toward brevity, this is less so than for the 2DH Matthew. Furthermore, he occasionally expands upon his Markan source. His order changes are relatively minor and plausible explanations are possible. His additions are likewise plausible albeit creating doublets, contra the rhetorical convention of brevity. Most problematic is the Lukan Great Omission of Mark 6:45–8:22. Explanations about differing and/or mutilated manuscripts notably have no basis in textual evidence and therefore (implausibly) argue from silence. The extent of omitted text makes accidental omission equally implausible leaving only deliberate omission, which is certainly possible and clearly enhances conciseness. At the same time, however, the purported reasons for the omissions (e.g., omitting doublets and avoiding gentile friendly material) run counter to the 2DH Lukan procedure elsewhere and involve avoiding Markan miracles that

\(^2\)Much of the material added in Matt 1–4, for instance, is in keeping with encomiastic topic lists in tables 2.2 and 2.3.
would have provided (otherwise missing) examples for his validation related list in Luke 7:21-22 (Jesus’ response to John). The problem is shared with the FH and to a much lesser extent with the 2GH (there is a smaller omission of Matthew’s partial parallel to Mark 6:45–8:22).

Nevertheless the additional order and selection problems associated with the 2GH (as above) still imply greater plausibility for the Markan priority hypotheses.

The FH Matthew essentially looks no different than the 2DH Matthew in relation his use of Mark as a primary source. The FH Luke, however, differs from the 2DH Luke in that he directly utilizes Matthew (in common with the 2GH Luke) alongside Mark. The implausibility of the 2GH Lukian rearrangement of Matthew (noted above) ceases to be a problem for the FH Luke who clearly follows Markan order in preference to Matthew. While Luke’s Great Omission is shared with the 2DH, it is perhaps slightly more troublesome for the FH Luke who deliberately omits it from not one but two sources. As with the 2GH Luke omission of several Matthean summaries is a problem (noting Luke’s penchant for such summaries in Acts) and there are no clear Matthean influences upon Lukan summaries, which are essentially explicable in relation to Mark (the one possible exception being the order change in relation to Luke 6:17-19). In miracle related tradition the FH Luke is very similar to the 2DH Luke. While he engages in some conflation and order changes, these are not especially troublesome for the FH.

In weighing up these various observations I conclude that, despite their problems, the Markan priority hypotheses more plausibly explain the order and selection of Gospel miracle tradition than does the 2GH. Particularly troublesome for the latter is Luke’s implied order and selection of Matthean miracle tradition. The 2DH and FH display similar degrees of plausibility although the general lack of evidence for Luke’s direct use of Matthew perhaps slightly favors the 2DH.  

\footnote{The advantage is slight at best in that FH proponents may argue that Luke is simply following the ‘one source at a time’ convention in relation to most of his miracle tradition (i.e. he is following Mark).}
7.3.2 Micro-Analysis: Rhetorical Transformation of Specific Miracle Pericopes

Chapter six comprised a micro-analysis of three specific miracle tradition pericopes in order to assess the relative redactional plausibility of our three chosen SP hypotheses. The implied redactional procedure was assessed from the standpoint of each hypothesis in relation to the rhetorical conventions of narrative and encomium identified in chapters two to four along with the miracle motifs of each evangelist identified in chapter five. The evidence for and against each hypothesis was tabulated in table 6.9 and summarized at the conclusion of chapter six. We may note the following highlights.

(a) The Gadarene Demoniac

In the narrative of the Gadarene demoniac (Mark 5:1-20; Matt 8:28–9:1; Luke 8:26-39) the 2GH Luke expands Matthew’s narrative to almost double its length. This obviously violates brevity albeit several changes are rhetorically plausible⁴ (e.g., added conversation between Jesus and healed demoniac). At the same time the 2GH Luke often recounts parallel details less succinctly, omits the cause of the confrontation, introduces a more problematic location (Gerasa), and violates clarity by having Jesus depart prior to the conversation with the healed man. High variation in verbal agreement (between 3 and 60%) indicates an inconsistent approach not readily explicable rhetorically. The differences between Matthew and Luke, therefore, are more plausibly explained by Markan priority hypotheses for the following reasons: with few exceptions the Lukan changes (relative to Matthew) are generally explicable in relation to Mark; the rhetorically plausible additions (e.g., conversation with healed demoniac) are present in Mark and thus indicate a reason for Luke preferring that account; and Luke no longer violates brevity since his account is shorter than Mark.

