

times, he could hardly have succeeded in incorporating every instance of verbatim agreement between Matthew and Luke without becoming quite pedantic. It is clear that Mark was not that kind of author. Thus, where a small stylistic change can be made without affecting the sense of the text, Mark will frequently introduce it into his version of the Gospel. It is not likely that this was done consciously. In all probability, for example, Mark simply preferred the use of the historic present and since its use did not alter the sense of the scripture, he was quite prepared to use the historic present even when both of his sources used the aorist tense. In this way a so-called "minor agreement between Matthew and Luke against Mark" would materialize. A "so-called" minor agreement in omission would occur whenever Mark has added a word or phrase to a text from Matthew and/or Luke where Luke had copied Matthew closely.

F. The "Two-Gospel Hypothesis" is scientifically testable.

1. The "Two-Gospel Hypothesis" rests on evidence and arguments at a number of points which, in our view, it would be very difficult to explain equally well in reverse order. These are: (1) The argument from patristic evidence; (2) The argument from order; (3) The argument from Jewish and Christian history; (4) The argument from compositional considerations; (5) The argument from form-critical considerations; (6) The argument from text-criticism based on literary characteristics.

2. There are categories of evidence which if examples could be found would tend to falsify the Two-Gospel Hypothesis; (a) Patristic evidence at variance with the hypothesis: e.g. any explicit statement by Clement of Alexandria or Irenaeus that he had it from the primitive elders that the Gospels with genealogies were written after those without genealogies would constitute evidence that would serve to falsify the Two-Gospel Hypothesis; (b) Any of the three critical criteria listed under II B above could be used to prove that the Two-Gospel Hypothesis is false if applicable evidence were available: e.g., (1) evidence that a parallel passage in Mark (where the verbatim agreement is so close as to indicate some direct literary dependence) is more Jewish or Palestinian than the same material in the parallel text of Matthew; (2) explanatory glosses in the text of Matthew but absent from the parallel text in Mark; (3) literary characteristics of Matthew showing up more frequently in common sayings material than do those of Mark and/or Luke.

G. Evidence from Tannaitic Judaism serves to prove that Matthew is more Jewish and Palestinian than Mark.

H. Evidence from Hellenistic culture serves to prove on form-critical grounds that Mark is secondary to Matthew and Luke. For example: Two of Mark's miracles represent Jesus using spittle in his healing. The use of spittle in healing is characteristic of Hellenistic miracle stories. There is no case of spittle being used in any of the miracle stories in Matthew or Luke.

I. Evidence from the patristic testimony strongly supports the "Two-Gospel Hypothesis."

1. Direct statements regarding the Gospels. The earliest and by far the most important direct Patristic statement bearing on the question of the sequence in which the Gospels were written is cited by Eusebius from the *Hypotyposes* of Clement of Alexandria. Clement testifies that he had received from the primitive elders the tradition that the Gospels with genealogies (Matthew and Luke) were written before those without genealogies (Mark and John). Clement was widely-traveled and one of the teachers he contacted in Achaea was from Asia Minor who may have known Christian teachers from the earlier circle of Polycarp. It is reasonable to conclude that one of the 'primitive elders' from whom Clement's tradition came was Polycarp. This one direct statement by Clement, the most highly respected Christian scholar of his day, is of more historical value than all of the theories that have ever been propounded about the sequence in which the Gospels were written, including the theories of Augustine.

It is well known that Irenaeus knows the canonical order. But von Campenhausen has noted that when Irenaeus argues against the heretics he takes up the Gospels in the order Matthew, Luke, Mark and John. This, says von Campenhausen, is probably "the order most familiar to Irenaeus himself." Was this the tradition in which Irenaeus was schooled? If so, we can trace this tradition from the city of Lyons back to Asia Minor and Irenaeus' teacher, the primitive elder, Polycarp. In this way, from the Rhone Valley north and west of Rome to the city of Alexandria in Egypt on the southeastern shores of the Mediterranean, we would have a united testimony supporting the tradition of an order older than that of the fourfold Gospel canon, and, as Clement clearly says, this tradition is a witness to the sequence in which the Gospels were composed. This tradition need by no means be attributed to Polycarp of Smyrna in the sense of his having originated it, even if he would appear to be the best point of contact for this tradition common to Irenaeus and Clement. For Clement tells us that this tradition had been received from the primitive elders — plural. And Clement had had

