

## The Lukan Travel Narrative (Luke 9:51–19:27) and the Extent of Q

David B. Sloan, PhD

Presented to the Q Section of the Society of Biblical Literature, Nov 2012

Two fundamental issues that proponents of the two-document hypothesis must address are the extent of Q and the criteria for determining which verses in Matthew and Luke were taken from Q. Regarding the extent of Q, Harry Fleddermann argues that ‘even though Q as a whole disappeared, the entire contents of Q survive because Matthew and Luke preserved all the Q material in the double tradition material of their gospels.’<sup>1</sup> Others argue that some of the verses unique to Matthew and Luke likely also come from Q, but most conclude that these cases are ‘very few.’<sup>2</sup> This paper argues that these positions are untenable, that Q was likely about twice as long as the double tradition, that many of its verses can be found in the Matthean and the Lukan *Sondergut*, and that they can be identified by giving attention to the style of Q and to the redactional tendencies of Matthew and Luke. To demonstrate this we will first consider Matthew’s and Luke’s redaction of Mark, then we will examine two stylistic peculiarities of Q that

---

<sup>1</sup> Harry T. Fleddermann, *Q: A Reconstruction and Commentary* (Leuven: Peeters, 2005), 74.

<sup>2</sup> Burnett Hillman Streeter, *The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins, Treating of the Manuscript Tradition, Sources, Authorship, & Dates* (New York: MacMillan, 1924), 289. Kloppenborg argues for ‘a very modest expansion of Q from 235 to 264 verses’ based on the likelihood that particular Matthean and Lukan *Sondergut* are from Q (John S. Kloppenborg Verbin, *Excavating Q: The History and Setting of the Sayings Gospel* [Minneapolis: Fortress, 2000], 99).

are found in Matthean and Lukan *Sondergut*, after which we will consider the possibility that many other verses in Luke's travel narrative are from Q.

### *Matthew's and Luke's Redaction of Mark*

A brief consideration of Matthew's and Luke's redaction of Mark will highlight the problem with the current state of research. Long ago Streeter noted that 'Matthew reproduces the substance of over 600 of' Mark's 661 verses, and Luke reproduces 'about 350 verses.'<sup>3</sup> Thus, if one were to attempt a reconstruction of Mark using only the overlap between Matthew and Luke, he/she would reconstruct about 327 of Mark's 661 verses (49%), accounting for verses that Luke includes and Matthew does not and vice versa. If, however, one could establish criteria for identifying Markan verses found in only one of the two gospels, he/she could potentially reconstruct 629 of Mark's 661 verses (95%).<sup>4</sup> It is this task that we will attempt with Q. While space does not permit a thorough treatment of this task, two peculiarities of Q can be noted.

### *Peculiarity #1: The τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν Question*

One stylistic peculiarity of Q is Jesus' use of questions that begin with τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν:

Matt 7.9 – τίς ἐστιν ἐξ ὑμῶν ἄνθρωπος, ὃν αἰτήσῃ ὁ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ ἄρτον, μὴ λίθον ἐπιδώσῃ αὐτῷ;

---

<sup>3</sup> Streeter, *Four Gospels*, 159–160.

<sup>4</sup> For these numbers I follow Streeter's list of Markan verses that are paralleled in Matthew and Luke (Streeter, *Four Gospels*, 195–198).

Luke 11.11 – τίνα δὲ ἐξ ὑμῶν τὸν πατέρα αἰτήσῃ ὁ υἱὸς ἰχθύον, καὶ ἀντὶ ἰχθύος ὄφιν αὐτῷ ἐπιδώσει;

Matt 6.27 – τίς δὲ ἐξ ὑμῶν μεριμνῶν δύναται προσθεῖναι ἐπὶ τὴν ἡλικίαν αὐτοῦ πῆχυν ἓνα;

Luke 12.25 – τίς δὲ ἐξ ὑμῶν μεριμνῶν δύναται ἐπὶ τὴν ἡλικίαν αὐτοῦ προσθεῖναι πῆχυν;

Matt 12.11 – τίς ἔσται ἐξ ὑμῶν ἄνθρωπος ὃς ἔξει πρόβατον ἓν καὶ ἐὰν ἐμπέσῃ τοῦτο τοῖς σάββασις εἰς βόθυνον, οὐχὶ κρατήσῃ αὐτὸ καὶ ἐγερεῖ;

Luke 14.5 – τίνος ὑμῶν υἱὸς ἢ βοῦς εἰς φρέαρ πεσεῖται, καὶ οὐκ εὐθέως ἀνασπάσει αὐτὸν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ τοῦ σαββάτου;<sup>5</sup>

Luke 15.4 – τίς ἄνθρωπος ἐξ ὑμῶν ἔχων ἑκατὸν πρόβατα καὶ ἀπολέσας ἓξ αὐτῶν ἓν οὐ καταλείπει τὰ ἐνενήκοντα ἐννέα ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ καὶ πορεύεται ἐπὶ τὸ ἀπολωλὸς ἕως εὗρη αὐτό;

---

<sup>5</sup> Luke has heavily redacted Q here (Fleddermann, *Q*, 708-709). The fact that these two verses come from Q will be defended later in this paper.

Matt 18.12 – Τί ὑμῖν δοκεῖ; ἐὰν γένηται τινι<sup>6</sup> ἀνθρώπῳ  
ἑκατὸν πρόβατα καὶ πλανηθῆ ἓν ἐξ αὐτῶν, οὐχὶ ἀφήσει τὰ  
ἑνεήκοντα ἑννέα ἐπὶ τὰ ὄρη καὶ πορευθεὶς ζητεῖ τὸ  
πλανώμενον;

Outside of Matthew and Luke, this expression is actually quite rare, occurring only twice in the LXX (2 Chron 36.23; Hag 2.3), once in the NT (John 8.46), and never in the Pseudepigrapha, Philo, Josephus, or the Apostolic Fathers.<sup>7</sup> Of the three occurrences outside of Matthew and Luke, none of them begins an analogy as do all of the occurrences in Matthew and Luke. Therefore it can be said that this use of τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν is unique to Q and to writers who follow Q. Is it possible that all of the analogies that begin with τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν are from Q? In addition to the four listed above, we have three other occurrences in Luke and none in Matthew:

Luke 11.5 – τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν ἔξει φίλον καὶ πορεύσεται πρὸς  
αὐτὸν μεσονυκτίου καὶ εἴπη αὐτῷ . . . ;

---

<sup>6</sup> *CritEd* rightly follows Luke here. Τί ὑμῖν δοκεῖ is very Matthean (cf. Matt 17.25; 21.28; 22.17, 42; 26.66).

