

THE ORDER OF A CRANK

Michael Goulder

University of Birmingham
P.O. Box 363, Birmingham 15

B.H. Streeter gave two reasons for dismissing 'the obvious suggestion that Luke knew Matthew's Gospel'. (1) Taken against the Marcan order, Luke's and Matthew's placing of Q material never agree. 'If Luke derived this material from Matthew . . . he must have proceeded with the utmost care to tear every little piece of non-Markan material he desired to use from the context of Mark in which it appeared in Matthew—in spite of the fact that the contexts in Matthew are always exceedingly appropriate—in order to re-insert it into a different context of Mark having no special appropriateness. A theory that would make an author capable of such a proceeding would only be tenable if, on other grounds, we had reason to believe he was a crank. (2) Sometimes it is Matthew, sometimes it is Luke, who gives a saying in what is clearly the more original form' (*The Four Gospels* [London, 1924], p. 183). Other arguments have been adduced since, but it is these two which still hold the centre of the discussion. I shall not in this paper treat the second argument; criteria for assessing 'what is clearly the more original form' have varied, and often seemed slippery, and the point can only be handled *seriatim*, in a commentary on both Gospels. But the order argument has seemed to many decisive on its own, and it is this which I am considering here.

Clearly Streeter's picture of Luke's supposed activity is grossly implausible; but is it our only option? I do not think so. Let us suppose that Luke was a 'minister of the word' writing in about 90; he has had a copy of Mark since the early 70s, and has used it regularly as the basis of his preaching; he has had a copy of Matthew since the early 80s, and has made much use of this too for instructing his congregation. He wishes now to write a Gospel of his own, and for

this purpose will need to combine his two primary sources. (We may leave aside the complication of what other sources, if any, Luke used; but we may suppose that Mark and Matthew were not the only Gospel-authors, and that Luke knew of other such writers.) How then should we expect him to proceed?

Our first response might be, 'Like a 19th century *Leben Jesu* writer; how else?' Luke would clearly be facing the same problem as any harmonist, and we know that the problem of order was felt acutely with respect to the Gospels only a generation after Luke, for Papias is concerned, with such guesses and evasions as he can muster, to justify both Mark's and Matthew's τάξις. Luke appears to feel the same, for the following translation seems to take up the natural stress of his opening period: 'Since many [Mark, Matthew, and the rest] have tried to set an account in order . . . it seemed good to me too, having followed everything accurately from the beginning, to write to you in order, most excellent Theophilus, that you may know the sure truth of the matters in which you have been instructed' (Luke 1.1-4). We cannot escape the combined force of ἀνατάξασθαι and καθεξῆς: Luke is concerned to get his order right.

There may however be some differences between Luke's situation and that of a modern harmonist, and I suggest four. (a) It is not so important for teaching material to be in order as for the incidents. Matthew is pretty faithful to Mark's order of incidents, but he moves Mark 13.9-13, 'They shall hand you over . . . to Matt. 10. Luke is similarly careful with Mark's incidents, but he moves Mark 10.42ff., 'The kings of the nations lord it over them . . .', to the Last Supper. He might take a similar licence with the Matthaean teaching matter. (b) It may be desirable to break up long units of teaching material into more manageable sections. Thus Luke abbreviates Mark's Harvest Parable Discourse from 34 verses in Mark 4 to fifteen verses, Luke 8.4-18, omitting the Seed Growing Secretly and the conclusion, and transferring the Mustard Seed. (c) Matthew has formed his Discourses mainly by expanding Mark (whether with Q/M traditions, or in his own idiom); thus Matt. 10 is built on a foundation of Mark 6 and Mark 13. If Luke's policy were to take Mark in large sections—as it is—without intrusions from Matthew, then of necessity he will have to have the non-Marcian material out of the Marcan context: so two missionary discourses, in Luke 9 from Mark and in Luke 10 from Matthew, would be quite a rational procedure. (d) Streeter thought in terms of 'conflation': his Matthew has a copy of Mark to one side,

and of Q to the other, and he 'conflates', a phrase from here, a word from there. I think such a proceeding very unlikely. My Luke has probably a cramped writing table with space for his own scroll and the one he is using as his base-of-the-moment. Mark and Matthew take turns to go on the floor. Where there are overlaps and minor agreements and such things, it is from reminiscence of a familiar parallel text.