contact with Christian teachers in Italy, Syria, Palestine and other places, as well as Achaëa. It is ironic that it is Polycarp and Irenæus who are the most likely to have had a hand in forming the fourfold Gospel canon, and thus to have originated the order: Matthew, Mark, Luke, John. Perhaps this is why the Church of Irenæus, Clement, Origen and Eusebius appears to have sensed no conflict between these two diverging orders.

2. Quotations of the Gospels. We have already noted that Irenæus, when refuting the heretics, begins with Matthew, then goes to Luke and then, to Mark and John, in that order. Actually the Patristic sources seldom cite Mark. The magisterial work of E. Massaux shows that Matthew was the foundational Gospel of the Church. This is the Gospel cited more often than all the others. That this Gospel, which is clearly more Jewish than the others, should be the foundational Gospel in the Gentile church, is powerful evidence in favor of its having achieved a place of primacy before Mark was written. For, since Mark so well adapted his Gospel to meet the needs of Gentiles, were his Gospel to have preceded the others, his Gospel, plus that of Luke, would have made Matthew unnecessary in those very Gentile Christian circles where we know that Matthew was in fact foundational. The sequence presupposed in the Two-Gospel Hypothesis explains the way in which the Gospels are quoted in the early Church far more satisfactorily than does the Two-Document Hypothesis.

J. The non-canonical Gospels exhibit characteristics and theological tendencies that are closer to those of Mark and John than to Matthew and Luke. With reference to Mark, this fact was first noticed by Schleiermacher and confirmed by Wilhelm Wrede in 1901. In circles which follow the lead of Wrede in recognizing the non-historical character of Mark's Gospel, this view of the Gospels, when combined with the Two-Document Hypothesis, has led to a reconstruction like that of Helmut Koester where the non-canonical Gospels of Thomas and Peter share with Mark and John direct access to the earliest documents, whereas Matthew and Luke have only indirect access to the earliest collection of sayings of Jesus lying behind "Q", and only indirect access to the primitive Passion Narrative of Ur-Marcus lying behind Mark. Against this reconstruction there is on balance the combined weight of both the direct statements about the Gospels and the quotations of them by the Patristic sources.

On the view of the "Two-Gospel Hypothesis," Matthew and Luke come before Mark and John, and Mark and John come before most if

not all non-canonical Gospels. Mark and John are characterized by tendencies to omit some very important topics and motifs treated by the earlier Gospels, and to expand on others. These same tendencies of Mark and John are even more developed in the second century apocryphal Gospels. So long as one realizes that once Matthew and Luke had been produced, the need for further Gospels would have been best served when each supplemented and/or complemented in some way the Gospel literature already available, then the actual state of affairs as pictured by the Two-Gospel Hypothesis is very reasonable. There would also be room by the second century for norming attempts like Titian's *Diatessaron*, Marcion's *Evangelion*, and the Church's Four-fold Gospel Canon, to help Christians sort out the earlier "Apostolic" witness from the later Gospel literature.

1. *The value of the Two-Gospel Hypothesis for theology/preaching*

1. The main value of the Two-Gospel Hypothesis is that it is (most likely) true. That is sufficient reason, theological and practical, for adopting it for theology and preaching.

2. A secondary value is that it restores to the critically trained preacher the same text of the Gospels that the Church has delivered to its members. To base theology and preaching on "Q," as one is constrained to do if one holds to the Two-Document Hypothesis, is to introduce an additional note of uncertainty into theology and preaching since there is no scholarly consensus on what the text of "Q" is. To be sure, all advocates of the Two-Gospel Hypothesis who hold to the historical critical method distinguish layers of tradition in the Gospels just as much as advocates of the Two-Document Hypothesis. But advocates of the Two-Gospel Hypothesis are prepared to argue that this hypothesis affords theologians and preachers a more adequate avenue to the earliest layer of the synoptic tradition, a more adequate avenue to New Testament christology, and a more adequate avenue to Church history.

