

STUDIEN ZUM NEUEN TESTAMENT UND SEINER UMWELT (SNTU)

Serie A, Band 30

Herausgegeben von DDr. Albert Fuchs
Professor em. Theologische Universität Linz

Die „Studien zum Neuen Testament und seiner Umwelt“ (Serie A = Aufsätze) erscheinen seit 1976, mit Originalaufsätzen oder bearbeiteten Übersetzungen sonst schwer zugänglicher Artikel. Inhaltlich werden wissenschaftlich-exegetische Arbeiten bevorzugt, gelegentlich auch historische und philologische Fragen behandelt.

Alle Manuskripte, Korrekturen, Mitteilungen usw., die die Serie betreffen, werden an den Herausgeber, Prof. Albert Fuchs, Blütenstr. 17, A-4040 Linz, erbeten. Es wird darum ersucht, die Manuskripte weitgehend unformatiert (Textverarbeitung mit WinWord) sowohl auf PC-Diskette oder per e-mail als auch ausgedruckt einzusenden. Abkürzungen, Zitate und Schreibweise (Angabe von Untertiteln, Reihe usw.) sollten den bisher erschienenen Bänden entsprechen bzw. sich nach TRE richten. Hebräische Texte werden bevorzugt in Transkription gedruckt.

Anschriften der Autoren und Autorinnen:

Dr. John Dennis, Post-Doc Researcher, K.U. Leuven
Prof. em. Dr. Albert Fuchs, Kath. Universität Linz
Prof. Dr. Beate Kowalski, University of Limerick (Ollscoil Luimnigh)
Prof. Jean-Paul Michaud, Université Saint-Paul, Ottawa
PD Dr. Hermann Josef Riedl, Universität Regensburg
Dr. Thomas Witulski, Wiss.Ass., Universität Münster

Die von den Autoren und Rezensenten vertretenen Positionen decken sich nicht notwendigerweise mit denen des Herausgebers.

Copyright: Prof. em. DDr. A. Fuchs, Linz 2004. Alle Rechte vorbehalten.
Gedruckt mit Förderung des Bundesministeriums für Bildung, Wissenschaft und Kultur in Wien

Bestelladresse: Studien zum Neuen Testament und seiner Umwelt
A-4020 Linz/Austria, Bethlehemsstraße 20
email: a.fuchs@ktu-linz.ac.at

INHALTSVERZEICHNIS

HERMANN JOSEF RIEDL

Der Seewandel Jesu Mk 6,45-52 parr. Eine Epiphanieerzählung und ihre
textpragmatische Intention 05

BEATE KOWALSKI

Der Fenstersturz in Troas (Apg 20,7-12) 19

THOMAS WITULSKI

Ein neuer Ansatz zur Datierung der neutestamentlichen Johannesapokalypse 39

JEAN-PAUL MICHAUD

Effervescence in Q Studies 61

JOHN DENNIS

The Presence and Function of Second Exodus-Restoration Imagery in John 6 105

ALBERT FUCHS

Zum Stand der Synoptischen Frage – J.S. Kloppenborg 123

Zum Stand der Synoptischen Frage – Ch. Münch 145

Zum Stand der Synoptischen Frage – D.A. de Silva 173

Zum Stand der Synoptischen Frage – L.W. Hurtado 185

Zum Stand der Synoptischen Frage – R.H. Stein 193

Zum Stand der Synoptischen Frage – M. Goodacre 215

REZENSIONEN 225

Allison D. C., Testament of Abraham (Fuchs) 261

Baarlink H., Verkündigtes Heil (Fuchs) 246

Baumert N., KOINONEIN und METECHEIN - synonym? (Fuchs) 259

Burkett D., Rethinking the Gospel Sources (Fuchs) 261

Burridge R.A., What are the Gospels? (Fuchs) 265

Busse U., Das Johannesevangelium (Fuchs) 231

DeSilva D., An Introduction to the NT (Fuchs) 262

Deines R., Die Gerechtigkeit der Tora im Reich des Messias (Fuchs) 227

Delville J.-P., L'Europe de l'exégèse au XVIIe siècle (Fuchs) 260

Deming W., Paul on Marriage and Celibacy (Gmainer-Pranzl) 249

Dormeyer D., Das Markusevangelium (Fuchs,) 230

Ebel E., Die Attraktivität früher christlicher Gemeinden (Gmainer-Pranzl) 252

Eerdman's Commentary, J.D.G. Dunn - J.W. Rogerson (Fuchs) 285

Evans C.A.- E. Porter S.E, Dictionary of New Testament Background (Fuchs) 272

Fenske W., Paulus lesen und verstehen (Huber) 267

Franco E., <i>Mysterium Regni. Ministerium Verbi</i> (Fuchs)	269
Gathercole S.J., <i>Where is Boasting?</i> (Labahn)	256
Giesen H., <i>Jesu Heilsbotschaft und die Kirche</i> (Fuchs)	285
Harnack A., <i>Marcion</i> (Fuchs)	275
Head P.M., <i>Christology and the synoptic problem</i> (Fuchs)	286
Hintermaier J., <i>Die Befreiungswunder in der Apostelgeschichte</i> (Jaros)	235
Janowski B.- Wilhelm G., <i>Texte zum Rechts- und Wirtschaftsleben</i> (Fuchs)	280
Johnson L.T., <i>Brother of Jesus, Friend of God</i> (Fuchs)	241
Kampling R., <i>Fs. Frankemölle</i> (Fuchs)	280
Klein H., <i>Lukasstudien</i> (Fuchs)	283
Köhn A., <i>Der Neutestamentler Ernst Lohmeyer</i> (Fuchs)	276
Kowalski B., <i>Ezechiel in der Offenbarung</i> (Oberforcher).....	245
Lewicki T., <i>Wort Gottes und Paraklese im Hebräerbrief</i> (Gmainer-Pranzl)	242
Luz U., <i>Das Evangelium nach Matthäus. 4. Teilband Mt 26-28</i> (Fuchs)	225
Mack B.L., <i>Wer schrieb das Neue Testament?</i> (Fuchs)	266
Mackay I. D., <i>John's Relationship with Mark</i> (Jaros)	234
McKnight S. - Osborne G.R., <i>The Face of New Testament Studies</i> (Fuchs)	264
Meyer A., <i>Mystagogie im Johannesevangelium</i> (Fuchs)	233
Miler J., <i>Les citations d'accomplissement dans Mt</i> (P.G. Müller)	228
Neuberth R., <i>Demokratie im Volk Gottes?</i> (Fuchs)	235
Nicholl C.R., <i>From Hope to Despair in Thessalonica</i> (Giesen)	239
Peres I., <i>Griechische Grabinschriften</i> (Zugmann)	277
Pietri L., <i>Die Geschichte des Christentums Bd. 1</i> (Fuchs)	251
Plümacher E., <i>Geschichte und Geschichten</i> (Fuchs)	277
Porter S.E., <i>Reading the Gospels Today</i> (Fuchs)	253
Reid D., <i>The IVP Dictionary of the New Testament</i> (Fuchs)	270
Roose H., <i>Eschatologische Mitherrschaft</i> (Giesen)	247
Schneider S., <i>Auferstehen</i> (Giesen)	237
Schweitzer A., <i>Vorträge, Vorlesungen, Aufsätze</i> (Fuchs)	270
Stanton-Longenecker-Barton, <i>The Holy Spirit and Christian Origins</i> (Giesen)	268
Theißen G., <i>Die Jesusbewegung</i> (Fuchs)	281
Thyen H., <i>Das Johannesevangelium</i> (Fuchs)	284
Trebilco P., <i>The Early Christians in Ephesus from Paul to Ignatius</i> (Fuchs)	272
Wahlen C., <i>Jesus and the Impurity of Spirits in the Synoptic Gospels</i> (Fuchs)	259
Wilckens U., <i>Theologie des Neuen Testaments, Bd. 1-2</i> (Fuchs)	255
Winter B.W., <i>Roman Wives, Roman Widows</i> (Pratscher)	273
Witherington B., <i>Revelation</i> (Kowalski)	243
Zimmermann R., <i>Christologie der Bilder im JohEv</i> (Grohmann)	232

Effervescence in Q Studies

If there is a domaine of biblical research in special ferment these days, it is surely that of the "Q source," traditional name for a document which Matthew and Luke are believed to have used, along with the gospel of Mark, as a source for their own gospels. Today, we witness a proliferation not only of articles but of entire specialized books on the subject, a body of literature which has become virtually impossible to master.¹ Nevertheless, I shall try to present a certain "state of the studies", here, not only about the existence of Q, but about all the questions which arise when its existence is taken for granted - this hypothetical source arguably more studied than the real gospels which we possess.

I-The Existence of Q

Q is part of the two-source theory which hypothesizes the priority of Mark (Mk), in the first place, and the existence of another source (called Q, from the German *Quelle* for source), to account for the relations of agreement between Matthew (Mt) and Luke (Lk) that cannot be explained by their common dependence on Mark. This is the most generally held hypothesis proposed as a solution to the *synoptic problem*.² But it remains an hypothesis, violently opposed by certain authors, elsewhere nuanced in a

¹ One can get an idea of this by consulting the Q Bibliography Supplement, published annually since 1990, at the time of the Annual Meeting of the *Society of Biblical Literature*, in the Seminar Papers. See also the bibliographies in *C.M. Tuckett*, Q and the History of Early Christianity, Studies on Q, Peabody, MA 1996, 451-476, in *John S. Kloppenborg Verbin*, Excavating Q. The History and Setting of the Sayings Gospel, Minneapolis 2000, 460-518, and the particularly critical "The State of Play", in *M. Casey*, An Aramaic Approach to Q. Sources for the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, Cambridge 2002, 1-50.

² That is, the problem of the resemblances and differences between the gospels of Mt, Lk and Mk, called the synoptics. For a detailed history of the problem, see *B. Reicke*, The History of the Synoptic Discussion, in: *D.L. Dungan* (ed.), The Interrelations of the Gospels (BETL, 95), Leuven 1990, 291-316. For a quick glimpse of recent positions, see *C.L. Blomberg*, The Synoptic Problem. Where We Stand at the Start of a New Century, in: *D.A. Black* and *D.R. Beck* (eds), Rethinking the Synoptic Problem, Grand Rapids, MI 2001, 17-40. But for a global view of all that has been published on the synoptic problem since the end of the 1960's, the works of *Frans Neirynck* remain indispensable: *Evangelica* (BETL, 60), Leuven 1982; *Evangelica II* (BETL, 99), 1991; *Evangelica III* (BETL, 150), 2001.

number of different ways even among those who support it. Evidently, the actual state of Q source research depends on studies of the synoptic problem. The simple act of surveying positions presently defended in regard to this problem will make clear what is thought concerning the existence of Q.

A- Neo-Griesbach theory or the Two-Gospel hypothesis

Taking up again a theory defended by J.J. Griesbach at the end of the 18th century, W.R. Farmer fought passionately against the priority of Mark from 1964 onwards. In his view, Matthew was the first gospel, reedited by Luke, while Mark, the last of the gospels, made a synthesis (very abridged) of the two earlier works.³ The fact that Lk knew Mt is sufficient to explain the agreements of Mt-Lk apart from Mk, and consequently there is no further need for the hypothetical Q document. Farmer created a school and his thesis is forcefully defended today by a whole group of disciples who have recently organized themselves into the *Research Team of the International Institute for Gospel Studies*.⁴

This is not the place to discuss this hypothesis in detail. C.M. Tuckett has examined it closely in his doctoral dissertation, *The Revival of the Griesbach Hypothesis*,⁵ and his reflections in *Q and the History of Early Christianity* are always pertinent.⁶ For

³ *W.R. Farmer*, *The Synoptic Problem. A Critical Analysis*, New York 1964. See *The Two-Gospel Hypothesis. The Statement of the Hypothesis*, in: *Dungan* (ed.), *The Interrelations*, 125-156; *The Minor Agreements of Matthew and Luke against Mark and the Two-Gospel Hypothesis*, in: *G. Strecker* (ed.), *Minor Agreements*, Göttingen 1993, 163-207 and, what is perhaps the last exposé of Farmer (he died on 30/12/2000): *The Case for the Two-Gospel Hypothesis*, which presents his thesis in 16 points, in *Black-Beck* (eds), *Rethinking*, 97-135.

⁴ See first of all, *D.L. Dungan*, *Response to the Two-Source Hypothesis*, in: *Dungan* (ed.), *The Interrelations*, 201-216 and *A History of the Synoptic Problem. The Canon, the Text, the Composition and the Interpretation of the Gospels* (The Anchor Bible Reference Library), New York 1999. Also, *A.J. McNichol*, *D.L. Dungan* and *D.B. Peabody* (eds), *Beyond the Q Impasse — Luke's Use of Matthew: A Demonstration by the Research Team of the International Institute for Gospel Studies*, Valley Forge, PA 1996, and very recently *D.B. Peabody*, *L. Cope* and *A.J. McNichol* (eds), *One Gospel from Two: Mark's Use of Matthew and Luke: A Demonstration by the Research Team of the International Institute for Gospel Studies*, Harrisburg, PA 2002. Apropos of these last works, see the review of the first by *C.M. Tuckett*, in: *JBL* 117 (1998) 363-365, and of the second by *H.T. Fleddermann*, in: *CBQ* 66 (2004) 498-500.

⁵ *C.M. Tuckett*, *The Revival of the Griesbach Hypothesis. An analysis and appraisal*, Cambridge 1983.

⁶ *Tuckett*, *Q and the History*, 11-16.

sure, the neo-griesbachians rightly emphasize that the two-source theory is not without difficulties, in particular in regard to the minor agreements between Mt and Lk against Mk. But, in my opinion, we must recognize that "it is far easier to accommodate the few significant minor agreements against Mark, for which various, if not completely satisfying explanations have been proposed, than it is to accept a Luke who drastically rearranged Matthew, or a Mark who conflated and abbreviated Matthew and Luke".⁷ And, we must pose the question, with W.D. Davies and D.C. Allison in their commentary on Matthew, and repeated by M. Goodacre: "Can one seriously envision someone rewriting Matthew and Luke so as to omit the miraculous birth of Jesus, the sermon on the mount, and the resurrection appearances, while, on the other hand, adding the tale of the naked young man, a healing miracle in which Jesus has trouble healing, and the remark that Jesus' family thought him mad?"⁸

It must be noted that the new positions taken by M.-É. Boismard concerning the synoptic problem bring him close, as he recognizes, to "la théorie des Deux Évangiles (Griesbach *redivivus*)", but only "sur un point très précis: par rapport à notre théorie précédente, nous admettons maintenant un nombre de cas beaucoup plus considérables où effectivement le texte actuel de Mc fusionne les textes des traditions matthéenne et lucanienne".⁹ Here, then, our actual Mark depends at one and the same time on an intermediate Matthew and a proto-Luke. As Boismard remarks also, this accords with the theory elaborated by P. Rolland, "selon laquelle Mc ne ferait que fusionner les textes, non pas de Mt et de Lc sous leur forme actuelle, mais d'un pré-Matthieu et d'un pré-Luc".¹⁰ However, Rolland distances himself from Griesbach's theory on two points:

⁷ *Kloppenborg Verbin*, *Excavating Q*, 38-43, here 43. See also *P. Rolland*, *Les faiblesses de la théorie de Griesbach*, in: *Les premiers évangiles. Un nouveau regard sur le problème synoptique* (Lectio divina, 116), Paris 1984, 26-31 and very recently *Mark Goodacre* who, in firmly establishing Markan priority: *Setting in Place the Cornerstone: The Priority of Mark*, in: *The Case Against Q*, Harrisburg, PA 2002, 19-45, automatically rejects the Griesbach hypothesis.

