

Order in the Double Tradition and the Existence of Q

JEFFREY PETERSON

Argument from the order of Synoptic pericopes holds a venerable place in discussion of the Two-Source Hypothesis.¹ Most often it is the agreements and disagreements of order in the triple tradition that have been taken up in relation to the priority of Mark.² But the order of pericopes in the double tradition has also figured in consideration of the second document of the Two-Source Hypothesis, the hypothetical Sayings Gospel Q.³ The differing arrangement of this material in Matthew and Luke

1 See the survey by David J. Neville, *Arguments from Order in Synoptic Source Criticism: A History and Critique* (NGS 7; Leuven: Peeters; Macon, Ga.: Mercer University Press, 1994). Despite the suggestion of comprehensiveness in his title, Neville neglects the argument considered in this essay. As the argument from double tradition order is significant only on the prior assumption of Marcan priority, Neville's omission is perhaps related to his erroneous judgment that '[T]he only theory to have mounted a serious challenge to the two-document hypothesis is the Griesbach or two-gospel hypothesis' (5). For other, principally American, examples of such neglect of the Farrer hypothesis as a live alternative to the Two-Source Hypothesis, see Mark S. Goodacre, *The Case against Q: Studies in Markan Priority and the Synoptic Problem* (Harrisburg, Pa.: Trinity Press International, 2002) 12.

2 It is now widely recognized that such argument is inconclusive as regards the priority of Mark (so e.g., John Kloppenborg Verbin, *Excavating Q: The History and Setting of the Sayings Gospel* [Minneapolis: Fortress, 2000] 26), but solid grounds for Marcan priority are supplied by instances of editorial fatigue in Matthew and Luke (Goodacre, *Case against Q*, 40–3, and more fully 'Fatigue in the Synoptics', *NTS* 44 [1988] 45–58; see already G. M. Styler, 'The Priority of Mark', in C. F. D. Moule, *The Birth of the New Testament* [3d ed.; San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1982] 285–316) and by the implausible conjectures involved in a Marcan redaction of Matthew and Luke (Goodacre, *Case against Q*, 28–40; E. P. Sanders and Margaret Davies, *Studying the Synoptic Gospels* [London/Philadelphia: SCM/Trinity Press International, 1989] 92, 112; Kloppenborg Verbin, 'The Theological Stakes in the Synoptic Problem', in F. Van Segbroeck, C. M. Tuckett, G. Van Belle, and J. Verheyden, eds., *The Four Gospels 1992: Festschrift Frans Neirynck* [3 vols.; BETL 100; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1992] 1.93–120). These implausibilities are now displayed at book length in David B. Peabody, ed., with Lamar Cope and Allan J. McNicol, *One Gospel from Two: Mark's Use of Matthew and Luke* (Harrisburg, Pa.: Trinity Press International, 2002).

3 Kloppenborg Verbin objects that '[b]ecause Q is an integral part of the 2DH [i.e., Two-Source Hypothesis] it is infelicitous to speak of "the Q hypothesis" as if it were logically separable from the 2DH' ('Is There a New Paradigm?' in David G. Horrell and Christopher M. Tuckett, eds.,

has been held to preclude a direct literary relationship between these Gospels and to require an indirect relationship, mediated by Q.⁴

In recent scholarship, the argument from double tradition order has not to my knowledge been made the subject of an article or monograph but rather appears in passing in a number of broader studies. Thus, in the preliminaries to his magisterial study of the Sayings Gospel, John Kloppenborg notes that postulating Luke's use of Matthew as an alternative to Q 'require[s] one to suppose that Luke rather aggressively dislocated sayings from the context in which he found them in Matthew, often transporting them to contexts in which their function and significance is far less clear than it was in Matthew'.⁵ A recent survey of research on Luke's Journey to Jerusalem maintains that 'the central section Lk 9, 51–18, 14 constitutes a major problem for those who defend Luke's dependence on Mt' in that this section 'shows little or no agreements of order with Mt'.⁶ E. P. Sanders and Margaret Davies, though deeply skeptical of the existence of Q, concede in their Synoptic textbook that 'the great strength of the two-source hypothesis is that it explains why Luke's narrative framework is the same as that of Matthew and Mark, while in the "Q" material its order is different from Matthew's'.⁷

Christology, Controversy and Community: NT Essays in Honour of David R. Catchpole [NovT Sup 99; Leiden: Brill, 2000] 23–47, 33 n. 31). But it is surely not otiose to distinguish hypothetical relations between extant documents from an entirely hypothetical document, or to indicate that Marcan priority is separable from Q, a fact not widely recognized outside the United Kingdom. My description of Q as hypothetical is not intended to prejudge the question of its existence but simply to note its status in the absence of a MS; on the role of hypothesis in the resolution of the Synoptic problem, see the suggestive comments in Kloppenborg Verbin, *Excavating Q*, 50–4.

4 For the hoariness of the argument, see J. C. Hawkins, 'Probabilities as to the So-Called Double tradition of St. Matthew and St. Luke', in W. Sanday, ed., *Studies in the Synoptic Problem by Members of the University of Oxford* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1911) 102–3; also E. W. Lummis, *How Luke Was Written: Considerations Affecting the Two-Document Theory with Special Reference to the Phenomena of Order in the Non-Markan Matter Common to Matthew and Luke* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1915) 3–4. B. H. Streeter does not argue for the existence of Q from the order of the double tradition in general, but his argument from the failure of Matthew and Mark to agree in placing Q material in the Marcan outline is a narrower form of this argument (*The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins* [London: Macmillan, 1924] 183); Goodacre observes that this form of the argument is less than compelling, as by Streeter's own account Luke has collected the vast bulk of his non-Markan matter in 6.20–8.3 and 9.51–18.14, his two interpolations into the Marcan outline (*Case against Q*, 84 and n. 10). Kloppenborg Verbin restates Streeter's observation in a form that allows the force of Goodacre's point to be felt: the bulk of double tradition in Luke appears 'between Mark 3.19 and 3.31 [in Luke 6.20–8.3] and between Mark 9.41 and 10.13 [in Luke 9.51–18.14]', *Excavating Q*, 67, 72; i.e., in the main Luke takes up Q (or Matthew) as his primary source only when he sets Mark aside. Cf. Michael Goulder, *Luke: A New Paradigm* (2 vols.; Sheffield: JSOT, 1989) 1.347, 409–10, 448.

