

Chapter 7

MATTHEW'S ENDING AND THE GENESIS OF LUKE–ACTS: THE FARRER HYPOTHESIS AND THE BIRTH OF CHRISTIAN HISTORY

Jeffrey Peterson

Along with such scholarly endeavors as manuscript collation and stylometry, study of the Synoptic Problem is one of the more technically demanding subfields of NT study. Surveying the literature on the subject, one might be forgiven for concluding that it is largely a matter of computing redactional vocabulary and subjecting the text of the Synoptics to statistical analysis in order to assess their bearing on arguments about directions of dependence and probable literary relationships. Such close work is of course requisite to a proper consideration of a Synoptic hypothesis, and other contributions to this volume shoulder that burden admirably.

Statistical fluency, however, is not universal among gospels scholars, nor does everyone have the leisure or incentive to closely engage the arguments for and against competing Synoptic hypotheses on a regular basis. Of greater weight in the consciousness of most working scholars is the usefulness of a Synoptic hypothesis for an exegetical investigation of the gospels that produces coherent (and interesting) results.¹ Christopher Tuckett points to what is surely the most commonly held perception of the value of Synoptic hypotheses when he writes, ‘The extent to which an hypothesis gives a coherent, consistent picture of the redactional activity of each evangelist will...be a measure of its viability’.²

1. On ‘usefulness’ (*Brauchbarkeit*) in redaction criticism as a criterion for evaluating Synoptic hypotheses, see Peter M. Head, *Christology and the Synoptic Problem: An Argument for Markan Priority* (SNTSMS, 94; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), pp. 34–8, which traces this theme through the work of James Robinson, Joseph Fitzmyer, Christopher Tuckett, and John Kloppenborg, among others.

2. Christopher Tuckett, *The Revival of the Griesbach Hypothesis: An Analysis and Appraisal* (SNTSMS, 44; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), p. 30.

The present study is offered primarily to illustrate the exegetical results made available by holding to Marcan priority along with Luke's knowledge of both Mark and Matthew. I shall suggest that adopting this as one's working model for exegesis affords a more plausible account of Luke's decision to compose, as a companion piece to his *prōtos logos* surveying Jesus' life and ministry, a *deuteros logos* covering the ministry and travels of the disciples through the succeeding generation, tracing the progress of the word of God from Jesus' first Jewish followers in Judea through Samaria to Gentile lands and peoples, toward the ends of the earth (Acts 1.1-2, 8).³

Perhaps unsurprisingly, the book of Acts finds only scant mention in most considerations of the Synoptic Problem. The pattern for such consideration as Acts has received was set by John Hawkins's treatment of 'The Linguistic Relations between St. Luke's Gospel and Acts'.⁴ That is, Acts supplies students of the Synoptic Problem with a quarry, comparable in extent to the third gospel, from which to mine data relevant to assessing Luke's stylistic and redactional tendencies.⁵ Yet the Synoptic Problem is only one aspect of the attempt to trace the process of literary creation documented in the work of three early Christian author/editors, focusing particularly on the use of written sources that their extensive agreements compel us to posit. An evaluation of competing Synoptic hypotheses therefore requires attention to the literary project each evangelist set for himself and the manner in which he executed it, and if a *deuteros logos* formed part of Luke's literary project from its conception (as I believe can be shown), then a full accounting requires a consideration of how competing Synoptic hypotheses might inform our understanding of the composition of Acts. When the Synoptic Problem is conceived of as one aspect of the attempt to clarify the aims and compositional processes involved in the production of early Christian gospels and related literature, it seems that in principle Acts may deserve more consideration than it has heretofore received in this connection.⁶

3. 'Luke' is used here for the author of the third gospel and Acts, but nothing crucial to the argument depends on his traditional identification as the missionary associate of Paul, nor on a first-century date of composition for Luke or Acts.

4. John C. Hawkins, *Horae Synopticae: Contributions to the Study of the Synoptic Problem* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1899), pp. 140–58.

5. See, for example, Michael D. Goulder, *Luke: A New Paradigm* (JSNTSup, 20; 2 vols.; Sheffield: JSOT, 1989), vol. 1, pp. 79–123; vol. 2, pp. 800–809; Mark S. Goodacre, *Goulder and the Gospels: An Examination of a New Paradigm* (JSNTSup, 133; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1996), esp. pp. 42–291.

6. Francis Watson has recently offered such a consideration of early Christian gospels and found the FH fruitful for this, but his work conforms to the common

The exegete must of course first be given at least *prima facie* grounds for considering the FH as an alternative to the 2DH, and here recent scholarship offers encouragement. The crucial question on which a decision between the 2DH and the FH turns is whether Luke knew and made use of Matthew's gospel in addition to Mark's.⁷ John Kloppenborg has recognized that 'if it could be shown in a systematic fashion that Luke could be derived from Matthew (and Mark), Q would become a superfluous supposition'.⁸ Following on such a demonstration, the hypothetical second document of the 2DH might be dispensed with, as Austin Farrer himself urged, since it was hypothesized to account for the non-Marcan matter that Matthew and Luke share, on the assumption that neither Matthew nor Luke knew the other's gospel.⁹ One might account for double tradition passages common in substance but varying in wording by appeal to Luke's preference for oral tradition or written sources no longer extant, or to his own creative redaction, but the exegete could safely dispense with a single source containing the vast majority of the non-Marcan material common to Matthew and Luke.¹⁰

pattern in offering no focused treatment of the composition of Acts as an outgrowth of the gospel tradition and including only a handful of citations (*Gospel Writing: A Canonical Perspective* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2013], esp. pp. 117–216; cf. 664 col. 2, s.v. 'Other Early Christian Literature: Acts of the Apostles').

7. The implausibility of the Griesbach hypothesis (*viz.*, the priority of Matthew to Luke plus Mark's use of both) is most economically displayed by John S. Kloppenborg ('The Theological Stakes in the Synoptic Problem', in F. Van Segbroeck, C. M. Tuckett, G. Van Belle, and J. Verheyden [eds.], *The Four Gospels 1992: Festschrift Frans Neirynck* [BETL, 100; 3 vols.; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1992], vol. 1, pp. 93–120), the most insightful redactional study of Mark on this hypothesis of which I am aware. In my judgment, this implausibility is not overcome in David Peabody (ed.), with Lamar Cope and Allan J. McNicol, *One Gospel from Two: Mark's Use of Matthew and Luke* (Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 2002).

8. John S. Kloppenborg Verbin, 'Is There a New Paradigm?', in David G. Horrell and Christopher M. Tuckett (eds.), *Christology, Controversy and Community: New Testament Essays in Honour of David R. Catchpole* (NovTSup, 99; Leiden: Brill, 2000), pp. 23–47, esp. 25, commenting on David R. Catchpole, *The Quest for Q* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1993), pp. 1–59, with the caveat that the adjective 'systematic' should be stressed (p. 25 n. 6) and the contention that 'Matthew contains elements that one would otherwise expect Luke to have taken over had he seen Matthew' (p. 25).