<sup>7</sup> More frequent are the similar expressions, τίς ὑμῶν (10x: 1 Esdras 2.33; 4 Macc 3.3; 1 Cor 6.1; Jas 1.5; 1 Pet 4.15; Josephus, *Ant.* 12.283; *J.W.* 4.44; 2 *Clem.* 9.1; *Barn.* 12.7; Herm. *Sim.* 9.28.6) and τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν (3x: Heb 3.13; 4.1; Jas 2.16), but analogies beginning with τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν are unique to Matthew and Luke.

Luke 14.28 – Τίς γὰρ ἐξ ὑμῶν θέλων πύργον οἰκοδομῆσαι  
οὐχὶ πρῶτον καθίσας ψηφίζει τὴν δαπάνην, εἰ ἔχει εἰς  
ἀπαρτισμόν;

Luke 17.7 – Τίς δὲ ἐξ ὑμῶν δοῦλον ἔχων ἀροτριῶντα ἢ  
ποιμαίνοντα, ὃς εἰσελθόντι ἐκ τοῦ ἀγροῦ ἐρεῖ αὐτῷ· εὐθέως  
παρελθὼν ἀνάπεσε . . . ;

Notice that all three of these passages use the expression the same way it is used in Q: to begin an analogy that illustrates the point that Jesus just made. While it is possible that Luke imitates Q's style in creating his own material<sup>8</sup> or that he finds this frequent Q expression in another source, a consideration of each of these passages reveals that it is far more likely that they all come from Q.

*Luke 11.5—8: The Friend at Midnight.* The first thing to note about Luke 11.5—8 is that it falls between two Q passages that also address the topic of prayer. While it could be argued that Luke expanded the Q passage by inserting verses 5—8 in the middle or that Q 11.2—4 and Q 11.9—13 were not originally together and Luke has brought together one Q passage, one L passage, and another Q passage, it is far more likely that all of Luke 11.2—13 is from Q. This is confirmed by a number of observations. First, just as in Q 11.11—13; 14.5; 15.4—7, the τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν question contains a gnomic future

---

<sup>8</sup> So Fleddermann, *Q*, 74.

verb, which is in the words of Jeremias ‘nicht lukanisch.’<sup>9</sup> Second, καὶ εἶπεν transitions similar to the one in 11.5 are common in Q (4.3, 6, 8, 9, 12; 7.9, 19, 22; 9.57, 58, 59, 60; 10.21; 11.15, 17; 17.20; 19.13, 17, 19), and over 50 sentences in the *Critical Edition of Q* (hereafter: *CritEd*) begin with καὶ, whereas Luke does not begin sentences with καὶ unless he finds them in his source and often not even then.<sup>10</sup> The beginning καὶ here suggests not only that this is not Luke’s creation but also that Luke is not switching sources as he often rephrases the first words when he changes sources.<sup>11</sup> Third, the concept of asking, seeking, and knocking in Q 11.9—10 is intricately connected to Luke 11.5—8 and serves well as that parable’s conclusion.<sup>12</sup> Fourth, the person asking his friend for bread (11.5—10) and the son asking his father for bread (11.11—13) serve as a pair of analogies.<sup>13</sup> Q regularly presents analogies in pairs (6.35, 39—40, 43—45; 9.58; 11.11—12, 29—32; 12.24—28, 35—48; 13.18—20; 15.4—10; 17.26—32), and often these pairs are separated by ἢ. Matt 7.9 retains the ἢ from Q even though it is missing the first

---

<sup>9</sup> Joachim Jeremias, *Die Sprache des Lukasevangeliums: Redaktion und Tradition im Nicht-Markusstoff des dritten Evangeliums* (KEK; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1980), 146, 221.

<sup>10</sup> Jeremias, *Sprache*, 33, 196–197; Henry J. Cadbury, *The Style and Literary Method of Luke* (HTS 6; Cambridge: Harvard University, 1920), 142–145; cf. James McConkey Robinson, Paul Hoffmann, and John S. Kloppenborg, *The Critical Edition of Q: Synopsis Including the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, Mark and Thomas with English, German, and French Translations of Q and Thomas* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2000).

<sup>11</sup> Cadbury, *Style and Literary Method*, 105.

<sup>12</sup> David Catchpole, “Q and the ‘Friend at Midnight’ (Luke xi.5–8/9),” *JTS* 34 (1983): 407–424, esp. pp. 418–419.

<sup>13</sup> Catchpole, “‘Friend at Midnight,’” 419.

analogy. Fifth, as Alan Kirk has observed, ‘the sequence of programmatic instruction (11:2–4) + illustrative rhetorical question [11:5–8] + central gnomes (11:9–10) + illustrative rhetorical questions (11:11–12) + closing application (11:13) is characteristic of Q composition, replicating the arrangement of Q 6:37–42 (Judge Not), and . . . of Q 12:22–31 (Do Not Be Anxious), as well as approximating to the structure of Q 6:27–35 (Love Your Enemies).’<sup>14</sup>

We could also note the following similarities between Q 11.5–13 and Q 15.3–10: (1) Jesus’ speech is introduced with καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς. (2) Jesus begins with the words τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν followed by a form of ἔχω. (3) A second analogy is given, beginning with the words ἢ τίς. (4) The second analogy contains the same form of ἔχω as the first analogy (future indicative in Q 11.5, 11; present participle in Q 15.4, 8). (5) The main character speaks to his friend(s), beginning with an aorist imperative followed by μοι and a causal adverbial conjunction (ἐπειδὴ in 11.6; ὅτι in 15.6). (6) Jesus follows the first analogy with a λέγω ὑμῖν clause with its main verb(s) in the future indicative form (11.8–9; 15.7). (7) Both analogies contain a negative particle (οὐ or μή). Some of these features are lost in Lukan redaction but retained in Matthew, suggesting that the presence of these features in Luke 11.5–8 is due not to Lukan creation or redaction but to a shared source. Luke 11.5–8 comes from Q.

