

hear the word of God and keep it'. But the death of Jesus at Jerusalem draws in the thought of Matt. 23.37-39, 'O Jerusalem, Jerusalem . . .' The rolled up section is reopened a short length, and an instinct is on the way to becoming a policy.

In his Woes in ch. 11 Luke covered the second half of Matt. 23 extensively, but the first part barely. There remain from the chapter (a) the opening verse on the scribes and Pharisees laying down the law in an oppressive manner, (b) their pride in taking the chief seats at dinners, etc., (c) 23.12, 'Whoever shall exalt himself shall be humbled, and whoever shall humble himself shall be exalted', (d) material on oaths, etc., which is a little precious for Luke. However in 14.1-14, immediately following 'Jerusalem, Jerusalem . . .', he gives us a scene in which all the first three points crop up: (a) 14.1-6, the man with dropsy, who is healed in the teeth of legalist objections by 'the lawyers and Pharisees', (b) 14.7-14, in which the dinner-guests choose the chief seats, and are warned against such pride, and (c) 14.11, 'Everyone who exalts himself shall be humbled, and he who humbles himself shall be exalted'. So Luke has now done and re-done Matt. 23.

Turning back, then, to Matt. 22, we find the latter two-thirds of the chapter to be solid Marcan material, which Luke will expound in Luke 20. There is, however, an important Matthaean innovation in the parable of the Royal Wedding Feast, 22.1-14, and here, next in the Lucan order, at 14.16-24, comes Luke's version of the same, the Great Dinner. Luke cuts out the impossible allegorical element with the army, and reduces the royal scale to his familiar middle class, but he leaves behind traces of other Matthaean details in the surrounding matter. Thus Matthew had a Wedding Feast, Luke a dinner; but in the setting of the parable Jesus says, not very pointedly, 'When you are invited by anyone to a *wedding*'. Matthew closed the parable with the unworthy guest who was cast into outer darkness; cf. the Lucan disciple of 14.34, who will not detach himself from his possessions—*ἔξω βάλλουσιν αὐτό*. Not one diamond shall be lost from the Matthaean tiara: all must be included.

The Cost of Discipleship, Luke 14.25-35, is a subject close to our evangelist's heart, and not to be dismissed so briefly. He opens it with a version of Matt. 10.37f., 'He who loves father or mother . . .', and closes it with a form of Matt. 5.13, 'If the salt has lost its taste . . .' But the substance of the section is the two short parables, the man who wished to build a tower (*πύργον οἰκοδομῆσαι*), and the king

who sent (*ἀποστειλάς*) an embassy of peace. Now if our scroll-rolling hypothesis is correct, we ought to find something that could serve as a suggestion for these two parables in Matt. 21, before the Wedding Feast. Matt. 21 ends with the Marcan Husbandmen: 'A householder man planted a vineyard, and built a wall round it and dug a press in it and built a tower (*οἰκοδόμησεν πύργον*) . . . and at harvest-time he sent (*ἀπέστειλεν*) his servants'. Although the words are not too uncommon, these are the only two occasions in the NT when someone builds a tower, and the connection of a subsequent embassy in both cases is not negligible; we have here yet another possibility of a Lucan substitute, an L passage taking the place of the next piece in the Matthaean order, where Matthew is over-writing Mark.

Immediately before Matthew's Husbandmen comes a further Matthaean intrusion, 21.28-32, the rather colourless little parable that begins 'A man had two children'. One of the sons refused to work in his father's vineyard, but later repented and did; and he is said to be like the publicans and harlots who will enter the kingdom. The other son said Yes, but didn't work, and he is said to be like the Jewish leaders, who did not repent. Now in the next scene in Luke after the Cost of Discipleship, Jesus is found preaching to publicans and sinners with a crowd of murmuring Pharisees to criticize him. He develops the theme of the Lost Sheep from Matt. 18.12ff. which is concerned with God's joy at the repentance of sinners, before telling his own incomparable version of the Two Sons parable. He opens, like Matthew, 'A certain man had two sons'. The first of these does not want to work in the family estate, and goes off and spends his patrimony; but afterwards he comes to himself, goes back to confess his fault and is willing to work with his father's hirelings—he is the repentant sinner. The other does the work, but resents his father's good-heartedness to the prodigal—he is the Pharisee. It would be difficult to think of a more striking candidate for Lucan substitute, though this time it is for what has traditionally been regarded as an M passage rather than one where Matthew is rewriting Mark.

