

# NEW TESTAMENT ESSAYS

STUDIES IN MEMORY OF  
**Thomas Walter Manson**  
1893-1958

sponsored by  
PUPILS, COLLEAGUES  
AND FRIENDS

edited by  
**A. J. B. HIGGINS**  
*Lecturer in New Testament Language  
and Literature in the University  
of Leeds*

MANCHESTER UNIVERSITY PRESS

© 1959

*Published by the University of Manchester at*  
THE UNIVERSITY PRESS  
*316-324 Oxford Road, Manchester 13*

Printed in Great Britain by Butler & Tanner Ltd., Frome and London

## THE ORIGINAL ORDER OF Q

*by*

V. TAYLOR

---

IN view of the great contribution which Professor T. W. Manson has made to the study of Q, a contribution for which all students of Gospel Origins are deeply grateful, it seems not inappropriate to offer in this essay a few comments on the Order of this source. There are several reasons why such an investigation is desirable. First, it will be agreed that, while many important contributions have been made to this question, the results cannot be regarded as completely satisfactory. Again, and not unconnected with this situation, there has been a shift of interest which has caused a temporary halt to these discussions. For something like a generation the earlier interest in literary criticism, so virile during the latter part of the nineteenth century and the opening decades of the twentieth, has abated owing to the competing claims of Form Criticism, New Testament Theology, Typology, and existentialist assessments of the Gospel tradition. These newer and fruitful interests are not to be regretted and it was perhaps necessary that the well tilled fields of literary criticism should lie fallow for a time. Nevertheless, it seems necessary, without neglecting the later disciplines, to return to the study of the older problems and to consider how far they are capable of a solution. Further, in the interval the existence of Q has been vigorously assailed, notably by such scholars as E. Lummis,<sup>1</sup> H. G. Jameson,<sup>2</sup> B. C. Butler,<sup>3</sup> and A. Farrer.<sup>4</sup> These scholars have revived the hypothesis that Luke used the Gospel of Matthew as a source, and Abbot Butler has gone so far as to describe Q as 'an unnecessary and vicious hypothesis'.<sup>5</sup> The Two Document Hypothesis has been strongly attacked. These attacks have not changed the views of its advocates, but in some quarters a certain uneasiness is manifest. There is a tendency to speak of Q as 'a hypothetical document' and its alleged unity has been questioned.<sup>6</sup> On the other

hand, there has been what must be described as a closer approach to the Q Hypothesis on the part of some Roman Catholic scholars. In the new *Catholic Commentary on Holy Scripture* (1953) Père Benoit has maintained that an original Aramaic Gospel of Matthew was used as a source by the three Synoptists. Similarly Dr. Alfred Wikenhauser,<sup>7</sup> who maintains that the Greek Matthew and Luke are both dependent on Mark, suggests that Matthew composed the *logia* in Aramaic, the Greek translation being the common source used in the Greek Matthew and Luke.

In these circumstances it may be timely to re-examine the order of Q in its bearings on the Q Hypothesis. At any rate this is the theme of the present essay.

## I

In this inquiry I shall use the symbol Q to represent those sayings and parables in Matt. and Luke which are commonly assigned to this source, accepting the view that Q was a document as 'a working hypothesis'. I shall leave aside the possibility that Q was preceded by earlier groups of sayings and examine the common source which, by hypothesis, lay before them as a unity. Several arguments have been held to support this hypothesis—the linguistic agreements between Matt. and Luke, the order reflected by the sayings, and the presence of doublets in the two Gospels which point to the use of Mark and at least one other source. I do not propose to discuss all these arguments, but only the question of order, which in many respects is the most objective and decisive argument of all. I shall use the sign M as a convenient symbol for the sayings and parables which are found only in Matt. With Streeter and Bussmann I believe that M was also a document, but it will not be possible within the limits of this essay to discuss this hypothesis, although the investigation will have something to contribute to it. It will not be necessary to examine the L hypothesis, and I must content myself with stating the belief that it was a body of oral tradition which Luke was the first to give a written form. All I wish to attempt is to consider whether the order of the sayings commonly assigned to Q is such as to render probable the view that this source lay before the two Evangelists in the form of a document at the time when they wrote.

