

# The τῖς ἐξ ὑμῶν Similitudes and the Extent of Q

Journal for the Study of  
the New Testament  
1–17

© The Author(s) 2016

Reprints and permissions:  
sagepub.co.uk/journalsPermissions.nav

DOI: 10.1177/0142064X15621655

jsnt.sagepub.com



**David B. Sloan**

Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, USA

## Abstract

Most recent studies of Q are built on the assumption that Q is not much more extensive than the double tradition, a questionable assumption given that Mark is much more extensive than the components of Mark that are found in *both* Matthew and Luke and that Matthew's selective rather than consecutive approach to Q may have caused him to leave out many verses of Q. This article considers three similitudes unique to Luke that begin with the phrase τῖς ἐξ ὑμῶν (Lk. 11.5-8; 14.28-33; 17.7-10) as well as one that is paralleled in Matthew but has been omitted from the *Critical Edition* (Lk. 14.5 *par.* Mt. 12.11-12) and argues that all four of these passages are from Q. The criteria of Vassiliadis and Kloppenborg for finding Q passages in Lukan *Sondergut* are used, with particular emphasis on Kloppenborg's 'stylistic coherence'.

## Keywords

Extent, Gospel of Luke, parables, sayings source, similitudes, synoptic problem, Q.

## Introduction

Gospels research has been greatly assisted by the publication of *The Critical Edition of Q* (*CritEd*; Robinson, Hoffmann and Kloppenborg 2000), but much of Q scholarship and *CritEd* in particular have been built on the assumption that Q is not much more extensive than the double tradition. In his commentary on Q, Harry Fleddermann (2005a: 74, emphasis mine) 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'. Others have argued for 'a very modest expansion of Q' that includes a few verses unique to either Matthew or Luke (Kloppenborg Verbin 2000: 99), but most of

---

### Corresponding author:

David B. Sloan, Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Deerfield, IL 60015 USA.

Email: david@davidbsloan.com

these expansions have been too modest.<sup>1</sup> Matthew omitted 113 of the 661 verses in Mark's gospel,<sup>2</sup> and Luke omitted 230 of them.<sup>3</sup> This means that 290 of Mark's verses (44%) are unparalleled in either Matthew or Luke.<sup>4</sup> It is unlikely, then, that Matthew and Luke *both* retained 'the entire contents of Q' (Fleddermann 2005a: 74) or even as high a percentage as the *Critical Edition of Q* or John Kloppenborg would propose.<sup>5</sup> The likelihood that Matthew retains such a significant percentage of Q *decreases* when we consider that Matthew does not follow the order of Q and so may have missed many verses that Luke retains. We cannot here consider all of the possibilities, but in this article we will consider four passages that share a feature with three known Q verses – an analogical rhetorical question beginning with  $\tau\acute{\iota}\varsigma \xi\acute{\xi}\ \acute{\upsilon}\mu\acute{\omega}\nu$ . In order to set the stage we will first consider the criteria for assigning Matthew's or Luke's special material to Q.<sup>6</sup>

Petros Vassiliadis (1999: 54) argues that unique Matthean or Lukan material can be identified as likely stemming from Q if some of the following conditions are met:

- (a) they have to do with components of either a text assigned to Q ... or a major unit of the document reconstructed so far; (b) they accord with the theological ideas of the Q-Document as reconstructed ... (c) they accord with the country-life language of Q; (d) they do not show any sign of editorial activity; (e) there are good reasons for the other Synoptist to have omitted them; (f) they fall into the Q-blocks of the so-called Great Insertion of Luke (9.51–18.14).

1. Notable exceptions include Schürmann 1968, Burkett 2009 and MacDonald 2012. Unfortunately these works have been unpersuasive for the majority of Q scholars. Schürmann and Burkett have not provided enough evidence in support of their proposals, and MacDonald has a unique view of the relationship between the gospels that not many will accept.
2. Mk 1.21, 23-28, 33, 35-39, 45; 2.27; 3.3, 9, 20-21, 28-30; 4.21-29; 5.8-10, 16, 18-21, 31-32, 35-36, 43; 6.12-13, 15, 30, 40, 52; 7.2-4, 9, 33-34, 36; 8.18, 22-26; 9.6, 10, 15-16, 20-24, 27, 33, 35, 38-41, 48-50; 10.10, 12, 15, 24, 50; 11.5-6, 11, 16, 18-19, 25; 12.32-34, 40-44; 13.11, 13, 37; 14.15, 51-52, 59; 15.25, 44; 16.3-4.
3. Mk 1.1, 6, 33; 3.11-12, 20-21, 28-30; 4.23, 26-29, 33-34; 5.32; 6.1-6, 17-29, 38; 6.45–8.26; 8.32-33, 37; 9.10-13, 16, 21-24, 26-30, 33, 35, 41-43, 45, 47-50; 10.1-12, 16, 24, 31, 35-36, 38-41; 11.11-14, 16, 20-25; 12.11, 32-33; 13.15, 18, 20-23, 32-36; 14.3-9, 19, 27-28, 31, 33, 39-42, 44, 46, 50-52, 55-60; 15.3-6, 8-10, 16-20, 23, 25, 35, 44-45; 16.3.
4. Sixty of the verses retained by Luke are missing in Matthew. Note that these statistics do not reflect verses that are partially paralleled in Matthew or Luke. Even more of Mark is omitted in one gospel or the other if we consider Mark's gospel at a clausal level.
5. *CritEd* adds only ten verses to the double tradition (Mt. 5.41; Lk. 12.49; 15.8-10; 17.20; and possibly Lk. 11.27-28; 17.28-29). John Kloppenborg adds 29 verses (Kloppenborg Verbin 2000: 99).
6. The existence of Q has increasingly come under fire in recent years. Space does not permit a defense of the Q thesis here, but the present author's defense of the Q thesis can be found online at <http://www.reconstructingQ.com/existence.php>. Also helpful are Fleddermann 2005a: 41-68 and, for both sides of the debate, Foster, Gregory, Kloppenborg and Verheyden 2011.