5 Kloppenborg Verbin, *Excavating Q*, 39.

6 Adelbert Denaux, 'Old Testament Models for the Lukan Travel Narrative: A Critical Survey', in C. M. Tuckett, ed., *The Scriptures in the Gospels* (BETL 131; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1997) 271–305, quotation on 298.

7 Sanders and Davies, *Studying the Synoptic Gospels*, 114; cf. p. 112: 'The two-source hypothesis is the best solution to the arrangement of Luke.' This is in spite of their judgment that '[o]f all the

A yet more striking use of the argument is made by Robert Gundry, who abandons a fundamental postulate of the Two-Source Hypothesis, that Matthew and Luke were written independently of one another, but continues to maintain the existence of Q because of diverging order in the double tradition. Surveying the Minor Agreements of Matthew and Luke against Mark, Gundry finds more than three dozen details of narrative or wording that comport with Matthew's Gospel but not with Luke's.⁸ From these 'Matthean foreign bodies' lodged in the text of Luke Gundry concludes that Luke was acquainted with Matthew.⁹ Yet Gundry, inhibited by 'the disarrangement of Matthean material' that must be posited if Luke used Matthew as one of his 'primary sources' rather than as a secondary 'overlay', does not follow Austin Farrer and Michael Goulder in dispensing with Q. He accounts for his Matthean foreign bodies by positing Luke's use of Matthew but for the arrangement of double tradition in Luke by retaining the evangelists' common use of Q.¹⁰ The argument from double tradition order thus constitutes Gundry's sole reason for continuing to assert the existence of Q. The present essay examines the logic of the argument from order in the double tradition and questions whether it affords such clear grounds for the existence of Q.

THE LUCAN ORDER AXIOM

The argument depends on a common presupposition in research on Q: whereas Matthew subjected the material he derived from Q to his own arrangement, Luke substantially preserved the order of the source.¹¹ Kloppenborg has offered the most

solutions, this one, which remains the dominant hypothesis, is least satisfactory' (117, for reasons detailed on pp. 67–97). Cf. also their endorsement of the Farrer hypothesis: 'Matthew used Mark and Luke used them both' (117).

8 Robert H. Gundry, 'Matthean Foreign Bodies in Agreements of Luke with Matthew against Mark: Evidence That Luke Used Matthew', in Segbroeck et al., *Four Gospels 1992*, 2.1467–95.

9 Gundry, 'Matthean Foreign Bodies', 1468.

10 Gundry, *Matthew: A Commentary on His Handbook for a Mixed Church under Persecution* (2nd ed.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983) 5. Gundry thus revives the Synoptic hypothesis of Eduard Simons (*Hat der dritte Evangelist den kanonischen Matthäus benutzt?* [Bonn: Georgi, 1880]), which proved influential on no less a proponent of the Two-Source Hypothesis than Heinrich Julius Holtzmann (*Lehrbuch der historisch-kritischen Einleitung in das Neue Testament* [Freiburg: Mohr (Siebeck), 1885] 339: '2) Lc hat neben Mr auch Mt gekannt.'). and of Robert Morgenthaler (*Statistische Synopse* [Zürich and Stuttgart: Gotthelf, 1971] 303–5).

11 In proposing the now common practice of citing passages in Q by reference to chapter and verse in Luke (e.g., Q 6.20 for Matthew 5.3//Luke 6.20), James Robinson was careful to qualify this as 'not necessarily implying that Luke . . . preserves the wording or sequence of Q' ('The Sermon on the Mount/Plain: Work Sheets for the Reconstruction', SBLSP 22 [1983] 451–2, quoted in James M. Robinson, Paul Hoffman, and John S. Kloppenborg [eds.], *The Critical Edition of Q* [Leuven: Peeters, 2000] lxvii n. 158). Yet the Lucan Order Axiom doubtless informed the choice of Luke's versification rather than Matthew's (one notes the 'not necessarily' in Robinson's disclaimer), and it is likely that the convention has furthered the acceptance of the Axiom.

substantial recent defense of what may be termed the Lucan Order Axiom, effectively summarizing previous work on the question.¹² Kloppenborg's case has three fundamental contentions. (1) Matthew and Luke present a significant amount of the double tradition in common order, which can be credited to Q. (2) The placement of double tradition in Matthew is demonstrably redactional, and therefore secondary. (3) The order of the double tradition in Luke shows no clear signs of redactional arrangement, and as it is unlikely that Luke received this material in its Matthaean sequence and rearranged it to stand as it does in his Gospel, the Lucan order should be recognized as substantially derived from Q.¹³

This argument can be criticized under two general heads: (a) it does not afford sufficient grounds on the terms of the Two-Source Hypothesis to accept the Lucan order of the double tradition as the order of Q; and (b) it does not take sufficient account of the alternative possibility that Luke derived his double tradition material from Matthew's Gospel rather than Q. Having identified reasons for refusing adherence to the Lucan Order Axiom, I will conclude by noting the implications of this refusal for the existence of Q.