In this endeavour I am compelled to refer to an article on 'The Order of Q' which I contributed to the *Journal of Theological Studies*<sup>8</sup> in April, 1953, since the present essay carries further conclusions there suggested. In that article I made a new approach to the question of order by suggesting that we must not be content to study parallel passages in Matt. and Luke in *two* columns, with Luke on the left, as presumably representing better the original order of Q, and Matt. on the right. Such lists point to a common order, as many scholars have argued, but the breaches of order in the lists are so many that the case has been felt to be much less strong and convincing than, in fact, it is. In the article referred to I set down the Lukan passages on the left, but instead of one column for Matt. I used *six*, including the Q sayings in the five great discourses in Matt., in 5-7, 10, 13, 18 and 23-25 and a sixth column containing the Q sayings in the rest of Matt. The result was to show an astonishing range of agreement, not continuous throughout, but visible in groups or series of passages in the same order in both Gospels. In all, only ten sayings stood apart from these series breaking their continuity, and it was suggested that, unless Luke used Matt. as a source, a strong argument existed in favour of the hypothesis that both Evangelists drew upon the document Q as one of their principal sources.

Obviously the tabulated series cannot be the result of happy chance, but, in default of any criticisms of the article known to me, I may perhaps be permitted to say that the table is open to two objections. First, I excluded a group of sayings and parables on the ground that in them by wide consent Matthew's preference, while possibly using Q, is dependent upon another source, with the result that the order of Q, as reflected in Matt. and Luke, may be obscured.<sup>9</sup> Secondly, I did not discuss in detail the ten short sayings which stand in a different order in the two Gospels. The table was left to speak for itself.

In the present essay I shall include all the passages mentioned, with the exception of Matt. 16:2 which is textually suspect. The effect is to break to some extent the regularity of the agreements, although not in one or two cases, but in any case it makes the investigation more complete. I now propose to discuss the order of the Q sayings in Luke as compared with that present in the five great discourses in Matt. and in the rest of this Gospel outside these discourses.

## II

## THE SERMON ON THE MOUNT

<i>Luke</i>	<i>Matt. 5-7</i>
6:20-3	5:3-6, 11 f.
6:27-30	5:39b-42
6:31	(7:12)
6:32-6	5:44-8
6:37 f.	7:1 f.
6:41 f.	7:3-5
6:43-5	7:16-20
6:46	7:21
6:47-9	7:24-7
<hr/>	
11:2-4	6:9-13
11:9-13	(7:7-11)
11:33	(5:15)
11:34 f.	6:22 f.
12:22-31	6:25-33
12:33b, 34	(6:20 f.)
12:57-9	(5:25 f.)
13:23 f.	7:13 f.
13:25-7	7:22 f., [25:10-12]
14:34 f.	(5:13)
16:13	(6:24)
16:17	5:18
16:18	5:32

*Notes*

1. The greater part of Matthew's Version consists of sayings from M. In particular, 5:21-48 includes six 'Antitheses', together with an introduction in 5:17-20. Into these sections Q sayings have been inserted. It is not surprising, therefore, that in these cases Matthew and Luke do not agree in order.

2. Further, there is an original group of M sayings in 6:1-8, 16-18 (and perhaps also in 19-21). This also affects the order in which Q is used.

3. In these circumstances the agreement in the order of Q in the two Gospels is remarkable. The order is not continuous, but consists of sequences in common, of which the first (broken by 7:12) is considerable, and the second (broken by 7:7-11 and 5:15) is hardly less notable. Two briefer sequences, consisting of two sayings each, follow. The bracketed passages are those which differ in order.

4. It will be seen that Matthew has used practically the whole of

Luke's Sermon on the Plain in Matt. 5 and 7, and in 6 various sayings from Luke 11-14 and 16. This distribution has the appearance of a consciously adopted plan.