John Kloppenborg (Kloppenborg Verbin 2000: 95) suggests some ‘adjustments to these criteria’. He wants to give priority to ‘stylistic coherence (which is less subjective)’ over theological coherence (Criterion B), although theological coherence is important as well. We will make great use of the stylistic coherence criterion in this article. Kloppenborg also wants to modify Criterion D (signs of editorial activity). Because Matthew and Luke regularly edit Q passages, this criterion should instead consider ‘whether Matthew or Luke would have reason to *create* the pericope or saying to fulfill some editorial function ... and, conversely, whether there is any evidence of a prior independent existence’ (2000: 95). This adjustment is apropos. Kloppenborg also finds unhelpful the criteria of ‘country-life language’ and the ‘Great Insertion’ section (C and F), but if these criteria are used to supplement others they can be helpful. He is certainly correct that ‘agricultural language and metaphors can be found’ in a wide variety of documents (Kloppenborg Verbin 2000: 95-96), but, to the extent that they are more frequent in Q than in other gospels, their presence in a passage can slightly increase the chance that the passage is from Q. Likewise, Q passages are found outside the so-called Great Insertion, and there are passages within the Great Insertion that are probably not drawn from Q (e.g., Lk. 10.38-42). However, the fact that the majority of Q passages are found in this section of Luke naturally increases the chances that a passage is from Q if it is in the Great Insertion. This is why Vassiliadis looks for multiple criteria to be met. It would be unwise to argue that a passage is from Q because it meets *one or two* of these criteria, but when *multiple* criteria are met, this is significant. Therefore we will proceed with these six criteria with Kloppenborg’s first two modifications.

### The τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν Similitudes in Matthew and Luke

One feature we see repeatedly in the double tradition is the rhetorical question that begins with the phrase τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν:

|           |  |   |
|-----------|--|---|
| Mt. 7.9   | ἢ τίς ἐστὶν ἐξ ὑμῶν ἄνθρωπος, ὃν αἰτήσῃ ὁ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ ἄρτον, μὴ λίθον ἐπιδώσῃ αὐτῷ;   | Or what man is there among you who [when] his son asks him for bread will give to him a stone?  |
| Lk. 11.11 | τίνα δὲ ἐξ ὑμῶν τὸν πατέρα αἰτήσῃ ὁ υἱὸς ἰχθύνη, καὶ ἀντὶ ἰχθύος ὄφιν αὐτῷ ἐπιδώσῃ;  | What father among you will [his] son ask for a fish, and instead of a fish will give to him a serpent?                                    |
| Mt. 6.27  | τίς δὲ ἐξ ὑμῶν μεριμνῶν δύναται προσθεῖναι ἐπὶ τὴν ἡλικίαν αὐτοῦ πῆχυν ἓνα;  | Who among you by being anxious can add to his lifespan one hour?  |
| Lk. 12.25 | τίς δὲ ἐξ ὑμῶν μεριμνῶν δύναται ἐπὶ τὴν ἡλικίαν αὐτοῦ προσθεῖναι πῆχυν;  | Who among you by being anxious can to his lifespan add an hour?   |
| Mt. 12.11 | τίς ἔσται ἐξ ὑμῶν ἄνθρωπος ὃς ἔξει πρόβατον ἐν καὶ ἐὰν ἐμπέσῃ τοῦτο τοῖς σάββασιν εἰς βόθρουν, οὐχὶ κρατήσῃ αὐτὸ καὶ ἐγερεῖ; | What man will there be among you who has one sheep and if this one falls on the Sabbath into a pit will not take hold of it and raise it? |

|           |  |  |
|-----------|--|--|
| Lk. 14.5  | τίνος ὑμῶν υἱὸς ἢ βοῦς εἰς φρέαρ πεσεῖται, καὶ οὐκ εὐθέως ἀνασπάσει αὐτὸν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ τοῦ σαββάτου; <sup>7</sup>  | [Among] you, whose son or ox will fall into a well, and he will not immediately draw it out on the day of the Sabbath?   |
| Mt. 18.12 | Τί ὑμῖν δοκεῖ; ἐὰν γένηται τινὶ <sup>8</sup> ἀνθρώπῳ ἑκατὸν πρόβατα καὶ πλανηθῇ ἓν ἐξ αὐτῶν, οὐχὶ ἀφήσει τὰ ἐνενήκοντα ἐννέα ἐπὶ τὰ ὄρη καὶ πορευθεὶς ζητεῖ τὸ πλανώμενον; | What do you think? If a certain man has a hundred sheep, and one of them goes astray, will he not leave the ninety nine on the hills and go and seek the one going astray? |
| Lk. 15.4  | τίς ἀνθρώπος ἐξ ὑμῶν ἔχων ἑκατὸν πρόβατα καὶ ἀπολέσας ἐξ αὐτῶν ἓν οὐ καταλείπει τὰ ἐνενήκοντα ἐννέα ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ καὶ πορεύεται ἐπὶ τὸ ἀπολωλὸς ἕως εὕρη αὐτό;               | What man among you having a hundred sheep and losing one of them does not leave the ninety-nine in the wilderness and go after the lost one until he finds it?             |

Three other passages in Luke contain the phrase τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν, all of them introducing a similitude as part of a rhetorical question. Outside of Matthew and Luke, the expression is actually quite rare, occurring only twice in the LXX (2 Chron. 36.23; Hag. 2.3), once in the NT (Jn 8.46) and never in the Pseudepigrapha, Philo, Josephus, the Apostolic Fathers or the Greek Apocryphal Gospels.<sup>9</sup> Of the three occurrences outside of Matthew and Luke, none of them begins a similitude, whereas six of the seven occurrences in Matthew and Luke do, and the seventh is placed between two similitudes (Mt. 6.27 = Lk. 12.25).<sup>10</sup>

- A number of scholars have proposed that the differences between Mt. 12.11 and Lk. 14.5 suggest that these authors did not derive this verse from the same source. See below for a defense of the presence of this verse in Q.
- CritEd* rightly follows Luke here. Τί ὑμῖν δοκεῖ is very Matthean (Mt. 17.25; 21.28; 22.17, 42; 26.66; cf. Kloppenborg Verbin 2000: 96).
- More frequent are the similar expressions, τίς ὑμῶν (10×: 1 Esd. 2.33; 4 Macc. 3.3; 1 Cor. 6.1; Jas 1.5; 1 Pet. 4.15; Josephus, *Ant.* 12.283; *War* 4.44; 2 Clem. 9.1; Barn. 12.7; Herm. *Sim.* 9.28.6) and τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν (3×: Heb. 3.13; 4.1; Jas 2.16), but analogies beginning with τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν are unique to Matthew and Luke.
- τίς ὑμῶν is used in this way in Epictetus, *Diatr.* i.27.19, but this is the only example I could find of an analogical, rhetorical use of a phrase like this, and I have been unable to find the expression τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν used this way outside of these seven passages and later discussions of them. The phrase with the preposition reflects the Hebrew phrase בְּכֶּ מִי or the equivalent Aramaic phrase בְּכֶּ מִן. The LXX translates בְּכֶּ מִי as τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν in 2 Chron. 36.23 and Hag. 2.3 and as τίς ἐν ὑμῖν in Isa. 42.23; 50.10; Ezra 1.3. In none of these cases is the phrase used to begin an analogy or a rhetorical question. At Qumran בְּכֶּ מִי is attested three times. The first two occurrences (CD-A vi.13 and 4Q266) are quotations of Mal. 1.10, where BHS has מִי בְּכֶּ מִן (again, in neither a rhetorical question nor an analogy). The third occurrence (4Q381 f76–77.10) does begin a rhetorical question (“who would oppose God?”) but not as an analogy or in parabolic teaching, like we have in all seven passages in Luke. The phrase never occurs in the Tosefta, and the three occurrences in the Talmud are not in rhetorical questions or analogies (cf. *b. Abod. Zar.* 2b; *b. Ber.* 6b; *b. Meg.* 12b), which is significant since some of Jesus’ parables have rabbinic parallels, but without anything like the בְּכֶּ מִי phrase. Thus it appears that the use of τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν to begin a rhetorical question regarding an analogy is unique to Q and to those dependent upon Q.