COMMON ORDER

Kloppenborg notes that common sequence is the strongest basis on which to reconstruct an original order for the double tradition material.¹⁴ Of the 67 pericopae into which his recent study divides the double tradition, he finds 27 exhibiting a common order in Matthew and Luke (i.e., 40 per cent).¹⁵ This figure arguably understates the extent of common sequence in the double tradition. In an intricate but neglected study, Edwin Lummis anticipated Farrer in holding to Marcan priority and to Luke's derivation of the double tradition from Matthew, so dispens-

12 Kloppenborg Verbin, *Excavating Q*, 88–91; John S. Kloppenborg, *The Formation of Q: Trajectories in Ancient Wisdom Collections* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987) 66–72. The later discussion summarizes, augments, and in some respects corrects the earlier treatment, to which it refers the reader for the basic argumentation supporting Luke as preserving Q's order. The presentation of Kloppenborg's case here draws on both discussions.

13 Kloppenborg identifies five varieties of argument that have been used to commend Luke's order as derived from Q (*Formation of Q*, 69, 72, with table intervening), basing his own case on the first four of these. This remains the case in *Excavating Q*, 88–91, though the later, briefer discussion does not delineate the arguments as clearly. The three points in the text represent my analysis of the logic of Kloppenborg's argument.

14 'By far the most secure argument [on which to base a reconstruction of the order of Q] is that of *already existing order*', i.e., common to Matthew and Luke (Kloppenborg, *Formation of Q*, 72; italics in original).

15 Kloppenborg Verbin, *Excavating Q*, 89. This is an increase from his earlier count of 35 out of 106 (*Formation of Q*, 72–3), or 33 per cent. In his own summary, Kloppenborg states the proportion as 'one-third' (*Excavating Q*, 29), which understates the results of the analysis on pp. 68–71.

ing with Q.¹⁶ In the 215 verses he ascribed to the double tradition, Lummis found three series of Lucan passages in Matthaean order, with 144 verses (67 per cent) in exactly common sequence and 170 verses (79 per cent) substantially reflecting common sequence.¹⁷ B. H. Streeter's review, while of course dissenting from Lummis's conclusion, endorsed his 'insistence on the relatively large amount of fundamental agreement in order between the Q material in Matthew and Luke, if one looks below the surface'.¹⁸

Kloppenborg's work offers no objection in principle to such a theory of multiple 'scans' of a source to yield a new arrangement. Indeed, Kloppenborg accepts as 'brilliant' Vincent Taylor's similar account of the composition of Matthew's discourses out of Q, with the caveat that 'the more scannings [that] are required, the more cumbersome and the less convincing is this kind of solution'.¹⁹ On this criterion, Lummis's solution, which accounts for Lucan order in the double tradition via three scans of Matthew, is more plausible than Taylor's, which accounts for the Matthaean order via 15 scans of Q.²⁰

Even Kloppenborg's 40 per cent figure is significant enough to suggest a direct relationship between Matthew and Luke as well as a relationship mediated by Q.²¹ The logic of the argument from double tradition order is rarely stated, and perhaps nowhere as clearly as by Lummis:

It is argued [on the Two-Source Hypothesis] that (a) the community of the Matthaean and Lucan sections of the Double tradition in point of

16 '[T]he Marcan scheme has provided the general framework both in Mt. and Lk.' (Lummis, *How Luke Was Written*, 34). Lummis offers as his principle filigree on the Two-Source Hypothesis, 'The inference is inevitable that Lk. **made use of Mk and Mt. concurrently**' (*How Luke Was Written*, 38; emphasis in original). In one of the very few discussions of this work, William R. Farmer neglects Lummis's retention of Marcan priority from the Two-Source Hypothesis (*The Synoptic Problem: A Critical Analysis* [New York: Macmillan, 1964] 111–12), a defect found also in David Laird Dungan, *A History of the Synoptic Problem: The Canon, the Text, the Composition, and the Interpretation of the Gospels* (New York: Doubleday, 1999) 369.

17 Lummis, *How Luke Was Written*, 4–17.

18 Streeter, *JTS* 17 (1915–16) 125. Lummis goes oddly uncited in *The Four Gospels*, although the two arguments Streeter there directs against Luke's use of Matthew (183) were rehearsed in the review.

19 Kloppenborg, *Formation of Q*, 68–9.

20 Kloppenborg's primary objection to the theory of Allan J. McNicol, David L. Dungan, and David B. Peabody, eds., (*Beyond the Q Impasse: Luke's Use of Matthew: A Demonstration by the Research Team of the International Institute for Gospel Studies* [Valley Forge, Pa.: Trinity Press International, 1996] esp. 14–21), which requires 25 Lucan 'passes' through Matthew to compose the Journey to Jerusalem, is not this high number of scans but the difficulty of discerning a principle of arrangement in the resulting Lucan composition (*Excavating Q*, 30 n. 21).

21 'If [double tradition] order is close enough to prove common use of *one* written source, it is close enough to allow direct copying from one gospel to another' (Sanders and Davies, *Studying the Synoptic Gospels*, 115; italics in original).

matter points to a common source, and (*b*) their divergence in point of *order* implies that this was an extrinsic source, not one of the two gospels in question. Just so far as the independence of Mt. and Lk. in point of order is shown to be illusory the force of the second inference will fail, while the first will still hold good. The Two-Source theory cannot be adequately defended by carrying back the agreement in order of Mt. and Lk. to the hypothetical source itself, since the hypothesis of an extrinsic source, so far as it is concerned with order, depends on *disagreement* in order between the two gospels. Other reasons, independent and separately sufficient, must, in the case supposed, be advanced for assuming a Logia-source Q.²²

In *Excavating Q*, Kloppenborg treats the question of Q's order (pp. 88–91) separately from the question of its existence (pp. 11–54), yet difference in double tradition order is the principal basis on which he argues against Luke's use of Matthew (pp. 29–32, 39, 41).²³ On the terms of his own discussion, the existence of Q is inextricably bound up with the question of its order, and so with Kloppenborg's arguments for accepting Luke's double tradition order as original in passages where Matthew and Luke diverge.

