

# **The Two Gospel Hypothesis**

Nicholas Wischman

THES 690-A07: Thesis Defense

September 4, 2024

## Contents

|                                                                |    |
|----------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| INTRODUCTION .....                                             | 1  |
| CHAPTER I: OBJECTIONS AGAINST THE TWO GOSPEL HYPOTHESIS .....  | 6  |
| The Formal Argument from Order .....                           | 7  |
| The Argument from Compositional Unity.....                     | 16 |
| The Argument from Doublets.....                                | 21 |
| The Doubled Healings .....                                     | 25 |
| The Argument from Editorial Fatigue .....                      | 27 |
| The Execution of John the Baptist.....                         | 35 |
| The Argument from Verisimilitude .....                         | 41 |
| The Argument from the Implausibility of Micro-conflation ..... | 45 |
| Arguments from Markan Redaction .....                          | 49 |
| The Argument from Regressed Grammar and Style.....             | 50 |
| The Argument from Christological Difficulty.....               | 51 |
| The Argument from Omission.....                                | 55 |
| CHAPTER II: THE COMPOSITION OF MARK .....                      | 62 |
| Two Gospel Hypothesis Models of Mark.....                      | 77 |
| Black’s Petrine Model.....                                     | 78 |
| Orchard’s Petrine Model.....                                   | 85 |
| Owen’s Synthetic Model.....                                    | 92 |
| Dungan’s Synthetic Model .....                                 | 92 |
| Griesbach’s Abridgment Model.....                              | 95 |
| Riley’s Abridgment Model .....                                 | 98 |

|                                                     |     |
|-----------------------------------------------------|-----|
| Mann’s Redactional Model.....                       | 107 |
| Peabody, Cope, and McNicol’s Redactional Model..... | 118 |
| Farmer’s Conciliatory Model.....                    | 132 |
| Summary.....                                        | 142 |
| The Polemical Model of 2GH Mark.....                | 144 |
| <br>                                                |     |
| CHAPTER III: LUKE’S USE OF MATTHEW.....             | 159 |
| Luke’s Redactional Procedures.....                  | 164 |
| The Galilean Ministry.....                          | 168 |
| The Rejection at Nazareth.....                      | 168 |
| The Call of Peter.....                              | 170 |
| The Controversy Complex.....                        | 171 |
| The Context of the Sermon.....                      | 172 |
| John the Baptist.....                               | 175 |
| The Parable of the Sower.....                       | 178 |
| The Second Mission Charge.....                      | 180 |
| The Five Scans.....                                 | 183 |
| The Central Section.....                            | 190 |
| Luke’s Initial Use of L.....                        | 190 |
| The Second Controversy Complex.....                 | 192 |
| Persecution to Eschatology to Repentance.....       | 197 |
| Judgment and Gentile Inclusion.....                 | 203 |
| Luke’s Ending Use of L.....                         | 207 |
| Luke’s Use of Matthew in the Central Section.....   | 213 |
| The Jerusalem Sequence.....                         | 222 |

|                                             |     |
|---------------------------------------------|-----|
| Luke’s Corrective Use of Matthew.....       | 223 |
| Summary .....                               | 227 |
| <br>                                        |     |
| CHAPTER IV: ARGUMENTS FROM ORDER .....      | 229 |
| The 2GH Markan Compositional Argument ..... | 233 |
| 2DH Matthean Compositional Arguments .....  | 242 |
| Lachmann.....                               | 245 |
| Allen.....                                  | 249 |
| Hawkins .....                               | 252 |
| Klostermann.....                            | 256 |
| Schweizer .....                             | 258 |
| Schniewind.....                             | 260 |
| Held.....                                   | 261 |
| Thompson .....                              | 265 |
| Burger .....                                | 267 |
| Theißen .....                               | 269 |
| Kingsbury.....                              | 272 |
| Tuckett .....                               | 273 |
| Conclusion .....                            | 277 |
| Bibliography .....                          | 281 |

## Abbreviations

|     |                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
|-----|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2DH | Two Document Hypothesis, the view that Mark wrote first and Matthew and Luke independently used Mark and a lost source called Q                                                                 |
| 2GH | Two Gospel Hypothesis, the view that Matthew wrote first, Luke used Matthew, and Mark used Matthew and Luke                                                                                     |
| AH  | Augustinian Hypothesis, the traditional view that Matthew wrote first, Mark used Matthew, and Luke used Matthew and Mark                                                                        |
| FH  | Farrer Hypothesis, the view that Mark wrote first, Matthew used Mark, and Luke used Mark and Matthew                                                                                            |
| MA  | Minor agreement, an instance in which Matthew and Luke share common wording that is not shared by Mark, which has been used as an argument against the 2DH                                      |
| Q   | German for “Quelle,” meaning “source,” the hypothetical source used by Matthew and Luke under the 2DH that accounts for the shared material between Matthew and Luke that is not shared by Mark |

## INTRODUCTION

The quests for the historical Jesus and the interrelationship of the Gospels have been inextricably linked throughout their history. Modern interest in the question of the compositional ordering of Matthew, Mark, and Luke, which came to be called the Synoptic Problem, first arose as a result of the publication of Reimarus's *Wolfenbützel Fragments*, published by Lessing in 1774-1778, which cast doubt on the reliability of the Gospels and posited that the story of Jesus' resurrection was a hoax propagated by the disciples wishing to continue their station in the newfound sect after the death of their expected Messiah.<sup>1</sup> Around the same time, Griesbach published his synopsis of the Gospels, which in the question of their interrelationship served, most importantly, not to emphasize the similarities of the Synoptic Gospels but to demonstrate their differences. In the preface he broke away from the attempt of the Church to harmonize these differences, instead confessing to the "heresy" that they are irreconcilable.<sup>2</sup> The break from the traditional view that Mark had abridged Matthew was finalized by Koppe in 1782, who opened the way for the contest of alternative theories as a result.<sup>3</sup> These three developments led to the beginning of the Synoptic Problem, with Reimarus providing the motive behind the search, Griesbach providing the methodological pathway, and Koppe severing the old theory and leaving a void for its replacement.

---

<sup>1</sup> Hermann S. Reimarus, *Fragments from Reimarus: Consisting of Brief Critical Remarks on the Object of Jesus and the Disciples as Seen in the New Testament*, trans. G. E. Lessing, ed. Charles Voysey (London: Williams & Norgate, 1879); cf. John S. Kloppenborg Verbin, *Excavating Q: The History and Setting of the Sayings Gospel* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2000), 275-80.

<sup>2</sup> J. J. Griesbach, *Synopsis evangeliorum Matthaei, Marci et Lucae: Textum Graecum ad fidem codicum, versionum et patrum emendavit et lectionis varietatum* (Halle, Germany: n.p., 1776), vii-viii.

<sup>3</sup> J. B. Koppe, *Marcus non epitomator Matthaei* (Göttingen, Germany: n.p., 1782).

In direct response to Reimarus, in 1783 Griesbach concluded from his examination of the resurrection accounts that Mark had used Matthew and Luke,<sup>4</sup> a theory that he further developed based on the order of pericopes in the Gospels, which would come to be called the Two Gospel Hypothesis (2GH).<sup>5</sup> And soon after in 1784, Lessing, the publisher of Reimarus's work, posited his own theory of an Ur-Gospel, a theoretical document that the three writers of the Synoptic Gospels had used independently, in response to Koppe's dissolution of Mark's use of Matthew.<sup>6</sup> The idea of an Ur-Gospel would develop into the theory of an Ur-Markus as it became more and more apparent that this document resembled the canonical Mark, which, alongside another lost document that contained the teaching material exclusive to Matthew and Luke that became known as Q, formed the Two Document Hypothesis (2DH), Matthew and Luke's independent use of the Ur-Markus and Q. This formulation was established as the dominant theory by Holtzmann in 1863<sup>7</sup> and paved the way for Streeter's formulation in 1924<sup>8</sup> of Matthew and Luke's direct use of canonical Mark.

---

<sup>4</sup> J. J. Griesbach, *Inquiritur in fontes unde Evangelistae suas de resurrectione Domini narrationes hauserint* (Jena, Germany: n.p., 1783); reprinted in *Opuscula academia*, vol. II, ed. J. Gabler (Jena, Germany: n.p., 1825), 241-56.

<sup>5</sup> J. J. Griesbach, "A Demonstration that Mark Was Written after Matthew and Luke," translated by Bernard Orchard, in *J. J. Griesbach: Synoptic and Text-Critical Studies 1776-1976*, edited by Bernard Orchard and Thomas R. W. Longstaff (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978), 103-35.

<sup>6</sup> G. E. Lessing, "New Hypothesis on the Evangelists as Merely Human Historians," in *Lessing: Philosophical and Theological Writings*, trans. and ed. H. B. Nisbet (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 148-71.

<sup>7</sup> H. J. Holtzmann, *Die synoptischen Evangelien: Ihr Ursprung und geschichtlicher Charakter* (Leipzig, Germany: Verlag von Wilhelm Engelmann, 1863).

<sup>8</sup> B. H. Streeter, *The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins, Treating of the Manuscript Tradition, Sources, Authorship, & Dates* (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2008).

With Griesbach's demonstration of the 2GH based on the order of pericopes in 1790,<sup>9</sup> Mark's use of Matthew and Luke became the accepted theory at the time. There are three developments, however, that led to its downfall, with the result that the 2DH has taken its place as the dominant theory. In 1832 the arguments from Sieffert that the Gospel of Matthew was written after the eyewitness period were deemed persuasive by scholars at the time, and this later placing of the Gospel greatly influenced the course of the Synoptic Problem. With Matthew as the first Gospel under the 2GH, this had the result that all of the Synoptic Gospels were collectively pushed later in date under the theory, furthering the distance from the time of Jesus to the evangelists.<sup>10</sup> In line with this development, in 1835 Strauss published his *Life of Jesus*, using late dates of the Gospels to allow for the development of myth before the time of the writing of Matthew, casting doubt on the ability of the Gospels to be used as reliable sources for the historical Jesus.<sup>11</sup> This crisis provided a motive for the priority of Mark to replace the priority of Matthew, since if it is the case that Matthew used Mark rather than that Mark used Matthew, Mark can then be placed as an early witness to the historical Jesus under the 2DH, avoiding the difficulty of the necessarily later dating of Matthew as the first Gospel under the 2GH. The third reason can first be found in the very pages of Griesbach's formulation of the theory itself, and has persisted up to current times, which is the inability for proponents of the theory, first, to provide a satisfactory explanation for Mark's arrangement and omission of material due to their

---

<sup>9</sup> J. J. Griesbach, "A Demonstration that Mark Was Written after Matthew and Luke," trans. Bernard Orchard, in *J. J. Griesbach: Synoptic and Text-Critical Studies 1776-1976*, ed. Bernard Orchard and Thomas R. W. Longstaff (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978), 103-35.

<sup>10</sup> F. L. Sieffert, *Ueber den Ursprung des ersten kanonischen Evangeliums: Eine kritische Abhandlung* (Königsberg, Germany: Conrad Poitsche, 1832); William R. Farmer, *The Synoptic Problem: A Critical Analysis* (Dillsboro, NC: Western North Carolina Press, 1976), 18-9.

<sup>11</sup> D. F. Strauss, *The Life of Jesus, Critically Examined*, vol. 1, trans. George Elliot (London: Chapman Brothers, 1846); cf. Hans-Herbert Stoldt, *History and Criticism of the Marcan Hypothesis*, trans. and ed. Donald L. Niewyk (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1980), 257-8.



own presuppositions concerning the nature and purpose of Mark, and second, their inability to recognize the pattern of Luke's use of Matthew, leaving a void from their lack of ability to substantiate their own theory, by which the proponents of the 2DH have been able to establish their theory as the most satisfactory option.

It is surprising—though, due to the nature of the subject, perhaps inevitable—the extent to which the history of Gospel research can be characterized as a battleground of religious presuppositions, with proponents of each side contending that their opinions are conclusions derived from the evidence, when in reality each attempts to force the data to accord with their particular view, dogmatic assertions often masquerading as the results of purportedly unbiased and objective reasoning. The proponents of the various theories exemplify the evidently incessant tendency to force the data of the Gospels into the paradigms dictated by their philosophical and theological preferences rather than allow the evidence to dictate their theories. It is but one front on which the scholarly presentation of Jesus is contested, and with the field in such a state, the question of the order and interrelationship of the Synoptic Gospels has accordingly evaded a satisfactory answer for centuries. The “Problem” of the Synoptic Problem is that proponents of Markan priority have been unable to force the data of the Gospels to fit their theory, an endeavor for which they aim because of its advantage to their view of the historical Jesus, and the proponents of Markan posteriority have been unwilling to posit a model of Mark that accords with the data because they are hindered by their dogmatic suppositions concerning the harmony and unity of the Scriptures. The answer to the Synoptic Problem can only be considered if the presuppositions that have resulted in the origination and continuation of the other theories and models that are so demonstrably incongruent with the data are set aside so that

the Gospels can be examined with a due regard to the potential realities behind the data rather than in accordance with such preconceptions about the Christian faith and its earliest documents.

Due to the inevitable connection between the Gospels and the historical Jesus, theories have been advanced not primarily because of a perceived greater amount of evidence in the favor of one option over another but because the theories are perceived to be presuppositionally beneficial to those advancing them. The 2DH has been championed by those seeking, on the one hand, to maintain the subjectability of Jesus to historical investigation, but on the other, for Mark and Q to be established as the earliest sources by which such investigations could be conducted. The 2GH has failed to return to its prior status as the predominant theory because its proponents have been unwilling to posit a model of Mark that properly accounts for the redactions and selection of material that result, hesitant concerning the implications of its writer's usage and treatment of the two previous Gospels. It is paradoxical that with matters as important as those concerning the truths of the Christian faith that it should be expected that those investigating it should be all the more intent to lay aside their own presuppositions out of a desire to arrive at the most certain truth concerning it, but because of its supreme importance, as it is, there is, as can be seen, all the more motive for the insertion of dogmatic considerations that have dictated the opinions of those investigating it and, along with it, their desire to persuade the views of others to the same. It has been one hundred years since the establishment of Matthew and Luke's direct use of canonical Mark, and it is time that the 2GH received a comprehensive and competent defense, one that is not partial to the presuppositions that have resulted in the perpetuation of the theories and models of the past that have been unable to account for the data of the Gospels.

## CHAPTER I

## OBJECTIONS AGAINST THE TWO GOSPEL HYPOTHESIS

As a theory produced not as the result of evidence but due to its expedience, the arguments used in defense of the 2DH against the 2GH are not only wholly unpersuasive but often apply equally or to a greater extent against their own position. The formal argument from order lost much of its applicability after the switch from the Ur-Markus to the canonical Mark, despite it still being appealed to longer afterward. After its collapse, 2DH proponents began to dismiss the importance of formal arguments from order altogether, aware that the order of pericopes readily lends to the 2GH, an observation they appear to acknowledge from the reversal in their approach but are careful not to admit. The inconsistency of their argumentation can be seen with their argument concerning Mark's compositional unity, which is in direct contradiction with their reasoning against the 2GH, using the very same reasoning both to advance Matthew and Luke's use of Mark and to repudiate Luke's use of Matthew. Their defense against the pleonasm in Mark has been unraveled, and the doublets, which once served as confident evidence for the 2DH, rather, as will be seen, points to the priority of Matthew. Their best example of possible Matthean editorial fatigue, the execution of John the Baptist, which is commonly cited in full confidence as one of the best evidences for the priority of Mark, itself better evidences Mark's use of Matthew. With the view long being abandoned that Mark was written as eyewitness testimony, as evidenced by the proliferation of minor details throughout the Gospel, what was once cited as evidence for the priority of Mark now cuts against it. 2DH proponents have attempted to discredit the 2GH due to the level of conflation with which Mark would have used Matthew and Luke, but the same objection applies to the 2DH in the Mark-Q overlap passages, which require Matthew to have done much the same. With the advent of form

criticism, the primary objection that has continually been made against the 2GH since the rise of the 2DH, the inexplicability of Mark's omission of material, now demands an answer from the 2DH as well, and which the 2DH is less equipped to provide.

### The Formal Argument from Order

It was not until Butler's exposition of what he termed the "Lachmann fallacy" that the order of pericopes in the Synoptic Gospels would cease to be used as an argument for Markan priority. In his 1835 treatise, Lachmann began from the assumption of a pre-Synoptic source that was used by Matthew, Mark, and Luke, and argued that this common source had a pericope order most closely represented by Mark, which the evangelists occasionally rearranged for purposes he sought to establish.<sup>12</sup> Butler was quick to note that Lachmann himself did not commit the fallacy, but only that the error revolved around his work; as Neville notes, however, Lachmann is not so blameless in this regard, since throughout his treatise he often called the primitive source "Mark," with it being the Gospel that closely retained the order of the Ur-Gospel, precipitating the error that would later arise when the 2DH moved from the Ur-Markus to the view that Matthew and Luke used the canonical Mark.<sup>13</sup> Lachmann's argument functioned under the principle that if two Gospels agreed in order and one dissented, the order maintained by the Gospels in agreement most likely retained the order of the Ur-Gospel. Since Matthew and Luke almost never disagree in order against Mark, Mark's Gospel would then have more

---

<sup>12</sup> Karl Lachmann, "On the Order of the Stories in the Synoptic Gospels," in "Lachmann's Argument," in *The Two-Source Hypothesis: A Critical Appraisal*, trans. N. H. Palmer, ed. Arthur J. Bellinzoni, Jr., Joseph B. Tyson, and William O. Walker, Jr. (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1985).

<sup>13</sup> B. C. Butler, *The Originality of St. Matthew: A Critique of the Two-Document Hypothesis* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1951), 62-3; David J. Neville, *Arguments from Order in Synoptic Source Criticism: A History and Critique*, vol. 7, New Gospel Studies (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1994), 56-7.

faithfully preserved the order of the Ur-Gospel.<sup>14</sup> And since Lachmann begins his investigation with the assumption that the three Gospels used an Ur-Gospel, the conclusion of his analysis is not that the three Gospels used an Ur-Gospel, but of what the order of the Ur-Gospel would be under that assumption. As a result, Lachmann's argument depends upon Matthew's use of the Ur-Gospel and loses applicability when the same arguments are made under Matthew's direct use of canonical Mark.<sup>15</sup> As Butler pointed out, once the shift from Ur-Markus to canonical Mark was made, Lachmann's argument lost much of its force, and the order of pericopes only shows that Mark is the "connecting-link" between Matthew and Luke, not necessarily their source.<sup>16</sup>

Springer is credited with discerning that there are two types of arguments from order, what will here be called "formal arguments" and "compositional arguments."<sup>17</sup> A formal argument is based on the observation that the order of pericopes itself lends to the order in which the Gospels were written, and the compositional argument pertains to the plausibility of the redactional explanations for why one evangelist may have rearranged the order of another Gospel. Put more fundamentally, one is an argument that accounts for the agreements of order and the other is an argument to explain the disagreements, or as Springer categorized it, the first is an argument from "collaboration," pertaining to the similarities in order that point to the Gospels using one another, and the second is from "explanation," a comparison of the arguments for the changes each evangelist would have needed to make according to a proposed source

---

<sup>14</sup> Ibid., 151.

<sup>15</sup> Ibid., 47-8, 56-7.

<sup>16</sup> Butler, *The Originality of St. Matthew*, 65.

<sup>17</sup> As noted by Neville, *Arguments from Order*, 112-23; J. F. Springer, "The Synoptic Problem. II. Facts and Conclusions as to the Synoptic Orders of Events," *Bibliotheca sacra* 81, no. 321 (1924): 59-88.

theory.<sup>18</sup> The fallacy of using the order of pericopes as a formal argument for the 2DH is most evident in the argument from order by Woods, who lists the following points in favor of Markan priority:

(1) The earliest and the latest parallels in all three Gospels coincide with the beginning and end of St. Mark. The first is the ministry of St. John the Baptist, the last the visit of the women to our Savior's tomb. (2) With but few exceptions we find parallels to the whole of St. Mark in either St. Matthew or St. Luke, and to by far the larger part in both. (3) The *order* of the whole of St. Mark, excepting of course what is peculiar to that Gospel, is confirmed either by St. Matthew or St. Luke, and the greater part of it by both. (4) A passage parallel in all three Synoptists is never *immediately* followed in both St. Matthew and St. Luke by a *separate incident or discourse* common to these two evangelists alone. (5) Similarly in the parts common to St. Matthew and St. Luke alone, no considerable fragments, with some doubtful exceptions, occur in the same relative order, so that it is unlikely that they formed part of the original source. (6) To this we may add the fact that in the same parts the differences between St. Matthew and St. Luke are generally greater than in those which are common to all three.<sup>19</sup>

It is surprising that such arguments could have been thought to establish Markan priority over the 2GH, and that they could have been held for so long. To preempt any doubt that these points were used to support Markan priority as the common source of Matthew and Luke against Matthean priority, he says immediately before listing the points, "I will now give the reasons which seem to me to prove conclusively that the original basis of the Synoptical Gospels coincided in its *range* and *order* with our St. Mark,"<sup>20</sup> and right afterward, "It may be added that arguments of a like kind could not be adduced to prove the priority of a Gospel resembling St. Matthew or St. Luke."<sup>21</sup> After a further explication of his third point, he then addresses the

---

<sup>18</sup> Springer, "II. Facts and Conclusions," 74.

<sup>19</sup> F. H. Woods, *The Origin and Mutual Relation of the Synoptic Gospels*, vol. 18, Analecta Gorgiana (New Jersey: Gorgias Press, 2006), 61-2, emphasis original.

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, 61, emphasis original.

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*, 62.

objection that the data are just as explicable under the 2GH, to which he responds by providing four objections against the 2GH: Mark's omissions, the lack of a persuasive compositional argument, the frequency of overlap with Matthew and Luke, and Luke's use of Matthew.<sup>22</sup>

Woods evidently finds the objections so compelling that the use of the formal argument itself as an argument against the 2GH is justified, despite his acknowledgment that the points of his formal argument accord with Mark's alternation between Matthew and Luke per the 2GH as well.

Butler's chapter on the Lachmann fallacy actually describes two fallacies. The first is the application of Lachmann's argument, which presupposed an Ur-Gospel, as an argument for the use of the canonical Mark by Matthew and Luke, an argument that fails to account for the fact that Lachmann's compositional argument relies on Matthew's use of the Ur-Gospel and do not carry over to Matthew's direct use of Mark. The second is that, even if it is the case that Lachmann's argument can be applied to Matthew's use of canonical Mark, this would function only to establish the 2DH as a plausible option, not as an argument against other theories, which entails the failure to recognize or acknowledge that other theories explain the same data.<sup>23</sup> This second argument is prominently featured in Woods' influential treatise on the 2DH arguments from order, where he fallaciously cites unrelated arguments against the 2GH as a means to disqualify his six points from lending to the 2GH, which in turn permits him, in his reasoning, to use that data as a positive argument for the 2DH.<sup>24</sup>

---

<sup>22</sup> Ibid., 66-7.

<sup>23</sup> Butler, *The Originality of St. Matthew*, 62-6.

<sup>24</sup> Woods, *Origin and Mutual Relation*, 61-7.

The height of this second fallacy is found in Streeter's work, where he says, "The order of incidents in Mark is clearly the more original; for wherever Matthew departs from Mark's order Luke supports Mark, and whenever Luke departs from Mark, Matthew agrees with Mark...and there is no case where Matthew and Luke agree together against Mark in a point of arrangement."<sup>25</sup> This is the same argument later used by 2GH proponents as part of the formal argument for Mark's use of Matthew and Luke, since it demonstrates the plausibility that Mark alternated between the other two Gospels. That this could ever be used as a formal argument for the 2DH against other theories, and the 2GH in particular, can rightly be called presuppositional, as it demonstrates the blinding commitment to the Markan theory that the 2DH proponents of the time must have held, that they were evidently unable or unwilling to consider the data from other perspectives, not least with regard to those theories they are combating, which otherwise would have resulted in the realization that this phenomenon lends to the 2GH over their own.

In his critique of the Markan theory, Jameson, in support of the traditional view of Matthew, Mark, Luke, what is called the Augustinian Hypothesis (AH), noted the flaw in the formal argument of Abbott, who used the analogy of three students copying from one another, to suppose that, because two of the students have much in common with the third but not with one another, those two students must have copied from the third. Jameson comments, "It must be hoped that this is not a reminiscence of actual history, or that at least, if so, the master did not administer hasty punishment!"<sup>26</sup> Streeter evidently ignored Jameson's exposition of the fallacy when he wrote *The Four Gospels*, a fact that Farmer has famously called "the single most

---

<sup>25</sup> Burnett Hillman Streeter, *The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins, Treating of the Manuscript Tradition, Sources, Authorship, & Dates* (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2008), 161.

<sup>26</sup> H. G. Jameson, *The Origin of the Synoptic Gospels: A Revision of the Synoptic Problem* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1922), 11-2.



unparalleled act of academic bravado on record.”<sup>27</sup> And it is not a question if Streeter was aware of the argument, since, as Farmer noticed, he made allusions to an attempt to revive the AH, which could only be directed toward Jameson.<sup>28</sup> There is no need to guess, however, since as Neville later discovered, Streeter reviewed Jameson’s book a year prior.<sup>29</sup> This misstep is so striking that Tuckett has come to the defense of Streeter in the hopes of alleviating some of the criticism that has been levied against him, though, as Neville has shown, the defense has not been completely successful.<sup>30</sup> Streeter has either attempted to use a phenomenon of the order of the Synoptics in support of the 2DH that actually lends to the 2GH over the 2DH, or he has recited the 2DH formal argument despite the exposition of its fallacy from Jameson who wrote in support of the AH; whether, then, he had in mind the 2GH or the AH, the only two alternatives at the time, as the opposing theory when developing the argument, he has used it as an argument for the 2DH despite knowing it upheld the 2DH against neither, seeing that it supports the 2GH over the 2DH and Jameson had already undermined the use of the 2DH formal argument against the AH a year prior. Based on the nature of his argumentation and subtle references to Jameson, it is likely he had in mind the AH and inadvertently confirmed the 2GH formal argument in trying to defend against the AH.

Streeter’s formal argument for the 2DH can be compared with a defining description of the 2GH formal argument that comes from Riley:

---

<sup>27</sup> William R. Farmer, *The Synoptic Problem: A Critical Analysis* (New York: The MacMillan Co., 1964), 152.

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid.*, 153.

<sup>29</sup> Neville, *Arguments from Order*, 136-8.

<sup>30</sup> Christopher M. Tuckett, “Arguments from Order: Definition and Evaluation,” in *Synoptic Studies: The Ampleforth Conferences of 1982 and 1983*, ed. C. M. Tuckett (Sheffield, UK: JSOT Press, 1984), 350-4; Neville, *Arguments from Order*, 139-46.

At every point where Matthew ceases to follow Mark's order, whether for a short or longer period, Luke continues in it; and wherever Luke ceases to follow Mark's order, Matthew in his turn continues in it. There is surely an inescapable conclusion to be drawn from this. If Matthew and Luke were dependent on Mark for the order of events, they must have agreed together that they would do this. Without constant collaboration, the result would be quite impossible.<sup>31</sup>

Stoldt has a much more emphatic characterization of the data, which, for the sake of maintaining its full force, should be quoted in full:

It is completely inexplicable—unless through a transcendental contact. What a mysterious understanding would have had to exist between the two for Luke to have known exactly when Matthew stopped accompanying Mark; that he then should have jumped in, at that same moment and without being told, in order to assume the accompaniment in place of Matthew, until after some time he stopped again, to be replaced by Matthew. This would have had to go on, back and forth, throughout the entire Gospel of Mark, from the beginning to the end. What magical events could have caused this repeated exchange of roles, and in uneven sequence and length at that? What utterly enigmatic understanding would have prompted the first and third Evangelists to sense, without knowledge of each other, when the other departed from the narrative sequence of Mark, and what uncanny parapsychological contact could, from time to time, have sent out the magical impetus for them once more to take their turns accompanying Mark? This whole conception is—well, let us just say: scarcely believable.<sup>32</sup>

In support of the 2DH, Neville argues against the 2GH representation of collusion or supernatural guidance behind the appearance of Matthew and Luke picking up when the other ceases to use Mark, noting that the triple tradition is the norm, and the times when Matthew and Luke make a rearrangement is the irregularity.<sup>33</sup> Neville recalculates a statistical analysis

---

<sup>31</sup> Harold Riley, "The Internal Evidence," in *The Order of the Synoptics: Why Three Synoptic Gospels?* (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1989), 7.

<sup>32</sup> Hans-Herbert Stoldt, *History and Criticism of the Marcan Hypothesis*, trans. Donald L. Niewyk (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1980), 142.

<sup>33</sup> David J. Neville, *Mark's Gospel—Prior or Posterior?: A Reappraisal of the Phenomenon of Order*, vol. 222, *Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series*, ed. Stanley E. Porter (London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002), 80-1.

completed by Tuckett and finds that the probability Matthew and Luke would have independently made their transpositions of Mark's order of pericopes per the 2DH and agreed in rearranging the same pericope is 63%, and 73% when it is limited to Mk 1:1-6:13, the section that is most rearranged by both Matthew and Luke. Despite these probabilities, Matthew and Luke never transpose the same pericope, which, despite Neville's claim that it should cause "little discomfort" for Markan priority,<sup>34</sup> poses an issue for the 2DH, and this is especially in comparison to the 2GH. As Neville had earlier acknowledged, the 2DH needs to explain Matthew and Luke's rearrangement of Mark, while the 2GH only needs to explain Mark's alternation between the two, since 2GH Mark did not alter Matthew or Luke's order, except for one instance.<sup>35</sup> Because, as he recognized, the 2DH formal argument from order is inconclusive due to the fact that other theories explain the data, Markan priorists need to make a compositional argument to show that Matthew and Luke's rearrangement of Mark is explicable under their theory, since the order of pericopes does not in itself lend to the 2DH.<sup>36</sup> As he says, then, at most the compositional arguments can only confirm the plausibility of the theory, but they do not constitute positive arguments. For example, the healing of the leper was placed by Matthew after the Sermon on the Mount because Jesus commanded the leper to abide by the requirements of the Law in the pericope, but this would be true whether he used Mark, a non-Gospel source like oral tradition, or another written source. If successful, the argument at most permits that Matthew could have rearranged Mark in that way if he used Mark, but it does not function as an argument that Matthew used Mark as opposed to any other source, since he would

---

<sup>34</sup> Ibid., 89-91.

<sup>35</sup> Neville, *Arguments from Order*, 58.

<sup>36</sup> Ibid., 145-6.

have rearranged that source in the same way according to the same explanation.<sup>37</sup> As Tuckett said concerning his reasoning for Matthew's placement of the healing of the leper, "One can say this on almost any source hypothesis."<sup>38</sup>

Tuckett disputes the validity of the 2GH formal argument from order on the grounds that inadequate explanation has been given for Mark's use of the other two Gospels. As he says: "The 2GH does offer an explanation of the facts at one level, in that it can point to the way that Mark must have followed his two sources alternately. But this observation needs to be supplemented with a coherent set of reasons for Mark's having proceeded in the way he is alleged to have done." He recognizes that, as Butler pointed out, appeals to the 2DH formal argument of order were fallacious, and he charges the 2GH of the same, but commits another fallacy himself when he denies the validity of the 2GH formal argument on the grounds that it needs to be accompanied by a successful compositional argument.<sup>39</sup> As he acknowledges, the fact that Matthew and Luke largely agree with the order of Mark does not point to the 2DH because that fact accords with the 2GH as well. However, that the facts of the 2DH argument from order can be explained by the 2GH argument from order does not mean all of the data that point to the 2GH are as explicable under the 2DH. The apparent alternation between Matthew and Luke by Mark under the 2GH that Tuckett himself acknowledges is readily explained by the 2GH and is coincidental under the 2DH. In short, the 2GH has greater explanatory power that encompasses and exceeds the facts that lend to the 2DH. Until it was shown to be fallacious by Butler, the 2DH formal argument was used as a positive argument in itself for Markan priority against other

---

<sup>37</sup> Ibid., 215-6.

<sup>38</sup> Tuckett, "Arguments from Order," 209.

<sup>39</sup> Christopher M. Tuckett, *The Revival of the Griesbach Hypothesis: An Analysis and Appraisal* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), 26-31.

theories. Now that it has been undermined, Tuckett has moved the goalpost and demands that a compositional argument be established before he is willing to recognize the 2GH formal argument has any force, despite acknowledging in the same breath that the alternation between Matthew and Luke, the 2GH formal argument, does readily lend to the 2GH, inadvertently admitting that the 2GH has on its side the formal argument over the 2DH.

As has been demonstrated, the use of the 2DH formal argument has been riddled with fallacies since its inception, whether that is the illegitimate transfer of Lachmann's argument under an Ur-Gospel system to Matthew's direct use of Mark, the use of the order of pericopes as a positive argument for the 2DH despite it being obvious that it lends more to the 2GH, and, after Butler's explication of the Lachmann fallacy and the undermining of the 2DH formal argument, apparently in a bid of desperation, the attempt to shift the goalpost in an effort to require that a compositional argument be established before it can be acknowledged that the formal argument lends to the 2GH over the 2DH. After Butler the formal argument has ceased to be used in support of the 2DH, and the first pillar of the 2DH edifice collapsed.

### The Argument from Compositional Unity

The argument for Markan priority based on compositional unity comes from Neiryck and Tuckett. As Neiryck argues, the pleonasms, or redundant phrasings, in Mark; the vocabulary; and cohesive narrative sequence point to a unity that suggests Mark's Gospel is written as a unity, and not something that was stitched together from using Matthew and Luke.<sup>40</sup> The most commonly cited example of Mark's conflation of Matthew and Luke from 2GH

---

<sup>40</sup> Frans Neiryck, *Duality in Mark: Contributions to the Study of the Markan Redaction*, rev. ed. (Leuven, Belgium: Peeters Publishers, 1988), 37.

proponents has been Mk 1:32, “When evening came, when the sun had set,” with Matthew’s parallel passage having the introduction, “When evening came” at Mt 8:16, the first part of Mark’s pleonasm in identical wording, and Luke has, “When the sun had set,” using similar wording, at Lk 4:40. Against the 2GH argument that these pleonasms are the result of Mark taking one phrase from Matthew and one from Luke, Tuckett points out that Mark often has a pleonasm where Matthew and Luke do not share either half, or that one half is used by one of the two but not the other, or that one evangelist has both halves and the other has neither, a set of observations that requires that the pleonasms are part of Mark’s style rather than being due to conflation as the 2GH proponents have claimed. On the contrary, Tuckett questions why more pleonasms do not take one half from Matthew and the other from Luke more often if Mark was conflating the two per the 2GH, and finds that the results accord with the 2DH proposition that Matthew and Luke, in using Mark, would be expected to sometimes carry over wording from the pleonasms, which would inevitably result in the two evangelists occasionally exhibiting each a different half, giving the appearance of Markan conflation.<sup>41</sup>

2GH proponents, however, have turned this argument on its head and have used it to frame the pleonasms as a secondary feature, pointing to the 2GH. If Mark has compositional unity, Matthew and Luke are then guilty of, as Stoldt evaluates, “transforming the well-composed, well-organized, consistent, ‘polished’ account of Mark into one that is disorganized, disjointed, poorly composed, and, in short, ‘rough.’ They would have had to tear the Gospel of Mark apart, dividing it up and inorganically inserting parts of speeches and other narrative material.”<sup>42</sup> This argument is particularly effective in the case of Matthew using Mark, especially

---

<sup>41</sup> Ibid., 16-21.

<sup>42</sup> Stoldt, *History and Criticism*, 157-8.

with regard to Matthew inserting unrelated pericopes throughout the controversy sequence early in Mark's Gospel, destroying its clear thematic unity, which is particularly pertinent against the 2DH, since this very reasoning has been repeatedly used as an objection against Luke's use of Matthew. As Stoldt says, "The proof from uniformity reduces itself *ad absurdum*."<sup>43</sup> Taking the 2DH argument against Luke's use of Matthew, the argument that Mark is too compositionally unified to be the product of his use of Matthew and Luke cuts against the supposition that Matthew and Luke used Mark.

Likewise, Peabody, Cope, and McNicol levy the criticism that the material in Mark that gives the impression of a compositional unity is unique to his Gospel, constituting what they call "the Markan overlay," the layer of additions and alterations that Mark appears to have made over the material from Matthew and Luke.<sup>44</sup> In their analyses, both Neiryneck and Tuckett are quick to repudiate the notion that the pleonasm in Mark point to an Ur-Markus or Deutero-Markus, presumably because they are aware that it would undermine the argument that the dualities in Mark lend to compositional unity.<sup>45</sup> On the one hand, proponents of the 2DH are interested in pointing to the compositional unity as an argument for Markan priority, but on the other many have been compelled to attribute the overlay to a revisionary stratum precisely because it points to Mark being secondary relative to Matthew and Luke.

In response to Tuckett's study on the pleonasm, Riley discovers a methodological error that greatly skewed the data. In Tuckett's analysis, he tallied up the number of times Matthew and Luke share one of the halves of Mark's pleonasm, but no consideration was given to

---

<sup>43</sup> Ibid., 158.

<sup>44</sup> David B. Peabody, Lamar Cope, and Allan J. McNicol, *One Gospel from Two: Mark's Use of Matthew and Luke* (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 2002), 38.

<sup>45</sup> Neiryneck, *Duality*, 44; Tuckett, *Revival*, 17.

whether the halves could stand independently in a pericope. For example, at Mk 12:14-15, the Pharisees ask Jesus, ““Is it lawful to pay taxes to Caesar or not? Should we pay or not pay?”” The second question cannot stand on its own and depends on the first. If Matthew and Luke were using Mark and could only choose one of the halves, the first would necessarily be selected by both. The halves need to have the possibility of independent usage, such as in the case of Mk 1:32//Mt 8:16//Lk 4:40, for both to have the potential of being selected by Matthew and Luke. Because Tuckett made no distinction between independent and dependent halves, the data is skewed toward there being no pattern of Matthew and Luke each selecting a different half. In Riley’s analysis, however, he finds that in the instances when the two halves of a pleonasm are equally weighted and able to stand independently in a pericope, Matthew and Luke always choose separate halves, which constitutes a weighty argument in favor of the 2GH. Further, he takes into account whether Mark would be following the sequence of Matthew or Luke in accordance with the 2GH, and finds that there is a strong correlation between Mark’s source under the 2GH argument from order and the use of the pleonasms in Matthew and Luke’s parallels. In other words, when Mark is following Matthew’s order as supposed by the 2GH, Matthew is more likely to have one or both of the halves, and the same for Luke when Mark is following Luke’s sequence per the 2GH. This phenomenon is not only inexplicable for the 2DH, but is also irreversible, and together with the finding that Matthew and Luke always choose separate halves in cases when the halves are able to function in a pericope independently, the pleonasms in Mark constitute a forceful argument against the 2DH in favor of the 2GH despite Tuckett’s initial attempt to use the data in support of the 2DH.<sup>46</sup>

---

<sup>46</sup> Harold Riley, *The Making of Mark: An Exploration* (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1989), 219-27.



Neiryneck attempts to explain the primary pleonasm that has been used in support of the 2GH, Mk 1:32, to demonstrate that Matthew and Luke under the 2DH would have redactional reasoning to select the half of the pleonasm that is particular to their version of the pericope. He points out that Luke selected the “when the sun had set” because the healings of Peter’s mother-in-law and the crowds come after Jesus exorcized a demon in a synagogue on the Sabbath, rendering the time of sunset significant. Matthew’s version, on the other hand, follows after the Sermon on the Mount and is the final pericope in the healing sequence of the leper, centurion’s servant, and Peter’s mother-in-law, with Matthew envisioning the sequence occurring on the same day.<sup>47</sup> However, rather than demonstrating the redactional plausibility that Matthew would have taken one half of the pleonasm and Luke the other per the 2DH, his argument instead shows that the temporal introductions are not mere selections from Mark’s wording but are more deeply ingrained in the sequence of their presentations and so are more likely to have originated in their Gospels rather than Mark’s. As Neiryneck has demonstrated, Matthew’s “when evening had come” is connected to the placement of the pericope as the last in a sequence of three healing stories that come after the Sermon on the Mount, and Luke’s “when the sun had set” derives from the fact that it comes after a healing in a synagogue on the Sabbath, with each deriving from redactional intentions that span at least one pericope prior, in the case of Luke, or reaching back through an entire section before the phrase in question, as in the case of Matthew. In order for this occurrence to lend to the 2DH, it would need to be supposed that Mark used a redundancy that happened to have one half that better aligned with Matthew’s redactional intentions and another half that anticipated Luke’s sequencing, and that such an occurrence is more likely than the two introductions deriving from Matthew and Luke as an outworking of

---

<sup>47</sup> Neiryneck, *Duality*, 41-3.

their redactional intentions. By showing that the reasoning for the introductions extends back to a previous pericope in the case of Luke and back an entire sequence of events in Matthew, Neiryneck demonstrates that the introductions are assuredly the product of Matthew and Luke, and that Mark has conflated the two, forming a compelling argument against his own theory.

### The Argument from Doublets

It has been a common 2DH argument since Weisse that doublets in Matthew and Luke, in cases where one of the versions is paralleled in Mark, constitute evidence that Matthew or Luke found one version of the doublet in Mark and the other in Q. This theory was dead on arrival, as even Weisse and Holtzmann struggled to account for the doublets in Mark, which, according to their theory, should point to Mark receiving one from one source and the other version from another source, which, as it stands also contradicts the argument from compositional unity, since, if it can be supposed that Mark has used written sources that underlie his doublets, there is nothing preventing Mark's characteristic redactional material from being an addition over material from Matthew and Luke, the 2GH Markan overlay.<sup>48</sup> This has even been granted by Neiryneck, who used the prevalence of the doublets in Mark alongside the pleonasm found throughout the Gospel as part of his argument that Mark has a compositional unity characterized by repetition and redundancy.<sup>49</sup> The early 2DH proponents were forced to relegate these instances to being "repetitions," an obvious case of special pleading. According to their rationale, where Matthew and Luke have doublets, it must be evidence of their use of two different sources, pointing to their use of Mark and Q, but if Mark has doublets, they must be repetitions

---

<sup>48</sup> Stoldt, *History and Critique*, 173-84.

<sup>49</sup> Neiryneck, *Duality*, 36-7.

of his own doing. Even more detrimental, Weisse failed to notice that Mk 9:35 and 10:43, which he chalked up to being a repetition, is not only a doublet but a triplet, with 10:31 being another variant of the same saying. According to the argument, then, Mark was using not two but three sources, each with a version of the saying that he copied from. The doublets in Mark are not limited to sayings, either, since the feeding of the five and four thousand constitute a doublet, which Weisse also did not recognize. Additionally, the argument fails to properly take into account that Matthew has doublets that are unique to his Gospel, and so cannot be due to his use of Mark and another source, such as in the case of Mt 10:5-6 and 15:24, which Weisse asserted is due to Matthew using another source that is now lost, a necessary assertion if he is to avoid contradicting his argument. Lastly, there are examples of the evangelists apparently noticing and wishing to avoid repetitions, refraining from copying over a variant found in another Gospel that they would have used under the 2DH, which contradicts their inclination for repetition otherwise.<sup>50</sup>

Goulder maintains the argument that doublets with a version paralleled by Mark evince Matthew's use of Mark, though the second version he attributes to Matthew's repetition. And this is not unfounded, since Matthew has cases of repetition in material unique to his Gospel.<sup>51</sup> There are several cases where, according to the Farrer Hypothesis (FH), the order of Mark, Matthew, and Luke, that Matthew has repeated a saying taken from Mark, with the second iteration also deriving from the Markan wording. In other words, because the wording is derived from Mark in both instances, neither of the variants is likely to come from another source. Furthermore, the "pluck it out and cast it from you" at Mt 18:9 is redactional, being unique to his

---

<sup>50</sup> Stoldt, *History and Critique*, 173-84.

<sup>51</sup> Michael D. Goulder, *Midrash and Lection in Matthew: The Speaker's Lectures in Biblical Studies 1969-71* (London: SPCK, 1974), 36-8.

Gospel, and is paralleled by Mt 5:29, and the redactional “except in adultery” from 19:9 is also found at 5:32, showing that Matthew is necessarily responsible for forming these doublets himself. Since these additions are redactional, they cannot be attributed to derivation from another source and must be from Matthew.<sup>52</sup> Eve acknowledges from the FH perspective that the two feeding stories could just as well have originated from Matthew, seeing that they are easily explicable as products of Matthew’s tendency to repeat material.<sup>53</sup> And Hawkins acknowledged from his analysis of the doublets that there are a category of examples in Matthew that, as he says himself, “show the occasional use of the same source twice over,” that is, cases where there is no Markan parallel, and others in Matthew showing the “freedom of editors in using their own phraseology” to form doublets, demonstrating that under the 2DH many of the doublets must be attributed to Matthew as a compositional tendency and cannot have originated from Matthew’s use of Mark and Q.<sup>54</sup> As Stoldt points out, Weisse noticed instances where Matthew and Luke omitted a variant that would have constituted a doublet in their use of Mark to prevent the repetition.<sup>55</sup> Such a practice, as has been established, is out of character for Matthew, who is evidently content with repetition and has unavoidably made doublets even from his own redactions. The evidence, rather, points to Matthew’s tendency to repeat material, leaving Mark to be the one who has omitted doubled material when its inclusion does not serve his purposes.

Hawkins lists three doublets that he presents as evidence that Matthew and Luke used Mark and Q: the teaching on divorce, with Mt 5:32 corresponding to Lk 16:18, both having

---

<sup>52</sup> Michael D. Goulder, *Luke: A New Paradigm* (Sheffield, UK: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989), 34-5.

<sup>53</sup> Eric Eve, “Reconstructing Mark: A Thought Experiment,” in *Questioning Q: A Multidimensional Critique*, ed. Mark Goodacre and Nicholas Perrin. (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2004), 100.

<sup>54</sup> John C. Hawkins, *Horae synopticae: Contributions to the Study of the Synoptic Problem*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1909), 80-2.

<sup>55</sup> Stoldt, *History and Critique*, 178-9.

derived from Q, and Mt 19:9 deriving from Mk 10:11-12; the injunction to take up one's cross at Mt 10:38 is paralleled by Lk 14:27, the variant taken from Q, while Mt 16:24 and Lk 9:23 are from Mk 8:34; and the eschatological principle expressed in Mt 25:29 and Lk 19:26 was taken from Q, while Mt 13:12 and Lk 8:18 are from Mk 4:25.<sup>56</sup> The first example, as was mentioned, has a redactional element from Matthew that is repeated in both. For the second example, Butler notes that the sayings are integral to the surrounding passages, such that the sayings do not seem appended to the preceding material, which lends to the possibility that they are original to their contexts.<sup>57</sup> In Mt 10, it is in the context of one facing harm from persecution, while in Mt 16 the saying is in the context of eschatological reward and punishment, and these differing contexts lend to them being separate traditions. For the third example, Butler argues that the wording of the repetitions is too similar in Matthew to have derived from two sources, and since Mt 25:29 is not necessary in its context, it is made more likely that it is a repetition of Mt 13:12 from the redactor.<sup>58</sup> As he puts it when commenting on another doublet, which is applicable to many of the examples: "The alternative explanation, that St Matthew is repeating himself, seems more probable, and would no doubt have been suggested and accepted long ago but for the supposition that the second member is from Mark."<sup>59</sup>

---

<sup>56</sup> Hawkins, *Horae synopticae*, 81-9.

<sup>57</sup> Butler, *The Originality of St. Matthew*, 140-1.

<sup>58</sup> *Ibid.*, 142.

<sup>59</sup> *Ibid.*, 138-9.

### The Doubled Healings

A similar argument is made by Streeter that Matthew doubled up his accounts of the healings of the blind beggar and Gadarene demoniac, omitting two of Mark's Christologically problematic healing stories, instead adding a person to two other healing accounts to compensate for the omissions.<sup>60</sup> Under the 2GH, this doubling originated with Matthew, conforming with his tendency for doublets, and was simplified to one person in each by Luke because the stories are unwieldy with two, and Mark has followed Luke. The healing of the demoniac at the synagogue at Mk 1:21-28 was omitted, says Streeter, because the demon seized the man violently when Jesus casted it out, which Matthew may have seen as problematic. This may be more convincing if Matthew did not retain the exorcisms of the Gadarene demoniac, the pericope that has been doubled as a result of its omission, and the young boy after the Transfiguration, both of which Matthew was content to remove similarly problematic details while still retaining the stories. With the omission of the problematic healing of the blind man at Mk 8:22-26 represented in the doubling of the blind beggars at Mt 9:27-31, this leaves the omission of the problematic healing of the mute and deaf man at Mk 7:31-37 to be accounted for. He finds that to compensate, Matthew has edited the healing summary of Mk 7:37, which is the ending of the omitted healing of the deaf and mute man, where the people are amazed that Jesus can make even the deaf and mute speak, at Mt 15:31, where the people are amazed that Jesus can heal the mute, crippled, lame, and blind.<sup>61</sup> Here Streeter seems to be confused, since Mk 7:37 mentions the deaf and mute, corresponding to the healing that it is connected to, and Matthew's healing summary not only removes mention of the deaf, which is contrary to the purported purpose of the alteration,

---

<sup>60</sup> Streeter, *The Four Gospels*, 169-71.

<sup>61</sup> *Ibid.*, 170.

but also adds other maladies that have nothing to do with the passage Streeter contends Matthew updated the summary to compensate for omitting.

Streeter then supposes that a mute demoniac was added by Matthew after the healing of the two blind men at Mt 9:27-34 as a form of compensation, and the healing of the blind men right before appear to be the doubled story compensating for the removal of Mark's blind man, but Matthew has the two blind beggars at Mt 20:29-34. Streeter gives the explanation that Matthew "preferred to tell it in its original context, but forgot to delete it in the earlier part of the Gospel," thereby creating two doubled stories for the omission of one.<sup>62</sup> As Neville argues, rather than supposing Matthew accidentally doubled two of the stories featuring blind men, it is more likely that Matthew doubled them on his own according to his redactional penchant for repetition and doublets.<sup>63</sup> While it initially sounds like an attractive proposition that Matthew has doubled pericopes that correspond to those in Mark he has omitted, upon further investigation, it can be seen that there is no reason for Matthew to have omitted the story of the synagogue demoniac, since he doubles the more problematic Gadarene demoniac account to compensate for its omission, and could have omitted the convulsion from the story as he did with the demon-possessed boy after the Transfiguration; the healing of the deaf and mute man has no proper compensation for its omission; and it must be held that Matthew has accidentally doubled the stories of the blind men twice to compensate for the omission of one blind man in Mark. These occurrences can be compared to the alternative, that the doublings are due to Matthew, in accordance with his demonstrable tendency to repeat and double material that, regardless of source theory, he has himself introduced.

---

<sup>62</sup> Ibid., 170-1.

<sup>63</sup> Neville, *Arguments from Order*, 98-9.

### The Argument from Editorial Fatigue

In his defense of Markan priority, Styler cites several examples of “editorial fatigue,” or instances in which Matthew appears to be misunderstanding Mark, or where he has added or omitted detail that conflicts with material carried over from his use of Mark. Styler points to Mk 8:14-21, used by Matthew at Mt 16:5-12, because Matthew understands the “yeast” of the Jewish authorities to be their teaching at v. 12, which Styler takes to be an interpretation he added to Mark’s version. However, this is difficult to compare, since Mark does not supply an interpretation, and so it is not possible to know what Mark thought the yeast was. Styler simply assumes Mark has a different, and more correct, interpretation and that Matthew has misunderstood Mark, as he says himself: “We are left with the suspicion that Matt. has not penetrated to the real sense.”<sup>64</sup> Since it is based on his mere “suspicion,” it can be seen that Styler has inserted his presuppositions into his reading of Mark and is arguing in a circle. Next, Styler says the “best example” is that Matthew seems to have interpreted Mark’s, “to those outside all things are in parables,” at Mk 4:11 as, “I speak to them in parables,” in Mt 13:13, to which he supplies a rather bumbling answer as to why this is irreversible, and ends up admitting that “Mk may have partly misunderstood what he recorded,” one step away from conceding the change is due to Mark’s redaction of Matthew, only serving to demonstrate, if it is indeed his best example, how weak the argument for Markan priority is.<sup>65</sup>

Next is a comparison of Mk 2:18//Mt 9:14, the introduction to the fasting controversy. Mark states that the disciples of John and the Pharisees were fasting, and uses ἔρχονται καὶ λέγουσιν to describe their approach, using a characteristic impersonal plural to indicate that some

---

<sup>64</sup> G. M. Styler, “Excursus IV: The Priority of Mark,” in *The Birth of the New Testament*, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed, ed. C. F. D. Moule, Black’s New Testament Commentaries (London: Adam & Charles Black, 1981), 228.

<sup>65</sup> Ibid.



people other than the disciples of John and the Pharisees approached Jesus. Matthew may have taken the subjects of the ἔρχονται καὶ λέγουσιν in Mark to be the disciples of John and Pharisees mentioned in the previous sentence in Mark, and so he makes the disciples of John the speakers, misunderstanding his source.<sup>66</sup> The difficulty in Styler’s argument, however, is that, as he notes, the impersonal plural is a common feature in Mark’s style, and he provides no argument why Mark did not rewrite Matthew’s passage per the 2GH, any more than that Matthew rewrote Mark under the 2DH. There is nothing incoherent about Matthew’s version if it was written first, and so the argument is circular. To the contrary, Styler has affirmed himself that the construction in Mark is from the hand of its redactor, a happenstance that one could indeed call “suspicious.” Since the difference between the two versions is Markan redaction, there is more reason to believe Mark used the impersonal plural in his use of Matthew, than that Matthew has altered Mark.

To these examples, Goodacre adds the differences in Matthew and Mark in their versions of the healing of the leper and the differences in the healing of the paralytic between Luke and Mark. In the former, Matthew places the pericope after the Sermon on the Mount, adding a unique introduction, “And when he had come down from the mountain, many crowds followed him,” at Mt 8:1, establishing a setting that conflicts with Mt 8:4//Mk 1:44, where Jesus commands the healed leper to “tell no one, but go, show yourself to the priest,” a command that is nonsensical in the setting established by Matthew, with crowds being present to witness that very healing.<sup>67</sup> However, Goodacre’s argument requires the view that Jesus’ command for the man not to tell others but show himself to the priests was added by Mark, since, if it is intrinsic

---

<sup>66</sup> Ibid., 228-9.

<sup>67</sup> Mark Goodacre, *The Case against Q: Studies in Markan Priority and the Synoptic Problem* (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 2002), 40-3.

to the story, the conflict with Matthew's addition of the crowds is due to his placement of the pericope after the Sermon on the Mount, which is the case whether he used Mark or received the story from oral tradition or another source. So, then, unless the command is a Markan redaction, there is no argument for the 2DH, and, even then, the argument would then be that Matthew contains material that is Markan redaction rather than it conflicting with his placement of the pericope after the Sermon. As for the healing of the paralytic, Luke writes a new introduction to the healing of the paralytic at Lk 5:17, omitting Mark's establishment of the setting, that Jesus was in a house, which is important to other details in Luke's version. Goodacre adds the observation that in both Matthew and Luke, the introductions are characteristically redactional in wording, lending to their changing of Mark.<sup>68</sup> What he fails to mention, however, is that Mark's introduction, especially the ἠκούσθη ὅτι ἐν οἴκῳ ἐστίν, is one of the clearest examples of redaction in any of the Gospels.

Elsewhere Goodacre finds another example in Luke's version of the feeding of the five thousand, which Luke places in Bethsaida, a setting that conflicts with Jesus' instruction to send away the crowd to find food and lodging because they are in the desert.<sup>69</sup> But this argument is circular if used against the 2GH, because under the 2GH Luke would have made the conflict due to his use of Matthew, which has the same detail of it occurring in the desert as does Mark. In his analysis of Goulder's arguments concerning Lukan muddle, Goodacre observes circularity with regard to how Goulder approaches material that is shared with other Gospels and material that is unique to Luke. In the cases of shared material, Goulder treats the muddle as evidence of his use of the other Gospels as Luke's sources, but in the cases of unique material he must admit the

---

<sup>68</sup> Ibid.

<sup>69</sup> Mark Goodacre, "The Farrer Hypothesis," in *The Synoptic Problem: Four Views*, ed. Stanley E. Porter and Bryan R. Dyer (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2016), 51.

inconsistencies are due to Luke himself.<sup>70</sup> Luke's rendition of the feeding of the five thousand is an example of an evangelist creating a difficulty from their own additions to the passage of another, whether he used Matthew or Mark, since the detail of it occurring in the desert is in both and the mention of Bethsaida is unique, demonstrating that an inconsistency does not necessarily suggest the combination of two sources but only that a passage was modified.

Stein sees Matthew's omission of the paralytic being lowered into the house as evidence that Matthew has abbreviated the story in Mark. At the scene of Jesus before Pilate, Luke narrates the crowd asking for Barabbas to be released in place of Jesus but omits the explanation for the custom included in Mark. Next, turning to the accounts of Jesus' baptism in both Matthew and Mark, Stein finds it persuasive that Mark has "immediately" right before the participial phrase "coming up from the water," so that it connects with the "he saw the heavens splitting" at Mk 1:10, whereas Matthew changed the participle "coming up" to a finite verb, which would make the "immediately," which he retains, connect to the "came up" rather than the "he saw" as it does in Mark. Matthew appears to have modified Mark in the pericope of the rich young man who asked Jesus how he could inherit eternal life due to the Christological difficulty of Jesus asking, "Why do you call me good?" The statement that follows, "There is only one who is good," at Mt 19:17 makes less sense in Matthew's context but is congruent with the differences in wording found in Mark's version, leading to Matthew changing some of Mark's wording at Mk 10:17-18 in an attempt to alleviate the theological difficulty. Lastly, in Matthew the mother of James and John approaches Jesus and asks that her sons will be seated at His right

---

<sup>70</sup> Mark Goodacre, *Goulder and the Gospels: An Examination of a New Paradigm*, ed. Stanley E. Porter (London: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996), 281.

and left in His new kingdom, compared to the brothers asking Jesus themselves. Because Jesus responds at Mt 20:22 in the plural, Stein sees it as likely that Matthew used Mark.<sup>71</sup>

The examples added by Stein also fail to convince. He posits that Matthew has abbreviated the story of the paralytic, neglecting to acknowledge that it is just as likely that Luke, followed by Mark, has expanded it, if not moreso. His argument that Luke omitted Mark's explanation concerning the custom behind Barabbas' release is circular because if Luke used Matthew, he would have omitted it in his use of Matthew instead of Mark. In Matthew's baptism account, the "immediately" is treating Jesus' rising up from the waters and seeing the heavens splitting as one sequence. Other examples in Matthew of "immediately" preceding multiple verbs separated by *καί* that are envisioned as a close sequence include 20:34, 24:29, and 26:74-75, and the same can be observed with other temporal adverbs or prepositional phrases in the examples of 1:24, 3:5-6, 14:1-2, 14:31, 24:9, 25:7, 26:45, and 26:67. The fact that "come up" is a verb rather than a participle in his version has no change in meaning. And Matthew uses the plural when speaking to the mother of James and John because, as Matthew says at Mt 20:20, "the mother of the sons of Zebedee came up to Jesus with her sons," with Jesus responding to them all.

Turning to the rich young ruler at Mt 19:16-22//Mk 10:17-22, Riley finds that the version in Mark ruins the logic of Matthew's version, which is more consistent. In Mark, Jesus' response of "'Why do you call me good?'" has nothing to do with the question and is off-topic, which is due to Matthew being modified.<sup>72</sup> In Matthew, Jesus asks, "'Why do you ask about what is good?'" and follows with the statement, "'One is good,'" because He is communicating the idea

---

<sup>71</sup> Robert H. Stein, *Studying the Synoptic Gospels: Origin and Interpretation*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2001), 79-83.

<sup>72</sup> Riley, "The Internal Evidence," 101.

that no man is good enough to fulfill the requirements of the Law, which follows the logic of the passage. Luke, followed by Mark, has misunderstood the meaning of this response and turned it into a statement of Jesus' identity, which is unrelated. 2DH proponents have argued that Matthew has softened a Christological difficulty by reframing the question, but they have not asked why there is a Christological statement in Luke and Mark in the first place, or noticed that it ruins the logic of the passage, whereas Matthew's version is logically unified.

As it concerns the healing of the paralytic, it is again suspicious that the added detail in Mark missing in Luke is the characteristically redactional, "it was heard that he was at home," at Mk 2:1, with the use of the impersonal plural. Goodacre's earlier argument that redactional language lends to that evangelist modifying another militates against his view here. Additionally, cases of editorial fatigue are more compelling when the addition of an evangelist conflicts with material carried over from their source, or that an evangelist omits a detail without considering it is connected to a detail they elsewhere include, but with this pericope it is less persuasive to suppose Luke has omitted the setting from Mark if it was available to him, compared to the arguments of editorial fatigue in other passages. It is difficult to believe Luke would have omitted the setting provided by Mark, since that does not constitute what makes for a persuasive instance of editorial fatigue, and the section omitted is characteristic of Markan redaction, which lends to Mark's use of Luke.

Lastly, Allen points out that Matthew's passage on Jesus' family standing outside at Mt 12:46-50 presupposes the setting of the house that is only mentioned in Mark's version of the Beelzebul controversy, which the family pericope immediately follows in Mark's sequence.<sup>73</sup>

---

<sup>73</sup> Willoughby C. Allen, "Two Critical Studies in St. Matthew's Gospel: II. The Dependence of St. Matthew i.-xiii. upon St. Mark," *Expository Times* 11, no. 6 (March 1900): 284.

However, it is evident that the introduction to the Beelzebul controversy shared by Matthew and Luke, the exorcism at Mt 12:22-23//Lk 11:14-15, must be from Q, as well as the teaching material that separates the family pericope in Matthew and a similar pericope in Luke. Mark has a unique introduction to the Beelzebul controversy at Mk 3:20-21 and the pericope is immediately followed by the family pericope at 3:31-35. In Matthew's sequence the controversy is at Mt 12:22-32 and the family pericope at Mt 12:46-50, the latter of which being followed by the parable of the sower. In the case of Luke, it appears that he has shifted the family pericope to after the parable of the sower at Lk 8 and used the Beelzebul controversy later in the Central Section. After reaching the placement of the family pericope in Matthew's placement of it after the Beelzebul controversy, Luke appears to substitute the family pericope for the woman who calls out to Jesus from the crowd at Lk 11:27-28, since he had already used it with the parable of the sower. Due to the shared introductions to the Beelzebul controversy in Matthew and Luke against Mark and the shared sequence of the intervening teaching material between the Beelzebul controversy and Mt 12:46-50//Lk 11:27-28, the family pericope would most likely be placed after the Beelzebul controversy and subsequent teaching material in Q, rather than its placement in Matthew being a case of editorial fatigue in his use of Mark.