But why would Matthew not include Q 11.5–8? Matthew places Jesus’ teachings on prayer in the Sermon on the Mount, but because he places the Lord’s Prayer in the

---

<sup>14</sup> Alan Kirk, *The Composition of the Sayings Source: Genre, Synchrony, and Wisdom Redaction in Q* (NovTSup 91; New York: Brill, 1998), 177.

section about practicing righteousness in secret – where Q 11.5–13 would not fit the purpose – he returns to Q’s teaching on prayer later in the sermon. But the τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν beginning of verse 5 naturally belongs after the topic has already been introduced (Jesus uses it to illustrate a point), so rather than adding another saying on prayer to precede Q 11.5–13, he skips ahead to the conclusion of the first analogy (which really communicates almost everything Q 11.5–8 was designed to teach) and then includes the second analogy.

*Luke 14.28–33: Counting the Cost before Building a Tower or Going to War.*

Another τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν question can be found at the beginning of Luke 14.28–33. Like Luke 11.5–13 and numerous other Q passages, Luke 14.28–33 gives two analogies to illustrate Jesus’ point. Also like Luke 11.5–8, it falls between two passages that are in *CritEd* (Luke 14.26–27 || Matt 10.37–38; Luke 14.34–35 || Matt 5.13). In Luke the pair of analogies illustrates the point of the preceding verses and leads to the warning of the following verses. Together they form one speech without any indication of a change in setting. While Matthew constructs longer speeches of Jesus by compiling individual sayings from different sources, we have no clear example of Luke having done this.<sup>15</sup> Therefore it is likely that all of Luke 14.26–35 is from Q. A comparison of 14.28–33 with Q 15.4–10 confirms this: (1) Both passages contain two analogies, the first beginning with τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν + pres. part., and the second with ἢ τίς + nom. (γυνή/βασιλεύς) + pres. part. (2) In both passages, each analogy contains a rhetorical question in which the apodosis begins with οὐχί (Luke 14.28, 31; Q 15.4, 8). (3) Both

---

<sup>15</sup> See the discussion below of the eleven times Luke expands Markan speeches.



passages feature the ‘nicht lukanisch’ gnomic future. (4) Both passages follow the analogies with a concluding statement that begins with οὕτως. Again, the presence of many of these features in Matt 18.12–14 suggests that these are not the result of Lukan redaction but are the style of Q. Not only does the style of Luke 14.28–33 follow the style of Q, but its message closely matches that of the pericope on the cost of discipleship in Q 9.56–60. For these reasons Q 14.26–35 should be seen as one continuous passage from Q. Matthew saw a use for Q 14.34–35 in the Sermon on the Mount and a use for Q 14.26–27 in the Sermon on Discipleship (Matt 18), but because both of those speeches are constructed from numerous sayings of Jesus, Matthew did not include the entire Q pericope in either. Having used two parts of this passage in his gospel, Matthew did not have a place to put the analogies that link the parts, and therefore he omitted them. We must not take the absence of Q 14.28–33 in Matthew as evidence that the passage was not in Q.

*Luke 17.5–10: The Servant Is Not Thanked.* As with the previous passages, the τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν question in Luke 17.7 follows a quotation that comes directly from Q with no indication by Luke that he is switching sources. This passage is also quite similar in style to Q 15.4–10. Following τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν is the present participle ἔχων and then an aorist participle just as in Q 15.4. The analogy also hinges on the word οὐχί, after which the main character speaks, beginning with an aorist imperative (Luke 17.8; cf. Q 15.4–6, 8–9), and it is concluded with a statement that begins with οὕτως (Luke 17.10; cf. Q 15.7, 10). The εἶπεν . . . εἶπαν . . . εἶπεν dialog in 17.1, 5, 6 is reminiscent of other passages in Q (3.7; 4.3, 6, 8, 9, 12; 7.9, 19, 22; 9.57, 58, 59, 60; 10.21; 11.15, 17, 29; 12.54; 17.20;

19.13, 17, 19; cf. 14.17–21). To this could be added a few observations of Jeremias regarding the prelukan nature of this passage. First, Luke does not himself construct double questions, let alone a group of three questions, like we have in Luke 17.7–9 – this is, however, a regular feature of Q (Q 6.32–34, 39, 41–42; 7.24–26; 11.11–12; 12.25–26, 56–57; 13.15–16, 18; 16.11–12; 22.27). Second, Jeremias argues that the pleonastic use of *παρελθών*, only here and in Luke 12.37 in the NT, is prelukan; this paper will demonstrate that Luke 12.37, like its surrounding verses, is from Q. Third, we again have an unlukan gnomic future in a rhetorical question (cf. Q 11.5–8, 11–13; 14.5, 31; 15.4–8). Finally, the absolute use of *οὕτως* occurs in Luke only when he is adopting it from his source (Luke 12.21; 14.33; 15.7, 10; 17.10; 21.31; 22.26; once Markan; six times from Q).<sup>16</sup> In addition to Jeremias’s observations we should note that the comparison of disciples to servants before a master is also found in Q 12.35–48 and 19.12–27. There is little reason to see why Luke would add this saying here if it were not originally in Q, but because Matthew uses Q 17.6 in the narrative of the demon that the disciples could not cast out (Matt 17.14–20), one can see why he would omit verses 7–10. Therefore *CritEd*’s limitation of this pericope to 17.1–4, 6 is unwarranted; all of Luke 17.1–10 must be from Q.

*Conclusion.* Based on this evidence it is clear that all seven analogies that are introduced by *τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν* are from Q, and therefore Q 11.5–8; 14.5, 28–33; 17.5, 7–10 should be added to our reconstruction of Q.

---

<sup>16</sup> Jeremias, *Sprache*, 263, 216.

*Peculiarity #2: Φαρισαῖοι καὶ Νομικοί*

In each gospel we find Jesus' opponents labeled differently. In Mark it is the chief priests and the scribes (8.31; 11.27; 14.1, 43, 53; 15.1, 31; etc.).<sup>17</sup> In Matthew it is the Pharisees and the scribes (5.20; 12.38; 15.1; 23.1–39).<sup>18</sup> In John it is the Jews.<sup>19</sup> In Luke it is typically just the Pharisees (5.33; 6.2; 7.36, 37, 39; 11.37, 38, 39, 49, 43; 12.1; 14.1; 16.14; 17.20; 18.10, 11; 19.39), but in three passages we find the unique expression, 'the Pharisees and the lawyers' (οἱ Φαρισαῖοι καὶ οἱ νομικοί; 7.30; 11.39–52; 14.3). Elsewhere in the Gospels and Acts νομικός is found only at Luke 10.25 and possibly its Matthean parallel, Matt 22.35, though there is a variant reading there.