Kloppenborg observes that '[r]econstructing the order of Q is in effect the obverse of understanding the redactional rearrangement of Q by one or both of the evangelists'.²⁴ In practice, Kloppenborg proceeds by arguing that the placement of double tradition in Matthew shows clear signs of redactional origin, while that in Luke does not. I will argue that Kloppenborg's demonstration that Matthew's double tradition order is redactional, while persuasive, does not establish it as secondary, whereas he fails to establish that Luke's order can be confidently ascribed to a source rather than the evangelist.

MATTHAEAN ORDER

Kloppenborg argues that Matthew's double tradition placement is manifestly redactional in those passages in which he conflates Q with Mark or presents double tradition in a Marcan context, and likely so elsewhere as Matthew clearly reorders his Marcan material and can thus be expected to have reordered what he derived from Q. Kloppenborg notes for example that Christology, discipleship, and faith are major themes in Matthew 8–9, arguing that the detection of this redactional framework is sufficient warrant for dismissing Matthew's placement of the Q sayings

22 Lummis, *How Luke Was Written*, 3–4.

23 On Kloppenborg's additional argument against the Farrer hypothesis (namely, Luke's failure 'to reproduce Matthew's "additions" to Mark and . . . to adopt the more obvious Matthaeanisms in the first gospel', *Excavating Q*, 41), see the redaction-critical response of Goodacre, *Case against Q*, 49–59: Luke omits those Matthaean additions to Mark that 'tend to have a strikingly Matthean stamp . . . [and] appear to be uncongenial to what we know of Luke's interests' (51).

24 Kloppenborg, *Formation of Q*, 69.

as secondary.²⁵ Kloppenborg's original discussion goes so far as to describe Matthew's conflation of Mark with Q as 'a matter of empirical fact'.²⁶ Here fact is confused with explanation. What can be observed empirically is that a number of Matthaean pericopae include both material parallel with Mark and material parallel to non-Marcian passages of Luke.²⁷ Matthaean conflation of Mark with Q is rather the explanation of this phenomenon required by the Two-Source Hypothesis, which is not thereby elevated to the status of fact.²⁸

Kloppenborg notes that it has sometimes been argued that Matthew conflated Q with M material, or transported Q sayings to M contexts. His rationale for dismissing this argument is instructive; it is 'particularly weak, since we have no independent access to M'.²⁹ Such caution is entirely sensible in the treatment of a source unique to Matthew that (whether oral or written) is not extant and must be reconstructed from Matthaean *Sondergut*, with an uncertain amount of the material attributable to the Evangelist's redaction. Consistently applied, however, such caution must to some degree undermine the Lucan Order Axiom, for on the terms of the Two-Source Hypothesis our access to Q is more direct than that to M only where Matthew and Luke agree in wording or order in their non-Marcian passages.³⁰ The uncertainty that attends the reconstruction of M (or L) applies also to Q once one undertakes the reconstruction of double tradition passages whose wording differs in Matthew and Luke, or the order of passages placed differently in those Gospels.³¹

25 Ibid., 73, 77 (table intervening).

26 Ibid., 72.

27 In Kloppenborg's list of conflate Matthaean passages (*Excavating Q*, 89–90 n. 66), Q 6.40 should read 6.39.

28 Were he composing *The Formation of Q* today, Kloppenborg would presumably state the point more cautiously, inasmuch as he has recently criticized Goulder's comment that 'Luke's use of Mark is a fact (or generally accepted as one)' ('Is Q a Juggernaut?' 670), insisting that 'Luke's use of Mark . . . remains an hypothesis – a reasonable and effective hypothesis, in my view – but no volume of scholarly literature in its support . . . will elevate its ontological status to anything more than that' (Kloppenborg Verbin, 'Is There a New Paradigm?' 33–4). Goulder's formulation that Marcan priority is 'a fact (or generally accepted as one)' is less open to criticism than Kloppenborg's rephrasing of this as 'a "fact" or even a "generally accepted fact"' (33).

29 Kloppenborg, *Formation of Q*, 72. Kloppenborg omits mention of M in the discussion in *Excavating Q*.

30 Even here there is cause for uncertainty on the terms of the Two-Source Hypothesis. If Q was independently redacted in just the same way as Mark, then by analogy with the Minor Agreements the Two-Source Hypothesis should posit well over 100 instances in which Matthew and Luke agreed in altering the wording of Q. *Ex hypothesi* these changes will remain invisible until a MS of Q comes to light, even as the Minor Agreements would be unknown if Mark had not survived.

31 Comparing the Matthaean and Lucan redaction of Mark with that of double tradition passages ought in theory to result in a more certain reconstruction of Q than of M, but Goulder has argued that the International Q Project reaches doubtful conclusions as to wording because of the presupposition that Q's style was un-Matthaean, in spite of verbatim double tradition passages that include Matthaean phrases and imagery ('Self-Contradiction in the IQP', *JBL* 118 [1999] 506–17).

