

Acts-Luke

E Bruce Brooks

University of Massachusetts at Amherst

(7 Feb 2011)

Fitzmyer (**Luke** 1/309f) found that the Lukan Birth Narrative (Lk 1-2) was not original, and that Luke's text had originally begun with the synchronisms of Lk 3:1. Though not further developed by Fitzmyer, this conclusion logically requires that Luke *was formed in two compositional stages*: one (my Luke A) which began with Lk 3:1, and a later one (Luke B) which also included Lk 1-2. I here explore that possibility.

Then Luke is not one text, but at least two, and occupies not one, but at least two, points on the Synoptic diagram. *This one fact revolutionizes all Synoptic calculations*. If for example Luke A precedes, and Luke B follows, Matthew, then bidirectionality in the common Lk/Mt material does not require the hypothesis of an outside source. It can instead be seen as the natural result of borrowing in both directions. Indications of growth in Acts lead in the end to a Luke A/B/C three-stage text-formation model. The plausibility of that model can be tested. What happens if from the long Lukan "travel narrative" (9:51–18:14), passages with Mt > Lk directionality are removed, leaving behind a presumptively original Luke A text? Does that text remain jumbled, no more coherent than the present one? Or does it have a more consecutive character? One part of the answer to that question is taken up at the end of this essay.

How Many Lukes?

The Birth Narrative is probably the most conspicuous addition to an earlier Luke, but it is not the only one. Consider these three passages.

The Nazareth Episode, Lk 4:16-30, comes at the start of Jesus' Galilean ministry, not later, as in Mark.¹ Fitzmyer 1/71 says that it "presents in capsule form the theme of fulfilment and symbolizes the rejection that will mark the ministry as a whole." Just so; that is surely why Luke moved it. Now consider the demand of the Nazarenes, "whatsoever we have heard done at Capernaum, do also here in thine own country" (Lk 4:23). But at that point in Luke, Jesus *has not yet been to Capernaum*. If this line were in Mark, and was overlooked when Luke took it from Mark and put it earlier in his own text, all would be well. *But it is not in Mark*. So Luke can only have added it. But when? Did he add it as a gratuitous absurdity, when he took the story from Mark and put it in a *pre-Capernaum* position? Or as a dramatic enhancement, when the Nazareth episode was still in the Markan *post-Capernaum* position in his own text?

¹In Mark 6:1-6 it follows the Healing of Jairus' Daughter and precedes the Sending of the Twelve. The corresponding position in Luke would be between Lk 8:56 (the end of the Healing of Jairus' Daughter) and 9:1 (the beginning of the Sending of the Twelve).

I prefer the less ridiculous option: that in Luke A the Nazareth episode occupied its Markan position and was enhanced by the “Capernaum” demand, and that Luke B later relocated it, for the reason Fitzmyer gives, not noticing that, *in that new position*, the previously added Capernaum line now created a narrative inconcinnity.

The Call of Peter. In Lk 4:38, Jesus “rose up from the synagogue, and entered the house of Simon. And Simon’s wife’s mother was holden with a great fever.” Fine, but at this point in Luke’s story, *we have not yet met Simon*. This problem does not arise in Mark, where Jesus first calls Simon (and Andrew, and the two Zebedees, who instantly follow him) and *then* preaches in the Capernaum synagogue. It arises because in Luke, the Call has been moved to a spot after the Capernaum Preaching (Lk 5:1-11), where, as Fitzmyer says, “it acquires a more psychologically plausible position, depicting disciples attracted to Jesus after a certain amount of ministry and preaching by him.” Just so. Not only have the Four heard Jesus’ Capernaum sermon, they have seen the Miraculous Catch of Fish, so emblematic of a fruitful lifetime in the preaching of the Word.. So when the Lukan Jesus says to Simon, “Fear not, from henceforth thou shalt catch men,” the prediction is magnificently orchestrated.

But was the social abruptness of Lk 4:38 part of Luke’s first design, or is it a consequence of his having later moved the story from a Markan position, where it involved no confusion in the order of events? The likelier option is to regard this flaw as an authorially overlooked detail rather than an intentional literary effect. I conclude that in Luke A no such flaw existed, and that, at the cost of an unintended absurdity, the Call of Peter was later moved to its present position.

The Call of the Seventy, Lk 10:1-12, follows Jesus’ entry into a Samaritan village which refused to admit him (Jesus declines to call down fire on them, 9:55, and they simply go “to another village”). A few persons offer to follow him. Then Jesus “appointed seventy others, and sent them two by two before his face into every city and place *where he was about to come*.” Their seeming dispatch into Samaria is soon contradicted, since during the rest of the journey Jesus meets Jews but no Samaritans. As he draws nigh to Jerusalem via Jericho (19:1), we realize that, in geographical fact, Jesus has been following the lowland or Jordan route to Jerusalem.²

Is this confusion intentional? Or is it the result of adding a Samaritan beginning to an original Jordan journey? I find no basis for the first option, and adopt the second: Jesus in Luke traveled by the Jordan, and the Samaritan beginning was added later. That “Samaritans” stand for “Gentiles” has been suggested by few, but the Seventy may plausibly be understood as emblematic of a mission to all nations.³

Can all three of these instances be explained by the minimal Luke A/B hypothesis? Or must we posit something more complicated? To find out, I now turn to Acts.

²Creed 139, “It is implied at 9:52 that he followed the route through Samaria. But at 18:35, 19:1 he passes through Jericho. This is not consistent with a direct journey through Samaria.”

³The allusion is to the 70 (or 72) nations of Genesis 10. See Enslin **Samaritans** 279f.

Acts I and II

In Acts, I note the signs of a break between Acts 15:35 and 15:36.

