

Lost Portions of Q Found! . . . in the Lukan Travel Narrative
ALTERNATIVE TITLE: Q Must Increase, L Must Decrease: A Reconsideration of
the Extent and Structure of Q

By David B. Sloan (dsloan@neo.rr.com)

The increasing agreement among scholars that Q was written in Greek,¹ that differences between the wording of Q material in Matthew and in Luke can be attributed to Matthean and Lukan redactional tendencies rather than to different versions of Q,² and that Luke generally preserves the order of Q,³ has allowed scholars to reconstruct Q with a high level of confidence. In particular the International Q Project has produced the *Critical Edition of Q* (hereafter: CEQ) as a basic text for further discussion of Q. But what if the extent of Q has been severely underestimated by scholars, who typically consider not much more than the double tradition? If one were to reconstruct Mark using only the overlap between Matthew and Luke, he/she would reconstruct a mere 327 of Mark's 661 verses (49%), and yet if one also considers material that is copied only by Matthew or only by Luke, he/she could – with the right criteria – reconstruct 629 of

¹ See especially Heinz O. Guenther, “The Sayings Gospel Q and the Quest for Aramaic Sources: Rethinking Christian Origins,” in *Early Christianity, Q and Jesus* (ed. John S. Kloppenborg and Leif E. Vaage; *Semeia* 55; Atlanta: SBL, 1992), 41-74, and John S. Kloppenborg Verbin, *Excavating Q: The History and Setting of the Sayings Gospel* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2000), 72-80.

² James McConkey Robinson, Paul Hoffmann, and John S. Kloppenborg, *The Critical Edition of Q: Synopsis Including the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, Mark and Thomas with English, German, and French Translations of Q and Thomas* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2000), xix.

³ Robinson, Hoffmann, and Kloppenborg, *Critical Edition*, xlvi-xlvi, lxxxix; Vincent Taylor, “The Original Order of ‘Q’,” in *New Testament Essays* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1972), 95-118. So Kloppenborg, *Excavating Q*, 111: “The conclusions that Q was a Greek document and that it conformed generally to Luke's sequence are not further hypotheses added onto the 2DH, but are entailed in the 2DH by the very nature of the Synoptic data themselves.”

Mark's 661 verses (95%).⁴ This paper will explore the possibility that Q is longer than is typically assumed by investigating the style of Q along with Luke's redactional tendencies. Such an analysis suggests that many verses unique to the Lukan travel narrative were from Q. This suggestion is confirmed by a study of the resultant structure of Q. We begin our study with two stylistic features that are peculiar to Q and to the Lukan travel narrative.

Peculiarity #1: The τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν Question

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

Matt 7:9 – τίς ἐστιν ἐξ ὑμῶν ἄνθρωπος, ὃν αἰτήσῃ ὁ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ ἄρτον, μὴ λίθον ἐπιδώσῃ αὐτῷ;

Luke 11:11 – τίνα δὲ ἐξ ὑμῶν τὸν πατέρα αἰτήσῃ ὁ υἱὸς ἰχθύν, καὶ ἀντὶ ἰχθύος ὄφιν αὐτῷ ἐπιδώσῃ;

Matt 6:27 – τίς δὲ ἐξ ὑμῶν μεριμνῶν δύναται προσθεῖναι ἐπὶ τὴν ἡλικίαν αὐτοῦ πῆχυν ἓνα;

Luke 12:25 – τίς δὲ ἐξ ὑμῶν μεριμνῶν δύναται ἐπὶ τὴν ἡλικίαν αὐτοῦ προσθεῖναι πῆχυν;

Matt 12:11 – τίς ἔσται ἐξ ὑμῶν ἄνθρωπος ὃς ἔξει πρόβατον ἐν καὶ ἐὰν ἐμπέσῃ τοῦτο τοῖς σάββασις εἰς βόθυνον, οὐχὶ κρατήσῃ αὐτὸ καὶ ἐγερεῖ;

Luke 14:5 – τίνας ὑμῶν υἱὸς ἢ βοῦς εἰς φρέαρ πεσεῖται, καὶ οὐκ εὐθέως ἀνασπάσει αὐτὸν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ τοῦ σαββάτου;⁵

⁴ For these numbers I follow Streeter's list of Markan verses that are paralleled in Matthew and Luke (Burnett Hillman Streeter, *The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins, Treating of the Manuscript Tradition, Sources, Authorship, & Dates* [New York: MacMillan, 1924], 159-160, 195-198).

⁵ Luke has heavily redacted Q here. The fact that these two verses come from Q will be defended in the next section of this paper.

Luke 15:4 – τίς ἄνθρωπος ἐξ ὑμῶν ἔχων ἑκατὸν πρόβατα
καὶ ἀπολέσας ἐξ αὐτῶν ἓν οὐ καταλείπει τὰ ἐνενήκοντα
ἐννέα ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ καὶ πορεύεται ἐπὶ τὸ ἀπολωλὸς ἕως
εὗρη αὐτό;

Matt 18:12 – Τί ὑμῖν δοκεῖ; ἐὰν γένηται τινι⁶ ἄνθρωπῳ
ἑκατὸν πρόβατα καὶ πλανηθῇ ἓν ἐξ αὐτῶν, οὐχὶ ἀφήσει τὰ
ἐνενήκοντα ἐννέα ἐπὶ τὰ ὄρη καὶ πορευθεὶς ζητεῖ τὸ
πλανώμενον;

Outside of Matthew and Luke, this expression is actually quite rare, occurring only twice in the LXX (2 Chron 36:23; Hag 2:3), once in the NT (John 8:46), and never in Josephus, Philo, the apostolic fathers, or the *Perseus Classics Collection*.⁷ Of the three occurrences outside of Matthew and Luke, none of them begins an analogy as do all of the occurrences in Matthew and Luke. Therefore it can be said that this use of τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν is unique to Q and to writers who follow Q. Is it possible that all of the analogies that begin with τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν are from Q? In addition to the four listed above, we have three other occurrences in Luke and none in Matthew:

Luke 11:5 – τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν ἔξει φίλον καὶ πορεύσεται πρὸς
αὐτὸν μεσονυκτίου καὶ εἴπη αὐτῷ . . . ;

⁶ CEQ rightly follows Luke here. Τί ὑμῖν δοκεῖ is very Matthean (cf. Matt 17:25; 21:28; 22:17, 42; 26:66), and Matthew's use of that expression here likely explains his redaction of Q's τίς ἄνθρωπος ἐξ ὑμῶν.

⁷ In the classics τίς ὑμῶν or τις ὑμῶν occurs over 100 times, but τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν *never* occurs, and only once do we find τις ἐξ ὑμῶν (Sophocles, *Oed. col.*, 70, where Oedipus says, ἄρ' ἄν τις αὐτῷ πομπὸς ἐξ ὑμῶν μόλοι;). In the LXX we have a couple occurrences of τις ὑμῶν (1 Esd 2:33; 4 Macc 3:3) and a couple occurrences of τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν (2 Chron 36:23; Hag 2:3). Neither expression occurs in the Pseudepigrapha or Philo. In Josephus and the apostolic fathers, we have respectively two and three occurrences of τις ὑμῶν (*Ant.* 12.283; *J.W.* 4.44; 2 *Clem.* 9.1; *Barn.* 12.7; *Herm. Sim.* 9.28.6), but none of τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν or τις ἐξ ὑμῶν. In the New Testament, τίς ὑμῶν occurs in 1 Cor 6:1; τις ὑμῶν in Jas 1:5 and 1 Pet 4:15; τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν in Heb 3:13; 4:1; Jas 2:16; and τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν in John 8:46 and in the passages under consideration here.

Luke 14:28 – Τίς γὰρ ἐξ ὑμῶν θέλων πύργον οἰκοδομῆσαι οὐχὶ πρῶτον καθίσας ψηφίζει τὴν δαπάνην, εἰ ἔχει εἰς ἀπαρτισμόν;

Luke 17:7 – Τίς δὲ ἐξ ὑμῶν δοῦλον ἔχων ἀροτριῶντα ἢ ποιμαίνοντα, ὃς εἰσελθόντι ἐκ τοῦ ἀγροῦ ἐρεῖ αὐτῷ· εὐθέως παρελθὼν ἀνάπεσε . . . ;

Notice that all three of these passages use the expression the same way it is used in Q: to begin an analogy that illustrates the point that Jesus just made. While it is possible that Luke imitates Q's style in creating his own material⁸ or that another source coincidentally uses an expression that is also in Q (and not used the same way in any other Greek writing), the simplest solution is that all three of these analogies come from Q. A consideration of each passage will strengthen this theory.

