

# Maximalist Q

By David B. Sloan  
Trinity Evangelical Divinity School  
Deerfield, IL, USA

“Because ... the procedure for establishing warranted Q has been carried over and employed as a means of determining the limits of actual Q, it is consistently assumed that *Sondergut* material must be presumed innocent of Q unless the contrary can be established. But [this] assumption ... is rather baseless in these circumstances.

“In considering the possible contents of actual Q, neither ‘guilt’ nor ‘innocence’ can be presumed for *Sondergut*.” – Nicholas Perrin<sup>1</sup>

“The working assumption that Q = [the double tradition material] is one of the major weaknesses in all Q research.” – James D. G. Dunn<sup>2</sup>

## Introduction

If we did not have Matthew today but had only Mark and Luke, we would likely conclude that Luke had used Mark as a source and that the rest of his material came from a different source.<sup>3</sup> Q and L work so well together as a document that they were once thought to be a document, Proto-Luke. Likewise, if we did not have Luke but had only Matthew and Mark, we would likely conclude that Matthew had used Mark as a source and had supplemented this source with material he had from elsewhere, which we may very well conclude was all from the same document. The reason we distinguish Q, M, and L is not because they differ stylistically or thematically or because of any intrinsic considerations, but because Q is the portion of the non-Markan material that made it into both Matthew and Luke. Nevertheless, this minimalist approach to Q has dominated ever since Harnack and

---

<sup>1</sup> Nicholas Perrin, “The Limits of a Reconstructed Q,” in *Questioning Q: A Multidimensional Critique*, ed. Mark Goodacre and Nicholas Perrin (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2004), 71-88, here pp. 80-81.

<sup>2</sup> James D. G. Dunn, “Jesus in Oral Memory: The Initial Stages of the Jesus Tradition,” in *Jesus: A Colloquium in the Holy Land*, ed. Doris Donnelly (New York/London: Continuum, 2001), 84-145, here p. 134 n. 69.

<sup>3</sup> Ronald V. Huggins, “Q Never Goes Away, It Just Changes Shape” (paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the SBL, San Diego, CA, 22 November 2014).

is the Q that is currently criticized by the Q skeptics.<sup>4</sup> This paper argues that a Maximalist Q, i.e. one that includes the double tradition + M + L + some Markan overlaps,<sup>5</sup> is strong enough to withstand the objections raised by Q skeptics and better explains the data before us than either Minimalist Q or the Farrer Hypothesis. In order to do this we will consider (1) the extent and nature of Q, if such a document existed, (2) the unity of the double tradition + M + L, (3) the major and minor agreements, and (4) arguments from order, then we will sum up our findings.

## The Extent of Q

John Kloppenborg writes: “[I]f Matthew and Luke treated Q at least as conservatively as they did Mark, a substantial portion of Q is preserved in them.”<sup>6</sup> How substantial? According to Streeter, only “about two-thirds of Mark” could be reproduced from the shared Matthew-Luke material if we did not

---

<sup>4</sup> Though the contours of Q vary among the different proponents, each of the following have more of a maximalist than a minimalist approach to Q: **Marie-Joseph Lagrange**, “Les sources du troisième évangile,” *RB* 4 (1895): 5-22; idem, “Les sources du troisième évangile,” *RB* 5 (1896): 5-38; **Bernhard Weiss**, *Die Quellen des Lukasevangeliums* (Stuttgart: J. G. Cotta, 1907); **John Caesar Hawkins**, “Probabilities as to the So-Called Double Tradition of St. Matthew and St. Luke,” in *Studies in the Synoptic Problem*, ed. William Sanday (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1911), 95-138; **Burnett Hillman Streeter**, “The Original Extent of Q,” in *Studies in the Synoptic Problem*, ed. William Sanday (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1911), 184-208 (though Streeter later changed his view); **Benjamin W. Bacon**, “The Q section on John the Baptist and the SHEMONEH ESREH,” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 45 (1926): 23-56; idem, *Studies in Matthew* (New York: Henry Holt, 1930), 105-119; **Heinz Schürmann**, “Sprachliche Reminiszenzen an abgeanderte oder ausgelassene Bestandteile der Spruchsammlung im Lukas- und Matthäusevangelium,” *NTS* 6 (1959): 193-210; **Edwin K. Broadhead**, “The Extent of the Sayings Tradition (Q),” in *The Sayings Source Q and the Historical Jesus*, ed. Andreas Lindemann (Leuven: Peeters, 2001), 718-728; **Delbert Burkett**, *Rethinking the Gospel Sources, Volume 2: The Unity and Plurality of Q*, *Early Christianity and Its Literature* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2009), 69-86; **Dennis R. MacDonald**, *Two Shipwrecked Gospels: The Logoi of Jesus and Papias’s Exposition of Logia about the Lord*, *Early Christianity and Its Literature* 8 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2012). In this paper I will be defending my own view of Q, which is more extensive than that of Bacon or Schürmann or Burkett, and which does not hold that Mark used Q, unlike Weiss, Broadhead, and MacDonald. Maximalist Q may be more difficult to define than Minimalist Q, but this does not mean that it is less accurate. If Q is substantially longer than the double tradition it is harder to determine what was in and not in Q, but that does not mean that Q is not substantially longer than the double tradition.

<sup>5</sup> On this view, M is not a third source for Matthew’s Gospel but is mostly Q material that Luke omitted, and L is not a third source for Luke’s Gospel but is mostly Q material that Matthew omitted. Cf. Ronald V. Huggins, “Looking for the Wrong Q in the Wrong Place” (paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the SBL, Baltimore, MD, 24 November 2013).

<sup>6</sup> John S. Kloppenborg, *The Formation of Q: Trajectories in Ancient Wisdom Collections* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987), 82.

have Mark.<sup>7</sup> Streeter's numbers are actually high. On ReconstructingQ.com I have mapped out the parallels between the Gospels and found that only 80% of Mark is paralleled in Matthew and only 63% in Luke.<sup>8</sup> If we attempted to reconstruct Mark using a minimalist approach, according to which Mark is recognized by the non-Q material that appears in *both* Matthew and Luke, we would end up with 54% of Mark! And yet even this number may be high because at times I have considered an entire verse to be paralleled when in reality particular phrases and brief clauses are omitted by one evangelist or the other. If Matthew and Luke did treat Q in the same way they treated Mark, then the *Critical Edition of Q* represents not much more than half of Q! One could object that Matthew and Luke were probably *more* conservative with Q than they were with Mark, but two observations militate against this.

First, Matthew and Luke do not treat Mark's *sayings of Jesus* any better than they treat Mark's *narrative material*, so the different nature of Q would likely not lead them to take a more conservative approach with Q. When only words of Jesus are considered, the percentage of the material that Matthew retains rises to 83%, and Luke's percentage stays the same (63%). This would result in 56% of the words of Jesus in Mark being reconstructed by a minimalist consideration of Matthew and Luke. In order to give concrete examples rather than overall statistics, let us consider the four longest speeches of Jesus in Mark.

---

<sup>7</sup> Streeter, "Original Extent," 185.

<sup>8</sup> A similar approach has been taken by Eric Eve, "Reconstructing Mark: A Thought Experiment," in *Questioning Q: A Multidimensional Critique*, ed. Mark Goodacre and Nicholas Perrin (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2004), 89-114, who notes that reconstructed Mark would be missing

*inter alia*, the preaching of John the Baptist about the coming one, the Temptation story, the Beelzebul Controversy, the Parables of the Mustard Seed and the Seed Growing Secretly, the Death of John the Baptist, the Healing of the Blind Man of Bethsaida, the Rebuke to Peter following Peter's Confession, the Discussion coming down the Mount of Transfiguration, the Episode of the Strange Exorcist, the Sayings about Temptations to Sin, the Teaching about Divorce, the Withering of the Fig Tree, the Anointing at Bethany, and, most significantly, all the material between Mark 6.44 and Mark 8.27 with the possible exception of the saying about leaven at Mark 8.14-21. [99-100]

The longest teaching of Jesus in Mark is the Apocalyptic Discourse (Mark 13:5–37), which is 525 words long. If one did not have Mark and tried to reconstruct this discourse from what is in Matthew and Luke, a minimalist approach would result in about 270 words (51%). Verses 11, 15, 18, 20–24a, 32–36 and possibly verse 27 would be lost and verses 9, 12, 19, and 37 would be greatly abbreviated. Matthew 24:17, 20, 22–25, 29a, 36, 42 and possibly 24:31 would be seen as “M,” even though these verses are taken from Mark 13:15, 18, 20–23, 24a, 32, 33, 27. Luke 21:14–15 and possibly 21:28 would be seen as “L,” though they are taken from Mark 13:11, 27. In reality Matthew adds material to Mark only in Matt 24:11–12, 26–28, 30, 37–41, 43–51. All of these verses except for vv. 11–12 and 30 are known to be from Q. Luke adds material to Mark only in Luke 21:18, 24, 34–38.<sup>9</sup> Vassiliadis has noted that verses 34–38 “might also have stood in Q.”<sup>10</sup> Thus Matthew and Luke are slow to add to Jesus’ words in Mark 13 (and when Matthew does so it is usually only to add Q material), but they will often omit verses from Mark 13. A maximalist approach to reconstructing Mark 13 may wrongly include some of Matthew’s and Luke’s additions (though access to Q would prevent many of these additions from being attributed to Mark), but it would come closer to reconstructing Mark 13 than a minimalist approach, which would result in only 51% of Mark 13.

