

Mark Goodacre, "Taking our leave of Mark-Q Overlaps: Major Agreements and the Farrer Theory," in Mogens Müller and Heike Omerzu, *Gospel Interpretation and the Q Hypothesis* (Library of New Testament Studies; London & New York: Bloomsbury, 2018), 201-22, reproduced with permission, on <http://markgoodacre.org/articles.htm>

Chapter 11

TAKING OUR LEAVE OF MARK-Q OVERLAPS: MAJOR AGREEMENTS AND THE FARRER THEORY

Mark Goodacre

11.1 *What Are the Mark-Q Overlaps?*

For students of the Synoptic Problem (hereafter SP), the 'Mark-Q overlap' passages represent a particularly fascinating set of data. These passages have a special place in the Two-Source Theory, occupying the space where the two major, independent sources of Matthew and Luke appear to 'overlap'. In this chapter, I would like to argue that the Mark-Q overlaps draw attention to the weakness of the Two-Source Theory. These passages contradict one of the major arguments for the existence of Q and they compromise the elegant architecture of the Two-Source Theory. When they are taken seriously, the model loses its appeal.

The Mark-Q overlap passages, and the difficulties they pose for the Two-Source Theory, are not widely understood.¹ It will be helpful, therefore, to lay out which passages are involved, why the theory of 'Mark-Q overlap' is invoked, and why it is problematic. The basic pattern for much, but not all, of the triple-tradition

1. The focus of this chapter is the Two-Source Theory and the difficulties that the Mark-Q overlaps pose for that theory. Other theories explain the Mark-Q overlaps in other ways, e.g. recently Delbert Burkett, *Rethinking the Gospel Sources, Volume 2: The Unity and Plurality of Q*, SBL Early Christianity and Its Literature (SBLECL) 1 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2009), 6-7, and see the response in John C. Poirier, 'Delbert Burkett's Defense of Q', in *Marcan Priority Without Q: Explorations in the Farrer Hypothesis*, ed. John C. Poirier and Jeffrey Peterson, The Library of New Testament Studies (LNTS) 455 (London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2015), 191-225 (195-9). For the Griesbach hypothesis, see especially William R. Farmer, *The Synoptic Problem: A Critical Review of the Problem of Literary Relationships Between Matthew, Mark and Luke* (New York: Macmillan, 1964; 2nd edn, Dillsboro, NC: Western North Carolina Press, 1976), esp. 142, and see the critique in Christopher M. Tuckett, *The Revival of the Griesbach Hypothesis: An Analysis and Appraisal*, Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series (SNTSMS) 44 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), 76-93. For Matthean posteriority theories, see below.

material is that there is a lot of agreement between Matthew and Mark alone, a lot of agreement between Mark and Luke alone, a lot of agreement between all three, but less agreement between Matthew and Luke. In other words, Mark is usually the middle term.² Proponents of the Two-Source Theory and the Farrer Theory, both of which postulate the priority of Mark, explain this phenomenon by suggesting that Matthew and Luke relied on Mark for the triple tradition. So far the Two Source Theory and the Farrer Theory, both Marcan Priority theories, are united.

However, there are several places where it is less clear that Mark is the middle term. These are the passages under discussion here, the so-called Mark–Q overlap passages, where there is substantial agreement between Matthew and Luke against Mark. For the Farrer theory, according to which Luke is familiar with Matthew as well as Mark, these passages present no difficulty.³ They are places where Luke is primarily dependent on Matthew, where he turns to Matthew's account rather than Mark's, generating much higher levels of agreement with Matthew than with Mark. For the Two-Source Theory, according to which Matthew and Luke are independent of one another,⁴ these passages appear problematic. How can Matthew and Luke be agreeing so extensively against Mark when they are dependent on Mark for their triple-tradition material?

The Two-Source Theory solves the problem that these passages present by suggesting that the two sources of Matthew and Luke sometimes overlapped. On such occasions, Matthew and Luke turned to the hypothetical source Q instead of or as well as Mark, thereby generating major agreements between one another and

2. See Goodacre, *Synoptic Problem*, ch. 2, esp. 35–9, for an introduction to this material. This description is itself a massive oversimplification of the evidence. See further below.

3. The theory is named after Austin Farrer, 'On Dispensing with Q', *Studies in the Gospels: Essays in Memory of R. H. Lightfoot*, ed. D. E. Nineham (Oxford: Blackwell, 1955), 55–88, but owes most to Michael Goulder. See especially *Luke: A New Paradigm*, Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series (JSNTSup) 20 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989). See also Mark Goodacre, *The Case Against Q: Studies in Marcan Priority and the Synoptic Problem* (Philadelphia: Trinity Press International, 2002); Mark Goodacre and Nicholas Perrin (eds), *Questioning Q: A Multidimensional Critique* (London: SPCK, 2004); Poirier and Peterson *Marcan Priority*, and Francis Watson, *Gospel Writing: A Canonical Perspective* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2013), esp. 117–216. Watson prefers the term 'L/M theory' (*Gospel Writing*, 118–19), but 'Farrer theory' is now well established in the literature, and 'L/M theory' could equally well characterize the very different Griesbach (Two-Gospel) hypothesis, which also postulates Luke's use of Matthew, but without Marcan Priority. On the hard-fought battle to distinguish the Farrer Theory from the Griesbach theory, and to stress the role played by Marcan Priority, see my *Case Against Q*, 9–14.

4. For useful introductions to the Two-Source Theory, see Robert H. Stein, *Studying the Synoptic Gospels: Origin and Interpretation* (2nd edn; Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 2001) and John S. Kloppenborg, *Q, the Earliest Gospel: An Introduction to the Original Stories and Sayings of Jesus* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2008).

against Mark. Thus, the passages for which ‘Mark–Q overlap’ is invoked are triple-tradition passages that feature substantial agreement between Matthew and Luke against Mark. B. H. Streeter explained the phenomenon in this way:

There are several places where Matthew, Mark, and Luke are all three substantially parallel, but where the variations in detail and additions in which Matthew and Luke agree against Mark are so striking that it is clear they must have derived their versions in part, if not wholly, from some other source than Mark.⁵

Although there are many passages that have been assigned to Mark–Q overlap,⁶ Streeter himself limited the category to six key passages:

- (1) John the Baptist (Matt 3.1–12 // Mark 1.1–8 // Luke 3.1–18)
- (2) Baptism of Jesus (Matt 3.13–17 // Mark 1.9–11 // Luke 3.21–22)⁷
- (3) Temptation (Matt 4.1–11 // Mark 1.12–13 // Luke 4.1–13)

5. B. H. Streeter, ‘St. Mark’s Knowledge and Use of Q’, in *Studies in the Synoptic Problem*, ed. William Sanday (Oxford: Clarendon, 1911), 165–83 (166). In this article, Streeter attributes the overlap passages to Mark’s use of Q. In *The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins, Treating of the Manuscript Tradition, Sources, Authorship and Date* (London: Macmillan, 1924), Streeter abandoned this explanation. On this, see further Ed Parish Sanders, ‘Mark–Q Overlaps and the Synoptic Problem’, *New Testament Studies (NTS)* 19 (1973): 453–65.

6. See, e.g. the expansive list of 25 overlap texts in Rudolf Laufen *Die Doppelüberlieferungen der Logienquelle und des Markusevangeliums* (Königstein: Peter Hanstein, 1980), 91–2. But Laufen counts elements within pericopae separately, e.g. Mark 1.2 is treated separately from Mark 1.7–8, and the Beelzebub Controversy is divided into three separate texts, parallel to Mark 3.22–26, 3.27 and 3.28–9. See similarly Harry T. Fleddermann, *Mark and Q. A Study of the Overlap Texts*, Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologiarum Lovaniensium (BETL) 122 (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1995), ix–xi and *Q: A Reconstruction and Commentary*, Biblical Tools and Studies (BTS)1 (Leuven: Peeters, 2005), 75–7, for a list of 29 overlap texts, and this still excludes parallels to Mark 1.1–6, 1.9–11, 1.12–13 and 12.28–24. For F. C. Burkitt, see below, n. 46.

