

10:29

ἔνεκεν ἑμοῦ
καὶ ἔνεκεν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου

par. Mt 19:29

ἔνεκεν τοῦ ὀνόματός μου

In Mt 5:11 ἔνεκεν ἑμοῦ (diff. Lk 6:22 ἔνεκα τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου) is probably Matthean redaction: compare Mt 10:32 (diff. Lk 12:8); Mt 16:21 (diff. Mk 8:31).

ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ὥρᾳ Mt 13:11 / Mk 10:19. Cf. Mt 8:13; 18:1; 26:55; cf. ἀπὸ τῆς ὥρας ἐκείνης Mt 9:22; 15:28; 17:18.

In Mt 18:1 (diff. Mk 9:33) and 26:55 (diff. Mk 14:48) ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ὥρᾳ is a Matthean transition formula. In both instances it resumes the Markan narrative after a Matthean expansion (compare Mt 17:24a,25b with Mk 9:33a; Mt 26:52a with Mk 14:48a.) A more typically Matthean formula is the conclusion of healing stories with ἐν τῇ ὥρᾳ ἐκείνῃ in Mt 8:13 (diff. Lk 7:10) and ἀπὸ τῆς ὥρας ἐκείνης in Mt 9:22 (diff. Mk 5:34); Mt 15:28 (diff. Mk 7:30); Mt 17:18 (diff. Mk 9:27);²⁴ “c’est l’ultime Rédacteur matthéen qui a ajouté l’expression” (1972, 159b, 210a, 235b, 256b).

3. Mk 13:9-11, in the second person, in contrast to v. 12, in the third person and originally connected with v. 8? Such a connection between Mk 13:8 and 12 has been suggested by L. Hartman (1966), R. Pesch (1968), *et al.*, but see now Pesch’s commentary: “Gegen eine unmittelbare Zusammengehörigkeit der VV 8.12 in einer nicht parännetischen, bloß weissagenden Vorlage spricht nicht nur der Stilunterschied (Asyn-dese in V 8, καί-Reihung in V 12), sondern auch die anders gerichtete Intention von V 12 sowie der traditionskritische Befund, der die Zusammengehörigkeit von VV 12-13a erweist” (1977, 283).

Boismard separates Mk 13:13a (in the second person: mission discourse) and Mk 13:12,13b (in the third person: eschatological discourse). If he can accept that Mt 10:21,22b (= Mk 13:12,13b) were secondarily added to the mission discourse (279-280: harmonization), why not Mt 10:21-22 (= Mk 13:12-13), and why not the entire section of Mt 10:17-22 (= Mk 13:9-13)? And finally how can Mk 13:13b (= Mt 10:22b; 24:13) be “Matthean” because of its contact with Dan 12:13 when Mk 13:4, too, depends on Dan 12 (275: “selon toute vraisemblance la formule de Marc reprend celle de Dan 12:7, sans dépendre ni de Matthieu ni de Luc”)?

F. NEIRYNCK

²⁴ Cf. *Evangelica*, 485-7.

THE TWO-GOSPEL HYPOTHESIS

THE STATEMENT OF THE HYPOTHESIS

I. THE TRADITION OF THE CHURCH

The historical evidence indicates that Matthew and Luke were composed before Mark and John.

The Two-Gospel Hypothesis is given this name, in the first instance, because it consists of a hypothesis that the two Gospels Matthew and Luke were written before Mark and John.

First: this hypothesis is supported by the testimony of Clement of Alexandria who, according to Eusebius, wrote in his *Hypotyposesis* that the Gospels with genealogies were written first. Subsequent interpreters in the Church have understood this to mean that the Gospels according to Matthew and Luke, each of which has a genealogy, were written before the Gospels according to Mark and John, neither of which has a genealogy.

Eusebius certainly accepted Clement’s testimony in this sense. He states that Clement is handing on a tradition from the primitive elders “concerning the order (τάξις) of the gospels.” After mentioning the sequential priority of the Gospels with genealogies, Clement next mentions Mark and then John. This suggests that as far as Clement was concerned Mark and John were Gospels which came in order of composition after Matthew and Luke.

All scholars familiar with the nature and value of tradition will be interested in Clement’s Testimonium which may be found in Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 6.14.5-7.

“And, again in the same books [*Hypotyposesis* 6], Clement has inserted a tradition from the primitive elders with regard to the order of the gospels as follows: he said that those gospels were written first which include the genealogies, and that the gospel according to Mark came into being in this manner....”