I

Well, then, if we were Luke, on such a hypothesis, how would we begin? With Matthew, because he starts with Jesus' legal ancestry, his virginal conception announced by an angel, his birth at Bethlehem, his youth at Nazareth, etc. We may choose between further hypotheses. In my view Luke totally rewrote the Matthaean infancy story, with his own meditation on the OT prophecies and stories that Matthew had used; others will prefer Baptist, Anawim and other traditions. But there is no difficulty to supposing that Luke knew Matt. 1-2; he has just improved on it. He has left out the Magi because he does not believe in astrology and magic. When he comes to John's Preaching, Jesus' Baptism and Temptations, he remains with Matthew, because Matthew is fuller and more interesting; though now there are some echoes of the familiar Marcan wording where it overlaps, especially in the Baptism. But down to Luke 4.13 the story follows Matthew without a waver, to Matt. 4.11.

At this point, if you are Luke with Matthew before you, you face a second decision. Not far ahead, at Matt. 4.25, are the crowds from many lands, followed at 5.1 by the mountain sermon; but it is not till Mark 3.7ff. that Mark has a parallel scene, in which there are crowds from the same places, followed by Jesus going up into a mountain at 3.13. So here, I suggest, Luke does his first reconciliation. Matt. 4.12-16 tells of Jesus' settling in Capernaum, followed by his beginning to preach in 4.17; and surely, Luke might feel, this corresponds very closely to Mark 1.21-34, Jesus' first day at Capernaum, followed by his first preaching tour in Mark 1.35-9. Did Luke really make this equivalence? He seems to have done, for there are two changes in the Marcan order which agree with Matthew. First, Matt. 4.13 notes that before Jesus settled in Capernaum, he left Nazara, as Matthew spells it here; and in just the same place in the sequence Luke inserts the story of Jesus' rejection at Nazareth—only he also spells it Nazara,

and here alone. Many commentators have Luke make the transfer 'for theological reasons', 'for his programmatic sermon', etc.; but my Luke is trying to get the (chronological) order right, and would not move a scene from Mark 6 without a text to justify it. Second, if we make Luke's supposed equivalence, the Call of the First Apostles will present him with a problem. In Matthew, at 4.18-22, the Call follows the settling at Capernaum and the mission; in Mark it precedes them, 1.16-20 before 1.21-39. Now Luke agrees with Matthew here, not Mark; he has the Call at 5.1-11, *after* the scenes at Capernaum, 4.31-41, and the mission, 4.42-44. So it seems that we have two pieces of evidence for Luke making the suggested equivalence, Matt. 4.13-17 = Mark 1.21-39.

There is still a long way to go to the crowds and mountain at Mark 3.7ff.; but fortunately Matthew gives the possibility of a second equivalence, for at 4.23 he writes of Jesus' tour of Galilee preaching and healing every kind of sickness, and Mark 1.40-3.6 gives a full account of exactly such activity. Thus Luke is able, on my hypothesis, to make a second satisfactory reconciliation. He can follow Mark in his fuller and better-told story of the early healings and controversies, with a verse from Matthew that covers the same ground; and he can arrive at the mountain for Mark 3.13 and Matt. 5.1 at the same time. Is there any indication of such a procedure in the text? Again, there seems to be; for the Marcan section ends with (a) 3.7-12, the gathering of great crowds, and (b) 3.13-19, the call of the Twelve; but in Matthew, the gathering of the great crowds runs directly into the Sermon, 4.24-5.1. Once again, Luke reverses the order of the Marcan units, and so brings the crowds directly before the Sermon, as they are in Matthew.

So Luke is back to Matthew again for the Sermon, without deserting him once. But now he does reduce the Matthaean volume—I would suggest for manageability, as with the Parables Discourse in Mark 4. Matthew's Sermon was a guide to the spiritual life; Luke has just had the apostles called, and to him the apostolic life is one of poverty and persecution. So he limits the Beatitudes to these matters, and expounds them from the end of Matt. 5, on loving our persecutors, and Matt. 7, not judging them, etc. Other topics can await a more leisured moment for exposition. Then, having already had the Leper (Matt. 8.1-4) at 5.12ff. in the Marcan sequence, he moves on to the Centurion's Boy, Matt. 8.5ff. = Luke 7.1-10.