⁸ *W.C. Davies* and *D.C. Allison*, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to Saint Matthew* (The International Commentary on the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments), Edinburgh, I (1988), 109. See *Goodacre*, *The Case*, 37.

⁹ *M.-É. Boismard*, *L'évangile de Marc. Sa préhistoire* (Études bibliques, n.s., 26), Paris 1994, 9. Apropos of this, see *F. Neiryck*: *Urmarcus révisé. La théorie synoptique de M.-É. Boismard nouvelle manière*, in: *Evangelica III*, 399-411 (1995 article).

¹⁰ *Boismard*, *L'évangile de Marc*, 9.

he maintains the independence of the actual gospels of Mt and Lk and, equally, the source common to Mt and Lk (Q), which he calls the Gospel of the God-Fearers.¹¹

This is also the position of Étienne Nodet of the École biblique de Jérusalem, who underscores the difficulties of the two-source theory, particularly the minor agreements of Mt and Lk against Mk in the triple tradition¹² and ends up aligning himself on the side of Griesbach.¹³ He does this mainly for two extraneous reasons which lead him to consider Mk as posterior to Mt and Lk: first, the combination of patristic witnesses which would indicate "qu'une certaine forme de Mc dépend d'autres sources, qui ne peuvent être que certains états plus ou moins archaïques de Mt et de Lc",¹⁴ and secondly, the fact that Mk, being unfamiliar with Jewish Galilee, would have been "très éloigné du milieu d'origine".¹⁵ Nodet does not really take into account, in my opinion, some responses given to the problem of the minor agreements, and opts for a solution which entails unverifiable hypotheses, as witness the "ce qu'il faut de menus remaniements, de rédaction progressive" and the "etc." which he has to add to account for some remaining problems.

All of this clearly illustrates the complexity of the synoptic problem and why, even today, it remains a problem.

¹¹ P. Rolland, *Les premiers évangiles*, 26-31 and 158-180. About this "adaptation de l'hypothèse de Griesbach" by P. Rolland, cf. *F. Neiryneck*, in: *Evangelica II*, 305-307 and 325-329.

¹² E. Nodet, *Le Fils de Dieu. Procès de Jésus et Évangiles (Josèphe et son temps, 4)*, Paris 2002, 89. 99. 144.

¹³ *Ibid.*, 115, and finally 145: "Disons brièvement qu'il n'y a aucune difficulté à reprendre la théorie de Griesbach, et de considérer que Mc dépend de Mt et Lc, avec ce qu'il faut de menus remaniements, de rédaction progressive, etc.!"

¹⁴ Nodet, *ibid.*, 108. An argument which the author reinforces by invoking the hypothesis that Mk was a liturgical composition ("*Sitz im Leben* rituel initiatique", 108), which the properly christian titles of Mk 1,1: "Jesus Christ" and "Son of God" ("déclaration liturgique faite au moment où cet évangile est proclamé", 108) would, notably, suggest. All this, if I understand rightly, requiring a late date for canonical Mk.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 115. These external considerations would, according to him, give the advantage to the Griesbach theory.

B- Priority of Mark and its variants

With the exception of the Griesbach theory, which its partisans now prefer to call the Two Gospel Theory,¹⁶ the priority of Mark remains the cornerstone of the other recent attempts to resolve the synoptic problem. But this priority is viewed in different ways depending on the acceptance of one form or another of Mark different from existing Mark. It is a question of some form of a proto-Mark, or some form of a deutero-Mark.

1- Proto-Mark

The classic difficulty constituted by the minor agreements Mt-Lk against Mk is, more than anything else, at the origin of the theory of an *Urmarkus* on which Mt and Lk would have depended, and which existing Mark would have modified somewhat.¹⁷ Recently, M.-É. Boismard in his own way returned to the hypothesis. The studies which he did, with A. Lamouille, on the Acts of the Apostles¹⁸ and the inventory which he made of Luke's characteristics led him to take up again in depth the theory which he had proposed in 1972 in the *Synopse des quatre évangiles en français*.¹⁹ As is well-known, Boismard defends a "Multi-Stage Hypothesis," according to which the relationships between the gospels ought to be explained, not by direct dependence on existing texts,

¹⁶ D.L. Dungan explains this new title, which he attributes to B. Orchard, A Synopsis of the Four Gospels in a New [English] Translation Arranged According to the Two Gospel Hypothesis, Macon, GA 1982, in his article Two-Gospel Hypothesis in: Anchor Bible Dictionary, New York, VI (1992), 671-679. M. Goulder contested this label: "my own theory [...] is also a Two-Gospel Hypothesis" (Lk using Mk and Mt), in: Strecker, Minor Agreements, 143, n. 1.

¹⁷ On the most ancient variations of the hypothesis, see F. Neiryneck, The Minor Agreements of Matthew and Luke against Mark with a Cumulative List, in collaboration with T. Hansen and F. Van Segbroeck (BETL, 37), Leuven 1974, 12-14; on the more recent, see T.A. Friedrichsen, The Matthew-Luke Agreements against Mark: A Survey of Recent Studies: 1974-1989, in F. Neiryneck (ed.), L'évangile de Luc. Problèmes littéraires et théologiques (BETL, 32), revised and enlarged edition, 1989, 335-392, here 341-343. A proto-Mk (Mk¹) has also been proposed by N. Walter, cf. Evangelica III, 210, n. 5.

¹⁸ M.-É. Boismard - A. Lamouille, Le texte Occidental des Actes des Apôtres. Reconstitution et réhabilitation, t. I: Introduction et textes; t. II: Apparat critique, Index des caractéristiques stylistiques, Index des citations patristiques (Synthèse, 17), Paris 1984.

¹⁹ M.-É. Boismard, with the collaboration of A. Lamouille and P. Sandevour, *Synopse des quatre évangiles en français*, t. II, Paris 1972 (2^e éd. in 1980, corrected by A. Lamouille).

but by appeal to more ancient hypothetical sources on which they depend.²⁰ He affirms with good reason that the complex synoptic problem "ne peut être résolu que par une solution complexe".²¹ In rereading Mk with these Lucan preoccupations in mind, Boismard believes he sees important Lucan influences on the existing text of Mk which oblige him to distinguish "au moins deux niveaux de rédaction dans cet évangile, le dernier niveau étant fortement influencé par le style de Lc".²² By eliminating all the Lukan influences from existing Mk, Boismard arrives at a proto-Mark reduced to its "simplicité primitive," in fact very diminished and even decapitated, since it stops at the account of the institution of the Eucharist (Mk 14, 22-25) and does not include the narrative of the passion and resurrection.²³

2- Deutero-Mark

a- Radical form: a new redaction of Mk

It is still in order to explain particularly the famous minor agreements between Mt-Lk against Mk, that Albert Fuchs has proposed a variant on the thesis of Markan priority. Mt and Lk no longer depend on a Mk anterior to existing Mk, but rather on a posterior Mk, a *Deuteromarkus*, which would be a new and augmented redaction of canonical Mk, used independently by Mt and Lk.²⁴ Therefore, "a three-stage theory (i.e. Mark, Deutero-Mark, Matthew/Luke) should be preferred [...]"²⁵ to the classic

²⁰ Boismard has given a very illuminating exposé and clarification of it in: *Théorie des niveaux multiples*, in: *Strecker*, *The Interrelations*, 231-243.

²¹ Boismard, *ibid.*, 232.

²² Boismard, *L'évangile de Marc*, 22.

²³ Boismard, *L'évangile de Marc*, 47 and the final synthesis (241-242) where the author gives his explanation. See the reaction of *Neiryneck* in: *Urmarcus révisé*, *Evangelica III*, 399-411.

²⁴ This is the theory which *A. Fuchs* expounded in his thesis: *Sprachliche Untersuchungen zu Matthäus und Lukas. Ein Beitrag zur Quellenkritik. Die Blindenheilung: Mt 9,27-31. Das Zeugnis der Christen in der Verfolgung: Lk 21,14-15* (*Analecta Biblica*, 49), Rome 1971, and which he refined and developed subsequently in numerous articles and reviews treating the synoptic problem, published mainly, since 1974, in the volumes of *Studien zum Neuen Testament und seiner Umwelt* (SNTU), Linz. For a critical presentation, see *T.A. Friedrichsen*, *The Matthean-Luke Agreements*, in: *Neiryneck* (ed.), *L'évangile de Luc*, 360-365.

²⁵ *A. Fuchs* in: *Strecker*, *Minor Agreements*, 92. See the earlier „Übereinstimmungen gegen Mk“, in: SNTU 3 (1978) 55.

two-source theory. In the beginning, Fuchs was not contesting, at least not directly, the components of the two-source theory: Markan priority, reciprocal independence of Mt and Lk, and existence even of a second source (Q). Later, he will remove from Q certain passages of the double tradition found also in Mk (Mark-Q overlaps): the preaching of John the Baptist, the temptation of Jesus, the controversy about Beelzebul, the parable of the mustard seed. This will lead him to call for a more rigorous definition of the Q source, requiring that it be truly "*Redequelle*" or "*Logienschrift*," without narrative elements.²⁶

As far as the minor agreements are concerned, they are seen - and this is capital - as secondary in relation to canonical Mk, which excludes any explanation based on a pre-Markan level. What is more, these agreements are seen as a global phenomenon, the product of a single hand, to which it is necessary to respond globally as well, that is by assuming that Mt and Lk depend on a redaction of Mk, i.e. *Deuteromark*, produced by the same author, certain of whose theological preoccupations it would even be possible to identify (v.g., enhancement of christological statements and ecclesiological interest). And this even if, in principle, one recognizes that several of these minor agreements could be explained as corrections of the Markan text by Mt and Lk, two independent redactors.

Following Fuchs and under his direction, several "disciples" have defended the existence of a *Deuteromark*, chiefly still for the purpose of explaining the minor agreements Mt-Lk against Mk, and albeit with nuances. Among them, Franz Kogler (1988), Christoph Niemand (1989) and Johann Rauscher (1990).²⁷ With these authors, the hypothesis of a *Deuteromark* has continued to evolve. This document, originally proposed to explain the minor agreements Mt-Lk against Mk in the triple tradition, which ended up including some texts of the double tradition localized in the Markan context, now includes, according to Kogler, some "Matthean special material". Like-

²⁶ A. Fuchs, Die Wiederbelebung der Griesbachhypothese, in: SNTU 5 (1980) 141-142; Versuchung Jesu, in: SNTU 9 (1984) 144.

²⁷ F. Kogler, Das Doppelgleichnis vom Senfkorn und vom Sauerteig in seiner traditions-geschichtlichen Entwicklung. Zur Reich-Gottes-Vorstellung Jesu und ihren Aktualisierungen in der Urkirche (Forschung zur Bibel, 59), Würzburg 1988; C. Niemand, Studien zu den Minor Agreements der synoptischen Verklärungspereikopen. Eine Untersuchung der literarkritischen Relevanz der gemeinsamen Abweichungen des Matthäus und Lukas von Markus 9,2-10 für die synoptische Frage (Europäische Hochschulschriften, 23/352), Frankfurt 1989; J. Rauscher, Vom Messiasgeheimnis zur Lehre der Kirche. Die Entwicklung der sogenannten Parabeltheorie in der synoptischen Tradition (Mk 4,10-12 par Mt 13,10-17 par Lk 8,9-10), Diss. Linz 1990.

wise, Niemand, in his thesis on the transfiguration, attributes almost all the minor agreements to a *Deuteromark* and rejects as unsatisfactory, except for some stylistic agreements, the explanation of independent redactions on the part of Mt and Lk. In those passages where the agreements are not strictly identical (his agreements nos. 3, 6, 14, 15 and 17), Niemand believes that Mt has better preserved the Deuteromarkan version. All of this leads Neiryneck to remark: "In fact, Niemand's *Deuteromarkus* is in reality a (post-Markan) Proto-Matthew".²⁸ J. Rauscher develops the same hypothesis and, in his work also, *Deuteromark* takes on a more and more Matthean coloration. In this context, the remark of T.A. Friedrichsen seems entirely pertinent: "As Deuteromarkus comes closer to Matthew, the significance of Q begins to wane and Luke's use of Deuteromarkus comes closer to Goulder's hypothesis of Luke's dependence on Matthew".²⁹

Thus, in the theory of *Deuteromark* there is a kind of gradual abandonment of the Q source. Beginning with Fuchs, *Deuteromark* incorporates elements of Q, and then through the works of Kogler, Niemand and Rauscher, it winds up approximating a proto-Matthew (posterior to canonical Mk). Q is, then, dispensed with, a bit in the manner of Goulder, as we will see. Is there really an advantage in replacing Q with another document which seems to be even more hypothetical, and which would certainly be difficult to reconstruct? To answer in the affirmative, it would have to be impossible to explain the minor agreements in any other way, and particularly to demonstrate the impossibility of independent redactions on the part of Mt and Lk. I will come back to these agreements. Let me just add, in closing, that it would be truly curious all the same if, instead of this improved Mark which is forever lost, the manuscript tradition had preserved only our *poor* canonical Mark...

b- Mitigated form: a recension of Mark

Ulrich Luz, in his commentary on Matthew, maintains the two-source theory and, thus, the existence of Q. But from time to time, due to minor agreements which are difficult to explain, he also allows that Mt and Lk knew Mk in a recension "which in a

²⁸ F. Neiryneck, *The Minor Agreements and the Two-Source Theory* (Symposium, Göttingen, 1991), in: *Evangelica* II, 36.

²⁹ T.A. Friedrichsen, *New Dissertations on the Minor Agreements*, in: *ETL* 67 (1991) 373-394, here 390. See as well F. Neiryneck, *The Minor Agreements*, in *Evangelica* II, 3-42 (*Niemand*, 34-40) and *ETL* 65 (1989) 440-441 (*Kogler*), 441-42 (*Niemand*).

number of points is secondary to our Mark".³⁰ So then, a *Deuteromark*", a deuteromarkan reworking of the Markan Text",³¹ but which would not be very different from canonical Mark. And which is not the only solution to the problem of the agreements. In fact, he writes:

But it is my view that the minor agreements do not necessitate a basic revision of the two-source hypothesis. Since they do not show a clear common linguistic and/or theological profile, it is not necessary to limit their explanation to one single hypothesis. Rather, depending on the passage, one may cite various hypotheses. Often one may assume corrections of the Markan text by Matthew and Luke which were done independently.³²

In his second volume, Luz often emphasizes the great number of these minor agreements. For the most part, he supports a redactional explanation, but sometimes he finds himself obliged, for instance apropos of Mt 9, 18-26, to accept a revised Mark as source: "Our text is one of those synoptic texts that are clear indications of the existence of a deuteromarkan recension".³³ However, he remains modest in his conclusions and seems to become more and more undecided. He says, for example, in regard to Mt 17, 1 (narrative of the transfiguration) "that a deuteromarkan recension is a possibility as the source for Matthew. However we cannot be certain; many minor agreements in this text may be independent redaction" (395). In his third volume (Teilband: *Mt 18-25*, 1997), the significant minor agreements are reduced again, and Neiryck comments about this: "their number is further reducible below the minimum that is required to constitute a 'recension' (or revised text) of Mark".³⁴ At the 1991 symposium, Luz himself concluded that the existence of a deuteromarkan revision - "most likely a Deuteromark (as according to Ennulat) which is slightly different from Mark"- introducing "an additional unknown text, to which I must turn with some of my

³⁰ U. Luz, *Matthew 1-7. A Commentary*, Minneapolis 1989, 48.