Language. Bernhard Weiss in 1886 noted the Semitic character of the first half of Acts; Torrey in 1916 proposed that it was a translation from Aramaic.⁴ For an Aramaic original I can imagine no plausible scenario. I agree with those who regard the style difference as due to Luke's intentional use of a Septuagintal style, to give a high and solemn tone to a narrative guided at many points by God, who (or whose angels) inspires, or advises, or releases individuals from prison, or transports them to places favorable for a brief missionary encounter, and generally directs the course of events. For such a history, an elevated tone and a Biblical style would be highly appropriate. This tone, I suggest, is what Luke has provided in this part of Acts.

Narrative Continuity. There is also a drastic inconcinnity after Acts 15:35:

Ac 15:32. And **Judas and Silas**, being themselves also prophets, exhorted the brethren with many words and confirmed them. [33] And after they had spent some time, they **were dismissed in peace** from the brethren unto those who had **sent them forth**. [35] But Paul and Barnabas tarried in Antioch, teaching and preaching the Word of the Lord, with many others also.

Ac 15:36. And after some days Paul said unto Barnabas, "Let us return now and visit the brethren in every city wherein we proclaimed the word of the Lord, [and see] how they are." [37] And Barnabas was minded to take with them John also, who was called Mark. [38] But Paul thought not good to take with them him who withdrew from them in Pamphylia, and went not with them to the work. [39] And there arose a sharp contention, so that they parted asunder one from the other, and Barnabas took Mark with him and sailed away unto Cyprus, [40] But **Paul chose Silas** and went forth . . .

How does Silas, who we have been told in Ac 15:32-33 went back with Judas to Jerusalem, come to be in Antioch in Ac 15:40? The text provides no answer.

This is not something to be labeled as an "aporia" and lightly passed by. It is a gross contradiction – so gross that the later scribes go to great lengths to mitigate it. Ephraemi Rescriptus (5c) and some later manuscripts insert a rationalizing verse:

Ac *15:34. But it seemed good unto Silas **to abide there**.

The improvement was further improved in Codex Bezae, which added to *15:34 the clause "and Judas returned alone." These patches solve the problem *for their readers*. But the original text lacked them. Ac 15:36 is not the sort of thing an author is likely to write on the same day as 15:33; it suggests a later reopening of the story. Then an original conclusion at Ac 15:35 was later overridden by a continuation at Ac 15:36f, in which Paul and Barnabas set out to visit the churches.

⁴Weiss **Lehrbuch** 569-584, Torrey **Composition** 40; compare Cadbury **Making** 224. For other suggestions that Acts breaks at 15:35 (Dieu 1920), see Dupont **Sources** 25, 29. Probably relevant is the fact is that Scriptural citations in Acts II are far fewer than those in Acts I (Torrey **Composition** 57). Independently, and from a rhetorical point of view, Kennedy **New** finds that Ac 1:1-15:35 "seems to be a compositional unit and could be read as a complete work" (p127). That Acts 15:35 was the original ending of Acts is the proposal of the present study.

Message. The two segments defined by these considerations also differ in content. In Acts I, Peter and Paul are virtually assimilated to each other.⁵ Peter, not Paul, first preaches to Gentiles.⁶ Both preach with success to mixed audiences. Both preach from OT prophecy. There are no differences of doctrine; no trace of the faith/works issue.⁷ The circumcision controversy is adjudicated at Jerusalem in a way agreeable to all: “When they had read it, they rejoiced for the consolation” (Ac 15:31). Acts I ends on this note of amity between Jewish and Gentile Christians.

In Acts II, the landscape is utterly different. Peter is gone,⁸ and only Paul remains. Except for one at Athens, Paul’s speeches are in his own defense. In them, Paul is not preaching the Gospel, but pleading for Christianity as harmless to Rome. Amity in Acts II is achieved not between Jewish and Gentile believers, but between official Rome and Christianity. Remarkably, the Jewish-Gentile amity of Acts I is replaced by Jewish-Christian hostility. Acts ends with rejection of Christianity by the Jews of Rome. Paul, after preaching to the Jews for an entire day, finds them utterly obdurate:

Ac 28:25. And when they agreed not among themselves, they departed, after that Paul had spoken one word: Well spake the Holy Spirit through Isaiah the prophet unto your fathers, [26] saying:

Go thou unto this people and say,
By hearing ye shall hear, and shall in no wise understand,
And seeing ye shall see, and shall in no wise perceive,
[27] For this people’s heart is waxed gross
And their ears are dull of hearing / And their eyes they have closed,
Lest haply they should perceive with their eyes,
And hear with their ears, and understand with their heart,
And should turn again, and I should heal them.

[28] Be it known therefore unto you, *that this salvation of God is sent unto the Gentiles; they will also hear.* [30] And he abode two whole years . . .

As far as this passage is concerned, the break is final.⁹

⁵For the parallels, see Rackham **Acts** xlvii-xlviii.

⁶The piece establishing this is Peter’s Conversion of Cornelius, Ac 10. It is noteworthy, in view of the forensic apologia of which Acts II in large part consists, that the first Gentile to be converted in Acts is a Roman; compare the Lukan story of the Centurion’s Boy, Lk 7:2-10. Not blaming Rome for the death of Jesus was part of Christian strategy from the beginning, as witness the hesitations of Pilate, already in the Markan Crucifixion story (Mk 15:6-15).

⁷That is, the Atonement doctrine (Brooks **Jacob** 111-112). Two passages in Mark imply that doctrine (Mk 10:45, 14:24); *Luke repeats neither*. Paul in Acts preaches from the OT, and never mentions the Atonement, or any other version of theologia crucis (his remark at Ac 20:28 is personal, addressed to an Ephesian colleague; not public). This strange lack has been observed (Vielhauer 45, “Nothing is said of the saving significance of the cross of Christ;” Moule 171, “There is in Acts almost as complete an absence of any explicitly *redemptive* interpretation of the death of Christ as in Luke’s Gospel,” but these observations have not been followed up. What they lead to is that Luke knew the Atonement doctrine *but opposed it*; he excised it both from his Gospel and from his history of Christianity.