7. Several scholars do not include the Baptism in Q, e.g. John S. Kloppenborg, *The Formation of Q: Trajectories in Ancient Wisdom Collections*, Studies in Antiquity and Christianity (Philadelphia: Fortress, 2000), 84–5 and *Excavating Q: The History and Setting of the Sayings Gospel* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2000), 93; Fledderman, *Mark and Q*, 16–18. The question of whether or not a given passage should be assigned to Q inevitably comes up repeatedly in a piece like this so my policy will be to focus on the six key passages isolated by Streeter in 1924. All six of these are treated as Q passages by the International Q Project, for which see especially James M. Robinson, Paul Hoffmann and John S. Kloppenborg Verbin; managing editor Milton Moreland, *Critical Edition of Q in a Synopsis, Including the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, Mark and Thomas, with English, German and French Translations of Q and Thomas*, Hermeneia (Philadelphia: Fortress, 2000).

- (4) Mission Discourse (Matt 10.5–15 // Mark 6.6b–13 // Luke 9.1–6 // Luke 10.1–12)
- (5) Beelzebul Controversy (Matt 12.25–32 // Mark 3.23–30 // Luke 11.17–23, 12.10)
- (6) Mustard Seed (Matt 13.31–32 // Mark 4.30–32 // Luke 13.18–19)⁸

In each case, the agreements between Matthew and Luke against Mark are substantial. There are agreements in order, where Matthew and Luke agree in placing the same double-tradition material in the same triple-tradition context, something that is not supposed to happen on the Two-Source Theory,⁹ and there are major agreements in wording. Of the six passages, the first (John the Baptist) and third (Temptation) are especially striking in that there is so much additional material in Matthew and Luke. Mark lacks parallels to Matt 3.7–10 // Luke 3.7–9 ('Brood of vipers . . .'), Matt 3.12 // Luke 3.17 ('whose winnowing fork . . .') and Matt 4.3–10 // Luke 4.3–12 ('If you are the Son of God . . .'). Moreover, it is not simply a question of wedges of additional double-tradition material getting spliced into the triple-tradition material. Matthew and Luke sometimes feature the same alternative means of structuring material. This is particularly clear in the Preaching of John the Baptist, and no more so in the following section, where they have the same

8. Streeter, *Four Gospels*, 305–6. His list here is more minimal than his earlier list ('St. Mark's knowledge', 167–75), where he has these six passages minus the Baptism, but also has Mark 4.21–25 and parallels (171–2), Mark 9.42–50 and parallels (175–6) and Mark 12.38–40 and parallels (176). But see his qualifiers in *Four Gospels*, 306. Ed Parish Sanders and Margaret Davies (*Studying the Synoptic Gospels* [London: SCM, 1989], 81) talk about 'the principal five passages' as the six above minus the Baptism.

9. The agreement is so precise in the first three cases, John the Baptist, Jesus' baptism and the Temptation story, that the standard articulation of the Two-Source Theory has to build these pericopae in as exceptions to the rule in a manner reminiscent of 'What have the Romans done for us?', e.g. John S. Kloppenborg, *Q, the Earliest Gospel*, 32, 'Apart from three Q pericopae concerning John the Baptist and the temptation that Matthew and Luke have connected with Mark in the same way . . ., Matthew and Luke always place the Mark-Q combination differently.' The fourth, fifth and sixth examples above also have similarities in ordering. Luke 9.1–6 is in the Marcan order, while Luke 10.1–12 comes shortly afterwards at the outset of Luke's central section setting out Jesus' journey as 'the Way of the Lord'. Both Matthew and Luke add the parable of the Leaven to the parable of the Mustard Seed (Matt 13.33 // Luke 13.20) on which see further Sanders and Davies, *Studying*, 79 and Ed Parish Sanders, 'The Argument from Order and the Relationship between Matthew and Luke', *NTS* 15 (1969): 249–61 (260–1). Luke features a chreia about Jesus' true family shortly after the Beelzebul Controversy (Luke 11.27–28, cf. Matt 12.46–50 // Mark 3.31–35 // Luke 8.19–20), on which see Michael Goulder, *Luke*, 509–11, and Eric Eve, 'The Devil in the Detail: Exorcising Q from the Beelzebul Controversy', in *Marcan Priority*, 16–43, here 32–3.

fresh structure alongside more than a verse of new material not found in Mark, at exactly the same point in mid-sentence:¹⁰

Matthew 3.11–12	Mark 1.7–8	Luke 3.15–17
<p>¹¹ Ἐγὼ μὲν ὑμᾶς βαπτίζω ἐν ὕδατι εἰς μετάνοιαν· ὁ δὲ ὀπίσω μου ἐρχόμενος ἰσχυρότερός μου ἐστίν, οὐ σὺκ εἰμι ἰκανὸς τὰ ὑποδήματα βαστάσαι· αὐτὸς ὑμᾶς βαπτίσει ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ <u>καὶ πυρί</u>.¹² οὐ τὸ πτύον ἐν τῇ <u>χειρὶ αὐτοῦ</u>, καὶ <u>διακαθαριεῖ τὴν ἄλωνα αὐτοῦ</u> καὶ <u>συνάξει τὸν σίτον αὐτοῦ εἰς τὴν ἀποθήκην</u>, τὸ δὲ ἄχυρον κατακαύσει <u>πυρὶ ἀσβέστῳ</u>.</p>	<p>⁷ καὶ ἐκήρυσσεν λέγων· Ἔρχεται ὁ ἰσχυρότερός μου ὀπίσω μου, οὐ σὺκ εἰμι ἰκανὸς κύψας λύσαι τὸν ἱμάντα τῶν ὑποδημάτων αὐτοῦ·⁸ ἐγὼ ἐβάπτισα ὑμᾶς ὕδατι, αὐτὸς δὲ βαπτίσει ὑμᾶς ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ.</p>	<p>¹⁵ Προσδοκῶντος δὲ τοῦ λαοῦ καὶ διαλογιζομένων πάντων ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις αὐτῶν περὶ τοῦ Ἰωάννου, μήποτε αὐτὸς εἴη ὁ χριστός,¹⁶ ἀπεκρίνατο λέγων πᾶσιν ὁ Ἰωάννης· Ἐγὼ μὲν ὕδατι βαπτίζω ὑμᾶς· ἔρχεται δὲ ὁ ἰσχυρότερός μου, οὐ σὺκ εἰμι ἰκανὸς λύσαι τὸν ἱμάντα τῶν ὑποδημάτων αὐτοῦ· αὐτὸς ὑμᾶς βαπτίσει ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ <u>καὶ πυρί</u>.¹⁷ οὐ τὸ πτύον ἐν τῇ <u>χειρὶ αὐτοῦ</u> <u>διακαθαῖραι τὴν ἄλωνα αὐτοῦ</u> καὶ <u>συναγαγεῖν τὸν σίτον εἰς τὴν ἀποθήκην αὐτοῦ</u>, τὸ δὲ ἄχυρον κατακαύσει <u>πυρὶ ἀσβέστῳ</u>.</p>

10. Matthew's and Luke's parallel reworking of Mark's composite quotation from Exod 23.20, Mal 3.1 and Isa 40.1 earlier in the pericope (Matt 3.3 // Mark 1.2–3 // Luke 3.4–6) is also striking. They agree (1) in extracting Isa 40.1, (2) saving Exod 23.20 and Mal 3.1 for the same point later in the narrative (Matt 11.10 // Luke 7.27), and (3) doing so using the same wording found in Mark 1.2–3. This presents difficulties for the Two-Source Theory. See Mark Goodacre, 'The Evangelists' Use of the Old Testament and the Synoptic Problem,' in *New Studies in the Synoptic Problem: Oxford Conference, 2008*. FS Christopher M. Tuckett, ed. Paul Foster, Andrew Gregory, John S. Kloppenborg and Joseph Verheyden, BETL 239 (Leuven: Peeters, 2011), 281–98, here 284–9, and literature cited there.