The second longest discourse in Mark is the Parables of the Kingdom (Mark 4:3–9, 11–32). A minimalist approach would greatly abbreviate Mark 4:5–6 and omit Mark 4:23–24, 26–32,<sup>11</sup> shortening

---

<sup>9</sup> Luke elaborates what is already in Mark in Luke 21:8b, 11b, 22, 25b-26a.

<sup>10</sup> Petros Vassiliadis, *ΛΟΓΟΙ ΙΗΣΟΥΣ: Studies in Q*, University of South Florida International Studies in Formative Christianity and Judaism (Atlanta: Scholars, 1999), 57.

<sup>11</sup> It is likely that Luke is not influenced at all by the wording of Mark 4:30-32 in his telling of the parable of the Mustard Seed (*CritEd* has Q matching Luke exactly here), so while Matthew-Luke agreements have alerted us to the presence of the parable in Q, if we had Q and were attempting to reconstruct Mark we would assume that Matthew’s differences from Q and Luke were due to Matthean redaction rather than to the presence of this parable in Mark. A similar scenario may have happened in the parable of the Tenants, where Matthew’s differences may reflect the presence of this passage in Q, and in the Entry narrative, where Luke’s differences may reflect the presence of this passage in Q.

the discourse from 460 words of Jesus to about 310 (67%).<sup>12</sup> The third longest discourse is Mark 9:39–50 (215 words), of which Luke retains only the first two verses and Matthew retains only verses 41–47. Luke does provide parallels to some of this latter material (Luke 17:1–2; 14:34–35) but does not appear to be influenced by Mark at all here, so that a minimalist approach would assume that Matthew derived these verses from Q alone and that none of the material from Mark 9:39–50 is actually from Mark. Luke 9:50 would be labeled “L,” Matthew 18:6 would be labeled “Q,” and Matthew 18:8–9 would be labeled “M,” even though all of these verses are from Mark. The fourth longest discourse in Mark (7:6–16, 18–23; 195 words) is entirely absent from Luke. Thus a minimalist approach to reconstructing the four longest speeches in Mark would result in 51%, 67%, 0%, and 0% of the speeches being reconstructed! Matthew and Luke are not more likely to retain words of Jesus than they are narrative, which suggests that *Matthew and Luke would not treat Q any more conservatively than they would treat Mark*.

A second observation also suggests this. Matthew does not follow Q consecutively as he does Mark. So while Matthew is unlikely to overlook a portion of Mark, it is very possible for him to do so with Q. Matthew may be skilled at finding places in the Markan narrative to insert Q material, but how many passages in Q would Matthew have forgotten about while following Mark and inserting Q material? Unless Matthew is crossing out passages and then later going back to see what did not get crossed out, he is going to omit a whole lot more of Q than he does of Mark. Sometimes it may have been entire passages; other times it may have been portions of passages, where Matthew had already taken a portion or two and just did not feel the need to retain the rest. For example, if he had placed the Lord’s Prayer (Q 11:1–4) in his teachings on genuine prayer in Matthew 6:7–15 and placed another part of the same Q passage elsewhere (Q 11:9–13 = Matt 7:7–11), would we expect Matthew to try to find a place for Q 11:5–8 (if this Lukan *Sondergut* was in Q) or would we expect Matthew to consider

---

<sup>12</sup> It would be shorter still if we considered more minor abbreviations than the ones I have mentioned here.

these words of Jesus a necessary loss for the sake of a flowing narrative?<sup>13</sup> The likelihood that Matthew is anywhere near as conservative with Q as he is with Mark is slim. Perhaps this is mitigated by the likelihood that Luke prefers Q to Mark, but one can hardly imagine in light of this that the double tradition would contain much more than half of the Q material. When we limit Q to the double tradition we are likely considering only half of the gospel.

## The Nature of Q

But if we are trying to describe the gospel based on half of its contents, our picture of Q can be quite skewed. Eric Eve attempted to reconstruct Mark using Matthew and Luke and found that major themes of Mark's Gospel, such as the negative portrayal of the disciples, the secrecy motif, and Mark's theology of the cross were difficult to recover based on Matthew's and Luke's failure to consistently retain these elements in the same passages.<sup>14</sup> As Ronald Huggins has observed, a minimalist approach to Q makes it so that

it is not the evangelist who put the most of Q *into* his gospel that ultimately determines the shape of our reconstructed Q, but the one who left most *out*. The latter serves as a kind of gatekeeper overseeing, anachronistically determining, what gets *in* reconstructed Q and what's left *out*....

Matthew's redaction of his non-Markan source is mainly driven by his speech building interests, which in turn necessarily creates the illusion that Q itself must have consisted primarily of sayings.<sup>15</sup>

---

<sup>13</sup> On the inclusion of Luke 11:5-8 in Q, see David B. Sloan, "The τὶς ἐξ ὑμῶν Similitudes and the Extent of Q," *JSNT* (forthcoming); online: <http://reconstructingQ.com/tis-ex-hymon.pdf>.

<sup>14</sup> Eve, "Reconstructing Mark," 101-111.

<sup>15</sup> Ronald V. Huggins, "Looking for the Wrong Q in the Wrong Place" (paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the SBL, Baltimore, MD, 24 November 2013), 1, 3. See also Broadhead, "Extent of the Sayings Tradition," 719-720: "To define the Sayings Tradition in this way is akin to describing a dinosaur by its footprint.... For the task of reconstructing the text, a minimal description is required.... For the task of defining the Sayings Tradition and describing its development, outlook, sociology, and theology, a maximal description is helpful." Likewise Perrin, "Limits of a Reconstructed Q," 71-88, notes:

This methodology [the minimalist approach] is altogether appropriate if the goal is to establish a 'critical minimum'. But if Q is recast in objectivized form and conceptualized as a text, that is, if it is no longer 'warranted Q' but 'actual Q' that is in view, there must be a concomitant reconsideration of what can

Huggins attributes the prevalence of this “illusion” to “the Papiian spell in all its Schleiermacherian glory,” which has continued long after Q scholarship dismissed the relevance of Papias for Q research.<sup>16</sup> Huggins is correct here. The testimony of Papias guided early discussions of Q in the wrong direction, and the Proto-Mark thesis made this process easier, allowing scholars to attribute non-Markan narratives in Matthew and Luke to Proto-Mark. At the beginning of the twentieth century, Walter Lock challenged this misuse of Papias and Paul Wernle overturned the Proto-Mark thesis,<sup>17</sup> but these works were immediately preceded by the discovery of a fragment of the Gospel of Thomas, which was immediately seen as a “concrete example” of what Q might have looked like.<sup>18</sup> A few years later when Adolf von Harnack would write his groundbreaking work on Q – notably titled *The Sayings of Jesus* – he would observe seven narratives within Q and feel the need to explain them away: the temptation narrative “serves as a prelude,” and “in the other six narratives the story serves only as an introduction to the discourse.”<sup>19</sup> Of course, Harnack here had only part of the data because he took a minimalist approach to Q. John Hawkins noticed that the Q material is repeatedly placed *in a narrative context* in Luke and that the narrative introductions and interruptions here do not resemble Luke’s style of writing, and so must be pre-Lukan.<sup>20</sup> If Q existed, it clearly had a concentration of sayings, but these

---

reasonably be claimed on the latter’s behalf. Source-critical criteria that were applied with a view of obtaining absolute and minimalistic results cannot be equally applied to establishing the full boundaries of the historical document we are hypothesizing. This is simply because a reasonable reconstruction of actual Q cannot be presumed to be identical with that which is probably in Q (warranted Q); it must also take into account that which *may* be in Q. [79]

<sup>16</sup> Huggins, “Looking for the Wrong Q,” 3.

<sup>17</sup> Walter Lock, “Interpretation of the Text,” in *Two Lectures on the “Sayings of Jesus” Recently Discovered at Oxyrhynchus*, ed. Walter Lock and William Sanday (Oxford: Clarendon, 1897): 15-27; Paul Wernle, *Die synoptische Frage* (Freiburg i. B.: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1899).

<sup>18</sup> Bernard P. Grenfell and Arthur S. Hunt, *ΛΟΓΙΑ ΙΗΣΟΥ: Sayings of our Lord* (London: Henry Frowde for the Egypt Exploration Fund, 1897), 18.

<sup>19</sup> Adolf von Harnack, *The Sayings of Jesus: The Second Source of St. Matthew and St. Luke* (London: Williams & Norgate, 1908), 228 n. 1.

<sup>20</sup> Hawkins, “Probabilities,” 124.

sayings may very well have been set in a narrative context. In a recent regional SBL meeting I gave six reasons for thinking of Q as a narrative:

1. when Luke speaks of his sources he calls them “narratives”;
2. Q narrates events and clearly opens with a narrative structure;<sup>21</sup>
3. Matthew’s use of Q may have caused him to omit other narrative elements;
4. there are significant minor agreements in Markan narrative passages;
5. “Q contains all the elements of narrative—plot, character, setting, narrative voice, theme, and tone”;<sup>22</sup> and
6. Q’s purpose is to portray Jesus as the Coming One, not to introduce his wisdom.<sup>23</sup>

Of course, if Maximalist Q is a narrative about Jesus and not a collection of sayings, it is very different in nature from what has been reconstructed by the minimalists. I would argue that it is this Q and not the Minimalist Q that is able to resolve the problems noticed by the Q skeptics. But before we turn to these problems I first want to consider the unity of the double tradition + M + L.