Luke 11:5-8: The Friend at Midnight. The first thing to note about Luke 11:5-8 is that it falls between two Q passages that also address the topic of prayer. While it could be argued that Luke expanded the Q passage by inserting verses 5-8 in the middle or that Q 11:2-4 and Q 11:9-13 were not originally together and Luke has brought together one Q passage, one L passage, and another Q passage, it is far more likely that all of Luke 11:2-13 is from Q. This is confirmed by a number of observations. First, τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν (11:5) is a common expression in Q. Just as in Q 11:11-13; 14:5; 15:4-7, the question contains a gnomic future verb, which is in the words of Jeremias “nicht lukanisch.”⁹ Second, καὶ εἶπεν transitions similar to the one in 11:5 are common in Q (4:3, 6, 8, 9, 12;

⁸ So Harry T. Fleddermann, *Q: A Reconstruction and Commentary* (Leuven: Peeters, 2005), 74.

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

7:9, 19, 22; 9:57, 58, 59, 60; 10:21; 11:15, 17; 17:20; 19:13, 17, 19), and over 50 sentences in CEQ begin with καί, whereas Luke does not begin sentences with καί unless he finds them in his source and often not even then.¹⁰ The beginning καί 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. Third, the concept of asking, seeking, and knocking in Q 11:9-10 is intricately connected to Luke 11:5-8 and serves well as that parable's conclusion.¹¹ Fourth, the person asking his friend for bread (11:5-10) and the son asking his father for bread (11:11-13) serve as a pair of analogies.¹² Q regularly presents analogies in pairs,¹³ and often these pairs are separated by ἢ. Matt 7:9

¹⁰ Jeremias, *Sprache*, 33, 196-197. According to Jeremias, πρὸς αὐτούς is Lukan, but this likely means no more than that Luke changed Q's καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ to καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς. Luke changes the object of εἶπον from Mark's dative case to πρὸς + acc. in Luke 4:43; 5:22, 31, 33, 34; 6:3, 9; 8:22, 25; 9:13, 14, 33, 43; 19:33; 20:2, 3, 23, 25, 52; 24:5; and according to CEQ he does the same with Q in Luke 7:40; 9:57, 59; 10:26, 29; 11:39; 12:3. The presence of a Lukan stylistic feature here does not negate the presence of an unlukan feature, which Jeremias rightly recognizes as being introduced through Luke's source and which I claim is a regular feature of Q.

¹¹ David Catchpole, "Q and the 'Friend at Midnight' (Luke xi.5-8/9)," *JTS* 34 (1983): 407-424, esp. pp. 418-419.

¹² Catchpole, "Q and the 'Friend at Midnight,'" 419.

¹³ In Q 6:29 Jesus applies a lesson to two situations: being struck on the cheek and having your cloak stolen (Matthew's going the extra mile is probably a Matthean addition). In Q 6:35 Jesus speaks of God causing his sun to rise on the wicked and the good and sending rain on the righteous and the unrighteous (here it is Matthew that follows Q; so CEQ). In Q 6:39-40 Jesus uses the analogies of a blind person leading a blind person and a teacher with his disciple. In Q 6:43-45 he uses the analogies of a tree with its fruit and a person with treasure. In Q 6:44 he gives two examples of fruit that does not grow on the wrong tree. In Q 7:24-25 he gives a reed shaken by the wind and a man dressed in soft clothing as examples of things the crowds did not go into the wilderness to see. In Q 7:32 he speaks of children playing a flute and a dirge. In Q 9:58 he gives foxes and birds as two examples of creatures that have no home. In Q 10:13 he pronounces a woe upon Chorazin and a woe upon Bethsaida. If not only Matt 11:21-23 but also verse 24 comes from Q (cf. Luke 10:13-15), then twice here Jesus compares

retains the ἦ from Q even though it is missing the first analogy. Fifth, as Alan Kirk has observed, “the sequence of programmatic instruction (11:2-4) + illustrative rhetorical question [11:5-8] + central gnomes (11:9-10) + illustrative rhetorical questions (11:11-12) + closing application (11:13) is characteristic of Q composition, replicating the arrangement of Q 6:37-42 (Judge Not), and . . . of Q 12:22-31 (Do Not Be Anxious), as well as approximating to the structure of Q 6:27-35 (Love Your Enemies).”¹⁴

We could also note the following similarities between Q 11:5-13 and Q 15:3-10:

1) Jesus’ speech is introduced with καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς. 2) Jesus begins with the words τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν followed by a form of ἔχω. 3) A second analogy is given, beginning with the words 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 modern cities to ancient cities. In Q 11:11-12 Jesus lists two things a son may ask a father for that the father will not replace with something worse. In Q 11:29-32 he uses the examples of Jonah and the queen of the South. In Q 11:42-52 he speaks woes first against Pharisees and then against lawyers. In Q 12:3 he speaks of what has been said in the dark and what has been whispered in the ear. In Q 12:22 he says to not be anxious about your life or your body. In Q 12:24, 27-28, Jesus tells the hearer to consider the ravens and to consider the lilies. In Q 12:33 he speaks of there being in heaven no thief and no moth. In Q 12:35-48 Jesus gives the examples of men waiting for the master to come home from the wedding feast and the master of a house being prepared for a coming thief. In Q 12:54-55 he speaks either of a cloud in the west and a south wind (Luke) or more likely a red sky in the evening and a red sky in the morning (Matthew). In Q 13:18-20 he compares the kingdom of God to a grain of mustard seed and to leaven. In Q 15:4-10 Jesus gives the parable of the Lost Sheep followed by the Lost Coin. In Q 16:18 Jesus applies his teaching to both the one divorcing his wife and the one marrying the divorced woman. In Q 17:26-32 both Noah and Lot are given as examples of what it will be like on the day that the Son of Man is revealed (CEQ needs to add the second example; for more evidence, see Kloppenborg, *Excavating Q*, 94f). In Q 17:34-35 he gives two situations in which one person is taken and another is left behind.

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

adverbial conjunction (ἐπειδὴ in 11:6; ὅτι in 15:6). 6) Jesus follows the first analogy with a λέγω ὑμῖν clause with its main verb(s) in the future indicative form (11:8-9; 15:7). 7) Both analogies contain a negative particle (οὐ or μή). Some of these features are lost in Lukan redaction but retained in Matthew, suggesting that the presence of these features in Luke 11:5-8 is due not to Lukan creation or redaction but to a shared source. Luke 11:5-8 comes from Q.

But why would Matthew not include Q 11:5-8? Matthew places Jesus' teachings on prayer in the Sermon on the Mount, but because he places the Lord's Prayer in the section about practicing righteousness in secret – where Q 11:5-13 would not fit the purpose – he returns to Q's teaching on prayer later in the sermon. But the τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν beginning of verse 5 naturally belongs after the topic has already been introduced (Jesus uses it to illustrate a point), so rather than adding another saying on prayer to precede Q 11:5-13, he skips ahead to the conclusion of the first analogy (which really communicates almost everything Q 11:5-8 was designed to teach) and then includes the second analogy.

Luke 14:28-33: Counting the Cost before Building a Tower or Going to War.

Another τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν question can be found at the beginning of Luke 14:28-33. Like Luke 11:5-13 and numerous other Q passages, Luke 14:28-33 gives two analogies to illustrate Jesus' point. Also like Luke 11:5-8, it falls between two passages that are in CEQ (Luke 14:26-27 || Matt 10:37-38; Luke 14:34-35 || Matt 5:13). In Luke the pair of analogies illustrates the point of the preceding verses and leads to the warning of the following verses. Together they form one speech without any indication of a change in setting. While Matthew constructs longer speeches of Jesus by compiling individual sayings from

different sources, we have no clear example of Luke having done this.¹⁵ Therefore it is likely that all of Luke 14:26-35 is from Q. A comparison of 14:28-33 with Q 15:4-10 confirms this: 1) Both passages contain two analogies, the first beginning with τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν + pres. part., and the second with ἦ τίς + nom. (γυνή/βασιλεύς) + pres. part. 2) In both passages, each analogy contains a rhetorical question in which the apodosis begins with οὐγί (Luke 14:28, 31; Q 15:4, 8). 3) Both passages feature the “nicht lukanisch” gnomic future. 4) Both passages follow the analogies with a concluding statement that begins with οὕτως. Again, the presence of many of these features in Matt 18:12-14 reveals that these are not the result of Lukan redaction but are the style of Q. Not only does the style of Luke 14:28-33 follow the style of Q, but its message closely matches that of the pericope on the cost of discipleship in Q 9:56-60. Furthermore, Jeremias argues that the phrase εἰ δὲ μή γε in Luke 14:32 is unlukan. In the NT it occurs in disjunctive conditional sentences only three times, all in Lukan passages that are shown in this paper to be from Q (10:6; 13:9; 14:31-32).¹⁶ For these reasons Q 14:26-35 should be seen as one continuous passage from Q. Matthew saw a use for Q 14:34-35 in the Sermon on the Mount and a use for Q 14:26-27 in the Sermon on Discipleship (Matt 18), but because both of those speeches are constructed from numerous sayings of Jesus,

