

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

**PayPal**

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for the *Journal of Theological Studies* (old series) can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_jts-os\\_01.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jts-os_01.php)

pdfs are named: [Volume]\_[1<sup>st</sup> page of article]

THE OVERLAPPING OF SOURCES IN MATTHEW  
AND LUKE.

IT is well known that throughout the Gospels of Matthew and Luke there are words and passages in which they agree *against* Mark in Marcan contexts. At the same time there are many omissions of Marcan material by Matthew and Luke, of which the most notable is that of Mk. vi 45-viii 26 by Luke. Upon these two sets of facts, in the main, have been based the various Ur-Marcus theories, and, more recently, theories of successive editions of Mark. These last have been worked out very fully by A. Wright (on an oral basis), A. S. Barnes, and W. W. Holdsworth; but there are weighty arguments against them. The omissions can, in all the most important cases, be explained as due to the editorial work of Matthew and Luke. We are then left with the problem of the agreements of Matthew and Luke against Mark. I believe that the key to the solution of this problem is given by Dr Sanday in the introductory chapter of *Oxford Studies in the Synoptic Problem*. He says (p. 21): 'I believe that by far the greater number of the coincidences of Mt. Lk. against Mk. are due to the use by Mt. Lk.—not of an Ur-Marcus or older form of the Gospel, but—of a recension of the text of Mk. different from that from which all the extant MSS of the Gospel are descended.' Again, on p. 20: 'I suspect that in some of the cases there has been an overlapping of the two documents. This overlapping of documents is a phenomenon that certainly happened sometimes.'

The agreements of Matthew and Luke against Mark have been collected by Dr E. A. Abbott in his book *The Corrections of St Mark* (Diatessarica, pt. 11, London, 1901), where they may be conveniently studied.

The object of the present paper is to shew that these 'corrections' belong to two quite distinct classes, and are due to two independent causes. One class comprises a large number of quite small agreements, scattered with fair uniformity over the whole of the Gospels, and is due to the use by Matthew and Luke of a recension different from canonical Mark. The other class includes a quite limited number of passages in which, for the most part, along with agreements against Mark there are also large agreements in material which is absent from Mark. In these cases we have the overlapping of two sources, which are mostly Mark and Q.

The argument is to shew that the larger and more complex agreements of Matthew and Luke against Mark really represent the version of Q (or some other non-Marcan source), and so are not evidence for an Ur-Marcus or earlier edition of Mark. We are then left with the lesser agreements, due to the common use of a recension differing from canonical Mark.

It follows that all three Gospels are based upon a document practically identical with canonical Mark. Moreover, the identification of passages in which the sources overlap, and the study of the manner in which this occurs, lead to the conclusion that in all these cases the writers are combining *written* sources, and not amplifying Mark from oral tradition. If the words in which Matthew and Luke agree with Mark and those in which they agree against Mark are underlined with ink of different colours, the places where overlap occurs can be sifted out with the greatest ease. The further question as to the extent to which the Logian sources of Luke and Matthew are identical is not here dealt with. The argument of the paper is not affected by it.

*A. Minor Agreements of Matthew and Luke against Mark in Marcan Contexts.*

Hawkins (*Horae Syn.* ed. 1 pp. 172 ff, ed. 2 pp. 210 f) has printed a list of 21 examples in which Matthew and Luke diverge from Mark, in the midst of Marcan material. Burkitt (*The Gospel History and its Transmission* pp. 42 ff) has examined these in detail, with a view to shewing that, in almost every case, Luke and Matthew may have varied independently in the same direction. It may be remarked that minor *omissions* might often be made by compilers working with an identical copy, as a result of such causes as (a) a tendency to drop as irrelevant the slight touches due to an eyewitness, (b) the fact that Mark is frequently condensed. But identical *additions* are very much more difficult to account for independently. A few striking cases may be explained thus, as by Burkitt; but it is not allowable to deal thus with a comparatively large number of trivial coincidences. Their frequency is an important factor, and affords cumulative evidence of a common original. It follows that a just inference requires a more minute survey than that embodied in Hawkins's table, and that Burkitt's argument may hold against an Ur-Marcus theory, but proves nothing as to recensions. In fact Hawkins (*op. cit.* ed. 2 p. 212) accepts the recension-theory, as stated by Sanday, as also does Allen (*Comm. on Mt.* p. xl).

The facts in question are fully recognized in two theories which may be mentioned, in addition to that of recensions here supported. One is that Luke has made use of Matthew. This theory creates more difficulties than it solves. Reference may be made to Allen on Matthew, p. xl, who thinks Luke may have read Matthew, but had not the work

before him when writing, and to Stanton *Synoptic Gospels* p. 140 who criticizes Simon's advocacy of the theory. B. Weiss has very elaborately worked out the theory that, in these coincidences, the minor as well as the major, Q, is involved. If this be true Q was practically a complete Gospel, except that it did not contain the story of the Passion. Stanton has criticized this theory very thoroughly (*op. cit.* pp. 49, 109 ff, 139 ff, 324 ff, where references to Weiss are given). Add, as a more recent expression of opinion, B. Weiss *Quellen des Lukasev.* pp. 193 f. The theory, as carried out by Weiss, is altogether too cumbersome. It certainly applies to one set of facts, but it is stretched to cover another set, which admits of a much simpler explanation.

By way of example some details are now given of the minor agreements of Matthew and Luke against Mark, taken only from four short passages.

1. The Cleansing of the Leper. Mk. i 40-44; Mt. viii 2-4; Lk. v 12-14.

Some variants may be passed by, as due to the free reproduction by the editors of common material. In particular, there are two omissions in which Matthew and Luke agree, which may be due to similar causes working independently. Both are references to the emotions of our Lord.

(a) *σπλαγχνισθείς* (D, a, &c., have *ὀργισθείς*). The variant looks like a marginal gloss explaining *ἐμβριμησάμενος*. *σπλαγχνισθείς* might be another gloss, upon the same word, but of an opposite tendency; but is more probably original.

(b) *καὶ ἐμβριμησάμενος αὐτῷ εὐθὺς ἐξέβαλεν αὐτόν*.

This phrase is thoroughly characteristic of Mark, and goes back to one who witnessed the scene. Matthew and Luke may have disliked it (yet see Mk. ix 30). Not only respect for our Lord, but the apparent contradiction of (a) and (b) may have resulted in their omission.

The variants which follow point in the direction of a common source. We note:

1. The insertion of (a) *ἰδοῦ* and (b) *κύριε*.

(a) On *ἰδοῦ* see Allen on Mt. i 20. *ἰδοῦ* and *καὶ ἰδοῦ* are not characteristic of Mark.

