

Bartosz Adamczewski

Q or not Q?

The So-Called Triple, Double,
and Single Traditions
in the Synoptic Gospels



PETER LANG

Internationaler Verlag der Wissenschaften

Contents

Introduction: The Q source and the so-called synoptic ‘traditions’	17
Chapter 1: The synoptic problem and recently adopted solutions to it.....	19
1.1 Synoptic features of the first three canonical Gospels and problems with their adequate interpretation	19
1.2 Solutions to the synoptic problem adopted during the last twenty-five years	21
1.2.1 Priority of Mk and the written source Q	23
1.2.1.1 Main arguments for the existence of the lost source Q	24
1.2.1.2 Modern proponents of the Q hypothesis.....	30
H. Schürmann.....	30
H. Koester	31
F. Neirynck.....	33
J. M. Robinson	34
J. Lambrecht.....	36
F. G. Downing.....	38
P. Hoffmann	39
D. R. Catchpole	40
D. Zeller	42
A. Denaux	43
U. Luz.....	44
P. Vassiliadis.....	46
P. M. Casey	47
J. S. Kloppenborg.....	49
C. M. Tuckett	53
J. Schlosser.....	57
H. T. Fleddermann	58
R. A. Piper.....	61
A. D. Jacobson	62
D. C. Allison, Jr.	63
The International Q Project.....	66
L. E. Vaage.....	70
B. L. Mack.....	72
R. Uro.....	73
M. Sato	74
T. A. Friedrichsen	76
A. Kirk.....	76
C. Heil	78
W. E. Arnal	79
J. Schröter.....	80

M. J. Goff	82
1.2.1.3 Problems with the theory of the priority of Mk and Q	83
Disappearance of the apparently widely known document Q	83
Hundreds of Mt-Lk agreements against Mk throughout the Gospels	85
Questionable proofs of the Mt-Lk priority discrepancy	93
1.2.2 Priority of Mk and/or common oral traditions	95
1.2.2.1 Main arguments for independent redactional use of common oral traditions	96
1.2.2.2 Modern proponents of the ‘oral tradition’ hypothesis	97
B. Reicke	97
B. Gerhardsson	98
J. D. G. Dunn	99
W. H. Kelber	102
R. A. Horsley	103
A. D. Baum	105
T. C. Mournet	106
1.2.2.3 Problems with the ‘oral tradition’ hypothesis	108
1.2.3 Priority of Mk and of some textually not recoverable traditions (D. C. Parker)	109
1.2.4 Priority of Proto-Mk and Q	111
1.2.4.1 Main arguments for the existence of Proto-Mk	111
1.2.4.2 Modern proponents of the hypothesis of the priority of Proto-Mk	112
H. Koester	112
N. Walter	113
W. Schmithals	113
R. Bartnicki	115
1.2.4.3 Problems with the hypothesis of the priority of Proto-Mk	115
1.2.5 Relative priority of Deutero-Mk (with or without Q) against Mt and Lk	116
1.2.5.1 Main arguments for the existence of Deutero-Mk	116
1.2.5.2 Modern proponents of the hypothesis of the relative priority of Deutero-Mk against Mt and Lk	117
J. Carmignac	117
A. Fuchs	118
M. Klinghardt	120
F. Kogler	121
C. Niemand	122
J. Rauscher	122
A. Ennulat	123
1.2.5.3 Problems with the hypothesis of the relative priority of Deutero-Mk against Mt and Lk	124

1.2.6 Numerous precanonical sources of the Synoptic Gospels	125
1.2.6.1 Main arguments for the existence of numerous precanonical sources of the Synoptic Gospels	125
1.2.6.2 Modern proponents of the hypothesis of the existence of numerous precanonical sources of the Synoptic Gospels	126
M.-É. Boismard	126
P. Rolland	129
D. R. Burkett	131
1.2.6.3 Problems with the multiple-source theories	132
1.2.7 Common use of one lost protogospel	133
1.2.7.1 Main arguments for common synoptic use of one protogospel	133
1.2.7.2 Modern proponents of the hypothesis of the priority of one protogospel	134
D. Flusser	134
C. Tresmontant	136
T. L. Brodie	136
S. Hultgren	138
H. M. Humphrey	140
1.2.7.3 Problems with the hypothesis of the priority of one proto- gospel	140
1.2.8 The Mt-Mk-Lk ('Augustinian') order of sequential literary dependence of the Synoptic Gospels	141
1.2.8.1 Main arguments for the Mt-Mk-Lk order of sequential literary dependence of the Synoptic Gospels	141
1.2.8.2 Modern proponents of the hypothesis of the Mt-Mk-Lk order of sequential literary dependence of the Synoptic Gospels	142
J. Wenham	142
A. Kowalczyk	143
1.2.8.3 Problems with the hypothesis of the Mt-Mk-Lk order of sequential literary dependence of the Synoptic Gospels	144
1.2.9 The Mt-Lk-Mk ('Two-Gospel') order of sequential literary dependence of the Synoptic Gospels	145
1.2.9.1 Main arguments for the Mt-Lk-Mk order of sequential literary dependence of the Synoptic Gospels	145
1.2.9.2 Modern proponents of the Two-Gospel hypothesis	146
W. R. Farmer	146
D. L. Dungan	149
J. B. Orchard	150
D. B. Peabody	151
H. Riley	153
A. J. McNicol	155