⁸His exit line is Ac 12:17c, which thus ends the account of his escape from jail and report at the house of John Mark’s mother: “And he departed, and went to another place.”

⁹Doubted by Soards **Speeches** 206. But in linear art, the final message *is the message*.

The break at Rome has a precedent in an earlier confrontation at Corinth:

Ac 18:6. And when they opposed themselves and blasphemed, he shook out his raiment and said unto them, Your blood be upon your own heads; I am clean; *from henceforth I will go to the Gentiles.*

A still earlier scene, at Pisidian Antioch in Acts I, seems to violate the contrast between Jewish/Gentile amity in Acts I and Jewish/Christian severance in Acts II. Upon inspection, however, the Ac 13 “severance” passage appears to be intrusive:

Ac 13:44. And the next Sabbath almost the whole city was gathered together to hear the word of God.

[45] But when the Jews saw the multitudes, they were filled with jealousy, and contradicted the things which were spoken by Paul, and blasphemed. [46] And Paul and Barnabas spake out boldly, and said, It was necessary that the word of God should first be spoken to you. Seeing ye thrust it from you, and judge yourselves unworthy of eternal life, lo, we turn to the Gentiles. [47] For so hath the Lord commanded us, saying, “I have set thee for a light of the Gentiles, / that thou shouldest be for salvation unto the uttermost part of the earth.” [48] And as the Gentiles heard this, they were glad, and glorified the word of God, and as many as were ordained to eternal life believed. [49] And the word of the Lord was spread abroad throughout all the region.

[50] But the Jews urged on the devout women of honorable estate, and the chief men of the city, and stirred up a persecution against Paul and Barnabas and cast them out of their borders. [51] But they shook off the dust of their feet against them, and came unto Iconium. [52] And the disciples were filled with joy and with the Holy Spirit.

This passage as it stands gives two accounts of the same incident. In outline:

- A. An audience gathers [44].
 - B. *But* when the Jews saw the many present, they were *jealous* [45]
 - C. Paul rejects the Jews in favor of the Gentiles [46-47]
 - D. The Gentiles *rejoice*; the Word is spread widely [48-49]
- B. *But* the Jews urged others to stir up opposition [50]
- C. Paul and Barnabas leave, rejecting the city [51]
- D. They go on to Iconium. The disciples *rejoice* [52]

The duplicating of initial *but* (δέ, 13:45 and 50) is typical of interpolations.¹⁰ The phrase “filled with jealousy” (ἐπλήσθησαν ζήλου) occurs also in Ac 5:17, but there it suits the Sadducees. The spreading of the Word is a typical conclusion to an Acts unit (compare 2:41-43 and 6:7, both mentioning the Word), but 13:48-49 *does not end* the Pisidian Antioch unit; rather, it creates a conflict with the other ending in 13:50-52. Then the original Pisidian Antioch scene (recounting Jewish opposition rather than Christian/Jewish severance) belongs to Acts I, and Ac 13:45-49 was later added to harmonize all of Acts along the thematic lines of Acts II.¹¹

Then Acts I is thematically consistent, and so is Acts II. This, with the other evidence, supports the conclusion that Acts I and Acts II are distinguishable texts.

¹⁰For this trait of interpolated passages, see Walker **Evidence** 19.

¹¹For Ac 13:45f (Acts II) and Lk 4:25f (Luke C, Neiryck **Luke 4:16-30** 374), see p167.

Acts and Luke

The minimal Luke hypothesis is Luke A/B. We now have Acts I/II. It would be convenient if they matched up as Luke A + Acts I followed by Luke B + Acts II. But the Gentile Mission emphasis in Acts I and the Sending of the Seventy in Luke B suggest instead that Luke B and Acts I represent the same text-formation phase, thus:

Luke A	Luke B	
	Acts I	Acts II

Was there then a Luke C, corresponding to Acts II? Seemingly so: several passages in Luke sound the “Gentiles Only” motif of Acts II. Here are five instances.¹²

A Nazareth Addition, Lk 4:25-30. Jesus’ reading from Isaiah (Lk 4:17-21) is a public self-identification (“Today hath this scripture been fulfilled in your ears,” 4:21). To proclaim that self-identification was the probable point of relocating this passage to the beginning of the Galilean ministry, and that detail may be ascribed to Luke B. But then comes a quite different statement by Jesus. It reads as follows:

Lk 4:24. And he said, Verily I say unto you, No prophet is acceptable in his own country.

[25] But of a truth I say unto you, There were many widows in Israel in the days of Elijah, when the heaven was shut up three years and six months, when there came a great famine over all the land; [26] and unto none of them was Elijah sent, but only to Zarephath, in the land of Sidon, unto a woman that was a widow. [27] And there were many lepers in Israel in the time of Elisha the prophet, and none of them was cleansed, but only Naaman the Syrian. [28] And they were all filled with wrath in the synagogue, as they heard these things, [29] and they rose up, and cast him forth out of the city, and led him unto the brow of the hill whereon the city was built, that they might throw him down headlong. [30] But he passing through the midst of them went his way.

Jesus’ “Gentiles Only” message, presaging rejection of Israel by God, is met by the Nazarenes’ rejection of Jesus, who try to kill him. The addition belongs to Luke C.

A Feast Addition, Lk 14:24. The Feast parable, Lk 14:15-24, has a parallel in Matthew (Mt 22:1-10). Both parables end with the servants gathering enough people to fill the wedding hall (Mt 22:10, Lk 14:23). But beyond that last point of similarity, there is a further line in the Lukan version which is not matched in Matthew, a final comment of the host, as though drawing a general moral: “[24] *For I say unto you, that none of those men that were bidden shall taste of my supper.*” Here is the note of exclusion: only the last-called [the Gentiles], and *none of the first-called* [the Jews], shall find felicity. This addition to the Feast parable probably belongs to Luke C.