³¹ U. Luz, ad Mt 13,10 in: *Matthew 8-20 (Hermeneia)*, Minneapolis 2001, 237. The same solution is invoked for the agreements in Mt 9,18-26 (41); 12,3-4 (179); 16,21 (381); 17,1-3 (395).

³² U. Luz, *Matthew 1-7*, 48.

³³ U. Luz, *Matthew 8-20*, 41.

³⁴ F. Neiryck, *The Sources of Matthew. Annotations to U. Luz's Commentary*, in: *Evangelica III*, 378.

problems *faute de mieux*", was not, ultimately, established and "should be used only as a last resort [*Verlegenheitshypothese*]"³⁵

On this point Luz refers, principally and often, to Andreas Ennulat - whose thesis he directed - who, more than anyone, has developed this idea of a partial and modest revision of Mark.³⁶ Actually, after having studied more than 1000 minor agreements, Ennulat proposes a deuterio-markan revision as the only acceptable solution for just 4% of the agreements. Among the latter, three or four belong to the Passion narrative, and the main one, Mt 26, 28/Lk22, 64 against Mk 14, 65, poses a special problem to which I will return later. For the rest, it seems simpler to think of independent revisions on the part of Mt and Lk than to imagine a new entity, a Mark lightly reworked, of which absolutely no trace exists.³⁷

C- Priority of Mark without Q, and posteriority of Luke

We have seen that the Two Gospel hypothesis (Griesbach *redivivus*) made Luke depend on Matthew. But the novelty proposed by Austin Farrer was to combine Markan priority with this idea that Luke knew Matthew.³⁸ Michael Goulder embraced this hypothesis with great fervor and popularized it in numerous articles, but above all in his principal work, *Luke: A New Paradigm*.³⁹ According to this new paradigm,

³⁵ U. Luz, in his response to W.R. Farmer, in Strecker, *Minor Agreements*, 220.

³⁶ A. Ennulat, *Die "Minor Agreements"*. Untersuchungen zu einer offenen Frage des Synoptischen Problems (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament. 2. Reihe, 62), Tübingen 1994. The dissertation dates from 1990. See the long review of T.A. Friedrichsen, in: ETL 67 (1991) 373-385.

³⁷ It must always be remembered, however, as is underscored so well by M.E. Boring, *The Synoptic Problem, "Minor" Agreements, and the Beelzebul Pericope*, in F. Van Segbroeck, C.M. Tuckett, G. Van Belle, J. Verheyden (eds), *The Four Gospels 1992*. Festschrift Frans Neiryck (BETL, 100), Leuven 1992, 617: "that it is inherently probable that all of our early documents circulated in different recensions". From this perspective, he concludes: "Positing such [like that of Luz] a Deuterio-Markan recension is only a minor adaptation of the classic 2SH."

³⁸ Theory presented by A. Farrer, *On dispensing with Q*, in D.E. Nineham (ed.), *Studies in the Gospels. Essays in Memory of R.H. Lightfoot*, Oxford, 55-88, in 1955, but suggested before him by J.H. Ropes, *The Synoptic Problem*, Cambridge, MA, in 1934.

³⁹ M. Goulder, *Luke. A New Paradigm* (JSNTSup. 20), Sheffield 1989. For a resumé of his position, see 22-26: *Alternative Paradigm*. R.H. Gundry "join[ed] arms with M.D. Goulder to

which replaces that of the two-source theory, Mk remains first, he was used by Mt, and Lk knew and used both. Already in 1978, Goulder concluded an article, entitled "On Putting Q to the Test," saying: "The evidence from the agreements shows that Luke knew Matthew and that Q is therefore no longer a valid hypothesis".⁴⁰ He maintains this position in his important work, *Luke: a New Paradigm*: "if Luke knew Matthew, we should have lost the main reason for believing in the existence of Q [...] If there were one significant and clear Minor Agreement in the Passion story, then we should know that Luke was following Matthew; and Q, and with it the whole structure, would be undermined".⁴¹ He took up his argumentation again, with some corrections, at the congress in Göttingen in 1991. To distance himself from certain interpretations of his position which he thought false, he concluded: "It is certainly true that no amount of argument on the minor agreements would 'automatically undo the Q hypothesis' [quoting Friedrichsen]".⁴² This did not prevent him from immediately affirming: "So an impressive string of minor agreements is enough to put Q to the test; and I have argued in my *Luke* that Q fails the test comprehensively" (159). Perhaps, however, his true position is articulated on the following page: "The Two-Source hypothesis [...] cannot be proved to be wrong. But it has to compete with other theories in plausibility" (160). However, according to his analysis of the minor agreements, he really thinks that the two-source theory is implausible.

argue that Luke used Matthew as well as Mark (though [he adds] I disagree heartily with Goulder's replacement of Q with Matthew and therefore would add that Luke used Q as well as Mark and Matthew)", in his essay: *Matthean Foreign Bodies in Agreements of Luke with Matthew Against Mark. Evidence that Luke used Matthew*, in: *The Four Gospels* 1992, 1468.

⁴⁰ M. Goulder, *On Putting Q to the Test*, in: *NTS* 24 (1978) 218-234, here 234. Cf. also his *Is Q a Juggernaut*, in: *JBL* 115 (1996) 667-681.

⁴¹ Goulder, *Luke*, 6. Goulder appeals here to the concept of "falsifiability" that he borrows from Karl Popper, the philosopher of science: an hypothesis can be refuted, falsified, if it can be established that the hypothesis does not account for one point, unique as it may be. Thus, "all swans are white" can be refuted by the discovery of a single black swan" (*Luke*, 3). On this basis he argues that "if there were any significant Minor Agreement (MA) of Matthew and Luke against Mark in the Passion story, that would imply that Luke knew Matthew (since Luke wrote later than Matthew, and there is no Q in the Passion story *ex hypothesi*)". Now this decisive minor agreement exists according to Goulder, and it is that one to which one must return: the agreement of Mt 26,68 /Lc 22, 64, against Mc 14, 65. Among all the minor agreements that can be discussed, this one is decisive, it is the black swan which suffices to upset the two-source theory!

⁴² M. Goulder, *Luke's Knowledge of Matthew*, in: *Strecker*, *Minor Agreements*, 159. For *Friedrichsen*, see: *The Matthew-Luke Agreements*, in: *F. Neirynck* (ed.), *L'évangile de Luc*, 384.

Goulder's assaults did not remain without echoes, and the fervent defenders of the two-source theory, especially F. Neiryneck and C.M. Tuckett, took up the challenge many times over. Neiryneck, who has ceaselessly returned to the question of the minor agreements in his long defense of the two-source theory,⁴³ responded to Goulder by maintaining, generally, the thesis of independent interpretation. So, while Goulder saw in the agreement Mt 16, 21/Lk 9, 22 against Mk 8, 31 an "accumulation of *uncharacteristic* Lukan changes", "the combination of [...] not very Lukan changes 'all in one verse, all in agreement with Matthew'", and concluded, if not about each agreement, at least about the sum of them, that Lk had Mt in front of him while he was writing,⁴⁴ Neiryneck responded (with T.A. Friedrichsen) that Lk 9, 22 "is not un-Lukan and can very well have been Luke's own reworking of Mk 8,31".⁴⁵ Only the exceptional agreement of Mt 26, 68/Lk 22, 64 against Mk 14, 65 forces Neiryneck to another solution: he must, for this unique case, have recourse to a conjectural emendation of the text of Mt.⁴⁶

For his part, Tuckett had already responded, in an article from 1984,⁴⁷ to the challenge launched by the Goulder articles of 1978 and 1980.⁴⁸ To establish that Lk knew Mt, Goulder had really specified that the agreements between Mt and Lk had to be "both positively Matthean and positively un-Lukan".⁴⁹ He presented twelve exam-

⁴³ See the series of six articles in *Evangelica* II, 3-138, and that of eight articles in *Evangelica* III, 209-339.

⁴⁴ *Goulder*, *Luke*, 48-50, 185, n. 51 and 438-439.

⁴⁵ *F. Neiryneck - T.A. Friedrichsen*, Note on Luke 9,22. A Response to M.D. Goulder, in: *Neiryneck* (ed.), *L'évangile de Luc*, 393-398 (*Evangelica* II, 43-48).

⁴⁶ He had had recourse to this hypothesis in his article in: ETL 63 (1987) 5-47 (*Evangelica* II, 95-138), he still adheres to it ten years later in: *Goulder and the Minor Agreements*, in: ETL 73 (1997) 84-93 (*Evangelica* III, 307-318, especially 315-317). On the legitimacy of invoking a conjectural correction to resolve a source-critical problem, see *C.M. Tuckett*, *The Minor Agreements and Textual Criticism*, in: *Strecker*, *Minor Agreements*, 119-143, and here, 135-141.

⁴⁷ *C.M. Tuckett*, *On the Relationship Between Matthew and Luke*, in: NTS 30 (1984) 130-142.

⁴⁸ Cf. "On Putting Q to the Test," in: NTS 1978 and the short, somewhat cavalier, article, *Farrer on Q*, in: *Theology* 83 (1980) 190-195.

⁴⁹ Cf. *Tuckett*, in: NTS 30 (1984) 130. Goulder concluded his 1980 article by saying that, to establish that Lk had known Mt, the agreements between the two had to satisfy two conditions: "First the words must be in some way characteristic of Matthew [...]. Second, the words must be in some way *uncharacteristic* of Luke...", *Theology* 83 (1980) 195.

ples which he thought fulfilled these conditions and which, consequently, entailed "the end of Q" ("Q to the Test," 234). Tuckett took up each of these examples in turn, demonstrating that "either they turn out to be not clearly Matthean, or they cannot be shown to be un-Lukan. Thus these examples do not show that Luke knew Matthew" and they do not invalidate "the Q hypothesis".⁵⁰ In his book, *Q and the History of Early Christianity*, Tuckett has also responded very well to the objection inspired by Popper's principle of "falsifiability", which Goulder invoked many times. Tuckett notes that this principle is applicable in the empirical sciences and if we can speak of "neutestamentliche Wissenschaft", in so far as New Testament studies are conducted with total intellectual rigor, nevertheless this discipline has its own rules which are not those of the empirical sciences.⁵¹ What is more, he recalls that Popper himself admitted the possibility of introducing "auxiliary hypotheses" into a general theory in order to account for otherwise inexplicable details. And, according to Tuckett, the theory of a conjectural emendation of the text of Mt, to account for the exceptional case of the agreement Mt-Lk against Mk 14, 65, "would fit into this category of an auxiliary hypothesis perfectly easily".⁵²

Despite all this, these responses did not succeed in convincing everyone and, in 1996, Mark S. Goodacre undertook, in his turn, a close examination of Goulder's *New Paradigm*.⁵³ While sympathetic to Goulder's thesis, Goodacre nevertheless criticizes several of his arguments. He maintains, of course, that the minor agreements

⁵⁰ Tuckett, in: NTS 30 (1984) 140. But the adversaries don't give up easily, and Goulder reacted in turn in his Luke (1989). Friedrichsen collected these latter reactions to Tuckett in an excursus to his long "Survey", in: Neirynek (ed.), L'Évangile de Luc, 378-380.

⁵¹ Tuckett, *Q and the History*, 24, n. 58. J.S. Kloppenborg Verbin also contested, in a long examination of the texts of *Thomas Kuhn* (who popularized the term "paradigm" in: *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, Chicago 1962 and 1970) and of *Karl Popper*, the use made by Goulder of the word *paradigm* and of the concept of *falsifiability*, *Is There a New Paradigm*, in: D.G. Horrell and C.M. Tuckett (eds), *Christology, Controversy and Community. New Testament Essays in Honour of David R. Catchpole*, Leiden 2000, 23-47.

⁵² Tuckett, *Q and the History*, 24, n. 59. It's also in large measure in response to Goulder that D.R. Catchpole has shown, in: *Did Q Exist?*, in *The Quest for Q*, Edinburgh 1993, 1-59, on the basis of 16 examples, that "Luke gives us access to an earlier version than that in Matthew" (7) and that "the Q hypothesis [...] permits a sensible reconstruction of the tradition history as a whole" (59).

⁵³ Mark S. Goodacre, *Goulder and the Gospels. An Examination of a New Paradigm* (JSNT SS, 133), Sheffield 1996. He dedicates a whole chapter of 42 pages (89-130) to the Minor Agreements.

constitute a serious difficulty for the two-source theory, but he squarely affirms that the argumentation of Goulder "featuring language characteristic of Matthew and uncharacteristic of Luke does not [...] prove Luke's knowledge of Matthew".⁵⁴ In his recent work, *The Case against Q*, Goodacre addresses, once again, the question of the agreements between Mt and Lk against Mk,⁵⁵ and particularly the one against Mk 14, 65 about which he concurs with Goulder: "this minor agreement is indeed one that tests the two-source theory and finds it wanting" (160). However, he lightly shifts the question to insist on what is implicit in Goulder's argumentation. He takes Goulder's phrase, "The evidence from the agreements shows that Luke knew Matthew," but adds the italics, "and [*since this runs contrary to the basic premise behind the Q hypothesis, that Matthew and Luke are independent of one another*] that Q is *therefore* no longer a valid hypothesis" (168). On the basis of his argumentation, however, it seems to me that Goodacre contributes little that is new. If he establishes Markan priority very solidly, "Setting in Place the Cornerstone" (19-45),⁵⁶ in my opinion the attack he makes on the independence of Mt and Lk is fruitless. Like Goulder, he really returns, but more faithfully, to the thesis of Austin Farrer: knowledge and use of Mk and Mt by Lk.⁵⁷ His epilogue attempts a description of what "a world without Q" might look like and takes leave of the Q hypothesis. This, I think, is a bit premature.

⁵⁴ Goodacre, Goulder, 129-130.

⁵⁵ Goodacre, *The Case*, 152-169: Major and Minor Agreements.

⁵⁶ And this is very important while the Two Gospel group pursues its ongoing battle...and has just published (2002) *One Gospel from Two. Mark's Use of Matthew and Luke*, which defends the posteriority of Mk, obviously.