9. For the degree of common wording in the double tradition, see Mark Goodacre's contribution to the present volume.

10. The most compendious attempt to date to commend this understanding of literary relationships among the Synoptics, Goulder's *Luke*, emphasizes Luke's creativity to the virtual exclusion of oral tradition or other written sources for

As to Luke's knowledge of Matthew, Robert Gundry has collected 38 'Matthean foreign bodies' in the text of Luke, i.e., textual phenomena that 'fit Matthew's redactional habits as evident elsewhere and his redactional purpose in the pericope at hand but do not fit Luke's redactional habits as evident elsewhere or his redactional purposes in the pericope at hand'.¹¹ More elegantly and concisely, Mark Goodacre has identified a smaller number of passages that exhibit 'literary fatigue', in which an evangelist, in the course of revising a passage, incorporates a detail appropriate to the original setting but rendered incongruous by the aims of the revision.¹² This evidence constitutes a significant obstacle to the position, crucial to the 2DH, that Matthew and Luke worked in complete independence of one another.

This evidence gains in significance when it is considered in light of the best gospels scholarship of recent decades. The tendency to treat Luke and the other evangelists as passive compilers of materials quarried from various sources has waned. Luke is better understood as a creative editor/author who shaped what he derived from others to serve his own literary and theological purpose.¹³ If Luke knew not only Mark but also

'QD' passages (i.e., non-Markan passages in Matthew and Luke common in substance but differing in wording, as distinguished from 'QC' passages exhibiting common wording). Goulder's ingenious study offers a host of worthwhile suggestions, but that his exclusive emphasis on a redactional explanation of Luke's differences from Matthew in the double tradition is not essential to 'Marcan priority without Q' is evident from the earlier work of A. M. Farrer ('On Dispensing with Q', in D. E. Nineham [ed.], *Studies in the Gospels: Essays in Memory of R. H. Lightfoot* [Oxford: Blackwell, 1955], pp. 55–88) and the later work of Mark S. Goodacre (*The Case against Q: Studies in Markan Priority and the Synoptic Problem* [Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 2002]), who both exhibit an openness to oral tradition as accounting for this.

11. Robert H. Gundry, 'Matthean Foreign Bodies in Agreements of Luke with Matthew against Mark: Evidence that Luke used Matthew', in Van Segbroeck, Tuckett, Van Belle, and Verheyden (eds.), *The Four Gospels 1992*, vol. 2, pp. 1467–95 (1468). Gundry retains a Q reduced in extent as an explanation for non-Markan passages in Luke that have wording or substance common with Matthew but different in order; such a compromise between the FH and the 2DH fails to reckon with the exegetical developments of the past generation or two, as sketched below in the text.

12. Mark Goodacre, 'Fatigue in the Synoptics', *NTS* 44 (1998), pp. 45–58. Goodacre here develops the convincing argument for Marcan priority offered by G. M. Styler, 'The Priority of Mark', in C. F. D. Moule, *The Birth of the New Testament* (3d ed.; San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1982), pp. 285–316, and turns it to the support of Luke's use of Matthew as well as Mark. See the detailed discussion of Goodacre's argument by John Poirier elsewhere in this volume, pp. 191–225.

13. See Heather Gorman's essay in this volume for a rhetorical study; Goodacre, *Case against Q*, pp. 105–21; Jeffrey Peterson, 'Order in the Double Tradition and

Matthew, and if he had significant freedom to adapt written material while also adapting teaching he had heard in catechesis, worship, and other settings, there is little difficulty imagining him compiling stories he wished to include from the total stock of material available to him, and ordering them to produce the gospel as we have it.

Kloppenborg finds the principal difficulty with the FH to be the acceptance of ‘a Luke who drastically rearranged Matthew’.¹⁴ Yet on the 2DH it is clear from the divergent order of double tradition pericopes in Matthew and Luke that one evangelist or the other (and perhaps both) engaged in significant rearrangement of the order of pericopes in Q to compose his gospel.¹⁵ On the common presupposition that Luke preserves the Q order, the 2DH assigns this role to Matthew – not unreasonably,

the Existence of Q’, in Mark S. Goodacre and Nicholas Perrin (eds.), *Questioning Q* (London: SPCK, 2004), pp. 28–42, esp. 37–40. Nor is it the case, as Kloppenborg maintains in criticism of the latter, that ‘it is not simply a matter of whether Luke’s arrangement of the double tradition is intelligible, but whether reasons can be adduced for Luke’s rather thorough *dislocation* and rearrangement of Matthew’s order’ (review of Mark S. Goodacre and Nicholas Perrin [eds.], *Questioning Q: A Multidimensional Critique*, *BTB* 36 [2006], pp. 42–3 [43, italics original]). To recognize in Luke’s work a satisfactory literary plan is of itself to identify sufficient reason for him to have abandoned Matthew’s order in favor of one that suited his authorial aims (as he does Mark’s on multiple occasions, as noted above). To construct a barbecue pit from an existing rock wall, one must first dislocate the stones one requires; the construction of the pit itself supplies the builder sufficient reason for removing and rearranging them. Indeed, the analogy puts Luke to greater labor than was required to compose his gospel, inasmuch as there was no need for Luke to physically disassemble his copy of Matthew; Luke was free to copy whatever passages he wished from Matthew (or Q) and arrange them in the order that best suited him, employing writing technology that by no means limited his authorial freedom as much as has sometimes been supposed.

14. John S. Kloppenborg Verbin, *Excavating Q: The History and Setting of the Sayings Gospel* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2000), p. 43.

15. The degree of common order discernible in the Double Tradition is often neglected. This ranges from a 40% minimum acknowledged by Kloppenborg to a maximal 67% or even 79% if one reckons with three Lucan ‘scans’ or raids through his Matthaean source; see the neglected study by Edwin Lummis, *How Luke Was Written: Considerations Affecting the Two-Document Theory with Special Reference to the Phenomena of Order in the Non-Marcan Matter Common to Matthew and Luke* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1915). For comparison, Vincent Taylor’s influential study of the order of Q (which Kloppenborg judges ‘brilliant’) posits that Matthew needed 15 scans of Q to produce his discourses. If a less complicated compositional procedure is the criterion of plausibility, then the FH defeats the 2DH by a margin of 12 points (scoring as in golf). See further my ‘Order in the Double Tradition’, pp. 31–3.

since (given Marcan priority) he clearly also rearranges Mark in Matthew 3–12. But it is unclear why one should recognize Matthew's ability to reorder material in order to shape a narrative satisfactory to his purpose but deny this ability to Luke.