Therefore it can be said that this use of *τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν* is unique to Q and to writers who follow Q. This is especially significant in light of the fact that there are parallels to two of these similitudes in *Thomas* and in rabbinic literature, and neither of these parallels contains an equivalent expression or even a rhetorical question (Q 15.4 = *Gos. Thom.* 107; Q 15.8 = *Song Rab.* 1.1.9). Rhetorical questions are abundant in Q (Fleddermann 2005a: 97), and when Q passages are paralleled in the *Gospel of Thomas*, the parallels do not contain the rhetorical questions (Q 6.34 [2×] = *Gos. Thom.* 95; Q 6.39 = *Gos. Thom.* 34; Q 6.41–42 [2×] = *Gos. Thom.* 26; Q 6.44 = *Gos. Thom.* 45; Q 12.28 = *Gos. Thom.* 36; Q 12.51 = *Gos. Thom.* 16; Q 12.56 = *Gos. Thom.* 91; Q 13.18 = *Gos. Thom.* 20 [but see Mk 4.30–32]; Q 13.20 = *Gos. Thom.* 96; Q 15.4 = *Gos. Thom.* 107; but see Q 7.24–26 [6×] = *Gos. Thom.* 78 [2×]).<sup>11</sup> Thus it is possible that the *τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν* form for similitudes is a feature introduced by Q. If so, we should consider the possibility that all seven *τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν* similitudes in Luke have come from Q. The *τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν* similitudes that are unparalleled in Matthew are as follows:

|           |   |   |
|-----------|---|---|
| Lk. 11.5  | <i>τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν</i> ἔξει φίλον καὶ πορεύσεται πρὸς αὐτὸν μεσονυκτίου καὶ εἶπῃ αὐτῷ ...;                                  | Who among you will have a friend and will go to him at midnight and would say to him ...?   |
| Lk. 14.28 | Τίς γὰρ ἐξ ὑμῶν θέλων πύργον οἰκοδομῆσαι οὐχὶ πρῶτον καθίσας ψηφίζει τὴν δαπάνην, εἰ ἔχει εἰς ἀπαρτισμόν;               | For who among you desiring to build a tower does not first sit down and calculate the cost, whether he has [enough] to complete [it]?           |
| Lk. 17.7  | Τίς δὲ ἐξ ὑμῶν δοῦλον ἔχων ἀροτριῶντα ἢ ποιμαίνοντα, ὃς εἰσελθόντι ἐκ τοῦ ἀγροῦ ἐρεῖ αὐτῷ· εὐθέως παρελθὼν ἀνάπεσε ...; | Who among you having a servant plowing or tending sheep, when he comes in from the field, will say to him, 'Come immediately and recline.' ...? |

All three of these passages are part of the so-called Great Insertion in Luke (Vassiliadis' Criterion F), all three follow a Q saying (Criterion A), and all three use the expression in the same way as it is used in Q: in a rhetorical question that includes a similitude that illustrates the point that Jesus just made (stylistic coherence, Criterion B). Of course it is possible that Luke is expanding Q passages by adding his own similitudes, using the style that he has picked up from Q (Fleddermann 2005b), or it is possible that the *τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν* similitude was part of traditions outside of Q (Bovon 2013: 100). Therefore we must examine these

11. In sum Q has 18 rhetorical questions in these 11 sayings that are paralleled in *Thomas*. Only one of these 11 sayings has rhetorical questions in *Thomas*, and even within that saying there are more rhetorical questions in the Q version (six) than in the *Thomas* version (two). If, on the one hand, *Thomas* represents an independent tradition, then this would suggest that the rhetorical question is a sign of Q's redaction. On the other hand, if *Thomas* is dependent upon the Synoptic Gospels, this at least demonstrates that a later writer would find unnecessary Q's proclivity toward rhetorical questions.

passages on a case-by-case basis. If they are Lukan creations, we would expect to find few un-Lukan expressions (cf. Criterion D). If they are from a tradition other than Q, we would expect the style, focus and theology to diverge from that of Q at various points (cf. Criteria B and C). If, however, they are from Q, we would expect to find neither to be the case and that we can offer a good reason for Matthew's omission of these passages (Criterion E). As will be shown, in each of these passages, all six criteria for identifying a Q passage in Luke's special material are met.