## **The Unity of the Double Tradition with M and L**

Adolf von Harnack, after investigating the vocabulary, style, and themes of Q concluded that when compared with the synoptics, Q “appears to be undoubtedly more homogeneous than any of the

---

<sup>21</sup> In the words of Mark Goodacre, *The Synoptic Problem: A Way through the Maze*, The Biblical Seminar (London: Sheffield Academic, 2001), 152:

One of the most interesting features of [the sequence of Q 3-7 as it has been reconstructed] is that it seems to be a *narrative* sequence—each event clearly proceeds from the previous one. John appears, preaches about his baptism, prophesies ‘the coming one’, who then appears, is baptized in connection with the ‘spirit’ as a ‘son’, is then led by the ‘spirit’ to be tested as a ‘son’ and so on.

Goodacre’s “so on” includes Jesus appearing in Nazareth, preaching a great sermon, going to Capernaum, healing a centurion’s servant, and responding to messengers from John about whether or not Jesus is indeed “the coming one.” If we continue to Q 9 we find another narrative, in which two or three potential disciples are forced to consider the cost of following Jesus. Cf. Mark Goodacre, *The Case Against Q: Studies in Markan Priority and Synoptic Problem* (Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 2002), 172-176.

<sup>22</sup> I am here quoting Harry T. Fleddermann, *Q: A Reconstruction and Commentary*, Biblical Tools and Studies (Leuven: Peeters, 2005), 106.

<sup>23</sup> David B. Sloan, “Q as a Narrative Gospel” (paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Eastern Great Lakes Biblical Society; Perrysville, OH, 12 March 2015), online: <http://reconstructingQ.com/narrative.pdf>



three.”<sup>24</sup> Arland Jacobson and Harry Fleddermann have used this homogeneity to argue for the unity of Q.<sup>25</sup> What is remarkable is that M and L share that homogeneity. A full treatment of the style of Q is not possible here, but we will focus on a few shared characteristics:

- (1) *Concentration on direct discourse.* Here we see an inconsistency in the *Critical Edition of Q*. In Chapters 3–9, 955 of the 1,152 words (83%) are direct discourse. In Chapters 10–22, 2,566 out of 2,618 words (98%) are direct discourse. 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.<sup>26</sup> It is unlikely that the nature of Q shifts between Chapter 9 and Chapter 10. Notably, most of the material after Q 9:60 is found in Matthew’s speeches,<sup>27</sup> though it has an unlukan narrative context in Luke.<sup>28</sup> But perhaps more significant is the fact that when we examine Luke 10:1–18:14, we find that 84% of the words are words of Jesus or of another character, so if all or almost all of Luke 10:1–18:14 is seen as being from Q there is consistency in the concentration on direct discourse with what has been found regarding Q 3–9. There are only two passages in this entire section of Luke that do not resemble Q’s preference for direct discourse – the story of Mary and Martha (Luke 10:38–42) and the story of the Ten Lepers (Luke 17:11–19), but even these end with a saying of Jesus, just as does Q 7:1–10. Thus we see a consistent shape to Q and L, which is in striking contrast with the Markan material in Luke. M also consists predominantly of direct discourse, with exceptions only in the infancy narrative and in Matt 4:24–25; 9:27–35; 14:28–31; 21:14–16; 27:3–10, 51b–53.

---

<sup>24</sup> Harnack, *Sayings*, 167.

<sup>25</sup> Arland D. Jacobson, “The Literary Unity of Q,” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 101 (1982): 365-389; Fleddermann, *Q*, 79-128.

<sup>26</sup> James M. 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*, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2000).

<sup>27</sup> There are nine exceptions to this, but in five of these exceptions (Q 12:10, 54-56; 13:28-30; 14:16-24; 16:16) the saying is attached in Q to another saying that is placed in one of Matthew’s larger discourses, and so Matthew has already removed the saying from its context because of his creation of larger discourses. Two of the other four exceptions actually retain their narrative settings in Matthew (Q 11:15, 17-23; Q 11:16, 29-30). Matthew places the saying from Q 17:6 in Mark’s narrative of the boy with the unclean spirit to highlight the disciples’ “little faith” (Matt 17:20). This may suggest Matthew’s knowledge of the disciples’ request to increase their faith, which precedes this Q saying in Luke (Luke 17:5). Thus, though Matthew has not preserved the narrative introduction that Luke preserves, he seems to know it. The final exception is Q 22:28, 30. Matthew places this in the narrative of the rich man who asks about eternal life, immediately after Peter points out that the disciples have left everything to follow Jesus (Matt 19:27-30). Q 22:28, 30 is the most profound statement regarding the role of the twelve in the kingdom, and so it provides a fitting response to Peter’s concern. In Luke these verses are found in the Last Supper, where Luke seems to follow a source other than Mark, though Matthew follows Mark pretty closely. It is possible that we have a Mark-Q overlap here and that Matthew had planned on following Mark rather than trying to harmonize the two, and so he placed this extra saying from Q in a different appropriate context, but this is of course uncertain. This is the only exception where it can be said that Matthew’s reason for losing the setting of the saying is not immediately clear.

<sup>28</sup> In Sloan, “Q as a Narrative Gospel,” I demonstrate the unlukan nature of a couple of these introductions.

- (2) *Dialogues*. Fleddermann observes in Q a dialogue that leads into a speech (Q 7:18–35); three double dialogues (Q 7:1–10; 9:57–60; 11:14–32); and a triple dialogue (Q 4:1–13).<sup>29</sup> If Luke 9:61–62 is from Q this would be a triple dialogue rather than a double, and it too leads into a speech of Jesus if we view Luke 9:56–10:16 as one pericope. If Luke 11:37–38, 45 is included in Q (the style is not Lukan), this is another double dialogue, and it too probably sets up the speech in Q 12:2–12.<sup>30</sup> If Kloppenborg is correct that Luke 12:13–21 comes from Q,<sup>31</sup> then this is another dialogue leading into the speech in Q 12:22–59. A dialogue in Luke 14:1–6 sets up the speech in Luke 14:7–35. This speech on a Minimalist Q Hypothesis consists of L+Q+L+Q+L+Q+L+Q; it would be better to see it as all from Q, with Matthew omitting four different portions. The dialogues in Matt 3:14–15; 9:27–31; 13:24–30 51–52; 14:28–31; 15:12–13; 17:24–27; 26:25; Luke 3:10–14; 7:36–50; 10:25–37; 11:27–28; 19:37–44 may also be from Q. The dialogue in Luke 3:10–14 is patterned very much like the one in Q 9:56–62 and is apparently alluded to in Q 7:29–30.
- (3) *Double analogies*. Double analogies are frequent in the double tradition (Q 6:35, 43–45; 7:33–34; 9:58; 10:12–15; 11:11–12, 29–32; 12:24–28, 54–56; 13:18–21; 17:26–32, 34–35); in Matthean *Sondergut* (Matt 5:13–16, 29–30, 34–36; 7:6; 10:24–25; 13:44–46; 23:16–22) and in Lukan *Sondergut* (Luke 4:25–27; 13:1–5; 14:28–33). Perhaps most interesting here is Matt 10:24–25, where two analogies are given, but only one of these is paralleled in Luke (Luke 6:40). On the Minimalist Q understanding, Matthew has created a double analogy based on a single analogy in Q, even though Matthew never does this with Mark, and Q repeatedly uses double analogies. Likewise two analogies are given in Luke 11:5–13; Luke 12:35–48; and Luke 15:3–10, but in each case only one is paralleled in Matthew. On either the Minimalist Q Hypothesis or the Farrer Hypothesis, Luke has just added a Q/Matthean feature to Q/Matthew. More likely, when either Matthew or Luke contains two analogies, their shared source contained two analogies.
- (4) *Makarisms*. Jacobson notes that makarisms are a regular feature of Q (Q 6:20, 21 [2x], 22; 7:23; 10:23; 12:43) and that they consistently use the word μακάριος, whereas Mark has only two makarisms, and they use the word εὐλογέω.<sup>32</sup> Interestingly, μακάριος is also frequent in M (Matt 5:5, 7, 8, 9, 10; 16:17) and L (Luke 1:45; 6:4 D; 11:27, 28, 37, 38; 14:14, 15; 23:29). Of course not every makarism is from Q (cf. John 13:17; 20:29; Acts 20:35), but the distribution of μακάριος (0x in Mark; 2x in John; 1x in Acts; 7x in Q; 6x in M, 9x in L) is telling, especially when we consider how much shorter Q, M, and L are than Mark, John, and Acts.<sup>33</sup> Jacobson argues that the traditional makarism in Q 6:22–23 has been redacted to

---

<sup>29</sup> Fleddermann, *Q*, 93.

<sup>30</sup> On this passage see Sloan, “Q as a Narrative Gospel.”

<sup>31</sup> John S. Kloppenborg, “Jesus and the Parables of Jesus in Q,” in *The Gospel Behind the Gospels: Current Studies on Q*, ed. Ronald A. Piper, Novum Testamentum Supplements 75 (Leiden: Brill Academic, 1997), 301–305; see also John S. Kloppenborg, *Q Parallels: Synopsis, Critical Notes & Concordance. Foundations & Facets* (Sonoma, CA: Polebridge, 1988), 128.