V. AN HISTORICAL ACCOUNT

OF THE COMPOSITION OF THE GOSPELS ON THE HYPOTHESIS
THEY WERE WRITTEN IN THE SEQUENCE MATTHEW, LUKE, MARK

1. *The Gospel of Matthew*

The gospel of Matthew clearly reflects the history of the primitive Palestinian Jewish Christian communities which suffered persecution at

the hands of the authorities. The Jewish Christian orientation of much of the text of Matthew is unmistakable. The Evangelist begins with the genealogy of Christ from Abraham, refers to Jewish customs, relates many sayings of Jesus against Jewish errors and religious hypocrisy, quotes the greatest number of passages from Jewish scriptures among the Gospels, answers Jewish objections against the Christian believers, and frequently makes use of the terms and phrases of Jewish theology.

In composing this Gospel, Matthew had a constant regard for the circumstances of those for whom he intended his narrative. This affected his choice of material and his treatment of it. This gave his Gospel its peculiar character. Since the Gospel of Matthew was accommodated to the stage, temper and disposition of the times in which it was written, it is clear that it was composed when the Church was or recently had been laboring under persecution. Clearly it contains many obvious references to such a situation.

The Evangelist informs the injured and persecuted Christians that their afflictions were no more than they had been taught to expect and what they had promised to bear when they embraced the Gospel (10:21, 22, 34-36; 16:24). No matter how unreasonable their sufferings might be, considered as the effects of the malice of their enemies, they were nevertheless useful and profitable to themselves as trials of their faith and fidelity (5:11; 24:9-13). Though grievous to bear at present, these trials operated powerfully to their future joy (5:4, 10-12). Deser-tion of the Faith would not improve that state and condition. On the contrary, they would be exposed to greater calamities by separating themselves from any hope of life to come after judgment (10:28, 32, 33, 39). They were not, however, forbidden to use the lawful means of preservation; but even enjoined to put them in practice, whenever they could do it with innocence (10:16; 17:23). The due observance of the Christian precepts was an excellent method to appease the wrath and fury of their enemies, as well as what they were obliged for reasons of prudence and duty to consider and do (5:29-30; 7:12, 24-27; 5:13-20). If their inevitable fate should be suffering martyrdom for their faith, it was infinitely better to continue faithful to their important trust, than by any base compliance to incur displeasure of God in whose hands are the issues not only of this life but also of that which is to come (16:25-27; 10:28; 25:31-46).

On the other hand, there is much in Matthew that serves to calm the passions of enraged Jews (like the former persecutor Paul), and win them over to the profession of the Gospel. Matthew labors to soften and abate Jewish prejudices, and to engage them in the practice of

meekness and charity (9:13; 12:7). To this end the Evangelist lays before them the dignity and amiableness of a compassionate, benevolent disposition; the natural good consequences that flow from it here; and the distinguished regard, which God himself will pay to it hereafter (5:5, 7, 21-26, 43-48; 10:40-42; 18:23-35; 25:31-46).

Matthew reminds Jewish readers of the repeated punishments, which God had inflicted on their forefathers for their cruel and barbarous treatment of his Prophets, and assures them that a still greater vengeance is reserved for themselves, if they obstinately persist in the ways of cruelty (23:27-39; 10:14, 15): For God, though patient and long-suffering, was certain at the end to vindicate his elect, and to punish their oppressors (unless they repented, believed, and reformed), with the dreadful ordeal of a general destruction. (13:36-43; 24:2, 19-22, 48-51; 25:30, 46).

For those who recognize Jesus according to his various messianic titles, Son of God, Son of David, Son of Man, Immanuel, Lord, etc., there is a call to carry forward an apostolic mission to all nations. With divine assurance the Lord will abide with those who take up this salvific mission (28:17-20).

With such arguments as these, Matthew comforted, exhorted, and inspired afflicted Christian readers, while he put on notice all who oppressed and injured them.