Matthew did not include the entire Q pericope in either. Having used two parts of this

¹⁵ While the Markan speeches of Jesus are usually either copied with no major changes or abbreviated by Luke, there are a few examples of expansions (Luke 8:46; 9:44; 18:31; 19:39-40; 20:18, 34-36; 21:8, 11, 15, 18). In most of these examples Luke adds an explanatory comment without contributing any new meaning to Jesus' words. In Luke 20:18 he adds a couple OT allusions to inform the reader of more of the background of the stone saying. Only in Luke 19:39-40 does he actually add a point to what is said, but there it is set off from the preceding verses by the Pharisees asking another question.

¹⁶ Jeremias, *Sprache*, 185.

passage in his gospel, Matthew did not have a place to put the analogies that link the parts, and therefore he omitted them. We must not take the absence of Q 14:28-33 in Matthew as evidence that the passage was not in Q.

Luke 17:5-10: The Servant Does Not Expect to Be Served or Thanked. As with the previous passages, the τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν question in Luke 17:7 follows a quotation that comes directly from Q with no indication by Luke that he is switching sources. This passage is also quite similar in style to Q 15:4-10. Following τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν is the present participle ἔχων and then an aorist participle just as in Q 15:4. The analogy also hinges on the word οὐχί, after which the main character speaks, beginning with an aorist imperative (Luke 17:8; cf. Q 15:4-6, 8-9), and it is concluded with a statement that begins with οὕτως (Luke 17:10; cf. Q 15:7, 10). The εἶπεν . . . εἶπαν . . . εἶπεν dialog in 17:1, 5, 6 is reminiscent of other passages in Q (3:7; 4:3, 6, 8, 9, 12; 7:9, 19, 22; 9:57, 58, 59, 60; 10:21; 11:15, 17, 29; 12:54; 17:20; 19:13, 17, 19; cf. 14:17-21). To this could be added a few observations of Jeremias regarding the prelukan nature of this passage. First, Luke does not himself construct double questions, let alone a group of three questions, like we have in Luke 17:7-9;¹⁷ this is, however, a regular feature of Q (Q 6:32-34, 39, 41-42; 7:24-26; 11:11-12; 12:25-26, 56-57; 13:15-16, 18; 16:11-12; 22:27). Second, Jeremias argues that the pleonastic use of παρελθὼν, only here and in Luke 12:37 in the NT, is prelukan;¹⁸ this paper will demonstrate that Luke 12:37, like its surrounding verses, is from Q. Third, we again have a “nicht lukanisch” gnomic future in a rhetorical question

¹⁷ Jeremias, *Sprache*, 263.

¹⁸ Jeremias, *Sprache*, 263.

(cf. Q 11:5-8, 11-13; 14:5, 31; 15:4-8).¹⁹ Finally, Jeremias notes that the absolute use of οὔτως occurs in Luke only when he is adopting it from his source (Luke 12:21; 14:33; 15:7, 10; 17:10; 21:31; 22:26; once Markan; six times from Q).²⁰ In addition to these stylistic features we should note that the comparison of disciples to servants before a master is also found in Q 12:35-48 and 19:12-27. There is little reason to see why Luke would add this saying here if it were not originally in Q, but because Matthew uses Q 17:6 in the narrative of the demon that the disciples could not cast out (Matt 17:14-20), one can see why he would omit verses 7-10. Therefore CEQ's limitation of this pericope to 17:1-4, 6 is unwarranted; all of Luke 17:1-10 must be from Q.

Conclusion. Based on this evidence it is clear that all seven analogies that are introduced by τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν are from Q, and therefore Q 11:5-8; 14:5, 28-33; 17:5, 7-10 should be added to our reconstruction of Q.

Peculiarity #2: Φαρισαῖοι καὶ Νομικοί

In each gospel we find Jesus' opponents labeled differently. In Mark it is the chief priests and the scribes (8:31; 11:27; 14:1, 43, 53; 15:1, 31; etc.).²¹ In Matthew it is the Pharisees and the scribes (5:20; 12:38; 15:1; 23:1-39).²² In John it is the Jews.²³ In Luke it is typically just the Pharisees (5:33; 6:2; 7:36, 37, 39; 11:37, 38, 39, 49, 43; 12:1;

¹⁹ Jeremias, *Sprache*, 263.

²⁰ Jeremias, *Sprache*, 216.

²¹ But sometimes Mark refers to the opponents as “the Pharisees and the Herodians” (3:6; 12:13; cf. 8:15) or “the Pharisees and the scribes” (2:16; 7:1, 5).

²² Matthew also summarizes Jesus' opponents as “the Pharisees and the Sadducees” (3:7; 16:1-12; 22:34) or “the chief priests and the elders” (21:23; 26:3, 47; 27:1, 3, 12, 20; 28:11-12).

14:1; 16:14; 17:20; 18:10, 11; 19:39), but in three passages we find the unique expression, “the Pharisees and the lawyers” (οἱ Φαρισαῖοι καὶ οἱ νομικοί; 7:30; 11:39-52; 14:3). Elsewhere in the Gospels and Acts νομικός is found only at Luke 10:25 and possibly its Matthean parallel, Matt 22:35, though there is a variant reading there. No other text in early Christian literature ever refers to Jesus’ opponents as νομικοί except for texts referring back to one of these accounts in Luke and Matthew. In order to determine Q’s label for Jesus’ opponents one need look no further than Q 11:39-52, where Jesus speaks woes first against the Pharisees (verses 39-44) and then against the lawyers (45-52). CEQ is certainly correct in following Luke here rather than Matthew, because it is clear that Matthew is rearranging the text and using his standard οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι (cf. Matt 5:20; 12:38; 15:1). Not only that, but when Luke adds his own conclusion to the woes he refers to the opponents as “*scribes* and Pharisees” (οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι): “And as he went away from there the scribes and the Pharisees began to oppose him terribly and to interrogate him about many things” (Luke 11:53). If Luke were at all inclined to refer to Jesus’ adversaries as νομικοί, he would certainly do so here. Instead, Luke uses the word when copying Q but not when adding to Q.

Pharisees and lawyers are found together also in Luke 7:30 and 14:3. CEQ gives 7:30 as a probable Q verse; the presence of this phrase makes it a certain Q verse. CEQ does not include 14:3, but there are a number of reasons to think this verse is also from Q.

²³ John 1:19; 2:18-25; 5:10-18; 6:41, 52; 7:1-13, 35; 8:22-59; 9:18, 22; 10:19, 22-39; 11:8, 54; 18:12-14, 31, 36, 38; 19:7, 12, 14, 21, 38; 20:19. Sometimes John refers to the opponents as “the Pharisees” (1:24; 4:1; 7:47-48; 8:13; 9:13-17, 40; 11:46; 12:19, 42) or “the chief priests and the Pharisees” (7:32, 45; 11:47, 57; 18:3).