There is only one considerable Matthaean intrusion into the previous two and a half chapters of Marcan incident: the Labourers in the Vineyard. Luke has left this out; perhaps he thought it rather similar to the Two Sons in the vineyard which he has just used; or perhaps he felt that he had taken its theme, 'The last shall be first . . .', not long since at Luke 13.30. The rest he will take up in the Marcan sequence in Luke 18-19. So that brings him back to Matt.

18, where there is indeed considerable new Matthaean material; and where in fact he has already begun to press his thinking, with the Lost Sheep. Matt. 18 ends with a parable on the importance of remitting debt, that is sin. There are three characters in the story: the king (i.e. God) who is owed a fabulous sum by his 'servant' (who is 'us'), and who in turn is owed a small sum by a 'fellow-servant' (who is the man who has offended against 'us'). The king makes an account (λόγος) with the servant, and lets him off; the servant demands of his fellow-servant, 'pay what you owe! (ἀπόδος εἴ τι ὀφείλεις)', and refuses to let him off; and the king then sends the unremitting servant to hell. The parable following the Two Sons in Luke is the Unjust Steward, which has the same structure, and the same moral. There is an owner who says to his steward, 'Give an account (λόγος) of your stewardship!' The account is temporarily stayed, and the steward summons his sub-debtors, saying to each, 'How much do you owe (πόσον ὀφείλεις)?' He then remits a suitable part of the debt, and so secures his future from their goodwill. The evangelists concur. How foolish, says Matthew, to insist upon the trivial wrongs done to us, when our eternal future depends upon the forgiveness of God! How wise, says Luke, to remit debts due to us, and so secure our eternal future with the angels in heaven! Luke cannot abide Matthew's fairy-tale style, though, with its oriental despot, its multi-millionaire satrap, its torture-chamber and the rest. He goes for down-to-earth situations as always, with believable debts payable in familiar produce, and a colourful ambiguous hero given to Lucan-style soliloquy. The parable would have been a great success if only Luke could have resisted the temptation to complicate it with the stewardship theme from Matthew's Talents; but that is another story.

The train of thought of the next Lucan paragraph, 16.14-31, is a standing problem. It contains the following elements: (a) the Pharisees were money-lovers, and Dives goes to hell for his love of money and contempt of the poor; (b) the Pharisees justify themselves before men, and are odious to God; (c) the law and the prophets were till John, but now the kingdom is preached, and everyone forces his way in; (d) nevertheless (δέ) it is easier (εὐκοπώτερον) for the universe to pass away than for one tittle to fall—i.e. presumably to become invalid (cf. later 'they have Moses and the prophets'); (e) remarriage is no better than adultery. Luke does not write inconsequential nonsense elsewhere, and we should consider, at least from motives of