Clearly these arguments relate to or closely reflect a situation of distress and persecution. Now the greatest persecution ever raised against the Church, while it was still a predominantly Jewish Christian community of believers, was first begun by the Jerusalem authorities and afterwards continued and conducted by agents, like Paul, with implacable rage and fury. The danger of such persecution from zealous Jews was a continuous threat to believers who were linked from the earliest days with a mission to Gentiles. The Jewish populace would be agitated by the question whether the non-observance of the law by Christians was provoking a jealous God. The oppression of the Christian minority by Jews zealous for the law would rise in direct proportion to the tension between Jerusalem and Rome.

Caligula's threat in A.D. 40 to erect a graven image of himself in the temple at Jerusalem occasioned great distress within the Jewish populace (Josephus, *War* 2.184-7, 192-203; *Antiquities* 18.261-309). Every effort would have been made to achieve compliance with the law within Jewish circles including the churches in Judea mentioned by Paul (Gal. 1:22) and those in other areas which were under the jurisdiction of recognized Jewish authorities.

Certainly the reference to the abomination of desolation spoken of by Daniel (in Matt. 24:15; cf. Dan. 12:11; 8:13; 9:27; I Macc. 1:54) points us to the importance of this particular crisis in the history of the Jewish nation and in the history of those Christian communities which continued to look to the Temple in Jerusalem as a locus of the divine presence.

After this particular crisis, there followed in the next decade, renewed tension between Jerusalem and Rome during the rule of Nero, especially upon Festus' coming into Judea (Josephus, *Antiquities* 20.182-196, Cf. *War* 2.271). Finally in 67 a full scale revolt broke out against Rome. This revolt was not settled until the early 70's, and it appears that tensions continued for some time thereafter. Sometime during this era of turmoil in Palestine Matthew took in hand the task of composing a powerful statement of faith aimed to support, comfort, and assist Christians in an uncertain and hostile environment. But what comfort could they possibly receive, in their stressful situation, comparable to that which resulted from the example of their suffering Master, and the promises he had made to his faithful followers? This example therefore, and these promises, Matthew appropriately laid before his readers, for their imitation and encouragement. In this stressful situation Matthew most likely wrote his Gospel. He then delivered it to his fellow Christians as the anchor of their hope to keep them steadfast in the face of persecution, while pointing them forward to their apostolic mission to all the nations. The task of composition was not accomplished all at once.

Since Matthew had no close model to follow he carefully prepared himself to write his Gospel. Regardless of the need for care in composing, certainly the need to complete his task as soon as possible was ever more pressing. Persecution came not only from zealous Jews but also from Roman authorities and their Jewish advisors. These authorities responsible for maintaining order would understandably find it difficult to distinguish carefully among the various sectarian groups in Jewish society. The authorities could not always be expected to be certain just who was responsible for the unrest in the land. Or how could they assess the destabilizing effect of eschatologically oriented preaching, regardless of whether that were Jewish or Christian? The end result was great peril for Christians, especially for those who were genuinely committed to a Gospel of the Kingdom which required that it be preached publicly throughout the whole world as a testimony (*martyrion*) to all the nations (Matt. 24:14).

It is not necessary for our argument to pinpoint the exact year or even the exact decade of Matthew's composition in order to see its original readers taking on flesh and blood within the history of the Church under threat from persecuting authorities, including Jewish persecutors, whether from synagogues, or the Sanhedrin in Jerusalem or both.

2. *The Gospel of Luke*

The composition of Luke-Acts follows naturally the composition of Matthew. Matthew compressed everything he had to say into the "dramatic" story of the flesh and blood martyrdom of the Son of God. Anything decisive in the history of the Church that had taken place following the death and resurrection of Jesus was cast into some form appropriate to be presented as a part of that story. But this use of dramatic license by Matthew was ill suited to the needs of the Gentile oriented Hellenistic Christian communities addressed by Luke.

Luke wrote for readers sensitive to the standards of Hellenistic historiography. His first decision, *vis-a-vis* his model Matthew, was to make his a two volume work — one for the "historical" account of the flesh and blood martyrdom of the Son of God, and the other, for the story of the spirit of the Risen Christ operating through the apostolic mission featuring the exploits and sufferings of the Apostles.

