

Critical Observations on a Team Effort: *Beyond the Q Impasse — Luke's Use of Matthew*

I. INTRODUCTION

At the 1997 CBA meeting in Seattle, David L. Dungan presented an overview of a forthcoming book, *Beyond the Q Impasse — Luke's Use of Matthew*, which has since been published through the editorial work of Allan J. McNicol, himself and David B. Peabody.¹ This work also represents the input of other members of the Research Team of the International Institute for Gospel Studies, William R. Farmer (who wrote the preface), Lamar Cope and Philip Shuler. The title of Dungan's 1997 paper suggested that the Team had found "objective proof" of Luke's use of Matthew, in support of their "Two Gospel Hypothesis" [= 2GH].² The Team's publication, however, does not make such an overstated claim, but seeks to give "a plausible account of the composition of the Gospel of Luke on the assumption that his major source was Matthew" (1),³ while "*taking Mark completely out of the picture and dispensing with Q*" (12).⁴ In this paper, I propose to offer an overview of the approach taken by the Team, as well as critical observations from the responses by other scholars⁵ and my own evaluation of the Team's argumentation.

¹Allan J. McNicol, David L. Dungan and David B. Peabody (eds.), *Beyond the Q Impasse — Luke's Use of Matthew: A Demonstration by the Research Team of the International Institute for Gospel Studies*. Valley Forge PA: Trinity, 1996, xvi-333pp. — This article began as a paper for the 63rd International Meeting of the Catholic Biblical Association of America at Loyola Marymount University, August 5-8, 2000, entitled, "On *Luke's Use of Matthew*. The Scholarly Response to and Additional Observations on the Demonstration by the Research Team of the International Institute for Gospel Studies."

²If memory serves, the title of the paper was "Is This Objective Proof that Luke used Matthew?"

³In their conclusion, however, the Team claims that they "*now have hard evidence*" (319) for Luke's use of Matthew. — *Beyond the Q Impasse* will often be cited in-text.

This Team project is offered as a direct response to the challenge for these supporters of the Griesbach Hypothesis—or as they prefer, the "Two Gospel Hypothesis"—from other participants at the 1984 Jerusalem Conference on the Synoptic Problem. For the papers at that conference, see David L. Dungan (ed.), *The Interrelations of the Gospels. A Symposium Led by M.-É. Boismard – W.R. Farmer – F. Neiryck, Jerusalem 1984* (BETL, 95), Leuven: Peeters 1990.

⁴There is little discussion with other scholars, as Tuckett notes (364; see reference below, n. 5): "For the most part, references to other secondary literature are kept to a minimum, and in one way it is a welcome relief to have the arguments of the authors uncluttered by proliferating footnotes." Nevertheless, there are at least two Markan priorists to whom the Team often turns for support: Michael D. Goulder, *Luke. A New Paradigm*. Vol. I: Part I. *The Argument*; Part II. *Commentary: Luke 1.1–9.50*; Vol. II: Part II (cont.). *Commentary: Luke 9.51–24.53* (JSNT SS, 20), Sheffield, 1989; and Robert H. Gundry "Matthean Foreign Bodies in Agreements of Luke with Matthew against Mark. Evidence that Luke used Matthew," in F. Van Segbroeck, *et al.* (eds.), *The Four Gospels 1992. Festschrift for F. Neiryck* (BETL, 100; 3 vols.), Leuven: Peeters, 1992, 1467-1495.

⁵Although a full scan of the scholarly literature is impossible, scholarly response to this work seems to be wanting. Solid reviews have been offered by Christopher Tuckett (*JBL* 117.2 [1998] 363-365) and John S. Kloppenborg (*CBQ* 61.2 [1999] 370-372), but to my knowledge, no other significant reviews have been written. — When the name of the reviewer is noted in the text, the page citation will also be given in the text.

II. THE TEAM'S READING OF THE GOSPEL OF LUKE

A. THE NARRATIVE FLOW OF LUKE

The focus of the Team's work is, of course, on the first of "Luke's two 'books'" (42).⁶ The narrative of the Gospel of Luke is divided into Parts (Roman Numerals), Sections ("S") and Pericopes ("¶"). At this point the major parts and sections are indicated, as well as some of the "interweaving transitional sections":

- I. 1:1–2:52 Birth and Infancy of John the Baptist and Jesus of Nazareth
- II. 3:1–4:16a The New Era of Salvation Announced by John and Jesus
Interweaving Transitional Unit: 4:14-16a
¶ 16. 4:14-16a Jesus Returns to Galilee
- III. 4:16b–7:15 The Inauguration of the Prophet-Messiah's Mission
Interweaving Transitional Unit (First Part): 7:11-15
¶ 33. 7:11-15 Jesus Goes to Nain and Brings the Son of a Widow Back to Life
- IV. 7:16–9:50 Jesus is Shown to be the Son of God
 - S 1: A Mighty Prophet Has Arisen? (7:16-50)
Interweaving Transitional Unit (Second Part): 7:16-17
¶ 34. 7:16-17 Fame of Jesus Spreads Everywhere. He is God's Mighty Prophet
 - S 2: Be Mindful How You Respond to the Word of God! (8:1-21)
 - S 3: Jesus Travels About Performing Miracles and Then Sends out the Twelve Apostles to Do the Same (8:22–9:11)
 - S 4: The Conclusion to Jesus' Galilean Ministry (9:12-36)
Interweaving Transitional Section to Part Five (First Half): 9:37-50
- V. 9:51–19:27 Jesus Journeys toward Jerusalem
 - ¶ 55. 9:51 Jesus Sets out for Jerusalem
Interweaving Transitional Section to Part Five (Second Half): 9:52-62—Ineptitude in Discipleship
 - S 1: The Great Mission (10:1-42)
 - S 2: To the Disciples: On Prayer (11:1-13)
 - S 3: To the People: On Spiritual Power (11:14-32)
¶ 72. 11:33-36 Lukan Thematic Summary
 - S 4: To Pharisees and Lawyers: On Hypocrisy (11:37-52)
 - S 5: To Friends and Disciples: Reject Fear and Anxiety. Trust God (12:4-34)

It is unfortunate that it was only after presenting the paper that I became aware of two additional reviews. See Robert A. Derrenbacker, Jr. "The Relationship of the Gospels Reconsidered," *Toronto Journal of Theology* 14 (1998) 83-88, and especially the thorough and insightful review by Mark Goodacre, "Beyond the *Q* Impasse or Down a Blind Alley?" *JSNT* 76 (1999) 33-52. — The observations of these reviewers have not included in this critical article, so the reader is encouraged to contact these on her/his own.

Besides these four review articles, a brief look at literature in recent journals and commentaries does not reveal many references to this work. It is briefly presented by David Laird Dungan, *A History of the Synoptic Problem. The Canon, the Text, the Composition, and the Interpretation of the Gospels* (Anchor Bible Reference Library). New York: Random House, 1999, 381-382.

⁶There are a few indications of "echoes" of the Gospel in Acts in the Team's presentation: Luke's "...account of the first Christian martyr, Stephen, is a story which echoes the death of Jesus precisely at those three points where Luke's Gospel differs from Mt's version: the two—strikingly different—sayings from the cross (Lk 23:34 and 23:46), and ... [a] plea for forgiveness (cf. Acts 7:59-60)" (304, and cf. 306-307 for more on Stephen's martyrdom). Also, "For an echo of Luke's language in Lk 23:5, note Acts 10:37" (299). — More generally, they note that "We found it necessary to pay continual attention to Acts..., since many of the key resonances and themes continue to remain active there as well" (30).

For papers of a recent conference on the "unity" of Luke and Acts, see J. Verheyden (ed.), *The Unity of Luke–Acts* (BETL, 142), Leuven: Peeters, 1999.

- S 6: To the Disciples and Others: Appropriate Conduct Before the Lord's Coming (12:35-53)
 S 7: To the Multitudes: Who is Truly Judged? (12:54-13:30)
 ¶ 84. 13:31-35 Interweaving Transitional Pericope
 S 8: To a Dinner Audience: The Messiah's Banquet Instructions (14:1-35)
 S 9: To Scribes and Pharisees: God Seeks and Saves the Lost (15:1-32)
 S 10: To Disciples and Pharisees: You Cannot Serve God and Money (16:1-31)
 S 11: To the Disciples: On Faith and Works (17:1-19)
 S 12: To Pharisees and Disciples: Where is the Kingdom? (17:20-27)
 S 13: To the Faithful and the Self-Righteous: On Prayer (18:1-14)
 S 14: To the Disciples, a Ruler and Hearers: On the Kingdom of God (18:15-30)
 S 15: To the Twelve and a Man: True Blindness (18:31-43)
 Interweaving Transitional Section to Part Six (First Half): 19:1-27—Preparation for the King to
 Come into His City
 VI. 19:28-21:38 The Arrival of the Prophet-King in Jerusalem
 Interweaving Transitional Section to Part Six (Second Half): 19:28-44—The King Comes to
 Claim His City
 S 1: The King Meets Opposition and Is Rejected by the City's Leaders (19:45-21:4)
 S 2: The King Predicts the Destruction of the Temple and the City (21:5-38)
 VII. 22:1-24:53 The Arrest, Death, and Resurrection of Jesus the King
 S 1: Jesus' Last Passover Meal (22:1-46)
 S 2: Jesus' Arrest, Trials, and Public Humiliation (22:47-23:25)
 S 3: Jesus' Crucifixion, Death, and Burial (23:26-56b)
 S 4: Conclusion of Book One. Appearances of the Risen Jesus (23:56c-24:53)

The Team's reading of the narrative of Luke is carefully considered, and provides interesting observations concerning themes employed by Luke,⁷ as well as the interconnectedness of Luke's narrative, which is accomplished through the use of "interweaving transitional" sections and summaries. By these, "Luke carefully wove together the ending and beginnings of his stories, to create overlapping, interlocking pericopes and sections" (44). At times, as evinced by the above outline, these weavings are split into halves, "so that each half of a transitional unit falls within the Parts or Sections they weave together" (44). The narrative detected by the Team, therefore, is a well-constructed, orderly narrative, quite comparable to other readings of Luke.⁸

⁷See Tuckett, 364: "A good deal of attention is given to the question of order.... At times that leads to some interesting and intriguing ways of reading Luke's narrative: for example, the material leading up to enhance the status of the 'seventy-two.' There are then several useful and interesting suggestions here about the way Luke structured his narrative, suggestions which retain their interest and value whatever source theory one presupposes."

The following "Major Themes in Luke" are identified: "Activity of the Holy Spirit" (36-37); "Jerusalem and the Temple" (37-38); "John and Jesus in Comparison" (38-39); "Jesus Role in the Divine Plan" (39-40); "Eschatological Reversals" (40).

⁸"Luke's revision of Matthew was guided by a number of considerations..., but the most important of all was his determination to write a narrative that was 'accurate,' i.e., presented in what he considered to be an appropriate *chronological* order for a literary work" (15). — The general narrative outline is quite similar to, e.g., I. H. Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke. A Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGTC, 3), Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1978, 7-11 and Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel according to Luke: Vol. I: I-IX; Vol. II: X-XXIV* (AB, 28 & 28A), Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1981 and 1985, I:134-142. The indication of sections, especially the thematic titles in the central section, are quite distinct. What is most distinct in their outline from Marshall's and Fitzmyer's is that while the first mention of Jerusalem as a destination, Lk 9:51, plays an important role in the Team's outline of Luke's narrative, the repetitions in Lk 13:22; 17:11 play no role in outlining the Central Section. The same apparent downplaying of these repetitions can be seen in John Nolland, *Luke 1-9:20, and 9:21-18:34, and 18:35-24:53* (Word Biblical Commentary, 35A, B & C), Dallas, TX: Word Books, 1989; 1993; 1993, III:vii-xii, Darrell L. Bock, *Luke*. 2 vols. I: *1:1-9:50*; II: *9:51-24:53* (Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament, 3A & B), Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1994 and 1996, I:44-48, and Joel B. Green, *The Gospel of Luke* (The New International Commentary on the New Testament), Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1997, 25-29.

In addition, the Team supplies a number of “Excurses” which explicate how and/or why Luke composes various sections in the way he does. Because some of these deal more specifically with Luke’s supposed use of Matthew, they will be more relevant in critical observations to come. By way of appreciation, however, the excurses do offer the reader important information with respect to the Team’s understanding of Luke’s compositional and thematic interests.⁹

B. LUKE’S PROPOSED USE OF CANONS OF HELLENISTIC HISTORIOGRAPHY

In order to compose his well-crafted narrative, Luke, according to the Team, employed canons of Hellenistic historiography. For this interesting suggestion, they take their cue from J. Dupont’s reference to Lucian of Samosata.¹⁰ “Lucian insisted that ... history should be truthful, rhetorically skillful, and written not just for the present but for all future ages” (30-32). Lucian offers his own explanation in “How to Write History”. The quotation below, with the Team’s emphasizing underlining of “key words ... [that] are important technical terms in genre discussions of the Gospels” (32), offers enough of an introduction to this proposed understanding of Luke’s composition for our purposes (words in parentheses are added by the Team for a clearer translation):¹¹

...After the preface, long or short in proportion to its subject matter, let the transition to the narrative be gentle and easy. For all the body of the history is simply a long narrative. So let it be adorned with the virtues proper to (such a) narrative, i.e., progressing smoothly, evenly and consistently, free from things jutting out and gaps. Then let the clarity (of the subject matter) show plainly, achieved, as I have said, both by means of the text and by means of the interweaving of the things (recounted). For he will make everything distinct and complete, and when finished with the first topic he will introduce the second, fastened to it and linked with it like a chain, to avoid breaks and a multiplicity of disjointed narratives. No, the first and second topics must always not merely be neighbors but share and mix the edges (of the units) together.

Although the treatment of these Hellenistic canons of historiography can be helpful in understanding Luke’s compositional methods, they do not immediately indicate anything about Luke’s source(s), despite what seems to be the attempt of the Team to suggest otherwise by the section’s title: “Some of Luke’s Compositional Techniques Emerging from Our Study of Luke’s Redaction of Matthew” (29). Nevertheless, more careful and complete studies of Hellenistic historiography and Luke’s narrative might well prove to be very productive for Lucan studies.¹²

C. SYNOPSES AND THE TEXT OF LUKE

⁹Cf. the following “Excurses”: “Reasons for Luke’s Parallelization of John and Jesus” (53); “The Image of the Wandering Sage in Greco-Roman Literature and Its Relevance for Understanding Luke’s Composition” (78-79); “The Selection of the 12 and the Message of Non-Retaliatio” (90-92) “How Luke Excerpted Matthew’s Sermon on the Mount” (103-104); “The Functions of Luke’s Introduction (Lk 9:37-62) to His Lengthy Collection of Jesus’ Teachings (Lk 10:1-19:27)” (141-145); “The Mission of the 12 and the 72: A Comparative Analysis” (160); “Luke’s Revision of Matthew’s Account of the Last Supper” (276-279).

¹⁰“La question du plan des Actes des Apôtres à lumière d’un texte de Lucien de Samosate,” *Novum Testamentum* 21 (1979) 220-231.

¹¹Both Lucian’s Greek text and the Team’s translation are on p. 32. They also provide seven “explanatory glosses” for some of the underlined text (32-33). For another translation of “How to Write History”, the Team refers the reader to the one by K. Kilburn (Loeb Series), Harvard University Press, 1958, 6:66-67.

¹²Kloppenborg, 371: “The suggestion that Luke employed the canons of Hellenistic historiography and, thus, preferred balanced episodes and smooth progressions without breaks or disjointed episodes might help to account for the shape of Luke’s narrative. More work, however, is required to demonstrate how such virtues are embodied concretely in Luke’s editorial choices.”

Before concluding this section on the Team's reading of Luke, a brief comment on available Synopses and the critical text of Luke is in order. First, the Team provides synopses to "clarify our compositional analyses" (43) because "no currently available synopsis enables the reader to quickly see the evidence we discuss in our source-critical arguments" (44).¹³ Some of these synopses are specific to the Team's proposed use of Matthew,¹⁴ but others demonstrate parallels within Luke's text,¹⁵ which can be compared to what the Team at times calls "echoes" within the Lucan text.¹⁶ These synopses are certainly helpful for following the Team's presenta-

¹³"Although we normally worked with two-column synopses, sometimes we had to create charts with four, five, even eight columns, to display adequately the parallels we were seeing between Matthew and Luke. This liberation from the blinders of three-column synopses was a critical step in opening our minds to Luke's use of Matthew" (13).

¹⁴Twenty Synopses and brief summaries of them are listed on pp. viii-ix. There are some missing synopses and other errors in their list, so I provide a list of Lucan pericopes and all proposed parallels gleaned from the synopses themselves. In this note I offer the Team's proposed parallels to Matthew, while I will list the parallels within the Gospel of Luke itself in the note below:

Lk 4:14-16 // Mt 4:12-13a, 23a, 24a; 9:26 (82; add to list)
 Lk 4:16, 22-24, 31-32 // Mt 13:53-55a, 57b-58; 5:2; 4:13; 7:28-29 (86)
 Lk 4:42-44 // Mt 4:17, 23, 25 (93)
 Lk 6:12-20a // Mt 4:23-5:1; 12:15-15; 9:35-10:4 (100-102)
 Lk 7:1; 4:31-32 // Mt 7:28-29 (103)
 Lk 8:1 // Mt 9:35; 11:1 (119)
 Lk 9:48b-c // Mt 10:40; 18:5 (148)
 Lk 9:1-6; 10:1-16 // Mt 9:35-10:16; 11:20-24; 10:40//18:5 (160-164)
 Lk 11:27-28 (and already at 8:19-21) // Mt 12:46-50 (179)
 Lk 11:33-36 // Mt 5:14-16; 6:22-23 (182)
 Lk 18:35-43 // Mt 9:26-31; 20:29-34 (240-241)
 Lk 21:12-19 (and 12:11-12) // Mt 10:17-22; 24:8-14 (260-262)
 Lk 21:20-36 (and 17:20-37) // Mt 24:15-42 (263-268)
 Lk 22:14-15, 21-24 // Mt 26:20-25 (280)
 Lk 22:16-18 // Mt 26:27-29 & 1 Cor 11:24-26 (281)
 Lk 22:19-20 // Mt 26:26-28 & 1 Cor 11:24-25 (283)
 Lk 22:54-65 (and 22:66-71) // Mt 26:57-75 (290-294)

¹⁵The Synopses for parallels within the Gospel of Luke:

Lk 5:20f. // Lk 7:48f. (118; add to list) Lk 15:4-7 // Lk 15:8-10 (216)
 Lk 14:7-11 // Lk 14:12-14 (210) Lk 14:28-32 // Lk 15:4-10 (217-218)
 Lk 14:28-30 // Lk 14:31-32 (214)

¹⁶For example: At Lk 2:14, "The word of the angelic host is strongly echoed (*Gloria in Excelsis*) at the scene of Jesus' entry into Jerusalem (Lk 12:38)" (65); "The series of themes [in Luke's Sermon] begins with 'good news to the poor' (an echo of the first public sermon in Nazareth; Isa 61:1-2)..." (103); In Lk 7:16, "The report of what the crowds actually say in direct speech is significant. The specific terms echo pronouncements from the infancy material about John the Baptist" (113); "Luke [8:19-21, "drawn from Mt 12:46-50,"] has changed the final statement of Jesus ... to 'my mother and my brothers are *those who hear the word of God and do it.*' This shift in terminology echoes the beginning of Luke's version of the Interpretation of the Parable of the Sower, where Luke has Jesus say: 'The seed is *the Word of God*' ..." (123; this echo seems in the wrong direction); The "dialogue [in Lk 9:18-22] echoes Lk 9:7-9, which is clearly hovering in the background of both the Matthean and the Lukan accounts" (137); At 12:22-34, Luke concludes "...with the saying about 'treasure' (Lk 12:33-34//Mt 6:19-21), an echo of Lk 12:21" (194); "The 'Lament over Jerusalem' [Lk 13:34-35] echoes other references to Jerusalem (Lk 13:4 and esp. Lk 13:33)" (207); "The references [in Lk 14:7-14] to the *πτωχούς, ἀναπίρους, χωλούς, and τυφλούς*, echo key categories in Jesus' inaugural sermon (Lk 4:18...; cf. also Lk 7:22...; cf. Mt 15:29-31)" (209); "Indeed worthy of note are the large number of echoes between Lk 19:41-44 and the Benedictus materials in Lk 1:71, 74, 78-79" (249); "The expression *ἀλλὰ ὦν ... τοῦτο τὸ γεγραμμένον δεῖ τελεσθῆναι ἐν ἐμοί* (Lk 22:36[37]) is a distinct echo of what

tion, and Kloppenborg notes that “it may be hoped, [the synopses] will be collected and published separately” (372).