Outside of Matthew and Luke this word is used only once or twice in reference to someone specializing in the Mosaic law. In *4 Macc.* Eleazar, who is about to be martyred, is described as τὸ γένος ἱερέως, τὴν ἐπιστήμην νομικὸς καὶ τὴν ἡλικίαν προήκων (5:4). The other possible reference is in the Egerton Gospel, where the first word that is visible is γομικο??. Bell and Skeat felt that the previous word (which is far less visible) was probably τοῖς, and so they have suggested that what follows is an

---

<sup>17</sup> But sometimes Mark refers to the opponents as 'the Pharisees and the Herodians' (3.6; 12.13; cf. 8.15) or 'the Pharisees and the scribes' (2.16; 7.1, 5).

<sup>18</sup> Matthew also summarizes Jesus' opponents as 'the Pharisees and the Sadducees' (3.7; 16.1–12; 22.34) or 'the chief priests and the elders' (21.23; 26.3, 47; 27.1, 3, 12, 20; 28.11–12).

<sup>19</sup> John 1.19; 2.18–25; 5.10–18; 6.41, 52; 7.1–13, 35; 8.22–59; 9.18, 22; 10.19, 22–39; 11.8, 54; 18.12–14, 31, 36, 38; 19.7, 12, 14, 21, 38; 20.19. Sometimes John refers to the opponents as 'the Pharisees' (1.24; 4.1; 7.47–48; 8.13; 9.13–17, 40; 11.46; 12.19, 42) or 'the chief priests and the Pharisees' (7.32, 45; 11.47, 57; 18.3).

address of Jesus to the lawyers, but it may be that νομικός here means “something pertaining to the law” and not “lawyer.”<sup>20</sup> Nevertheless, if Bell and Skeat are correct we have a second reference to someone who is an expert in the Mosaic law as a “lawyer.” But neither the LXX, the rest of the Pseudepigrapha, Philo, Josephus, the rest of the New Testament, or the Apostolic Fathers uses this word. The more common word is γραμματεύς, occurring 85 times in the LXX and 63 times in the NT, as well as in the Pseudepigraph (7x), Philo (2x), Josephus (29x), the Apostolic Fathers (1x), and the Apocryphal Gospels (9x). Or Luke will sometimes use the word νομοδιδάσκαλος (Luke 5:17; Acts 5:34; cf. 1 Tim 1:7). But it is particularly in Matthew and Luke that Jesus’ opponents are referred to as νομικοί.<sup>21</sup>

In order to determine Q’s label for Jesus’ opponents one need look no further than Q 11.39–52, where Jesus speaks woes first against the Pharisees (verses 39–44) and then against the lawyers (45–52). *CritEd* is certainly correct in attributing these two labels to Q, since Matthew is using his standard οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι (cf. Matt 5.20; 12.38; 15.1). Moreover, when Luke adds his own conclusion to this pericope in verse 53 he refers to the opponents as ‘scribes and Pharisees’ (οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι).<sup>22</sup>

---

<sup>20</sup> H. Idris Bell and T. C. Skeat, eds, *Fragments of an Unknown Gospel and Other Early Christian Papyri* (London: British Museum Press, 1935).

<sup>21</sup> The word is used adjectivally to describe things pertaining to the law in *Let. Aris.* 142 and Titus 3:9. It is used in Titus 3:13 and *Sib. Or.* 8.112 to refer to lawyers, but not to those trained in Mosaic law. The only references to practitioners of Mosaic law as νομικοί are in *4 Macc.* 5:4 and *P.Eg.* 2.

<sup>22</sup> The shift from νομικοί in 11:45-52 to γραμματεῖς in 11:53 is awkward enough that a few later scribes used νομικοί here (f1 D it vg) or even had both νομικοί and γραμματεῖς (Θ), but γραμματεῖς has the

If Luke were at all inclined to refer to Jesus' adversaries as *νομικοί*, he would certainly do so after the woes against the *νομικοί*. Instead, Luke uses the word when copying Q but not when adding to Q.

Pharisees and lawyers are found together also in Luke 7.30 and 14.3. *CritEd* gives 7.30 as a probable Q verse; the presence of this phrase makes it a certain Q verse. *CritEd* does not include 14.3, but there are a number of reasons to think this verse is also from Q. First, we have already seen that Luke does not refer to Jesus' opponents as lawyers even when concluding a passage that repeatedly uses the term (Luke 11.53–54). Having lawyers grouped with Pharisees is especially Q-like. Second, it is generally held that Luke 14.11 comes from Q (so *CritEd*). In Luke, verse 11 serves as the conclusion to Jesus' teaching in 14.8–10, which is set up by the scenario in verse 1. If Luke takes only verse 11 from Q then the change of topics from Q 13.34–35 to Q 14.11 is rather abrupt. It will be demonstrated below that Q regularly contains a narrative introduction to its sayings, as in Q 3–9. Q 14.16–18, 21, 23 also seem to assume a similar narrative backdrop. Third, Luke 14.5 has a Matthean parallel (Matt 12.11). While *CritEd* excludes this verse (against the initial decision of the International Q Project) because of differences in wording, a number of scholars have included it due to the shared words, concepts, and structure between Luke 14.5 and Matt 18.11.<sup>23</sup> Every difference is

---

external and internal support by far (cf. I. Howard Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke: a Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGTC; Exeter: Paternoster Press, 1978), 507–508).

<sup>23</sup> Notably, Fleddermann, who excludes every other verse discussed in this paper, includes 14.5 and gives six reasons for doing so (Q, 708–709). The International Q Project originally included 14.5 as a

explainable by Lukan and Matthean redactional tendencies, and the style matches what we see elsewhere in Q: a rhetorical question beginning with τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν followed by the nom. sg. ἄνθρωπος and the verb ἔχω, an aor. subj. verb in the protasis, the apodosis beginning with οὐχί, and a series of gnomic future verbs. Fourth, one can understand why Matthew would adopt Q 14.5 but omit 14.1–4, 6 if the latter were in his source. The question in Luke 14.3 (ἐξεστὶν τῷ σαββάτῳ θεραπεῦσαι ἢ οὐ;) is so similar to the one in Mark 3.4 (ἐξεστὶν τοῖς σάββασιν ἀγαθὸν ποιῆσαι ἢ κακοποιῆσαι;) that in copying Mark 3, Matthew could naturally decide to insert Q 14.5 into the Markan narrative, conflating the two stories. Luke, however, copies Mark 3.1–6 earlier in his gospel and there uses a wording closer to that of Mark 3.4 than he uses here. He must have had a separate source that included 14.1ff to decide to include this similar account and to not use the wording he uses earlier in copying Mark. Notably, the Matthean parallel to Luke 14.5 contains a second rhetorical question (Matt 12.12) that is structured very similarly to Q 12.7, 14. It seems that Luke is actually condensing Q 14.5 and that the setting for this saying in Luke 14.1–4 comes from Q. For these reasons we can conclude that every passage in which Luke mentions ‘Pharisees and lawyers’ is from Q.