First, we have already seen that Luke does not refer to Jesus' opponents as lawyers even when concluding a passage that repeatedly uses the term (Luke 11:53-54). Having lawyers grouped with Pharisees is especially Q-like. Second, it is generally held that Luke 14:11 comes from Q (so CEQ). In Luke, verse 11 serves as the conclusion to Jesus' teaching in 14:8-10, which is set up by the scenario in verse 1. If Luke takes only verse 11 from Q then the change of topics from Q 13:34-35 to Q 14:11 is rather abrupt. It will be demonstrated below that Q regularly contains a narrative introduction to its sayings, as in Q 3; 4; 7; and 9. Q 14:16-18, 21, 23 also seem to assume a similar narrative backdrop. Third, Luke 14:5 has a Matthean parallel (Matt 18:11). While CEQ excludes this verse (against the initial decision of the International Q Project) because of differences in wording, a number of scholars have included it due to the shared words, concepts, and structure between Luke 14:5 and Matt 18:11.²⁴ Every difference is explainable by Lukan and Matthean redactional tendencies, and the style matches what we see elsewhere in Q: a rhetorical question beginning with τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν followed by the nom. sg. ἄνθρωπος and the verb ἔχω, an aor. subj. verb in the protasis, the apodosis beginning with οὐχί, and a series of gnomic future verbs. Fourth, one can understand why Matthew would adopt Q 14:5 but omit 14:1-4, 6 if the latter were in his source. The question in Luke 14:3 (ἐξεστὶν τῷ σαββάτῳ θεραπεῦσαι ἢ οὐ;) is so similar to the one in Mark 3:4 (ἐξεστὶν τοῖς

²⁴ Notably, Fleddermann, who excludes every other verse discussed in this paper, includes 14:5 and gives six reasons for doing so (*Q*, 708-709). The International Q Project originally included 14:5 as a probable Q verse (Jon Ma. Asgeirsson and James M. Robinson, "The International Q Project: Work Sessions 12-14 July, 22 November 1991," *JBL* 111 [1992]: 500-508). Schürmann argues that 14:1-6 is entirely from Q (Heinz Schürmann, *Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu den synoptischen Evangelien* [Düsseldorf: Patmos-Verlag, 1968], 213).

σάββασιν ἀγαθὸν ποιῆσαι ἢ κακοποιῆσαι;) that in copying Mark 3, Matthew could naturally decide to insert Q 14:5 into the Markan narrative, conflating the two stories. Luke, however, copies Mark 3:1-6 earlier in his gospel and there uses a wording closer to that of Mark 3:4 than he uses here. He must have had a separate source that included 14:1ff to decide to include this similar account and to not use the wording he uses earlier in copying Mark. Notably, the Matthean parallel to Luke 14:5 contains a second rhetorical question (Matt 12:12) that is structured very similarly to Q 12:7, 14. It seems that Luke is actually condensing Q 14:5 and that the setting for this saying in Luke 14:1-4 comes from Q. For these reasons we can conclude that every passage in which Luke mentions “Pharisees and lawyers” is from Q.

There is one more occurrence of νομικός in Luke, this time without Φαρισαῖος: in Luke 10:25, where a lawyer tests Jesus. Those who do not think Luke 10:25-28 is from Q postulate that this narrative is taken from Mark 12:28-34 and adapted to set up the parable of the Good Samaritan, but there are too many differences between Mark 12:28-34 and Luke 10:25-28, and it is not clear why Luke would move Mark 12:28-34 here, thus losing one of the tests of Jesus that could have been in Luke 20. More likely, Luke omits Mark 12:28-34 when he comes to Luke 20 because he recognizes the similarity between those verses and the verses that are his source for Luke 10:25-28. So far in Luke 10, Luke’s source has been Q, and this is also his source at the beginning of chapter 11. Therefore, Luke 10:25-28 is likely to be from Q. This possibility is strengthened when we note the presence of νομικός here and also in Matt 22:35, where Matthew copies Mark 12:28-34. Luke only uses νομικός elsewhere when copying Q (and not when

adding to Q!) and Matthew nowhere else uses νομικός. Some have argued based on the lack of νομικός in $f^1 e sy^s$ that this word was a later addition based on its presence in Luke.²⁵ But the external evidence very strongly favors the inclusion of νομικός, which suggests that Matthew has inserted this one detail from Q into the Markan pericope.

As further evidence, we should notice that everywhere else where we find lawyers in Q we also find Pharisees. Therefore it is noteworthy that Jesus is put to the test twice in the travel narrative, once here and once in the next chapter (Luke [Q] 11:16). While Luke does not name the opponents in the latter test, Matthew names them as οἱ Φαρισαῖοι (Matt 9:34; 12:24, 38). What we have in Q 10-11, then, is two tests – one by a lawyer (Q 10:25-28) and one by the Pharisees (Q 11:14-16) – followed by Jesus speaking woes against the Pharisees (Q 11:39-44) and the lawyers (Q 11:46-52). Therefore it is almost certain that Luke 10:25-28 is from Q. As further confirmation we can note the double rhetorical question in Luke 10:26 that is a “nicht lukanisch” feature often seen in Q.²⁶

Is there evidence that not only Luke 10:25-28 but also Luke 10:29-37, the parable of the Good Samaritan, is from Q? First, we should note that the test of the Pharisees in Luke 11:15-16 leads into a lengthy teaching in Q (18 verses), and so it would be surprising if the test of the lawyer in Luke 10:25 leads into only a one-verse response by Jesus. Second, we see elsewhere in Q similar dialogs between Jesus and an interlocutor that lead to a lengthy teaching by Jesus (Q 7:18-35; 9:57 – 10:16; 11:14-26; 12:13-59), and so the presence of one here suggests that this is also from Q. Third, the parable

²⁵ Bruce Manning Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* (2d ed.; New York: United Bible Societies, 1994), 48-49.

²⁶ Jeremias, *Sprache*, 190.

contains a pair of negative examples (the priest and the Levite) followed by a positive example (the Samaritan); this is a feature seen elsewhere in Q (7:24-28; 10:13-14; 11:11-13; 11:39 – 12:1). Therefore it is likely that the parable of the Good Samaritan also comes from Q.

But why would Matthew, who is interested in Jesus as a teacher, exclude such a great teaching of Jesus? We must consider how Matthew uses Q. Unlike Luke, who follows Q for chapters on end, as he does Mark, Matthew chooses isolated sayings from Q to construct his five speeches that present Jesus as the new Moses and only rarely places lengthier passages from Q in his gospel. Each of Matthew's five speeches highlights a different theme: discipleship (5-7), missions (10), mystery (13), relationships in the church (18), and the future (23-25). None of the themes corresponds to the lesson of Q 10:25-37. Matthew does occasionally use Q for a purpose other than constructing his speeches, but the examples are limited.²⁷ The very fact that Matthew does not follow the order of Q clues us into Matthew's purposes in using Q: he is not interested in reproducing Q (as he is in reproducing Mark), but he will use Q when it adds something that fits into his predetermined outline. Luke, on the other hand, seems to be interested in preserving both Mark and Q (and hence follows the order of both). Matthean omissions are thus very explainable.

²⁷ Matthew uses Q to fill out the details of John's preaching and the temptations, which were rather sparse in Mark, and to fill out his narrative sections that precede the second and third speeches (i.e., Matt 8-9 and 11-12), so that the kingdom discourse, which is early in Mark, can come after the speeches about discipleship and mission and the three speeches could still have some separation. Other than this and the five speeches he uses Q only in very short sayings and in the parable of the Wedding Feast (22:1-14).

Considering Another Passage: Luke 12:13-21

We have considered a couple stylistic peculiarities that allow us to expand our list of Q passages to include the following pericopes: 10:25-37; 11:5-8; 14:1-10, 28-33; 17:5-10. Sometimes there may not be one feature that is unique to Q but a number of features that are common to Q that when considered together make the case for an entire passage to be from Q. A few observations can be made in this regard concerning the parable of the Rich Fool in Luke 12:13-21.

First, the phrase οὐκ ἔχω ποῦ συνάξω (“I do not have a place where I will gather [my crops]”) is a little peculiar. Outside of the NT we have ἔχω with ποῦ only at Josh 8:20 LXX, not in the Pseudepigrapha or Josephus or Philo or the Apostolic Fathers.²⁸ In the New Testament it is found only in Matt 8:20 = Luke 9:58 (Q 9:58) and here (Luke 12:17). While this could be a mere coincidence, it is likely that the same form reflects the same hand, i.e., the author of Q 9:58. Second, Jesus’ words in Q 12:22 begin with διὰ τοῦτο λέγω ὑμῖν (“Therefore, I tell you”), so there must have been something related to this issue preceding Q 12:22.²⁹ CEQ resolves this by placing 12:33-34 before 12:22-31, but Luke is not known to elsewhere take a couple verses from the beginning of a passage and move them to the end; Q 12:33-34 must have been after Q 12:22-32 already in Q, and the διὰ τοῦτο refers back to Q 12:13-21. Third, the mention of barns (ἀποθήκας) in Q 12:24 likely alludes back to the bigger barns (ἀποθήκας) that the rich man stored his

²⁸ The closest we have is in Herm. *Mand.* 12.5.4, where we have μὴ ἔχων τόπον ποῦ εἰσέλθῃ, but ποῦ here modifies τόπος.