<sup>32</sup> Jacobson, “Unity,” 373–374.

<sup>33</sup> Makarisms are also frequent in the Gospel of Thomas (Gos. Th. 7; 57 [=Q 6:20]; 68 [=Q 6:22]; 69 [2x; =Matt 5:10 and Q 6:21]); 79 [3x; =Luke 11:27, 28; 23:29]; 103 [cf. Q 12:39]). Of the eight makarisms in Thomas, seven are paralleled in Q, M, or L. If Thomas is independent of Q and of the synoptic gospels, then the frequent use of makarisms is not peculiar to Q.

introduce “the deuteronomistic tradition of the violent fate of the prophets.”<sup>34</sup> A similar emphasis has been given to the L makarism in Luke 23:28–31.

- (5) *Woes.*<sup>35</sup> Mark has two woes (13:17; 14:21), both addressed to a third-person object. Woes addressed to a second person do not occur in Mark, John, Acts, or the NT Epistles but occur eight times in Q (10:13 [2x]; 11:42, 43, 44, 46, 47, 52; 17:1), three times in M (Matt 18:7a; 23:15, 16), and four times in L (Luke 6:24, 25 [2x], 26).
- (6) *Parables beginning with ὁμοιῶ or ὁμοίός ἐστιν.* Jacobson notes that in Q parables typically begin with ὁμοιῶ or ὁμοίός ἐστιν (Q 6:48, 49; 7:32; 13:19, 21; 14:16), whereas in Mark this happens only once and “in the one parable it has in common with Q” (Mark 4:30).<sup>36</sup> This is, however, a typical way for parables to begin in M (Matt 13:24, 44, 45, 47, 52; 18:23; 20:1; 25:1), and it is also attested in L (Luke 12:36). Never does Matthew or Luke add this introduction to a Markan parable, so it is not redactional but traditional, and yet the tradition is shared by the double tradition, M, and L.<sup>37</sup>
- (7) *Parables beginning with τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν.* Jacobson notes that τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν “is not a typical introduction to a parable; it reflects prophetic usage.”<sup>38</sup> These parables are found in both Q (Q 11:11–13; 12:25–26; 14:5; 15:4–7) and L (Luke 11:5–8; 14:28–33; 17:7–10). In a forthcoming *JSNT* article I demonstrate that these three L passages meet all of Vassiliadis’s and Kloppenborg’s criteria for including *Sondergut* in Q.<sup>39</sup>
- (8) *Compound parallelism.*<sup>40</sup> A number of passages in Q, M, and L have an ABCDA’B’C’D’ structure: Q 6:24–28; 7:33–34; 11:31–32; 12:8–9, 10, 24–28; 13:18–21; 17:23; Matt 5:21–48; 6:2–6, 16–18; 25:31–46; Luke 4:25–27; 13:1–5; 14:28–33; 15:4–10. Of course the most intricate example of compound parallelism is found in Matt 25:31–46, which has the following pattern: A-B-C-D-E-F-G-H-I-B’-E’-F’-G’-H’-I’-J-K-B”-C’-D’-E”-F”-G”-H”-I”-B””-E””-F””-G””-H””-I””-J’-K’-A’.
- (9) *Broken third compositions.*<sup>41</sup> Here we have two lines or sections that carefully parallel one another followed by a third that is parallel but slightly modified. In the temptation narrative (Q 4:1–13) we have two “if you are the Son of God” temptations followed by one that drops

---

<sup>34</sup> Jacobson, “Literary Unity,” 374. Jacobson sees the list of makarisms as traditional and the extended final makarism as redactional, and he uses the absence of the Deuteronomistic theme in the parallels in Gos. Th. 68; 1 Pet 4:14 as evidence.

<sup>35</sup> Jacobson, “Literary Unity,” 374.

<sup>36</sup> Jacobson, “Literary Unity,” 377 n. 56.

<sup>37</sup> Parables also begin this way in Gos. Th. 8 (=Matt 13:47); 13; 20 (=Mark 4:30//Q 13:18); 21; 22 (cf. Mark 10:13); 76 (=Matt 13:45); 96 (=Luke 13:20); 102 (cf. 11:52); 107 (=Q 15:3); 109 (=Matt 13:44).

<sup>38</sup> Jacobson, “Literary Unity,” 377–378. Jacobson also notes that Q tends to place the parables in an eschatological context. Parables with an eschatological setting are not only frequent in Q while absent in Mark and John but also are frequent in M (Matt 13:24–30, 47–50; 18:23–35; 20:1–16; 25:1–12).

<sup>39</sup> Sloan, “τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν Similitudes.”

<sup>40</sup> Fleddermann, *Q*, 84–85.

<sup>41</sup> Fleddermann, *Q*, 86–87.

that form. Other examples include Q 9:58; 14:18–20, 26–27; 19:16–26. Broken third compositions are also found in Matt 10:21–22, 41–42; Luke 13:1–9; 15:1–35.<sup>42</sup>

(10) *Descriptive vocatives*. Whereas elsewhere in the Gospels and Acts people are addressed as “lord,” “teacher,” “man,” “father,” “brother,” “rabbi,” “woman,” “child,” etc., Q, M, and L repeatedly use more descriptive vocatives, such as

- a. “brood of vipers” (Q 3:7; Matt 12:34; 23:33),
- b. “hypocrite(s)” (Q 6:42, 56; Matt 7:5; 15:7; 22:18; 23:27, 29; Luke 13:15; but see Mark 7:6<sup>43</sup>),
- c. “fool(s)” (Q 11:40; Matt 5:22; Luke 12:20),
- d. “you of little faith” (Q 12:28; Matt 8:26; 14:31; 16:8),
- e. “workers of evil” (Q 13:27),
- f. “good [and faithful] servant” (Q 19:17),
- g. “wicked [and lazy] servant” (Q 19:22; Matt 18:32),
- h. “empty head” (Matt 5:22),
- i. “friend” (Matt 20:13; 22:12; 26:50; Luke 11:5; 14:10),
- j. “blind guides” (Matt 23:16, 24),
- k. “blind fools” (Matt 23:17),
- l. “blind men” (Matt 23:19),
- m. “blind Pharisee” (Matt 23:26),
- n. “serpents” (Matt 23:33),
- o. “soul” (Luke 12:19),
- p. “little flock” (Luke 12:32),
- q. “daughters of Jerusalem” (Luke 23:28), and
- r. “foolish ones and slow of heart to believe” (Luke 24:25).

(11) *Catchwords*. Fleddermann notes: “The verb ‘to give’ (δίδωμι) functions as an internal catchword both in the Disciple’s Prayer and an Exhortation to Pray [Q 11:1–4, 9–13] and in the Pounds [Q 19:11–27], and it carries theological weight in both pericopes.”<sup>44</sup>

Fleddermann fails to note that this catchword also occurs 3x in the L passage between Q 11:1–4, 9–13 (which is also a τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν parable and the first in a double analogy when combined with Q 11:9–13). Furthermore, παραδίδωμι is used as a catchword in Matt 10:17 (M), 19 (Q), 21 (M) and ἀποδίδωμι is used as a catchword in Matt 18:25–35 (7x).

Fleddermann also notes that “[a]ll six occurrences of ‘to kill’ (ἀποκτείνω) in Q involve catchwords,”<sup>45</sup> but he fails to note that the final occurrence (Q 13:34) is not only a “remote catchword” but a catchword that links Q 13:34 with Luke 13:31 (L). Next Fleddermann notes

---

<sup>42</sup> On Luke 13:1-9; 15:1-35, see William R. Farmer, “Notes on a Literary and Form-Critical Analysis of Some of the Synoptic Material Peculiar to Luke,” *NTS* 8 (1961-62): 301-316; David B. Sloan, “Lost Portions of Q Found . . . in the Lukan Travel Narrative” (paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature, Chicago, IL, 18 November 2012), online: <http://reconstructingQ.com/lost-portions.pdf>

<sup>43</sup> This is the only example outside of Q, M, and L of what I would consider a “more descriptive vocative,” unless we include Mark’s “faithless generation” (Mark 9:19), which is an allusion to Deut 32:20. Otherwise forty-eight of the forty-nine examples in the Gospels and Acts are in Q, M, and L.

<sup>44</sup> Fleddermann, *Q*, 119.

<sup>45</sup> Fleddermann, *Q*, 120.

that μεριμνάω is a catchword in Q 12:22–31 (3 or 4x), linking it to Q 12:11,<sup>46</sup> but he fails to note that the verse that follows Q 12:22–31 in Matthew uses the same word twice (Matt 6:34). This word occurs nowhere else in the Gospels or Acts. Fleddermann also identifies “servant” as a key word in Q and speaks of the importance of the servant parables in Q’s theology of discipleship,<sup>47</sup> but some of the greatest lessons on discipleship come in the M and L servant parables, Matt 18:23–35 and Luke 12:36–38; 17:7–10 (Luke 17:7–10 is another τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν passage). Finally, Fleddermann notes the importance of bearing fruit for Q.<sup>48</sup> This is what weaves together Matt 7:16 (Q), 17(M), 18 (Q), 19 (M), and 20 (M). Dozens of other examples can be given.