If Luke's greater fidelity to the Marcan order is taken as reason to suppose that he adopted a policy of preserving the order of his sources, *mutatis mutandis*, one may recall the 'well-known transpositions of Marcan episodes in Luke' discussed by Joseph Fitzmyer and others.¹⁶ Fitzmyer concedes that these relocations of Marcan episodes by Luke 'may at first sight seem to militate against the thesis that Luke preserves the Marcan order', but he then evidently seeks to blunt the force of this observation by describing these divergences from Mark's sequence as 'readily explicable in terms of Lucan composition; in each instance one can detect a clear reason why Luke has made the transposition'.¹⁷ This, however, is an explanation of the transpositions, not a disqualification of them *as transpositions*, i.e., Marcan passages that Luke relocated to serve his own narrative purposes. If Luke evidences so little reluctance to reorder the source that supplies his narrative outline, it seems rash to assume that he would make a priority of preserving the order of a source from which he quarries mostly teachings and to make that assumption pivotal in the reconstruction of his editorial procedure, as contemporary defenders of the 2DH do. The dogmatic position on this question often seen in defense of the 2DH does not withstand scrutiny, especially when one considers the writing technology available to Luke – including the possible use of a secretary (cf. Rom. 16.22), an outline to order his composition, and wax tablets for composing preliminary drafts of sections.¹⁸

16. Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel according to Luke* (AB, 28; 2 vols.; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1981–85), vol. 1, p. 71.

17. Fitzmyer, *Luke*, vol. 1, p. 71. The seven passages Fitzmyer discusses as transpositions are: John's imprisonment (Lk. 3.19-20 // Mk 6.17-18); Jesus' visit to Nazareth (Lk. 4.16-30 // Mk 6.1-7); the call of Simon and other disciples (Lk. 5.1-11 // Mk 1.16-20); the report of the crowds following Jesus (Lk. 6.17-19 // Mk 3.7-12) and the appointment of the Twelve (Lk. 6.12-16 // Mk 3.13-19), where Luke simply inverts the Marcan order; the narrative about Jesus' true family (Lk. 8.19-21 // Mk 3.31-35); Jesus' prediction of his betrayal (Lk. 22.21-23 // Mk 14.18-21), deferred until after the Last Supper; and the reordering of Jesus' interrogation (Mk 14.55-64a), abuse (Mk 14.64b-65), and denial by Peter (Mk 14.66-72) to yield a narrative of his denial by Peter (Lk. 22.54c-62), abuse (Lk. 22.63-65), and interrogation (Lk. 22.66-71).

18. See John C. Poirier, 'The Roll, the Codex, the Wax Tablet and the Synoptic Problem', *JSNT* 35 (2012), pp. 3–30. Specifically on the use of outlines, see Gregory E. Sterling, *History and Self-Definition: Josephos, Luke-Acts and Apologetic Historiography* (NovTSup, 64; Leiden: Brill, 1992), pp. 337–8.

The artistry of Luke's Journey to Jerusalem (Lk. 9.51–19.27) has been much maligned. But before concluding that this section makes little narrative sense and betrays Luke as a plodder, determined to retail much of Q's content and wedded to its order, one might consider how much of Acts is occupied with apostolic and missionary journeys in which teaching is related at various stages on the way.¹⁹ If Luke composed Jesus' journey from Galilee to Jerusalem as a kind of anticipatory parallel to the travels of his inspired emissaries from Jerusalem to Rome, this would accord well with the widely recognized parallels Luke draws between his ministry and theirs. Indeed, it is conceivable that the attention he planned to give to apostolic travels in Acts supplied the inspiration for incorporating much of Jesus' teaching into a basically Marcan narrative through the expansion of the journey to Jerusalem in Mark 10. Jesus' journey suffers in comparison with Peter's and Paul's travels in Acts principally from a relative paucity of local color and dramatic incident.

Our consideration of source-critical issues has led us to confront a major question in scholarship on Luke and Acts which must be clarified before proceeding: Did Luke in fact hope his effort would be received as two volumes of a single work?²⁰ An affirmative answer is strongly suggested by certain events key to the narrative arc that runs through Luke–Acts, which are anticipated but not narrated in the gospel. To be clear: the claim is not that any event predicted in the gospel must be narrated before the conclusion of Acts for the text to exhibit narrative coherence; the destruction of the Temple (Lk. 21.5-6), the siege of Jerusalem (Lk. 21.20-24) and the coming of the son of Man (Lk. 9.23-27; 21.25-28) would constitute obvious exceptions. Rather, from its opening the narrative of the gospel is so driven by anticipation of certain pivotal events that are in fact narrated in Acts, that when reading both books one can

19. J. C. O'Neill's suggested division of Luke and Acts into five parallel sections does not carry entire conviction, but I am indebted to it for the general suggestion of a parallel between Jesus' journey in chs. 9–19 of the gospel and the missionary travels of Acts 8–21 (*The Theology of Acts in its Historical Setting* [2d ed.; London: SPCK, 1970], pp. 59–76).

20. Mikeal C. Parsons and Richard I. Pervo put this question on the agenda of NT scholarship in their jointly authored *Rethinking the Unity of Luke and Acts* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993). See also Pervo, *Acts: A Commentary on the Book of Acts* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2009), pp. 18–20; Andrew F. Gregory, *The Reception of Luke and Acts in the Period Before Irenaeus: Looking for Luke in the Second Century* (WUNT, 2/169; Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 2003); Gregory and Christopher Kevin Rowe (eds.), *Rethinking the Unity and Reception of Luke and Acts* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2010).

recognize the incompleteness of the gospel's narrative in the absence of its sequel.

Notable among these are Jesus' fulfillment of scriptural promises to the Davidic dynasty for the deliverance of Abraham's descendants (Lk. 1.32-33, 54-55, 68-75; 2.29-32), his gift of salvation also to the Gentiles (Lk. 2.29-32; 4.24-27), and his bestowal of the eschatological Spirit of God (Lk. 3.16).²¹ As Morna Hooker observes, the opening of Acts picks up all three of these unfulfilled promises of the gospel narrative.²² She further suggests that here as elsewhere Luke may have imitated biblical histories in opening his second volume with story that concluded his first, noting this phenomenon in the cases of 1–2 Kings and 2 Chronicles/Ezra–Nehemiah, the overlap signaling 'that the second volume is a continuation of the story told in the first'.²³ Henk Jan de Jonge argues convincingly that Acts 1.2-3 should be read as a chronological sequence, with the 'assumption' in v. 2 preceding the forty days of appearances in v. 3b, and that 1.4-11 reverts to the time frame of 1.2, recounting the same meal discourse (*συναλιζόμενος*, Acts 1.4) with which the gospel closed (cf. Lk. 24.41-43). Thus, according to de Jonge, both the gospel and Acts date the ascension on Easter Day. De Jonge's reading removes the sharpest arrow in the quiver of those who would separate Luke and Acts in origin.²⁴

Of the three promises Hooker notes as unfulfilled in the narrative of Luke's gospel, particular weight must be ascribed to the inclusion of Gentiles in the scope of God's deliverance, particularly as Luke departs from his Marcan source at key points to emphasize it. First, he extends the Isaianic quotation that serves as the prophetic overture to Jesus'

21. Morna D. Hooker, *Endings: Invitations to Discipleship* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2003), pp. 56–7. On the Davidic dynasty tradition, see further Mark L. Strauss, *The Davidic Messiah in Luke–Acts: The Promise and its Fulfillment in Lukan Christology* (JSNTSup, 413; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1995), pp. 76–193.