5. The passages in brackets obviously call for special discussion, and it will be useful to consider first those in Matt. 5:17-48, and then those in the rest of the Matthaean Sermon.

#### *The Q sayings in Matt. 5:17-48*

The six Antitheses are (1) 21 ff. on Murder, (2) 27 ff. on Adultery, (3) 31 f. on Divorce, (4) 33 ff. on Vows and Oaths, (5) 38 ff. on Retribution, and (6) 43 ff. on Love of one's Neighbour. The theme of the Introduction, 5:17-20, is the Attitude to be taken to the Law. Of the Q sayings in 5:17-48 that on reconciliation in 25 f. is loosely appended to 24 in No. 1 and it is not surprising that the Lukan order is broken. What is surprising in that 18 (in the Introduction) and 32 in No. 3 stand in their Lukan order, and that the same is true of 39b-42 and 44-8 in Nos. 5 and 6. Nos. 2 and 4 contain no Q sayings.

These facts are naturally explained if Matthew has edited the Introduction and has himself added Nos. 3, 5, and 6 to an original group of three Antitheses in Nos. 1, 2, and 4. This hypothesis has independently been suggested by M. Albertz<sup>10</sup> and W. L. Knox<sup>11</sup> on literary grounds<sup>12</sup> and receives further support from the order of the Q sayings. With the exception of the editorial use of Matt. 5:25 f., dependence on Q in Matt. 5:17-48 in an order common to Matt. and Luke is a reasonable assumption. Matt. 5:18 and 32 are used earlier than the parallel sayings in Luke because they are inserted by Matthew into this complex.

#### *The Q Sayings in the Rest of the Sermon on the Mount*

In their Lukan order these sayings are Matt. 7:12, 7:7-11, 5:15, 6:20 f., 5:13, 6:24; and with these 7:13 f. and 22 f. may with advantage be considered.

1. *Matt. 7:12* (Luke 6:31): 'All things therefore whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, even so do ye also unto them: for this is the law and the prophets.'

Apart from the Matthaean addition in the final clause, Matt. and Luke agree closely.<sup>13</sup> Dependence on Q is highly probable, and the only question to consider is why Matthew incorporates the saying at a later point. In reply, it is to be noted that both

Evangelists use it as a summary passage. The position in Luke is much to be preferred since it is the conclusion to a group, Luke 6:27-30, arranged in Semitic parallelism and revealing both rhyme and rhythm when translated back into Aramaic.<sup>14</sup> Apparently, Matthew has delayed his use of the saying to sum up the considerable number of Q sayings in 6:22-7:11. In short, he alters Luke's order for editorial reasons.

2. *Matt. 7:7-11 (Luke 11:9-13): On Answer to Prayer*

The agreement is close, but the clue to the difference of position in the two Gospels is obscure. McNeile says that in Matt. the saying stands in no apparent relation to the context.<sup>15</sup> In Luke it appears in a section on Prayer (11:1-13) following the Lord's Prayer (2-4) and the parable of the Friend at Midnight (5-8). Knox<sup>16</sup> suggests that the section is a (pre-Lukan) tract on Prayer, but, if so, this suggestion does not exclude the probability that in Q Luke 11:9-13 originally followed immediately Luke 11:2-4. Why, then, in Matt. 7:7-11 is it separated from the Prayer (Matt. 6:9-13) by several passages from Q and M, placed immediately after the M saying, 'Give not that which is holy to the dogs', and before the summary saying, 7:12, on doing to others as we wish them to do to us? No completely satisfactory answer has been given to this question, and it may be insoluble. Only a conjecture can be offered. The natural place for the passage in Matt. would be after the Lord's Prayer (Matt. 6:9-13) as in Luke. But at this point Matthew uses a saying from Mark or M on forgiveness (Matt. 6:14 f.). This change of theme leaves the passage on Answer to Prayer on his hands; and he finds no place for it, save, in an unsuitable context, after the extracts from Q and M immediately before 7:12 as indicated above. In any case, and whatever may be the explanation, Matthew's use of 7:7-11 is probably editorial.