With respect to the critical text of the Gospel of Luke, some members of the Team have pointed out that the Nestle-Aland and UBS texts¹⁷ have been developed with too much dependence on the Two Document Hypothesis [= 2DH].¹⁸ It was to be expected that they would make a number of textual observations,¹⁹ but few are in disagreement with UBS⁴:

Jesus said at the beginning of his ministry and a similar quotation from Isaiah... (Lk 4:21; cf. Lk 4:18-19//Isa 61:1-2; 58:6, another text from Isa)” (287); “Herod the Tetrarch is portrayed as being eager to see Jesus, an obvious echo of the earlier Lukan references to Herod at Lk 9:7-19; 13:31-32” (300); In Lk 11:27-28 “... the womb and the breasts that nourished Jesus were honored. Now, in Lk 23:29, the wombs and breasts of these women will be dry and barren. This verse also echoes Lk 21:23 which is also a text on the Fall of Jerusalem” (302); At Lk 23:35 (parallel to Mt 27:41-43), “The words ‘If he is the *Christ of God*, his *Chosen One*’ are a deliberate echo of several momentous earlier usages of these terms: the angels (Lk 2:11), Peter (Lk 9:20), the Voice of God at the Transfiguration (Lk 9:35; cf. Acts 2:36; 3:18)” (304); “...the reference to women who followed Jesus from Galilee (Lk 23:49) echoes Lk 23:27 and Lk 8:1-3, where these women were first named, and looks forward to Lk 23:55 and to Lk 24:6-10, where the women are named again, and to Lk 24:22-24 which includes an explicit retrospective reference to the women’s roles in Luke’s narrative” (309).

¹⁷The Team most consistently refers to UBS⁴ in this work. They also often cite the presentations in Bruce Metzger’s *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament; A Companion Volume to the United Bible Societies’ Greek New Testament* (3d ed.), London – New York: United Bible Societies, 1971; ²1994.

¹⁸For example, David L. Dungan, “Two-Gospel Hypothesis” in David N. Freedman, *et al.* (eds.), *Anchor Bible Dictionary*, Garden City, NY: Doubleday, vol. 6, 1992, 671-679, esp. 673 col. 2, and more recently *A History of the Synoptic Problem*, 341.

¹⁹The following all opt for the UBS⁴ text:

- Lk 6:39 “...εἶπεν δὲ καὶ παραβολὴν αὐτοῖς, if it is part of the original text, is Lukan redaction (cf. Lk 5:36; 12:16; 13:6; 14:7; 15:3; 20:9, 19; 21:29)” (107).
- Lk 8:28 “...in Luke’s account, the demons call him υἱὲ τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ὑψίστου (D omits τοῦ θεοῦ), which resembles Lk 1:32...” (129).
- Lk 9:2 The Team reads “τούς ἀσθενεῖς with **Σ** A D L alii” (132).
- Lk 9:10 The reference to Bethsaida, “as the rich number of variants in the manuscript tradition indicates, ... introduced serious strains in Luke’s account” (135).
- Lk 9:35 “UBS⁴ argues that the Voice in Lk 9:35 said: Οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἐκλελεγμένος.... The witnesses in support of this reading include $\mathfrak{P}^{45, 75}$ **Σ** B L vgst sy^s, hmg. In support of versions closer to Matthew’s text, there are: ὁ ἀγαπητός supported by A C* R W it vg^{ww} sy^{(c).p.h} Mcion Cl; and ὁ ἀγαπητός ἐν ζ εὐδόκησα—fully parallel with Mt’s text: C³ D. We are inclined to agree with UBS⁴, despite the powerful support of the ‘Western’ witnesses for a text similar or identical to Mt, and despite our hypothesis which says Luke was working directly from Matthew’s text (so we view ‘harmonizations’ in a different light than the UBS committee). In this case, we believe Luke changed Mt’s ‘my beloved’ (Mt 17:5) to ‘my chosen one’ in anticipation of the voice of the crowd at Lk 23:35 ὁ Χριστὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ὁ ἐλεκτός...” (140-141).
- Lk 10:1 “The confusion between ‘70’ and ‘72’ ... probably stems from the...” ambiguity in Num 11:26-30, wherein Moses chooses 70 elders, but 72 elders receive his spirit. “The manuscripts of Luke could have been ‘corrected’ in either direction, but the later manuscripts tend to agree on 70. We agree with the conjecture of UBS⁴, principally following \mathfrak{P}^{75} B D the Diatessaron, itala, and Origen, that it should be ‘72,’ because the somewhat more complicated, literal use of these materials from the book of Numbers by Luke seems the more difficult reading, and therefore more original” (166).
- Mt 18:11 “Mt 18:11 was not in the text of Mt known to Luke” at 15:3-7 (228).
- Lk 20:47 “This verse has almost the same wording as the doubtful reading Mt 23:14. Since Mt 23:14 is missing in the best early manuscripts (**Σ** B D L Θ several versions and Origen, Cyril and Jerome), and since, when this verse does appear in the MSS, it sometimes comes before and sometimes after Mt 23:13, UBS⁴ omits this verse as a harmonization, in our judgment correctly” (256).

- Lk 3:22b They read the Western text's quotation of Ps 2:7 (cf. Acts 13:33), υἱὸς μου εἶ σύ, ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά [sic] σε instead of the wording that is also found in Mk 1:11, σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱὸς μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν σοὶ εὐδόκησα.²⁰
- Lk 4:44 They question the reading of τῆς Ἰουδαίας, and seem to prefer τῆς Γαλιλαίας.²¹
- Lk 23:34 UBS⁴ places Jesus' forgiveness from the cross within double brackets, "indicating their view that it is not original with a grade of {A}. Nevertheless, they leave it in the text.... We are inclined to accept this verse as original...."²²

Moreover, as critical as the team can be about the use of synoptic hypotheses in text critical decisions, they themselves give into the temptation ever so slightly:

- Lk 24:52 "Καὶ αὐτοὶ προσκυνήσαντες αὐτόν has also been questioned, but in view of the overwhelming ms. evidence, and especially Mt 28:17 καὶ ἰδόντες αὐτὸν προσεκύνησαν..., we are inclined to view this as original in the text of Luke..." (317).

Finally, there are two instances, Mt 12:40 and Lk 17:6, at which the Team hints at possible hypothetical readings,²³ despite objections against such proposals by Two Document theorists.²⁴

- Lk 22:43-44 "These verses are considered to be an interpolation by UBS⁴. The ms. evidence against their genuineness is very strong: \mathfrak{P}^{75} \mathfrak{N}^1 A B N T W and a few early versions. In favor are the original hand plus the second corrector of \mathfrak{N} , as well as D L Δ Θ Ψ , numerous versions and virtually all of the patristic citations. The UBS committee therefore regards it as an ancient and honorable early reading, but not original. ... On balance we incline to omit, mainly because of the ms. evidence" (288).
- Lk 24:12 "This verse was barely included in the text on a split vote by UBS³ with a grade of {D}. By UBS⁴ it was included by the majority of the editorial committee with a grade of {B}. We agree with the latter position. The textual evidence for inclusion is very strong...." (311).
- Lk 24:51b "The phraseology καὶ ἀνεφέρετο εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν has in the past been questioned as to its originality. However, UBS⁴ includes it, as do we, primarily because the Ms. evidence is overwhelming, but also because its omission is understandable as an attempt to bring this passage into greater harmony with the next 'ascension' described in Acts 1:9-11..." (317).

²⁰The quotation of Ps. 2:7 "...is found in D it (numerous mss) Justin, Clement *et al.* The UBS reading is supported by \mathfrak{P}^4 \mathfrak{N} A B L W Θ vg, sy, cop, arm, eth, Augustine *et al.* ... We think that Luke's original reading was indeed *meant to be* a quotation from Ps 2:7, since Luke later explicitly quoted Ps 2:7 again in Acts 13:33, clearly looking back at this passage (N.B. the synopses of Boismard and Greeven who also adopt the Western reading). One can see why the later orthodox Fathers may have altered Luke's original reading to conform to Mk" (76). — Certainly harmonization to Mark is a possibility. But as for the reference to Acts 13:33, Luke is not dealing with Jesus' baptism or prayer thereafter, but with Jesus' resurrection. Moreover, Luke specifically cites—on the lips of Paul—τῷ ψαλμῷ ... τῷ δευτέρῳ before the direct quotation. The Western reading at Lk 3:22, then, could be a harmonization to Acts 13:33. Moreover, one can wonder whether source theory is not part of the background for the Team's decision.

²¹Τῆς Ἰουδαίας from \mathfrak{P}^{75} \mathfrak{N} B C *et al.* "is questionable (note Metzger's explanation that the UBS editorial committee basically relied on the 'rougher reading' principle; Metzger 1994:114f.). The earlier Western text's 'Galilee,' may well be the original text (A D Δ Θ Ψ it [11 mss] vg, syr, cop, *et al.*). The reading accepted by UBS, despite its attestation in otherwise reliable manuscripts, appears to be a harmonistic echo of Mt 4:25, intended to expand Jesus' field of activity. If it is genuine, it may be a Lukan anticipation of Jesus' conflict with the Pharisees. In Mt 3:5-7 the Pharisees come from Judea (cf. Lk 5:17)" (93-94).

²²"A number of early witnesses omit the verse entirely: \mathfrak{P}^{75} \mathfrak{N}^1 B D* W Θ it^{a,d} syr^s cop^{sa bo}. The great majority of witnesses, including other important early ones, include it: \mathfrak{N}^* ² A C D² L Δ Ψ and a large number of patristic citations." The Team accepts it "as original for two main reasons. The evidence in Sinaiticus suggests an answer to the conflicting text-critical evidence. The original hand included it; the first corrector omitted it, possibly under the influence of anti-Jewish sentiment which permeated the orthodox Church from the mid-second century onwards....

"Our second consideration is that Jesus' act of forgiveness fits perfectly into Luke's moral and theological agenda..." (303)

²³Their presentations on these verses:

III. THE MAJOR ARGUMENTS SUPPORTING LUKE'S USE OF MATTHEW

Having offered some general comments on the reading and text of the Gospel of Luke from the Team's presentation, we can move to the primary interest of this paper, the demonstration of the composition of Luke on the basis of Matthew as Luke's primary source (without Marcan priority or Q). This daunting task had not been fully completed by the Team's theoretical patriarchs, Henry Owen (*Observations on the Four Gospels*, 1764) and Johann Jakob Griesbach (*Demonstration that Mark Was Written After Matthew and Luke*, 1790). In order "to remedy this lacuna" and to respond to the observation and implied challenge of the 1984 Jerusalem Conference that "the single most compelling argument to support any source hypothesis would be a complete redaction-critical analysis of the texts of all three Gospels,"²⁵ the Team has produced this impressive work.

Besides the daunting nature of the task itself, this work faces a considerable wall of contemporary scholarship which is quite skeptical toward the Team's 2GH. This is pointed out clearly in their brief historical overview of scholarly work on the synoptic problem.²⁶ They note some of the most pointed arguments against Luke's use of Matthew as a primary source by Kümmel²⁷ and Fitzmyer,²⁸ the latter of whom they present as follows (11):

1. Luke never reproduces "the typically Matthean additions within the Triple Tradition."
2. Luke occasionally has versions of material similar to Matthew but in a different form.
3. "Why would Luke have wanted to break up Matthew's sermons, especially the Sermon on the Mount, incorporating only part of it into his Sermon on the Plain and scattering the rest of it in an unconnected form in the loose context of the travel account?"
4. "Apart from [the preaching of John the Baptist and the Temptation], Luke never inserted the material [common with Matthew] in the same Marcan context as Matthew."
5. "Analysis of the [material shared with Matthew] reveals that it is sometimes Luke and sometimes Matthew who preserves...the more original setting of a given episode."
6. "If Luke depended on Matthew, why did he constantly omit Matthean material in episodes lacking Marcan parallels?"

Mt 12:40 "Luke [11:30] omitted the reference to Jonah being '3 days and nights in the belly of the fish', if it was in his text of Matthew, so as not to contradict his passion predictions... (Lk 9:22; 18:31-33; cf. Lk 24:7, 21)" (181).

Lk 17:6 "...Luke changed Mt's 'mountain, move to yonder place' (Mt 17:20...) to 'sycamine tree, be rooted up and planted in the sea' (Lk 17:6). Could 'sycamine' (συκάμινος) be a later scribal corruption from a more original 'sycamore' (συκομορέα [sic])? If so, it would have provided an anticipation of the tree mentioned in the Zacchaeus story, unique to Lk (cf. Lk 19:4, συκομορέα), something Luke would have done" (230).

²⁴Namely, with respect to the elimination of τῆς ἑσπιν ὁ παίσας σε from Mt 26:68 (//Lk 22:64 against Mk 14:65), see William R. Farmer, *The Synoptic Problem. A Critical Analysis*, New York-London: Macmillan, 1964; rev. ed., Dillsboro, NC: Western North Carolina Press, 1976, 148-149 (contra Streeter).

²⁵From Farmer's preface, xii.

²⁶"Our Historical Context", 1-12, the first section of the "Introduction" 1-44.

²⁷See pp. 10-11 for their reference to W. G., Kümmel, *Introduction to the New Testament* (New Testament Library), trans. of the ¹⁷1973 German ed. by H. C. Kee, Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 1975, 64.

²⁸*Luke I-IX*, 73-75.

The Team dismisses much of this list²⁹ rather easily (11-12)—too easily for this synoptic student:

Notice how the first reason focuses attention only on the Lukan material shared with Mark and Matthew. Notice how the third and the sixth reasons assume the priority of Mark. This is understandable in Fitzmyer's context, because, *as had become customary*, he preceded this list with seven pages of carefully reasoned arguments proving that Mark was Luke's main source. Since we categorically reject this premise ... these arguments become moot.

It is not clear how the Team's observation on #1 is a sufficient dismissal. How is #3 dependent on Marcan priority? The issue of Luke's dismantling Matthean discourses, especially the Sermon, is a problem with which the Team, in fact, will busy themselves. Perhaps "the third" is an error (as they take it up below), and should have been "the fourth", because it is clear that observations #4 and #6 are based on Marcan priority. At some point, however, the Team will need to show that their 2GH offers a better explanation than the 2DH offers of the "Double Tradition" material and what in their hypothesis are common omissions of Luke and Mark against Matthew.

After their smooth dismissals, they note:

The remainder of the list are not arguments; they are just requests for information.

#2 Why would Luke give something similar to Matthew's version but different?

#3 Why would Luke dismember Matthew's great speeches and locate them throughout his narrative?

#5 Why would Luke sometimes preserve an earlier version of a saying also found in Matthew?

With that, the team is prepared to move forward: "*Working as an interdisciplinary team using impartial instruments, taking Mark completely out of the picture and dispensing with Q, we will address the questions above, and many others besides*" (12).

A. LUKE'S USE OF MATTHEW'S ORDER

The first task to be tackled is how Luke's order can be seen as his compositional work on his primary source, Matthew, and other nonMatthean sources. To demonstrate their theory, the Team looks at each of the seven major parts of Luke (cf. outline above for more detail). What becomes clear both in the general summary (14-20, summarized on 21) and the detailed explanation in the body of the book (47-317) is that Luke works quite differently with his primary source in many of the parts/sections.

²⁹Bock, *Luke 1:1-9:50*, 8, makes use of Fitzmyer's list, but notes that the 2GH and Goulder's theory contain "a denial of Luke 1:1-4 with its appeal to many predecessors."

Part One: Luke 1:1–2:52
John the Baptist and Jesus of Nazareth³⁰

Perhaps most unusual in the confidence of the Team that Luke used Matthew is that for the very first part of Luke, the Birth and Infancy of John the Baptist and Jesus of Nazareth, they have to admit that “Luke adopted elements from but not the order of Mt 1–2” (21). Nevertheless, Luke did keep “comparable birth and infancy stories ... in the same order as ... in Matthew (cf. Mt 1:18-24/Lk 1:26-38 and Mt 1:25, 2:1-23/Lk 2:1-40)” (15). Would Luke have had the baby adored or named before he was born, if he had not been prompted by Matthew?

Luke delayed Matthew’s genealogy, because “it was not appropriate in Hellenistic biographies to begin ... with a lengthy genealogy” (15; more below). The Team gives no indication of where one can find an “implicit” “contrast/comparison between John and Jesus” in Mt 1–2, but Luke picked it up, as well as from later passages, “Mt 3:1ff.; 11:2-19; 17:10ff” and “used it as a dominant Lukan motif in rewriting the birth accounts of John and Jesus in Lk 1–2” (15). But, of course, on this theory, Luke is *rewriting* the birth of Jesus while *writing* his own birth of John in “contrast/comparison” to it.

If one is not yet convinced of Luke’s use of Matthew in his infancy narrative, the Team turns to one of its favorite themes, “echoes”³¹ of Matthew in Luke. With respect to Luke’s infancy narrative, they note that it is “remarkable how much of Matthew 1–2 is echoed in Luke amidst the discernible differences with Matthew” (50): a genealogy emphasizing Davidic lineage (Lk 3:23-38/Mt 1:1-17); “Luke 2:1-23 also echoes strongly Mt 1:25 and several places in Mt 2:1-23...; indeed, Luke frames his account of Jesus’ birth with echoes of Mt 1:25 (Lk 2:7, 21)”; visitors (Mt 2:1-12; Lk 2:8-20 [magi vs. shepherds!]); “a celestial sign” [angels vs. star!]; birth in Bethlehem and rearing in Nazareth; and “true to Matthew, Luke finishes his account with an em-

³⁰The titles for each part are taken from the headings at the beginning of the treatment of each Part of Luke’s Gospel in the Team’s presentation.