22. Hooker, *Endings*, p. 58, citing also Parsons, *The Departure of Jesus in Luke–Acts: The Ascension Narratives in Context* (JSNTSup, 21; Sheffield: JSOT, 1987). I regard Hooker's observations as sufficient to defeat the proposal of Parsons and Pervo to separate the interpretation of Luke and Acts for interpretive purposes in any thoroughgoing manner (*Rethinking the Unity of Luke and Acts*), notwithstanding some valid observations of differences in narrative manner and theological emphasis between the two volumes; see also Sterling, *History and Self-Definition*, pp. 331–9.

23. Hooker, *Endings*, pp. 51–2.

24. Henk Jan de Jonge, 'The Chronology of the Ascension Stories in Luke and Acts', *NTS* 59 (2013), pp. 151–71.

ministry, as also in Mk 1.2 and Mt. 3.3, to embrace the scriptural promise that ‘all flesh shall see the salvation of God’ (ὄψεται πᾶσα σὰρξ τὸ σωτήριον τοῦ θεοῦ, Lk. 3.6 cit. LXX Isa. 40.5), anticipating Peter’s Pentecost sermon on the text, ‘In the last days it shall be, God declares, that I will pour out my spirit on all flesh... Then everyone who calls on the name of the Lord will be saved’ (Acts 2.16-21, citing Joel 3.1-5a [Eng. 2.28-32a]).²⁵ Second, in transposing and expanding the Nazareth pericope, Luke relates the sending of God’s prophets beyond the borders of the Land to non-Israelites as the climactic point of Jesus’ inaugural sermon (Lk. 4.24-27), which incites the wrath of his fellow Nazarenes (4.28-29) and his departure from them (4.30-31a).

The narrative pattern established in the Nazareth sermon recurs as a *leitmotif* throughout Luke–Acts. Thus, in the events leading to the climax of the gospel, Jesus threatens the scribes and chief priests, custodians of the temple service, that ‘the lord of the vineyard will come and destroy those tenants and give the vineyard to others’ (Lk. 19.16 NRSV) and that (per Ps. 118.22) the stone rejected by the builders has been established as God’s keystone and will prove their destruction. It is in response to this warning that the priests and scribes evince a desire to do Jesus violence (Lk. 19.19). They nurse this desire as the feast approaches (Lk. 22.1), contracting with Judas Iscariot (Lk. 22.3-6), who delivers Jesus into the hands of the high priest (Lk. 22.47-54a), leading to trials (Lk. 22.63–23.25) and crucifixion on the Roman prefect’s orders (Lk. 23.26-49).

In the continuing mission inspired by God’s Spirit, poured out by the risen Christ on all flesh (Acts 2.32-33), initially on Jews relocated to Jerusalem from across the Gentile world (Acts 2.5), the news that God has appointed Christ as Messiah of Israel and the Lord on whom all may call for salvation (Acts 2.36) is characteristically shared first with the Jewish community in a city or region (cf. ὑμῖν ἦν ἀναγκαῖον πρῶτον λαληθῆναι τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ, Acts 13.46), with limited favorable response (Acts 2.1–8.1; 9.1-2 [εἰς Δαμασκὸν πρὸς τὰς συναγωγάς]; 11.19; 13.5; 13.13–14.7; 16.1-5, 11-15; 17.1-17; 18.1-8, 19, 24-28; 19.1-8). Just as characteristically, Jewish communities *en masse*, and especially their leaders (though cf. Crispus, Acts 18.8), reject the one whom God has installed at his right hand as Messiah and Lord. They oppose those who

25. In the opening of the quotation, Luke and Matthew of course agree against Mark in omitting the problematic, non-Isaianic first verse of the Marcan quotation (Mk 1.2), which both include a Double Tradition passage ascribed to Q on the 2DH (Mt. 11.10 // Lk. 7.27) – a notable instance of Q solving problems that Matthew and Luke both appear to notice in Mark.

bring these tidings, and who then take the message of salvation to the Gentiles (Acts 4.1-22; 5.17-42; 6.8-8.1a; 9.1-2, 23-25, 29-30; 12.1-17; 13.44-52; 14.2, 4-7, 19-20; 15.1-2, 5 [?]; 17.5-9, 13-15; 18.5-17; 19.8-10, 17-20; 20.3; 21.27-36; 22.22-24; 22.30-23.10; 23.12-35; 24.9; 24.27-25.12). Luke's second volume closes in the imperial capital with a mixed reaction to Paul's preaching of Jesus as the fulfillment of a scriptural promise (Acts 28.23-24). Evidently, the leadership of the Jewish community largely rejects Paul's message, as Paul hurls Isaian invective at them and turns once again to the Gentiles (28.25-28), the word of God continuing its spread to the ends of the earth unimpeded (28.15-30).

The overarching significance of this pattern of mission and rejection for the composition of Luke's narrative is most compactly expressed in Stephen's speech, which limns Moses' career as involving an initial rejection by his people (τοῦτον τὸν Μωϋσῆν ὃν ἠρνήσαντο, Acts 7.35; cf. τοῦτον τὸν Ἰησοῦν ὃν ὑμεῖς ἐσταυρώσατε, 2.36; τὸν ἅγιον καὶ δίκαιον ἠρνήσασθε, 3.14), after which God 'sent' him to them afresh (τοῦτον ὁ θεὸς καὶ ἄρχοντα καὶ λυτρωτὴν ἀπέσταλκεν, Acts 7.35; cf. κύριον αὐτὸν καὶ χριστὸν ἐποίησεν ὁ θεός, τοῦτον τὸν Ἰησοῦν..., 2.36), resulting in a second rejection (ἀπώσαντο, Acts 7.39; cf. ἀπωθεῖσθε, 13.46). The reader is prepared to recognize the pattern of Jesus' career in Stephen's description of Moses, especially by Peter's statement: 'You are the descendants of the prophets and of the covenant that God gave to your ancestors, saying to Abraham, "And in your descendants all the families of the earth shall be blessed."' When God raised up (ἀναστήσας) his servant, he sent (ἀπέστειλεν) him first to you, to bless you by turning each of you from your wicked ways' (Acts 3.25-26, NRSV). In Jesus' resurrection and the ministry his outpouring of the Spirit empowers, God has fulfilled his scriptural promise to 'raise up' a prophet like Moses (Acts 2.24, 32; 3.26; 10.41; 13.33-34; 17.3, 31; cf. προφήτην ὑμῖν ἀναστήσει ὁ θεὸς ἐκ τῶν ἀδελφῶν ὑμῶν ὡς ἐμέ, Acts 3.22; 7.37 cit. Deut. 18.15).²⁶