3. *Matt. 5:15 (Luke 11:33): 'Neither do men light a lamp, and put it under the bushel, but on the stand; and it shineth unto all that are in the house.'*

Matt. 5:15 stands in an M context (Matt. 5:13-16) and may even belong to M. In this case no problem arises: Matthew follows the order of M. More probably, however, the saying has been taken from Q. The parallel passage in Luke 11:33 has a doublet in

Luke 8:16 (= Mark 4:21) and shares with it the words *οὐδεὶς*, *ἄψας*, and *εἰσπορευόμενοι* and the idea that those who see the light enter from without. This explains the linguistic differences between Luke 11:33 and Matt. 5:15.<sup>17</sup> That a common source is used is suggested by the fact that Matt. 5:15, 6:22 f., and 6:25-33 follow in the same relative order as Luke 11:33, 34 f., and 12:22-31.<sup>18</sup> The earlier position of Matt. 5:15 is caused by its insertion in its present M context (see above).

4. *Matt. 6:20 f.* (Luke 12:33b-34): Treasure on Earth and in Heaven.

Apart from the closing words (*Matt. 6:21* and *Luke 12:34*) the linguistic differences are considerable. These differences and the variation of rhythm<sup>19</sup> in the two forms suggest that Matthew is drawing upon M and Luke on Q. In this case the difference in position is not surprising.

5. *Matt. 5:13* (Luke 14:34 f.): On Salt.

Here again Matthew's source may be M.<sup>20</sup> If he is using Q, the difference of order in Matt. and Luke is due to the M. context in which *Matt. 5:13* appears.

6. *Matt. 6:24* (Luke 16:13): On Serving Two Masters.

The two versions are in almost verbatim agreement; the only difference is that Luke has *οἰκέτης* with *οὐδεὶς*. With the last saying this is one of those 'scattered fragments' which Streeter<sup>21</sup> says there is good reason to assign to Q, although they are not found embedded in the mass of other material from that source. Easton<sup>22</sup> soundly observes that its place in Q is quite uncertain.

It is possible to state a case in favour of the order of either of the Evangelists. Luke attaches it to a group of L sayings (Luke 16:10-12) which follow the parable of the Unjust Steward (16:1-9) and the connexion seems determined *ad vocem* by the word 'Mammon'. This arrangement appears to be artificial as compared with that of Matthew who uses the saying to introduce the passage on Anxiety (6:25-34). The two are connected by the phrase *διὰ τοῦτο* and the idea suggested is that, as we cannot serve two masters, we are not to be anxious for our life. This connexion is good, but somewhat artificial. Luke has the passage on Anxiety earlier (12:22-31) after the parable of the Rich Fool (12:13-21), and in this arrangement *διὰ τοῦτο* seems to point back to the pre-

ceding Q saying on the guidance of the Holy Spirit in a time of anxiety (12:11 f.). As in Matt. this connexion is good, but perhaps superficial. Anxiety about food and clothing and about one's defence before a legal tribunal are connected by little save the idea of anxiety itself. No compelling argument enables us to decide between Matt. and Luke and we must agree with the opinion of Easton, cited above, that the place of the saying on Serving Two masters in Q is uncertain. Editorial activity has been at work in either Matt. and Luke, and perhaps in both.

7. *Matt. 7:13 f.* (Luke 13:23 f.): The Two Ways, and *Matt. 7:22 f.* (Luke 13:26 f.): The Shut Door.

Linguistically the two sayings have so little in common that it is possible that both have been taken from M.<sup>23</sup> Moreover, *Matt. 7:13 f.* speaks of the narrow *gate* which leads to the ways of destruction and life, whereas Luke speaks of the narrow *door* which many are not able to enter. The sayings on the Shut Door also agree only in the common use of Ps. 6:9. Phrases in Luke 13:25 recall the parable of the Ten Virgins in M (*Matt. 25:1-13*).