³¹For “echoes” of Luke in Luke, cf. above, n. 16, and of Luke in Acts, n. 5. There are also “echoes” of Matthew in Luke, which will be delineated for each part of Luke. But there are also “echoes” of the Old Testament, and perhaps even Paul, in Luke. First, “echoes” of the Old Testament:

As noted above, n. 16, in Luke’s Sermon “the series of themes begins with ‘good news to the poor’ (an echo of the first public sermon in Nazareth; Isa 61:1-2)...” (103); “The activities that do not reflect the prophecies of Isaiah (i.e., ‘the lepers are cleansed’ and ‘the dead are raised’) echo the actions of the prophets Elisha (‘the lepers are cleansed’ cf. Lk 4:27//2 Kgs 5) and Elijah (‘the dead are raised’; cf. Lk 4:25-26//1 Kgs 17:17-24)” (115); Lk 19:45-46 (//Mt 21:12-17) “emphasized ‘casting out’—a term he gets from Mt but Lk also echoes the wider context in Jer 7[11-15]” (249-250); “Although καταλιθάζειν is a hapax legomenon, it may echo καταλιθοβολεῖν in Ex 17:4 and Num 14:10 and thus be a Lukan Septuagintism” (251); Lk 22:36-37 echoes both Lk 4:18-19, 21, but also Isa 61:1-2; 58:6 (287, cf. above, n. 16); “The addition of the phrase τοῦ ἡλίου ἐκλιπόντος in Mt 27:45//Lk 23:45 to explain the darkness at the crucifixion (cf. Lk 22:32) echoes Joel 2:31 (cf. Acts 2:20). ... Note also that Jesus, as the New Adam (cf. Lk 3:38) has just opened the doors of paradise to one of the thieves (Lk 23:43)” (306); At Lk 23:46, Luke “did not echo Ps 22 (=Ps 21 LXX) which is formative for Mt 27:46-50.... Instead, Luke echoed Ps 31:5 (=Ps 30:5 LXX) as the spiritual basis for Jesus’ final words” (306); and Lk 23:49 “appears to echo directly Ps 38:12 (= Ps 37:12 LXX)” (307).

And possible “echoes” of Paul in Luke: For Lk 22:24-28, “Echoes of conflict between the apostles can be clearly detected in Paul’s letters and the Gospel of John” (285; this is certainly a different sort of echo from others); “The term φιλονεικία is a NT *hapax legomenon* at Lk 22:24. Could it be an echo of 1 Cor 11:16? The clause in 1 Cor 11:16 δοκεῖ φιλονεικεῖν εἶναι also appears in Lk 22:24 δοκεῖ εἶναι. Furthermore, this reference to φιλονεικεῖν can also point forward to the squabbling at Corinthian Eucharists described by Paul in 1 Cor 11:17-22. These could be additional indications that Luke is quite familiar with not only the Gospel of Matthew but also the Pauline tradition preserved in 1 Cor 11, not only with the received terminology on the supper but also the rebuke against squabbling which Luke also seems to have combined with Mt 26:26-29” (285-286).

phasis on journeys” [but to Egypt and then finally Nazareth vs. a return trip home!].³² The following presents more detail on additionally proposed “echoes”:

- Following Goulder (1:208), there is “a faint echo of Mt 1:18 where Jesus is born ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου in Lk 1:15 where it is promised that John will carry out his mission in the power πνεύματος ἁγίου. The unit appears to be Lukan composition” (55).
- Lk 1:31 employs “τίκτειν (Isa 7:14 LXX)[, which] echoes Matthew’s use of Isa 7:14 (Mt 1:21-23)” (57).
- “Luke has already echoed Mt 1:18-24 in the account of the Annunciation to Mary (Lk 1:39-56)” (63).
- Although “echo” isn’t used, the “‘great joy’ (χαρὰν μεγάλην) expressed by the shepherds directly parallels the reaction of the Magi (Mt 2:10; cf. Goulder 1:247). This is slight evidence that Luke was aware of Matthew’s account even though he did not follow it closely” (65).
- “In Lk 2:21a (καὶ ἐκλήθη τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦς) Luke clearly echoed Mt 1:25b (καὶ ἐκάλεσεν τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦς). Luke has used Mt 1:25 as an *inclusio* around the birth account (Lk 2:7, 21)” (65).
- “χρηματίζειν [Lk 2:36] is also found in Acts 10:22... [and] in a different sense in Acts 11:26. It can hardly be called a Lukan linguistic characteristic. Perhaps this is a Lukan echo of Mt 2:12, 22” (66).
- Lk 2:25-35 has “a sober note to Mary [2:34]” which “is an anticipation of the major theme of the rejection of Jesus by the leaders of Israel (...). Indeed, this rejection, as a sword bringing to light the opposition to Jesus, would pierce the very heart of his mother (Lk 2:35). Perhaps this is the Lukan echo of Mt 2:13-18, the Massacre of the Innocents” (67).
- “Luke prefers ἐπιστρέφειν to the Matthean ἀναχωρεῖν, and Lk 2:39 echoes Mt 2:22b-23. At any rate, at Lk 2:39b Luke clearly echoed Mt 2:22b-23 as the source for his composition. Indeed, the two-fold expression εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν and εἰς πόλιν ἑαυτῶν Ναζαρέθ in Lk 2:39 echo εἰς τὰ μέρη τῆς Γαλιλαίας and εἰς πόλιν λεγομένην Ναζαρέτ in Mt 2:22-23” (67).

In sum, “although Luke uses his own compositional agenda in Lk 1:5–2:52 to provide the setting for his narrative, he also demonstrates great respect for the general content of Mt 1:1–2:23 within this section of his narrative” (50).

Did Luke need to resound Matthew’s narrative to have Jesus born in Bethlehem and raised in Nazareth? One almost expects that Luke’s use of Mary and Joseph as the names of Jesus’ parents to be assessed as clear echoes of Matthew’s narrative! Although the Team at first considers Luke’s genealogy as related to Matthew’s, later, after reaffirming that both evangelists were “concerned to set forth the argument that Jesus was both Son of David and Son of God” (76), they say that “Luke has used a source other than Matthew for his account of Jesus’ genealogy” (76-77). Perhaps this was an “account of Jesus’ ancestry from Palestinian Christians—perhaps the same sources that supplied him with some of the material in the birth Narratives” (77). In all of the examples offered by the Team, their “echoes” seem rather distorted. For example, how the prophetic word that Mary would be pierced by a sword (Lk 2:34) echoes the massacre of innocents (Mt 2:13-18), except in its ominous tone, is indiscernible for this reader. If Matthew were telling his infancy story from a mount, and heard back Luke’s infancy story, I doubt he would suspect an “echo”, but rather, an independent voice.

³²With respect to some of the other differences and omissions, the Team notes: Luke omits the massacre as he is careful to show that “Jesus’ kingship will [not] pose a direct threat to Rome”; the flight to Egypt was “implausible for a woman who had just given birth to a child”; and “Luke does not have Jesus interact with Gentiles nor have them play a major role in his story in any significant sense until after the resurrection” (50).

AN OVERVIEW OF LUKE 3–9

Of course, if Luke did use non-Matthean traditions in his infancy narrative, and direct dependence on Mt 1–2 is too much of a stretch, the 2GH cannot be undermined by those observations. Luke’s use of Matthew in the rest of the gospel narrative is much more important to establishing this hypothesis. Before moving on to Parts Two–Four, a general overview of Luke 3–9 is in order, because the Team proposes that “Luke has arrived at Matthew’s account of the preaching of John the Baptist (Mt 3:1), and he began following Matthew’s order systematically,” so that Lk 3:1–9:62(+10:1-22) works through Mt 3:1–18:5. At that point, Matthew’s discourse on community regulations begins, and Luke takes a new compositional turn as he develops his central section.

In this section,

Luke’s procedure was to get what material he needed for each part of his narrative, *going back* in Matthew’s order when necessary to get something else, but, having gone back, moving forward again from that point in Matthew, selecting other material he wanted to utilize *in Matthew’s order*, pulling new stories into his narrative that he had not yet used. By following this process of successive, cyclically progressive, orderly utilizations, guided by his narrative agenda, Luke eventually used most of the material between Mt 3:1 and 18:5 [my underlining, pp. 15 and 18; 16-17 are charts of this process].

In order to accomplish this feat, “Luke scanned Matthew five times, lifting out materials *in Matthean order* and reproducing them in five slightly overlapping blocks (3:1–4:44; 4:42–6:19; 6:17–8:21; 8:22–9:56; 9:57–10:22).”³³

For Lk 3:1–4:44, Luke begins with Mt 3:1-12 (John the Baptist), but then, already against the method outlined for this section, jumps forward to Mt 14:3-12 for Lk 3:19-20, the imprisonment of John. Lk 3:21-22 recommences Matthew’s order with the Baptism of Jesus, Mt 3:13-17, and then, again, against Matthew’s order, Luke introduces a genealogy (cf. above), Lk 3:23-38. Resuming the use of Matthew’s order, Lk 4:1-13 takes up Mt 4:1-11, the Temptation, and then the summary of Lk 4:14-16a is considered parallel to Mt 4:12-17. At this point Luke moves forward to Jesus’ first sermon, Mt 5:1–7:29, and crafts his pericope of Jesus’ sermon in Nazareth, 4:16b-32, which is indicated in the Team’s chart (16-17) as “a unit only in Luke”,³⁴ while later in their work, they say that “Luke reached forward to Mt 13:54-58 and, using non-Matthean tradition as well, created...” this account (86). They also develop a complicated synopsis for this passage (pp. 86-87: Lk 4:16, 22-24, 31-32//Mt 13:53-55a, 57b-58; 5:2; 4:13; 7:28-29) and indicate a number of “echoes” from Matthew.³⁵ After that, Jesus goes to Capernaum, where the healing of the demoniac (4:33-36) and the summary of Jesus’ fame (4:37) are unparalleled in Matthew. But now at 4:38-41, Luke picks up the healing of Simon’s mother-in-law and others, Mt 8:14-17.³⁶ This pass concludes with a brief indication of Jesus’s intent to preach in other

³³Kloppenborg 370.

³⁴Tuckett, 365: “...the diagrammatic presentation of the procedure (pp. 16-17) covers over a few awkward features, such as Luke 4:16-30 going ahead a long way in the order to use material from Matt 13:54-58 (p. 16 implies that Luke 4 is not parallel to Matthew 13, but p. 86 assumes that Luke is using this material).” — Note, too, on p. 133 the Team admits that Luke used “parts of this account [Mt 13:54-58] ... early on in his version of Jesus’ inaugural sermon at Nazareth.”

³⁵The Matthean “echoes” in this passage noted by the Team are: “The reference in Lk 4:15 ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς αὐτῶν (cf. εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν in Lk 4:16) echoes directly ἐν τῇ συναγωγῇ αὐτῶν from Mt 13:54” (87); “Lk 4:22-24 echoes Mt 13:54-57. The reference to Capernaum in Lk 4:23 is puzzling” (88).

³⁶See Kloppenborg (371): “The account of Luke’s reason for passing over Matthean pericopes only to return to them later is often weak. After using Matt 7:28-29 in Luke 4:31-32, Luke passes over Matt 8:1-4 and 8:5-13, the

cities, Lk 4:42-43, which the Team proposes is taken from Mt 9:35–11:1, the mission of the twelve.

Lk 4:42–6:19 involves Luke’s second pass through Matthew. While taking some hint from Mt 9:35–11:1 (cf. immediately above), Luke also returns to Mt 4:12-17 for Lk 4:42-44, which goes against the general description provided by the Team, for here Luke reuses a portion of Matthew already used, rather than going back to pull “new stories into his narrative that he had not yet used” (cf. above). Luke follows that summary with his own call of three disciples, Lk 5:1-11. For 5:12-14, the healing of a leper, Luke moves forward to Mt 8:14, and then introduces his own summary of Jesus’ fame in 5:15-16. Luke then jumps to Mt 9:1-8, the healing of a paralytic, and 9:9-17, the “Call of Levi [sic!] etc.” (16, and inserted charts) for Lk 5:17-26, 27-39, respectively. Lk 6:1-5 and 6-11, plucking grain and healing on the Sabbath, are taken in order from Mt 12:1-8, 9-14, though omitting Mt 12:11-12.³⁷ Then Luke peeks back at Mt 10:1-4, against his “process of successive, cyclically progressive, orderly utilizations,” for the call of the Twelve, Lk 6:12-16. At Lk 6:17-19, the healing of a crowd, Luke seems to return to Matthew’s order, 12:15-21, but “having arrived at Mt 12:15 (which is the beginning of a summary passage in Mt), moved back from Mt 12:15 to similar material in Mt 4:23–5:1” (99), and this “use of Mt 4:23-5:1 and 12:14-15 also echoes Mt 9:35–10:2, the introduction to the Call of the Twelve (Mt 10:2-4), which may have promoted Luke to tell that story first (Lk 6:13-16)” (102; cf. their synopsis).

For the third cyclic progression, Lk 6:20–8:21, Luke first returns to and abbreviates Matthew’s Sermon on the Mount (5:1–7:29) for his Sermon on the Plain (6:20–7:1a), and then picks up the healing of the Centurion’s son/servant (Mt 8:5-13/Lk 7:1-10). The raising of a widow’s son and the summary of fame, Lk 7:11-15, 16-17, are specific to Luke. Then Luke leaps forward to Mt 11:2-19 for a pericope on John the Baptist and Jesus, Lk 7:18-35. Luke’s ensuing story of the anointing by and forgiving of a sinful woman, Lk 7:36-50, is not a transposition of Mt 26:6-13, the anointing in Bethany, which “Luke did not use ... at that parallel point in his narrative” (117). Rather, “this story may be a variant of that account (cf. also Jn 12:1-8)” (117). The reference to women disciples, Lk 8:1-3, is likewise special to Luke, followed by the Parable of the Sower through its explanation, 8:4-15, which comes from Mt 13:1-23 (see below for more specifics). To this, Luke appends, out of order, “material taken from Mt 5:15 about how to use a lamp properly” (124)³⁸ thereby creating a large pericope, “¶ 38. Jesus teaches his disciples to take heed how they hear the Word of God [Lk 8:4-18]” (121). Finally, for a pericope on true family, Lk 8:19-21, Luke does not move forward to Mt 13:54-58, in keeping with the proposed progressive use of Matthew, because “Luke has already used [that] much earlier, at Lk 4:16-30,” so “Luke now brings Mt 12:46-50 from its position immediately prior to Matthew’s parable collection to a position following Luke’s equivalent of it” (126).

Luke now rolls his Matthean scroll back to Mt 8:23-27//Lk 8:22-25, the Stilling of the Storm, to begin his fourth progressive use of Matthew, Lk 8:22–9:56. Then Lk 8:26-39, the

latter because ‘it would clash with [Luke’s] central purpose in this part of his narrative, which was to describe the process of calling disciples’ (p. 90). It seems rather too strong to speak of a ‘clash,’ especially since Matt 8:11-12 apparently speaks of future disciples sitting with the patriarchs.”

³⁷Kloppenborg, 371: “...the reasons for Lucan omission of Matthean material are not [always] clear: McN. observes that Luke omitted Matt 12:11-12 (Luke 6:6-11)—odd, since Luke uses the same argument by *qal wā hōmer* in very similar Sabbath controversies in 13:15 and 14:5.”

³⁸Tuckett notes (365): “Luke 8:16-18//Matt 5:15 could represent another disruptive element in the alleged scheme (again on p. 17 no parallel is assumed, but on p. 124 Luke is said to be using this Matthean verse).”

Healing of the Demoniac, employs Mt 8:28-34; for the next pericope, Jairus' Daughter and the Woman with a Hemorrhage, Lk 8:40-56, Luke has progressed to Mt 9:18-26. Luke's Mission of the Twelve, 9:1-6, is the next orderly use of Matthew (9:35-11:1). After that, "Luke moved forward from the conclusion of Mt's Mission Discourse (Mt 11:1) to the end of Matthew's parable chapter (Mt 13:53...)" (133), and since he has already used "parts" of Mt 13:54-58,³⁹ he moves on to the next Matthean passage, Herod's thoughts on Jesus, Mt 14:1-2//Lk 9:7-9. "Luke has already mentioned John's imprisonment (Lk 3:18-20[//Mt 14:3-12])" (134), so he moves onto the Feeding of the Five Thousand, Lk 9:10-17//Mt 14:13-21. This miracle "set the stage for the next story," because "having performed this incredible miracle" (136) the identity of Jesus is particularly germane, and is thus treated in the Confession of Peter and First Prediction of the Passion, Lk 9:18-22 (//Mt 16:13-23; Lk 9:18 is "a conflation of Mt 14:22-23 and Mt 16:13" [137]). That pericope begins a block of Lucan material that takes up five Matthean pericopes in order, the largest such block so far. The ensuing four pericopes are: on discipleship (Lk 9:23-27//Mt 16:24-28); the Transfiguration (Lk 9:28-36//Mt 17:1-13); Healing a Possessed Boy (Lk 9:37-43a//Mt 17:14-21); the Second Passion Prediction (Lk 9:43b-45//Mt 17:22-23). Following this block, "Luke skipped ... the Payment of the Temple Tax (Mt 17:24-27) since it held little meaning for his Gentile audience" (147), and instead picked up Mt 18:1-5, an instruction on True Greatness, in Lk 9:46-48.⁴⁰ At this end of his fourth pass through Matthew, Luke appends a passage, 9:49-56, "Faults of the Twelve" (17), most specifically John and James.

As Luke begins his fifth and final pass through Matthew, for Lk 9:57-10:22, he does something that he has not done in any of the other cyclic progression: Luke moves back farther in Matthew, to Mt 8:18-22//Lk 9:57-62, than he had in the previous pass which had gone back to Mt 8:23-27. Then Luke seemingly goes against his proposed working method again when, for his Mission of the Seventy-Two, Lk 10:1-12, he uses Mt 9:35-11:1 for a third time (cf. above, Lk 4:42-44 and 9:1-6), and thus, provides "... an example of Luke creating a doublet [9:1-6 and 10:1-12] instead of removing one" (160).⁴¹ Before Luke has the seventy-two return, 10:17-20, a

³⁹Cf. above at n. 34.

⁴⁰Although nothing is mentioned at this point, the Team later suggests that "the story of the Mother of the Sons of Zebedee's request, [omitted in Lk 18, its parallel context] ... may have been used much earlier at Lk 9:46-50 (cf. Mt 18:1-6 and Mt 20:20-28)" (246).

⁴¹In the Team's treatment of "doublets", there are nine (or eight?) times in which Luke created a "doublet": Lk 8:16-18/11:33-36 use sayings on light from Mt 5:14-16 (213; not specifically called a "doublet"); Lk 8:19-21/11:27-28 are about true family lineage based on Mt 12:46-50 (179 and 180); Lk 9:1-6//10:1-12, under examination here; Lk 9:7-8/9:19 treat the report to Herod and the answer of Jesus' disciples (133-134); in Lk 9:46-48/22:21-26, "Luke created a doublet with precisely this same conjunction of prediction of suffering followed by a quarrel over who is greatest, at the Last Supper..." (147; cf. 143, where the doublet is indicated as 22:24-30); Lk 11:43-44/20:46 is a doublet "created ... of Mt 23:27-28 by portraying Jesus giving a similar warning about the *scribes*" as he did the Pharisees in Lk 11:43-44 (256); Lk 14:11/18:14, a doublet on exalting/humbling, is claimed to be "a close echo" of Mt 18:4, though it is truly closer to Mt 23:12, which is only mentioned for conferral (235); Lk 22:15-16/22:17-18, a doublet about not eating/drinking from this point on is "created" when "Luke divided the Matthean passage [26:27-29] in half" (282); Lk 22:40/22:46, "the instruction to pray against temptation in Mt 26:41" was placed by Luke "at the beginning of the scene and then repeated ... at the end, creating a doublet which forms a nice *inclusio*" (288).

In addition, Luke "conflated" eleven (or ten?) Matthean "doublets" thereby reducing them to single instances: Lk 6:43-45, on "by their fruits", uses Mt 7:15-20/12:33-35 (176 and 177); Lk 10:12, on Sodom, is from Mt 10:15/11:24 (160, 167 and 169); Lk 11:14-15, on Beelzebul, conflates Mt 9:32-34//12:22-24 (176 and 177); Lk 11:29-32, on the sign of Jonah, conflates Mt 12:38-42/16:1-6 (189, 200 and 233); Lk 13:30, the logion of "the great eschatological reversal", is found in Mt 19:30/20:16 (201-202); Lk 12:40, on preparedness for the Lord's coming, uses Mt 24:42/25:13 (196); Lk 16:16, on John the Baptist and the law and the prophets, depends on Mt 5:17/11:12-13 (224; not specifically called a "doublet"); Lk 16:18, on divorce, "conflated" the doublet of Mt 5:31-32/19:9 (224

passage only in Luke, he picks up Woes on Cities from Mt 11:20-24 in Lk 10:13-16. This cycle is then concluded with Jesus' Prayer of Thanksgiving, Lk 10:21-22, from Mt 11:25-27.