A Lazarus Addition, Lk 16:27-31. The basic Lazarus story (Lk 16:19-26) contains the archetypal Lukan poverty message: the rich man has already had his day; whereas in the next world, poor Lazarus will enjoy felicity.

¹²On the present hypothesis, Goulter’s suggestion (Tuckett **Beatitudes** 212) that Lk 6:22f reflects the (c85) Birkat ha-Minim could be construed as a Luke C addition. But that Beatitude has its parallel in the derivative Matthean Beatitudes, and thus must have stood in Luke A.

So far Luke A. But the final paragraph goes further:

Lk 16:27. And he said, I pray thee therefore, father, that thou wouldest send him to my father's house, [28] for I have five brethren, that he may testify unto them, lest they also come into this place of torment. [29] But Abraham saith, They have Moses and the prophets, let them hear them. [30] And he said, Nay, father Abraham, but if one go to them from the dead, they will repent. [31] And he said unto him, If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded, if one rise from the dead.

This directly expresses the hopelessness of preaching Christ Risen to those who "have Moses and the prophets;" namely, the Jews. Only Gentiles are open to that persuasion. This final paragraph may thus be seen as belonging typologically to Luke C.

The Good Samaritan, Lk 10:29-37, shows a priest and a Levite conspicuously refusing to give aid to a wounded man, whereas a Samaritan . . . well, let Luke tell it:

[33] But a certain Samaritan, as he journeyed, came where he was, and when he saw him, he was moved with compassion, [34] and came to him, and bound up his wounds, pouring on oil and wine, and he set him on his own beast, and brought him to an inn, and took care of him. [35] And on the morrow he took out two shillings and gave them to the host, and said, Take care of him, and whatsoever thou spendest more, I, when I come back again, will repay thee.

The point of the story is not the kindness of the Samaritan, but the *refusal of kindness by the Jews*. As Jesus puts it, "Which of these three, thinkest thou, proved neighbor to him that fell among the robbers?" The entire parable thus belongs to Luke C.

The Ten Lepers, Lk 17:11-19, shows ten healed, but only one, a Samaritan, returning to give thanks. Jesus summarizes that situation this way: "[17b] Were not the ten cleansed? But where are the nine? [18] Were none found that returned to give glory to God, save this stranger (ἀλλογενῆς)? [19] And he said unto him, Arise and go thy way, thy faith hath made thee whole."

Only the stranger gives glory to God, and only he has truly received the gift of Jesus. The entire parable thus belongs to Luke C.

Conclusion: The author of Acts II has placed harmonizing material (the Pisidian Antioch interpolation) in Acts I, and he has also placed these harmonizing passages in his Gospel. All of them should be attributed to the time when Acts II was composed, as an extension to Acts I. We thus cannot avoid positing a Luke C. The final lineup is:

Luke A	Luke B	Luke C
	Acts I	Acts II

This concludes the argument for the Luke A/B/C model.

Again Luke B. Does the secondarity of the Lukan Birth Narrative, with which we began, find support elsewhere in Luke and Acts? It does. The element of miracle in the Birth Narrative is also evident in the Miraculous Catch of Fish (Lk 5:1-11). Separately, the pronounced Semitic character of its language (so strong that it has been thought to be based on a Hebrew original; Montefiore 2/364) agrees with the also notably Semitic character of Acts I, and justifies aligning Acts I with Luke B.

Then these *individual* features combine to give a consistent *collective* impression, not of a unitary Luke-Acts, but of Luke and Acts developing in the same direction.

The Luke/Acts Join

The A/B/C theory implies that Acts was not begun at the same time as Luke A; rather, the first part of Acts, my Acts I, was added to the Gospel at the Luke B stage. Is there further evidence that this was the case? There is. It consists in the mismatch between the scene which ends the Gospel and the one which begins Acts.

As Enslin **Ascension** 72 first noticed, and as Epp **Ascension** 224 later agreed, the Ascension of Jesus as a separate event *occurs only in Acts*. In Luke, the last moments of the risen Jesus on earth read like this:

Lk 24:50. And he led them out until [they were] over against Bethany, and he lifted up his hands and *blessed them*. [51] And it came to pass, *while he blessed them*, he parted from them, and was carried up into Heaven.

Jesus simply vanishes *in the middle of a blessing*, without fanfare, much as he had earlier vanished, again after a blessing, from the Emmaus Two in Lk 24:31, thus:

Lk 24:30. And it came to pass, when he had sat down with them to meat, he took the bread and *blessed*, and breaking it he gave it to them. [31] And their eyes were opened, and they knew him, and he vanished out of their sight.

These sudden vanishings are how the risen Jesus parts from his disciples in Luke.

Acts, in striking contrast, envisions a protracted period in which Jesus instructs his disciples, and describes a separate Ascension event with many details not in Luke A:

Ac 1:2 . . . until the day in which he was received up, after that he had given commandment through the Holy Spirit unto the apostles whom he had chosen, [3] to whom he also showed himself alive after his passion by **many** proofs, appearing unto them by the space of **forty days**, and speaking **the things concerning the Kingdom of God**. [4] And being assembled together with them, he charged them not to depart from Jerusalem . . . [9] And when he had said these things, as they were looking, he was taken up, and **a cloud received him out of their sight**. [10] And while they were looking steadily into Heaven as he went, behold, **two men** stood by them in white apparel, [11] who also said, Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye looking into Heaven? This Jesus, who was received up from you into Heaven **shall so come in like manner** as ye beheld him going into Heaven. [12] Then they returned unto Jerusalem . . .

Forty days of teaching, two angelic figures who predict the Return – all this is new.