Thus, Luke's *prōtos logos* describes Jerusalem's initial tragic visitation (οὐκ ἔγνωσ τὸν καιρὸν τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς σου, Lk. 19.44; cf. ἀνέβη ἐπὶ τὴν καρδίαν αὐτοῦ ἐπισκέψασθαι τοὺς ἀδελφούς αὐτοῦ τοὺς υἱούς Ἰσραὴλ, Acts 7.23) by the Son it rejects, but whom God 'raises up' as a prophet like Moses and installs as heir to the Davidic throne. Luke's *deuteros logos* describes how God 'sent' him to visit his people a second time through those who received the Spirit he poured out from God, beginning from Jerusalem and proceeding through Judea and Samaria toward the ends of

26. Luke Timothy Johnson, *The Acts of the Apostles* (SP, 5; Collegeville: Liturgical, 1992), p. 128.

the earth – with mixed but largely tragic results for Israel, but bringing arrival of God’s salvation among the Gentiles. And this took place ‘not in a corner’ (Acts 26.26), so that all flesh indeed saw it.²⁷

Turning to the conclusion of Luke’s first volume, we may begin with an observation common to the 2DH and the FH: like Matthew, Luke evidently found the Marcan conclusion inadequate to his purposes.²⁸ Of this he leaves two indications. First, Luke renders the empty tomb (Lk. 24.1-12) in language that exhibits at most three verbally parallel sequences of 3–4 words with Mk 16.1-8, and barely a handful of other common vocabulary.²⁹ While the outline of the story is recognizable, the paucity of close linguistic parallels is striking. Second, Luke was clearly unsatisfied with Mark’s abrupt and ambiguous conclusion, and so extends his narrative beyond the empty tomb to include the risen Christ’s appearance to disciples, as Matthew also did.

In the first pericope of his conclusion, then, Luke is as little indebted to Mark in details as he is anywhere in the triple tradition. Counterintuitively, it may be that the Lk. 24 pericope reflecting closest engagement with the text of Mark is the Journey to Emmaus (vv. 13-35). Michael Goulder ingeniously suggested that Luke found justification for this story in part through a creative interpretation of the angelic word in Mk 16.7: ‘Go, tell his disciples and Peter that he is going before you to Galilee. There you will see him, just as he told you’ (NRSV). On Goulder’s reading, Luke takes the prediction *ἐκεῖ αὐτὸν ὄψεσθε* to anticipate a reunion not *in* Galilee but on the road *toward* Galilee, along which Jesus was advancing before them (*προάγει*). In Lk. 24.22, Cleopas and his companion describe the women who followed Jesus from Galilee as of their company (*γυναῖκές τινες ἐξ ἡμῶν*), hence Emmaus was not the home of the two disciples but the end of the first leg of their journey home to Galilee. The Marcan angel’s directing this prediction of reunion with the

27. On the apologetic significance of Acts 26.26, see Abraham J. Malherbe, *Paul and the Popular Philosophers* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989), pp. 147–63.

28. I assume that Mk 16.1-8 is the earliest extant ending of the gospel and, indeed, its original conclusion, but for the purposes of the present argument, it is only required that any lost ending was unavailable to Luke or proved no more appealing to him in details than the rest of Mk 16 (cf. N. Clayton Croy, *The Mutilation of Mark’s Gospel* [Nashville: Abingdon, 2003]). It seems clear from Mk 14.28 and 16.7 that a lost Marcan ending would not have narrated Easter Day appearances of the risen Christ in Jerusalem.

29. Note *τῇ μιᾷ τῶν σαββάτων*, Mk 16.2 // *τῇ δὲ μιᾷ τῶν σαββάτων*, Lk. 24.1; *ἠγέρθη, οὐκ ἔστιν ὧδε*, Mk 16.6 // *οὐκ ἔστιν ὧδε, ἀλλὰ ἠγέρθη*, Lk. 24.6; *ἔρχονται ἐπὶ τὸ μνημεῖον*, Mk 16.2 // *ἐπὶ τὸ μνήμα ἦλθον*, Lk. 24.1; *ἀποκεκλύσται ὁ λίθος*, Mk 16.4 // *τὸν λίθον ἀποκεκλυσμένον*, Lk. 24.2; *ἀπὸ τοῦ μνημείου*, Mk 16.8 // Lk. 24.9; *ἀρώματα*, Mk 16.1 // Lk. 24.1; *εἰσελθοῦσαι*, Mk 16.5 // Lk. 24.3.

risen Jesus 'to his disciples and to Peter' supplied Luke with justification for narrating the visit to two disciples in Emmaus as having taken place simultaneously with or earlier than the appearance to Simon (Lk. 24.33-34). Luke will have been familiar with the latter appearance from the tradition attested in 1 Cor. 15.5, and he will have assumed it occurred in Jerusalem, as he understands Peter's early post-resurrection ministry as being centered there (Acts 1.3-6.7; 8.1, 14-25; 9.26-11.18; 12.1-17; 15.1-29; cf. Gal. 1.17-18; 2.1-10).³⁰

If the opening of Lk. 24 is marked by a scant amount of detailed agreement with Mk 16.1-8, it is equally striking how much agreement in outline one can see between the Lucan chapter and the final pericope of Matthew's gospel. A selective synopsis (see overleaf) will clarify the agreements and prepare for some observations on the relationship between the texts.

The passages describe the reunion of Jesus with 'the eleven'. The settings, personnel, and action differ: Matthew describes only the eleven approaching Jesus on a Galilean mountain, while in Luke Jesus appears in the midst of a larger company of disciples (24.33) gathered for the evening meal (24.41-43). There is scarcely less commonality of language here than between Mk 16.1-8 and Lk. 24.1-12, and the parallel words and phrases are not insignificant, as will be noted below.

Beyond common language, one notes the parallel structure and a number of common motifs. First, the remaining members of the Twelve are referred to as 'the eleven'. There is only one such reference in Matthew (28.16), but two in Luke (24.9, 33; cf. Acts 1.26; 2.14 [in the sense 'the eleven other apostles']). The usage is obvious enough after Judas Iscariot's suicide in Mt. 27.3-5 and not surprising for Matthew, who uses the numerical designation δώδεκα of the group eight times (with one further reference in Mt. 19.28 to the 'twelve thrones' they will occupy in the new world, lacking in Lk. 22.30), both absolutely and modifying forms of μαθητής and ἀπόστολος (the latter a *hapax* in Mt. 10.2). Luke, however, uses δώδεκα of the company seven times (never modifying μαθητής) and a form of ἀπόστολος five times. On statistical grounds alone, then, Luke was almost as likely to use ἀπόστολοι as ἑνδεκα, so if he and Matthew wrote independently of one another, their agreement in using the numerical reference may be judged a slight coincidence. When we recall that Luke has not yet told his reader of the death of Judas (cf. Acts 1.18-19), the coincidence must be reckoned somewhat more than slight.