To conclude this section of the paper, a few observations are in order. As a general critique, Tuckett notes that "Luke has to be seen as scanning through Matthew's text in several broad sweeps in succession, picking up material in order in each sweep. But the more sweeps one has to postulate (the authors have five), the less convincing the argument becomes..." (365).⁴² In addition, the number of times Luke actually departs from the proposed "process of successive, cyclically progressive, orderly utilizations" weakens, at the very least, the argument that this is *how* Luke used Matthew, and even seems to put a cloud over the general proposal that Luke used Matthew as a major source. Finally, although there is no way to argue that Luke's cyclic sweeps through Matthew would have to correspond to the narrative flow of Luke—at least as plotted out by the Team—if there were such a correspondence,⁴³ then one could easily see that "good reasons can be given for the procedure itself."⁴⁴ But, Part Two corresponds only to a fraction of the first pass;⁴⁵ Part Three spans the remainder of the first, the second and half of the third cycles; Part Four includes the second half of the third, the fourth, and the first pericope of the fifth passes through Matthew; and, finally, the opening of Part Five includes the tail end of the fifth cyclic use of Mt 3:1–18:5. The Team's general presentation of the use of Matthew in Luke 3–9, therefore, appears complex, inconsistently followed, and lacking a clear overall narrative purpose. A closer look at some of the specifics in the narrative parts of Luke, however, may provide some additional evidence for the Team's hypothesis.

and 225); Lk 17:5-6, on faith, "conflated" Mt 17:19-20/21:21-22 (228); Lk 18:35-43, the Healing of Two Blind Men, conflates Mt 9:26-31/20:29-34 (131 and 239-241); Lk 21:12-19 treats foretold persecutions by mostly using the latter part of Mt 10:17-22/24:8-14 (197).

Finally, the Team identifies two instances in which Luke is seen totally omitting Matthew's "doublets": Lk 14:26-35 has "echoes" of verses on temptation from Mt 18, which is his only use of the doublet Mt 5:29-30/18:8-9 (213; yet later, p. 228, the Team says that Luke "omitted" both! For both of these contexts, cf. below, n. 65); "Mt 18:18 on 'binding and loosing' and its doublet at Mt 16:19 were never utilized by Luke..." (228).

⁴²He refers to a similar critique by John Kloppenborg of an argument about the order of Q in *The Formation of Q*, Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988, 68-69. This critique becomes even more pointed against the Team's presentation of the composition of Luke's Central Section; for Kloppenborg's own argument against multiple passes, cf. below, at n. 76.

⁴³The Team correctly notes that "what is not self-evident from this chart [of Luke's cyclic passes through Mt 3:1–18:5] is *why* Luke selected the Matthean pericopes that he did, *when* he did. Here the task is to identify correctly what were the main narrative concerns that guided Luke ... to choose *this* story, then skip two or three pericopes to *that* story, then go back and pick up *those* sayings, and so on" (18).

⁴⁴Kloppenborg, 371; cf. below, n. 76, for the full context.

⁴⁵This is incorrectly indicated on the Team's chart inserted in the back of the book. According to their chart, Part Two corresponds exactly to the first pass through Matthew, but that first pass ends at Lk 4:44, not 4:16a. Part Two, therefore, contains five of seven Matthean passages (or six of eight if the genealogy is counted) used in the first pass—one [or two, if including the genealogy] of which is [are] a transposition[s].

Part Two: Luke 3:1–4:16a

The New Era of Salvation Announced by John and Jesus

As noted above, Lk 3:1–4:16a corresponds to a portion of the first pass through Matthew, beginning at 3:1 and ending at 4:17, with two transpositions (Lk 3:19-20//Mt 14:3-12 and, I'm including the genealogy, Lk 3:23-38//Mt 1:1-18—cf. above). As the Team moves through this section, describing Luke's use of Matthew, based on their working presumption, they call special attention to some specifics to help make their case at Lk 3:3, 7-9, 17; 4:14-16.⁴⁶

Much of the evidence the Team marshals in this section is only evidence of Luke's use of Matthew because they have assumed that Luke is using Matthew. Would the so-called Matthean characteristics found in Luke, which can even become "one-way indicators" for the Team, be all that evident without their starting assumption? Tuckett offers a general observation for why he thinks not (365):

Such a criterion is, however, potentially misleading. For it almost assumes that what is "characteristic" of Matthew is a redactional creation. The possibility that Matthew might have taken a feature from his source(s) (possibly even a source shared also by Luke!), and repeated it (perhaps because he liked it) is almost excluded *a priori*.

Kloppenborg strongly points out the problem by a specific example (370):

The case for Luke's having used Matthew directly is marred by arguments of dubious merit, for example, the argument that Mattheanisms in Luke 3:7-10 are "clear evidence for Luke's direct use of Matthew" (p. 72). These Mattheanisms are, according to M. D. Goulder (*Luke: A New Paradigm...*), γεννήματα ἔχιδνῶν (Q 3:7 + Matt 12:34^{Red}; 23:33^{Red}); ποιεῖν καρπὸν (Q 3:8, 9; 6:43 [*bis*] + Matt 7:17^{Red}; 13:26^S; 21:43^{Red}) and ἐκκόπτεται καὶ εἰς πῦρ βάλλεται (Q 3:9 + Matt 7:19^{Red}). The frequency of each phrase, however, is well below statistical significance, and in any event phrases that occur from two to eight times in Matthew and from one to four times in Luke are hardly distinctly Matthean. They may just as well be Q phrases which Matthew liked.

⁴⁶They present the following points:

- 3:3 περίχωρον τοῦ Ἰορδάνου "appears to be taken from Mt 3:5" (71).
- 3:7-9 γεννήματα ἔχιδνῶν (Mt 3:7; 12:34; 23:33); "ἐκκόπτειν with βάλλειν (Lk 3:9//Mt 3:10) followed by a reference to 'fire' is also a Matthean characteristic (cf. Mt 7:19...); "good fruit" in contrast to "evil fruit" is used nine times by Matthew, but "only here and at Lk 6:43 in contexts clearly parallel to Mt's order" (72).
- 3:17 "gather his grain into the barn" is found in Mt 3:12; 13:30, "a distinctive Matthean phrase" [!], "as is the use of συναγεῖν (see Goulder 1:14). These linguistic characteristics of Mt in the parallel of Lk are strong evidence that Luke copied from Mt and not a source such as Q" (74).
- 4:14a, 16 εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν and Ναζαρά (both from Mt 4:12) are used by Luke "to frame this transition unit. This is further literary evidence for Luke's dependence upon Matthew" (81). "The unique spelling of 'Nazareth' ... in combination with all of the other evidence of Luke's dependence upon several Matthean redactional contexts in Lk 4:14-16, suggests that Luke is directly dependent upon the canonical Gospel of Matthew..." (83).
- 4:14b-15 "...is based upon a collage of phrases taken from a number of Matthean summary passages. This is extremely significant source-critical evidence," because the summary statements "have the highest likelihood of coming from the final redactor of the Gospel of Matthew, not any of Mt's sources" (81). Their synopsis for this passage (82) proposes Luke's use of Mt 4:12-13a; 4:23a, 24a; 9:26. The most impressive for them is Lk 4:15/Mt 4:23a: ἐδίδασκεν/διδάσκων ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς αὐτῶν. This is the only occurrence of this phrase in Luke. On the other hand, 'in their synagogues' occurs at Mt 4:23; 9:35; and 10:17. This is an example of a 'one-way indicator,' [cf. the section on such indicators below] i.e., a phrase occurring a number of times in Mt which occurs in Lk only in a parallel passage where there is evidence of copying" (82).

Part Three: Luke 4:16b–7:15

The Inauguration of the Prophet—Messiah’s Mission

As already noted, this part of Luke results in general from the last part of Luke’s first pass (Mt 8:14–9:35), the second cycle (Mt 4:12–12:21), and part of the third reading (Mt 4:23–8:13). This is further complicated by the very first movement of Luke through Matthew is to reach way ahead to Mt 13:54-58 for the Nazareth pericope (Lk 4:16b-32; cf. above on the confused presentation). Again, the Team’s “echoes” of Matthew in Luke are noted at Lk 4:22-24 (Mt 13:54-57); 4:31-32 (7:28b-29a); 4:38-41 (8:14-17); 4:42-44 (4:17-25); 6:12-20 (12:14-15; 4:23–5:1; 9:35–10:2); 6:39 (15:14); 7:1a (7:28).⁴⁷

Again the evidence put forward by the Team does not seem up to their task. For them, strong evidence is Luke’s use of Matthean summary or transitional phrases (see below the section on “one-way indicators”), but at Lk 4:31-32 they admit that “many of the words ... found in the text of Luke are fragmentary preservations of characteristic Matthean transitional phrases” (89). How can “fragmentary preservations” be evidence for dependence, and more especially, “clear evidence the Luke has carefully avoided all of the Sermon on the Mount (saving it for later use)” (89)? In addition, they present a synopsis “illustrating Luke’s conflation of Matthean redactional phraseology” (p. 93; Lk 4:42-44//Mt 4:17-25), which illustrates that not even one phrase in Luke’s supposed conflation agrees with any one phrase in his source!

⁴⁷The specifics:

- 4:15 At the start the team repeats their treatment of this verse (cf. the note above), but it adds no further support for their argument.
- 4:22-24 “...echoes Mt 13:54-57” (88), but even their synopsis (86-87) shows the “echoes” to be very fragmentary.
- 4:31-32 “At the conclusion to his version of Jesus’ inaugural sermon, Luke paraphrased Mt 7:28b-29a: ‘they were amazed at his teaching because his word was with authority’ (Lk 4:31-32). The presence of this terminology drawn from a *redactional* section of Mt, both at the end of Luke’s inaugural Sermon (Lk 4:31-32) and again at the end of the Sermon on the Plain (Lk 7:1), is strong evidence for Luke’s direct use of canonical Mt” (108). — See the section below on “one-way indicators.”
- 4:38-41 “...paraphrased Mt 8:14-17. Luke characteristically skipped the Matthean fulfillment of prophecy + quotation in Mt 8:17. However, there are definite echoes of the omitted quotation, Lk 4:40 νόστος // Mt 8:17 νόσους and Lk 4:40 ἀσθενούντας // Mt 8:17 ἀσθενῆς” (90).
- 4:42-44 “This short summary passage ... is a bridge to the next story, the call of Peter, James and John. As such, although it echoes Matthew, it is mostly Luke’s own creation and is full of Luke’s characteristic terminology. ... The following synopsis [93] reveals Luke’s conflation of summary compositional language from Mt 4:17-25” (92). — But again the echo is so fragmentary as to be unrecognizable as an ‘echo’.
- 6:12-20 “...in Mt 12:15b, Luke found language echoing the context of Mt 4:23–5:1, where also ‘many crowds followed Jesus and he healed them.’ Luke added the references to Gentiles (cf. ‘Tyre and Sidon’ in Lk 6:17) in combining the Matthean summaries from Mt 4:25 and 12:15. The use of Mt 4:23–5:1 and 12:14-15 also echoes Mt 9:35–10:2, the introduction to the Call of the Twelve (Mt 10:2-4), which may have prompted Luke to tell the story first (Lk 6:13-16). By this strategy, Luke has introduced all of the 12 Apostles, as well as the crowds, for Jesus’ great sermon” (102; see the synopsis, 100-102).
- 6:39 “Then Luke (6:39) echoed the brief saying in Mt 15:14 where Jesus likens the Pharisees ... to ‘blind guides’ (a major Matthean concept; see Mt 15:14; 23:16, 17, 24, 26); that is, blind teachers of the law (cf. Lk 5:27–6:11)” (106).
- 7:1 “Having completed this first utilization of Mt’s Sermon on the Mount ([at Lk 6:20b-49] other parts will be used later on), Luke (7:1a) acknowledged this fact by echoing Mt 7:28. Then, having already utilized Mt 8:1-4 (cf. Lk 5:12-16), Lk turned to the *next* pericope in Mt’s order, ‘The Healing of the Centurion’s Servant’ (Mt 8:5-13)” (107). — But this “echo” is hardly verbatim, for “...Luke has clearly re-written Mt 7:28a in his own idiom (cf. Goulder 1:376).” They relate this to Lk 4:31-32; cf. above in this note.

Part Four: Luke 7:16–9:50
Jesus is Shown to be the Son of God

The general treatment of Luke’s use of Matthew’s order showed that this fourth Part of Luke, 7:16–9:50, includes the second half of the third, the fourth, and the first part of the fifth cyclic progressive uses of Matthew by Luke. This Part is further divided into Sections, the first of which, Lk 7:16-50, opens with a summary specific to Luke (vv. 16-17), makes use of the Matthean passage (11:2-19) on John and Jesus, at Lk 7:18-35, and concludes with a Lukan passage, the anointing in 7:36-50. As noted above, the Team does not consider the anointing to be a transposition of Mt 26:6-13, but suggests that it “may be a variant of that account (cf. also Jn 12:1-18), which Luke introduced here” (117).

Besides the nearly identical comments about John the Baptist in Lk 7:24-28//Mt 11:7-11, the Team points to the presence of σκανδαλίζειν in Lk 7:23//Mt 11:6 as “clear evidence of Luke’s literary dependence on the canonical Gospel of Matthew,” and “not a source such as ‘Q’” (115).⁴⁸ They are certain of this because Matthew uses the term sixteen times, while “it is found in Lk only twice, always in contexts parallel to Mt: Mt 18:6//Lk 17:2; and Mt 18:7 (three times)//Lk 17:2 (once)” (115; see below on “one-way indicators”). Could be, but Tuckett’s caution quoted above is again relevant.

The second Section, Lk 8:1-21, makes use of more of Matthew (see the general treatment above), echoing Matthew, in an otherwise wholly Lucan pericope (8:1-3): “...Jesus and the Twelve set out on a tour, ‘city by city and village by village.’ These words echo Mt 11:1 and Mt 9:35, the verses which serve to open and close Matthew’s Missionary Discourse (Mt 9:35-11:1)” (120). To demonstrate this, the Team provides a three-column synopsis (119), which, similar to other synopses, demonstrates common vocabulary terms but no verbatim agreement in any one phrase in Lk 8:1 with any one phrase in Mt 9:35 and/or 11:1. From there, Luke moves on to his radical reduction of Matthew 13, the Parable Chapter, to the parable of the Sower, an explanation of using parables, and an interpretation of the Sower, though he will use the Leaven and Mustard Seed later (Lk 13:18-21//Mt 13:31-33). Now Luke goes against Matthew’s order (122): he “inserted two sayings” (8:16, 17//Mt 5:15; 10:26), “added [a] warning” (8:18a [cf. Mk 4:24]), “then ... went back in this context and added” a saying on dual recompense (8:18b//Mt 13:12), and finally “to conclude this section, Luke brought forward and modified Mt’s account of ... Jesus’ true relatives” (8:19-21//Mt 12:46-50). In this way, Luke is able to “re-emphasize [the section’s] main point: ‘Take heed how you hear the Word of God!’ (Lk 8:18a)” (121, cf. 126).

Section Three, Lk 8:22–9:11, returns to Luke’s proposed orderly use of Matthew by scrolling back to Mt 8:23-27, the Stilling of the Storm, and moving forward from there (see above on fourth pass through Matthew). Besides the general description, “echoes” of Matthew are found in Luke: Lk 8:22 (Mt 8:18);⁴⁹ 8:41, 44 (9:18, 20);⁵⁰ 9:1-2, 6 (10:1; 11:1);⁵¹ 9:10-11

⁴⁸On the oddness of the Team’s reference to Q, see the more general methodological observations below.

⁴⁹“Although Lk 8:22 does echo Mt 8:18 (δέ + a compound of ἐρχομαι [sic] + εἰς τὸ πέραν), Lk 8:22 also shares a number of features with Mt 8:23.

“Lk 8:22 ...καὶ αὐτὸς ἐνέβη εἰς πλοῖον καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ [corrected omission of αὐτός]

“Mt 8:23 καὶ ἐμβάντι αὐτῷ εἰς τὸ πλοῖον... οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ.

“The appearance of verbal parallels in Luke 8:22 to both Mt 8:18 and to Mt 8:23 is all the more intriguing since the intervening material—Mt 8:18-22, a story about two unprepared would-be followers of Jesus—is later utilized by Luke to compose a series of three vignettes depicting the faults of would-be disciples in Lk 9:57-62. This evidence of meticulous utilization of Mt’s *redactional* phraseology, stripped from around a specific pericope (Mt 8:18 and 23), supports our contention that Luke made direct use of the canonical Gospel of Matthew” (128).

(14:13).⁵² But the first instance would be a stronger case, if it were in direct parallel to Matthew. Κράσπεδον in Lk 8:44 (Mt 9:20; also 14:36; 23:5), if one is assuming Luke's use of Matthew, is a clear indication of that dependence; but without that assumption, Tuckett's earlier comment is again germane, and this Matthean characteristic may well be repeated use from a source also known to Luke—on the basis of the 2DH, Mk 6:56.⁵³ Little argument is given on Lk 9:1-2, 6, while the argument for Luke's dependence on Matthew for the introduction to the feeding miracle is seen as a confluence of supporting evidence (135):

The presence of Matthean linguistic characteristics [κατ' ἰδίαν; οἱ ὄχλοι ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ] within the text of Luke in contexts where Lk is parallel with Mt's order, combined with the presence of Lukan linguistic characteristics where Lk differs from Mt in the same contexts, is strong evidence that Luke is literarily dependent upon the canonical Gospel of Matthew, not 'Q'.

Not only the presence of so-called Matthean characteristics in Luke, but also the presence of Lukan characteristics in the same context somehow bolsters the case for Luke's use of Matthew. To this supportive confluence is added another theoretical jab at Q, even though few Two Document scholars have proposed Q as the source for this introduction to the Feeding of the 5000.⁵⁴

Finally, the fourth Section, Lk 9:12-36, and the interweaving section, Lk 9:37-50, that concludes Part Four, closely follow Matthew's order (Mt 14:13-21; 16:13-17:23; 18:1-5—see above). Since this Part of Luke's narrative focuses on Jesus' identity, he omits the Walking on the Water and its focus on Peter (Mt 14:22-33), and moves from "praying alone" (Lk 9:18), "which is taken from Mt 14:23 ... to the next major story about Peter" (his confession, Mt 16:13-23), in which "the identity of Jesus ... is critical" (137). For the remainder of this part, Luke follows Matthew, making modifications that "bring out significant aspects of Luke's theology" (138; cf. too 136, 145, 146), and adds his own pericope in which John attempts to stop a stranger exorcising in Jesus' name (Lk 9:49-50). "Echoes" and "one-way indicators" are absent from this, though they do propose "a conflation of Mt 18:5 and Mt 10:40: 'whoever accepts you accepts me and he who accepts me accepts Him who sent me'" (148) at Lk 9:48b-c, to which the 2DH can easily propose Luke's redaction of Mk 9:37 and 9:35b.⁵⁵

⁵⁰On the "unusual phraseology from Mt echoed here" (130), see below the section on Matthean vocabulary in Luke, esp. at n. 108.

⁵¹"Lk 9:1-2, 6 seem to echo both the opening of Matthew's missionary discourse and its ending" (132).

⁵²The mention of 'going apart privately' reflects the wording of Mt 14:13, where Jesus is reacting to the report that Herod Antipas has just executed John the Baptist" (134-135).