Eusebius’ report of Clement’s Testimonium is quite clear, as Lawlor and Oulton recognize. It tells us plainly that: concerning the order of the Gospels (περὶ τῆς τάξεως τῶν εὐαγγελίων) Matthew and Luke were earlier than Mark. The use of τάξις in this context is decisive. It

indicates that Matthew and Luke were written first, and that Mark and John came after Matthew and Luke.

Moreover, this tradition is not to be understood as tradition which has originated with Clement's immediate teachers, whom he also calls "elders", but from the primitive elders, i.e. "the elders who lived in the first days." It is not unreasonable to suppose that some of these primitive elders themselves had living contact with the Gospel writers or at least with their disciples. Much depends, of course, on when the Gospels were written. The point is that the burden of proof in this matter, in any case, rests upon the critic who would discount this tradition as having no historical value. This Testimonium from the primitive elders, which has come to us through Clement and Eusebius, was accepted in the Church according to the plain sense of the text as Eusebius understood it, all the way down into the ninth century. This is made certain by the learned ninth century Irish monk Sedulius Scottus. He explains that Mark omitted the birth narratives because he knew that they had already been recorded "in the first two evangelists." Scottus makes this comment while explaining a passage from the "Monarchian" prologue of Mark. This fourth or fifth century prologue also shares the view that the Gospel of Mark was composed after Matthew and Luke and that Mark had seen both of these earlier Gospels.

In commenting on this Scottus writes: "... Matthew and Luke, who, according to some, as the *Ecclesiastical History* relates, wrote their Gospels before Mark..." The reference to "*The Ecclesiastical History*" clearly refers to Eusebius' *E.H.* 6.14.5. While all writers known to Scottus might not have agreed with the view that Matthew and Luke were written before Mark, this is the view which is represented by the learned Eusebius in his *Ecclesiastical History*, i.e. according to the understanding of Scottus. That Scottus makes this view his own is clear from what he says about the Gospels in the section cited above (Migne, *Patrologia Latina*, vol. 103, col. 279-86).

There is, however, an alternative tradition in the Church that the Gospels were composed in the order Matthew, Mark, Luke, John. One finds support for this tradition in various places including the "Monarchian" prologue of Luke. According to this prologue, Luke was written in Achaia after Matthew had been written in Judea and after Mark had been written in Italy. But the wording of this relatively late prologue to Luke is so close to the wording of the earlier "Anti-Marcionite" Prologue of Luke, that it seems probable that the agreement between the two prologues is due to literary dependence. In any case we have

two differing traditions; Luke before Mark, and Mark before Luke. How can this apparent discrepancy in Church tradition be resolved?

We should bear in mind that in the second century, when the "Anti-Marcionite" Prologues were written, the current order of the Fourfold Gospel canon probably represented the order in which the Anti-Marcionite bishops wanted the Gospels to be read. The particular order Matthew, Mark, Luke, John places the two genuine works from the circle of the Twelve Apostles at beginning and end, enclosing those by "apostolic men" in between. In this way, the genuine version of Luke (associated with the Apostle Paul, the darling of the Marcionites), is placed after Mark (penned in the name of the Apostle Peter), between two bulwarks of orthodox tradition: Matthew and John.

Assuming for the sake of discussion that this was the way in which the fourfold Gospel canon was originally arranged in the Greek manuscript tradition, how can we explain the fact that this order does not follow the chronological order of composition reflected in the tradition from the primitive elders accepted by Clement in the famous and influential school of Alexandria?

One answer suggests itself immediately: in the orthodox tradition, it was more important to have a "theological order" than a merely chronological or historical order. From a theological point of view there were powerful reasons for placing Luke after Mark in between Matthew and John. Marcion had given preference to the gospel tradition preserved in Luke in reconstructing his gospel text. In the process he had rejected the authority of all the apostles except Paul. In reply, the Anti-Marcionite bishops placed Luke, the Pauline Gospel, next to and after Mark, Peter's Gospel, reinforcing the Irenaean "Salvation History" (first Peter, then Paul) consciousness of the Anti-Marcionite Catholic Church which formed the fourfold Gospel canon. There is no reason to think that this "theological order" was regarded in the school of Alexandria as contradicting the tradition regarded by Clement. Eusebius, who is aware of this "theological order," gives not the slightest hint of any implied contradiction. The two traditions were on different planes of tradition.