(12) *Characteristic vocabulary.* There are a number of words that occur nowhere else in the NT, but occur in the double tradition and in M and/or L:

- a. ἀξίνη (Matt 3:10=Luke 3:9; Luke 13:7);
- b. ἀποθήκη (Matt 3:12=Luke 3:17; Matt 6:26=Luke 12:24; Matt 13:30; Luke 12:18);
- c. βαλλάντιον (Q/Luke 10:4; Luke 12:33; 22:35–36);
- d. δανείζω/δάνειον/δανειστής (Q/Matt 5:42; Q/Luke 6:34; Matt 18:27; Luke 6:35; 7:41);
- e. ἔνδυμα (Matt 6:25 = Luke 12:23; Q/Matt 6:28; Matt 3:4; 7:15; 22:11–12; 28:3);<sup>49</sup>
- f. ἐννέα (Matt 18:12, 13=Luke 15:4, 7; Luke 17:17);
- g. κοπρία (Q/Luke 14:35; Luke 13:8);
- h. μαμωνᾶς (Matt 6:24=Luke 16:13; Luke 16:9, 11);
- i. ὀλιγόπιστος (Matt 6:30=Luke 12:28; Matt 8:26 [Mark-Q overlap?]; 14:31; 16:8 [Mark-Q overlap?]);
- j. ποσάκις (Matt 23:37=Luke 13:34; Matt 18:21);
- k. ῥαπίζω (Q/Matt 5:39; Matt 26:67);
- l. σαρώω (Matt 12:44=Luke 11:25; Luke 15:8);
- m. σκοτεινός (Matt 6:23=Luke 11:34; Luke 11:36);
- n. συλλέγω (Matt 7:16=Luke 6:44; Matt 13:28–30, 40–41, 48);
- o. συναίρω (Q/Matt 25:19; Matt 18:23–24);
- p. ταμεῖον (Q/Matt 24:26; Q/Luke 12:3; Q/Luke 12:24; Matt 6:6);
- q. φωτεινός (Matt 6:22=Luke 11:34; Matt 17:5 [Mark-Q overlap?]; Luke 11:36).

In addition there are almost 100 words that occur in the Gospels and Acts only in the double tradition + M + L. Sometimes there are exact phrases that occur in the NT only in the double tradition + M + L, such as:

- a. γεννήματα ἐχιδνῶν (Matt 3:7=Luke 3:7; Matt 12:34; 23:33);
- b. ὁ πιστὸς οἰκονόμος/δοῦλος ὁ φρόνιμος (Matt 24:45=Luke 12:42; Luke 16:8, 10);
- c. ἐκεῖ ἔσται ὁ κλαυθμὸς καὶ ὁ βρυγμὸς τῶν ὀδόντων (Matt 8:12=Luke 13:28; Matt 13:42, 50; 22:13; 24:51; 25:30);

<sup>46</sup> Fleddermann, *Q*, 121.

<sup>47</sup> Fleddermann, *Q*, 121.

<sup>48</sup> Fleddermann, *Q*, 121.

<sup>49</sup> Elsewhere Matthew uses ἱμάτια (Matt 17:2=Mark 9:3; Matt 26:65 in place of Mark’s χιτῶν [Mark 14:63]; Matt 27:31, 35 = Mark 15:20, 24) or χλαμύς (Matt 27:28, 31, in place of Mark’s πορφύρα [purple]).

d. ἐκ τοῦ καρποῦ γινώσκεται (Matt 7:16=Luke 6:43; Matt 12:34); and so on.

None of these points is strong enough on its own to demonstrate the unity of the double tradition + M + L, but together these add plausibility to the idea that M is really just the portions of Q that Luke did not copy and L is really just the portions of Q that Matthew did not copy. To be sure, there are individual verses in M or in L that are not from Q (e.g., Matt 4:14–16; 8:17; 13:35; Luke 11:53–54; 13:22), and the infancy narratives in Matthew and Luke do not seem to have been in Q, but Q is probably closer to the double tradition + M + L than it is to the double tradition alone. The fact that the homogeneity of this material includes not only M but also L provides a challenge not only against Minimalist Q but also against the Farrer Hypothesis. Having demonstrated this, we can now turn to the main objections to the Q Hypothesis.

## Minor Agreements

Mark Goodacre claims that Matthew and Luke’s minor agreements against Mark are “a major anomaly” for the Two-Document Hypothesis.<sup>50</sup> Michael Goulder says “the Minor Agreements have been for so long a thorn in the side of the standard theory.”<sup>51</sup> But as John Poirier has noted, “a big enough Q can account for many of the Minor Agreements.”<sup>52</sup> Poirier does not think a bigger Q is a “justifiable expedient,” but let us consider a parallel scenario. What if the first two gospels written were Mark and John and one of these was lost but recoverable through a later gospel that used both as its sources? How many Mark-John overlap passages are there? I count nineteen:

1. John's Testimony to Jesus (Mark 1:1–8//John 1:19–34);
2. Clearing the temple (Mark 11:15–18//John 2:13–22);

---

<sup>50</sup> Goodacre, *Case Against Q*, 165.

<sup>51</sup> Michael D. Goulder, *Luke: A New Paradigm*, 2 vols., JSNTSup 20 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989), 1:50.

<sup>52</sup> John C. Poirier, “The Q Hypothesis and the Role of Pre-Synoptic Sources in Nineteenth-Century Scholarship,” in *Questioning Q: A Multidimensional Critique*, ed. Mark Goodacre and Nicholas Perrin (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 2004), 13-27, here p. 27.

3. Feeding the Five Thousand (Mark 6:30–44//John 6:1–15);
4. Walking on Water (Mark 6:45–52//John 6:16–21);
5. Request for a Sign after the Miraculous Feeding (Mark 8:11–12//John 6:30–31);
6. Healing a Blind Man with Saliva (Mark 8:22–26//John 9:1–12);
7. Anointing at Bethany (Mark 14:3–9//John 12:1–11);
8. Triumphal Entry (Mark 11:1–10//John 12:12–19);
9. Jesus' Last Supper (Mark 14:17–26//John 13:1–30);
10. Jesus Predicts Peter's Denial (Mark 14:27–31//John 13:31–38);
11. Jesus' Arrest (Mark 14:43–52//John 18:1–14);
12. Peter's Threefold Denial (Mark 14:66–72//John 18:15–18, 25–27);
13. Trial before the High Priest (Mark 14:53–65//John 18:19–24);
14. Trial before Pilate (Mark 15:1–15//John 18:26–19:16);
15. Jesus or Barabbas (Mark 15:6–15//John 18:38–40);
16. Mocking of Jesus (Mark 15:16–20//John 19:1–3);
17. Crucifixion of Jesus (Mark 15:21–39//John 19:17–37);
18. Burial of Jesus (Mark 15:40–47//John 19:38–42); and
19. Mary Magdalene Finds an Empty Tomb (Mark 16:1–8//John 20:1–18).<sup>53</sup>

Considering that John is more removed from Mark chronologically and possibly also theologically, is it not likely that if Q existed, there were at least as many Mark-Q overlaps as Mark-John overlaps? On the Minimalist Q Hypothesis there are overlaps in John's Testimony to Jesus, the Temptation Narrative, the Beelzebul Controversy, the parable of the Mustard Seed, the Mission Discourse, and the Request for a Sign, because there are major agreements between Matthew and Luke

---

<sup>53</sup> For a more exhaustive list of parallels between John and the synoptics see James D. G. Dunn, "John and the Oral Gospel Tradition," in *Jesus and the Oral Gospel Tradition*, ed. H. Wansbrough (JSNTSup 64; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1991), 351-79; repr. James D. G. Dunn, *The Oral Gospel Tradition* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2013), 138-163.

here against Mark.<sup>54</sup> Goodacre sees even these as a difficulty for the Q Hypothesis because “agreement against Mark in both wording and order [in, for example, the parable of the Mustard Seed], should not be present.”<sup>55</sup> But in all of these overlap passages except the first two (where there is only one possible place to put them in the Markan outline), Luke seems unaware of where Matthew has placed them. Moreover, in the parable of the Mustard Seed Luke is missing the Markan elements that are found in the Matthean version. Thus, on the Farrer Hypothesis, Luke must have gone through the Matthean version, removed the phrases Matthew took from Mark, and offered what was left. There is no good reason for this. Rather it seems that Luke has an alternate version of the parable and Matthew has taken the Markan and the (pre-)Lukan version and combined them. The Farrer Hypothesis cannot explain the major agreements as well as the Q Hypothesis can.

But the Minimalist Q approach cannot explain the minor agreements well. To be sure, most of the minor agreements are likely coincidental agreements in how to improve Mark’s grammar or remove his redundancies. With how often Matthew or Luke modifies Mark’s beginning *καί* to *δέ* independently of the other evangelist, there is no surprise in how often they agree in doing so. But other minor agreements are more significant. For example in Matt 26:67–68//Luke 22:64, Matthew and Luke add five words to Mark’s account, using the exact same words in the exact same forms in the exact same order, even using a word for “struck” that appears nowhere else in Matthew or Luke and that *differs from the word each of them used in narrating the striking of Jesus*.<sup>56</sup> Perhaps we could attribute this to oral tradition, but in the passages where significant minor agreements occur there is often a high

---

<sup>54</sup> Some would list other Mark-Q overlaps (e.g., Fleddermann, *Q*, 75-77), but I am focusing here on the *stories* that I see overlapped just as I did with Mark and John. If we include sayings of Jesus that overlap in Mark and John, we can potentially add 57 more, smaller Mark-John overlaps (see the list in Dunn, “John and the Oral Gospel Tradition,” 357; repr. pp. 143-144).