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

crops in in Luke 12:18, but that could only have been the original intention if the mention of barns in Luke 12:18 was present in Q. Notably, ἀποθήκη occurs elsewhere in the NT only in Q passages (Matt 3:12 = Luke 3:17; Matt 6:26 = Luke 12:24) and in Matt 13:30, which may also be from Q (Matt 13:31-33 = Luke 13:18-21). In addition, the word ψυχή (12:19, 20, 22, 23) also links the passages together. Fourth, the back-and-forth dialog with a sixfold repetition of εἶπεν in Luke 12:13-21 is typical of Q (Q 4:1-13; 9:57-62; 19:12-27; cf. 10:25-37 [eightfold] and 14:15-24 [ninefold]). Fifth, Q regularly places more colorful words like ψυχή and ἄφρων in the vocative (Q 3:7; 6:42; 11:5, 40; 12:32, 56; 13:15, 27, 34; 14:10; 19:17, 22), whereas outside of the Q passages Luke only uses more standard vocatives, such as κύριε, ἄνθρωπε, and διδάσκαλε. Furthermore the only other occurrence of ἄφρων in Luke is also in the vocative case and in a Q passage (11:40). Sixth, the word ἀπαιτέω occurs only twice in the NT, here and in Luke 6:30, where it seems to come from Q (so CEQ). Seventh, the word θησαυρίζω in Luke 12:21 occurs only two other times in the Gospels, in Matt 6:19 and 6:20, which are from the following passage in Q (Q 12:33). While it is possible that Luke uses the word at 12:21 to set up the following passage (though he does not copy that word there), it is more likely that θησαυρίζω comes from Q in both Q 12:21 and Q 12:33. Eighth, we again have an absolute use of οὕτως, which is common to Q (12:21; cf. 14:33; 15:7, 10; 17:10; 22:26) and is unlukan. Finally, Kloppenborg has demonstrated the similarity of Luke 12:13-14 to Q 9:57-60 and of the criticism of riches in the passage to Q 12:33-34; 16:13.³⁰ Therefore Luke 12:13-21 should be added to the list of passages in Q.

³⁰ Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 222.

Narrative Introductions in Q

Having made the case that CEQ is missing a number of passages that were likely in Q, we should also question whether passages that are longer in Luke than in CEQ were Lukan expansions or Matthean omissions of part of a passage. First we will consider the narrative introductions to Jesus' sayings. An investigation of earlier passages in CEQ (chapters 3-9) reveals a lot more dialog (4:1-12; 7:3-9; 7:18-35; 9:57-60) and narrator comments (3:0-3, 21-22; 4:13, 16; 6:20; 7:1, 29-30) than in the later CEQ passages. In CEQ 3-9, 955 of the 1,152 words (83%) are words of Jesus or of another character. In CEQ 10-22, 2,566 out of 2,618 words (98%) are sayings. At one point there are 1,654 words of Jesus in a row (Q 11:29-17:6) – almost four times the length of the Sermon on the Plain! It is unlikely that the nature of Q shifts between chapter 9 and chapter 10. Perhaps a better explanation is that CEQ poorly represents the Q passages in the travel narrative. In other words, maybe Q 10-19 is just as likely to contain narrator comments and dialog as is Q 3-9. If one investigates Luke 10-19 (except for the Markan passages), he/she will discover that Luke's text here is 84% (5,622 out of 6,694) words of Jesus or of the other characters, remarkably close to the 83% in CEQ 3-9. By contrast, Luke 18:15-43, the one portion of the Lukan travel narrative that is from Mark, is only 58% speech. The Lukan travel narrative is relatively uniform in its ratio of sayings to narrative, and this ratio matches what we know elsewhere of Q. One would expect that Luke follows Q more closely in the travel narrative than CEQ suggests.

For example, in Luke 11:37-54 we have woes against the Pharisees and the lawyers. CEQ gives no indication that there was a narrative setting in Q. More likely

there was something in Q to set up the woes, just as there was something in Q to set up John's words (Q 3:1-22), Jesus' responses to the devil's temptations (Q 4:1-13), Jesus' words about John (Q 7:18-35), and Jesus' sayings about the cost of discipleship (Q 9:57-60). Why not assume that the brief narrator comments in Luke 11:37-38, 45 represent what was in Q? The dialog in which a first person says something (or in this case is merely astonished), Jesus responds, then a second person says something, and Jesus responds again is reminiscent of Q 9:57-60 and, to a lesser extent, Q 4:1-13.

Furthermore, Jeremias gives a number of reasons why Luke 11:37-38, 45 cannot be a Lukan creation. First, Luke himself does not use the historical present. His dislike of it is seen in the fact that he eliminates 92 of Mark's 93 historical present-tense verbs. Therefore the present tense ἐρωτᾷ in verse 37 has more likely come from Luke's source than from his own mind. Second, the use of ὅπως after ἐρωτάω is likewise unlukan. Third, in verbs related to table fellowship, Luke often changes Mark's ἀνα-composites to κατα-composites, so it is hardly likely that in creating his own introduction to this Q pericope he would use the word ἀναπίπτω. Fourth, the verb ἀριστάω (Luke 11:37) and the noun ἄριστον (11:38) appear nowhere in Acts or in Luke's redaction of Mark; Luke uses different words to refer to a meal. Ἄριστον occurs in the NT only in Matt 22:4 (= Q 14:7); Luke 14:12 (likely also from Q); and here. Finally, Luke elsewhere constructs the intransitive θαυμάζω either absolutely or with ἐπί + dative; nowhere else does Luke use θαυμάζω + ὅτι.³¹ Therefore it is hard to hold that Luke created verses 37-38 to introduce Q 11:39-44; they were likely already present in Q. We can also note that the lawyer's

³¹ Jeremias, *Sprache*, 205-206.

protest in Luke 11:45, which serves as a transition from the woes against the Pharisees to the woes against the lawyers, makes the passage a dialog with multiple interlocutors as we see elsewhere in Q (4:1-13; 9:57-62) and that without this verse Q 11:39-44 is properly introduced but Q 11:46-52 is not. We cannot examine here every narrative introduction in the Lukan travel narrative, but this example, along with Q 10:25-28 and 14:1-4, 6, discussed above, is enough to demonstrate that the narrative introductions in the Lukan travel narrative often come from Q.

Another Partial Passage: Luke 12:22-59

Now if Matthew has left out entire passages of Q and the narrative setting of particular passages, is it possible that Matthew has at times grabbed part of a saying while Luke has recorded the entire pericope? We know from his use of Mark that, unlike Matthew, Luke is not prone to add words of Jesus to his source. He does so only eleven times in the Markan material: nine times the addition merely explains the Markan saying without attempting to add a new thought (Luke 8:46; 9:44a; 18:31; 20:34-36, 38c; 21:8, 11, 15, 18), and two times the addition consists of an OT allusion (Luke 19:40; 20:18). Never is a Markan speech otherwise expanded by Luke. Why, then, should we expect Luke to be so expansive of the Q material? It is more likely that when some verses of a passage are paralleled in Matthew the entire Lukan pericope is from Q. As an example let us consider Luke 12:22-59, of which only verses 22-31, 33-34, 39-40, 42b-46, 49, 51, 53-56, and 58-59 are in CEQ. Accordingly Luke copied part of his source, then inserted a verse, then copied more, then inserted a few more verses, then copied some more, then inserted a couple more verses, and so on. Let us investigate this possibility.

Verse 32 (“Fear not, little flock, . . .”). Contrary to the views of some, the “abrupt shift from the second person plural address . . . to the second person singular” at 12:32a³² is not problematic since the rest of 12:32 is plural and Q is elsewhere known to shift to the singular when a collective vocative is used (Q 13:34). Nor does the perspective on the kingdom change from “human striving” in verse 31 to “a gift of God” in verse 32³³ any more than the same verbs in Q 11:9 (ζητέω, δίδωμι) express differing perspectives. Rather, 12:32 is the natural conclusion to 12:31. Luke 12:32 contains the descript kind of vocative (τὸ μικρὸν ποίμνιον) that we see elsewhere in Q, and the reference to the disciples as a “flock” parallels Q’s description of the disciples as “sheep” in Q 10:3 and 15:4. Εὐδοκέω/εὐδοκία is attested elsewhere in Q (10:21), and reference to God as “your Father” is a common feature of Q (Q 6:35f; 11:2, 13; 12:6, 24, 30), but elsewhere in Luke Jesus never refers to God as “*your* Father.” Furthermore there is no good reason for Luke to interrupt copying his source to add this verse. Luke 12:32 is from Q.