There are of course certain practical pedagogical advantages in placing Mark before Luke in the Canon. For example this sequence serves the principle of "incremental gain." If Matthew is read first, then by also reading Mark one can learn more, and after reading Matthew and Mark, one can learn still more by reading Luke, and finally still more by reading John. Whereas if one waits to read Mark until after having read Matthew and Luke, one learns very little that has not

already been covered by Matthew and Luke. Again, when read in the canonical order Mark carries the reader forward from the very Jewish account of Matthew to the more universal account of Luke. Moreover, one notes that in the process Mark's account remains essentially faithful to that of Matthew while it fittingly prepares the reader to take up Luke's quite different account. These practical advantages may not have contributed to the origin of the canonical order, but they would have commended this order once adopted.

One major requirement of contemporary New Testament and patristic study is to reassess in an impartial manner the early tradition of the Church concerning the provenance, authorship, and date of composition of the Gospels. Proponents of the Two-Document Hypothesis generally disregard their responsibility to understand or explain the Church's traditions on these matters.

Any adequate treatment of early Church tradition must do justice to the fact that the tradition which places the composition of Luke after Mark cannot with confidence be traced back any earlier than an anonymous anti-Marcionite prologue from the late second century. There it hangs in mid-air in a text whose author cannot be connected with any known person in the Church. Compare this considerable uncertainty with the tradition that places the composition of Matthew and Luke first. This tradition can be connected with known historical figures like Eusebius and Clement. These scholars were well acquainted with all relevant traditions, written and oral. Consider that Clement had this particular tradition (it appears to have been oral) about the priority of Matthew and Luke from "primitive" (ἀνέκαθεν) elders who lived even earlier than Clement's teachers, i.e. elders who were active during the generation of Papias and Ignatius. One of those "blessed and truly notable men" whom Clement tells us he was privileged to hear was an Ionian whom he met in Greece. This sage could have been acquainted with Ionian Greeks who had known disciples of the bishops Polycarp and Papias. And when Clement tells us of another of those early Christian sages who lived in Coele-Syria, we may be sure that this mentor would have known some persons who could remember having heard the Antiochian bishop Ignatius preach and teach.

If this prolonged discussion of the reasons for giving due weight to Clement of Alexandria's Testimonium appears somewhat tedious in the light of the plain sense of the text, the reader must bear in mind the full impact of this piece of external evidence on the question of Marcan priority. Defenders of Marcan priority cannot accept this evidence and hold to their theory. If they hold to their theory, they must ignore, explain away or deny the value of this tradition.

One purpose of this discussion is to prepare the reader to weigh carefully any attempt to discount Clement's testimony. For example, in answer to the possible objection that the tradition that Luke was written after Mark may also go back to the time of the primitive elders, and if so would serve to cancel out the value of Clement's testimony, it may be asked: If Papias' five volume *Exposition of the Lord's Oracles*, or if any other writing from that era of scholarship had contained a tradition from an earlier time which in any way contradicted the tradition which Clement passed on from the "primitive elders" in his *Hypotyposes*, could Clement have overlooked it? Our answer is that, while such an oversight could have been made, it would have been corrected, certainly by Eusebius if not long before, by, for example, Origen. Scholarly texts then available were gathered together in the libraries of Alexandria and/or Caesarea, to which scholars like Clement, Origen, Pamphilus and Eusebius, and their several assistants and disciples, had ready access. An essential function of these schools or centers of Christian learning was to note and correct such errors. Otherwise, the teachings of these schools would be held up to public ridicule as inconsistent.

In sum, it is a distinct advantage of the Two-Gospel Hypothesis that it enjoys the support of the historical evidence critically evaluated. The Gospel of Matthew and the Gospel of Luke were, as far as this external evidence is concerned, clearly believed to have been composed before the other Gospels — certainly by Clement and presumably by all scholars who accepted Clement's Testimonium, including Eusebius, clear down to the ninth century.

Second: it was Augustine of Hippo who, building on the work of Ammonius in the form of the canons of Eusebius, first laid out in detail the results of a prolonged and exhaustive comparative study of all four Gospels (*De consensu evangelistarum*). From his painstaking study of the texts of the Gospels Augustine came to the conclusion that each succeeding evangelist made use of the work of his predecessor(s).

The Clementine view that Mark was sequentially composed after Matthew and Luke would have meant for Augustine that Mark had made use of both Matthew and Luke. Indeed, the view which Augustine preferred comports with, though it does not strictly require, the conclusion that Mark did know both Matthew and Luke.