Table (Continued)

Matthew 3.11–12	Mark 1.7–8	Luke 3.15–17
<p>11 <u>I, on the one hand, am baptizing you with water for repentance, but he who is coming after me is mightier than I, and I am not fit to remove his sandals; he will baptize you with the Holy Spirit and fire. 12 His winnowing fork is in his hand, and he will clear his threshing floor; and he will gather his wheat into the barn, but he will burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire.</u></p>	<p>7 And he was preaching, and saying,</p> <p>‘After me one is coming who is mightier than I, and I am not fit to stoop down and untie the thong of his sandals. 8 I baptized you with water; but he will baptize you with the Holy Spirit.’</p>	<p>15 Now while the people were in a state of expectation and all were wondering in their hearts about John, as to whether he might be the Christ, 16 John answered and said to them all, ‘I, <u>on the one hand, am baptizing you with water; but one is coming who is mightier than I, and I am not fit to untie the thong of his sandals; he will baptize you with the Holy Spirit and fire. 17. His winnowing fork is in his hand to clear his threshing floor, and to gather the wheat into His barn; but he will burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire.</u></p>

The agreement between Matthew and Luke is clear and substantial. Mark’s John first speaks about the coming of ‘the one who is mightier than me’ (Ἔρχεται ὁ ἰσχυρότερός μου, Mark 1.7), and subsequently says, ‘I baptized you with water ...’ (ἐγὼ ἐβάπτισα ὑμᾶς ὕδατι . . ., Mark 1.8). Both Matthew and Luke, in parallel, structure the saying differently, with a μὲν . . . δέ sentence (‘On the one hand . . . on the other hand’) in which John first announces that he is baptizing in water (now present tense, Ἐγὼ μὲν ὑμᾶς βαπτίζω ἐν ὕδατι . . .) before he talks about the stronger one who is coming (Matt 3.11 // Luke 3.16). They then insert almost exactly the same wording at exactly the same place in the Marcan narrative, even to the extent of running on at the same point with a conjunction not found in Mark. ‘He will baptize you with the holy spirit’, Mark’s John prophesies (Mark 1.8). ‘And fire!’ continue Matthew’s and Luke’s John in parallel (Matt 3.11 // Luke 3.16)

before running on with an entire verse describing harvest, separation and fiery judgement (Matt 3.12 // Luke 3.17).¹¹ It is, of course, far too much to attribute this kind of agreement to Matthew's and Luke's independent redaction of Mark, and no two-source theorist takes this route. In order to retain the notion of Luke's independence from Matthew, two-source theorists appeal to Mark-Q overlap. According to this theory, Mark and Q here overlap in content and wording, and Matthew and Luke independently make the same use of the overlapping content and wording in Mark and Q.¹²

11.2 What Is the Problem?

It is important to notice what is happening here. In order to explain substantive agreement between Matthew and Luke against Mark, the Two-Source Theory appeals to an 'overlapping' of its two sources, but in making this appeal, its advocates are conceding one of the fundamental arguments that is made for the existence of Q in the first place, that Luke never features Matthew's additions to Mark in triple-tradition material. It is worth remembering just how fundamental an argument for the existence of Q this is. Influential advocates of the existence of Q press the point. 'Is it conceivable,' Kümmel asks, 'that Luke would have taken over none of the Matthean additions to the Markan text?'¹³ Christopher Tuckett similarly asks, 'If Luke knew Matthew, why does he never show any knowledge of Matthew's redaction of Mark?'¹⁴ So too Fitzmyer, 'Luke is never seen to reproduce the typically Matthean additions within the Triple Tradition.'¹⁵ In each case, these scholars use the word 'never'.¹⁶ Luke supposedly never reproduces Matthew's

11. Cf. Watson, *Gospel Writing*, 140, 'Matthew's addition of "and fire" . . . also connects this with the typically Matthean judgement-saying that now follows, concluding as it does with a reference to "unquenchable fire" (cf. Mt. 13.30; 25.41).' On the Matthean apocalyptic scenario here, see further below.

12. Watson, *Gospel Writing*, 139–41, notes the extraordinary coincidences that are involved if Luke and Matthew are here redacting Mark and Q independently of one another.

13. Werner Georg Kümmel, *Introduction to the New Testament* (Engl. Trans., London: SCM, 1966; rev. ed., 1975), 50.

14. Christopher M. Tuckett, 'The Existence of Q,' in *The Gospel Behind the Gospels*, ed. Ronald A. Piper, 19–47 (25); *Q and the History of Early Christianity: Studies on Q* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1996), 8.

15. Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke I-IX*, The Anchor Bible (AB) 28 (New York: Doubleday, 1981), 73–4.

16. Stein, *Studying the Synoptic Gospels*, 99, appears to be conscious of the difficulty and so places 'never' in inverted commas, 'One of the strongest arguments against the use of Matthew by Luke is the fact that when Matthew has additional material in the triple tradition ('Matthean additions to the narrative'), it is "never" found in Luke.' Here 'never' appears to mean 'occasionally'.

additions to Mark, a claim that is contradicted by the phenomenon of the ‘Mark–Q overlap’ passages in which Luke agrees with Matthew’s substantive additions to Mark. The scholars in question generally qualify the argument by listing triple-tradition passages where Luke does not feature Matthew’s additions to Mark,¹⁷ but this does not detract from the misleading nature of an argument that uses the term ‘never’ when ‘sometimes’ is meant.¹⁸

The Q sceptic’s objection to the Mark–Q overlap theory is not, therefore, an objection to the idea of overlapping sources. It is a question of what the concession implies about arguments for the very existence of Q. These are passages that should not be present given the way that the model is constructed. The foundation of the Two-Source Theory is the notion that Matthew and Luke edited Mark independently of one another, yet here they are manifestly editing Mark in identical ways, with substantial agreements in wording and order.

Proponents of the Q hypothesis frequently frame the difficulty posed by the Mark–Q overlaps as an abstract objection to the idea of overlapping sources. Kloppenborg, for example, says:

Although a few critics of 2DH [the Two-Document Hypothesis] make much of the Mark–Q overlaps as a significant problem, these really pose little difficulty.

17. Even here, the evidence is sometimes overstated, e.g. Fitzmyer and Tuckett suggest that it would be surprising for Luke to have omitted Matthew’s additions to an entire pericope that Luke omits from Mark (Matt 14.28–31, Peter’s Walking on the Water), on which see my *Case Against Q*, 49–51. This point is conceded by Christopher Tuckett in ‘The Current State of the Synoptic Problem’, in *New Studies*, ed. Paul Foster et al., 9–50 (41 n. 82). Similarly, the frequent expressions of surprise at Luke’s omission of Matt 16.17–19 (Jesus’ commendation of Peter) generally ignore Luke’s omission of Mark 8.33 (Jesus’ rebuke of Peter), on which see Mark Goodacre, ‘The Rock on Rocky Ground: Matthew, Mark and Peter as Skandalon’, in *What Is It That the Scripture Says?: Essays in Biblical Interpretation, Translation, And Reception. FS Henry Wansbrough Osb*, ed. Philip McCosker, LNTS 316 (London: Continuum, 2006), 61–73 (68–9). John Kloppenborg, ‘On Dispensing with Q: Goodacre on the Relation of Luke to Matthew’, *NTS* 49 (2003): 210–36, here 221–2 and Tuckett, ‘Current State’, 40–1 find Luke’s omission of Matt 16.17–19 surprising in the light of Luke’s interest in Peter, but my point (*Case Against Q*, 51) is not about redactional tendency but about narrative development. Peter indeed has ‘a key role’ in Acts (Kloppenborg, ‘On Dispensing’, 222) but what Matthew’s Jesus prophesies is not that Peter is important but that he is foundational.

18. Compare Sanders’s more accurate summary, ‘The two-document hypothesis is dependent on the statement that Matthew and Luke do not agree together against Mark, and holders of that hypothesis are forced to explain away the existence of the actual agreements. The principal weakness of the two-source theory is that it is constructed to explain the synoptic interrelationships on the assumption that there are no agreements between Matthew and Luke against Mark, rather than on the assumption that *there are almost always some, but usually not many* such agreements. Since the latter statement is the true one, the two-document hypothesis must be considered inadequate, at least as a hypothesis which gives an account of all the evidence’ (‘Mark–Q Overlaps’, 453). See further my discussion in *Case Against Q*, 49–54.

In the first place, it is hardly surprising that two independent tellings of the Jesus tradition (Mark and Q) should sometimes narrate the *same* events or sayings. And they do.¹⁹

The difficulty with the Mark–Q overlaps has nothing to do with the plausibility or otherwise of overlapping sources. The point is, in the words of E. P. Sanders, as follows:

The proposed Mark–Q overlaps show the weakness of the two-document hypothesis. They are mostly points at which there are too many agreements between Matthew and Luke against Mark – both in words and in order – to be overlooked.²⁰

The category effectively achieves a kind of argumentative coup for the Two-Source Theory by allowing its advocates to insist on the counter-factual claim that Luke ‘never’ agrees with Matthew in substantive ways in triple-tradition material. Moreover, there is an element of misdirection here. Two-Source theorists do discuss the minor agreements between Matthew and Luke against Mark but by placing these in a separate category of their own, as if fundamentally different in nature from the Mark–Q overlaps, they are able to imply that Matthew and Luke only agree in ‘minor’ ways in the triple-tradition material.