30. See Goulder, *Luke*, vol. 2, pp. 780-81.

<p style="text-align: center;">Mt. 28.16-20³¹</p> <p>¹⁶ Οἱ δὲ <u>ἐνδεκα</u> μαθηταὶ ἐπορεύθησαν εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν εἰς τὸ ὄρος οὗ ἐτάξατο αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς,</p> <p>¹⁷ καὶ ἰδόντες <u>αὐτὸν προσεκύνησαν</u>, οἱ δὲ ἐδίστασαν.</p> <p>¹⁸ καὶ προσελθὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐλάλησεν αὐτοῖς λέγων· ἐδόθη μοι πᾶσα ἐξουσία ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.</p> <p>¹⁹ πορευθέντες οὖν μαθητεύσατε <u>πάντα τὰ ἔθνη ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι μου</u>,</p> <p>²⁰ διδάσκοντες αὐτοὺς τηρεῖν πάντα ὅσα ἐνετείλαμην ὑμῖν.</p> <p><u>καὶ ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ μεθ' ὑμῶν εἰμι πάσας τὰς</u> <u>ἡμέρας ἕως τῆς συντελείας τοῦ αἰῶνος.</u></p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Lk. 24.33, 37, 41, 44-49</p> <p>³³ ... <u>τοὺς ἐνδεκα</u> ... [cf. τοῖς ἐνδεκα καὶ πᾶσιν τοῖς λοιποῖς, 24:9]</p> <p>³⁷ πτοηθέντες δὲ καὶ ἔμφοβοι γενόμενοι ἐδόκουν πνεῦμα θεωρεῖν.</p> <p>⁴¹ ἔτι δὲ ἀπιστούντων αὐτῶν ἀπὸ τῆς χαρᾶς καὶ θαυμαζόντων.</p> <p>⁴⁴ Εἶπεν δὲ πρὸς αὐτούς·</p> <p style="text-align: center;">οὔτοι οἱ λόγοι μου οὓς ἐλάλησα πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἔτι ὡν σὺν ὑμῖν, ὅτι δεῖ πληρωθῆναι πάντα τὰ γεγραμμένα ἐν τῷ νόμῳ Μωϋσέως καὶ τοῖς προφήταις καὶ ψαλμοῖς περὶ ἐμοῦ.</p> <p>⁴⁵ τότε διήνοιξεν αὐτῶν τὸν νοῦν τοῦ σμυῖναι τὰς γραφάς· ⁴⁶ καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ὅτι οὕτως γέγραπται παθεῖν τὸν χριστὸν καὶ ἀναστῆναι ἐκ νεκρῶν τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ, ⁴⁷ καὶ κηρυχθῆναι <u>ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ μετάνοιαν εἰς ἅφεςιν ἁμαρτιῶν εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη</u>. ἀρξάμενοι ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλήμ ⁴⁸ ὑμεῖς μάρτυρες τούτων.</p> <p>⁴⁹ <u>καὶ ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ πατρὸς μου ἐφ' ὑμᾶς· ὑμεῖς δὲ καθίσατε ἐν τῇ πόλει ἕως οὗ ἐνδύσησθε ἐξ ὕψους δύναμιν.</u> ⁵⁰</p> <p>Ἐξήγαγεν δὲ αὐτοὺς ἔξω ἕως πρὸς Βηθανίαν, καὶ ἐπάρας τὰς χεῖρας αὐτοῦ εὐλόγησεν αὐτούς. ⁵¹ καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ εὐλογεῖν αὐτὸν αὐτοὺς διέστη ἀπ' αὐτῶν καὶ ἀνεφέρετο εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν.</p> <p>⁵² Καὶ αὐτοὶ <u>προσκυνήσαντες αὐτὸν</u> ὑπέστρεψαν εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ μετὰ χαρᾶς μεγάλης ⁵³ καὶ ἦσαν διὰ παντὸς ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ εὐλογοῦντες τὸν θεόν.</p>
--	---

31. I follow H. Benedict Green in reading the Eusebian variant πορευθέντες οὖν μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι μου in Mt. 28.19, rather than πορευθέντες οὖν μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, βαπτίζοντες αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος ('Matthew 28:19, Eusebius, and the Lex Orandi', in Rowan Williams [ed.], *The Making of Orthodoxy: Essays in Honour of Henry Chadwick* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989], pp. 124–41).

A second common motif can be found in the reunion with the risen Lord, which produces a mixed reaction in both accounts. Matthew presents the matter tersely: when they saw Jesus, the eleven ‘paid him obeisance, but [also] doubted’ (ἰδόντες αὐτὸν προσεκύνησαν, οἱ δὲ ἐδίσταναν, 28.17).³² Startled and frightened, Luke’s disciples suppose they are seeing a ghost (24.37), a fear the Lord dispels first by inviting them to touch him (24.38-40) and then by sharing in their fish (24.41-43). Like Matthew’s disciples, Luke’s also doubt, or ‘disbelieve’ (ἔτι δὲ ἀπιστούντων αὐτῶν, 24.41), but their motivation is Luke’s characteristic joy, and they marvel at Jesus’ presence among them: Lk. 24.41a looks suspiciously like Lucan redaction of Matthew’s οἱ δὲ ἐδίσταναν (28.17). Even more noteworthy is the way Luke’s disciples, like Matthew’s eleven, do obeisance to the risen Lord, following Jesus’ ascension (προσκυνήσαντες αὐτὸν, 24.52 B*; om. D it sy^s). If one accepts the reading of Vaticanus, this would be a striking example of a Matthaean ‘foreign body’ in the Lucan text, as the word occurs thirteen times in Matthew (10× with Jesus as object) and only twice elsewhere in Luke, with obeisance directed toward Jesus in neither passage but rather toward the Adversary (4.7) and God (4.8).

A third common motif consists in the way Jesus’ address in Matthew opens with the universal authority (πᾶσα ἐξουσία ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ [τῆς] γῆς) he has been granted (ἐδόθη) by the Father. The eleven are to go and make ‘all the nations’ (πάντα τὰ ἔθνη) students under his authority, teaching them to live observant of all that he taught, beginning from the Sermon on the Mount (Mt. 28.19-20a). The instruction in Luke likewise recalls ‘my words that I spoke to you while I was still with you’ – though this seems more extensive and is not merely a reminder of lessons previously taught. The Lucan Jesus introduces his disciples to bold new interpretation of Israel’s Scriptures with his own messianic death and resurrection as the interpretive key, leading to the proclamation of repentance and forgiveness of sins for ‘all the nations’ (πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, 24.47 in verbatim agreement with Matthew). An imperative note appears implicit in the declaration ‘Beginning from Jerusalem, you are witnesses of these things’ (Lk. 24.47-48), further aligning the two addresses.

32. In the absence of an introductory οἱ μὲν, this is a better rendering than NRSV’s ‘they worshiped him; but some doubted’. See Ulrich Luz, *Matthew 21–28: A Commentary* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Augsburg, 2005), pp. 622–3; P. W. van der Horst, ‘Once More: The Translation of *hoi de* in Matthew 28:17’, *JSNT* 27 (1986), pp. 27–30.