The two sayings are considered here in order to have as many facts before us as possible because (a) they stand in the same order in Matt. and Luke, and (b) the intervening passages, *Matt. 7:16-20* (Luke 6:43 f.) and *Matt. 7:21* (Luke 6:46), also stand in the same order.<sup>24</sup> Moreover, *Matt. 7:16-20* and 21 also, like 7:13 f. and 22 f., may come from M. If the source is Q, Matthew has followed its order; if M he (or the compiler of M) is aware of Q's order or of a tradition common to Q and M. Probably the editorial work is that of Matthew himself. He connects 7:16-20 and 21 because they stand in that order in the Lukan Sermon on the Plain (Q) and 7:13 f. and 22 f. because they follow in the same order in those passages outside of the Lukan Sermon which he uses in compiling the Sermon on the Mount.

### *Conclusions regarding the Sermon on the Mount*

From the above investigation it would appear that, apart from cases of conflation with M, and insertions and additions to it, Matthew has followed the order of Q as it stood in Luke. The necessity of discussing cases where the order is broken must not obscure the fact that for the most part the agreement of order is patent and therefore does not need discussion. In the cases

examined conflation and editorial changes are departures from the order present in Luke, except on rare occasions when Luke is responsible for the differences. A point of interest is that M supplies about two-thirds of the whole, which suggests that M itself contained a version of the Sermon beginning with Beatitudes. If so, Matthew has followed M in 5:3-11 with additions and modifications suggested by Q.

#### THE MISSION CHARGE

<i>Luke</i>	<i>Matt. 9:37-10:42</i>
6:40	(10:24 f.)
10:2	9:37 f.
10:3-12	10:9-16
10:16	(10:40)
12:2 f.	10:26 f.
12:4-7	10:28-31
12:8 f.	10:32 f.
12:11 f.	(10:19 f.)
12:51-3	10:34-36
14:26 f.	10:37 f.
17:33	10:39

#### Notes

1. The Matthaean discourse contains material from M and Mark, but mainly from Q. (For 10:9-16 see footnote 26.)

2. It will be seen that, apart from 10:24 f., 40, and 19 f., the Q passages listed (24 verses) agree exactly in order in Matt. and Luke.

3. Obviously the three exceptions (5 verses) call for examination in order to see why they appear in a different order.

1. *Matt. 10:24 f.* (Luke 6:40): 'A disciple is not above his master, nor a servant above his lord. It is enough for the disciple that he be as his master, and the servant as his lord' (Matt.); 'The disciple is not above his master: but every one when he is perfected shall be as his master' (Luke).

It should be noted that Luke 6:39 has a parallel in Matt. 14:14 which is also not in Luke's order. Luke 6:39 f. is a unit, not connected closely with its context in the Lukan Sermon, which Matthew has not included in the Sermon on the Mount. In 15:14 he applies 39 to the Pharisees<sup>25</sup> and, as we see, sets 40 in the Mission Charge. Both Matthaean sayings stand in an M context and both may belong to M;<sup>26</sup> but the artificiality of the construction in

15:12-14 and 10:23-5 raises the question whether after all both have been derived from Q.

A common dependence on Q is suggested by the agreements and by the fact that Matthew's modifications appear to be secondary. Instead of the general application which the sayings have in Luke 6:39 f. he applies 39 to the Pharisees and adapts 40 for use in the Mission Charge in 10:24 f., where the context and the double use of the term 'his lord' suggest that he is thinking of Jesus himself.