The Acts account is not a more detailed but compatible version of the Luke account. *It is a different account*, and the difference implies discontinuity. These two, again, are not the kind of thing that the same author would write on the same day. Nor are they the kind of narrative inconcinnity that occurred when the author resumed his story of Christianity at Ac 15:36. The Acts Ascension looks more like something which has been mythically expanded in the meantime. The evident passage of time adds further emphasis to the differences already noted between Luke A (without Acts) and Luke B (with appended Acts I). Luke B and Acts I are not authorial afterthoughts; *they are later revisitings and extensions of territory previously covered*.

Then the Gospel was *not originally envisioned* as continuing in Acts. The Gospel was originally the whole story. With Fitzmyer (1/3), and with Parsons/Pervo (60-64), Acts should be seen as a *later sequel* to Luke, not as the second part of a single work.

Supporters of the unity of Luke and Acts have argued that Luke anticipates Acts; Barrett (**Third** 1453f) cites 41 places where this seems to be the case. And Luke *does* anticipate Acts. The only question is *whether those anticipations are original*. Several of Barrett's 41 passages have been construed above as secondary in Luke. The passage on which Barrett most relies, however, is his #41, at the end of Luke. I here quote it, giving the four relevant Acts passages in brackets. I suggest that two of these four Acts-relevant Luke passages [indented] are later interpolations, which, if excised, leave behind a plausible conclusion for the original Luke:

Lk 24:46. And he said unto them, Thus it is written, that the Christ should suffer, and rise again from the dead the third day,

[47] and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name unto all the nations, beginning from Jerusalem. [Ac 1:4-8]

[48] Ye are witnesses of these things.

[49] And behold, I send forth the promise of my Father upon you, but tarry ye in the city, until ye are clothed with power from on high. [Ac 2:1-4]

[50] And he led them out until they were over against Bethany, and he lifted up his hands, and blessed them. [51] And it came to pass while he blessed them, he parted from them, and was carried up to heaven. [Ac 1-9-11]

[52] And they worshipped him, and returned to Jerusalem with great joy,

[53] and were continually in the Temple praising God. [Ac 1:12-14]

The excised passages work like this. (1) The disciples in 24:48 are witnesses of the risen Christ (24:46), *but not of "preaching to all nations"* (24:47), an event which has not yet occurred; 24:46 and 24:48 tell a consistent story which 24:47 complicates. Thus Lk 24:47 is indeed an anticipation of Acts, but it is best seen an interpolation.¹³ (2) Ac 1:8 repeats the promise of Lk 24:49, and shows it being fulfilled. Lk 24:49 is thus indeed an Acts anticipation, but it is not essential to the Gospel narrative.

As for Lk 24:50-51, I have argued above that it is not a *prediction*, but a *different version*, of the Ascension. Note that Ac 1:12-14 does not show the apostles praying in the Temple, but in an "upper room;" it does not realize, but conflicts with, Lk 24:53. Then the two truly predictive verses, 24:47 and 49, can be seen as later additions to an originally unpredictable, but literarily satisfactory, conclusion to the Gospel.

In terms of text formation, we may note that the planting of anticipations of Acts in Luke A, in the Luke B / Acts I phase, is entirely analogous to the planting of the Pisidian Antioch precedent for Acts II in Acts I, in the Luke C phase. Both bespeak an author concerned, not only to update his narrative in the light of recent ideas or events, but to maintain consistency over the whole of the resulting extended text. Luke's Gospel turns out to be continually under Luke's concerned authorial eye.¹⁴

¹³In addition to its anticipation of the beginning of Acts, Lk 24:47 (Luke B) has a close verbal link to the Conversion of Cornelius (Ac 10:34f, Acts I); see Neiryck **Luke 4:16-30** 379.

¹⁴These evidences of retouching the earlier layers of both the Gospel and Acts so as to maintain consistency between them, unavoidably implies that the author of Acts, including its second segment, Acts II, *still maintained control over the Gospel*, and was capable of making harmonizing additions to it. This refutes any theory which assumes an Acts separate from, and datable apart from, the Gospel. The Gospel and Acts, throughout their compositional history, must have remained under the same authorship or (what is equivalent) the same sponsorship.

Bidirectionality in Luke and Matthew

Now comes the crux. The argument so far helps to show how Luke worked as an author. But these findings also bear on the Synoptic Problem, defined as drawing lines between the points on the Synoptic Chart which represent Mark, Matthew, and Luke. The present proposal is that *Luke occupies not one, but three* positions on that chart.

What is the directionality of the Mt/Lk common material? Goulder (2/679f) argues for Mt > Lk by showing how Luke has messed up an original Matthew parable:

The Parable of the Talents, Mt 25:14-20 > Lk 19:11-27, which Goulder characterizes as “an unhappy blend of inconsequence and absurdity:”

Lk 19:12-13. “The ‘man’ of Matthew’s parable he makes a noble, and sends him to a ‘far country’ . . . to receive a kingdom and return . . . Given the scale on which Matthew thinks, with money laid out by the talent, nobles and kingdoms would not be out of place, but Luke has an aversion from big business, and he reduces the investments to a [mina] apiece, 100 denarii . . .”

Lk 19:20. “By v20, Luke has forgotten that he had ten servants, and in place of ‘the third’ writes ‘the other.’”¹⁵

Lk 19:21. “Matthew’s master is accused fairly of taking the return from the land without working for it; Luke’s master is accused unfairly of taking (profit) from (investments) he had not made . . . Luke is not at home with business.” [Conclusion]. “Luke . . . has superimposed the kingship theme on the Matthean Talents, an uneasy combination.”