⁴Here and following ‘plausibly’ and ‘plausible’ will be used to refer to changes that are explicable from the standpoint of rhetorical conventions of narrative (elements and virtues of narrative and encomium) and the identified miracle motifs of each evangelist. For details of these changes refer to chapter six and especially the summary of findings in table 6.9.
Chapter 7: Conclusion

In conflating Matthew and Luke the 2GH Mark prefers the longer Lukan version and even adds his own details (e.g., ‘all were amazed’ in Mark 5:18-20), changes that are largely explicable in relation to person and validation. Furthermore, he enhances clarity (relative to Luke) by having the demon address Jesus while he gets into the boat rather than after he left. Other expansions, however, violate brevity without being obvious rhetorical enhancements (e.g., Mark 5:12). Furthermore, the 2GH Mark sometimes violates clarity (e.g., shifts from singular to plural; having the demons run from afar in Mark 5:6) and frequently engages in micro-conflation. While the latter is not impossible, the implied mechanical difficulties along the ancient preference for ‘one source at a time’ makes it implausible. The implausibility of this procedure for the 2GH Mark is heightened by the fact that none of the examples of micro-conflation are obvious rhetorical enhancements. For these various reasons 2GH Markan conflation is less plausible than Markan priority.

The 2DH Matthew evidences various rhetorical enhancements related to conciseness (146 words in place of 325), clarity, cause, person, style, and sometimes credibility (see table 6.9 for details). At the same time he omits details related to person, cause (‘fear of townspeople’), and especially validation and discipleship (miracle proofs and concluding dialogue with healed man). The 2DH Lukan use of Mark agrees with Matthew in being more concise albeit not consistently so and to a lesser extent. Various other changes relate to clarity (omit ‘ran from afar’; omit ‘evening’ in Luke 8:22; adds nakedness), person/validation (e.g., change Markan ὄρκιζω formula), and discipleship (‘at Jesus feet’). At the same time he occasionally compromises conciseness, violates clarity by having Jesus’ return home prior to the healed man speaking to him, and omits the (typically Lukan) amazement motif from Mark 5:20. While some of the Matthean omissions from Mark are significant and these last two Lukan differences are problematic, the difficulties noted above in relation to the 2GH Luke and Mark indicate that Markan priority remains more plausible in relation to this particular pericope.
While the FH Matthew is no different from the 2DH Matthew, the FH Luke differs from both the 2GH Luke (who only has Matthew) and the 2DH Luke (who only has Mark). While greater overlap with Mark indicate that this was the FH Luke’s primary source, various MAs raise the possibility that Luke directly utilized Matthew alongside Mark. These MAs, however, are equally plausibly explained by independent redaction. Furthermore, the FH Luke omits Matthean rhetorical enhancements of Mark (e.g., change to Gadara and notation about the demons blocking the path).

In weighing up these various observations I conclude that while problems remain for Markan priority hypotheses (e.g., Jesus departs before the final conversation in Luke),\(^5\) the differences between Matthew and Luke, as well as the relationship of both these Gospels to Mark, are less plausibly explained (in relation to the rhetoric of narrative) by Markan posteriority (2GH) than by Markan priority (2DH and FH). In weighing the 2DH against the FH, however, the evidence is less conclusive. While the lack of any obvious influence of Matthew upon Luke clearly counts against the FH, the ancient preference for ‘one source at a time’ may have meant that Luke was simply following Mark (alone) for this pericope.

(b) Jairus’ Daughter and the Hemorrhaging Woman

Turning to the account of Jairus’ daughter and the hemorrhaging woman (Mark 5:21-43; Matt 9:18-26; Luke 8:40-56) the 2GH Luke has significant verbal overlap with Matthew and exhibits various rhetorical enhancements related to person, validation, faith/discipleship, and clarity (see table 6.9). Alternatively while occasionally enhancing conciseness (e.g., Luke 8:44), he generally expands Matthew (287 words in place of 138). While some expansions are rhetorical enhancements, others provide no obvious rhetorical benefit. The 2GH Luke omits elements of narrative cause (e.g., reasons for requests -- though equally problematic for all hypotheses) and compromises clarity and credibility in changing Matthew’s report notice into a secrecy command (Luke 8:56). Considered in isolation the evidence is relatively balanced and the high verbal

\(^5\)This particular problem occurs for the 2GH also in relation to Luke’s use of Matthew.
overlap clearly implies direct utilization. As with the Gadarene demoniac, however, many of the
similarities and differences between Matthew and Luke are equally explicable in relation to
Mark. This is frequently true of rhetorical enhancements, verbal overlap (noting the high
variation when compared to Matthew alone), and Luke’s violation of conciseness (noting he is
more concise than Mark) and credibility (especially reversal of secrecy command). Other
changes are merely stylistic and unproblematic for any hypothesis. While the MAs possibly
suggest Luke’s knowledge of Matthew (on which see below) they offer no advantage for the
2GH over the FH.