The placement of the family pericope after the parable of the sower and the inclusion of the woman in the crowd after the Beelzebul controversy, rather, better lends to Luke's use of Matthew, as a transposition of the family pericope from before the parable, as it is placed in Matthew's sequence, to after, with the Beelzebul controversy being in a separate section of his Gospel, as does the similarity of the family pericope with the woman in the crowd, where it is placed where Luke would have reached the family pericope in Matthew's sequence after using the Beelzebul controversy. Luke explicitly places the telling of the parable of the sower in an

outside setting, which Allen's argument requires that he has independently committed the same error as Matthew. Contrary to his assertion, however, in Matthew's Gospel the setting is not specified, and it could be assumed to have taken place in a synagogue, although that is not stated. The addition of Jesus being in a house, as with the healing of the paralytic and especially with Mark's unique introduction to the Beelzebul controversy, is characteristic of Markan redaction. As can be seen, in many of the examples adduced by 2DH proponents, the section that is claimed to have been removed by Matthew and Luke is highly characteristic of Mark, with this being one of the most detrimental to their position. Under the 2DH, then, it must be argued that both evangelists used the introduction of the Beelzebul controversy from Q against Mark, despite the fact that Matthew still attached the family pericope from Mark to the end of the teaching material that follows in Q; that Matthew omitted the explicit mention of setting found in Mark in preference for ambiguity; that it is a coincidence that the family pericope in Luke follows the parable of the sower, which is the pericope immediately before the parable in Matthew's sequence, in a context completely separate from the Beelzebul controversy in Luke; that it is a coincidence that at the place in which Luke would have reached the family pericope after using the Beelzebul controversy in Matthew, having already used the family pericope with the parable of the sower, he has used the similar pericope of the woman in the crowd; and that the detail omitted by Matthew and Luke should happen to be highly characteristic of Markan redaction. It would be more convincing if 2DH proponents returned to the theory of an Ur-Markus or Deutero-Markus so that they can affirm these omitted details as editorial additions than suppose they are consistently omitted by both Matthew and Luke in circumstances where, by the nature of their argument, they are admitted to be conducive to the other evangelist's purposes. It is no surprise that this argument has not been used in recent presentations of the 2DH, seeing that it

serves better as an example of editorial fatigue on the part of Luke as a transposition of the family pericope in his use of Matthew's sequence, than that it was caused by Mark.

As Styler concedes, there are many instances where Matthew has the more primary version of certain pericopes relative to Mark, such that it is necessary that it be postulated Matthew had access to source material outside of Mark if Markan priority is to be upheld. As Styler says, "There are passages, especially in sections of teaching, where Matt.'s version may well be judged more original than Mk's parallel. If the existence of a non-Markan source is denied, it will be difficult to maintain that in such passages Mk is prior to Matt.; rather, they support the priority of Matt. to Mk." In an effort to prevent such a conclusion, he appeals to Q, and reasons that the possibility Matthew's parallels of the passages in which Mark has what appears to be a secondary version make use of Q rather than Mark dismisses the issue and saves Markan priority from disrepute. In the case of Mark's version of John's preaching in particular, which has the appearance that Mark used Matthew, Styler recognizes it must be granted that Mark had access to Q, from which Matthew's version derives, to avoid the conclusion that he used Matthew directly. Styler supposed that the arguments of editorial fatigue in favor of Markan priority outweighed those in favor of the 2GH,<sup>74</sup> but far more examples can be produced in favor of editorial fatigue from Mark, and examples that are far more persuasive, consisting of more than circular arguments and instances that are more convincing in the reverse.

### The Execution of John the Baptist

Styler reserves the best argument for last, which pertains to the execution of John the Baptist at Mk 6:14-29//Mt 14:1-12. First he notes that the comment at Mt 14:9, that Herod was

---

<sup>74</sup> Styler, "Excursus IV," 223-7.



grieved by the request for John to be executed, conflicts with Matthew's introduction at Mt 14:5, which portrays Herod as the one who wanted John to be killed. Mark's parallel to Mt 14:9, on the other hand, does not conflict with Mark's version of the introduction because of he includes the details that Herod was keeping John alive and that it was Herodias, not Herod, who wanted John killed. In this same verse, Styler argues, it appears that Matthew has carried over Mark's description of Herod as a "king," since Matthew elsewhere calls him a tetrarch and Mark only calls him a king. Lastly, after Matthew's pericope, the next verse at Mt 14:13 is portrayed as being in chronological sequence after the events of the story about John, despite the fact that the story was intended as a flashback that connected to Mt 14:1-2. That his next pericope is worded as following after a story that was a past event betrays his use of Mark, Styler contends, because Mark does not make this same mistake.<sup>75</sup> As Goulder notes, it can be added, it is stated in Mark that Herod had married his brother's wife Herodias, while Matthew only says John was imprisoned on account of Herodias because John told Herod he cannot "have" her, without specifying the fact that they had married.<sup>76</sup>

Peabody, Cope, and McNicol, however, find a possible example of editorial fatigue in the direction of Mark using Matthew, that Mark did not understand Matthew's γάρ...δὲ construction of Mt 14:3 and 13, which was used to indicate an extended parenthesis. Mark added the αὐτός before the γάρ at Mk 6:17 and a second use of γάρ at v. 20, further showing he did not take note of Matthew's construction. While Styler commented that Matthew makes the pericope that follows in his sequence connected to the flashback of John's execution, Peabody, Cope, and McNicol note that Mark uses the passage similarly, although not explicitly, seeing that he uses it

---

<sup>75</sup> Ibid., 228-9.

<sup>76</sup> Goulder, *Luke: A New Paradigm*, 9.

as an aside to fill in the interval and literarily extend the time between the sending out and return of the Twelve.<sup>77</sup>

While Matthew's use of "king" is used as an argument that the author of the first Gospel used Mark, Riley employs the same argument in the reverse for Mark's use of the title "the Baptist" as evidence that he used Matthew. There are two occasions Mark uses the "the Baptist" as the title for John and three times he uses "the Baptizer," a title that is unique to his Gospel. Mark's first use of "the Baptizer" is Mk 1:4, which is parallel to Matthew's "the Baptist" at Mt 3:1, but this is in Mark's introduction, which has undergone major reworking overall. Mark uses "the Baptist" at Mk 8:28 in his version of Peter's confession because he is following Matthew. The other instances of a title are in the execution pericope. As Riley notes, if Mark used Matthew and Luke per the 2GH, Mark has primarily used Lk 9:7-9 for Mk 6:14-16. Mark's title "the Baptizer" at v. 14, then, is not a modification of Matthew's "the Baptist" but an addition to Luke's simple "John," which, if Mark added his own title from Luke's lack of one, "the Baptizer" accords with his redactional tendencies. In Mark, after Herod makes an oath to Herodias' daughter, she seeks counsel with her mother for what she should ask, and her mother says, "The head of John the Baptizer," a verse not found in Matthew at all. Mark uses "the Baptist" at v. 25 where he joins back in parallel with Matthew, at a point where Mark and Matthew share seven identical words in sequence, requiring direct copying from one to the other. As Riley puts it, "If Matthew is here dependent on Mark, it is remarkable that he happens not to be using Mark's text where 'the baptizer' appears, but finds his own form 'the Baptist' appearing for the first time in Mark when he does so." Every time Mark uses "the Baptist," it is in parallel with his sources, never using it independently, and in each instance that he uses "the Baptizer," it

---

<sup>77</sup> Peabody, Cope, and McNicol, *One Gospel from Two*, 160-1.

is clear that it is his own redaction. It is especially striking that in this pericope, Mark uses “the Baptizer” in a verse not paralleled by Matthew, at v. 24, only to then use “the Baptist” in v. 25 where he shares seven words with Matthew.<sup>78</sup> If Matthew’s use of “king” is an argument for his use of Mark, Mark’s use of titles for John in this pericope serves as an even more persuasive argument for the 2GH.

Goulder describes Matthew as correcting Mark’s title of “king” for Herod to “tetrarch” at v. 1 but that he “relapsed” into using Mark’s “tetrarch” at v. 9.<sup>79</sup> Elsewhere he envisions editorial fatigue in the following way: “When an editor begins a story, he may amend freely to suit his interest; later the magnet of the story he is following pulls him into more docile reproduction.”<sup>80</sup> Whereas the 2GH argument concerning the titles for John is not that Mark is intent on correcting “the Baptist” to “the Baptizer,” but that he uses the latter as his redactional preference when he wishes to use a title and it is not present in his sources, it is difficult to imagine that Matthew would have been intent to expressly correct Mark’s “king” to “tetrarch” at v. 1 but then copied “king” just eight verses later. Rather, it is more believable that Mark made Matthew’s terminology more consistent, to align it with its usage soon after, and chose “king” over “tetrarch” between the two. Perhaps he has used the title out of confusion with Herod the Great. Cases of editorial fatigue are less convincing when they entail the deliberate intention of the evangelist to correct his predecessor in one instance but to perpetuate the mistake soon after a few verses later. Editorial fatigue is more likely in cases where the evangelist shows no particular attention to a detail in the account of another and decides to omit it, not realizing another detail

---

<sup>78</sup> Riley, “The Internal Evidence,” 106-7.

<sup>79</sup> Goulder, *Midrash and Lection in Matthew*, 376-7.

<sup>80</sup> *Ibid.*, 35.

he does include builds off the detail omitted, or in cases of addition, when the added detail conflicts with a detail carried over from his source. That Matthew changed one instance of “king” in Mark to “tetrarch” and then decided to carry over the next instance eight verses later is not persuasive; rather, it is more persuasive that Mark was using Matthew and that he believed he was correcting Matthew’s “tetrarch” at v. 1 to “king” to align it with the use of “king” at v. 9, which is a more believable direction of redaction.

Riley responds to the charge that Matthew has made a contradiction between his comment that Herod wanted to kill John in his introduction with the expression of the king’s regret at Mt 14:9. Matthew says in v. 5 that Herod did not want to kill John because he feared the reaction of the people, which is the reason for his regret at v. 9.<sup>81</sup> As Parker notes, the reason provided by Matthew agrees with the statement of Josephus that Herod was afraid of the people, which lends to Matthew’s reasoning being original.<sup>82</sup> This is similar to Mt 21:45-46 and 26:4-5, where Matthew says the Pharisees wanted to kill Jesus but were prevented because they feared how the people would react. The reason it seems contradictory to 2DH proponents is because they are reading Mark’s reasoning into Matthew’s version rather than allowing Matthew’s rationale to speak on its own. If anything, Mark’s reasoning is contradictory because he presents Herod as having married his brother’s wife but wanting to keep John alive because he recognizes him as a holy man. Surely this contradictory presentation was devised by Mark in his use of Matthew because he did not appreciate the rationale provided by his predecessor. Matthew provides a satisfactory explanation for why Herod would imprison John but be wary of executing him, while in Mark the fact that Herod imprisoned John at all conflicts with Herod’s positive

---

<sup>81</sup> Riley, “The Internal Evidence,” 100.

<sup>82</sup> Pierson Parker, “A Second Look at the Gospel before Mark,” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 100, no. 3 (1981): 399.

impression of John as a holy man. In Matthew, John was imprisoned because the prophet was criticizing Herod's marriage, but he stopped short of killing John out of fear of the people; in Mark, Herod wanted to keep John alive because he valued him as a righteous man, but he imprisoned John because he was speaking against Herod's immoral marriage with his brother's wife.

On the contrary to Styler's assertion, Mark's additions conflict with the material he carried over from his source, and Matthew's account is internally consistent. Mark did not appreciate the reasoning provided by his source and in trying to supply his own, with the result that the additions have conflicted with the material carried over from Matthew. Even in the most confident example cited by 2DH proponents, with it being frequently referenced as one of the best evidences for Markan priority, it is demonstrably more likely that Mark has altered Matthew. It is more likely that Matthew's "tetrarch" was altered to "king" by Mark to align it with the usage of "king" in v. 9 than that Matthew should have changed Mark's "king" to "tetrarch" but failed to do the same just eight verses later. It is more likely that Matthew's explanation for Herod's motives are more original, since they align with the other details of the story, while Mark's additions are conflictory with the details that were carried over from Matthew's version. And it can be seen that Mark's use of "the Baptizer" as a title for John appears where there is none in Matthew's version, and that "the Baptist" is carried over where it is used by Matthew. Styler must not have been too confident in the arguments from editorial fatigue, however, since immediately after his explanation of the pericope on John's execution he briefly points to the verisimilitude of Mark as the strongest argument for Markan priority before proceeding to his conclusory remarks.<sup>83</sup>

---

<sup>83</sup> Styler, "Excursus IV," 230.

### The Argument from Verisimilitude

The argument that Mark's Gospel is the product of Petrine testimony goes back to the beginnings of Synoptic research, with Taylor being one of its most prominent, modern proponents. He finds that Mark has "picturesque details" in his account of the call of the disciples, such as the mending of the nets and the presence of hired hands on the boat with Zebedee, which were informed by the "reminiscences of Peter."<sup>84</sup> Taylor acknowledges that the story presupposes prior acquaintance between Jesus and the disciples he called, such as is described in John's Gospel, but, wishing to reconcile Mark's story with the evangelist's access to Peter, he first suggests that Mark was intending to emphasize the immediacy of the call, and soon after even entertains that "Peter himself...may have forgotten the gradual growing of his enthusiasm for Jesus, while only the one moment, in which the words of Jesus marked the final decision, remained for him unforgettable."<sup>85</sup> Taylor is willing to posit the ridiculous notion that Peter forgot about his acquaintance with Jesus before the call narrated by Mark to maintain his presupposition that Petrine testimony stands behind the Gospel.

Taylor maintains that the detail of the paralytic being carried by four people, which is unique to Mark, likewise comes from eyewitness testimony, as does the detail of the paralytic being lowered down from the roof.<sup>86</sup> Compared to instances throughout his commentary where he attributes details unique to Mark as later additions to the text, it is evident that Taylor's framework is circular. When a unique phrase does not lend to his theory of Petrine witness, he is content to ascribe it to later redaction, but when it is a secondary detail that he is content with

---

<sup>84</sup> Vincent Taylor, *The Gospel according to St. Mark: The Greek Text with Introduction, Notes and Indexes*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1966), 168.

<sup>85</sup> *Ibid.*, 169-70.

<sup>86</sup> *Ibid.*, 193-4.

permitting as part of Peter's testimony, he asserts in these cases that it is not necessary to suppose the detail is a later redaction because it has its source in Peter, and this he admits. As he says himself, "To decide what is imaginative," that is, differentiating what is Markan addition as opposed to details received from eyewitness testimony, "is more speculative." His argument runs as follows: "There may be other passages of the kind," that is, those introduced by Markan redaction, "but the great majority of the items in the list have rather the appearance of graphic details recorded because they were given in the tradition. What point, for example, is there in mentioning 'the hired servants' (i. 20), the fact that the paralytic was 'borne of four' (ii. 3), the description of the breaking up of the roof (ii. 4)...?"<sup>87</sup> He has presuppositionally ruled out the possibility that Mark has added details for the purpose of the appearance of verisimilitude, as the apocryphal Gospel writers have done, and assumes his conclusion, that the details are Petrine. He is forced to maintain that certain details of the paralytic pericope, that those accompanying the paralytic dug through the roof and let the paralytic down on a mat because the crowd would not let them pass through to Jesus, which are implausible and more readily explicable as the product of Lukan literary creativity, as can be supposed under the 2GH, come from Petrine testimony because these details are shared with Luke and, as such, cannot be later additions to Mark. When he says "because they were given in tradition," what he means is that the details are paralleled by Matthew or Luke and so are necessitated as part of Mark, and by extension Petrine testimony, whereas the secondary details that are unique to Mark can be relegated to later addition, although he denies the existence of an Ur-Markus, taking the additions to be scribal instead.<sup>88</sup>

---

<sup>87</sup> Ibid., 139-40.

<sup>88</sup> Ibid., 76.

Taylor is an anomaly, and, unlike the early German 2DH proponents who used the picturesque details as an argument that Mark was based on Petrine testimony, 2DH supporters today have largely rejected the view that Petrine testimony is behind the Gospel, in favor of the view that Mark records oral tradition. This shift is as detrimental to the 2DH as the shift from Ur-Markus to canonical Mark was for the argument from order. 2DH proponents are quick to point to the conclusory statements made by Sanders at the end of his study on the tendencies of apocryphal texts in relation to the Gospels. As Sanders said,

There are no hard and fast laws of the development of the Synoptic tradition. On all counts the tradition developed in opposite directions. It became both longer and shorter, both more and less detailed, and both more and less Semitic. Even the tendency to use direct discourse for indirect, which was uniform in the post-canonical material which we studied, was not uniform in the Synoptics themselves. For this reason, *dogmatic statements that a certain characteristic proves a certain passage to be earlier than another are never justified.*<sup>89</sup>

This Stein uses to defend the 2DH against the charge that Mark's addition of specific detail relative to Matthew and Luke does not indicate it is secondary.<sup>90</sup> Tuckett notes that even Farmer updated his argument in the second edition of his *The Synoptic Problem* that the added details in Mark are comparable to the details added in the apocryphal Gospels, indicating the secondariness of Mark.<sup>91</sup> It would seem, however, that these writers did not actually read through Sanders's study and instead went to the conclusion, read up to that statement, and closed the book, since, not more than two pages later he says that unless there is an extenuating redactional consideration, documents that have added more detail and changed indirect speech to direct,

---

<sup>89</sup> E. P. Sanders, *The Tendencies of the Synoptic Tradition*, vol. 9, Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2000), 272, emphasis original.

<sup>90</sup> Stein, *Studying the Synoptic Gospels*, 190-1.

<sup>91</sup> Tuckett, *Revival*, 9-10.



mentioning these two tendencies in particular due to their strong correlation, are likely to be secondary.<sup>92</sup> In his analysis of the apocryphal Gospels, Sanders notes a tendency for the addition of detail and a “clear tendency” to supply proper names to unnamed persons in the Gospel accounts, with it being evident that the apocryphal Gospels have a tendency to make details more explicit, and with it being the case, from his comparative analysis of the Synoptics that Mark is “very much more detailed than Matthew and considerably more detailed than Luke,” a datum that “supports the order Matthew, Luke, Mark.”<sup>93</sup> While it is the case that in other areas this order is not supported, Sanders provides his reasoning for this occurrence:

The simple priority of any one Gospel to the others cannot be demonstrated by the evidence of this chapter. It is clear, rather, that the questions which finally emerge from this section concern redactional method and the relation of Mark to the eye-witness period. The categories which argue for Matthew’s priority to Mark are just those which some would explain as containing material which Mark owes to his eye-witness source. Matthew, in this view, found such evidences of the eye-witness source period unnecessary and omitted them. Those who cannot place Mark’s material so early in the stream of the tradition or who do not agree that eye-witness tradition was detailed, however, should be moved, on the basis of the evidence, to question Mark’s absolute priority to Matthew and Luke.<sup>94</sup>

It is the case that there is a strong tendency for the apocryphal Gospels to change indirect speech to direct, and Matthew, against expectation of the 2GH, has more direct speech. Sanders finds it plausible, however, that Matthew’s use of direct speech is due to Semitic influence, or because Matthew’s style can be likened to a more common Greek, both of which feature a tendency toward direct over indirect speech.<sup>95</sup> In the case of Matthew, there are plausible extenuating

---

<sup>92</sup> Sanders, *The Tendencies of the Synoptic Tradition*, 174.

<sup>93</sup> *Ibid.*, 144-6, 183-7.

<sup>94</sup> *Ibid.*, 188.

<sup>95</sup> *Ibid.*, 257-62.

reasons for his exhibition of typically secondary features. In the case of Mark, however, the plausible extenuating reason for the abundance of minor detail relative to Matthew and Luke was his access to eyewitness testimony through Peter. If it is accepted that the material in Mark's Gospel is derived from oral tradition and the use of Petrine testimony behind the Gospel is rejected, the prevalence of the minor details in Mark cuts against the 2DH and points to the secondary nature of the Gospel, and indeed suggests it is akin to the apocryphal Gospels in its alteration of Matthew and Luke. As Sanders argued, if it is denied that the details are derived from eyewitness testimony, the details can then be seen as additions that are secondary relative to Matthew and Luke, and the argument that was once used in support of the 2DH now militates against it.

#### The Argument from the Implausibility of Micro-conflation

The apparent conflation of Matthew and Luke in Mark's Gospel is frequently appealed to by 2GH proponents against the 2DH. Under the 2GH, Mark not only alternates between Matthew and Luke in the sequence of pericopes, but also appears to alternate between them in the very wording at the pericope level. Kloppenborg redirects this phenomenon against the 2GH, with the argument that such a thorough level of conflation, referred to as "micro-conflation," lacks attestation in ancient literature. The expectation, instead, is that authors conflating two sources would alternate between sources pericope by pericope or section by section, using each source in turn, rather than conflating the wording of both sources within a pericope.<sup>96</sup> Longstaff has written in defense of Markan micro-conflation by comparing the Synoptic Gospels to Tatian's

---

<sup>96</sup> John S. Kloppenborg, *Q, the Earliest Gospel: An Introduction to the Original Stories and Sayings of Jesus* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2008), 8-9.

*Diatessaron* and two medieval writers who are known to have conflated sources, ending with the conclusion that Mark's method of conflation is attested by the medieval writers, and that his text is more difficult to explain as Matthew and Luke each taking from Mark per the 2DH.<sup>97</sup> Tuckett reviewed each of the works Longstaff examined and found that Tatian sought to include all of the details in the Gospels, frequently resulting in repetition of detail, which is not comparable to Mark, and the two medieval writers can be observed to follow one of their sources at a time rather than conflating phrase by phrase as Mark would under the 2GH, addressing each passage Longstaff categorized as micro-conflation.<sup>98</sup>

However, an issue for the 2DH is posed by Peabody, Cope, and McNicol: "Advocates of the Two Document Hypothesis would have to explain how Matthew and Luke, while *independently* editing [a] pericope in Mark, have managed both to eliminate all of Mark's literary characteristics and to split the remaining words within the pericope between them."<sup>99</sup> This argument can be split into two: First, Matthew and Luke would have had to consistently carry over the wording around the parts that accord with Markan redaction, avoiding the Markan redactive overlay. Second, one must question if Matthew and Luke's use of Mark is easier to explain. Tuckett is adamant in his analysis of the medieval chroniclers that they "copied one source at a time, often very exactly," and, "sometimes whole clauses, or at least self-contained 'thought-units,' could be inserted; but there are no examples in these two writings where a single word, or a single phrase not easily detachable from its context, is incorporated from a second

---

<sup>97</sup> Thomas R. W. Longstaff, *Evidence of Conflation in Mark?: A Study of the Synoptic Problem*, vol. 28, SBL Dissertation Series (Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1977), 201.

<sup>98</sup> Tuckett, *Revival*, 41-6.

<sup>99</sup> Peabody, Cope, and McNicol, *One Gospel from Two*, 90, emphasis original.

source into the middle of a section dependent on another main source,”<sup>100</sup> but this is what is required by Matthew and Luke’s use of Mark, with each taking parts of Mark’s wording so as to give the appearance that Mark’s text is a conflation of the two. While his argument stands that these findings do not accord with the 2GH, neither do they with the 2DH, which requires that both Matthew and Luke independently took words or phrases here and there from the text of Mark, the very process he admitted was not evidenced in the two conflated works he examined. Further, based on the wording that they take from Mark, Matthew and Luke have the appearance of using the Gospel as if they were micro-conflating it with another source, and Tuckett does not seem to realize that his analysis does not accord with his own theory either. And even further, Matthew and Luke often take the wording from Mark that was not used by the other, which is the datum that results in Mark having the appearance of using Matthew and Luke. The 2DH proponents make the claim that 2GH micro-conflation does not align with ancient compositional conventions, but the procedure under their theory has greater difficulty.

Further compounding these difficulties is the observation that Matthew under the 2DH must have conflated the wording of Mark and Q at the pericope level in the Mark-Q overlap sections in a similar manner to Mark under the 2GH. Derrenbacker maintains that the alternation in wording at the pericope level causes an issue for 2GH because it is incongruent with ancient compositional practices,<sup>101</sup> but he also acknowledges that Matthew would have conflated Mark and Q. To defend the 2DH in the face of this observation, he makes the claim that Matthew switches between Mark and Q infrequently and less thoroughly than Mark under the 2GH, and

---

<sup>100</sup> Tuckett, *Revival*, 46.

<sup>101</sup> R. A. Derrenbacker, Jr., *Ancient Compositional Practices and the Synoptic Problem* (Leuven, Belgium: Leuven University Press, 2005), 161-2.

posits the possibility that Matthew has used either Mark or Q as a main source and supplied patches of wording from the other from memory, making it unnecessary to suppose he was viewing both when constructing his text.<sup>102</sup> This was undoubtedly the case in Mark's use of Matthew and Luke under the 2GH in some passages as well, which is evidenced by a lower degree of verbal similarity to one of the Gospels when he is not likely to have been using it directly.

Every source theory must postulate micro-conflation to some degree: the question is not if it has occurred, but how thorough, to what extent, and in what sections it has occurred. In the Mark-Q overlap sections, it is clear that Matthew is the middle term. Under the 2DH, this requires that Matthew conflated Mark and Q, similar to how Mark conflated Matthew and Luke under the 2GH, and under the 2GH, Luke and Mark have both used Matthew, which can be compared to how Matthew and Luke both used Mark under the 2DH.<sup>103</sup> The alternation between Luke and Mark can be seen in Matthew's text of the Beelzebul controversy, Mt 12:22-37, with the underlining indicating comparable wording with Luke and bold type with Mark, although some of the parallel material is reworded and transposed:

**22** Τότε προσηνέχθη αὐτῷ δαιμονιζόμενος τυφλὸς καὶ κωφός, καὶ ἐθεράπευσεν αὐτόν, ὥστε τὸν κωφὸν λαλεῖν καὶ βλέπειν. **23** καὶ ἐξίσταντο πάντες οἱ ὄγλοι καὶ ἔλεγον, Μήτι οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς Δαβὶδ; **24** οἱ δὲ Φαρισαῖοι ἀκούσαντες εἶπον, Οὗτος οὐκ ἐκβάλλει τὰ δαιμόνια εἰ μὴ ἐν τῷ Βεελζεβούλ ἄρχοντι τῶν δαιμονίων. **25** εἰδὼς δὲ τὰς ἐνθυμήσεις αὐτῶν εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Πᾶσα βασιλεία μερισθεῖσα καθ' ἑαυτῆς ἐρημοῦται καὶ πᾶσα πόλις ἢ οἰκία μερισθεῖσα καθ' ἑαυτῆς οὐ σταθήσεται. **26** καὶ εἰ ὁ Σατανᾶς τὸν Σατανᾶν ἐκβάλλει, ἐφ' ἑαυτὸν ἐμερίσθη· πῶς οὖν σταθήσεται ἡ βασιλεία αὐτοῦ; **27** καὶ εἰ ἐγὼ ἐν Βεελζεβούλ ἐκβάλλω τὰ δαιμόνια, οἱ υἱοὶ ὑμῶν ἐν τίνι ἐκβάλλουσιν; διὰ τοῦτο αὐτοὶ κριταὶ ἔσονται ὑμῶν. **28** εἰ δὲ ἐν πνεύματι θεοῦ ἐγὼ ἐκβάλλω τὰ δαιμόνια, ἄρα ἔφθασεν ἐφ' ὑμᾶς ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ. **29** ἢ πῶς δύναται τις εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν τοῦ ἰσχυροῦ καὶ τὰ σκεύη αὐτοῦ ἄρπάσαι, ἐὰν μὴ πρῶτον δῆσῃ τὸν ἰσχυρόν; καὶ τότε

<sup>102</sup> Ibid., 244-6.

<sup>103</sup> E. P. Sanders and Margaret Davies, *Studying the Synoptic Gospels* (Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press International, 1996), 84-7.

**τὴν οἰκίαν αὐτοῦ διαρπάσει. 30** ὁ μὴ ὄν μετ' ἐμοῦ κατ' ἐμοῦ ἐστίν, καὶ ὁ μὴ συνάγων μετ' ἐμοῦ σκορπίζει. **31** Διὰ τοῦτο λέγω ὑμῖν, **πᾶσα ἁμαρτία καὶ βλασφημία ἀφεθήσεται τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, ἢ δὲ τοῦ πνεύματος βλασφημία οὐκ ἀφεθήσεται. 32** καὶ ὃς ἐὰν εἴπῃ λόγον κατὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, ἀφεθήσεται αὐτῷ· ὃς δ' ἂν εἴπῃ κατὰ τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου, οὐκ ἀφεθήσεται αὐτῷ οὔτε ἐν τούτῳ **τῷ αἰῶνι** οὔτε ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι.

As can be seen, whether Mark and Luke are using Matthew or Matthew is conflating Mark and Luke, Matthew is the middle term, and under the 2DH, Matthew has micro-conflated Mark and Q akin to the 2GH. Contrary to Derrenbacher, this is not what would be expected of a conflation according to the principles of ancient compositional practices as he described, and it is not the case that the switches between Mark and Q are few in number within the same pericope as he claimed. As with Mark's conflation of Matthew and Luke under the 2GH, Matthew's change of sources under the 2DH is at the phrase and sentence level. Throughout his composition of the pericope, then, Matthew must have alternated between Mark and Q and micro-conflated his two sources, whereas it would be expected according to normal practice that this pericope would be constructed through the use of one source, either Mark or Q. Micro-conflation, then, is not unique to the 2GH and must be acknowledged as fundamental to the framework of the 2DH as well.

#### Arguments from Markan Redaction

As the 2DH proponent Head has assessed of the condition of the debate between Markan priority and the 2GH, "Since the loss of confidence in many of the arguments that previous generations had used to 'establish' Markan priority, new arguments have been actively sought by the scholarly community." The argument that has retained much of its force pertains to the intentions of the redactional activity of Mark in his use of Matthew and Luke, and the purposes

for the writing of the Gospel that necessarily result.<sup>104</sup> With the other objections to the 2GH addressed, there are three remaining that pose a difficulty for current 2GH models, each arguing for the implausibility of the 2GH on the basis of Mark's redaction of Matthew and Luke.

### The Argument from Regressed Grammar and Style

The first is the objection of grammar. As Styler has noted, Mark often has less sophisticated grammar than Matthew and Luke in parallel passages. Since grammatical improvement is in the direction of Mark to Matthew and Luke, Mark's use of these two Gospels would constitute seemingly purposeful grammatical degradation. Styler gives the example that Mark uses ἐφύλαξάμην, which is less correct, and Matthew uses ἐφύλαξα, which is more correct, at Mk 10:20//Mt 19:20.<sup>105</sup> Stein offers the examples of Mk 4:41, 16:6, and 5:9-10 as instances where Mark uses a singular verb where Matthew or Luke uses a plural, where the plural is more fitting. If Matthew and Luke used Mark, their change to the plural as a grammatical improvement is understandable, but if Mark used Matthew and Luke, he either made a mistake, which is unlikely because he is directly using sources that use the improved form and makes this alteration several times, or the change is intentional, which is unlikely because there is seemingly no reason for him to do so.<sup>106</sup> A significant example is Mt 13:58, "And he did not do many works there because of their unbelief," which would be changed under the 2GH to Mk 6:5-6, "And he was not able to any works there, except that he placed his hands on a few who were sick and

---

<sup>104</sup> Peter M. Head, *Christology and the Synoptic Problem: An Argument for Markan Priority*, vol. 94, Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 34.

<sup>105</sup> Styler, "Excursus IV," 227-8.

<sup>106</sup> Stein, *Studying the Synoptic Gospels*, 56-9.

healed them. And he marveled because of their unbelief,” with Matthew’s version being more grammatically polished and less theologically problematic.<sup>107</sup> Black has noted that some of Mark’s parallels feature asyndeton, a Semitic-influenced syntax that involves the lack of connecting particles, where the parallels in Matthew and Luke do not. The most striking feature of Mark’s style is his paratactic syntax. The constant use of καί may be a parallel to the Hebrew waw consecutive, especially in connection to the LXX.<sup>108</sup> The καί fits with the broader observation of Mark’s style, as Streeter has noted: “Mark reads like a shorthand account of a story by an impromptu speaker—with all the repetitions, redundancies, and digressions which are characteristic of living speech. And it seems to me most probable that his Gospel, like Paul’s Epistles, was taken down from rapid dictation by word of mouth.”<sup>109</sup> The paratactic syntax is particularly characteristic of the recitation of oral tradition, and, more generally, spoken rather than written communication, and its ubiquity in the Gospel aligns with other facets of Mark’s characteristic style that lend to the recording of speech.

### The Argument from Christological Difficulty

Related to the first objection is Christological difficulty. Perhaps the best example is Mark’s version of the wilderness temptation at Mk 1:12, where it says that the Spirit “drove out” Jesus into the wilderness, using the verb ἐκβάλλω, the same verb used for the expulsion of demons and is in every other instance used in a similarly negative connotation in Mark. The

---

<sup>107</sup> John S. Kloppenborg, *Excavating Q: The History and Setting of the Sayings Gospel* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2000), 41-2.

<sup>108</sup> Matthew Black, *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts*, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1967), 55-69.

<sup>109</sup> Streeter, *The Four Gospels*, 163.



parallels at Mt 4:1//Lk 4:1, however, use the much more palatable verb ἀνάγω, “led up.” It is more likely Matthew and Luke would have changed Mark than for Mark to have changed the verb used by Matthew and Luke to ἐκβάλλω.<sup>110</sup> Likewise, Head sees it as a weighty argument for Markan priority that under the 2GH Mark must have altered or removed many of the uses of various Christological titles in his sources, which is readily explicable under the 2DH.<sup>111</sup> The absence of the two-stage healings in Mark, which portray Jesus as using spit to heal and failing to complete the healings in the first attempt, is easily explained under the 2DH as being removed by Matthew and Luke for theological reasons, whereas they are, as Goodacre contends, more difficult to account for under the 2GH.<sup>112</sup>

In several areas 2GH proponents have made arguments for the posteriority of Mark on the basis of theological, linguistic, and geographical development. Walker points out that the order of the Gospels under the 2GH correlates with a decreased number of eschatological Son of Man sayings, with Matthew having more and Mark featuring mainly non-eschatological sayings, while under the 2DH it must be reconciled that the Gospels’ use of the sayings developed to become more eschatological, against the observed theological development in the early church to the contrary.<sup>113</sup> Kloppenborg, in defense of the 2DH, has the following response:

Even if it were correct that the SM [Son of Man] title arose as Walker supposes and that the suffering SM is a secondary development, the shifts that Walker detects on both the 2DH and the 2GH cannot be attributed to a non-reversible Tendez at work in early christology. Redactional interests – e.g., Mark’s concern to emphasize a passion

---

<sup>110</sup> Stein, *Studying the Synoptic Gospels*, 57.

<sup>111</sup> Head, *Christology and the Synoptic Problem*, 148-262.

<sup>112</sup> Goodacre, *The Case against Q*, 32-4.

<sup>113</sup> William O. Walker, “The Son of Man Question and the Synoptic Problem,” *New Testament Studies* 28, no. 3 (1982): 374-9.

christology – are surely more significant factors in the choice of which type of SM sayings are emphasized.<sup>114</sup>

Similarly, Farmer makes the argument that the Jewishness of Matthew lends to its priority and the proliferation of Latinisms in Mark to its posteriority according to a geographical and cultural development, corresponding to the spread of the Gospel from Palestine to Rome.<sup>115</sup> Responding to more Jewish Gospel that explains Jewish customs for an unfamiliar audience, Tuckett has the following defense:

An appeal to Matthew’s “Jewishness” in this respect does not substantiate the claim that it was precisely Matthew’s version to which Mark added his explanatory gloss. To assume that the whole gospel tradition underwent a simple, unilinear development from a Jewish to a non-Jewish provenance imposes too rigid a scheme on the historical, geographical and cultural influences which are now known to have been at work. The widespread interpenetration of Jewish and Hellenistic ideas, both inside and outside Palestine in the first century A.D., precludes any neat theory of a move by the church from a Palestinian, “Jewish” milieu to a non-Palestinian, “Hellenistic” one.<sup>116</sup>

Kloppenborg shares a similar sentiment:

It should be stated from the outset, however, that for the most part it is not possible to argue that one scenario of development is more probable than another. Various scholars have argued, for example, that the fact that Matthew displays a greater familiarity with Jewish exegetical traditions than does Mark amounts to evidence in favour of Markan posteriority. This, however, gratuitously assumes a linear de-Judaizing tendency and ignores the impact of local factors on redactional formulations. Matthew’s proximity to a synagogue or contact with Jewish critics may just as easily have precipitated a “re-judaizing.”<sup>117</sup>

---

<sup>114</sup> John S. Kloppenborg, *Synoptic Problems: Collected Essays* (Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck, 2014), 29.

<sup>115</sup> Farmer, *Synoptic Problem*, 227-8, 122-3.

<sup>116</sup> Tuckett, *Revival*, 9-10.

<sup>117</sup> Kloppenborg, *Collected Essays*, 27.

Both Tuckett and Kloppenborg contend, then, that the Jewishness of Matthew does not point to its relative priority to Mark because such an argument fails to acknowledge that different communities at the same time had different cultural and theological views, and it is illegitimate to envision the Church as developing homogeneously. Likewise, Brown issues the argument that there is Christological development in the direction of the resurrection in Acts and Paul's letters, the baptism in Mark, the conception in Matthew and Luke, and pre-existence in John.<sup>118</sup> Despite his study constituting an argument for the order of the Gospels based on Christological differences, Head responds, "What must be noted here is that the order of the synoptics is presupposed as a given, and the christological development is worked out subsequently; there is no independent verification of the direction of development."<sup>119</sup> Both Head and Kloppenborg base their arguments not on Christological development *per se*, but the omission or alteration of Christological material that they perceive to conflict with the redactor's interests as reflected elsewhere. Kloppenborg bases his argument on Mark's omission of material that portrays Jesus as judge, despite having an interest in Jesus having ἐξουσία, which is a non-reversible criterion that does not depend on a false conception of theological development in the early church.<sup>120</sup> The argument, then, does not concern theological development but the coherence of Markan omission and redaction under the 2GH. In their responses to arguments of development made by 2GH proponents, the 2DH proponents provide their own arguments against the use of Christological development for Markan priority. What needs to be examined, then, is if Mark has a consistent, coherent Christology under current models of the 2GH.

---

<sup>118</sup> Raymond E. Brown, *The Birth of the Messiah: A Commentary on the Infancy Narratives in Matthew and Luke* (New York: Doubleday, 1977), 29-32, 135, 140-1.

<sup>119</sup> Head, *Christology and the Synoptic Problem*, 26.

<sup>120</sup> Kloppenborg, *Collected Essays*, 29-30.

### The Argument from Omission

The most prevalent objection against the 2GH pertains to the material Mark would have omitted in his use of Matthew and Luke. Although Sanders and Davies recognize that Mark could have used the first and third Gospels as outlined by the 2GH, they reject the theory because there does not seem to be a reason for the Gospel to have been written. As they put it, “It may be that here we face only a failure of imagination: why would anyone carefully conflate parts of Matthew and Luke, while omitting so much of both? Nevertheless, scholarship cannot accept a theory of literary relationship that it cannot comprehend.”<sup>121</sup> Mark’s omissions of the birth and resurrection appearance accounts pose a difficulty for the 2GH, and as Kloppenborg points out, there is an inconsistency, which goes back to Griesbach, that Mark apparently has a redactional interest in referring to Jesus as “Teacher,” and yet he omits most of the teaching material in Matthew and Luke.<sup>122</sup> Similarly, Goodacre questions why Mark would have added so few unique pericopes, since he likely would have had access to additional material through oral tradition.<sup>123</sup>

Markan priorists have failed to recognize that their arguments apply not only to the 2GH but to their own theories as well. For one, 2GH Mark is not the only one who has inexplicably omitted material from his sources. The absence of Mk 6:45-8:27 in Luke constitutes what is called “The Great Omission.” As Conzelmann notes, some have used the Ur-Markus theory to account for the omitted material, that the section was absent from the version of Mark used by Luke but added as part of the redaction of canonical Mark.<sup>124</sup> Taylor admits that those who have

---

<sup>121</sup> Sanders and Davies, *Studying the Synoptic Gospels*, 92, 117.

<sup>122</sup> Kloppenborg, *Q, the Earliest Gospel*, 10-2, 22-3.

<sup>123</sup> Goodacre, *The Case against Q*, 34.

<sup>124</sup> Hans Conzelmann, *The Theology of St. Luke*, trans. Geoffrey Buswell (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1982), 52.

held to Luke's direct use of canonical Mark and that the omission was intentional have had to combine their view with a recognition of accidental omission to some extent, or supplemented it with some extenuating circumstance, which is necessary for it to be explicable under the 2DH. In his view, it is necessary to postulate Proto-Luke to account for the data, if Ur-Markus is to be rejected, because it allows him to maintain that Proto-Luke, rather than Mark, was Luke's primary source. This allows the omissions to be considered not so much as omissions but as "non-insertions," as he puts it. That is, it is not that the material was actively excluded but passively not included, since Mark, under this theory, was used as a source simply to supplement Proto-Luke, with Luke only using material from Mark that was of particular interest.<sup>125</sup> Streeter rejects the notion that the omitted section was added in a later revision of Mark due to its stylistic and thematic homogeneity that reflects shared authorship, and instead posits that Luke used a manuscript of Mark that was mutilated and missing the omitted section.<sup>126</sup> The argument from omission, then, also cuts against the 2DH due to Luke's omission of material from Mark, which requires a supplemental, extenuating justification to account for the data.

Second, Goodacre has failed to realize that his argument concerning oral tradition applies to Markan priority. In his view, it is an argument against the 2GH that Mark did not include more teaching material from Matthew and Luke, and that Mark also neglected to add material he would have received through oral tradition beyond what is found in the other two Gospels. Under Markan priority, then, Mark would have had access to oral tradition of Jesus' teachings and made the deliberate decision to omit them. Likewise, against Kloppenborg, it is also the case

---

<sup>125</sup> Vincent Taylor, *Behind the Third Gospel: A Study of the Proto-Luke Hypothesis* (India: Skilled Books, 1926), 138-40, 188-93.

<sup>126</sup> Streeter, *The Four Gospels*, 172-9.

under the 2DH that Mark has a redactional interest of calling Jesus “Teacher” but has neglected to include much of any of His teachings that would have been known to him from oral tradition. In response to the notion from some scholars that Jesus could not have taught in parables because Q does not include such material, facing a similar objection against Q as the 2DH objection against the 2GH, Streeter contends that the writer of Q “wrote to supplement, not to supersede, a living oral tradition,” and that the author must not have thought the parables necessary to include because they are so memorable, and thus did not require inclusion.<sup>127</sup> Riley redirects this point against the 2DH and points out that whether Mark wrote first or after Matthew, he left out the parables and much of Jesus’ teaching that he would have known through oral tradition.<sup>128</sup> And if this argument should be used in defense of the 2DH, it has no force to be used against the 2GH in Mark’s use of Matthew and Luke.

Repeating the typical 2DH argumentation, Trocmé finds it inconceivable that Mark under the 2GH could have omitted the teachings, birth narratives, resurrection appearances, Christological statements, and Old Testament references that are found in Matthew and Luke.<sup>129</sup> This assumes, however, that the centerpoint of Mark’s redactional interest is portraying Jesus’ personage and teachings, that he had the same general intentions in writing his Gospel as did his predecessors. He continues: “And so there is no document extant that can be said to be the source of Mark. There is no other solution, then, if we persist in our quest for the documents used by the Evangelist, but to reconstruct them in the mind.”<sup>130</sup> Trocmé and other 2DH proponents who

---

<sup>127</sup> Ibid., 228-9.

<sup>128</sup> Riley, “The Internal Evidence,” 78-80.

<sup>129</sup> Etienne Trocmé, *The Formation of the Gospel according to Mark*, trans. Pamela Gaughan (Philadelphia, PA: Westminster Press, 1963), 9-10.

<sup>130</sup> Ibid., 11.

perpetuate the argument of omission are operating under the implicit premise that, because Mark cannot have used Matthew and Luke due to what he omits, the sources of Mark cannot have contained the same or comparable material either. The presumption, then, is that this material was not known to Mark, either in another written source or through oral tradition. The contrary Trocmé later admits when he says that Mark has achieved his redactional purposes “by choosing, among the material offered by tradition, the parts that would best serve his purpose,” which undermines his earlier statement and affirms that Mark omitted material comparable or the same as that contained in Matthew and Luke due to his redactional interests.<sup>131</sup> Furthermore, as Nineham points out, even in the section of teaching in Mk 4, Mark’s focus is more on Jesus’ use of parables than on the parables themselves, evidencing that he is not intending to provide a “cross-section” of Jesus’ teachings.<sup>132</sup>

Prior to the advent of form criticism, arguments concerning the Synoptic Problem were framed according to the perspective of literary dependence and without sufficient consideration for the oral tradition that existed before and alongside the writing of the Gospels. As Farmer suggests, the 2DH was able to flourish only before the advent of form criticism because, with the current conception of oral tradition, the Gospels can now be approached differently under both the 2GH and 2DH, as it is recognized that Mark did not include all the tradition he knew of Jesus’ teaching, regardless of the source theory. The concern that Matthean priority under the 2GH compromises the stability of the historical Jesus, which served as the primary impetus for the development of the 2DH at the first, has been rendered obsolete, and the objection that Mark

---

<sup>131</sup> Ibid., 85.

<sup>132</sup> D. E. Nineham, *Saint Mark*, rev. ed. (Middlesex, UK: Penguin Books, 1972), 125-6.

omitted of much of the teaching material in Matthew and Luke, the primary objection against the 2GH since its formulation, has been undermined.<sup>133</sup>

Because the material absent from the second Gospel would have been available to its redactor, and that he omitted it from oral tradition by 2DH proponents' admission, the composition of Mark under either source theory requires that it was composed without having the general purpose of presenting Jesus' personage and teachings as would be expected of a Gospel, as is exemplified by Matthew and Luke. This was recognized by the form critic Dibelius, who in examining the material included by Mark, questions if the redactor is evidenced to have intended to include all the material available to him of the Jesus tradition. As Dibelius points out, Mark hardly includes parables and other teachings, except where it aligns with specific redactional interests. At 12:1 Mark says, "And he spoke to them in parables," but proceeds to include only one, to which 12:38 and 3:23 can be added as similar, an occurrence that evinces Mark was using a source containing a collection that extended beyond the one teaching he included. Dibelius notices that in several passages Jesus is merely summarized as teaching, but Mark does not include any teaching material, which has the appearance that he is omitting teaching material present in his sources by way of narrativial summarization. Dibelius considers that the reason why Mark did not include much teaching material must be explained, to which he answers, "A number of observations makes it probable that the words of Jesus were handed down under other conditions than were the narratives of His acts." In order to reconcile the Gospel of Mark with the overall lack of Jesus' teaching, then, he supposes that the teachings of Jesus were transmitted separately from the narratives. He is forced to the conclusion: "We must

---

<sup>133</sup> William R. Farmer, "A Fresh Approach to Q," in *The Two-Source Hypothesis: A Critical Appraisal*, ed. Arthur J. Bellinzoni, Jr., Joseph B. Tyson, and William O. Walker, Jr. (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1985), 402-3.



see that this was not on account of personal prejudice, but because this tradition of the actual words had been preserved, in a way quite its own, separated from the handing down of general events, and kept for quite special purposes.” Perhaps realizing the weakness of his argument, he then proceeds with what should have been argued at the first, that Mark’s exclusion of much teaching material is because of his redactional interests, that his Gospel “is a book of secret epiphanies,” “an esoteric revelation to the circle of the trustworthy” that is “comprehensible only to the initiated,” as he says. Rather than intending to produce “directions for practical life” which is in line with “a [general] Christian message,” contrary to the purposes of Matthew, who intended a book for ecclesiastical, devotional use, and also Luke, who had a more literary and historiographical purpose than Matthew, Mark’s selection of material, as Dibelius says, “shows they were used as proof-passages of Christian teaching and as witnesses to epiphanies of Jesus,” not for the general purposes as is normally supposed for his Gospel, assumed according to the expectations deriving from Matthew and Luke, not to provide the teachings and acts of Jesus for the purposes of religious furtherment, but “only proof texts for this message.”<sup>134</sup> As Dibelius admits, then, Mark had a particular motive for the inclusion of the material in his Gospel, and it was not the general purpose of the other two evangelists but according to his particular redactional interests.

The argument from omission, once used against 2GH, now slices against 2DH. The special purposes of Mark must be granted under either source theory, and this serves as an argument against Markan priority, not only due to the implausibility that the Gospel would be received if written first but also the implausibility that the first Gospel would be composed as

---

<sup>134</sup> Martin Dibelius, *From Tradition to Gospel*, trans. Bertram Lee Woolf, ed. William Barclay (Cambridge: James Clarke & Co., 1971), 229-65.

such. Even from the 2DH perspective Weeden acknowledges the tendency for the themes and purposes in the other Gospels to be inserted into Mark, which, in his view, changed how Mark would have been read as the first Gospel by the early church.<sup>135</sup> This recognition cuts against the 2DH, however, since if Mark was written first, the early church would have been less likely to have accepted it, without Matthew and Luke having been written first to set the expectations that would have influenced the perception of Mark; and, by extension, it is unlikely the author would have composed it without another Gospel having been published because the polemical intentions of his Gospel would be all the more evident, and, secondarily, because it is less likely the first Gospel would be one that used the stories and teachings about Jesus that existed in Church tradition to portray the disciples negatively than one that was composed for edification and use in the Church. That it came after the other two Gospels allowed for its message to be diluted by the other Gospels that preceded it. Trocmé concluded under the 2DH that Mark was using the Jesus tradition “to confront tradition and those who transmitted it with a statement of the real ecclesiological intentions of Jesus.” He continues: “If this arrangement of his material turns out to be almost biographical, it is because the tradition, whose supreme authority the Evangelist was seeking to shake, referred to constantly to the man Jesus.”<sup>136</sup> Mark omitted teaching material because he was not intending to create a Gospel for general purposes like Matthew or Luke, but had a special purpose that otherwise does not pertain to his presentation of Jesus, which is to use the material to compose a polemic against the Jerusalem disciples.

---

<sup>135</sup> Theodore J. Weeden, *Mark: Traditions in Conflict* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1971), 54.

<sup>136</sup> Trocmé, *The Formation of the Gospel*, 84-5.

## CHAPTER II

## THE COMPOSITION OF MARK

That Mark has particular purpose for his Gospel beyond the simple collation of tradition must be accounted for according to any source theory, whether Mark wrote first or third. The evangelist's omission of much of Jesus' teachings and his redactions are present whether he used the other two Gospels per the 2GH or oral tradition and other written sources per the 2DH. Even under Markan priority, then, the evangelist's selection of material and redaction of his sources require that the Gospel is intended as more than a collection of Jesus' teachings and traditions of His works. It is the 2DH proponents that have brought attention to the fact that Mark has intended his Gospel to serve as a polemic against the Jerusalem apostolate, and this redactional interest has been increasingly recognized by proponents of Markan priority.

Trocmé identified the major redactional interest of Mark under the 2DH as a vendetta against the Jerusalem apostles, particularly Peter and James, both directly and by the suggestion of their ideological likeness to the Pharisees. Under any source theory, Mark shows animosity toward the scribes and Pharisees, deliberately casting them in a negative light through the selection and arrangement of his material, especially the sequence of controversies early in his Gospel, and by his redactional changes to that material, particularly at the beginning and end of pericopes, in which Mark has added these groups to specify them as the opponents of Jesus.<sup>137</sup> Even in the case of the one scribe presented somewhat favorably at Mk 12:28-34, Trocmé finds he is portrayed as "bordering on insolence," and this is followed by two passages in which the scribes are vituperatively attacked, serving to highlight how harshly the scribes are criticized in every other instance. As he notes, the passage appears to have been used by Mark because it

---

<sup>137</sup> Etienne Trocmé, *The Formation of the Gospel according to Mark*, trans. Pamela Gaughan (Philadelphia, PA: Westminster Press, 1963), 88-9, 94-9.

implies criticism of the requirements of the Law beyond the moral commands that apply to Gentiles that are specified in the pericope.<sup>138</sup>

Throughout his Gospel, Mark uses the criticism of the Pharisees to indirectly criticize the faction in the church that held beliefs sympathetic to the Pharisees, implying that, just as one was the enemy of Jesus during His ministry, so is the other oppositional to the ministry of the church. The best indirect example is the warning against the leaven of the Pharisees, all the more intended to be applied to contemporaries of the evangelist, on account that the hearers of the saying are not specified in Mark's passage.<sup>139</sup> Jesus' controversies with the Pharisees, to include the abrogation of the Jewish dietary laws, restrictions concerning the Sabbath, and the prohibition against Jews sitting and eating with tax collectors and sinners, are directed against the ideologies of the Judaizers of the church.<sup>140</sup>

Compared to Matthew and Luke, Mark deemphasizes the special privilege of Peter, inserting James and John in his parallel passages to form an inner circle of three, such as when Jesus enters Peter's house to heal his mother-in-law. The antagonistic presentation of Peter in the cases of Peter finding Jesus praying alone at Mk 1:36, the rebuke after Peter's confession at 8:27-33, and his reaction during the Transfiguration at 9:5-6, leads Trocmé to the conclusion that, according to the 2DH, "Peter is presented in such an unfavourable light that Matthew and Luke felt bound to suppress or tone down the anti-petrine thrust by the author of Mark" by removing or altering the offensive material, adding other disciples alongside Peter to reduce the focus directed against him, or adding favorable material alongside what is found in Mark.<sup>141</sup>

---

<sup>138</sup> Ibid., 96-8.

<sup>139</sup> Ibid., 109-11.

<sup>140</sup> Ibid., 113-6.

<sup>141</sup> Ibid., 129.

Most severe is Mark's treatment of Jesus' family, which is directed against the Lord's brother James due to his association with the Judaizing party. After the rejection at Nazareth, Mark's version adds to the saying that a prophet is not honored in his homeland or house with the added phrase, "and among his family," to emphasize that Jesus' family had rejected Him as well. Trocmé observes that this theme is most pronounced in the case of the Beelzebul controversy at Mk 3:20-35, noticing that Matthew and Luke omitted Mk 3:20-21 because Mark has Jesus' family confront Him after hearing He was beside Himself, which connects forward and interprets the pericope on Jesus' family in vv. 31-5, where Mark describes Jesus' family as "summoning" Him at 3:31, and similarly again at v. 32, as opposed to the more amiable approaches found in Matthew and Luke. Mark has Jesus look at the disciples sitting around Him, to the exclusion of His family who is standing outside, when He identifies those who are His true family, whereas Matthew has the more general identifier that His disciples are His family, and Luke removes a gesture altogether and supplies a more inclusive answer, leading to the conclusion that Mark has explicitly differentiated and excluded Jesus' family from those who do God's will. This differentiation is exacerbated by Mark in the appointment of the Twelve right before vv. 20-21, serving as another contrast of Jesus' family and disciples; Mark inserts the Beelzebul controversy between vv. 20-21 and vv. 31-35, with Matthew and Luke, under the 2DH, separating the two pericopes with the sayings material from Q; v. 21, that Jesus' family came to talk to Him because they believed He had gone mad, is set beside v. 22, the Pharisees' accusation of demonic possession, equating the two; v. 30, at the end of the Beelzebul controversy, and right before the second part of the family pericope, connects to the claims in v. 21 and v. 22, further lending to their association. Trocmé concludes, "If, then, the scribes who have come from Jerusalem have committed a sin that can never be forgiven, so has the family of

Jesus.” Mark associates Jesus’ family with the accusation of the Pharisees and their attribution of the unforgivable sin, which based on Mark’s redactional changes that concern the Law and inclusion of the Gentiles throughout his Gospel, is undoubtedly directed toward James because of his connection with the Judaizing party.<sup>142</sup>

Building on the work of Trocmé, Weeden recognizes that Mark has a polemical purpose, as is evident from the persistent disparagement of the disciples, although he disagrees that it is directed toward the Judaizing party in Jerusalem, on the grounds that in some pericopes Jesus upholds the demands of the Law, providing the examples of Mk 7:10-13, 10:17-19, 12:28-34 and Jesus’ habitual teaching in the synagogues.<sup>143</sup> But these are not persuasive examples, considering that in 7:10-13 Jesus is quoting the commandment to honor one’s father and mother to point out Pharisaic hypocrisy in following the “Corban” tradition. As it concerns 10:17-19, Weeden leaves out what Jesus says after v. 19, His command to the young man to sell his possessions so that he can be perfect, which suggests that Jesus is calling him to a higher standard than what is contained in the Law. This implies that the Law is not in itself sufficient to achieve eternal life, and nowhere is it suggested that the dietary laws or other requirements the Judaizers enforced were needed for one to attain salvation, which would be required for the passage to serve Weeden’s viewpoint; and indeed, Mark appears to have preferred this pericope precisely because of the implication to the contrary. For 12:28-34, it is certainly not a commendation of keeping Jewish-specific requirements for Jesus to say the greatest commandments are to love God and neighbor, with the result that Jesus says in response to the well-answering scribe that he is “not far from the kingdom of God.” As for the four pericopes that take place in a synagogue, two

---

<sup>142</sup> Ibid., 131-6.

<sup>143</sup> Theodore J. Weeden, *Mark: Traditions in Conflict* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1971), 21.

revolve around Jesus casting out a demon, which is hardly flattering for the Jewish place of worship; in another Jesus heals a man with a withered hand; and the fourth is the rejection at Nazareth, all of which involve a controversy either with the Pharisees over the stipulations of the Law or over Jesus' identity, except for 1:39, which is a summary statement. The scenes that are set in synagogues, then, are not portrayed positively by Mark. Contrary to Weeden's assertion that these passages weigh against Mark's intention to write against the Judaizers on the grounds that Mark includes passages that seem to uphold the Law, he fails to notice that these passages are aligned with the opposite redactional purpose. In the examples Weeden adduced, Jesus describes the fulfillment of the Law's moral obligations apart from the Jewish-specific restrictions that Mark was opposed to. His final example, Mk 1:44, is his best, but Mark redacts the passage so that the leper does not show himself to the priests and instead begins proclaiming that Jesus healed him. Rather than supporting the Law, Mark has the leper ignore it. Additionally, Mark has heavily reworked the passage around the leper's seeming doubt, which Mark uses to have Jesus respond in anger. The messianic secret theme is also accentuated in comparison to the parallel versions. In other words, Mark has heavily redacted this passage in accordance with interests observed throughout his Gospel, so it is not a persuasive argument that he must have carried it over because of a pro-Law sentiment. And, accordingly, it does not take more than a page for Weeden to concede that the crowds are intended as a positive foil to the Jewish religious leaders, with the former being portrayed as so interested in Jesus' message and works that they impede Jesus' way and serve as an obstacle, Jesus' popularity with the crowds functioning as a contrast with Mark's vehemence for the Jewish religious authorities.<sup>144</sup>

---

<sup>144</sup> Ibid., 22-3.

Weeden sees three stages in the development of the spiritual blindness of the disciples, the second stage marked by Peter's confession and the third by Judas' betrayal. In the first part of Mark's Gospel the disciples are obdurate and repeatedly fail to recognize His identity, and the crowds are shown to have more spiritual perceptibility and faith. Under the 2DH, Matthew has removed Mk 1:37, which suggests the disciples are misaligned with Jesus' mission, as elaborated in v. 38. Whereas Mark stresses the inability of the disciples to understand the parable of the sower, despite supposedly being granted the inner secrets of the kingdom, Matthew removes this unflattering depiction and instead stresses the reason for Jesus' use of parables with the crowds. Matthew changed the disciples' cry out for help in Mark's stilling of the storm, to make it clear that they believed Jesus was able to stop the storm. Similarly, in the account of Jesus walking on the sea, Matthew removes Mark's redactional statement of the disciples' hardness of heart, and instead replaces it with the disciples bowing down to Jesus. Matthew adds an introductory sentence to soften Jesus' response to the disciples during the feeding of the five thousand at Mk 6:37. Matthew also presents the disciples as obtuse early in his Gospel, but even in these cases it is not as extreme as Mark's versions. Matthew qualifies Mk 7:17-18 by adding "still" in his parallel at Mt 15:16, which implies the disciples will understand in the future. And this does happen, at least to some extent, in Matthew almost immediately, after Jesus warns them about the leaven of the Pharisees and Sadducees at Mt 16:12, but Mark has no parallel of Mt 16:12, opting rather to leave the misunderstanding of the disciples unalleviated. Under the 2DH, both Matthew and Luke have also added material that represents the disciples positively that is not included in Mark.<sup>145</sup>

---

<sup>145</sup> Ibid., 26-32.



The confession of Peter marks the second phase, which is characterized by the disciples' misunderstanding of the meaning of Jesus' messiahship. Each of Jesus' death and resurrection predictions is contrasted with the disciples' focus on worldly power, with the expectation that Jesus would align with those of their Jewish contemporaries. Quite the contrary to Peter's confession being a profession of faith, Mark frames it as a revelation of his unbelief. The disciples did not comprehend, let alone believe in, the meaning of the death and resurrection predictions, which reflect the actual significance of Jesus' mission. This is made evident by the apparent parallelism of Peter's confession and rebuke, contrasted with Jesus' correction and revelation of the necessity of the Messiah to lay down His life. The saying at the end of the passage, Mk 8:38, that the Son of Man will be ashamed of those who are ashamed of Him, points forward to Peter's denial. Later on the disciples unsuccessfully attempt to cast out a demon, and at Mk 9:19, Jesus castigates them as being part of the "unbelieving generation." At Mk 9:38-41, Jesus reprimands the disciples for trying to stop the exorcist who was casting out demons in His name. They are then reprimanded at Mk 10:13-16 for a similar reason, though for attempting to stop children from approaching Jesus. Mark inserts 14:3-9 between vv. 1-2 and v. 10-11 to give the impression that the anointing at Bethany was the reason for Judas' betrayal, when Jesus rebukes the disciples for judging the woman for pouring the perfume on Jesus. These instances and those similar can be compared to Matthew and Luke's treatments. While they also record the failure of the disciples, their parallel versions have the apparent intention of softening the criticism and presenting them in a more hopeful light. While Peter's confession is a spark of insight in the other Gospels, for Mark it is a subtle confirmation of the persistence of his unbelief.<sup>146</sup>

---

<sup>146</sup> Ibid., 32-8, 65-9.

The spiritual blindness of the disciples reaches its pinnacle in the third part of Weeden's sequence. After Jesus is arrested and the disciples flee, they are not seen for the remainder of the Gospel, neither at the crucifixion or the empty tomb, except for Peter, who denies Him. While the disciples come to believe and Peter is rehabilitated in Matthew and Luke, there is no such indication in Mark. Rejecting the longer ending of Mark, Weeden leaves Mk 16:8 as the purposeful, redactional ending to his Gospel, with which the story ends with the women leaving the tomb in silence, implying that the other disciples were not informed of the angel's message. Taking the portrayal of the disciples throughout the Gospel into account, it is apparent that Mark is seeking to undermine the disciples' apostolic authority entirely. As Weeden puts it, "The effect, of course, is a startling, and to many an offensive, suggestion that the disciples never received the angel's message, thus never met the resurrected Lord, and, consequently never were commissioned with apostolic rank after their apostasy." In his view, the arguments for the longer ending of Mark are unpersuasive and only supported out of theological, presuppositional motive in order to avoid the conclusions that result if Mark intended to end his Gospel at 16:8 as the evidence suggests.<sup>147</sup>

Rejecting Trocmé's notion that Mark's polemic against the disciples is because of their Judaizing restrictions upon Gentile converts, Weeden instead proposes that the warnings of false messiahs in the eschatological discourse are directed against certain individuals in the Church who were exhibiting the same worldly understanding of discipleship as Peter in his confession of Jesus' messiahship. In the first section of Mark, the crowds recognize Jesus as a *theios aner*, a man imbued with divine power, and they come to Him for healing and spiritual revelation. Throughout this section the question of Jesus' identity appears repeatedly, both elements leading

---

<sup>147</sup> Ibid., 38-51.

up to Peter's confession, where he expresses the same view as the crowds.<sup>148</sup> Weeden points to the opponents of Paul referenced in his letters to the Corinthians as examples of the *theios aner* mentality, as those who aim for power and superiority within the Church, using the spiritual gifts to place themselves over others. Mark's pericopes on the unknown exorcist and the children who were hindered from seeing Jesus are directed toward those who seek to exclude others and elevate themselves in the community.<sup>149</sup> Weeden argues that Mark is identifying the disciples as the false Christs he warns about in his eschatological discourse,<sup>150</sup> which only remains a possibility because of his earlier dismissal of Trocmé's proposition that Mark was countering the Judaizing party in the Church, which Weeden has based, as was demonstrated, on weak arguments in an attempt to dismiss Mark's antagonism toward the requirements of the Law. The removal of the resurrection appearances, then, are connected with the charismatic opponents described by Paul, as a means for Mark to undercut their claim to power through revelatory experience.<sup>151</sup> This argument, however, requires Weeden to ignore Mark's redactional interests in the inclusion of the Gentiles and the exclusion of the Law.