The content of the two discourses likewise has more in common than appears at first glance. The language in which the Matthaean Jesus asserts the authority to initiate the mission is drawn from the description of the reign granted to the ‘one like a son of man’ (Dan. 7.14): *καὶ ἐδόθη αὐτῷ ἐξουσία, καὶ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη τῆς γῆς κατὰ γένη καὶ πᾶσα δόξα αὐτῷ λατρεύουσα*.³³ Luke thus describes a course of instruction in the Scriptures through which the risen Lord led his disciples, while Matthew offers a sample interpretation of a scriptural text fulfilled in his person. If the previous points of commonality are sufficient to suggest a literary relationship between Matthew’s and Luke’s conclusions, this point appears to commend Luke’s knowledge of Matthew, as Luke (like a copyist who elides difficulties wherever possible) would be more likely to convert an allusive (obscure) reference into a clear description of Jesus’ procedure than the typically clear Matthew would be to move in the reverse direction.

A fourth common motif can be found in Jesus’ concluding words in Matthew. Jesus gives a promise of his continuing (indeed eternal) presence with the disciples as they undertake their mission to the nations (also likely indebted to Dan. 7.14: *ἡ ἐξουσία αὐτοῦ ἐξουσία αἰώνιος, ἥτις οὐ μὴ ἀρθῆ [Th. ἥτις οὐ παρελεύσεται]*). Matthew ends his gospel on a note of encouragement, as Jesus promises his disciples that they will not be left to their own devices to fulfill the commission he lays upon them, recalling his pledge that ‘where two or three are gathered in my name (*εἰς τὸ ἐμὸν ὄνομα*), there am I, in the midst of them (*ἐκεῖ εἶμι ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν*)’ (Mt. 18.20). The earlier passage suggests how the later passage should be read, as a promise of Jesus’ spiritual presence among his followers. Matthew’s conclusion dramatically suggests the idea of Jesus’ continuing spiritual presence by having him repeat his promise, and by leaving off any narration of a departure. Jesus remains with his disciples for all time.

If taken literally, however, Matthew’s conclusion might raise awkward questions. Did Jesus indeed remain visibly in the presence of the eleven and never leave them? Would this state of affairs continue ‘all the days’ until the age was consummated (whenever that might be)? If the eleven were no longer on the scene, could Jesus be found somewhere in the company of present-day disciples? Where might one go to enter Jesus’ presence and see him as the disciples had on the mountain? If Jesus was no longer present in this way, had he abandoned his disciples?

33. Goulder, *Luke*, vol. 2, p. 793.

It is striking that the final lines of Luke's gospel forestall the very misunderstandings a passing acquaintance with Matthew's conclusion might engender. After leading his disciples to Bethany, Jesus departs from them and is taken up into heaven, and they return to Jerusalem to await the power that Jesus promised to send them. Jesus is unmistakably absent in body from the day of his resurrection, but he will be present with the disciples through the medium of the Holy Spirit.

It is striking as well to contrast the force that each of these narratives has as a conclusion to the story its gospel tells. Matthew's conclusion marks a significant advance in the scope of the mission entrusted to Jesus' disciples. Before his resurrection, Jesus and the Twelve were sent only to 'the lost sheep of the house of Israel' (10.6), and, with few exceptions, confined their work to that sphere. In the conclusion, the mission to Israel is expanded to encompass the nations, inaugurating the era in which the 'gospel of the kingdom will be proclaimed in all the *oikoumenē*' (Mt. 24.14). Luke's conclusion, while dramatic with its ascension and forward-looking with its promise, lacks the Matthaean sense of advancing the story to a new stage. The auditor of Luke's gospel has heard promises before – promises of Israel's restoration from the time of the annunciation to Mary, of light shining on the nations from the time of the infant Jesus' presentation in the temple, of the salvation of God being made visible to all people, and of an eschatological outpouring of his Spirit. Now that the one on whom the Spirit of the Lord has descended has been raised up, he utters yet another promise. Then he departs, leaving the disciples to wait.

The final parade scene of *Star Wars*, with the celebration of the heroes' victory heralding a bright new chapter in the struggle against evil, does not afford a more satisfying conclusion than that which Matthew provides for his narrative. Luke's conclusion, in contrast, is more like that of *The Empire Strikes Back*, which simply stops and looks forward to the next adventure, when separated friends will be reunited and unsatisfactory circumstances set right. Just as that film's conclusion is satisfying only if one knows that *Return of the Jedi* follows, so also the conclusion to Luke's gospel satisfies only if one knows that the story is continued in the book of Acts.

On the terms of the 2DH, it must be regarded as at least a minor curiosity that Luke, working independently of Matthew, carries the narrative of his first volume down to a point precisely parallel with Matthew's conclusion, picking the story up from that same point in a second volume. It is a further curiosity if Matthew and Luke, without consulting each other's work, should have arrived at nearly identical

frames for the composition of gospels in which they would incorporate much of Mark and Q. On the 2DH, each independently elected (1) to retain the Marcan account of Jesus' public ministry as the spine of his own work while incorporating material from Q, but (2) to preface this with an account of Jesus' birth in Bethlehem and early life (featuring an angelic announcement of his birth to a parent, actual or supposed, a visit by troops of men divinely guided to the infant, and a relocation of Jesus' family from Bethlehem to Nazareth), and then (3) to append to Mark's empty tomb an account of appearances of the risen Jesus first to a company of disciples other than 'the eleven', who see him only subsequently, concluding with (4) Jesus' commission to the eleven at their first post-resurrection reunion to teach or preach what they have received from him to 'all the nations' in his name. No single one of these authorial choices for revising Mark is especially remarkable, but their multiplication increases the implausibility that two authors of differing sensibilities and interests should independently revise Mark's account of Jesus' ministry in such similar ways.

A more plausible explanation for the composition of Luke's gospel and the origin of Acts can be offered on the FH, *viz.* that Luke was inspired to write Acts by his familiarity with both Mark and Matthew. Luke writes at a period when narrative accounts of Jesus' ministry were being composed, copied, and circulated among Christian communities (Lk. 1.1-2).³⁴ Luke knew a plurality of these, though just how many is uncertain, and the tendency of authors (ancient and modern) to accentuate in prefaces the difficulties of the task they have undertaken should be borne in mind. Mark and Matthew exhibited strengths and weaknesses,

34. For the understanding of the milieu in which the Synoptic gospels were composed taken here, see Harry Y. Gamble, *Books and Readers in the Early Church: A History of Early Christian Texts* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995), and Richard Bauckham (ed.), *The Gospels for All Christians: Rethinking the Gospel Audiences* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998). Luke's preface, it may be noted, betrays no trace that he is acquainted with a document answering to the description of Q on the 2DH, which is surprising if he employed it as one of two principal written sources. Luke's capsule history of early Christian teaching begins with 'eyewitnesses' of 'events brought to fulfillment among us' (*viz.*, the people whose history he recounts in Luke-Acts). Those eyewitnesses 'became' (*γενόμενοι*, Lk. 1.2) 'servants of the word', involved in the ministry of preaching and exhortation that Luke attributes to the Twelve (Acts 6.4), most visibly Peter. This tradition of deeds or events (not only sayings) was handed down to more recent members of the community, including Luke, who undertook to write an ordered account marked by attention to sequence only after having become acquainted with other written efforts, in order to assist Theophilus and others like him, who had received some instruction but desired more.

in Luke's judgment, and failed to address all the pastoral needs with which he was acquainted. To mention but one likely weakness of a clearly popular book about Jesus, Mark's gospel ends abruptly and squanders the opportunity to relate stories of the risen Lord's appearances to his disciples.³⁵

The remedy for an abrupt conclusion is to compose one that brings the narrative to a more gradual and satisfying close. That was one element of the revision of Mark that Matthew accomplished (whether on the FH or the 2DH): he extended the empty tomb story to include the resurrection appearances that Mark only previews (Mk 14.28; 16.7), and he carried the story down as far as the risen Jesus' inauguration of a mission to the nations. If Luke knew only Mark (and not also Matthew), he might likewise have limited himself to a revision of Mark, augmented with material collected from such other books and teaching as he could collect. It would be surprising if, in carrying out that task, he should have augmented Mark's narrative in virtually the identical proportions as another writer/editor with whose work he was unacquainted.