Luke-Acts tells the story of the westward expansion of the Church, its growth from Jerusalem to Rome. It is far better suited than is Matthew to meet the needs of predominantly Gentile churches.

The purpose of Luke is clearly stated in his preface. He wrote that his readers might see and be convinced as to how well founded are those things in which they had been instructed by their teachers (1:3, 4).

Writing mainly to Gentiles, removed, as many think, from the scene of action and consequently ignorant of Jewish affairs, and to accomplish what he had in view, he was compelled to trace the subject right up to its source, and then proceed through Jesus' ministry in a circumstantial and methodical order. This explains the fact that his "history" begins with the birth of John the Baptist (1:5ff), as introductory to that of Christ, and this careful specification of the times and places [e.g. 2:1-7; 3:1, 23]. Such detailed information was demanded in the urbane, Greco-Roman world, but hardly had to be recited to the Jews, who could easily supply it from their own knowledge.

Although Luke wrote his Gospel primarily for the use of Gentile churches, these churches often had been founded by Jews like Paul and

had many members of Jewish extraction. Luke was writing for a mixed Church. For the sake of the Jewish heritage still very alive in the Gentile churches, Luke retains the Gospel's essentially Jewish character in his narrative.

In its general construction, Luke's Gospel seems to follow Matthew's, differing mainly in the way he handles the discourses of Jesus. Matthew arranges most of Jesus' teaching into several lengthy discourses. Luke takes over some opening units from each of Matthew's discourses, keeping them in the same relative order in his account except for the discourse on the parables and the discourse on the apostolic mission, the order of which he reverses. Other sayings from these several discourses which Luke takes over into his account from Matthew are either given appropriate settings in his narrative or are worked together thematically with sayings material from other sources in his great Central Section (9:52-18:14). In reading Luke's account one can skip from 9:1 to 18:31. If one skips over this section his narrative moves along much more efficiently over essentially the same ground covered by Matthew. There is Jesus with John in the Jordan valley. Then there is the ministry in Galilee. Finally there is the climactic account of Jesus' passion in Jerusalem.

If now it appears that Luke's account follows that of Matthew more closely, it is because his essential purpose is not all that different. The state and condition of the Gentile converts was similar to that of the Jewish.

Of course, it was necessary that Luke should adjust the points of his history, as Matthew had done before, to the circumstances of the persons to whom he wrote and so modify his materials as to make them applicable to those particular times. Luke directs his arguments with great propriety both to the support of the persecuted Christians (6:20-23; 12:4-12,31; 18:28-30; 21:12-19), and to the conversion of their obstinate and malicious adversaries (6:24-26; 10:12; 13:1-5; 19:41-44) — the chief of whom were still some of the Jews residing in the diaspora. This explains why the scope and shape of Luke's arguments are in so many places so very similar to those of Matthew. Both Evangelists had similar designs.

There are, however, some essential differences between Matthew and Luke on the issue of persecution. The sociological ground for the Jewish persecution of Christians in Matthew is religious. Jews zealous for the law perceive that some measure of transgression of the law seems to be inherent in the Christian Gospel — at least as it is preached

to the Gentiles. Matthew wants to reassure the Jews at this point. Though Jesus may have broken the Sabbath law, he had legal precedent to do so. Jesus was by no stretch of the imagination an antinomian. Matthew's teaching on the point is unambiguous. The disciples are instructed by the risen Christ in the Great Commission to "make disciples of all the Gentiles... teaching them to observe all that I have commanded." Included with this Gentile mission was an admonition to keep the law even down to its smallest detail (5:17-20).

It is quite otherwise in Luke's account. There is no such dominical command to keep the law in Luke's Gospel. The sociological ground for persecution of Christians is more political than religious. In the diaspora, Christians had no legal standing apart from their being perceived as Jews. But in the eyes of diaspora Jews the Christians' claim to be heirs of the promises contained in the Law and the Prophets was groundless. Most Gentile Christians were not circumcised as a sign of the covenant. The rage and envy of the Jews sprang now from a different cause. They were moved by indignation at Gentile Christian claims to be sons of Abraham with all the privileges appertaining thereunto — above all the privileges of being accounted persons adhering to a legal religion in the eyes of the Roman authorities. Ironically, the Gentile Christian's claim to Jewishness was often his best defense against harassment and persecution from his own countrymen.