Tyson contributes the observation that the recognition of Jesus' identity in Mark's Gospel ranges from His identification by the unclean spirits, the partial perception of the disciples, and the rejection of the Jewish authorities. While the recipients of Jesus' miracles are often instructed not to tell others of their healing or exorcism, the disciples fail to understand who Jesus is. As Tyson puts it, "It is not as if the disciples had discerned the nature of Jesus but are prohibited from broadcasting it, but it is that the disciples have a wrong conception about his nature." In

---

<sup>148</sup> Ibid., 54-9.

<sup>149</sup> Ibid., 60-4.

<sup>150</sup> Ibid., 73-81.

<sup>151</sup> Ibid., 109.

support of this claim he points to the stilling of the storm at Mk 4:35-41, Jesus walking on water at 6:45-52, Jesus blessing the children at 10:13-16, the rich young man at 10:17-27, the obscurity of the parables at 4:10-34, the programmatic failure of the disciples to comprehend the nature of Jesus' suffering messiahship after His three predictions, and the confession of Peter that equates the apostle's understanding with that of Satan's.<sup>152</sup> The self-serving, aggrandizing mentality of the disciples displayed after each of the predictions are juxtaposed with the selfless humility of Jesus. Tyson sees that the Pauline Mark was countering the Judaizers in Jerusalem who wished to impose the restrictions of the Law on the Gentiles, and out of his concern for the outreach to the Gentiles, which was being undermined by the Jerusalem leadership, Mark in turn intends with his Gospel to undermine their apostolic authority.<sup>153</sup>

In his analysis of the theological implications of the 2GH, Kloppenborg notes that Mark's redactional changes to Matthew and Luke indicate a purposeful vilification of the disciples and Jesus' family. The infancy narratives were likely omitted because they portrayed Jesus' family favorably, the structuring of vv. 20-21 and vv. 31-35 around the Beelzebul controversy attributes to Jesus' family the unforgivable sin that was attributed to the Pharisees, and the disciples are portrayed as not only holding to the Jewish messianic expectation of a political and military leader but also an exclusive mentality against "outsiders" like the unknown exorcist. He agrees with Tyson and Weeden that this accords with the apparent tension between the Pauline and Jerusalem camps, most clearly expressed in Galatians, involving the inclusion of the Gentiles and the Jewish restrictions placed upon them by the Judaizers. Mark's replacement of Peter's walking on the water and veneration of Jesus with a statement of the disciples' hardness of heart

---

<sup>152</sup> Joseph B. Tyson, "The Blindness of the Disciples in Mark," in *The Messianic Secret*, ed. Christopher Tuckett, vol. I, Issues in Religion and Theology (Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1983), 35-7.

<sup>153</sup> *Ibid.*, 38-42.

and Mark's portrayal of the disciples at the garden of Gethsemane, in which Matthew focuses on the resolve of Jesus but Mark on the dissolution of the disciples, and the removal of the resurrection appearances require an antagonism that renders it unimaginable that Mark was writing as an assistant to Peter under the 2GH. Kloppenborg frames these redactional decisions throughout his discussion as reflections of Mark's purpose under the 2GH, failing to acknowledge that Tyson and Weeden, with whom he agrees, are writing from the perspective of the 2DH, and the antagonism against Jesus' family, to the extent that Kloppenborg says they are portrayed as "unbelieving opponents," and the disciples, whom he agrees in Mark are criticized for their exclusivism and anti-Christian messianic conception. He defends the 2DH from being attributed what he applies to the 2GH, stating that under the 2DH it is possible that Mark was not aware of the infancy narratives, but this can hardly be the case for the resurrection appearances, and it does not provide an answer to Mark's redactions of the material he does include, which Kloppenborg acknowledges is condemnatory toward Jesus' family and the disciples. He admits, "Why should Mark have taken such a tack? This, of course, is a question that the 2DH must ask as well, but in the case of the 2GH it is all the more pressing since on that hypothesis, Mark has done considerably more to accentuate the opposition to Jesus' kin," but all he has offered that applies more to the 2GH than the 2DH is the lack of a Markan infancy narrative in the former, which is not only a weak argument because Mark's redactional interest of vilifying Jesus' family and disciples does not depend on his omission of a birth narrative, but also because this argument only applies if it is to be assumed that Mark was unaware of a birth narrative under the 2DH. This is an argument of silence that is not only weak but unnecessary, since Kloppenborg supplies the reason for its omission himself, that it accords with the antagonism toward Jesus' family, as he readily acknowledges. He provides a reason for its

omission, which would be the case whether Mark used Matthew and Luke as under the 2GH or other sources per the 2DH. He admits that “on the 2DH, the most likely explanation has to do with the Markan theme of the blindness of Jesus’ disciples. They too display a lamentable lack of understanding of Jesus’ purpose and stubborn resistance to the passion Christology evinced by Mark.” Kloppenborg attempted to argue that the disparagement of the disciples would be a stronger theme under the 2GH because of the omitted birth narrative, as a presuppositional argument to dissuade its acceptance, but then admits that the changes throughout the Gospel material require the same for the 2DH as well.<sup>154</sup>

Even from the perspective of the 2DH, Mark has modified the Beelzebul controversy and subsequent pericope on Jesus’ family in order to associate the latter with the accusation of the Pharisees. The material that intervenes the two pericopes in Matthew and Luke follow the controversy in Q; Mark, on the other hand, can be presumed to have received the two pericopes in tradition with the family pericope following the controversy. Under the 2GH, by contrast, Mark would have omitted the intervening material for the purpose of pairing the two pericopes. Crossan finds that the introduction of vv. 20-21, that Jesus’ family heard He was beside Himself, is Mark’s composition, was purposefully set beside the accusation of the Pharisees at v. 22. This accusation has been heightened from the use of Satan to cast out demons to possession, which is likened to the report of v. 21 that caused Jesus’ family to confront Him. With the family pericope subsequent to the controversy, the redactional vv. 20-21 sandwich the controversy between the two settings pertaining to Jesus’ family, a characteristically Markan compositional technique.<sup>155</sup>

---

<sup>154</sup> John S. Kloppenborg, *Synoptic Problems: Collected Essays* (Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck, 2014), 11-27.

<sup>155</sup> John Dominic Crossan, “Mark and the Relatives of Jesus,” *Novum Testamentum* 15, no. 2 (1973): 81-9.

The redactional addition of v. 30 after the pronouncement of the unforgivable sin at vv. 28-29 confirms the reason for the attribution of the condemnation, which is the accusation that Jesus was possessed, pointing back to the accusations at vv. 21-22, of which Jesus' family and the Pharisees are attributed.<sup>156</sup> In the family pericope of vv. 31-35, Mark has doubly emphasized the placement of Jesus' family outside and His disciples sitting around Him, a feature missing in the other Gospels, for the purpose of further distinguishing the two, to the exclusion of Jesus' family.<sup>157</sup> Mark's addition of "and among his kin" in his version of the rejection at Nazareth serves to reiterate the rejection of Jesus' family, which is redundant because it was added to the saying that already mentions "among his household," causing the addition to be a repetition, and all the more emphasized.<sup>158</sup> Lastly, Crossan points to the lists of women present at Jesus' crucifixion, burial, and at the empty tomb. Whereas Matthew lists one of the women as "the other Mary," Mark clarifies this woman is Mary the mother of James, Joseph, or both in her appearances, with the seeming intention to clarify that the woman is not Mary the mother of Jesus.<sup>159</sup> Crossan identifies the purpose of Mark's polemical redactions as a means to target the Jerusalem apostles, ending his Gospel at 16:8 to suggest that the disciples did not witness the risen Lord, undermining the basis of their apostolic authority, and excluding Jesus' family as a means to exclude James the Lord's brother from the Christian faith.<sup>160</sup>

This is further substantiated by the findings of Pryke, who in his analysis of Mark's redactional activity, agrees that Mark has strategically apposed the accusation of Jesus' family

---

<sup>156</sup> Ibid., 95-6.

<sup>157</sup> Ibid., 96-7.

<sup>158</sup> Ibid., 103.

<sup>159</sup> Ibid., 105-10.

<sup>160</sup> Ibid., 109-13.

and the Pharisees in the Beelzebul controversy so as to associate the former with the unforgivable sin. The evangelist's redactional activity results in the conclusion, "Mark shows a strong animus against the brother of the Lord and his Jerusalem episcopate, with its Jewish-Christian tendencies."<sup>161</sup> Pryke is able to confidently confirm Mk 4:11-13, 6:52, 8:21, 14:51-52, and 16:8 as redactional; however, he does not appear to have noticed the similarity in the language shared between the references to the young man at the garden and at the tomb, resulting in the entirety of 14:51-52 to be included as redactional but not 16:5, despite the evangelist using the same wording in both descriptions.<sup>162</sup> He argues that 16:8 as the ending of the Gospel aligns with Mark's characteristic redactional tendencies, rejecting the longer ending of 16:9-20 as a later composition.<sup>163</sup>

Approaching Markan priority from the perspective of the FH rather than 2DH, Eve engages in a thought experiment to test the ability for Q under the 2DH to be reliably reconstructed by evaluating the possibility that Mark could be reconstructed if Mark, rather than Q, was lost, and Matthew, Luke, and Q were available instead. Since the reconstructed Mark under this thought experiment would consist of the material shared by Matthew and Luke that could not have derived from Q, Eve analyzes the differences in Mark's text in comparison to what constitutes the triple tradition under the 2DH.<sup>164</sup> Mark's section on the parable of the sower has Jesus criticize the disciples' inability to understand the parables, which, since it is not shared by Matthew or Luke, could not be reconstructed as part of Mark according to his experiment.

---

<sup>161</sup> E. J. Pryke, *Redactional Style in the Marcan Gospel*, vol. 33, Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 42.

<sup>162</sup> *Ibid.*, 151-76.

<sup>163</sup> *Ibid.*, 44-5.

<sup>164</sup> Eric Eve, "Reconstructing Mark: A Thought Experiment," in *Questioning Q: A Multidimensional Critique*, ed. Mark Goodacre and Nicholas Perrin (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2004), 89-91.



The manner in which the disciples wake Jesus in Mark's version of the stilling of the storm is more of a rebuke than in Matthew or Luke, which would be omitted in the reconstruction. The extended critique in the warnings of the yeast of the Pharisees at Mk 8:17-18 is lost, even if it is granted that Matthew used Mark when composing Mt 16:9. Mark would be attributed Judas' betrayal, the abandonment at Gethsemane, and Peter's denial, but with there being resurrection appearances in Matthew and Luke it may be assumed that the disciples were also rehabilitated in Mark. Mark's interpretation of Peter's comment during the Transfiguration would be lost, as would be the disciples' misconception about Jesus' death and resurrection prediction on their way down the mountain, and the conclusion of the disciples' attempt to perform an exorcism on the young boy after the Transfiguration. Mark's addition at Mk 9:34 that the disciples were afraid to answer Jesus after He inquired of their discussion over who is greatest would be absent from the reconstructed Mark. After the confession of Peter, the disciples' inability to comprehend Jesus' death and resurrection predictions is greatly softened if not entirely removed from Mark. Eve offers his conclusion: "The overall effect is to transplant the disciples from the stony ground to the good soil." If the negative representations of the disciples unique to Mark are replaced with those of Matthew and Luke, the perception of the disciples is entirely altered and lends to their presentation as "just fallible enough for the audience to be able to identify with their frailties, while nevertheless being basically loyal, obedient and successful enough to exemplify true disciples....This is hardly the case in canonical Mark."<sup>165</sup>

As proponents of Markan priority have rightly noted, Mark's selection of material and his redactions of his sources evince an intention behind the composition of his Gospel that extends beyond the desire to present the teachings and deeds of Jesus for the purposes of edification as is

---

<sup>165</sup> Ibid., 101-11.

found in the other two Gospels. That Mark's sources under the 2DH are not available does not obscure the fact that he omitted much of Jesus' teachings and stories significant to the life of Jesus that would have been available to the evangelist through church tradition, and that he has modified the traditions he does include with the intention to undermine the apostolic authority of the disciples. Under the 2DH, then, it was the evangelist's intention to compose a polemic against the Jerusalem apostolate, an intention that is made all the more readily verifiable under the 2GH with Mark's redaction of Matthew and Luke.

### Two Gospel Hypothesis Models of Mark

The intention to undermine the authority of the disciples has been acknowledged as the purpose for Mark's composition by an increasing number of Markan priorists, but it has continued to be denied by proponents of the 2GH, leaving the source theory to remain without a plausible model that is able to establish it as a viable solution to the Synoptic Problem. In the attempt to establish other purposes of the Gospel's composition, 2GH proponents have been unable to account for Mark's selection of material and his redactional changes, and, in their effort to support such theories, are demonstrably required to dismiss or downplay the evidence of Mark's polemical intentions, the denial of such evidence and the repeated propositions of models that are internally contradictory or foreign to the material and redactions of the Gospel resulting as a product of their own presuppositions concerning the purpose of the Gospel, with each model reflecting how its proponent wants Mark to have been written rather than it being a conclusion derived from evidence.

### Black's Petrine Model

The weakest form of the 2GH comes from the attempt to harmonize Mark with the patristic tradition. In the starting paragraph of his presentation, Black reveals the presupposition underlying his model of the 2GH when he says that “patient investigation enables us today to formulate a hypothesis that does justice both to critical scholarship and to the integrity of the ancient church fathers,” suggesting that defending the accuracy of the church fathers should be a goal that a model of the 2GH should uphold.<sup>166</sup> According to his framework, Matthew was written by the namesake apostle as traditionally ascribed, and Luke, as a companion of Paul, wrote his Gospel for a Gentile audience, adding details not found in Matthew and using a different birth story from Mary. Despite the fact that Luke composed his Gospel based on the testimony of eyewitnesses such as Mary, Black maintains the Gospel would have lacked credibility in the Church because it was written by someone who was not an eyewitness himself. As such, Paul wanted Luke’s Gospel to be approved by Peter, who happened to be at Rome at the time, and it was decided that Peter would compare Luke’s Gospel with Matthew’s as a means to approve it, so that Luke’s Gospel could be published for use in the Gentile churches. Black envisions Peter delivering a series of formal lectures attended by a great crowd, an event of such import that even some non-believers from the public in Rome were present, including guards from the Praetorium as stated in the testimony of Clement, in which he alternated between Matthew and Luke, supplementing with details from his own reminiscences as an eyewitness. Peter did not speak to the birth narratives or the resurrection appearances because he only wanted to review what he personally experienced and could approve as truthful. Since Peter knew the Gospel of Matthew very well, if not to the point of memorization, he primarily used Matthew

---

<sup>166</sup> David Alan Black, *Why Four Gospels?: The Historical Origins of the Gospels*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (Gonzalez, FL: Enegrion Publications, 2010), 1.

and supplemented with additions from Luke and details from his own reminiscences as an eyewitness. Peter ended his lectures at Mk 16:8, but after his death, Mark added the longer ending of vv. 9-20, resulting in both editions existing in the manuscript tradition.<sup>167</sup>

There are several difficulties with Black's framework. First, he affirms the additions and changes in Luke's Gospel were derived from a thorough, historical investigation of eyewitnesses, which, if true, would mean that the added material already comes from eyewitness testimony. There is no reason to suppose Luke's Gospel needed a formal comparison of his Gospel with Matthew by an eyewitness for it to be accepted for use in the Gentile churches. Furthermore, this view is predicated on the assumption that the Gospel of Luke was intended for such a purpose, which encounters difficulty in the face of the prologue and the elevated, literary style that is more suitable for private rather than congregational use, and if this simple, tenuous premise is undercut, the entire structure of his setting for the Gospel's composition collapses.

Second, Black supposes the birth and resurrection appearance narratives were not reviewed by Peter because they were not among his personal experiences, and while this applies to Jesus' birth, Black seems to be forgetting that the appearance in Galilee in Matthew's Gospel and the appearances to Peter and the Twelve in Luke were experienced by the apostle. Further, because the resurrection appearances constitute one of the main discrepancies between Matthew and Luke, if Peter was reviewing the two to affirm the accuracy of the accounts, his review of the resurrection appearances would have been one of the primary reasons for Peter's contribution in approving Luke. The exclusion of the sections that have the most differences between the two Gospels undermines the theory that Peter was comparing Luke with Matthew and his own personal experiences due to Luke's departures from Matthew.

---

<sup>167</sup> Ibid., 3-16.

While Black previously stated that Peter did not continue to the resurrection appearances because he was limiting himself to his own experiences, he must have later realized the blunder in his argument, instead contending that, as he says, “at the conclusion of the earthly ministry of Jesus, Peter ended his discourses, having exhausted his reminiscences, since Paul had his own personal visions of the risen Christ and did not require Peter’s corroboration in this respect.”<sup>168</sup> It is apparent from the weakness of this explanation that Black is presuppositionally motivated to produce any rationale as is necessary to protect his theory. To begin, Paul’s experience of a different post-resurrection appearance has nothing to do with Peter’s narration, especially since, as Black characterizes the occasion, the very purpose of the lectures is for Peter to compare Luke to his experiences, with his resurrection experience merely alluded to by Luke being paramount, alongside the others mentioned in both Gospels involving the apostle, which would be in accordance with the supposed purpose of securing Peter’s confirmation for the additions made in Luke’s Gospel. For the omission of the Central Section in particular, and by extension the rest of the teaching material omitted in Mark, Black implies Peter must not have been present to hear these teachings, wishing only to comment on the sections for which he had personal experience.<sup>169</sup> It is astounding that of all the teaching material in both Matthew and Luke, the only teachings Peter could personally confirm is that which was included in Mark, such that it would seem that, under Black’s theory, Peter was absent from Jesus during His ministry more than he was present. This is especially difficult since the apostles are appointed from among the disciples in Mark immediately before the placement of the Sermon in Luke, and Peter is first called in Mark right before the Sermon in Matthew. According to all three Gospels Peter was

---

<sup>168</sup> Ibid., 15.

<sup>169</sup> Ibid., 14.

called before the Sermon. The suggestion that the only teachings in Matthew and Luke that Peter was present to hear are those that are included in Mark again reveals Black's commitment to his presuppositions against the evidence, and if true, undermines the foundational premise that Peter was in a position as an eyewitness of Jesus' ministry to approve the Gospels in the first place.

Third, and most obvious, is that there would no need for Peter to use Matthew at all in Black's scenario, if his purpose was to affirm the accounts found in Luke. This difficulty is compounded by the fact that, as Black recognizes, Peter would not only have used Matthew but used Matthew more than he did Luke, with Matthew being Mark's primary source under the 2GH and Luke as secondary. He writes, "Peter, of course, would have known the Gospel of Matthew almost, if not entirely, by heart, and therefore he intended to follow it more closely, but adding Luke's extra details wherever he could."<sup>170</sup> If the apostle knew the Gospel by heart, then that is all the more reason not for him to have used it. His line of reasoning that Peter would have used Matthew more closely because he had it memorized is confused, not only because the opposite would follow, that he would have less of a need to use Matthew in that case, but also because his use of Matthew has nothing to do with the purported reasoning for the occasion that his model revolves around. If it is true that Peter intended to approve the reliability of the details in Luke, he would have read through Luke, and one could imagine that he might add details from his reminiscences that could be published into its own document. Put simply, Black is attempting to postulate two contradictory purposes for the occasion of Mark's composition, one that better accords with his interpretation of the external data and the other the internal evidence that Mark used Matthew.

---

<sup>170</sup> Ibid., 15.

Fourth, since the purpose was to approve the accuracy of Luke's account, Black's theory presupposes that Peter found no account to be in need of adjustment or correction; it is the case, however, that the changes in Mark in the use of material in Luke extend beyond addition and omission, and that Mark sometimes prefers a version of Matthew's account of the same event over Luke's, such as the calling of the disciples, the rejection at Nazareth, and the anointing at Bethany. According to his theory, this would suggest Peter did indeed find Luke to be in need of correction, which in turn would suggest the Gospel should not have been published in its current form without the alterations Peter's lectures would have necessitated according to the purported occasion of Black's theory. If it is the case that Peter approved Matthew's version of an event against Luke's, despite the purpose of the occasion being an evaluation of the trustworthiness of Luke's account, this would suggest Luke was not in fact approved by Peter and that modifications would be needed before it could be authorized for use in the Gentile churches. Additionally, the added details from Peter's reminiscences that are present in Mark but not in Luke would indicate that Luke did not value Peter's additions, since he did not include them in a revision, which would be easily implemented with Mark having become available to him, which was the transcript of Peter's narration.

Black justifies the fact that the Gospel of Mark was held in obscurity relative to the popularity of Matthew, and secondarily to Luke, despite it being the record of Petrine testimony, with the explanation that, "despite its being highly prized by the church as the personal reminiscences of Peter, it did not enjoy universal circulation because it was not intended to supersede either Matthew or Luke."<sup>171</sup> What is more likely is that its relative obscurity is due to the fact that the Gospel was never understood to be the direct recording of Peter, which is

---

<sup>171</sup> Ibid., 16.

evidenced not only by the patristic sources intended to prove the opposite by Black and Orchard, which instead point to the contrary, but also from the absence of its treatment as such by the early church, as is reluctantly admitted. Similarly, he addresses the instances in which Mark is placed second rather than third in some sources by supposing that Mark is placed according to its authority, being connected to Peter.<sup>172</sup> However, if it is the record of Peter's preaching, it would be expected that the Gospel would be placed first under that framework. If it is the case that Mark was the amanuensis of Peter, the Gospel would have been attributed to Peter, just as any other document is attributed to the one dictating the wording, not the one recording the speech of the author.

Against the charge that the patristic traditions are inconsistent and unreliable, he responds that it needs "no refutation when we recall the scholarship, intelligence, and integrity of these outstanding churchmen," supposing his view to concur with patristic testimony.<sup>173</sup> It is clear that Black's theory is an attempt to substantiate his presupposition of Petrine involvement, but it does not align with the internal evidence that Mark was composed by alternating between Matthew and Luke or the patristic testimonies either. The occasion of Peter's lectures and the writing of Mark are based on Clement's statement that Peter was preaching the gospel publicly in Rome in front of Caesar's guard, and that the guard requested Peter's message in writing from Mark, a testimony that not only does not suggest Black's theory but militates against it. He counters the interpretation of Irenaeus that Mark wrote after Peter died, despite translating the church father as affirming that Mark wrote after the "demise" of Peter and Paul, with the defense that if Irenaeus intended to say that Mark wrote after Peter's death, his statement would be counter to

---

<sup>172</sup> Ibid., 29.

<sup>173</sup> Ibid., 33.



other patristic testimony, opting for the understanding that Irenaeus only intended to communicate the authority of Mark as passing on the testimony of Peter. With these two purported inconsistencies addressed, he affirms, “The main patristic texts down to Jerome are never contradictory and are perfectly clear in all essentials; the one or two secondary inconsistencies can easily bear a consistent interpretation.”<sup>174</sup> It is clear that he is selecting favorable details among the patristic traditions, however, since in the quotation from Clement that Peter spoke in front of Caesar’s guard, Clement not only says Mark wrote the Gospel after being asked by the soldiers, and no such formal occasion is mentioned, but that Peter was “publicly preaching” and “uttering many testimonies about Christ,” as Black himself translates the passage. In the Old Latin Prologue and in Eusebius, Mark is portrayed as writing the Gospel by request, and when Peter heard about it, he approved it to be read in the Church. In the quotation of Papias, Mark is presented as writing down the teachings of Peter, which he learned from accompanying the apostle. Black points to another quotation of Clement to support his view, using the detail that when Peter knew of the Gospel, he neither explicitly approved nor rejected it, which not only contradicts the tradition that he authorized it for use in the churches, but passes over Clement’s other statement that the Gospel was written by Mark after “Peter had publicly preached the word in Rome” and the hearers of his preaching asked Mark to write down his teachings “as one who had followed him for a long time and remembered what had been spoken,” directly contradicting the private, formal occasion necessitated by Black’s theory. The only church father that Black can point to as supporting his theory without ignoring contradictory details comes from Jerome, who says the Gospel “consists of Peter’s narration and [Mark’s]

---

<sup>174</sup> Ibid., 35.

writing.”<sup>175</sup> He picks details from various traditions, then, ignoring the contradictory details even in the same quotations he uses, attempting to give the impression that there are no inconsistencies that speak against his theory of Mark’s recording of Peter’s narration, an undertaking that is either due to an incompetent mishandling of the data or its purposeful misrepresentation.

#### Orchard’s Petrine Model

A similar approach is taken by Orchard, who also points to external patristic sources to support his position, though, unlike Black, he stops short of attempting to use the historical evidence to substantiate the setting of Peter’s lectures, and instead finds that patristic testimony simply supports Mark as the author of the Gospel, which was written based on the reminiscences of Peter before the death of the apostle and formally published by Mark afterward.<sup>176</sup> While Black took it as an affront to the trustworthiness and credibility of the early church fathers to suggest misunderstanding or the reception of rumor on their part, and sought to explain any apparent inconsistencies between accounts, Orchard readily acknowledges such inaccuracies and misunderstandings. For example, he maintains that the mistaken belief that Matthew was written in Aramaic or Hebrew is found in Origen, who paraphrased the ambiguous wording of Irenaeus, who in turn paraphrased Papias’ statement that Matthew was written in “Hebrew style,” causing a misunderstanding; the second recension of the Old Latin Prologue to Mark, which Black uses as part of his evidence, used the first recension and made interpretations from it to clarify some

---

<sup>175</sup> Ibid., 32-46, 59-61.

<sup>176</sup> Bernard Orchard, “The Historical Tradition,” in *The Order of the Synoptics: Why Three Synoptic Gospels?* (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1989), 226.

of its ambiguous wording; and Eusebius intentionally misinterpreted Papias' statement about the apostle John as the author of the Apocalypse to refer to a second, different person referred to as John the Elder, due to his opposition to the millenarianism expressed in the Apocalypse.<sup>177</sup>

Orchard shares Black's view on Peter's lectures, that the apostle alternated between Matthew and Luke, as the setting of the writing of Mark, but is not compelled to interpret every patristic source to be in support of his view.

In addressing Irenaeus's statement that Mark "published" the content of Peter's preaching after the apostle's death, Orchard agrees that the Gospel was published after Peter died, an interpretation resisted by Black, but inserts into Irenaeus's statement the allowance that Mark was first composed while Peter was still alive, and that the Gospel was only distributed after Peter's death. He makes the argument that the perfect tense of παραδέδωκεν, that Mark "has handed down" the content of Peter's preaching, according to Irenaeus's wording, leaves room for the interpretation that the Gospel was already written while Peter was alive; however, it is clear that Orchard is pressing the natural meaning of the text for the sake of defending direct Petrine narration behind the Gospel's composition.<sup>178</sup>

Orchard then turns to Eusebius' famous quotation of Papias at *EH* III. 39.14-17 that says, as Orchard translates it,

Mark, being the recorder of Peter, wrote accurately but not in order whatever he [Peter] remembered of the things either said or done by the Lord. For he had neither heard the Lord nor followed him, but later Peter, as I said, who used to make [his] discourses according to the chreias, but not making as it were a literary composition of the Lord's sayings, so that Mark did not err at all when he wrote certain things just as he [Peter] recalled them. For he had but one intention, not to leave out anything he had heard nor to falsify anything in them.

---

<sup>177</sup> Ibid., 129, 162, 181-3.

<sup>178</sup> Ibid., 163.

Orchard's interpretation requires the word ἑρμηνευτής to be translated as "recorder," rather than "interpreter," which is the natural reading of the text, grasping onto the translation of "recorder" because it is required for his theory. His interpretation also requires that in the use of the pronoun "he" throughout the passage, it must be understood as referring to Peter, despite it more naturally referring to Mark as the grammatical antecedent in each instance.<sup>179</sup> A further difficulty to Orchard's interpretation is the statement that "Mark did not err at all when he wrote certain things just as he recalled them," which, in Irenaeus's portrayal of the tradition, is due to the fact that Peter πρὸς τὰς χρείας ἐποιεῖτο τὰς διδασκαλίας, "would make his teachings according to the chreiai."<sup>180</sup> The use of the imperfect ἐποιεῖτο suggests a custom of Peter's manner of teaching, not a singular instance or particular occasion. Because Peter taught in this manner, the reasoning goes, Mark cannot be faulted for his manner of writing, because it is based on how he heard Peter teach. The necessity for Orchard to interpret the "as he remembered" to refer to Peter rather than Mark ruins the connection of the phrase to the previous clause of Peter's manner of teaching. If Peter is the antecedent rather than Mark, the structure of the sentence becomes nonsensical. Furthermore, if the "as he remembered" refers to Peter, it is unclear how that could be thought to reflect poorly on Mark, who would merely be the one recording Peter's speech. This leads to a greater issue with the models of Black and Orchard, that the Gospel entails the narration of Peter, because all of the patristic witnesses attribute the Gospel to Mark, who, according to their theory, was only the amanuensis. By comparison, the letters of Paul are considered letters of Paul and not a letter by Tertius or Silas or the one recording Paul, since their

---

<sup>179</sup> Ibid., 188-91.

<sup>180</sup> Ibid.

function is only to record the speech of the one dictating the letter. The very attribution of the Gospel to Mark as one who recorded the teaching of Peter implies he was not an amanuensis but that he wrote the Gospel on his own based on what he previously heard, since, if the Gospel of Mark is the record of Peter's narration as Orchard and Black suppose, the Gospel would be attributed to Peter and not Mark, since the latter was not an apostle and who only have functioned as the one recording the speech of the one who had apostolic authority. It is unimaginable that Mark could have recorded the speech of Peter and that the Gospel would be unanimously attributed to the non-apostolic amanuensis rather than the apostle being recorded.

As it concerns Irenaeus' statement in *Adv. Haer.* III.1.1 as recorded in Eusebius' *EH* V.8.1-5, which says, "Now Matthew brought out a written gospel among the Jews in their own dialect, while Peter and Paul were evangelizing in Rome and founding the church. But after their demise, Mark himself the disciple and recorder of Peter, has also handed on to us in writing what had been proclaimed by Peter," Orchard, as mentioned, understands Irenaeus to mean that the Gospel that Mark wrote while Peter was alive continued to carry his message even after his death, but he fails to acknowledge the juxtaposition of Irenaeus' comment on Mark with that of Matthew, that Matthew composed his Gospel while Peter and Paul were founding the church of Rome, but Mark wrote his Gospel after their demise.<sup>181</sup> It should be understood that as Irenaeus was speaking of the time of writing of Matthew's Gospel, so was he speaking the same of Mark's Gospel, unless it should be suggested, to apply Orchard's argument, that Irenaeus was attributing to the Gospel of Mark a continuing effect after the death of the apostles, but that Matthew did not. Orchard's interpretation, as with other instances, requires the Latin *interpres*, which translates the Greek ἐρμηνευτής, to mean "recorder" rather than "interpreter," again

---

<sup>181</sup> Ibid., 161-3.

resting his model on this tenuous interpretation.<sup>182</sup> And, as with the previous testimony, Irenaeus' comment allows for Mark to be the author of the Gospel, while Orchard's interpretation has Peter as the author with Mark as the amanuensis, a role that should not receive special attention in terms of authorship.

In Clement's *Adumbrationes in epistolas canonicas*, he relays the following: "Mark, the follower of Peter, while Peter was publicly preaching the Gospel at Rome in the presence of some of Caesar's knights and uttering many testimonies of Christ, on their asking him to let them have a written record of the things which had been said, wrote the Gospel which is called the Gospel of Mark, from the things said by Peter."<sup>183</sup> In his comments of this passage Orchard admits, "Peter had had no previous intention of writing a book of his proclamation of the gospel, nor had Mark," and that Mark provided a transcript of Peter's preaching upon request of the knights.<sup>184</sup> If it is the case that neither Peter nor Mark had any intention of writing a document based on Peter's preaching, as Orchard agrees, and that Mark provided the transcript upon request, the implication is, then, that Mark wrote the Gospel after the request was made, since he would not have transcribed Peter's proclamation while it was being given. In reading his theory into the passage, Orchard understands the Latin *palam* to mean not only that the preaching was done publicly but that it was "on official occasions," which is not suggested anywhere in the text, and seems contradicted by the very fact that the proclamation was made publicly.<sup>185</sup> In the first recension of the Old Latin Prologue to Mark, it says that "after the demise of Peter himself, the same [Mark] published this Gospel in the regions of Italy," which Orchard takes to mean that

---

<sup>182</sup> Ibid., 129.

<sup>183</sup> Ibid., 131.

<sup>184</sup> Ibid., 168.

<sup>185</sup> Ibid., 132.

Mark only published the Gospel after Peter's death, but had written it before. This serves only to preserve his theory, since with no separate mention of the writing of the Gospel and with only the publication mentioned, it can be assumed that the writer of the prologue was not intending a distinction and held the writing of the Gospel to be after Peter's death. In the second recension, Mark is again described as the *interpretes*, or in Greek, the ἐρμηνευτής of Peter, and that, "having been asked by the brethren in Rome, he wrote this short Gospel in the regions of Italy; when Peter heard about it, he approved and authorized it to be read to the church with [his own] authority." Even here Orchard seems to admit that Mark wrote the Gospel upon request and that Peter later learned of its composition.<sup>186</sup> While this supports the composition of Mark's Gospel during Peter's lifetime, it can hardly be the case that Peter could have been unaware of its composition in the setting advanced by Orchard, and so while it supports his theory in one way it undercuts it in another.

Orchard shares a similar setting for the composition of Mark as Black, though with some improvements. Recognizing that Mark's Gospel mainly uses Matthew and contains pericopes not found in Luke, rather than supposing Peter was approving Luke, Orchard sees Peter as "linking up" Matthew and Luke, which entails smoothing over inconsistencies, conflating the wording, and adding his own details as an eyewitness. Perhaps seeing the difficulty of Mark being Peter's attendant and managing the scrolls as well as recording his speech verbatim, Orchard envisions several secretaries who recorded Peter's lectures, and upon request of some in the audience, which included the knights mentioned by Clement, Mark used the transcripts of the secretaries to write an account. After Peter's death, Mark added the longer ending and published the Gospel

---

<sup>186</sup> Ibid., 148-50.

himself.<sup>187</sup> While Orchard's model removes the difficulties inherent in Black's theory that the purpose of the occasion was for Peter to approve the Gospel of Luke, he loses the basis for the occasion in the first place. If it is the case that Peter was intending to bridge the differences between the two Gospels, it should be expected that the product would be composed as a Gospel intended to replace the two, and at the least, upon its composition, such a model does not accord with Peter's indifference to its promulgation, if indeed the discrepancies between Matthew and Luke were such a difficulty that Peter felt the need to hold lectures to reconcile them.

Like Black, Orchard fails to sufficiently account for the omissions of the teaching material and resurrection appearances. Mark's publication of a second edition with an extended ending after Peter's death is described as having been composed out of respect for Peter, but that would entail the contrary. Orchard and Black must at the same time defend Peter as having good reason for stopping at Mk 16:8 but then deny that Mark's later addition was done because he perceived the account as deficient, that Mark did not respect or appreciate Peter's decision to end the narration at that point, and that it would be presumptuous for Mark to add to Peter's testimony. At the same time they implicitly concede it is a later addition, but they cannot allow for the Gospel to end at 16:8 because of its effect on the interpretation of the Gospel it necessitates, just as the redactions made in the Gospel, in comparing details in Mark with Matthew and Luke, particularly with regard to its presentation of the disciples, must also be ignored. The nature of the occasion in either model, whether Peter was approving Luke or reconciling Matthew with Luke, does not accord with the public description of the event as stated in the patristic testimony. Herein lies the primary issue with this model, that it attempts to

---

<sup>187</sup> Bernard Orchard, "How the Synoptic Gospels Came into Existence," in *The Order of the Synoptics: Why Three Synoptic Gospels?* (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1989), 263-74.



reconcile the internal redactional evidence with the external patristic testimony, with the result that it agrees with neither.

### Owen's Synthetic Model

In establishing the 2GH, Owen rejected the patristic testimony that Mark wrote his Gospel while Peter was in Rome on the grounds that such a scenario would be incompatible with the timing of its composition, and instead held that, due to the order of Mark compared to Matthew and Luke, the explanatory glosses added to his text, and the apparent conflation of his text with Matthew and Luke, that Mark intended to synthesize the Jewish Gospel of Matthew and Gentile Gospel of Luke.<sup>188</sup> This model Griesbach is likely to have encountered and rejected, due to the evidence that he had read and was influenced by Owen's work to further investigate the 2GH argument from order.<sup>189</sup>

### Dungan's Synthetic Model

The interest of connecting the Gospel to Peter persists with Dungan's model, though it avoids the difficulties inherent in the view that it was composed as a record of Peter's narration, instead maintaining that Mark, as the assistant of Peter and Paul, wrote the Gospel after the death of the apostles. Important to the formulation of his model is the Gospel's relation to 1 Peter, which he argues was written by the apostle. This functions as Dungan's primary form of external

---

<sup>188</sup> Henry Owen, *Observations on the Four Gospels: Tending Chiefly, to Ascertain the Times of Their Publication; And to Illustrate the Form and Manner of Their Composition* (London: n.p., 1764), 49-84, 107.

<sup>189</sup> As Dungan relays, Orchard discovered that Owen's work was catalogued as part of Griesbach's library upon his death. Personal letter from Bernard Orchard dated 1988, quoted in David L. Dungan, *A History of the Synoptic Problem: The Canon, the Text, the Composition, and the Interpretation of the Gospels* (New York: Doubleday, 1999), 484 n. 48.

evidence to substantiate his theory, foregoing the appeal to patristic testimony as seen with the other models. His argument depends on three points: 1 Peter was written by the namesake apostle, incorporating elements from liturgies and other church traditions, references from the LXX, and motifs present in both Jewish and Gentile religious thought; there was a need for reconciliation between the Judaizing and Pauline camps in the Church, of which Peter stood in the middle; and there was a time of peace in Rome under Vaspasian's reign after the death of Nero, during which some from the Roman elite, seeking to know more about Christianity, contacted Mark as one who had accompanied both Peter and Paul, and requested a written record of Jesus' ministry. In Dungan's view, they were unwilling to read Matthew or Luke, despite being, as Dungan agrees, generously distributed at the time and undoubtedly available, because the Roman elite, wanting to know more about the Christian faith, did not want an account from either the Judaizing or libertine factions. As such, the Gospel that was produced was intended to be above the debate, siding with neither, instead focusing on Jesus' miracles, with the result that Mark omitted much of the teaching material. A birth narrative is excluded because Mark wished to follow the Petrine outline as presented in Acts. The presuppositional desire to view Mark as the synthesis of Jewish and Gentile Christianity as represented by Matthew and Luke reaches its climax in Dungan, who, after emphasizing the divide in the Church between the two factions and seeing himself as establishing Mark as the synthesis bridging the two, proclaims, "If it had not been for the meticulously sewn kerygmatic suture between the Gospels of Matthew and Luke [that is, the Gospel of Mark], the second century orthodox leadership probably could not have had the ammunition to survive the ravages of the Marcionite and Montanist controversies."<sup>190</sup> In

---

<sup>190</sup> David L. Dungan, "The Purpose and Provenance of the Gospel of Mark according to the 'Two-Gospel' (Owen-Griesbach) Hypothesis," in *New Synoptic Studies: The Cambridge Gospel Conference and Beyond*, ed. William R. Farmer (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1983), 439.

his presuppositional excitement, then, of the potential that the Gospel of Mark could have theologically bridged the two previous Gospels, each representing a faction of the Church, he goes so far as to say, as can be seen from his statement, that the writing of Mark is what sewed the Church together and prevented division from the two parties, a supposition that is patently ridiculous.<sup>191</sup>

The dogmatic motive of seeing Mark as the synthesis of Matthew and Luke, the former representing Jewish Christianity and the latter Gentile Christianity reaches its height in Dungan. Even in the formulation of his model, however, he acknowledges that Mark exhibits a “disdain for the niceties of the commandments of Moses” and that Mark has added the comment that Jesus declared all foods clean at Mk 7:19, observations that undermine his presentation of Mark as a non-partisan document in the debate about Torah observation.<sup>192</sup> It seems, then, that Dungan does not even believe his own theory, and it derives, rather, from a desire to place a bow on the history of Christianity, that is, that there was a controversy that existed in the Church, with one side represented by Matthew and the other side by Luke, with Mark serving as the knot that tied both together, serving to present the Synoptic history in a neat package; but that it seems “too perfect” to not be the case, as one can describe it, does not, evidently to the disappointment of many 2GH proponents, mean the model accords with reality; rather, the study of the history of the Synoptic Gospels requires a maturity and scholarly integrity to view the data as the evidence best suggests, and not to contort the data into a paradigm because it is ideal according to one’s presuppositions. It is not surprising that those who espouse such a view of Mark point to the external evidence of the debate in the Church rather than internal evidence from the selection of

---

<sup>191</sup> Ibid., 411-40.

<sup>192</sup> Ibid., 436.

material and redactional changes made by the evangelist, because there is no internal evidence to commend it. On the contrary, Mark is a thoroughly Gentile Gospel, and evinces an intention not only to include material from Matthew and Luke that promotes the extension of the gospel to the Gentiles as a primary redactional interest but also material that emphasizes the needlessness of following the Law. Furthermore, Mark's redactions of his source material only accentuate these themes, with the result that Mark can be considered, far from Dungan's portrayal of the Gospel, more pro-Gentile and anti-Law than Luke. This discrepancy also seems implicitly admitted by the form of his argument. Dungan argued for the Petrine authorship of 1 Peter so intently because, as he recognized, it is vital to his argument by fulfilling the same purpose as does patristic testimony for the other models previously described. By linking Peter and Mark through 1 Peter and the Gospel, this allows Dungan to speak over the apparent lack of internal evidence to support the model with his assertion that the Gospel is associated with the apostle and the controversy over the Law. Dungan, then, is completely blinded by his dogmatic interests to accurately characterize the redactional interests of Mark according to the internal evidence.

#### Griesbach's Abridgment Model

The demonstrable alternation between Matthew and Luke according to the order of pericopes in Mark serves as the primary argument for Markan posteriority by Griesbach, who, like Owen, took it as self-evident that Mark's use of the other two Gospels is contradictory to Mark's recording of Peter's testimony. Papias, he argues, inferred that Mark wrote his Gospel using Peter's testimony in order to explain how Mark could have written the Gospel, since he did not follow Jesus during His ministry, and this association would be natural due to the connections between Peter and Mark, and that Papias, in seeking to explain the difference in

Mark's order, inferred that Mark wrote as he remembered Peter's preaching. Against Papias' statement that Mark intended not to omit anything he had remembered, Griesbach counters that this cannot be true due to Mark's omission of a resurrection appearance from Peter, which Mark would undoubtedly have heard, a contradiction that betrays the conjecture behind Papias' statements, rather it deriving from reliable tradition. Griesbach notes the discrepancy in Clement's accounts, that as recorded in *EH* II.15 Peter approved of the request for Mark to write, while in *EH* VI.14 he learned of it afterward and gave his approval, again showing the unreliability of the patristic traditions. The testimony behind Mark's composition is at one place identified with Peter's preaching in public and elsewhere as dictation to Mark. According to Griesbach, the "traditions" are more aptly described as rumors, rife with conflict and conjecture, and as such, are not reliable witnesses to the composition of Mark's Gospel.<sup>193</sup>

While Griesbach's notice of the order of the Synoptic material is what gave rise to Markan posteriority, it is within the pages of this very treatise that contained its downfall. In attempting to answer objections concerning Mark's redaction of the material from Matthew and Luke as required by his theory, Griesbach recognized that such redactions would have had to have been according to some unknown intention of the author. To the objection that Mark would be unnecessary under the 2GH, he replies that the Gospel was meant to serve the needs of the evangelist's community, but there is provided no indication of what needs the Markan redaction suggest. Against the objection that an abridgment of Matthew and Luke would not have been received by the Church, Griesbach counters that the audience of his Gospel cannot be known, and that even under Markan priority he would have known and omitted the story of Jesus' birth

---

<sup>193</sup> J. J. Griesbach, *J. J. Griesbach: Synoptic and Text-Critical Studies 1776-1976*, vol. 34, Society for the New Testament Studies Monograph Series, ed. Bernard Orchard and Thomas R. W. Longstaff (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978), 103-18.

due to his inevitable exposure to such traditions as an apostolic attendant. He writes, “It depends entirely on the intention of the author whether it is preferable to add to, or subtract from, what others wrote before him,” but he fails to advance any theory on the intentions behind the Gospel’s composition.<sup>194</sup> In the introduction of his treatise, he finds that Mark has an apparent interest in Jesus as Teacher, but in answering to the omission of much of the teaching material in his sources, he admits that Mark’s rationale for the omissions is inexplicable.<sup>195</sup> Mark uses the story in Matthew of Jesus and Peter walking on the sea, but omits the experience of Peter, to which Griesbach again has no answer.<sup>196</sup> Most telling of all, Griesbach recognizes that Mark includes from Matthew the promise made by Jesus that the disciples would meet Him in Galilee after the resurrection, but that he omits the appearance. Contrary to his previous answers that the objections of omission are baseless and purposeless because the intentions behind the Gospel’s composition cannot be known, this omission is apparently too much for him to reconcile with the rationale of his previous responses, and so he denies that Mark could have ended his Gospel at 16:8, supposing that the true ending must be lost. As he notes, however, this objection militates against Markan priority as well, since, whether Mark used Matthew and Luke according to the 2GH or oral tradition, Peter’s testimony, or some other sources according to Markan priority, the theory must be reconciled with the fact that Mark has narrated the anticipation of a Galilee appearance but closed his Gospel without an appearance narrative.<sup>197</sup>

While Griesbach recognized the inconsistencies of the patristic sources and the seeming alternation between Matthew and Luke in Mark’s order that lends to the 2GH, he was not able to

---

<sup>194</sup> Ibid., 119.

<sup>195</sup> Ibid., 106, 123-5.

<sup>196</sup> Ibid., 126.

<sup>197</sup> Ibid., 127-8.

provide a plausible explanation for the evangelist's use of his sources, a deficiency that plagued the theory and persisted among its proponents until Markan priority rose to preeminence in the void that was created by the 2GH proponents' inability to substantiate their theory.

### Riley's Abridgment Model

Riley introduces his model with the useful observation that it should not be assumed that each of the Gospels was written for the same purpose, with Matthew appearing to have been written for general use in the Church, while Luke's dedication to Theophilus, historiographical approach, and higher literary style reveal the intention for his Gospel to be part of private collections. Rather than starting from the external evidence of the patristic sources, Riley turns to the internal evidence of Mark's redactions to determine his purposes for writing the Gospel. With regard to Mark's omission of the birth narratives of his predecessors, Riley appeals to Mark's apparent disinterest in Jesus as the Son of David as the reason for his decision not to include the material on Jesus' birth. This is despite the fact that Mark could present a birth narrative without that emphasis, even if it was important to Matthew and Luke. The difficulty with the use of this rationale becomes immediately apparent when Riley turns next to his reasoning for Mark's omission of much of the teaching material, since, contrary to his reasoning for Mark's omission of the birth narratives, Mark does refer to Jesus as Teacher and narrate instances of His teaching frequently throughout his Gospel, as Riley is forced to admit. As he puts it, "Although there is much teaching in Matthew and Luke which he does not use, clearly Mark does not underestimate the place of teaching in Jesus' Ministry."<sup>198</sup> Sharing the same point

---

<sup>198</sup> Harold Riley, "The Internal Evidence," in *The Order of the Synoptics: Why Three Synoptic Gospels?* (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1989), 77.

that Griesbach previously argued, it is evident from Mark's constant references to Jesus' parables that he must have been aware of other parables than those he included, whether under the 2GH or 2DH alike. The teaching material that he does include appears to share similar thematic interests, particularly the proclamation of the gospel. He is forced to the conclusion that follows: "Mark was aware of many parables of Jesus which he did not include in his Gospel; that he was not setting out, like Matthew or Luke, to include an exposition of the teaching of Jesus for the sake of the Christian disciples, but writing with a more limited purpose, and confining himself to the presentation of Jesus as the Christ and Son of God."<sup>199</sup>

Riley addresses the possibility that Mark was written to denigrate the disciples, with three objections. First, he finds that most of the examples are carried over from Matthew and Luke. Second, he finds there to be only two examples that come from Mark, one in each of the two feeding stories, and these he finds to be derived from Mt 16:8-11. Third, he finds a counter-example in comparing Mk 14:4 with Mt 26:8, where Mark seems to be casting the disciples in a better light than does Matthew. To the contrary of the denigration of the disciples, Riley supposes that the young man who fled at Gethsemane is autobiographical, and in including this detail the author is associating himself with the failure of the other disciples.<sup>200</sup> Riley instead finds that Mark has decided to focus on the acts of Jesus rather than His teachings, with the aim of producing faith in the reader through the demonstration of Jesus' identity through the material describing His miracles and passion. As he says, "His book is strictly kerygmatic: its purpose is to call men to 'repent, and believe in the gospel' (1:15). It is a book of appeal to Christian

---

<sup>199</sup> Ibid., 73-9.

<sup>200</sup> Harold Riley, *The Making of Mark: An Exploration* (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1989), 213-4.



commitment, the consequences of which could be worked out in the continuing life of the church.”<sup>201</sup> The Gospel of Mark, then, is an evangelistic tract intended to persuade unbelievers of the truth of Jesus through the presentation of narrative material, from which further instruction on the teachings of Jesus can be received upon introduction into the Church. Since he has rejected the possibility that Mark wrote his Gospel to attack the disciples, he argues for the authenticity of the longer ending of Mark, arguing first that if the women failed to inform the disciples of the incident, Mark himself could not have known, which requires the assumption that the young man at the tomb is an angel as in Mark’s sources; second, that the “appearances are part of the experience of Jesus’ followers, not an account of what was happening to their Lord,” implying that the Gospel writers did not believe Jesus’ body had a physical location in between appearances; and third, that the longer ending does align with Mark’s style as represented elsewhere, which is not without reason or coincidence a position that is only paired with concerns for the interpretation of Mark’s Gospel if it is held to have ended at 16:8.<sup>202</sup>

Riley’s denial of Mark’s intended denigration of the disciples is only possible because he blinds himself due to his own presuppositions and denies the readily apparent purposes of Mark’s redactional changes to his sources. In the case of the Beelzebul controversy, he acknowledges that Mk 3:20-21, which speaks of οἱ παρ’ αὐτοῦ, “those around/with Him,” who came to restrain Him because they heard Jesus was out of His mind, has been made structurally parallel to the scribes coming down from Jerusalem because they said Jesus has Beelzebul in v. 22, and that vv. 20-21, which is a Markan composition that replaces the exorcism in Matthew and Luke, is unrelated to the pericope of Jesus’ family that has been appended to the controversy

---

<sup>201</sup> Ibid., 214.

<sup>202</sup> Ibid., 93-7.

at vv. 31-35, denying that the οἱ παρ' αὐτοῦ, as a result of its placement, refers to Jesus' family. The placement of the two pericopes at the beginning and end of the Beelzebul controversy are unexplained, except that he says it is "intervening material to cover the lapse of time [that] has been set," which is counter to the fact that vv. 20-21, as he recognized, are Mark's composition, with vv. 31-35 coming from Matthew and Luke. It cannot be accurate, then, that vv. 22-30 is inserted between vv. 20-21 and 31-35, since the composition of vv. 20-21 would be for the purposes of connecting to vv. 31-35 after the Beelzebul controversy it is set before. His explanation for the purpose of vv. 20-21, if it is to be maintained that it is unrelated to vv. 31-35, is simply that Mark replaced the exorcism in Matthew and Luke and "has instead provided his own kind of introduction," with no rationale for why he decided to replace the introduction in both of his sources and compose his own. After the Beelzebul controversy of vv. 22-30, Riley supposes that Mark moves to the pericope of Jesus' family at vv. 31-35, omitting the material shared by Matthew and Luke, for the reason that, "Mark can feel he has made his point" concerning the controversy, skipping ahead to the family pericope being placed right afterward, which he views as unrelated to vv. 22-30.<sup>203</sup>

After the parable of the sower, the disciples ask the meaning of the parable, and, following Matthew, Mark says at Mk 4:10-12 that parables are given to those outside so that they would not understand and be forgiven. Mark then adds at v. 13 that Jesus says, "Do you not understand this parable? How then will you understand all the parables?" This redaction Riley attributes to Mark being "blunt" but without an intention to denigrate the disciples, elsewhere calling it an "expansion," failing to recognize that Mark has purposefully added the statement from Jesus that the disciples do not understand the parables immediately after His claim that they

---

<sup>203</sup> Ibid, 40-3.

are intended to confound outsiders, that is, equating the disciples with those who do not believe.<sup>204</sup> At the end of his commentary on the parable section, Riley admits that Mark appends to the phrase taken from Matthew, “He did not speak to them [the outsiders] without a parable,” with his own additional detail at vv. 33-34, “but privately to His own disciples he explained everything,” curiously admitting it builds off v. 11, where Jesus said, “to you has been given the secret of the kingdom of God, but for those outside everything is in parables,” a connection that would suggest the identification of the disciples with the outsiders who are to be confounded by the parables.<sup>205</sup>

At the rejection of Nazareth, to Matthew’s phrasing at Mt 13:57, “A prophet is not without honor, except in His own country and in his own house,” Mark adds at Mk 6:4, “and among His own kin,” which Riley sees as a pleonastic redundancy of Matthew’s “and in His own house,” akin to the redundancies found throughout Mark’s Gospel.<sup>206</sup> In the feeding of the five thousand, after Jesus tells the disciples to give the crowds bread to eat, it is Mark’s addition to Matthew and Luke that the disciples chastise Him with the question, “Shall we go and buy two hundred denarii worth of bread, and give it to them to eat?” Due to John’s account having similar wording, Riley attributes Mark’s addition to the knowledge of tradition outside the other two Gospels, which was included in John as well.<sup>207</sup> In the following account of Jesus walking on the water, Mark omits Peter’s walking on the water, which, as he mentions, is in line with his omission of other stories about Peter, because, as he says, “they do not contribute to the working

---

<sup>204</sup> Ibid., 47, 123.

<sup>205</sup> Ibid., 51-2.

<sup>206</sup> Ibid., 67.

<sup>207</sup> Ibid., 80.

out of his own evangelistic purpose.”<sup>208</sup> Mark removes the detail that the disciples fell at Jesus’ feet and extolled Him as the Son of God, instead replacing this with, “They were utterly astounded, for they did not understand about the loaves, but their hearts were hardened,” which, as Riley admits, is also connected to the following feeding story, where Jesus asks the disciples, “Do you not yet perceive or understand? Are your hearts hardened?”<sup>209</sup> Despite the recognition of this redactional overlay in Mark that functions to denigrate the disciples, Riley continues to deny such an intention on the part of the evangelist.

The two unique healings in Mark of the blind and deaf men are understood by Riley to connect to his redactional statements of the misunderstandings of the disciples throughout his Gospel, and that they speak figuratively of spiritual deafness and blindness, but rather than connecting the statements that are of the disciples with the healings as statements about the disciples, Riley instead interprets them as figurative lessons to the readers of the Gospel, that Jesus can cure their spiritual deafness and blindness as well.<sup>210</sup> In between these two unique healings is the feeding of the four thousand and the pericope on the yeast of the Pharisees, where Mark adds Jesus’ rebuke, “Are your hearts hardened? Having eyes do you not see, and having ears do you not hear?” which Riley acknowledges points back to the parable of the sower at Mk 6:52, which addressed the inability of the outsiders to comprehend Jesus’ parables.<sup>211</sup> Riley concedes, then, that the pericope of Jesus walking on the water connects directly to the two feeding stories, and that the feeding of the four thousand and pericope on the yeast of the Pharisees are surrounded by two unique healings that allegorize spiritual deafness and blindness,

---

<sup>208</sup> Ibid., 82.

<sup>209</sup> Ibid.

<sup>210</sup> Ibid., 96.

<sup>211</sup> Ibid., 94.

with this section interwoven with redactional statements on the spiritual obduracy of the disciples, but refuses to admit the redactional intention to denigrate the disciples. Riley perhaps did not see it as important that Mark has omitted Matthew's vocative, "You of little faith," of Jesus' response to the obdurate disciples, which would have been omitted because it grants that the disciples had faith, but does note the omission of Matthew statement that the disciples understood the metaphor at the end of the pericope, where Mark abruptly ends his version with Jesus' question, "Do you not understand?"<sup>212</sup> The confession of Peter follows the second unique healing in Mark, where Mark removes the content of Peter's rebuke, "God forbid, Lord! This shall never happen to You," which lends to the theme of denigration, as well as the comment in Jesus' response, "You are a stumbling block to Me," which does not, but Riley has no comment on the purpose behind either of these changes.<sup>213</sup>

After the Transfiguration, Mark adds a comment after Jesus tells the disciples not to tell anyone what they saw until after the resurrection, that the disciples did not understand what Jesus meant by saying He would rise from the dead, an addition of the disciples' misunderstanding, and after Jesus tells them that John the Baptist is the Elijah who was to come before the Son of Man would suffer, Mark omits the confirmation in Matthew that the disciples understood, an omission of the disciples' understanding.<sup>214</sup> In the pericope of the disciples preventing children from coming to see Jesus, Mark adds the detail that Jesus "was indignant" at them.<sup>215</sup> In the third passion prediction, Mark adds the detail that the disciples were following Jesus to Jerusalem

---

<sup>212</sup> Ibid., 93-5.

<sup>213</sup> Ibid., 99.

<sup>214</sup> Ibid., 104.

<sup>215</sup> Ibid., 118.

afraid.<sup>216</sup> In the request of James and John, Riley is forced to admit that Mark has omitted that their mother made the request directly, which under the 2DH was added by Matthew to soften the negative portrayal the request makes of the disciples, and that the evangelist has replaced the description of the mother's request in Matthew, "asking Him for something," to the direct and less flattering quotation from James and John, "Teacher, we want you to do for us whatever we ask of you."<sup>217</sup> In the story of the healing of Bartimaeus, Matthew specifies that the crowds rebuked the beggars, whereas Mark replaces the crowds with the subject "many," which is an ambiguity that would allow for those who rebuked the beggar in his version to consist of the disciples as well as the crowd as found in Matthew's version, an alteration that the subtle effect of which is not recognized by Riley.<sup>218</sup> He persists in his obduracy concerning the consistent extension and heightening of the theme of the disciples' spiritual obtuseness.

In the scene of the garden of Gethsemane, after Jesus confronts the sleeping disciples, Mark adds, "they did not know what to answer Him," which points back to his addition of much the same in his version of the Transfiguration.<sup>219</sup> Turning to Jesus' arrest, Riley also notes that the instruction to "lead Him away safely" was added by Mark to the instruction to seize Jesus.<sup>220</sup> He recognizes that the unique addition of the young man who is described as following Jesus at Mk 14:51 after the other disciples are said to have forsaken Jesus and fled in the previous verse, suggests that the young man continued to follow Jesus after the others departed. As he says, then, because the other disciples fled, this information must have come from the young man himself if

---

<sup>216</sup> Ibid., 123-4.

<sup>217</sup> Ibid., 125.

<sup>218</sup> Ibid., 128.

<sup>219</sup> Ibid., 170.

<sup>220</sup> Ibid., 171.

Mark is to have recorded it, and offers the possibility that it is autobiographical. He notes the similarities in wording between the description of this young man and the one present at the empty tomb. However, because the young man's garment is grabbed and he runs away as well, Riley finds that the man is cast in the same light as the other disciples, failing to note the difference in his portrayal, and concludes that nothing is to be made of the similarities with the empty tomb story, because the similar descriptions, the unique word for "young man," the word for "clothed," and "fled," the latter of which is also used at v. 50 to describe the fleeing of the other disciples, had no opportunity to be used elsewhere, and so constitute a coincidence.<sup>221</sup> With regard to Peter's denial, Riley acknowledges that Mark has two cock crows rather than the one in Matthew and Luke, but provides no possible rationale for this redactional decision according to his model.<sup>222</sup>

In examining the longer ending of Mark, Riley agrees that there are differences in wording that are uncharacteristic with Markan style elsewhere, but contends that this is due to the uniqueness of the section in comparison to the rest of the Gospel. He finds it "probable" that the longer ending is authentic, no doubt because, as he says, the ending of 16:8, the women's silence, does not function as a dramatic climax and nor is it, as he puts it, "the most effective way of proclaiming the Resurrection;" as such, in his estimation, there cannot be found a reason for the Gospel to end at this point. Later on, however, due to his lack of confidence in the authenticity of the longer ending, he entertains the possibility that Mark ended at 16:8 because it marks the end of the similarities between Matthew and Luke.<sup>223</sup> His evaluation of the Gospel is

---

<sup>221</sup> Ibid., 172.

<sup>222</sup> Ibid., 178.

<sup>223</sup> Ibid., 195-207.

characterized by a presuppositional dismissal of the possibility that Mark had a redactional intention of portraying the disciples negatively, which in turn prevents the recognition of a valid rationale for Mark to end his Gospel at 16:8. Rather than forming a conclusion of Mark's purpose in writing from his redactional changes, Riley has formed his conclusion from his own presuppositions and either ignored, misinterpreted, or downplayed the evidence of Mark's polemic against the disciples in an effort to preserve those presuppositions. Contrary to Riley's initial assertion that no redactional interest to denigrate the disciples is identifiable in Mark because the examples are mere expansions of his sources or selections of paralleled material present in Matthew and Luke, Riley denies the relevance of the consistently observed examples to this effect on the basis of its implication for the purpose of the Gospel's composition.

#### Mann's Redactional Model

Recognizing that Mark's particular selection of material necessitates the evangelist's use of the Gospel material for definite purposes, Mann centers his model of Mark around the apocalyptic discourse in Mk 13. In his view, Mark was writing for a church undergoing the tumultuous time leading up to the destruction of Jerusalem, identifying the Gospel as primarily revolving around the theme of conflict. He sees the Mk 13 discourse as more urgent than Matthew's in terms of the imminence of the destruction of Jerusalem, but as distancing the eschaton. Mark was foreseeing the destruction that was on the horizon and intent to warn the church to prepare, while Matthew connected the time of the destruction of Jerusalem with the arrival of the eschaton. Mann maintains that the Gospel ended at 16:8, rejecting the longer



ending that is supported by most other 2GH proponents, seeing the sudden and fearful ending as reflective of the urgency and danger of the circumstances surrounding the Gospel's writing.<sup>224</sup>

Several redactional changes can be observed in Mark's use of Matthew and Luke that concern eschatology. Mark has omitted "and with fire" at Mk 1:8 in his version of the Baptist's preaching, which Mann seems to agree is likely to refer to eschatological judgment.<sup>225</sup> Mann has nothing to say of the redactional purposes behind Mark's version of the signs of times at Mk 8:11-13, despite noting it is conflation of Matthew and Luke, which is especially noteworthy due to his model hinging on Mark's eschatological views.<sup>226</sup> In this pericope, Mark is following the order of Matthew, and Mark has drastically truncated the material and instead given Jesus a rather abrupt denial of the request. The evangelist appears to have an overall interest in dissuading speculation of the timing of the end, preferring the approach of maintaining a disposition prepared for the Lord's return. In Mark's inclusion of the saying about being "salted with fire" at Mk 9:49-50, Mann posits that the fire represents the circumstances of the community, with the message that they will "emerge as 'seasoned' protagonists" once on the other side.<sup>227</sup>

In his analysis of the Beelzebul controversy, Mann is compelled to agree that οἱ παρ' αὐτοῦ refers to Jesus' family, that they came to seize Him because they heard Jesus had lost Himself in His religious fervor. Mann repudiates the interpretation that ἐλεγον γὰρ ὅτι ἐξέστη is in reference to the crowd, that Jesus' family heard the crowd had become unruly, noting that

---

<sup>224</sup> C. S. Mann, *Mark: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1986), 72-95.