### The Ox in the Pit (Matthew 12.11 ~ Luke 14.5)

Although the International Q Project originally included Lk. 14.5 as a probable Q verse (Asgeirsson and Robinson 1992: 500-508), the editors of *CritEd* ruled against its inclusion. Nolland (1998: 746) argues that 'there is no significant common language between the two forms of the tradition, which probably suggests that the evangelists had different sources here'. In Matthew, the hearer's 'sheep' falls into a 'pit', and it is assumed that he 'will take hold of it and raise it out'. In Luke, the hearer's 'son or ox' falls into a 'well', and it is assumed that he will immediately 'draw it out'. These differences have led many to assume that, rather than seeing a shared written source here, we should see 'a favorite and well-known argument against Sabbath observation which circulated in the oral tradition' (Koester 1990: 147 n. 3). But it is also possible that these differences are related to Matthew's and Luke's redactional tendencies. Fleddermann (2005a: 709) notes that Matthew uses the word *πρόβατον* eleven times in comparison to Mark's two, Luke's two and John's one, and that Matthew even introduces the word into the text of Q 10.3 in Mt. 10.16. Luke may have added the word *υἱός* and changed the well into a pit to make the situation more dire, thus helping the reader to agree with Jesus' basic premise.<sup>12</sup> The change to a well necessitates a different verb: no longer can someone grab the animal and lift it out; now he must draw it with a rope. As Bovon remarks: 'Luke has accentuated the gravity of the risk and stressed the necessity of immediate assistance' (Bovon 2013: 345). Luke's insertion of the word *υἱός* into this *a priori* argument is so awkward that later copyists (cf.  $\aleph$  K L  $\Psi$  f 1.13 et al.) chose to change the word to *ὄνος*, reflecting Lk. 13.14 and Deut. 22.4 (Marshall 1978: 579-80). Thus, the passage in Q may well have looked like this: *καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν ἄνθρωπος ἔξει βοῦς καὶ πεσεῖται τοῖς σάββασιν εἰς βόθρον, καὶ οὐχὶ κρατήσῃ αὐτὸ καὶ ἐγερεῖ; πόσω οὖν διαφέρει ἄνθρωπος βοός.*

Fleddermann (2005a: 708-709) notes how such a saying reflects both 'the thought of Q' regarding the law (cf. Q 11.42; 16.16-18) and 'the diction and style

12. It is also possible that Luke saw something similar to Mt. 12.12a in his source and decided to make the jump from animal to man more explicit by using the word *υἱός*.

of Q' (cf. εἰς βόθυνον πεσοῦνται in Q 6.39; ἐγείρω in Q 3.8; 7.22; 11.31; the similar uses of ἔχω in Q 3.8; 7.2-3, 8, 33; 9.58 [2×]; 17.6; 19.24, 26 [3×]; and Q's frequent rhetorical questions, 39 of them by Fleddermann's count). To this we could add six observations.

(1) The introduction to the saying (Matthew: ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς; Luke: καὶ πρὸς αὐτοὺς εἶπεν) looks very much like the standard introduction to sayings in Q, καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς (Q 3.7; 4.8, 12; 7.9, 22; 9.58, 60; 10.21; 11.17, 29; 17.20; etc.). (2) In the Matthean version, τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν is followed by the word ἄνθρωπος, a construction attested in Q/Mt. 7.9, where the Lukan parallel omits ἄνθρωπος, and in Q/Lk. 15.4, where the Matthean parallel omits it. (3) Matthew's version includes the future indicative ἔξει, which is found in the τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν question in Lk. 11.5, which I will show next is from Q. The present participle of the same verb is found in the τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν questions in Q/Lk. 15.4, 8 as well as Lk. 17.7, which I will also demonstrate below to be from Q. (4) As in Mt. 7.9-10 = Q/Lk. 11.11-12, this τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν passage has gnomic future verbs in both the protasis and the apodosis, even though the gnomic future in a rhetorical question is un-Lukan (Jeremias 1980: 236). Matthew likely changed πεσεῖται to ἐμπέση when he added the word ἐάν, as he did in Mt. 18.12 (cf. Q/Lk. 15.4). (5) Matthew begins the apodosis with οὐχί, the same word that begins the apodosis in the τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν questions in Q/Mt. 18.12; Q/Lk. 15.8; Lk. 14.28, 31 (also Q, as will be shown below). (6) The Matthean version ends with a rhetorical question that looks like what we see elsewhere in Q: πόσῳ οὖν διαφέρει ἄνθρωπος προβάτου. The only other occurrences of διαφέρω in Matthew and Luke are in Q passages (Mt. 10.31 = Lk. 12.7; Mt. 6.26 = Lk. 12.24).

Thus all of the differences between Matthew and Luke can be attributed to their redaction of the same source, and there are numerous stylistic and thematic reasons to think that the source behind these is Q. Next we will consider the three τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν similitudes that are found in Luke alone.

## The Friend at Midnight (Luke 11.5-8)

Luke 11.5-8 falls between two Q passages that address the topic of prayer (Criterion A). While it could be argued that Luke expanded the Q passage by inserting vv. 5-8 in the middle, stylistic, structural and thematic evidence suggest that all of Lk. 11.2-13 is from Q.<sup>13</sup>

That the style is much closer to that of Q than Luke can be seen from a number of observations. First, as in Q 11.11-13; 14.5; 15.4-7, the τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν

13. Arguments for inclusion of this pericope in Q have been advanced in Catchpole 1993: 201-28; Kirk 1998: 176-82; Easton 1926: xxi, 177; Schmid 1930: 241-42; Knox 1957: II, 30; Schürmann 1968: 119; Burkett 2009: 79-80; MacDonald 2012: 374-76. These arguments have failed to convince the majority of Q scholars so far.

question contains the un-Lukan gnomic future verb (Jeremias 1980: 146, 221). Second, *καὶ εἶπεν* transitions, such as 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 are so un-Lukan that sometimes Luke will change the wording when copying these verses (Jeremias 1980: 33, 196-97; Schürmann 1968: 119; Cadbury 1920: 142-45). Over 50 sentences in *CritEd* begin with *καὶ*, but Luke's redactional sentences do not begin with *καὶ*. The opening *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 (Cadbury 1920: 105). Third, the paratactic structure of these verses is un-Lukan and is similar to what is seen elsewhere in Q (Jeremias 1980: 196-97; Nolland 1998: 623-24). *καὶ* is used to link clauses five times in vv. 5-7. Finally, the word *χρηζῶ* occurs in the gospels only here and in Mt. 6.32 = Q/Lk. 12.30, where it is also associated with seeking things from the Father. There are Lukan elements in the passage, such as the use of *πρὸς αὐτούς* after *εἶπεν* in v. 5, *ἐπειδὴ* in v. 6, or *εἰς* instead of *ἐν* in v. 7, but all of these appear to be improvements to a passage that must have already existed in a source of Luke's, and the stylistic affinities to Q suggest that that source is Q.