charity, whether there may be some rational explanation for such an apparent muddle. Now our labyrinthine thread has given us an opportunity not open to those before us. On our hypothesis Luke is sitting looking at a scroll of Matthew open at the end of Matt. 18. He has just rolled back a good length, two and a half chapters. It would not be implausible for his eye to fall on Matt. 19; and it may be an encouragement to think so when we notice the rare word εὐκοπώτερον at Matt. 19.24, 'It is easier for a camel to pass through the eye of a needle than for a rich man (πλούσιον) to enter the kingdom of God'. But the Lucan parable is about riches as a bar to heaven! Here is point (a), the Pharisees' cupidity, illustrated by 16.19, 'There was a certain rich man (πλούσιος)', and his subsequent tormented afterlife. Furthermore, the Rich Ruler in Matt. 19 is the clearest text we have for the teaching that the gospel requires more than the Law (viz. 'selling all'); and this will provide a pointful meaning for the contrast in point (c), 'The law and the prophets were till John; from then the kingdom is evangelized'. Indeed, in Matthew the rich man asked how he should gain eternal life, and he was told, 'keep the commandments'; so there is point (d), no tittle shall fall from the law, they have Moses and the prophets. Jesus specifies in the Matthaean text, 'Thou shalt not murder, thou shalt not commit adultery, μοιχεύσεις'; and here we have point (e), remarriage is adultery. In the Marcan, and both the Matthaean versions of the remarriage text, 'he commits adultery' is μοιχῶται—only Luke has μοιχεύει. So the verb could come from Matt. 19.18; and the closest form of the remarriage text to Luke is the Vaticanus version of Matt. 19.9, which is read by Greeven. The two have in common, against both Mark and Matt. 5.32, (i) 'he commits adultery', absolutely, at the end of both sentences, (ii) ὁ ἀπολελυμένην γαμῶν/—ήσας, participial, in the second clause.

So it looks as if we have the key to Luke's thinking. The only missing point is (b), the Pharisee's justification of himself before men; and this seems to come from Matt. 6.1-18, where the Pharisees do their righteousness to be seen of men, but God sees in secret. Luke has just concluded the Steward with the Mammon saying from Matt. 6.24. For the rest, as he looks at Matt. 19 he thinks of the rich man as a proud Pharisee, just as he turned the innocent Simon of Mark 14 into Simon the Pharisee of Luke 7. These people derided Jesus in their self-conceit, thinking they could force their way into the kingdom; but now we have not only to keep the law, but to give away our possessions as well. The rich man in Matthew refused to see this.

But the whole law is still valid—for instance the marriage law which the Pharisees also disputed in Matt. 19.3-9. In fact so far from giving all to the poor, they live like Dives, and to hell they will go. It is Matt. 19 which shows us the thrust of this over-compact section. It would have been neater if Luke had put Dives, etc., before the Steward, as Matt. 19 is before Matt. 18 in our supposed scroll-rolling; but I am not arguing for neatness, but for plausibility.

With Luke 17.1-10, on πίστις, we are on easier ground. Luke has covered the Remission of Debt parable; now he moves back to the first half of Matt. 18. First he treats Matt. 18.6f., the scandalizing of the little ones, and the millstone; then Matt. 18.15, 'If your brother sins, rebuke him . . .'; then Matt. 18.21f., forgiveness seven times and more. The discussion of who was greatest, Matt. 18.1-5, Luke has given in the Marcan sequence; the Lost Sheep, Matt. 18.12-14, he has expounded already. Visiting sinners with witnesses, etc., is a bit legalistic for Luke. But with only four verses out of the first half of Matt. 18, he needs more material to make a lesson, and moves back into Matt. 17. The Coin in the Fish's Mouth he also omits, but before that, at Matt. 17.20, is πίστις as a grain of mustard seed, the only other Matthaean introduction into a Marcan chapter; illustrated by the Servant of All Work, a parable of faithfulness.

Luke 17.11-19 is the Ten Lepers. The story is opened with the astonishing comment that Jesus is passing through Samaria and Galilee en route for Jerusalem. It contrasts the grateful Samaritan with the nine thankless Jews, as he kneels before the Lord who has 'had mercy on him' (ἐλέησον). We cannot come so far without noting that N-A<sup>26</sup> puts 'Mt 17.15!' alongside, for there Matthew tells of the father who knelt before Jesus and asked him to have mercy (ἐλέησον) on his son; and Christ had lamented the faithless generation he must be with. The Lucan context suggests (17.19 [cf. 17.5]; 18.8) that he thinks of gratitude as πίστις, so the central point, and the contrast with 'this faithless generation', and the image of the kneeling man are the same. Luke has taken Mark's possessed boy in Luke 9, so here is another of his 'substitutes', the leper material coming from Mark 1 and 4 Kgdms 5. The journey through Galilee to Jerusalem is taken from Matt. 17.22, 'While they were gathering in Galilee, Jesus said to them, The Son of Man is to be delivered . . .'