<sup>225</sup> *Ibid.*, 197.

<sup>226</sup> *Ibid.*, 330-1.

<sup>227</sup> *Ibid.*, 384.

while Matthew's version describes the crowd as astonished due to the exorcism they had witnessed, there is no suggestion of unruliness and nor does the context in Mark suggest it. The use of κρατέω suggests more than calming a crowd, and lends to the idea of Jesus' family seeking to restrain Jesus. However, Mann, in not wishing to incriminate Jesus' family with an association with the condemned Pharisees, maintains that the pericope on Jesus' family in vv. 31-35 is placed after the Beelzebul controversy merely because of its related topic of Jesus' family, but he makes no effort to provide a rationale for vv. 20-21, which is necessarily Mark's redaction on the 2GH. Thus, in his view, vv. 20-21 are connected to the Beelzebul controversy only so far as there is an accusation against Jesus in both, and vv. 31-35 is placed after the controversy because of the shared topic on Jesus' family.<sup>228</sup>

Mann struggles with the fact that in Mark's version of the parable of the sower, that according to the reason for Jesus' use of parables according to Mk 4:10-12, Jesus purposefully taught enigmatically so that the crowds would not understand and would be condemned, positing either that Mark misunderstood what was intended by the word "parables" or that this section was placed in this context due to association with the word "parable," in an effort to obviate the theological difficulty. Although he sees that the disciples will be later presented as spiritually blind, here they are given the secrets of the kingdom. However, when he turns to v. 13, where the disciples are portrayed as not being able to understand the parables, Mann admits, "If the discussion in the previous section does issue in Mark's passing harsh judgment, then this preliminary sentence certainly blames the hearers."<sup>229</sup>

---

<sup>228</sup> Ibid., 251-9.

<sup>229</sup> Ibid., 264-7.

Turning to the pericope of Jesus walking on the sea, Mann admits to the disparaging intention of the redactional addition of Mk 6:52 at the end of the story and to the difficulty of the omission of Peter's experience, though he suggests that Peter's experience as recorded by Matthew does not portray the apostle favorably. Such a claim, however, is contradicted by his admitted difficulty in explaining why Mark would omit it, since, if it were the case that Matthew's account was unfavorable, there should be no difficulty with Mark's omission of it.<sup>230</sup> For the pericope on the yeast of the Pharisees, Mann argues that its redactional links to the two feeding stories, and to Jesus walking on the water through Mk 6:52, which he neglects to admit, as well as the removal of Matthew's mention of the disciples' moment of understanding, results in a "terse ending" where "their total failure to apprehend the warning in v. 15 is left without a word of comment;"<sup>231</sup> yet he maintains that the disciples are intended to be sources of comfort for the readers, who may struggle with doubts or confusion as well. He rightly observes of the passage, "The 'signs' are always there, and they are self-authenticating, though hidden wholly from unbelievers."<sup>232</sup> His proposed redactional purpose hinges on his claim that Matthew and Mark's intentions are aligned, but if it is the case that Matthew's version aligned with that purpose, then Mark should not have made the redactional changes that can be observed in his version that have the result of unnecessarily disparaging the disciples.<sup>233</sup> It is evident that Mann's intention is to deny the changes Mark has made to protect his presuppositions concerning what he wishes Mark to have purposed in composing his Gospel. This he admits in his commentary on the next pericope, the blind man healed in two stages, where he first seeks to dismiss any

---

<sup>230</sup> Ibid., 306.

<sup>231</sup> Ibid., 333.

<sup>232</sup> Ibid.

<sup>233</sup> Ibid., 332-4.

potential implications of the passage that pose a difficulty for his model by positing it is merely a doublet with 7:32-37, and then writes, “One suggestion may be offered here with considerable hesitation. It is that Mark, anxious to emphasize that there was hope for the disciples to see the truth of the ministry of Jesus (and also need for his own community to do the same), found a fragmentary account of the healing of a blind man and adapted the narrative of 7:32-37 to the present account,” which, as he says, is suggested “with considerable hesitation,” an admission that it is due to his presuppositions that he is want to dismiss the passage as a doublet rather than recognize the Markan redaction in its construction.<sup>234</sup>

This is all the more evident by his intention to separate the confession of Peter that follows from the healing of the blind man, even going so far as to explicitly assure the reader that there is a “sharp division” between the two pericopes, with Peter’s confession beginning a distinct, new section.<sup>235</sup> He then attempts to explain the reasoning for the omission of the material positive toward Peter in the pericope, to which he says, “For our part, we regard the Markan text as all of a piece with the tightly controlled narrative so characteristic of this gospel. Everything extraneous to the account of ministry in action is excluded, and certainly anything which would draw attention away from Jesus.”<sup>236</sup> While it is certainly the case that under any source theory Mark has omitted that which does not pertain to his particular redactional interests, Mann’s argument faces the difficulty that the omission is in the context of Jesus’ rebuke of Peter, which is counter-weighted in Matthew by Jesus’ promise to the apostle, and that such a rationale requires the isolation of the instance from the context of the rest of the Gospel, which is rife not

---

<sup>234</sup> Ibid., 335-6.

<sup>235</sup> Ibid., 338-9.

<sup>236</sup> Ibid., 341.

only with omissions of material favorable to the disciples but active alterations and additions to their detriment. The unstated argument is that this is not an example of Markan hostility toward the disciples because the example does not on its own advance such a conclusion, but that is only the case because every other example is likewise treated in isolation and downplayed, or outright ignored, resulting in a self-feeding argument, where every instance is deemed insufficient to substantiate the claim because every other instance has been dismissed as insufficient for the same reason.

Mann's model depends on the Mk 13 discourse being programmatic for the purpose of the Gospel, but he does not produce much in the way of evidence to support such a contention. Mark aligns with both Matthew and Luke, except for minor changes, up to Mk 13:9-13, for which Mark switches to Luke and uses Lk 21:12-19, which itself takes from the discourse material in Mt 10, before returning to Matthew and closely following his version's wording and sequence for the remainder of the discourse. The redactional addition of Mk 13:10, "And the gospel must first be proclaimed to all the Gentiles/nations," is, as Mann observes, characteristically Markan language, lending to it being his composition, that interrupts the structure of vv. 9 and 11. Mann claims that it is "almost impossible to discern the purpose of the saying in its present context," because he rejects the notion that Mark has an interest in Gentile outreach. Rather, it appears that Mark is influenced by Mt 24:14 and has composed the insertion while using Luke, which he used to write vv. 9-13. He forms no conclusions from Mark's change of Lk 21:16, "You will be betrayed even by parents and brothers and relatives and friends, and they will put some of you to death," to Mk 13:12, "And brother will deliver brother to death, and father child, and child will rise up against parent and put them to death," which, he fails to recognize, uses Mt 10:21 rather than Lk 21:16, instead opting to use a version elsewhere from

Matthew's Gospel rather than the version available to him in the section of Luke's eschatological discourse that he is directly using as his source. The relevance of such a change is that the Matthean version emphasizes the hostility from brother to brother, which Mark may have preferred in accordance with his intention to denigrate the Lord's brother. Mann finds that at vv. 19-20, the details that no greater tribulation has or will occur, and that the days are cut short so that some will survive, are undeniably eschatological language, which is connected to the fall of Jerusalem at the hands of the Romans. Mann denies that in Mk 13:24-27 the evangelist envisioned a literal return of Jesus to earth, contending that the "hearing" of wars and other catastrophes is intended to prepare the church for the imminent tribulation upon the Roman attack of Jerusalem, but the imagery of "seeing" the Son of Man is a metaphor for perceiving in faith Jesus' mission and identity in light of the Passion, with the "coming" of the Son of Man and the new age referring to the dawning of the new covenant and age of the Church that was achieved by Jesus' death. To Mann, the Church's conception of the literal, physical return of Jesus originated from a misunderstanding, with Mark espousing the original view. This he has difficulty reconciling with the section on the parable of the fig tree that follows, particularly v. 30, "Truly I tell you that this generation will not pass away until all these things happen," which, whether it is in reference to either the Passion or the spiritual enlightenment of the disciples that resulted after the resurrection, is rendered nonsensical by his interpretation. As Mann rightly notes, however, one of the most noteworthy redactional changes is that Mark adds admonishments to be watchful throughout the discourse at vv. 9, 23, and especially at the end at vv. 33-37, adding a heightened sense of urgency to the discourses of his sources.<sup>237</sup> Against Mann, in acknowledging that Mark has a heavily evidenced interest in the inclusion of the

---

<sup>237</sup> Ibid., 498-541.

Gentiles, from Mark's changes it can be observed that he has the view that the ingrafting of the Gentiles must occur before the parousia, the accomplishment of which he sees as nearing or already fulfilled. As such, he calls the readers to diligence and preparation for the imminent return of Jesus.

While most 2DH proponents take the opportunity granted by the ambiguity of Mk 13:14 to place Mark before the fall of Jerusalem, Hooker makes the contrary argument. There is a seeming tension in Mark's version of the discourse between the reassurances that the end is yet to come despite the observation of the fulfillment of certain signs, and the urgent calls for watchfulness on account of the imminence of the parousia. While the latter is often associated with an early eschatology, it is also fitting soon after the destruction of the temple. With this first sign fulfilled, Mark excitedly reminds his readers, who perhaps had become disheartened by the delay of the parousia, that they have entered into the last times, and Jesus is expected to return at any time.<sup>238</sup> Mark follows Matthew closely after Mk 13:13, to the end of the discourse, with one of the most significant changes at v. 24, changing Matthew's *Εὐθέως δὲ μετὰ τὴν θλίψιν τῶν ἡμερῶν ἐκείνων* to *Ἀλλὰ ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις μετὰ τὴν θλίψιν ἐκείνην*, removing the *εὐθέως*, which is a word that Mark would be expected to carry over unless there is good reason for its omission.<sup>239</sup> This change is significant because of its pivotal placement in the discourse, with the material up to v. 23 describing the destruction of Jerusalem and v. 24 and on the arrival of the eschaton. Mark's removal of "immediately" at v. 24, while retaining the "after that tribulation" from Matthew's phrasing, permits an interval of time after the destruction of Jerusalem until the

---

<sup>238</sup> Morna D. Hooker, *The Gospel according to Saint Mark*, Black's New Testament Commentaries, ed. Henry Chadwick (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1997), 297-303.

<sup>239</sup> David B. Peabody, Lamar Cope, and Allan J. McNicol, *One Gospel from Two: Mark's Use of Matthew and Luke* (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 2002), 270-1.

coming of the Son of Man. Mark still keeps the “in those days,” which suggests the evangelist perceived that the current time had not yet exceeded that temporal description. This is contrary to Matthew’s presentation, which suggests the simultaneity of the parousia, and despite recognition of this fact, Matthew has been commonly dated to after the destruction of the temple, which, astoundingly, has not been seen to be contradictory with Matthew’s belief that Jesus would return at the time of the temple’s destruction. If Matthew anticipated that the parousia would happen “immediately” after the destruction of the temple, his Gospel could not have been written years or even a decade after the fact, as should be obvious. While this view is common among 2DH proponents, it is most egregious in the case of Strauss, who, to leave as much room as possible for the development of legend, dates Matthew so late that he makes an argument against Justin Martyr’s use of the Gospel in the middle of the second century,<sup>240</sup> and yet, he later cites Matthew’s use of εὐθέως to demonstrate that the evangelist believed the parousia would occur when Jerusalem fell, as an example of failed Christian prophecy.<sup>241</sup> At the same time, then, it is to be believed that Matthew thought the parousia would happen when the temple was destroyed, and unless it is to be supposed the evangelist thought Jesus returned in the past relative to the time of his writing, it is clear that this points to the time of the Gospel’s composition being before the destruction of the temple, in anticipation of the event.

An argument of equal footing is made by Sanders and Davies, who contend that the prediction in Mk 13 that the temple would not be left with one stone on top of another is evidence that his Gospel was written before AD 70, since, when the temple was destroyed, there

---

<sup>240</sup> David Friedrich Strauss, *The Life of Jesus, Critically Examined*, vol. 1, trans. George Elliot (London: Chapman Brothers, 1846), 58.

<sup>241</sup> David Friedrich Strauss, *The Life of Jesus, Critically Examined*, vol. 3, trans. George Elliot (London: Chapman Brothers, 1846), 85-6.



were in fact stones left on top of one another, resulting in the prediction not being literally true. Matthew and Luke, writing afterward, according to their argument, must have simply copied Mark without updating the prediction, despite finding that Luke has updated his discourse with details of the Roman seige.<sup>242</sup> This is a weak argument for several reasons. First, Sanders and Davies are not allowing for figurative speech, which would naturally be assumed, since it would be apparent to readers, as it must have been to Matthew and Luke, that the detail was not intended literally, critiquing the wording of the prediction to the point of absurdity. Second, if Matthew and Luke both kept the phrasing found in Mark, there is no reason to suppose that Mark could not have done the same with his source, whether oral or written, if he wrote after the fact like the other Gospels that are thought to have used his Gospel. Because Matthew and Luke have the same prediction, the same critique applies to them, making the argument for Mark being earlier a case of special pleading. Third, this assumes Mark would know that there are or are not in fact some stones left on top of another, which is an equally absurd expectation. The prediction is an expression of the temple's destruction, and whether there were or were not any stones still on top of another is not in view.

The best evidence that has been adduced for Matthew's dating after the destruction of the temple is that in the parable of the wedding banquet the king sends his troops to destroy the people who killed his servants and then burns down their city, which aligns with the fact that the Romans burned the temple when they attacked Jerusalem.<sup>243</sup> As Hooker notes, a prediction that Jerusalem would be destroyed by the Romans should not be taken as surprising. The Jewish prophetic tradition has a long history of such predictions, as it is the natural means that God's

---

<sup>242</sup> E. P. Sanders and Margaret Davies, *Studying the Synoptic Gospels* (Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press International, 1996), 17-8.

<sup>243</sup> *Ibid.*

punishment of the nation would be accomplished, and the increasing tensions between Judea and Rome brought such an outcome to near inevitability. Josephus records that a rabbi contemporary with Jesus also warned that the temple would be destroyed around the same time Jesus would have issued His prophecy.<sup>244</sup> The only detail in Matthew's parable that could be surprising, then, is that Matthew portrays the king as destroying the city with fire. It should not be surprising that fire would be used to destroy a city, so it must be judged if Matthew's reference to a city being destroyed is unlikely unless it was written after Jerusalem suffered such a fate. But with it established that such a prediction is par the course for the Jewish prophetic tradition, and became increasingly inevitable in the political climate at the time, as Mann noted, the parable did not need the fall of Jerusalem for inspiration, and it certainly does not undo the evidence that Matthew anticipated the parousia as coinciding with the temple's destruction. To the contrary, Matthew's inclusion of the pericope on the temple tax, which under the 2GH Luke and Mark would have later excluded, lends to the conclusion that the Gospel was written before the temple was destroyed more forcefully than the mention of a king destroying a city by fire in the parable of the wedding banquet lends to it being written after.<sup>245</sup>

While the differences between the two versions of the eschatological discourse point to Mark as secondary relative to Matthew, that the latter was written prior to the destruction of the temple and Mark in light of its fulfillment, there is little to suggest the topic constitutes a major interest for Mark. As Mann admitted, Mark largely follows Matthew's wording and sequence for his version of the discourse and there is little that pertains to eschatology in the Gospel elsewhere. The minor changes of removing "immediately" and adding three brief admonitions to

---

<sup>244</sup> Hooker, *The Gospel according to Saint Mark*, 304.

<sup>245</sup> Orchard, "How the Synoptic Gospels," 234.

be prepared in the discourse are certainly not sufficient to establish the topic as the primary purpose behind the Gospel's composition, especially since Mann has denied the relevance of other changes in the same passage that are at least of equal consequence, such as the importance for the ingrafting of the Gentiles to be accomplished before the parousia, which Mann was compelled to dismiss, and the exchange of a saying from Matthew in a section otherwise taken from Luke that pertains to the denigration of the disciples, a theme that Mann, as has been demonstrated, was forced to ignore not only in his analysis of this discourse but throughout the Gospel in order to maintain his presupposition, despite the evidence for such a redactional interest being far more pervasive and emphatic in comparison to the interest proposed by his model.

#### Peabody, Cope, and McNicol's Redactional Model

Peabody, Cope, and McNicol agree with Mann that the rationale behind the redactional alterations and omissions of material by Mark must be rooted in some particular motive beyond a general desire to present the teachings and deeds of Christ or as a mere abridgement of Matthew and Luke. The Gospel was written for the purpose of strengthening a persecuted church, which is primarily portrayed through the hostilities against Jesus from the Jewish religious authorities and Roman political leadership, with the disciples wavering in faith between Jesus and His opponents. This theme of conflict begins with Jesus' bout with the devil in the wilderness and is typified by the death of John the Baptist, which foreshadows the death of Jesus. Throughout His ministry, Jesus' identity as the Son of God remains hidden, providing an example to the Church

who were suffering at the hands of those who did not recognize the faith.<sup>246</sup> Peabody, Cope, and McNicol grant the negative portrayal of the disciples throughout the Gospel, which they see as building up to Peter's renunciation of Jesus, an event included to warn against the danger of apostasy. Since even Peter succumbed to it, the danger of apostasy knocks on the door of every Christian, and must all the more be guarded against. As such, in their view, even if the Gospel ended at 16:8, the rehabilitation of the disciples is implied.<sup>247</sup> The resurrection resulted in the full insight of the disciples who had previously failed, and the readers must cling to the faith they have in enduring persecution.<sup>248</sup>

While Matthew was concerned with the interpretation of the Law from a Christian perspective and Luke was concerned with the inclusion of the Gentiles into the Church, Mark is viewed to be written after the controversy over the Law and inclusion of the Gentiles had passed, when the Church already consisted largely of Gentiles. The Gospel, then, was intended to present the path of discipleship for the persecuted Gentile church in Rome. At the same time, Mark intended to reconcile contradictions between Matthew and Luke, since such discrepancies served as a difficulty for the Church, but Peabody, Cope, and McNicol also wish to maintain that, due to the omissions of material in Matthew and Luke, Mark was not written to replace Matthew and Luke.<sup>249</sup>

Mark adds the detail that Jesus was in the wilderness with "wild beasts," and Peabody, Cope, and McNicol take this to be a reference to the beasts that devoured Christians in Rome,

---

<sup>246</sup> Peabody, Cope, and McNicol, *One Gospel from Two*, 56-63

<sup>247</sup> *Ibid.*, 59.

<sup>248</sup> *Ibid.*, 59, 63.

<sup>249</sup> *Ibid.*, 60-3.

per the theme of persecution.<sup>250</sup> After following Matthew to the call of the disciples at Mk 1:16-20, Mark switches to Luke, where, after the healing of the leper, Mark uses Luke for the sequence of controversies between Jesus and the Jewish religious authorities, spanning Mk 2:1-3:6, which culminates in the plot to kill Jesus, taken from Matthew.<sup>251</sup> To the account of Jesus and the disciples plucking grain in the fields, Mark includes a saying on the Sabbath not present in his predecessors, which intensifies the liberal attitude toward the Law present in the story.<sup>252</sup> Although Mark is following Luke's sequence, he sides with Matthew by including the detail that after the healing of the man with the withered hand the Pharisees took counsel "so that they could kill Him," whereas Luke has the more ambiguous "they were discussing with one another what they might do to Jesus."<sup>253</sup> Peabody, Cope, and McNicol take note of the Markan addition to the story of Jesus walking on the water, that it is linked to the feeding stories by Mark, which they recognize as communicating that the disciples' spiritual blindness is caused by God and can only be remedied by divine action. This redaction, connected to the story of the rough waters, is according to their model intended to function as a metaphor for the spiritual strength given by God to believers who are in tumultuous situations.<sup>254</sup> In Mark's version of the young rich man who asked Jesus the requirements to inherit life, Mark omitted the reference to the Twelve judging the twelve tribes, though, they preface, this may be due to the specifically Jewish topic. Mark adds to the end of the saying the phrase "along with persecutions," evincing that his

---

<sup>250</sup> Ibid., 79.

<sup>251</sup> Ibid., 101, 105.

<sup>252</sup> Ibid., 108.

<sup>253</sup> Ibid., 110.

<sup>254</sup> Ibid., 167.

community was enduring persecution.<sup>255</sup> In Mark's version of Jesus' prediction that the disciples will desert Him when He is arrested, Mark omits the *οἱ μαθηταὶ* found in Matthew and instead uses *πάντες*. This change of subject has the purpose of including the readers in the disciples' assertion that they will not abandon Jesus, following in line with the theme of perseverance.<sup>256</sup>

This 2GH model, however, is built on one example and several other tenuous interpretive assumptions from their presuppositions of Mark's redactional purposes. The notion that the "wild beasts" refers to animals in arenas is tenuous at best. The controversies with the Pharisees are neutral to their model, as they have no advantage compared to other options. The placement of the pericope of Jesus walking on water is dictated by the sequence of Mark's sources due to his progression through Matthew and Luke, and does not necessarily evince a deeper meaning by being placed between the two feeding stories, just as the pericope on the signs of the times in the same section does not have particular significance according to their model, and it is unclear what Jesus' teaching on the cleanness of food and the healing of the Syrophenician woman's daughter, which are also set between the two feedings, have to do with this theme. The explicit connection to the feeding of the five thousand at Mk 6:52, at the end of the pericope of Jesus walking on water, is a description of the spiritual blindness of the disciples, as they recognize. The purpose of the connection of the pericopes of Jesus walking on water and the feeding of the five thousand, then, is stated by Mark in the redactional addition of Mk 6:52, and the rationale provided, while they attempt to connect it to the apparent denigration of the disciples, does not require it. They suppose that Mark needed to denigrate the disciples to properly represent the disciples as the readers for it to be better understood that it is intended as a metaphorical

---

<sup>255</sup> Ibid., 219-24.

<sup>256</sup> Ibid., 291.

encouragement for the readers to persevere in tumultuous circumstances. That Mark decided it would be useful to denigrate the readers by proxy so that they would better understand the story applies to them is not only a stretch of the imagination but treats Mk 6:52 in isolation, as though it is the only instance of this theme. Indeed, their interpretation concerning Mk 6:52 would only carry weight if the denigration of the disciples was unique to the pericope of Jesus walking on water, since the explanation provided necessarily can only apply to this pericope. However, as will be demonstrated, it is the case as they admit themselves that the theme persists throughout the entire Gospel, and their explanation of connecting it to the theme of persecution becomes steadily more and more neglected as their rationale to account for Mark's redactional changes as their analysis progresses. Furthermore, the removal of Peter's experience walking on the water as found in Matthew lends against their view, since, if according to their model, the purpose of the disparaging material on the disciples is to encourage the readers to faithfulness, all the more should Mark have included Peter's walking on the water, since, according to their view, the scene symbolizes the ability for the disciples to endure tumultuous circumstances. But, according to that interpretation, all the more should Peter's experience have been used by Mark, since its inclusion would be congruent with this model; indeed, its inclusion would be so suitable that its omission heavily militates against their view.

The crowning example of their model is the addition of the phrase "along with persecutions" at Mk 10:31, but this one example certainly does not substantiate the topic as a major redactional interest, let alone the defining principle behind the composition of the Gospel. Lastly, the suggestion that *οἱ μαθηταὶ* at Mt 26:35 was omitted so that Mk 14:31 reads, "they all were saying the same," as a type of joined recitation with the readers, is another instance of extensive, even if creative, interpretive liberty. In both Mt 26:33 and Mk 14:29, Peter says, *Εἰ*

(καὶ) πάντες σκανδαλισθήσονται, without οἱ μαθηταὶ, which both Mt 26:35 and Mk 14:31 point back to. The persecution theme, then, is built on one example, the addition of “and persecutions,” which is then assumed to be Mark’s purpose for the Gospel, and the other examples, which do not in themselves lend to this purpose, are hanged on this assumption, rendering the model insufficiently evidenced and circular. Even if it is the case that in all of these examples the purported redactional interest can be detected, the paucity of examples would hardly constitute a major theme, let alone the fundamental interest behind Mark’s redactions overall and the reason for the Gospel’s composition.

Mark first emphasizes the theme of the inclusion of the Gentiles in his redaction of the parable of the sower, changing the crop yield from one hundred, sixty, and thirty to thirty, sixty, and one hundred as a metaphor for the spread of the gospel and growth of the Church, a change that is also made at the end of his version of the parable’s interpretation, carrying over from Luke’s interpretation of the parable the explicit identification of the seed as “the word,” which refers to the gospel in both.<sup>257</sup> In his version of the purpose of parables at Mk 4:11-12, Mark expresses a different view than either Matthew or Luke, and instead sees a distinction between those on the outside who are given parables and those inside who are given salvific understanding of the gospel by God, with his focus on “the word” in his version of the interpretation of the parable shifting focus from the sower as in his sources to the soils’ reception of the gospel.<sup>258</sup> Mark’s unique addition of the parable of the seed growing secretly, omission of the other parables present in his sources, and the use of the parable of the mustard seed align

---

<sup>257</sup> Ibid.

<sup>258</sup> Ibid., 124-30.



with this intentional theme of growth.<sup>259</sup> Leading up to the pericope of the Syrophenician woman, Mark has modified the account of Jesus' travels to make it more explicit that Jesus had wandered into Gentile territory, changing the "withdraw" in Matthew to "went out," to portray it as a journey for the purpose of reaching Gentiles, whereas in Matthew it is for the purpose of withdrawing from hostile opponents. Mark has omitted the saying at Mt 15:24, "I was sent only to the house of Israel," due to his Gentile interest, and to Mt 15:26, "It is not right to take the children's bread and toss it to the dogs," Mark has modified it to, "Let the children be fed first," with the addition of "'first'" anticipating further Gentile outreach. As Peabody, Cope, and McNicol note, the woman's reply to Jesus' initial response is made more bold in Mark, which they find central to Mark's use of the passage.<sup>260</sup> More significant is Mark's insertion of Mk 13:10 into the eschatological discourse, that "the gospel must first be preached to all the nations" before the end, which is not only a statement that the gospel will reach the Gentiles but that the end will not come until that has happened.<sup>261</sup> And lastly, the evangelist has purposefully omitted previous references to Jesus as the Son of God in the course of his Gospel so that the exclamation of the Gentile centurion that Jesus is the Son of God could better serve as its climax.<sup>262</sup>

Mark's redaction of Jesus' controversy with the Pharisees over unwashed hands is paralleled only by Matthew and is one of the most thoroughly redacted passages in Mark's Gospel, with changes in order, explanatory glosses, several modifications to the wording, the

---

<sup>259</sup> Ibid., 130-5.

<sup>260</sup> Ibid., 175-8.

<sup>261</sup> Ibid., 267.

<sup>262</sup> Ibid., 316-21.

expansion of “and you do many things like this” at Mk 7:13, and the addition of the abrogation of dietary restrictions at v. 19.<sup>263</sup> The tying together of the themes of contention against the Jewish religious authorities and the inclusion of the Gentiles finds a dramatic example in the cleansing of the temple and the fig tree. Mark has split the curse of the fig tree and its withering into two pericopes surrounding the cleansing, allegorizing the Jewish religious leaders as the fruitless fig tree that will soon experience the judgment of God. Unique to Mark is the detail that the temple courts were being used for mundane reasons, and thus not respected as a place for Gentile worship, and adds that the temple is a house of prayer “for all the Gentiles” at Mk 11:17.<sup>264</sup> The sequence of controversies with the Pharisees that follows is an intensification of the previous controversy sequence from Mk 2:1-3:6, which ends at the beginning of Mk 13 with the prediction of the destruction of the temple.<sup>265</sup> While Matthew’s version of Jesus’ trial before the Sanhedrin maintained some legitimacy in the proceedings, Mark reworks it to highlight the disagreeing witnesses and false testimony, with the intention of further casting the Jewish authorities in a negative light.<sup>266</sup>

In Mark’s version of the Beelzebul controversy, the evangelist has elevated the accusation of the Pharisees from the charge that Jesus was performing exorcisms through Satan to the heightened charge that he was Himself possessed by the devil. To defend against the interpretation that the οἱ παρ’ αὐτοῦ of Mk 3:21 refers to Jesus’ family, Peabody, Cope, and McNicol argue that they are not said to have arrived until v. 31, but, against this view, v. 21 does not say that the people in question arrived. At v. 21 Mark says the people “went out” because

---

<sup>263</sup> Ibid., 170-5.

<sup>264</sup> Ibid., 241-6.

<sup>265</sup> Ibid., 248.

<sup>266</sup> Ibid., 299.

they heard Jesus was “beside Himself,” and it is not until v. 31 that Mark narrates their arrival. The very use of ἐξῆλθον at v. 21, an ἐξ- compound, lends to the connection to the ἔρχεται at v. 31. They recognize that the two accusations from οἱ παρ’ αὐτοῦ and the Pharisees at vv. 21-22 are reinstated and form an *inclusio* with v. 30, which are both Markan redactions, equating the accusations of vv. 21-22. They admit that Mark’s removal of the intervening material between the Beelzebul controversy and pericope of Jesus’ family at Mk 3:31-35 is for the purpose of setting the two pericopes together, with vv. 31-35 forming a conclusion to what began at vv. 20-21, despite denying the identification of οἱ παρ’ αὐτοῦ with Jesus’ family. It is further admitted that Mark has changed Mt 12:49, “he stretched His hand out to His disciples,” when Jesus was identifying His true family, to Mk 3:34, “and looking around at those sitting around Him,” a change that serves to further differentiate Jesus’ disciples and His blood relatives who were standing outside. The implication of this change is not acknowledged.<sup>267</sup> Lastly, Peabody, Cope, and McNicol agree that Mark’s addition of Jesus’ family in the rejection at Nazareth points back to Mk 3:31-35, with the intention to communicate that “Jesus’ true family is not necessarily his earthly relatives,” but these changes are not recognized as the product of an intention to disparage Jesus’ family, of whom James, the Lord’s brother, would be the likely target, due to the aforementioned emphatic development of themes throughout the Gospel that align with such an interest.<sup>268</sup>

Similarly, Peabody, Cope, and McNicol acknowledge that the Markan compositions of the healings of the deaf and blind men in his Gospel surround the pericopes of the feeding of the four thousand and the yeast of the Pharisees and so are intended to reflect the deafness and

---

<sup>267</sup> Ibid., 119-24.

<sup>268</sup> Ibid., 151.

blindness of the disciples, but they maintain that this is intended to make the theological point that spiritual insight is only revealed by God. In reference to the feeding of the four thousand, it is admitted that, “for Mark, it functions as part of a wider unit providing another occasion to highlight the obduracy of the disciples,” with the response of the disciples concerning the lack of provisions at Mk 8:4 serving as an allusion to the people of Israel in the wilderness.<sup>269</sup> In the pericope on the yeast of the Pharisees, Jesus’ redactional accusation that the disciples could not see or hear is reflected in the two unique healing stories added by Mark, and they arrive at the following conclusion: “The description of the spiritual condition of the disciples makes them appear like ‘those on the outside’ than Jesus’ new spiritual family (Mk 3:31-35) who have a special insight into the nature of the kingdom (cf. Mk 4:10-12).”<sup>270</sup> The placement of the two-stage healing of the blind man immediately before Peter’s tenuous confession, is, as they admit, in anticipation of the merely partial revelatory insight of Peter, with it being Mark’s apparent intention that Peter would be portrayed as having a deficient understanding of the identity and mission of Jesus.<sup>271</sup> Even in their attempt, then, to present a model of Mark under the 2GH that repudiates the possibility that the Gospel was intended to denigrate the disciples, Peabody, Cope, and McNicol find it unavoidable that Mark’s redaction in this section is intended for such a purpose. Contrary to their earlier statement that Mark was portraying the disciples negatively for the sake of making an example to Christians facing persecution, they have concluded that Mark is equating the disciples with unbelievers, which can hardly be reconciled with their previously stated view, that the disciples are portrayed in such a manner to reflect the readers so that the

---

<sup>269</sup> Ibid., 179-81.

<sup>270</sup> Ibid., 187-8.

<sup>271</sup> Ibid., 189.

readers could better insert themselves into the narrative, unless it should be supposed that Mark was intending to characterize his readers as such.

Mark omits Mt 16:17-19 in his version of Peter's confession, to which Peabody, Cope, and McNicol provide the explanation, "Perhaps Mark did not think that, given the later conduct of Peter, it was appropriate to attribute his confession to revelation."<sup>272</sup> Even with this confession they maintain that Mark's omission of the phrase, "You are a hindrance to Me," despite the retention of the rest of Jesus' rebuke to Peter, militates against the view that Mark has the intention to disparage the disciples.<sup>273</sup> In their view, despite Mark implying by the construction of the previous sequence that Peter is an unbeliever and omitting that his confession was revealed to him by God as stated by Matthew, the omission of the unnecessary and simple, "You are a hindrance to Me," in their view negates the amount of admitted evidence that Mark is indeed attempting to cast Peter in a negative light, a discrepancy that betrays that their analysis is in accordance with a presuppositional avoidance of the conclusion of their own observations, rather than being the product of an attempt to conduct an objective analysis of Mark's redactional changes.

In Mark's version of the request of James and John at Mk 10:35-45, the evangelist removes the detail in Matthew that it was the mother of the apostles who asked Jesus rather the brothers, which has the result that Mark's version portrays James and John more negatively, with the following material on servanthood carried over by Mark serving as a juxtaposition of their attempt at self-aggrandizement. At Mk 10:44 Mark changes the wording in Mt 20:27, "whoever wants to be first must be your servant," where the "your" refers in context to the Twelve, to,

---

<sup>272</sup> Ibid., 194.

<sup>273</sup> Ibid.

“whoever wants to be first must be servant at all,” which Peabody, Cope, and McNicol recognize as an avoidance to promote servitude to the Twelve in particular or church leadership in general. Next they observe that the final pericope before Jesus’ arrival at Jerusalem, the healing of the blind beggar, was included by Mark to further emphasize the spiritual blindness of the disciples, following in the same vein as the two unique healings of the deaf and blind men.<sup>274</sup>

In Mark’s account, Jesus predicted that Peter would deny Him three times after the cock crowed twice, rather than once as in the other Gospels. Peabody, Cope, and McNicol have the initial explanation that the first of the two crows is intended as a device to increase the reader’s confidence that Jesus’ prediction will stand.<sup>275</sup> It seems they do not even think this is convincing, since they soon admit that “its insertion appears to intensify the wretchedness of Peter’s betrayal,” and later point out that in Mark’s Gospel, Peter would have been reminded of Jesus’ prediction after the first crow and would have had more reason not to deny Him.<sup>276</sup> As they themselves say, “Peter’s denial thus becomes an amazing act of cowardice on the part of the key member of Jesus’ inner circle. Jesus had already condemned the leaders of the temple in Jerusalem for their betrayal of God’s purposes (Mk 11:12-19; 12:9-12). Now a chosen leader of Jesus’ new spiritual community, in the hour of trial, fares no better than the old leaders.”<sup>277</sup> Amazingly, despite this admission, they still maintain that the point of Mark’s depiction of the disciples is to call the readers to endurance.<sup>278</sup> The redaction of Matthew’s version of Jesus’ prediction of the disciples’ apostasy before His arrest, Πάντες ὑμεῖς σκανδαλισθήσεσθε ἐν ἐμοὶ

---

<sup>274</sup> Ibid., 228-9.

<sup>275</sup> Ibid., 289.

<sup>276</sup> Ibid., 290.

<sup>277</sup> Ibid., 298.

<sup>278</sup> Ibid., 289, 298.

ἐν τῇ νυκτὶ ταύτῃ, to the simpler, Πάντες σκανδαλισθήσεσθε, as it says in Mark, reduces it to a more general statement, which Peabody, Cope, and McNicol argue is an attempt to connect the prediction more to the readers in their situation of persecution, as a warning against apostasy. They do not consider that this change accords with the view of Mark's disparagement of the disciples, since, while the reduction could be seen as intended to generalize the prediction so as to open it to the readers, it just as well could function as a generalization of the disciples' apostasy, that is, their desertion of Jesus is not limited to that night but with regard to their followership in general. In Jesus' statement that after His death He will go before them to Galilee at Mk 14:28, Mark has replaced Matthew's δὲ with ἀλλὰ, which heightens the distinction between the two events.<sup>279</sup> Peabody, Cope, and McNicol agree that Mark's changes to the scene at Gethsemane is likely intended to heighten the suffering of Jesus, in turn to further reflect poorly on the disciples for abandoning Him when He is arrested. The additions of Jesus' question, "Simon, are you asleep?" and the use of the second person singular directed toward Peter, in contrast to the plural used in Matthew and Luke, and the addition of Mk 14:40b, "and they did not know what to answer Him," all serve to degrade the disciples, and Peter in particular, in anticipation of his betrayal.<sup>280</sup>

Mark retains the account of one of the disciples cutting off the ear of the high priest's servant, but omits the response from Jesus in Matthew and the healing of the ear in Luke. Peabody, Cope, and McNicol attempt to establish that the attacker is "one of the bystanders" and thus not a disciple, but the word is characteristically Markan and elsewhere simply refers to someone standing nearby, which, since it is in the context of Jesus alone with His disciples after

---

<sup>279</sup> Ibid., 289-90.

<sup>280</sup> Ibid., 294-5.

the Last Supper praying in the garden before His demise, is naturally understood to be one of the disciples. They see that the inclusion of the enigmatic young man who fled along with the other disciples is intended to heighten the sense of abandonment.<sup>281</sup> While Matthew and Luke emphasize different theological motifs in their accounts of Jesus' crucifixion, for Mark it is that Jesus is dying rejected and abandoned.<sup>282</sup> As they note, Mark has used the same word for the fleeing of the disciples at Jesus' arrest as he does for the women departing from the tomb at 16:8, perhaps intentionally connecting the two.<sup>283</sup> They acknowledge, like Riley, that the description of the young man at Gethsemane "is nearly identical" to the young man at the empty tomb, that both use the phrasing καὶ...νεανίσκος...περιβεβλημένον...ὁ δέ, and that there is the thematic connection that, as they say, "The young man who had abandoned Jesus is now the first to announce his victory over death. In turn, his announcement will cause the women 'to flee;'" however, they prevent themselves from drawing conclusions from the evidence and continue, "But, in the end, they too must come to faith—as the longer ending intimates." They advocate for the longer ending on the basis that the shorter ending is "problematic," since if the Gospel ended at 16:8, this would suggest the women did not inform the disciples of the young man's message, and Mark himself could not have known.<sup>284</sup> No conclusion is made that the angels of the previous Gospels have been altered into the young man that is thematically and semantically connected to the young man who fled in the garden. Peabody, Cope, and McNicol acknowledge that Mark has seemingly made such linguistic and thematic connections between the young men but refuse to take the additional step and equate the two.

---

<sup>281</sup> Ibid., 296-7.

<sup>282</sup> Ibid., 317.

<sup>283</sup> Ibid., 325.

<sup>284</sup> Ibid., 326-7.



### Farmer's Conciliatory Model

Farmer is quick to acknowledge the redactional changes of Mark that he can use to point to the secondariness of the Gospel relative to Matthew and Luke. Explanatory glosses have been added to explain Jewish practices to an unfamiliar Gentile audience where necessary. Minor details have been added in an attempt at verisimilitude in a similar manner to the apocryphal Gospels of the second century, although he retracted this in the second edition.<sup>285</sup> The unique healing stories describe Jesus as using spit to perform His healings, which is characteristic of Hellenistic healing stories, and Mark provides Jesus' words in Aramaic that he used to perform the miracles, evincing a belief in the efficacy of the very words themselves, an interest that is shared with later apocryphal writings.<sup>286</sup> Proponents of both the 2DH and 2GH alike recognize the peculiarities of Mark's healing stories and the redactional interests behind them. Montefiore sees the possibility that in Mk 6:5 Jesus did not have the capability to heal because of the peoples' lack of faith, the use of spit was introduced in Mark's healing stories because it was believed to have healing properties, and that in some of the other stories in the Gospel the faith of the petitioner is a factor for the healing to be enacted.<sup>287</sup> Dungan connects the dots left unconnected by Farmer and finds that the Aramaic healing expressions included by Mark are magical healing formulas that were thought to have contained the power of healing through their recitation, and were recorded in the Gospel for their use in healings and exorcisms by the

---

<sup>285</sup> William R. Farmer, *The Synoptic Problem: A Critical Analysis* (New York: The MacMillan Co., 1964), 227-8.

<sup>286</sup> *Ibid.*, 166-73.

<sup>287</sup> C. G. Montefiore, *The Synoptic Gospels: Edited with an Introduction and Commentary*, vol. I, Library of Biblical Studies, 2nd ed., ed. Harry M. Orlinsky (New York: KTAV Publishing, 1968), 119, 172, 212-4.

Church.<sup>288</sup> Likewise, Nineham finds it likely that the exorcisms in Mark function to provide the readers with instructions on their performance. He connects the metaphor of the strong man being bound in the Beelzebul controversy to the wilderness temptation, with the temptation being Jesus' victory over Satan and the subsequent exorcisms corresponding to the "robbing," an observation made more prescient by the fact that Mark adds a comment about Satan's "end" at v. 26 in the Beelzebul controversy, right before the parable about the strong man at v. 27.<sup>289</sup> Similarly, Mann sees the exorcisms in Mark as the advancement of the kingdom of God against the dominion of Satan, which entails, as he says, "a restoration of order to a creation characterized by disorder."<sup>290</sup> This aligns with the observation of Peabody, Cope, and McNicol that Mark has a subtle motif of the use of resurrection imagery evidenced in several of his healing stories, such as the healing of Peter's mother-in-law, Jairus' daughter, and the possessed boy, which he is intent to carry over from his sources or adds himself.<sup>291</sup> With these connections between the exorcisms and the wilderness temptation evidenced, the view of Hooker can be applied to the wilderness temptation in Mark under the 2GH, that the evangelist portrayed it as a reversal of the fall in Genesis, with the otherwise enigmatic mention of the "wild animals" likening the state of the wilderness after the temptation to the garden before the fall.<sup>292</sup> This explains what appears to be a Christological difficulty that has been often used against the 2GH, that Mark must have changed from Matthew and Luke that Jesus was "led" by the Holy Spirit

---

<sup>288</sup> David L. Dungan, "Mark—The Abridgment of Matthew and Luke," in *Jesus and Man's Hope*, vol. 1, ed. David G. Buttrick and John M. Bald (Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh Theological Seminary, 1970), 54-5.

<sup>289</sup> D. E. Nineham, *Saint Mark*, The Pelican New Testament Commentaries (London: Penguin Books, 1963), 46, 120-1.

<sup>290</sup> Mann, *Mark*, 140.

<sup>291</sup> Peabody, Cope, and McNicol, *One Gospel from Two*, 91.

<sup>292</sup> Hooker, *The Gospel according to Saint Mark*, 50.

into the wilderness to Mark's statement at 1:12 that the Holy Spirit "drove out" Jesus into the wilderness, with it having the purpose of equating Jesus' entry into the wilderness to Adam and Eve being "driven out" of the garden after the fall. Far from being a "difficulty" for the 2GH, this redactional change is very much intentional and accords with a theological interest that is interwoven throughout the Gospel.

The first significant redaction to a healing story in Mark is in the healing of the leper at Mk 1:40-45, where the evangelist adds that Jesus responded with anger after the leper said, "If you are willing, you are able to cleanse me." Before Jesus admonishes the leper not to tell others but show himself to the priests, Mark adds that Jesus "cast him out," using the verb ἐκβάλλω, the same word used for the expulsion of demons, among other uses of negative connotation. Mark has given Jesus an angry reaction to the leper's question, because it implies doubt that Jesus could heal him, questioning that the healing could be effected. This accords with an emphatic redactional interest evinced in the alterations to and selection of the miracle stories in Mark, the essentiality of the confidence of faith on the part of the recipient for a miracle to be performed. Mark's changes to the healing of the leper betrays his apparent frustration at a possibly increasing lack of confidence in the ability for miracles to be performed, and here he provides the answer to his readers for why they have experienced ineffective attempts at healing, and the solution for their accomplishment. Luke has the statement, completely absent in Matthew, that the leper told the story and that it circulated around the area, after which Jesus withdrew and prayed, a detail that Mark altered. In his version, Jesus could not speak openly because of the proclamation of the leper, aligning it with his motif of the messianic secret. There are two elements added to the account by Mark, the first being Jesus' angry response to the leper's request and the second the need for Jesus to remain hidden after the leper's proclamation.

While Luke records in indirect speech that Jesus commanded the demons possessing the Gerasene demoniac to depart from him, Mark changes it to a command in direct speech to provide an exorcism formula. This is immediately followed by the demand in Luke to the demon for its name, which is frequently recognized as evincing the belief that knowing the name of a demon allows the exorcist to have greater authority over it. This Mark retains, in keeping with his interest in providing instructions on healings and exorcisms. In the raising of Jairus' daughter, Luke has Jesus take the girl's hand and say, "Child, arise," to accomplish her resurrection, but Mark provides the Aramaic that Jesus spoke and its translation in Greek. In the first of Mark's unique healings, the deaf and mute man, Jesus first takes the man aside privately and afterward forbids proclamation of the healing to those who saw the man healed upon their return, in accordance with the secrecy motif. Mark describes the healing in great detail, that Jesus put His fingers in the man's ears, spit, touched His tongue, looked up to heaven sighing, and spoke a healing formula, which Mark again provides in the Aramaic he believes Jesus to have spoken, with the translation in Greek. The second unique healing has a heightened element of secrecy, with Jesus not only taking the blind man aside but leading him out of the village, and afterward commanding him not enter back into the village, which is, due to this change, conducted more effectively compared to the first unique healing in terms of the preservation of its secrecy: In the first unique healing Jesus takes the man aside and issues an instruction of silence to the people who saw the healed man after their return and already began telling others, a reactive measure, but in the second healing He leads the man outside of the village to prevent the observation of others, such that He needed only to speak to the healed man himself afterward. In the second unique healing, Jesus spit on the man's eyes, laid His hands on him, and asked him if he experienced improvement, before Jesus again laid His hands on him and the restoration of

the man's sight was completed after a second attempt. It can be seen that, alongside the purposes of its strategic placement before Peter's confession, Mark intended an encouragement to his readers not to relinquish the attempt after experiencing a failed or partial healing, content to even use Jesus as the example.

In Mark's version of the exorcism of the possessed boy after the Transfiguration, Matthew and Luke both say the disciples were "not able" to cast out the demon, while Mark changes the wording to "not strong enough." In Matthew and Luke, after the boy is brought to Jesus, He rebukes the demon and casts it out; Mark, on the other hand, after the boy convulses on the ground, has Jesus ask the father how long the boy had been possessed, and the father, echoing the leper, says, "but if you are able to do anything, help us." In a similar fashion, Jesus responds with indignation, "If you are able?" All things are possible for those who believe." The father's response is likewise unique to Mark, "I believe; help my unbelief." Matthew and Luke simply record that Jesus rebuked the demon to cast it out, but Mark again provides an exorcism formula, "Unclean spirit, I command you, come out of him, and you may enter him no more." In Matthew the disciples ask why they were unable to cast the demon out, and Jesus responds with teaching on faith. Curiously, Mark has the response, "This kind is not able to leave except by prayer," despite Jesus addressing the demon directly rather than through prayer in the story. In his version, then, Mark appears to be providing the formula that is to be used to cast out a demon, the need for faith for a healing or exorcism to be effectuated, and the route an exorcist is to take if the exorcism fails.

The importance of faith in healing can be seen in Mark's version of the healing of the blind beggar. Matthew records that Jesus touched the beggars' eyes to restore their sight, while Luke has Jesus say, "Receive your sight. Your faith has healed you." Mark follows more

closely to Luke but has Jesus only say, “Your faith has healed you,” resulting in the restoration of the man’s sight. In this case, Mark has perhaps deemed the formula and ritual in his unique healing of a blind man to be sufficient to prescribe the method for healing blindness and has instead decided to emphasize the need for faith for healing to be performed. This redactional interest can be seen in Mark’s rendition of the rejection of Nazareth, where Matthew at 13:58 records, “And He did not perform many miracles there because of their unbelief,” while Mark has at 6:5-6, “And he was not able to perform any miracles there, except that He laid His hands on a few who were sick and healed them. And He was amazed because of their unbelief.” Head argues that Matthew’s version makes it more clear that the peoples’ unbelief is the reason Jesus did not perform many miracles, which poses a difficulty for the 2GH.<sup>293</sup> However, Matthew’s version is likely to have been interpreted by Mark as being discrepant with his view of the need for faith in healings. Matthew says Jesus was able to perform miracles, though not many, due to their lack of faith. For Mark, the recipient needs to have faith for a miracle to occur, and so Matthew’s wording needed to be clarified, to prevent the interpretation that someone with unbelief could still experience a healing. To Mark, the reason for the lack of many miracles in Matthew’s account is obscure. Matthew simply says Jesus did not perform many, and so Mark clarifies that Jesus was “not able,” which is to say that it is not due merely to Jesus’ refusal to perform miracles, but that due to the peoples’ unbelief it was not possible for Jesus to heal them, except for the few who were sick. Mark wishes to clarify potential unwillingness to inability. Based on Mark’s expanded qualifier that a few of the sick were healed and his rephrasing of Matthew’s connection of the peoples’ unbelief and the paucity of miracles, Mark is carefully attempting not to attribute unbelief to the people generally, to avoid the insinuation that those

---

<sup>293</sup> Peter M. Head, *Christology and the Synoptic Problem: An Argument for Markan Priority*, vol. 94, Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 71-3, 81-2.

who experienced miracles were among those with unbelief, opting instead to make the notice of the peoples' unbelief more distanced, against Matthew's direct connection of the unbelief to the healings. He is attempting, then, to affirm all at once that faith is necessary for healing, and that the people in general were unbelieving, but also that some were healed, and while doing so, wishing to avoid the implication that the few who were healed were among those who did not believe.

In defending against argumentation from Abbott that under the 2GH Mark appears to have purposefully carried over wording shared by Matthew and Luke, Farmer is compelled to argue that Mark's purpose in composition was to "[bear] concurrent testimony," or, as he says in his conclusion, to produce a Gospel that contained the "common ground" shared by the previous two Gospels.<sup>294</sup> This is opposed to the other 2GH models that affirm the opposite, that Mark was writing to reconcile their differences. And this Farmer is immediately compelled to concede in the same paragraph, where he says the following: "It would follow from this that where the texts of such a writer's sources did not bear 'concurrent testimony,' that is, where they deviated, he would then be free to follow the one or the other, or to make use of other sources if he had access to them, or to compose his text in such a way as to combine their differing accounts, or even to exercise his own creative imagination."<sup>295</sup> As he acknowledges, then, Mark includes material that is not shared by Matthew and Luke, whether it is material included in one Gospel but not the other, unique to his Gospel and not found in either of the other two, or that contain redactional alterations or additions to the accounts found in the other Gospels that purposefully deviate from both.

---

<sup>294</sup> Farmer, *The Synoptic Problem*, 74-9, 281.

<sup>295</sup> *Ibid.*, 79.

He admits in the demonstration of his model of Mark that the evangelist has omitted the material from the Sermons in Matthew and Luke, although he cites the differences between the beatitudes as reason to consider them irreconcilable. However, despite the fact that most of Luke's Sermon is indeed "common ground" with Matthew's, Farmer has already admitted that Mark often chooses one Gospel over another where they deviate, and so he has undermined his stated rationale for the exclusion of the Sermon material. This extends further to the rest of the double tradition teaching material, which Mark does not include despite it often having nearly identical wording between his sources, certainly constituting "concurrent testimony." Mark added to Jesus' sayings on divorce as found in Matthew and Luke to better align it with Roman views on divorce. Concerning Mark's change to the fig tree and cleansing of the temple, Farmer says, "In Mark 11:11-25 there is a phenomenon which indicates that Mark was not unwilling to exercise his freedom to create a discrepancy between his Gospel and both Matthew's and Luke's," again admitting evidence that opposes his model.<sup>296</sup> Mark uses the pericope of the widow at the temple that is not found in Matthew and so does not abide by the theory that Mark was recording concurrent testimony. And as Farmer noted, Mark contains warnings to be watchful in his version of the eschatological discourse at Mk 13:9 and 13:23 that are additions to the versions of his sources.<sup>297</sup> Farmer has pointed to these passages throughout Mark to argue that it is more likely Mark is secondary than for Matthew and Luke's versions to be derived from Mark, but in so doing he has also pointed out the extent of the material that is not shared by both Matthew and Luke and the unique redactional changes that are present in Mark that directly contradict Farmer's purported rationale behind Mark's composition.

---

<sup>296</sup> Ibid., 258.

<sup>297</sup> Ibid., 233-83.



Farmer wants at the same time to affirm that Mark's purpose of writing was to provide a Gospel that contained the concurrent testimony of Matthew and Luke, but he is forced to admit that Mark has included material found in one Gospel but not the other, that he selected a version of the same pericope from one Gospel against a discrepant version of the other that he does not attempt to reconcile, and that he omitted great amounts of material shared by both, all of which militate against his model. All of the instances that contradict the model are too numerous to be detailed in a summary, but some of the most readily apparent examples are as follows: the pericopes carried over from Matthew not found in Luke include the execution of John the Baptist, Jesus walking on water, Jesus' teaching on food and defilement, the Syrophenician woman, the feeding of the four thousand; the pericopes carried over from Luke not found in Matthew include the exorcism in the synagogue, Jesus praying after healing a multitude, the unknown exorcist, and the widow at the temple; the pericopes in which Mark selects Matthew's version of a discrepant account against Luke includes the calling of the disciples, the rejection at Nazareth, and the anointing at Bethany; the pericopes in which Mark selects Luke's version of a discrepant account against Matthew includes the healing of the paralytic, the healing of the Gerasene demoniac, and the diatribe against the Pharisees before the eschatological discourse; the pericopes that share near identical wording in Matthew and Luke that were omitted by Mark includes the centurion's servant, John the Baptist's inquiry, and much of the discourse material, most notably the sayings material after the Beelzebul controversy; and the pericopes that Mark has added that are not found in either of his sources includes the parable of the seed growing secretly, the two unique healings, and the young man at Gethsemane. It is apparent that Mark does not have an intention of recording the material common to Matthew and Luke, but has other redactional interests that have dictated the material he has selected from his sources.

The greatest irony of Farmer's model is that his primary argument for the 2GH against the 2DH is the minor agreements (MAs) of Matthew and Luke against Mark, instances where Mark has made alterations in places where his two sources concur, which he has done hundreds of times throughout his Gospel, the ubiquity of which is to such an extent that Farmer contends they render the 2DH untenable, and yet his model for the Gospel of Mark is that the evangelist primarily intended to copy the concurrent testimony of the two. Farmer's model of his source theory is contradicted by the very argument he uses to establish that source theory. The greatest deficiency of Farmer's argument is that it requires the dismissal of the redactional alterations and additions Mark has made to his sources, or the denial of their relevance. He contends that the ἐξέστη of Mk 3:20-21 does not have a negative meaning, instead maintaining that it pertains to Jesus' religious experience and that Mark was simply using vv. 20-21 to provide a reason for Jesus' family to come see Him. He provides the reasoning that "pejorative connotations...are not consonant with Mark's usage elsewhere, and are not required by context here,"<sup>298</sup> ironically committing the same fallacy that he rightly accuses Streeter of making with regard to the MAs, who categorized the MAs and attempted to provide an explanation for each in isolation, which Farmer rightly criticized as obfuscating the force of their prevalence in the context of each pericope. In the same way, Farmer has treated Mk 3:20-21 in isolation from the context of the "full concatenation" of the Markan redactions pertaining to the denigration of the disciples throughout his Gospel.<sup>299</sup>

---

<sup>298</sup> Ibid., 163-4.

<sup>299</sup> Ibid., 138-9.

## Summary

Despite his self-asserted deference to patristic testimony, Black's model requires the reinterpretation of the early church fathers' statements on the origination of Mark, which is, contrary to his claim, an attempt to reconcile his presupposition of direct Petrine narration behind the Gospel and the internal evidence that demonstrates Mark used both Matthew and Luke under the 2GH. Orchard is willing to concede the conflicting nature of the patristic witnesses, and selects the statements that best suit his opinion; even then, however, he is compelled to argue for tenuous interpretations that run contrary to their natural reading and betray his intention to substantiate his presupposition of Petrine involvement. Seeing that Matthew is a Gospel for the Jews and Luke for the Gentiles, Owen supposes Mark was intended to bridge the two. This is heightened by Dungan, who claims the writing of Mark's Gospel healed the divide between the Judaizing and libertine parties and saved the Church from schism, despite admitting evidence that Mark is more pro-Gentile and anti-Law than Luke. Griesbach recognizes that the internal evidence of Mark's conflation of Matthew and Luke is contrary to the patristic testimony of the Gospel's origin, but neglects to offer an adequate explanation for Mark's selection of material and redactions. Riley fails to account for Mark's redactions and omission of material, and despite acknowledging the ubiquity and severity of Mark's portrayal of the disciples, he persists in his assertion that the Gospel is an abridgment of Matthew and Luke. Mann acknowledges that Mark must have a particular purpose of the composition of the Gospel but does not establish the relation of the changes to the eschatological discourse to the evangelist's selection of material and redactional changes throughout in the Gospel. Peabody, Cope, and McNicol admit the pervasive theme of the denigration of the disciples but attempt to account for the data by reinterpreting it in a contradictory and circular framework that envisions the disciples as

representative of the readers. Lastly, Farmer posits that Mark sought to record the common testimony of Matthew and Luke, which is not only contradicted by Mark's selection of pericopes but also the MAs, which he uses as the primary evidence against the 2DH to substantiate his source theory.

In every model that involves a thorough analysis of the Gospel, the severity of Mark's disparagement of the disciples is admitted; their obduracy is exemplified, however, in the resistance to the conclusion that such evidence demands, that Mark has written his Gospel for the purpose of undermining the authority of the Jerusalem apostles. The inexplicability of Mark's redactions and selection of material has persisted as the fundamental objection against the viability of the 2GH as an alternative to Markan priority. It is the inability of 2GH proponents to posit a plausible model of Mark that accounts for the data of the evangelist's use of Matthew and Luke that has undermined the theory from its initial formulation and opened the way for the development of alternate theories, ultimately leading to its deposition by the 2DH. 2GH proponents have proven unwilling to acknowledge the redactional changes Mark has made to his sources as necessitated by the theory, due to the implications such changes suggest of the purpose of the Gospel's composition, with the result that they have not been able to propose a model of the Gospel that accounts for the data. Unless a plausible model of Mark under the 2GH can be provided, the theory cannot be presented as a viable alternative to Markan priority. As such, the 2GH is in need of a reappraisal that advances a model capable of answering the remaining primary objection of the inexplicability of Mark's use of his sources that prevents the establishment of the theory as the best explanation for the interdependence of the Synoptic Gospels.

### The Polemical Model of 2GH Mark

It has been demonstrated that, whether Mark has used Matthew and Luke according to the 2GH, or used oral or other written sources under the 2DH, Mark has a particular purpose in his selection and redaction of material, omitting much of Jesus' teaching, including no birth narrative, and ending the document without any resurrection appearance story that would have been available to him in some form under any source theory. The evangelist omits that which does not pertain to this particular purpose, and he modifies the material he does use accordingly. In contrast to Matthew and Luke who evince an interest in presenting the works, teachings, and passion of Jesus for the general purposes of edification, Mark appears to have used the Gospel material as a means to promote a more particular purpose, not having an interest in the content of the material for its own sake, as with his predecessors, but, rather, he uses the Gospel material as the means with which to construct a negative depiction of the disciples.

Mark has primarily selected material that pertains to the denigration of the disciples, the inclusion of the Gentiles, and the abrogation of the Law. Mark begins his Gospel with the preaching of John the Baptist, the forerunner of Jesus, as a suitable beginning, omitting the birth narratives, first, because he has no interest in presenting biographical material for its own sake, and, second, because of its positive portrayal of Jesus' family. Mark rushes through the preaching of John, the wilderness temptation, and Jesus' baptism to move forward to the beginning of Jesus' ministry, having minimal interest in the Gospel material that precedes Jesus' interactions with His disciples. Mark uses Matthew's version of the call of the disciples over Luke's because it better presents the disciples' leaving their boats at Jesus' beckoning as having a supernatural causation rather than it being their own decision, as Luke has intended to portray it, which accords with Mark's presentation of their unbelief. The disciples left the boats not

because they made the decision from their belief in Jesus but because they were divinely compelled.

Mark then switches to Luke for his sequence of the controversies against the Pharisees and the disputes over the Law, ending with the crowds following Jesus and the appointment of the Twelve, which Mark has switched in order because the Beelzebul controversy that follows is not suitable in the sermonic setting of Jesus' proclamation to great crowds. Mark reaches the Sermon in Luke's Gospel, which the evangelist is want to omit, since the section, which centers on teachings about withholding judgment and loving one's enemies, is certainly not conducive to his purposes. Rather, the Beelzebul controversy is Mark's equivalent of the Sermons in the other Gospels, placed at the same point in both of his sources, the redaction of which is directed against James the Lord's brother due to his association with the Judaizers in Jerusalem, who, in Mark's view, were guilty of placing unnecessary burdens on the Gentiles and impeding their entry into salvation. This is perceived as a misrepresentation of the gospel, and in response, Mark has associated James with the Pharisees and attributed to him the unforgivable sin, condemning him to hell. In making the Beelzebul controversy the pinnacle of the controversy sequence and his equivalent to the Sermons, Mark has given the passage pride of place, and it serves as the transition to the next sequence, turning from the Pharisees to the disciples, which continues up to Jesus' arrival at Jerusalem.

Mark then moves forward in both Gospels to the parable of the sower, resulting in the omission of a few healing stories in Luke that Mark might otherwise have included. The sequence of the parable of the sower following after the Beelzebul controversy is instrumental to his purposes, since, after the controversy sequence with the Pharisees, Mark uses the Beelzebul controversy to transfer from the Pharisees to the Jerusalem apostles, beginning with James in the

Beelzebul controversy and proceeding to the other apostles beginning with the section on the parable of the sower. This section permits him to liken the apostles to unbelievers through the material pertaining to the purpose of Jesus' parables. The parable of the sower begins the section primarily devoted to the denigration of the disciples, using material that pertains to associated themes, such as the inclusion of the Gentiles and the needlessness of the Law. Alongside the intention to provide the Church with healing formulas and rituals, the proliferation of miracle accounts in this section compound the imperceptibility of the disciples, accumulating in a case against them. Mark includes a sequence of miracle stories from Luke before returning to Matthew for the rejection at Nazareth. He alternates to Luke for the mission charge and back again to Matthew for the execution of John the Baptist, which is heavily redacted and used as the interlude of the disciples' mission.

Mark follows Matthew for the sequence that revolves around the feeding stories, circumscribing the feeding of the four thousand and pericope on the yeast of the Pharisees with two unique healings. The partial healing of the blind man leads up to Peter's confession, which is placed before as a metaphor for Peter's spiritual blindness. While this passage is used to indicate the increasing understanding of Peter in Matthew and Luke, in Mark it is used to emphasize the lack thereof. This marks another point of convergence in Mark's use of Matthew and Luke, which continues until the end of the Central Section of Luke. In this section, Mark is intent to carry over the three passion predictions, which are each followed by a story pertaining to the obduracy of the disciples, and contrastive sayings material on discipleship that present the disciples as failing to exemplify the humility and selflessness that characterizes Jesus' disciples. After Jesus' arrival at Jerusalem, Mark carries over the second controversy sequence

with the Pharisees, the eschatological discourse that he has modified to remove the suggestion that Jesus would return upon the destruction of the temple, and the passion account.