This would seem to be decisive as to the directionality **Mt > Lk B**. The problem is that other examples *point no less clearly in the other direction*. As witness:

The Parable of the Feast (Mt 22:1-14 < Lk 14:16-24). Many of the absurdities¹⁶ are due to Mt 22:6-7 (where the King’s troops attack the murderous guests, destroy them, and burn their – and his own! – city). Omitting this as a possible interpolation predicting the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus in 70, we have left these differences:

Mt 22:1. Luke’s “man,” presumably a rich man but not otherwise empowered, becomes a king: narratively superfluous but typically Matthean.

Mt 22:2. Luke’s “banquet” similarly becomes “a marriage feast for his son,” an occasion less likely to be declinable by the king’s leading citizens.

Mt 22:11-14. Not in Luke: The king sees that a guest picked up by his servants lacks a wedding garment (as is natural, given the suddenness of the invitation) and has him bound and thrown into the outer darkness, “where man will weep and gnash their teeth” (a favorite Mattheanism; 8× in Matthew vs 1× in Luke). Love of punishment is a Matthean trait.

Harnack, who sees Matthew as original in almost all the Mt/Lk common material, nevertheless says, of these and several other points, “There is no need of many words to prove that here St Matthew is almost everywhere secondary” (**Sayings** 121). Then Luke is here original, and in contrast to the above example, we have **Lk A > Mt**.

¹⁵For this example of a second author’s failure to sustain a change made in a source text, see Goodacre **Fatigue** 55.

¹⁶Hilariously dealt with in Beare **Matthew** 431-437.

Bidirectionality of the Mt/Lk common material is a main support of the Q theory. But as above noted, the Luke A/B/C model accounts for the bidirectionality without the need to posit an outside text like Q. It will also explain the Minor Agreements, which Q does not, and the Birth Narratives, which Q cannot. The case for Luke A/B/C is thus promising. Further evidence would be a plausible reconstruction of Luke A. That is not practical here,¹⁷ but as a sample, I will reconstruct the first part of the Travel Narrative; the part containing the enigmatic¹⁸ story of Mary and Martha.

A Test of the Model: Lk 9:51-11:32

The story of Mary and Martha occurs early in the long passage Lk 9:51–18:14, known as Luke’s “Special Section” or “Travel Narrative,” though the material consists of sayings of Jesus and takes little narrative account of the land that Jesus traverses.

The Lk 9:51-11:32 inventory is as follows (Matthean parallels are at right):

Lk	Mt
9:51-56. Refusal of the Samaritan villages to receive Jesus [C]	
9:57-58. A man offers to follow; Jesus dissuades him	8:19-20
9:59-60. A man asks to bury his father; Jesus refuses	8:21-22
9:61-62. A man asks to say farewell; Jesus refuses	
10:1-12. Appointment of the Seventy ¹⁹ [C]	
10:13-16. Woes to the Galilean churches	11:21-23, 10:40
10:17-20. Return of the Seventy [C]	
10:21. Wisdom revealed unto babes	11:25-26
10:22. “All things have been delivered unto me”	11:27
10:23-24. “Blessed are your eyes”	13:16-17
10:25-28. The Lawyer’s question about inheriting eternal life ²⁰	
10:29-37. The Good Samaritan [C]	
10:38-42. Mary and Martha	
11:1-4. The Lord’s Prayer	6:9-13
11:5-8. The Friend at Midnight	
11:9-13. Ask and the Father will give you good gifts	7:7-11
11:14-23. Casting out a demon; the Beelzebul controversy	12:22-30
11:24-26. Return of the evil spirit	12:43-45
11:27-28. Praise of Jesus’ mother rebuked by Jesus	
11:29-32. An evil generation	12:38-40, 42, 41

The demonic series (11:14-26) and the criticism of the age (11:29-32) differ in tone from the material around them and are more at home in Mt 12:22-45 and 12:38-42. Removing them leaves the unique Lukan reproof of a woman who would venerate Jesus’ physical mother;²¹ Jesus instead directs attention to the family of the faithful.

¹⁷For further work along this line, see Brooks **Steward** and Brooks **Way**.

¹⁸“[No interpretation] is fully satisfactory” (Nolland 2/601); “ambiguous” (Bovon 2/67).

¹⁹Draws on the Sending of the Twelve, but Matthew has no parallel to the Seventy as such.

²⁰This is a Lukan relocated passage; the Matthean and Markan parallels are at another place.

²¹Such veneration appears in the Birth Narrative, Lk 1-2. But Lk 1-2 is not original to Luke (p130 above) and belongs to Luke B. Then Lk 11:27-28 is clearly earlier, and must be Luke A.

Eliminating these, and passages earlier identified as Luke B or C,²² we get:

Lk	Mt
9:51a. Introduction: Departing for Jerusalem	
9:57-58. A man offers to follow; Jesus dissuades him	
9:59-60. A man asks to bury his father; Jesus refuses	8:19-20
9:61-62. A man asks to say farewell; Jesus refuses	8:21-22
10:13-16. Woes to the Galilean churches	11:21-23, 10:40
10:21. Wisdom revealed unto babes	11:25-26
10:22. "All things have been delivered unto me"	11:27
10:23-24. "Blessed are your eyes"	13:16-17
10:38-42. Mary and Martha	
11:1-4. The Lord's Prayer	6:9-13
11:5-8. The Friend at Midnight	
11:9-13. Ask and the Father will give you good gifts	7:7-11
11:27-28. Praise of Jesus' mother rebuked by Jesus	

Consider first Lk 10:13-16, 21, 22, and 23-:24, which become consecutive once the Seventy passage Lk 10:17-20 [C] is removed. All have Matthean parallels:

Lk 10:13-16	Mt 11:21-23, 10:40	Woes to the Galilean churches
Lk 10:21	Mt 11:25-26	Wisdom revealed unto babes
Lk 10:22	Mt 11:27	"All things have been delivered unto me"
Lk 10:23-24	Mt 13:16-17	"Blessed are your eyes"

Mt 13:16-17 stands out from the other Matthean parallels. In its own context:

Lk 8:9-10	Mt 13:10-15	Explanation of teaching in parables
Lk 10:23-24	Mt 13:16-17	"Blessed are your eyes"
Lk 8:11-15	Mt 13:18-23	Explanation of the Sower Parable

the Mt 13 group *is* consecutive: (1) the people cannot understand; (2) the disciples can understand; (3) an esoteric explanation. In Luke, on the other hand, the wise disciples ("blessed are your eyes") are suddenly called children ("unto babes"). The more consistent context may be the original, If so, then Mt 13:18-23 > Lk (B) 8:11-15.