The 2GH Markan conflation of Matthew and Luke implies some rhetorical enhancement but
the evidence is minimal compared to the problems associated with this hypothesis (see lists in
table 6.9). The primary difficulties include the following: the general tendency for the 2GH Mark
to expand his sources, often with redundancies and without obvious rhetorical enhancement;
frequent micro-conflation but without obvious rhetorical enhancement; and changes that violate
clarity (e.g., addition of ‘be healed from your affliction’ in Mark 5:34 and order changes in Mark
5:42-43).

Turning to the 2DH, we find that Matthew tends toward stylistic improvement (e.g.,
subordination replacing parataxis) and is again more concise (138 words in place of 374),
frequently without loss of clarity, credibility, narrative elements or miracle motifs. The primary
exceptions are the frequent omissions of details related to the element of person. He also omits
Markan miracle proofs and the statement of amazement (Mark 5:42-43), both relating to
validation. While there is possible loss of clarity in his change from ‘crowd’ to ‘disciples’ (Matt
9:19), clarity is enhanced by changes to the Markan statement about the woman’s healing (Matt
9:22; Mark 5:34) and his reversal of the Markan secrecy command (also enhances credibility and
validation). The 2DH Luke also enhances brevity (287 words in place of 374) albeit to a lesser
extent than the 2DH Matthew. He retains more Markan details relating to person and has only a
few potential losses in relation to narrative cause (omits Mark 5:28 and part of 5:23) and clarity
(parents enter house after mourners). In addition to greater succinctness (generally without compromising narrative rhetoric) other changes enhance clarity and validation: e.g., adding the phrase ‘because they knew she was dead’ in 8:53 and moving the feeding command to earlier (see complete list in table 6.9).

While the FH Matthew is essentially the same as the 2DH Matthew, the FH Luke differs from the 2DH Luke in having Matthew (as well as Mark) as a direct source. The various MAs provide the primary evidence of Luke’s direct utilization of the Matthew alongside Mark. Most of these, however, are equally plausibly explained as independent redaction by Matthew and Luke. The primary exception is the eight word agreement in Luke 8:44a (par. Matt 9:20). At the same time while Luke possibly seeks to avoid the problems associated with the Markan secrecy command (by having the mourners present), he nevertheless passes over the clearer and more credible Matthean solution (omission/reversal of the secrecy command). In essence the evidence is not strong in either direction.

The cumulative weight of the evidence once again suggests greater plausibility for Markan priority hypotheses (over against the 2GH) in relation to explaining the similarities and differences between Matthew and Luke as well as explaining how they both relate to Mark. Neither one of the Markan priority hypotheses, however, has a clear advantage over the other in relation to this story of Jairus’ daughter the hemorrhaging woman.

(c) The Centurion’s Servant

Insofar as there is no Markan parallel for the Centurion’s servant (Matt 8:5-13; Luke 7:1-10) Matthew and Luke were compared with each other and with the reconstructed Q text of the IQP. In relation to the both the 2GH and FH it was noted that much of the evidence (either for or against Luke’s purported use of Matthew) is of ‘uncertain’ value since it essentially looks the same for all three hypotheses (e.g., the problem of the Lukan embassy; see complete list in table 6.9). While some changes were more plausibly explained by the ‘Q’ hypothesis (omission of Matt 8:11-12; transformation of opening transitional statement in Luke 7:1a; and Luke’s
omission of ‘as you have believed’ and ‘from that hour’), Luke’s general tendency to expand Matthew violates *conciseness* (contrary to the tendency of the 2DH Luke in relation to Markan miracle stories). Such a procedure is most consistent with the 2GH Luke who regularly expands upon Matthean miracles.