There are also structural reasons for seeing this as part of Q. First, the words and concepts that were used in bringing together Q 11.2-4 and Q 11.9-13 are present in vv. 5-8 (*ἄρτος*, vv. 3, 5, 11; *δίδωμι*, vv. 3, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13; the theme of patronage) (Kirk 1998: 179). Second, Alan Kirk (1998: 180, following Conley 1984: 175, 182-83) notes that '[v]erses 9-10 are enthymemic in form' and that '[t]he mid-speech position of this enthymeme is ... an indicator that 11:5-8 preceded it in Q, for in rhetorical practice the assertions of an enthymeme appearing in the middle of a speech commonly draw upon premises supplied by "proofs" preceding it in the speech'. He further notes that the presence of vv. 5-8 before vv. 9-10 would also 'explain why 11:9-10, taken alone, appears excessively optimistic and tautological'. Third, the enthymeme in Q 11.9 provides no objects for the asking, seeking and knocking. This may be because the objects were already explicated in vv. 5-8 (Catchpole 1993: 222).<sup>14</sup> Third, Joel Green (1997: 445; cf. Bovon 2013: 99) notes that 'Luke 11:5-13 divides easily into two sections (vv 5-10, 11-13), each with a similar structure: parabolic material (vv 5-8, 11-12) → ramifications (vv 9-10, 13)'. This parallel structure suggests that vv. 5-8 were already a part of the passage in Luke's source, a suggestion that is supported by

14. Kloppenborg (1987: 203 n. 132) argues that 'the *Gos. Thom.* version of the saying (92) shows that there is no need to explicate the objects'. This statement is surprising since *Gos. Thom.* 92 does refer to what the disciple is to seek after: 'what you asked me about in former times and which I did not tell you then' (cf. Koester 1996: 136). But even if it is not *necessary* to explicate the objects, it is *normally expected* that the objects of transitive verbs would be explicated. This is not the strongest evidence that vv. 5-8 came from Q, but it is evidence.



the observation that the ramifications for the first half, which are certainly in Q (Lk. 11.9-10 = Mt. 7.7-8) continue the image of asking, seeking and knocking that was introduced in the Lukan similitude (Schmid 1930: 241-42; Catchpole 1993: 222). Fourth, if Lk. 11.5-8 is from Q, then Q has a pair of analogies here separated by the word ἦ, which is a regular feature of Q (6.35, 39-40, 43-45; 7.33-34; 9.58; 11.11-12, 29-32; 12.24-28, 35-48; 13.18-20; 15.4-10; 17.26-32). Matthew 7.9 retains the ἦ from Q at the beginning of the latter similitude even though he does not have the earlier similitude, suggesting that the two similitudes were already together in Q (Catchpole 1993: 211, 222-23). Thus the structure of Q 11.2-14 must have been ‘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)’, a sequence that ‘is characteristic of Q composition, replicating the arrangement of’ Q 6.37-42, Q 12.22-31 and Q 6.27-35 (Kirk 1998: 177).

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 ἀντὶ. (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 ἦ 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 of Q 15.3-10 but retained in Matthew’s version, suggesting that the presence of these features in Lk. 11.5-8 is due not to Lukan creation or redaction but to a shared source. Thus it appears that Lk. 11.5-8 is from Q.

But why would Matthew not include Q 11.5-8? Two main reasons can be offered. First, Matthew places Jesus’ teachings on prayer in the Sermon on the Mount, but because he places the Lord’s Prayer in the 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. However, the τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν beginning of v. 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 – urging the hearer to ask, seek and knock (Mt. 7.7-8 = Q/Lk. 11.9-10) – without including the analogy of a friend knocking. As confirmation that Matthew has omitted something here, Matthew begins the second analogy with ἦ, even though he did not retain the first analogy (Mt. 7.9).

Second, Matthew may well have disliked this similitude, which compares God to a terrible friend who is moved only by the impudence of the one making

the request.<sup>15</sup> Indeed, the lesson in Q 11.5-8 is to continue asking, which is the very thing that Matthew urges against in Mt. 6.7-8! In fact, there are enough connections between Mt. 6.7-8 and Lk. 11.5-8 to suggest that Matthew may be reacting against what he has found in Q. Catchpole (1993: 225-26) notes that Mt. 6.7-8 differs from Mt. 6.2-6, 16-18 in that it gives different opponents (*ἐθνικοί* rather than *ὑποκριταί*), opposes them for a different reason, and does not address the theme of rewards. He argues that Mt. 6.7-8 is from Q, but it is more likely that Matthew has composed these verses in reaction to Q. Matthew teaches against the use of many words in prayer and says, 'Your Father knows what you need [*ὧν χρείαν ἔχετε*]' before you ask him'. This could be a Matthean response to the emphasis in Q that it is only because of tireless knocking that the giver gives 'whatever he needs [*ὅσων χρήζει*]' (Lk. 11.8).<sup>16</sup> Thus there are strong reasons to suggest that Matthew would not have copied Q 11.5-8 had he found it in his source.<sup>17</sup> This, combined with the reasons for seeing these verses as being from Q, suggests that this *τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν* similitude should be added to our reconstruction of Q. The similitude meets all of Vassiliadis's criteria, and the style and structure of the passage suggest that the entire passage comes from Q.

### Building a Tower or Going to War (Luke 14.28-33)

Another *τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν* question can be found at the beginning of Lk. 14.28-33. Like Lk. 11.5-13 and numerous other Q passages, Lk. 14.28-33 provides two similitudes to illustrate Jesus' point. Also like Lk. 11.5-8, it falls between two passages that are in *CritEd* (Lk. 14.26-27 || Mt. 10.37-38; Lk. 14.34-35 || Mt. 5.13), thus meeting Vassiliadis's Criterion A. In Luke the similitudes illustrate the point of the preceding verses and lead to the warning of the following verses. Together they form one speech without any indication of a change in setting. Therefore, there is good reason to think that vv. 28-33 may have been in Q. This is confirmed by an examination of the style of Lk. 14.28-33 and of the relationship between Q 14.26-27 and Q 14.34-35.

- 
15. On the debate regarding whether the *ἀναίδειαν* is related to the one making the request or the one inside the house, see especially Catchpole 1993: 204-207.
  16. Fitzmyer (1985: 910) also notes the stark contrast between Mt. 6.7-8 and Lk. 11.5-10. The fact that Matthew puts this immediately prior to the Lord's Prayer, taken from Q 11.2-4, is significant.
  17. The same can be said of the twin of this parable, Lk. 18.1-8. If there are passages that Matthew would likely not have copied had he seen them in his source, we must seriously consider the possibility that they could have been in that source. If there are great affinities between that passage and Q it is likely that it is from Q. Just as Matthew's omission of Mk 3.20-21, where Jesus' family decides that Jesus is out of his mind, is hardly a reason to suggest that these verses were not in Matthew's copy of Mark, Matthew's omission of Q 11.5-7 and 18.1-8 (with their unfavorable comparisons for God) is not strong evidence that these passages are not in Q.