The issue here is partly a question of how we choose to describe the data. The difficulty with the term ‘Mark–Q Overlaps’ is that it describes a particular set of data, passages featuring major agreements between Matthew and Luke against Mark, using the terminology of the Two-Source Theory.²¹ This is far from ideal

19. Kloppenborg, *Q: The Earliest Gospel*, 34 (emphasis original). Kloppenborg compares the overlapping of John and the Synoptics, and Thomas and the Synoptics (ibid.). The analogy will not be especially helpful to those who attribute the overlapping to John’s familiarity with the Synoptics and Thomas’s familiarity with the Synoptics. See also Christopher Tuckett, ‘Current State’, 46, ‘In general terms, the possibility that sources overlapped seems not at all implausible or impossible. Hence a ‘Mark–Q overlap’ in principle is surely not an inherent problem’. See similarly Brice Jones, *Matthean and Lukan Special Material: A Brief Introduction with Texts in Greek and English* (Eugene: Wipf and Stock, 2011), 7, ‘Most advocates of the Two-Source hypothesis, however, do not think that the Mark–Q overlaps pose any real threat, since two independent yet similar traditions are bound to have existed prior to the composition of the Gospels as we know them’ which likewise responds to an argument that no one is actually making. See also Stein, *Studying the Synoptic Gospels*, 120–1, ‘Yet, on a purely theoretical basis, it would be most unusual if two sources concerning Jesus, such as Mark and Q, did not overlap in some way. After all, they do deal with the same person, with incidents in his life and sayings that he uttered, so that some overlap would be expected.’

20. Sanders, ‘Mark–Q Overlaps’, 463.

21. In German speaking scholarship, the term often used for the Mark–Q overlaps is *Doppelüberlieferung*, e.g. especially Laufen, *Die Doppelüberlieferungen*.

if there is to be a level playing field for studying the phenomenon. Adherents of the Farrer theory do not label minor agreements between Matthew and Luke as 'Luke's minor borrowing from Matthew in triple tradition'. If they did, they would be rightly criticized for allowing their description of the set of data to be influenced by their explanation of the data.²² In order to encourage an open and fair discussion, therefore, there should be 'mandatory retirement'²³ for using 'Mark-Q overlaps' as a label for a set of data. Instead, the phenomenon should be described more neutrally as 'major agreements between Matthew and Luke against Mark' or more simply 'the major agreements'.²⁴

11.3 Major and Minor Agreements

The development of these discrete categories, 'Mark-Q overlaps' on the one hand and 'minor agreements' on the other, is not just a failure to describe the data as neutrally and objectively as possible. By assigning different passages to different categories, the student can fail to see that the agreement between Matthew and Luke is on a continuum, from lesser to greater degrees of agreement between Matthew and Luke. The continuum ranges from pure triple tradition to pure double tradition, with varying degrees of agreement along the way, from relatively minor to quite major agreement between Matthew and Luke against Mark. It is a pattern that makes good sense on the assumption that Luke uses Mark, but supplements his use of Mark with his use of Matthew, sometimes in minor ways, sometimes in major ways. The Mark-Q overlaps are not a different category of data to be

22. In Mark Goodacre, *The Synoptic Problem: A Way through the Maze* (London: Continuum, 2001), ch. 2, I attempted to describe the synoptic data without prejudice to any Synoptic theory. This was in conscious contrast to the usual approach that refracts the data through the particular solution that is being proposed. My suggestion is that introductory students are often prejudiced in favour of a particular solution because of the way that the data is described.

23. For the term, see Paula Fredriksen, 'Mandatory Retirement: Ideas in the Study of Christian Origins Whose Time Has Come to Go', *Studies in Religion / Sciences Religieuses* 35 (2006): 231–46.

24. See further my *Case Against Q*, ch. 8, 'Major and Minor Agreements' for the terminology and the argument. Occasionally, the Mark-Q overlaps are described as 'major agreements' by Q advocates, e.g. Kloppenborg, *Q: The Earliest Gospel*, 35, 'If the Mark-Q overlaps could be called the major agreements of Matthew and Luke against Mark, there are also a number of smaller agreements of Matthew and Luke against Mark.' Compare also Streeter's language, 'In nearly all the passages we have examined, the verbal agreements between Matthew and Luke against Mark are very substantial' ('St. Mark's Knowledge', 178).

separated off and explained in a unique way. They are, rather, points that one can plot on a graph, points on a continuum.²⁵

Christopher Tuckett responds to this point in the following way:

Many would however argue that there is no *continuous* spectrum of agreements in the tradition: rather, they virtually all seem to cluster into two groups: one of 'minor' agreements made up almost exclusively of tiny details, mostly totally inconsequential in relation to meaning, and one of 'major' agreements, where many would argue that the agreements are so extensive that they seem to provide evidence for the existence of a non-Markan version of the tradition. And there is not much in between these poles. Thus to talk about a 'continuum' of agreements may not be fully persuasive. That there are different categories of agreement is undeniable – but they seem to be more discrete than continuous.²⁶

The idea that there is a spectrum of agreement is, however, straightforward to illustrate. The two ends of the spectrum are clear. There are triple-tradition passages with just a few minor agreements on one end of the spectrum,²⁷ and there are

25. I attempted to develop this point in *Case Against Q*, 163–4. The point was anticipated, though I had not realized it, by Sanders in 'Mark-Q Overlaps', 454–5, 'Virtually every single pericope in the triple tradition has some such agreements. One could construct a chart enumerating the agreements of Matthew and Luke against Mark by pericope, and the chart would show numbers ranging from 0 to 34, with many of the numbers in between being listed. (This is counting only strong positive agreements – the presence of the same word in Matthew and Luke which is not in Mark – and excepting the proposed overlaps).'

26. Tuckett, 'Current State', 43, emphasis original (but note one minor concession at 43 n. 87 in relation to Mark 12.28–34); cf. Christopher Tuckett, 'Review of Mark Goodacre, *Case Against Q*, *Novum Testamentum (NovT)* 46 (2004): 401–3, here 402, 'Goodacre contents himself with the general point about Luke's using Matthew's additions to Mark, and/or referring to different levels of 'agreements' against Mark here; he talks about a 'broad spectrum' and a 'sliding scale' (161) or a 'continuum' (163) of the level of Matthew-Luke agreements against Mark. However, he never analyses any of these 'overlap' passages in any detail. And in terms of any 'broad spectrum', the trouble is that there is not much by way of a 'continuum': there are examples at both ends of the spectrum but not much in between.'

27. Note, however, Sanders's important point that there are very few passages that feature no minor agreements between Matthew and Luke against Mark, 'One can best observe the extent of these agreements, both positive agreements and agreements in omission, by trying to find a triple-tradition pericope which does *not* have any agreements between Matthew and Luke against Mark; there are only one or two' ('Mark-Q Overlaps', 453 n. 4, emphasis original); cf. Sanders and Davies, *Studying the Synoptic Gospels*, 67.

double-tradition passages where Mark is not present at all at the other end of the spectrum. The material in between these two poles is what is here in focus. These are the figures for five of the six major Mark–Q overlap passages:²⁸

- (1) Matt 3.1–12 // Mark 1.1–8 // Luke 3.1–18 (John the Baptist): 94 Matt-Luke agreements against Mark out of 345 words in Luke (27%).
- (2) Matt 3.13–17 // Mark 1.9–11 // Luke 3.21–2 (Baptism of Jesus): 3 Matt-Luke agreements against Mark out of 43 words in Luke (7%).
- (3) Matt 4.1–11 // Mark 1.12–13 // Luke 4.1–13 (Temptation): 114 Matt-Luke agreements against Mark out of 203 words in Luke (56%).
- (4) Matt 12.25–32 // Mark 3.23–30 // Luke 11.17–23, 12.10 (Beelzebub): 65 Matt-Luke agreements against Mark out of 146 words in Luke (45%).
- (5) Matt 13.31–2 // Mark 4.30–2 // Luke 13.18–19 (Mustard Seed): 11 Matt-Luke agreements against Mark out of 40 words in Luke (28%).