There is one more occurrence of νομικός in Luke, this time without Φαρισαῖος: in Luke 10.25, where a lawyer tests Jesus. While some have suggested that Luke is merely

---

probable Q verse (Jon Ma. Asgeirsson and James M. Robinson, “The International Q Project: Work Sessions 12–14 July, 22 November 1991,” *JBL* 111 (1992): 500–508). Schürmann rightly argues that 14.1–6 is entirely from Q (Heinz Schürmann, *Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu den synoptischen Evangelien* (Düsseldorf: Patmos-Verlag, 1968), 213).

adapting Mark 12.28–34 here, it is not clear why Luke would make so many changes to the wording if Mark were his source or why he would move it away from its Markan location. More likely, Luke omits Mark 12.28–34 later to avoid a doublet with what he finds in a different source here.<sup>24</sup> So far in Luke 10, Luke’s source has been Q, and this is also his source at the beginning of chapter 11. Therefore, Luke 10.25–28 is likely to be from Q. Further suggesting this is the presence of three agreements between Matthew and Luke against Mark: a “lawyer” addresses Jesus as “teacher,” and they discuss the greatest commandment “in the law.”<sup>25</sup> That Matthew and Luke both add these elements to Mark’s narrative makes it clear that this passage is in Q. Some have argued based on the lack of νομικός in *f*<sup>1</sup> *e* *sy*<sup>s</sup> that this word was a later addition to Matt 22:35 based on its presence in Luke,<sup>26</sup> but the external evidence strongly favors the inclusion of νομικός there, and we have already seen that elsewhere Luke uses this word only when copying Q.

Furthermore, we should notice that everywhere else where we find lawyers in Q we also find Pharisees. Therefore it is noteworthy that Jesus is put to the test twice in Luke 10–11, once here and once in the next chapter (Luke (Q) 11.16). While Luke does not name the opponents in the latter test, Matthew names them as οἱ Φαρισαῖοι (Matt 9.34; 12.24, 38). Q 10–11, then, gives two tests – one by a lawyer (Q 10.25–28) and one

---

<sup>24</sup> Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke: Introduction, Translation, and Notes* (2 vols.; AB 28-28A; Garden City: Doubleday, 1981–1985), 1:81–82.

<sup>25</sup> Rudolf Bultmann, *History of the Synoptic Tradition* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1968), 22–23.

<sup>26</sup> Bruce Manning Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* (2d ed.; New York: United Bible Societies, 1994), 48–49.

by the Pharisees (Q 11.14–16) – followed by Jesus speaking woes against the Pharisees (Q 11.39–44) and the lawyers (Q 11.46–52). Therefore it is almost certain that Luke 10.25–28 is from Q. As further confirmation we can note the double rhetorical question in Luke 10.26, which is an unlukan feature often seen in Q.<sup>27</sup>

Is there evidence that not only Luke 10.25–28 but also Luke 10.29–37, the parable of the Good Samaritan, is from Q? First, we should note that the test of the Pharisees in Luke 11.15–16 leads into a lengthy teaching in Q (18 verses), and so it would be surprising if the test of the lawyer in Luke 10.25 leads into only a one-verse response by Jesus. Second, we see elsewhere in Q similar dialogs between Jesus and an interlocutor that lead to a lengthy teaching by Jesus (Q 7.18–35; 9.57 – 10.16; 11.14–26; 12.13–59), and so the presence of one here suggests that this is also from Q. Third, the parable contains a pair of negative examples (the priest and the Levite) followed by a positive example (the Samaritan); this is a feature seen elsewhere in Q (7.24–28; 10.13–14; 11.11–13; 11.39 – 12.1). Therefore it is likely that the parable of the Good Samaritan also comes from Q.

But why would Matthew, who is interested in Jesus as a teacher, exclude such a great teaching of Jesus? We must consider how Matthew uses Q. Unlike Luke, who follows Q for chapters on end, Matthew chooses isolated sayings from Q and only rarely places lengthier passages from Q in his gospel. Each of Matthew's five major speeches highlights a different theme: discipleship (5–7), missions (10), mystery (13), relationships

---

<sup>27</sup> Jeremias, *Sprache*, 190; cf. Adolf von Harnack, *The Sayings of Jesus: The Second Source of St. Matthew and St. Luke* (New York: Putnam, 1908), 6; Cadbury, *Style and Literary Method*, 82-83.



in the church (18), and the future (23–25). None of the themes corresponds to the lesson of Q 10.25–37. Matthew does occasionally use Q for a purpose other than constructing his speeches, but the examples are limited.<sup>28</sup> The very fact that Matthew does not follow the order of Q clues us into Matthew’s purposes in using Q: he is not interested in reproducing Q (as he is in reproducing Mark), but he will use Q when it contributes to his predetermined outline. Luke, on the other hand, seems to be interested in preserving both Mark and Q (and hence follows the order of both). Matthean omissions are thus very explainable.

*Considering Another Passage: Luke 12.13–21*

We have considered a couple stylistic peculiarities that allow us to expand our list of Q passages to include the following pericopes: 10.25–37; 11.5–8; 14.1–10, 28–33; 17.5–10. Sometimes there may not be one feature that is unique to Q but a number of features that are common to Q that when considered together make the case for an entire passage to be from Q. A few observations can be made in this regard concerning the parable of the Rich Fool in Luke 12.13–21.

First, the phrase οὐκ ἔχω ποῦ συνάξω (‘I do not have a place where I will gather [my crops]’) is a little peculiar. Outside of the NT we have ἔχω with ποῦ only at Josh

---

<sup>28</sup> Matthew uses Q to fill out the details of John’s preaching and the temptations, which were rather sparse in Mark, and to fill out his narrative sections that precede the second and third speeches (i.e., Matt 8–9 and 11–12), so that the kingdom discourse, which is early in Mark, can come after the speeches about discipleship and mission and the three speeches could still have some separation. Other than this and the five speeches he uses Q only in very short sayings and in the parable of the Wedding Feast (22.1–14).