The category of ‘uncertain evidence’ is much smaller for the 2DH Matthew. It consists of two (understandable) narrative rhetorical enhancements of Q by Matthew (both in v. 13) but these offer no obvious advantage over other hypotheses insofar as it is equally plausible that the 2GH or FH Matthew either found these same elements in his (non ‘Q’) source or added them himself. Indeed there is no clear evidence favoring Matthew’s use of Q that cannot be equally plausibly explained from the standpoint of the 2GH or FH. Alternatively there are various evidences against the Matthean use of Q which may be summarized as follows: a general tendency to expand Q (violates *conciseness* and the 2DH Matthean tendency in relation to Mark); his expanded description of illness is inconsistent with the 2DH tendency in the previous two pericopes; high verbal overlap with the centurion’s speech is inconsistent with 2DH Matthean tendency elsewhere; and an awkward insertion of the speech in Matt 8:11-12 (does not seem to fit best in this context). The 2DH Luke expands Q to an even greater degree (86% longer) in which the most plausible addition is the Lukan conclusion (Luke 7:10) constituting a rhetorical enhancement (conclusion missing in Q). While from the 2GH and FH perspective this may be taken as a rhetorical enhancement of Matthew, Luke would then be noted to have omitted a couple of Matthean phrases (‘as you believed’; ‘from that hour’) that would have been rhetorically appealing in relation to faith and validation. While other additions (e.g., the embassies) enhance *person* (especially in relation to the centurion), they nevertheless compromise *conciseness* and *clarity* in a manner that is inconsistent with 2DH Lukan procedure in relation to the two Markan miracles discussed above (see also table 5.3). While the same problem is faced by all hypotheses, it is clearly least problematic for the 2GH Luke who
regularly expands upon Matthew (up to twice the length for the two pericopes analyzed above) albeit violating rhetorical conventions of the day.

The FH Luke retains all the problems associated with the 2DH Lukan expansion of Q insofar as Matthew (Luke’s source) is itself only a slight expansion of Q. The implied procedure, therefore, is inconsistent with the FH Luke’s procedure elsewhere in relation to Mark. While there is no clear evidence of Matthean redactional phrases appearing in Luke (once Q is assumed), a couple of phrases from Matt 8:13 (‘as you believed,’ ‘from that hour’) are surprisingly omitted from Luke 7:10. In essence the analysis of this pericope indicates an idiosyncratic procedure for both the 2DH and FH Luke in relation to their sources (Q for the 2DH and Matthew for the FH). The same is true for the 2DH Matthew in relation to Q, a problem escaped by the FH (and 2GH) insofar as Matthew’s source is no longer available for comparison.

In essence our analysis of this pericope goes against the conclusions of chapter five and the analysis of previous two pericopes in chapter six insofar as the 2GH Lukan transformations of Matthew are the most plausible. In particular they are consistent with Luke’s procedure elsewhere in relation to Matthew, which is marked by fairly radical expansion. It nevertheless remains the case that the implied procedure of the 2GH Luke in relation to Matthew is idiosyncratic and contravenes the narrative rhetorical conventions of his day. For these reasons the findings in relation to the Centurion’s servant do not overrule the conclusions already reached above, namely that the Markan priority hypotheses provide a more plausible explanation of implied redaction of miracle traditions in the synoptic Gospels. It is difficult to determine which of our two Markan priority hypotheses (2DH and FH) is the most plausible in relation to the Centurion’s servant.⁶

---

⁶Ironically the problems produced by the 2DH would be alleviated somewhat if there were an expanded version of Q whereby the implied changes were more akin to the changes (of Luke and Matthew) in relation to Mark.
7.4 Conclusion

Narrative rhetorical analysis of Gospel miracle tradition in relation to order and selection (chapter 5) along with re-presentation of three individual pericopes (chapter 6) leads to the general conclusion that Markan priority provides a more plausible explanation of the implied redaction than does Markan posteriority (2GH). Neither of our Markan priority hypotheses (2DH and FH), however, is demonstrably more plausible than the other. While the concentrated focus on Gospel miracle traditions contributes to a lacuna in SP discussion, the conclusions drawn here must be considered in light of the larger scope of SP discussion outlined briefly in chapters one and two. Specifically this study contributes to this larger discussion in the following three ways: (a) methodologically it reinforces the utilization of ancient literary and rhetorical analogies to the synoptic evangelists in order to evaluate the greater or lesser plausibility of their implied redaction upon assumption of any given hypothesis; (b) the cumulative evidence considered here points to the greater plausibility of Markan priority hypotheses (2DH and FH) over against Markan posteriority (2GH); and finally (c) this study points the way for additional studies specifically related to the narrative rhetoric and the SP, for example in relation the Gospel Passion Narratives.
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