In this selection of key Mark–Q overlap passages, there are Matt-Luke agreements ranging from 7 per cent of Luke's words in a given pericope to 56 per cent in a given pericope, with agreement levels well spaced in that range, at 27, 28 and 45 per cent. If one were to sample particular sub-pericopae within the larger pericopae, there can be remarkably high degrees of agreement. In Matt 3.12 // Luke 3.17, for example, 88 per cent of Luke's words agree with Matthew; in Matt 3.7–10 // Luke 3.7–9, 85 per cent of Luke's words agree with Matthew's. To place this in context, this kind of agreement is as high as one sometimes sees in the pure double-tradition material.²⁹

The question, though, is how this level of agreement compares with levels of agreement among triple-tradition passages that feature minor agreements. There are plenty of pericopae with just a handful of minor agreements, producing a percentage of agreement lower than the 7 per cent we see in the Baptism, for example:

- (6) Matt 8.1–4 // Mark 1.40–45 // Luke 5.12–16 (Leper): 5 Matt-Luke agreements against Mark out of 98 words in Luke (5%).
- (7) Matt 9.1–8 // Mark 2.1–12 // Luke 5.17–26 (Paralytic): 12 Matt-Luke agreements against Mark out of 212 words in Luke (6%).
- (8) Matt 9.9–13 // Mark 2.13–17 // Luke 5.27–32 (Levi): 5 Matt-Luke agreements against Mark out of 94 words in Luke (5%).

28. The figures are from Sanders, 'Mark-Q Overlaps', 457–8. He does not provide figures for the Mission Discourse which is more complex because the overlap is across two Lucan contexts, one with more agreements with Mark (Luke 9.1–6) and one with more agreements with Matthew (Luke 10.1–12).

29. On the question of high verbatim agreement in the double tradition, see Mark Goodacre, 'Too Good to Be Q: High Verbatim Agreement in the Double Tradition', in *Marcan Priority without Q*, ed. Poirier and Peterson, 82–100.

The lower end of agreement in a Mark–Q overlap passage (7%) is just above the level of agreement in these triple-tradition passages that feature minor agreements (5% and 6%). It is worth asking the additional question whether there are any (non Mark–Q overlap) triple-tradition pericopae in which the number of Matthew–Luke agreements against Mark are as great as 7 per cent of the total Lucan words in the pericope. If so, it will be clear that the continuum is one in which the supposedly different categories in fact overlap with one another. There are indeed such pericopae:

- (9) Matt 14.13–21 // Mark 6.30–44 // Luke 9.10–17 (Five Thousand): 15 Matt–Luke agreements against Mark out of 164 words in Luke (9%).
- (10) Matt 21.1–9 // Mark 11.1–10 // Luke 19.28–38 (Entry into Jerusalem): 12 Matt–Luke agreements against Mark out of 167 words in Luke (7%).
- (11) Matt 21.23–27 // Mark 11.27–33 // Luke 20.1–8 (Question About Authority): 10 Matt–Luke agreements against Mark out of 118 words in Luke (8%).
- (12) Matt 22.34–40 // Matt. 12.28–34 // Luke 10.25–28 (Great Commandment): 18 Matt–Luke agreements against Mark out of 73 words in Luke (25%).³⁰
- (13) Matt 26.57–75 // Mark 14.53–72 // Luke 22.54–71 (Trial and Peter’s Denial): 25 Matt–Mark agreements against Mark out of 263 words in Luke (9.5%).³¹

These examples show that the degree of agreement between Matthew and Luke against Mark is sometimes higher in passages with so-called ‘minor agreements’ than it is in passages that are labelled ‘Mark–Q overlap.’ In other words, it is clear that there is not only a continuum with different degrees of agreement from low (triple-tradition passages with few Minor Agreements) to high (Mark–Q overlap passages with many Major Agreements), but there is also some overlapping between the degree of agreement between Matthew and Luke in passages normally designated Mark–Q overlap and passages normally designated triple tradition.³²

30. This passage has occasionally been included in Q and so would also be a Mark–Q overlap. In order to avoid subjectivity, I have included as Mark–Q overlap passages only those included in Q by the International Q Project. (See also above, n. 7.)

31. The figures for the triple-tradition passages are extrapolated from A. M. Honore, ‘A Statistical Study of the Synoptic Problem’, *NovT* 10 (1968): 95–147.

32. Moreover, there is one Matthew–Luke agreement assigned to Mark–Q overlap by the International Q Project that amounts to just one word, Ναζαρά in Matt 4.13 // Luke 4.16, on which see Shawn Carruth and James M. Robinson, *Q 4:1–13, 16. The Temptations of Jesus – Nazara*, volume editor: Christoph Heil (Leuven: Peeters, 1996), 392–462 and Frans Neiryneck, ‘NAZARA in Q: Pro and Con’, in *From Quest to Q. FS James M. Robinson*, ed. Jon Ma. Asgeirsson, Kristin de Troyer and Marvin W. Meyer, BETL 146 (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2000), 159–69 and Michael Goulder, ‘Two Significant Minor Agreements (Mat. 4:13 Par.; Mat. 26:67–68 Par.)’, *NovT* 45 (2003): 365–73.

11.4 The Degree of Mark in Luke's Mark-Q Overlap Passages

There is a further, related point about the nature of the Mark-Q overlap passages. It is commonly claimed that Matthew's and Luke's versions of the Mark-Q overlap passages look different. Matthew tends to blend Mark and Q in the overlap passages whereas Luke tends to reproduce Q alone. Drawing on Gerald Downing's work,³³ Christopher Tuckett underlines this point:

In these passages, one can indeed refer to Luke's use of Matthew's additions to Mark, and/or to extensive non-trivial Matthew-Luke agreements. However, any non-Q theory has to explain Luke's apparently almost pathological refusal in some of these texts to use any Marcan material at all (e.g. the Beelzebul controversy, or the Mustard Seed). As Gerald Downing argued many years ago, Luke's procedure on the Farrer-Goulder-Goodacre model appears totally at odds with his procedure elsewhere (where, according to Goodacre and others, Luke knows Mark far better than Matthew and uses Mark in preference to Matthew). In these passages, Luke must have studiously avoided all the points where Matthew and Mark agree and reproduced only Matthew's additions to Mark.³⁴

It is one of the curiosities of scholarship on the SP that a point with so slim an evidentiary basis is so often repeated. It is simply not the case that Luke lacks Marcan material in the Mark-Q overlap passages. In John the Baptist's preaching (Matt 3.1-12 // Mark 1.1-8 // Luke 3.1-18), for example, there are extensive triple agreements as well as agreements between Mark and Luke alone. In the section surveyed above (Matt 3.11-12 // Mark 1.7-8 // Luke 3.15-17), there are clear Mark-Luke agreements like the claim that John is unworthy 'to loose the thong on his sandals' (λύσαι τὸν ἱμάντα τῶν ὑποδημάτων αὐτοῦ, Mark 1.7 // Luke 3.16; contrast Matt 3.11, τὰ ὑποδήματα βαστάσαι).³⁵ Similarly, the baptism story features many triple agreements (represented by double underline) as well as a couple of minor Mark-Luke agreements (represented by single underline):

33. The key article is F. Gerald Downing, 'Towards the Rehabilitation of Q', *NTS* 11 (1964): 169-81 (but see also more recently 'Disagreements of Each Evangelist with the Minor Close Agreements of the Other Two', *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses (ETL)* 80 [2004]: 445-69). Downing's 1964 article is persuasively answered in Ken Olson, 'Unpicking on the Farrer Theory', in *Questioning Q: A Multidimensional Critique*, ed. Mark Goodacre and Nicholas Perrin (London: SPCK, 2004), 127-50. Tuckett does not mention Olson's discussion. See now also Eric Eve, 'The Devil in the Detail', 16-43, which provides a persuasive exegesis of the Beelzebul Controversy on the basis of the Farrer theory.

34. Tuckett, 'Review of *Case Against Q*', 402. The point is made again in Tuckett, 'Current State', 44.

35. See the synopsis of the passages above 205-6 which clearly shows the triple agreements as well as the Mark-Luke only agreements.