Going back to Lk 10:13-16, I note that the cursing of the Galilean churches is more in character for legalistic Matthew than for gentle Luke. The Matthean context is:

Lk 7:31-35	Mt 11:16-19	Criticism of the present generation
Lk 10:13-15	Mt 11:20-24	Woes on the Galilean churches
Lk 10:21-22	Mt 11:25-26	Wisdom revealed unto babes

These Mt criticisms seem consecutive: woes on the "senior" Galilean tradition imply praise of the "junior" or Jerusalem tradition. Then the Matthean order may be original, and if so, the directionality is Mt 11:16-26 > Lk (B) 7:31-35, 10:13-15, and 10:21-22.

For the Lord's Prayer, I agree with those who find the Matthean form secondary.²³

²²See above. The Lawyer's Question (Mt 10:25-28), has obviously been moved in Luke to precede the Good Samaritan, which gives Jesus' answer to the lawyer's second question.

²³For example, Fitzmyer 2/897. Harnack 64, "All the other clauses found in St Matthew are either accretions which attached themselves . . . during the process of transformation into a solemn congregational prayer . . . or they were added by Matthew himself."

Eliminating passages which seem to be original in Mt, and thus secondary in Lk, gives us, for the probable original content of this part of Lk A, the following passages:

- 9:51a. Introduction: Departing for Jerusalem
- 9:57-62. A man offer to follow; Jesus dissuades him
- 9:59-60. A man asks to bury his father; Jesus refuses
- 9:61-62. A man asks to say farewell; Jesus refuses
- 10:38-42. Mary and Martha
- 11:1-4. The Lord's Prayer
- 11:5-8. The Friend at Midnight
- 11:9-13. Ask and the Father will give you good gifts
- 11:27-28. Praise of Jesus' mother is rebuked

In this proposed Luke A material, we may now discern a definite formal pattern:

[1. Total Dedication to the Way]

- 9:51a. Introduction: Departing for Jerusalem
- ⌈9:57-62. A man offers to follow; Jesus dissuades him
- 9:59-60. A man asks to bury his father; Jesus refuses
- ⌋9:61-62. A man asks to say farewell; Jesus refuses
- 10:38-42. **Mary and Martha** [against domestic distractions]

[2. Prayer as Companion Along the Way]

- ⌈11:1-4. **The Lord's Prayer**
- 11:5-8. The Friend at Midnight [prayer will be answered]
- ⌋11:9-13. Ask and the Father will give you good gifts
- 11:27-28. Praise of Jesus' mother rebuked [against sentimental distraction]

The pattern consists of two thematic sections, one on dedication and one on prayer. Each consists of a triplet of statements or illustrations, here followed by a concluding piece which applies the lesson of the triplet to women. The Mary and Martha story, as here restored, concludes the group on the need for dedication. As the man who would take leave of his family is rebuked for hesitation, so Martha, "cumbered about much serving," is rebuked for her priorities. "Mary hath chosen the good part."²⁴ Reliance on the Heavenly Father in 11:9-13 is contrasted with misguided adoration of Jesus' earthly mother in 11:27-28. In both, "Jesus" directs attention to higher things. An unclear connection²⁵ is thus clarified²⁶ by removing intervening later material.²⁷ The final passages in both groups can be seen to address erring women.

I find this pattern convincing, and offer it as a correct reading of this part of Luke's "Special Section." In view of this result, I propose to call the section Luke's "Sermon on the Way," intending "Way" as both a sermon delivered on the way to Jerusalem, and as expounding the Way: the dedication and hope which characterize discipleship.

²⁴For the many interpretations of the commentators, see Nolland 2/601.

²⁵Fitzmyer 2/926 on Lk 11:27-28, "it is hard to see why Luke has put this episode here."

²⁶Creed 162 calls Lk 11:27-28 a "variant" of the Mk 3:19b-21 and 31-35 passage where Jesus rejects his birth family. It is rather a doublet (the counterpart occurs at Lk 8:19-21): not rejection of Jesus' family, but Luke's reproof of the *popular enthusiasm* for Jesus' family, and especially his mother, which probably provided part of the push behind the divinization of Jesus himself in the 1st century (for the textual results, see Brooks **Four** 27).

²⁷For the logic of Luke B's placement of this later material, see Brooks **Way** 194-196.

Matthew's Predilection for Twos

Matthew's predilection for twos is obvious.²⁸ It is evident in the above passage, where Lukan triplets (chiding followers; assurances about prayer) become duplets in Matthew. Here is another example of Matthew's duplet way with Luke's triplets:

Lk 15:3-7	The Lost Sheep	[Mt 18:12-14]
Lk 15:8-10	The Lost Coin	[not in Mt]
Lk 15:11-32	The Lost ["Prodigal"] Son	

Matthew is less interested in women than is Luke, so his omission of the Woman with the Lost Coin parable is in character. As for the Lost Son parable, its extreme poverty may have repelled the high-budget Matthew. But he *has* included it, greatly rewritten, as the Parable of Two Sons (Mt 21:28-32),²⁹ with the clear directionality **Lk A > Mt**. This is then a further example of a Lukan triplet transformed into a Matthean duplet. It is also a further example of the directionality Lk > Mt.