<sup>55</sup> Mark Goodacre, “Ten Reasons to Question Q,” online: [www.markgoodacre.org/Q/ten.htm](http://www.markgoodacre.org/Q/ten.htm), accessed 15 May 2015.

<sup>56</sup> Goodacre, *Synoptic Problem*, 145-146.



number of minor agreements in the same passage. Interestingly these significant minor agreements are limited to thirteen passages:

1. John's Baptism (Mark 1:1–8 *par.*);<sup>57</sup>
2. Cleansing the Leper (Mark 1:40–45 *par.*);<sup>58</sup>
3. On Parables (Mark 4:10–12 *par.*);<sup>59</sup>
4. Calming the Storm (Mark 4:35–41 *par.*);<sup>60</sup>
5. Sending the Twelve (Mark 6:6–13 *par.*);<sup>61</sup>
6. Feeding the Five Thousand (Mark 6:30–44 *par.*);<sup>62</sup>
7. Parable of the Tenants (Mark 12:1–12 *par.*);<sup>63</sup>
8. Two Greatest Commandments (Mark 12:28–34 *par.*);<sup>64</sup>
9. Jesus' Arrest (Mark 14:43–50 *par.*);<sup>65</sup>
10. Trial before the High Priest (Mark 14:53–65 *par.*);<sup>66</sup>
11. Peter's Threefold Denial (Mark 14:66–72 *par.*);<sup>67</sup>

---

<sup>57</sup> "In those days / the fifteenth year"; placement of Isaiah quotation; omission of Malachi quotation; πᾶσα ἡ περιχώρος τοῦ Ἰορδάνου; plus the major agreements.

<sup>58</sup> ἰδοῦ; worshiped / fell on his face; κύριε; omission of σπλαγχνισθεῖς; omission of Mark 1:43, 45b.

<sup>59</sup> Omission of ὅτε ἐγένετο κατὰ μόνας; γνῶναι τὰ μυστήρια; omission of Mark's redactional τοῖς ἔξω (Mark probably added these words to continue the criticism of Jesus' family that he said twice in the previous passage was "standing outside"); omission of τὰ πάντα γίνεται; οὐ βλέπουσιν / μὴ βλέπωσιν; omission of βλέπωσιν καὶ and ἀκούωσιν καί; plus the major agreements if we consider Luke 10 here as well.

<sup>60</sup> Omission of ὀψίας γενομένης; omission of Mark 4:36; "on the lake"; omission of ὥστε ἦδη γεμίζεσθαι τὸ πλοῖον; omission of ἐν τῇ πρύμνῃ ἐπὶ τὸ προσκεφάλαιον; προσελθόντες; κύριε/ἐπιστάτα; omission of οὐ μέλει σοι ὅτι; omission of σιώπα, πεφίμωσο; ἐθαύμασαν λέγοντες; plural winds.

<sup>61</sup> "Preach the kingdom"; "heal"; no staff; no silver; ἐξερχόμενοι ἔξω/ἀπὸ ... τῆς πόλεως ἐκείνης.

<sup>62</sup> Omission of Mark 6:31; οἱ ὄχλοι ... ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ; omission of ὅτι ἦσαν ὡς πρόβατα μὴ ἔχοντα ποιμένα; healing; βρώματα; omission of Mark 6:38; omission of συμπόσια συμπόσια; περισσεύω.

<sup>63</sup> Matt 21:44//Luke 20:18 (external evidence strongly supports that Matt 21:44 is original); ἀκούσαντες; omission of καὶ ἀφέντες αὐτὸν ἀπῆλθον.

<sup>64</sup> νομικός; [ἐκ]πειράζων; διδάσκαλε; ἐν τῷ νόμῳ; omission of Mark 12:29; ἐν (3x); omission of Mark 12:32-34.

<sup>65</sup> ἰδοῦ; πατάσσω; ἐν μαχαίρῃ; ὥρα; Jesus addresses Judas; Jesus speaks after a disciple strike's the servant's ear.

<sup>66</sup> "Tell us"; "you say so"; "from now on"; τίς ἐστὶν ὁ παῖσας σε;

12. Crucifixion of Jesus (Mark 15:21–39 *par.*);<sup>68</sup> and

13. Empty Tomb (Mark 16:1–8 *par.*).<sup>69</sup>

Is it not conceivable that these thirteen passages could have been Mark-Q overlaps, just like the Mark-John overlaps?<sup>70</sup> Two of these passages have already had portions of them attributed to Q (1, 5). Seven of them are paralleled in John (1, 6, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13), and two more are paralleled in Thomas (3, 7), which suggests that these passages are common enough that their inclusion in both Mark and Q would not be surprising even if there is no literary relationship between Mark and Q. Perhaps the minimalist would expect agreements in these passages to be more significant, but if Matthew prefers Mark's text he may be taking little from Q when the two are very similar. Eric Eve argues that if we tried to reconstruct Mark from Matthew and Luke minus the *Critical Edition of Q*, we would omit John's preaching of the Coming One, the Temptation, the Beelzebul Controversy, and the parable of the Mustard Seed because there are no extensive agreements between Matthew and Luke against Q here.<sup>71</sup> Thus it would not be surprising if our minimalist approach to Q has caused us to omit many of the above passages even if they were in Q.<sup>72</sup>

---

<sup>67</sup> κάθημαι; ἦν μετά; ἄνθρωπος; ἄλλος; καὶ σύ; rooster crows only once; ἐξεληθὼν ἔξω ἔκλαυσεν πικρῶς.

<sup>68</sup> οὗτος in inscription; "if you are the Son of God"/"if this is the Christ of God"; τὸ πνεῦμα; ἑκατοντάρχης; τὸ γενόμενον; ἐφοβήθησαν/ἐδόξαζεν.

<sup>69</sup> ἰδοῦ; ἀστραπή; φοβ\*; became like dead men / bowed their faces to the ground; word order of οὐκ ἔστιν ὧδε· ἠγέρθη; "as he said / told you" after "he has risen"; ἀπαγγέλλω.

<sup>70</sup> Sending the Twelve may have minor agreements only because both Matthew and Luke are here influenced by Q's wording in Sending the Seventy-Two; it is probably not the case that there are two mission discourses in Q.

<sup>71</sup> Eve, "Reconstructing Mark," 97.

<sup>72</sup> Eve, "Reconstructing Mark," 112: "[T]here may in fact be similar asymmetric cases of Mark-Q overlaps where Matthew and Luke have both preferred the Markan to the Q version, so masking the existence of a Q parallel (the most that we could observe under such circumstances would be a few minor agreements of Matthew and Luke against Mark). Similarly, one could imagine that there might be further Mark-Q overlaps where either Matthew or Luke had preferred Mark and the other had preferred Q; again, all that could be observed would be that one Evangelist had followed Mark more closely than the other (having made due allowances for what could clearly be seen to be a result of either Evangelist's redaction). The implication is that Q could contain a great many more parallels to Markan material than we have any means of discerning."

## Arguments from Order

Here is where arguments from order become important. Research into Q has repeatedly upheld the notion that Luke's order for the double tradition material is more primitive than Matthew's order. If this is true, it is problematic for the Farrer Hypothesis. In his essay on "Order in the Double Tradition," Jeffrey Peterson questions the argument that Luke is not prone to change the order of his source material. Peterson notes that Kloppenborg "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 reordering his sources."<sup>73</sup> If Luke's literary aims lead him to rearrange passages in Mark, there is no reason to suppose that Luke has not done the same – and more frequently – with material he obtains from Matthew. But Peterson overlooks some important data in the places Luke diverges from Mark – some of which Minimalist Q proponents themselves have not fully observed. There are thirty occasions on which Luke disagrees with Mark on the placement of a passage. In sixteen of these Luke has major agreements with Matthew against Luke (i.e., typical Q passages):

| <b>Pericope</b>             | <b>Mark</b> | <b>Luke</b>  | <b>Matthew</b> |
|-----------------------------|-------------|--------------|----------------|
| Healing on the Sabbath      | 3:1–6       | 14:1–6       | 12:9–14*       |
| Beelzebul Controversy       | 3:20–27     | 11:14–23     | 12:22–27*      |
| On Blasphemy                | 3:28–30     | 12:10        | 12:32*         |
| With the Measure You Use    | 4:24c       | 6:38c        | 7:2b           |
| More Will Be Given          | 4:24d       | 12:31b       | 6:33b          |
| Parable of the Mustard Seed | 4:30–32     | 13:18–19     | 13:31–32*      |
| Demand for a Sign           | 8:11–13     | 11:16, 29–32 | 12:38–42       |
| Causing to Sin              | 9:42        | 17:2         | 18:6*          |
| On Salt                     | 9:50        | 14:34        | 5:13           |
| On Divorce                  | 10:11–12    | 16:18        | 5:32           |
| The Last Will Be First      | 10:31       | 13:30        | 8:11–12        |
| On Faith                    | 11:23       | 17:6         | 17:20          |
| On Prayer                   | 11:24       | 11:10        | 7:8            |
| On Forgiveness              | 11:25       | 11:4         | 6:9–13         |

---

<sup>73</sup> Jeffrey Peterson, "Order in the Double Tradition and the Existence of Q," in *Questioning Q: A Multidimensional Critique*, ed. Mark Goodacre and Nicholas Perrin (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2004), 28-42; here pp. 35-36, referencing Kloppenborg's figure "Luke's Disagreements with Marcan Order" in John S. Kloppenborg Verbin, *Excavating Q: The History and Setting of the Sayings Gospel* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2000), 22.