Matt 3.13, 16–17 ³⁶	Mark 1.9–10	Luke 3.21–2
<p>1¹³ Τότε παραγίνεται ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰορδάνην πρὸς τὸν Ἰωάννην τοῦ βαπτισθῆναι ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ .</p>	<p>9 Καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις ἦλθεν Ἰησοῦς ἀπὸ Ναζαρέτ τῆς Γαλιλαίας καὶ ἐβαπτίσθη εἰς τὸν Ἰορδάνην ὑπὸ Ἰωάννου.</p>	<p>21 Ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν τῷ βαπτισθῆναι ἅπαντα τὸν λαὸν καὶ Ἰησοῦ</p>
<p>... 16 βαπτισθεὶς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εὐθὺς ἀνέβη ἀπὸ τοῦ ὔδατος· καὶ ἰδοὺ ἠνεώχθησαν οἱ οὐρανοί, καὶ εἶδεν πνεῦμα θεοῦ καταβαῖνον ὡσεὶ περιστερὰν ἐρχόμενον ἐπ’ αὐτόν· 17 καὶ ἰδοὺ φωνὴ ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν λέγουσα· Οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν ᾧ εὐδόκησα.</p>	<p>10 καὶ εὐθὺς ἀναβαίνων ἐκ τοῦ ὔδατος εἶδεν σχιζομένους τοὺς οὐρανοὺς καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα ὡς περιστερὰν καταβαῖνον εἰς αὐτόν· 11 καὶ φωνὴ ἐγένετο ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν· Σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱὸς μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν σοὶ εὐδόκησα.</p>	<p>βαπτισθέντος καὶ προσευχομένου ἀνεψοχθῆναι τὸν οὐρανὸν 22 καὶ καταβῆναι τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον σωματικῶ εἶδει ὡς περιστερὰν ἐπ’ αὐτόν, καὶ φωνὴν ἐξ οὐρανοῦ γενέσθαι· Σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱὸς μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν σοὶ εὐδόκησα.</p>
<p>13 Then <u>Jesus</u> came from Galilee to John at the Jordan, to be baptized by him 16 And when Jesus had been baptized, just as he came up from the water, suddenly <u>the</u> <u>heavens</u> were opened to him <u>and</u> he saw the <u>Spirit</u> of God <u>descending like a</u> <u>dove</u> and alighting on <u>him</u>. 17 <u>And a voice from</u> <u>heaven</u> said, “This is <u>my</u> <u>Son, the Beloved, with</u> <u>whom I am well</u> <u>pleased</u>.”</p>	<p>9 In those days <u>Jesus</u> came from Nazareth of Galilee and was baptized by John in the Jordan. 10 And just as he was coming up out of the water, he saw <u>the</u> <u>heavens</u> torn apart <u>and</u> <u>the Spirit</u> <u>descending like a</u> <u>dove</u> into <u>him</u>. 11 <u>And a voice came from</u> <u>heaven</u>, ‘<u>You are my</u> <u>Son, the Beloved; with</u> <u>you I am well</u> <u>pleased</u>.’</p>	<p>21 Now when all the people were baptized, and when <u>Jesus</u> also had been baptized and was praying, <u>the</u> <u>heaven</u> was opened, 22 <u>and the Holy Spirit</u> <u>descended upon him</u> in bodily form <u>like a dove</u>. <u>And a voice came from</u> <u>heaven</u>, ‘<u>You are my</u> <u>Son, the Beloved; with</u> <u>you I am well</u> <u>pleased</u>.’</p>

36. I have omitted Matt 3.14–15 from the synopsis because there are no parallels in Mark and Luke so it is not relevant to the discussion of Mark // Luke agreements here. Kloppenborg (‘On Dispensing,’ 219–20) argues that Luke would not have omitted these

There is more triple agreement in this pericope than there is Matthew-Luke agreement. It is clear that Luke is not avoiding Mark's wording in passages like this.³⁷ The specific examples mentioned by Tuckett are the Beelzebub Controversy (Matt 12.25–32 // Mark 3.23–30 // Luke 11.17–23, 12.10) and the Mustard seed (Matt 13.31–32 // Mark 4.30–32 // Luke 13.18–19). These passages include several agreements between Mark and Luke. There are triple agreements and there are Mark-Luke agreements. Luke's versions are clearly not Mark-free zones. On Sanders's count, the Beelzebub Controversy features 31 triple agreements, 35 Matthew-Mark agreements, 5 Mark-Luke agreements and 65 Matthew-Luke agreements. Similarly, the Mustard Seed, on Sanders's count, features 14 triple agreements, 11 Matthew-Mark agreements, 6 Mark-Luke agreements and 11 Matthew-Luke agreements.³⁸ These are straightforward to see in synopsis:

Matt 13.31–32	Mark 4.30–32	Luke 13.18–19
Ἄλλην παραβολὴν παρέθηκεν αὐτοῖς λέγων· Ὅμοια ἐστὶν ἡ <u>βασιλεία</u> τῶν οὐρανῶν <u>κόκκῳ σινάπεως</u> , ὃν λαβὼν ἄνθρωπος ἔσπειρεν ἐν τῷ ἀγρῷ αὐτοῦ· ³² ὁ μικρότερον μὲν ἐστὶν πάντων τῶν σπερμάτων, ὅταν δὲ αὐξηθῇ μείζον τῶν λαχάνων ἐστὶν καὶ γίνεται δένδρον, ὥστε ἐλθεῖν	Καὶ <u>ἔλεγεν</u> · Πῶς <u>ὁμοιώσωμεν τὴν</u> <u>βασιλείαν</u> τοῦ θεοῦ, ἣ ἐν <u>τίνι</u> αὐτὴν παραβολῇ θῶμεν; ³¹ ὡς <u>κόκκῳ σινάπεως</u> , ὃς ὅταν σπαρῇ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, μικρότερον ὃν πάντων τῶν σπερμάτων τῶν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς – ³² καὶ ὅταν σπαρῇ, ἀναβαίνει καὶ γίνεται μείζον πάντων τῶν λαχάνων καὶ ποιεῖ κλάδους μεγάλους, ὥστε δύνασθαι ὑπὸ τῆν σκιάν	Ἔλεγεν οὖν· Τίτι ὁμοία ἐστὶν ἡ <u>βασιλεία</u> τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ <u>τίνι ὁμοιώσω αὐτήν</u> ; ¹⁹ ὁμοία ἐστὶν <u>κόκκῳ σινάπεως</u> , ὃν λαβὼν ἄνθρωπος ἔβαλεν εἰς κῆπον ἑαυτοῦ, καὶ ηὔξησεν καὶ ἐγένετο εἰς δένδρον, καὶ

verses if he had known them. However, Luke has completed his John narrative in the previous passage with John's arrest, which moves him off stage (Luke 3.18–20), so he is hardly likely to reintroduce the character at this point.

37. The Mission Discourse (the fourth example above) is also rich in Marcan material but is more complicated because unlike the other examples, there are two versions in Luke, the first in Luke 9.1–6 and the second in Luke 10.1–12. But even Streeter acknowledged the presence of Marcan material in Luke 9.1–6, 'Matthew as usual conflates Mark and Q, and so for once to some small extent does Luke in 9.1–5, but Luke also has a version in 10.1–12, much, if not all, of which is Q' ('St. Mark's knowledge', 173).