There is now a break in the Matthaean sequence for the first time:

John's Question, and the material following, are brought forward (on my hypothesis) from Matt. 11.2-19. I have argued elsewhere (*The Evangelists' Calendar* [London, 1978]) that Matt. 11-13 were intended for use over the festal season New Year-Atonement-Tabernacles, as Matt. 26-28 were intended for Passover-Easter. Jesus' healings were a sign that God's reign had begun, the theme of New Year; his preaching as the greater than Jonah, and the Pharisees' rejection of forgiveness in Matt. 12 were a topic for Atonement; the harvest parables of Matt. 13 were a Christian message for Tabernacles. It was a strong support for this that the same topics were to be found in Mark: Mark 1, the coming of God's reign, Mark 2, forgiveness, Mark 4, the harvest parables. We should then have an explanation for the similar sequence in Luke: 7.18-34, the Baptist's Question (as in Matthew); 7.36-50, the Sinner forgiven (with echoes of Mark 2, already used for Atonement); 8.4-18, the harvest parables, for Tabernacles. For the argument, I must refer the reader to my book.

But even without the Lectionary hypothesis, there is little difficulty explaining Luke's bringing forward the Baptist's Question. Julius Wellhausen, *Das Evangelium Lucae* (Berlin, 1904), suggested that Luke has now had the preaching to the πωχοί following the leper and other healings in chs. 5-6; he only requires a raising story (7.11-17) and some blind people (rather hurried on in 7.21) to enable Jesus to come out with the famous answer. Indeed, my theory is only a liturgical form of Wellhausen's; he offers a topical, I a calendrical urgency for claiming the fulfilment of the Isa. 35 and 61 prophecies.

This insertion, and the (L) Sinner following, bring us to the end of Luke 7, and there are three verses, 8.1-3, before we return to the Marcan sequence. Jesus goes preaching, accompanied by the Twelve, and certain women who had been healed (τεθεραπευμένοι) from evil πνεύματα and ἀσθενεῖαι; Mary from whom seven δαίμονια had gone out, and many others who ministered (διηκόνου) to them. Now it is at such a moment that hypotheses like ours can be put to the test. If Luke has really been following Matthew as carefully as I have been suggesting, then he should be doing so here too. Well, we left Matthew at the Centurion's Boy, 8.13, and the next story is the healing of Peter's mother-in-law: we have had her in the Marcan section, but she ministered to him (διηκόνει). Then, 8.16f., Jesus was brought many δαίμονιζομένους, and he cast out the πνεύματα and healed (ἐθεράπευσεν) the sick, so fulfilling Isaiah, 'He took our ἀσθενεῖας'. That is a lot of words to find in common, and it suggests

a process of which we shall find a number of examples, a process which I shall call 'substitution': that is, *where Luke has already used a topic in the Marcan sequence, he may provide a similar substitute when he reaches that topic in the Matthaean sequence.*

This brings us to Matt. 8.18, 'And Jesus, seeing a crowd about him, commanded to depart to the other side', with the Storm to follow. The fuller account of the Storm, and succeeding incidents, is in Mark 4.35ff, but the crowd might be from the preceding Marcan Parables Discourse, which Luke has not yet given. He therefore turns over to Mark 4.1, and follows Mark, virtually in sequence, though with minor and major omissions, almost to the end of Mark 9. As he had left Mark at Mark 3.19, the Call of the Twelve, all that has been left out is the Beelzebul story and the Mother and Brothers. The latter he appends deftly to the Sower sermon at Luke 8.19-21; the former he prefers to tell in its fuller Matthaean form. This is not the place for an account of Luke's omissions from Mark in Luke 9; but we may see that he must leave Mark before Jesus reaches the borders of Judaea at Mark 10.1; there is a lot of Galilaean matter from Matthew to fill in before he gets that far.