(b) Where Mark has *ὅτι* Matthew and Luke have *κύριε*. It is difficult to suppose that they inserted this independently. A question also arises as to the import of the var. ll. In Matthew and Luke *κύριε* is the constant reading. In Mk. i 40 we have *ὅτι, κύριε, κύριε + ὅτι*, and absence of both. This may simply mean that very early the Mark-text felt the influence of the other canonical form. It might also be collateral evidence of a Marcan recension which read *κύριε*.

2. Two changes of phrasing :

(a) λέγων for καὶ λέγει ;

(b) εὐθέως for εὐθύς.

3. Two slight changes of order :

(a) Mark has λέγων αὐτῷ, where Matthew and Luke appear to agree in reversing.

(b) Mark has αὐτοῦ ἤψατο, where Matthew and Luke reverse.

These six modifications, taken together, can hardly be accounted for by mere coincidence. The insertion of ἰδοῦ and κύριε is not noticed in Hawkins's list, to say nothing of the other changes.

2. The Sower. Mk. iv 3-12 ; Mt. xiii 3-15 ; Lk. viii 4-10.

Mk. iv 3 σπείραι. Mt. τοῦ σπείρειν. Lk. τοῦ σπείραι.

Mk. iv 4 ἐν τῷ σπείρειν. Mt. and Lk. + αὐτόν.

Mk. iv 7 συνέπνιξαν. Mt. and Lk. ἀπέπνιξαν.

Mk. iv 9 ὅς ἔχει. Mt. and Lk. ὁ ἔχων.

Mk. iv 10 ἡρώτων. Mt. and Lk. + οἱ μαθηταί.

Mk. iv 11 καὶ ἔλεγεν. Mt. ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν.

Lk. ὁ δὲ εἶπεν.

τὸ μυστήριον. Mt. and Lk. γινῶναι τὰ μυστήρια.

Burkitt (*op. cit.* p. 43) only mentions the last variant ; but the value of its testimony to a common source is greatly enhanced when all the others are taken into consideration. The strength of the case rests on the accumulation of such details.

3. The Raising of Jairus's Daughter. Mk. v 21-43 ; Mt. ix 18-34 ; Lk. viii 40-56.

Mk. v 22. Mt. and Lk. insert ἰδοῦ.

εἰς τῶν ἀρχισυκαγῶγων. Mt. and Lk. ἀρχων.

Mk. v 23 θυγάτριον. Mt. and Lk. θυγάτηρ.

Mk. v 27 ἐλθοῦσα. Mt. and Lk. προσελθοῦσα.

ἤψατο. Mt. and Lk. add τοῦ κρασπέδου.

Mk. v 34 θυγάτηρ. Mt. and Lk. θύγατερ.

Mk. v 38 ἔρχονται . . . τὸν οἶκον. Mt. and Lk. ἐλθὼν . . . τὴν οἰκίαν.

Mk. v 39 οὐκ ἀπέθανεν. Mt. and Lk. add γάρ.

Mk. v 41 τοῦ παιδίου. Mt. and Lk. αὐτῆς.

Burkitt (*l. c.* p. 45 : so also Wernle *Synoptische Frage* p. 57) considers that τοῦ κρασπέδου comes from Mk. vi 56. If so, is it not more likely that its insertion was due to the editor of the common recension than to an independent transference of the words?

4. The Young Man who had Great Possessions. Mk. x 17-31 ; Mt. xix 16-30 ; Lk. xviii 18-30.

Mk. x 20 ἐφυλάξάμην. Mt. and Lk. ἐφύλαξα.

Mk. x 21 οὐρανῷ. Mt. and Lk. οὐρανοῖς.

Mk. x 22 στυγάσας. Mt. and Lk. ἀκούσας

Mk. x 23 καὶ . . . λέγει. Mt. and Lk. δὲ εἶπεν.

Mk. x 25 *πρυμαλιῶς*. Mt. and Lk. *τρήματος*.  
διελθεῖν. Mt. and Lk. εἰσελθεῖν.

Mk. x 26. Mt. and Lk. + ἀκούσαντες.

Mk. x 27 λέγει. Mt. and Lk. δὲ εἶπεν.

Mk. x 28 ἠκολουθήκαμεν. Mt. and Lk. ἠκολουθήσαμεν.

Mk. x 29 ἔφη. Mt. and Lk. δὲ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς.

Mk. x 30 ἑκατονταπλασίονα. Mt. and Lk. πολλαπλασίονα.

This is a very different array from the single reference given by Burkitt (*op. cit.* p. 50).

Of such agreements Abbott's list contains about 230, and his list is not quite exhaustive. He has also classified these agreements, and so brings out clearly their secondary and editorial character. He notes many examples in which (1) the subject or object is more clearly defined, (2) a connecting word is supplied, (3) the Historic Present is corrected, (4) a finite verb is changed into a participle, (5) the form εἶπεν is preferred, (6) δέ is substituted for καί, (7) the style is corrected for smoothness, (8) ἰδοῦ is inserted.

As an example of the general method, a note is here given on the treatment of the very characteristic εὐθύς of Mark by Luke and Matthew.

In the following cases they agree to omit: Mk. i 20 f, 23, 28 f, 30,<sup>1</sup> 43; ii 8; iii 6; iv 29; v (2), 30, 42 b; vi 25, 27, 54; viii 10; ix 20, 24 d; xv 1. The rest of the cases are as follows:

Mk. i 10. Mt. iii 16 εὐθύς. Lk. om.

Mk. i 12. Mt. iv 1 τότε. Lk. om. (iv 1 δέ).

Mk. i 18. Mt. iv 20 εὐθέως. Lk. om.

Mk. i 42. Mt. viii 3 εὐθέως. Lk. v 13 εὐθέως.

Mk. ii 12. Mt. om. Lk. v 25 παραχρήμα.

Mk. iv 5. Mt. xiii 5 εὐθέως. Lk. om.

Mk. iv 15. Mt. om. Lk. viii 12 εἶτα.

Mk. iv 16. Mt. xiii 20 εὐθύς. Lk. om.

Mk. iv 17. Mt. xiii 21 εὐθύς. Lk. om.

Mk. v 29. Mt. om. Lk. viii 44 παραχρήμα.

Mk. v 42 a. Mt. om. Lk. viii 55 παραχρήμα.

Mk. vi 45. Mt. xiv 22 εὐθέως. Lk. om.

Mk. vi 50. Mt. xiv 27 εὐθύς. Lk. om.

Mk. vii 25. Mt. xv 22 ἰδοῦ. Lk. om.

Mk. ix 15. Mt. om. Lk. ix 38 ἰδοῦ (probably).