It is not only in the selection of material that Mark's intentions are evidenced, but in the redaction of the pericopes that he uses. While in Lk 4:42-44 the townspeople ask Jesus to remain with them after His healing of the sick and demoniacs, in Mk 1:35-39 it is Peter and the other disciples, which lends to their misunderstanding of Jesus' mission;<sup>300</sup> he composes 3:20-21, placing the accusation that Jesus was deranged, which, upon hearing it, caused Jesus' family to retrieve him, next to the accusation of the Pharisees that he is possessed in v. 22, and further reinforcing the connection with v. 30, forming an *inclusio* with vv. 21-22, likening the two accusations, associating Jesus' family with the Pharisees and thereby attributing to them the unforgivable sin that was pronounced against the opponents;<sup>301</sup> the pericope of Jesus' family in 3:31-35 is then placed beside the Beelzebul controversy, with the family departing to retrieve Jesus in vv. 20-21 and arriving at v. 31, who, upon arriving, are changed to "summon" or "call" for Him from the outside, and who are indicated as excluded from among the disciples who are sitting around Him;<sup>302</sup> after the parable of the sower, in Mk 4:10-12, Jesus explains that those on the outside are unable to understand the parables, after which Mark adds in v. 13 the rebuke, "Do you not understand this parable? How, then, will you understand all the parables?" before the parable of the sower's interpretation is given, equivocating the disciples with the outsiders of

---

<sup>300</sup> Trocmé, *The Formation of the Gospel*, 129; Weeden, *Traditions in Conflict*, 26-32.

<sup>301</sup> Riley, *The Making of Mark*, 40-3; Mann, *Mark*, 251-9; Peabody, Cope, and McNicol, *One Gospel from Two*, 119-24; Trocmé, *The Formation of the Gospel*, 131-6; Crossan, "Mark and the Relatives of Jesus," 81-9.

<sup>302</sup> Peabody, Cope, and McNicol, *One Gospel from Two*, 119-24; Trocmé, *The Formation of the Gospel*, 131-6; Crossan, "Mark and the Relatives of Jesus," 103.



vv. 10-12;<sup>303</sup> he changes Jesus' response after he stills the storm from, "Oh you of little faith," to "Do you still not have faith?" in Mk 4:40, which, first, alters Jesus' description of the disciples from having little faith to none, and second, emphasizes the persistence of their condition;<sup>304</sup> in the saying about the prophet not being honored in His homeland after Jesus was rejected at Nazareth, Mark adds the phrase, "among His own relatives," which is all the more significant because it is redundant alongside the "and in His own home" that was already included;<sup>305</sup> the incredulous, unbelieving response of the disciples when asked to give the crowd of five thousand bread to eat is heightened in Mk 6:37;<sup>306</sup> the experience of Peter stepping out onto the water is removed from Mk 6:45-52, and the mention of the disciples falling down in worship to Jesus walking on the water is replaced by the redactional comment at v. 52 that the disciples lacked understanding because their hearts were hardened;<sup>307</sup> in Mk 7:18, he has changed Matthew's, "Hear and understand," which was addressed to the crowd, to the rebuke to the disciples, "Are you also without understanding?" which points back to the categorization of the disciples as outsiders from the parable of the sower;<sup>308</sup> the response of the disciples to Jesus during the feeding of the four thousand is intended to liken them to the Israelites in the

---

<sup>303</sup> Riley, *The Making of Mark*, 47; Mann, *Mark*, 264-7; Weeden, *Traditions in Conflict*, 26-32; Tyson, "The Blindness of the Disciples," 35-7; Eve, "Reconstructing Mark," 101-11.

<sup>304</sup> Weeden, *Traditions in Conflict*, 26-32; Tyson, "The Blindness of the Disciples," 35-7; Eve, "Reconstructing Mark," 101-11.

<sup>305</sup> Riley, *The Making of Mark*; 67; Peabody, Cope, and McNicol, *One Gospel from Two*, 167; Trocmé, *The Formation of the Gospel*, 131-6.

<sup>306</sup> Riley, *The Making of Mark*, 80.

<sup>307</sup> Riley, *The Making of Mark*, 82; Mann, *Mark*, 306; Peabody, Cope, and McNicol, *One Gospel from Two*, 167; Tyson, "The Blindness of the Disciples," 35-7; Weeden, *Traditions in Conflict*, 26-32.

<sup>308</sup> Weeden, *Traditions in Conflict*, 26-32.

wilderness;<sup>309</sup> afterward, when Jesus warns the disciples of the leaven of the Pharisees, Mark again removes Jesus' address to the disciples as, "You of little faith," and the questions in vv. 17-18, "Do you not yet perceive nor understand? Have your hearts been hardened? Having eyes, do you not see? And having ears, do you not hear?" have been inserted into Mt 16:9 alongside the other questions already present, referencing back to the quotation in the explanation for Jesus' use of parables in Mk 4:10-12, again pointing to the unbelief of the disciples and their status as outsiders, at the end of the pericope, while Matthew narrates the moment of the disciples' understanding of the phrase, Mark has removed this mention and replaced it with the final, "Do you not yet understand?" from Jesus, ending the pericope on this question;<sup>310</sup> before and after the feeding of the four thousand and pericope on the yeast of the Pharisees, so as to enclose these pericopes, Mark has added redactional miracle stories that illustrate the deafness and blindness of the disciples, the partial healing of the blind man placed before the confession of Peter to point to the partialness of his understanding of Jesus;<sup>311</sup> Mark has removed Jesus' establishment of Peter's authority after his confession, leaving Jesus' response to Peter to entail only the rebuke that equates his mentality with that of Satan;<sup>312</sup> Mark accentuates Peter's embarrassing comment during the Transfiguration that is found in Luke, against Matthew; after the Transfiguration, Mark inserts at Mk 9:10 that the disciples did not understand what Jesus

---

<sup>309</sup> Peabody, Cope, and McNicol, *One Gospel from Two*, 179-81.

<sup>310</sup> Riley, *The Making of Mark*, 94; Mann, *Mark*, 333; Peabody, Cope, and McNicol, *One Gospel from Two*, 187-8; Weeden, *Traditions in Conflict*, 26-32; Eve, "Reconstructing Mark," 101-11.

<sup>311</sup> Riley, *The Making of Mark*, 96; Mann, *Mark*, 338-9; Peabody, Cope, and McNicol, *One Gospel from Two*, 189.

<sup>312</sup> Mann, *Mark*, 341; Peabody, Cope, and McNicol, *One Gospel from Two*, 194; Trocmé, *The Formation of the Gospel*, 129; Tyson, "The Blindness of the Disciples," 35-7.

meant in saying that the Son of Man would rise from the dead;<sup>313</sup> in the healing of the demon-possessed boy, to the story that the disciples were not able to cast out the demon, Mark adds Jesus' statement, "Everything is possible for the one who believes," further reinforcing the disciples' inability to perform the exorcism due to a lack of faith, even inserting the superfluous addition of vv. 20-23 that repeats details of the story for the purpose of leading into this second response of Jesus, keeping the first, in which Jesus responds with the rebuke, "You unbelieving generation," upon hearing the disciples could not cast the demon out;<sup>314</sup> Mark reiterates in 9:32 that the disciples did not understand what Jesus meant in His second prediction of His death and resurrection, describing them as too afraid to ask for clarification, again following Luke against the description in Matthew that the disciples were grieved in response;<sup>315</sup> Mark adds the detail that Jesus was indignant at the disciples after they rebuked the children who wanted to meet him;<sup>316</sup> before the third passion prediction, it is added that the disciples were afraid to go with Him to Jerusalem;<sup>317</sup> in the request of James and John, the disciples ask Jesus directly rather than their mother, with their question changed to, "Teacher... we want you to do for us whatever we ask," a portrayal that colors them with audacity, which have the effect of further compounding their error;<sup>318</sup> in a section that Mark otherwise uses Luke, in Mk 13:12, Mark switches to the version of a saying as found in Matthew to emphasize the betrayal of a brother against a brother,

---

<sup>313</sup> Trocmé, *The Formation of the Gospel*, 129; Eve, "Reconstructing Mark," 101-11.

<sup>314</sup> Eve, "Reconstructing Mark," 101-11.

<sup>315</sup> Riley, *The Making of Mark*, 104; Eve, "Reconstructing Mark," 101-11.

<sup>316</sup> Riley, *The Making of Mark*, 118; Weeden, *Traditions in Conflict*, 65-9; Tyson, "The Blindness of the Disciples," 35-7.

<sup>317</sup> Riley, *The Making of Mark*, 123-4; Tyson, "The Blindness of the Disciples," 38-42.

<sup>318</sup> Riley, *The Making of Mark*, 125; Peabody, Cope, and McNicol, *One Gospel from Two*, 228-9.

alluding to James as the enemy of Jesus; the woman named Mary that assisted Jesus in His ministry is further identified by Mark to prevent the implication that she is the mother of Jesus and James;<sup>319</sup> Mark skipped the birth narratives in Matthew and Luke, at least in part, because of their positive portrayal of Jesus' family;<sup>320</sup> the role of Peter is diminished in some of the miracle stories by grouping him with James and John;<sup>321</sup> Mark changes the "crowd" that attempted to silence Bartimaeus to "many," suggesting that some of Jesus' disciples were among those who rebuked him;<sup>322</sup> Mark changes Jesus' prediction to the disciples from, "'You will all fall away because of me this night,'" to, "'You will all fall away,'" removing the temporal qualification and suggesting the finality of their apostasy; in Jesus' instruction for the disciples to go before Him to Galilee at Mk 14:28, Mark changes Matthew's δὲ for ἀλλὰ, increasing the distinction between the two events;<sup>323</sup> Mark has added details to the scene at Gethsemane before Jesus' betrayal that function to further separate the disciples, and Peter in particular;<sup>324</sup> Mark has retained the detail that one of the disciples drew his sword and cut off the servant's ear, but removes from Luke that Jesus healed it; when Peter denies Jesus three times, Mark has changed the one crow of the rooster in Peter's denial to two, so that the added crow could be added before the three denials are complete, as a reminder to Peter, heightening the severity of his apostasy;<sup>325</sup> and the young man that fled the garden when Jesus was arrested, because his garment was

---

<sup>319</sup> Crossan, "Mark and the Relatives of Jesus," 105-10.

<sup>320</sup> Kloppenborg, *Collected Essays*, 11-27.

<sup>321</sup> Trocmé, *The Formation of the Gospel*, 129

<sup>322</sup> Riley, *The Making of Mark*, 128; Peabody, Cope, and McNicol, 228-9.

<sup>323</sup> Peabody, Cope, and McNicol, *One Gospel from Two*, 289-90.

<sup>324</sup> Riley, *The Making of Mark*, 170; Peabody, Cope, and McNicol, *One Gospel from Two*, 294-5.

<sup>325</sup> Riley, *The Making of Mark*, 178; Peabody, Cope, and McNicol, *One Gospel from Two*, 290.

removed and not due to faithlessness as with the other disciples, goes to the tomb early in the morning and witnesses the risen Lord, but the disciples do not receive his message and so fail to meet Jesus at Galilee, having fallen from the faith and left void of a claim to apostolic authority.<sup>326</sup> It is the case, then, that the intention of Mark to disparage the details is demonstrated not only by his selection of pericopes but by his further redaction within those pericopes, emphasizing their lack of belief, commenting on the hardness of their hearts, increasing the severity of their errors, associating them with unbelievers, and implicating their condemnation.

A difficulty for the other models of Mark under the 2GH is that a version of the Gospel without the longer ending was transmitted, with some supposing that Mark wrote up to 16:8 while Peter was alive and then wrote the longer ending after his death. While most of the argumentation has been directed toward the identification of the author of the longer ending with that of the rest of the Gospel, the argument is pointless for models contending against its intention to disparage the disciples, since even if it was the same author, the initial ending of Mark at 16:8 has implications concerning the purpose of the Gospel's composition, and the longer ending could have been appended by that same author due to outside pressure, because of the implications that may have arisen from it. The acknowledgement of the longer ending does not dispel the purposes that are evident in the initial ending of the Gospel at 16:8, as it still must be explained why the Gospel was initially ending at this point, even if the longer ending was appended later, without permitting its connection to the polemical purposes that are evident throughout the rest of the document. To avoid these implications, it is necessary to suggest that the longer ending was lost in a stream of its transmission, but it must be questioned, then, how the omission of the longer ending continued to survive amongst the contemporaneous

---

<sup>326</sup> Weeden, *Traditions in Conflict*, 38-51.

proliferation of the longer ending alongside it, which should have caused the recognition and resolution of the error, especially since the ending at 16:8 is so striking, as the same 2GH proponents agree, and demands resolution. For the ending at 16:8 to lend to its continuation and the resolution of its difficulties, and for the longer ending to have circulated alongside it, there must be sufficient reason why the longer ending was not altogether accepted, which must be that the longer ending was met with doubt as to its authenticity, a fact that itself lends to the original publication of the Gospel ending at 16:8. In either case, the evidence of Mark's selection and redaction of material to disparage the disciples, as has been demonstrated, does not depend on the ending at 16:8, but is evidenced throughout the Gospel. The evidence of this intention elsewhere in turns supports the intention of the author to have originally ended the Gospel at 16:8, seeing that the ending is consistent with the intent to disparage the disciples throughout the rest of the Gospel. This is reinforced even more when the young man at the garden and the empty tomb is considered, which has not yet been discussed, but is, alongside the Beelzebul controversy, the strongest evidence for this redactional interest.

The polemical model is not to suggest Peter, James, or the other Jerusalem disciples were indeed associated with the circumcision party, but only that this was Mark's perception, whether that be because the circumcision party associated themselves with the apostles, while the apostles were still alive or after their death, in an attempt to garner legitimacy for their position, or because of a misunderstanding that the two were opposed, perhaps as a result of the circulation of Paul's letter to the Galatians, in which he describes the instance when he chastised Peter for following the example of the circumcision party, who were said to have been sent from James.

If a polemical intention of Mark is recognized under the 2DH, it must be questioned how the Gospel could have been accepted by the Church with such a presentation of the disciples.

The very nature of the enterprise is an attempt to undermine the disciples but in such a way that it would be subtle enough to avoid detection and subsequent rejection by the Church. The author decided to use the Gospel material to build a narrative and portray the apostles negatively rather than make explicit pronouncements against them. Mark does not himself proclaim that James is condemned but associates him with the Pharisees whom Jesus condemned; he does not call the disciples unbelievers but identifies them with those on the outside who do not understand the parables; and, most of all, he does not narrate that the disciples did not see the risen Lord but ends the narrative at 16:8 to suggest they did not receive the message from the women who ran away from the tomb in silence. It is more likely that the subtlety of Mark's intentions would not be noticed or could be overlooked if it was read and filtered through the lens of the parallel portrayals of the other two Gospels that were more widely distributed and known. 2DH proponents who recognize the polemical intent must suppose that Mark's purposes were obscured by the backdrop of the oral traditions alone, and that when it was published its readers were not cognizant to notice the particularities of Mark's selection and use of those traditions. This is especially a difficulty with the identification of the young man at the garden and the empty tomb, seeing that, if Mark was written first, it would likely have been understood by its readers that the writer was presenting the two as the same, but this was hindered because the young man at the tomb was interpreted as one of the angels that are present in Matthew and Luke.

At the garden of Gethsemane, the disciples abandon Jesus, and Mark includes the unique detail of a young man who fled the garden after his garments were grabbed, causing him to be exposed. This young man is described in much the same way as the young man who relays Jesus' message to the women at the empty tomb. As Peabody, Cope, and McNicol note, to

narrate that the women ran away from the tomb, Mark uses the word φεύγω to describe them as having “fled,” the same word that is used to describe the disciples fleeing during Jesus’ arrest and the young man who fled because his garment was grasped, and he seems to have intentionally used this description of the women as a connection between the two events.<sup>327</sup> The descriptions of the young man at the garden and the young man at the empty tomb can be compared:

Mk 14:51: νεανίσκος τις συνηκολούθει αὐτῷ, περιβεβλημένος σινδόνα

Mk 16:5: νεανίσκον καθήμενον ἐν τοῖς δεξιοῖς, περιβεβλημένον στολὴν λευκὴν<sup>328</sup>

The similarities in the two descriptions are apparent, both in structure and word choice, making it evident that Mark has deliberately used similar language in describing the two men in order to connect the two. After Peter denies Jesus three times, none of the apostles are seen for the remainder of the Gospel, having abandoned Him. At the scene of the empty tomb, the young man reappears and reminds the women of Jesus’ earlier instruction for the disciples to go to Galilee to see Him, but the women depart and say nothing. Mark ends his document here because the women’s silence subtly implies that the disciples were not reminded to go to Galilee, and so could not have seen the risen Jesus. This serves as the climax of Mark’s intent to disparage the disciples, denying their having seen the risen Lord, and, as a result, denying their legitimacy as apostles. The young man had gone to the tomb before the women and saw Jesus, serving as a contrast to the disciples. It is likely that this man was intended to serve as the author’s informant

---

<sup>327</sup> Peabody, Cope, and McNicol, *One Gospel from Two*, 325.

<sup>328</sup> *Ibid.*, 326-7.



for the “true” account of the stories he provides throughout, as the source of the changes he has made to the versions found in Matthew and Luke, with the additional minor details, more vulgar style, and abundant use of καί intended to emulate the recounting of an eyewitness. The Jerusalem apostles fled the garden because they abandoned Jesus out of fear of arrest, but Mark, needing the young man to flee for another reason, narrates the otherwise inexplicable detail that the man fled after his garment had been torn off, which allows Mark to remove him from the scene when the other disciples had fled but without impugning him of deserting Jesus due to faithlessness. By contrast, the young man had to flee because he had been exposed and not because he abandoned Jesus as with the others, a reason of propriety, not faithlessness, thus permitting the young man to leave the scene until after the death of Jesus but retaining his status as the “true apostle” in contrast to the other disciples.

The young man was present at the empty tomb when the women arrived because he was faithful to go to the tomb early in the morning and see Jesus risen from the dead. This young man, then, who is the same man who was exposed at the garden, was able to see the risen Jesus, in contrast to the Jerusalem apostles, who had not been reminded to go to Galilee. The evangelist undermines their apostolic authority by implying they had not gone to Galilee to see the risen Lord, while the young man saw Jesus and can be understood to have apostolic authority as an eyewitness. With the narrative ending at 16:8, it is presented with such subtlety so as not to prevent the acceptance of the document and its proliferation within the Church. What otherwise appears to be the strange detail of the young man losing his garment and being exposed as naked is readily explained by the equivocation of the young man at the garden and the tomb for the purpose of presenting him as the true apostle who did not abandon Jesus due to faithlessness but went to the tomb to see Him after He was raised, serving both as a contrast to those who deserted

Jesus at the garden and failed to meet Him at Galilee and as the authority upon which the rectification of details throughout Mark's account can be rested. That the young man at the empty tomb is intended to be the young man at the garden at the time of Jesus' arrest is evidenced by the nearly identical wording used in their descriptions, which seems intentional to connect the two; the otherwise inexplicable purpose of the existence of the young man at the garden; its congruence with the ending at 16:8, which connects to the otherwise insoluble sudden ending concerning the women and absence of post-resurrection appearance accounts; and it accords with the presentation of the disciples throughout the rest of the composition, especially seeing that young man at the garden is one of only four pericopes that are unique to Mark. The redactional changes, selection of material, paratactic and more vulgar style, purpose of the young man at the garden, and ending of the account at 16:8 are all readily explicable by the 2GH polemical model of Mark. The objections against have been made against the 2GH concerning Mark are not only inapplicable against the polemical model, but the model is suggested by those very observations.

In response to the Judaizing party placing requirements on the Gentiles and hindering them from attaining salvation, Mark has written to portray the apostles as unbelievers, undermine their apostolic authority, and damn them to hell. To James the Lord's brother has been attributed the unforgivable sin. The disciples are likened to unbelievers. The young man at the empty tomb is the only one who saw the risen Lord. While the Gospels of Matthew and Luke have the purpose of presenting the teachings and life of Jesus to edify believers, Mark uses the material from these Gospels to condemn his opponents, and so his composition, while using Gospel material, does not really constitute a Gospel at all, but is instead an ecclesio-political tract against the Judaizing party. The name of the source theory, the Two Gospel Hypothesis, is, then, all the

more fitting. In his use of the two Gospels of Matthew and Luke, Mark has composed an ecclesio-political tract against the Jerusalem apostolate due to their association with the Judaizing party, selecting and redacting the Gospel material to construct a narrative that portrays the disciples as unbelievers and undermine their authority as apostles, damning them to hell for placing the requirements of the Law onto Gentile believers and impeding their entry into the Church and attainment of eternal life.

## CHAPTER III

## LUKE'S USE OF MATTHEW

The remaining obstacle for the establishment of the 2GH is an explanation for Luke's use of Matthew. This involves consistently patterned and coherent redactional processes in his use of Matthew for the first section of his Gospel, before switching to another source for the Central Section, and returning to Matthew for the remainder of the narrative. It is likely that, based on the ordering of some of Luke's unique material, the evangelist had access to at least one written source aside from Matthew, which will be referred to as "L," and whether Luke's unique material comes from a single written source or multiple, and whether he used oral tradition, Luke's unique material will be referred to as "L material" for the sake of simplicity. If L involved a written source, as is likely, its distribution is indeterminable, if it was published at all. The difficulty in evaluating Luke's use of other sources, no matter whether that is Mark, Q, and L under the 2DH or Matthew and L under the 2GH, is that he at times reproduces the wording nearly identically, and at other times the Lukan version must be so heavily rewritten that it is possible he had a variant tradition from another source available to him. As even Goulder says of Luke's unique parable of the unjust judge, "Linguistic considerations... can hardly prove more than that Luke has, or has not, put the parable in his own words."<sup>329</sup> Before attributing unique material to Lukan composition, then, rather than to a written source L or oral tradition, there should be good reasoning for ruling out revision or the use of a variant tradition, contra McNicol, Dungan, and Peabody, who err on the side of invention than the use of L in cases where the

---

<sup>329</sup> Michael D. Goulder, *Luke: A New Paradigm* (Sheffield, UK: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989), 660.

passage has a high percentage of Lukan wording.<sup>330</sup> But as Cadbury also contends, due to how Luke evidently rewrote material derived from Mark and Q, or Matthew under the 2GH, vocabulary and style cannot be used to determine if Luke is using a source and if that source is written or oral.<sup>331</sup> An additional complication is that Luke is likely to have conflated Matthew and L at some points, further blurring the line of his sources and composition.<sup>332</sup> Luke heavily revised some passages from Matthew to the extent that they would be surmised to be Lukan composition under the procedure of McNicol, Dungan, and Peabody if Matthew was not available, which contradicts their principle by analogy, since there is no reason not to expect that he would have used the L material in roughly the same way. For example, Luke's use of Matthew, or Q under the 2DH, ranges from near identical wording, such as in the case of the woes to the two cities at Lk 10:13-15, to instances in which the passage is revised to such an extent that it is likely he was using a variant, such as with the section following the worry over worldly troubles at Lk 12:32-34, which corresponds to Mt 6:19-21. Likewise, a good contender for Lukan composition is the added material to the pericope on the followers' excuses at Lk 9:57-62, which aligns with his Elijah-Elisha theme and pairs with the fiery response to the Samaritan rejection from James and John; but, on the other hand, the parable of the dishonest steward is the best example of unique material that must be pre-redactional. For this reason, Luke's unique material will be labeled as L, unless there is further rationale that renders it more likely a passage is Lukan composition; at the same time, in the reverse, an argument will only be

---

<sup>330</sup> Allan J. McNicol, David L. Dungan, and David B. Peabody, *Beyond the Q Impasse: Luke's Use of Matthew* (Valley Forge, PA: Trinity International Press, 1996), 25-6.

<sup>331</sup> Henry J. Cadbury, *The Making of Luke-Acts*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1958), 67-8.

<sup>332</sup> McNicol, Dungan, and Peabody, *Luke's Use of Matthew*, 26.

made that material shared with Matthew is intrusive to L if the order of the unique material, or on some other grounds, likely points to an underlying written source available to Luke.

From Luke's prologue it can be detected that he held his sources to be deficient and considered that he was capable of composing an improved Gospel, not only in its presentation and style but also its sequence and factuality. In comparison to his predecessors he intended to write ἀκριβῶς and καθεξῆς, "accurately" and "in proper sequence," though he viewed Matthew as generally reliable and able to be used as the foundation for his own work.<sup>333</sup> If it can be demonstrated that Luke used Matthew per the 2GH, it would be the case that Luke has replaced Matthew's material with what he considered more reliable tradition where appropriate, which he "received from those who were eyewitnesses from the beginning and who were ministers of the word," indicating that the traditions he received were passed on from what he considered to be more reliable sources of tradition, that this material should supersede the versions found in Matthew, and that "it seemed good to [him]" to write an account as one who had been "following everything closely from the beginning," further suggesting the availability of information external to these previous accounts. Fitzmyer's objection against Luke's use of Matthew that Luke sometimes has the more primitive tradition despite being secondary literarily, then, is answered by the evangelist himself in the prologue.<sup>334</sup> As Goulder notes, despite his view that

---

<sup>333</sup> Cf. E. P. Sanders and Margaret Davies. *Studying the Synoptic Gospels* (Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press International, 1996). 22-3, 36-8; Goulder, *Luke: A New Paradigm*, 199; McNicol, Dungan, and Peabody, *Luke's Use of Matthew*, 30, 52; William R. Farmer, *The Synoptic Problem: A Critical Analysis* (New York: The MacMillan Co., 1964), 222-3; Mark A. Matson, "Luke's Rewriting of the Sermon on the Mount," in *Questioning Q: A Multidimensional Critique*, ed. Mark Goodacre and Nicholas Perrin (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2004), 47-8; David L. Dungan, *A History of the Synoptic Problem: The Canon, the Text, the Composition, and the Interpretation of the Gospels* (New York: Doubleday, 1999), 14; Paul W. Felix, "Literary Dependence and Luke's Prologue," *The Master's Seminary Journal* 8, no. 1 (Spring 1997): 61-75.

<sup>334</sup> J. A. Fitzmyer, "Luke's Use of Q," in *The Two-Source Hypothesis: A Critical Appraisal*, ed. Arthur J. Bellinzoni, Jr., Joseph B. Tyson, and William O. Walker, Jr. (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1985), 250.

Luke used both Matthew and Mark, based on Luke's tendency to hyperbolize in other instances, his comment on there being "many" previous attempts to write a Gospel before him is likely a literary exaggeration, citing instances such as Lk 7:21, Acts 1:3, 24:2, and 24:10 to establish such a tendency.<sup>335</sup> It cannot be known if L or any other sources Luke may have used were standalone documents that were published and circulated, but whether Luke was including them alongside Matthew in his mention of the "many" previous written accounts does not depend on this being the case. As Howard and Stein note, too much should not be made of the use of "many" because its use is in line with literary conventions.<sup>336</sup> While Luke has some criticism for Matthew's Gospel and sees that he can improve it, he does have respect for his source and the author who composed it. It is known that Matthew proved popular upon its reception, so the ambiguity may have functioned as a device to be polite to his predecessor. Matthew's Gospel would have been widely known at the time and likely acknowledged as the source Luke would have been referring to, and so Luke opted to pluralize his reference. Luke's approach to Matthew can be seen both by Luke's extensive use of his predecessor in the composition of his own Gospel and in his recognition of its need for improvement and even correction, which is evidenced not only by the more apparent alterations he has made to sections such as the infancy narrative, genealogy, and post-resurrection appearance accounts, but also in the minor changes he has made to Matthew's material throughout his Gospel.

Orchard notices that while the appearance of the Matthean discourses follow the sequence of Luke's use of Matthew, the displaced material is used topically throughout the

---

<sup>335</sup> Goulder, *Luke: A New Paradigm*, 198.

<sup>336</sup> I. Howard Marshall, *Luke: Historian and Theologian* (Exeter, UK: Paternoster, 1988), 40-1; Robert H. Stein, "Luke 1:1-4 and *Traditionsgeschichte*," *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 26, no. 4 (December 1983): 422.

Central Section.<sup>337</sup> This accords with Acts 1:1, where Luke says that in his previous work, his Gospel, that he detailed all of what Jesus did and taught, and this appears to indeed reflect his structuring of his Gospel, with the narrative of Jesus' deeds presented first and then His teachings reserved for the next section.<sup>338</sup> As a part of composing a well-paced narrative, Luke wanted to ensure that his sections blended into one another, and that the material flowed from one pericope and section to another, which is why he would have wanted to deconstruct Matthew's conglomerated discourses. Throughout his Gospel he anticipates upcoming themes in earlier pericopes, and often this is done so seamlessly and thoroughly that it is not possible to divide his work into distinct sections thematically without the recognition of the continuation of themes from previous sections.<sup>339</sup> While the common defense of 2GH, FH, and AH proponents for Luke's displacement of material from the Sermon of the Mount, and his deconstruction of the other Matthean discourses, is due to a dislike for longer discourses, it can be seen from a few passages in Acts, particularly Stephen's speech, that he is not opposed to longer discourses *per se*, but as Goodacre notes, unlike Matthew, who is content to compile material into athematic collections, Luke's concern is to compose thematically coherent discourses that contain material pertinent to their purpose within the outer narrative and direction of the Gospel.<sup>340</sup>

---

<sup>337</sup> Bernard Orchard, *Matthew, Luke & Mark*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (Manchester: Koinonia Press, 1987), 52-3.

<sup>338</sup> Bernard Orchard and Harold Riley, *The Order of the Synoptics: Why Three Synoptic Gospels?* (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1989), 51-2.

<sup>339</sup> McNicol, Dungan, and Peabody, *Luke's Use of Matthew*, 30-1.

<sup>340</sup> Mark Goodacre, *The Case Against Q: Studies in Markan Priority and the Synoptic Problem* (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 2002), 96.



### Luke's Redactional Procedures

There are four related principles necessary to account for Luke's use of Matthew and L in the construction of his Gospel: first, Luke conducted cycles through Matthew's material to construct his Galilean Ministry up to 9:51, progressing forward through his sequence five times to accumulate the thematic and compositionally coherent sequences that comprise this portion of his Gospel; second, he inserted pericopes from his unique material into the primarily Matthean sequences of the Galilean Ministry where suitable and in accordance with his redactional purposes; third, while Luke followed Matthew in establishing the sequence of his material prior to and after the Central Section of Lk 9:51-19:27, he was intent to replace the wording of his predecessor's material with what he considered better tradition that was available to him where it overlapped; and second, he reserved Matthew's discourse material for use in his Central Section to build onto L as it pertained topically.

Starting with the preaching of John the Baptist, the sequence of Luke can be outlined in the following manner, with ">" indicating where Luke switches from Matthew to L and vice versa, or has moved forward in Matthew and skipped unused material, not counting instances where Luke instead uses a variant from L in the Central Section. The use of "≥" indicates cases in which the next pericope in Matthew is the next unused pericope in Luke's sequence, excluding material Luke altogether omits. The outline is separated into sections, each beginning with a sequential number, indicating the number of times Luke uses a passage out of sequence in his use of Matthew, whether it is due to a "scan" of Matthew, where he moves forward in Matthew carrying over material for a specific purpose before flipping back to an earlier point to repeat the process; cases in which Luke moves far forward in Matthew and skips material that he uses later, evidently with a particular intention in the use of that pericope next in his sequence; or where a

pericope is used out of sequence relative to its sequence in Matthew, with each example requiring an explanation of Luke's redactional intent. The initial pericope of each section, then, signifies the anomalous changes of Matthew's order that need to be explained for Luke's use of Matthew to be viable. This is the sequence from the preaching of John, which follows the infancy narratives in both Matthew and Luke, to the parable of the Good Samaritan, which begins his switch to L as his primary source and, as such, the implementation of a different redactional procedure:

1. Preaching of John the Baptist, Lk 3:1-18//Mt 3:1-12 (M)  $\geq$  Jesus' baptism, Lk 3:21-22//Mt 3:13-17 (M)
2. Jesus' genealogy, Lk 3:23-38 (L)  $>$  Wilderness temptation, Lk 4:1-13//Mt 4:1-11 (M)
3. Rejection at Nazareth, Lk 4:14-30 (L)  $\geq$  Exorcism in the synagogue, Lk 4:31-37 (L)
4. Healing of Peter's mother-in-law, Lk 4:38-41//Mt 8:14-17 (M)  $>$  Call of the disciples, Lk 5:1-11 (L)
5. Healing of leper, Lk 5:12-16//Mt 8:1-4 (M)  $>$  Healing of paralytic, Lk 5:17-26//Mt 9:1-8 (M)  $\geq$  Matthew and the tax collectors, Lk 5:27-32//Mt 9:9-13 (M)  $\geq$  Bridegroom and fasting, Lk 5:33-39//Mt 9:14-17 (M)  $>$  Lord of the Sabbath, Lk 6:1-5//Mt 12:1-8 (M)  $\geq$  Man with the withered hand, Lk 6:6-11//Mt 12:9-14 (M)
6. Appointment of the Twelve, Lk 6:12-16//Mt 10:1-4 (M)
7. Pre-sermonic healing summary, Lk 6:17-19//Mt 4:23-25 (M)  $\geq$  Beatitudes and woes, Lk 6:20-26//Mt 5:1-12 (M)  $>$  Love of enemies, Lk 6:27-36//Mt 5:43-48 (M)  $>$  Do not judge, Lk 6:37-38//Mt 7:1-2 (M)  $\geq$  (After sayings at Lk 6:39-40) Plank in the eye, Lk 6:41-42//Mt 7:3-5 (M)  $>$  Trees and their fruits, Lk 6:43-45//Mt 7:16-20 (M)  $\geq$  "Lord, Lord," Lk 6:46//Mt 7:21-23 (M)  $\geq$  Two builders, Lk 6:47-49//Mt 7:24-27 (M)  $\geq$  Centurion's servant, Lk 7:1-10//Mt 8:5-13 (M)  $>$  Widow of Nain, Lk 7:11-17 (L)
8. The Baptist's inquiry, Lk 7:18-35//Mt 11:1-19 (M)  $>$  The repentant woman, Lk 7:36-50 (L)

9. Parable of the sower and Jesus' family pericope, Lk 8:1-21//Mt 12:46-13:23 (M, noting that the family pericope is the pericope immediately before the parable of the sower)
10. Stilling of the storm, Lk 8:22-25//Mt 8:23-27 (M)  $\geq$  Gerasene demoniac, Lk 8:26-39//Mt 8:28-34  $\geq$  Jairus' daughter and woman with issue of blood, Lk 8:40-56//Mt 9:18-26 (M)  $>$  Mission charge, Lk 9:1-6//Mt 10 (M)  $>$  Herod's inquiry about Jesus, Lk 9:7-9//Mt 14:1-2 (M)  $\geq$  Feeding of the five thousand, Lk 9:10-17//Mt 14:13-21 (M)  $>$  Peter's confession, Lk 9:18-20//Mt 16:13-20 (M)  $\geq$  First death prediction, Lk 9:21-22//Mt 16:21-23 (M)  $\geq$  Discipleship material, Lk 9:23-27//Mt 16:24-28 (M)  $\geq$  Transfiguration, Lk 9:28-36//Mt 17:1-8 (M)  $\geq$  Healing of demon-possessed boy, Lk 9:37-43a//Mt 17:14-21 (M)  $\geq$  Second death prediction, Lk 9:43b-45//Mt 17:22-23 (M)  $\geq$  Greatest in the kingdom dispute, Lk 9:46-48//Mt 18:1-5 (M)  $>$  Unknown exorcist, Lk 9:49-50 (L)  $>$  Samaritan rejection, Lk 9:51-56 (L)
11. Followers' excuses, Lk 9:57-62//Mt 8:18-22 (M)  $\geq$  Mission charge, Lk 10:1-12//Mt 10 (M)  $>$  Woe to the cities, Lk 10:13-15//Mt 11:20-24 (M)  $>$  Jesus' response to the seventy-two, Lk 10:17-20 (L)  $>$  Father's revelation through the Son, Lk 10:21-22//Mt 11:25-27 (M)  $\geq$  Blessedness of the disciples, Lk 10:23-24//Mt 13:16-17 (M)

Many of the pericopes beginning each line are not due to an anomaly of their own but because it is the first unused pericope after the anomalous use of another passage, such as the pre-sermonic healing summary, which is the first pericope of a scan after the specific placement of the appointment of the Twelve before the Sermon, and the stilling of the storm, which is again the first pericope of a scan following the parable of the sower complex. In other words, they are the next unused pericope that Luke has flipped back to after the specific use of other material for a different section. It should be noticed that the progressions at line 10 and line 11 both include the mission charge in Mt 10, creating a doublet of Luke's charge to the Twelve and then to the seventy-two. Before the Central Section, then, this leaves the following anomalies of order to be explained:

1. Jesus' genealogy, Lk 3:23-38

2. Rejection at Nazareth, Lk 4:14-30
3. Healing of Peter's mother-in-law, Lk 4:38-41
4. Healing of the leper, Lk 5:12-16
5. Appointment of the Twelve, Lk 6:12-16
6. The Baptist's inquiry, Lk 7:18-35
7. Parable of the sower and Jesus' family pericope, Lk 8:1-21

In the Central Section, Luke's redactional procedure changes and he turns to L as his main source, building onto its frame with material from the Matthean discourses. He returns to the next unused pericope per the first redactional procedure in Matthew twice after this point, once with the Beelzebul controversy, which he previously passed over to reserve it for the Central Section, and the parables of the mustard seed and leaven. Near the end of the Central Section and in the section following it, the Jerusalem sequence, the order is as follows:

1. Blessing the children, Lk 18:15-17//Mt 19:13-15 (M)  $\geq$  The rich man and the kingdom of God, Lk 18:18-30//Mt 19:16-30 (M)  $\geq$  Third death prediction, Lk 18:31-34//Mt 20:17-19 (M)  $>$  Healing of the blind beggar, Lk 18:35-43//20:29-34 (M)  $>$  Zacchaeus, Lk 19:1-10 (L)  $\geq$  Parable of the ten pounds, Lk 19:11-27//Mt 22:1-14 (L/M)  $>$  Triumphant entry, Lk 19:28-40//Mt 21:1-11 (M)  $>$  Lament over Jerusalem, Lk 19:41-44 (L)  $>$  Cleansing of the temple, Lk 19:45-48//Mt 21:12-17 (M)  $\geq$  Question about Jesus' authority, Lk 20:1-8//Mt 21:23-27 (M)  $\geq$  Parable of the wicked tenants, Lk 20:9-19//Mt 21:33-46 (M)  $\geq$  Render to Caesar, Lk 20:20-26//Mt 22:15-22 (M)  $\geq$  Marriage after the resurrection, Lk 20:27-40//Mt 22:23-33 (M)  $\geq$  The Son of David, Lk 20:41-44//Mt 22:41-46 (M)  $\geq$  Warning over the teachers of the Law, Lk 20:45-47//Mt 23 (M)  $>$  Widow's mite, Lk 21:1-4 (L)  $>$  The eschatological discourse, Lk 21:5-38//Mt 24 (M)

As can be seen, with the possible exception of the parable of the pounds, which may be a conflation of an L version with Matthew's parable of the talents, Luke follows Matthew's sequence entirely up to the beginning of the passion narrative. There are, then, no anomalies in

this section. The two sections of his Gospel that require explication are the Galilean Ministry and the Central Section, both of which operate under a different redactional procedure. From the preaching of John through the mission charge to the seventy-two at the beginning of the Central Section, Luke follows the sequence of Matthew as his main source, supplying tradition from L as it is suitable. This he accomplishes with successive progressions through Matthew's sequence, carrying over material that pertains to his purposes in the composition of a section, then returns back to the next unused pericope and progresses through again, repeating this process until he conducts a final scan with the pericope on the followers' excuses and the second use of the mission charge at Mt 10. At this point he switches over to L as his main source and builds onto its material using the Matthean discourse material. What follows is a detailed explication of Luke's redactional purposes in his use of Matthew and L, in order to establish that Luke has used his sources in the construction of his Gospel in the manner described, first detailing his cyclical use of Matthew up to the Central Section and afterward his switch to L as his primary source and supplementation with the Matthean discourse material.

### The Galilean Ministry

#### The Rejection at Nazareth

At Mt 4:12-13, Matthew includes the detail that after John was imprisoned Jesus withdrew into Galilee, then left Nazareth and went to Capernaum, with no explanation for the mention of Nazareth, why Jesus went there, or why he left. This may have spurred the idea in Luke to insert the rejection at Nazareth at this point.<sup>341</sup> This is despite the fact that, as Fitzmyer

---

<sup>341</sup> McNicol, Dungan, and Peabody, *Luke's Use of Matthew*, 80-1.

recognizes, based on the mention at Lk 4:23 of prior miracles performed in Capernaum, it is evident the pericope was not first in Luke's source. It was deliberately placed, then, at the beginning of Jesus' ministry, and it can be seen that this was done with the intention that it would serve as the thematic preface to Jesus' ministry. The theme of rejection is foreshadowed in Simeon's prophecy in the infancy narrative and functions programmatically for the remainder of Jesus' ministry, throughout which Jesus' rejection is emphasized.<sup>342</sup> Luke not only included material from Matthew that showcases the ineptitude of Jesus' disciples before the Central Section, which serves as the concluding section of the Galilean Ministry before the beginning of Jesus' journey to Jerusalem, but added material to this section from L, a theme that heightens over the course of the Gospel to the pinnacle of Judas's betrayal, the abandonment of the disciples, and Peter's denial, coalescing with the rejection of the people and religious leaders to result in Jesus' crucifixion. If the pericope on the disciples' reservations about following Jesus at Lk 9:57-62 is taken as three instances, there are four stories on the failure of the disciples immediately before 9:51 and four after.<sup>343</sup> This serves as one example that the rejection at Nazareth serves as a fitting preface to Jesus' ministry and sets the stage for the themes Luke intends to develop over the course of his Gospel.

The following pericope of the exorcism at Lk 4:31-37 comes from L and is paired with the rejection at Nazareth. The exorcism at the synagogue in Capernaum shares a parallel setting and is intended as a contrast to the rejection at the synagogue in Nazareth: in one Jesus is expelled from the town, and in the other He expels the demon; the townspeople did not know His

---

<sup>342</sup> J. A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel according to Luke I-IX: Introduction, Translation, and Notes* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1981), 526-9.

<sup>343</sup> McNicol, Dungan, and Peabody, *Luke's Use of Matthew*, 142-9, 123.

identity, but the demon recognizes He is the Messiah; in the former Jesus was rejected, and in the latter He was vindicated. The statement of the news about Jesus spreading throughout the region at the end of the exorcism pericope at v. 37 links to the similar statement at v. 14 at the beginning of the rejection pericope, forming an *inclusio*, further solidifying the pairing of the two.<sup>344</sup>

### The Call of Peter

The saying of Jesus at v. 43 after the healing Peter's mother-in-law and crowds echoes the wording of the Isaiah prophecy that was quoted in the sermon at Nazareth, with the εὐαγγελίσασθαί με...ἀπεστάλην reflecting the language of the εὐαγγελίσασθαι...ἀπέσταλκέν με from the prophecy.<sup>345</sup> This is a Lukan addition to Matthew, reinforcing Luke's intent for the prophecy to be programmatic for Luke's presentation of Jesus throughout the Gospel. Luke transposes the healing of Peter's mother-in-law to before his version of the call of the disciples in order to feature an interaction between them before they are called, in contrast to the suddenness of Matthew's presentation.<sup>346</sup> The healing of Peter's mother-in-law along with the miraculous catch provides a developed reason for why he would follow Jesus.<sup>347</sup> As Orchard points out, it is not a coincidence that the genealogy of Jesus, His rejection at Nazareth, and call of the disciples, the pericopes that are associated with a sequence change before Luke's scan for his controversy section, are from a source other than Matthew.<sup>348</sup>

---

<sup>344</sup> Ibid., 88-9.

<sup>345</sup> Goulder, *Luke: A New Paradigm*, 314.

<sup>346</sup> Ibid., 316.

<sup>347</sup> McNicol, Dungan, and Peabody, *Luke's Use of Matthew*, 90.

<sup>348</sup> Bernard Orchard, *Matthew, Luke & Mark*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (Manchester: Koinonia Press, 1987), 49-50.

### The Controversy Complex

Following the call of the disciples Luke uses the next unused pericope in Matthew aside from the Sermon, the healing of the leper, which functions as the preface to the controversy section of 5:12-6:11 to heighten the conflict with the Pharisees. As McNicol, Dungan, and Peabody put it, “To accentuate the theme, Luke related an account where Jesus went out of his way to be sensitive to the scruples of Jewish piety. This will underscore the fact that when the opposition to him emerges it will appear unreasonable, quibbling and petty.”<sup>349</sup> Accordingly, Luke makes minor changes to Matthew’s wording in this section to increase the sense of hostility, such as in the healing of the paralytic, where Luke changes Matthew’s “some of the teachers of the law” at Mt 9:3 to the more encompassing “the Pharisees and the teachers of the Law” at Lk 5:21 and then expands their reviling thoughts against Jesus,<sup>350</sup> the latter of which is also changed to a form that aligns with Luke’s theme on Jesus’ identity that is developed throughout this section. Luke then moves forward in Matthew’s sequence, using the pericopes that pertain to Jesus’ disputes with the Pharisees, with the pericope of the man with a withered hand at Mt 12:9-14 as the final confrontation in Jesus’ controversy with the Pharisees. He then picks up the pericope on the appointment of the Twelve at Mt 10:2-4, though making changes according to his unique material, on his way back to the beginning of the Sermon to have the apostles selected before the Sermon begins. With the Twelve appointed first, the stage is better set for the Sermon as Luke presents it, seeing that they are later expected to proclaim Jesus’ message on their missionary journeys. In contrast, Matthew in his eagerness rushes to the

---

<sup>349</sup> McNicol, Dungan, and Peabody, *Luke’s Use of Matthew*, 95.

<sup>350</sup> *Ibid.*, 96-7.



Sermon first and narrates that the apostles were appointed afterward, with Luke's change serving as a marked improvement.<sup>351</sup>

### The Context of the Sermon

The placement of the controversy section and appointment of the Twelve prepares for Luke's intention with the Sermon, which is to present the disciples with a "Two Ways" dichotomy to either follow Jesus' way or that of the Pharisees. Luke opens Jesus' ministry with Jesus' rejection by the people of His hometown and, after narrating the calling of Jesus' first disciples, scans Matthew to compile his controversies against the Pharisees before the Sermon, ensuring that the Twelve are appointed beforehand. Goulder suggests Luke truncated Matthew's Sermon because it was too lengthy and covered too many topics, and that it contained material not aligned with his interests, such as the material on the Law, and while it is true there is some material he does not use at all in his Gospel, it can be seen that Luke's redaction is more dictated by his intent for the Sermon in the context of the narrative he has so far constructed. In contrast with the general compilation of ethical teachings found in Matthew's version, the first half of Luke's Sermon is an encouragement to the disciples to take on a disposition of lowliness and kindness as exemplified by Jesus in the face of the hostility that has been directed against Him, and the second half is a warning against the disposition of hypocrisy and judgment as was demonstrated by the Pharisees.<sup>352</sup> The hostility of the townspeople at Nazareth who attempted to kill Jesus and the Pharisees who opposed Him throughout the controversy section constitute the

---

<sup>351</sup> Ibid., 102.

<sup>352</sup> Goulder, *Luke: A New Paradigm*, 346-8.

underlying context of the Sermon. As such, it functions as Jesus' teaching to His disciples in that context, instructing them to be neither retaliatory nor condemnatory, themes that correspond to the narrative sequence leading up to the Sermon, with its introduction, the beatitudes and woes, either modified to point back to the programmatic prophecy in Isaiah he quoted at Nazareth per McNicol, Dungan, and Peabody,<sup>353</sup> or from L, which was chosen over Matthew's version for the same reason. The ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν of Mt 5:44, which introduces the command to love one's enemies as the antithesis to the imperative of old, is retained by Luke but changed to ἀλλὰ ὑμῖν λέγω, brilliantly repurposed as an antithesis to those who revile and persecute the disciples in Mt 5:11, the intervening material being displaced for use elsewhere or omitted. The added τοῖς ἀκούουσιν points to the disciples,<sup>354</sup> and forms a part of his theme of hearing the word of God, which is developed throughout the Gospel. Luke also changed the second clause of each beatitude to be second person, having Jesus address His disciples more directly, with the intent of identifying them as the poor and destitute described in the beatitudes, those who have left all to follow Him.<sup>355</sup> The disciples are the ones who accompanied Jesus during the sequence of controversies with the Pharisees, so they are the direct recipient of these teachings.

Luke moves Mt 5:45 to before the conclusory v. 48 to better lead into the following section on judgmentalism at Mt 7:1, which he proceeds to next.<sup>356</sup> The saying of the blind guides leading others into the ditch has two links, first with the idea of sight, connecting it to the metaphor of the plank in the eye that follows, and second with the collapsing building at the end,

---

<sup>353</sup> McNicol, Dungan, and Peabody, *Luke's Use of Matthew*, 91, 103-6.

<sup>354</sup> Edward William Lummis, *How Luke Was Written* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1915), 70.

<sup>355</sup> Goulder, *Luke: A New Paradigm*, 350-1.

<sup>356</sup> Lummis, *How Luke Was Written*, 70-1.

forming an *inclusio*. The “He also told them this parable” at 6:39 introduces the only material Luke added, and whereas Goulder says it functions to split the Sermon into two parts,<sup>357</sup> the split is at 6:37. That this introductory formula is not at the middlepoint but to introduce the only instance Luke would have inserted a saying that was not included by Matthew in his Sermon lends to Luke’s use of Matthew’s Sermon. There is no need to suppose Luke left his place in Matthew to add the saying: as Drury notes, such a brief, pithy saying need not require Luke referenced the later text in Matthew from which it is derived.<sup>358</sup> The first half teaches the disciples not to retaliate against those who are hostile, as Jesus did, and the second half adjures them not to be judgmental, as the Pharisees were. The trees and fruits pericope leads into the two builders metaphor, which functions as a capstone to the Sermon as a whole, ending with a “Two Ways” dichotomy that has an embedded hortatory element, encouraging the disciples to follow in His footsteps and warning them not to act like the Pharisees. So, then, the Sermon functions according to a particular purpose that corresponds with the narrative leading up to the Sermon that has been carefully constructed by Luke, and is not meant to function as a general compilation of teachings as it does in Matthew. As Lummis puts it, “The occasion of the address, as Lk. conceives it, is that Jesus is giving an initial charge to a select inner circle of disciples, some of whom, at least, are being ordained to a ministry. All that cannot find place in such a charge must be passed over or deferred.”<sup>359</sup> The Sermon is placed after the controversy sequence that was constructed from Luke’s forward progression through Matthew’s sequence.

---

<sup>357</sup> Goulder, *Luke: A New Paradigm*, 369, 348.

<sup>358</sup> John Drury, *Tradition and Design in Luke’s Gospel* (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1976), 136-7.

<sup>359</sup> Lummis, *How Luke Was Written*, 64.

### John the Baptist

Integral to Luke's Gospel in relation to Matthew's is his treatment of John the Baptist. Luke exerts great effort to portray the purpose of John the Baptist's ministry as a forerunner of Jesus in his infancy narrative. His infancy narrative pulls heavily from similar stories in the Old Testament, most notably with Elizabeth being likened to Hannah and John to Samuel, which is especially significant because, just as John was the bridge between the old and new covenants and was the one who made the way for the Messiah, so too was Samuel the bridge between the judges and the king.<sup>360</sup> As Conzelmann points out, Luke's omission of the story of John's death, which is quite glaring because he records Herod's thought that Jesus was John risen from the dead, is likely to avoid a typological connection between the two, as was, by contrast, intended by Mark.<sup>361</sup> Luke is careful to shift the imprisonment of John to before Jesus' baptism to prevent the scenario as found in Matthew of John baptizing Jesus, which could be taken to mean that the Baptist is an authority over Jesus. It is noticeable that Luke omits language that refers to John as the "Elijah who is to come" as he is referred to in Matthew, although he is willing to permit as a substitute that the Baptist "came in the power and spirit of Elijah" at Lk 1:17. He omits Matthew's description of John that he wears a garment of camel hair and eats locusts and wild honey, which is a reference to Elijah.<sup>362</sup> In his section on the Baptist's inquiry, he changes the proclamation in Mt 11:11, "There has not arisen anyone among those born of women who is greater than John the Baptist" to his rendition in Lk 7:28, as Goulder argues for, "There is no greater prophet than John among those born of women," with the drop of "prophet" in some texts

---

<sup>360</sup> Drury, *Tradition and Design*, 58-9.

<sup>361</sup> Hans Conzelmann, *The Theology of St. Luke*, trans. Geoffrey Buswell (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1982), 24, 24 n. 1.

<sup>362</sup> McNicol, Dungan, and Peabody, *Luke's Use of Matthew*, 49, 56, 72, 74-5, 112.

likely being an assimilation to Matthew. Luke completely omits Mt 11:14, which again refers to John as the “Elijah who is to come.”<sup>363</sup> As Drury notes, such a portrayal as found in Matthew, if not corrected, could also lend to the impression that Jesus’ miracles are the “double portion” of His master, who would be John,<sup>364</sup> and with John at least being the one who has come “in the spirit of Elijah,” as Luke is willing to grant, he is most interested in preventing such a conclusion concerning Jesus’ miracles through the Spirit. As Conzelmann notices, this theme persists even into the crucifixion account, where Luke has omitted the instances where the onlookers taunted Him asking if Elijah will come down to save Him from the cross.<sup>365</sup>

After the Sermon in both Gospels is the pericope on the healing of the centurion’s servant, which is followed in Luke by the raising of the widow’s son from his source L. This pairing of the centurion with the raising of a widow’s son is an allusion to Elijah and Elisha, pointing back to the sermon at the rejection of Nazareth at 4:25-27, where Jesus references Elijah’s help to the widow and Elisha’s cleansing of Naaman the military commander.<sup>366</sup> They serve as examples of rejected prophets, and Luke inserts material as an allusion to them elsewhere, most notably his L addition of James and John asking to call down fire from heaven on the cities that rejected Jesus, and immediately after, his added third instance to the pericope of the followers’ excuses.<sup>367</sup> At the end of the widow pericope at 7:16, the people exclaim, “A great prophet has risen among us!” and “God has visited his people!” which echo Zechariah’s

---

<sup>363</sup> Goulder, *Luke: A New Paradigm*, 389.

<sup>364</sup> Drury, *Tradition and Design*, 129-30.

<sup>365</sup> Conzelmann, *The Theology of St. Luke*, 88.

<sup>366</sup> McNicol, Dungan, and Peabody, *Luke’s Use of Matthew*, 109.

<sup>367</sup> Goulder, *Luke: A New Paradigm*, 304.

pronouncement at 1:67-79 concerning John after his birth, that he would be a great prophet. As McNicol, Dungan, and Peabody put it, “The reaction of the crowd at Nain makes Jesus appear to be perceived as a prophet in the tradition of John the Baptist.”<sup>368</sup> Luke has an interest, then, in showing that Jesus is not just a prophet like John but something greater, and this is evidenced by his constant attempts to restructure Matthew to prevent the impression that Jesus is subordinate to John. After Jesus performs the two miracles and the people extol him as a great prophet, Luke has the interest of proceeding to the pericope on John’s inquiry to further differentiate Jesus as more than a successor in the prophetic tradition. Luke redacts Matthew’s version of John’s inquiry, Lk 7:18-35, to have the question of Jesus’ identity posed by John asked twice, once by John and again by his envoys to Jesus directly, to further emphasize its importance, with the Isaianic prophecy again pointing back to the rejection at Nazareth.<sup>369</sup>

This theme of the identity of Jesus and the questioning of who He is pervades throughout the Galilean ministry, first having its basis in Jesus’ Nazarene sermon, serving as a major feature of the pericope that follows John’s inquiry, the repentant woman.<sup>370</sup> The connection of this story to John’s inquiry hinges on Luke’s change from the enigmatic Mt 11:19, ἐδικαιώθη ἡ σοφία ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν ἔργων αὐτῆς, “Wisdom is justified by her works,” to Lk 7:35, ἐδικαιώθη ἡ σοφία ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν τέκνων αὐτῆς, “Wisdom is justified by her children.” In the redactional Lk 7:29-30, of the people and tax collectors who repented and assented to John’s baptism Luke says, ἐδικαίωσαν τὸν θεόν, “they were justified by God,” but the Pharisees, in contrast, rejected this path of justification. This corresponds to the sinful woman who repented and the Pharisee who

---

<sup>368</sup> McNicol, Dungan, and Peabody, *Luke’s Use of Matthew*, 113, emphasis removed.

<sup>369</sup> *Ibid.*, 114-5.

<sup>370</sup> *Ibid.*, 118.

judged her in the following pericope, suggesting that the “children” in Lk 7:35 are the ones who are repentant like the woman and the tax collectors. Due to Jesus’ response to the woman the Pharisee questions Jesus’ status as a prophet, which Jesus ironically confirms by reading his thoughts,<sup>371</sup> which forms an *inclusio* around the Baptist’s inquiry, contrasting the reaction of the Pharisee to the people who recognized Jesus’ prophetic status but thought Him as nothing more than a prophet. This story of the repentant woman and the Pharisee functions as the prime example and pinnacle of the theme developed so far through the controversy stories and Sermon, with Jesus exemplifying His way of forgiveness and the Pharisee demonstrating the hostility and judgmentalism that is condemned in this section of the Gospel.

#### The Parable of the Sower

After the section on John the Baptist from Matthew and the repentant woman from L, Luke jumps ahead of other material he will use later to the parable of the sower, which he edits to accentuate the theme of the word of God. Here the section has the importance of constituting what Luke sees as Jesus’ prophetic message and confirming that His message is not from a mere prophet but the hinge upon which one’s spiritual outcome depends. The several changes Luke makes to Matthew’s version are instructive. He adds a pericope about the women who assisted Jesus in His journey and moved the pericope about Jesus’ mother and brothers, which is right before the parable of the sower in Matthew, to the end of the section. These two pericopes then form an *inclusio*, with the meaning that the women who helped Jesus are His real family, functioning as examples of those who hear the word of God.<sup>372</sup> Luke adds a brief introductory

---

<sup>371</sup> Ibid., 116-7.

<sup>372</sup> Goulder, *Luke: A New Paradigm*, 408.

formula at 8:8 before the “Whoever has eyes to hear, let him hear” that is at the end of Matthew’s parable, to separate it for emphasis. At the beginning of his interpretation he changes Matthew’s “word of the kingdom” to “word of God,” and the saying of the family pericope is changed from Matthew’s “Whoever does the will of my Father in heaven is my brother and sister and mother” to “My mother and brothers”—transposing the phrase to the beginning for emphasis—“are those who hear the word of God and do it.”<sup>373</sup>

Between the interpretation of the parable and the family pericope is a brief collection of sayings not found in Matthew’s version, each a saying taken from each of the discourses up to this point in Matthew, with v. 16 taking from Mt 5:15 in Matthew’s Sermon, v. 17 from the mission charge at Mt 10:26, and v. 18 from Matthew’s parable discourse at Mt 13:12, specifically from Matthew’s version of the parable of the sower, which Luke saves to use here. The first two of these sayings are used again, at Lk 11:33, which is in another similar sayings collection compiled by Luke, and soon afterward in 12:2, respectively. The sayings are distinct in wording from their Matthean counterparts such that they are either variant traditions or, as is more likely, rewritten from memory. The redactional addition of *Βλέπετε οὖν πῶς ἀκούετε* at v. 18a is a repeat of v. 8, which was separated by an introductory formula for emphasis. The sayings equate the believer to a light, with v. 16 having the difference from its Matthean counterpart that in Luke’s rendition the light is seen by those who enter, whereas in Matthew the light shines with the purpose of being seen by everyone. The next saying seems to return to the theme of warning the disciples from going the way of the opponents of Jesus. The final saying reinforces the eschatological urgency of the hortative additions.<sup>374</sup> The sayings collection inserted

---

<sup>373</sup> McNicol, Dungan, and Peabody, *Luke’s Use of Matthew*, 121-6.

<sup>374</sup> *Ibid.*



after the parable of the sower is directed against the Pharisees, those who have rejected Jesus and whose true intentions and works will soon be brought to light.

The description of the good soil at the end of the interpretation was heavily revised as well. This is Matthew's ending: "This is the one who hears the word and understands it, who brings forth fruit and produces, some a hundredfold, some sixty, and some thirty." And Luke's: "These are those who have an honest and good heart, who hear the word and hold it fast, and bear fruit in perseverance." It can be seen that Luke's version has a heightened hortative element, which is directed to the disciples as a final warning that is ultimately unheeded, as seen by the theme of their persistent misunderstanding and eventual abandonment.<sup>375</sup> The emphasis on having "a good and honest heart" is again in contrast with the Pharisees. Luke's use of the parable of the sower, especially with the redactional changes made to the interpretation and family pericope, and the inclusion of the sayings collection at 6:16-18 demonstrate that the section is an extension of the themes and purpose of the Sermon, and the themes underlying the construction of the sayings collection is particularly important in identifying his redactional intentions.

### The Second Mission Charge

Luke does another scan and picks up the remaining narrative material in Matthew's sequence through the Transfiguration, which includes demonstrations of Jesus' power such as the stilling of the storm, the exorcism of the Gerasene demoniac, the raising of Jairus' daughter and the woman with the issue of blood, and the feeding of the five thousand. These

---

<sup>375</sup> Ibid.

demonstrations are congruent with a theme of the revelation of Jesus' identity, alongside the mission charge to the Twelve, Peter's confession, Jesus' first passion prediction, sayings material on discipleship, which serves as a contrast with the disciples, and then the culmination of the theme in the Transfiguration, which is in turn followed by the healing of the demon-possessed boy, the second passion prediction, which the disciples did not understand, and the argument of who is the greatest. The pericope of the unknown exorcist at Lk 9:49-50 is a unique addition, which is another instance of the obtuseness of the disciples. At Lk 9:52-3, Jesus sends disciples to Samaria, reversing Jesus's instruction in Matthew's mission charge not to enter Samaria. For Matthew, Jesus and His disciples did not enter the region because he expressly forbade it, but for Luke it is because He tried to reach them but was prevented by their rejection, which aligns with his interest in the extension of the Gospel to the Gentiles.<sup>376</sup> This is one of the most noteworthy corrections to Matthew outside of the beginning and ending chapters. From this Luke adds the unique material about James and John asking if they can call down fire from heaven to destroy the Samaritans who rejected Jesus. Throughout this section is the dichotomy of the revelation of Jesus through His miracles, the promulgation of His message in the mission charge, and His teaching, which culminates in the ultimate revelation in the Transfiguration, and, serving as a contrast, the imperceptibility of the disciples.

Luke then conducts another scan, picking up the pericope of those who gave excuses not to follow Jesus, Mt 8:18-22, which is at this point the next earliest unused pericope, and adds a unique third instance to the pericope, which pairs with the aforementioned story of James and John as another reference to Elijah and Elisha. This constitutes the second instance in which Luke created a pair of pericopes alluding to Elijah and Elisha. It is clear that Luke has the

---

<sup>376</sup> McNicol, Dungan, and Peabody, *Luke's Use of Matthew*, 155-6.

intention of portraying Jesus as the typological fulfillment of Elijah, as the one who ascended into heaven and gave His Spirit to His disciples, not as a disciple of John as Elisha was to Elijah, which is how Luke perceived Matthew had portrayed the two and wished to prevent. The followers' excuses pericope functions as an excellent transition from the theme of the failure of the disciples to the movement of the teaching journey on Jesus' way to Jerusalem generally and the mission charge of the seventy-two specifically. That this theme of the failure of the disciples is intentional is all the more evident by the fact that three of the eight examples in the surrounding section are Lukan additions. Both mission charges take after passages in Numbers, with the Twelve corresponding to the twelve scouts who investigated the promise land and brought back a negative report, and the seventy-two to the elders who received the Spirit. When the Twelve return, they receive no recognition from Jesus, but He is elated in response to the report of the seventy-two in contrast.<sup>377</sup> Through this final scan, Luke has purposefully created a doublet of Mt 10 so that he could present a separate mission charge from that of the Twelve, which is evidenced by his use of Matthew's sequence, the reservation of the followers' excuses pericope to preface the second mission charge, the apparent reservation of material in the mission charge to the Twelve to produce a fuller mission charge to the seventy-two, the difference in Jesus' responses at the disciples' returns, and the correspondence of the number of disciples in both pericopes with their allusion to Numbers that reflects their presentation in his narrative.