|                      |          |          |           |
|----------------------|----------|----------|-----------|
| False Christs        | 13:21–23 | 17:23    | 24:26*    |
| Return of the Master | 13:33–37 | 12:35–48 | 24:44–51* |

The Farrer Hypothesis cannot explain why 53% of the time Luke diverges from Mark in order he chooses to follow Matthew’s wording rather than Mark’s, even though in seven of these passages (marked by an asterisk above) Matthew agrees with Mark on the placement of the passage, and in none of the other nine does Luke place his parallel where Matthew places it!<sup>74</sup> The Q Hypothesis adequately explains why major agreements are likely to be found at places where Luke diverges from Mark’s order – Luke is not following Mark, but Q. At the same time, the Minimalist Q Hypothesis cannot explain the other fourteen passages in which Luke diverges from Mark’s order:

| <b>Pericope</b>                    | <b>Mark</b> | <b>Luke</b> |
|------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|
| Call of Peter                      | 1:16–20     | 5:1–11      |
| Choosing the Twelve                | 3:13–19     | 6:12–16     |
| Jesus’ Mother and Brothers         | 3:31–35     | 8:19–21     |
| Rejection at Nazareth              | 6:1–6       | 4:16–30     |
| John’s Imprisonment                | 6:17–29     | 3:19–20     |
| Leaven of the Pharisees            | 8:15        | 12:1        |
| Jesus’ Baptism of Death            | 10:38       | 12:50       |
| Who Is the Greatest?               | 10:41–45    | 22:24–27    |
| Two Greatest Commandments          | 12:28–34    | 10:25–28    |
| No One on the Roof or in the Field | 13:15–16    | 17:31       |
| Anointing of Jesus                 | 14:3–9      | 7:36–50     |
| Jesus Predicts His Betrayal        | 14:18–21    | 22:21–23    |
| Mocking of Jesus                   | 14:65       | 22:63–65    |
| Peter’s Denials                    | 14:66–72    | 22:56–62    |

Typically the argument regarding Luke 4:16–30; 5:1–11; 7:36–50; 10:25–28 would be that Luke is following L, but this only explains why Luke’s *wording* diverges so much from Mark’s; it does not explain why Luke’s *placement* would differ. Three of these four passages follow a double tradition passage. If Q included these passages as well, *that* would explain their placement in Luke: the Nazareth sermon comes immediately after the temptation narrative because it did so in Q; the anointing of Jesus

---

<sup>74</sup> Luke 6:38c, placed in the Sermon on the Plain, is not an exception even though Matthew has the same saying in the Sermon on the Mount, because Matthew and Luke disagree on where to put the Sermon on the Mount/Plain in Mark’s Gospel (after Mark 1:20 or after Mark 3:19).

comes immediately after the question of John’s disciples because that is where it is found in Q; the lawyer’s test comes immediately after the sending of the 72 because that is where it is found in Q. Christopher Tuckett has made a compelling case for the inclusion of Luke 4:16–30 in Q.<sup>75</sup> Luke 7:36–50 resembles Luke 11:37–54 (Q) in form,<sup>76</sup> has an interest in debts (cf. Q/Luke 11:4 and the Jubilee theme in Luke 4:16–30), and continues the interaction with Deut 6–8 and with Isaiah that is found elsewhere in Q.<sup>77</sup> Luke 10:25–28 has a number of minor agreements with Matthew and represents (in both Matthew and Luke) a test from a “lawyer”; lawyers occur elsewhere only in double tradition passages.<sup>78</sup> The fourth passage, Luke 5:1–11, follows a passage that according to Heinz Schürmann is another Mark-Q overlap passage, Luke 4:42–44,<sup>79</sup> and so this may be another case where Luke’s order can be explained by his following Q. Matthew may have decided to follow Mark for these passages, while Luke decided to follow Q, and so there are no major agreements here, but that does not mean that these passages were not in Q. Luke’s order suggests that they were.

The other passages also seem to have a relationship to Q. Luke 3:19–20 follows double tradition material.<sup>80</sup> Luke 8:4–21 follows a large block of Q/L (all Q?) material (Luke 6:12–8:3). It is generally thought that Luke is following Mark for Luke 8:4–21 but transposing the parables and the statement about Jesus’ mother and brothers, but there is a lot of evidence that Luke is still following Q here,

---

<sup>75</sup> Christopher M. Tuckett, *Q and the History of Early Christianity: Studies on Q* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1996), 221-237; cf. David B. Sloan, “Luke 3-4 – How Much Is From Q?” (paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Eastern Great Lakes Biblical Society, Erie, PA, 5 April 2013), online: <http://reconstructingQ.com/luke3-4.pdf>

<sup>76</sup> Joel B. Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 468.

<sup>77</sup> On the relationship between this passage and Deut 6-8 and Isaiah, see Vernon K. Robbins, *Who Do People Say I Am? Rewriting Gospel in Emerging Christianity* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2013), 85-87. On the possibility that Luke 7:36-50 is from Q, see Hawkins, “Probabilities,” 134.

<sup>78</sup> For a defense of the inclusion of Luke 10:25-37 in Q, see Sloan, “Lost Portions”; cf. Weiss, *Quellen des Lukasevangeliums*, 289-290; Streeter, “Original Extent,” 192; Jan Lambrecht, “The Great Commandment Pericope and Q,” in *The Gospel Behind the Gospels*, ed. Ronald A. Piper (Leiden: Brill Academic, 1997), 73-96.

<sup>79</sup> Schürmann, “Sprachliche Reminiszenzen.”

<sup>80</sup> Of all of the examples considered here, I am the least certain on Luke 3:19-20. Luke is not really transposing a Markan passage here but rather making a short historical comment that relates some basic details of Mark 6:17-29. It may be that Luke is not following Q here but is adding a parenthetical comment to his Q material.

though he may be bringing in details from Mark's version. Matthew begins with a phrase that is reminiscent of L (Matt 12:46a//Luke 11:27) and then Matthew 12:46–49 and Luke 8:19–21 have six minor agreements against Mark 3:31–35.<sup>81</sup> The presence of this pericope in the Gospel of Thomas, 2 *Clement*, and the Gospel of the Ebionites confirms that this is a common enough story that a Mark-Q overlap here would not be surprising. The same can be said of the parable of the Sower, where the agreements between Matt 13:10–13 and Luke 8:9–10 against Mark 4:10–12 are particularly significant. Luke is probably influenced by Mark here, but he may be more heavily influenced by Q.

Luke 12:1, 50; 17:31 are in the midst of Q passages, and Luke 12:1 even has a minor agreement (προσέχετε) with Matthew 15:6 against Mark. Luke 6:12–19 sets up the Sermon on the Plain, and here too there are minor agreements between Matthew and Luke: both have Jesus go on a mountain (Matt 5:1 = Luke 6:12), his disciples come to him (Matt 5:1 = Luke 6:12), and him heal many (Matt 4:23–25 = Luke 6:17–19) right before this sermon. Luke's language of people "coming to hear" (Luke 6:18) anticipates the end of the sermon, where Jesus criticizes those who "come to hear" his words and do not do them (Luke 6:47).<sup>82</sup>

Luke 22:21–23 and Luke 22:24–27 are in the Last Supper discourse, where Luke differs greatly from Mark and has double tradition material (Luke 22:28, 30). Could this entire discourse be from Q, with Matthew having omitted verses 21–27 because they parallel what he has copied elsewhere from Mark? In fact, Luke 22 as a whole diverges greatly from Mark and has numerous minor agreements with Matthew. In our list of Mark-John overlaps above, eleven of the nineteen overlaps are in the passion narrative. If someone were to write a new gospel and had Mark's and John's Gospels at hand and then one of the two sources got lost, would we recognize that this author is not diverging from one source but is combining two sources? If two new gospels were written today, one by an evangelist who prefers

---

<sup>81</sup> See Frans Neirynck, *The Minor Agreements in a Horizontal-Line Synopsis*, Studiorum Novi Testamenti Auxilia 15 (Leuven: Peeters, 1991), 85-87.

<sup>82</sup> Green, *Luke*, 261.

the first source and another by an evangelist who prefers the second source, would the differences between the two be similar to what we see in Matthew and Luke? Minimalist Q proponents widely agree that Q did not contain a passion narrative, but a Maximalist Q view makes a passion narrative in Q quite likely.