Mk. x 52. Mt. xx 34 εὐθέως. Lk. xviii 43 παραχρήμα.

Mk. xi 3. Mt. xxi 3 εὐθύς. Lk. om.

Mk. xi 12. Mt. xxi 2 εὐθύς. Lk. om.

<sup>1</sup> Here εὐθύς may be reflected in the παραχρήμα. Cf. Lk. iv 39.

Mk. xiv 43. Mt. xxvi 47 *ιδού*. Lk. xxii 47 *ιδού*.

Mk. xiv 45. Mt. xxvi 49 *εἰθέως*. Lk. om.

Mk. xiv 72. Mt. xxvi 74 *εἰθέως*. Lk. xxii 60 *παραχρήμα*.

There may be some question as to the strict correspondence with *εἰθύς* of the alternative words in Mt. iv 1, xv 22; Lk. iv 39, v 25, and viii 12. If, however, these may be counted, there are 19 places where Matthew and Luke agree in discarding Mark's *εἰθύς*, out of a total of 41 occurrences. They only agree to recognize it four times. Matthew retains *εἰθύς* six times, where Luke rejects it altogether. Matthew substitutes *εἰθέως* seven times, in which Luke only agrees with him once.

In Matthew *τότε* (once) and *ιδού* (twice) may replace *εἰθύς*.

In Luke *εἶτα* (once), *ιδού* (twice), and *παραχρήμα* (five times) are used where Mark has *εἰθύς*.

The agreement of Matthew and Luke to read *ιδού* for the *εἰθύς* of Mk. xiv 43 can hardly be accidental; and the same is true of the case in which both give *εἰθέως* in the parallel to Mk. i 42; for Luke never elsewhere substitutes it for *εἰθύς*. These corrections probably belong to the recension of Mark used by Matthew and Luke, in which also it is likely that *εἰθύς* had already been discarded several times. It looks as if, in respect of this word, the process of revision begun in their common recension, had been carried further by Matthew, and still further by Luke. The reverse process is almost unthinkable, namely, that whilst Luke's form of Mark contained a few time qualifications, Matthew's form contained more, chiefly in the form *εἰθέως*, whilst canonical Mark doubled the number, at the same time changing all to the one form *εἰθύς*.

#### *B. Major Agreements of Matthew and Luke against Mark in Marcan Contexts.*

Cases of overlap may now be considered. The passages which come under this designation are more intricate than those just reviewed. Overlapping occurs when two (or more) sources are used at the same point.

The most striking cases of overlap are those in which both Mark and Q record the same incident or conversation, in the same relative position, as in the Preaching of the Baptist, the Temptation, the Instructions to the Twelve, and perhaps the Beelzebub Controversy. In these cases the patchwork appearance of Matthew and Luke does not accord with the theory that they represent the full form of Q, which Mark has abbreviated. Mark has an independent version. In most cases the context of Mark and Q is different, but the phraseology gets interlaced. The two accounts are conflated, and at certain points, where the wording is identical, there is overlapping.

The following are the most important examples :

1. The Baptist's Preaching. Mk. i 1-8; Mt. iii 1-12; Lk. iii 1-17.

In Mk. v. 1 is editorial. V. 2 b is probably an insertion by a later hand, from the Q-material of Mt. xi and Lk. vii.<sup>1</sup> This insertion has resulted in the correction (of T. R.) ἐν τοῖς προφήταις. Mk. vv. 3-8 are incorporated almost wholly in Matthew, and to a less extent in Luke. These replace οἱ Ἱεροσολυμῆται πάντες by a phrase of Q, and omit κύψας, which is, no doubt, original, and not an addition in Trito-Mark.

In Mt. v. 1 Ἐν δὲ ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις has no proper connexion with the close of ch. ii (cf. Smith *Days of His Flesh* p. xx). Hence it is not editorial, but from Q, as also is ὁ βαπτιστής.

Mt. v. 2 is mainly editorial. Mt. v. 4 b is represented by the one word μετανοεῖτε, and the phrase ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν is characteristic of Matthew.

Vv. 3-6, except the phrase πᾶσα ἡ περίχωρος τοῦ Ἰορδάνου, belong to Mark. Vv. 4-6 are not an addition in Deutero-Mark, for Luke omits them in order to make room for a fuller statement of the message.

V. 7 a is mainly editorial (cf. Harnack *Sayings* pp. 40 f). The Pharisees and Sadducees are introduced at once, as the unremitting opponents of the better way.

Vv. 7 b-12 are practically all from Q. Mt. v. 11 is also parallel with Mark. That Mark and Q overlap is partly indicated by the somewhat different order of the common material, an order in each case perfectly suited to the context. In Mark the transposing of the phrase ἐγὼ ἐβάπτισα ὑμᾶς results in a compact and forcible statement suited to a very brief summary. It may well be a stereotyped traditional summary of John's message, and not directly an abbreviation of Q. That Mk. v. 11 is from Q is shewn by the phrase ἐν πνεύματι ἀγίῳ καὶ πυρί. The phrase καὶ πυρί is from Q, and therefore the preceding words also. In Matthew Syr. Sin. and in Luke Syr. Sin. and Cur. reverse the phrase. They may give an ancient Q-form of the phrase, and thus a further intimation that the whole verse is from Q, and is not a mere welding of Q and Mark.

In v. 11 the phrase τὰ ὑποδήματα βαστάσαι is given by Harnack to Q; but it may be a later insertion of a phrase more familiar or more intelligible to those for whom the Gospel was written (cf. Smith *Days of His Flesh* p. xxi).

In Lk. vv. 1 f are editorial. They may be intended to fix definitely the time indicated in the general phrase (probably from Q) ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις, which Matthew preserves.

Vv. 5 f are editorial. Luke probably continues the quotation for the sake of πᾶσα σάρξ, at the end.

<sup>1</sup> Yet see Rendel Harris *Testimonies* Part I p. 49.



V. 7. The word *ὄχλοις* may be due to Luke. Sometimes he may introduce a reference to the *ὄχλος* inferentially; but most often it may be due to his source, as he carefully distinguishes words spoken to the *ὄχλος* from those spoken to disciples.

Vv. 10-15 are not found elsewhere. They may have been part of Q, as known to him, or from a special source. V. 15 is an explanation introducing words undoubtedly from Q. It is quite suitable, even necessary, and of a kind frequently associated in Luke with words from Q. Similarly vv. 10-14 are a suitable sequel to vv. 7-9. They indicate just the sort of questioning that John's sharp words were calculated to provoke; and are not in the least likely to be a free invention of St Luke. Spitta (*Die syn. Grundschrift* &c. pp. 12 f) gives a good reason why Matthew should omit vv. 10-14. His substitution of the Pharisees and Sadducees for the *ὄχλος* explains the omission.