⁵⁷ Cf. A. Farrer, in: D.E. Nineham (ed.), *Studies in the Gospels*, 55-88. Moreover, Goodacre proposes to drop the expression "Farrer-Goulder theory," often employed (by Tuckett, Neiryneck, Kloppenborg Verbin), in favor of "Farrer theory". He intends, in doing this, to distance himself somewhat from Goulder, whom he reproaches for the "theses of the lectionary origin of Scripture and the notion that the evangelists were highly creative authors who used minimal source material", *The Case*, 14. Citing E.P. Sanders and M. Davies, *Studying the Synoptic Gospels*, London/Philadelphia 1989, 116-117: "We think that Matthew used Mark and undefined other sources, while creating some of the sayings material. Luke used Mark and Matthew, as well as other sources, and the author also created sayings material. [...] Thus far Goulder has not persuaded us that one can give up sources for the sayings material. With this rather substantial modification, however, we accept Goulder's theory: Matthew used Mark and Luke used them both", Goodacre declares, still more precisely: "This modified version of Goulder's thesis is essentially the one that will be argued in this book", 13, n. 53.

D- Priority of Mark with Q, and posteriority of Matthew

In a very recent work,⁵⁸ Martin Hengel reverses the order of origin of the gospels⁵⁹ and explains their literary dependences in a new way: it is no longer Lk who depends on Mt but the reverse, Mt knew and used Lk. The hypothesis of Matthean *posteriority* had sometimes been evoked in passing, but as an extreme position which was not even worth discussing. Tuckett remarks that the "Matthean dependence on Luke is hardly ever advocated, though one sometimes wonders why given the tendency of many to believe that Luke's version is very often more original".⁶⁰ Hengel recalls that "only in very rare cases has a possible dependence of Matthew on Luke been considered, for example by C.G. Wilke, one of the first champions of the priority of Mark".⁶¹ However, D.R. Catchpole had noted that "[l]ogically, even though the discussion has not paid much attention to this possibility, Matthew's use of Luke ought not to be excluded".⁶² Certain hypotheses which argue for a proto-Luke used by Mt (Boismard) evidently come close to this solution.

⁵⁸ *M. Hengel*, *The Four Gospels and the One Gospel of Jesus Christ. An Investigation of the Collection and Origin of the Canonical Gospels*, Harrisburg, PA 2002.

⁵⁹ "Presumably Mark was the first 'written' Gospel, which was also used in worship in Rome; around ten to fifteen years later Luke, and a further ten to fifteen years later the first 'apostolic' Gospel 'according to Matthew' followed," in: *The Four Gospels*, 130.

⁶⁰ *Tuckett*, *Q and the History*, 4, n. 10. In his response to Goulder in: *NTS* 30 (1984) 137, *Tuckett* notes, apropos of the agreement Mt 26,68/Lc 22,64, that the question, "Who is it that struck you?", "fits Luke's context and not Matthew's, and hence could be used to show Matthew's knowledge of Luke".

⁶¹ *M. Hengel*, *The Four Gospels*, 170 and note 663, p. 303-304, where he sets out certain arguments of *C.G. Wilke* drawn from *Der Urevangelist, oder exegetisch-kritische Untersuchung über das Verwandtschaftsverhältnis der drei ersten Evangelien*, Dresden - Leipzig 1838. Wilke's hypothesis is mentioned in passing by *P. Rolland*, *Les premiers évangiles*, 24-25; by *M. Goulder*, who affirms that the "aberrant factor" of the minor agreements "already in 1838 seduced Wilke into thinking that Matthew had read Luke", *Luke*, I, 47; by *F. Neirynck* in: *The Minor Agreements*, 12 and also in: *Evangelica* II, 51 which alludes to a "Matthean dependence upon Luke (Wilke)". Only *Bo Reicke*, in: *The History*, in: *Dungan* (ed.), *The Interrelations*, mentions it at greater length, concluding that "Wilke's purely literary analysis yielded an extreme form of the utilization hypothesis [meaning of this expression on p. 292], implying the sequence Mark-Luke-Matthew" (295).

⁶² *D.R. Catchpole*, *The Quest for Q*, 2, n. 5.

The sole recent author whom Hengel cites favorably is R.V. Huggins, whose article on the "Matthean Posteriority" has been ignored by researchers.⁶³ "The only problem with Huggins", writes Hengel, "is that he does not consider whether Matthew has yet other sources with discourse material at his disposal alongside Mark and Luke, sources which Luke too could have used, perhaps in a rather different form".⁶⁴ For Huggins, in effect, "[w]hat had been the lost document Q would now become simply the sum of the non-Markan passages taken over from Luke by Matthew".⁶⁵ For his part, and despite this knowledge of Luke by Matthew, Hengel maintains the existence of Q: "Certainly the existence of 'Q', whatever is to be understood by that, cannot be ruled out from the start. Even if we can be certain that Matthew as a rule follows Mark and has largely used him, and we conjecture with good reason that he also took over material from Luke, the sum total of his sources remains as unknown to us as the πολλοί in Luke 1,1".⁶⁶ Finally, Hengel asks the question: "[C]an it really be proved adequately that Luke is essentially earlier than Matthew?" And he answers: "In my view there are so many good reasons for this that I would almost speak of a stringent proof".⁶⁷ Over several pages, Hengel endeavors to show "the chronological priority of the Gospel of Luke over the Gospel of Matthew".⁶⁸ What strikes one is how easily the minor agreement of Mt 22, 35/Lk 10, 25 against Mk 12, 28 (according to Hengel, "one of the most striking minor agreements")⁶⁹ where one finds the unique presence of νομικός in Mt, is explained by a borrowing from Lk 10, 25. In any case, I accept the late date, in

⁶³ R.V. Huggins, *Matthean Posteriority: A Preliminary Proposal*, in: *NovT* 34 (1992) 1-22. Hengel says that he learned of this text "only after finishing [his] own studies", (304, n. 666).

⁶⁴ Hengel, *The Four Gospels*, 171.

⁶⁵ Huggins, *NovT* 34 (1992) 1-2.

⁶⁶ Hengel, *The Four Gospels*, 171. Further along, he adds: "That means that I do not dispute the existence of 'Q', but only the possibility of demonstrating its unity and reconstructing it in any way which is at all reliable, since a whole series of indications suggest that the later Matthew used the earlier Luke. Here Matthew, too, could have one or more logia sources at his disposal" (173).

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, 186-187.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, 186-204.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, n. 767, p. 318. The agreement Mt 26,28/Lc 22,64 against Mk 14,65, along with others, is also easily explained by the posteriority of Mt, n. 667, p. 307.

relation to Luke, which the trinitarian baptismal formula in Mt 28, 19 presupposes.⁷⁰ This seems evident to me. For sure, P. Rolland has enumerated some of the "strangenesses" that this Matthean posteriority implies.⁷¹ Apropos of this, Hengel has offered a few responses which show, among other things, "how Matthew has come to differ from Luke, the disciple of Paul".⁷² A certain dependence, which Matthean posteriority in relation to Luke would authorize, would clearly resolve the whole question of the minor agreements.⁷³ It does not automatically suppress the Q hypothesis, even if it makes this source more difficult to construe. The thesis is attractive and even if F. Neiryck does not think that "there is a future for the theory of Matthew's dependence on Luke",⁷⁴ it seems to me that this posteriority of Matthew must be taken more seriously.

Summary on the minor agreements

It is evident, therefore, that the agreements Mt/Lk against Mk constitute "the Achilles heel of the two-source theory"⁷⁵ for many, "a thorn in the side of the standard theory"⁷⁶ and throw into question even the existence of the Q source.

In reality, each theory has to take these agreements into account. Those which imply either a knowledge of Mt on the part of Lk (Farrer-Goulder-Goodacre), or a knowledge of Lk on the part of Mt (Huggins-Hengel) offer an easy solution. Others make appeal to a hypothetical avatar of the text of Mk - whether it be a proto-Mark on which Mt and Lk depend, or a deutero-Mark posterior to existing Mk - which would account for the agreements between Mt and Lk not found in canonical Mark. But these theories remain every bit as hypothetical as the two-source theory, if not more so.

⁷⁰ Ibid., 199: "By contrast Luke - who is earlier - still has exclusively, like Paul, a one-member baptismal formula". But the references that Hengel gives are to Acts 2, 38; 8, 16; 10, 48; 19, 5; cf. Rm 6, 3; Ga 3, 27, n. 779, p. 319.

⁷¹ Rolland, *Les premiers évangiles*, 25-26.

⁷² Hengel, *The Four Gospels*, 181-184, here 182.

⁷³ Ibid., 228, n. 125: "The problem of the minor agreements disappears if one assumes that Matthew used Luke, which seems to me to be fairly certain".

⁷⁴ Neiryck, *Evangelica III*, 339.

⁷⁵ Goodacre, *The Case*, 152.

⁷⁶ Goulder, *Luke*, 50.

Despite all this, it seems to me that those who hold the two-source theory, in particular F. Neirynck and C.M. Tuckett, have responded sufficiently to the difficulty of the minor agreements. Neirynck, who has worked on it since his book *The Minor Agreements* of 1974, has remained faithful to the general explanation which he reiterated at the Göttingen Symposium in 1991: "it is sound methodology among Markan priorists that no alternative for the minor agreements is needed as long as the basic assumption of independent redaction provides a satisfactory solution. The main objection is the difficulty of some individual cases of agreement, but [...] the extent of the 'unexplained remainder' is not irreducible".⁷⁷

Only two agreements, nevertheless, remain difficult to explain: that of Mt 22, 35/Lk 10, 25 against Mk 12, 28 and that of Mt 26, 68/Lk 22, 64 against Mk 14, 65. In the first case, it is primarily the simultaneous use of $\nu\omicron\mu\iota\kappa\acute{o}\varsigma$ which causes the problem. It is true that the manuscript tradition seems uncertain on this point, and the *United Bible Societies* text as well as that of Nestle²⁷ put $\nu\omicron\mu\iota\kappa\acute{o}\varsigma$ in brackets in Mt 22, 35.⁷⁸ Clearly, the elimination of $\nu\omicron\mu\iota\kappa\acute{o}\varsigma$ from the text of Mt would radically eliminate the problem. Neirynck, who has examined the whole issue very closely, remains undecided here and does not exclude the possibility that a copyist, seeing the resemblance between the texts of Mt and Lk, could have "heightened the similarity by adding $\nu\omicron\mu\iota\kappa\acute{o}\varsigma$ in Matthew".⁷⁹ But if the agreement were original? Neirynck then opts for a redactional

⁷⁷ Neirynck, *Evangelica* II, 29. In 1995, in: *The Minor Agreements and Q*, he will repeat his principle, this time to avoid uselessly resorting to the Q source - which he certainly admits otherwise - for the "major agreements": "in triple-tradition passages where Matthew's and Luke's independent redactions provide a satisfactory explanation of their agreement against Mark there is no need to suggest the existence of a second non-Markan source (Q)", *Evangelica* III, 249.

⁷⁸ See the explanation which *B.M. Metzger* gives, "Despite what seems to be an overwhelming preponderance of evidence supporting the word $\nu\omicron\mu\iota\kappa\acute{o}\varsigma$, its absence from family 1 as well as from widely scattered versional and patristic witnesses takes on additional significance when it is observed that, apart from this passage, Matthew nowhere else uses the word. It is not unlikely, therefore, that copyists have introduced the word here from the parallel passage in Lk 10, 25. At the same time, in view of the widespread testimony supporting its presence in the text, the Committee was reluctant to omit the word altogether, preferring to enclose it within square brackets", in: *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, United Bible Societies, corrected edition 1975, 59. *U. Luz*, in *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus*, 3, (EKK I/3), Zürich and Düsseldorf 1977, 269, n. 1, remarks quite rightly about this: "Nur ganz wenige Textzeugen (f¹, e, sy^s, arm, geo, Or) streichen $\nu\omicron\mu\iota\kappa\acute{o}\varsigma$. Daß bei diesem Textbefund die Herausgeber des GNT und von Nestle²⁶ $\nu\omicron\mu\iota\kappa\acute{o}\varsigma$ in [] setzen, ist textkritisch unbegreiflich und nur von den Schwierigkeiten der Quellenscheidung her verständlich".

⁷⁹ *Evangelica* III, 289. See also 304 and *Evangelica* II, 191-193.

explanation: "If original, νομικός can be read in the light of ἐν τῷ νόμῳ (v.36), ὅλος ὁ νόμος καὶ οἱ προφῆται (v. 40) [...] and Matthew's liking of the cognate νόμος - ἀνομία...".⁸⁰ Thus: redaction by Mt, with the possibility of intervention by a copyist influenced by the text of Lk, if it were established that νομικός does not belong to the original text of Mt.

Tuckett, for his part, keeps νομικός in the original text of Matthew.⁸¹ But this time he does not maintain a redactional explanation: "yet the fact that the word is not used elsewhere in Matthew still makes a MattR origin here hard to conceive".⁸² Rather, he thinks that a version of the history of the great commandment is found "in Q [Mt 22, 34-40/Lk 10, 25-28] as well as Mark [12, 28-34]". His solution: "Presence in a source [which is the Q source here], rather than either a redactional creation or a later scribal addition, seems a more satisfactory explanation".⁸³

A. Fuchs also rejects a redactional explanation in the present case: "Der ständige Zwang der Zweiquellentheorie zu (dritt-)redaktioneller Interpretation der agreements stellt sich also nochmals als *petitio principii* heraus, die keineswegs beweist, was sie vorgibt ...".⁸⁴ He also opts for presence in a source, but this time in *Deuteromark*.

Without doubt, one may remain dissatisfied. However, it must be recognized that those who hold the two-source theory have provided several possible explanations of the agreement Mt 22,35/Lk 10,25 and that, therefore, this agreement is not "irreducible," as Neiryneck says. It does not jeopardize the existence of Q.

In the second case, the agreement is viewed as even more of a threat to the existence of Q. In the mockery scene of the Passion, in both Mt 26, 68 and Lk 22, 64 Jesus is asked the question: "Who is it that struck you?", a question which is absent

⁸⁰ Evangelica III, 289.

⁸¹ Tuckett, *Q and the History*, 417, n. 81: "The possibility that νομικός is not part of Matthew's text should probably be rejected. The manuscript evidence for omitting the word [f¹ e syr^{sin}] is very weak and would not be considered seriously were it not for the difficulty of explaining the word in Matthew". Thus, he echoes the remark of Luz.

⁸² C.M. Tuckett, *The Temptation Narrative in: Q*, in *The Four Gospels* 1992, 485, n. 30.

⁸³ Tuckett, *Q and the History*, 416 and 417, n. 81. Neiryneck didn't keep "the Great Commandment" in his reconstruction of Q, cf. *Evangelica* II, 416-417; *Evangelica* III, 256.