On the 2DH, a work combining Mark and Q would represent a challenging project, given their differences of genre and emphasis. It might be somewhat surprising if a writer who set himself the task of combining those sources into a coherent and useful whole should also decide, as part of the same project from its inception, to compose a companion volume focused on the disciples' ministry. In contrast, it is readily conceivable that an author who on the FH had known and used Matthew as well as Mark in his own teaching might be led by reflection on their conclusions to take a different approach than either of them had.

35. It is unlikely, however, that Mark's ending was quite as disturbing regarding the women at the tomb and the male disciples of Jesus as is sometimes suggested. The auditors of the gospels were, after all, assembled in the name of Jesus to hear the text declaimed by a lector (Mk 13.13; Mt. 24.15; cf. 1 Thess. 5.27; Col. 4.16). Those who had been adherents for some years, at least, had heard since the time of their initiation (whether that bore a Pauline stripe or some other) about how the crucified Messiah had appeared risen from the dead to Peter and the Twelve, to his brother James and all the apostles, and also (Pauline circles, at least, insisted) to Paul, and how they began the job of forming communities from which the churches those who heard the gospels declaimed had developed (1 Cor. 15.3-11). In a paper on "The 'Paulinism' of First John" presented at the Society of Biblical Literature Annual Meeting in Boston, 24 November 2013, I argued that catechetical traditions like those embedded in Rom. 3.21-31 and 8.34 (c. 58 CE) remained a potent resource in the life of the communities addressed in 1 John (c. 80-90 CE). In such a context for the hearing of the gospels, there is much merit in a hortatory construal of Mark's conclusion along the lines sketched out by Larry W. Hurtado, *Mark* (NIBC, 2; Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1989), pp. 279-86.

On the FH, Luke had known Mark's gospel and used it in preaching and teaching for some years, perhaps even decades; Matthew he had known and employed for some years fewer. He appreciated Mark's power and vigor, but its language was often crude and sometimes opaque, its report of the Lord's teaching was thin, and its ending always left congregations baffled and required explanation. On the other hand, Luke valued Matthew's clear organization and wealth of teaching; a fine *vade mecum* for the teacher, the larger book was less suited for declamation to congregations.³⁶ (Luke was unsure whether any lay Christian in the Empire could recall the topics covered in the last third of the Sermon on the Mount, before the striking parable of the Wise and Foolish Builders.) Further, its topic selection was not ideal for the congregations of former God-fearers and pagans that Luke mostly ministered among. Matthew's poetic and didactic conclusion represented an advance on Mark's abrupt and enigmatic one, but it too demanded clarification and correction.

Luke saw what Matthew was trying to accomplish in his conclusion and in his book generally, but he believed the job could be done in a way that would better serve his flock. Luke would compose a gospel suited for cultured persons like his most excellent acquaintance Theophilus, not a teacher but an earnest and inquisitive soul. To encourage the reception of his gospel, Luke would compose it in roughly the same proportions as Matthew, so that it would benefit from familiarity and Matthew's growing positive reception. He would follow Mark's outline for the most part and adopt his anecdotal style and, while incorporating the vital teaching that Matthew records and augmenting it as well, he would spare his auditors by limiting his speeches to half the length of Matthew's great and terrible mountaintop sermon.³⁷

Matthew's conclusion suggested to Luke a major innovation in the written transmission of the 'events fulfilled' among followers of Jesus. He would compose a companion volume for his gospel and tell the story that Matthew only gestured at in his closing lines, showing how the witnesses of the risen Christ were empowered to minister in his name by the Father's Spirit, which the Son poured out upon them after the days of his bodily presence were past, to carry the word of God to the ends of the earth.³⁸ By relating the story of Peter and the Twelve, Stephen and Philip,

36. For an interpretation of Matthew emphasizing its utility for the teaching ministry, see Paul Minear, *Matthew: The Teacher's Gospel* (New York: Pilgrim, 1982).

37. The longest speech in Luke–Acts, Stephen's in Acts 7, is approximately 125 lines of Nestle–Aland text, the Sermon on the Mount approximately 250.

38. Cf. the comment of Denis Farkasfalvy: 'What appears at the end of Matthew only as a barely sketched projection – the sending off of the disciples into the totality

Barnabas and Paul, he would instruct and encourage those of his own day to imitate the faith of the first generation and complete the mission they had begun.

Luke would write an account of the church's origins that would assist Christians with some social standing or ambition to profess their faith without embarrassment. In the unlikely event that his work should fall into the hands of literate pagans, they too would be able to see how remarkable and admirable a people was formed through the ministry of Jesus and his followers. Perhaps Theophilus might even be persuaded to take Luke on at his villa for the duration of the project and afford him the assistance of that broken-down old scribe Tertius he kept on retainer.

Just So Stories, even edifying ones, do not appeal to all scholars. We will end this one here and return to our starting point, the concerns of the gospel exegete for the interpretive suggestiveness of competing Synoptic hypotheses. On the FH, one might describe the book of Acts as a massive Lucan redaction of the final passage in Matthew's gospel (Mt. 28.16-20). By so expanding on Matthew's conclusion and producing a companion volume to his Gospel, Luke opened the nascent Christian literary tradition to drawing on both Jewish and Hellenistic historical traditions and become the father of Christian historiography.³⁹ The vagaries of the Synoptic Problem aside, the reading of Luke–Acts available on the FH offers a fresh perspective with the potential to open up new lines of exegetical inquiry. While not in itself sufficient reason to accept it, this does perhaps give exegetes who have paid little mind to recent source-critical discussion a reason to engage the evidence for this hypothesis and explore what further interpretive fruit it may bear.

of space and time – takes concrete shape in Luke's work' (*Inspiration and Interpretation: A Theological Introduction to Sacred Scripture* [Washington DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2010], p. 38).

39. For Luke–Acts as the first Christian entry in the Hellenistic tradition of 'apologetic historiography', and for the variety of historiographic models on which it draws, see Sterling, *History and Self-Definition*, esp. pp. 311–89.