We have therefore some justification for reconstructing Q somewhat as follows: (a) Mt. iii 1 (except τῆς Ἰουδαίας). Here Matthew preserves Q, and Luke substitutes a chronological note. (b) Lk. iii 3. Here Matthew modifies the form, because he welds Mark and Q. (c) Lk. iii 7. Again Matthew modifies, and Luke will be nearer to Q. This gives the following result: Ἐν δὲ ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις παραγίνεται Ἰωάννης ὁ βαπτιστὴς ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ. Καὶ ἦλθεν εἰς πᾶσαν περιχώρον τοῦ Ἰορδάνου (κηρύσσων βάπτισμα μετανοίας εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν). Καὶ ἔλεγεν τοῖς ἐκπορευομένοις βαπτισθῆναι ὑπ' αὐτοῦ—the rest practically as Lk. vv. 7 b-17. B. Weiss (*Quellen der syn. Überlief.* p. 1) reconstructs the introduction somewhat differently. He assigns vv. 10-15 to the special source of Luke. He also gives the long form of the quotation from Isaiah to Q, with the introduction of Mt. v. 3. Yet the (short) quotation may be peculiar to Mark, where we have (a) the quotation which sets forth the relation of John to the Christ, (b) a brief description of his work and person, and (c) an epitome of his message. In Q there may have been nothing but the message, with the briefest possible introduction. Probably Mark and Q overlap at Mt. iii 1 (in part), 11 and Lk. iii 2, 3, and 16. It is evident that where we are searching for scraps of Q retained by only one Evangelist, the process is highly speculative. The attempt is, nevertheless, worth making; for the comparison of various suggestions may lead to fair certainty in the end.<sup>1</sup>

2. The Temptation. Mk. i 12 f; Mt. iv 1-11; Lk. iv 1-13.

Mark's account is not likely to be an excerpt of Q. Short as it is, the forms *ἐκβάλλει* and *στανᾶ* along with the reference to the ministry of angels, sufficiently distinguish it from the version of Q, in which, moreover, the temptation takes place only at the end of the forty days.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. a suggestion by Buckley (*Int. to Syn. Problem* p. 142). He would read for Q (after Mt. v. 11a) a shorter form—ὁ δὲ ἐρχόμενος ὑμᾶς βαπτίσει ἐν πυρὶ.

In Mark it is continuous throughout the whole period. In Luke both points of view are combined. The Q-account no doubt had an introduction, for the reconstruction of which see Harnack (*Sayings* pp. 43-45). The τεσσαράκοντα ἡμέρας may be Marcan only. In that case νηστεύσας would arise from the editorial welding of Mark with Q; and then we might find in Lk. v. 2 b the original form of Q. But, on the other hand, the presence of καὶ νύκτας in Matthew along with ἡμέρας τεσσαράκοντα, where Luke agrees in reversing the Marcan order of the words, would equally favour the assigning of the whole of Mt. v. 2 to Q. Thus it is probable that in Mt. iv 1 f and Lk. iv 1 f Mark and Q overlap.

The close of the account in Q is abrupt, τότε ἀφίησιν αὐτὸν ὁ διάβολος. Weiss adds καὶ ἰδοὺ ἄγγελοι διηκόνουν αὐτῷ, which is allowable only on the (improbable) supposition that Mark drew from Q. Luke has produced a much more finished ending, without, strange to say, including in it the Marcan reference to the angels.

It is possible that the Q-account actually closed by saying that Jesus returned to Nazareth. We find in Mt. iv 13 and Lk. iv 16 the form Ναζαρά, not elsewhere written in N. T., which may be a fragment of Q. It is less likely that it reflects the Ναζαρέτ of Mk. i 9, which, omitted both by Matthew and Luke as unnecessary, would not be inserted later. Whereas, if it occurred in Q, Matthew would naturally work it into his transition to Mark, whilst Luke, wishing to insert the Rejection at Nazareth at the opening of his account of our Lord's public ministry, would find it a convenient peg. Bartlet (*Oxford Studies* p. 329) gives Mt. iv 13 (i.e. probably only 13a) to Matthew's form of Q, and Lk. iv 14 b, 15 to Luke's form. He regards Ναζαρά as the 'more vernacular form'. I do not agree with Bartlet in inferring that Luke found the incident in its present position in his non-Marcan source. More probably he brought it forward from its Marcan position because it forecasts the rejection by Israel as a whole; and he prefers the version he gives because it contains a fine statement of the Gospel programme.

Thus at the close of the section there is no overlapping, unless very doubtfully Mt. iv 11 b.

3. League with Beelzebul. Mk. iii 20-30; Mt. xii 22-37; Lk. xi 14-24 (also Lk. xii 10, vi 43-45).

Demand of a Sign. (Mk. viii 11); Mt. xii 38-45; Lk. xi 24-26, 29-36.

There is no doubt that Mark and Q both have a version of this incident, and that Matthew adheres to the Mark-position, conflating the two accounts, whilst Luke gives the Q-position, and, in the main, the Q-form. Hawkins (*Oxford Studies* pp. 45-49) argues the entire

independence of Luke and Mark. As to the main points, this may be granted, though it seems hardly necessary to exclude every trace of Marcan influence from the Luke-account. Mark describes no miracle; but he does indicate, *v.* 20 a, a condition of great excitement, such as might be expected to follow such a miracle. This consideration would point to the unity of the whole section in Mark.

For the reconstruction of Q see Harnack (*Sayings* pp. 21 f). The task is complicated by the fact that Matthew describes the miracle twice, i. e. at ch. ix 32-34 as well as at ch. xii 22 ff. Taking the double parallel with Luke, apart from Mark, we have the following agreements—*κωφόν . . . τοῦ δαιμονίου . . . ἐλάλησεν ὁ κωφός. Καὶ ἐθαύμασαν οἱ ὄχλοι . . . Βεελζεβούλ . . . δὲ εἰδὼς αὐτῶν . . . εἶπεν . . . πάντα . . . μερισθείσα ἐρημοῦται . . . πῶς σταθήσεται ἡ βασιλεία αὐτοῦ.* All this is in the strictest connexion with Marcan material, and yet must belong to Q. It follows that at Mt. xii 24-26 and Lk. xi 15-18, Mk. *vv.* 22 b-26 a and Q overlap. That Mark has remodelled Q, as Weiss thinks, is not a very likely theory. Also in the case of Mk *v.* 27 there appears to be overlap. Here Matthew follows Mark, but closes with a sentence of Q, and Luke gives what looks like a free paraphrase of Mark, concluding with the same piece of Q. The difficulty is to understand how Matthew and Luke could simultaneously desert Q for Mark, and simultaneously return to it again. If Mt. *v.* 29 is from Q, it is extraordinarily near to Mark, much more so than in the case of *vv.* 24-26 above. It is preferable to suppose that Matthew has here given the Mark-phrasology. In that case, can Lk. *vv.* 21 f be Q? That is unlikely, for they have a distinctly Lucan tone, as witness the more finished style, and the forms *τὰ ὑπάρχοντα, ἐπελθὼν, ἐπεποίθει, διαδίδωσιν.* There may have been something difficult or unusual about the Q-version at this point, which led Matthew to transcribe Mark, and Luke to combine Mark and Q in a free paraphrase. If so, *ἐν εἰρήνῃ* and *τὴν πανοπλίαν αὐτοῦ αἶρει ἐφ' ἧ ἐπεποίθει* may represent something that stood in Q. Weiss, however, simply accepts the Lucan form as Q.