The style contrasts that of the parallel in *Gos. Thom.* 98, where we have only one similitude, no rhetorical question and no  $\tau\acute{\iota}\varsigma \epsilon\acute{\xi} \acute{\upsilon}\mu\acute{\omega}\nu$  expression. *Gospel of Thomas* 98 begins, ‘The kingdom of the Father is like a man who wanted to kill a powerful one’. The differences between *Gos. Thom.* 98 and Lk. 14.28-33 are features of Q (double analogies, rhetorical questions,  $\tau\acute{\iota}\varsigma \epsilon\acute{\xi} \acute{\upsilon}\mu\acute{\omega}\nu \dots \eta \tau\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ ).<sup>18</sup> Moreover, the additional similitude in the Lukan version (building a tower) reflects the ‘country-life language’ of Q (Criterion C), assuming the tower is a watchtower/storage area for a farm or vineyard (so Marshall 1978: 593; Nolland 1998: 763; Bovon 2013: 390).

But the stylistic affinity of Lk. 14.28-33 to Q is most clearly seen by comparing Lk. 14.28-33 with Q 15.4-10: (1) Both passages contain two similitudes, the first beginning with  $\tau\acute{\iota}\varsigma \epsilon\acute{\xi} \acute{\upsilon}\mu\acute{\omega}\nu$  + pres. part., and the second with  $\eta \tau\acute{\iota}\varsigma$  + nom. ( $\gamma\upsilon\nu\eta/\beta\alpha\sigma\iota\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\upsilon\varsigma$ ) + pres. part. (2) In both passages, each similitude contains a rhetorical question in which the apodosis begins with  $\omicron\upsilon\chi\acute{\iota}$  (Lk. 14.28, 31; Q 15.4, 8). (3) Both passages feature the un-Lukan gnomic future. (4) Both passages follow the similitude with a concluding statement that begins with  $\omicron\upsilon\tau\omega\varsigma$ . If Lk. 14.28-33 is not taken from Q, its author meticulously mimicked the style of Q in composing it.

However, there are also problems with assuming that Lk. 14.28-33 was not in Q. Without this bridge between Q 14.26-27 (on hating family and taking up one’s cross) and Q 14.34-35 (on salt), the transition between these sayings is too abrupt. *CritEd* resolves this by following Matthew in placing Q 17.33 immediately after Q 14.26-27 (cf. Marshall 1978: 664; Kloppenborg 1987: 158-59). Matthew, however, is hardly a reliable guide to the placement of a Q passage, and Luke never moves a Markan passage to an entirely new context,<sup>19</sup> so there is little reason to think he does so with Q 17.33.<sup>20</sup> Matthew may have chosen to place Q 17.33 here because in Mk. 8.34-35 the saying about losing one’s life follows the saying about taking up the cross (Fleddermann 2005a: 762). Kloppenborg (1987: 157-58) argues that Q 17.33 could not follow Q 17.30, but if Lk. 17.31-32 is also from Q (and so we have a Mark-Q overlap), Q 17.33 fits well where Luke has it.<sup>21</sup> But if Luke has not relocated Q 17.33, then something else must have

18. Notably the only other  $\tau\acute{\iota}\varsigma \epsilon\acute{\xi} \acute{\upsilon}\mu\acute{\omega}\nu$  passage with a parallel in *Thomas* is Q 15.3-7, where the Thomasine version also begins, ‘The kingdom is like ...’ (*Gos. Thom.* 107).

19. In each of the possible examples (Lk. 3.19-20; 4.16-30; 5.1-11; 6.17-20; 7.36-50; 10.25-28; 22.24-30) it is clear that Luke is working with a different source.

20. *CritEd* has two pericopes displaced by Luke, this one and Q 15.4-10 (neither displacement is correct, in my opinion). The only other displaced pericopes in *CritEd* are adjacent pericopes that are swapped or, better, portions of a pericope that are swapped.

21. Kloppenborg (Kloppenborg Verbin 2000: 119-21) himself notes the importance of Lot for the author of Q, but he takes the reference to Lot’s wife in Lk. 17.32 as Lukan redaction based on the preceding reference to Lot in Q 17.28-30, largely because he sees Lk. 17.31 as redaction of Mk 13.15-16 (Kloppenborg 1987: 157-58), but others have made a case for the inclusion of vv. 31-32 in Q (Manson 1949: 144-45; Marshall 1978: 664).

provided the transition from Q 14.26-27 to Q 14.34-35. In Matthew's version of Q 14.35, Jesus says insipid salt is εἰς οὐδέν ἰσχύει ἔτι. The word ἰσχύω echoes the twofold use of that word in Lk. 14.29-30.<sup>22</sup> Thus it appears that in editing Q 14.35 Luke has obscured the catchword link that brought vv. 28-33 together with vv. 34-35.<sup>23</sup> Matthew's version of Q 14.35 shows the connection to Lk. 14.28-33 better than Luke's version, revealing that Luke must have taken the connection between vv. 28-33 and vv. 34-35 from Q.

Luke 14.28-33 also connects Q 14.26-35 more tightly with the preceding pericope in Q. In Q 14.18-20, people miss the eschatological banquet because they refuse to leave their new field, oxen and wife. In Q 14.26 the person who does not hate his family cannot be Jesus' disciple, and in Lk. 14.33 the person who does not leave possessions behind cannot be Jesus' disciple (Tannehill 1991: 157).<sup>24</sup> In fact this is in some ways the culmination of a theme that runs from Q 9.57 through Q 14.35. Q 14.26-27 and Lk. 14.33 give three things someone must do to be Jesus' disciple: hate family (14.26; cf. Q 9.57-62; 12.51-53; 14.20), take up one's cross (14.27) and leave one's possessions behind (14.33; cf. Q 6.30; 9.57-58; 10.4; 12.22-34; 14.18-19; 16.13). Each of these has parallels elsewhere in Q, but it is the third saying, which is not present in Matthew, that has the *most* connections with other Q passages. Luke likely took 14.33 from Q.

In addition, Fitzmyer (1985: 1063) notices the connection between Q 14.26 and the call of Elisha (especially via Q 9.59-62), but he fails to notice that Elisha left not only his parents but also his yoke of oxen, which he sacrifices before leaving everything to follow Elijah (cf. Q 14.18-19; Lk. 14.33). Thus, the same background that is reflected in Q 14.26 is also reflected in Lk. 14.33, suggesting that these verses were together from the beginning and are related to Q 9.59-62. Luke 9.61-62 (probably from Q) even uses the same juxtaposition of words, ἀποτάσσω and εὐθετός ἐστιν, as Lk. 14.33, 35.<sup>25</sup> Thus there is a consistent message in Q that a person must leave family (as in Q 14.26-27) and possessions (as in Lk. 14.33).