⁵³On this "minor agreement," see F. Neiryck's paper for the Göttingen Symposium, "The Minor Agreements and the Two-Source Theory," in *Evangelica II: 1982-1991 Collected Essays*, ed. by F. Van Segbroeck (BETL, 99), Leuven: Peeters, 1991, 3-41 (additional note, 41-42), 12-16.

For the contributions at the symposium, see Georg Strecker, ed., *Minor Agreements. Symposium Göttingen 1991* (GTA, 50), Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993.

⁵⁴On the introduction to the feeding miracle, cf. again, F. Neiryck, "The Minor Agreements and the Two-Source Theory," 29-34, where he summarizes his arguments for independent redaction and refers to earlier articles on this passage (30 n. 151).

⁵⁵For example, John Nolland, *Luke 9:21-18:34*, 520: For Lk 9:48b, "Luke follows the Markan text closely. His verbal changes are only to complete the parallelism between v 48a and v 48b." Then, in v 48c, "Luke has delayed his equivalent to Mark 9:35b for this final climax position: the theme of greatness becomes explicit here at the end as it was at the beginning."

Part Five: Luke 9:51–19:27
Jesus Journeys Toward Jerusalem

At the outset, the Team admits that “Luke’s utilization of Mt followed a more complex path than was the case in Lk 3 through 9, or 20–24 [see below]” (151). After having followed Mt 16:13–18:5 for Lk 9:18-50, Lk 9:51 “has come into contextual parallel with Jesus’ Discourse on Community Regulations in Mt 18:1–19:1,” and thus, “the Lukan Travel Narrative provides a literary context, similar to Matthew’s discourses, where longer collections of teachings of Jesus may be narrated” (152). In order to do so, “Luke made use of material from *all* of the long speeches of Jesus in Mt, both those which Luke had already drawn upon to some extent and the one or two Luke had not yet reached in his use of Mt (cf. Mt 23:1–26:1)” (152). “Luke blended these materials into sections on major themes of Jesus’ teaching... that would be of direct benefit to Christians throughout the Hellenistic world” (152). We will give a brief overview of the fifteen sections that result from Luke’s proposed composition of the Travel Narrative.

For the transitional section at the beginning of this Central Section (Lk 9:52-62), Luke begins with a passage specific to his narrative (9:52-56),⁵⁶ and then takes up Mt 8:19-20, 21-22—the beginning of Luke’s fifth cyclic use of Mt 3:1–18:5. For “Section One. The Great Mission. Lk 10:1-42” (158), related to the Mission of the Twelve (Lk 9:1-6), Luke again uses Matthew’s mission pericope, 9:35–11:1 (160). But the picture soon gets more complicated: Lk 10:1-7 uses Mt 9:35-10:16 along with 11:20-24 and 10:40; Lk 10:17-20 is Lukan composition;⁵⁷ Lk 10:21-22 depends on Mt 11:25-27; in Lk 10:23-24 one finds Mt 13:16-17, unused from Mt 12:46–13:23 at Lk 8:4-21 (171); for the Greatest Commandment and the Good Samaritan, Lk 10:25-37, Lk used Mt 5:43-48; 19:16-30; 22:34-40 and a non-Matthean story. Non-Matthean material is also used for the story of Mary and Martha, Lk 10:38-42.

For “Section Two. To the Disciples: On Prayer. Lk 11:1-13” (173), Luke returns to pick up unused portions of Matthew’s Sermon on the Mount, namely 6:1-18 for Lk 11:1-4 and its context, and 7:7-11 for Lk 11:9-13. Between these two is a non-Matthean parable with a similar theme to Lk 18:1-8. The Team is confident that the “secondary character of Luke’s version of this prayer [the Lord’s prayer] is manifest” (174). But Tuckett notes that this “claim ... will also strike some as a little optimistic in explaining all of Luke’s differences from Matthew here” (364).

Lk 11:14-32, “Section Three. To the People: On Spiritual Power” requires a complicated use of Matthew. For Lk 11:14-26, “The crowds demonize Jesus,” the Team notes that Luke uses Mt 9:32-34; 12:22-30; 16:1//12:38; 12:43-45 (176). For True Blessedness, Lk 11:27-28, a doublet of Lk 8:19-21, again uses Mt 12:46-50,⁵⁸ and also “anticipates the opposite and contrasting affirmation at Lk 23:29...,” a Lukan composition (179). Lk 11:29-32, the Sign of Jonah, depends

⁵⁶The team does note, however, that “there are a number of echoes and parallels to Mt 9:35–10:16, not only in Lk 10:1-12, but also in Lk 9:52-56. Two of these echoes of Mt 9:35ff. within Lk 9:52-56 are

“(1) the use of ἀπέστειλιν to refer to Jesus’ sending out disciples and

“(2) the use of a form of εἰσερχομαι + εἰς + ‘house/village of the Samaritans,’ both within Lk 9:52 and Mt 10:5” (155).

⁵⁷Nevertheless, “the mentioning of ‘serpents’ in Lk 10:19 echoes the comment about serpents in Mt 10:16. This provides some evidence that Luke knew the text of Mt at this point” (168).

⁵⁸“This pericope echoes the story in Mt 12:46-50, which Luke had already used in an edited form at Lk 8:19-21. ... To create his account, Luke continued following the Matthean order: ‘the crowds demonize Jesus,’ (Mt 12:22-37//Lk 11:14-26) is followed by ‘the demand for a sign’ (Mt 12:46-50//Lk 11:27-28), in the course of which Luke reused the reference to Jesus’ mother (cf. Mt 12:46-50//Lk 8:19-21)” (180). Cf. above, n. 41 on doublets.

on Mt 12:38-45; 16:1-2a, 4; the “Lukan thematic summary”, Lk 11:33-36, is taken from Mt 5:14-16 and 6:22-23.

Section Four, Lk 11:37-52, “To Pharisees and Lawyers: On Hypocrisy” (185) is largely from Mt 23: vv. 37-44 (Mt 23:1-36); 45-52 (Mt 23:4, 29-32, 34-36, 13). A transitional pericope, 11:53–12:3, picking up Mt 23:1-2; 10:26-27; 16:1, 6, prepares for “Section Five. To Friends and Disciples: Reject Fear and Anxiety; Trust and Treasure God! Lk 12:4-34” (189). The first pericope, Lk 12:4-12, uses Mt 10:28-33; 12:32; 10:19-20, while the second, Lk 12:13-34, turns all the way back to Mt 6:25-33, 19-21. This leads to an appreciation of Luke’s composition by the Team (194-195):

Note that the verses that fall between Mt 6:19-21 and Mt 6:25-34 used by Luke here are just the verses (i.e. Mt 6:22-23) less one (Mt 6:24) that Luke included ... at Lk 11:33-36. Should we be surprised, then, that Luke utilized the verses on both sides of Mt 6:22-23 as source material for Lk 12:13-34? And should we be surprised to find the one remaining verse from Mt 6:19-34, i.e., Mt 6:24, appearing at last at Lk 16:13? Luke’s use of Mt 6:19-34 is creative, clear and remarkable.

Certainly, if one is assuming Luke’s use of Matthew, no matter how complicated, no use of Matthew would be surprising, and the more complicated it seems, the more “creative ... and remarkable.” But clear? This leads me to wonder, “How would advocates of the ‘Q’ hypothesis refute this web of evidence?”⁵⁹

“Section Six. To the Disciples and Others: Appropriate Conduct Before the Lord’s Coming. Lk 12:35-53” (195), Luke alludes to Mt 25:1-13⁶⁰ and 24:42-51 for Lk 12:35-48, and to Mt 10:34-37 for Lk 12:49-53.⁶¹ Then Luke first turns to Mt 16 as he begins “Section Seven. To the Multitudes: Who is Truly Judged? Lk 12:54–13:30”, but then quickly scrolls back to Mt 5: Lk 12:54-59//Mt 16:2-3; 5:25-26. Lk 13:1-9 is “composed entirely of nonMatthean tradition” (203). Now Luke scrolls forward to Mt 12:9-14 and 13:31-33 for Lk 13:10-21, the Healing of the Bent Over Woman⁶² and the Parables of the Mustard Seed and Leaven. To treat the number who will be saved, Lk 13:22-30, Luke pieces together Mt 25:1-13; 7:13-14, 21-23; 8:11-12; and 19:30//20:16.⁶³ A final transitional pericope, Lk 13:31-35 uses Mt 23:37-39, though vv. 31-33 have no parallel in Mt.

“Section Eight. To a Dinner Audience: The Messiah’s Banquet Instructions. Lk 14:1-35” (207) is largely “skillfully composed from material drawn from nonMatthean tradition” (208),⁶⁴ “except for Luke’s continuing verse by verse use of Mt 10 at Lk 14:26-27//Mt 10:37-38, and the

⁵⁹The Team poses this question on p. 177, after expounding “three paths” by which Luke came to Mt 12:22//Lk 11:14, the introduction to the Beelzebul Controversy. — See below, p. 34, on the Team’s treatment of Q.

⁶⁰The allusion to the Parable of the Wise and Foolish Virgins seems a stretch, but the Team assures the reader that “Luke will make (a second?) clearer use of this same parable later within the context of Lk 13:22-27” (196). At Lk 13:22-27, however, Luke conflates this parable with “similar teachings to be found in Mt 7:13-14, 21-23” (205).

⁶¹“Mt 19:3-9 [?]” appears in the heading for this section; their “[?]” could be any reader’s question, for there is no specific reference to this passage in the explanation of Lk 12:49-53.

⁶²“Luke may have drawn the story ... from nonMatthean tradition, although there are clear echoes of Mt 12:9-13//Lk 6:6-11. Compare Lk 14:1-6 for yet another story of a Sabbath healing by Jesus that has no parallel in Mt, unless it is Mt 12:9-13. This is probably a case where Luke has other tradition that is similar to Mt 12:9-13 and preferred to use this nonMatthean tradition. However, there are other places in Lk where the same rationale for healing on the Sabbath is used (compare especially Lk 13:15 with Lk 14:5; cf. Lk 6:6-11), so the unit might be a Lukan composition” (204).

⁶³Cf. above, n. 50.

⁶⁴But note an earlier comment at Lk 6:6-11 (99): “...a portion of Mt that Luke omitted here (Mt 12:11-12) is echoed later in Lk 14:4-6.” Cf. above, n. 36.

addition of the saying on Salt from Mt 5:13 ... at 14:34-35” (208).⁶⁵ “Interestingly, [the Team]. argues that the parable of the great supper (Luke 14:15-24) is not from Matt 22:1-10 but from independent tradition.”⁶⁶ But, this is directly related to the Team’s position on “Section Nine. To Scribes and Pharisees: God Seeks and Saves the Lost. Lk 15:1-32,” which is “artfully constructed from nonMatthean tradition,” except perhaps the Parable of the Lost Sheep which Luke may have taken from Mt 18:10-14 (215; cf. 216 and 218).⁶⁷ These rather unexpected source-critical positions rest on the observation by the Team that two short parables followed by a longer parable in Lk 14 “is identical to the structure of Lk 15.... This similarity in structure may provide some evidence of a nonMatthean parable source” (211).

Lk 16:1-31, “Section Ten. To the Disciples and Pharisees: You Cannot Serve God and Money” (219), begins with nonMatthean material, the Dishonest Manager, Lk 16:1-13, except for the concluding use of Mt 6:24.⁶⁸ The picture offered of Lk 16:14-18 is much more involved, as Luke purportedly uses Mt 11:12-13; 5:17-18//24:34-35; 5:31-32//19:1-9.⁶⁹ The section concludes as it began, with nonMatthean material, Lk 16:19-31, the Rich Man and Lazarus.

In the eleventh section, “To the Disciples On Faith and Works. Lk 17:1-19” Luke opens with Matthean material in vv. 1-6 (Mt 18:6-7, 15-17, 21-22, and 21:18-19 [!]⁷⁰). Luke then incorporates more of his special material, Lk 17:7-10, 11-19, as well as 17:20, to begin “Section Twelve. To Pharisees and Disciples: Where Is the Kingdom? Lk 17:20-37” (232). Luke then scans forward to Mt 24:17-18, 23-28, 37-41, and goes back to pick up 10:39, for Lk 17:21-37.

Due to a hint from Mt 21:22, which Luke had in mind during 17:1-6, he turns to one of his favorite themes, prayer, in “Section Thirteen. To the Faithful and the Self-Righteous: On Prayer. Lk 8:1-14” (234). Lk 18:1-8, the Unjust Judge and the Widow, is nonMatthean, while 18:9-14, in v. 14, has “a close echo of Mt 18:4 (cf. 23:12)” (235). In turn, this “prepares for the transition to the next saying about accepting the Kingdom like children” (235), Lk 18:15-17 (“//Mt 19:13-15 plus Mt 18:3!” [236]⁷¹), which opens “Section Fourteen. To the Disciples, a

⁶⁵But the picture may be even more complicated: “...Luke’s material in 14:26-35 contains several echoes of the intervening verses in Mt 18:6-9. Indeed, unless Mt 18:8-9 is echoed here, Luke has not made any use of those verses from Mt 18 nor of the doublet to Mt 18:8-9 at Mt 5:29-30 [cf. above, n. 41 on doublets]. Be that as it may, all of the material in this part of Lk pertains to true discipleship, a major theme in Mt’s chapter on Community Regulations” (213). — But note, p. 228 [!]: “Luke omitted not only Mt 18:8-9 (‘if your eye offends you, pluck it out’) but also its doublet at Mt 5:27-30 when he took materials from Mt’s Sermon on the Mount” (cf. above, n. 41 on doublets).

⁶⁶Kloppenborg, 371. The main reason given is that there is “no evidence of Matthean linguistic characteristics present in this (parallel?) Lukan account, which one would expect if Luke were relying upon Mt at this point” (211).

⁶⁷Another exception may be the introduction: “Lk 15:1-3 echoes Mt 9:10-11. Luke has composed this introduction either reusing Mt 9:10-13 or nonMatthean tradition where Jesus welcomes sinners over the protestations of the religious establishment. Luke previously used Mt 9:1-17 at Lk 5:17-39” (215).

⁶⁸“Only in the last verse (Lk 16:13) is there a clear use of Mt (Mt 6:24//Lk 16:13). Here Luke copied the text of Mt exactly except for the Lukan addition of the word, οἰκέτης...” (222).

⁶⁹On divorce, Luke “echoed Jesus’ critique in Mt 19:1-12,” esp. Mt 19:8. “Luke conflated Mt 19:9 with the Matthean doublet at Mt 5:31-32 to produce Lk 16:18” (224; cf. above, n. 41 on doublets).

⁷⁰“When Lk reached Mt 21:18-19, the story of the cursing of the fig tree, he omitted it. There is, however, an echo of that account here at Lk 17:5-6 [?]. Furthermore, the closing affirmation in Mt 21:22, ‘All things whatsoever you should ask *in prayer*, believing, you will receive,’ may have provided Luke with the suggestion that he present here another unit on prayer (Lk 18:1-14; cf. Lk 11:1-13) before the end of the Travel Narrative” (230).

⁷¹The Team notes that Mt 18:3 “was the single verse that Luke had not used at Lk 9:46-48//Mt 18:1-5. Such detailed and painstaking utilization would seem to indicate that Luke deliberately circumscribed the entire Travel Narrative (Lk 9:49–18:17) by means of the material in Mt 18:1-5.”

Ruler, and Hearers: On the Kingdom of God. Lk 18:15-30” (235). Luke follows Matthew’s order when he picks up Mt 19:16-30 for Lk 18:18-30.

For the final and fifteenth section, “To the Twelve and a Man: True Blindness. Lk 18:31-43” (238), Luke skips Matthew’s parable of the Laborers in the Vineyard,⁷² and sequentially picks up Mt 20:17-19 and 29-34,⁷³ for Lk 18:31-34 and 35-43, though the latter is a conflation of Matthew’s doublet of two blind men, 20:29-34 and 9:26-31.⁷⁴ Finally, a transitional section, “Preparation for the King to Come into his City. Lk 19:1-27” (242) prepares for the next major Part of Luke’s narrative. The story of Zacchaeus, Lk 19:1-10, is nonMatthean; the Parable of the Pounds is similar to that of the Talents in Mt 25:14-30,⁷⁵ but “Luke may have found this allegory in his nonMatthean tradition, for it is quite different” from the Matthean version (243).

In conclusion, Kloppenborg (371) notes that for the central section the Team proposes that

...Luke repeatedly scanned the five Matthean discourses, extracting sayings material (again in Matthean order) which he assembled into the Travel Narrative. In order to maintain the appearance of agreement with Matthean sequence, however, many passes are required. Constructing Luke 10:1-42, for example, Luke moved from Matthew 10 (Luke 10:1-12), to Matthew 11 (Luke 10:13-15, 25-27) to Matthew 13 (Luke 10:23-24; first pass), and finally to Matthew 5; 19; 22 (Luke 10:25-28; second pass). In order to construct the entire Travel Narrative, [the Team] must assume more than twenty-five passes through Matthean discourses.

Clearly, the difficulty with five passes noted by Tuckett for Lk 3–9 (see above) is squared for the central section (I’m trusting Kloppenborg’s count!). Kloppenborg is quite skeptical:⁷⁶

...such an argument is effective only when one can show that A and B can be reconciled by a limited number of passes by B through A, and only when good reasons can be given for the procedure itself. In the case of Matthew’s scanning of Q, he did so in order to group thematically related material into discourses. In the Two-Gospel Hypothesis the opposite intention must be assumed, for Luke distributes thematically grouped materials throughout his rather heterogeneous Travel Narrative.

The Team would probably object that they have discerned a thematic grouping, designated by the fifteen sections into which the central section is divided. But that defense might work if Luke

⁷²Luke does, however, use the framing, Mt 19:30 and 20:16 at Lk 13:30 (206) and again at 18:30, “even if it is slightly out of context here” (236). The Team says nothing about the difference in wording between Lk 18:30 and Mt 19:30//Mt 20:16, nor about how Lk 18:30 is closer in both wording and content to 19:29b. In addition, there is a rather curious (though rejected) speculation at 13:30: “Given the repeated language of Mt 19:30 and Mt 20:16, Luke’s omission of the parable at Lk 18:30-31 might have been a scribal error, but we doubt it” (206). In the end, they decide that Mt 20:1-15 (unused by Luke) is at some odds with Mt 7:24-29//Lk 6:46–7:1, and that the omission was done “in favor of the parable material he took from nonMatthean tradition” (206).

⁷³On the omission of the request of the Mother of Zebedee’s sons, see above, n. 40.

⁷⁴The main evidence for conflation is that Lk 18:42 ἡ πίστις σου σέσωκέν σε “relates to similar wording in Mt 9:29 [κατὰ τὴν πίστιν ὑμῶν γενηθήτω ὑμῖν]. This is no parallel to the idea of salvation by faith in Mt 20:34, so this connection ... provides good linguistic evidence that Luke had both stories in Mt in mind when he composed Lk 18:35-43” (239, cf. 241; cf. above, n. 41 on doublets.). — Of course, this small bit of information does not require conflation (and emendation) if Luke is using Mk 10:52, ἡ πίστις σου σέσωκέν σε.

⁷⁵Luke had supposedly used the Parable of the Wise and Foolish Virgins at 12:35-40 and 13:22-27 (cf. above at nn. 60 and 63). “If Luke utilized the Parable of the Talents at Lk 19:11-27, even if only for a ‘contextual parallel’ into which Luke inserted comparable nonMatthean tradition, Luke would have completed his use of the first two of the three parables in Mt 25. The last ‘parable’ in Mt 25, the Judgment of the Nations (Mt 25:31-46), has no parallel in the Gospel of Luke...” (242).