⁸⁴ A. Fuchs, *Die Last der Vergangenheit*, in: *SNTU* 16 (1991) 167, n. 36.

from Mk (14, 65). How to explain this accord of Mt/Lk against Mk? Once again here, appeal is made to the redactional explanation. This is entirely legitimate in the case of Luke: the question is in fact entirely appropriate in the Lukan context where Jesus is blindfolded. Lk has only clarified the "Prophecy!" of Mk. But the redactional solution does not work for Mt where the context (Jesus is not blindfolded) does not justify the question. So, where does the *τίς ἐστὶν ὁ παλασσεύει*; of Mt come from? From a source that Mt would have had before his eyes? From a reworked Mark where Mt would have found it? It is Fuchs' solution which explains equally well both the Lukan and the Matthean texts.⁸⁵ Some others have spoken of a "pre-Lukan source" known to Mt.⁸⁶ Yet others speak of the oral tradition: Mt and Lk would have found these five words in the oral tradition.⁸⁷ But Neiryck has wondered, with reason, "can a common oral tradition be restricted to these five words"?⁸⁸

As a consequence, and only for this case, advocates of the two-source theory find themselves obliged to invoke an interpolation in the text of Mt (harmonization with the text of Lk) by a later copyist. Actually, Neiryck adheres to the hypothesis "of an early and widespread interpolation in the case of Mt 26, 68", "the exceptional case where an assimilation of Matthew to Luke has pervaded all textual witnesses".⁸⁹ He admits that such a "textual solution" or "conjectural emendation" is a dubious enterprise in itself, but he recognizes that "the debate [theoretical discussion] is not closed," adding, "I see a growing number of scholars for whom an exceptional instance of con-

⁸⁵ *A. Fuchs*, Die Behandlung der mt/lk Übereinstimmungen gegen Mk durch S. McLoughlin und ihre Bedeutung für die Synoptische Frage, in: *A. Fuchs* (ed.), Probleme der Forschung (SNTU/A, 3) 1978, 25-57 (41-42).

⁸⁶ *J.A. Fitzmyer*, The Gospel according to Luke (X-XXIV) (AB, 28A), Garden City, NY 1985, attributes this passage to "L," the *Sondergut* of Lk (1458 et 1466).

⁸⁷ It is the solution of *M.L. Soards*, A Literary Analysis of the Origin and Purpose of Luke's Account of the Mockery of Jesus in: BZ 31 (1987) 113: "One best understands this striking agreement by inferring that Luke and Matthew knew the same non-Markan tradition; and, the dissimilarities between the accounts of Luke and Matthew make it unlikely this tradition was written. Therefore, it seems justified to conclude that Luke and Matthew had access to the same oral tradition in Greek". Repeated as is in: The Passion According to Luke. The Special Material of Luke 22 (JSNT SS, 14), Sheffield 1987, 102. *R.E. Brown* came around to this solution in: The Death of the Messiah, New York 1993, 579.

⁸⁸ *Neiryck*, Evangelica II, 119, n. 136.

⁸⁹ *Neiryck*, Evangelica II, 137.

jectural reading is no longer methodologically unacceptable".⁹⁰ This is also the solution maintained by Tuckett: "the theory that the extra question ["Who hit you?"] is a later interpolation from Luke into Matthew's text is by no means impossible".⁹¹ In an important presentation at the Göttingen congress, he ably demonstrated the legitimacy of such a possibility in textual criticism.⁹²

At the end of this tour, I retain Tuckett's conclusion as sound and acceptable: "Given then that the 2DH [Two-Document hypothesis] is believed by many to provide a reasonably satisfactory explanation of the extant texts of the gospels everywhere else in the tradition, an appeal to an otherwise invisible development in the textual tradition at just one point is probably not a very high price to pay in seeking to explain one part of the development of the whole tradition by the 2DH".⁹³

⁹⁰ *Neiryneck*, *Evangelica* III, 73; cf. also 317. By way of examples, see *A. Vanhoye*, *L'intérêt de Luc pour la prophétie en Lc 1,76; 4,16-30 et 22,60-65*, who recognizes also that the question " 'Quel est celui qui t'a frappé' est à sa place dans le texte de Luc et ne l'est pas dans celui de Matthieu. L'hypothèse du Prof. F. Neiryneck trouve donc là un appui très ferme", in: *The Four Gospels 1992, 1548. S. Légasse*, who has also read Neiryneck comes to the same conclusion: "Reste une solution qui, tout bien pesé, est la meilleure: quoique toute garantie manuscrite lui fasse défaut, elle consiste à envisager que le texte de Matthieu a été glosé sous l'influence de celui de Luc et que c'est par cette voie que la question devinette y est entrée." in: *Le procès de Jésus*, Paris 1995, 206.

⁹¹ *Tuckett*, *On the Relationship*, in: *NTS* 30 (1984), 137: Cf. *Q and the History*, 17, n. 41; 24, n. 59.

⁹² *Tuckett*, *The Minor Agreements and Textual Criticism*, in: *Strecker*, *The Minor Agreements*, 119-141, especially 135-141. It should be noted that *S. McLoughlin*, in a very well documented, but rarely cited, article: *Les accords mineurs Mt-Lc contre Mc et le problème synoptique. Vers la théorie des deux sources*, in: *ETL* 43 (1967) 17-40, had also accepted the hypothesis of a harmonization in the text of Mt 26,68. See his analysis of this verse (31-35) and his conclusion: "Ainsi, la question (posée en *Mt.*, XXVI, 68 par ceux qui frappaient Jésus) n'est pas une objection à la théorie des Deux-Sources: elle se classe tout simplement comme non-authentique" (35).

⁹³ *Tuckett*, in: *Strecker*, *Minor Agreements*, 138. *Tuckett* adds, with reason, that theories which postulate an edition or revision of Mk utilized by Mt and Lk, which has left no trace in the manuscript tradition of the text of Mk are appealing, by this very fact, to "such 'invisible' developments in the textual tradition" (138-139).

Conclusion

This overview has thrown into relief the immense effort expended by scholars to resolve the famous synoptic problem. The problem endures, nevertheless, and one could think that the solution which would account for all the difficulties is unattainable, given the documentation that we have in hand. Kloppenborg Verbin has remarked this with regard to the minor agreements. How can a consensus be arrived at when "1) it is impossible to reconstruct with absolute precision the Greek text of any of the gospels; and 2) the transmissional processes by which one gospel came to be used by another evangelist are not known at all".⁹⁴ Several *logical* solutions to the problem are possible. Each underscores some real issues. Each helps us to better understand the evangelical texts and their multiple nuances. But, these are nothing except hypotheses, and we will never have anything else. This state of affairs is not, in itself, negative: if hypotheses do not reproduce reality, they remain important tools, "heuristic models intended to aid comprehension and discovery".⁹⁵ In this sense, the two-source theory is still an hypothesis, nothing more. However, of all the hypotheses proposed, and despite a few rare difficulties, in my opinion, it remains the most plausible. It presupposes - beyond Mk, beyond other possible sources whose existence is mysteriously evoked by the πολλοί; of Lk 1, 1, beyond the oral tradition which was not extinguished all at once - that Mt and Lk knew and used another common source, the Q document. To what extent, though, must new hypotheses be accumulated in the study of this hypothetical document? That is a whole other question. It will be the subject of the second part of this article.

II- The Abysses of Q Research

Once the existence of a common source for Mt and Lk had been admitted, scholars strove in countless studies to describe the nature of this source, to reconstruct the text, to identify the stages of its composition, to analyze the content and even to attach it to a precise community of Jesus' disciples. Why all this research or this curiosity? To resolve a simple problem of literary dependencies? Maybe so: scholars have surprising passions! However, I suspect that the frenzy surrounding the Q source is secretly motivated by another search: the dream not only to better understand Christian origins, but ultimately to get back, through the fog that surrounds this document, to the

⁹⁴ *Kloppenborg Verbin, Excavating Q*, 36.

⁹⁵ *Kloppenborg Verbin, ibid.*, 51.

historical Jesus. It is these different points which must be examined by venturing cautiously into "the abysses of 'Q' research".⁹⁶

A- The nature of Q

1- Oral tradition or written document?

How are we to imagine this source used by both Mt and Lk? Several authors, among whom J. Jeremias is without doubt the most well-known, have maintained, or maintain still, that the oral tradition is sufficient to explain the texts common to Mt and Lk.⁹⁷ Still, the high degree of verbal agreements between many long Matthean and Lukan, non-Markan, passages (v.g., Q 3, 7-9 or Lk 3, 7-9//Mt 3, 7-10 where one finds 60 consecutive identical words; or again Q 11, 24-26) requires a literary dependence, a written text. In the same way, the common order of parallel sequences strongly suggests that the source of this material was a unified document in written form.⁹⁸ P. Vassiliadis, in an article which is still very useful, discusses several variations of the orality thesis. While he maintains that Q was certainly a written document, he wisely remarks that "we have to allow the influence of oral tradition both in the pre-canonical circulation of the Q-document, but mainly at the redactional level, i.e., by the Evangelists themselves".⁹⁹ Kloppenborg Verbin has pointed out a special aspect of this oral influence. He recalls that ancient documents were written *scripta continua*, with neither space between the words nor punctuation. Reading them publicly, then, implied a certain interpretation, the texts "functioning more like a musical script than a modern book [...] Each oral performance of Q could be varied, depending on the occasion. Subsequent copyings of Q could not be isolated from the influence of such performances".¹⁰⁰ This would readily explain certain variations between Mt and Lk. But it is James D.G. Dunn, in his very recent work *Jesus Remembered*, who convincingly restores the oral tradition to a

⁹⁶ The expression is from *M. Hengel*, *The Four Gospels*, 172.

⁹⁷ See *J. Jeremias*, *New Testament Theology*, London 1971, I, 38-39.

⁹⁸ See the exposé of *Kloppenborg Verbin*, *Excavating Q*, 56-60; *Tuckett*, *Q and the History*, 3-4. 38. 83.

⁹⁹ *P. Vassiliadis*, *The Nature and Extent of the Q-Document*, in *NovT* 20 (1978) 49-73 (which reproduces ch. II of his thesis written in Greek), here 54.

¹⁰⁰ *Kloppenborg Verbin*, *Excavating Q*, 60.

very significant place.¹⁰¹ Even if almost everyone admits that the tradition concerning Jesus was *oral* in its beginnings, the study of the gospels, particularly the synoptics, has been linked almost exclusively with the literary tradition. Dunn exhorts researchers to let go of this "literary paradigm." He invites them to "change the 'default setting' of the literary paradigm, the 'pre-set preference' built into a centuries-old literary mindset, and allow the likelihood that such a paradigm is far too limited to explain the complexities of the Jesus tradition".¹⁰² He is convinced "that the shape and verbal variations of most of the Synoptic traditions are better explained by such an oral hypothesis than exclusively in terms of literary dependence" (336). Dunn admits the priority of Mk and the existence of Q as a written document (144, 147-149, 222, 234, 237 and 253). But he also recalls "that in an age of high illiteracy documents were written to be *heard* and that a reading can also be likened to a performance" (204). It is in this context of "performances" ("Not Layers but Performances", 248-249), of "performances/retellings of the tradition" (336), that Dunn situates the Q source also. He thinks that Mt and Lk would not have known only a written document, but would have "regarded Q as a form of oral retelling (that is, they had heard Q material being read/performed), so that their own retelling retained the oral characteristics of the traditioning process" (237). This is clearly valuable for the passages of the double tradition where the agreements between Mt and Lk are lesser. Too easy a solution for the disagreements between Mt and Lk? The thesis is attractive and forces us, in my opinion, to give more importance back to the oral tradition, to the "combination of *fixity* and *flexibility*, of *stability* and *diversity*" which characterizes it or, if you will, to its principle of "variation within the same," which Dunn reiterates many times over.¹⁰³

¹⁰¹ *J.D.G. Dunn, Jesus Remembered. Christianity in the Making, I, Grand Rapids, MI 2003, especially ch. 8: The Tradition, 173-254. Dunn's method has been called into question by two scholars of the Scandinavian school, B. Holmberg et S. Byrskog, in: JSNT 26 (2004) 445-457 et 459-471. But Dunn seems to me to have justified his enterprise very well in his response, ibid., 473-487.*

¹⁰² In *Jesus Remembered*, 336. *Dunn* has developed this point of view in what must be called, in my opinion, a seminal article which, if it were taken seriously, would change the entire approach to the synoptic problem: *Altering the Default Setting: Re-envisaging the Early Transmission of the Jesus Tradition*, in: *NTS* 49 (2003) 139-175. At the end of the article (172-173), *Dunn* envisions the quasi-seismic repercussions which this approach would have on the Q source, especially concerning the reconstruction of the text and the character of the community alleged to have possessed this text.

¹⁰³ In: *Jesus Remembered*, 234. 236. 336 and in: *NTS* 49 (2003) 154-155. 173. 175.

2- A single document?

The majority of scholars are in accord about attributing to a single source the passages where Mt and Lk are in verbal agreement, independently of each other, in long sequences (see Q 3, 7-9 once again). It seems that this conclusion imposes itself.¹⁰⁴ But when the agreements are less total? In the context of the "literary paradigm", to repeat Dunn's expression, the solutions are diverse. If one judges that Mt and Lk have used the common source in an independent manner, it is normal to think that they could have either faithfully preserved the exact words of the source, or introduced some variations. If they were not absolutely faithful to the text of Mk which they were using, why would they have acted differently in regard to the Q source? One may thus think that non-identical passages of the double tradition belonged, nonetheless, to the Q source. This is the position maintained by Neiryneck who, instead of appealing to different versions to explain the variants, adheres to the redactional intervention of the evangelists. Here he applies the principle which led him to reject an intermediate stage between Mk and Mt/Lk in a Deutero-Markan recension: recourse to different recensions of the common source or to several sayings sources is, according to him, the result of a "too restrictive notion of Matthean and Lukan redaction".¹⁰⁵

On his side, Tuckett has really stressed that, given the conditions of writing in the first century and the technical difficulty of easily reproducing identical copies of the same text, "there must have been more than one copy of Q. Matthew's copy would not have been the same as Luke's copy, and hence, given the nature of text production at the time, it is highly likely that Matthew's version of Q was not identical to Luke's".¹⁰⁶ That there were different copies of Q, agreed. This is another reason, besides redactional intervention, which would explain certain verbal divergences, next to identical passages, in Mt and Lk. Must we, however, go further and consider that the copy used by

¹⁰⁴ But here, *M. Hengel*, exploits the posteriority of Mt logically and radically reverses the perspective: "since we cannot exclude in principle a partial use of Lukan passages by Matthew [...], we would have to adopt precisely the opposite procedure: *specifically in cases of word-for-word agreement we have to reckon with a use of the earlier Luke by the later Matthew, whereas in the case of great differences in wording, different translation variants deriving from divergent logia sources can be conjectured* [emphasis original]," in: *The Four Gospels*, 179.

¹⁰⁵ *F. Neiryneck*, Q^{Mt} and Q^{Lk} and the Reconstruction of Q, in: *Evangelica II*, 475-480, here 480.

¹⁰⁶ *Tuckett*, Q and the History, 97. *Kloppenborg Verbin* says the same thing: "At a minimum, it should be conceded that the copies of Q used by Matthew and Luke differed in at least some minor respects," in: *Excavating Q*, 109.

Mt contained material unknown to Lk, and vice versa? In other words, is it possible to attribute to Q some *Sondergut* passages? This problem touches the question of the reconstruction and étendue of Q. I will come back to this.