Verses 35-38: Servants Waiting for Their Master. Verses 35-38 are also likely to be from Q. First, comparisons in which the word ὁμοιος occurs (Luke 12:36) are common in Q (6:47, 48, 49; 7:31, 32; 13:18, 19, 21; cf. 13:20) but are not found elsewhere in Luke’s Gospel except here (but see Acts 17:29). Second, makarisms are a common feature of Q, and one is found in verses 37-38. Crossan notes that this makarism is structured identically to the one in Q 12:43-44 and that each is centered

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

³³ Kloppenborg, *Q Parallels*, 132.

within an otherwise negative parable in order to add a positive tone.³⁴ Third, the message of these verses is so similar to the message of verses 42-46 that it is unclear why Luke would *add* these verses to the beginning of the parable in Q; why not let the message of Q stand on its own? Fourth, the ideas behind this passage are highly consistent with those behind Q 19:11-27. It is true that the idea of the master serving the servants stands in stark contrast to Luke 17:7-10, which we have argued is a Q passage, but the style is so similar that it is likely that the contrast is intentional and was written by the same author. Fifth, verse 37 contains the word ἀνακλίνω; once again Jeremias has made a strong case that Luke himself uses the κατα- prefix with table-fellowship verbs rather than the ἀνα- prefix, which we see elsewhere in Q (Q 11:37; 13:29; 14:10, 15; 17:7; 22:27).³⁵ Finally, it is understandable why Matthew would omit this passage since he records a similar parable in Matt 25:1-13.³⁶ Luke 12:35-38 is also from Q.

Verses 41, 47-48, 50, 52, and 57. In verse 41 Peter asks if the parable is spoken “for us or for all.” We have already demonstrated that dialogs are a larger part of Q than is typically assumed, and one can understand why Matthew would omit Peter’s question, while it is difficult to see why Luke would insert it before 12:42-46 if it were not already there in Q.

In verses 47-48 Jesus speaks of the beatings that will come to the unprepared servant who knew his master’s will and to the one who did not know his master’s will.

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

³⁵ Jeremias, *Sprache*, 167, 220.

³⁶ Crossan, *In Fragments*, 58.

Jeremias notes numerous unlukan stylistic features in these verses: antithetical parallelism; the negated participle with the article (ὁ μὴ γνούς);³⁷ the divine passives,³⁸ the third person plural as a circumlocution for God's name, and the semiticizing anacoluthon παντὶ δὲ ᾧ ἐδόθη πολὺ. . . .³⁹ Luke clearly did not construct these verses himself, and if he took them from a source, the most likely source is Q. Each of these features is repeatedly seen in Q. Furthermore, Crossan argues for the inclusion of these verses since a distinction between insiders and outsiders followed by a distinction among the insiders themselves is also attested in Q 19:12-26.⁴⁰

In verse 50 Jesus speaks of the baptism he is to be baptized with. Jeremias argues that Luke is not fond of figura etymologica, whereas we do find it in Q 6:48, 49; 7:29; 11:46.⁴¹ Jeremias also notes that the phrase ἕως ὅτου and the absolute use of συνέχω are unlukan, so Luke 12:50 must come from a source, and the most likely source is the same one as in 12:49, 51. Verse 52, like verse 53, speaks of household division. Jeremias notes a couple unlukan features,⁴² and it is difficult to see why Luke would add

³⁷ The negated participle with the article is attested elsewhere in Luke only in likely Q material (3:11; 11:23 [2x]; 19:26-27; 22:36).

³⁸ Jeremias lists 74 divine passives in Luke. Fifteen are taken over from Mark, and 29 are clearly from Q. The other 30 are all from passages that I would argue are from Q. Luke *never* adds a divine passive to his Markan material and sometimes rewrites the Markan material to remove the passive voice. See Jeremias, *Sprache*, 122-123.

³⁹ Jeremias, *Sprache*, 222. Anacolutha beginning with πᾶς ὅς are found elsewhere in Luke only in three passages, Luke 6:47; 12:8, 10, which are all from Q.

⁴⁰ Crossan, *In Fragments*, 60.

⁴¹ Jeremias, *Sprache*, 74-75, 223.

⁴² Jeremias, *Sprache*, 224.

this verse if he is copying verses 51 and 53 from Q, so it is highly probable that Luke 12:52 represents an original Q 12:52.

Verse 57 serves as a transition from Jesus' words about interpreting the present time to his exhortation about going with your accuser to the magistrate. One can understand why Matthew would not include this verse since he separates the two sayings (Matt 5:25-26 = Q 12:58-59 and Matt 16:2-3 = Q 12:54-56), even removing the "accuser" saying from the eschatological context it has in Q and Luke. With CEQ missing verse 57, however, the connection between verses 54-56 and 58-59 in Q is obscured. Luke 12:57 is also from Q.

Conclusion. In sum, all eleven verses that are missing from CEQ were likely in Q. Therefore when reading a passage in Luke that contains elements of Q it may be more accurate to assume that all of the verses are from Q than to assume that only the verses attested in Matthew are from Q. One may be able to demonstrate a good reason for considering a particular verse or phrase to be due to Lukan redaction, but the default assumption should be that the whole passage has its basis in Q. Space does not permit us to perform a similar analysis here of other Lukan passages that are partially paralleled in Matthew, but we should note that a similar argument could be made for the following: Luke 3:1-22; 4:16-30; 7:18-35; 9:57 – 10:24; 13:10-35; 14:1-35; 15:1-32; 16:1-13; 16:14-31; 17:1-10; 17:20-37; 19:11-27; 22:14-38.

The Structure of Q

This paper has argued that Q 10:25-37; 11:5-8; 12:13-21; 14:1-6, 28-33; and 17:5-10 should be added to our reconstruction of Q and that non-Markan passages in Luke that

are partially paralleled in Matthew are likely wholly from Q. Once these verses are added to our reconstruction, there is little left of Luke 9:57 – 18:14 that is not from Q. Could Luke have decided to copy one source with little interruption for this portion of the gospel? This thesis is strengthened by a consideration of the structure of Q. In his commentary on Q, Fleddermann argues that Q sets out to answer two questions: “Who is Jesus?” and “What does it mean to be his disciple?”⁴³ Many have noted that Q 3:1 – 7:35 functions as a unit, beginning and ending with the relationship between John and Jesus, who is at each end identified as ὁ ἐρχόμενος.⁴⁴ Some, including Fleddermann, have argued that this section is chiasmic.⁴⁵ Notably, a number of scholars have also attempted to demonstrate a chiasmic structure to the Lukan travel narrative,⁴⁶ but have ultimately failed because some passages do not fit the chiasm. Blomberg therefore argues that the chiasmic nature of the travel narrative must be due to Luke’s source rather than to Luke’s own creativity.⁴⁷ Blomberg seems to be correct here, but because he was working from

⁴³ Fleddermann, *Q*, 102.

⁴⁴ T. W. Manson, *The Sayings of Jesus* (London: SCM, 1949), 39-71; Arland D. Jacobson, *The First Gospel: An Introduction to Q* (Sonoma, Calif.: Polebridge, 1992), 24, 127, 156; Crossan, *In Fragments*, 156; Dale C. Allison, Jr., *The Jesus Tradition in Q* (Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 1997), 8-11; Kirk, *Composition*, 364-397; Fleddermann, *Q*, 112-114.

⁴⁵ Kirk, *Composition*, 364-397; Allison, *Jesus Tradition*, 8-11; Fleddermann, *Q*, 112-114.

⁴⁶ See, for example, M. D. Goulder, “The Chiasmic Structure of the Lukan Journey,” *TU 87* (1964): 195-202, and Charles H. Talbert, *Literary Patterns, Theological Themes, and the Genre of Luke-Acts* (Missoula: SBL, 1974), 51-52.