Kloppenborg is convincing in thus presenting the placement of the double tradition in Matthew as redactional, but this is only a necessary condition for the conclusion that Lucan order is original, not a sufficient condition. Kloppenborg presupposes that either Matthew's order or Luke's order in divergent passages is derived from Q and thus limits himself to deciding which Evangelist preserves the prior order; yet on the Two-Source Hypothesis one might argue that neither Matthew nor Luke consistently preserves the order of the source. Moreover, Kloppenborg's treatment of Matthew is consistent with the account of the double tradition offered by the Farrer hypothesis, for which the double tradition is accounted for as those substantial additions Matthew made to Mark that Luke then incorporated into his Gospel, according to his own plan. As for the Farrer hypothesis, so for the Lucan Order Axiom the crucial question is how one deals with the text of Luke.

LUCAN ORDER

To commend the Lucan Order Axiom, it is thus not sufficient to show that the Matthaean placement of double tradition is redactional; analysis of Luke must also show that its double tradition order derives not from the Evangelist but from his source. Kloppenborg argues for the pre-Lucan origin of Luke's double tradition order on two grounds.³² First, Luke's respect for the Marcan order can be generalized to support his respect of the order of his sources generally. Second, no principle of composition can be found to account for Luke's dismantling of Matthew's thematic discourses. I will respond to each of these in turn.

First, Luke scarcely exhibits such scruples regarding the rearrangement of his sources as is sometimes suggested. Kloppenborg's original treatment of the question began with G. B. Caird's count of 17 Lucan transpositions of Mark and follows Caird in accounting for the majority of these as owing either to the influence of Q or of tradition unique to Luke; Kloppenborg's commendable reticence to invoke the order of M here vanished in respect of L.³³ He thus originally reduced to 2 the number of Luke's 'genuine' transpositions of Mark. His more recent summary credits Luke with 5 sheer transpositions of Marcan pericopae, plus 2 possibly attributable to L – enough to suggest that Luke has no objection in principle to

32 Kloppenborg offers a third argument, from Matthew's incorporation of sayings in Lucan order, but grouped by content (cf. especially Matthew 10.24–39). This is only a specific instance of his second argument: it is unlikely 'that Luke saw in Q a topically ordered set of sayings and scattered them throughout Q [*sic*]' (*Excavating Q*, 89). The fundamental question is whether one can account for Luke's order in terms of his own narrative. It is perhaps worth noting Lummis's contrary conclusion: 'the phenomena of comparative order [namely, the three Matthaean-order series in Luke] . . . resist all attempts to derive the Matthaean arrangement from the Lucan, while they admit of explanation on the assumption that the passages are taken by Luke from Matthew' (*How Luke Was Written*, 22).

33 Kloppenborg, *Formation of Q*, 69 n. 120, where Kloppenborg raised Caird's count in both of these categories, attributing 11 or 12 of the transpositions to Q (Caird definitely attributed 8 passages to Q with 2 more questionable, for a total possible of 10) and 4 to L (vs. Caird's 3).

reordering his sources.³⁴ Nor can one easily generalize from Luke's mode of using a narrative source to that of a sayings collection; Kloppenborg himself warns against the assumption 'that Luke would automatically treat a document lacking a clearly narrative structure in the same way that he treated a narrative document like Mark'.³⁵

In fact, Luke's use of Mark shows him ready to make relocations that effect significant changes in the shape of the Marcan narrative. To take the first example the Gospel affords, the relocation of the Nazareth rejection (Mark 6.1–6a) to the outset of Jesus' ministry (Luke 4.16–30) foregrounds Jesus' rejection by Israel and his opening to Gentiles, anticipating the climactic rejection of Paul's message by Jews at Rome and his consequent turn to Gentiles there (Acts 28.17–31). It is of course possible that the beginning of Jesus' ministry in L supplied Luke with a pericope so well suited to the principal themes Luke develops throughout his two volumes, but it is more economical to attribute the placement to Luke himself.

A simple count of aggregate pericopae transposed by Luke is thus an inadequate index of the place transposition holds in his work. Inquiry properly begins with determining the kind of narrative Luke set out to construct and for which he quarried material from his predecessors. This brings us to Kloppenborg's second basis for maintaining Luke's order as original: the claim that it is more likely that Matthew would group Q sayings thematically than that Luke would scatter them. This is pivotal, for if the Lucan order of the double tradition owes as much to redaction as the Matthaean, then there is no basis for reconstructing an original order for Q beyond the passages that exhibit common order. Further, as the differing order in the double tradition supplies Kloppenborg's strongest reason for denying Luke's use of Matthew, concluding that Luke's order is substantially redactional would leave the existence of Q without clear basis and so tend to support the Farrer hypothesis.

Criticism of Kloppenborg's second point may begin with the observation that it oversimplifies the data, as Mark Goodacre has observed is common; the double tradition appears not only in Matthew's five thematic discourses but in a number of other contexts as well.³⁶ Especially noteworthy is the appropriation of Q that the Two-Source Hypothesis must posit in Matthew 8.19–22; 9.37–8; 11.2–27; 12.22–45; and 22.1–10. In these passages Matthew places Q material not in themat-

34 Namely, Luke 3.1–18; 6.12–16; 8.19–21; 22.21–3, 24–30, and (perhaps influenced by L) 4.16–30 and 5.1–11 (Kloppenborg, *Excavating Q*, 22). Kloppenborg here finds only seven Matthaean transpositions of Marcan pericopae, plus four rearrangements within pericopae (21), which would make the incidence of Marcan transposition in Matthew and Luke nearly identical as he finds also in Luke three rearrangements within Marcan pericopae (91). Seven is, however, too low a number for Matthew, as a glance at the synopsis will show.