The introduction to the discourse in Q may have stood somewhat as follows: *καὶ ἦν ἐκβάλλων δαιμόνιον κωφόν· καὶ ἐκβληθέντος τοῦ δαιμονίου ἐλάλησεν ὁ κωφός. καὶ θαύμασαν οἱ ὄχλοι, τινὲς δὲ ἐξ αὐτῶν εἶπαν . . .*

Again, Mk. *vv.* 28-30 to some extent overlap the similar statement of Q (Mt. *v.* 32). Matthew takes the Mark-form, somewhat condensing it, and at once adds the Q-form, slightly conflating the two; for *ὃς δ' ἄν* reflects Mark, and *οὔτε ἐν τοῦτῳ τῷ αἰῶνι οὔτε ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι* may be an attempt to simplify *ἐνοχός ἐστιν αἰωνίου ἁμαρτήματος.* Luke omits the Marcan saying, and gives the Q-form in ch. xii 10, yet slightly influenced by Mark (*βλασφημῆσαντι*). The connexion of the statements in Mark and Luke appears about equally suitable, and Luke may very well

preserve the Q-context. We have, therefore, both in Matthew and Luke, a very slight overlapping of the two forms of the saying. If it should be thought that we have really two cognate sayings, and not two forms of the same saying, at any rate it is obvious that they are treated by the Evangelists as variant forms of the same saying. In this case three sources may be involved.

Lk. vi 43-45 is related both to Mt. vii 15-20 and to Mt. xii 33-35. There is here a doublet in Q, but no direct connexion with Mark.

There still remains Lk. v. 16 ἑτέροι δὲ πειράζοντες σημεῖον ἐξ οὐρανοῦ ἐζήτουν παρ' αὐτοῦ, with which compare Mk. viii 11 ζητοῦντες παρ' αὐτοῦ σημεῖον ἀπὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, πειράζοντες αὐτόν. Here Luke appears to have brought forward the sentence from Mark, by way of introduction to vv. 29-32. The comments on the charge of alliance with Beelzebul and the demand for a sign are recorded both by Matthew and Luke as parts of a continuous discourse, though Mark indicates (ch. viii 11) a later occasion for the demand for a sign. Luke makes use of the Marcan words in the Q-connexion, without causing any confusion, because he omits them later. Matthew gives both the Q- and the Mark-versions of the incident, at different places, at the same time, in the later passage, conflating Mark and Q. This will be noticed again further on.

4. The Lamp and the Lamp-stand. Mk. iv 21; Lk. viii 16;

Lk. xi 33; Mt. v 15.

The saying, in Mark, is connected with the subject of Teaching by Parables. Lk. viii 16 is parallel, but is also influenced by the Q-form (cf. Weiss *Syn. Überlief.* pp. 38 f). Lk. xi 33 gives the Q context. Mt. v 15 is also from Q, somewhat modified to suit the place where the editor has put it. After οὐ δύναται of v. 14 we have οὐδὲ καίουσιν. The phrases ὑπὸ τὸν μόδιον and ἐπὶ τὴν λυχνίαν are common to Mark and Q. Οὐδεὶς λύχνον ἄψας and ἴνα οἱ εἰσπορευόμενοι τὸ φῶς βλέπωσιν are repeated in the two Lucan passages; but it is not certain that they represent Q, though possible.

5. The Parable of the Mustard Seed. Mk. iv 30-32; Mt. xiii 31 f; Lk. xiii 18 ff.

Here the case for a double version is very clear. Matthew gives the parable in the Mark-connexion. Luke gives it in conjunction with the parable of the Leaven, as he found it in Q, and probably in the Q-position also. For the reconstruction of Q see Harnack *Sayings* pp. 26 ff. Matthew, to some extent, conflates. Necessarily, both in Matthew and Luke, there is some overlapping. Cf. *Oxford Studies* pp. 50 f.

6. The Mission of the Twelve. Mk. vi 7-13; Mt. ix 35-x 42; Lk. ix 1-6 (x 1-20).

In Mt. x 9-14 and Lk. ix 1-5 there is evident overlapping of two accounts, though it is very hard to give any satisfactory explanation of their relations.

In the case of Matthew there are evident parallels both with chs. ix and x of Luke, which record the charges to the Twelve and to the Seventy. The whole section in Matthew, to the end of ch. x, is of a highly complex character. He is evidently giving a general summary of instructions to missionaries, collecting all he can find, both from Mark and Q, that is relevant to this subject. The result is, in some respects, confusing. He omits the information which Mark gives (ch. vi 12, 13, and 30) about the starting and return of the Twelve, on the occasion of their first mission. All we have is a quite general word—*ἀπέστειλεν*, v. 5—probably from Q. At the same time he incorporates (probably from Q) instructions which applied to that mission, and, it may be, to that alone.