After mentioning his earlier view set forth in Book I, that Mark was second and has abbreviated Matthew, Augustine himself in Book IV turns to another view that he says is more probable:

"...in accordance with the more probable account of the matter [vel quod probabilis intelligitur] he [Mark] holds a course in conjunction with both [Matthew and Luke] [cum ambobus incedit]. For although he is at one with Matthew in the larger number of passages he is nevertheless at one rather with Luke in some others [Nam quamvis Matthaeo in pluribus, tamen in aliis nonnullis Lucae magis congruit];..." [De cons. evang. 4.10.11].

If we consider this excerpt within its larger context and in relation to all other relevant passages in *De consensu*, we must draw the conclusion that it was Augustine's final opinion that "Mark is literarily dependent upon both Matthew and ... Luke."

Augustine's literary analysis is paralleled by a recognition of the theological themes that characterize both Matthew and Luke. In the human face of Mark's Gospel, says Augustine, one can discern the figure of one who fulfills both the kingly office of Christ lifted up by Matthew and the priestly image of Christ emphasized by Luke.

Although Augustine makes no reference to the Testimonium of Clement, his preferred view is certainly consonant with that tradition.

II. THE PURPOSE OF MARK ON THE TWO-GOSPEL HYPOTHESIS

Mark created a more encompassing theological future for his church by unifying Matthew and Luke.

The unanimous consensus of early tradition locates the composition of the Gospel of Mark with the church in Rome. Further, it is associated with the oral proclamation of the Apostle Peter while he was in Rome. Beyond this, the early traditions are silent, and scholarly conjecture must fill the gap. In particular, all that the earliest tradition says about Mark is that Mark took pains to record carefully what Peter had said. For us to understand this Gospel more fully, however, we must first observe the two Gospels on either side of it. The Gospel of Matthew represented the continuing vital interests of those who stood in the apostolic tradition of the Jerusalem Apostles. Luke, in its own way, represented the vital interests of the Gentile oriented churches which had been founded by Paul. Mark, by blending these two traditions together, made it possible for local churches to retain and cherish at one and the same time both Matthew and Luke and to do that within the theological context of a profound Pauline-Petrine orientation to the faith. In bringing this about, Peter/Mark underlined the need for more than one perspective on the tradition. In this "more-than-one-

Gospel canon" no single written account of the Church's Gospel was or ever will be an adequate textual basis for Christian doctrine or practice. At the same time, Mark, under the auspices of the Pauline εὐαγγέλιον unified within the collective consciousness of the Church the diverse and sometimes diverging accounts of Matthew and Luke. "Whoever loses his life for my sake and for the sake of the Gospel will save it." (Mark 8:35. Only Mark adds: καὶ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου. This fourfold Gospel canon, especially under Mark's influence, was to steel Christians under persecution and unite them in their apostolic *martyria* to leave all for the sake of Christ and for the sake of the Gospel; "Truly, I say to you, there is no one who has left house or brothers or sisters or mother or father or children or lands, for my sake and for the sake of the Gospel, who will not receive a hundredfold now in this time, houses and brothers and sisters and mothers and children and lands with persecutions, and in the age to come eternal life." (Mark 10:29-30. Only Mark adds: καὶ ἔνεκεν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου).

Outside of Mark in the New Testament, it is only the Apostle Paul who uses εὐαγγέλιον absolutely in this same way. It is striking evidence of Mark's close relationship to Paul that he begins his Gospel with the dramatic statement: ἀρχὴ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. Mark is the first Evangelist, therefore, to identify his written text with "the Gospel." It would have been Mark's Gospel, perceived as a written account of "the Gospel of Jesus Christ," that first would have been seen as: "The Gospel according to [a particular author]." From this viewpoint the fourfold Gospel canon can be seen as a deuterio-Pauline construction, where these four narrative texts were each perceived as separate but authentic written expressions of the one true εὐαγγέλιον for which Christians were to leave all [Mk 10:29-30], and, if necessary, suffer persecution and even death [Mk 8:35]. Once one recognizes the preeminent importance the Church gave to this deuterio-Pauline construction, and sees how, through these uniform ascriptions, this theological construction gives shape and impetus to the collective influence of the fourfold Gospel canon, then it becomes possible, on the Two-Gospel Hypothesis, to see that Mark-not-only-unites Matthew and Luke, but also unifies the narrative corpus of the Gospels with the Pauline theology of the Cross. Moreover, Mark, by making a Pauline εὐαγγέλιον available to those who composed the fourfold Gospel canon, has pioneered the way for the Church to prevail against Marcion and the Gnostics in its determination to hold together the Pauline epistles with the fourfold Gospel canon, and thus Paul with the Twelve. Briefly put, Mark is a bridge not only between Matthew and Luke, but also

between the Gospels (with Acts) and the Pauline corpus. Mark's εὐαγγέλιον provided the Church with the unifying principles of its canon.