35 Kloppenborg Verbin, *Excavating Q*, 89. See also Goodacre, *Case against Q*, 88–9.

36 Goodacre, *Case against Q*, 82–3, citing Matthew chaps. 3–4; 8.5–13, 19–22; 9.37–8; 11.2–27; 12.22–45; 22.1–10; and 23. Kloppenborg describes Matthew's arrangement of Q material as 'normally having to do with a desire to produce thematically related groupings (e.g., in Matthew 5–7; 10.1–42; 13.1–53; 18.1–35; 24–5)', thus rendering 'the reasons for Matthew to have rearranged Q . . . patent', while Luke's in contrast remain 'opaque' (*Excavating Q*, 88).

ically arranged discourses but in narrative contexts presumably regarded as appropriate to their content. This narrative technique is similar to Luke's in his presentation of double tradition material, especially in his Journey to Jerusalem (9.51–19.46).³⁷ In these passages a teaching of Jesus is placed like a gem in a setting that serves to adorn it and enhance its force.

As for breaking up and scattering thematically related material, the Matthew of the Two-Source Hypothesis does precisely this with Q 10.13–15, 21–2, and 23–4, relocated from the Q mission discourse. Luke was clearly not averse to such relocation, as his disposition of Mark 4.1–34 and 9.33–50 shows.³⁸ The question is whether such relocation can be generalized to account for Luke's episodic presentation of the double tradition. It has sometimes been questioned whether such a procedure was technically possible, but this concern is addressed easily enough if we credit Luke's likely patron Theophilus with the resources and inclination to supply the Evangelist a scribe (cf. Romans 16.22) and a quantity of *tabellae* for taking notes and composing drafts in wax before committing the finished product to papyrus.³⁹ The real question concerns the literary plausibility of such rearrangement.

Kloppenborg assesses Luke's putative motives for 'dislocating sayings from their Matthaean setting' as 'quite opaque'.⁴⁰ This judgment is not without precedent; Adolf von Harnack, although favoring Matthew as preserving the order of Q, was content to describe Luke's procedure in the ordering of double tradition as 'highly capricious'.⁴¹ Yet simply to repeat this near century-old judgment is to pass over in silence recent developments in Lucan scholarship. The cutting edge of interpretation gives pride of place to the narrative analysis of Luke (and the other Gospels), shifting

37 A number of commentators follow the Aland synopsis in identifying the Journey narrative as extending only through 18.14. This delineation is intelligible on source-critical grounds, since at 18.15 Luke returns to the Marcan outline, from which he departed at 9.51 (Luke 9.49–50 = Mark 9.38–41, and Luke 18.15–17 = Mark 10.13–16). In terms of the Lucan narrative, however, the Journey to Jerusalem continues through the climactic entry into the temple courts in 19.28–46 (cf. the motifs of ascent in 19.28; approach in 19.29, 37, 41; and entry in 19.45). The summary in 19.47–8 effects a narrative transition to Jesus' ministry in Jerusalem.

38 Goodacre, *Case against Q*, 91–3.

39 On the tools and techniques of composition relevant to the Gospels, see Loveday Alexander, 'Ancient Book Production and the Circulation of the Gospels', in Richard Bauckham, ed., *The Gospels for All Christians: Rethinking the Gospel Audiences* (Grand Rapids and Cambridge: Eerdmans, 1998) 71–111; Harry Y. Gamble, *Books and Readers in the Early Church: A History of Early Christian Texts* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1995) 49–50 and 268–9 n. 36; and the earlier discussion of Luke reflected in Goulder, 'Luke's Compositional Options', *NTS* 39 (1993) 150–2. For the possibility that Theophilus was Luke's patron, see Alexander, *The Preface to Luke's Gospel: Literary Convention and Social Context in Luke 1.1–4 and Acts 1.1* (SNTSMS 78; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993) 187–91.

40 Kloppenborg Verbin, *Excavating Q*, 88.

41 Adolf von Harnack, *The Sayings of Jesus: The Second Source of St. Matthew and St. Luke* (London: Williams & Norgate, 1908 [1907]) 181, cited by Kloppenborg Verbin, *Excavating Q*, 88.

the primacy from diachronic to synchronic interpretation.⁴² Rather than focusing on issues of redaction (and therefore source) criticism, recent major engagements with Luke trace themes, plot, characterization, and intertextual echo through the Gospel, including of course the double tradition passages, and through Acts as well.⁴³ Endorsement of von Harnack's judgment that the Luke's order in the double tradition appears capricious can be maintained today only in sustained dialogue with such readings, which Kloppenborg does not offer.⁴⁴ Indeed, the narrative criticism of the Gospels, and Luke among them, may justly be described as in its infancy. To paraphrase Farrer on the relation between form criticism and literary interpretation: in the current state of Gospel studies it is not the narrative critics who must wait for the source critics but rather the reverse.⁴⁵

Luke's Journey to Jerusalem is especially criticized as an ill-structured compendium of tradition that Luke was apparently loath to omit but could not be troubled to organize.⁴⁶ Attempts to account for Lucan order in the Journey have tended to seek a large-scale structure (usually typological or chiasmic), and the failure of any of these proposals to win general acceptance is the strongest support for Kloppenborg's negative assessment of Luke's placement of double tradition. Overall, it may be objected that this approach to the structure of Luke tends to evaluate the Gospel on criteria tacitly derived from Matthew, principally clarity of topical organization.⁴⁷

42 For two excellent brief accounts of this shift as it pertains to the interpretation of Luke, see Robert C. Tannehill, 'Freedom and Responsibility in Scripture Interpretation, with Application to Luke', in Richard P. Thompson and Thomas E. Phillips, eds., *Literary Studies in Luke–Acts: Essays in Honor of Joseph B. Tyson* (Macon, Ga.: Mercer University Press, 1998) 265–78, and William S. Kurz, S.J., *Reading Luke–Acts: Dynamics of Biblical Narrative* (Louisville, Ky.: Westminster/John Knox, 1993) 1–6. For the interaction between synchronic, narrative-critical exegesis and diachronic, source-critical investigation, see Goodacre, *Case against Q*, 105–20.