To construct the second mission charge Luke proceeds to the next unused pericope in Matthew after the followers' excuses, the Lord of harvest at Mt 9:35-38, which is the pericope immediately prior to Mt 10. To construct the discourse he uses the Lord of harvest saying, which

---

<sup>377</sup> Ibid., 156-68.

thematically serves as a fitting introduction; more of the material left over from the Mt 10 discourse that he did not use in his version of the mission charge to the Twelve; the woe to the two cities, which is the next unused pericope in Matthew, just after the Baptist's inquiry, which has already been used; and the prayer of praise to God and the saying of the Father's revelation through the Son, which immediately follow the woe to the two cities in Matthew. Luke skips over the Beelzebul controversy again, of which he has the intention of using in the Central Section, proceeding to the saying on the blessedness of the disciples in Matthew's parable of the sower section, which Luke reserved when writing his own section on the parable of the sower for use here. The positive response of Jesus to the seventy-two upon their return at Lk 10:17-20 is unique and is argued to be Lukan composition by McNicol, Dungan, and Peabody, with the disciples' ability to subjugate the demons contrasting with the failure of the Twelve to accomplish the exorcism of the demon-possessed boy after the Transfiguration, the idea of Jesus proleptically envisioning the eschatological fall of Satan perhaps being prompted by the fall of Capernaum to Hades in the previous pericope, and the mention of serpents deriving from Mt 10:16b.<sup>378</sup> This aligns with the thread woven throughout the Gospel that the manifestation of the miraculous power of the kingdom of God not only advances the kingdom of God but furthers the overthrow of Satan's kingdom.<sup>379</sup>

### The Five Scans

After his unique birth narrative, Luke's Gospel aligns with Matthew's at Lk 3 with the preaching of John of Baptist. The unique genealogy is inserted between the pericopes of John the

---

<sup>378</sup> Ibid., 168.

<sup>379</sup> Goulder, *Luke: A New Paradigm*, 478.

Baptist's preaching and the wilderness temptation. Luke's unique version of the rejection at Nazareth follows the wilderness temptation, and the exorcism at the synagogue, not found in Matthew, is placed after the rejection at Nazareth as its counterpart. Since Luke wishes to place the healing of Peter's mother-in-law before the call of the disciples, he proceeds in Matthew from the wilderness temptation, ending at Mt 4:11, to Mt 8:14-17. Next he includes his own version of the call of the disciples, Lk 5:1-11. The preaching of John of Baptist, the wilderness temptation, and healing of Peter's mother-in-law constitute the first scan through Matthew's material. The pericopes that do not share the same relative sequence as their Matthean counterparts—the genealogy, rejection at Nazareth, and call of the disciples—are variant traditions that are inserted from another source.

Luke then begins a scan through Matthew to collect controversy stories, beginning with the healing of the leper at Mt 8:1-4; then moving on to the healing of the paralytic at Mt 9:1-8, passing over the centurion's servant, the would-be disciples of Mt 8:18-22, the stilling of the storm, and the Gadarene demoniacs; the call of Levi at Mt 9:9-13 and the fasting controversy at Mt 9:14-17 follow after the healing of the leper in Matthew's sequence; and then Luke continues to the controversy stories at Mt 12:1-14, passing over the raising of Jairus's daughter and healing of the women with the infirmity, the blind men, the exorcism of the deaf man, the pericopes pertaining to the mission charge of Mt 10, John the Baptist's inquiry, the woe to the cities, and the sayings of Mt 11:25-30. Luke has, then, constructed a unified sequence of the controversy stories from Matthew, progressing forward through his sequence, with each pericope maintaining its sequence in Luke according to its order in Matthew.

Wishing to narrate the appointment of the apostles before the Sermon on the Plain, Luke carries over the appointment of the Twelve at Mt 10:2-4 on his way back to the Sermon on the

Mount, which begins at Mt 4:23, including the healing of the crowds that precedes it. Luke then proceeds with a second progression through Matthew's sequence, beginning with the Sermon, which he places at the end of the controversy sequence he has constructed. Reaching the end of the Sermon, he continues past the healing of the leper, because it has already been used in the controversy sequence, to the centurion's servant, to which he adds the story of the widow of Nain from L; he skips past the would-be disciples, stilling of the storm, Gadarene demoniacs, the controversy stories from Mt 9:1-17 he has already included, the raising of Jairus' daughter and healing of the woman with the infirmity, the healing of the blind men, the exorcism, and the Mt 10 mission charge sequence, reaching John the Baptist's inquiry at Mt 11:1-19, which he includes. To this he appends his unique version of the repentant woman. Luke then proceeds to the parable of the sower and pericope on Jesus' family at Mt 12:46-13:23, completing a third scan through Matthew's sequence.

Luke returns to the next unused pericope in Matthew's sequence, excluding the would-be disciples of Mt 8:18-22, carrying over the miracle stories that have not so far been used, the stilling of the storm at Mt 8:23-27, the Gadarene demoniacs at Mt 8:28-34, the raising of Jairus's daughter and the healing of the woman at Mt 9:18-26, passing over the controversy stories that have been used in the second scan; Luke skips the pericope about the harvest at Mt 9:35-38 to use it with his mission charge to the seventy-two because he wishes the mission charge to the Twelve to be portrayed negatively, with this pericope used instead to contribute to the optimism of the second; he then reaches the mission charge at Mt 10, which he includes; Luke then proceeds forward to the introduction of the execution of John the Baptist that begins at Mt 14:1, then includes the feeding of the five thousand at Mt 14:13-21, Peter's confession at Mt 16:13-20, the passion prediction and subsequent discipleship material at 16:21-28, the Transfiguration at

Mt 17:1-13, the exorcism of the young boy at Mt 17:14-21, and the second passion prediction at Mt 17:22-23. The pericope on the temple tax is omitted, leading Luke to the final pericope he includes in this progression, Mt 18:1-5. This is the furthest point he reaches in Matthew's sequence until he begins the Central Section, and it is at this same point he returns to Matthew when he nears the end of L.

Luke begins his Central Section with the successful mission charge to the seventy-two. He returns back to the would-be disciples at Mt 8:18-22, which was fittingly reserved for this sequence, then proceeds to the pericope about the harvest at Mt 9:34-38 that precedes the mission charge in Matthew, reuses the Mt 10 mission charge to compose his mission charge to the seventy-two, and includes the woes to the cities at Mt 11:20-24, the sayings material at Mt 11:25-27, and reserved material from the parable of the sower sequence at Mt 13:16-17. After completing this fifth scan concerning the second mission charge, Luke then switches over to L as his primary source.

The argument of order for the 2DH attempts to establish the compositional reasons for Matthew and Luke's rearrangement of Mark's material, but Luke's use of Matthew is comparatively reinforced by the additional strength of the formal argument, just as with Mark's use of Matthew and Luke under the 2GH, that Luke's order has the appearance that he conducted five scans through Matthew's sequence. This formal argument combines with the strength of the compositional argument that demonstrates that the successive progressions through Matthew's material would have been conducted in thematic, coherent sections in accordance with Luke's redactional interests so as to construct his Gospel as it is now observed. If the previous listing of Luke's order is divided by the progressions through Matthew's order without separations due to L variants placed differently than their Matthean counterparts or skipped material, Luke's scans

through Matthew can be readily seen, with “ $\geq$ ” designating that the next unused pericope immediately follows in Matthew’s sequence or that Luke continues in his use of L, and “ $>$ ” designating where Luke switches sources or skips Matthean material:

1. Preaching of John the Baptist (M)  $\geq$  Jesus’ baptism (M)  $>$  Jesus’ genealogy (L)  $>$  Wilderness temptation (M)  $>$  Rejection at Nazareth (L)  $\geq$  Exorcism in the synagogue (L)  $>$  Healing of Peter’s mother-in-law (M)
2. Call of the disciples (L)  $>$  Healing of leper (M)  $>$  Healing of paralytic (M)  $\geq$  Matthew and the tax collectors (M)  $\geq$  Bridegroom and fasting (M)  $>$  Lord of the Sabbath (M)  $\geq$  Man with the withered hand (M)  $>$  Appointment of the Twelve (M, placed here since Luke uses this pericope on his way back to the Sermon)
3. Pre-sermonic healing summary (M)  $\geq$  Beatitudes and woes (M)  $>$  Love of enemies (M)  $>$  Do not judge (M)  $\geq$  (After sayings at Lk 6:39-40) Plank in the eye (M)  $>$  Trees and their fruits (M)  $\geq$  “Lord, Lord” (M)  $>$  Two builders (M)  $\geq$  Centurion’s servant (M)  $>$  Widow of Nain (L)  $>$  The Baptist’s inquiry (M)  $>$  The repentant woman (L)  $>$  Parable of the sower and Jesus’ family pericope
4. Stilling of the storm (M)  $\geq$  Gerasene demoniac  $\geq$  Jairus’ daughter and woman with issue of blood (M)  $>$  Mission charge (M)  $>$  Herod’s inquiry about Jesus (M)  $\geq$  Feeding of the five thousand (M)  $>$  Peter’s confession (M)  $\geq$  First death prediction (M)  $\geq$  Discipleship material (M)  $\geq$  Transfiguration (M)  $\geq$  Healing of demon-possessed boy (M)  $\geq$  Second death prediction (M)  $\geq$  Greatest in the kingdom dispute (M)  $>$  Unknown exorcist (L)  $>$  Samaritan rejection (L)
5. Followers’ excuses (M)  $\geq$  Mission charge (M)  $>$  Woe to the cities (M)  $>$  Jesus’ response to the seventy-two (L)  $>$  Father’s revelation through the Son (M)  $\geq$  Blessedness of the disciples (M)

It can be seen that with each progression through Matthew’s sequence, Luke has carried over material that pertains to particular themes and purposes. The first progression includes the material that necessarily begins Jesus’ ministry, and Luke moves forward to the healing of Peter’s mother-in-law to include it before the call of the disciples, against Matthew’s order of the two. The second progression is a sequence of controversy stories. The third progression contains the Sermon, healing of the centurion’s servant, John the Baptist’s inquiry, and parable of the



sower, each of which pertains to Jesus' message as a teacher, prophet, and counterexample to the Pharisees. In the fourth progression Luke accumulates the miracle stories that demonstrate Jesus' power and teaching material that pertains to His mission and identity. In the fifth progression Luke collects material that pertains to the commission of the seventy-two, reusing the mission charge to Mt 10 to compose it, as he passes through the section in accordance with Matthew's sequence. There is then the introductory, controversy, didactic, revelatory, and mission doublet scans, with each of the five successive progressions through Matthew's sequence having an intelligible, thematic purpose behind the pericopes Luke has included.

Not only, then, is Luke's sequencing in the Galilean Ministry explicable and rational with his use of Matthew, seeing that the instances in which Luke transposed pericopes or skipped material he would later use are all eagerly explicable under the 2GH, the ordering of this portion of Luke's Gospel serves as an argument for Luke's use of Matthew. The purpose of the fourth scan is to include the remaining miracle stories that had not yet been added in the other progressions, along with the sayings material that needed to be placed before the Central Section, with the result that Luke reaches Mt 18 in his use of Matthew in the fourth scan. The purpose of the fifth scan is to construct the second mission charge by passing through Mt 10, along with the other pericopes that are used in its sequence, the fourth having a more general purpose than the fifth. Toward the end of the Central Section, when he nears the end of his special source and he returns to using the sequence of Matthew, it is at the same point he left off at the end of the fourth scan that the material Luke uses that follows Matthew's sequence returns, which is an anomaly that points to the redactional procedure as outlined by the 2GH. It is also anomalous that the second mission charge in the fifth scan should appear in Luke's sequence where the mission charge in Mt 10 should appear in Matthew's order. It is anomalous that Luke's order in

the Galilean Ministry should accord exactly with Matthew's order, as though the pericopes of Matthew's order were collected into thematic, compositionally coherent sequences as Luke progressed through his sequence. It is anomalous that the first pericope of each progression is the first unused pericope that accords with the redactional purpose of that sequence. It is anomalous that in each of the scans, Luke always progresses forward through Matthew's sequence before returning to the next unused pericope before beginning the next scan. And it is anomalous that the only pericopes that differ in order between the two Gospels according to this redactional procedure are those pericopes that have been acknowledged as variant traditions, which Luke would have inserted from another source.

The introductory scan includes the pericopes that are best suited for the beginning of the Gospel and includes the healing of Peter's mother-in-law, to place it before the call of the disciples, with the reversal of Matthew's order of the two serving as a marked improvement. The controversy scan collects the pericopes involving Jesus' controversies with the Pharisees, leading up to the Sermon. Luke places the Sermon after the controversy sequence and continues with material that pertains to Jesus' role as prophet and teacher, constructing the didactic scan. The revelatory scan picks up the remaining miracle stories that culminate in the Transfiguration. Luke then conducts the mission doublet scan, passing through Mt 10 again to create the mission charge to the seventy-two. The Galilean Ministry, then, consists of five progressions through Matthew's sequence, each having a readily observable redactional purpose, and with these progressions following Matthew's order of pericopes, it is evident that Luke has used Matthew to construct this section. This constitutes a compelling formal argument for the 2GH alongside Mark's alternation between Matthew and Luke, since it would otherwise need to be a

coincidence that Luke's order accords with five progressions through Matthew's sequence in the manner described.

### The Central Section

#### Luke's Initial Use of L

The beginning of the parable of the Good Samaritan at Lk 10:25 marks where Luke's redactional procedure changes. At this point he switches from Matthew to L as his main source. Whereas in the Galilean Ministry he conducted multiple scans through Matthew's sequence and filled in relevant L material as was suitable, here he follows L and builds on that outline with material from Matthew. Since he is primarily following the sequence of L, then, it is the topics of the L material that now dictate the material Luke uses from Matthew, and so the Matthean material is no longer implemented in relative sequence; rather, Luke pulls from the various Matthean discourses as it relates topically to the material in L.

The parable of the Good Samaritan and the story of Martha and Mary are both from L and form a pair as male-female counterparts, serving as examples of those who demonstrate exemplary faith.<sup>380</sup> The next pericope is Luke's version of the Lord's Prayer, which is a variant of the tradition in Matthew's Gospel. Luke appears to be abiding by the sequence of L in the transition from the pericope of Martha and Mary to the Lord's Prayer due to the uncharacteristic, sudden jump to the topic of prayer and from the fact that it is in the midst of L material, both before and after. It is followed by the parable of the friend at midnight, which is also from L and continues the topic of prayer. Not even Goulder, who consistently seeks to supply a rationale for the ordering or insertion of Luke's material as being either prompted by his use of Matthew,

---

<sup>380</sup> McNicol, Dungan, and Peabody, *Luke's Use of Matthew*, 172.

Mark, or the Old Testament, attempts a rationale for the switch in topic to prayer.<sup>381</sup> It may be significant that Matthew's version of the Lord's Prayer follows after the command not to pray long-winded, repetitive prayers, and Luke follows his version with a parable encouraging the disciples to keep praying persistently for their requests. It is possible that Luke has moved the parable of the midnight friend to after the Lord's Prayer, and this is not just due to their common topic on prayer but because it serves as a corrective to the context of Matthew's version. The transition from Martha and Mary to the Lord's Prayer, however, is likely due to Luke following L's sequence.

After the L parable, Lk 11:9-10 and Lk 11:13 share nearly identical wording with Mt 7:7-8 and Mt 7:11 respectively, so Matthew must have returned to the Sermon on the Mount to add to the topic on prayer with material from a Matthean discourse. In this section, Luke changed Matthew's "good gifts" at v. 11 to "the Holy Spirit," which is a clear redactional change according to Luke's interests. The intervening Lk 11:11-12//Mt 7:9-10 has undergone some revision, including a transposition of the verses and the switch from "bread" and "stone" to "egg" and "scorpion." This accords with Luke's composition of the return of the seventy-two, which spoke of the disciples being able to tread upon snakes and scorpions. The transposition of the Matthean verses aligns with this phrasing of the L material, by shifting the reference to the snake to maintain the "snakes and scorpions" order. The explanation for the "snakes and scorpions" phrasing from McNicol, Dungan, and Peabody is that it derives from Ps 91:13, which was in mind, they suppose, because Ps 91:11-12 was quoted by Satan in the wilderness temptation.<sup>382</sup> However, Ps 91:13 says nothing about scorpions and places snakes as the second

---

<sup>381</sup> Goulder, *Luke: A New Paradigm*, 500.

<sup>382</sup> McNicol, Dungan, and Peabody, *Luke's Use of Matthew*, 168-9.

item in its phrasing, whereas the passages in Luke are adamant about the specificity of the order and wording of the snake first and scorpion second, as evidenced by the transposition of Mt 7:19-10. Drury has the better suggestion that it is an allusion to Dt 8:15, with the reasoning that Lk 11:11-13 has the same position as Dt 8:15 if Luke modeled his sequence after Deuteronomy,<sup>383</sup> but he seems to miss that the phrase does not first appear at Lk 11:11-13 but 10:18-20; nevertheless, that the wording takes from Dt 8:15 is clear, with it being the only passage in the Old Testament with this phrase. As such, Goulder is most likely correct that the phrasing is taken from Dt 8:15 and applied to the topic of prayer due to the phrase's similarity to that of Ps 91.<sup>384</sup>

### The Second Controversy Complex

After the Sermon on the Mount, the Beelzebul controversy follows soon after. It is the next unused pericope in Matthew's sequence, which Luke has reserved for the Central Section. It may appear to be a difficulty for Luke's use of Matthew that he did not end the first controversy complex with the Beelzebul controversy, which seemingly would have served as the perfect capstone to that section, as Mark did. It is the next unused pericope after the healing of the man with a withered hand, separated only by Mt 12:15-21, which Luke does not use, so its order lends to its inclusion at the end of the first controversy sequence. Luke's decision to pass over it for this purpose is answered by the fact that the Beelzebul controversy is used as part of a larger complex in the Central Section as a polemic against the Pharisees, and its concomitant passages would not have fit with the structure of the narrative leading up to the Sermon. The Beelzebul

---

<sup>383</sup> Drury, *Tradition and Design*, 145.

<sup>384</sup> Goulder, *Luke: A New Paradigm*, 479.

controversy pericope itself is more of a sayings pericope than narrative, and the teaching material that follows it certainly are. Luke uses the lengthy discourse in the Beelzebul controversy and the sign of Jonah pericope, in which Jesus negatively responds to the request for a sign, and the parable of the impure spirit, which he transposes to direct it against the Pharisees, to construct a second controversy complex, which has material added to it from the Mt 23 and Mt 10 discourses. That the sign of Jonah pericope functions as part of the disputation is made more evident by the redactional change to the introduction of the Beelzebul controversy, where Luke preempts its address with the addition of Lk 11:16.<sup>385</sup> As such, Luke passed it over when composing the first controversy complex so that it can be better implemented to kickstart a second one later on in the Central Section.

As McNicol, Dungan, and Peabody point out, Luke's version of the exorcism that serves as the introduction to the Beelzebul controversy is a conflation of Matthew's version as well as the doublet in Mt 9:34, which is made all the more likely by the fact that Luke has just used the pericope that follows in Matthew, the Lord of the harvest, at the beginning of his mission charge to the seventy-two, and he also would have passed it on his way to the Beelzebul controversy from his use of the pericope on prayer in the Sermon on the Mount.<sup>386</sup> With regard to Jesus' response to the Pharisees' accusation, Luke appears to be conflating an L variant with Matthew's. Here is Luke's version of Jesus' response at Lk 11:17-23, with the wording identical to that of Matthew's rendition underlined, the dotted underline indicating cases where Luke's wording is easily identifiable as a likely revision of Matthew's text, and the underlining between words indicating shared word order:

---

<sup>385</sup> McNicol, Dungan, and Peabody, *Luke's Use of Matthew*, 177-8.

<sup>386</sup> *Ibid.*, 117.

17 Πᾶσα βασιλεία ἐφ' ἑαυτὴν διαμερισθεῖσα ἐρημοῦται καὶ οἶκος ἐπὶ οἶκον πίπτει. 18 εἰ δὲ καὶ ὁ Σατανᾶς ἐφ' ἑαυτὸν διμερίσθη, πῶς σταθήσεται ἡ βασιλεία αὐτοῦ; ὅτι λέγετε ἐν Βεελζεβούλ ἐκβάλλειν με τὰ δαιμόνια. 19 εἰ δὲ ἐγὼ ἐν Βεελζεβούλ ἐκβάλλω τὰ δαιμόνια, οἱ υἱοὶ ὑμῶν ἐν τίνι ἐκβάλλουσιν; διὰ τοῦτο αὐτοὶ ὑμῶν κριταὶ ἔσονται. 20 εἰ δὲ ἐν δακτύλῳ θεοῦ ἐκβάλλω τὰ δαιμόνια, ἄρα ἔφθασεν ἐφ' ὑμᾶς ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ. 21 ὅταν ὁ ἰσχυρὸς καθωπλισμένος φυλάσῃ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ἀλλήν, ἐν εἰρήνῃ ἐστὶν τὰ ὑπάρχοντα αὐτοῦ· 22 ἐπὰν δὲ ἰσχυρότερος αὐτοῦ ἐπελθὼν νικήσῃ αὐτόν, τὴν πανοπλίαν αὐτοῦ αἶρει ἐφ' ἧ ἔπεοίθει καὶ τὰ σκῦλα αὐτοῦ διαδίδωσιν. 23 ὁ μὴ ὦν μετ' ἐμοῦ κατ' ἐμοῦ ἐστίν, καὶ ὁ μὴ συνάγων μετ' ἐμοῦ σκορπίζει.

As can be seen, vv. 19 and 23 are identical or nearly so; 18a is nearly identical except for the change of making μερίζω a compound word and exchanging Matthew's κατά for ἐπί, which is also reflected in 17a; and v. 20, except for the change of πνεῦμα for δάκτυλος. The changes in vv. 17-18a are fully explicable as revisions from Luke, and 18b may be redactional, the wording of which is redundant right before v. 19, which is from Matthew virtually verbatim. Luke's versions for vv. 21-22 are so distinct that they must derive from another source, and with that established, it is evident that Luke has access to a variant tradition for at least some of the material. This may be the cause for the change of πνεῦμα to δάκτυλος, due to his preference of L, and the reminiscent but distinct wording of 17b. The phrasing at the end of v. 17, however, need not be a different tradition. The phrasing οἶκος ἐπὶ οἶκον πίπτει is likely a revision of Matthew's wording, purposefully pointing back to the two builders metaphor in the Sermon, insinuating the Pharisees' collapsing house is the same house that Jesus is causing to fall by His advancement against Satan's kingdom. Even if Matthew and Luke both used Q, vv. 21-22 require that at least one of the evangelists used a variant tradition, since a single written text does not underlie the two. This is further strengthened by the fact that the saying on the unforgivable sin, which is appended to Matthew's version, is in another context in Luke, most likely because they are in different contexts in L.

Luke inverted the order of the pericopes on the impure spirit and the sign of Jonah to include the former in his initial response against the Pharisees, making them the referent of the metaphor. At this point in Matthew the next unused pericope in sequence is the family pericope Luke has already used in his parable of the sower complex. He decides to create a doublet with the composition of Lk 11:27-28, caused by his two passes through this section of Matthew.<sup>387</sup> The wording of the two sayings can be compared, particularly the phrasing at the ends of each:

Lk 8:21: Μήτηρ μου καὶ ἀδελφοί μου οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ ἀκούοντες καὶ ποιῶντες.

Lk 11:28: Μενοῦν μακάριοι οἱ ἀκούοντες τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ φυλάσσοντες.

The woman's words form a contrast with Jesus' woe to Jerusalem directed to nearby women during the crucifixion account.<sup>388</sup> As Goulder notes, because Lk 8:21 is paralleled by Matthew, these passages cause an issue for the Q theory. If Lk 11:28 is attributed to L, this means both documents had such a similar passage both right after the Beelzebul controversy. And if Lk 11:28 is taken to be a Lukan composition, it would have been written at the point he passed by the family pericope again under his use of Matthew. This phenomenon is far better explained by Luke's use of Matthew, and that Luke passed by the family pericope twice while using the other Gospel, using the first for the parable of the sower complex and composing the second himself for use here.<sup>389</sup> This, then, constitutes another doublet caused by Luke passing through the same material in Matthew, as is verified by the relative order of shared pericopes.

---

<sup>387</sup> Ibid., 178-80.

<sup>388</sup> Ibid., 302.

<sup>389</sup> Goulder, *Luke: A New Paradigm*, 510-1.



For the following pericope on the sign of Jonah, Luke replaces Matthew's allusion to the prophet's incident with the great fish and instead uses a tradition that seems more original and consonant with the message of the passage, Lk 11:30, which is not in Matthew. Luke then transposes the saying about the men of Nineveh with the Queen of the South, to conclude the pericope with mention of Jonah as there is in the pericope's beginning. Due to the overall agreement in wording, it is likely Luke has corrected Matthew's text from his outside knowledge of the tradition at Lk 11:29-32:

**29** Ἡ γενεὰ αὕτη γενεὰ πονηρά ἐστιν· σημεῖον ζητεῖ, καὶ σημεῖον οὐ δοθήσεται αὐτῇ εἰ μὴ τὸ σημεῖον Ἰωνᾶ. **30** καθὼς γὰρ ἐγένετο Ἰωνᾶς τοῖς Νινευίταις σημεῖον, οὕτως ἔσται καὶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου τῇ γενεᾷ ταύτῃ. **31** βασίλισσα νότου ἐγερθήσεται ἐν τῇ κρίσει μετὰ τῶν ἀνδρῶν τῆς γενεᾶς ταύτης καὶ κατακρινεῖ αὐτούς, ὅτι ἦλθεν ἐκ τῶν περάτων τῆς γῆς ἀκοῦσαι τὴν σοφίαν Σολομῶνος, καὶ ἰδοὺ πλεῖον Σολομῶνος ᾧδε. **32** ἄνδρες Νινευῖται ἀναστήσονται ἐν τῇ κρίσει μετὰ τῆς γενεᾶς ταύτης καὶ κατακρινουῖσιν αὐτήν· ὅτι μετενόησαν εἰς τὸ κήρυγμα Ἰωνᾶ, καὶ ἰδοὺ πλεῖον Ἰωνᾶ ᾧδε.

While vv. 31-32 are nearly identical, they are switched in order, sandwiching the saying on the Queen of the South between the mentions of Jonah. 30b shares verbal similarity with Mt 12:40, but its connection to 30a, which is distinct both in its wording and overall meaning, suggests it is a variant tradition: in Matthew's version, the sign is a typological parallel to Jonah's time in the belly of the fish, but in Luke the sign is Jonah's preaching itself, which better captures the intent of Matthew's version if v. 40 is excised from the passage. The difference in wording and change in the identification of the sign suggests Luke is correcting Matthew with a more reliable tradition. This also corresponds with Luke's version of the sign of the times at Lk 12:54-6, the parallel of which, Mt 16:1-4, has appended to it a near identical doublet at v. 4 of Mt 12:39, which is in turn parallel with v. 29 of Luke's sign of Jonah pericope above, again suggesting that vv. 29-30 are a correction permitted by Luke's access to a more reliable version of the tradition.

This is followed by Lk 11:33-36, which is another collection of sayings, similar to Lk 8:16-18, which drew from material at Mt 5:14-16, 10:26-27, and 13:12. This second collection uses Mt 5:14-16 as did the first collection, but here Luke uses Mt 6:22-23. The collections relate to the antithesis of Jesus and the Pharisees. The disciples of Jesus are to do good deeds openly out of sincerity, while the Pharisees make themselves appear pious but hide their evil; their deeds will be exposed in the eschaton, while the work of the disciples will be illuminated. Lk 11:35 is not from Matthew and may be Luke's attempt to link the other two sayings he used. McNicol, Dungan, and Peabody find there to be a third collection that comes soon after the second at Lk 12:1b-3, which uses 10:26-27 again, so that the three collections share material, and by extension, have a thematic unity.<sup>390</sup> Against this suggestion, Luke used Mt 16:6, which he had previously skipped over for use here, to preface material from Mt 10 to identify the Pharisees as those whose vileness is hidden and would harm the disciples as a continuation of the controversy section. In other words, it is not another sayings collection but the beginning of the discourse that follows, and viewing it as a separate, standalone sayings collection like the first two ruins the continuity of the material. The second set of sayings, as with the first, is distinct in its wording with the corresponding Matthean counterparts, and so it should not be envisioned that Luke turned to these sections in Matthew.

#### Persecution to Eschatology to Repentance

For the diatribe against the Pharisees in Lk 11:37-52, Luke proceeded to the discourse in Mt 23, and for the next scene turns to the mission charge of Mt 10 to use the eschatological material from this passage that was not suitable in previous contexts. Drury sees a movement in

---

<sup>390</sup> McNicol, Dungan, and Peabody, *Luke's Use of Matthew*, 183-4.

the theme of Luke's material from the beginning of the Central Section to this point, moving from ethical and practical teaching in the Good Samaritan and section on prayer to the Church's struggle with opponents in the second controversy section to the material on eschatology.<sup>391</sup> That Luke is intending to intensify the conflict with the Pharisees in this complex is evident from the narration that after the woes against the Pharisees, they left to plan against Jesus, and, upon seeing their defeat, the crowds gathered to such an extent that they were beginning to trample one another. To begin the ensuing discourse Luke inserts Mt 16:6, which he passed over earlier to use for this second controversy complex, fitting well in a context of others being warned about the Pharisees. As McNicol, Dungan, and Peabody note, the next two sections, the rich fool from L and worry over worldly troubles from the Sermon on the Mount, proceed from Lk 12:1b-12 as pertaining to anxiety over things of this life rather than the focusing on the will of God and His kingdom at their expense.<sup>392</sup> Within this discourse is Luke's version of the unforgivable sin, Lk 12:10, which is removed from the Beelzebul controversy, having been appended to it by Matthew in his version. The wording shared between the two versions is underlined:

Lk 12:10: καὶ πᾶς ὃς ἐρεῖ λόγον εἰς τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, ἀφεθήσεται αὐτῷ· τῷ δὲ εἰς τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα βλασφημήσαντι οὐκ ἀφεθήσεται.

And Matthew's version with the parallel wording to Luke's version underlined:

**31** πᾶσα ἁμαρτία καὶ βλασφημία ἀφεθήσεται τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, ἡ δὲ τοῦ πνεύματος βλασφημία οὐκ ἀφεθήσεται. **32** καὶ ὃς ἐὰν εἴπῃ λόγον κατὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, ἀφεθήσεται αὐτῷ· ὃς δ' ἂν εἴπῃ κατὰ τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου, οὐκ ἀφεθήσεται αὐτῷ οὔτε ἐν τούτῳ τῷ αἰῶνι οὔτε ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι.

---

<sup>391</sup> Drury, *Tradition and Design*, 144.

<sup>392</sup> McNicol, Dungan, and Peabody, *Luke's Use of Matthew*, 190.

It is possible that Lk 12:10 is a rewriting of Mt 12:32 from memory, since most of the differences are not integral and involve the exchange of synonyms or the use of different tenses or cases for the same words. In this case Luke has removed v. 31 and the ending of v. 32. The other option is that Luke is using a variant, the knowledge of which would inform Luke that the saying is not inherently part of the Beelzebul controversy as it would appear from its use in Matthew, unless it is to be imagined Luke realized it would fit better in the eschatological context of his own accord. In Matthew and Mark the context around the saying suggests the Pharisees are guilty of the unforgivable sin because they are attributing Jesus' miracles to Satan, but Luke reinterprets it as a warning not to apostasize in the face of persecution. With this in mind, it is more likely Luke is aware of the tradition from outside knowledge, although he may be influenced by Matthew's wording.

Following the parable of the rich fool from L is the pericope on worldly troubles, which is parallel to the Sermon on the Mount at Mt 6:25-34 and has a high degree of verbal similarity, suggesting direct dependence. Here Matthew's "birds of the heavens" are exchanged for the "ravens" that fed Elijah, continuing this theme that pervades the Gospel.<sup>393</sup> Luke follows this pericope with the one that precedes it in Matthew, Mt 6:19-21. This is Luke's version of Mt 6:19-21, with the overlap of Matthew's wording underlined:

**32** Μὴ φοβοῦ, τὸ μικρὸν ποίμνιον, ὅτι εὐδόκησεν ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν δοῦναι ὑμῖν τὴν βασιλείαν. **33** Πωλήσατε τὰ ὑπάρχοντα ὑμῶν καὶ δότε ἐλεημοσύνην· ποιήσατε ἑαυτοῖς βαλλάντια μὴ παλαιούμενα, θησαυρὸν ἀνέκλειπτον ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, ὅπου κλέπτῃς οὐκ ἐγγίζει οὐδὲ σῆς διαφθείρει· **34** ὅπου γάρ ἐστιν ὁ θησαυρὸς ὑμῶν, ἐκεῖ καὶ ἡ καρδιά ὑμῶν ἔσται.

McNicol, Dungan, and Peabody contend that v. 32 is a reworking by Luke of Mt 6:34, but the verses are so different in form and meaning that it can hardly be called a variant tradition, let

---

<sup>393</sup> Goulder, *Luke: A New Paradigm*, 540.

alone a direct revision. 33a has the appearance of Lukan composition, however, and was likely influenced by the nearby Mt 6:1-4. They assert that the pericope as a whole is similar enough to avoid needing to posit L overlap.<sup>394</sup> 33b may be a rewriting of Matthew or derived from another source. Based on the closeness of the two pericopes in Matthew and the nearly verbatim Lk 12:34, however, it is clear Luke is dependent on Mt 6:19-21.

Luke then proceeds to the final discourses in Mt 24-25, first with a summarization of Mt 25:1-3, carries over Mt 24:42-51, then goes back to Mt 10 to insert the eschatological material that remains in the mission charge discourse. The parable of the ten virgins at the beginning of Mt 25 has the issues that the bridesmaids should be attending the bride and not waiting for the groom, and it is cast in a favorable light that the wise ones did not share oil with the others, resulting in their condemnation, a message that Luke may have wanted to avoid.<sup>395</sup> As such, he provides a summary of the first half of the parable that avoids these issues. Luke then continues the discourse with two pericopes paralleled in Matthew that he applies to the eschatological context. In Matthew, the signs of the times pericope at Mt 16:1-4 puts the saying in the context of a narrative introduction in which the Pharisees ask Jesus to confirm His authority with a sign, whereas in Luke it is recast in an eschatological context, that is, a sign that the eschaton is nearing. Next is the parable of the judge and bailiff, which is paralleled by Matthew, and which, in its context in the Sermon on the Mount, is interpreted as referring to reconciliation with another person, while, with its placement in Luke's eschatological discourse, it is reinterpreted as

---

<sup>394</sup> McNicol, Dungan, and Peabody, *Luke's Use of Matthew*, 194.

<sup>395</sup> Goulder, *Luke: A New Paradigm*, 543-4.

encouraging reconciliation with God.<sup>396</sup> This is the text of Luke's signs of the times pericope for comparison:

**54** Ὅταν ἴδητε νεφέλην ἀνατέλλουσαν ἐπὶ δυσμῶν, εὐθέως λέγετε ὅτι Ὅμβρος ἔρχεται, καὶ γίνεται οὕτως· **55** καὶ ὅταν νότον πνέοντα, λέγετε ὅτι Καύσων ἔσται, καὶ γίνεται. **56** ὑποκριταί, τὸ πρόσωπον τῆς γῆς καὶ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ οἴδατε δοκιμάζειν, τὸν καιρὸν δὲ τοῦτον πῶς οὐκ οἴδατε δοκιμάζειν;

And Luke's pericope of the judge and bailiff:

**57** Τί δὲ καὶ ἀφ' ἑαυτῶν οὐ κρίνετε τὸ δίκαιον; **58** ὡς γὰρ ὑπάγεις μετὰ τοῦ ἀντιδίκου σου ἐπ' ἄρχοντα, ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ δὸς ἐργασίαν ἀπηλλάχθαι ἀπ' αὐτοῦ, μήποτε κατασύρη σε πρὸς τὸν κριτήν, καὶ ὁ κριτής σε παραδώσει τῷ πράκτορι, καὶ ὁ πράκτωρ σε βαλεῖ εἰς φυλακὴν. **59** λέγω σοι, οὐ μὴ ἐξέλθῃς ἐκεῖθεν, ἕως καὶ τὸ ἔσχατον λεπτὸν ἀποδῷς.

The pericope on the signs of the times is too distinct to likely be a rewriting of Matthew. Because it is likely from another source, it is in turn also likely that the pericope on the judge and bailiff is a variant that follows in the same source, which Luke may have conflated with the Matthean version, v. 59 in particular being a rewriting of Matthew. This would best account for the placement of the two passages into vastly different contexts, unless it should be attributed to Luke that he would have perceived in these passages and others an eschatological reinterpretation from his encounter of them in their Matthean contexts. If the passages are not in L, it is at least the case that oral tradition has informed him of an eschatological application of the pericopes. In either case the occasional Matthean elements need not require that he turned back to the passages in Matthew, and may, on the contrary, suggest that he did not, with the similarities better explained as carrying over from memory. That the passages are variants from

---

<sup>396</sup> Joachim Jeremias, *The Parables of Jesus*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., trans. S. H. Hooke (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1972), 43-4.

L is supported by the fact that the next two pericopes are from L and continue the theme of a warning to repent to avoid the coming judgment.

The following story of the healing of the crippled woman is either a Lukan composition or a tradition from L that has been reworded according to Luke's characteristic style. It perhaps was intended to portray Jesus as the one who is capable of correcting someone's spiritual posture, as the answer to the warnings of judgment just prior.<sup>397</sup> Less imaginative is the observation that a dispute with the Pharisees is embedded in the story, which connects back to the controversy of the Beelzebul controversy. It must be remembered that Luke used the Beelzebul controversy to construct a second controversy complex, which he further built up by preempting the request for a sign in the Beelzebul introduction at Lk 11:16, which includes the sign of Jonah pericope in the theme of dispute. He changed the order of Matthew's sign of Jonah and impure spirits pericopes to direct the latter against the Pharisees; added the second sayings collection, which is a warning to reject the disposition of the Pharisees; turns to Mt 23 to include the material from Matthew's woes to the Pharisees discourse; and then prefaces the material in Mt 10 about those who would harm the disciples with Mt 16:6, which identifies those opponents as the Pharisees. The theme of the material from Mt 10 leads into the pericopes of the rich fool, worry over worldly troubles, and the eschatological material in Mt 24-25 and Mt 10. To this he added Lk 12:54-59, which are likely variants from L, and then the parables in 13:1-9, which are unique to Luke, all of which develop the eschatological theme.

---

<sup>397</sup> McNicol, Dungan, and Peabody, *Luke's Use of Matthew*, 204-5.

### Judgment and Gentile Inclusion

Following the two eschatological parables on repentance, the judge and bailiff, parallel to Mt 5:25-26, and the Galileans and those who were killed by the tower in Siloam, from L, Luke proceeds with a parable from L that transitions from a call for repentance to the charge that the Pharisees have failed to heed the call and rendered themselves fruitless and in danger of being cut down like a barren fig tree. As Goulder argues, the healing is intended by Luke to exemplify the failure of the Jewish religious leadership, placed after the parable of the barren fig tree, which is a metaphor for their refusal to repent, and is followed by the parable of the mustard seed, a sequence that communicates that because the Jewish leaders are being cut off like the fig tree, the Gentiles will then be ingrafted.<sup>398</sup> He changes Matthew's contrast of the large tree growing from a small seed to a focus on the tree's sprawling branches, which represents the outreach to the Gentiles.<sup>399</sup>

The healing of the crippled woman, in isolation, relates to the theme of dispute against the Pharisees, not the eschatological material that Luke pulled from Matthew's discourses, although it is made to relate by the thematic development produced by the manner in which Luke has progressed the topic from persecution to eschatology to repentance. Luke initially progressed into the eschatological theme because he applied the material from Mt 10 he used in Lk 12:2-12 to the Pharisees through the use of Mt 16:6 at Lk 12:1. If the Matthean discourse material is removed, and the L material appended to it in the crafting of this section, the healing of the crippled woman follows the Beelzebul controversy in L, which Luke is turning back to after his diversion into eschatology which he himself developed from the topic of controversy with the

---

<sup>398</sup> Goulder, *Luke: A New Paradigm*, 564-5.

<sup>399</sup> *Ibid.*, 567.



Pharisees. The L material of the rich fool, signs of the times, judge and bailiff, and material on repentance in Lk 13:1-9 was added by Luke from other sections in L to continue the eschatological discourse, and with the healing of the crippled woman he has returned to the next unused pericope after his variant of the Beelzebul controversy in L, returning back to the original topic of Jesus' dispute with the Pharisees, forming a thematic *inclusio*. When Luke reached the Beelzebul controversy in L, or at least the material he decided to conflate with Matthew's Beelzebul controversy, he turned to Matthew and proceeded from his sequence. This, then, explains the three abrupt changes in topic from his use of L's sequence, first the shift from the second mission charge to the parable of the good Samaritan, then the L variant of the Lord's Prayer, and third the L variant of the Beelzebul controversy material. It is a secondary possibility that the L variant of the Beelzebul controversy material is located elsewhere, but that he came next to the healing of the crippled woman after the section on the Lord's Prayer and switched to Matthew to use his section on the Beelzebul controversy because he intended to use it to begin his second controversy complex, of which the healing pericope would be a part.

The next pericope Luke uses is the paired parables of the mustard seed and leaven, which is parallel to Mt 13:31-33. Luke's text of the parable of the mustard seed can be compared with Matthew's:

**18** Τίτι ὁμοία ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τίτι ὁμοιώσω αὐτήν; 19 ὁμοία ἐστὶν κόκκῳ σινάπεως, ὃν λαβὼν ἄνθρωπος ἔβαλεν εἰς κῆπον ἑαυτοῦ, καὶ ἠϋξήσεν καὶ ἐγένετο εἰς δένδρον, καὶ τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ κατεσκήνωσεν ἐν τοῖς κλάδοις αὐτοῦ.

And the parable of the leaven:

**20** Τίτι ὁμοιώσω τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ; 21 ὁμοία ἐστὶν ζύμη, ἣν λαβοῦσα γυνὴ ἔκρυπεν εἰς ἀλεύρου σάτα τρία ἕως οὗ ἐζυμώθη ὅλον.

Luke's versions of the parables are clearly dependent on Matthew's, with two primary differences. He prefaces each with a question, taking language from the Matthean text. In the parable of the mustard seed he changes Matthew's sowing in the field to the planting of one seed in a garden, which is more fitting for the analogy.<sup>400</sup> The parables are the next unused pericope after Matthew's Beelzebul controversy, separated only by Matthew's parables of the sower and tares. With the two parables following soon after the Beelzebul controversy in Matthew's Gospel, it is likely Luke intended to use the parables after the healing of the crippled woman as part of the second controversy complex that began with the Beelzebul controversy, rather than it being a switch of sources from L to Matthew to scan for more material.

The next passage in Luke is the parable of the narrow door, which McNicol, Dungan, and Peabody argue is a Lukan construction taking elements from the narrow gate at Mt 7:13-14 and the parable of the ten virgins at Mt 25:1-13, which Luke previously summarized in his eschatological discourse. Mt 7:13-14, 21-23, and 25:1-13 are naturally connected due to their similar language and themes, especially the "Lord, Lord" connection between Mt 7:21 and 25:11 and the "I do not know you" shared between 7:23 and 25:12, with "narrow door" in Luke deriving from "narrow gate" in Mt 7 and "closed door" in Mt 25.<sup>401</sup> In addition, it is possible the details of eating and drinking are from the parable of the sheep and the goats in Mt 25. The three passages in Matthew can be compared to Luke's rendition, with the verbatim overlap between Mt 7 and Luke underlined and the overlap with Mt 25 italicized:

**24** Ἀγωνίζεσθε εἰσελθεῖν διὰ τῆς στενῆς θύρας, ὅτι πολλοί, λέγω ὑμῖν, ζητήσουσιν εἰσελθεῖν καὶ οὐκ ἰσχύσουσιν. **25** ἀφ' οὗ ἂν ἐγερθῇ ὁ οἰκοδεσπότης καὶ ἀποκλείσῃ τὴν θύραν καὶ ἄρξησθε ἔξω ἐστάναι καὶ κρούειν τὴν θύραν λέγοντες, Κύριε, ἄνοιξον ἡμῖν, καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ἐρεῖ ὑμῖν, *Οὐκ οἶδα ὑμᾶς πόθεν*

---

<sup>400</sup> Ibid., 566-7.

<sup>401</sup> McNicol, Dungan, and Peabody, *Luke's Use of Matthew*, 205-6.

ἐστέ. **26** τότε ἄρξεσθε λέγειν, Ἐφάγομεν ἐνώπιον σου καὶ ἐπίομεν καὶ ἐν ταῖς πλατείαις ἡμῶν ἐδίδαξας· **27** καὶ ἐρεῖ λέγων ὑμῖν, Οὐκ οἶδα πόθεν ἐστέ· ἀπόστητε ἀπ' ἐμοῦ πάντες ἐργάται ἀδικίας.

Due to the similarities and the fact that Luke previously summarized the parable of the ten virgins, the passage is most likely a Lukan composition combining elements of the three passages in Matthew, with a distinctiveness of the wording that does not require he consulted any of them directly. This is further substantiated by the fact that he then appended the remainder of the unused portion of the saying from the centurion's servant pericope and a brief, common saying promising the reversal of fortune at the eschaton. This is Luke's version of the saying displaced from the centurion's servant pericope:

**28** ἐκεῖ ἔσται ὁ κλαυθμὸς καὶ ὁ βρυγμὸς τῶν ὀδόντων, ὅταν ὄψησθε Ἀβραὰμ καὶ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ Ἰακώβ καὶ πάντας τοὺς προφήτας ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ, ὑμᾶς δὲ ἐκβαλλομένους ἔξω. **29** καὶ ἤξουσιν ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν καὶ δυσμῶν καὶ ἀπὸ βορρᾶ καὶ νότου καὶ ἀνακλιθήσονται ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ.

Luke has transposed the “weeping and gnashing and teeth” to be first, with the mention of the patriarchs second, and the first clause in Matthew put last. He added the mention of the prophets and “north and south,” perhaps reflecting his emphasis on the universality of the gospel proclamation. The repeated ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ appears to be a result of Luke's reworking of Matthew's text, particularly because of his move of 28a to be the first clause. Luke is dependent on Matthew's version; there is no need to posit an L variant. Lk 13:22-29 was likely constructed by Luke to continue the use of parables from his inclusion of the parables of the mustard seed and leaven. He changes Matthew's οἱ ἐργαζόμενοι τὴν ἀνομίαν to ἐργάται ἀδικίας because the issue is not that they are ones who break the Law but those whose wrongdoing is so encompassing and complete that they are identified by it.<sup>402</sup>

---

<sup>402</sup> Goulder, *Luke: A New Paradigm*, 574.

Luke then proceeds with a pericope from L at Lk 13:33-35 that is likely to have followed the healing of the crippled woman in L's sequence. First, the warning from the Pharisees, which is intended to get Jesus to leave, follows from their embarrassing defeat at the synagogue; second, Jesus' response pertains to exorcizing demons and healing; and third, the material separating the two pericopes is from Matthew and Lukan composition. If that is the case, this results in the sequence of the Beelzebul controversy, healing of the crippled woman, and Lk 13:31-33 in L. As McNicol, Dungan, and Peabody note, the added "and all the prophets" at Lk 13:28, which is the saying displaced from the centurion's servant pericope in Matthew to the narrow door parable, is likely an addition that anticipates the "Jerusalem, Jerusalem" lament at Lk 13:34-35, which is taken from the Mt 23 discourse, the woes to the Pharisees.<sup>403</sup> This lament circles back to the theme of the Jewish religious leaders being judged for their refusal to repent and lack of fruitfulness, which will result in them being cut down like a barren fig tree.

#### Luke's Ending Use of L

Luke then continues with the next pericope in L, which continues the topic of controversy with the Pharisees, another dispute in a synagogue due to Jesus healing on the Sabbath. The similarities of this pericope with the healing of the crippled woman provide an additional reason that Lk 13:31-33 stood between the two in L's order, since it is difficult to imagine two such similar pericopes would have stood next to each other in the same source. This transitions to the pericope on taking a lowly seat at a wedding feast, to inviting the lowly to one's table, then to the L variant of the parable of the banquet, all from L and likely in L's order.

---

<sup>403</sup> McNicol, Dungan, and Peabody, *Luke's Use of Matthew*, 207.

Luke now switches topics to the cost of discipleship, prefacing L material with sayings taken from Mt 10, and ending with the saying on salt from the Sermon on the Mount.

**34** Καλὸν οὖν τὸ ἄλας· ἐὰν δὲ καὶ τὸ ἄλας μωρανθῇ, ἐν τίνι ἀρτυθήσεται; **35** οὔτε εἰς γῆν οὔτε εἰς κοπρίαν εὐθετόν ἐστιν, ἔξω βάλλουσιν αὐτό.

The differences in v. 34 need not require Luke went back to Mt 5, and v. 35, as McNicol, Dungan, and Peabody notice, is likely influenced by the wording of the sayings at Mt 18:8-9, which Luke must have passed for the parable of the lost sheep that follows.<sup>404</sup> The change in topic that begins the sayings on discipleship is likely predicated on the order of L due to the differences in the L material that the sayings from Mt 10 and Mt 5 preface and conclude. The parable of the lost sheep then follows, taken from Mt 18:12-14:

**4** Τίς ἄνθρωπος ἐξ ὑμῶν ἔχων ἑκατὸν πρόβατα καὶ ἀπολέσας ἐξ αὐτῶν ἓν οὐ καταλείπει τὰ ἐνενήκοντα ἐννέα ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ καὶ πορεύεται ἐπὶ τὸ ἀπολωλὸς ἕως εὕρη αὐτό; **5** καὶ εὐρῶν ἐπιτίθησιν ἐπὶ τοὺς ὄμους αὐτοῦ χαίρων **6** καὶ ἐλθὼν εἰς τὸν οἶκον συγκαλεῖ τοὺς φίλους καὶ τοὺς γείτονας λέγων αὐτοῖς, Συγγάρητέ μοι, ὅτι εὗρον τὸ πρόβατόν μου τὸ ἀπολωλός. **7** λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι οὕτως χαρὰ ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ ἔσται ἐπὶ ἐνὶ ἁμαρτωλῷ μετανοοῦντι ἢ ἐπὶ ἐνενήκοντα ἐννέα δικαίοις οἵτινες οὐ χρεῖαν ἔχουσιν μετανοίας.

Due to the parables of the lost sheep and lost coin in Luke constituting a male-female pair and being followed by the parable of the prodigal son from L, the lost coin being unique to Luke, and the drastic rewording of the parable of the lost sheep after v. 4, it is likely that Luke has a variant version in L. It is difficult to imagine the lost coin and prodigal son formed a pair due to the comparatively extreme difference in form, whereas the lost sheep and lost coin bear great similarity that lends to their pairing.

As with the change of topic at Lk 14:25 from the parable of the banquet to the discipleship material caused by Luke following the order of L, the parable of the lost sheep

---

<sup>404</sup> Ibid., 213.

introduces another abrupt change. At this point in his use of Matthew, Luke has used up to Mt 18 and is nearing the end of his use of Matthew in the Central Section, until he nears the end of L and switches back to Matthew for the remainder of the Gospel. The parable of the lost sheep comes after the Matthean material used in Lk 17:1-3, which Luke intended to use with his parables about the greed of the Pharisees, the dishonest steward and the rich man and Lazarus. If he arrived at the parable of the lost sheep by using Matthew's sequence, it would be expected that he would have used the material in Lk 17:1-3 and the L parables connected to it first, before using the lost sheep and the parables from L connected to it, due to their order in Matthew. This indicates that the parables connected to the lost sheep precede the parables connected to the Matthean material used in Lk 17:1-3 in L's sequence. Luke had been following L for quite some time, and has not turned to Matthew's sequence over L since the controversy complex that began with the Beelzebul controversy. If he is following L and there is a variant of the second to next unused pericope in Matthew in his source, it would not constitute much of a coincidence that Luke would eventually reach that variant. The extent of the coincidence is that Luke uses adjacent material from Mt 18 after the parable of the rich man and Lazarus, but it is separated by a considerable amount of L material from the parable of the lost sheep, and even then material from John's inquiry and the Sermon on the Mount is used at Lk 16:16-18, between the two. When it is considered that the parable of the lost sheep in Luke is also preceded by a considerable amount of L material, it becomes clear that the sudden shift from the discipleship material at Lk 14:25-35 to the parable of the lost sheep at 15:1-7 is due to Luke following L's sequence.

According to Jeremias, the parable of the dishonest steward originally ended at Lk 16:8 and had additional material appended to it due to attempts at reinterpretation of the material

during the course of its oral transmission.<sup>405</sup> McNicol, Dungan, and Peabody believe Luke is responsible for appending 19b-13, despite acknowledging that 19b is not Lukan composition, to better prepare for the parable of Lazarus and the rich man;<sup>406</sup> but while 19a could exist independently of 19b, 19b could not exist independently of 19a, and so either the two are connected in Luke's source, Luke wrote 19b, or Luke is aware of and using outside tradition. It is more likely that the material in 19b-13 better prepares for the following pericope not because it is Luke's doing but because the pericopes are sequential in L, and that is why they are adjacent in Luke's Gospel, aside from the intervening material shared with the Sermon on the Mount. With Luke's addition of Lk 16:13-15 it is evident Luke is directing the parable against the Pharisees and their love of money. The added material from the Sermon on the Mount serves to connect to the following pericope in which the rich man's family did not listen to the Law, and the thought process behind vv. 17-18 is that the advent of the Gospel does not remove the Law, and so commands like that of divorce are still in force.<sup>407</sup>

Goulder must reconcile the parable of the dishonest steward with his view that Luke's unique material is his invention and not a parable to which he has appended material in reinterpreting it. Because it shares with Matthew's parable of the unforgiving servant at Mt 18 a middleman between an authority to whom debt is owed, he is forced to conclude that the parable of the dishonest steward is a rewriting of Matthew's unforgiving servant. Goulder must then reconcile Lk 16:10ff with the meaning of the parable up to v. 9, since what appears to be the original form of the parable views the steward in a good light. From v. 10, however, it appears

---

<sup>405</sup> Jeremias, *The Parables of Jesus*, 45-7.

<sup>406</sup> McNicol, Dungan, and Peabody, *Luke's Use of Matthew*, 223.

<sup>407</sup> *Ibid.*, 223-6.

Luke has added material that likens the steward to the Pharisees and reinterprets the parable so that the steward is viewed negatively. Goulder finds that Luke repurposes the conclusion of Matthew's parable of the talents at v. 10, adds commentary in vv. 11-12, and then uses the two masters saying from the Sermon on the Mount before narrating the response of the Pharisees. To the objection that this would involve Luke creating a parable that directly contradicts the conclusory material that he adds to it, Goulder simply suggests it is not unusual for Luke to create such a conflict in his material.<sup>408</sup> In response, however, while it is the case Luke can create minor difficulties, Goulder wishes one to imagine that Luke crafted a parable himself and had it portray the steward positively, and then appended a conclusion from another parable to reinterpret what he had just written. This is the clearest case that at least some of Luke's unique material has come from another source and is not Lukan composition as Goulder contends.

After the brief diversion of Matthean material inserted by Luke, he continues from the dishonest steward in L to another parable about money. At Lk 17:1-6, Luke adds discourse material from Mt 18:6-7, transposing the two verses from their Matthean order because with the use of Mt 18:1-5 elsewhere, there is nothing connecting to the "these little ones" in the next verse, which would abruptly come next. Luke appends the material to the parable with the thought of Lazarus, and the poor and lowly like him, as the referent.<sup>409</sup> He connects vv. 7-10 from L, and takes the opportunity to add the redactional v. 11 due to the sudden shift with the presumable next pericope in L, the healing of the ten lepers. As McNicol, Dungan, and Peabody

---

<sup>408</sup> Goulder, *Luke: A New Paradigm*, 618-25.

<sup>409</sup> *Ibid.*, 639-40.



point out, this is a fitting place for the narratival continuation of the journey to Jerusalem established at 9:51 due to the connection of the Samaritans in the pericopes following both.<sup>410</sup>

Following from the view embedded in Lk 11:20—“If I cast out demons by the finger of God, then the kingdom of God has come upon you”—that healings and miracles were instances of the in-breaking of the kingdom of God, Luke then attaches 17:20-21 from L, which serves as the transition from the healing of the ten lepers to the discourse material in Mt 24 about the eschatological coming of the Son of Man.<sup>411</sup> The following parable of the persistent widow allows for two observations about Luke’s use of L and Matthew. The first is that the abrupt change from the eschatological material pulled from Matthew to the topic of prayer with the parable of the persistent widow from L indicates Luke has finished with the topic at hand, switched to L, and proceeded with the next unused pericope in L’s sequence. The second is that the parable of the persistent widow would have subtly but naturally followed in sequence after the healing of the ten lepers. In Jesus’ saying at the end of the healing pericope, he mentions giving praise to God, and this leads thematically into a pericope on prayer. It seems, though, that Luke did not notice this underlying connection between the two pericopes in L and instead took the healing of the ten lepers to a different route, appending vv. 20-21 from L that pertains to the coming of the kingdom of God before turning to Matthew for the discourse material on the coming of the Son of Man. The next pericope in Luke, the self-righteous Pharisee and the sinner calling out to God, likely followed the parable of the persistent widow in L. At this point Luke returns to Matthew as his main source.

---

<sup>410</sup> McNicol, Dungan, and Peabody, *Luke’s Use of Matthew*, 231-2.

<sup>411</sup> *Ibid.*, 232-3.

### Luke's Use of Matthew in the Central Section

Against the possibility that Luke used of Matthew, Fitzmyer objects: "It is difficult to explain adequately why Luke would want to break up Matthew's sermons, especially the Sermon on the Mount, in order to incorporate a part of it in his Sermon on the Plain and scatter the rest around in an unconnected and disjointed fashion in the loose context of the travel account," characterizing the Central Section as "almost unconnected episodes or sayings."<sup>412</sup> It can be seen from this demonstration, however, that the Matthean discourse material is added to the frame of L's sequence topically, just as Luke inserted L material into the Matthean sequence in the Galilean Ministry in accordance with his redactional interests. This is contrary to Streeter's infamous objection against Luke's use of Matthew, that it would entail Luke displacing Matthean material "in spite of the fact that contexts in Matthew are always exceedingly appropriate—in order to re-insert it into a different context of Mark having no special appropriateness."<sup>413</sup> First, as it has been pointed out by Butler, this characterization is misleading because, except for a few verses, Luke does not relocate the Matthean material into Markan contexts but moves the displaced passages to the non-Markan Central Section.<sup>414</sup> Second, it is ironic that less than twenty pages earlier Streeter had described Matthew's discourses as "agglomerations," that Matthew must have appended together teaching material without thematic cohesion into long discourses, or, to put it in Streeter's wording, that the placements of these passages together in Matthew's discourses are of "no special appropriateness."<sup>415</sup> Quite the contrary to Streeter's assertion, it is

---

<sup>412</sup> Fitzmyer, "Luke's use of Q," 249.

<sup>413</sup> Burnett Hillman Streeter, *The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins, Treating of the Manuscript Tradition, Sources, Authorship, & Dates* (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2008), 183.

<sup>414</sup> B. C. Butler, *The Originality of St. Matthew: A Critique of the Two-Document Hypothesis* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1951), 23.

<sup>415</sup> Streeter, *The Four Gospels*, 166-7.

not Luke who would have torn the sayings from the suitable contexts of his source and placed them in other contexts of no particular suitability, but Matthew.

Streeter held that by analogy to Luke's maintenance of Mark's order that Luke largely retained the order of Q, and it is Matthew who is responsible for most of the rearrangement.<sup>416</sup> With this in mind, against Fitzmyer's assessment that "the explanation that [Luke] has quarried the material from Matthew's sermons is the least convincing,"<sup>417</sup> it is either Matthew who has quarried Q in constructing his discourses or Luke who has quarried Matthew, and so the only question is if it is more likely Matthew would have deconstructed the thematically cohesive discourses from the order of Q as retained in Luke's Gospel to construct his thematically disparate "agglomerations," or if Luke took from the material in the order as found in Matthew according to topic to construct his discourses. 2DH proponents try to have it both ways, portraying it as unimaginable that Luke could disassemble the edifices that are Matthew's discourses, but also acknowledging that Matthew's discourses are topically discordant, and they appeal to whichever is most convenient for their arguments at the time. If Matthew must have pulled together sayings from throughout Q to construct his discourses under the 2DH, it cannot be an objection against Luke's use of Matthew that he would have constructed his discourses by "quarrying" Matthew. As it stands, between the 2DH and 2GH, the same procedure must be attributed to one of the evangelists, and so it is a matter of which direction is more likely. As has been demonstrated, Luke's ordering of material is thematically coherent, making it more likely he has used Matthew, than that Matthew should have broken apart the cohesion of Luke's discourses to construct agglomerate discourses out of them, to use the 2DH objection against

---

<sup>416</sup> Burnett Hillman Streeter, "On the Original Order of Q," in *Oxford Studies in the Synoptic Problem*, ed. W. Sanday (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1911), 145-7.

<sup>417</sup> Fitzmyer, "Luke's Use of Q," 250.

Luke's restructuring of Matthew in turn against Matthew's restructuring of Q. With the argument that Luke's discourses are topically cohesive, this argument for the 2DH instead cuts against it and all but necessitates Matthew's priority relative to Luke.

Furthermore, against Fitzmyer's characterization of the Central Section as "almost unconnected episodes or sayings" as an argument against Luke's relocation of Matthean discourse material,<sup>418</sup> it has been demonstrated that in Luke's Gospel the Matthean discourse material was appended topically to the L material in the sequence of L, and that abrupt changes in topic are always initiated with L pericopes, not Matthean discourse material. Luke's transition to L as his primary source occurs at the close of the second mission charge and beginning of the Good Samaritan, which comes from L. The abrupt change to the topic of prayer is due to Luke's variant of the Lord's Prayer, from L. The Beelzebul controversy marks another abrupt change, and it is evidenced that Luke conflated Matthew and L for his version. Even if it is denied that Luke's variant of the Beelzebul controversy was next in sequence after the pericopes on prayer in L, and that it is supposed the L variant is located elsewhere and that the abrupt change is due to Luke switching from L's sequence to Matthew's, it must be questioned what warranted the switch. The next L pericope after the Beelzebul controversy is the rich fool. This is used after the eschatological Matthean material, which is made to follow the diatribe against the Pharisees by Luke's use of Lk 12:1-7, which is the evangelist's transition between the two topics. In this case, Luke used the Beelzebul controversy here to place it before the eschatological material because he wanted to connect it to the Pharisees. If the rich fool followed the pericopes on prayer in L, that would still constitute an abrupt change in topic due to the order of L, seeing that the next pericope on prayer in L is not until the persistent widow near the end of the Central Section.

---

<sup>418</sup> Ibid., 249.

If the transitions at Lk 13:6 and 14:1 are considered changes in topic, they are again caused by L pericopes. Likewise, the change from the great banquet to material on discipleship at 14:25 is caused by an L pericope. The parable of the lost sheep beginning at 15:1 is also an L variant, and even if it is considered that Luke used Matthew in its composition, it precedes the parables of the lost coin and prodigal son, which are both from L, with the parables of the lost sheep and lost coin constituting a pair. The order, then, is likely due to L, not Matthew. The changes from the prodigal son to the dishonest steward, material on discipleship at 17:1-10 to the healing of the lepers, and the eschatological material at 17:20-37 to the parable of the persistent widow, are all caused by an L pericope. In no case does the Matthean discourse material initiate a new topic, but always follows the L material it is thematically connected to, showing that Luke is following the order of L and supplementing it thematically with Matthew. His use of Matthew in the Central Section, then, does not depend on the order of Matthew but L, which explains the use of material from various discourses in Matthew with no relation to its order. Luke uses his predecessor's discourses not with respect to its order but with respect to L's order and its topical relevance to the L material to which it is appended, just as in the sequences before the Central Section he used Matthew's order and inserted L material as it pertained topically. In every case new topics are initiated by L pericopes and the Matthean discourse material follows the L pericopes it thematically develops.