This shows that there are stylistic, structural and thematic reasons for thinking that Lk. 14.28-33 came from Q. These verses are a component of a passage that

22. The phrase may have also been in Q 14.31, where Luke replaced it with *δυνατός ἐστιν*.

23. Fleddermann (2005a: 757) argues for the originality of the Lukan reading since 'Luke uses the verb often so he had no reason to avoid it', but Fleddermann fails to note that every time ἰσχύω is used in this sense in Luke-Acts it is complemented by an infinitive (Lk. 6.48; 8.43; 13.24; 14.6, 29, 30; 16.3; 20.26; Acts 6.10; 15.10; 25.7; 27.16). Had Luke found an expression like the one in Mt. 5.13 in his source, we have no basis for saying that Luke would have preserved it.

24. Marshall (1978: 591) also notes that Lk. 14.28-33 addresses the opposite end of the spectrum that is already being addressed in Q 14.18-20: 'If the guests in the preceding parable refused to face the cost of accepting the invitation, other men may be tempted to underestimate the cost of discipleship and to embark on a course which is beyond their abilities'.

25. In both places Luke likely altered ἰσχύει to εὐθετός ἐστιν.

Luke derives from Q (Criterion A), they accord with the theology and style of Q (Criterion B) and with the country-life language of Q (Criterion C), and they are found in Luke's so-called Great Insertion (Criterion F). While there are redactional elements in vv. 28-33, almost all commentators agree that these verses are not due to Lukan creation (Criterion D). The only question that remains is why Matthew would have omitted these verses.

Matthew placed Q 14.34-35 in the Sermon on the Mount alongside the light saying, and he placed Q 14.26-27 in the Missionary Discourse as part of his description of the family conflict that will arise. In either position Q 14.28-33 would create too much of a disjunction. Matthew could have returned to the skipped verses elsewhere, but he had already taken three sayings from this pericope, and so he may not have seen a need to retain these verses that did not fit well in the contexts where he placed the rest of the pericope. It should not surprise us that as Matthew places portions of Q pericopes in new contexts he loses other portions of the same pericopes.

### **The Servant Is Not Thanked (Luke 17.7-10)**

As with the previous passages, this one meets all of the given criteria for inclusion in Q. The τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν question in Lk. 17.7 follows a quotation that comes directly from Q, and in Luke there is no interruption between v. 6 and vv. 7-10; Lk. 17.6-10 reads as one continuous speech of Jesus (Criterion A). I will demonstrate below that this passage coheres stylistically and theologically with Q (Criterion B). As Fitzmyer (1985: 1146) has noted, 'Envisioned is a small farmer who has one servant who not only works his farm (plowing and tending sheep) but also prepares his meals'.<sup>26</sup> Thus the similitude 'accord[s] with the country-life language of Q' (Criterion C). It is not clear why Luke would have created these verses to go here if he had not found them in his source (Kloppenborg's modification to Criterion D). Matthew placed Q 17.6 in the narrative of the demon that the disciples could not cast out (Mt. 17.14-20), where vv. 7-10 would not fit, so there is reason for Matthew to have omitted these verses. Furthermore, this similitude sharply contrasts Matthew's rewards theology, since, as Minear (1974: 84) notes, Jesus is here 'ruling out any expectation of rewards according to merit' (Criterion E). Finally, the passage falls into one of 'the Q-blocks of the so-called Great Insertion of Luke' (Criterion F). There is ample reason, then, to think that this passage is from Q. Let us note a few stylistic and structural connections between Lk. 17.7-10 and Q to strengthen this case.

26. Green (1997: 614) and Bovon (2013: 496) make similar statements. Bailey (1980: 114-15) notes that it is not only the wealthy who have servants in the Middle East, but also 'the people of very little means' (cf. Mk 1.20).

(1) The embedding of a similitude in a rhetorical question beginning with *τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν* is a feature of Q. This similitude has a parallel in *m. Ab.* 1.3, 2.8, where it is not phrased as a rhetorical question and we do not find the expression *τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν*. (2) We have here three rhetorical questions. Jeremias (1980: 263) notes that Luke does not himself construct double or triple questions, but this 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). (3) Jeremias (1980: 263) argues that the pleonastic use of *παρελθών*, only here and in Lk. 12.37, which some have attributed to Q, is pre-Lukan. (4) We again have an un-Lukan, Q-like gnomic future in a rhetorical question (cf. Q 11.5-8, 11-13; 14.5, 31; 15.4-8). (5) Jeremias (1980: 216, 263) argues that the absolute use of *οὕτως* occurs in Luke only when he is adopting it from his source (Lk. 12.21; 14.33; 15.7, 10; 17.10; 21.31; 22.26). In at least three, if not more, of these examples, that source is Q. (6) The structure is similar to that of Q 15.4-10. Following *τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν* is the present participle *ἔχων* and then an aorist participle (so Q 15.4). The similitude also hinges on the word *οὐχί*, after which the main character speaks, beginning with an aorist imperative (Lk. 17.8; cf. Q 15.4-6, 8-9), and it is concluded with a statement that begins with *οὕτως* (Lk. 17.10; cf. Q 15.7, 10). (7) The comparison of disciples to servants before a master is also found in Q 12.35-48 and 19.12-27. (8) The shift of focus from the central figure in the similitude to those subordinate to him in the final verse (here, v. 10) is reminiscent of Q 11.9-10 and Q 11.13 (cf. Nolland 1998: 842).<sup>27</sup> Finally, (9) we should note that in Lk. 17.10 the servants describe themselves as *ἀχρεῖοι*, a word that occurs elsewhere in the NT only in the Matthean version of Q's parable of the Entrusted Money, where it also describes a servant, but this time on the lips of the master (Q/Mt. 25.30). It is unlikely that Luke has created all of this in an effort to mimic Q, especially since there is widespread agreement that at least v. 7, if not all of vv. 7-10, is pre-Lukan.<sup>28</sup> Therefore we must conclude that Luke drew this passage from Q.

## Implications

*The Critical Edition of Q* and most studies of Q today are built on the assumption that Q is not much more extensive than the double tradition. The fact that Mark is

27. Bovon (2013: 493-94) suggests that v. 10 was added to the traditional similitude by the author of L. If Bovon is correct that these conclusions were not part of the oral tradition, it is likely the author of Q who adds them, as they are explicit in each of the *τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν* similitudes.