II

What then does Luke seem to do with the rest of Matthew's Galilaean ministry? Mark 9.30ff. speaks of Jesus travelling through Galilee with a view to his passion, so Luke opens the Journey at 9.51 with Jesus' setting his face for Jerusalem. He then moves over to Matthew once more, and as he had left Matthew at 8.18 with the Storm, he begins from the omitted section, Matt. 8.19-22, the aspiring disciples and the sayings about foxes and burying the dead. These are linked with the refusal of the Samaritans to accept him; so (we are to understand) Jesus could not travel south, but turns east along the Galilee-Samaria border, where he still is at Luke 17.11.

Matt. 8-9 had been mostly close to the Marcan text, and the next considerable new section is Matt. 9.35ff., 'The harvest is plenteous', which prepares for the Mission Discourse in Matt. 10. These are the topics next covered in Luke, then (10.1-16): 'The harvest is plenteous' (Matt. 9.37f.), the first part of the Discourse (Matt. 10.7-16), and its last verse (Matt. 10.40). As Luke shortened the Marcan Parables Discourse, so does he here. Matthew expanded Mark 6.7-13 with much material on persecution, and this Luke leaves by as not

immediately relevant; but he does allow the mention of Sodom and Gomorrah (Matt. 10.15 = Luke 10.12) to attract in the Tyre and Sidon logia from Matt. 11.21-23 (Luke 10.13-15).

The first nineteen verses of Matt. 11 have been taken already, the Baptist's Question; so this brings Luke to Matt. 11.25-27, the logion on the wise and the babes. He interprets this, as Matthew does, of the acceptance of the gospel by the disciples and its rejection by the leaders of Israel, but emphasizes the mission situation as its occasion (Luke 10.17-22). Again he draws in a subsidiary saying to stress his point. The Son has revealed the gospel to his disciples; 'Blessed are the eyes which see what you see . . .', follows on aptly from Matt. 13.16f.

Matthew proceeds to the Yoke logia (11.28-30), and to an expanded version of the Marcan Cornfield (12.1-8). Luke has told the Cornfield already, but there is a brief note in Matthew's expansion which is close to Luke's heart, 'I desire ἔλεος and not sacrifice'; and this, I suggest, he expands. The same theme is to be found in the story of the Great Commandment, for there the scribe had said that to love one's neighbour was more than all holocausts and sacrifices. Matthew has Jesus say (12.6), 'A greater than the Temple is here'. So Luke brings forward the story of the scribe who asked about the Great Commandment, and he has Jesus reply with the story of the priest and the Levite who left the wounded man by the roadside, while the Samaritan was a true neighbour to him, and did mercy (ἔλεος) with him. I think there may be another reason for so bold a transfer; but I do not think Luke lacked a Matthaean text to justify his order.

But what of the Yoke logia? Here is my boldest suggestion. I think that Luke liked the teaching but was repelled by the image; for 'burdens' hard to bear were imposed by the lawyers in Luke 11.46, and the Law was a 'yoke' with which the Lucan church had dispensed (Acts 15.10). So in Luke 10.38-42 he draws the picture of Mary sister of Martha coming to Jesus and receiving rest for her soul, while Martha is cumbered about with the yoke of service. In 11.1-13 Jesus lays on his disciples the light yoke of his discipline—to say the Lord's Prayer, and to keep praying. There is no verbal support for these suggestions, and there might be other reasons for the order here—I have suggested elsewhere that Luke took the Lord's Prayer as a Christian substitute for the *Shema*; or there is the influence of the Elisha cycle.

With 11.14ff., the Beelzebul story, we are back to Matt. 12 without

any hesitations. In 12.22-30 Matthew describes the controversy itself, and Luke follows him closely in Luke 11.14-23, though he draws in some words from the similar incident in Matt. 9.32-34, and the request for a sign from Matt. 12.38. Matthew rounds the story off with three appendages, 12.31-37 on blasphemy, 12.38-42 on the sign of Jonah, and 12.43-45 on the seven demons. As usual Luke prefers a more compact story, and the piece that rounds off an exorcism tale most effectively is unquestionably the seven demons, which he transcribes in 11.24-26. We have not long to wait for the other two appendages; and Luke 11.16, on the sign, suggests that the sign appendage was in Luke's *Vorlage*.