43 See the representative treatments of Robert C. Tannehill, *The Narrative Unity of Luke–Acts: A Literary Interpretation* (2 vols.; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986); Luke Timothy Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke* (SP 3; Collegeville, Mi.: Liturgical Press, 1991), and *The Acts of the Apostles* (SP 5; Collegeville, Mi.: Liturgical Press, 1992); Joel B. Green, *The Gospel of Luke* (NICNT; Grand Rapids and Cambridge: Eerdmans, 1997).

44 The bibliography of *Excavating Q* does not include the commentaries of Johnson or Green, and Tannehill is cited in connection with the interpretation of three particular passages rather than the discussion of method in the reconstruction of Q (525, s.v. 'Tannehill, R. C.').

45 Farrer, *A Study in St Mark* (Westminster: Dacre, 1951) 22.

46 Even so, such a judgment is not fatal to the conclusion that Luke quarried the double tradition material in this 'scrap basket' from Matthew rather than Q; see Morton S. Enslin, 'Luke and Matthew: Compilers or Authors?' *ANRW* 25.3 (1985) 2371–4.

47 Cf. Goodacre, *Case against Q*, 85–6. Though somewhat neglected (e.g., by Gundry), Paul Minear's *Matthew: The Teacher's Gospel* (New York: Pilgrim, 1982) offers in significant respects the most satisfying recent interpretation of Matthew. In this popular study, as in his more recent *Good News according to Matthew: A Training Manual for Prophets* (St. Louis: Chalice, 2000), Minear presents the Gospel as a guide for teachers and prophets leading Christian congregations; hence among other things the organization of Jesus' teaching by theme. Matthew's principles of organization may contribute to the Gospel's appeal to modern teachers, academic and ecclesiastical, and so influence the critical judgment that its arrangement is preferable to Luke's.

Architectonic approaches to the shape of the Journey have not been without exegetical gain, however, especially those that have found in the Journey Luke's initial exposition of Jesus as the 'prophet like Moses'.⁴⁸ The importance of this theme in Luke–Acts is shown by the allusion in Luke 9.35 to Deuteronomy 18.15, which is then quoted twice in Acts (3.22–3; 7.37).⁴⁹ But recognition of typological and intertextual motifs should not lead to neglect of other Lucan interests evident in his composition of the Journey. Among these, a suggestion of Rudolf Bultmann has gone largely undeveloped in recent criticism:

[Luke] can sense how false a picture is given if all the units are indifferently placed into one immediate temporal context, as happened in Mark at first, and was then further developed by Matthew.⁵⁰

Where Matthew groups the bulk of Jesus' teaching by topic (and like Mark produces a narrative that when pressed accounts for only a few days in Jesus' ministry), Luke relates it in a series of episodes that leads the reader from Galilee to Jerusalem in Jesus' steps, as Acts will follow Paul from Jerusalem to Rome. Luke's Journey affords a further element of realism by depicting Jesus in constant and alternating interaction with disciples, opponents, and the masses.⁵¹

David Moessner has sought to define the basic interpretive problem posed by the Journey as its 'dissonance of form from content',⁵² but one may wonder whether this characterization is not too broad. More precisely stated, the difficulty the section has presented is the paucity or (in the case of Luke 17.11) incongruity of geographic indicators and consequently of the sense of geographical progression that so marks the narrative of Acts.⁵³ Yet even in antiquity, Luke's would not be the only 'road trip' to focus on events and encounters en route rather than the itinerary; Mary Ann Tolbert notes ancient popular literature's use of 'the motif of journey to tie together

48 See David Moessner, *Lord of the Banquet: The Literary and Theological Significance of the Lukan Travel Narrative* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989; reprinted, Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 1998), helpfully adumbrated in 'Luke 9.1–50: Luke's Preview of the Journey of the Prophet Like Moses of Deuteronomy', *JBL* 102 (1983) 575–605; also Edgar Mayer, *Der Reiseerzählung des Lukas (Lk 9,51–19,10): Entscheidung in der Wüste* (Frankfurt am Main and New York: Peter Lang, 1996). For assessment of both, see Denaux, 'Old Testament Models', 293–6.

49 Johnson, *Gospel of Luke*, 156.

50 Rudolf Bultmann, *History of the Synoptic Tradition* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1963 [1921]) 360. My thanks to Mark Goodacre for drawing my attention to Bultmann's anticipation of redaction criticism (337–67) in this context.

51 On the alternation of audience throughout the Journey, see Moessner, *Lord of the Banquet*, 212–21. On the sequential delineation of Jesus' relationships with crowds, opponents, and disciples, see Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, 1.141–274. 'Realism' is here used as in Erich Auerbach, *Mimesis: The Representation of Reality in Western Literature* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1953).

52 Moessner, *Lord of the Banquet*, 14–44.

53 Cf. Goulder's translation of K. L. Schmidt: 'though Jesus is always traveling to Jerusalem, he never makes any progress on this journey' (*Luke: A New Paradigm*, 2.454).

separate encounters and adventures'.⁵⁴ Luke's Journey expands Mark 10.1–52 into an 'episodic plot pattern' that resembles not only the scriptural tales of Moses and Elijah/Elisha but also the popular literature of the early common era and also develops the Gospel's christological and hortatory themes.⁵⁵ It is far from certain that Matthew's disposition of the double tradition struck ancient auditors as unquestionably superior to Luke's.⁵⁶

In conclusion, we return to Lummis, who again states a fundamental point at issue with remarkable clarity:

Agreement in order, extensive enough to exclude mere coincidence is a much stronger argument for community than disagreement in order against community. The inference: 'Lk. departs from the order of Mt.; therefore he cannot have known Mt.' implies the major premiss 'No writer who uses a document ever for any reason rearranges the matter which he borrows'; and this is plainly false. On the other hand the difference in order is by no means insignificant, and must not be ignored. No dependence-theory, for instance, can be considered satisfactory unless it either accounts for the order in the dependent gospel or at least discloses some reason for the disturbance of order, and indicates some principle of arrangement in the secondary document.⁵⁷

Kloppenborg has agreed with David Catchpole that 'if it could be shown in a systematic fashion that Luke could be derived from Matthew (and Mark), Q would become a superfluous supposition'.⁵⁸ A full presentation of the case that Luke derived his double tradition material from Matthew rather than Q would take the form of a commentary on the Gospel that first exhibited the literary strategy of Luke's two volumes and then accounted for his use of his extant sources (i.e., Mark and Matthew).⁵⁹ My aim here has been the more modest one of identifying some

54 See Mary Ann Tolbert, *Sowing the Gospel: Mark's World in Literary-Historical Perspective* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989) 74.

55 Denaux stresses the influence of Mark ('Old Testament Models', 298). On the 'episodic plot pattern', see Tolbert, *Sowing the Gospel*, 70–8.

56 In addition to Tolbert, see Whitney Shiner, 'Creating Plot in Episodic Narratives: *The Life of Aesop* and the Gospel of Mark', in Ronald F. Hock, J. Bradley Chance, and Judith Perkins, eds., *Ancient Fiction and Early Christian Narrative*, Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1998) 155–76. Matthew's pride of place in the ancient Church is not of itself evidence to the contrary, since this was principally popularity among bishops, i.e., teachers, rather than among Christian or other auditors at large.

57 Lummis, *How Luke Was Written*, 4.

58 Kloppenborg Verbin, 'Is There a New Paradigm?' 25, citing David Catchpole, *The Quest for Q* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1993) 1–59.

59 Goulder's exhaustive redaction-critical effort (*Luke: A New Paradigm*) is indispensable but in need of narrative-critical refinement; see Goodacre, *Case against Q*, 116–20. For further contributions towards such an understanding of Luke, each suggestive but none fully satisfactory, see John

principles of Luke's arrangement that may aid in accounting for his arrangement of the double tradition and so call into question both the Lucan Order Axiom and the hypothesis of Q.

Since Streeter, it has been common to answer objections raised to the independence of Matthew and Luke (and therefore to the necessity of Q) by a strategy of *divide et impera*: the various forms of agreement between Matthew and Luke against Mark are sorted into separate bins (Minor Agreements, Mark/Q overlaps, double tradition) and accounted for in different ways.⁶⁰ This strategy obscures the very range of Matthew's agreement with Luke that is not mediated by Mark. For the Two-Source Hypothesis to retain its plausibility, this category must remain in the background. The Farrer hypothesis accounts for all these agreements by positing Luke's use of Matthew as well as Mark. In recasting the story of Jesus previously told by these two predecessors in writing (and perhaps others as well), Luke creates his narrative via three broad compositional methods: (1) he follows Mark, with echoes of Matthew small (whence the Minor Agreements) or great (whence the overlaps); (2) he follows Matthew, sometimes closely (in verbatim double tradition), sometimes more distantly (in double tradition with divergent wording); and (3) he passes on or composes material uniquely his.⁶¹

Certain Minor Agreements have led Gundry, like Simons, Holtzmann, and Morganthaler before him, to the conclusion that Luke was familiar with Matthew as well as Mark. These scholars have found reason to question one of the two pillars of the Two-Source Hypothesis: while holding that Mark was the first Gospel written, they deny that Matthew and Luke were written in literary independence of one another. Yet they stop short of denying the source that was hypothesized to account for instances of non-Markan agreement between Matthew and Luke. Gundry's offers the clearest rationale for failing to join Lummis, Farrer, and Goulder in dispensing with Q, but as we have seen the order of the double tradition provides no firm impediment to taking this step, provided Luke truly was the 'consummate literary artist' that Streeter said he was, rather than the timid botcher that Streeter,

Drury, *Luke* (New York: Macmillan, 1973), *Tradition and Design in Luke's Gospel* (London: Darton, Longman, & Todd, 1976), and *The Parables in the Gospels: History and Allegory* (New York: Crossroad, 1985); Eric Franklin, *Luke, Interpreter of Paul, Critic of Matthew* (Sheffield: JSOT, 1994).

⁶⁰ Farrer, 'On Dispensing with Q', in D. E. Nineham, ed., *Studies in the Gospels: Essays in Memory of R. H. Lightfoot* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1955) 61–2, commenting on Streeter, *Four Gospels*, esp. 293–331. The distinction between primary and subsidiary Matthaean influence drawn by F. Neiryck, 'Goulder and the Minor Agreements' (*ETL* 73 [1997] 93 and n. 29) and Timothy A. Friedrichsen ('The Matthew–Luke Agreements against Mark: A Survey of Recent Studies 1974–1989', in Frans Neiryck, ed., *L'Évangile de Luc* [BETL 32; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1989] 386) continues this tradition. Cf. also Kloppenborg Verbin, 'Is There a New Paradigm?' 25 n. 6.

⁶¹ Goulder, 'Is Q a Juggernaut?' 670 n. 16.

Kloppenborg, and other adherents to the Lucan Order Axiom must in practice make him out to be.⁶² The range of material in which Matthew and Luke agree without benefit of Marcan mediation invites questioning Q itself.

62 Streeter, *Four Gospels*, 548. Note Kloppenborg's minimizing of Luke's compositional work in the Journey narrative: 'his only obvious interventions seem to have been to intersperse some of his special material and to add a few transitional expressions' (*Excavating Q*, 90).