In Luke we have two missions and two sets of instructions, in connexion with both of which the starting and return of the company of preachers is definitely recorded. The instructions in ch. ix overlap those of Mk. ch. vi; but Lk. ch. x is quite independent of Mark. In a reckoning of probabilities, it seems much more likely that Matthew, who has one section devoted to this subject, should combine two sets of instructions, than that Luke, whose tendency is not to multiply instances, but the reverse, should fabricate a second missionary expedition. If Luke found only one such mission in Q, which he thought to be other than that in Mark, why should he have mixed *part* of Q with Mark, and relegated the remainder to another occasion? Why not keep the two quite distinct? (cf. *Oxford Studies* p. 57). As to the historical possibility of the Mission of the Seventy, we do not know that the omission by Matthew had any other than a literary cause; nor do we know whether the composer of the First Gospel was in as close touch with eyewitnesses of the work of Jesus as was Luke. At least we have a right to assume that Luke was quite well able to get first-hand information, and that he would never have recorded such an event had he not been assured of its actual occurrence. If he had regarded the two sets of instructions in Mark and Q as equally important records of the same event, he could have combined them, as Matthew did, or omitted one of the two. He probably *did* find Mt. x 5 b-8 in his Q-version of the Mission of the Twelve, and omitted it. In ch. ix 2 he has a reflexion of Mt. v. 7. Hence Luke's form of Q may have begun very much as his ch. ix 1 *συνκαλεσάμενος δὲ τοὺς δώδεκα ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς δύναμιν ἐπὶ πάντα τὰ δαιμονία καὶ νόσους θεραπεύειν· καὶ ἀπέστειλεν αὐτοὺς λέγων· Εἰς ὁδὸν ἐθνῶν μὴ ἀπέλθῃτε, &c.*, as Mt. x 5-8, then *Μηδὲν αἴρετε εἰς τὴν ὁδόν, &c.*, as Lk. ix 2 b-6, perhaps omitting *εἰς μαρτύριον*,

at the end of *v.* 5. In some respects canonical Mark appears to be secondary. In Mt. x 10 and Lk. ix 3 the staff is forbidden, and in Mt. x 10 and Lk. x 4 the sandals, or other footgear. In Mark both are expressly permitted. Surely, in the case of such commonly used and necessary aids to travel, no specific permission would have been thought of, in the first instance. For special reasons they might be forbidden, in connexion with some particular journey or journeys of short duration (cf. Allen on Mt. x 9); and later on, and as a general rule, the restrictions might be withdrawn. Mark appears to reflect that later stage.

In this passage Mark and Q will overlap in Mt. x 1, 9, and 10 and Lk. ix 1-5.

7. The Sign of Jonah. Mk. viii 12; Mt. xvi 4; Lk. xi 29.

Luke gives but one incident and conversation, ch. xi 16 and 29-36, as we have already seen (in no. 3), antedating the incident recorded by Mark, and following Q for the conversation. Matthew gives two occasions and conversations, namely, ch. xii 38-45, which is from Q, and ch. xvi 1-4, where the incident is recorded in Mark's words and position; but the conversation is from Q. At any rate, *vv.* 2 b and 3, though peculiar to Matthew, may belong to Q (if *vv.* 2 and 3 a are retained in the text), though the passage probably had some other position originally. Mt. xvi 4 repeats Mt. xii 39 verbatim, except for the omission of τοῦ προφήτου, at the end. For Q see Harnack *Sayings* p. 137 and *Oxford Studies* pp. 45 f.

The overlapping is quite evident at Mt. xvi 4.<sup>1</sup> In Luke there may be also some conflation of the two sources (ἀντη and simple ζητεῖ).

8. The Leaven of the Pharisees. Mk. viii 15; Mt. xvi 6; Lk. xii 1.

This saying is closely connected in Mark with the demand for a sign; and Matthew follows Mark. In Luke it occurs in ch. xii, which may all be taken from Q. As to this particular saying, it probably belongs to Q, and stood at the head of a string of miscellaneous sayings which followed the discourse against the Pharisees. In that case, προσέχετε will be from Q, and the words ἀπὸ τῆς ζύμης τῶν Φαρισαίων will be common to Mark and Q. Weiss, on the other hand (*Quellen des Lucasev.* p. 78 and n.), gives a very good account of the passage, on the assumption that Luke is taking the words from Mk. viii 15.

9. Bearing the Cross. Mk. viii 34; Mt. xvi 24; Lk. ix 23.

Mt. x 38; Lk. xiv 27.

Here Mark has the positive form of the statement, which is also given in the parallels. Mt. x 38 and Lk. xiv 27 have the negative form. At the same time there is a difference between them. Matthew has the threefold refrain οὐκ ἔστιν μου ἄξιος, and Luke οὐ δύναται εἶναι μου

<sup>1</sup> In Mark the Sign is refused outright. In Q the Sign of Jonah is given.

μαθητής. In other ways also Luke has a tone peculiar to itself, certainly not due to the editor. Here Weiss states the case very strongly for regarding Luke as independent of Q (*Quellen des Lukasev.* pp. 254 f, and Harnack *Sayings* p. 87). There are good reasons for regarding the whole of *vv.* 1-33 as belonging to a special source of Luke.

Here then we have three sources involved, of which Q and Luke's special source are used in positions different from each other and from Mark. At the same time both Matthew and Luke use Mark. Here they agree to vary from Mark only in the words ἀπολέση and ἄνθρωπος, neither of which come from Q (Mt. x 38 f). They belong to the Matthew-Luke recension of Mark, and do not indicate overlap. It was thought worth while to discuss the passage, because, where three sources are involved, one would naturally expect it to occur.

10. The First will be Last. Mk. ix 35.

Mk. x 43 f; Mt. xx 26; Lk. xxii 26.

Mt. xxiii 11.

The form in Mt. xxiii 11 is probably from Q; but the phrase ἔσται ὑμῶν διάκονος may come from Mark. It is found in Mk. x 43 and Mt. xx 26. Luke rests on Mk. x 43 f, but he has displaced the passage. At the same time he has ὁ μείζων, as Mt. xxiii 11. The phrase ἔσται ὑμῶν διάκονος would appear to be common to Mark and Q.

11. Offending a Little One. Mk. ix 42; Mt. xviii 6; Lk. xvii 2.

Here Luke gives the Q-version, which is very near to that of Mark, but is connected with a word about offences in general. In Matthew the two halves of the Q-passage are transposed, and the second part is combined with the Marcan word about the Hand and Foot Offending, which Matthew uses twice, but Luke not at all. Here there will be overlap at Mt. xviii 6 and Lk. xvii 2.

12. Faith as a Grain of Mustard Seed.

Mk. xi 22 f; Mt. xxi 21 f.

Mt. xvii 20; Lk. xvii 6.

Luke probably reproduces Q. Mt. xvii 20 has ἐὰν ἔχητε πίστιν ὡς κόκκον σινάπεως, as Luke (εἰ ἔχετε π. κτλ.), and the rest of the sentence is precisely similar in construction to that of Luke, but with a quite different vocabulary, and the reference to a mountain, instead of a sycamine tree. In any case there is a slight overlapping of Mark and Q at Mt. xxi 21. Cf. Hawkins *Horae Syn.* ed. 1 p. 72, ed. 2 pp. 89 f.