But, the position of M. Casey must be pointed out first. He does not allow that Q could have been "a single document". Believing that he can demonstrate that Q was first written in Aramaic, he argues "that some parts of Q reached both evangelists in the same Greek translation, and that other parts are due to two different translations being made whether by the evangelists, their assistants or by more distant sources".¹⁰⁷ He summarizes his thesis as follows:

[...] part of the Q material was transmitted in Aramaic, and translated twice as part of the process of becoming what we now read in Matthew and Luke. [...] It has, however, often been noted that parts of Q are verbally identical in Matthew and Luke, so that some parts of the Q material were translated once and transmitted in Greek. It follows that we must opt for a relatively *chaotic model of Q* [my emphasis]. These facts alone require at least two layers of Q, one Aramaic layer translated into Greek twice, and one Greek layer which had been translated from Aramaic once.¹⁰⁸

The thesis of an Aramaic Q remains to be proven, as we will see. However, many of Casey's observations are valid and, while one may hesitate to speak of a "chaotic model of Q", his ideas reinforce the notion that the document used by Mt was not, point for point, identical with that of Lk. Redactional intervention, different copies of Q, "chaotic model", besides which it must not be forgotten that this or these written documents were circulating in an oral tradition milieu.

3- *In which language?*

No one disputes the idea that the traditions transmitted by Q could have existed first in Aramaic. Much of this material might even be traceable back to Jesus himself who, no doubt, spoke mainly Aramaic. Thus, the existence of certain semitic features in the document is normal and does not necessarily lead to the conclusion that it was written in Aramaic. But here the issue is the Q document in the form used by Mt and Lk, not the traditions which preceded it. The verbal agreements in long passages of

¹⁰⁷ M. Casey, *An Aramaic*, 2.

¹⁰⁸ *Ibid.*, 103. In conclusion (189), Casey presents his "chaotic model of Q" in five points.

the Greek texts of Mt and Lk, which demanded just above that Q be a written document, demand equally that this document be written in Greek. While this is very widely recognized,¹⁰⁹ certain researchers still think of an original Q document in Aramaic. M. Casey has just reopened the debate in his book, *An Aramaic Approach to Q*. On many occasions, he seems very sure of himself. He forcefully disputes the analyses Kloppenborg made of certain Aramaic evidence in his 1987 work, *The Formation of Q* (analyses presented again in 2000, in *Excavating Q*).¹¹⁰ But it must be recognized that the title of his work speaks only of an "Approach," not of an established thesis. And while he presupposes that the original of Q was in Aramaic, "the amount of verbal agreement" in numerous passages of the source obliges him to acknowledge that these texts "reached both evangelists in Greek" (114; cf. 115. 129.144. 149). For my part, I retain the idea that if Q was an Aramaic document in the first place (which has not been proven), the text that the evangelists had in hand was a Greek document, even if it was a translation. And, it is for this Greek document that we must reserve the symbol 'Q', as Tuckett has demanded many times.¹¹¹

B- Reconstruction of Q

Is it possible to reconstruct the text of this common source itself? Even among those who accept the two-source theory and recognize that Q was really a document written in Greek, opinions are divided. M. Hengel, for instance, believes that this reconstruction is impossible:

¹⁰⁹ In modest terms by *Tuckett*: "it seems most likely that the Q material was available to Matthew and Luke in a written, Greek form. Oral and/or Aramaic traditions do not really explain the evidence adequately", in: *Q and the History*, 92; in more categorical terms by *Kloppenborg Verbin* who affirms that "the likelihood of demonstrating an Aramaic Q [is reduced] to near zero", in: *Excavating Q*, 80. After a glimpse of more ancient positions, *Vassiliadis* concluded: "We may, therefore, safely say that Q was a Greek document with only pre-literary connexion with Aramaic," in: *NovT* 20 (1978) 57. See also the devastating article of *H.O. Guenther*, *The Sayings Gospel Q and the Quest For Aramaic Sources: Rethinking Christian Origins*, in: *Semeia* 55 (1992) 41-76 and his conclusion: "The Aramaic hypothesis is thus in all its forms and at all levels based on ideology, not on textual evidence" (73). However, these latter words could seem curious in a long article which "does not discuss a single Aramaic word", as *M. Casey* says reproachfully, in: *An Aramaic*, 42.

¹¹⁰ Cf. *Casey*, *An Aramaic*, 22-25.

¹¹¹ *Tuckett*, *Q and the History*, 84.

There is no way in which we can make a direct reconstruction of 'Q', which previously seemed possible, after excluding all the common Mark material by subtracting the texts in both Matthew and Luke which corresponded with each other. This material could too often have been taken over by Matthew from Luke, and it could also come from a variety of logia collections (or different versions of a collection) which both had at their disposal.¹¹²

In the same way, J.D.G. Dunn proves to be extremely skeptical, at least about the recovery of the Q text in its entirety: "For if much of the shared Matthew/Luke material attests *oral* dependency rather than *literary* dependence, then *the attempt to define the complete scope and limits of Q is doomed to failure*" [emphasis original].¹¹³

Among the leading lights, Neiryck has always remained very reserved on this point, adhering rigorously to a "minimal Q", which is to say, in practice, to texts of the double tradition. Back in 1982, he wrote:

Although there is some hesitation about one or another isolated saying, a rather general tendency can be observed to include only passages attested by both Matthew and Luke and to include all of them. The possibility that a *Sondergut* passage may stem from Q is not denied but it is seen as too uncertain to be reckoned with.¹¹⁴

This was also the first principle proposed by Vassiliadis for the reconstruction of the document: "All extensive or consecutive sayings in Matthew and Luke which

¹¹² *M. Hengel*, *The Four Gospels*, 206. See also 178 and 310 n. 696.

¹¹³ *J.D.G. Dunn*, *Altering the default*, in: *NTS* 49 (2003) 172. *M. Hengel* would go in the same direction: "this logia source (or sources) can now no longer be reconstructed in any way, especially as it had no single form in Greek, but evidently circulated in different forms of language and probably also with different extents," in: *The Four Gospels*, 178.

¹¹⁴ *Neiryck*, *Evangelica* II, 415-416. He took up this text again, verbatim, in 1990 (*Evangelica* II, 475), in 1993 (*Evangelica* III, 81-82, where he added: "If I had to rewrite my survey [...], I would mention that some scholars now tend to include again minor agreements [from the triple tradition] and *Sondergut* passages"), in 1995 (*Evangelica* III, 245), and finally, even after the critical edition of Q, in 2001 in: *The Reconstruction of Q and IQP/CritEd Parallels*, in: *A. Lindemann* (ed.), *The Sayings Source Q and the Historical Jesus* (BETL, 158), Leuven, 53.

show an almost verbatim agreement in wording *quite certainly* belong to Q".¹¹⁵ For his part, Tuckett keeps as his working hypothesis "the theory that Q contained at least all the passages where Matthew and Luke agree in substance and (at least some) wording and where their agreement is not due to dependence on Mark".¹¹⁶ But he thinks that Q "probably also contained more material, some of which may have been preserved by Matthew or Luke alone" (96). Thus, a few *Sondergut* passages, especially Lk 4, 16-30, which he thinks is particularly important for the christology of Q due to the reference to Is 61 (cf. 236).¹¹⁷ Kloppenborg Verbin finds the minimalist approach the most simple, "but not the most reasonable",¹¹⁸ and himself accepts certain passages of the triple tradition (Mark-Q overlaps) or certain *Sondergut* passages.¹¹⁹

One can say, then, that in the classical theory, "Q was normally reconstructed on the basis of the material shared only by Matthew and Luke",¹²⁰ with very few exceptions. Or "only passages attested by both Matthew and Luke and [...] all of them," as Neiryck said. As Tuckett expresses it, "Q [was] postulated primarily to explain the agreements between Matthew and Luke which cannot be explained as due to dependence on Mark".¹²¹ In this perspective, it was almost axiomatic that Mark and Q were independent of each other (Tuckett, 279). But recently, certain authors have

¹¹⁵ *Vassiliadis*, in: NovT 20 (1978) 66. See his "state of the debate" (60-66) and the ensemble of his principles (66-71). *E.K. Broadhead*, *The Extent of the Sayings Tradition (Q)*, has disputed this minimalist approach which basically restricts the content of Q to the double tradition. He believes it necessary to include in the "Sayings tradition" certain elements of the triple tradition, he thinks that Mk could also have drawn on this and that certain *Sondergut* passages in Mt and Lk came from this tradition, in: *A. Lindemann* (ed), *The Sayings Source Q*, 719-728.

¹¹⁶ *Tuckett*, *Q and the History*, 93.

¹¹⁷ In response to *C.S. Rodd* who had maintained that "we do not know and there is no way in which we can possibly know" the content of Q, (*The End of the Theology of Q?*, in: *The Expository Times* 113 (2002) 5-12, here 11), *C.M. Tuckett* made an excellent presentation of the way in which one can legitimately make a certain reconstruction of Q: *The Search for a Theology of Q: A Dead End?*, in: *ExpT* 113 (2002) 291-294.

¹¹⁸ *Kloppenborg Verbin*, *Excavating Q*, 98.

¹¹⁹ See his complete presentation in: *Reconstructing Q*, *ibid.*, 87-111 and his argument for the insertion into Q of the Lukan parable of the lost coin (Lk 15, 8-10), 96-98.

¹²⁰ *I. Dunderberg*, *Q and the Beginning of Mark*, in: *NTS* 41 (1995) 502.

¹²¹ *Tuckett*, in: *Biblica* 78 (1997), 282-283.

contested this consensus and maintained that Mark, also, knew and used Q.¹²² In their footsteps, but systematically this time, Harry T. Fleddermann took up this thesis again in his *Mark and Q. A Study of the Overlap Texts*.¹²³ Reactions were quite severe.¹²⁴ In the name of good method, Fleddermann had not used Mk to reconstruct the original Q text ("a significant departure from Lambrecht's method")¹²⁵. At the end of his thesis, however, he affirmed that "this procedure [use of Mk to reconstruct Q] now becomes legitimate" (215-216). In fact, this conclusion demolishes the very procedure employed to establish that Mk knew Q. Tuckett has pointed out this contradiction well:

In his (highly laudable) attempt to be rigorous, detailed, and not to pre-judge any issues, Fleddermann constructs the Q wording independently of his theory, i.e. by using Matthew and Luke and *not* using Mark; but the theory of Mark's dependence on Q then calls the basis for this reconstruction radically into question.¹²⁶

Perhaps in the end, what must be remembered is that, in reality, this knowledge of Q by Mk threatens the two-source theory itself. I. Dunderberg has shown this very well:

[I]f Mark used Q as a source, Q can no longer be reconstructed only on the basis of Matthew and Luke. Q should no longer even be defined as a sayings source used by *Matthew and Luke*. The redefinition of the Q hypothesis as a source common to all synoptic gospels demands the re-examination of the

¹²² See in particular, *D. R. Catchpole*, The Beginning of Q: A Proposal, in: NTS 38 (1992), 205-221 (reproduced in his *The Quest of Q* [Edinburgh 1993], 60-78); *J. Lambrecht*, John the Baptist and Jesus in Mark 1, 1-15: A Markan Redaction of Q?, in: NTS 38 (1992) 357-384.

¹²³ *Fleddermann*, *Mark and Q. A Study of the Overlap Texts* (BETL, 122), Leuven 1995. *Neiryneck*, even though it was he who had recommended the publication in BETL, wrote a long critique as an appendix to the thesis itself, 263-303, reproduced in: *Evangelica III* 505-545.

¹²⁴ *T. A. Friedrichsen* gives a list at the beginning of his article The Parable of the Mustard Seed, Mark 4, 30-32 and Q 13, 18-19, in: ETL 77 (2001) 297, n. 1. This didn't shake Fleddermann who strongly maintains his positions. See his *Mark's Use of Q: The Beelzebul Controversy and the Cross Saying*, in: *M. Labahn - A. Schmidt*, *Jesus, Mark and Q. The Teaching of Jesus and Its Earliest Records* (JSNT SS, 214), Sheffield 2001, 17-33. After having reconstructed the Q text for the two passages, he believes he is able to show that Mk knew and used this text of Q and concludes that "[t]he most obvious explanation for these facts is that Mark had the entire Q document in front of him" (27, 33)!

¹²⁵ *Neiryneck*, *Evangelica III*, 539.

¹²⁶ *Tuckett*, in: *Biblica* 78 (1997), 282. See also *Friedrichsen*, in: ETL 77 (2001) 316-317.

whole synoptic question. [...] An extreme, but nevertheless logical consequence of the Markan knowledge of Q would be that any synoptic passage having a triple attestation by Matthew, Mark, and Luke can derive from Q.¹²⁷

All these works would seem to indicate that the reconstruction of Q is just a chimerical project, plain and simple. However, not everyone shares this opinion. Some other authors, swept up no doubt by what has become the extraordinary and quasi-industrial enterprise of the *International Q Project* (IQP), are much more enthusiastic and frankly affirm, as does Q.R. Cameron: "We do have a text of Q; what we do not have is a manuscript".¹²⁸ Indeed, in 1983 James M. Robinson launched a huge project on Q in Claremont, California, in collaboration with the *Society of Biblical Literature*. The objective: "by the end of the decade to be able to have in hand a reconstruction, translation and commentary on Q that will result from such a team effort".¹²⁹ The work progressed, with annual reports in *JBL* and, in the end, the presentation of the "IQP text" in 1997.¹³⁰ This was not yet the final reconstruction and, after other revisions, *The Critical Edition of Q* appeared in 2000, the result of nearly 20 years of work.¹³¹ This was a triumph, attested already in the preface signed by the three editors: "The text of Q need no longer be just an imaginary black box lurking somewhere behind certain

¹²⁷ Dunderberg, in: NTS 41 (1995), 502-503. See also Tuckett: "Indeed the whole of Mark could derive from Q, so that all the triple tradition agreements between Matthew and Luke are due to dependence of all three on Q," in: *Biblica* 78 (1997), 283.

¹²⁸ Q.R. Cameron, *The Sayings Gospel Q and the Quest of the Historical Jesus: A Response to John S. Kloppenborg*, in: HTR 89 (1996) 352. But see the reaction of M. Wolter to this in: *Reconstructing Q?*, in: ExPT 114 (2004) 119, and his remarks (117-118) about the illusion ("wrong impression since it suggests a non-existing certainty") represented by the attempt of the IQP and *The Critical Edition* to reconstruct "the actual wording of Q" (see the introduction to the latter, lxix).

¹²⁹ For the history of the project, see J.M. Robinson in the introduction to the critical edition, in J.M. Robinson, Paul Hoffmann and John S. Kloppenborg (eds), *The Critical Edition of Q*, Leuven 2000, p. lxvi-lxxi and F. Neirynck in: *The Reconstruction of Q*, 53-56.

¹³⁰ See "the cumulative critical text of Q 1989-1996", in: *JBL* 116 (1997) 524-525.

¹³¹ The critical edition is preceded by a long introduction by J.M. Robinson who retells the whole History of Q Research. It ends with a Concordance [of the Greek text] of Q attributed to J.S. Kloppenborg, 563-581. Several abridged editions appeared immediately: *The Sayings Gospel Q in Greek and English, with Parallels from the Gospels of Mark and Thomas*, Minneapolis 2002 (here in the title, Q has become a *Gospel*, on the same footing as Mark and Thomas); *Die Spruchquelle Q. Studienausgabe Griechisch und Deutsch*, edited by P. Hoffmann and C. Heil, Darmstadt/Leuven 2002.