And so we come to the last Q pericope in the Journey, 17.20-37, the Day of the Son of Man. Synopses print Matt. 24 sections alongside it, but not in sequence, and commentators note some uncomfortable

veering of thought. Why the Pharisees' opening question (ἐπερωτηθεῖς), when the discourse is to the disciples? Why 'the kingdom of God comes not with watching', when the discourse gives the signs of the Day of the Son of Man? Why, when we are being told that the Son of Man will come like lightning, is it said, 'But first he must suffer many things and be reviled from this generation'? How can it be sensible to say of that Day, 'He that would gain his life shall lose it, and he who loses his life will preserve it'? Well, before Matt. 17 comes Matt. 16, and Matt. 16 opens with the Pharisees questioning (ἐμπρωτέρων) Jesus and asking for a sign; but, he replies, they shall have no sign but the sign of Jonah. Then (after two Marcan incidents) Matthew gives his version of the teaching on Jesus' coming sufferings, and his return in judgment. 16.21, 'He must suffer many things from the elders . . .'; 16.25, 'He that would save his life shall lose it, and he who loses his life for my sake shall find it'; 16.27, 'For the Son of Man is to come in the glory of his father with his angels, and then will he render to every man after his work'; 16.28, 'They will see the Son of Man coming in his kingdom'.

As with Luke 16.14ff., there is a hidden thread on which the Matthaean pearls are strung. Luke takes the Matt. 16 verses in order, 16.1, 4, 21, 25, while the Son of Man's coming (vv. 27f.) is the leitmotif of the whole. The Matt. 24 verses are not in order, and are used to expound the Matt. 16 text as is convenient. The Pharisees' question comes first, and Jesus' answer, 'No sign', is interpreted as 'not with watching . . . here or there', as in Matt. 24.23; and the 'here or there' of Matt. 24.26, and the ἀστραπή logion following, are resumed in 17.23-24. Luke then returns, somewhat inconsequentially, to Matt. 16.21, 'First he must suffer' (17.25), before resuming the theme of the day of the Son of Man. The beckoning text for this is the Noah logion (Matt. 24.37-39), to which Luke adds a Lot parallel of his own. 'Remember Lot's wife' leads him back to Matt. 16.25, 'He who would save his life . . .', for she was saving hers, and lost it. And so to the couples in bed and at the mill, and to the eagles. The actual imminent coming of the Son of Man to judgment (Matt. 16.27f.) is developed in the parable of the Widow and the Judge: 'I say to you, he will vindicate them soon. But when the Son of Man comes, will he find faithfulness on the earth?' (Luke 18.8). Thus the Matt. 16 texts provide the string, and the Matt. 24 texts the pearls.

Well now, men and brethren, what shall we say to these things? We have seen reason to think that, if Luke were familiar with Matthew as well as Mark, he would have been likely to attempt a reconciliation of them. For 1.5-9.50 there seemed to be evidence that this is what he has done: following Matt. 1-4.11 (with replacements) down to Luke 4.13, and Matt. 5.1-8.10 from Luke 6.20-7.10; and skilfully using the Matthaean summaries to bring in blocks of Mark. Thus Matt. 4.12f. was used to bring in the Rejection at Nazara, Luke 4.14-30; Matt. 4.13b-17 was taken as equivalent to Mark 1.21-39, Capernaum and the first mission, Luke 4.31-44; the Call of the first disciples then fell in the Matthaean sequence, Matt. 4.18-22 // Luke 5.1-11; Matt. 4.23 then gave opportunity for Jesus' healing ministry of Mark 1.40-3.6 = Luke 5.12-6.11; and Matt. 4.24f., the great crowds, accounted for the reversing of the crowds (Mark 3.7-12) and the Call of the Twelve (Mark 3.13-19) in Luke 6.12-19. There was a similar use of Matt. 8.14-17 in Luke 8.1-3. The overall neatness of this account was disturbed by the bringing forward of the Baptist's Question and following matter, Matt. 11.2-19, for which I offered my own calendrical explanation, or, as an alternative, Wellhausen's topical theory.