28. Crossan (1974: 30-31) argues that vv. 8-9, 10b are Lukan but attributes vv. 7, 10ac to Q! Previously Weiser (1971: 107-14) had suggested that Lk. 17.7, 9, 10ac come from Q, while v. 8 was added by Luke. Minear (1974: 87) concludes that vv. 7-9 come from Luke's source. Dupont (1984: 233-51) has made a compelling case that vv. 7-10 all come from Luke's source. Fitzmyer (1985: 1145) attributes a word or two in each verse to Luke but argues that 'the rest is derived from the pre-Lukan source' (cf. Jeremias 1980: 263; Nolland 1998: 841-42). Bovon (2013: 493-97) contends that v. 10 was a later addition but still pre-Lukan.

much more extensive than the components of Mark that are found in *both* Matthew and Luke has led some to challenge this assumption, especially since Matthew's selective rather than consecutive approach to Q may have caused him to leave out many verses in Q. This article has considered only the *τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν* similitudes and has shown the likelihood that all of them are from Q even though Matthew omits three of them. This would suggest that there are other passages from Q that Matthew and/or Luke have omitted. The criteria formulated by Vassiliadis, with some modifications from Kloppenborg, can be helpful in identifying Q passages in the Matthean and Lukan *Sondergut*. It is right for us to be cautious in expanding our reconstruction of Q beyond the double tradition, but we should be equally cautious about attempting to discern the theology of Q and the nature of the Q community without considering other potential Q passages (so Broadhead 2001). This article provides a model for how we can proceed in identifying these passages.

## References

- Asgeirsson, Jon Ma. and James M. Robinson  
 1992 'The International Q Project: Work Sessions 12–14 July, 22 November 1991', *JBL* 111: 500-508.
- Bailey, Kenneth E.  
 1980 *Through Peasant Eyes: More Lucan Parables, their Culture and Style* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans).
- Bovon, François  
 2013 *Luke 2: A Commentary on the Gospel of Luke 9:51–19:27* (trans. Donald S. Deer; Hermeneia; Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press).
- Broadhead, Edwin K.  
 2001 'The Extent of the Sayings Tradition (Q)', in Andreas Lindemann (ed.), *The Sayings Source Q and the Historical Jesus* (Leuven: Peeters): 719-28.
- Burkett, Delbert  
 2009 *Rethinking the Gospel Sources. II. The Unity and Plurality of Q* (Early Christianity and its Literature; Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature).
- Cadbury, Henry J.  
 1920 *The Style and Literary Method of Luke* (HTS, 6; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press).
- Catchpole, David R.  
 1993 *The Quest for Q* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark).
- Conley, Thomas M.  
 1984 'The Enthymeme in Perspective', *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 70: 168-87.
- Crossan, John Dominic  
 1974 'The Servant Parables of Jesus', in R.W. Funk (ed.), *A Structuralist Approach to the Parables* (Semeia, 1; Missoula, MT: Society of Biblical Literature): 17-62.

- Dupont, Jacques  
 1984 'Le maître et son serviteur (Luc 17, 7–10)', *ETL* 60: 233-51.
- Easton, Burton Scott  
 1926 *The Gospel According to St. Luke* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark).
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A.  
 1985 *The Gospel According to Luke X–XXIV: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB, 28A; Garden City, NY: Doubleday).
- Fleddermann, Harry T.  
 2005a *Q: A Reconstruction and Commentary* (Leuven: Peeters).  
 2005b 'Three Friends at Midnight (Luke 11,5–8)', in R. Bieringer, G. Van Belle, J. Verheyden (eds.), *Luke and his Readers: Festschrift A. Denaux* (BETL, 182; Leuven: Leuven University Press): 265-82.
- Foster, Paul, Andrew Gregory, John S. Kloppenborg and J. Verheyden (eds.)  
 2011 *New Studies in the Synoptic Problem* (BETL, 239; Leuven: Peeters).
- Green, Joel B.  
 1997 *The Gospel of Luke* (NICNT; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans).
- Jeremias, Joachim  
 1980 *Die Sprache des Lukasevangeliums: Redaktion und Tradition im Nicht-Markusstoff des dritten Evangeliums* (KEK Sonderband; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).
- Kirk, Alan  
 1998 *The Composition of the Sayings Source: Genre, Synchrony, and Wisdom Redaction in Q* (NovTSup, 91; Leiden: Brill).
- Kloppenborg, John S.  
 1987 *The Formation of Q: Trajectories in Ancient Wisdom Collections* (SAC; Philadelphia: Fortress Press).
- Kloppenborg Verbin, John S.  
 2000 *Excavating Q: The History and Setting of the Sayings Gospel* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press).
- Knox, Wilfred L.  
 1957 *The Sources of the Synoptic Gospels* (ed. H. Chadwick; 2 vols.; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Koester, Helmut  
 1990 *Ancient Christian Gospels: Their History and Development* (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press).  
 1996 'The Gospel of Thomas', in J.M. Robinson (ed.), *The Nag Hammadi Library in English* (trans. T.O. Lambdin; 4th rev. edn; Leiden: Brill): 124-38.
- MacDonald, Dennis R.  
 2012 *Two Shipwrecked Gospels: The Logoi of Jesus and Papias's Exposition of Logia about the Lord* (SBLECL, 8; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature).
- Manson, T.W.  
 1949 *The Sayings of Jesus* (London: SCM Press).



Marshall, I. Howard

- 1978 *The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGTC; Exeter: Paternoster Press).

Minear, Paul S.

- 1974 'A Note on Luke 17.7–10', *JBL* 93: 82-87.

Nolland, John

- 1998 *Luke 9:21–18:24* (WBC, 35B; Dallas: Word).

Robinson, James M., Paul Hoffmann and John S. Kloppenborg (eds.)

- 2000 *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, MN: Fortress Press).

Schmid, Josef

- 1930 *Matthäus und Lukas: Eine Untersuchung des Verhältnisses ihrer Evangelien* (BS, 23; Freiburg: Herder & Herder).

Schürmann, Heinz

- 1968 *Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu den synoptischen Evangelien* (Düsseldorf: Patmos-Verlag).

Tannehill, Robert C.

- 1991 *The Narrative Unity of Luke–Acts: A Literary Interpretation. I. The Gospel According to Luke* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press).

Vassiliadis, Petros

- 1999 *ΛΟΓΟΙ ΙΗΣΟΥΣ: Studies in Q* (Atlanta: Scholars Press).

Weiser, Alfons

- 1971 *Die Knechtsgleichnisse der synoptischen Evangelien* (Munich: Kösel).