Matthean and Lukan verses as their source, but can emerge as a text in its own right" (xiii). But above all in the article of J. M. Robinson, *The Critical Edition of Q and the Study of Jesus*: "Prior to the availability of *The Critical Edition of Q*, Q usually functioned only as a source [...] It was rarely treated as a text, much less a Gospel, in its own right, which, like the canonical Gospels, would inevitably have its own way of shaping the material it took over from the tradition".¹³² And, he added with satisfaction: "In more practical terms, a facile offhanded dismissal of Q as a mere hypothesis is harder to carry off with *The Critical Text of Q* open on the desk" (28)! We must also mention, accompanying this critical edition, the appearance of the research databases, *Documenta Q: Reconstruction of Q through Two Centuries of Gospel Research* - a project supposed to total 31 volumes when completed. Each volume begins with the same introduction which gives the principles of the reconstruction and affirms confidence in the undertaking: "the reconstruction of Q is not in fact as hopeless or hypothetical a project as is sometimes imagined".¹³³

While acknowledging these impressive accomplishments, others have retained their critical spirit. From this point of view, F. Neiryneck's long evaluation of the critical edition is a "must read".¹³⁴ To begin with, he refuses to follow Robinson who insists on giving the title *Gospel* to the Q source, and maintains his 1995 position: "Personally, I consider it to be an advantage of the full designation (Synoptic) Sayings *Source Q*' in that it reminds us of the fact that we have no direct access to the text of Q: it remains a hypothetical source text that we can reconstruct from Matthew and Luke".¹³⁵ He seems,

¹³² In: A. Lindemann (ed), *The Sayings Source Q*, 27.

¹³³ These databases which compile the opinions of authors (in their original languages) over the last 200 years on each verse or element of a verse believed to belong to Q represent a colossal enterprise. They will provide an impressive mass of information which would be difficult to access otherwise. Up to now, seven volumes have appeared (varying from 200 to 800 pages each) on the following passages (by simple convention, the numbering of the Q verses follows the Lukan numerotation; it has not been possible to follow the same order as Q for publication): Q 11:2b-4; Q 4:1-13, 16; Q 12:49-59; Q 12:8-12; Q 22: 28, 30; Q 6:20-21; Q 7:1-10. In preparation: Q 6:37-42; Q 14:26-27/17:33/14:34-35; Q 17:20-21, 23-24, 37 and Q 11:9-13.

¹³⁴ F. Neiryneck, *The Reconstruction of Q*, in: A. Lindemann (ed), *The Sayings Source Q*, 53-147.

¹³⁵ *Ibid.*, 57. See his 1995 article: *Q: From Source to Gospel*, in: *Evangelica III*, 419-431. The article begins with these words: "What's in a name?" It is without any doubt this article to which *Kloppenborg Verbin* responds in: *Q as a "Gospel": What's in a Name?*, a very strong defense of the word *Gospel* to qualify Q, in: *Excavating Q*, 398-408. There is more at stake here

too, to stick to his "minimal Q" (92). Other scholars have also underscored the dangers which the remarkable success of the critical edition brings in its wake.¹³⁶ J.D.G. Dunn rightly reminds us that "[i]t should not be assumed that the publication of *The Critical Edition of Q* (Robinson/Hoffmann/Kloppenborg) has settled the content or scope of the Q document. And it should certainly not be concluded that Q material existed solely in written or documentary form".¹³⁷ One might think that these authors cannot hold their own vis à vis the specialists of Q that Robinson and Kloppenborg are. However, when the warning comes from another specialist, such as C.M. Tuckett, maybe we should heed it. In a short review of *Die Spruchquelle Q*, published by Hoffmann and Heil, Tuckett recalls, five times over, the hypothetical character of this reconstruction: "any Q text is at best a reconstruction from the Gospels of Matthew and Luke"; "[a]ny reconstruction of a 'text' like Q must remain to a certain extent conjectural"; "any such reconstructed text will be permanently provisional and open to reconsideration"; "one should not lose sight of the provisional nature of the 'results' of its [i.e., IQP's] work"; "[i]t would certainly be a shame if continued printing of its reconstructed text alone gave it a higher status than that text can legitimately claim".¹³⁸ The danger exists!

than a simple question of naming. *KV* ends his argument by evoking the possibility that primitive christianity might have included different kerygmas and that Q might have represented, in any case, a "different way of thinking of death and vindication and [a] differntness in framing a message of salvation" (408). We can see, the stakes are high. This supposed kerygmatic difference has been exploited by the *Jesus Seminar* and by American research in general in the quest for the historical Jesus. Moreover, it is to the suggestion of *J.D. Crossan* (in the SBL Q Seminar, 1987) that *KV* attributes the English expression "the Sayings Gospel Q" (*Excavating Q*, 398, n. 63). *Crossan* will say it very clearly: "I term it, to give it full honor, the Q Gospel because I do not think of it as just somebody else's source," in: *Who Killed Jesus?*, San Francisco 1995, 25.

¹³⁶ Confronted with this "critical edition," the danger is that we will forget for example that this source "n'est justement qu'une hypothèse de travail", according to *E. Cuvillier*, in: *Études théologiques et religieuses* 76 (2001) 428; or, that we will think that, henceforth, this text must be considered "as the received text of Q", according to *H.T. Fleddermann*, in: *CBQ* 64 (2002) 392.

¹³⁷ *J.D.G. Dunn*, *Jesus Remembered*, 237, n. 261.

¹³⁸ *C.M. Tuckett*, in: *The Journal of Theological Studies* 55 (2004) 228-230. What is more the extensive use, in *The Critical Edition of Q*, of double square brackets [[]], i.e. of "reconstructions that are probable but uncertain" (lxxxii), or "probably in Q, but only with an evaluation of {C}," this letter signifying "that there is considerable degree of doubt" according to the procedure of textual criticism which seems to be accepted here (lxxx), strongly attests this provisional character.

C- Compositional history

The reconstruction of Q aims to establish the final text, the one used by Mt and Lk, yet this text would have had a history. One can think of at least two stages: "an earlier Q-tradition being used by a later Q-redactor".¹³⁹ But, according to D.C. Allison, "most modern scholars" go much further and maintain "that Q was not created at once but was produced in stages: it is a composite document made up primarily of units that originally circulated in isolation, a document that grew as several hands contributed to it".¹⁴⁰ It is the thesis of J.S. Kloppenborg, *The Formation of Q*, which has had the greatest influence on this point.¹⁴¹ He distinguished three levels in the Q document. The first grouping, described as sapiential, was constituted by paraenetic elements, instructions and exhortations; the second level, characterized by various "prophetic" elements: announcements of judgment, the Lot cycle and deuteronomistic view of history (violence done to the prophets); and, finally, a third less developed level consisting of a few narrative elements (principally the temptation story) and others pertaining to the Law (Q 11, 42c; 16, 17).¹⁴²

Despite its popularity, Kloppenborg's schema has not won unanimous acceptance. D.C. Allison, for instance, questioned the distinction made between "sapiential and prophetic layers," "sapiential complexes and prophetic complexes" and maintained that the "reconstruction of an early wisdom document is not persuasive".¹⁴³ He himself proposed his "three-stage compositional history" (40). For him, Q¹ would

¹³⁹ C.M. Tuckett, On the Stratification of Q. A Response, in: *Semeia* 55 (1992) 221.

¹⁴⁰ D.C. Allison, *The Intertextual Jesus. Scripture in Q*, Harrisburg, PA 2000, 206. According to *Kloppenborg Verbin*, "two decades of close analysis of Q has convinced most specialists that a fairly complex compositional history preceded the 'final text'," in: *Excavating Q*, 130.

¹⁴¹ *Kloppenborg's* doctoral dissertation (1984) was entitled "The Literary Genre of the Synoptic Sayings Source" but, accepted by J.M. Robinson in the *Studies in Antiquity and Christianity* series, it became *The Formation of Q: Trajectories in Ancient Wisdom Collections*, Philadelphia 1987. *Kloppenborg Verbin* reproduces his whole exposition in: *The Composition and Genre of the Sayings Gospel Q*, in: *Excavating Q*, 112-165.

¹⁴² According to B. Mack, this would have been in 1988, in the Q Seminar of the *Society of Biblical Literature*, for whom "the three layers of textual tradition in Q had already become an acceptable working hypothesis," that the notations which would become customary, Q¹+Q²+Q³, were created "in order to refer to each layer", cf. *The Lost Gospel. The Book of Q & Christian Origins*, San Francisco 1993, 44.

¹⁴³ D.C. Allison, *The Jesus Tradition in Q*, Harrisburg, PA 1997, 7.

have been "an old document of instruction and encouragement for missionaries" (31). This first collection, "with its narrow focus upon itinerants, was [...] turned into a tract of general Christian exhortations," Q² (32). Lastly, a third part, very rich christologically, would have included Q 3, 7-7, 35 and 11, 14-52 (33-34).¹⁴⁴ Neiryneck has hardly said a word on the subject, it seems to me, apart from a few allusions. Tuckett, for his part, has expressed his reservations several times. To begin with in 1992 when, asked to give his reactions, he raised several methodological questions, being uneasy especially about the continuity or discontinuity between different stages: "if too much of a disjunction between layers is postulated [...], the question arises why the earlier tradition was ever used at all by the later editor".¹⁴⁵ Still in 1992, the purpose of his article, *The Temptation Narrative in Q*, was to call into question the necessity "for the theory that Q existed in a series of different stages in its growth".¹⁴⁶ In 1996, he ended his analysis of *The Formation of Q* as follows:

In conclusion, Kloppenborg's detailed stratification model may be not quite as securely founded as some have assumed. [...] If, as I have tried to argue, it is unnecessary to postulate a Q³ subsequent to Q², and if the pre-Q² material is perhaps rather more disparate [not entirely sapiential], and the alleged 'Q¹' stratum not necessarily capable of being shown to have existed as a literary unity in its own right before Q², then we may have a rather simpler model, viz. a Q-editor taking up and using (possibly a variety of) earlier materials.¹⁴⁷

In 2001, he returned in a critical way to Kloppenborg's three strata and repeated "that it is not so easy to claim that clearly identifiable strata of the text of Q itself can be discerned".¹⁴⁸ Finally, J.D.G. Dunn, in his *Jesus Remembered*, after several pages (152-158) of musing about "A Redactional Q?", rejects stratification and declares that "[t]he evidence is fully satisfied by the alternative hypothesis of a single compositional

¹⁴⁴ Ibid., *The Compositional History of Q* (1-66), disputed evidently by *Kloppenborg Verbin*, in: *Excavating Q*, 117. n. 7.

¹⁴⁵ *C.M. Tuckett*, *On the Stratification of Q*, in: *Semeia* 55 (1992) 214. *F.G. Downing*, *Word-Processing in the Ancient World: The Social Production and Performance of Q*, also rejects the stratification proposed by Kloppenborg, in: *JSNT* 64 (1996) 29-48.

¹⁴⁶ *C.M. Tuckett*, *The Temptation Narrative in Q*, in: *The Four Gospels 1992*, 479, n. 1.

¹⁴⁷ *C.M. Tuckett*, *Q and the History*, 73-74.

¹⁴⁸ *C.M. Tuckett*, *The Son of Man and Daniel 7: Q and Jesus*, in: *A. Lindemann* (ed.), *The Sayings Source Q*, 383.

act" (157). I don't know if it is exact to say, as he does, that "[t]he pendulum may have begun to swing against Kloppenborg in recent treatments of Q which argue for a single compositional stage",¹⁴⁹ but I do think that, à propos of Q studies, it is more recommended to follow the counsel of Tuckett: "Before we seek to say anything about what something might have meant at any 'pre-Q' level or in an earlier stratum within Q, we should perhaps start with 'Q itself' (insofar as that is accessible to us)," that is, with "the 'final' form of Q",¹⁵⁰ the stage in the development of the Q traditions reached when Q was used by Matthew and Luke.

D- Independent kerygma and Q community?

Tuckett's comment is certainly applicable to any redactional study which attempts to present a precise theology of Q. Certain scholars have even denied the possibility of establishing such a theology. Because we can never know - unless a manuscript would be discovered - the exact dimensions of the Q document, C. S. Rodd concludes that "to attempt to present the theology of Q is utter folly".¹⁵¹ To that, Tuckett wisely responds that we must not try to construct a theology of Q on the basis of what is not in Q, but on the basis of "the material that is there" (let's say the double tradition, or the minimal Q according to Neiryneck):

Thus claims about the possible significance of a "Son of Man Christology", a Wisdom Christology, wisdom ideas, the theme of judgment set within a deuteronomistic view of history, are all thought (by some) to characterize Q's "theology" because of the material that is there by common consent.¹⁵²

Besides it is for this reason that Tuckett admits to being "suspicious of those who advocate theories about different strata in Q with radically different outlooks in each stratum. My own attempt to outline aspects of the 'theology' of Q (in Q and the History)

¹⁴⁹ *J.D.G. Dunn, Jesus Remembered*, 156, n. 80, where he cites several authors, among them, J. Schröter, A. Kirk, P. Hoffmann, D. Lührmann.

¹⁵⁰ *Tuckett*, in: *A. Lindeman* (ed.), *The Sayings Source Q*, 372 and the n. 7.

¹⁵¹ *C.S. Rodd, The End*, in: *ExpT* 113 (2002) 12.

¹⁵² *C.M. Tuckett, The Search*, in: *ExpT* 113 (2002), 292.

did attempt to adopt such a 'literary' approach by considering the contribution of all the Q material as a whole".¹⁵³

Is this theology different from what we find elsewhere in the New Testament? According to S. Schulz,

Behind Q there is a special sphere of tradition with an independent kerygmatic tradition, i.e., a distinct community which preserved and continued to proclaim Jesus's message in the post-Easter situation.¹⁵⁴

But, Burton Mack has drawn the most provocative interpretation from what we do not find in Q:

The remarkable thing about the people of Q is that they were not Christians. They did not think of Jesus as a messiah or the Christ [...] They did not regard his death as a divine, tragic, or saving event. And they did not imagine that he had been raised from the dead to rule over a transformed world. [...] Thus they did not gather to worship in his name, honor him as a god, or cultivate his memory through hymns, prayers, and rituals. They did not form a cult of the Christ such as the one that emerged among the Christian communities familiar to readers of the letters of Paul. The people of Q were Jesus people, not Christians.¹⁵⁵

D.C. Allison has done justice, in my opinion, to the would-be conclusions that some have wanted to draw from the silences of Q.¹⁵⁶ I myself have underlined the ambiguity of this argument and shown, besides, that it has not been established that Q

¹⁵³ Ibid., 294, n. 14.