All this is true even if Luke 6:39 f. is not in its original order. Creed<sup>27</sup> says that its position is editorial and Easton<sup>28</sup> thinks the connexion is artificial. But there is not a little to be said for the view that Luke retains the order of Q. Luke 6:39 f. follows the saying on Not Judging (6:37 f.) and precedes that on the Mote and the Beam (6:41 f.). The idea appears to be that the man who condemns others is a blind guide who can benefit no one. Teacher and disciple alike will fall into a pit, for the disciple's insight will rise no higher than that of his teacher even if the lesson is learned perfectly. Moreover, the man who judges is blind in another sense. He sees the mote in his brother's eye, but not the beam in his own eye, and thus deceives himself. This connexion of thought seems too subtle to be editorial. It is easier to suppose that Luke is reproducing the order of Q.<sup>29</sup> If so, on his understanding of the sayings, Matthew has regarded them as unsuitable for the Sermon on the Mount and has transferred them to the contexts in which they now stand.

2. *Matt. 10:40* (Luke 10:16): 'He that receiveth you receiveth me, and he that receiveth me receiveth him that sent me' (Matt.); 'He that heareth you heareth me; and he that rejecteth you rejecteth me; and he that rejecteth me rejecteth him that sent me' (Luke). Cf. Mark 9:37, 'Whosoever shall receive one of such little children in my name, receiveth me: and whosoever receiveth me, receiveth not me, but him that sent me.'

It is important to note that, while these versions of the saying are not in the same order in Matt. and Luke, each belongs to the conclusion of the Mission Charge in the two Gospels. Apparently, Matthew has postponed the use of it deliberately until he has used additional sayings from Q, M, and Mark. It is not certain, however, that Q is his source. Matt. 10:40 f. may be from M and

10:42 is probably taken from Mark 9:41. Dr. Manson<sup>30</sup> says that Luke 10:16 is to be assigned to Q, but that one may have doubts whether Matt. 10:40 should be labelled Q or M. He further suggests that Matt. 10:40, Mark 9:37, and Luke 10:16 may go back to a fuller common original. The possibility arises that, if Matt. 10:40 is drawn from M, its position at the close of the Charge is suggested by the place of Luke 10:16. In any case, whether it be from Q or M, its use by Matthew is determined by editorial considerations.

3. *Matt. 10:19 f.* (Luke 12:11 f.): 'But when they deliver you up, be not anxious *how or what* ye shall speak: for it shall be given you in that hour what ye shall speak. For it is not ye that speak, but the Spirit of your Father that speaketh in you' (Matt.); 'And when they bring you before the synagogues, and the rulers, and the authorities, be not anxious *how or what* ye shall answer, or what ye shall say: for the Holy Spirit shall teach you in that very hour what ye ought to say' (Luke). Cf. Mark 13:11 and Luke 21:14 f.

The difference of order in Matt. and Luke is explained by the fact that the closer parallel to Matt. 10:19 f. is Mark 13:11. Matthew's source in 10:17-22 is Mark 13:9-13. It is often maintained that Luke 12:11 f. is from Q because of its small linguistic agreements with Matt. 10:19 f. which are not present in Mark, especially the phrase 'how or what'. This view is weakened if, as Streeter thinks, the phrase is due to textual assimilation,<sup>31</sup> but it is not altogether destroyed. Streeter points out that in both Gospels the saying stands in the same discourse as Luke 12:2 ff. = Matt. 10:26 ff., though separated by a few verses, and argues that the presence of Luke 12:11 f. explains the use of the saying in both Gospels.<sup>32</sup> Q may have suggested to Matthew the use of Mark 13:9-13 in the Mission Charge rather than in the Eschatological discourse in Matt. 24 where it is merely summarized (Matt. 24:9, 13).

### *Conclusions regarding the Mission Charge*

In considering the above passages one must not forget that, even more impressively than in the Sermon on the Mount, much the greater number of Q sayings (approximately four-fifths) are in the same order in Matt. and Luke. Where there is a difference of order, the arrangement in Matt. (and possibly occasionally in

Luke) is due to editorial reasons or the use of other sources and that in some cases (10:19 f. and 40) Matthew appears to be aware of the order he deserts. Thus, the differences do not weaken the hypothesis of a common order, but tend to confirm it.