1.2.9.3 Problems with the hypothesis of the Mt-Lk-Mk order of sequential literary dependence of the Synoptic Gospels	156
External evidence scanty and not pertaining to the hypothesis	157
Internal evidence better explained by the hypothesis of Markan priority.....	157
Implausible dispersion and omission of much Matthean and Lukan material	159
Assumed poor redactional skill of Mark.....	160
1.2.10 The Mk-Mt-Lk order of sequential literary dependence of the Synoptic Gospels.....	161
1.2.10.1 Main arguments for the Mk-Mt-Lk order of sequential literary dependence of the Synoptic Gospels.....	161
1.2.10.2 Modern proponents of the hypothesis of the Mk-Mt-Lk order of sequential literary dependence of the Synoptic Gospels	162
M. D. Goulder	162
R. H. Gundry	164
H. B. Green	166
E. Franklin.....	168
M. S. Goodacre	169
1.2.10.3 Problems with the hypothesis of the Mk-Mt-Lk order of sequential literary dependence of the Synoptic Gospels	171
Unconvincing linguistic evidence.....	171
Implausibility of Luke's omission of several Lukan-like motifs from the Gospel of Matthew	172
Implausibility of Luke's decomposition of the Matthean literary-rhetorical structures.....	172
1.2.11 The Mk-Lk-Mt order of sequential literary dependence of the Synoptic Gospels.....	173
1.2.11.1 Main arguments for the Mk-Lk-Mt order of sequential literary dependence of the Synoptic Gospels.....	173
1.2.11.2 Modern proponents of the hypothesis of the Mk-Lk-Mt order of sequential literary dependence of the Synoptic Gospels	176
M. Hengel.....	176
R. V. Huggins.....	179
E. Aurelius.....	180
G. A. Blair.....	181
1.2.11.3 Problems with the hypothesis of the Mk-Lk-Mt order of sequential literary dependence of the Synoptic Gospels	182
Mattheanisms in the double Mt-Lk tradition	182
Unidentified sources of the Lukan non-Markan material.....	183
No support for the Mk-Lk-Mt order of the composition of the Gospels in the early Church tradition	184

1.2.12 Conclusions	184
1.3 Conclusions	185
Chapter 2: The basic pattern of literary interdependence of the Synoptic Gospels	187
2.1 Criteria for ascertaining the existence and direction of possible direct literary dependence among the Synoptic Gospels	187
2.1.1 Questionable criteria of direct literary dependence	188
Vocabulary characteristic of a given Gospel	188
Shorter and longer version of a common text	190
Repetitions and doublets	191
Increasing clarity	191
Evident inconsistencies and logical errors	192
Growing Hellenization of the gospel tradition	192
Implausibility of removing established Christian theological ideas and literary motifs	194
Dependence on the redactional work of another evangelist	194
Explicable disagreements in the order of common material	196
2.1.2 More reliable criteria of direct literary dependence	196
Conflations of elements of other Gospels	196
Presence of vocabulary, phraseology, structural patterns, etc. typical of another Gospel and occurring only in the passages that are evidently paralleled in that other Gospel	198
Contrariety of the ideas expressed in the passages that are paralleled in another Gospel to the ideas expressed elsewhere in the given Gospel and especially peculiar to it	201
Not easily perceivable inconsistencies and logical errors in the passages that are paralleled in another Gospel, in which the inconsistency or error in question is absent	201
Increasing confusion	202
Evident congruity of the features of style, redactional technique, theology, etc. of a given passage with those peculiar to the Gospel in question, together with relative incongruity of the corresponding features of the parallel passage in another Gospel with those of that other Gospel	203
Dependence on extant and not merely hypothetical works	204
2.1.3 Conclusions	205
2.2 Test cases of direct literary dependence among the Synoptic Gospels:	
Mk 1:14-2:28 parr.	205
Mk 1:14-15 parr.	206
Mk 1:16-20 parr.	209
Mk 1:21-22 parr.	210
Mk 1:23-28 parr.	212