⁷⁶Kloppenborg, 371; he refers to Vincent Taylor, *New Testament Essays* (London: Epworth, 1970), in which Taylor did a similar thing in reconstructing Q.

had rather consistently used Matthew in order, rather than providing an attempt, as Kloppenborg notes, “to maintain the appearance of agreement with Matthean sequence.” So, not only is Luke’s use of Matthew in the central section different from his approach in Lk 3–9, it is again not as orderly and sequential as the Team proposes.

Additionally, Tuckett points out (365):

Some of the “reasons” given for Luke’s jumping around Matthew in the Travel Narrative are little more than statements of what he must have done; and they also at times presuppose an almost incredibly detailed knowledge of Matthew’s text and the context (sometimes quite broadly conceived) of allegedly linked verses in Matthew (even when Luke himself betrays no awareness of the alleged link: cf. p. 234 on Luke 17:21–37, where Luke is said to be guided by the Matthean *Stichwort parousia* in choosing material from Matthew 24, even though the word does not appear in Luke).⁷⁷

The Team, then, has again provided a “demonstration” based on their starting assumption, but they have not yet shown how their explanation of the Central Section is a better explanation than that provided by the 2DH.

Part Six: Luke 19:28–21:38

The Arrival of the Prophet-King in Jerusalem

Having already seen that Luke’s supposed use of Matthew has been quite different for Lk 1–2, 3–9, 10–19:27, Luke employs a fourth method for the bulk of his last two Parts 19:28–24:53, in that “Luke followed the general sequence of pericopes in Matthew fairly closely, although he revised each unit internally” (20). For Part Six, Luke continues the interweaving transition begun in Lk 19:1–27, with 19:28–44, “The King Comes to Claim His City” (246), wherein he conflates Mt 20:17; 21:1–9 (and perhaps 21:15–16).

For “Section One: The King Meets Opposition and Is Rejected by the City’s Leaders. Lk 19:45–21:4” (249), as noted, follows Matthew’s order relatively closely: Lk 19:45–48//Mt 21:12–13; Lk 20:1–8//Mt 21:23–27; Lk 20:9–19//Mt 21:33–46; Lk 20:20–26//Mt 22:15–22; Lk 20:27–40//Mt 22:23–33, 46; Lk 20:41–44//Mt 22:41–45; Lk 20:45–47//Mt 23:1, 6, 14 and Lk 21:1–4 (nonMatthean). In this process, Luke omitted the cursing of the fig tree, Mt 21:18–22,⁷⁸ the Parable of Two Sons, Mt 21:28–32,⁷⁹ and the question about the Great Commandment, Mt 22:34–40.⁸⁰

Luke continues to follow Matthew for “Section Two: The King Predicts the Destruction of the Temple and the City. Lk 21:5–38” (257): Lk 21:5–7//Mt 24:1–3; Lk 21:8–11//Mt 24:4–7; Lk

⁷⁷Complicated use of sources had been severely critiqued by David L. Dungan: “Neiryck’s elaborate theory of ‘Matthean anticipations’ seems as far-fetched today as it did in 1967, ... namely the confusing jumble of parallel texts corresponding to Matthew 4:23–11:1. ... We find little ... to balance or justify the complicated manipulation of words and phrases Neiryck alleges the author of Matthew to have carried out. As a result, this textual discussion is perceived by us, at least, as an arid mechanical *tour de force* having little human feeling, historical validity or persuasive power” (“Response to the Two-Source Hypothesis”, in *Idem*, ed., *The Interrelations of the Gospels* [BETL, 95], Leuven: Peeters, 1990, 201–216, 205). — Dost Dungan protest too much?

⁷⁸Cf. p. 250: “...perhaps because of the earlier parable about a fig tree which symbolically predicted the fate of Jerusalem (Lk 13:6–9), which he had taken from his nonMatthean tradition,” Luke omitted the cursing.

⁷⁹“Luke omitted ... [this parable], probably because he had just talked about John the Baptist (cf. Mt 21:32) and because he already had used a parable of two sons (Lk 15:11–32). Nevertheless, the appearance of ἵδοντες...αὐτόν (viz., τὸν υἱόν) in Lk 20:14, also found in the Parable of the Two Sons in Mt 21:32, could be an indication that Luke made passing use of the first parable even as he chose the second [parable about vineyards] for his narrative (Lk 20:14//Mt 21:32)” (252).

⁸⁰“Luke had already utilized it earlier (Lk 10:25–28)” (255; cf. above, p. 20).

21:12-19// Mt 24:8-14⁸¹ (but also picks up 10:17-22⁸²); Lk 21:20-28//Mt 24:15-21, 29-31;⁸³ and Lk 21:29-36//Mt 24:32-36. Lastly, the “brief unit [21:37-38] was composed by Luke,” and “has many parallels with Lk 19:47-48,” as well as “echoes” of Mt 21:17-18.⁸⁴

Part Seven: Luke 22:1–24:53

The Arrest, Death, and Resurrection of Jesus the King

To open the first section of this Part, “Jesus’ Last Passover Meal. Lk 22:1-46,” Luke uses Mt 26:1-5 in Lk 22:1-2, jumping over “the intervening material, Mt 24:37–25:46,” which “he had already used ... or echoed ... elsewhere” (273).⁸⁵ Luke then omits Mt 26:6-13,⁸⁶ before re-summing his orderly use of Matthew: Lk 22:3-6//Mt 26:14-16; Lk 22:7-13//Mt 26:17-19; Lk 22:14-20//Mt 26:20-21a, 26-29 (cf. 1 Cor 11:23-26);⁸⁷ Lk 22:21-23//Mt 26:23-25; Lk 22:24-38//Mt 26:31-35 (18:1-5; 20:25-28; 19:28);⁸⁸ Lk 22:39-46//Mt 26:30, 36-46.

“Section Two: Jesus’ Arrest, Trials, and Public Humiliation. Lk 22:47–23:25” (289) continues to follow Matthew’s order: Lk 22:47-53//Mt 26:47-56; Lk 22:54-65 and 66-71//Mt 26:57-75 and 27:1; 26:59-66;⁸⁹ Lk 23:1-25//Mt 27:2-26.⁹⁰ This systematic use of Matthew persists in

⁸¹See the synopsis (260-262), “Illustrating the use of Mt 10:17ff. at Lk 12:11f., and subsequent conflation of Mt 10:17-22 and Mt 24:8-14 at Lk 21:12-19” (260).

⁸²Note, on p. 260: “...with the exception of Mt 10:23, which finds its echo in the Lukan Travel Narrative as a whole, the only material in the Matthean Mission Discourse Luke did not explicitly use previously is precisely the two pericopes which appear here in Lk 21, i.e., Mt 10:17-18 and Mt 10:21-22.”

⁸³The synopsis (263-268) shows “Luke’s repeated use of Mt 24 in Lk 17 and again in Lk 21” (263).

⁸⁴“The statement [Lk 21:37] τὰς δὲ νύκτας ἐξερχόμενος ἠγλίετο εἰς τὸ ὄρος τὸ καλούμενον Ἐλαιῶν echoes the text of Mt 21:17 Καὶ καταλιπὼν αὐτοὺς ἐξῆλθεν ἔχων τῆς πόλεως εἰς Βηθανίαν καὶ ἠγλίσθη ἐκεῖ”; and “The reference to rising early in the morning (ὀρθρίζειν, Lk 21:38) perhaps echoes Mt’s use of πρωί (Lk 21:38//Mt 21:18, cf. Goulder 2:717)” (271).

⁸⁵They offer the following parallels (273):

Mt 24:37-39//Lk 17:26-30	Mt 25:1-13//Lk 13:22-27
Mt 24:40-41//Lk 17:34-35	Mt 25:14-30//Lk 19:11-28
Mt 24:42-51//Lk 12:39-46	

⁸⁶“Luke ...omitted Mt 26:6-13 because he had included a similar story of a sinful woman at Lk 7:36-50” (274).

⁸⁷On “echoes” of Paul in Luke, see above, n. 31.

⁸⁸The Team notes some “echoes” toward making their case here: For the entire pericope, “...Luke made general use of Mt 26:31-32, but he also brought together two other Matthean texts (Mt 20:25-28; 19:28) and echoed Mt 18:1-5, to make a new complex that became a definitive statement by Jesus at the Last Supper on the disciples’ use of their power (after the Resurrection)” (285); “That Luke [22:26] should alter μέγας to μείζων is understandable because the comparative degree of the adjective is proper Greek while the positive degree is more typical of Hebrew style or the LXX. Our conclusion is that this cluster is an echo of what is otherwise a fairly wide-spread Matthean phrase that includes μείζων (cf. Mt 11:11; 18:1, 4; cf. Mt 5:19). The echoes with Mt 18:1-5 are especially noticeable” (286); on Lk 22:31-34: “...it is precisely here, in Jesus’ last words to Peter, that Luke echoed Mt 16:17-19 (Peter’s confession; cf. Lk 22:32) and Mt 16:22-23 (the reference to Satan; cf. Lk 22:31), which Luke had not used earlier” (279).

⁸⁹See the synopsis (290-294), “Illustrating Luke’s revision of Mt 26:57-75 to create a midnight detention at the High Priest’s house (Lk 22:54-65), followed by a morning hearing before the Jerusalem authorities (Lk 22:66-71)” (290).

Note, too, their comments on “echoes”: “The reference to day comes in Mt 27:1. The rest of Lk 22:66 clearly echoes Mt 26:57 (ἀπὸ γαλακτοῦ) and Mt 26:59 (συνέδριον)” (296); On Lk 22:69 [echo isn’t used]: “Matthew uses the expression ἀπ’ ὄρου three times in his Gospel. All three Matthean usages are in texts paralleled by Luke. Every time the expression appears in the text of Matthew, the parallel text of Luke either lacks the expression (Mt 23:39; cf. Lk 13:35) or the expression ἀπὸ τοῦ ὕψους is found (Mt 26:29//Lk 22:18; Mt 26:64//Lk 22:69). Luke uses ἀπὸ τοῦ ὕψους three other times within his Gospel and once in Acts (Lk 1:48; 5:10; 12:52; Acts 18:6). Collison (158-159) notes that ‘The expression ἀπ’ ὄρου, used 3 times in Mt (and at Jn 13:19; 14:7; and Rev 14:13), is condemned by the Atticists’.... This evidence is wholly consistent with the 2GH whereby Luke made direct use of Matthew. If the

“Section Three: Jesus’ Crucifixion, Death, and Burial. Lk 23:26-56b” (301): Lk 23:26-31//Mt 27:31b-32;⁹¹ Lk 23:32-43//Mt 27:27-31, 33, 35, 37-38, 41-44;⁹² Lk 23:44-49//Mt 27:45, 51, 50, 54-55; Lk 23:50-56b//Mt 27:57-61.⁹³

Luke has now arrived at his final section, “Conclusion of Book One. Appearances of the Risen Jesus. Lk 23:56c–24:53” (309) in which he uses Matthean⁹⁴ and nonMatthean material. Lk 23:56c–24:12 is parallel to Mt 28:1-10.⁹⁵ At Lk 24:13-32, the Emmaus Story, “Luke departed entirely from the general order of pericopes in Mt, finishing his composition with stories that are unique among the Gospels” (312). Nevertheless, for the two concluding pericopes, Lk 24:33-49 and 24:50-53, even though Luke did not “...take over Mt’s conclusion (Mt 28:16-20), ... he preserved significant echoes of it, indicating to us that he was quite aware of the importance of its contents” (313).⁹⁶

Atticists condemned ἀπ’ ἄρτι, it would be appropriate for Luke, who is generally regarded as a better Greek stylist to have improved Mt’s Greek expression” (297).

⁹⁰“Although Luke followed the general order of events in Mt to get this scene [of three trials], he made numerous alterations” (298). Note, too: “Luke’s trial scene is so disjunctive from Mt that the possibility must be left open that Luke utilized another source at this point” (298). Nevertheless, “...after letting his guards playfully torture Jesus a little ([in Lk 23:6-12] an echo of Mt 27:27-30, transposed to this Jewish context!), Herod sends Jesus back to Pilate.”

⁹¹Prior to this passage, Luke “...omitted the single most damning passage in Mt’s entire narrative regarding Roman involvement in Jesus’ death... [Mt 27:27-31]. We interpret this as another attempt on the part of Luke to shift blame from Jesus’ death away from the Roman authorities. ... In place of Mt’s beating scene, Luke substituted a scene not found in Mt: Jesus’ warning to the women of Jerusalem about the impending destruction of the city” (301).

⁹²“Luke followed Mt’s order for the crucifixion account, although, as before, he omitted some material from Mt, transposed other material, and inserted nonMatthean tradition in order to bring his vision into line with his literary and theological agenda” (303).

⁹³“Luke followed Mt’s order for the account of the burial of Jesus, but expanded it considerably, introducing clarifications for the sake of his non-Jewish audience” (308). For Lk 23:52, “the considerable number of minor agreements” (with reference to Goulder, 2:772-773, and Gundry, “Matthean Foreign Bodies,” 1490-1491), help the Team make their case.

⁹⁴Luke omitted “Mt 27:62-66, the story of the attempt to bribe the guards to put out a false rumor regarding the theft of Jesus’ body. That account may have been repellent to Luke for a number of reasons. First, it brought Pilate back into the picture...” which is contrary to his narrative. “Second, it re-involved the Roman soldiers..., and Luke had finished with them by means of the centurion’s glowing statement. ... Third, it introduced ... a rumor concerning *possible* underhanded dealings by Jesus’ disciples that was out of line with Luke’s portrayal of them following Jesus’ resurrection” (310).

⁹⁵On Lk 24:4-5: “The words of the angel in Mt required modification because Luke’s narrative plan contained no appearances of Jesus in Galilee (although Lk 24:6b still contains the word). There are numerous echoes between Lk 24:5 and Mt 28:4-5. In Mt 28:4, the appearance of the angel produces fear (φόβος) and shaking (σειεῖν). Mt 28:4 also says the guards became as dead. Φόβος and its cognates are characteristic of Mt [with reference to Robert Gundry, “Matthean Foreign Bodies,” 1491-1492]” (311).

⁹⁶More specifically: Lk 24:44-48 is “Luke’s decisive rehabilitation of the eleven apostles. ...Jesus adds the important words: ‘repentance and forgiveness of sins should be preached in (my) name to all nations’ (Lk 24:47; cf. Lk 3:3/Mk 1:4 and Acts 5:31), which we consider to be an intentional echo of Mt 28:19-20. This verse, with its weighty pronouncement: ‘you are my witnesses’ (Lk 24:48) is the ‘Lukan Great Commission’” (316). In addition, see the text-critical comment on Lk 24:52, above p. 7.

Conclusion

For the Team, in establishing Luke's use of Matthew, "...most important is the evidence that Luke followed the sequential order of Matthew in the major narrative sections of his Gospel" (318). This, of course, omits the infancy narrative section, Lk 1–2, while admitting, as noted above, that Luke uses a different method for supposedly following Matthew's order in each of the other major narrative sections, Lk 3–9, 10–19 and 20–24.⁹⁷ Moreover, inconsistencies in the proposed methods in each section may be noted, but do not cause the Team much consternation with their proposal. There is, however, other evidence marshaled to support their position.

B. LINGUISTIC EVIDENCE: "ONE-WAY INDICATORS" OF LUKE'S USE OF MATTHEW

In addition to the evidence from order, the Team provides some linguistic evidence of Luke's use of Matthew, which they call "one-way indicators," though they do admit other possibilities.⁹⁸ They divide these indicators into three categories: Matthean summary phraseology, grammatical constructions, and favorite vocabulary in Luke. They often depend on the work of Dennis Tevis.⁹⁹

1. Matthean Summary Phraseology in Luke

In order to make the case of "one-way" influence, the Team proposes (21-22)

...to look for a special class of verbal parallelism, what might be called narrative summaries which function to close off one part of the narrative and lead into the next. The Gospel of Matthew has a number of such narrative summaries that are universally acknowledged as having come from the hand of the final compiler of the Gospel, not from a source.

Matters become interesting when fragments of such narrative summaries typical of Gospel A also appear in Gospel B, where they are not typical. Matters become even more interesting when such verbal parallels *do not occur anywhere else in Gospel B except where A and B are in sequential narrative parallel...* When *that* combination of literary phenomena occurs, we have a rare "one-way indicator" that B has copied, not a common source, but A itself.

The first example offered involves the summaries after Matthean discourses, "and when Jesus had finished these sayings" (Mt 7:28; 11:1; 13:53; 19:1; 26:1), most especially the following proposed parallel (23; they provide the following quotations in English, which hides some differences in the Greek; the underlining is theirs):

⁹⁷With respect to Luke "following Matthew's sequential order", Tuckett notes that Luke does so "in different ways in the different sections (Luke 3–9:50; 9:51–19:48; 20–24)" (364). Tuckett notes later that "the concluding claim—that Luke can be seen to be following Matthew's sequential order—only works some of the time; and three [—four, if Lk 1–2 is included—] very different broad redactional strategies have to be postulated for three [or four] sections of Luke" (365).

⁹⁸When, in two Gospels, there are "equally striking parallels in identical phrases and precisely similar turns of speech ... three possibilities immediately present themselves: either A copied B, or B copied A, or both copied an earlier document." — See the critical comment by Tuckett, above, p. 16.

⁹⁹Dennis Gordon Tevis, *An Analysis of Words and Phrases Characteristic of the Gospel of Matthew*, unpubl. diss. Perkins School of Theology, 1982 (from 22 n. 6).

- Mt 7:28-29 Καὶ ἐγένετο ὅτε ἐτέλεσεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τοὺς λόγους τούτους, ἐξεπλήσσαντο οἱ ὄχλοι ἐπὶ τῇ διδαχῇ αὐτοῦ·
²⁹ἦν γὰρ διδάσκων αὐτοὺς ὡς ἐξουσίαν ἔχων...
- Lk 4:31-32 ...καὶ ἦν διδάσκων αὐτοὺς ἐν τοῖς σάββασιν· ³²καὶ ἐξεπλήσσαντο ἐπὶ τῇ διδαχῇ αὐτοῦ, ὅτι ἐν ἐξουσίᾳ ἦν ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ.
- Lk 7:1 Ἐπειδὴ ἐπλήρωσεν πάντα τὰ ῥήματα αὐτοῦ εἰς τὰς ἀκοὰς τοῦ λαοῦ, εἰσηλθεν εἰς Καφαρναούμ.

Since the Gospel of Mark has been totally left out of the Team's consideration, they do not indicate the Marcan parallel:

- Mk 1:21-22 Καὶ εἰσπορεύονται εἰς Καφαρναοῦμ· καὶ εὐθὺς τοῖς σάββασιν εἰσελθὼν εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν ἐδίδασκεν.
²²καὶ ἐξεπλήσσαντο ἐπὶ τῇ διδαχῇ αὐτοῦ· ἦν γὰρ διδάσκων αὐτοὺς ὡς ἐξουσίαν ἔχων καὶ οὐχ ὡς οἱ γραμματεῖς.

Clearly this seems to be an odd case on which to build their argument. With respect to the repetitive summary statement that concludes Matthean discourses, καὶ ἐγένετο ὅτε ἐτέλεσεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τοὺς λόγους τούτους, neither Lk 4:31-32 nor 7:1 have a verbatim agreement. On the other hand, the common phrase in Mt 7:28 and Lk 4:32, ἐξεπλήσσαντο ... ἐπὶ τῇ διδαχῇ αὐτοῦ, is also found verbatim in Mk 1:22, thereby eliminating the “one-way” quality of this indicator—except when assuming both Luke's use of Matthew and no possible influence from a common source, most especially, Mark.¹⁰⁰

The Team provides a second example, Lk 4:14-16, which they take as “a pastiche of Matthean *summary passages* occurring in parallel narrative contexts” (23), because

- (a) This is Luke's introduction to Jesus' first public sermon. Just as Mt 4:12-13 and 4:23-24 are Matthew's introduction to Jesus' first public sermon in his Gospel, so Lk 4:14-16 is in sequential parallel with Matthew's order *and* we find Matthean *summary phraseology* occurring here in the parallel text of Luke.
- (b) This passage also contains echoes of other Matthean *summary phraseology* about the ‘report of Jesus' fame spreading throughout all the district’ (cf. Mt 9:26, 31).