38. Sanders, 'Mark-Q Overlaps', 458.

Table (Continued)

Matt 13.31–32	Mark 4.30–32	Luke 13.18–19
<p><u>τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ</u> καὶ <u>κατασκηνοῦν</u> ἐν τοῖς κλάδοις αὐτοῦ.</p>	<p>αὐτοῦ <u>τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ</u> <u>κατασκηνοῦν</u>.</p>	<p><u>τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ</u> <u>κατεσκήνωσεν</u> ἐν τοῖς κλάδοις αὐτοῦ.</p>
<p>He put before them another parable: ‘The kingdom of heaven</p>	<p>He also <u>said</u>, ‘With what can we <u>compare</u> the kingdom of <u>God</u>,</p>	<p>He <u>said</u> therefore, ‘What is the kingdom of <u>God</u> like?</p>
<p>is like a <u>mustard seed</u> that someone took and sowed in his field; ³² it is the smallest of all the seeds,</p>	<p>or what parable will we use for <u>it</u>? ³¹ It is like a <u>mustard seed</u>, which, when sown upon the ground, is the smallest of all the seeds on earth; ³² yet when it is</p>	<p>And to what should I <u>compare it</u>? ¹⁹ It is like a <u>mustard seed</u> that someone took and sowed in the garden;</p>
<p>but when it has grown it is the greatest of all shrubs and becomes a tree, so that <u>the birds of the air</u> come and <u>make nests in its</u> branches.</p>	<p>sown it grows up and becomes the greatest of all shrubs, and puts forth large branches, so that <u>the birds of the air</u> can <u>make nests in its</u> shade.</p>	<p>it grew and became a tree, and <u>the birds of the air</u> <u>made nests in its</u> branches.</p>

There are plenty of triple agreements here (represented by double underline). Matthew has the blander opening, simply stating ‘He put before them another parable . . .’ but Mark and Luke agree with one another in formulating the same kind of double-question about comparison with the kingdom of God, an element that is particularly striking given its presence in the introduction to the parable. Even here, in one of Tuckett’s choice examples, there is hardly an ‘almost pathological refusal’ to include any Marcan material. It is true, of course, that there is a substantial degree of agreement between Matthew and Luke against Mark in these passages, but that is why Q theorists characterize them as ‘Mark–Q overlap’ rather than as triple-tradition pericopae with minor agreements.

In cases like these, the complaint is effectively that Luke agrees with Matthew too much. But if Luke is using Matthew as well as Mark, it is not surprising that on some occasions he will agree with Matthew far more than he does with Mark. It is one end of a spectrum where there is a greater degree of agreement between Matthew and Luke than there is between Mark and Luke. It is a difference in degree and not a difference in kind. On the Farrer theory, the explanation is straightforward. On occasions like this, where Matthew is the middle term among the Synoptics, Luke is working with Matthew as his primary source and not Mark. The usual triple-tradition situation, where there are major agreements with Mark and minor

agreements with Matthew, is reversed and, instead, there are major agreements with Matthew and minor agreements with Mark. If Luke is working with both Matthew and Mark, it is not surprising that on occasions Luke turns to Matthew as his primary source, even in triple-tradition material. Indeed it is worth noting how often this happens where Matthew has a fuller account than Mark, in the John the Baptist material, the Temptations, Beelzebub and the Mission discourse.

11.5 The Direction of Dependence

If it is true that the Mark–Q overlap passages pose serious difficulties for the Two-Source Theory, is it clear that the Farrer theory should take the spoils? The idea of standing the Farrer theory on its head and reversing the direction of dependence is occasionally aired.³⁹ One way of approaching this question is to ask whether Luke appears to betray his knowledge of Matthew through docile reproduction while engaged in the complex business of working from his two sources.⁴⁰ E. P. Sanders points to such an example in Luke’s reworking of the Mission discourse.⁴¹

Matt 10.11–15	Mark 6.10–11	Luke 9.4–5
<p>¹¹ εἰς ἣν δ’ ἂν πόλιν ἢ κώμην εἰσέλθητε, ἐξετάσατε τίς ἐν αὐτῇ ἄξιός ἐστιν· κἀκεῖ μείνατε ἕως ἂν ἐξέλθητε. ¹² εἰσερχόμενοι δὲ εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν ἀσπάσασθε αὐτήν. ¹³ καὶ ἐὰν μὲν ἦ ἡ οἰκία ἀξία, ἐλθάτω ἡ εἰρήνη ὑμῶν ἐπ’ αὐτήν· ἐὰν δὲ μὴ ἦ ἀξία, ἡ εἰρήνη ὑμῶν</p>	<p>¹⁰ καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς· Ὅπου ἐὰν εἰσέλθητε εἰς οἰκίαν, ἐκεῖ μένετε ἕως ἂν ἐξέλθητε ἐκεῖθεν.</p>	<p>καὶ εἰς ἣν ἂν οἰκίαν εἰσέλθητε, ἐκεῖ μένετε καὶ ἐκεῖθεν ἐξέρχεσθε.</p>

39. See Robert K. MacEwen, *Matthean Posteriority: An Exploration of Matthew’s Use of Luke and Mark as a Solution to the Synoptic Problem*, LNTS 501 (London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2015). See too Ronald V. Huggins, ‘Matthean Posteriority: A Preliminary Proposal’, *NovT* 34 (1992): 1–21. Alan Garrow, *The Gospel of Matthew’s Dependence on the Didache*, JSNTSup 254 (London: T&T Clark, 2004) is also a Matthean posteriority theory, but it retains a Q source.

40. Cf. Mark Goodacre, ‘Fatigue in the Synoptics’, *NTS* 44 (1998): 45–58 (54–8). In discussions of the Farrer theory over against the Two-Source theory, fatigue can only be suggestive given the hypothetical nature of Q, with which Luke may have been fatigued. However, in the discussion of the direction of dependence between Luke and Matthew, the category is more useful.

41. Sanders and Davies, *Studying the Synoptic Gospels*, 95. In this synopsis, I have not added the Lucan doublet of the Mission Discourse to the Seventy (Luke 10.1–12), but it is

Table (Continued)

Matt 10.11–15	Mark 6.10–11	Luke 9.4–5
πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἐπιστραφήτω. ¹⁴ καὶ ὅς ἂν μὴ δέξηται ὑμᾶς μηδὲ ἀκούσῃ τοὺς λόγους ὑμῶν, ἐξερχόμενοι ἕξω τῆς οἰκίας ἢ <u>τῆς πόλεως</u> <u>ἐκείνης</u> ἐκτινάξατε τὸν κονιορτὸν τῶν ποδῶν ὑμῶν.	¹¹ καὶ ὅς ἂν τόπος μὴ δέξηται ὑμᾶς μηδὲ ἀκούσωσιν ὑμῶν, ἐκπορευόμενοι ἐκεῖθεν ἐκτινάξατε τὸν χοῦν τὸν ὑποκάτω τῶν ποδῶν ὑμῶν εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς. ¹⁰ He said to them, 'Wherever you enter a house, stay there until you leave the place.	⁵ καὶ ὅσοι ἂν μὴ δέχωνται ὑμᾶς, ἐξερχόμενοι ἀπὸ <u>τῆς πόλεως ἐκείνης</u> τὸν κονιορτὸν ἀπὸ τῶν ποδῶν ὑμῶν ἀποτινάσσετε εἰς μαρτύριον ἐπ' αὐτούς. ⁴ Whatever house you enter, stay there, and leave from there.
¹¹ Whatever <u>town</u> or village you enter, find out who in it is worthy, and stay there until you leave. ¹² As you enter the house, greet it. ¹³ If the house is worthy, let your peace come upon it; but if it is not worthy, let your peace return to you. ¹⁴ If anyone will not welcome you or listen to your words, as you leave that house or <u>that town</u> , shake off the dust from your feet.	¹¹ If any place will not welcome you and they refuse to hear you, as you leave, shake off the dust that is on your feet as a testimony against them.'	⁵ Wherever they do not welcome you, as you are leaving <u>that town</u> shake the dust off your feet as a testimony against them.

In Luke 9.5, τῆς πόλεως ἐκείνης ('that town') has no antecedent. Only οἰκίαν ('house') has been mentioned. It appears to have come over from Matt 10.14, where reference to 'that town' is coherent since entry to a town is mentioned earlier in the passage (Matt 10.11). On the Matthean posteriority hypothesis, Luke is working here from Mark and his reference to 'that town' is incomprehensible, while Matthew presciently fixes the problem ahead of time by supplying the antecedent. Luke's use of Matthew is the stronger hypothesis.⁴²

worth noting that there are some triple and many double (Matthew-Luke) agreements here in Luke 10.5–11.

42. On Matthean posteriority, Matthew is here conflating Mark's Mission Discourse (Mark 6.6b–13) with Luke's Mission Discourse (Luke 9.1–6) and Luke's Mission to the

Luke's use of Matthew also provides a stronger account of the distinctively Matthean nature of the material they share in the first major Mark–Q overlap passage, the Preaching of John the Baptist. The language, imagery and rhythm of the new material is Matthean through and through. The first line of John's preaching provides a telling example:

Matt 3.7 // Luke 3.7: γεννήματα ἐχιδνῶν, τίς ὑπέδειξεν ὑμῖν φυγεῖν ἀπὸ τῆς μελλούσης ὀργῆς
 'Brood of vipers! Who warned you to flee from the coming wrath?'