Additionally, there are several cases in which Luke develops the topic of an L pericope into another with the addition of Matthean and L material, and after the discourse is finished, the next L pericope relates to the topic of the initial L pericope and not the developed theme. For instance, the second controversy complex beginning with the Beelzebul controversy develops into an eschatological discourse and then transitions into the topic of repentance. The parable of

the barren fig tree and healing of the crippled woman which follow both connect back to the original topic of dispute with the Pharisees, possibly revealing that the Beelzebul controversy and healing of the crippled woman are sequential in L. After the parables of the mustard seed, leaven, and narrow door is a dialogue from L at Lk 13:31-33 between the Pharisees and Jesus that is fitting as the next pericope after the healing. At Lk 17, after the healing of the ten lepers Luke adds material from L and Matthew about the coming of the kingdom of God, and the next L pericope pertains to prayer, which connects back to Jesus' reprimand that nine of the lepers failed to "give praise to God," a connection Luke seems to have missed and instead proceeded another direction by appending Lk 17:20-21 from L and discourse material from Mt 24.

After the parable of the mustard seed, Luke wished to continue his use of parabolic material, but rather than include a number of Matthew's parables, in a stroke of literary brilliance he composed a parable by taking elements from the narrow gate, false prophets, ten virgins, and the sheep and the goats. Unless it is to be supposed this passage came from Q and that Matthew expanded it into the four corresponding parables or that he happened to have parables that corresponded with elements found in the narrow door parable, the alternative is that Luke included this parable from another source and that it had overlapping elements with the four parables unique to Matthew by coincidence. Supporting the latter option is the fact that Luke appears to have summarized the parable of the ten virgins up to Mt 25:10 at Lk 12:35-36 and later implemented the verses that follow, vv. 11-12, which he omitted in the previous summary, in the parable of the narrow door. As was mentioned, the phrasing "narrow door" is a combination of the "narrow gate" and "closed door" from two of the Matthean parables it draws from. The only material in Matthew's diatribe against the Pharisees and eschatological discourse in Mt 23-25, except for Mt 23:8-12, which is connected to vv. 1-7, that is not used by Luke or

paralleled by an L variant is the parables that share elements with his narrow door parable, lending to his use of Matthew. And that Luke is aware of Matthew's narrow gate and false prophets parables from the Sermon on the Mount is evidenced by the collapsing of Lk 6:46 onto his two builders parable, which is a result of Luke excising Matthew's false prophets passage, Mt 7:21b-23. The alternative to this Lukan redaction is that Matthew has interposed the false prophets pericope where Luke has Lk 6:46, making the introduction of Luke's one pericope into a not only integral but reinterpreted component of a second pericope. If it is not a Matthean composition, then Luke's source excised it, giving the appearance that Luke excised it from Matthew.

Luke uses most of the material from the discourse in Mt 23 in his Central Section. He turns to Matthew as his main source after the Central Section and follows his sequence from that point. When he reaches the point that Matthew has the Mt 23 discourse in his use of Matthew's sequence, Luke has what appears to be an abbreviation of Mt 23:1-7, the section of the discourse he had not yet used. In his contribution to *Oxford Studies*, Streeter makes the argument that Mark's parallel of this Lukan abbreviation, Mk 12:38-40, which is nearly identical in wording, is evidence of his use of Q because it appears to be a summarization of the discourse in Matthew, which would have had Q as its source. Since he holds to the 2DH, in an attempt to save face he cited the relevant passages in the other two Gospels as Mt 23:1-36, the entirety of the diatribe against the Pharisees, and Lk 11:39-52, Luke's parallel to Mt 23:13-36, rather than citing Lk 20:45-47, which is the actual, nearly verbatim parallel to Mark's version.<sup>419</sup> It appears he does this to avoid the difficulty that Lk 20:45-47 does not correspond to Mt 23:13-36 but vv. 1-7, which is the section Luke had not yet used in his Gospel. Implicit in his argument is the fact that

---

<sup>419</sup> Burnett Hillman Streeter, "St. Mark's Knowledge and Use of Q," in *Oxford Studies in the Synoptic Problem*, ed. W. Sanday (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1911), 176.

it is difficult to imagine Mt 23:1-7 could have been crafted by Matthew out of Lk 20:45-47//Mk 12:38-40; instead, it is more likely the parallel in Luke and Mark is an abbreviation, which necessitates Mark found it in Q, if it is to be avoided that Luke and Mark are secondary to Matthew. Similarly, Luke's woe about the unmarked tombs at Lk 11:44 is likely secondary to Matthew's 23:27-28, since it disrupts the formal and thematic unity found in Matthew's version of the discourse. In several ways, then, is Luke evidenced to be secondary to Matthew with regard to the Mt 23 discourse.

Another phenomenon of Luke's use of material shared with Matthew is the pericopes that have been reinterpreted to such an extent that it is nearly impossible that one of the evangelists does not have knowledge of the traditions from another source, either written or oral, that presents the traditions in a different context. The two most compelling examples are adjacent in Luke, the signs of the times and the judge and bailiff. In Matthew's Gospel, the former is in the context of the Pharisees asking Jesus to perform a sign in order to provide confirmation that His message is sanctioned by God, and the latter is in the Sermon on the Mount in the section about reconciling with one's brother. In Luke, the two pericopes are in the same eschatological context, with the former referring to signs that the eschaton is drawing near and the latter being a plea for one to be reconciled with God while there is opportunity before the end. In Matthew, the unforgivable sin is placed at the end of the Beelzebul controversy, suggesting that the sin is attributing miracles done by the Holy Spirit to Satan, while Luke has it placed in an eschatological context, understanding it as a warning not to apostasize in the face of persecution. In Matthew, the sign of Jonah is the allusion to Jonah in the great fish, being a metaphor for Jesus' death and resurrection, but Luke, using the passage in its Matthean sequence, understands the sign to be Jonah's preaching. This interpretation is even embedded in Matthew's version,



with v. 41 stating that the people of Nineveh repented from hearing Jonah's preaching, which is incongruent with the identification of the sign in v. 40.

That Luke's versions are due to his knowledge of outside tradition is best evidenced by Mt 16:25//Lk 9:24 and Mt 10:39//Lk 17:33. These are the Lukan verses compared with their Matthean counterparts:

Lk 9:24: ὅς γὰρ ἂν θέλη τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ σῶσαι ἀπολέσει αὐτήν· ὅς δ' ἂν ἀπολέσῃ τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ οὗτος σώσει αὐτήν.

Lk 17:33: ὅς ἐὰν ζητήσῃ τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ περιποιήσασθαι ἀπολέσει αὐτήν, ὅς δ' ἂν ἀπολέσῃ ζῶγονήσει αὐτήν.

The nearly identical wording shared by Mt 16:25 and Lk 9:24 points to literary dependence. Both are in the same context, the discipleship material following Jesus' first prediction of His death and resurrection. On the other hand, Mt 10:39 is a warning not to apostasize in the face of persecution and hardship while Lk 17:33 is in reference to the eschatological coming of the Son of Man, as a warning for believers not to go back for their possessions when calamity strikes. Lk 17:33 either derives from outside tradition or is a reinterpretation of Mt 10:39 that has been repurposed by Luke for a different context, with a correlated difference in wording that makes Lk 17:33 either a rewriting from memory or a deliberate revision if it is based on Mt 10:39 rather than a separate tradition. This must be true under the 2DH as well, since only the first pair is paralleled in Mark. Because Lk 17:33 would be the only verse taken from Mt 10, with the rest from Mt 24, it is most likely that Luke is aware of the saying from outside tradition.

Additionally, seeing that Luke has modified the parable of the mustard seed for his purposes at Lk 13:18-21, a case in which he must have used Matthew's text rather than an L variant, and that under the 2DH Matthew must have agglomerated disparate material without regard to its thematic congruence in the construction of his discourses, it is more likely Luke is responsible

for correcting the contexts of the other passages than vice versa, pointing to Luke's versions as secondary. The alternative to Luke's correction of Matthew in accordance with other tradition is that the recontextualization of these five passages was Luke's doing, which is difficult to imagine, although not impossible. Against this is that in each case the differences in wording have the appearance of variant tradition, with the contrast between Mt 16:25//Lk 9:24 and Mt 10:39//Lk 17:33 serving as an instructive example. The redactional change to the parable of the mustard seed, by contrast, is in line with the changes that would be expected from one evangelist's use of another.

Lastly, the only material shared with Matthew in the Central Section that evinces a cyclical progression through Matthew's sequence as with the first part of Luke's Gospel is material not found in the discourses. Luke passed over the Beelzebul controversy twice in his successive progressions through Matthew's sequence, before he used it the third time he came to the passage, with the purpose of using it to initiate his second controversy complex. The material from the discourses, on the other hand, is used topically based on the sequence of L. The Beelzebul controversy has characteristics of both, having too much sayings material to be suitable for use before the Central Section, but the sayings material is placed in the pericope's narrative context, lending to its implementation through the redactional procedure Luke used for Matthew's narrative material rather than the "quarrying" method that is more conducive to his use of Matthew's discourses.

Just as Luke's mission charge of the seventy-two is a doublet of the mission charge to the Twelve due to Luke arriving at the passage twice in his cyclical progression through Matthew's sequence, the woman calling out to Jesus in the second controversy complex is a doublet of the family pericope that follows the Beelzebul controversy and precedes the parable of the sower in

Matthew. The parable of the mustard seed is the next unused pericope in Matthew's sequence after the Beelzebul controversy, sign of Jonah, and parable of the impure spirits, which is separated by the material Luke adds from the Matthean discourses and L. Due to his modifications to the Matthean version that emphasizes the outreach to the Gentiles, it is likely Luke intended to use it after the barren fig tree parable and healing of the crippled woman, and so it can effectively be considered an extension of the progression through Matthew that began with the Beelzebul controversy.

### The Jerusalem Sequence

After the parable of the Pharisee and the tax collector, and Luke is nearing the end of his unique material, Luke's redactional procedure changes back to Matthew as his main source and proceeds with his sequence. This has the result that the Central Section ends in the same section of Matthew that it began, with it beginning at Mt 18:1-5, the argument of who is greatest, and the pericope after the Central Section being Jesus' blessing of the children at Mt 19:13-15, which is the next narrative pericope after Mt 18:1-5, with some of the intervening material used by Luke to build on L in the Central Section.<sup>420</sup> That this is intentional is further evidenced by the fact that Luke pulls from Mt 18:1-5, used at the beginning of the Central Section, in his version of Mt 19:13-15, the first pericope after it ends, at Lk 18:16//Mt 18:3, the two similar pericopes forming an *inclusio*. Luke follows Matthew's sequence to the end of his Gospel, though he supplies the pericopes of Zacchaeus and the parable of the pounds, a variant of Matthew's parable of the talents, from L, and saves Matthew's request of James and John to be seated at Jesus' left and right side for the Last Supper, inserting unique material as appropriate, such as the poor widow

---

<sup>420</sup> McNicol, Dungan, and Peabody, *Luke's Use of Matthew*, 236.

before Jesus' discourse on the destruction of the temple. At the point where Matthew has the woes against the Pharisees at Mt 23, because Luke has already used this material in his second controversy complex at Lk 11, he supplies a summary of the material, which is a datum that weighs strongly in favor of the 2GH. The comment about the Pharisees "devouring widow's houses" points forward to the next pericope about the poor widow.<sup>421</sup> Saving the pericope on James and John's request for later use puts the third death prediction next to the healing of the blind man, which Luke uses to draw a parallel to the blindness of the disciples. Zacchaeus then functions as a pair with the blind man pericope, just as Luke paired the widow of Nain from L to form a pair with the centurion's servant from Matthew, with the thematic connection that the tax collector climbed the tree so that he could see Jesus.<sup>422</sup>

#### Luke's Corrective Use of Matthew

A significant difference between Luke's Gospel and Acts is that the beginning of the sequel at 1:3 specifies that Jesus appeared to His disciples for forty days after His resurrection, but in his Gospel Luke is intent to contain the appearances within the same day. After the women discover the empty tomb, at 24:13 it says, ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ, "on that same day," before the appearance to the disciples walking on the road to Emmaus. After their encounter with Jesus, the two disciples head to Jerusalem αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ at v. 33 to tell the other disciples what happened, which, based on Luke's other uses of this phrase in his Gospel, is an expression meaning "at that time," but even if this is not noticed, at the most it can mean "at that very hour." At v. 36 he introduces the next appearance with ταῦτα δὲ αὐτῶν λαλοῦντων, "while they were telling them

---

<sup>421</sup> Ibid., 256-7.

<sup>422</sup> Ibid., 239-41.

these things,” and he leads into the account of the ascension at v. 50 right afterward, with the “them” in v. 50 referring to the disciples present at the appearance narrated up to v. 49.

Strauss entertained the possibility that Luke thought the appearances all occurred in one day when writing his Gospel but was corrected with better information in the time before he wrote Acts, but with Luke’s use of Matthew he would have omitted Mt 26:32, “But after I am raised I will go before you to Galilee;” Mt 28:10, Jesus’ post-resurrection instruction that served as a reminder; and the ending appearance at Galilee before He ascended. The most telling is Luke’s change to the angels’ words at the empty tomb. Mt 28:5 has the angel say, “Do not be afraid, for I know that you seek Jesus who was crucified. He is not here, for He was raised as He said—come and see the place where He was laid. And go quickly and tell the disciples, “He was raised from the dead, and behold, He goes before you to Galilee. There you will see Him, as He said to you.”” At Lk 24:5-7 Luke instead has the angels say, “Why do you seek the living among the dead? He is not here, but was raised. Remember what He said to you when He was still in Galilee, saying that it is necessary for the Son of Man to be betrayed into the hands of sinful men and be crucified and be raised on the third day.” Luke has changed Galilee as the content of the instruction to the place it was spoken, making it instead a reference to the three death and resurrection predictions rather than a reference to the command in Matthew for the disciples to go to Galilee, deliberately reworking the Matthean material to remove all mention of the Galilean appearance. Luke specifies the ascension happened at Bethany, not Galilee, and that the disciples stayed in Jerusalem until Pentecost.<sup>423</sup> Contrary to the possibility that Luke was corrected in the interval between his Gospel and Acts, in light of the changes Luke made to Matthew, the persistent time references in his appearance account and the compression of the

---

<sup>423</sup> David Friedrich Strauss, *The Life of Jesus, Critically Examined*, vol. 3, trans. George Elliot (London: Chapman Brothers, 1846), 329-34.

account into one day is instead a correction of Matthew, a deliberate and express attempt to preclude the Galilee appearance, with the intention of hurrying the narrative along so that there is no gap or opportunity in his presentation of events where it could be inserted, despite knowing the appearances happened over a course of forty days rather than one as he says in the introduction to the sequel.

This corrective approach is also represented at the beginning of the Gospel, with Luke making Mary rather than Joseph the recipient of the revelation concerning the miraculous conception, one informed before and the other after; the reason for the family's displacement from Bethlehem to Nazareth in Matthew, and reason for journeying from Nazareth to Bethlehem in Luke; the wise men are exchanged for the shepherds; Luke establishes a familial relation between Jesus and John the Baptist, while in Matthew it is not so much as implied; Matthew's genealogy that he derived from the Old Testament is replaced by one Luke must have had reason to believe was accurate, which he placed between the declaration of Jesus as the Son of God at His baptism and Satan's temptation because of its mention of the same title,<sup>424</sup> a genealogy that goes back to Adam to emphasize the universality of Jesus' mission to all mankind. This creates the sequence of the baptism, genealogy, and wilderness temptation, each carrying the theme of Jesus as the Son of God, with the wilderness temptation retained in the third position because it functions as the Gospel's equivalent to the more direct Acts 1:8. As Luke says in his introduction to Acts, the gospel proceeded from Jerusalem to Judea, Samaria, and the rest of the world; his restructuring of the three temptations in the Gospel are a parallel, corresponding to Jesus' ministry, having the sequence of the wilderness, to the kingdoms of the world, and then to Jerusalem, functioning as a prefatory roadmap of Jesus' travels, placed before the programmatic

---

<sup>424</sup> McNicol, Dungan, and Peabody, *Luke's Use of Matthew*, 76.

rejection at Nazareth that begins Jesus' ministry. Indeed, as McNicol, Dungan, and Peabody note, that many of the details of Luke's infancy narrative have their parallel with details found in Matthew's account lends to his use of Matthew, despite the alteration of those details for those of his own.<sup>425</sup> As Sanders and Davies put it, "Once one thinks that Luke could have used Matthew, it is easy to see the Third Gospel as in part a correction of the First."<sup>426</sup>

With the differences between the two, it is evident that Luke's account is not intended as a supplement to Matthew's version but to present a narrative of his own.<sup>427</sup> The appearance accounts effectively form an *inclusio* with the infancy narrative at the beginning of the Gospel, both sections entailing major corrections to Matthew's Gospel, demonstrating that, against some presuppositions concerning his reception of Matthew, Luke considered it a generally reliable source and not only one that needed to be improved or adapted in terms of its sequence, literary presentation, and suitability for his Gentile audience, but that he viewed it as needing correction in terms of the details of its content. Luke thoroughly reworked Matthew's presentation of Jesus' relation to John the Baptist, sending him to prison before he could baptize Jesus, removing references to John as Elijah, and omitting the account of his execution to prevent it from functioning typologically to foreshadow Jesus' death; his infancy narrative is reworked in several details that have their counterpart in his predecessor's account, without regard to its harmonization; Luke expressly contradicted Matthew's notion that Jesus refused to reach the Samaritans, instead supplying the alternative account that the Samaritans rejected His attempt to do so; he replaced many of the traditions in Matthew with versions from other sources that he

---

<sup>425</sup> Ibid., 47-50; cf. David Friedrich Strauss, *The Life of Jesus, Critically Examined*, vol. 1, trans. George Elliot (London: Chapman Brothers, 1846), 122-269.

<sup>426</sup> Sanders and Davies, *Studying the Synoptic Gospels*, 115.

<sup>427</sup> Contra Drury, *Tradition and Design*, 134 n. 51.

held to be more reliable and accurate. That Luke not only redacted all mention of Matthew's Galilean appearance in his parallel material but portrayed the resurrection appearances as occurring over the course of one day in his Gospel, despite knowing, as he says in Acts, that the appearances happened over the course of forty, not just describing it as occurring in one day but having the appearance of being meticulous to progress the narrative in such a way so as to exclude the opportunity for Matthew's appearance to be inserted, is best explained by Luke's use of Matthew.

### Summary

It is demonstrable that Luke has conducted five scans through Matthew's material to construct his version of the Galilean Ministry, with each scan having an identifiable theme and purpose in the structure of the Gospel. The 2DH faces the difficulty that Luke's order of pericopes corresponds to the order of Matthew according to this redactional procedure, which is otherwise inexplicable, and thus an untenable coincidence, if Luke's independence of Matthew is to be maintained. Luke switches to L as his primary source in the Central Section, which is evidenced by the fact that abrupt changes in topic are initiated by L material; the Matthean discourse material is used to develop themes present in the L material; there are several instances in which the following L pericope after intervening Matthean discourse material relates topically to the L pericope the Matthean material was used to thematically develop, suggesting that the material from Matthew was inserted into the sequence of L; and the Central Section begins and ends using material from the same passage in Matthew, suggesting the alternation to L as his primary source for the composition of the section. There are several instances in which a doublet in Luke was created by passing through material in Matthew previously used in accordance with



the redactional procedures described, such as the mission charges, the pericope on Jesus' family, and the diatribe against the Pharisees. The parable of the narrow door appears to have been composed using elements present in Matthean parables not otherwise used, Luke is evidenced to have excised material or used other traditions in his use of Matthew's discourses, and Luke's composition of several passages evince a deliberate intention to correct Matthew's presentation of the same accounts, all of which point to his Gospel being secondary relative to Matthew. These observations constitute such forceful evidence for Luke's use of Matthew that they should not be used merely in defense of the 2GH but as an argument against the theories that require their independence.

CHAPTER IV:  
ARGUMENTS FROM ORDER

It is Griesbach who developed the formal argument of order of Mark's alternation between Matthew and Luke into the primary argument for the 2GH, which has continued in prominence and remains the evidential cornerstone of the source theory. It has naturally served as the outline for reconstructions of Mark's use of his sources in the composition of his tract, first seen after Griesbach in Farmer's resurrection of the theory and followed by others who turned to the 2GH in the wake of his reappraisal.<sup>428</sup> The order of pericopes leads to the observation common to defenses of the 2GH that Mann puts into the form of a question directed against the 2DH, "Since it is assumed on this hypothesis [the 2DH] that both Matthew and Luke depended on Mark but were unknown to each other, why then does Matthew usually follow Mark when Luke goes his own way, and why does Luke similarly follow Mark when Matthew departs from Mark's order?"<sup>429</sup> Behind this apparent coincidence of Matthew taking up Mark where Luke departs and Luke taking up Mark where Matthew departs is the more foundational observation that if Mark did indeed write third, he has progressed through both his sources as he alternated between each, never returning back to a previous place in either Gospel but progressing forward in their sequences, which has the result that, whenever he ends with one source and takes up the

---

<sup>428</sup> J. J. Griesbach, "A Demonstration that Mark Was Written after Matthew and Luke," trans. Bernard Orchard, in *J. J. Griesbach: Synoptic and Text-Critical Studies 1776-1976*, ed. Bernard Orchard and Thomas R. W. Longstaff (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978), 103-35; William R. Farmer, *The Synoptic Problem: A Critical Analysis* (Dillsboro, NC: Western North Carolina Press, 1976), 233-83; C. S. Mann, *Mark: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Co., 1986); Harold Riley, *The Making of Mark: An Exploration* (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1989); David B. Peabody, Lamar Cope, and Allan J. McNicol, *One Gospel from Two: Mark's Use of Matthew and Luke* (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press Int'l, 2002).

<sup>429</sup> Mann, *Mark*, 52.

other, it is always the case that, excepting one instance, the next pericope shared by Mark with either Matthew or Luke is the next unused pericope in their sequence.

The one exception to this forward progression is the transposition of Mk 3:7-12, the gathering and healing of the crowds, and the next pericope, Mk 3:13-19, the appointment of the Twelve, which, as has been detailed, is for the purpose of changing the setting to be more fitting for the context of the Beelzebul controversy. As for the reverse under the 2DH, Tuckett provides a reversed rationale, that Luke switched the pericopes as found in Mark to give the Sermon a more appropriately public setting in front of the crowds; Matthew, on the other hand, moves the appointment of the Twelve before the mission charge due to their thematic relation.<sup>430</sup> The one exception of the 2GH, then, necessarily corresponds to the reverse under the 2DH, with paralleled, opposite reasoning for Luke's transposition. Tuckett acknowledges that while according to the 2DH procedure that Matthew and Luke have both generally followed the order of Mark, there are six exceptions in Matthew's use of Mark and four in Luke's use of Mark.<sup>431</sup> This can be compared to the one exception of Mark's use of Matthew and Luke under the 2GH, which is readily explicable, and it is the case that the 2DH entails the same transpositions that are found in Luke's use of Matthew under the 2GH, aside from the transposition of the genealogy because it is not included by Mark. In the case of Luke, the same rationales that are used by 2DH proponents apply to the changes inherent in Luke's use of Matthew according to the 2GH. It is agreed with Tuckett that Luke placed Jesus' rejection at Nazareth early because it is programmatic for the rest of his work, the saying about "true relatives" at Lk 8:19-21 was moved to function as an ending to the parable section, and the call of the disciples is moved to after the

---

<sup>430</sup> C. M. Tuckett, "Arguments from Order: Definition and Evaluation," in *Synoptic Studies: The Ampleforth Conferences of 1982 and 1983*, ed. C. M. Tuckett (Sheffield, UK: JSOT Press, 1984), 211.

<sup>431</sup> *Ibid.*, 204.

healing of Peter's mother-in-law because it makes the disciples' decision to follow Jesus less sudden, among other reasons.<sup>432</sup>

Three of the changes in order are the same in Luke's use of Matthew under the 2GH and for the same reasoning, while the other is the direct opposite of a change that Mark would have made under the 2GH, with the same, but reversed, rationale. The transposition of the appointment of the Twelve and healing of the crowds is less fitting under the 2DH, however, since in Matthew the Sermon is addressed more openly, while in Luke it is directed more to the disciples who have followed Jesus through the sequence of controversies with the Pharisees. It is more reasonable that Luke has kept the setting from his use of Matthew than that he should have changed Mark to make the setting more public when the purpose of his Sermon is more congruent with the context that is already present in Mark. It is noteworthy, and certainly not surprising, that the one transposition that is not shared between the 2DH and Luke's use of Matthew under the 2GH, since under the 2GH it would be a change made by Mark rather than Luke, constitutes a difficulty for the 2DH. It is not a coincidence that this is the case for the one example that is non-reversible between the two source theories, while there is no difficulty for the other examples that are shared between the two theories. Under the 2DH, both Matthew and Luke have transposed the appointment of the Twelve so that the Sermon begins after the preceding healing summary. This transposition better lends to Luke's use of Matthew than his use of Mark, since it is more likely he would have retained the placement of the Sermon as the next section after the healing summary as found in Matthew than that he should have transposed the appointment of the Twelve in a manner contrary to his purposes in his use of Mark.

---

<sup>432</sup> Ibid., 211-2.

It also cannot be coincidental that with every transposition Luke would have made in his use of Matthew under the 2GH, a variant tradition is used. The only pericopes that are aberrations from the 2GH redactional procedure of Luke conducting five scans through Matthew's sequence are those he would have inserted from another source. With these variant traditions excluded, then, there are no exceptions of the 2GH redactional procedure of Luke's use of Matthew. The 2GH has two redactional procedures that account for the rearrangement of pericopes in Luke's use of Matthew and Mark's use of Matthew and Luke. In Luke's use of Matthew, it can be observed that he has conducted five thematic scans through Matthew's sequence to construct his Galilean Ministry, which is evidenced by the observation that, in Luke's Galilean Ministry, each of the progressions through Matthew's sequence are thematically related and proceed forward through his sequence, consisting of the introductory, controversy, didactic, revelatory, and mission doublet scans; and that, in constructing the Central Section, he supplemented the sequence of L with the Matthean discourse material, as evidenced by the observations that abrupt changes in topic are always initiated by L material, the Matthean discourse material is always used to develop the themes of the L material after which they are appended, and that thematically developmental Matthean material has been inserted between L pericopes that are themselves thematically congruent. In Mark's use of Matthew and Luke, Mark has alternated between both his sources, progressing forward through the sequence of each. The 2GH, then, has redactional procedures for both Luke's use of Matthew and Mark's use of Matthew and Luke, with the former having no exceptions and the latter having one exception that is readily explicable as a necessary change to account for Mark's use of the Beelzebul controversy at the end of the controversy sequence instead of the Sermon, the passage that is,

uncoincidentally, the most compositionally significant in the tract, at least prior to the final chapters.

As for the 2DH, it is plausible that Luke has generally followed the sequence of Mark to construct his Galilean Ministry, with his omissions of material from Mark corresponding to the material he would have omitted from Matthew under the 2GH, and with the same rationales for the changes in order. As for the selection of material, the material absent in Luke that Mark must have carried over from Matthew according to the 2GH would have been the material Luke omitted in his use of Matthew, and this is the same material that would have been omitted by Luke in his use of Mark under the 2DH, which Matthew would have had interest to include. Under the 2DH, Luke would have transposed the healing of the crowds and the appointment of the Twelve against his more private address to the disciples in his version of the Sermon, which is less congruent with his purposes than for Mark to make the transposition in his exchange of the Sermon for the Beelzebul controversy, but, aside from this consideration, whether by the order of pericopes or the selection of material, the relationship between Mark and Luke has no other advantages between either source theory and can be considered comparable. The difficulty for the 2DH, however, is Matthew's rearrangement of Mark.

#### The 2GH Markan Compositional Argument

Under the 2GH, Mark shares the introductory section on the preaching of John the Baptist, Jesus' baptism, and wilderness temptation with Matthew and Luke, but proceeds with Matthew to include his version of the call of the disciples, leading him up to the Sermon on the Mount. Not wishing to use Luke's presentation of the call of the disciples because it provides more of a basis for Peter and the others to decide to follow Jesus, Mark prefers Matthew's more

sudden portrayal, which suggests supernatural causation for the fishermen to suddenly leave their boats at Jesus' beckoning. Mark then switches to Luke to include his series of controversy stories, which leads him to the Sermon on the Plain. Here Mark switches back to Matthew for the Beelzebul controversy, which, taking the place of the Sermons, is given a prominent place in Mark's composition as the capstone to the hostility of the Pharisees against Jesus and the transition to Mark's attack on the disciples. The parable of the sower, a point of convergence in the sequences of the two Gospels, is then placed next by Mark because the section on the purpose of parables allows him to equate the disciples with the unbelieving outsiders to whom Jesus speaks in parables. Now at the same passage in both Gospels, he carries over the sayings collection of Mk 4:21-25 from Luke and the parable of the mustard seed from Matthew, alternating between the two. The following sequence of miracle stories is from Luke, until the evangelist reaches Luke's mission charge. However, he wishes to use the execution of John the Baptist as the interlude while the disciples are on their mission, which he takes from Matthew. Matthew's rejection at Nazareth is added before initiating the mission charge from Luke, and Mark then proceeds with the execution story from Matthew. After reaching Luke's Central Section he switches over to Matthew and continues with his sequence until the two Gospels converge again in sequence, toward the end of the Central Section, before Jesus' arrival at Jerusalem. Mark proceeds with both Matthew and Luke from that point to the end of his tract, with both predecessors generally having a shared sequence.

Aside from the transposition of the appointment of the Twelve and the gathering of the crowds due to Mark using the Beelzebul controversy as his compositional equivalent to the Sermons, which are adjacent pericopes in Luke's sequence and shifted by Mark to provide a more appropriate setting for the Beelzebul controversy, Mark progresses forward through the

sequences of Matthew and Luke to the effect that with each alternation between one and the other, the following pericope is always proceeding in sequence from the last used pericope of that particular Gospel. That Mark's order corresponds to the sequences of Matthew and Luke such that he would have followed Matthew up to the Sermon on the Mount before switching to Luke, then continued with Luke's sequence up to the Sermon on the Plain before returning to Matthew, and followed Luke up to the Central Section before turning back to Matthew again is compelling evidence for the formal argument from order of Mark's use of Matthew and Luke. It is observable that in multiple instances he has followed the order of one Gospel until he reaches a major teaching section that he has omitted. The primary difficulty for Mark's use of Matthew and Luke, the omission of the material between his Beelzebul controversy and the parable of the sower, which includes the sermonic teaching material and some miracles stories he would otherwise be expected to include, is then readily explicable under the 2GH polemical model of Mark.

The selection and omission of material in Mark's use of the two Gospels is congruent with Mark's intention of composing a tract to denigrate the disciples. While Matthew and Luke have included material on the teachings and works of Jesus for the sake of edification, Mark has used the Gospel material as a means to present a narrative for this specific purpose, having no interest in including Jesus' teachings or biographical narrative that do not contribute to this end. This is the main purpose of the two Gospels, but Mark is using the Gospel material not to compose a Gospel but to manipulate the material for the purposes of his presentation of the disciples throughout the tract, choosing which pericopes to include or omit; and what to add, alter, or omit in those pericopes; and in the construction of his narrative in his alternation between Matthew and Luke. The birth narratives, pertaining to the time before Jesus' ministry



and the introduction to the disciples, do not accord with this purpose, not least because of their positive representation of Jesus' family, but also because the author has no interest to include extended biographical information about Jesus for its own sake. Omitting the birth narratives, then, the preaching of John the Baptist as the forerunner of Jesus is a fitting opening to his tract as the preface to Jesus' ministry, which Mark quickly moves through, excising John's admonishment to the crowds and only including his prophecy about Jesus' coming, then narrating the wilderness temptation and baptism, carrying over the skeletal outline of these introductory sections with an apparent interest to move the reader along to the beginning of Jesus' ministry.

With it being the primary difficulty for the 2GH that Mark omitted some miracle stories he would otherwise be expected to include, most notably the healing of the centurion's servant, it is congruent with the 2GH polemical model that such omissions should be on either side of the Beelzebul controversy, which is the most significant passage in the section of the tract that pulls from the sequences of miracle stories in Matthew and Luke. Mark follows Luke for his sequence of controversy stories before reaching the Sermon on the Plain, transposes the appointment of the Twelve with the healing of the crowds so as to separate the Beelzebul controversy from the setting with the crowds, and then switches to Matthew for the Beelzebul controversy, which he uses as the culmination of the hostility between Jesus and the Pharisees. This results in Mark skipping ahead in Matthew's sequence from the call of the disciples ending at Mt 4:22 to the beginning of the Beelzebul controversy at Mt 12:22, by which he omits the healing of the centurion's servant, Mt 8:5-13; the would-be disciples of 8:18-22; the healings of the blind men and demoniac at Mt 9:27-34; the mission charge sequence, Mt 9:35-10:42; the inquiry of John the Baptist, woes against the unrepentant cities, and the teaching material at the end of Mt 11;

and the Old Testament quotation at Mt 12:15-21. The passages Mark would otherwise be expected to carry over, the healings of the centurion's servant, blind men, and demoniac, is omitted in this pass through Matthew because Mark wants to place the Beelzebul controversy as the climax to the controversy sequence and the transition to the attack on the disciples and Jesus' family. Mark has introduced the Beelzebul controversy with the brief mention of Jesus' family at Mk 3:21-22 because his redaction purposefully associates the motives of the family to inhibit Jesus' ministry with the accusation of the Pharisees. The omission of the intervening material between the Beelzebul controversy and pericope about Jesus' family at Mk 3:31-35 forms an *inclusio* between the two passages and solidifies them as sequential. It should not be expected that these miracle stories would be inserted between the controversy sequence from Luke and the Beelzebul controversy from Matthew, which is its culmination, because it would then be a random interruption into the thematic sequence Mark has carefully constructed.

With the Beelzebul controversy functioning as the beginning of his polemic against the disciples, it is important that the parable of the sower follows. It is in this passage that Mark is able to associate the disciples with those on the outside who do not understand the parables, implicating the disciples as unbelievers. This is the next pericope in Matthew, and Mark takes the opportunity to move from condemning Jesus' family in the Beelzebul controversy to the disciples with the parable of the sower. It is possible that he brings both Matthew and Luke up to the beginning of the parable after the Beelzebul controversy, seeing that he appears to have alternated between the two Gospels in this section, including the collection of sayings from Lk 8:16-18 at Mk 4:21-25, and then switches to Matthew for the parable of the sower. However, due to the low verbal similarity between Lk 8:16-18 and Mk 4:21-25, it is possible he composed his version of Lk 8:16-18 from memory to prevent the need for such rapid alternation, although

being aware of the collection's placement in Luke and wishing to include it. It fits nicely with Mark's purposes, the passage insinuating that there is a dark truth that will soon be exposed, with Luke intending it for the Pharisees but Mark repurposing it and redirecting it toward the disciples.

Whether Mark brought Luke up to the parable of the sower at the point of reaching the parable of the sower as the next pericope in Matthew's sequence or after carrying over the parable of the mustard seed, Mark uses Luke for the sequence of miracle stories that follows, beginning at Mk 4:35. Since he has brought Luke forward to the parable of the sower, Mark has omitted Luke's version of the centurion's servant, the raising of the widow's son, John's inquiry, and Luke's version of the repentant woman, of which Mark includes Matthew's version prior to the passion narrative. The first two pericopes would otherwise be expected to be included by Mark. After the parable of the mustard seed in Matthew is a continued sequence of parables that Mark omits because of their irrelevance to his purposes, upon which he alternates to Luke. Mark's compositional, thematic advantage of using Matthew's parable of the sower as the next pericope after his use of the Beelzebul controversy is made clear under the polemical model of the 2GH, a redactional decision that resulted in the omission of the two miracle stories from Luke.

Mark's selection of material from the parable of the sower to the Jerusalem sequence, which entails the omission of great amounts of teaching material, also accords with the polemical model. Reaching the end of the miracle sequence in Luke occasions Mark's alternation to Matthew, from which he includes the rejection at Nazareth, which he includes and redacts to further his purposes of attacking Jesus' family. The next pericope in Matthew's sequence is the execution of John the Baptist, but Mark decides to first include the mission charge to the Twelve

from Luke and use the story about John the Baptist as the interlude while the disciples are on their mission. With the feeding of the five thousand serving as a point of convergence in the sequences of the two Gospels, Mark then carries over Jesus walking on water, the controversy about dietary restrictions, the Syrophoenician woman, the feeding of the four thousand, and the yeast of the Pharisees from Matthew before reaching Peter's confession, which comes immediately after the feeding of the five thousand in Luke, at which point the two Gospels reconverge in sequence. Mark places two unique healing stories around the feeding of the four thousand and yeast of the Pharisees, with the second story before Peter's confession, to emphasize the deafness and blindness of the disciples to Jesus' identity and mission. Each of these pericopes pertains to the inclusion of the Gentiles or the needlessness of the Law, the imperceptibility of the disciples, or the sustained revelation of Jesus that the disciples continued to misunderstand, each miracle that Mark adds accumulating in a case against them.

From this point until Jesus' arrival at Jerusalem there are five pericopes from Matthew's sequence that Mark has omitted: the teaching on the temple tax, Mt 17:24-27, which is an obvious omission; the parable of the wandering sheep, Mt 18:10-14; the process of church discipline, Mt 18:15-20; the parable of the unmerciful servant, Mt 18:21-35; and the parable of the workers in the vineyard, Mt 20:1-16, all of which are teaching pericopes. It is at this point that Luke's Central Section begins, which, consisting primarily of teaching material, Mark is want to omit. As was said, Mark has no interest in including teaching material for its own sake, since he is not writing a Gospel as did Matthew and Luke, and is only intent to include that which, whether teaching or narrational material, furthers his the particular ideological and ecclesio-political purposes for which he set out to compose his tract.

From the feeding of the five thousand to Jesus' arrival at Jerusalem in Mark's sequence, the teaching material in Mark does include pertains either to the Law, particularly the Gentiles' relationship to it, or to discipleship, which is placed after a failing of the disciples to serve as a contrast between the exemplification of discipleship in the teaching material and the disciples who fail to meet such a standard. After the first passion prediction is the material on discipleship at Mk 8:34-38; after the second prediction is Jesus' teaching for the disciples to be humble like children, and, with it, first, the unknown exorcist from Luke because it acknowledges that there are those who serve Christ from outside the circle of the disciples, and, next, the teaching material of Mk 9:42-50, serving as a warning against those who would cause others to stumble, which, considering the entirety of Mark's purposes against the disciples, is likely directed toward them as those who caused the Gentiles to stumble as the result of the burdens of the Law they were content to place upon them; and after the third prediction is the request of James and John, which is followed by the teaching material of Mk 10:42-45, all of which serve as a foil against the disciples.

The pericope of the young rich man at Mk 10:17-27 is beneficial because of the implication that the man's adherence to the Law is not effective to save him. After Jesus' arrival at Jerusalem, Mark omits the eschatological parables from Matthew, but is want to include Jesus' debates with the Pharisees, who Mark has likened to the Jerusalem apostles throughout his tract. The pericope on the greatest commandment at Mk 12:28-34 is preferred because of the statement that loving God and neighbor are more valuable than sacrifices, which implies the unimportance of the other specific restrictions and requirements of the Law. The remaining omission is the post-resurrection appearances, and with his tract ending with the women rushing away from the

tomb in silence, it is insinuated that the disciples did not receive the message to meet Jesus at Galilee, and so did not see the risen Jesus.

It can be seen, then, that Mark's omission of narrative material centers around two passages that are particularly relevant to his presentation of the disciples, the Beelzebul controversy and the post-resurrection appearances. By placing the Beelzebul controversy from Matthew after the controversy sequence from Luke, Mark passes over any unused material from the call of the disciples to the Beelzebul controversy, resulting in the omission especially of the healing of the centurion's servant. Mark uses the Beelzebul controversy to transition to his polemic against the disciples, using the parable of the sower as the next pericope in Matthew's sequence for this purpose, with the result that the healing of the centurion's servant and raising of the widow's son in Luke passed over. The omission of the centurion's servant in Mark has especially been used as an argument against the 2GH, but the fact that both instances of its omission surround the Beelzebul controversy, which is the most significant passage under a polemical model of Mark under any source theory, perhaps next to the resurrection narrative, is such an astounding coincidence otherwise that it is not only a compelling defense for the omission but should serve as a positive argument for the 2GH. Aside from the birth and post-resurrection narratives and the material surrounding the Beelzebul controversy, the remainder of the omitted pericopes are teaching material, all of which accord with the polemical model of Mark, that the author was not interested in including biographical material for its own sake or teaching material for the purpose of edification, but to use the Gospel material as a means to denigrate the disciples. Mark's selection and omission of material under the 2GH are not only explicable under the theory but are so congruent so as to suggest it.

## 2DH Matthean Compositional Arguments

Under the 2GH, Mt 8-9 is the section Luke has rearranged in the construction of his Galilean Ministry, which Mark in turn would have used. As such, it is the section under the 2DH in which Matthew has rearranged Mark, which is necessarily the subject of the 2DH compositional arguments. The section that begins Mark's use of Luke's sequence at Mk 1:21 marks the beginning of the section that differs from Matthew, which continues until the parable of the sower at Mk 4:1. There is then a sequence of three miracle stories spanning Mk 4:35-5:43 used in Mt 8-9, the stilling of the storm, the Gerasene demoniac, and the raising of Jairus's daughter and the woman with the bleeding issue. Correspondingly, Matthew has three of the controversy stories from Mark placed at Mt 12:1-32, separated by the mission charge at Mt 10 and John the Baptist's inquiry at Mt 11. Under the 2DH, then, Matthew has transposed the healing of the leper, Mk 1:40-45, to its place as the first story after the Sermon on the Mount. After this is the healing of the centurion's servant, which is not found in Mark. The exorcism at the synagogue, Mk 1:21-28, which is the first miracle story in Mark's sequence, has been omitted by Matthew. Next in Mark's sequence is the healing of Peter's mother-in-law, which Matthew retains as the next pericope after the centurion's servant. The pericope of the would-be disciples of Jesus at Mt 8:18-22 follows, which is not from Mark. The next two pericopes in Matthew's sequence are from the sequence of three miracle stories in Mk 4:35-5:43, the stilling of the storm and the Gadarene demoniacs. Three of the controversy stories from Mark, which follow after the leper in his sequence, are now used, the healing of the paralytic, the call of Levi, and the question about fasting. At Mt 9:18-26 Matthew uses the third story in the sequence of the three miracle stories in Mk 4:35-5:43, the raising of Jairus's daughter, followed by two miracle stories not found in Mark, the healing of the two blind men and an exorcism. After the mission

charge at Mt 10, which is prefaced by the appointment of the Twelve, and John the Baptist's inquiry at Mt 11, come the last three of the controversy stories in Mark's sequence.

Matthew's use of Mark according to the 2DH does not readily lend to the redactional procedure necessary for the 2DH formal argument. According to the order of pericopes, under the 2DH Matthew must have followed Mark's order up to the point where he decided to insert the Sermon on the Mount in Mk 1, and from the point of the rejection at Nazareth in Mk 6 and on, Matthew abides by Mark's sequence, which is where Matthew and Luke agree in sequence until Luke's Central Section, after which, according to the 2GH, Mark has switched to using Matthew's sequence until the end of the Central Section. It is in this intervening section where the discrepancies in order between Matthew and the other two Gospels occur. It is neither surprising nor a coincidence that the order of the material in Matthew from the end of the Sermon on the Mount until the appointment of the Twelve, the section of Mt 8-9, which is where Matthew's order varies from Luke's and where Luke follows Mark, should be the section that causes difficulty for the 2DH, and that, under the 2GH, it is in this section that, first, Luke would have conducted his five scans through Matthew to organize the material into thematically coherent sequences, and that, second, Mark would have used the sequence of Luke rather than that of Matthew. It is precisely in the section that these two conditions are met according to the 2GH that Matthew's use of Mark becomes unintelligible, which serves as a compelling argument that Matthew did not use Mark but that Mark is following Luke, and that the section in Luke used by Mark is part of a larger redactional procedure that involves the organization of Matthew's material.

Tuckett denies that a formal argument from order had ever been used to argue for the 2DH, and while this is false, as has been demonstrated, this denial does serve as an admission



that the 2DH does not have a formal argument in its support, since, if one could be made, based on the simple nature of such an argument, one should surely have been made in the history of the Synoptic Problem, and even if one had not, Tuckett had opportunity to present it after noting its absence.<sup>433</sup> While the 2DH formal argument has been made persistently throughout the history of the theory, Tuckett would be correct that it should not have been. The 2GH formal argument of order is the explanation that the arrangement of pericopes inherently lends to Mark's use of the two Gospels, that it is an obvious pattern that is easily identifiable and readily points to the source theory as the reality behind the observable order of the Gospels, and if the same applied to the 2DH, the claim is ready to be made that Matthew and Luke both appear to have followed the sequence of Mark. The statement that the 2DH does not have a formal argument from order is a concession that Matthew's order does not readily lend to his use of Mark's order, and that it cannot be used as a positive argument for the 2DH against other theories. The 2GH does have a formal argument, however, in that the order of pericopes shared by Mark with Matthew and Luke does give the appearance that Mark alternated between the two. While the formal argument from order is a positive argument for the 2GH, proponents of the 2DH can only defend the possibility that Matthew and Luke used Mark through redactional justifications for their rearrangements, as a defensive position. The best a positive 2DH argument from order can accomplish is to establish the source theory as a valid option, but it cannot function as a means of establishing the 2DH as the more plausible option compared to another, while the 2GH formal argument from order, to the contrary, serves to advance the 2GH as more likely against alternatives such as the 2DH. The order of pericopes does not naturally lend to Matthew's use of

---

<sup>433</sup> Ibid., 197-202.

Mark, and so a satisfactory compositional argument must be established if the plausibility of the 2DH is to be maintained.

### Lachmann

An early argument that Matthew and Luke have rearranged the order of Mark comes from Lachmann, who writes in response to Griesbach's argument for the 2GH Markan argument from order. He characterizes Griesbach's Mark as "a bungling dilettante, unsure of his way, borne hither and thither between Matthew's and Luke's gospels by boredom, desire, carelessness, folly or design," and saying of the 2GH argument that, "though it looks clever and subtle, is really not ingenious at all, but an absolute frost."<sup>434</sup> Based on the rather blatantly biased characterization, it should be apparent that Lachmann has no interest in objectivity and is content to establish his argument using misleading rhetoric. And this he has done, dividing the pericopes of Mark and Matthew into blocks according to their points of disagreement, dividing Mark as follows: (I) the healing of Peter's mother-in-law and Jesus' solitary prayer, the latter of which Matthew has omitted, Mk 1:29-39; (II) the healing of the leper, Mk 1:40-45; (III) the healing of the paralytic, the call of Levi, and the fasting controversy, Mk 2:1-22; (IV) the Sabbath controversy, healing of the man with the withered hand, and section on the parable of the sower, Mk 2:23-4:34; (V) the stilling of the storm and the Gerasene demoniac, Mk 4:35-5:20; (VI) Jairus's daughter and the woman with the bleeding issue, Mk 5:21-43; (VII) the rejection at

---

<sup>434</sup> Karl Lachmann, "On the Order of the Stories in the Synoptic Gospels" trans. N. H. Palmer, in *The Two-Source Hypothesis: A Critical Appraisal*, ed. Arthur J. Bellinzoni, Jr., Joseph B. Tyson, and William O. Walker, Jr. (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1985), 125.

Nazareth, Mk 6:1-6; (VIII) the mission charge of the Twelve, Mk 6:7-13; and (IX) the execution of John the Baptist, Mk 6:14-29.<sup>435</sup>

Lachmann suggests that the healing of the leper, block II, was placed before the centurion's servant and healing of Peter's mother-in-law because it is before Jesus entered Capernaum, and, due to the nature of his condition, the leper would be ostracized, making it reasonable that Jesus should encounter him beforehand. As for Matthew's placement of the mission charge and John the Baptist's inquiry in Mt 10-11 before the Beelzebul controversy and parable section, Lachmann simply suggests that it is "quite likely, and not unreasonable" that the apostle Matthew placed the pericopes in such an order, and that the later writers of the Gospel, differentiating the two, did not wish to change it against the arrangement of the apostle, an assertion based on possibility and conjecture rather than an argument of any substance. He then proclaims, as though proud of such an explanation, taking his circular argument to be persuasive, that "there were, then, compelling reasons" for the changes of order seen in Matthew's Gospel.<sup>436</sup> For the shift of the raising of Jairus's daughter, which in Mark appears in a sequence of three miracle stories, Lachmann suggests it needed to be moved so that the prophecy in Mt 11:5 be exemplified in Jesus' miracles before its quotation, but that is irrelevant to the change of the other two miracle stories, the stilling of the storm and the Gerasene demoniac, which is split from those pericopes in Lachmann's structure into a separate block, with which the third miracle should have been moved. This anomaly should be the object of Lachmann's explanation but is ignored because of his arbitrary division of Mark's sequence of the three miracle stories into two distinct blocks. Lachmann then questions why the stilling of the storm and Gerasene demoniac

---

<sup>435</sup> Ibid., 123-5.

<sup>436</sup> Ibid., 125-6.

has been placed after the healing of Peter's mother-in-law, before the healing of the paralytic, and he posits that the paralytic was moved because it is too close to the healing of the centurion's servant, who suffered from the same condition.<sup>437</sup>

By placing the controversy stories of Mk 2:23-3:6 into the same block as the parable of the sower in his sequences for Matthew and Mark, Lachmann attempts to remove the need to explain the movement of the controversy stories away from their placement among the other controversy stories in Mark to the separated placement as found in Matthew, despite the fact that he includes the Beelzebul controversy in his Matthean block, which Matthew would have displaced in his use of Mark, which should have resulted in this block being separated into several smaller blocks to account for the transposition of its pericopes, if Lachmann's framework is to account for all the transpositions of Matthew. Rather than address these rearrangements of Mark's order, Lachmann has placed them into the same block in an attempt to ignore their need for explanation. The raising of Jairus's daughter is placed in a separate block from the stilling of the storm and the Gerasene demoniac, which appear together as a sequence of miracle stories in Mark, despite the latter two stories being transposed for a reason that also applies to the raising of Jairus's daughter, according to the explanation provided by Lachmann, and the raising of Jairus's daughter was transposed for a reason that also applies to the other two stories, so that he does not need to account for the separation of Jairus' daughter from the other two stories in Matthew's sequence. The call of Levi and fasting controversy are placed in the same block as the healing of the paralytic so that a rationale that can justify the healing of the paralytic can be applied to the other two stories. If the healing of the paralytic needed to be moved because it was too close to the centurion's servant, the two associated controversy stories should have been

---

<sup>437</sup> Ibid., 126-7.

placed first and second, with the paralytic placed after these two, which would be less of a change to Mark's order. By placing the three in one block, this allows Lachmann to suggest that the two stories needed to be moved with the healing of the paralytic so that it can be rationalized why the two controversy stories were moved with the paralytic, and the stilling of the storm and the Gerasene demoniac were shifted to fill the space for which the controversy stories were in position. The grouping of pericopes into the same block and separation of otherwise connected pericopes into separated blocks allows Lachmann to arbitrarily dictate which explanations can apply to other pericopes by their grouping and which explanations can be disabled with reference to pericopes they should apply. There is no explanation for his division of pericopes into blocks, with some pericopes separated from others that form a sequence in Mark's order or combined into the same block with other pericopes despite their transposition, with the result that the division into blocks is used as a substitute for explanation of Matthew's arrangement. Lastly, Lachmann's structuring of pericopes into blocks assumes the underlying premise that the pericopes that are shifted in place because they are in the same block as a pericope that has a rationale for its transposition are shifted with that pericope because there would be no other reason for its own rearrangement relative to the other pericopes in its block. This framework requires, then, that there is no overall organizational principle or scheme behind Matthew's arrangement that could necessitate the transposition of a pericope to align it with such a scheme after the transposition of another pericope in its block for a consideration specific to that pericope, except that the order of Mark should otherwise be maintained.

## Allen

In order for 2DH compositional arguments of Matthew's rearrangement of Mark to function as an argument for the 2DH against the 2GH, it is necessary that the explanations for Matthew's rearrangement of Mark should provide better rationales for differences in order than Luke's rearrangement of Matthew, which Mark would in turn have followed where he differs from Matthew under the 2GH. This Allen has realized when he noted at the end of his compositional argument, "The purpose of this paper has been to show that whilst it is easy to explain this difference [of order up to Mk 6:13] on the principle that Matthew has rearranged and expanded Mark's narrative on a literary and artistic basis (not a chronological basis), it is impossible to find any motive which can have led Mark to rearrange the sections as they appear in Matthew."<sup>438</sup> It has been noted that a common 2DH argument against Luke's use of Matthew is that he must have disassembled his predecessor's great discourses, and this very argument cuts against the 2DH severely with regard to Matthew's use of Mark. Matthew must have disassembled the controversy sequence that resulted from Luke's thematic scans through Matthew, which is retained by Mark in Mk 2-3, and the sequence of miracle stories in Mk 4-5. From the former Matthew placed the Sabbath controversy and healing of the man with the withered hand of Mk 2:23-3:6 after the mission charge and inquiry from John the Baptist of Mt 10-11, separating it from the three controversy stories he retained from Mk 2:1-22 at Mt 9:1-17, and from the latter he has separated the raising of Jairus's daughter and the woman with the bleeding issue at Mk 5:21-43, placing it after the three controversy stories, and placing the other two miracle stories, the stilling of the storm and exorcism of the Gerasene demoniac, before it,

---

<sup>438</sup> Willoughby C. Allen, "Two Critical Studies in St. Matthew's Gospel: II. The Dependence of St. Matthew i.-xiii. upon St. Mark," *Expository Times* 11, no. 6 (March 1900): 283.

destroying the organization of Mark's sequence into an arrangement that 2DH proponents have struggled to explain.

The first set of miracle stories in Mt 8-9 is the leper, centurion's servant, and Peter's mother-in-law, with the first and third being switched in order relative to the order in Mark, and the second being inserted from another source. Allen provides no explanation for the change in order, though he says the evangelist wanted a sequence of healings for those inflicted with a "typical disease," being leprosy, paralysis, and a fever. In his view, the exorcism at the synagogue in Mark has been replaced by the healing of the leper, despite the fact that the healing of the leper is already in Mark and so cannot be a replacement, and he provides no reasoning for Matthew's decision to move it elsewhere rather than omit it entirely. Allen then supposes that Matthew skips the healing of the paralytic because it is said to have occurred during a second visit to Capernaum, which Matthew would not want to place right after the healing of Peter's mother-in-law, which could cause the readers to confuse the two visits to the city. Matthew then uses three of the controversy stories from Mark, but moves Mk 2:23-3:6 to a later section because "it is not relevant to Matthew's immediate purpose," which is not a substantive explanation, seeing that Matthew has included the three of the controversy stories from this sequence, and Mk 3:7-35 is not used because it does not have a healing story, which, first, is not applicable in the case of the version Matthew uses, and, second, is irrelevant because the two latter controversy stories used by Matthew, which the next story from Mark would follow, do not involve miracles either. Matthew then inserts Mt 8:19-22 from another source and uses the stories of Jesus stilling the storm and the exorcism of the Gerasene demoniac, leaving the raising of Jairus's daughter and the woman with the bleeding issue. Allen considers that "the most obvious thing to do" at this point is to return to the place he "broke into Mark's order," the end

of the healing of the leper, and continues with the healing of the paralytic, the next miracle in Mark's order, for the purpose of demonstrating Jesus' power over the "natural," "demoniacal," and "spiritual," supposing the stilling of the storm, exorcism, and healing of the paralytic to constitute a set of three miracle stories.<sup>439</sup>

The call of Levi and the fasting controversy, which follow next in Mark's sequence, are then carried over by Matthew. Allen provides the following rationale: "At this point he borrows Mk ii. 13-22 = Mt ix. 9-17 simply because it was connected in Mark with the preceding, and in spite of the fact that it interrupts his illustrations of Christ's miracles."<sup>440</sup> Here he is compelled to treat the healing of the paralytic as primarily being a miracle story rather than one of controversy with the Pharisees, forming a triplet with the stilling of the storm and exorcism rather than forming a triplet with the call of Levi and fasting controversy, and that these latter two pericopes are included merely because they follow in Mark's sequence, despite the fact that they are contrary to Matthew's purposes of constructing a sequence of miracle stories, which Allen states was Matthew's principle behind his rearrangement of Mark's order. The raising of Jairus's daughter and the woman with the well of blood are then added to Matthew's sequence, with the healing of the blind men and the mute demoniac, forming a triplet of stories "illustrative of Christ's power to restore life, sight, and hearing," seemingly missing that the last miracle involves a man who was not able to speak, not hear. Matthew then inserts the non-Markan sayings material of Mt 10-11 before going back for the three controversy stories against the Pharisees from Mk 2:23-3:6 and 3:22-30, with Allen supposing that the healing summary and

---

<sup>439</sup> Ibid., 280-2.

<sup>440</sup> Ibid., 282.



Old Testament quotation at Mt 12:15-21 is a paraphrase of Mk 3:7-12, which breaks apart his set of three controversy stories.<sup>441</sup>

### Hawkins

Hawkins provides his compositional argument after Allen, making the critique that the final set of miracle stories in Mt 8-9, which are supposed to form a metaphor for the new life, speech, and hearing for the believer, would place “hearing” as the last of the three, which he rightly notes would be anti-climactic. Rather, one would expect, if this was Matthew’s purpose, to place the raising of Jairus’s daughter third in the sequence, so that “new life” would form a proper climax to the three stories. Next he critiques Allen’s theory that Matthew structured his stories as triplets, arguing rather for an emphasis on the number ten. The ten miracles are meant to reflect the importance of the number to the Jews, such as the ten plagues of Egypt, among other examples.<sup>442</sup> This requires that the raising of Jairus’s daughter and the healing of the bleeding woman were considered by Matthew to be separate miracle stories, which may be possible, but this has the difficulty that Matthew has also turned Mark’s one demoniac into two and Mark’s blind man into two, which speak against Matthew having the intention of presenting a sequence of ten miracle stories with the raising of Jairus’s daughter and the healing of the woman counting as two miracles.

More significantly, with Hawkins agreeing with Allen that Matthew had such a purpose, he must then explain the pericopes that do not pertain to miracles, which Matthew has decided

---

<sup>441</sup> Ibid.

<sup>442</sup> John C. Hawkins, “The Arrangement of Materials in St. Matthew viii.-ix,” *Expository Times* 12, no. 10 (July 1901): 473-4.

not to place elsewhere, despite his placement of some of the controversy stories from the same sequence in Mark after Mt 10-11. He supposes that the pericope of the two would-be disciples at Mt 8:18-22 must have been placed before the appointment of the Twelve and mission charge at Mt 10 because they had become Jesus' disciples and took part in those two events, which requires a major assumption of Matthew's understanding of the passage.<sup>443</sup> This also treats the positioning of the content of Mt 10 as if it is fixed relative to the surrounding material, despite the fact that Matthew inserts material about John the Baptist in the following chapter and then a controversy sequence in the next, none of which requires the content of Mt 10 to come before, making the necessity for Mt 8:18-22 to be placed in the supposed miracle sequence arbitrary. The call of Levi is retained in its placement after the healing of the paralytic, as Hawkins says, "not because there was any very close connexion between the two incidents...but merely because there was no reason for removing the second of them from the place in which he found it."<sup>444</sup> One excellent reason he seems to forget, according to his formulation, is the supposed purpose of presenting a collection of miracle stories, which Hawkins has been arguing is the organizing principle behind Matthew's rearrangement of Mark's order, the basis for his compositional argument. If Matthew was intending to construct a collection of miracle stories, a reason for displacing the story is because it is not a miracle story and its placement interrupts that purpose, which is the very principle Hawkins has been using to argue for the pericopes Matthew does displace. In the case of the displacements of Mark's order that involve a miracle story, Hawkins supposes it is because Matthew is intending to construct a series of miracle stories, but in the cases where the evangelist retains stories that do not suit this purpose, he says "there was

---

<sup>443</sup> Ibid., 472-3.

<sup>444</sup> Ibid., 472.

no reason for removing [them]...from the place in which he found [them],” perhaps being too blinded by the aims of his argument to notice the blatant special pleading.<sup>445</sup> He admits it is “no doubt surprising” that the fasting controversy at Mt 9:14-17 was not placed with the rest of the controversy stories at Mt 12, deriving from the τότε added by Matthew at Mt 12:1 at the beginning of the Sabbath controversy that the evangelist was aware the events took place at different times and so wished to separate them.<sup>446</sup> To account for exceptions to his framework, Hawkins must appeal to the evangelist having an external historical knowledge, and supposes that this knowledge sometimes overrides his compositional purpose for the section. It is not only the case, then, that Matthew has inserted controversy stories into what is intended to be a collection of miracle stories, but also that Mark has an edifice of sequential controversy and miracle stories that Matthew has disassembled and separated, which is the very accusation 2DH proponents have made against Luke’s use of Matthew, except that, with regard to Matthew’s use of Mark, it is actually the case that Matthew has displaced Markan material into less appropriate locations.

In his second article, Hawkins returns with additional and updated arguments for each transposition in Mt 8-9. For the healing of the leper, he argues against the possibility that it was placed after the Sermon in another source on the basis that its placement results in a difficulty with the setting required by the Sermon, since Jesus’ command to the leper not to tell anyone of his healing is contradicted by the presence of the crowds that were present when Jesus was teaching. Rather, the pericope was given a pride of place as the first miracle because of its respect for the Law. The healing of Peter’s mother-in-law then follows after the healing of the

---

<sup>445</sup> Ibid.

<sup>446</sup> Ibid.

centurion's servant, which comes after the Sermon in Q, because it is the first unused pericope in Mark's sequence, with the healing of the leper moved and the exorcism at the synagogue omitted.<sup>447</sup> Although Hawkins makes comment about the centurion's servant, he skips over the would-be disciples of Mt 8:18-22 and moves on to the stilling of the storm and Gadarene demoniacs in Matthew's sequence, agreeing with Allen that the latter two miracles and the healing of the paralytic constitute a triple of healing stories, though he disagrees with Allen's reasoning that the paralytic healing was moved to avoid the conflation of Jesus' two visits to Capernaum, doubting that it would be a concern for the evangelist or his audience. He maintains with Allen that there is an ascending display of authority over natural, demonic, and spiritual matters in the stories, which is a reason the paralytic was not placed with the other controversy stories, and adds that Matthew would have wanted to further distance the paralytic from the centurion's servant, which also involves paralysis.<sup>448</sup> Hawkins then completely skips over the call of Levi and the fasting controversy, which are the most difficult passages for his theory. In his explanation he only addresses the miracle stories, the passages that accord with his theory and are thus easier to explain, but ignores the pericopes that contradict it. For the placement of the raising of Jairus's daughter after the fasting controversy in Matthew, contrary to its placement after the Gerasene demoniac in Mark, no rationale is provided for its separation from the miracle stories it is connected to in its Markan sequence, except that it is noted that Matthew begins the passage with ταῦτα αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος, which would connect it temporally with the prior pericope, though he does acknowledge it may be an accidental shift of the phrase from Mk 5:35.<sup>449</sup>

---

<sup>447</sup> John C. Hawkins, "The Arrangement of Materials in St. Matthew viii.-ix. II," *Expository Times* 13, no. 1 (October 1901): 21-2.