It was necessary for Luke to prove that Christian claims to the promises of the Law and the Prophets were just and valid ones. To support the Christian claim to Jewishness, Luke reminds the unbelieving Jews — and any Roman authorities who wanted to read his account — that, though they were formerly God's chosen nation, and consequently entitled to his peculiar favour, God had often directed his Prophets to confer on persons of other nations those blessings which they had rendered themselves unworthy to receive by their ingratitude (4:25-27; Acts 13:45-51). This was again the case with regard to the Gospel. It was ungratefully rejected by unrepentant Israel and it was therefore proper to preach it to the more obedient Gentiles (20:9-16). The resentment and hatred which unrepentant Israel expressed on that account was both unreasonable and inhuman (15:11-32). God, when he came to vindicate his elect, would severely punish them for the injurious attempts they made on his elect, and for the aggravated provocation they had offered to himself (18:7, 8). Therefore unrepentant Israel had better look at the consequences and strive to avert by faith and penitence the grievous judgments coming upon them (13:1-5; 21:5-6).

But so strong was animosity from some Jews toward the Gentile Christians that they endeavored to degrade the character of those who asserted the full acceptance of the Gentiles without their being bound by the tradition of Moses.

Jewish Christians, susceptible to the arguments of their still unconverted countrymen and supported by certain traditions that have been preserved in the Gospel of Matthew, argued that Jesus chose no more than twelve Apostles to whom he committed the care of his Church. Anyone other than the Twelve who undertook to preach to the Gentiles were consequently only deputies, the truth of whose doctrine entirely depended on its agreement with the teaching of the original Apostles. Therefore, the grand fundamental teaching of Paul and his associates must needs be false, since it lacked the seal of apostolic authority. (This appears to be the anti-Pauline case which Paul's autobiographical statements in Galatians 1-2 are aimed to counter. Matthew's Gospel could be used to strengthen this anti-Pauline case).

To obviate these objections, Luke informs his readers that the Lord appointed Seventy others (10:1-16), besides the Twelve, who were particularly called Apostles, to convey the knowledge of his teaching to the world; and not only so, but invested them with the same authority — charged them with the same instructions — and endowed them with like power of working miracles in proof of their mission, as he had done to the brethren before; and consequently that the Twelve Apostles were not the sole commissioned Preachers of the Gospel, though they were indeed the first and principal.

It can be seen, therefore, that while the Gospels of Matthew and Luke are very similar in fundamentals, they diverge from one another in significant ways which were potentially divisive for the Church. If the ecumenical tendencies integral to both Matthew and Luke-Acts, when taken separately, were to continue to bear fruit for the Church, it was necessary for their common witnesses to be unified in some way. This was especially the case with a Church facing persecution.

3. *The Gospel of Mark*

The Gospel of Matthew opens with an account of an Herodian persecution which forced Joseph and Mary with the infant Jesus to take refuge in Egypt. Thus Christians who are being persecuted by the Roman government know that they are in solidarity with the infant Jesus and his threatened parents.

The Gospel of Luke, by way of contrast, opens with a series of

peaceful and orderly scenes featuring the stable role of the Temple cultus within the Roman Empire.

The Gospel of Mark bypasses the conflicting infancy narratives of Matthew and Luke and begins with the fulfillment of the prophecy of Isaiah [Mark 1:1-3]. After an account of Jesus' baptism, Mark again bypasses the conflicting Matthean and Lucan accounts of Jesus' temptations and has Jesus thrown by the Spirit out into the wilderness where he was with the wild beasts — and where the angels ministered to him. Like Daniel thrown into the lions' den, Roman Christians had been thrown out onto barren arenas to face the wild beasts. Facing those wild beasts, these Roman Christians had been able to identify with the Master Martyr. He too had been tested by Satan. As he had endured to the end, so had they [cf. Mark 13:13]. They drank the cup that he drank, and they had been baptized with the baptism with which he had been baptized [Mark 10:38-39].