For the first part of the Journey, we found an extension of this process. Luke could be seen as resuming Matthew where he had left off, with the Aspiring Disciples, Matt. 8.19-22 // Luke 9.56-60; and following him with 'The harvest is plenteous . . .', Matt. 9.37f. // Luke 10.2, the Mission Discourse, Matt. 10.7-16, 40 // Luke 10.3-16, the Woes on the Cities, Matt. 11.21-24 // Luke 10.13-15, 'I thank you, Father . . .', Matt. 11.25-27 // Luke 10.21f., the Beelzebul pericope, Matt. 12.22-45 // Luke 11.14-26, 29-32, and Jesus' True Family, Matt. 12.46-50, cf. Luke 11.27f. The last raised an interesting question, because it appeared that Luke was writing a substitute for the next unit of Matthew, which happened to be a Matthaean redaction of verses in Mark which Luke had had earlier, at 8.19-21. If so, then it seemed that Luke knew Matt.R., or in other words Matthew; and it was possible to suggest that the 'missing' pieces of Matthew in Matt. 11.28-12.7 had also been substituted for, 'I desire mercy and not sacrifice' with the Good Samaritan, the Easy Yoke with Mary and the Lord's Prayer.

Luke not only seems to substitute on occasion; he also may be seen as adding in texts from elsewhere which are to his point, as he added 'Blessed are the eyes . . .' to the Babes logion. This realization

delivers us from the wooden interpretations that draw lines between tables of pericopae, and purport to show little relation of order between Luke and Matthew after Matt. 12. In fact a reason can be offered for Luke to have pretermitted the mainly Marcan matter in Matt. 13-22; and Luke 11.37-13.33 seem to rest on a chain of Matthaean texts in Matt. 23-26.2. The Woes on Pharisees and Lawyers, Luke 11.37-53, follow Matt. 23; Fearless Confession, Luke 12.1-12, follows sections of Matt. 10, whose original context was Mark 13 = Matt. 24.9-14; Readiness for the Hereafter, Luke 12.13-40, follows Matthew's Thief, 24.43f., and his Return from the Marriage, 25.1ff., amplified by the Cares logia from Matt. 6; Repentance, Luke 12.41-13.9, expands Matt. 24.45-51, the Two Servants; Judgment, Luke 13.10-30, takes up the end of the Marriage parable in Matt. 25.10-13, and the rejection of the reprobate in Matt. 24.30-46; and the Two-Days-then-Martyrdom saying, Luke 13.31-33, looks like a version of Matt. 26.2. Here again it seems possible to account for the Lucan order on the basis of Luke's knowledge of Matthew. Most of the links in the chain are obvious. Of the two 'substitutes', the Fearless Confession is plausible without being evident, but the coincidence of order and content with Matt. 26.1f. is rather impressive, and again with Matt.R.

It is the second half of the Journey which seems to me to settle the question. The process suggested, that Luke set out to cover Matthew's additions to Mark in Matt. 13-23 by going back up the scroll, is psychologically believable. The remaining Lucan material till he rejoins Mark runs from 13.34 to 18.14, and it has been possible to suggest correspondences (often multiple correspondences) for the whole of this section down to 18.8. This covers ten pericopae, and they follow the (reversed) order of Matthew continuously, with the sole exception of the Matt. 19 parallels following the Matt. 18.23-35 parallels. The Matthaean matter used starts from 'Jerusalem, Jerusalem . . .' just before where Luke has got to, and goes back to the beginning of Matt. 16; and Luke has either used from Mark, or deliberately omitted, most of Matt. 13-15.