After Beelzebul, Matthew returns to Mark, with the Mother-and-Brothers at 12.46-50: whoever does the will of Jesus' Father is his true family. Now we come upon a second striking substitute. Luke has already told this story at 8.19ff. in the Marcan section, and he tells of a brief incident in which a woman in the crowd spoke of Jesus' mother being blessed, but he replied, 'Blessed rather are those who hear the word of God and keep it'. It looks as if Luke is following the Matthaean order, and has composed a substitute for Matt. 12.46-50 to save the duplication, much as he did at 8.1-3.

At Luke 11.29-36 we have the omitted Sign of Jonah from Matt. 12.38-42. Luke takes the Sign to be not so much the Resurrection as the preaching, so there is some restyling; and the theme is then expanded with some other material. Luke thought the gospel was a light to lighten the Gentiles, so he adapts Matt. 5.15 with the lamp on the stand giving light to all who enter the house; and he adds the light sayings from Matt. 6.22-23.

III

Luke has now covered Matt. 1-12, and faces a new decision of policy: for in Matt. 1-12 there is an enormously expanded form of Mark 1-3, while Matt. 13-28 is only a mildly expanded form of Mark 4-16. In Matt. 1-12 there are considerable divergences from the Marcan order; Matt. 13-28 virtually follows the Marcan order. But Luke has already given the events of Mark 4-9, and he means to return to Mark for the order of Mark 10-16. So all he has to do now is to cover the little pieces which Matthew has added to Mark in the second half of his Gospel; and these are to a large extent concentrated in Matt. 23 and 24.37-25.46. Luke could have ploughed straight on through

Matt. 13, but he feels no compulsion to do this. All that remains is sayings material, and Luke no doubt knew that the sayings were not in chronological order in either of his predecessors. What he in fact does is to combine the washing controversy of Matt. 15.1ff. with the controversy in Matt. 23 on washing cups, and other matters. Once he is in Matt. 23, he stays there; we will consider in a moment what he does with the enormous chasm he has overleapt. For the moment he abbreviates Matt. 23, as he has every other discourse. Matthew had seven Woes addressed to the scribes and Pharisees. Luke cuts these in half, just as he turned Matthew's eight Beatitudes into four Beatitudes and four Woes in ch. 6; he selects the three most cogent instances of hypocritical piety with which to reproach the Pharisees (tithing, seating, and being hidden tombs), and the three best charges of oppression for the lawyers (loads hard to bear, prophets' tombs, and the key of knowledge). The prophets' tombs do not fit the lawyers very well.

Luke shows us, as he opens ch. 12, that he has not done with the theme of Pharisaic hypocrisy from Matt. 23, and he expounds it by rewriting 'There is nothing hidden which shall not be revealed . . .' from Matt. 10.26ff. But the particular form of hypocrisy Luke is concerned about is described in Matthew's rewriting of Mark in Matt. 24.9-14, 'Then they will hand you over to tribulation and will kill you . . . Then many will be scandalized . . . and the love of many will wax cold.' This passage naturally then leads him further into Matt. 10, since it was there that Matthew gave a fuller and more memorable account of Christians under persecution for their faith—and indeed Luke postponed this section of Matt. 10 till the topic should come up. So once more we have a kind of substitute; only this time it is with a linked passage of Matthew. Luke draws in the 'fear not . . .' passage, 'your hairs are numbered', confessing and denying the Son of Man and the inspiration of the Holy Spirit from Matt. 10; and adds the blasphemy against the Spirit from Matt. 12.

Luke 12.13-40 is a long section on the coming judgment; it opens with the (L) Rich Fool, and closes with the Thief in the Night from Matt. 24.43f. The latter is preceded by a shortened form of the Bridesmaids from Matt. 25.1-13; the Christians' lights are to be burning, and they like men (this time) waiting for their Lord on his coming from his wedding—blessed are those servants whom the Lord on his coming will find awake. So the climax of the section is drawn from the end of Matt. 24 and beginning of Matt. 25; and the

Rich Fool carries the same moral, except that Matthew still expected judgment to come with the Lord's Parousia, while Luke has come to think of it at our death. Between the Fool and the Marriage Luke has inserted the long passage on wealth from Matt. 6, which takes up the themes of caring for one's soul, gathering corn into one's barns, and laying up treasure on earth; but the judgment sections before and after show that the stress is on 'a treasure that fails not in heaven'.