⁴⁷ Craig L. Blomberg, “Midrash, Chiasmus, and the Outline of Luke’s Central Section,” in *Studies in Midrash and Historiography* (ed. R.T. France and David Wenham; vol. 3 of *Gospel Perspectives*; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1983), 217-261.

the assumption that the parables in the travel narrative come from a source other than the Q material, he limits the chiasm to the parables and postulates a “parables source” that includes Luke 10:25-37; 11:5-8, 11-13; 12:13-21, 35-38; 13:1-9; 14:1-6, 7-24, 28-33; 15:1-32; 16:1-13, 19-31; 17:7-10; 18:1-8, 9-14.⁴⁸ We have argued, however, that most, if not all, of these passages are from Q. Moreover, Blomberg recognizes that the Q material here coheres topically with the nearest parable and therefore suggests that Luke rearranged his Q material to fit the outline of the chiastic parables source.⁴⁹ A more likely explanation is that Q is itself chiastic, with the first chiasm answering Fleddermann’s first question, “Who is Jesus?” and the second chiasm answering the second question, “What does it mean to be his disciple?” The second chiasm could be outlined as follows:

? A. 7:36 – 8:3	A'. 23:27 – 24:12	Love and Forgiveness ?
B. 9:57 – 10:24	B'. 22:14-38	Mission
???	C'. 19:11-27	Faithfulness
D. 10:25-37	D'. 18:9-14	Pride and Self-Justification
E. 11:1-13	E'. 18:1-8	Prayer
F. 11:14-26, 29-36	F'. 17:20-37	The Presence of the Kingdom
G. 11:37-52; 12:1-12	G'. 17:1-10	Israel’s Failed Leadership
H. 12:13-21	H'. 16:14-31	Riches
I. 12:22-59	I'. 16:1-13	Wise Management
J. 13:1-9	J'. 15:1-32	Repentance

⁴⁸ Blomberg, “Midrash,” 243.

⁴⁹ Blomberg, “Midrash,” 244-247.

According to this outline, Luke has inserted into his Q material only two periscopes in Luke 9:56 – 18:14: Mary and Martha (10:38-42) and the Ten Lepers (17:11-19), which are notably the only two periscopes that are predominantly narrative rather than discourse. Perhaps Luke added the story of Mary and Martha where he did to prevent the reader from overemphasizing works based on an unbalanced reading of the parable of the Good Samaritan. He likely also added the references to Jesus' journey to Jerusalem at 13:22 and 17:11 and may have decided to place the Ten Lepers story with the second of those references. Once these periscopes are removed, what remains is chiasmic, though there seems to be no parallel to Q 19:11-27. It is possible that the parallel overlapped Mark's parable of the Wicked Tenants and was thus skipped over until Luke came to the proper place in the Markan narrative. This would explain why Matthew and Luke agree against Mark in alluding to Isa 8 and Dan 2 after the quotation of Psalm 118, but this is of course highly speculative. The above outline also includes passages that have not yet been discussed in this paper, most notably 7:36 – 8:3 and 23:27 – 24:12. A strong case can be made for the inclusion of these passages, but due to space constraints the case must be made elsewhere. Regardless, a case can be made for a chiasmic structure here that includes every Q pericope that has been proposed by this paper.

Q 9:57 – 10:24 and 22:14-38: Mission. The allusion to Q 10:4 (“Carry no purse, no bag, no sandals”) in Luke 22:35-36 (“When I sent you without purse or bag or sandals, . . .”) suggests that the two passages parallel one another. Luke 22:35-36 is part of a

lengthier pericope that is primarily words of Jesus and that contains two verses that have a Matthean parallel and are therefore included in CEQ. Other parallels between Q 9:57 – 10:24 and Luke 22:14-38 can be noted. First, both passages emphasize the nearness of the kingdom (10:9, 11; 22:16, 18; βασιλεία occurs four times in each passage; no other Lukan pericope has as many occurrences of βασιλεία). Second, both passages anticipate rejection. Third, the promise that the disciples would “eat and drink” at Jesus’ table and judge the twelve tribes of Israel (22:30) echoes the offer to the seventy-two to “eat and drink” what is provided as wages for their labor (10:7) as well as the call to wipe from their feet the dust of every city that rejects them (10:10-11). Finally, the call to “become as the youngest” (22:26) echoes the confession that God has revealed these things to children (10:21).

Q 10:25-37 and 18:9-14: Pride and Self-Justification. We argued above that Luke 10:25-37 is from Q. The parable of the Good Samaritan is Jesus’ response to a man who “wants to justify himself.” The word δικαιώω is used in reference to a person only two other times in Luke (Luke/Q 16:15; 18:14). The latter, the parable of the Pharisee and the Tax Collector, is a clear parallel to Q 10:25-37. It is spoken to “some who trust in themselves that they are just” (18:9). The two parables begin similarly (ἄνθρωπός τις κατέβαινεν ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλὴμ, 10:30; ἄνθρωποι δύο ἀνέβησαν εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν, 18:10). Each parable has an expected hero (priest/Levite, Pharisee) who does the wrong thing and an expected villain (Samaritan, tax collector) who does the right thing and is ultimately justified.⁵⁰ In both parables the expected hero remains at a distance (ἀντιπαρῆλθεν,

⁵⁰ Blomberg, “Midrash,” 240.

σταθείς πρὸς ἑαυτὸν) from the one on whom God has compassion. Finally, these are the only two parables with a fixed location, and in both cases the location is given “to show that God’s service is not localized in the temple along lines of conventional understanding.”⁵¹

Q 11:1-13 and 18:1-8: Prayer. Twice in Luke Jesus teaches on prayer, both times emphasizing persistence in prayer. In both passages one person goes to another (καὶ πορεύσεται πρὸς αὐτὸν μεσονυκτίου καὶ εἶπη αὐτῷ, 11:5 / καὶ ἦρχετο πρὸς αὐτὸν λέγουσα, 18:3) expecting to receive something he/she lacks. In both cases the request is first refused (11:7; 18:4) and then a concessive first class condition (εἰ καὶ οὐ + 1st person indicative verb + διὰ γε, a construction found in the NT only at Luke 11:7-8 and 18:4) is given to explain why the person changes his mind. In both cases the reason given is the first person’s persistence – he/she has “caused trouble” (παρέχω + κόπος; the word κόπος occurs nowhere else in either Q or Luke). In both cases Jesus follows the parable with an explanation of how it applies to prayer (11:9-10; 18:6-8); both explanations contain the expression λέγω ὑμῖν. In both cases Jesus also follows the parable with a rhetorical question assuring the reader that God is more generous than the person in the parable.⁵²

Q 11:14-26, 29-36 and 17:20-37: The Presence of the Kingdom. Though Luke breaks up the pericope by adding verses 27-28, Q 11:14-26, 29-36 were certainly viewed as one unit in Q as the narrative introduction (11:14-16) introduces both challenges that are addressed in this pericope. Q 17:20-37 parallels Q 11:14-26, 29-36 in a number of

⁵¹ Blomberg, “Midrash,” 240.

⁵² Blomberg, “Midrash,” 241.

ways. First, the lament against “this generation” (Q 11:29, 30, 31, 32) is taken up again in Q 17:25. Second, just as Q 11:30-32 compares “the Son of Man” to Jonah and then to Solomon, Q 17:26-33 compares “the days of the Son of Man” to the days of Noah and then to the days of Lot. The wording is remarkably similar (compare, e.g., 11:30 and 17:26). Third, in both Q 11:20 and 17:20-21 Jesus tells the Pharisees that the kingdom has already come, an idea not explicated elsewhere. Fourth, in both Q 11:29 and 17:20 Jesus explains that a sign will not be given. Fifth, the word ἄστραπή (lightning), which occurs only these two times in Q, is used in both Q 11:36 and 17:24 to refer to the clarity with which the days of the Son of Man should be recognized.

Q 11:37 – 12:12 and 17:1-10: Israel’s Failed Leadership. We have already argued that Luke 11:53-54 is a Lukan conclusion to the Q passage and was not in Q. Therefore, Q 11:37 – 12:12 was originally one pericope rather than two. Both this passage and Q 17:1-10 begin with woes, each set of woes concluding with how the censured has been the downfall of others (11:44, 52; 17:2) and therefore severe judgment is announced (11:50; 17:2). In both passages these woes are immediately followed by the phrase προσέχετε ἑαυτοῖς. The word προσέχω occurs nowhere else in Q. Q 11:37 – 12:12 continues with an exhortation to fear God and acknowledge him before men, while Q 17:1-10 continues with an exhortation to put faith in God and serve him freely.

Q 12:13-21 and 16:14-31: Riches. Both Q 12:13-21 and Q 16:14-31 begin with a narrative introduction involving someone who loves money. Then Q 12:14 alludes to Exod 2:14 in a way that contrasts Moses with Jesus, while Q 16:16 contrasts the time of the Law and the Prophets with the present era in which the gospel of the kingdom of God

is preached. After this each passage contains a parable about a foolish rich man. The two parables begin with similar expressions (ἀνθρώπου τινὸς πλουσίου εὐφόρησεν ἡ χώρα, 12:16; Ἄνθρωπος δέ τις ἦν πλούσιος, . . . εὐφραϊνόμενος καθ’ ἡμέραν λαμπρῶς, 16:19). In both parables the rich man has many “goods” (ἀγαθά, which is used as a substantive in Luke only at 1:53; 12:18-19; 16:25), leading him to “celebrate” (εὐφραίνω; 12:19; 16:19), but then he loses the goods when he dies.⁵³ Thus the point of both parables is that earthly riches do not benefit a person (and may even harm him/her) once life is done.