13. Forgiveness whilst Praying. Mk. xi 25; Mt. vi 14 f.

Here the passages are in a widely different context, in Mark the occasion of the Withered Fig-tree, and in Matthew (Q) the Sermon on the Mount. Here, whilst the phrasing is different, there is a close correspondence of vocabulary—Mt. καὶ . . . ὁ πατήρ ἡμῶν ὁ οὐράνιος . . .

τὰ παραπτώματα ὑμῶν, and Lk. καὶ ὁ πατήρ ὑμῶν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς . . . τὰ παραπτώματα ὑμῶν.

14. The Scribe's Question. Mk. xii 28-34; Mt. xxii 34-40; Lk. x 25-28.

On this section note *Oxford Studies* pp. 41-45; Allen on Mt. pp. 240 f; Stanton *Syn. Gospels* p. 89; Wright *Synopsis* p. 123. Wright considers that there is one incident only, which he refers to Deutero-Mark. He regards it as an intrusion, in the place assigned to it by canonical Mark, Luke being nearer to Proto-Mark. It is, however, quite reasonable to suppose that there may have been two occasions on which the Great Commandment was the subject of discussion, one of which was recorded by Mark, and the other in Q, and possibly also in one of Luke's special sources. In Luke the Scribe's question leads on to the Parable of the Good Samaritan. This is a 'story-parable', a type of which verifiable Q contains few or no examples. This is not to be pressed. The parables of the Talents and the Great Supper were, in some form, represented in Q, and possibly the Good Samaritan also. However, it is quite as likely that the whole of Lk. x 25-42 is from a special source of Luke, in which case we shall have three sources involved in the passage under review. Bartlet (*Oxford Studies* p. 346) thinks that Luke's source was already a fusion of Q with other material.

Matthew, preferring the Mark-incident, has combined it with the phraseology of Q. Luke omits the Marcan incident, in accordance with his tendency to avoid doublets. His language, nevertheless, is affected by Q, and also (in the phrase ἐξ ὅλης τῆς καρδίας, and the reference to ἰσχύς) by Mark. The change from ἐξ to ἐν is very noticeable.

It appears as if Matthew, in combining Mark and Q, has somewhat changed the character of the incident (see Weiss *Life of Christ* E. T. vol. ii pp. 289 n. and 291 n.). In Mark the question of the Scribe is spontaneous, and is not designed as a trap. This is recognized in the commendation of Jesus. Lk. xx 39 f also recognizes this. But Matthew, inserting πειράζων αὐτόν, from Q, and even more by v. 34, makes this another official test. The form of Q will be very much as reconstructed by Weiss (*Syn. Überlief.* pp. 34 f). The chief overlapping with Mark is in the phrases ἀγαπήσεις κύριον τὸν θεὸν σου and τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτόν. The phrases τί ποιήσας ζωὴν αἰώνιον κληρονομήσω; τί γέγραπται; πῶς ἀναγινώσκεις; ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν, ὁρθῶς ἀπεκρίθης, τοῦτο ποιεῖ καὶ ζήσῃ may reflect Luke's special source. We have to note besides that Lk. x 25 b contains exactly the same question as Lk. xviii 18 b, namely, τί ποιήσας ζωὴν αἰώνιον κληρονομήσω;, whilst in Mt. ch. xxii and Mk. ch. xii the question is about the First Commandment. Lk. xviii 18 is almost exactly Marcan, and Lk. x 25 b is certainly



secondary to it. Did Luke inadvertently confuse the two occasions? It is more likely that Q or Luke's special source had the question of the Scribe in a form so much like that of Mk. x 17 that Luke gave them both in precisely the same words. This would give another verbal coincidence in different sources.

15. The Chief Places at Feasts. Mk. xii 39; Mt. xxiii 6; Lk. xx 46.  
Lk. xi 43.

The parallel between Mark and Luke is close, both in form and order. In Matthew we have the Q-material worked into the Mark-position. In Lk. xi 43 we have Q-material *not* in a Marcan setting. Thus Mark and Q overlap at Mt. xxiii 6; and, what I have not noticed elsewhere, we have a case where Mark and Luke give one version and Matthew and Luke the other (Q), all four passages in almost identical form. Mk. xii 39 and Lk. xx 46 read *καὶ ἀσπασμὸς ἐν ταῖς ἀγοραῖς, καὶ πρωτοκαθεδρίας ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς, καὶ πρωτοκλισίας ἐν τοῖς δείπνοις*, and Lk. xi 43 and Mt. xxiii 6 (Q) *τὰς πρωτοκαθεδρίας* (Lk. *τὴν πρωτοκαθεδρίαν*) *ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς, καὶ τοὺς ἀσπασμὸς ἐν ταῖς ἀγοραῖς*.

Luke also (ch. xiv 7 ff) refers to the same subject, and, to a slight extent, in the same language; but he is here drawing on a third source.

16. He that is on the Housetop. Mk. xiii 15 f; Mt. xxiv 17 f; Lk. xvii 31.

It might appear that Mark and Q are involved here, seeing that Lk. xvii 20-37 is mostly from Q. There is good ground, however, for believing that *vv.* 31-33 are an editorial insertion and that Luke is reproducing Mark (see the excellent discussion of the passage by Weiss *Quellen des Lucasev.* pp. 85 ff). Lk. xvii 33 also is merely a repetition of Lk. ix 24, where Mark is the source. The Q-form of the saying is found at Mt. x 39 in another connexion.

For the sake of completeness a few passages may now be referred to in which Mark and Q are not both involved at the same place, but one or other of them with a special source of Luke. In these cases there is more or less of coincidence, often with slight overlap.

Overlapping of Mark with Luke's Special Source.

1. The Call of Simon. Mk. i 16-20; (Mt. iv 18-22); Lk. v 1-11.

The story of Mark, repeated by Matthew, is replaced in Luke by a totally different version, given in a somewhat different order. The transposition appears to be due in part to the previous transposition of the Visit to Nazareth, which will be noticed below. Having brought forward the latter incident, Luke was obliged to postpone the former. Luke's story does not appear to be taken from Q. It is too purely narrative in substance. The very slight overlapping in language is mainly due to the oneness of the subjects, though *ἀφέντες . . . ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ* may be a reflexion of Mark, in the recension common to

Matthew and Luke. The miracle is often explained as a variant of that recorded in Jn. xxi. Wernle (*Syn. Frage* pp. 37 f) thinks it is compiled out of Mk. i 16-20 with details from Mk. iv 1 f and the story of the miracle which we have in Jn. xxi. It is more probable that Luke is reproducing a true variant of the Story of the Call. There is no conclusive reason why he should disallow a Resurrection appearance in Galilee, and no dogmatic or literary reason for the transfer.