The correspondences may be seen most clearly in a table:

13.34f.	Jerusalem, Jerusalem	Matt. 23.37-39
14.1-14	Pharisaic legalism, best seats, humility	Matt. 23.6-12
14.15-24	The Great Dinner, based on	Matt. 22.1-14
14.25-35	The Tower-Builder and Embassy, based on	Matt. 21.33f. R

- 15.1-31 Pharisees and Sinners: The Two Sons, based on Matt. 21.28-32
- 16.1-13 The Steward who remitted debts, based on Matt. 18.23-35
- 16.14-31 Harder for the rich to enter heaven . . . Matt. 19.9, 16-26R
- 17.1-10 Offences, Forgiveness, Faith Matt. 18.6-21; 17.20
- 17.11-19 Ten Lepers, based on Matt. 17.14-23
- 17.20-18.8 The Coming of the Son of Man, based on Matt. 16R, with 24.

(R indicates a passage where Matthew is rewriting Mark.)

It is impossible that such a sequence should occur by accident; and several of the passages are Matt.R.

Our task has in some ways resembled that of an archaeologist uncovering a building that has been twice rebuilt. The pillars and stones of the first building (Mark) were in part incorporated as they stood by the second builder (Matthew), and in part moved and refashioned. It has been clear for many years that the third builder (Luke) was working on a modification of the original structure (Mark); the question has been whether he was aware of the second builder. We have seen that the third builder in fact modifies the second design as well as the first over Luke 1.5-13.33; and in places that he uses the refashioned stones, or supplies similar ones (substitutes). But over 13.34-18.8 he has done something much easier to see, once we are looking for it. He has taken out the second builder's additions to, and some adaptations of, the first, and built them into an extension of his own; and he has taken them in sequence. So Luke's knowledge of Matthew seems to be multiply confirmed, and his ordering of Matthew shown to be, on the whole, careful, rational and indeed sophisticated. I should like to propose that Canon Streeter owes St Luke an apology.

## THE CREDIBILITY OF LUKE'S TRANSFORMATION OF MATTHEW

H. Benedict Green CR

College of the Resurrection  
Mirfield, West Yorkshire

If Luke had known the gospel of Matthew, could he have used it with the freedom that the hypothesis requires that he did? In the practice of the critical mainstream this has been virtually reduced to a rhetorical question, the repetition of which is held sufficient to dispense the scholar from serious consideration of evidence that might bear the other way;<sup>1</sup> the case is never really heard. To treat it as, on the contrary, a real question, as I propose to do, implies the possibility of an affirmative answer, which, while it will not itself establish the hypothesis, ought (in the best of possible worlds) to allow a fair hearing to what evidence there is in its favour.

Austin Farrer<sup>2</sup> was here before me. It would involve too much of a digression to analyse in detail the reasons why his argument failed as a whole to carry conviction with those to whom it was directed;<sup>2a</sup> briefly, though he correctly identified the objections and answered some of them effectively, he allowed himself to be sidetracked into a typological account of what Luke was about, where most of his readership could not follow him. I shall endeavour to stay closer to those I am arguing with.

I follow Farrer, however, in not seeking to dispense with Mark as a source as well as Q. That was being done in his time by Abbot (now Bishop) Butler in the interests of the Augustinian solution;<sup>3</sup> the inheritors of the Benedictine tradition of Matthaean priorism in this country have now gone over to the Griesbachian.<sup>4</sup> I do not find the newer fashion an improvement so far as understanding Luke is concerned, for the Augustinian hypothesis at least allowed Luke access to Mark as well as Matthew, and without this no plausible solution is likely to emerge. To derive Luke, with Griesbach, from Matthew alone seems to involve the same difficulties, especially in