8.20 LXX, not in the Pseudepigrapha or Philo or Josephus or the Apostolic Fathers. In the New Testament it is found only here and in a Q passage (Matt 8.20 = Luke 9.58), suggesting that Luke 12:17 may be from the same source as Luke 9:58. Second, Jesus' words in Q 12.22 begin with διὰ τοῦτο λέγω ὑμῖν ('Therefore, I tell you'), so there must have been something related to this issue preceding Q 12.22.<sup>29</sup> *CritEd* resolves this by placing 12.33–34 before 12.22–31, but Luke is not known to elsewhere take a couple verses from the beginning of a passage and move them to the end; Q 12.33–34 must have been after Q 12.22–32 already in Q, and the διὰ τοῦτο refers back to Q 12.13–21. Third, the mention of barns (ἀποθήκας) in Q 12.24 likely alludes back to the bigger barns (ἀποθήκας) that the rich man stored his crops in in Luke 12.18, but that could only have been the original intention if the mention of barns in Luke 12.18 was present in Q. Notably, ἀποθήκη occurs elsewhere in the NT only in Q passages (Matt 3.12 = Luke 3.17; Matt 6.26 = Luke 12.24) and in Matt 13.30, which may also be from Q (Matt 13.31–33 = Luke 13.18–21). In addition, the word ψυχή (12.19, 20, 22, 23) also links the passages together. Fourth, the back-and-forth dialog with a sixfold repetition of εἶπεν in Luke 12.13–21 is typical of Q (Q 4.1–13; 9.57–62; 19.12–27; cf. 10.25–37 (eightfold) and 14.15–24 (ninefold)). Fifth, Q regularly places more colorful words like ψυχή and ἄφρων in the vocative (Q 3.7; 6.42; 11.5, 40; 12.32, 56; 13.15, 27, 34; 14.10; 19.17, 22), whereas outside of the Q passages Luke only uses more standard vocatives, such as

---

<sup>29</sup> Schürmann, *Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen*, 232; John S. Kloppenborg, *The Formation of Q: Trajectories in Ancient Wisdom Collections* (Studies in Antiquity and Christianity; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987), 216 n. 182.

κύριε, ἄνθρωπε, and διδάσκαλε. Furthermore the only other occurrence of ἄφρων in Luke is also in the vocative case and in a Q passage (11.40). Sixth, the word ἀπαιτέω occurs only twice in the NT, here and in Luke 6.30, where it comes from Q (so *CritEd*). Seventh, the word θησαυρίζω in Luke 12.21 occurs only two other times in the Gospels, in Matt 6.19 and 6.20, which are from the following passage in Q (Q 12.33). While it is possible that Luke uses the word at 12.21 to set up the following passage (though he does not copy that word there), it is more likely that θησαυρίζω comes from Q in both Q 12.21 and Q 12.33. Eighth, we again have an absolute use of οὕτως, which is common to Q (12.21; cf. 14.33; 15.7, 10; 17.10; 22.26) and is unlukan. Finally, Kloppenborg has demonstrated the similarity of Luke 12.13–14 to Q 9.57–60 and of the criticism of riches in the passage to Q 12.33–34; 16.13.<sup>30</sup> Therefore Luke 12.13–21 should be added to the list of passages in Q.

### *Narrative Introductions in Q*

Having made the case that *CritEd* is missing a number of passages that were likely in Q, we should also question whether passages that are longer in Luke than in *CritEd* were Lukan expansions or Matthean omissions of part of a passage. First we will consider the narrative introductions to Jesus' sayings. An investigation of earlier passages in *CritEd* (chapters 3–9) reveals a lot more dialog (4.1–12; 7.3–9; 7.18–35; 9.57–60) and narrator comments (3.0–3, 21–22; 4.13, 16; 6.20; 7.1, 29–30) than in the later passages. In *CritEd* 3–9, 955 of the 1,152 words (83%) are words of Jesus or of

---

<sup>30</sup> Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 222.

another character. In *CritEd* 10–22, 2,566 out of 2,618 words (98%) are sayings. At one point there are 1,654 words of Jesus in a row (Q 11.29–17.6) – almost four times the length of the Sermon on the Plain! It is unlikely that the nature of Q shifts between chapter 9 and chapter 10. Perhaps a better explanation is that *CritEd* poorly represents the Q passages in the travel narrative. In other words, maybe Q 10–19 is just as likely to contain narrator comments and dialog as is Q 3–9. If one investigates Luke 10–19 (except for the Markan passages), he/she will discover that Luke’s text here is 84% (5,622 out of 6,694) words of Jesus or of the other characters, remarkably close to the 83% in *CritEd* 3–9. By contrast, Luke 18.15–43, the one portion of the Lukan travel narrative that is from Mark, is only 58% speech. The Lukan travel narrative is relatively uniform in its ratio of sayings to narrative, and this ratio matches what we know elsewhere of Q. One would expect that Luke follows Q more closely in the travel narrative than *CritEd* suggests.

For example, in Luke 11.37–54 we have woes against the Pharisees and the lawyers. *CritEd* gives no indication that there was a narrative setting in Q. More likely there was something in Q to set up the woes, just as there was something in Q to set up John’s words (Q 3.1–22), Jesus’ responses to the devil’s temptations (Q 4.1–13), Jesus’ words about John (Q 7.18–35), and Jesus’ sayings about the cost of discipleship (Q 9.57–60). Why not assume that the brief narrator comments in Luke 11.37–38, 45 represent what was in Q? The dialog in which a first person says something (or in this case is merely astonished), Jesus responds, then a second person says something, and Jesus responds again is reminiscent of Q 9.57–60 and, to a lesser extent, Q 4.1–13.