Mk 1:29-31 parr.	212
Mk 1:32-34 parr.	213
Mk 1:35-38 parr.	215
Mk 1:39 parr.	215
Mk 1:40-45 parr.	216
Mk 2:1-12 parr.	217
Mk 2:13-17 parr.	220
Mk 2:18-22 parr.	221
Mk 2:23-28 parr.	223
Conclusions.....	224
2.3 Conclusions.....	225
Chapter 3: Mark's use of his sources.....	227
3.1 The origin of the literary structure of the Gospel of Mark.....	227
3.1.1 Paul's letters.....	229
Mk 1:1-7:37.....	232
Mk 8:1-10:45.....	248
Mk 10:46-12:44.....	256
Mk 13:1-15:15.....	260
Mk 15:16-16:8.....	264
3.1.2 Homer's <i>Iliad</i>	266
3.2 Conclusions.....	269
Chapter 4: Luke's use of his sources.....	275
4.1 The sources and their use in Lk 3:1-4:13.....	275
Lk 3:1-6.....	276
Lk 3:7-20.....	277
Lk 3:21-22.....	280
Lk 3:23-38.....	281
Lk 4:1-13.....	282
Conclusions.....	284
4.2 The sources and their use in the so-called Lukan 'little interpolation' (Lk 6:20-8:3).....	285
Lk 6:20-49.....	286
Lk 7:1-35.....	290
Lk 7:36-8:3.....	293
Conclusions.....	297
4.3 The sources and their use in the Lukan 'travel narrative' (Lk 9:51- 19:28).....	298
4.3.1 Lk 9:51-13:21.....	301
Lk 9:51-62.....	302
Lk 10:1-24.....	309
Lk 10:25-37.....	319
Lk 10:38-11:13.....	322

Lk 11:14-36.....	325
Lk 11:37-54.....	331
Lk 12:1-12.....	336
Lk 12:13-34.....	339
Lk 12:35-53.....	341
Lk 12:54-13:21.....	345
Conclusion.....	351
4.3.2 Lk 13:22-17:10.....	352
Lk 13:22-14:24.....	352
Lk 14:25-35.....	358
Lk 15:1-32.....	360
Lk 16:1-15.....	361
Lk 16:16-18.....	363
Lk 16:19-31.....	365
Lk 17:1-6.....	368
Lk 17:7-10.....	370
Conclusion.....	371
4.3.3 Lk 17:11-19:28.....	371
Lk 17:11-19.....	372
Lk 17:20-37.....	374
Lk 18:1-14.....	378
Lk 18:15-43.....	380
Lk 19:1-10.....	382
Lk 19:11-28.....	385
Conclusion.....	388
4.3.4 Conclusions.....	388
4.4 Conclusions.....	390
Chapter 5: Matthew's use of his sources.....	401
5.1 Matthew's use of Lk.....	401
5.1.1 Alleged Lukan emendations of the Matthean version of the double Mt-Lk tradition.....	401
Lk 4:5-6 par.....	402
Lk 11:3-4 par.....	403
Lk 12:9 par.....	404
Conclusion.....	405
5.1.2 Matthew's redactional use of Lk.....	406
5.1.3 Conclusions.....	407
5.2 Matthew's use of Acts and of the letters attributed to the Jewish Christian leaders.....	407
5.2.1 The post-Pauline letters attributed to the Jewish Christian leaders.....	408
5.2.1.1 The Letter of Pseudo-James (Jas).....	409
5.2.1.2 The Letter of Pseudo-Peter (1 Pet).....	414

Conclusion.....	417
5.2.2 Matthew's use of Acts and of Jas with 1 Pet	418
5.2.2.1 Matthew's insertions into the Markan narrative framework and relocations of the Markan material	419
'Inflation' of the 'Jewish' sections of the gospel story.....	419
Anticipations and reworking of the Markan material in Mt 1-13.....	422
Composition of the 'Petrine' pericopes in Mt 14-20	426
Sequential hypertextual reworking of Acts in Mt.....	428
5.2.2.2 Matthew's detailed use of Jas	430
5.2.2.3 Matthew's detailed use of 1 Pet.....	434
Conclusion.....	436
5.2.3 Conclusions	437
5.3 Conclusions	437
General conclusions	441
Bibliography	449
Primary sources	449
Israelite-Jewish.....	449
Graeco-Roman	450
Early Christian (I-II c. AD)	450
Secondary literature.....	451
Index of ancient sources	512