In Luke's Gospel, Peter had asked Jesus whether his warning about the end was for the disciples "or for all" [Luke 12:41]. In Mark's Gospel Jesus answers: "What I say to you, I say to all: Watch!" [Mark 13:37].

Mark's Gospel is fundamentally a restatement of the Gospels of Matthew and Luke for Roman Christians facing persecution. It was written for a Church which had known persecution first hand. Like Luke, Mark's Church had also known peaceful times — probably the rule of the Flavians. In combining and reconciling Matthew and Luke, Mark gave the Roman Church the "bedrock message of the new Faith" which they wanted to know. Using Peter's public speeches as his guide and model Mark sought to produce the kind of vivid narrative message that the Apostle Peter had consistently proclaimed. But the memory of the persecution of Christians in Rome has left its indelible stamp on Mark's Gospel. And the Church was to be ever on guard [Mark 13:32-37]. Mark's Gospel story could serve admirably as a drama filled liturgical guide for such a Church.

Mark's repeated emphasis upon "the Gospel" used in its Pauline sense (1:1, 15; 8:35; 10:29; 13:10; 14:9 [16:15?]) made it possible for this Evangelist to omit Luke's apostolic mission of the Seventy without diminishing his Gospel's Gentile tendency. Mark's retention of the mission of the Twelve, attested by both Matthew and Luke, is thus balanced with a strong Pauline concern which emphasizes an important intention of Luke without repeating a major Lucan discrepancy with Matthew, i.e., an additional mission of the Seventy. After 70 A.D., for

the Church in Rome, there was only one apostolic mission and that was to preach the Gospel to all the nations (Mark 13:10).*

William R. FARMER

THE TWO-GOSPEL HYPOTHESIS
TEXTUAL DISCUSSION

THE COMPOSITION OF THE SYNOPTIC
ESCHATOLOGICAL DISCOURSE

PREFACE

This paper is a linguistic and stylistic explanation of the composition of the synoptic eschatological discourse (Mt 24:1-51; Mk 13:1-37; Lk 21:5-36).¹ The paper is based on the hypothesis that the Synoptics were composed in the order, Matthew, Luke, and Mark; that Luke utilized Matthew as a source for his composition; and that Mark utilized both Matthew and Luke. Since Mark is believed to have used the two extant gospels of Matthew and Luke, this synoptic source theory is called the Two-Gospel Hypothesis.

The paper develops along the following lines. After brief descriptions of the compositional methods of Matthew and Luke, we will demonstrate, with the aid of an original synopsis, how Luke drew material from Mt 24:1-51 in order to compose three separate units of his gospel (Lk 12:35-48; 17:20-37; 21:5-36). Based on this synopsis, our analysis will indicate that, after Luke composed the eschatological discourses in 12:35-48 and 17:20-37, he followed the same order as Matthew in composing Luke 21:5-36. In Luke's three eschatological accounts, we will see that Luke omits from Matthew 24 only 24:10-12, 14, 20-22, 24-25, 30a, 31, and 36. Our discussion will provide possible reasons for these omissions by Luke and for other significant stylistic and linguistic changes made by Luke when he drew from Matthew.

This analysis is necessary in order to understand the compositional procedure of the Gospel of Mark; especially the Markan omissions. When Mark constructs his eschatological discourse, as the second section of the paper will indicate, he has before him two similar

¹ It will be necessary to refer to Mt 25:1-30 from time to time in the course of the paper because it will be shown, on the presupposition of the Two-Gospel Hypothesis, that both Luke and Mark consider Mt 24:1-25:30 to be a literary unit. Nevertheless our intention is to discuss Mt 25:1-30 only when it has some effect on the composition of Mk 13 and Lk 21.

* [What is written in this historical account, especially about the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, has been largely taken over with some editing from Henry Owen's *Observations on the Four Gospels*, London, 1764. While some parts of Owen's history have been omitted, and while much has been added in this account, and while the whole of this historical account has undergone more than one revision, indebtedness to the text of Owen's work will be unmistakable to its readers, and its use is gratefully acknowledged.]