III. LITERARY EVIDENCE

The internal evidence considered as a whole confirms that Mark used both Matthew and Luke.

First: the Two-Gospel Hypothesis does not require the critic to deny the existence of earlier sources used by the evangelists, written and/or oral. In fact, advocates of the Two-Gospel Hypothesis give full recognition to the importance of oral tradition in the development of the Jesus traditions utilized by the evangelists. Moreover, oral tradition continued alongside the compositional activity of the evangelists, no doubt exercising its influence upon each evangelist even as he was making use of the written compositions of his predecessors. But the Two-Gospel Hypothesis makes it quite unnecessary to appeal to hypothetical documents like Q in order to explain close verbatim agreement among the Gospels which can be more readily explained by a recognition that, as Augustine saw, no one of the evangelists did his work in ignorance of that of his predecessor. Thus, according to the Two-Gospel Hypothesis, Matthew wrote first, making extensive use of existing sources (oral and written), Luke wrote second, making extensive use of Matthew and extensive use of other source material (oral and written), Mark composed his Gospel making extensive use of both Matthew and Luke with a limited use of other source material (oral and written). All three evangelists exercised their authorial freedom in different ways, and all three made distinctive contributions to their compositions.

Second: It was not until the 18th century that scholars in general began to take note of the internal evidence that demonstrates that Mark had artfully combined the texts of Matthew and Luke. By this time Augustine's earlier view that Mark was the epitomizer of Matthew had mistakenly become fixed as the traditional view of the Church. Since this putative tradition of the Church conflicted with the newly discovered internal evidence that Mark had united Matthew and Luke, it soon appeared to represent a view of Mark that was very much out of date. As such it only served to justify scholars under the influence of the Enlightenment in their low estimate of Church tradition as a whole. If the great Augustine could be mistaken, whom could you trust? This

may explain in part why these 18th century scholars appeared to have placed no weight on Clement's Testimonium. In any case an increasing number of scholars became convinced that Mark, quite apart from the Clement Testimonium, had indeed combined his texts of Matthew and Luke. The evidence for this seems first to have been publicly pointed out by the Rev. Dr. Henry Owen, Rector of St. Olave in Hart-Street, London, and Fellow of the Royal Society. In his book, *Observations on the Four Gospels; Tending Chiefly to Ascertain the Time of their Publication; and to Illustrate the Form and Manner of their Composition*, published in London in 1764, Owen wrote:

In compiling this narrative [i.e. the Gospel of Mark], he had little more to do, it seems, than to abridge the Gospels which lay before him — varying some expressions, and inserting additions, as occasion required. That St. Mark followed this plan, no one can doubt, who compares his Gospel with those of the two former Evangelists. He copies largely from both; and takes either the one or the other almost perpetually for his guide. The order indeed is his own, and is very close and well connected. In his account of facts he is also clear, exact, and critical; and the more so perhaps, as he wrote it for the perusal of a learned and critical people. For he seems to proceed with great caution, and to be solicitous that his Gospel should stand clear of all objections. [pp. 51-2]

Later on Owen writes:

It is apparent that St. Mark makes quick and frequent transitions from one Evangelist to the other; and blends their accounts, I mean their words, in such a manner as is utterly inexplicable upon any other footing, than by supposing he had both these Gospels before him. [p. 74]

Owen offers as a specimen set of parallel passages, Mark 12:13-27 // Matt. 22:16-32 // Luke 20:20-38, and suggests that here the reader will find "as ample a proof of such a commixture of phrases and sentences, as can well be desired" [p. 74].

This understanding of Mark was subsequently made famous by Johann Jacob Griesbach of Jena University, whose name became associated with this hypothesis. It was widely held by many competent New Testament critics, representing widely diverse approaches, including Friedrich Bleek and Friedrich Schleiermacher in Berlin, and F.C. Baur, Eduard Zeller and David Friedrich Strauss in Tübingen. It was brought to its most critically defensible form in the highly esteemed work of W.M.L. De Wette of Basel. This is hardly a mean list of scholars!

Third: The first step in proposing any solution to the Synoptic Problem is the recognition of the literary fact that Matthew, Mark and Luke all three agree significantly with one another to varying degrees in