¹⁵⁴ S. Schulz, Die Gottesherrschaft ist nahe herbeigekommen (Mt10,7/Lk 10,9): Der kerygmatische Entwurf der Q-Gemeinde Syriens, in: H. Balz (ed.), Das Wort und die Wörter: Festschrift Gerhard Friedrich, Stuttgart 1973, 58. I cite the translation of *Kloppenborg*, in: The Formation of Q, 26. *Kloppenborg* adds (39): "a discrete group in which Q functioned as the central theological expression [...]. As indicated above [this position] has the most to recommend it. Consequently, Q must be understood without recourse to theological harmonization with either the passion kerygma or the passion stories".

¹⁵⁵ B. Mack, The Lost Gospel, 4.

¹⁵⁶ D.C. Allison, The Jesus Tradition in Q, 43-46.

does not include any allusion to the death-resurrection of Jesus.¹⁵⁷ One could also observe quite simply, with J.D.G. Dunn, "that the limited purpose of a particular collection of Jesus' sayings should not be taken as an indication that this purpose encompassed the full extent of the concerns and knowledge of Jesus tradition on the part of those who compiled or used the collection".¹⁵⁸

As we see, this question of the theology or non-theology of Q is often linked to that of an alleged community which one can perceive reflected in the Q source. I will not take up again, here, the examination of the different socio-historical hypotheses which have been imagined to describe those to whom this document could be attributed:¹⁵⁹ the thesis of itinerance (G. Theissen), the cynic hypothesis (G. Downing, B. Mack, L. Vaage),¹⁶⁰ the renewal movement in the villages of Galilee (R.A. Horsley), the more or less dissident scribes of the villages in Lower Galilee in conflict with the high style of writing prevalent in Jerusalem (J.S. Kloppenborg).¹⁶¹ But, is there really a community behind every text? And more than that, behind each level of text? In any case, we must certainly reject, with J.D.G. Dunn

the "one document per community" fallacy. It simply will not do to identify the character of a community with the character of a document associated with it. Such a document will no doubt indicate concerns and emphases in the community's teaching. But only if we can be confident that the single document was the community's sole document (or traditional material) could we

¹⁵⁷ J.-P. Michaud, Quelle(s) communauté(s) derrière la source Q, in: A. Lindemann (ed.), *The Sayings Source Q*, 593-598.

¹⁵⁸ J.D.G. Dunn, *Jesus Remembered*, 151, n. 52.

¹⁵⁹ See Michaud, Quelle(s) communauté(s), 581-593.

¹⁶⁰ Nevertheless, we must remark the astonishing fervor with which *Kloppenborg Verbin*, without supporting the hypothesis himself, defends the legitimacy of the comparison with the cynics—remember that, in the beginning, it was not a simple comparison for Mack and Vaage—and severely criticizes all those who dare to oppose the hypothesis, in: *Excavating Q*, 420-444, which takes up again his long polemical article: *A Dog among the Pigeons: A Cynic Q*, in: *From Quest to Quelle: Festschrift James M. Robinson (BETL, 146)*, Leuven 1999, 73-117.

¹⁶¹ W.E. Arnal, in: *Jesus and the Village Scribes. Galilean Conflicts and the Setting of Q*, Minneapolis 2001, has developed the suggestion of Kloppenborg (his thesis director) "that the persons responsible for Q were scribal figures, and, more particularly, were village scribes (κωμογραμματεὺς)" (170). See *Excavating Q*, 201. Although he retains Kloppenborg's stratification, yet Arnal thinks "that a single group was responsible for its various stages" (162).

legitimately infer that the concerns and beliefs of the community did not extend beyond those of the document. And we cannot have such confidence.¹⁶²

It should also be added that this question of the link of a gospel with a particular community has begun to stir up new debates. After having recalled that the word *gospel*, in Mark, has the meaning of a universal proclamation linked to a narrative about Jesus (cf. Mk 13, 10, but especially 14, 9, without forgetting 16, 15 in the secondary conclusion of Mk which seems to link Mk 13, 10 and 14, 9 with the ending of Mt 28, 18-20), which is not addressed solely to the community in Rome or the churches of Italy, M. Hengel has shown, convincingly in my opinion, that

[c]ontrary to a widespread view, none of the four Gospels was written only for one particular community; far less do they simply reproduce the views of one individual community. They give primarily the views of their authors. [...] So we should stop talking automatically about "the community of Mark," "of Luke," "of Matthew," "of John" as the one really responsible for the composition of a Gospel writing and its theology. The four Gospels have nothing to do with "letters" which were occasioned by a community. [...] Even more nonsensical is the term "Q community", i.e. the community of the Logia source (we do not even really know in what forms this source [or these sources] existed).¹⁶³

It is this same possibility

that an evangelist writing a Gospel expected his work to circulate widely among the churches, had no particular Christian audience in view, but envisaged as his audience any church (or any church in which Greek was understood) to which his work might find its way

that Richard Bauckham vigorously defended in his article, *For Whom Were Gospels Written?*¹⁶⁴ This presentation of the gospels as literature written for all the churches has

¹⁶² J.D.G. Dunn, *Jesus Remembered*, 150.

¹⁶³ M. Hengel, *The Four Gospels*, 106-107. On this view of the gospels as "narrative proclamation" or "kerygmatic biography of Jesus," see p. 97, but also 92, 94, 108 and 210, n. 5.

¹⁶⁴ R. Bauckham, *For Whom Were Gospels Written?*, in R. Bauckham (ed.), *The Gospels for All Christians. Rethinking the Gospel Audiences*, Grand Rapids, MI/Cambridge, U.K. 1998, 9-48 (here, 11). Hengel does not cite this work, but speaks independently of very similar ideas.

provoked, and still provokes, considerable turmoil.¹⁶⁵ In any case, very relevantly for this discussion, it recalls that "the early Christian movement [...] was not a scattering of isolated, self-sufficient communities with little or no communication between them, but quite the opposite: a network of communities with constant, close communications among themselves" (30).¹⁶⁶

To return to the Q source, it is inconceivable that there would have existed, above all if one situates it in the limited territory of Galilee, a community of Christians, totally separated from other Christians and their networks of communication, and which would have maintained an entirely different kerygma, ignorant of the paschal kerygma or in opposition to it.¹⁶⁷ As if this community would have been surrounded by a wall separating it from the rest of the known Christian communities elsewhere. And that, even if it included itinerant missionaries (cf. Q 10, 2-4) who, after having traveled all around Palestine or Syria, were obliged to report back to the community echoes of what was being said and celebrated elsewhere, echoes of this paschal tradition which Paul evokes in 1 Cor 15, 1-5, and which dated back to his "conversion" in about 35, scarcely a few years after the death of Jesus.¹⁶⁸ The fact that Mt and Lk would insert this Q tradition into their own work shows clearly that they did not see in it any opposition to their proper "Gospel". I continue to think that the redactor of Q should be located

¹⁶⁵ See *P.F. Esler*, *Community and Gospel in Early Christianity: A Response to Richard Bauckham's Gospels For All Christians*, in: *Scottish Journal of Theology* 51 (1998) 235-248 and *R. Bauckham*, *Response to Philip Esler*, *ibid.*, 249-253; *D.C. Sim*, *The Gospels for All Christians? A Response to Richard Bauckham*, in: *JSNT* issue 84 (2001) 3-27.

¹⁶⁶ On the high degree of mobility in the first century Roman world, see *M.B. Thompson*, *The Holy Internet: Communication Between Churches in the First Christian Generation*, in: *R. Bauckham*, *The Gospels for All Christians*, 49-70. *Thompson* concludes: "It is thus less likely that the gospels were produced for a select few, and more likely that they were written with an eye to their dissemination" (70). On the communications between communities, see *Dunn*, *Jesus Remembered*, 152, and in reference to *Bauckham*, 251.

¹⁶⁷ An hypothesis mentioned by *Kloppenborg* in: *The Formation of Q: "We must either posit two somewhat asymmetrical 'kerygmas' existing side by side in the same churches, or alternatively presume that Q's 'kerygma' derives from circles different from those which created the 'Crucified and Risen Lord' kerygma" (21-22).*

¹⁶⁸ See *Michaud*, *Quelle(s) communauté(s)*, in: *A. Lindemann*, *The Sayings Source Q*, 597-598.

among these πολλοί who would have, according to Lk 1,1, "undertaken to compile a narrative of the things which have been accomplished among us".¹⁶⁹

Conclusion: Q and the *Historical Jesus*

I gave the impression, in launching into the "abysses" of Q source research, that this pursuit was not purely platonic and often seemed oriented toward the quest for the Jesus of history.¹⁷⁰ The recent *Colloquium Biblicum Lovaniense* (2000), which is at the origin of the imposing work, *The Sayings Source Q and the Historical Jesus*, shows clearly, it seems to me, that this is so.

One can think that this theme has garnered attention due to the utilization of the results of Q research by certain members of the *Jesus Seminar* (B. Mack, L. Vaage, J.D. Crossan, M. Borg) and other North American scholars. In particular, the stratification proposed by Kloppenborg seemed to have opened a royal road to the Jesus of history. By privileging Q¹, the sapiential level presumed to be the most ancient, it was concluded that, since this document put us "as close to the historical Jesus as we will ever be",¹⁷¹ the real Jesus had been an itinerant sage after the manner of the cynic philosophers. Subsequently, the tradition would have arbitrarily attached to him apocalyptic and eschatological preoccupations.¹⁷² Thus, the Jesus of whom the

¹⁶⁹ See Michaud, *Quelle(s) communauté(s)*, 605.

¹⁷⁰ Pointing in this direction are, for example, the affirmation of *J.M. Robinson*: "It is in the archaic collections imbedded in Q that one can with the most assurance speak of material that goes back to sayings of Jesus himself," in: *The Critical Edition of Q and the Study of Jesus*, in: *A. Lindemann* (ed.), *The Sayings Source Q*, 44; and his final remarks where he says that the text of the Q movement, the Sayings Gospel Q, furnishes "the most reliable information we have about the historical Jesus," and that "the Jesus of Q points more to the historical Jesus than to [...] the kerygmatic Christ" (52).

¹⁷¹ *B. Mack*, *Who Wrote the New Testament? The Making of the Christian Myth*, San Francisco 1995, 47. See *The Lost Gospel*, 203.

¹⁷² This wasn't the only argument, but this stratification has certainly been perceived as an important factor in their presentation, even if *Kloppenborg Verbin* thinks that "it is an error [...] to conclude that the stratification theory of Q is the logical basis of either Mack's or Crossan's proposals," in: *A. Lindemann* (ed.), *The Sayings Source Q*, 159. See the comments of *Tuckett*, in: *Q and the History*, 76, n. 23 on *Mack* and *The Lost Gospel*, and 369-373 on *L.E. Vaage* and his *Galilean Upstarts. Jesus' First Followers according to Q* (Valley Forge 1994).

most ancient stratum of the Q document would permit a glimpse was, indeed—as the *Jesus Seminar* will like to present him - "a non-eschatological Jesus".¹⁷³

Yet Kloppenborg himself had expressly declared that:

[t]o say that the wisdom components were formative for Q and that the prophetic judgment oracles and apophthegms describing Jesus' conflict with "this generation" are secondary is *not* to imply anything about the ultimate tradition-historical provenance of any of the sayings. It is indeed possible, indeed probable, that some of the materials from the secondary compositional phase are dominical or at least very old, and that some of the formative elements are, from the standpoint of authenticity or tradition-history, relatively young. Tradition-history is not convertible with *literary history*, and it is the latter which we are treating here.¹⁷⁴

In an article which is devoted expressly to the Jesus of history, Kloppenborg shows himself reserved, at first: "the efforts to understand the theological dynamics and the compositional history of Q *cannot* naively be translated into statements about the historical Jesus".¹⁷⁵ But, after having affirmed clearly that "it is illegitimate [...] to argue from silence that what is not in Q was not known to the editors or, still less, that what is not in Q cannot be ascribed to Jesus" (330), he still basis the portrait of Jesus which he traces (329-334) on certain "silences" (relative silence about the miracles, an activity which thus would not have characterized Jesus; silence on the salvific character of the death of Jesus; absence of controversies about the Sabbath and rarity of logia

¹⁷³ See *M.J. Borg*, *Jesus in Contemporary Scholarship*, Valley Forge, PA 1994, 7-9, 30-31, 47-96, but also *R.W. Funk*, *The Five Gospels. The Search for the Authentic Words of Jesus*, New York 1993, 4, according to whom "[t]he liberation of the non-eschatological Jesus of the aphorisms and parables from Schweitzer's eschatological Jesus is the fifth pillar [of his seven] of contemporary scholarship."

¹⁷⁴ *J.S. Kloppenborg*, *The Formation of Q*, 244-245. This is a declaration which Kloppenborg has not ceased to repeat to distinguish himself from those who were using his stratigraphy, moreover more or less faithfully, to reach the Jesus of history: see *Excavating Q*, 351 and n. 43; and *Discursive Practices in the Sayings Gospel Q and the Quest of the Historical Jesus*, in: *A. Lindemann* (ed.), *The Sayings Source Q*, 159 and n. 29.

¹⁷⁵ *J.S. Kloppenborg*, *The Sayings Gospel Q and the Quest of the Historical Jesus*, in: *HTR* 89 (1996) 307-344 (323), reproduced in French translation in *D. Marguerat, E. Norelli, J-M. Poffet* (éds), *Jésus de Nazareth. Nouvelles approches d'une énigme* (*Le Monde de la Bible*, 38), Genève 1998, 225-268 (245).

about the Torah).¹⁷⁶ And, this leads him to conclude: "The role of Q in historical Jesus scholarship is thus a crucial one" (334). His final words concur with those of B. Mack:

Assuming that the Q people were in some geographical and social continuity with the first followers of Jesus, and given the generally conservative nature of transmissional processes, *the gap between Jesus and Q is probably not too great* (343) (emphasis mine).

Perhaps. But we sense once again, in these words, the ever present temptation to pass from a text to the reality which it interprets. In order to recover the Jesus of history, and despite the dream of researchers, the Q source is not in any better position than the rest of the synoptic tradition which alone, moreover, has preserved a trace of its existence. It too interprets. We will never have a direct access to Jesus himself. The Jesus we attain is a Jesus mediated by the eyes and memory of witnesses, whether this memory has been preserved by the reconstructed document we call Q, by the synoptics, the gospel of John, the rest of the New Testament texts, or still other texts which have not been included in the canon of the Scriptures. Whatever his or her domaine of research, the historian today knows that it will always be impossible to get back to the past "wie es eigentlich gewesen" (Ranke). It is no different in the case of Jesus. Condemned to modesty, in this sense, the better part of wisdom would be, perhaps, to accept that "the only realistic objective for any 'quest of the historical Jesus' is Jesus *remembered*".¹⁷⁷ The Q source, even in its most ancient elements, offers us nothing else.

¹⁷⁶ One finds in *Excavating Q* (362), a fine example of this passage from the Q document to the historical Jesus: "if Q's silence concerning a salvific interpretation of Jesus' fate makes it difficult or impossible to conclude that the historical Jesus considered his own death vicarious [...], one might still wish to claim the notion of Jesus' death 'for us' (1 Cor 15:3) as a key Christian theologoumenon, but it would be difficult to affirm any rootedness of this doctrine in the historical Jesus." The silence of Q becomes, thus, quasi-normative and imposes its limits.

¹⁷⁷ *Dunn, Jesus Remembered*, 882.