Furthermore, Jeremias gives a number of reasons why Luke 11.37–38, 45 cannot be a Lukan creation. First, Luke himself does not use the historical present. His dislike of it is seen in the fact that he eliminates 92 of Mark’s 93 historical present-tense verbs. Therefore the present tense ἐρωτᾷ in verse 37 has more likely come from Luke’s source than from his own mind. Second, the use of ὅπως after ἐρωτάω is likewise unlukan. Third, in verbs related to table fellowship, Luke often changes Mark’s ἀνα-composites to κατα-composites, so it is hardly likely that in creating his own introduction to this Q pericope he would use the word ἀναπίπτω. Fourth, the verb ἀριστάω (Luke 11.37) and the noun ἄριστον (11.38) appear nowhere in Acts or in Luke’s redaction of Mark; Luke uses different words to refer to a meal. Ἄριστον occurs in the NT only in Matt 22.4 (= Q 14.7); Luke 14.12 (likely also from Q); and here. Finally, Luke elsewhere constructs the intransitive θαυμάζω either absolutely or with ἐπί + dative; nowhere else does Luke use θαυμάζω + ὅτι.<sup>31</sup> Therefore it is hard to hold that Luke created verses 37–38 to introduce Q 11.39–44; these verses were likely already present in Q. We can also note that the lawyer’s protest in Luke 11.45, which serves as a transition from the woes against the Pharisees to the woes against the lawyers, makes the passage a dialog with multiple interlocutors as we see elsewhere in Q (4.1–13; 9.57–62) and that without this verse Q 11.39–44 is properly introduced but Q 11.46–52 is not. We cannot examine here every narrative introduction in the Lukan travel narrative, but this example, along with Q 10.25–28 and 14.1–4, 6, discussed above, is enough to demonstrate that the narrative introductions in the Lukan travel narrative often come from Q.

---

<sup>31</sup> Jeremias, *Sprache*, 205–206.

*Another Partial Passage: Luke 12.22–59*

Now if Matthew has left out entire passages of Q and the narrative setting of particular passages, is it possible that Matthew has at times grabbed part of a saying while Luke has recorded the entire pericope? We know from his use of Mark that, unlike Matthew, Luke is not prone to add words of Jesus to his source. He does so only eleven times in the Markan material: nine times the addition merely explains the Markan saying without adding a new proposition (Luke 8.46; 9.44a; 18.31; 20.34–36, 38c; 21.8, 11, 15, 18), and two times the addition consists of an OT allusion (Luke 19.40; 20.18). Never is a Markan speech otherwise expanded by Luke. Why, then, should we expect Luke to be so expansive of the Q material? It is more likely that when some verses of a passage are paralleled in Matthew the entire Lukan pericope is from Q. As an example let us consider Luke 12.22–59, of which only verses 22–31, 33–34, 39–40, 42b–46, 49, 51, 53–56, and 58–59 are in *CritEd*. Accordingly Luke copied part of his source, then inserted a verse, then copied more, then inserted a few more verses, then copied some more, then inserted a couple more verses, and so on. Let us investigate this possibility.

*Verse 32* (*‘Fear not, little flock, . . .’*). Kloppenborg sees here an ‘abrupt shift from the second person plural address in Q 12.22–31 to the second person singular,’ suggesting a different hand at work, but Q is elsewhere known to shift to the singular when a collective vocative is used (Q 13.34).<sup>32</sup> He also argues that Luke 12.32 has a different perspective on the kingdom than Q 12.31, since one focuses on ‘human striving’

---

<sup>32</sup> Cf. John S. Kloppenborg, *Q Parallels: Synopsis, Critical Notes & Concordance* (Sonoma, Cal.: Polebridge, 1988), 132.

while the other portrays the kingdom as ‘a gift of God,’ but we find the exact same contrast using the exact same words (ζητέω, δίδωμι) in Q 11.9.<sup>33</sup> Rather, 12.32 is the natural conclusion to 12.31. Luke 12.32 contains the descriptive kind of vocative (τὸ μικρὸν ποίμνιον) that we see elsewhere in Q, and the reference to the disciples as a ‘flock’ parallels Q’s description of the disciples as ‘sheep’ in Q 10.3 and 15.4. Εὐδοκέω/εὐδοκία is attested elsewhere in Q (10.21), and reference to God as ‘your Father’ is a common feature of Q (Q 6.35f; 11.2, 13; 12.6, 24, 30), but elsewhere in Luke Jesus never refers to God as ‘your Father.’ Furthermore there is no good reason for Luke to interrupt copying his source to add this verse. Luke 12.32 is from Q.

*Verses 35–38: Servants Waiting for Their Master.* Verses 35–38 are likely also from Q. First, comparisons in which the word ὁμοιος occurs (Luke 12.36) are common in Q (6.47, 48, 49; 7.31, 32; 13.18, 19, 21; cf. 13.20) but are not found elsewhere in Luke’s Gospel except here (but see Acts 17.29). Second, makarisms are a common feature of Q, and one is found in verses 37–38. Crossan notes that this makarism is structured identically to the one in Q 12.43–44 and that each is centered within an otherwise negative parable in order to add a positive tone.<sup>34</sup> Third, the message of these verses is so similar to the message of verses 42–46 that it is unclear why Luke would *add* these verses to the beginning of the parable in Q; why not let the message of Q stand on its own? Fourth, the ideas behind this passage are highly consistent with those behind Q

---

<sup>33</sup> Kloppenborg, *Q Parallels*, 132.

<sup>34</sup> John Dominic Crossan, *In Fragments: The Aphorisms of Jesus* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1983), 58–60.

19.11–27. It is true that the idea of the master serving the servants stands in contrast to Luke 17.7–10, which we have argued is a Q passage, but the style is so similar that it is likely that the contrast is intentional and was written by the same author. Fifth, verse 37 contains the word ἀνακλίνω; once again Jeremias has made a strong case that Luke himself uses the κατα- prefix with table-fellowship verbs rather than the ἀνα- prefix, which we see elsewhere in Q (Q 11.37; 13.29; 14.10, 15; 17.7; 22.27).<sup>35</sup> Finally, it is understandable why Matthew would omit this passage since he records a similar parable in Matt 25.1–13.<sup>36</sup> Luke 12.35–38 is also from Q.

*Verses 41, 47–48, 50, 52, and 57.* In verse 41 Peter asks if the parable is spoken ‘for us or for all.’ We have already demonstrated that dialogs are a larger part of Q than is typically assumed, and one can understand why Matthew would omit Peter’s question, while it is difficult to see why Luke would insert it before 12.42–46 if it were not already there in Q.

In verses 47–48 Jesus speaks of the beatings that will come to the unprepared servant who knew his master’s will and to the one who did not know his master’s will. Jeremias notes numerous unlukan stylistic features in these verses: antithetical parallelism, the negated participle with the article (ὁ μὴ γινούς),<sup>37</sup> the divine passives,<sup>38</sup>

---

<sup>35</sup> Jeremias, *Sprache*, 167, 220.