<sup>448</sup> *Ibid.*, 22-3.

<sup>449</sup> *Ibid.*, 23-4.

Lastly, Hawkins attempts to justify the omission of the exorcism at the synagogue in Mk 1:22-28. The first possibility he posits is that because Mk 1:22 shares nearly identical wording with Matthew's conclusion to the Sermon on the Mount at 7:28-29, Matthew may have seen Mark's introduction to the exorcism and mistakenly believed it already been copied. The more likely possibility, he suggests, is that the story was omitted because it contained nothing that was not already told in the story of the Gadarene demoniacs, and chose the latter as the more interesting.<sup>450</sup> He later recognizes that the exorcism story at Mt 9:32-34 is a repetition of the introduction to the Beelzebul controversy, admits it is itself "colourless and uninteresting," and even supposes that it was likely added so that Mt 8-9 could have ten miracles.<sup>451</sup> Here Hawkins supplies contradictory reason for the omission of Mk 1:22-28 and the inclusion of Mt 9:32-34, arguing that the former was omitted because it lacked any interesting details that were not already contained in the exorcism of the Gadarene demoniacs, but permits the inclusion of Mt 9:32-34, despite it being a duplicate of a story that Matthew was prepared to soon include in a different context, has less in the way of interesting detail than the story that was omitted, and included only so that Mt 8-9 could reach ten miracles.

#### Klostermann

For all the talk from 2DH proponents of the omissions Mark would have made under the 2GH, little has been said of the omissions Matthew would have made under the 2DH. There are several that cause a difficulty for the theory, with one of the most significant being found in Mark's sequence of pericopes Matthew would have used in his composition of Mt 8-9. In his

---

<sup>450</sup> Ibid., 20-1.

<sup>451</sup> Ibid., 24.

attempt to explain Matthew's omission of Mark's exorcism of the synagogue at Mk 1:21-28, Klostermann supposes it was omitted because of the violence done to the demoniac after the demon was cast out, details that Matthew is inclined to omit, pointing to the Gadarene demoniacs and the young boy exorcised after the Transfiguration for support.<sup>452</sup> However, Klostermann cites these examples to support his contention that Matthew would have omitted Mk 1:21-28, but his argument rather serves to show that Matthew is inclined to include such exorcism stories, but with the minor details omitted, as he has omitted the details in the other exorcism stories he uses from Mark, which feature similar details that Klostermann supposes caused Matthew to omit the account entirely. Klostermann points to examples in which Matthew has carried over an exorcism story that had the offensive details omitted as evidence that Matthew would omit the story, not realizing that these examples serve to demonstrate the contrary of his argument. This omission, as will be seen, causes a major difficulty due to the inclusion of the exorcism story at Mt 9:32-34, which is a repetition of the introductory exorcism of the Beelzebul controversy. This militates against Matthew's knowledge of Mark, since if he had used Mark's sequence of pericopes to construct Mt 8-9, he would be expected to have used a version of the synagogue exorcism with the offensive details omitted rather than repeat a miracle used later. Matthew appears to have reused the exorcism at 9:32-34 because he felt compelled to add a third miracle story to the sequence of 9:18-34 to retain the pattern of triplet sequences, and the fact that he reused a story rather than use the one he would have omitted from Mark under the 2DH speaks against his use of Mark.

Klostermann contends that the section of Mt 8-9 has ten miracle stories, with the number of miracles referencing the ten plagues of Egypt, in agreement with Hawkins, intended as a

---

<sup>452</sup> Erich Klostermann, *Das Matthäusevangelium*, vol. 4, Handbuch zum Neuen Testament (Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck, 1927), 72.

“grand illustration of Jesus’ miracle-working power.”<sup>453</sup> However, as he himself admits, this has the difficulty, first, that Mk 8:17 would then be a “partial conclusion,” featuring an Old Testament quotation that Matthew uses to claim the previous three miracles were a fulfillment of prophecy, which speaks against the notion that Matthew viewed all of the miracles of the two chapters to be part of this singular purpose; and, more importantly, that throughout Mt 8-9 the evangelist has included several passages that are not miracle stories.<sup>454</sup> He mentions these objections in passing in an attempt to preempt them, but he evidently does not have a better theory to offer that accounts for Matthew’s order and avoids such difficulties as the one proposed. The second objection in particular is especially noticeable, and based on the fact that he is compelled to defend a theory that is so readily and fundamentally undermined, it is all the more apparent that the order of Matthew does not lend itself to a dependence on Mark’s order as the 2DH stipulates, an observation that persists in later attempts.

### Schweizer

Schweizer unwittingly discovered corroborating evidence of the 2GH argument from order of Luke’s use of Matthew, noticing that the passages in Luke that contain a disproportionate amount of Hebraisms, which otherwise appear to be scattered randomly throughout his Gospel, happen to be parallel with two sections in Matthew, one of which is Mt 8-9. This discovery supports the notion that Luke has completed several scans through this section of Matthew in composing his Gospel in accordance with the 2GH. He even offers that the source from which Luke received the tradition may have been familiar with Matthew, one step from

---

<sup>453</sup> Ibid. The translation is mine.

<sup>454</sup> Ibid.

admitting direct dependence. In addressing the 2DH argument from order of Matthew's use of Mark and, agreeing that there is no satisfactory explanation for why Matthew would rearrange Mark's sequence in such a way, he posits that the source from which Matthew obtained his material in Mt 8-9 was used by Mark, serving as an intermediary between the two.<sup>455</sup> He questions,

Aber warum beginnt er mit der Heilung des Aussätzigen, fügt die bei Mk. fehlende Geschichte vom Hauptmann in Kapernaum ein, greift wieder zurück auf die von Mk. viel früher in anderem Zusammenhang gebrachte Heilung der Schwiegermutter des Petrus, fügt den Aufruf an die Nachfolger als inhaltlich disparates Gut dazu, erzählt darauf die Geschichte vom Seesturm und den Gadarenern, die bei Mk. viel später erscheint, kehrt wieder zurück zum Mk.-Zusammenhang, mit dem er am Anfang einsetzte, indem er die dort direkt auf die Heilung des Aussätzigen folgende Perikope vom Paralytischen referiert, springt dann wieder hinüber zur Erzählung von Jairus, die bei Mk. gleich nach der von den Gadarenern eingereiht ist, und schließt endlich mit den zwei Dubletten zu Geschehnissen, von denen er später nochmals berichten wird? Ließe sich der umgekehrte Vorgang erklären: daß die Reihenfolge des Mt. im wesentlichen diejenige jener Wundergeschichtensammlung war, die dem Mk. als Quelle diente?<sup>456</sup>

Rather than supposing Matthew has rearranged Mark's sequence, which, as he says, is inexplicable, Schweizer suggests Mark has rearranged the sequence found in Matthew, but, in an attempt to maintain the 2DH, he is compelled to accept the solution that there must be a intermediary source used by both Matthew and Mark, with Matthew retaining its order and Mark altering it. Schweizer next provides what he sees as rational, satisfactory explanations for Mark's change to the order found in Matthew's Gospel, recognizing Mark's order to be secondary and readily explicable.<sup>457</sup> Under the 2GH, this would be Luke's rearrangement of Matthew, which in

---

<sup>455</sup> Eduard Schweizer, "Eine hebraisierende Sonderquelle des Lukas?" *Theologische Zeitschrift* 6, no. 3 (May/June 1950): 172-9.

<sup>456</sup> *Ibid.*, 180.

<sup>457</sup> *Ibid.*, 180-3.



turn was used by Mark. As he observes, then, the Hebraisms throughout Luke's Gospel are concentrated in pericopes that are parallel to two specific blocks of material in Matthew, with one being Mt 8-9, and the order of pericopes represented by Luke and Mark are secondary to Matthew, with the rearrangement of Matthew's order into Mark's being readily explicable, both of which lend to the priority of Matthew's sequence and the reordering of Mt 8-9 as described by the 2GH argument from order. As Schweizer demonstrates, the best explanation for Matthew's rearrangement of Mark's order is that Mark has rearranged Matthew.

#### Schniewind

In his commentary on Mt 8-9, Schniewind details the changes Matthew must have made to Mark's order under the 2DH and admits, "Why the section is arranged this way can only be guessed."<sup>458</sup> He supposes that Mt 9:1-17, which includes the healing of the paralytic, call of Levi, and question about fasting, has been severed from the remainder of the controversy sequence in Mark, separated by several healing stories, the mission charge, and John's inquiry to Jesus, because Matthew may have been aware that the latter stories constitute a single instance of controversy between Jesus and the Pharisees, of which the other controversy stories were not a part. The healings in Mt 9:18-31 carried over from Mark that follow after the question of fasting in Matthew's sequence are intended to connect with the healing of the paralytic at Mt 9:1-8, which is separated by the call of Levi and the question about fasting, because they were seen to fulfill messianic prophecy, despite the two sets of pericopes being separated by the call of Levi and the question about fasting. A historical connection between these two controversy stories and

---

<sup>458</sup> Julius Schniewind, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus*, vol. 2, Das Neue Testament Deutsch, ed. Paul Ulthaus and Gerhard Friedrich (Göttingen, Germany: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1964), 107. The translation is mine.

the healing of the paralytic can be supposed to allow for the other healing stories to come after Mt 9:9-17, rather than being placed next to the healing of the paralytic, overriding Matthew's purpose of creating a sequence of healing stories for the sake of showing Jesus was fulfilling the prophecy.<sup>459</sup> Even with these considerations, placing the healing of the paralytic last in the set of controversy stories before the raising of Jairus's daughter would be an obvious, simpler solution, seeing that Matthew is content to move Mark's pericopes freely as they suit his compositional purposes, since that would place the healing of the paralytic adjacent to both sets of stories as described. Schniewind ends with the conclusion that Matthew has ordered his stories according to how they have been presented to him in oral tradition, that he must have known the stories according to a certain order before receiving them in the order as presented by Mark. The result is that Matthew has chosen the order from the oral tradition to compose his Gospel, and, as such, Schniewind's conclusion is an admission that Matthew has indeed not used the order of Mark. And so he abandons the 2DH argument from order, recognizing it as insufficient to account for the changes in sequence between Matthew and Mark.<sup>460</sup>

### Held

A turning point can be found in Held's work, who identifies a thematic organization in Matthew's sequence, though he persists in the idea that Mt 8-9 functions as a collection of miracle stories. The summary statements of Mt 4:23 and 9:35 serve to thematically combine the Sermon with Mt 8-9, which he sees as a presentation of Jesus as the Messiah of both word and

---

<sup>459</sup> Ibid., 106-7.

<sup>460</sup> Ibid.

deed.<sup>461</sup> The first three stories form a sequence of miracle stories, concluded by the quotation of Isaiah at Mt 8:17. Counting the raising of Jairus' daughter and the bleeding woman, he maintains that 9:18-31 is a set of three miracle stories, and places the exorcism of 9:32-34 outside the other sections as a capstone to the section as a whole.<sup>462</sup> This awkward organization demonstrates the difficulty with wishing Jairus's daughter and the bleeding woman to count as two miracle stories so that the number of miracle stories can be ten and the result that the last sequence of miracle stories then becomes a sequence of four rather than a triplet as is the first. With the view that Mt 8-9 is a demonstration of Jesus' deeds, Held anticipates the difficulty of Matthew's insertion of Mt 10 before Mt 11. It is at Mt 11:2 where the evangelist states John the Baptist "heard about the deeds of the Christ" before sending his disciples to Jesus, which refer to the miracles that were narrated in Mt 8-9, and which fulfill the prophecy of 11:5-6. His explanation is that the miracles performed by the disciples count as "deeds of the Christ," as the disciples' miracles were performed under and by Jesus' authority, referencing 9:35-10:1 for support.<sup>463</sup> While it is possible Matthew was intending to make this theological statement, it is more likely Mt 10 was placed after Mt 8-9 because of its relation to the miracle stories, due to Matthew's propensity to group pericopes together thematically, and Mt 11:2 was intended to redirect the reader's attention to those miracles performed by Jesus. Although it is not a major point against it, the placement of Mt 10 between Mt 8-9 and 11 does speak against the purported intention of Matthew to construct Mt 8-9 as a miracle collection.

---

<sup>461</sup> Heinz Joachim Held, "Matthäus als Interpret der Wundergeschichten," in *Überlieferung und Auslegung im Matthäusevangelium*, 7th ed., vol. I, Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament, ed. Ferdinand Hahn and Odil Hannes Steck (Neukirchen-Vluyn, Germany: Neukirchener Verlag, 1975), 234.

<sup>462</sup> *Ibid.*, 236.

<sup>463</sup> *Ibid.*, 236-40.

The greater difficulty for Held's paradigm is Mt 8:18-9:17, which he places in a single section, supposing that the controversy stories of the call of Levi and the question about fasting were included after the healing of the paralytic only because the evangelist wished to preserve their historical sequence. He supposes, then, that Matthew was aware from external sources that these stories were in historical sequence, and that Matthew would have wished to retain their order after the healing of the paralytic. He says the call of Levi and Jesus' sitting with the tax collectors and sinners pertain to Jesus' place over His community, as they relate to His disciples, just as the miracle stories demonstrate His power over the various ailments and demonic powers.<sup>464</sup> He adds, "Even if their occurrence at this point must be justified by tradition, the fact remains that Matthew has worked out the community problem of discipleship in Mt 8:18-27 and indicates in 9:2-8 that Jesus' authority is also that of his community."<sup>465</sup> With his admission that Matthew's sequence can only be justified by supposing the evangelist had outside knowledge from tradition that the controversy stories occurred together, it is apparent that even Held himself is not convinced of his explanation concerning the relation of the call of Levi and fasting controversy to the other stories in Mt 8-9. And so Held tosses forward two possible explanations but does not seem particularly convinced by either, implicitly admitting, first, that Matthew's sequence does not readily lend to a rearrangement of Mark and, second, that the controversy stories militate against his framework of the organization and purpose of Mt 8-9. This is further reinforced by Held's recognition that the healing of the paralytic is primarily a controversy story, with the healing merely providing the occasion for the controversy that ensues, which would support the notion, against his theory, that the healing of the paralytic, call of Levi, and question

---

<sup>464</sup> Ibid., 236-7.

<sup>465</sup> Ibid., 237. The translation is mine.

about fasting were intended to be a sequence of controversy stories.<sup>466</sup> Otherwise, if Held's framework is to be maintained, it would be coincidental that Matthew was using the paralytic primarily as a miracle story, despite it actually being a controversy story, and that the other two stories were kept after the paralytic because he was aware of the sequence of the stories from outside tradition.

In order to explain the repeated omission of minor details from Matthew's use of Mark's pericopes, Held argues that Matthew has primarily used Mark in the role of an "interpreter," or expositor, of the miracle stories, removing unnecessary information in order to highlight theological points he wishes to make in his use of each passage.<sup>467</sup> This is his primary thesis concerning Matthew, as can be seen no less from the title of the work, and seems necessary to suppose as a counterpart to the possibility that Mark has added minor details in his use of Matthew and Luke, since Matthew's omission of these details under the 2DH demands explanation. And so Held holds that Matthew was more interested in making theological points in his use of Mark, choosing to omit the minor details that would provide more historical information. Held's primary conception of Matthew can be seen to contradict his argument for Matthew's arrangement of Mt 8-9, since it requires that Matthew would be intent to maintain the order of the call of Levi and question about fasting after the healing of the paralytic despite their interference with Matthew's purpose of constructing a collection of miracle stories to demonstrate Jesus as the Messiah of deeds and fulfillment of prophecy. In the pericopes he uses, Matthew was content to remove and alter details for the sake of making theological points, and it would be expected that Matthew would rearrange Mark's pericopes with the same purpose, and

---

<sup>466</sup> Ibid., 167.

<sup>467</sup> Ibid., 157-61.

not that he would retain the order of certain pericopes despite their incongruence with his theological purposes for the sake of maintaining their historical order based on tradition. Held's argument devolves into the assertion that Matthew is compelled to rearrange Mark's material for the sake of theological presentation against historicity, but when it comes to tradition he is compelled to maintain the order for the sake of historicity against theological presentation, which is another compositional argument built on special pleading.

### Thompson

Thompson makes the case that the stories in Mt 8-9 are centered geographically around Capernaum and the area around the Sea of Galilee as a fulfillment of the Isaianic prophecy of 4:12-17, which is placed before the call of the disciples and the Sermon on the Mount, with the introductions to each pericope coming from Matthew's hand.<sup>468</sup> Holding to the view that Matthew's pericopes are thematically arranged, Thompson contends that the three miracles of Mt 8:1-17 demonstrate Jesus' power over disease and His fulfillment of Old Testament prophecy, ending with the quotation from Isaiah at 8:14-17.<sup>469</sup> The next section begins at 8:18 and continues through the controversy stories of the paralytic, call of Levi, and fasting controversy to 9:17, focusing on the theme of discipleship. The structure of the stilling of the storm forms a chiasm, with the topic of the disciples' faith at the center. After the exorcism at the tombs, Jesus is asked to depart the region, which connects back to Jesus's response to the scribe at 8:20 that the Son of Man has no place to rest. Thompson continues the section into the healing of the

---

<sup>468</sup> William G. Thompson, "Reflections on the Composition of Mt 8:1-9:34," *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 33, no. 3 (July 1971): 368, 370, 378.

<sup>469</sup> *Ibid.*, 368-70.

paralytic, supposing that the authority over the man's condition as exemplified by Jesus will soon be conferred upon His disciples, who are assumed to be present, although not mentioned explicitly. This theme of discipleship is maintained in this pericope despite the fact that the healed man is told to get up and go home, rather than encouraged to follow Jesus as would be expected in accordance with the theme, with Thompson admitting that the theme is "somewhat submerged" in this pericope. The call of Levi follows and is related by Jesus' beckoning to the tax-collector to follow him, and Thompson supposes that the fasting controversy that comes afterward again pertains Jesus' relation to His disciples.<sup>470</sup>

While the fasting controversy does pertain to Jesus' disciples, it does not relate to the more specific theme of following Jesus as it is present in the other pericopes, and Thompson himself admits the application of the theme is tenuous in the case of the paralytic. Next is another set of three miracle stories, which have the added theme from Matthew's hand that the news of the miracle spread throughout the region, a detail that is repeated after the raising of Jairus's daughter and the healing of the blind beggars.<sup>471</sup> This requires that Matthew has counted the healing of the woman as a separate healing story alongside the raising of Jairus's daughter despite being embedded within it, and despite not having its own mention of the report spreading about, dependent on the mention at the end of the raising of Jairus's daughter. The healing of the leper in Mark is a pericope that already contains a mention that the report of the healing spread, which Matthew would have had to remove under his use of Mark. Against Thompson's formulation, then, it would rather be expected that the story of the leper would be used in the final sequence, since it has this ending detail according to the pronouncement theme and has

---

<sup>470</sup> Ibid., 371-8.

<sup>471</sup> Ibid., 379-85.

already been moved by Matthew to its position in his Gospel. His theory requires that the final story of the demoniac at Mt 9:32-34 is left to its own section, rather than being part of the sequence of miracle stories that precedes it.<sup>472</sup> According to his theory, then, the healing of the leper is better suited for the final sequence of miracles, the relation of the healing of the paralytic and the fasting controversy to the discipleship theme is stretched, it requires that the healing of the woman is treated as its own story in a series of three miracles that pertain to the spread of the news of Jesus' healings, despite it not having its own mention of such a detail but sharing the same with the raising of Jairus's daughter, and the ending exorcism is then left on its own, excluded from the previous sequence of miracle stories after which it follows.

#### Burger

Recognizing the faults of previous views, Burger acknowledges that the purpose of Mt 8-9 is not to be a collection of miracle stories. Several of the pericopes are not miracle stories, and with Mt 8:18-22 coming from Q rather than Mark, it is all the more apparent that the inclusion of these pericopes was a deliberate redactional decision. Matthew omits the exorcism at the synagogue in Mark but places the healing of the man with the withered hand outside the complex in Mt 12, separating it from the rest of Mark's sequence. If his intention was simply to compile miracle stories he would have carried over the three stories of Mk 4:35-5:43 in its sequence, but he split the third from the other two with the sequence of controversy stories from Mk 2. The disinterest with creating a miracle compilation is further substantiated by the placement of Mt 8:17, the statement that Jesus' miracles fulfilled a prophecy from Isaiah, after the first three miracles, and the change of setting initiated by the following pericope inserted from Q. And as

---

<sup>472</sup> Ibid., 385-8.



he notes, some of the stories have been redacted by Matthew in such a way that focus is diverted from the miracle itself.<sup>473</sup>

Burger notes that Mt 8-9 is divided into four sections. 8:1-17 is a set of three miracle stories, 8:18-8:34 includes three pericopes that pertain to following Jesus, 9:1-17 carries over three pericopes from Mark's sequence of controversy stories, and 9:18-34 is another set of three miracle stories. He argues that in the first set of miracle stories, the healing of the leper, the centurion's servant, and Peter's mother-in-law, there is a theme of including those who are normally excluded from full participation in Jewish worship, a leper, a Gentile, and a woman. In the case of the centurion's servant this is strengthened by the appended sayings material. In the next section, the added story of Peter stepping out onto the water to follow Jesus when he was walking on the sea is placed after the insertion of 8:18-22 from Q, the two would-be disciples of Jesus. The next pericope is the exorcism of the Gadarene demoniacs, and the comment at the end that Jesus was asked to leave the region connects with His saying at 8:20 that He has no place to lay His head. These three pericopes, then, pertain to the theme of following Jesus.<sup>474</sup>

With it established Matthew has ordered his material according to four sets of three related pericopes, Burger perceives that the 2DH argument from order now needs a sufficient explanation to justify why Matthew would decide to expend such great effort to rearrange Mark's order in this particular way. In his view, Matthew has portrayed the founding of the Church through the life of Jesus. The evangelist begins with the inclusion of those who were previously excluded, then moves on to material about discipleship, then uses the controversy

---

<sup>473</sup> Christoph Burger, "Jesu Taten nach Matthäus 8 und 9," *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 70, no. 3 (1973): 275-83.

<sup>474</sup> *Ibid.*, 283-7.

passages to differentiate the old and new covenants and present the principles the Church should exercise, and ends with the final miracle stories as a metaphor for the new life, sight, and speech of the Church.<sup>475</sup> The application of the metaphor to the last two sections in particular is quite the stretch, and leaves the suggestion overall unconvincing. The idea that Matthew arranged the material in these chapters to create a metaphor for the founding of the Church through stories of the life of Jesus has little to commend it. To the contrary, the implausibility of the theory does demonstrate something, which is the extent 2DH proponents are forced to go in their attempt to provide a rationale for why Matthew would rearrange Mark's order in such a manner, which in turn only serves to undergird the observation that the 2DH has no formal argument and that the compositional arguments for Matthew's rearrangement of Mark are desperate.

#### Theißen

Theißen rightly acknowledges that Mt 11:5 follows after Mt 8-9 so that the prophecy about Jesus' miracles can be fulfilled before it is quoted, and that the main purpose of the section cannot be to present a miracle collection, due to the inclusion of other stories. It seems that Theißen has recognized that these placement of the miracle stories before Mt 11:5 is not sufficient an explanation for their arrangement, since, with it granted according to the 2DH that Matthew has carried over the corresponding sequence of pericopes from Mark before he inserts the material of Mt 11 from Q, that does not pertain to Matthew's rearrangement of those pericopes within the section but only the placement of the material from Mark as a whole relative to the material from Q. The ordering of the pericopes from Mark within the sequence carried over from Mark is what needs to be explained, and the placement of the Markan section relative

---

<sup>475</sup> Ibid., 287.

to the material from Q is relevant to the 2DH argument from order only so far as it may help explain the rearrangement of the Markan material. His solution, then, is that the pericopes are arranged geographically to fulfill the Isaianic prophecy quoted at Mt 4:12-17 before the Sermon. To match the prophecy, the stilling of the storm and exorcism of the Gadarene demoniacs has been brought forward, corresponding to the “way of the sea” and “beyond the Jordan” of the prophecy.<sup>476</sup> Central to this argument is that 4:23 forms an *inclusio* with 9:35, with the Sermon and the stories of Mt 8-9 forming a unified section in the Gospel.<sup>477</sup> While it is certainly the case that the mentions of Jesus’ location at Capernaum and around the Sea of Galilee are significant to Matthew because they support the fulfillment of the prophecy of 4:12-17, there is little to commend the idea that Matthew has moved Mark’s pericopes to match it.

Matthew himself describes Jesus’ location using the phrasing Καφαρναούμ τὴν παραθαλασσίαν ἐν ὁρίοις Ζαβουλῶν καὶ Νεφαλίμ at v. 13 in his introduction to the quotation, which corresponds to v. 15 of the prophecy, identifying Capernaum as the “way of the sea” and the place that is “beyond the Jordan.” These phrases modify “land of Zebulun and Naphtali” in the prophecy, as Matthew is sure to describe Capernaum as ἐν ὁρίοις Ζαβουλῶν καὶ Νεφαλίμ. In the introduction to the quotation Matthew attaches the modifier τὴν παραθαλασσίαν to Capernaum, meaning he sees Capernaum as the “way by the sea,” not that he envisions the crossing of the sea as the fulfillment of the phrase. If the story of the Gadarene demoniacs is meant to correspond to “beyond the Jordan,” the Sea of Galilee would be substituting for the Jordan, and with Matthew’s evident care that the prophecy is fulfilled literally, this would seem

---

<sup>476</sup> Gerd Theißen, *Urchristliche Wundergeschichten: Ein Beitrag zur formgeschichtlichen Erforschung der synoptischen Evangelien*, vol. 8, Studien zum Neuen Testament, ed. Günter Klein, Willi Marxsen, and Wolfgang Schrage (Göttingen, Germany: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1974), 209-11.

<sup>477</sup> *Ibid.*, 205-7.

incongruent with his penchant for precise fulfillment. With it being an emphasis of Theißen's that 4:23 and 9:35 form an *inclusio* around the intervening chapters, it is a difficulty for his theory that the call of the disciples is placed after 4:12-17, dividing the quotation from the beginning of the *inclusio*, contrary to what would be expected according to the theory. This shows that the prophecy is not in a satisfactory position as a preface to the beginning of the *inclusio* to function programmatically for the organization of 4:23-9:35 as Theißen contends, although its placement does secure the importance of Jesus' location for the pericopes that follow.

While Theißen mentions the rearrangement of the stilling of the storm and the demoniacs, the theory is insufficient to explain the other transpositions. The healing of the leper, healing of Peter's mother-in-law, and raising of Jairus's daughter have no reference to location. What Theißen does not seem to have considered is that the placement of the healing of the paralytic because of the location of the event lends to Matthean priority, with Mark having a rearrangement of his order, since the paralytic follows after the crossing of the sea in Matthew, narrating Jesus' return to Capernaum after His first visit when He healed the centurion's servant and Peter's mother-in-law, while it is much less of a consideration in Mark. Matthew says Jesus "came to His own town" in his introduction of the pericope in Mt 9:1; Luke has the introduction, "while Jesus was in one of the towns" in Lk 5:12; and Mark specifies the town as Capernaum in Mk 2:1. If Matthew's main consideration was geography, with the intention of centering Jesus' location around Capernaum specifically, it is incredible that he would have changed Mark's explicit mention of Capernaum to a more generic and ambiguous phrase, and not only that, but that Mark and Luke would mention its location, despite it not being important to them, in the same sequence as if one of them had cycled through Matthew and carried over pericopes

according to specific themes. That Matthew does not specify the town to be Capernaum, despite its purported importance in fulfilling the prophecy in 4:12-16 in accordance with Theißen's paradigm, and places the pericope after the stilling of the storm and Gadarene demoniacs, whereas the location of the pericope is hardly more than incidental in Mark and Luke, lends to Matthean priority and the rearrangement of his sequence.

### Kingsbury

Although he acknowledges the arrangement of four sets of three pericopes, Kingsbury rejects the view that Mt 8-9 is intended as a metaphor for the founding of the Church as posited by Thompson, issuing the compelling objections that, first, passages found elsewhere such as the confession of Peter and the Great Commission are integral to Matthew's understanding of the founding of the Church, and, second, it is not congruent with the fact that Matthew has deliberately moved the appointment of the Twelve from Mark's placement, where it comes before, to its place in Matthew after Mt 8-9. Against the view that the first set of miracles are primarily intended to proclaim the inclusion of those previously excluded, Kingsbury contends they are primarily Christological, refocusing on 8:17, that the purpose is to proclaim Jesus as the one who fulfills prophecy by His miracle-working. He emphasizes the connection of 4:23 and 9:35, which are nearly identical summary statements that tie together the Sermon with chapters 8-9, describing Jesus as "teaching," "preaching," and "healing," which Mt 8-9 as a whole seeks to demonstrate.<sup>478</sup> What Kingsbury does not seem to realize, however, is that while he has rightly undermined other theories for Matthew's rearrangement of Mark, he does not supply a sufficient

---

<sup>478</sup> Jack Dean Kingsbury, "Observations on the 'Miracle Chapters' of Matthew 8-9," *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 40, no. 4 (1978): 562-73.

alternative, merely noting that the evangelist has compiled a collection, while thematically organized, of material that pertains to the general outline that Jesus taught, preached, and healed, an organization that accords more with Matthew having written first, rather than it supporting the 2DH supposition that he has rearranged the sequence of Mark. Seeing that the rationales offered in other attempts have been insufficient, Kingsbury has gone the opposite route and all but removed any justification for Matthew's rearrangement at all, which has the result that, to the list of arguments from order the 2DH does not make, the compositional argument can be added alongside the formal. It is imperative for the 2DH, however, that the theory has a satisfactory compositional argument to explain Matthew's rearrangement of Mark's order, for the theory to be a viable option in this front.

#### Tuckett

Tuckett recognizes that the point for Matthew to have inserted his Sermon in Mark's sequence that is most favorable to the 2DH is between Mk 1:21 and 1:22, rather than the other option that has been advocated by some 2DH proponents, after the summary statement of Mk 1:39, which would result in an increase to the number of transpositions Matthew would have made to Mark's order.<sup>479</sup> It must be considered if it is more likely that Matthew would insert his Sermon between these two verses or that these two verses in Mark are placed together because he has omitted the Sermon from Matthew. In Mark, the context is of Jesus teaching at a synagogue, which Matthew would have changed to the context for the Sermon. Luke placed his version of the rejection at Nazareth to after the wilderness temptation because it is programmatic for the rest of his Gospel, and the exorcism at the synagogue, which is shared with Mark, follows

---

<sup>479</sup> Tuckett, "Arguments from Order," 208.

as its counterpart. The next pericope in Matthew, after Mt 4:12-17, which Luke does not use, is the calling of the disciples. Under the 2GH, Luke skips ahead to the healing of Peter's mother-in-law so that he can place it before his version of the call of the disciples, and in so doing skips past the Sermon on the Mount. Based on the similarity of the wording, it is likely that Lk 4:31-32 derives from Matthew's conclusion of the Sermon at 7:28-29. The two can be compared:

Mt 7:28-29: ἐξεπλήσσοντο οἱ ὄχλοι ἐπὶ τῇ διδαχῇ αὐτοῦ· ἦν γὰρ διδάσκων αὐτοὺς ὡς ἐξουσίαν ἔχων καὶ οὐχ ὡς οἱ γραμματεῖς αὐτῶν.

Lk 4:31-32: καὶ ἦν διδάσκων αὐτοὺς ἐν τοῖς σάββασιν· καὶ ἐξεπλήσσοντο ἐπὶ τῇ διδαχῇ αὐτοῦ, ὅτι ἐν ἐξουσίᾳ ἦν ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ.

This accords with Luke's usage of Matthew under the 2GH, since he used Matthew up to the wilderness temptation before the Sermon on the Mount, and before the next pericope he uses from Matthew that comes after the Sermon, a teaching summary from the conclusion of the Sermon is carried over. Under the 2GH, Mark uses Matthew for his version of the calling of the disciples and then switches to Luke beginning at Mk 1:21. Rather than using Lk 4:32, Mark would have used Mt 7:28-29. The two verses in Mark can be compared to their counterparts:

Mk 1:21: Καὶ εἰσπορεύονται εἰς Καφαρναοὺμ· καὶ εὐθὺς τοῖς σάββασιν εἰσελθὼν εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν ἐδίδασκεν,

Lk 4:31: Καὶ κατήλθεν εἰς Καφαρναοὺμ πόλιν τῆς Γαλιλαίας. καὶ ἦν διδάσκων αὐτοὺς ἐν τοῖς σάββασιν·

Mk 1:22: καὶ ἐξεπλήσσοντο ἐπὶ τῇ διδαχῇ αὐτοῦ· ἦν γὰρ διδάσκων αὐτοὺς ὡς ἐξουσίαν ἔχων καὶ οὐχ ὡς οἱ γραμματεῖς.

Mt 7:28-29: ἐξεπλήσσοντο οἱ ὄχλοι ἐπὶ τῇ διδαχῇ αὐτοῦ· ἦν γὰρ διδάσκων αὐτοὺς ὡς ἐξουσίαν ἔχων καὶ οὐχ ὡς οἱ γραμματεῖς αὐτῶν.

Aside from the removal of Matthew's *οἱ ὄχλοι* and *αὐτῶν*, Mark copies Matthew's conclusion to his Sermon verbatim in Mk 1:22. Under the 2GH, this is the place in which Mark changes from using Matthew for the call of the disciples to Luke for the synagogue exorcism, and it can be easily imagined that Mark would use the call of the disciples in Matthew and proceed in his sequence through the Sermon on the Mount before he switches over to Luke, using Matthew's version of Mt 7:28-29//Lk 4:32 out of a preference for his wording, which he copies almost exactly. Thus, under the 2GH, this place of Matthew's Sermon corresponds not just to this passage in one of the other Gospels but, astoundingly, with both, first with Luke and then with Mark in his use of Luke, which serves as a compelling argument for the 2GH.

Tuckett rejects the notion that Matthew's sequence is ordered according to an overarching principle or theme and returns to the approaches of earlier attempts that sought to explain each transposition on its own, finding the endeavor of later approaches to seek for an overarching purpose to Matthew's rearrangement to be in vain.<sup>480</sup> In his view, the healing of the leper was placed in a position of prominence after the Sermon due to its relevance to the Law, an explanation that, as he acknowledges, would be shared with the 2GH, as it is. Mt 8:1-17 and 9:18-34 are sequences of miracle stories, and he justifies the transposition of the raising of Jairus's daughter and the bleeding woman to the second miracle sequence because of its pertinence to faith. He says the story of the exorcism in Mt 9:32-33 "may also belong here" because Matthew often uses exorcism and healing stories to underline the faith of the recipient.<sup>481</sup> The difficulty is that although other such miracle stories do emphasize the faith of the recipient, the exorcism story of 9:32-33 is no such story, and it is illegitimate to point to what is common

---

<sup>480</sup> Ibid.

<sup>481</sup> Ibid., 209-10.



to other similar stories and pretend it is found in this one. The healing of the centurion's servant, on the other hand, epitomizes the theme of demonstrated faith, but is included in the previous miracle sequence. It cannot be objected that it is placed early because it comes after the Sermon in Q's sequence, because Matthew evinces no reservations about rearranging Mark's sequence for his purposes under the 2DH. Thus, Matthew has a pericope that is characteristically void of a description of the recipient's faith in the sequence that is supposed by Tuckett to pertain to such a theme, and the pericope that epitomizes such a theme is found in the other miracle sequence.

The stilling of the storm and Gadarene demoniacs follow after the would-be disciples of Mt 8:18-22 because the former relates to the faith of the disciples and the rejection of Jesus at the end of the latter points back to Jesus' comment in Mt 8:20. The controversy stories were added, Tuckett supposes, because of their relevance to this theme of discipleship, which is clearly seen in the call of Levi and implicitly in the healing of the paralytic. At the end of the healing, the people are amazed that God had granted men such authority, which points forward to Jesus granting the disciples this authority when he commissions them in Mt 10. The appointment of the Twelve, however, has been moved to the beginning of Mt 10 because "Matthew has a clear tendency to systematize and to collect his material into thematic blocks,"<sup>482</sup> a "clear tendency" that is evidently not present in Matthew's transposition of the healing of the paralytic, since he has placed the paralytic and the subsequent controversy stories before the raising of Jairus's daughter and its subsequent miracle stories, despite the controversy stories coming right before the appointment of the Twelve in Mark. The raising of Jairus's daughter, which is further in Mark's sequence, has been brought forward by Matthew to separate the paralytic and the other controversy stories from the appointment of the Twelve and mission charge, with two other

---

<sup>482</sup> Ibid., 210-1.

miracle stories not from Mark appended. The other two miracle stories found in Mark's sequence, the stilling of the storm and the Gerasene demoniac, have been placed before the paralytic, and yet the raising of Jairus's daughter is placed after. If Tuckett's proposition should have any weight, if it to be supposed that Matthew used Mark's sequence, it would be the case that Matthew retained Jairus's daughter after the stilling of the storm and the Gerasene demoniac, and appended the other miracle stories there, and proceeded with the paralytic and controversy stories before Mt 10, and, better, though it is not necessary to suppose, may have moved the paralytic to the third position of the sequence to place it before the Mt 10 sequence. Not only would this better accord with Matthew's purposes as those posited by Tuckett, but it would also be in closer retention of Mark's order, since, under the 2DH, Mark has seemingly intentionally separated the controversy stories from Mt 10, which is contrary to his apparent purposes. The controversy stories are already placed before the appointment of the Twelve in Mark's sequence, and under the 2DH Matthew would have intentionally moved miracle stories to separate the two, against his purposes according to Tuckett's formulation. If Matthew used Mark and had the purposes as described by Tuckett, the opposite of what is observed would be expected; indeed, he has seemingly rearranged Mark in a manner that is contrary to his supposed purposes rather than rearrange Mark in conformity with those purposes.

### Conclusion

It can be seen from the history of 2DH proponents' attempts to make sense of Matthew's rearrangement of Mark alone that Matthew's order does not inherently lend to his use of Mark. To the contrary, they have still not been able to posit a theory that accounts for Matthew's transpositions. Whether under the 2DH or 2GH, it is necessarily the case that Matthew has

ordered Mt 8-9 with some rationale to his order, but it must be considered if his order is more likely a product of his use of Mark or if it is more likely that he wrote first. It is a point of agreement that Matthew has intentionally placed the healing of the leper first after the Sermon because of its relevance to the Law, and that placement is the same despite the source theory. It is also agreed that Matthew constructed miracle sequences in Mt 8:1-17 and 9:18-34 and wished to convey the theme of discipleship through his arrangement of material in 8:18-9:17. It can also be agreed that the sequencing of Mt 10, 11, and 12 aligns with his redactional purposes. It cannot be agreed, however, that Matthew would destroy the sequence of Mark and place the paralytic and its subsequent controversy stories in between the stilling of the storm, Gerasene demoniac, and Jairus's daughter, separating the controversy sequence from the sequence of Mt 10; that a rationale can be provided for the placement of the healing of the paralytic that does not better lend to Matthean priority; that there is a reason for the inclusion of the call of Levi and question about fasting in Mt 8-9, rather than placing them with the other controversy stories reserved for Mt 12; that the exorcism introducing the Beelzebul controversy in Matthew should be repeated at Mt 9:32-34 if he had access to the exorcism at the synagogue that he would have omitted from Mark; that the controversy stories of Mt 9:1-17 should be inserted such that the raising of Jairus's daughter would be separated from the other miracle stories as found in Mark's sequence; or that there is any observable overarching purpose behind the arrangement of Mt 8-9 beyond the basic intention of including pericopes pertaining to Jesus' healing and teaching in sets of triplets.

The 2DH argument is not advanced by the discovery that Mt 8:1-17 is a miracle sequence intended to portray Jesus as the fulfillment of prophecy, 8:18-34 pertains to the theme of discipleship, 9:1-17 is a controversy sequence, and 9:18-34 is another miracle sequence. Under the 2GH, Matthew had a rationale for the ordering of his pericopes, and this organization is

shared with both theories. It must be considered if such an organization is more likely to be the result of Matthew's use of Mark's sequence or if it is more likely that the sequence in Mark is the result of a reorganization of Matthew's sequence. The fact that Matthew's sequences in Mt 8-9 appear to be so fundamentally unrelated that they only relate so far that they are pericopes about Jesus' healings and teachings should be indicative that his composition is a result of the evangelist's reception of church tradition or another source rather than a rearrangement of Mark's sequence. If it was the case that he rearranged Mark, there should be an overarching intention that would account for his apparent effort to restructure Mark's order so thoroughly. It is unsurprising that in the void of a compositional argument that account for the differences in order between Matthew and Mark under the 2DH, there is a readily available explanation under the 2GH. Luke's order, when compared to Matthew, has the appearance that Luke has conducted five scans through Matthew's sequence to construct his Galilean Ministry, and Mark appears to have used Luke where he differs from Matthew, with an order that, when compared to Matthew and Luke, has the appearance that he has alternated between the two, and that he has sided with the order of Luke in the case of Mt 8-9. Under the 2GH, then, both have compositionally coherent explanations for their ordering of material that each accord with a demonstrable redactional procedure. In support of the 2DH is that there is no apparent pattern in the order of pericopes that lends to Matthew's use of Mark and there are no sufficient compositional explanations to justify his aberrations from Mark's order.

It is ironic that one of the major points against the 2GH is the purported destruction of Matthew's discourses by Luke, but if the mirror is pointed toward the 2DH it can be seen that Matthew is actually the one that has destroyed the sequence of another evangelist, and in such a senseless manner that his rearrangement is still unable to be explained by proponents of the

theory. It is a testament to the absence of competent defenses of the 2GH in the history of the Synoptic Problem that proponents of the 2DH have repeatedly and freely made arguments against it that apply more to their own theory than the 2GH. It is Matthew, not Luke, who has disassembled great, thematic composites of material and strewn the pericopes into disparate locations with evasive justification. From the fact that 2DH proponents cite the lack of sufficient justification for Mark's selection of material in his use of Matthew and Luke and the supposedly inexplicable rearrangement of Luke's use of Matthew as their primary reasons for supporting the 2DH, despite the observation that their theory is itself unable to account for Matthew's use of Mark, it is evident that their advocacy for the 2DH over the 2GH is due to presuppositional considerations rather than the reasons provided. The primary arguments from 2DH proponents against the 2GH are at a degree of hypocrisy that should be shocking to any who become aware of both the arguments that are made against the 2GH and the state of the arguments made in support of the 2DH.

## Bibliography

- Abbott, Edwin A. *The Corrections of Mark*. Vol. II, Diatessarica. London: Adam & Charles Black, 1901.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Gospels." In *Encyclopedia Britannica*, 9<sup>th</sup> ed. Edinburgh: A & C Black, 1879.
- Allen, Willoughby C. "Two Critical Studies in St. Matthew's Gospel: II. The Dependence of St. Matthew i.-xiii. upon St. Mark." *Expository Times* 11, no. 6 (March 1900): 279-84.
- Andrejevs, Olegs, and David B. Sloan. "Matthean Conflations and Luke's Utilization Procedure under the Farrer Hypothesis: In Defense of F. Gerald Downing." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 141, no. 4 (2022): 737-59.
- Aune, David E. "Luke 1:1-4: Historical or Scientific Prooimion?" In *Jesus, Gospel Tradition and Paul in the Context of Jewish and Greco-Roman Antiquity*. Vol. 303, Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament. Edited by Jörg Frey. Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck, 2013.
- Barrett, C. K. "Q: A Re-examination." In *The Two-Source Hypothesis: A Critical Appraisal*, edited by Arthur J. Bellinzoni, Jr., Joseph B. Tyson, and William O. Walker, Jr., 259-68. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1985.
- Barton, George A. "The Question of 'Ur-Markus' Once More." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 48, no. 3/4 (1929): 239-47.
- Black, David Alan. *Why Four Gospels?: The Historical Origins of the Gospels*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Gonzalez, FL: Energion Publications, 2010.
- Black, Matthew. *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts*, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1967.
- Bradby, E. L. "In Defense of Q." In *The Two-Source Hypothesis: A Critical Appraisal*, edited by Arthur J. Bellinzoni, Jr., Joseph B. Tyson, and William O. Walker, Jr., 287-93. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1985.
- Breytenbach, Cilliers. "Metaphor in Argument: The Beelzebul-controversy in the Gospel according to Mark." *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde des Urchristentums* 110, no. 2 (2019): 133-145.
- Brown, Raymond E. *The Birth of the Messiah: A Commentary on the Infancy Narratives in Matthew and Luke*. New York: Doubleday, 1977.
- Burger, Christoph. "Jesu Taten nach Matthäus 8 und 9." *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 70, no. 3 (1973): 272-87.

- Burkill, T. A. *New Light on the Earliest Gospel: Seven Markan Studies*. London: Cornell University Press, 1972.
- Butler, B. C. *The Originality of St. Matthew: A Critique of the Two-Document Hypothesis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1951.
- Cadbury, Henry J. *The Making of Luke-Acts*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1958.
- Catchpole, David R. *The Quest for Q*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1993.
- Conzelmann, Hans. *The Theology of St. Luke*. Translated by Geoffrey Buswell. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1982.
- Cope, O. Lamar. *Matthew: A Scribe Trained for the Kingdom of Heaven*. Vol. 5, The Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic Biblical Association of America. 1976.
- Crossan, John Dominic. "Mark and the Relatives of Jesus." *Novum Testamentum* 15, no. 2 (1973): 81-113.
- Dahl, Nils Alstrup. "The Purpose of Mark's Gospel." In *The Messianic Secret*, edited by Christopher Tuckett, 29-34. Vol. I, Issues in Religion and Theology. Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1983.
- Davies, W. D., and Dale C. Allison, Jr. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to Saint Matthew*. Vol. I, *Introduction and Commentary on Matthew I-VII*. The International Critical Commentary on the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1988.
- Derrenbacker, Jr., R. A. *Ancient Compositional Practices and the Synoptic Problem*. Leuven, Belgium: Leuven University Press, 2005.
- Dibelius, Martin. *From Tradition to Gospel*. Translated by Bertram Lee Woolf. Edited by William Barclay. Cambridge: James Clarke & Co., 1971.
- Downing, F. G. "Towards the Rehabilitation of Q." In *The Two-Source Hypothesis: A Critical Appraisal*, edited by Arthur J. Bellinzoni, Jr., Joseph B. Tyson, and William O. Walker, Jr., 269-85. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1985.
- Drury, John. *Tradition and Design in Luke's Gospel*. London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1976.
- Dungan, David L. *A History of the Synoptic Problem: The Canon, the Text, the Composition, and the Interpretation of the Gospels*. New York: Doubleday, 1999.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "Mark—The Abridgment of Matthew and Luke." In *Jesus and Man's Hope*, vol. 1, edited by David G. Buttrick and John M. Bald, 51-97. Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh Theological Seminary, 1970.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Purpose and Provenance of the Gospel of Mark according to the 'Two-Gospel' (Owen-Griesbach) Hypothesis." In *New Synoptic Studies: The Cambridge Gospel Conference and Beyond*, edited by William R. Farmer, 411-40. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1983.
- Eve, Eric. "Reconstructing Mark: A Thought Experiment." In *Questioning Q: A Multidimensional Critique*, edited by Mark Goodacre and Nicholas Perrin, 89-114. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2004.
- Edwards, Richard A. *A Theology of Q: Eschatology, Prophecy, and Wisdom*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1976.
- Farmer, William R. "A Fresh Approach to Q." In *The Two-Source Hypothesis: A Critical Appraisal*, edited by Arthur J. Bellinzoni, Jr., Joseph B. Tyson, and William O. Walker, Jr., 397-408. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1985.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Lachmann Fallacy." *New Testament Studies* 14, no. 3 (April 1968): 441-43.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Modern Developments of Griesbach's Hypothesis." *New Testament Studies* 23, no. 3 (1977): 275-95.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Synoptic Problem: A Critical Analysis*. New York: The MacMillan Co., 1964.
- Farrer, Austin. "On Dispensing with Q." In *The Two-Source Hypothesis: A Critical Appraisal*, edited by Arthur J. Bellinzoni, Jr., Joseph B. Tyson, and William O. Walker, Jr., 321-56. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1985.
- Fitzmyer, J. A. "Luke's Use of Q." In *The Two-Source Hypothesis: A Critical Appraisal*, edited by Arthur J. Bellinzoni, Jr., Joseph B. Tyson, and William O. Walker, Jr., 245-57. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1985.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Gospel according to Luke I-IX: Introduction, Translation, and Notes*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1981.
- Fleddermann, Harry T. *Mark and Q: A Study of the Overlap Texts*. Leuven, Belgium: Leuven University Press, 1995.
- France, R. T. *The Gospel of Mark: A Commentary on the Greek Text. The New International Greek Testament Commentary*. Edited by I. Howard Marshall and Donald A. Hagner. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 2002.



- Felix, Paul W. "Literary Dependence and Luke's Prologue." *The Master's Seminary Journal* 8, no. 1 (Spring 1997): 61-82.
- Goodacre, Mark. "A World without Q." In *Questioning Q: A Multidimensional Critique*, edited by Mark Goodacre and Nicholas Perrin. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2004.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Beyond the Q Impasse or Down a Blind Alley?" *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 22, no. 76 (2000): 33-52.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Goulder and the Gospels: An Examination of a New Paradigm*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter. London: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Case against Q: Studies in Markan Priority and the Synoptic Problem*. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 2002.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Farrer Hypothesis." In *The Synoptic Problem: Four Views*, edited by Stanley E. Porter and Bryan R. Dyer, 47-66. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2016.
- Goulder, Michael D. *Luke: A New Paradigm*. Sheffield, UK: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Midrash and Lection in Matthew: The Speaker's Lectures in Biblical Studies 1969-71*. London: SPCK, 1974.
- Griesbach, J. J. "A Demonstration that Mark Was Written after Matthew and Luke." Translated by Bernard Orchard. In *J. J. Griesbach: Synoptic and Text-Critical Studies 1776-1976*, edited by Bernard Orchard and Thomas R. W. Longstaff, 103-135. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Inquiritur in fontes unde Evangelistae suas de resurrectione Domini narrationes hauserint* (1783). Reprinted in *Opuscula academia*, vol. II. Edited by J. Gabler. Jena, Germany: n.p., 1825.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Synopsis evangeliorum Matthaei, Marci et Lucae: Textum Graecum ad fidem codicum, versionum et patrum emendavit et lectionis varietatum*. Halle, Germany: n.p., 1776.
- Grundmann, Walter. *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus*, 4th ed. Vol. I, Theologischer Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament. Edited by Erich Fascher. Berlin, Germany: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1975.
- Gundry, Robert H. *Matthew: A Commentary on His Handbook for a Mixed Church under Persecution*, 2nd ed. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 1994.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Refusal of Matthean Foreign Bodies to Be Exorcised from Luke 9,22; 10, 25-28." *Ephemerides theologicae Lovanienses: commentarii de re theologica et canonica* 75, no. 1 (1999): 104-122.

- Harnack, Adolf. *The Sayings of Jesus: The Second Source of St. Matthew and St. Luke*. Vol. II, New Testament Studies. Translated by J. R. Wilkinson. London: Williams & Norgate, 1908.
- Hawkins, John C. *Horae synopticae: Contributions to the Study of the Synoptic Problem*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1909.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Arrangement of Materials in St. Matthew viii.-ix." *Expository Times* 12, no. 10 (July 1901): 471-4.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Arrangement of Materials in St. Matthew viii.-ix. II." *Expository Times* 13, no. 1 (October 1901): 20-25.
- Head, Peter M. *Christology and the Synoptic Problem: An Argument for Markan Priority*. Vol. 94, Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Held, Heinz Joachim. "Matthäus als Interpret der Wundergeschichten." In *Überlieferung und Auslegung im Matthäusevangelium*, 7<sup>th</sup> ed., vol. I, Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament, edited by Ferdinand Hahn and Odil Hannes Steck, 155-287. Neukirchen-Vluyn, Germany: Neukirchener Verlag, 1975.
- H. J. Holtzmann, *Die synoptischen Evangelien: Ihr Ursprung und geschichtlicher Charakter*. Leipzig, Germany: Verlag von Wilhelm Engelmann, 1863.
- Hooker, Morna D. *The Gospel according to Saint Mark*. Black's New Testament Commentaries. Edited by Henry Chadwick. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1997.
- Jameson H. G. *The Origin of the Synoptic Gospels: A Revision of the Synoptic Problem*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1922.
- Jeremias, Joachim. *The Parables of Jesus*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Translated by S. H. Hooke. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1972.
- Jordan, Richard. "The Significance of Mark 3:20-End for Understanding the Message of Mark's Gospel." *The Expository Times* 124, no. 5 (2013): 227-233.
- Kelber, Werner H. *The Kingdom in Mark: A New Place and a New Time*. Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1974.
- Kingsbury, Jack Dean. "Observations on the 'Miracle Chapters' of Matthew 8-9." *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 40, no. 4 (1978): 559-73.
- Kloppenborg, John S. *Excavating Q: The History and Setting of the Sayings Gospel*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2000.

- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Formation of Q: Trajectories in Ancient Wisdom Collections*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2007.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Synoptic Problems: Collected Essays*. Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck, 2014.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Q, the Earliest Gospel: An Introduction to the Original Stories and Sayings of Jesus*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2008.
- Klostermann, Erich. *Das Matthäusevangelium*. Vol. 4, Handbuch zum Neuen Testament. Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck, 1927.
- Koppe, J. B. *Marcus non epitomator Matthaei*. Göttingen, Germany: n.p., 1782.
- Lessing, G. E. "New Hypothesis on the Evangelists as Merely Human Historians." In *Lessing: Philosophical and Theological Writings*, translated and edited by H. B. Nisbet, 148-71. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Lachmann, Karl. "On the Order of the Stories in the Synoptic Gospels." Translated by N. H. Palmer. In *The Two-Source Hypothesis: A Critical Appraisal*, edited by Arthur J. Bellinzoni, Jr., Joseph B. Tyson, and William O. Walker, Jr., 123-31. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1985.
- Lambrecht, Jan. "John the Baptist and Jesus in Mark 1.1-15: Markan Redaction of Q?" *New Testament Studies* 38, no. 3 (1992): 357-84.
- Lindsey, Robert L. *The Jesus Sources: Understanding the Gospels*. Tulsa, OK: HaKeshar, 1990.
- Longstaff, Thomas R. W. *Evidence of Conflation in Mark?: A Study of the Synoptic Problem*. Vol. 28, SBL Dissertation Series. Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1977.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Minor Agreements: An Examination of the Basic Argument." *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 37, no. 2 (1975): 184-92.
- Lummis, Edward William. *How Luke Was Written*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1915.
- Luz, Ulrich. *Matthew 1-7: A Commentary*. Translated by James E. Crouch. Edited by Helmut Koester. Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg Fortress, 2007.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Matthew 21-28: A Commentary*. Translated by James E. Crouch. Edited by Helmut Koester. Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg Fortress, 2005.
- Mann, C. S. *Mark: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1986.

- Marshall, I. Howard. *Luke: Historian and Theologian*. Exeter, UK: Paternoster, 1988.
- Matson, Mark A. "Luke's Rewriting of the Sermon on the Mount." In *Questioning Q: A Multidimensional Critique*, edited by Mark Goodacre and Nicholas Perrin, 43-70. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2004.
- McNicol, Allan J., David L. Dungan, and David B. Peabody. *Beyond the Q Impasse: Luke's Use of Matthew*. Valley Forge, PA: Trinity International Press, 1996.
- Nineham, D. E. *Saint Mark*. The Pelican New Testament Commentaries. London: Penguin Books, 1963.
- Marxsen, Willi. *Introduction to the New Testament*. Translated by G. Buswell. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1968.
- Moffatt, James. *An Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament*, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1918.
- Montefiore, C. G. *The Synoptic Gospels: Edited with an Introduction and Commentary*. Vol. I, Library of Biblical Studies, 2nd ed. Edited by Harry M. Orlinsky. New York: KTAV Publishing, 1968.
- Mosse, Martin. *The Three Gospels: New Testament History Introduced by the Synoptic Problem*. UK: Paternoster, 2007.
- Neiryck, Frans. "Argument from Order and St. Luke's Transpositions." *Ephemerides theologicae lovanienses* 49, no. 4 (1973): 784-815.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Assessment." In *Mark and Q: A Study of the Overlap Texts*, edited by Harry T. Fleddermann, 263-307. Leuven, Belgium: Leuven University Press, 1995.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "A Symposium on the Minor Agreements." *Ephemerides theologicae lovanienses* 67, no. 4 (1991): 361-72.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Duality in Mark: Contributions to the Study of the Markan Redaction*, rev. ed. Leuven, Belgium: Peeters Publishers, 1988.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Sermon on the Mount in the Gospel Synopsis." *Ephemerides theologicae lovanienses* 52, no. 4 (December 1976): 350-57.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Order of the Gospels and the Making of a Synopsis." *Ephemerides theologicae lovanienses* 61, no. 1 (1985): 161-6.
- Neville, David J. *Arguments from Order in Synoptic Source Criticism: A History and Critique*. Vol. 7, New Gospel Studies. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1994.

- \_\_\_\_\_. *Mark's Gospel—Prior or Posterior?: A Reappraisal of the Phenomenon of Order*. Vol. 222, Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series. Edited by Stanley E. Porter. London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002.
- Nineham, D. E. *Saint Mark*, rev. ed. Middlesex, UK: Penguin Books, 1972.
- Orchard, Bernard. "How the Synoptic Gospels Came into Existence." In *The Order of the Synoptics: Why Three Synoptic Gospels?*, 229-79. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1989.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Matthew, Luke & Mark*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Manchester: Koinonia Press, 1987.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Historical Tradition." In *The Order of the Synoptics: Why Three Synoptic Gospels?*, 111-226. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1989.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Solution of the Synoptic Problem." *Scripture Bulletin* 18, no. 1 (1987): 2-14.
- Owen, Henry. *Observations on the Four Gospels: Tending Chiefly, to Ascertain the Times of Their Publication; And to Illustrate the Form and Manner of Their Composition*. London: n.p., 1764.
- Parker, Pierson. "A Second Look at the Gospel before Mark." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 100, no. 3 (1981): 389-413.
- Peabody, David B., Lamar Cope, and Allan J. McNicol. *One Gospel from Two: Mark's Use of Matthew and Luke*. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 2002.
- Pryke, E. J. *Redactional Style in the Marcan Gospel*. Vol. 33, Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Reimarus, Hermann S. *Fragments from Reimarus: Consisting of Brief Critical Remarks on the Object of Jesus and the Disciples as Seen in the New Testament*. Translated by G. E. Lessing. Edited by Charles Voysey. London: Williams & Norgate, 1879.
- Riley, Harold. "The Internal Evidence." In *The Order of the Synoptics: Why Three Synoptic Gospels?*, 3-108. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1989.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Making of Mark: An Exploration*. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1989.
- Robinson, John A. T. *Redating the New Testament*. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2000.
- Sanders, E. P., and Margaret Davies. *Studying the Synoptic Gospels*. Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press International, 1996.
- Sanders, E. P. *The Tendencies of the Synoptic Tradition*. Vol. 9, Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2000.

- Schniewind, Julius. *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus*. Vol. 2, Das Neue Testament Deutsch. Edited by Paul Ulthaus and Gerhard Friedrich. Göttingen, Germany: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1964.
- Schweizer, Eduard. "Eine hebraisierende Sonderquelle des Lukas?" *Theologische Zeitschrift* 6, no. 3 (May/June 1950): 161-85.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Good News according to Matthew*. Translated by David E. Green. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1975.
- Sieffert, F. L. *Ueber den Ursprung des ersten kanonischen Evangeliums: Eine kritische Abhandlung*. Königsberg, Germany: Conrad Poitsche, 1832.
- Simpson, R. T. "The Major Agreements of Matthew and Luke against Mark." In *The Two-Source Hypothesis: A Critical Appraisal*, edited by Arthur J. Bellinzoni, Jr., Joseph B. Tyson, and William O. Walker, Jr., 381-95. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1985.
- Springer, J. F. "The Synoptic Problem. II. Facts and Conclusions as to the Synoptic Orders of Events." *Bibliotheca sacra* 81, no. 321 (1924): 59-88.
- Stein, Robert H. "Luke 1:1-4 and *Traditionsgeschichte*." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 26, no. 4 (December 1983): 421-30.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Studying the Synoptic Gospels: Origin and Interpretation*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2001.
- Stoldt, Hans-Herbert. *History and Criticism of the Marcan Hypothesis*. Translated by Donald L. Niewyk. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1980.
- Strauss, David Friedrich. *The Life of Jesus, Critically Examined*. Vol. 1. Translated by George Elliot. London: Chapman Brothers, 1846.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Life of Jesus, Critically Examined*. Vol. 3. Translated by George Elliot. London: Chapman Brothers, 1846.
- Strecker, Georg. "The Theory of the Messianic Secret in Mark's Gospel." In *The Messianic Secret*, edited by Christopher Tuckett, 49-64. Vol. I, Issues in Religion and Theology. Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1983.
- Streeter, Burnett Hillman. *The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins, Treating of the Manuscript Tradition, Sources, Authorship, & Dates*. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2008.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "On the Original Order of Q." In *Oxford Studies in the Synoptic Problem*, edited by W. Sanday, 141-64. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1911.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "St. Mark's Knowledge and Use of Q." In *Oxford Studies in the Synoptic Problem*, edited by W. Sanday, 165-84. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1911.
- Styler, G. M. "Excursus IV: The Priority of Mark." In *The Birth of the New Testament*, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed, edited by C. F. D. Moule, 223-32. Black's New Testament Commentaries. London: Adam & Charles Black, 1981.
- Taylor, Vincent. *Behind the Third Gospel: A Study of the Proto-Luke Hypothesis*. India: Skilled Books, 1926.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Gospel according to St. Mark: The Greek Text with Introduction, Notes and Indexes*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1966.
- Theißen, Gerd. *Urchristliche Wundergeschichten: Ein Beitrag zur formgeschichtlichen Erforschung der synoptischen Evangelien*. Vol. 8, Studien zum Neuen Testament. Edited by Günter Klein, Willi Marxsen, and Wolfgang Schrage. Göttingen, Germany: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1974.
- Thompson, William G. "Reflections on the Composition of Mt 8:1-9:34." *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 33, no. 3 (July 1971): 363-88.
- Trocme, Etienne. *The Formation of the Gospel according to Mark*. Translated by Pamela Gaughan. Philadelphia, PA: Westminster Press, 1963.
- Tuckett, Christopher M. "Arguments from Order: Definition and Evaluation." In *Synoptic Studies: The Ampleforth Conferences of 1982 and 1983*, edited by C. M. Tuckett, 197-213. Sheffield, UK: JSOT Press, 1984.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Introduction: The Problem of the Messianic Secret." In *The Messianic Secret*, edited by Christopher Tuckett, 1-28. Vol. I, Issues in Religion and Theology. Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1983.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Revival of the Griesbach Hypothesis: An Analysis and Appraisal*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.
- Tyson, Joseph B. "The Blindness of the Disciples in Mark." In *The Messianic Secret*, edited by Christopher Tuckett, 35-43. Vol. I, Issues in Religion and Theology. Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1983.
- Walker, William O. "The Son of Man Question and the Synoptic Problem." *New Testament Studies* 28, no. 3 (1982): 374-88.
- Weeden, Theodore J. *Mark: Traditions in Conflict*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1971.
- Wenham, John W. *Redating Matthew, Mark and Luke: A Fresh Assault on the Synoptic Problem*. London, Hodder & Stoughton, 1991.

Witherington, Ben III. *The Gospel of Mark: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary*. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 2001.

Woods, F. H. *The Origin and Mutual Relation of the Synoptic Gospels*. Vol. 18, *Analecta Gorgiana*. New Jersey: Gorgias Press, 2006.

Zahn, Theodor. *Des Evangelium des Matthäus*, 4th ed. Vol. I, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament*. Leipzig, Germany: A. Deichertsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1922.