Formal Order and Formal Violation

If Luke's Sermon had such a nicely calculated form (it will inevitably be asked), why would he then spoil that form by his later additions? Such questions recur in the study of ancient texts. The proprietors of the *Analects*, the home text of the Confucian school of Lǚ, arranged their sayings of Confucius in pairs and grouped the pairs under four topics, resulting in 24-sayings chapters.³⁰ They later added sayings which violated that arrangement. One can only say that a writer's reason for adding later material is, at that moment, more urgent than any consideration of previous formal arrangements or original narrative coherence. The attention of the writer is directed elsewhere.

Has Horace spoiled his beautifully arranged *Carmina*, with their peroration at 3:30, by adding further material in his 4th book? Formally, yes. But who would sacrifice *Quem tu Melpomene* (4:3) to preserve the finality of *Exegi monumentum* (3:30)?

Envoi

I believe that it has been shown that the bidirectionality of the common Mt/Lk material can be accounted for without the need for an outside source. Besides Q itself, the chief theory which this proposal replaces is the Farrer-Goulder Hypothesis (FGH), after a proposal of Austin Farrer (1955) as later realized by Michael Goulder (1989). In view of the contribution of Morton Enslin to both aspects of the present argument, and if these things are to be given names at all, I should like the model here proposed to be known as the Enslin-Brooks Hypothesis (EBH).³¹

²⁸Taking Zechariah 9:9 literally, Matthew sends Jesus into Jerusalem on *two* animals (21:7). He also recasts Mark's one Gerasene Demoniac as *two* [Gadarene] Demoniacs (Mt 8:28-34), and Mark's one blind man as *two* blind men (Mt 20:29-34). There are several other instances.

²⁹See Gundry **Matthew** 421-424 or Gundry **Parable**.

³⁰For details, see Brooks **Analects**.

³¹I am reminded by Stephen Carlson that Ropes (**Synoptic**, 1934) preceded Enslin ("Luke," 1938; **Matthew**, 1967) in recording doubts about Q. Considering that the present model deals, as it must, with more than Q, I think I will let the above suggestion stand.

Works Cited

- C K Barrett. The Third Gospel as a Preface to Acts? in F van Segbroeck et al (ed), The Four Gospels 1992, 2v Peeters (1992) 2/1451-1466
- Francis W Beare. The Gospel According to Matthew. Harper 1981
- François Bovon. Luke. 3v Fortress 2002, 2013, 2012
- E Bruce Brooks. The Epistle of Jacob. Alpha v1 (2107) 58-70
- E Bruce Brooks. Four Gospel Trajectories. Alpha v1 (2017) 15-16
- E Bruce Brooks. Luke's Sermon on the Way. Alpha v1 (2017) 167-179
- E Bruce Brooks. Luke's Parable of the Canny Steward. Alpha v1 (2017) 158-166
- E Bruce and A Taeko Brooks. The Original Analects. Columbia 1998
- Henry J Cadbury. The Making of Luke-Acts. 3ed 1958; SPCK 1968
- John Martin Creed. The Gospel According to St Luke. Macmillan 1930
- Jacques Dupont. The Sources of the Acts. 1960; Herder 1964
- Morton S Enslin. The Ascension Story. JBL v47 (1928) 60-73
- Morton S Enslin. Luke and Matthew. JQR v57 (1967) 178-191
- Morton S Enslin. "Luke" and Paul. JAOS v58 (1938) 81-91
- Morton S Enslin. Luke and the Samaritans. HTR v36 #4 (1943) 277-297
- Eldon Jay Epp. The Ascension in the Textual Tradition of Luke-Acts. 1981; in Perspectives on New Testament Textual Criticism, Brill (2005) 211-225
- A M Farrer. On Dispensing with Q; in D E Nineham, Studies in the Gospels, Oxford (1955) 55-86
- Joseph A Fitzmyer. The Gospel According to Luke. 2v Doubleday 1970, 1985
- Mark Goodacre. Fatigue in the Synoptics. NTS v44 (1998) 45-58
- Michael Goulder. Luke: A New Paradigm. 2v Sheffield 1989
- Robert H Gundry. Matthew. Eerdmans 1982
- Robert H Gundry. Matthew's Parable of the Two Sons. Alpha v1 (2013) 152-154
- Adolph von Harnack. The Sayings of Jesus. 1907; tr Williams & Norgate 1908
- George A Kennedy. New Testament Interpretation Through Rhetorical Criticism. North Carolina 1956
- Leander E Keck and J Louis Martyn (ed). Studies in Luke-Acts. Abingdon 1966
- C G Montefiore. The Synoptic Gospels. 2ed 2v Macmillan 1927
- C D Moule. The Christology of Acts; in Keck **Studies** 159-185
- Frans Neiryck. Luke 4:16-30 and the Unity of Luke-Acts; in Verheyden **Unity** 357-395
- John Nolland. Luke. 3v Word 1989, 1993, 1993
- Mikeal Parsons and Richard Pervo. Rethinking the Unity of Luke and Acts. Fortress 1993
- R B Rackham. The Acts of the Apostles. Methuen 1901
- James Hardy Ropes. The Synoptic Gospels. Harvard 1934
- Marion L Soards. The Speeches in Acts. Westminster 1994
- Charles C Torrey. The Composition and Date of Acts. Harvard 1916
- C M Tuckett and M D Goulder. The Beatitudes. NovT v25 (1983) 193-216
- Joseph Verheyden (ed). The Unity of Luke-Acts. Peeters 1999
- Philipp Vielhauer. On the "Paulinism" of Acts. 1950; in Keck **Studies** 33-50
- William O Walker Jr. Evidence for Interpolation in Paul. Alpha v1 (2017) 17-22
- William O Walker Jr. Interpolations in the Pauline Letters. Sheffield 2001
- Bernhard Weiss. Lehrbuch der Einleitung in das Neue Testament. Hertz 1886