Q 12:13-59 and 16:1-31: Wise Management. Q 12:13-59 and 16:1-31 contain two parables about a “steward” (οἰκονόμος, only here in Luke-Acts) entrusted with his master’s “possessions” (ὑπάρχοντα). In both parables we hear the steward’s internal monolog about “my master” (ὁ κύριός μου). In the first parable the steward is called “faithful and wise” (ὁ πιστὸς οἰκονόμος ὁ φρόνιμος, 12:44). The word πιστός occurs elsewhere in Luke only in Luke 19:17 (from Q) and in the conclusion of the second parable (16:10-12). The word φρόνιμος occurs elsewhere in Luke only in the second parable, where it describes the steward and those of this world who are like him (16:8). In each parable the servant is commanded for the way he “acts” (ποιέω, 12:43; 16:8; cf. 12:47-48). Furthermore, the first parable concludes that of everyone to whom much (πολύς) was given, much (πολύς) will be required (12:48). The second parable concludes that the one who is faithful in a little is also faithful in much (πολύς), while the one who is unjust in a little is also unjust in much (πολύς, 16:10). The first parable is introduced

⁵³ Blomberg notes as well that only in these two parables does the main character die (“Midrash,” 241).

with a command to “sell your possessions, give alms, [and] make for yourselves [ποιήσατε ἑαυτοῖς] purses that do not grow old, an inexhaustible treasure in the heavens” (12:33). The second parable is concluded with a command to “make for yourselves [ἑαυτοῖς ποιήσατε] friends from unjust mammon, so that when it runs out they will receive you into eternal dwellings” (16:9). Likewise Q 16:12 questions who would give to you “what is your own” (τὸ ὑμέτερον, i.e. true, eternal riches) if you have been unfaithful in what is someone else’s, while Q 12:31-33 assures the disciples that they need not fear for the Father is pleased to give to them the kingdom and eternal treasures.

Q 13:1-9 and 15:1-32: Repentance. In Luke 13:1-9 Jesus gives two examples that express the need for repentance, closing each example with the same exhortation: “No, I tell you, but unless you repent, you will all likewise perish” (13:3, 5). Then Jesus tells the parable of the Barren Fig Tree as a call for Israel to repent. In Luke 15:1-32 Jesus gives two examples that express the joy repentance brings, closing each with a similar exhortation: “In the same way I tell you that there is more joy before the angels of God over one sinner who repents” (15:10, cf. v. 7). Twofold repetition of μετανοέω occurs elsewhere only in Q 17:3-4, where the parallel is not nearly as strong. Furthermore, as in Q 13:1-9, the two examples in Q 15:1-32 are followed by a parable (the Prodigal Son) which calls for Israel (the older brother) to repent. The two passages parallel each other in form, structure, and emphasis.⁵⁴

⁵⁴ 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; Blomberg, “Midrash,” 242.

Q 13:10-21, 23-35 and 14:1-35: The Cross and the Sabbath Rest. The Lukan travel narrative contains two Sabbath healings (13:10-17; 14:1-6). Jesus' defense of his actions is similar in both cases (13:15-16; 14:5) as is the inability of his adversaries to respond (13:17; 14:6). Both healings then lead into a discussion about the spread of the kingdom of God to outsiders (13:18-30; 14:15-24), the fact that Israel's leaders will miss the eschatological banquet (13:23-28; 14:15-24), the need for humility (13:30; 14:7-14), and the need to bear the cross (13:31-35; 14:25-34).

It is thus clear that Q is chiastic, not only at Q 3:1 – 7:35, but also at Q 9:57 – 22:38 (or possibly 7:36 – 24:12). These parallels are not due to Luke's arrangement of the material, for Luke repeatedly obscures the chiastic arrangement. They indicate instead that Luke worked from a chiastic source, namely Q, which is about twice as long as the double tradition.

Conclusion

Q cannot be reduced to the double tradition. Matthew only preserves for us a few longer Q pericopes and often incorporates short sayings that were part of a longer narrative in Q. Q is thus not a collection of isolated sayings, but a narrative (that is over 80% discourse) with a clearly defined structure. Luke has preserved for us lengthy portions of Q, and a study of Luke's redactional techniques can help us to approximate the original wording of Q. This has a number of implications for Q and Lukan scholarship. First, Q is so syntactically and structurally uniform that it is unlikely that it is the product of multiple recensions.⁵⁵ Second, whereas the double tradition often

⁵⁵ Contra Kloppenborg, *Formation*, et al.

appears to be a loose collection of sayings, this does not reflect the nature of Q itself, which is a document with narrative settings and movement. Third, studies of the “Q community” and the theology of Q need to be reworked in light of the likelihood that Q contains more than the double tradition and in view of the chiasmic structure of Q (especially its highlighting of the cross and the eschatological banquet). Finally, Luke is a more careful preserver of tradition than is typically assumed, supplementing Mark, Q, and the infancy narrative with only a handful of traditions and adding little to the words of Jesus in his sources. More work must be done on the extent and structure of Q; hopefully this thesis will stimulate much new discussion.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Allison, Dale C., Jr. *The Jesus Tradition in Q*. Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 1997.
- Asgeirsson, Jon Ma., and James M. Robinson. "The International Q Project: Work Sessions 12-14 July, 22 November 1991." *JBL* 111 (1992): 500-508.
- Blomberg, Craig. "Midrash, Chiasmus, and the Outline of Luke's Central Section." Pages 217-261 in *Studies in Midrash and Historiography*. Edited by R. T. France and David Wenham. Vol. 3 of *Gospel Perspectives*. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1983.
- Catchpole, David. "Q and the 'Friend at Midnight' (Luke xi.5-8/9)." *Journal of Theological Studies* 34 (1983): 407-424.
- Crossan, John Dominic. *In Fragments: The Aphorisms of Jesus*. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1983.
- Farmer, William R. "Notes on a Literary and Form-Critical Analysis of Some of the Synoptic Material Peculiar to Luke." *NTS* 8 (1961-62): 301-316.
- Fleddermann, Harry T. *Q: A Reconstruction and Commentary*. Leuven: Peeters, 2005.
- Goulder, M. D. "The Chiastic Structure of the Lucan Journey." *TU* 87 (1964): 195-202.
- Guenther, Heinz O. "The Sayings Gospel Q and the Quest for Aramaic Sources: Rethinking Christian Origins." Pages 41-74 in *Early Christianity, Q and Jesus*. Edited by John S. Kloppenborg and Leif E. Vaage. *Semeia* 55. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1992.
- Jacobson, Arland D. *The First Gospel: An Introduction to Q*. Sonoma, Calif.: Polebridge, 1992.
- Jeremias, Joachim. *Die Sprache des Lukasevangeliums: Redaktion und Tradition im Nicht-Markusstoff des dritten Evangeliums*. Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1980.
- Kirk, Alan. *The Composition of the Sayings Source: Genre, Synchrony, and Wisdom Redaction in Q*. Supplements to Novum Testamentum 91. New York: Brill, 1998.
- Kloppenborg Verbin, John S. *Excavating Q: The History and Setting of the Sayings Gospel*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2000.
- _____. *The Formation of Q: Trajectories in Ancient Wisdom Collections*. Studies in Antiquity and Christianity. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987.
- _____. *Q Parallels: Synopsis, Critical Notes & Concordance*. Sonoma, Calif.: Polebridge, 1988.
- Manson, T. W. *The Sayings of Jesus*. London: SCM, 1949.

- Metzger, Bruce Manning. *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*. 2d ed. New York: United Bible Societies, 1994.
- Robinson, James McConkey, Paul Hoffmann, and John S. Kloppenborg. *The Critical Edition of Q: Synopsis Including the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, Mark and Thomas with English, German, and French Translations of Q and Thomas*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2000.
- Schürmann, Heinz. *Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu den synoptischen Evangelien*. Düsseldorf: Patmos-Verlag, 1968.
- Streeter, Burnett Hillman. *The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins, Treating of the Manuscript Tradition, Sources, Authorship, & Dates*. New York: MacMillan, 1924.
- Talbert, Charles H. *Literary Patterns, Theological Themes, and the Genre of Luke-Acts*. Missoula: SBL, 1974.
- Taylor, Vincent. "The Original Order of 'Q'." Pages 95-118 in *New Testament Essays*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1972.