2. The Rejection at Nazareth. Mk. vi 1-6; Lk. iv 16-30.

Luke evidently preferred the non-Markan version of this incident because it contained so fine an inauguration of the Gospel work. For this reason, and also because the action of the Nazarenes was typical of the attitude of the whole nation, Luke has set the piece out of its chronological order, at the very beginning of the public ministry. The accounts as a whole overlap; but the details are remarkably different. Practically the only words in common are ἐν τῇ πατριδι αὐτοῦ, Lk. iv 24; Mk. vi 4.

Overlap of Q with Luke's Special Source or Sources.

Sanday *Expository Times* xi 473 refers to the possibility that these two sources may overlap. See also Buckley *Int. to Syn. Problem* p. 138. The following list will include the most important passages where this is possible. Space does not permit the full discussion that might be desirable. Some of the chief points are briefly indicated.

1. The Centurion's Servant. Mt. viii 5-13; Lk. vii 1-10.

Here it is assumed that Q is one of the sources. That is not granted by some scholars. By Wright, Barnes, and others the section is thought to be Proto-Mark. Harnack suggests that Q ended without any statement about the cure, but with the words, 'I have not found so great faith, no, not in Israel' (*Sayings* pp. 209 ff). In any case, Luke's account differs much in details that are by no means unimportant; yet he records the conversation in almost identical words. This is the stranger because it does not suit the lips of the deputation nearly so well as it does the Centurion himself. It is a most evident case of overlap. Luke admired the words of Q and the setting of the other source, and simply set one down almost on the top of the other.

2. On Bearing the Cross. The passage is discussed as no. 9 above.

Probably Lk. xiv 27 is from Luke's special source and Mt. x 38 from Q. The coincidences are only in words that could hardly differ, in variant versions of the same saying.

3. The Lost Sheep. Mt. xviii 12-14; Lk. xv 3-7.

Here the wording of the parable, as well as the context, differ greatly in Matthew and Luke. Luke has so much the better connexion that we do not wonder that he prefers it, and with it the non-Q form. There is some temptation to take Lk. xv 4-10 as a piece of Q; but if it were

we should expect to find both sister parables in Matthew. Here, apart from the numbers, there is not much identical in the wording; but in both cases the parable is cast in the form of a question.

4. The Great Supper. Mt. xxii 1-14; Lk. xiv 15-24.

The agreements and differences of the two parables are clearly set out by Harnack (*Sayings* pp. 119 f). The main idea of the two parables is the same, and the divergences from it in the two versions are quite in accord with the genius of the respective Gospels. They probably rest on a common original of a somewhat simpler type. Mt. xxii 11-13 really belongs to another parable, of the type of the Tares and the Fish-net. Now if Matthew rests on a Q-version, which is not quite certain, Luke must have had two versions of this parable before him, as of that of the Lost Sheep; and he preferred the non-Q form of it. There is very little coincidence of language at all between the two forms.

5. The Talents and the Minae. Mt. xxv 14-30; Lk. xix 11-27.

Only a few points can be noted. We must hold to the originality of Luke's main outline. Streeter (*Oxford Studies* pp. 199 f) has put the historical connexion of the parable very clearly. At the same time there must have been a personal element, such as is given in the entrusting of the minae. But there is evidence of the combination of this with some elements from the parable of the Talents, which may very well have stood in Q.

In Luke, though ten servants have received a mina apiece, only three, as in Matthew, give an account. Moreover, though the capital is equal in each case, and much less than in Matthew, the five and ten reappear, vastly raising the proportion, and in a different relation to the original amount. Again, this intrusive element is not really consistent with the rest; for the talents will stand for the external gifts and opportunities of life, which do expand with faithful use; but the minae, being equal, rather represent the position in the Kingdom which is common to all the disciples (much as Weiss explains the matter), which may be improved by faithfulness, and lost by unfaithfulness, but can hardly be conferred on any one else. It may therefore be suggested that Luke found the 'Talents' in Q, and the 'Minae' in another source, and to some extent combined them.

In the following cases there is some coincidence of similar material in which neither Mark nor Q is necessarily involved.

1. The Keeping of the Sabbath. Mt. xii 11; Lk. xiv 5.

There is the same reference to an animal falling into a pit; but in Matthew we have a sheep, and in Luke a 'son or an ox'. This is similar to the variation in the saying about Faith, where Mark has a mountain, and Q a tree (see no. 12 above).

2. Signs of the Weather. Mt. xvi 2 f; Lk. xii 54-56.

Here the wording is very different. Luke may be from Q or a special source, and Matthew from a source which is not Q.

3. The Stone of Stumbling. Mt. xxi 44; Lk. xx 18.

Luke cannot here depend on Q; but rather on some 'Testimony Book'. The omission of the parallel in Matthew by some important Western authorities makes it possible that it may have come into Matthew from Luke at a very early period. Both Matthew and Luke in their rendering of the associated parable vary a good deal from one another, as well as from Mark; but, apart from the saying under discussion, there is nothing to shew that they have a common source other than Mark. At the same time *v.* 43 in Matthew is quite peculiar to this Gospel, and may indicate a double source for Matthew. Of course, if this is so, we should have a very remarkable case of overlap here, in Matthew, and then also in Luke, if Q were a source for the parable as well as Mark. In that case the words about the Stone of Stumbling would betray Q in both Gospels. But the balance of probabilities seems to be against this.

It may be noted that in three sections above, nos. 9, 14, and 15, On Bearing the Cross, The Scribe's Question, and The Chief Places at Feasts, three sources appear to be involved. See also p. 137 above.

In the case of the Beatitudes and the Lord's Prayer, Luke may have had versions both of Q and other sources before him, in which case there would be some overlapping in his final renderings; but the two passages are far too complicated to discuss in a short paper.

If to these examples are added *doublets* traceable to more than one source,<sup>1</sup> we shall have surveyed all the most important cases of coincidence in the various sources of the Synoptic Gospels. It is believed that the cases in which overlapping can be certainly demonstrated, when studied in contrast to those in which Mark and Luke follow a common recension of Mark different from that represented by the canonical Mark, afford a proof that Matthew and Luke had Q before them in written form. That their copies of Q themselves differed considerably in some places does not affect the argument.

The general result of the paper is to work out in detail the suggestions of Dr Sanday referred to at the beginning of the paper, but not followed up in the other contributions to the *Oxford Studies*. It may be said that the same conclusions had been reached, and the examples had all been worked out, before the *Oxford Studies* were published, and may therefore be regarded as independent confirmation of the suggestions there made.

T. STEPHENSON.

<sup>1</sup> See *J. T. S.* October 1918 vol. xx pp. 6-8.