Michael Goulder labels this rhythm an 'echidnic'. The offensive vocative + rhetorical question⁴³ occurs twice again in remarkably similar forms:

3.7: γεννήματα ἐχιδνῶν, τίς ὑπέδειξεν ὑμῖν φυγεῖν ἀπὸ τῆς μελλούσης ὀργῆς;
 12.34: γεννήματα ἐχιδνῶν, πῶς δύνασθε ἀγαθὰ λαλεῖν πονηροὶ ὄντες;
 23.33, ὄφεις, γεννήματα ἐχιδνῶν, πῶς φύγητε ἀπὸ τῆς κρίσεως τῆς γεέννης;

3.7: 'Brood of vipers! Who warned you to flee from the coming wrath?'
 12.34: 'Brood of vipers! How can you speak good things when you are evil?'
 23.33: 'Snakes, brood of vipers! How can you flee from the judgement of gehenna?'

These links should not be played down. These are not everyday phrases. 'Brood of vipers' occurs in only these places in the gospel tradition, and the notion of fleeing from wrath coheres with the broader Matthean stress on a fiery judgement expressed using harvest imagery. This becomes clear in Matt 3.10 // Luke 3.9:

3.10: πᾶν οὖν δένδρον μὴ ποιοῦν καρπὸν καλὸν ἐκκόπτεται καὶ εἰς πῦρ βάλλεται
 'Therefore every tree not producing good fruit will be cut down and thrown into the fire.'

Virtually the identical sentence occurs again in Matt 7.19. Once again it is not just the language but also the imagery and thought that is Matthean. It is Matthew among the evangelists who exploits harvest imagery to tell the story of judgement and hell-fire. The Matthean apocalyptic scenario, here appearing for the first time in the Gospel, will be repeated at regular intervals. The pattern in this scenario is clear:

Seventy (Luke 10.1–12). On this scenario, Matthew must have seen 'that town' in Luke 9.5 and realized that he could make it work in context by drawing in the references to the town in Luke 10.8–11.

43. Michael D. Goulder, *Midrash and Lection in Matthew* (London: SPCK, 1974), 79; but see my critique in *Goulder and the Gospels: An Examination of a New Paradigm*, JSNTSup 133 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996), 48–9 and 83. Goulder over-stressed distinctive Matthean vocabulary elements, but he is on stronger ground in relation to rhythm, imagery and thought.

- (1) *There is a stark contrast.* In every case, there is a black-and-white contrast, in which the good are distinguished from the wicked, usually using harvest imagery. Here in John's speech, there is 'wheat' and 'chaff' (Matt 3.12 // Luke 3.17); later, there are 'good trees' and 'bad trees' (Matt 7.15–20 // Luke 6.43–45); there are 'wheat' and 'tares' (Matt 13.24–30; 36–43) and fish that are either good or bad (Matt 13.48), virgins who are either 'wise' or 'foolish' (Matt 24.1–13) and 'sheep' and 'goats' (Matt 25.31–46).
- (2) *There is a demand for good fruits.* Here (Matt 3.8–10 // Luke 3.8–9), the challenge is to 'bear fruits worthy of repentance' (3.8), leading to the metaphor of people as trees (3.9) who produce good or bad fruit. The metaphor is developed with good trees and bad trees subsequently in Matt 7.15–20 // Luke 6.43–5 and Matt 12.33.
- (3) *There is a separation at the harvest.* 'The angels' (Matt 13.34, 41, 49, cf. 25.31) separate 'the wicked from among the righteous' (Matt 13.48–9) at the end of the age, symbolized as a harvest when wheat is separated from chaff (Matt 3.9 // Luke 3.9), or wheat from tares (Matt 13.24–30; 36–43), or good fish from bad fish (13.49), or sheep from goats (Matt 25.32).
- (4) *There is an eternal fire where the evil are burned.* The chaff, the tares, the bad fish, the bad trees are all thrown into the eternal, unquenchable fire (Matt 3.10, 12; 7.19, 13.30, 13.42, 13.50). It is a view of hell that coheres with Matthew's characteristic stress on 'weeping and gnashing of teeth' (Matt 8.12 // Luke 13.28, Matt 13.42, 50; 22.13; 24.51; 25.30).

Several of these motifs do, of course, also appear in Luke,⁴⁴ but it is Matthew who regularly clusters them together, as when in Matt 12.34, the 'brood of vipers' invective is again combined with teaching about trees and their fruits (Matt 12.33) alongside the day of judgement (Matt 12.36). The apocalyptic scenario, with its clusters of related themes, with regular use of harvest imagery and fiery judgement are clearly characteristic of Matthew, and it suggests that the direction of dependence in the Mark-Q overlap material in Matt 3 and Luke 3 goes from Matthew to Luke.

11.6 Conclusion

The SP is often perceived as unimportant to the wider task of discussing the history and theology of early Christian texts. As a complex and obscure aspect of the SP, discussion of the Mark-Q overlaps can seem particularly abstruse. The contributors to this volume do not, of course, share such a perception, but it is worth thinking about how we draw attention to the importance of the topic to the wider field. One area where Mark-Q overlaps have major importance is in historical

44. Luke's one major exploration of the afterlife (Luke 16.19–31) also features a fiery Hades, but it is worth noting that Luke's eschatological reversal is here typically not so much about the evil and the righteous as the rich and the poor (cf. *Case Against Q*, 136–8).

Jesus research. The role played by the criterion of multiple attestation in the work of many historical Jesus scholars,⁴⁵ alongside an acceptance of the Two-Source Theory, means that traditions apparently attested in both Mark and Q become especially important and, as a result, passages attributed to Mark–Q overlap attain a significance that may be out of proportion to their historical value.⁴⁶

One of the reasons commonly given for treating Jesus' baptism as historical is that it occurs in both Mark and Q. But if Luke knew Matthew as well as Mark, those agreements are simply the result of Luke's taking over several of Matthew's modifications of Mark, and not evidence of an independent attestation in another source, a conclusion that will be disappointing to many historical Jesus scholars. And if Luke knew Matthew, then it becomes less clear that John's apocalyptic preaching derives from a parallel source that is independent of Mark. It may simply be Matthew's characteristic expansion of his Marcan source, drawing on the same stock of imagery that he uses also for Jesus' preaching, with the brood of vipers, the wheat and the chaff and the eschatological separation and fiery judgement, a conclusion that will be a disappointment to those who have invested a great deal in reconstructing the historical John the Baptist.

The inconvenience of a possible conclusion should not, however, deter us from asking the difficult questions. Reflection on the role played by Mark–Q overlaps may encourage interesting discussion on a range of topics in scholarship on Christian origins, not least the exploration of the way one literary work appropriates, expands and reworks another. The more limited purpose of this chapter, though, has been to draw attention to the difficulties that they pose for the Two-Source Theory and to suggest that the Farrer theory explains the data better. These passages are problematic not because overlapping sources are implausible but because they contradict one of the primary reasons for accepting the Q hypothesis in the first place. It is said that Matthew and Luke 'never' agree with one another in substantial ways against Mark, but these passages illustrate that this is not true. Along with the so-called minor agreements, they are part of a broader spectrum of evidence according to which Luke sometimes agrees with Matthew in minor ways and sometimes in major ways. They are what we would expect to find if indeed Luke knew Matthew as well as Mark. Perhaps it is time to take our leave of Mark–Q overlaps, to acknowledge these major agreements, and to think again about dispensing with Q.

45. For a critique of this criterion, including the role Mark-Q overlaps play in its practice, see Mark Goodacre, 'Criticizing the Criterion of Multiple Attestation: The Historical Jesus and the Question of Sources', in *Jesus, Criteria, and the Demise of Authenticity*, ed. Chris Keith and Anthony Le Donne (London: T&T Clark, 2012), 152–69.

46. Cf. Benedict T. Viviano, 'The Historical Jesus in the Doubly Attested Sayings: An Experiment', *RB* 103/3 (1996): 367–410, 'If Q and Mark are indeed *independent* of each other, the cases where they echo the same saying or phenomenon take on high significance as the most solidly grounded early sources available' (367). The appeal to the double attestation of Mark and Q goes back to F. Crawford Burkitt, *The Gospel History and Its Transmission* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1906); see especially 147. Burkitt did not use the term Mark-Q overlaps but his list is far larger than Streeter's, e.g. it includes the Parable of the Sower (152).