More specifically, on Lk 4:15, the Team notes that “teaching in their synagogues” is “...the only occurrence of this phrase in Luke. On the other hand, ‘in their synagogues’ occurs at Mt 4:23; 9:35; and 10:17” (82).¹⁰¹ As such, the Team values this as a “one-way indicator,” though again, there is another possibility, namely, that Luke anticipated “their synagogues” of Mk 1:39 (par Mt 4:23).¹⁰²

2. Matthean Grammatical Constructions in Luke

A second type of “one-way indicator” is provided by “characteristic Matthean grammatical constructions in the text of Luke, where the two are in close sequential, narrative parallel” (23). The first example is “...the appearance of the genitive absolute followed by the word ‘be-

¹⁰⁰The Team's argument is: “Mt 7:28-29 was created by the author of the Gospel of Matthew.... The presence of precisely this Matthean summary phraseology *both* at the conclusion of Jesus' first public discourse in Capernaum (Lk 4:31f.) *and* at the conclusion of *Luke's version* of Matthew's Sermon on the Mount (Lk 6:20-49), where Luke is clearly in sequential parallel with Matthew's order, is plausible evidence for Luke's direct dependence on the Gospel of Matthew” (23; cf. 103). — But since the phraseology in Lk 4:31-32 is closer to Mk 1:21-22 than Mt 7:28-29, there is no “one-way indication” of Luke's use of Matthew there, which in turn calls the Team's assumption into question. The similarity, though hardly verbatim, of the summary at the end of the Sermon in Mt 7:28-29 and Lk 7:1, therefore, is also open to one of the “other possibilities” (cf. above, n. 98).

¹⁰¹This is part of the larger complex of Lk 4:14b-15, for which the Team provides a synopsis (81-82). Also, the unique spelling Ναζαρά occurs in Lk 4:16//Mt 4:13. They do not, however, claim any of their other observations as “one-way indicators”, though “the unique spelling ... in combination with all the other evidence of Luke's dependence upon several Matthean redactional contexts in Lk 4:14-16, suggests that Luke is directly dependent upon the canonical Gospel of Matthew in this context” (83).

¹⁰²E.g., John Nolland, *Luke 1–9:20*, 187: “αὐτῶν ... is merely repeated from Mark 1:39.”

hold' (ἰδοῦ) in Luke. This grammatical construction is, according to Tevis, a unique literary characteristic of Matthew" (p. 23; 11 times in Mt: 1:20; 2:1, 13, 19; 9:10, 18, 32; 12:46; 17:5; 26:47; 28:11). "The only other place it occurs in all the Gospels is in the Lukan parallel in the story of the arrest of Jesus" in Mt 26:47//Lk 22:47, which is taken as "...strong evidence that Luke has taken over this Matthean construction directly from Matthew" (24). Could be. But, what follows ἰδοῦ differs;¹⁰³ the genitive absolute also appears in Mk 14:43; and the addition of "καὶ ἰδοῦ is a probable characteristic of Lukan style" (145; on Lk 9:38//Mt 17:14). Taken together it seems possible that the genitive absolute + ἰδοῦ, despite its uniqueness in Luke, and the entire verse, 22:47, could be Luke's own change of Mk 14:43.¹⁰⁴

The second example (24):

The verb προσέρχομαι followed by the dative occurs twenty-five times in Matthew. Except for three parallel passages in Mark and Luke (one of them in this example [Mt 27:58 // Lk 23:52]), it occurs nowhere else in the New Testament. It is found throughout Matthew, in places which unmistakably come from the author of the Gospel of Matthew. There is just one occurrence of this construction in the Gospel of Luke, precisely where Luke is in narrative sequential parallel and is identical to the language of Matthew for nine consecutive words.

Again, we regard this as strong evidence that Luke copied directly from Matthew.

This example is strengthened by another "minor agreement" in this verse, namely resumptive οὗτος, which "Gundry considers ... a linguistic characteristic of the text of Matthew," and thus, "an indication of direct Matthean influence on Luke" (308)¹⁰⁵ and surrounding verses. Numerous Two Document Theorists have not found independent coincidence untenable in this case.¹⁰⁶ Moreover, as will be treated below, the minor agreements are not support but are a problem for the 2GH.

Finally, the Team proposes a third example (269-270):

[Lk 21:32:] An example of a "one-way indicator" of literary dependence of Luke upon Mt occurs at Lk 21:32//Mt 24:34. The formulation ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν + οὐ μὴ + Aorist subjunctive verb + ἕως ἄν + Aorist subjunctive verb is a recurrent linguistic feature of the text of Matthew (see Mt 5:18, 26; 10:23; 16:28; 23:39; 24:34; 26:29]). The same formulation occurs at Lk 21:32 in a passage parallel to Mt's order of pericopes (Mt 24:34). In fact, if Lk 22:18 is a Lukan construction based

¹⁰³Compare:

Mt 26:47	g.a. ἰδοῦ	Ἰουδας εἰς τῶν δώδεκα ἦλθεν καὶ μετ' αὐτοῦ ὄχλος πολὺς...
Lk 22:47	g.a. ἰδοῦ	ὄχλος, καὶ ὁ λεγόμενος Ἰουδας εἰς τῶν δώδεκα προήρχετο αὐτοῦς...
Mk 14:43	g.a. παραγίνεται	Ἰουδας εἰς τῶν δώδεκα καὶ μετ' αὐτοῦ ὄχλος...

¹⁰⁴F. Neiryneck, "Minor Agreements Matthew-Luke in the Transfiguration Story", in *Evangelica*, 1982, pp. 797-810 (orig. in P. HOFFMANN, *et al.* [eds.], *Orientierung an Jesus*. FS J. Schmid, Freiburg – Basel – Wien, 1973, pp. 253-266), 805, notes: "The genitive absolute ἐτι αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος is used also in the LXX, sometimes followed by καὶ ἰδοῦ. Only one of the four Matthean instances with ἰδοῦ has its parallel in Luke. F. Rehkopf rightly notes the appropriateness of this usage." Cf. I. H. Marshall, *Luke*, 746: "a natural addition."

¹⁰⁵They refer to his "Matthean Foreign Bodies", 1490-1491. They also refer to Goulder, 2:772-773 in this context. Other minor agreements in surrounding verses are added as further support (308-309): ἐνετύλιξεν αὐτό (Mt 27:59 and Lk 23:53) and ἐπιφώσκειν (Mt 28:1 and Lk 23:54)

¹⁰⁶E.g., John Nolland, *Luke 18:35–24:53*, 1164: "...Luke reproduces with only minor verbal changes the Markan wording (but note the agreement with Matthew...)"

On οὗτος, Tuckett notes that "Goulder himself refers to Lk. 20. 27 for a case of Luke's redactionally inserting οὗτος. There is ... nothing in Luke's phrase which cannot be adequately explained as LkR, and the example is certainly not un-Lukan" ("On the Relationship between Matthew and Luke", *NTS* 30 [1984] 130-142, 138). And on προσελθῶν, Tuckett again disagrees with Goulder, noting that "Matthew's use of προσέρχομαι is probably redactional; but Luke uses the verb 11 times in the gospel and 12 times in Acts, so the use of the verb is not un-Lukan. Further Luke generally reserves εἰσερχομαι for entering into something (e.g. a city or a house) which is usually specified" (*ibid.*).

upon the similar formula at Lk 22:16//Mt 26:29, then every occurrence of this formula in Luke's Gospel can be explained on the basis of Luke's having fragmentarily copied the formula from Mt (Lk 12:59//Mt 5:26; Lk 9:27//Mt 16:28; Lk 13:35//Mt 23:39; Lk 21:32//Mt 24:34; and Lk 22:16//Lk 22:18//Mt 26:29). However, the reverse is not true, because Matthew can utilize this formula ... in literary contexts independent of Lk (Mt 5:18 and 10:23). ... This complex structure of data is regarded by us as another "one-way indicator" of Luke's direct dependence upon canonical Mt.

There is no argument that Matthew likes this particular formulation, but that "this complex structure of data" can carry the weight of 'one-way indication' is optimistic. Mark has been assumed, not demonstrated, out the picture, so for Lk 9:27//Mt 16:28//Mk 9:1; Lk 21:32//Mt 24:34 [cf. Mk 13:30]; and Lk 22:16//Lk 22:18//Mt 26:29//Mk 14:25, Lukan dependence on Matthew is not the only possibility. Moreover, Q has been assumed, not demonstrated, out the picture, so for Lk 12:59//Mt 5:26 and Lk 13:35//Mt 23:39, Lukan dependence on Matthew is again not the only possibility.

3. Matthean Favorite Vocabulary in Luke

"A third type of 'one-way indicator'—although not as convincing as the foregoing for a number of reasons—involves the appearance of favorite *words* of Matthew in passages that are in close sequential parallel" (24). The following examples are pointed out by the Team:

[Lk 7:23; 17:2:] One example is found in Luke 7:23 and 17:2, where the word σκανδαλίζειν 'to stumble, cause to sin' occurs. This word occurs sixteen times in various contexts of Matthew but only twice in Luke, both in passages that are closely parallel to the Matthean order of narration. Again, this is evidence that Luke got this word from Matthew. [p. 24]¹⁰⁷

[Lk 8:41, 44:] Goulder (1:424-425) has noted two examples of unusual phraseology from Mt echoed here in Luke. See ἄρχων εἰς from Mt 9:18 also found in Lk 8:41 and τοῦ κρασπέδου τοῦ ἱματίου αὐτοῦ from Mt 9:20 repeated in Lk 8:44. The distinctively Jewish term κρασπέδον [sic] appears three times in Mt, once in this parallel passage in Lk and once in a Marcan passage, but nowhere else in the NT (Mt 9:20//Lk 8:44; Mt 14:36//Mk 6:56 and Mt 23:5). We believe this to be 'one-way' evidence of the literary dependence of Luke (and Mark) on Mt. [pp. 130-131]¹⁰⁸

Lk 9:1-2 contains language not typical of Luke's Gospel elsewhere. We believe these are fragmentary preservations of typically Matthean linguistic characteristics. See, for example, Mt 4:23, 9:35 and 10:1. Luke has fragmentarily preserved pieces of these most distinctively Matthean redactional passages at Lk 9:1 νόσους θεραπεύειν, and Lk 9:2 κηρύσσειν [sic] τὴν βασιλείαν [sic] and τοὺς ἀσθενεῖς (reading τοὺς ἀσθενεῖς with **Σ** A D L alii). This is again "one way" evidence of Luke's direct literary dependence upon Mt. [Matthew may have taken some of these phrases from prophetic texts, cf. Mt 8:17//Isa 53:4.] Note also Luke's earlier and typical omission of the

¹⁰⁷Later they reaffirm their point: "The appearance of σκανδαλίζειν in the text of Luke (Lk 7:23//Mt 11:6) is clear evidence of Luke's literary dependence on the canonical Gospel of Matthew. ...it is a 'one-way indicator' of Luke's direct dependence on the canonical Gospel of Matthew, not a source such as 'Q' (...)" (115; on Lk 17:2, cf. 229). — But that observation is true if and only if they have clearly shown the Q hypothesis to be untenable (see below for comments on this issue). For the 2DH, Jesus' response to the question from John the Baptist (Lk 7:23) is a Q passage. With respect to Luke 17:2, Mt 18:6 and Mk 9:42 are in parallel, and then Mt 18:7 and Lk 17:1 have a saying not in Mark. So, e.g., Joseph Fitzmyer, *Luke X-XXIV*, 1136-1137, explains: "Superficially, the saying about the stumbling blocks is related to Mark 9:42 and Matt 18:6-7. Whereas Matt 18:6 is dependent on Mark 9:42, the Lukan formulation coincides with the Marcan form only in three phrases.... The woe in v. 1c has, however, a similarity with Matt 18:7, which has no Marcan counterpart. ... [This] suggests that part of the Lukan statement is derived from 'Q,' and since the sayings in the next section (vv. 3b-4,5-6) are derived from that source, it seems likely that a form of vv. 1b-2 also existed in that source. Luke would be preserving the sayings in the 'Q' order. He has, however, also been influenced by Mark 9:42—a passage which would correspond to his Little Omission."

¹⁰⁸On this minor agreement, cf. above, at n. 53.

prophetic proof text which probably supplied Matthew with these literary characteristics at Mt 8:16-17 (cf. Lk 4:40-41). [p. 132]¹⁰⁹

[Lk 9:10-11:] That Mt's story lies behind Luke's version is demonstrated by the appearance of a number of Matthean literary characteristics in the parallel account in Lk: ὑπεχώρησεν (cf. the Matthean ἀνεχώρησεν at Mt 14:13; Tevis, Tables 13 and 15), κατ' ἴδιον [sic] (Mt 14:13//Lk 9:10; cf. Tevis, Table 28); οἱ ὄχλοι ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ (cf. Mt 14:13; Tevis, Table 4) and θεραπεία [sic] cf. ἐθεράπευσεν at Mt 14:14 (cf. Tevis, Tables 5 and 8). The presence of Matthean linguistic characteristics within the text of Luke in contexts where Lk is parallel with Mt's order, combined with the presence of Lukan linguistic characteristics where Lk differs from Mt in the same contexts, is strong evidence that Luke is literarily dependent upon the canonical Gospel of Matthew, not 'Q'. [p. 135; cf. above at n. 54]

[Lk 21:23:] The phrase ἐν γαστρὶ plus ἔχειν [sic] in Lk 21:23 (from Mt 24:19) occurs only here in Luke. It occurs in the parallel in Mt here and twice elsewhere in Mt (1:18, 23). As such, it is an example of a recurrent phrase in one Gospel that appears only once in a parallel context in another Gospel. We consider such evidence a one-way indicator that Luke made direct use of the canonical Gospel of Matthew. [p. 269]¹¹⁰

Conclusion

As noted earlier, the Team relied on the work of Dennis Tevis, whom they believe "... succeeded in establishing the existence of a number of typical Matthean expressions, using an impartial method that did not rely upon any source hypothesis" (22). But is this really possible? Unless Matthew used no rather set oral or written traditions, it seems that one cannot automatically assume that the literary characteristics are "positively Matthean"¹¹¹—they may be taken over from his source(s). The Team even seems to admit this when they note that they "... are working toward a redactional analysis of Matthew independent of any assumption of Matthew's dependence on Mark and 'Q.' That task will ultimately include a tradition-historical separation of the sources of Matthew, including what may go back to the historical Jesus" (319). Without that project first completed, it seems premature to identify Mattheanisms.

¹⁰⁹Lk 9:1-2 is considered Luke's own redaction of Mark by some 2DH advocates (cf. Joseph Fitzmyer, *Luke I–IX*, 753 and John Nolland, *Luke 1–9:20*, 426), while others surmise that the minor agreements here indicate some overlap with Q. For the latter view, see, for example, Christopher Tuckett, "On the Relationship between Matthew and Luke", *NTS* 30 (1984) 130-142, esp. 135-136 (*contra* Goulder): "The use of νόσος as the direct object of θεραπεύειν is unique in Luke-Acts and is un-Lukan. But it appears to be equally un-Matthean. The usage occurs here in Matthew and in two similar phrases in 4.23 and 9.35; however, it is widely recognized that these three verses are deliberately worded in an identical way to form an *inclusio* around chs. 5–9 and to show the disciples as continuing Jesus' work. Thus the use of the phrase ... cannot be regarded as three independent occurrences.... It seems ... most likely that the phrase comes from a common source. On the traditional two-document hypothesis ... Luke's two versions in Lk. 9, 10 are not simply the Markan and Q versions respectively: rather, there has been a certain amount of cross-fertilization from the Q version into Lk. 9. Thus it may well be that the note about 'healing diseases' in the opening instructions is due to influence from Q. ... Thus Goulder's claim about the 'completely characteristic wording of Matt. x. 1' again overstates the evidence. At the crucial point, where Luke agrees with Matthew, Matthew's wording is uncharacteristic. Once again Luke's version has links only with Matthew's source material."

¹¹⁰But "one-way" can only be assumed here because Mark has been excised from consideration: ἐν γαστρὶ ἐξούσσις is found in Mk 13:17//Mt 24:19//Lk 21:23.

¹¹¹I take this indication from the discussion of minor agreements between Michael Goulder, "On Putting Q to the Test," *NTS* 24 (1977-78) 218-234 and Christopher Tuckett, "On the Relationship between Matthew and Luke", *NTS* 30 (1984) 130-142 (cf. above, n. 109 for an example). In order to show Lukan dependence on Matthew, "the Matthew-Luke agreement must be both positively Matthean, and positively un-Lukan" (Tuckett, 132). This seems to be a relevant standard for the Team's indication of "one-way indicators"—but the standard is not met. — See above, n. 109, for an example.

For example, in the process of studying tradition and redaction in Matthew, on the basis of Matthean priority, perhaps the Team's confidence in the redactional quality of summary statements, which provides some of their "one-way indicators", will need more nuance. Can it be reasonably assumed that every summary statement is redactional? For example, listing the similarity of the summary statements after each of the Matthean discourses makes a strong case for Matthew's appreciation of that formulation. If, for example, he took up a traditional Sermon (or some other discourse), is there any way to know with certainty that that traditional discourse did not have such a summary statement, which Matthew liked and then reused to conclude the other discourses? And if the traditional summary, which Matthew reuses, happens to be the one in a parallel context with Luke's use of it—albeit non-verbatim use—then the "one-way" character is compromised, for another "possibility" might explain the parallel.¹¹²

In addition, for a number of the "one-way indicators" and "echoes", the Team makes rather generous and positive use of Gundry's and Goulder's observations concerning Matthean stylistic characteristics. Yet Gundry's and Goulder's judgments are made on the basis of Markan priority and Matthew's direct dependence on Mark. Then, with respect to Luke, Gundry opines that Luke used Mark and Q as primary sources and Matthew as a subsidiary source, while Goulder argues for Luke's use of Mark and Matthew as his primary sources and that there is then no need for Q. To use these scholars' observations on Mattheanisms seems, then, to be inconsistent with the Team's own theory—unless, of course, the as yet unexamined tradition used by Matthew is quite Mark-like.

It seems to this synoptic student that with respect to the identification of "echoes" and "one-way indicators" on the basis of supposed Mattheanisms in Luke's text, the Team has a problem of order: the cart is before the horse.

¹¹²See above, n. 98, for the other possibilities listed by the Team.

IV. SOME PROBLEMATIC TEXTS FOR LUKE'S USE OF MATTHEW IN MORE DETAIL

In general, it is fair to say that the Team has supported their hypothesis of Matthean priority and Luke's direct use of Matthew on the "formal" level, but what is lacking here is a close comparison of the text on the "compositional" level.¹¹³ That is to say, the care and detail with which the Team works through the order of Luke can easily mask for the reader the difficult details for their position. Although a number of particular passages could be considered, a few examples will suffice here.

First, in the call of Matthew (Mt 9:9//Lk 5:27//Mk 2:14), Luke changed the name to Levi, who is not listed among the disciples (and, on this theory, Mark followed Luke into this conundrum!). The Team too easily brushes over this problem (97):

According to Luke, the one whom Jesus called is named "Levi" and not "Matthew" (Mt 9:9). Luke lists Matthew as one of the twelve who will be chosen later (Lk 6:15). Possibly Luke gives the alternative name here to prevent confusion for his readers. Luke's major interest is in the meal to follow.