According to Acts 10:36–43 (cf. Acts 1:22; 13:23–31), the gospel spans from the baptism of John to the resurrection of Jesus. If Q did not begin with John’s baptism it would be easier to see Q as a “sayings gospel,” but Q begins the way the early Christian kerygma began; might not it have ended as the early Christian kerygma ended? Notably there are very Q-like sections in Luke’s passion narrative (esp. Luke 22:14–38; 23:27–31, 39–43). There are more significant minor agreements in the passion narrative than anywhere else in the Gospels. In one of these (Matt 27:40//Luke 23:37) the Matthean version is worded exactly like Q 4:3, 9. In my paper “A Passion Narrative in Q?” I go through all of the minor agreements in the Passion Narrative and the places where Luke diverges from Mark and demonstrate the likelihood that a complete non–Markan passion narrative is present here.<sup>83</sup>

Thus in every place where Luke diverges from Mark’s order the double tradition lurks in the background. This is best explained if it is Luke’s second source that leads him to diverge from Mark, in which case that second source cannot be Matthew, since Luke never agrees with Matthew *against Mark* on the placement of a passage.<sup>84</sup> Luke’s second source also cannot be Minimalist Q since this would not explain Luke’s divergent placement of the Anointing of Jesus, the Two Greatest Commandments, and many of the other passages discussed here, nor can it explain why there are minor agreements in many of these passages. It is more likely that Luke is using two sources: (1) Mark and (2) a source he shares with Matthew that includes much more than the double tradition. Luke does not transpose passages;

---

<sup>83</sup> David B. Sloan, “A Passion Narrative in Q?” (paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature, Atlanta, GA, November 2015), online: <http://reconstructingQ.com/passion.pdf>

<sup>84</sup> Any time Matthew places a Markan passage elsewhere in his gospel, Luke has it either in the Markan position or in an entirely different position. The Sermon on the Mount/Plain is no exception – Matthew places it after Mark 1:20 and Luke places it after Mark 3:19.

instead he omits Markan passages that are paralleled in Q (whereas Matthew is more likely to omit the Q version or to include materials from it in the Markan position). Luke's desire to give an "orderly account," then, is not a negative objection to the order of Mark or Q but a positive decision to weave together two sources that are difficult to harmonize because of their divergent placement of similar passages.<sup>85</sup>

## Conclusion

If we tried to reconstruct Mark using the principles that have been used in reconstructing Q, we would have about half of Mark and would lose many characteristic themes of Mark. This, I believe, we have done with Q. But the unity of the double tradition + M + L suggests that Matthew and Luke really did share a second source and that that source is much bigger than the double tradition. That source was likely a narrative gospel with a high concentration (over 80%) on direct discourse. Shared style and themes in the double tradition, M, and L can help identify passages in M and L that came from Q, as can Luke's placement of passages (almost everything in Luke 3:1–4:30; 6:12–8:3; 9:51–18:14; 22:14–23:48 came from Q). The Farrer Hypothesis can explain neither the unity of the double tradition + M + L nor Luke's failure to agree with Matthew against Mark on the placement of a single passage, but Minimalist Q cannot explain either the apparent narrative structure of Q 3–9, the unity of the double tradition + M + L, the significant minor agreements, or Luke's placement of certain passages. Therefore the Two-Document Hypothesis must be redefined to account for all of the data. A Maximalist Q approach would accomplish this.

---

<sup>85</sup> Pace Francis B. Watson, *Gospel Writing: A Canonical Perspective* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2013), 125.



## Bibliography

- Bacon, Benjamin W. "The Q section on John the Baptist and the SHEMONEH ESREH." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 45 (1926): 23–56.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Studies in Matthew*. New York: Henry Holt, 1930.
- Broadhead, Edwin K. "The Extent of the Sayings Tradition (Q)." Pages 718–728 in *The Sayings Source Q and the Historical Jesus*. Edited by Andreas Lindemann. Leuven: Peeters, 2001.
- Burkett, Delbert. *Rethinking the Gospel Sources, Volume 2: The Unity and Plurality of Q*. Early Christianity and Its Literature. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2009.
- Dunn, James D. G. "Jesus in Oral Memory: The Initial Stages of the Jesus Tradition." Pages 84–145 in *Jesus: A Colloquium in the Holy Land*. Edited by Doris Donnelly. New York/London: Continuum, 2001.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "John and the Oral Gospel Tradition." Pages 351–379 in *Jesus and the Oral Gospel Tradition*. Edited by H. Wansbrough. JSNTSup 64. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1991. Reprinted pages 138–163 in *The Oral Gospel Tradition*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2013.
- Eve, Eric. "Reconstructing Mark: A Thought Experiment." Pages 89–114 in *Questioning Q: A Multidimensional Critique*. Edited by Mark Goodacre and Nicholas Perrin. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2004.
- Fleddermann, Harry T. *Q: A Reconstruction and Commentary*, Biblical Tools and Studies. Leuven: Peeters, 2005.
- Goodacre, Mark. *The Case Against Q: Studies in Markan Priority and Synoptic Problem*. Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 2002.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Synoptic Problem: A Way through the Maze*. The Biblical Seminar. London: Sheffield Academic, 2001.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Ten Reasons to Question Q." Online: [www.markgoodacre.org/Q/ten.htm](http://www.markgoodacre.org/Q/ten.htm)
- Goulder, Michael D. *Luke: A New Paradigm*. 2 vols. JSNTSup 20. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989.
- Green, Joel B. *The Gospel of Luke*. NICNT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997.
- Grenfell, Bernard P., and Arthur S. Hunt. *ΛΟΓΙΑ ΙΗΣΟΥ: Sayings of our Lord*. London: Henry Frowde for the Egypt Exploration Fund, 1897.
- Harnack, Adolf von. *The Sayings of Jesus: The Second Source of St. Matthew and St. Luke*. London: Williams & Norgate, 1908.
- Hawkins, John Caesar. "Probabilities as to the So-Called Double Tradition of St. Matthew and St. Luke." Pages 95–138 in *Studies in the Synoptic Problem*. Edited by William Sanday. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1911.

- Huggins, Ronald V. "Looking for the Wrong Q in the Wrong Place." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the SBL. Baltimore, MD. 24 November 2013.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Q Never Goes Away, It Just Changes Shape." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the SBL. San Diego, CA. 22 November 2014.
- Jacobson, Arland D. "The Literary Unity of Q." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 101 (1982): 365–389.
- Kloppenborg, John S. *Excavating Q: The History and Setting of the Sayings Gospel*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2000.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Formation of Q: Trajectories in Ancient Wisdom Collections*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Jesus and the Parables of Jesus in Q." Pages 275–320 in *The Gospel Behind the Gospels: Current Studies on Q*. Edited by Ronald A. Piper. Novum Testamentum Supplements 75. Leiden: Brill Academic, 1997.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Q Parallels: Synopsis, Critical Notes & Concordance. Foundations & Facets*. Sonoma, CA: Polebridge, 1988.
- Lagrange, Marie-Joseph. "Les sources du troisième évangile." *RB* 4 (1895): 5–22.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Les sources du troisième évangile." *RB* 5 (1896): 5–38.
- Lambrecht, Jan. "The Great Commandment Pericope and Q." Pages 73–96 in *The Gospel Behind the Gospels*. Edited by Ronald A. Piper. Leiden: Brill Academic, 1997.
- Lock, Walter. "Interpretation of the Text." Pages 15–27 in *Two Lectures on the "Sayings of Jesus" Recently Discovered at Oxyrhynchus*. Edited by Walter Lock and William Sanday. Oxford: Clarendon, 1897.
- MacDonald, Dennis R. *Two Shipwrecked Gospels: The Logoi of Jesus and Papias's Exposition of Logia about the Lord*. Early Christianity and Its Literature 8. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2012.
- Neiryck, Frans. *The Minor Agreements in a Horizontal-Line Synopsis*. Studiorum Novi Testamenti Auxilia 15. Leuven: Peeters, 1991.
- Perrin, Nicholas. "The Limits of a Reconstructed Q." Pages 71–88 in *Questioning Q: A Multidimensional Critique*. Edited by Mark Goodacre and Nicholas Perrin. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2004.
- Poirier, John C. "The Q Hypothesis and the Role of Pre-Synoptic Sources in Nineteenth-Century Scholarship." Pages 13–27 in *Questioning Q: A Multidimensional Critique*. Edited by Mark Goodacre and Nicholas Perrin. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2004.
- Robbins, Vernon K. *Who Do People Say I Am? Rewriting Gospel in Emerging Christianity*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2013.

- Robinson, James M., 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*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2000.
- Schürmann, Heinz. "Sprachliche Reminiszenzen an abgeanderte oder ausgelassene Bestandteile der Spruchsammlung im Lukas- und Mattheusevangelium." *NTS* 6 (1959): 193–210.
- Sloan, David B. "Lost Portions of Q Found . . . in the Lukan Travel Narrative." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature. Chicago, IL. 18 November 2012. Online: <http://reconstructingQ.com/lost-portions.pdf>
- \_\_\_\_\_. "A Passion Narrative in Q?" Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature. Atlanta, GA. November 2015. Online: <http://reconstructingQ.com/passion.pdf>
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Q as a Narrative Gospel." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Eastern Great Lakes Biblical Society. Perrysville, OH, 12 March 2015. Online: <http://reconstructingQ.com/narrative.pdf>
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν Similitudes and the Extent of Q." *JSNT* (forthcoming). Online: <http://reconstructingQ.com/tis-ex-hymon.pdf>
- Streeter, Burnett Hillman. "The Original Extent of Q." Pages 184–208 in *Studies in the Synoptic Problem*. Edited by William Sanday. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1911.
- Tuckett, Christopher M. *Q and the History of Early Christianity: Studies on Q*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1996.
- Vassiliadis, Petros. *ΛΟΓΟΙ ΙΗΣΟΥ: Studies in Q*. University of South Florida International Studies in Formative Christianity and Judaism. Atlanta: Scholars, 1999.
- Watson, Francis B. *Gospel Writing: A Canonical Perspective*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2013.
- Weiss, Bernhard. *Die Quellen des Lukasevangeliums*. Stuttgart: J. G. Cotta, 1907.
- Wernle, Paul. *Die synoptische Frage*. Freiburg i. B.: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1899.