Luke 12.41-13.9 continues the theme of judgment, which is expanded into repentance. It opens with the parable of the faithful and wise Servant, and the wicked Servant, from Matt. 24.45-51. Luke expands this with other texts from elsewhere in Matthew which he bends to his purpose: the 'five in a house' which Jesus' coming divides, from Matt. 10.34-36 (but perhaps Luke's 'five' have come from the five bridesmaids—note the *νύμφη*); the cloud rising in the west, perhaps suggested by Christ's coming on the clouds for judgment in Matt. 24.30; and the settlement on the road before judgment from Matt. 5.25f. The L material on repentance in 13.1-9 reaches its climax in the parable of the Fig-Tree, which is often taken to be a parable form of Mark 11.12-14 // Matt. 21.18f.; but there is reference to the parable of the Fig-Tree in Matt. 24.32 also. Thus the leading theme of the section is drawn from Matt. 24.45ff., and Luke may either have elaborated this from elsewhere as he pleased, or he may have substituted again for topics in the surrounding discourse.

We have not left Matt. 24-25 in the section following, on the condemnation of Israel. The (L) Bent Woman is concerned with the rejection of Jesus by the synagogues (13.10-17); 'so he said', says Luke making a connection, that the Church will grow into a great tree full of (Gentile) birds (Matt. 13.31-33). But the paragraph then moves on to our need to enter the narrow door, lest the Lord shut it, and we are left standing outside knocking; we may knock, but he will say, 'I know you not'. Luke has had the first part of Matt. 25.1-13, readiness for the return of the Lord from his wedding, at Luke 12.35ff.; now he has the close of the parable, 'The door was shut . . . Lord open to us . . . I know you not' (Matt. 25.10-12). He introduces this with an adaptation of the gate in Matt. 7.13f., and there is a further adaptation of the 'Many will come from east and west . . . logion in Matt. 8.11. But the scene is not based upon these texts, but upon the Judgment scene in Matt. 25. Luke's 'Then (*τότε*) you will begin to say, We ate and drank before you . . . And he will say (*ἐπεῖ*), Depart from me, all workers of injustice', goes back to Matthew's

'Then he will say (*τότε ἐρεῖ*) also to those on the left, Go from me, you cursed . . . For I was hungry and you gave me not to eat, I was thirsty and you gave me not to drink.' Matt. 7.22f. is printed alongside Luke 13.26 by Aland and Greeven, but the details are different, and also the meaning. For Luke is concerned with eating and drinking, not prophesying and miracles, and Matt. 25 is primary; even 'There shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth' is probably drawn in via Matt. 25.30.

IV

So, according to our hypothesis, Luke has now run through the non-Marcian sections of Matthew. Sometimes he has copied the matter word for word (especially in the early sections, the Baptist's Sermon and Temptations); sometimes he has emended freely, so much so that we need our Ariadne's thread to find our way through the labyrinth after him. But he has gone through Matt. 1-12 and 23-25, we may feel, carefully and in order, even if he has made a number of surprising omissions. And now, dear reader, you are St Luke, and there is the scroll of Matthew on the table before you, and the rolled up portion is Matt. 1-25, and the next words in Matt. 26 open the Passion narrative. You are aware that you have not even been through Matt. 13-22 for non-Marcian gems: what would be your policy? Well, I hope you will not think me a crank for suggesting it; but the obvious move seems to me *to go back through the rolled up scroll, and to take the missing pieces as they come, backwards*. It is true that this will involve sacrificing the principle of order; but then Luke has only teaching, no incidents, to concern himself with in the gleaning process—and in fact his leap from Matt. 12 to Matt. 23 necessarily involved gleaning in some form, and therefore the sacrifice of the Matthaean order *in toto*.

Policies often spring from small decisions, and we may first notice a small point. After the Great Assize, Jesus says (Matt. 26.2), 'You know that after two days is the Passover, and the Son of Man is handed over to be crucified'. After the Lucan Assize, 13.24-30, Jesus says, 'I cast out demons today and tomorrow, and the third day I am perfected'; he explains that he means his death in Jerusalem. Now this is not a Q-logion, but it looks very like another of the substitutes, an L-logion in place of a Matthaean redaction of Mark, which we found with the ministering women and 'Blessed rather are those who