But from where does Luke learn that "Levi" is *the* alternative to Matthew, except from Mark?¹¹⁴ If Luke is only depending on Matthew, the use of this alternative by Luke cannot "prevent", but only produce, "confusion for his readers". That Matthew changed the name in Mark, while Luke followed his source, Mark, seems much more likely.

With respect to the Twin Parables of the Mustard Seed and Leaven (Lk 13:18-21//Mt 13:31-33), the Team provides a detailed proposal of Luke's use of Mt 13,¹¹⁵ but even if that were convincing, a closer look at the text proves problematic for the 2GH. It seems unlikely that Luke would add a Marcan-like double question to introduce the Mustard Seed (and then repeat one

¹¹³David J. Neville, *Arguments from Order in Synoptic Source Criticism: A History and Critique* (New Gospel Studies, 7), Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1994: "...it is possible to classify any specific argument as one of two basic types. The first type is really an inference regarding the direction of dependence between gospels from purely formal considerations. In other words, this type of argument from order is essentially a deduction based on the formal pattern of agreement and disagreement in the collocation of pericopes..." (8). "The second type of argument from order, which goes beyond formal considerations, tries to account for specific details in the texts of the gospels. ... What specifically differentiates this from the formal type of argument ... is that it attempts to provide a plausible rationale for attributing a particular disagreement in order to one of the gospel redactors by carefully comparing the relevant texts and judging which is likely to be the dependent text on the basis of form-critical or redaction-critical criteria" (9). "For this study, arguments of the first type ... are called 'formal' arguments from order. Arguments of the second type are termed 'compositional' arguments from order..." (10). (I appreciate this reference which I found in David Dungan, *A History of the Synoptic Problem*, 510 n. 90, though his quotation of p. 9 could be more accurate).

¹¹⁴Dungan also slides over this difficulty when describing the "historical perspective" of their theory: Matthew "...might plausibly be viewed as [the] first gospel created by the disciples of Jesus (Levi/Matthew acting as scribe)..." ("Two-Gospel Hypothesis", 677 col. 1).

¹¹⁵"The two simile parables (Lk 13:18-21) are taken from Mt 13:31-33. Luke used Mt 13:1-23, but omitted Mt 13:16-17, at Lk 8:4-15. Luke then used these previously omitted verses, Mt 13:16-17, at Lk 10:23-24 to introduce the Parable of the Good Samaritan (Lk 10:25-37) and the story of Mary and Martha (Lk 10:38-42). Having chosen to omit both the Parable of the Wheat and the Weeds (Mt 13:24-30) and its interpretation (Mt 13:36-43) from his Gospel altogether, Luke then chose the twin parables of the Mustard Seed and the Leaven that intervene (Mt 13:31-33) for use here and in the same order in which they appear in Mt.... Luke adopted nothing else from this *third* Matthean discourse (Mt 13:34-53) elsewhere in the Gospel (Lk 13:22-24:52)" (204).

part of the question prior to the Leaven).¹¹⁶ On what basis would Luke change Mt's ἐν τῷ ἀγρῷ αὐτοῦ (13:31) to εἰς κήπον ἑαυτοῦ (Lk 13:19)? Why in Luke's presumable desire to rewrite Matthew into a much more concise form, would Luke drop his source's "the largest shrub" and keep only "tree", which is problematic on the level of verisimilitude? It still seems more likely that Luke followed Q, except for the reminiscence of Mk 4:30 in the double question of Lk 13:18, and that Matthew conflated his two sources, Mark and Q.¹¹⁷

Other examples have been noted in the previous sections and their notes, many of which deal with Double Tradition passages.¹¹⁸ As a further example, Luke's supposed changes to Matthew's beatitudes (Lk 6:20b-26//Mt 5:2-12) are insufficiently explained: Why did Luke omit some of them?¹¹⁹ What motivated Luke's rewording?¹²⁰ Why a change from first person to "Son of Man" in the final beatitude? While other specific examples could be offered, there remains some more general methodological concerns to which we now turn.

V. SOME MORE GENERAL METHODOLOGICAL OBSERVATIONS

In addition to the earlier raised issues concerning the identification of Matthean characteristics on the basis of the 2GH (even using some judgments made on the basis of Marcan Priority), there are a few other more general methodological observations to be made. First, the Team often attacks Q as if it stands on its own,¹²¹ but, of course, the Q hypothesis stands or falls first and foremost on the priority of Mark, and then the independent use thereof by Matthew and Luke. Therefore, to undermine the Q hypothesis from within this theory, the Team would first need to offer a plausible presentation of Mark as conflator of Matthew and Luke—on both the "formal" and the "compositional" levels. They appear to admit, however, that they have not yet accomplished that: "We now turn our attention to a pericope-by-pericope compositional analysis of Mark's use of both Matthew and Luke" (319). Given that, it seems that the title of the book,

¹¹⁶See my "'Minor' and 'Major' Matthew–Luke Agreements against Mk 4,30-32", in F. Van Segbroeck, *et al.* (eds.), *The Four Gospels 1992. Festschrift for F. Neirynck* (BETL, 100; 3 vols.), Leuven: Peeters, 1992, 649-676, most especially my attempt to support the Marcan character of the double question in Luke (662-675, "The Double Question: Mk 4,30 / Lk 13,18"). — Harry T. Fledderman, whom I argued against, responded with continued support of the position that the double question comes from Q (*Mark and Q. A Study of the Overlap Texts* [BETL, 122], Leuven: Peeters, 1995, 91-93 [see the assessment by F. Neirynck, 277-278]).

¹¹⁷See my response to the 2GH on this passage in "Alternative Synoptic Theories on Mk 4,30-32", in C. FOCANT (ed.), *The Synoptic Gospels. Source Criticism and the New Literary Criticism* (BETL, 110), Leuven: Peeters, 1993, 427-450, esp. 427-430, "I. The Griesbach Hypothesis".

¹¹⁸For example, cf. above: p. 20 on the Lord's Prayer; n. 38 on Mt 5:15//Lk 8:16-18; n. 66 on the Parable of the Banquet.

¹¹⁹Tuckett, 364: "...one looks in vain here for reasons why, for example, Luke omitted the beatitudes that now occur in Matthew alone (and that seem so congenial to Luke)." Cf. the note below, too.

¹²⁰Kloppenborg, 371: "...an explanation of Luke's attenuation of the Matthean beatitudes is missing, and if one urges that Luke has Isa 61:1-2 in mind, Luke's shift of Matthew's second beatitude *away* from the language of Isa 61:2 (παρακαλέσαι πάντας τοὺς πενθοῦντας) is curious."

¹²¹See above, n. 50, the text after n. 56 on the introduction to the Feeding of the 5000, and n. 109.

Beyond the Q Impasse — Luke’s Use of Matthew, is more fitting for a Goulder-like “Two Gospel Hypothesis,”¹²² but not yet for the Team’s own 2GH.

Second, from the outset, the Team eliminates Mark from the picture. But one cannot possibly solve the Synoptic Problem by eliminating one of the Gospels from an evidentiary hearing. In fact, it seems that Dungan has even (wrongly) criticized Neiryck for this: “Recommendations to begin by splitting the Gospels apart in order to compare them pairwise (Mark//Matthew and Mark//Luke) destroys the basic evidence.”¹²³ Certainly in the 2GH, it is going to be necessary to study the pair of Matthew//Luke in order to offer a plausible explanation of that side of the hypothesis (just as it is necessary to pair up gospels in the 2DH to offer a plausible explanation of aspects of that hypothesis). But, eliminating Mark completely (and not having a study of Matthew’s tradition and redaction on the basis of his priority, as noted above) results in assessments of the data that are too optimistic.

If the Team had sufficiently disallowed Marcan priority, then their observations on Q and their exclusion of Mark from their consideration of Luke’s use of Matthew would be more consequent. Nevertheless, it must be admitted that the “one-way indicators” and “echoes” identified by the Team are often “minor agreements” which cause discomfort to serious problems—depending on the theorist’s point of view—for the 2DH.¹²⁴ Ironically, however, precisely the phenomenon of the minor agreements will make it very difficult to argue for Mark’s posteriority *vis-à-vis* Matthew and Luke, because the minor agreements are quite clearly improvements and secondary to the Marcan text.¹²⁵ It will be very difficult to make the argument that the minor agreements are Mark’s omissions and grammatical worsening of the concurrent testimony of his two primary sources, Matthew and Luke.

¹²²Goulder could use this handle, for his theory holds that Mark wrote first, Matthew expanded on Mark, and Luke used Mark and Matthew as his primary sources—thus, no Q. Goulder raised this issue in Göttingen; see F. Neiryck “A Symposium on the Minor Agreements” *ETL* 67(1991) 361-372, 362. — Surprisingly, Goulder is incorrectly presented as a supporter of the Augustinian hypothesis by David L. Dungan, *A History of the Synoptic Problem*, 376 (Ampleforth Conferences, 1982-83) and 378 (Göttingen Conference on ‘the Minor Agreements’). It might also be noted here that Dungan gives no mention of the contributions by U. Luz (Marcan recension hypothesis) and A. Fuchs (*Deuteromarkus*) at Göttingen.

¹²³“Two Gospel Hypothesis”, 673 col. 1. This was suggested by F. Neiryck in “Synoptic Problem”, in *The Interpreter’s Dictionary of the Bible. Supplementary Volume*, Nashville, TN, 1976, pp. 845-848, and in “Synoptic Problem”, in *The New Jerome Biblical Commentary*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1990, pp. 587-595. — Neiryck does not “begin” there. His suggestion follows a discussion of the common order of the Triple Tradition pericopes, which can be explained a number of ways on a formal level—one of which is the 2GH. But when more closely considered, Neiryck concludes that “...the differences in Matt and Luke can be plausibly explained as changes of Mark made according to the general redactional tendencies and the compositional purposes of each Gospel” (*NJBC*, 588 col. 1).

¹²⁴See, of course, F. Neiryck (with the collaboration of T. Hansen and F. Van Segbroeck), *The Minor Agreements of Matthew and Luke against Mark with a Cumulative List* (BETL, 37), Leuven, 1974, and a more recent and brief presentation of the Greek texts, *The Minor Agreements in a Horizontal-line Synopsis* (SNTA, 15), Leuven, 1991. Cf., too, my “The Matthew-Luke Agreements against Mark. A Survey of Recent Studies: 1974-1989”, in F. NEIRYNCK (ed.), *L’Évangile de Luc – The Gospel of Luke* (BETL, 32), Leuven, 1989, pp. 335-392.

¹²⁵I concluded this in the course of my doctoral work: “...careful study of the minor agreements shows them to be generally secondary to Mark. This, then, questions those who propose some type of posteriority of Mark on the basis of them” (“The Matthew-Luke Agreements against Mark. A Survey of Recent Studies: 1974-1989,” 391). See, too, F. Neiryck, who writes: “I share the opinion of many scholars that the minor agreements are post-Markan: if not improvements on Mark, at least changes of the text of Mark” (“The Minor Agreements and the Two-Source Theory,” 40).

Finally, and in relationship to many arguments for various synoptic theories, is it really possible to avoid *all* circular reasoning in this type of historical research? For example, is it so wrong for Fitzmyer to note the problems for Luke's use of Matthew on the basis of the theory he finds works well with the great majority of the evidence?¹²⁶ Given the Team's critique of such presentations, it is surprising to find that their own argument has not been more carefully fashioned. From the outset, they assumed Matthean priority, Luke's use of Matthew, and no influence of Mark or a Q-like source, before, as already noted, doing a full study of Matthean tradition and redaction and sufficiently demonstrating Mark's conflation of Matthew and Luke. Therefore, all the Team has managed to do is to demonstrate what they assumed in the first place—the circle is complete. As a result, “often, the explanation of Luke's procedure is no more than a restatement of what, on the Two-Gospel Hypothesis, Luke must have done. This does not solve the problem; it only renames it.”¹²⁷

VI. CONCLUSION

To sum up and conclude this paper, the Team members “attempt several things: to provide an account of Luke's selection and rearrangement of Matthew, to explain the non-Matthean in Luke, to make intelligible Luke's alterations of Matthew, and to assemble evidence of Luke's direct use of Matthew (constituting disproof of the Two-Document Hypothesis).”¹²⁸ In this way, the Team goes a long way to answer a persistent critique of the Griesbach—now Two Gospel—Hypothesis, namely, that a full treatment of Luke's use of Matthew had not been undertaken.¹²⁹ Thus, both Kloppenborg¹³⁰ and Tuckett¹³¹ note, that this makes the work of the Team an important moment in the defense of the 2GH and “...their work will need—and fully deserves—to be carefully sifted and tested in future discussions of the Synoptic Problem.”¹³²

In the Team's own conclusion, they summarize what they have presented (318): “the most important ... evidence,” Luke's sequential use of Matthew's order; a “second level of evidence... where Luke has preserved key phrases that were created by Matthew for redactional summaries or introductions”; and a “third level of evidence,” which the Team found “most delightful,” namely, that “time after time, Luke's use of Matthew was best and most easily explained by Luke's widely recognized compositional concerns” (318). As a result, the Team believes they have provided “more than a demonstration that Luke *might* have used Matthew,” that

¹²⁶Cf. above. at nn. 28-29.

¹²⁷Kloppenborg, 371; cf. too, Tuckett, 365, quoted above, p. 23.

¹²⁸Kloppenborg, 370; he also notes: “Explanation of non-Matthean material is a simpler matter. It does not differ substantially from Two-Document explanations: some of the non-Matthean material is of Lucan creation, while other non-Matthean items are traditional items taken over by Luke” (371).

¹²⁹Tuckett, 364: “It has been a long-standing comment about the 2GH that a detailed analysis of the redactional activity of the secondary evangelists is lacking. In the case of Luke, the present volume is therefore a welcome attempt to fill that gap.” Kloppenborg, 370: “The weak link in the chain of that hypothesis [2GH] remained the supposition of Luke's direct use of Matthew. Griesbach had not addressed the problem, and no one since E. Simons (*Hat der dritte Evangelist den kanonischen Matthäus benutzt?* [Bonn: Georgi, 1880]) had attempted a systematic treatment of it.”

¹³⁰“The importance of the volume under review ... is that for the first time in this century we have a systematic exposition of Luke assuming Luke's knowledge of Matthew and without assuming Marcan priority” (370).

¹³¹“...the authors here are to be warmly thanked for giving what is clearly by far the most comprehensive attempt so far to explain Luke's Gospel on the basis of the 2GH” (365).

¹³²*Ibid.*

is to say, they believe 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” (318-319). The élan of the Team upon completing this major work is understandable, but the strength of the conclusion here can be contrasted with William Farmer’s more judicious statement in his Preface: “we are aware that there are other ways to interpret the evidence we have discovered” (xiii).

With respect to the evidence brought forward by the Team (most especially the first and second levels, but also the third level), this paper has attempted a critical examination, with the help of the responses by Kloppenborg and Tuckett. On one level, the critique shows Farmer to be correct, that much of the evidence is reversible,¹³³ and thus, the Team’s demonstration does not appear as convincing as their conclusion holds. More importantly, however, many of the observations in this paper have attempted to show that even within the Team’s 2GH, there are problems yet to be resolved. Luke’s supposed sequential use of Matthew is not all that sequential, in that it is virtually ignored in Lk 1–2, and for two sections it requires a complicated hypothesis of multiple passes, five for Luke 3–9 and twenty-five for Luke 10–19. Only Lk 20–24 appears to qualify for the assessment that Luke sequentially used Matthew. The linguistic evidence, the so-called “one-way indicators,” are methodologically problematic as well as explainable within the 2DH. Finally, it seems fair to say that a more detailed study of the text of Luke and his supposed use of Matthew is necessary to show whether one can confidently propose that Luke is consistently developing Matthew according to his compositional concerns. Whenever a case for such redaction could be made, the Team often did so, but in many of those cases, Luke’s use of Mark would work just as well, or even better. For other pericopes, some of which were briefly examined in this paper, the Team did not consider the details enough in order to see the problems they cause for the 2GH.

As a result, Tuckett’s polite evaluation is true (364): “...those not fully convinced of the merits of the case for the 2GH may need a little more convincing than the present volume provides.” At best, the Team has only completed the circle, clearly showing what Luke would have had to have done in his use of Matthew, which they had already assumed. For the Team, their presentation is a “plausible account”. But, in this synoptic student’s opinion, it is neither as nor more plausible than the account offered by the Two Document Hypothesis.¹³⁴

¹³³Tuckett, 365: “The concluding claims ... probably go too far. Much of the evidence is, and remains, reversible and explicable on different source theories.”

¹³⁴See Tuckett (365): “several of the parallels [in supposed redactional introductions and summaries in Matthew] turn out to be not particularly striking, or in any case explicable without difficulty on the basis of the alternative Two-Source theory.”

I offer the following list of some corrections:

- viii The first synopsis, Lk 4:14-16 is not listed; it is found on p. 82; Synopsis #1, is noted as on p. 82, read 86; #2, is noted as on p. 92, read 93; Before #5, add Lk 5:20f. // 7:48f. on p. 118; #8, Lk 11:27:28 (*bis*), read Lk 11:27-28 and the page indication, 164, should read 179; #9, Lk 11:33, read Lk 11:33-36.
- ix Synopsis #13, Lk 14:28:30, read Lk 14:28-32; #18, is noted as on p. 282, read 281; #19, Lk 22: 19-20, read Lk 22:19-20.
- 2 line 2, *chairos*, read *kairos*
- 11 2nd to last text line, the third and sixth, read the fourth and sixth (cf. above, pp. 8-9)
- 16 Matthew’s column, #15, Call of Levi, read Call of Matthew (chart inserts, too); Matthew’s column, #33 and #34, 14:22-23 and 14:24–16:12, read 14:22-33 and 14:34–16:12, resp. (chart inserts, too)
- 20 line one, *Lk 19:28-24:9*, read *Lk 19:28-24:53* (no reason for limiting this section to 24:9 is evident)
- 76 line 5, γεγέννηκά, read γεγέννηκά
- 103 the synopsis, col. 3, line 4, ἀκοὰς τοῦ read ἀκοὰς τοῦ

By Timothy A. Friedrichsen
 Assistant Professor of New Testament
 Dept. of Religion and Religious Education
 The Catholic University of America
 Washington, DC

-
- 112 last line, transitionalstion, read the Ointment
 128 new para., line 1, ἔρχομαι read ἔρχομαι; Lk 8:22 (indented text), καὶ ἐνέβη, read καὶ αὐτὸς ἐνέβη
 130 line 2, κρασπέδον, read κράσπεδον
 132 at Lk 9:1-2, line 5, κηρύσσειν read κηρύσσειν; line 6, βαλισείαν read βασιλείαν
 135 at first bullet, line 4, ἰδιαν read ἰδιάν; line 6, θεραπεία read θεραπείας
 159 last line, Mt 10:40–11:1 read ... 11:1
 177 at Lk 11:14, ntoice, read notice
 198 at Lk 12:50-51, line 2, aqnd, read and
 230 at Lk 17:5-6, para. 2, line 4, συκομαρέα, read συκομορέα
 269 at Lk 21:23 ἔχειν, read ἔχειν
 287 at the bullet, line 3, 22:36, read 22:36-37
 295 n. 4 line 1 “major agreement” read, major “minor agreement”
 314 Second bullet, line 6, קל ופא, read קל ופא
 332 To the index entry, “Echoes of Matthew”, add 271, 296, 300, 311, 313, 316; To “One-way indicator”, add 131, 132.