<sup>36</sup> Crossan, *In Fragments*, 58.

<sup>37</sup> The negated participle with the article is attested elsewhere in Luke only in likely Q material (3.11; 11.23 (2x); 19.26–27; 22.36).

<sup>38</sup> Jeremias lists 74 divine passives in Luke. Fifteen are taken over from Mark, and 29 are clearly from Q. The other 30 are all from passages that I would argue are from Q. Luke *never* adds a divine



the third person plural as a circumlocution for God's name, and the semiticizing anacoluthon, παντι δε ᾧ ἐδόθη πολυ.<sup>39</sup> Luke clearly did not construct these verses himself, and if he took them from a source, the most likely source is Q. Each of these features is repeatedly seen in Q. Furthermore, Crossan argues for the inclusion of these verses since a distinction between insiders and outsiders followed by a distinction among the insiders themselves is also attested in Q 19.12–26.<sup>40</sup>

In verse 50 Jesus speaks of the baptism he is to be baptized with. Jeremias argues that Luke is not fond of *figura etymologica*, whereas we do find it in Q 6.48, 49; 7.29; 11.46.<sup>41</sup> Jeremias also notes that the phrase ἕως ὅτου and the absolute use of συνέχω are unlukan, so Luke 12.50 must come from a source, and the most likely source is the same one as in 12.49, 51. Verse 52, like verse 53, speaks of household division. Jeremias notes a couple unlukan features,<sup>42</sup> and it is difficult to see why Luke would add this verse if he is copying verses 51 and 53 from Q, so it is highly probable that Luke 12.52 represents an original Q 12.52.

Verse 57 serves as a transition from Jesus' words about interpreting the present time to his exhortation about going with your accuser to the magistrate. One can

---

passive to his Markan material and sometimes rewrites the Markan material to remove the passive voice. See Jeremias, *Sprache*, 122–123.

<sup>39</sup> Jeremias, *Sprache*, 222. Anacolutha beginning with πᾶς ὅς are found elsewhere in Luke only in three passages, Luke 6.47; 12.8, 10, which are all from Q.

<sup>40</sup> Crossan, *In Fragments*, 60.

<sup>41</sup> Jeremias, *Sprache*, 74–75, 223.

<sup>42</sup> Jeremias, *Sprache*, 224.

understand why Matthew would not include this verse since he separates the two sayings (Matt 5.25–26 = Q 12.58–59 and Matt 16.2–3 = Q 12.54–56), even removing the ‘accuser’ saying from the eschatological context it has in Q and Luke. With *CritEd* missing verse 57, however, the connection between verses 54–56 and 58–59 in Q is obscured. Luke 12.57 is also from Q.

*Conclusion.* In sum, all eleven verses that are missing from *CritEd* were likely in Q. Therefore when reading a passage in Luke that contains elements of Q it may be more accurate to assume that all of the verses are from Q than to assume that only the verses attested in Matthew are from Q. One may be able to demonstrate a good reason for considering a particular verse or phrase to be due to Lukan redaction (e.g. Luke 11:53–54), but the default assumption should be that the whole passage has its basis in Q. Space does not permit us to perform a similar analysis here of other Lukan passages that are partially paralleled in Matthew, but we should note that a similar argument could be made for the following: Luke 3.1–22; 4.16–30; 7.18–35; 9.57 – 10.24; 13.10–35; 14.1–35; 15.1–32; 16.1–13; 16.14–31; 17.1–10; 17.20–37; 19.1–27; 22.14–38.

### *Conclusion*

Q cannot be reduced to the double tradition. Matthew preserves for us only a few longer Q pericopes and often incorporates short sayings that were part of a longer narrative in Q. Q is thus not a collection of isolated sayings, but a narrative (that is over 80% discourse) with a clearly defined structure. Luke has preserved for us lengthy portions of Q, and a study of Luke’s redactional techniques can help us to approximate the original wording of Q.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Asgeirsson, Jon Ma., and James M. Robinson. "The International Q Project: Work Sessions 12–14 July, 22 November 1991." *JBL* 111 (1992): 500–508.
- Bultmann, Rudolf. *History of the Synoptic Tradition*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1968.
- Cadbury, Henry J. *The Style and Literary Method of Luke*. Harvard Theological Studies 6. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1920.
- Catchpole, David. "Q and the 'Friend at Midnight' (Luke xi.5–8/9)." *Journal of Theological Studies* 34 (1983): 407–424.
- Crossan, John Dominic. *In Fragments: The Aphorisms of Jesus*. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1983.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A. *The Gospel According to Luke: Introduction, Translation, and Notes*. 2 volumes. Anchor Bible 28–28A. Garden City: Doubleday, 1981–1985.
- Fleddermann, Harry T. *Q: A Reconstruction and Commentary*. Leuven: Peeters, 2005.
- Harnack, Adolf von. *The Sayings of Jesus: The Second Source of St. Matthew and St. Luke*. New York: Putnam, 1908.
- Jeremias, Joachim. *Die Sprache des Lukasevangeliums: Redaktion und Tradition im Nicht-Markusstoff des dritten Evangeliums*. Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1980.
- Kirk, Alan. *The Composition of the Sayings Source: Genre, Synchrony, and Wisdom Redaction in Q*. Supplements to Novum Testamentum 91. New York: Brill, 1998.
- Kloppenborg, John S. *The Formation of Q: Trajectories in Ancient Wisdom Collections*. Studies in Antiquity and Christianity. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Q Parallels: Synopsis, Critical Notes & Concordance*. Sonoma, Calif.: Polebridge, 1988.
- Kloppenborg Verbin, John S. *Excavating Q: The History and Setting of the Sayings Gospel*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2000.
- Metzger, Bruce Manning. *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*. 2d ed. New York: United Bible Societies, 1994.
- Robinson, James McConkey, Paul Hoffmann, and John S. Kloppenborg. *The Critical Edition of Q: Synopsis Including the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, Mark and Thomas with English, German, and French Translations of Q and Thomas*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2000.

Schürmann, Heinz. *Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu den synoptischen Evangelien*. Düsseldorf: Patmos-Verlag, 1968.

Streeter, Burnett Hillman. *The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins, Treating of the Manuscript Tradition, Sources, Authorship, & Dates*. New York: MacMillan, 1924.