#### THE DISCOURSE ON TEACHING IN PARABLES

In this, the third of Matthew's five discourses most of the material is taken from the two sources, Mark (4:1-9, 10-12, 13-20, 30-2) and M (Matt. 13:24-30, 36-43, 44, 45 f., 47-50, 51 f.). The Q material is limited to one saying and two parables (The Mustard Seed and the Leaven), of which the Mustard Seed (Matt. 13:31 f.) is a conflation of the Q version with Mark 14:30-2.<sup>33</sup> This material, arranged in the Lukan order, is as follows:

<i>Luke</i>	<i>Matt.</i>	
10:23 f.	13:16 f.	'Blessed are the eyes which see'.
13:18 f.	13:31 f.	The Mustard Seed.
13:20 f.	13:33	The Leaven.

#### Notes

1. There are no Q passages in an order other than that of Luke.
2. It is reasonable to suppose that in constructing the discourse Matthew takes his point of departure from Mark 4:1, adding a considerable amount of parabolic matter from M, and inserting extracts from Q.
3. He conflates the Q version of the Mustard Seed (Luke 13:18 f.) with Mark 4:30-2, and appends the parable of the Leaven because the two stood together in Q.
4. Already Matthew has on his hands the saying, 'Blessed are your eyes' (Luke 10:23 f. = Matt. 13:16 f.), having replaced this passage by the M saying, 'Come unto me, all ye that labour' (Matt. 11:28-30), after the saying, 'I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth' (Luke 10:21 f. = Matt. 11:25-7). He places the saying after the Markan passage on the Purpose of Parables (Mark 4:10-12 = Matt. 13:10-15), adding the phrase 'and your ears, for they hear' and substituting 'righteous men' for 'kings'. As Easton<sup>34</sup> says, the arrangement is obviously artificial. Matthew chooses the best place he can find for the saying previous to the second and third extracts from Q fixed by the use of Mark 4:30-2, the parable of the Mustard Seed.
5. It is to be noted that Matthew had already used all the Q material in Luke which stands before 11:23 f., as well as all the sayings between this passage and the parable of the Mustard Seed (Luke 13:18 f.), with

the exception of the saying on the Great Commandment (Luke 10:25-28). Thus, the three extracts from Q stood together ready for use in Matt. 13.

### *Conclusions on the Discourse on Teaching in Parables*

The amount of Q sayings in the discourse is small, but, so far as it goes, it confirms the hypothesis that Matthew follows the order of Q as it is reflected in Luke.

### THE DISCOURSE ON DISCIPLESHIP

The fourth Matthaean discourse is constructed like the third. It consists of material taken almost wholly from Mark (9:33-7, 42-8) in 18:1-9 and from M in 18:10-35. A few Q sayings appear to be used in the order in which they are found in Luke.

<i>Luke</i>	<i>Matt.</i>	
14:11	18:4	On humbling oneself.
[15:4-7, 10]	[18:12-14]	The Lost Sheep.
17:1 f.	18:6 f.	On Stumbling-blocks.
17:3 f.	18:15, 21	On Forgiveness.

The extent to which Matthew uses Q in these passages is debatable.

It is open to question if the second belongs to Q. Matt. 18:4 differs considerably from Luke 14:11, and Matt. 18:6 f. and 15, 21 are confections of material from Q and M.

All the more remarkable is the agreement in order shown above. Moreover, Matthew had not to search for the Q sayings: they probably lay immediately before the eye. He had already drawn upon all the sayings in Q which precede Luke 14:11 and those also which lie between this saying and Luke 17:1 with the exception of the sayings which apparently he intended to use in 23-25. Thus, the three sayings listed above stood in succession ready for use in 18.

In view of the difficult questions which arise in these sayings it is necessary to examine them in detail.

1. *Matt. 18:4* (Luke 14:11): 'Whosoever therefore shall humble himself as this little child, the same is the greatest in the kingdom of heaven' (Matt.); 'For every one that exalteth himself shall be humbled; and he that humbleth himself shall be exalted' (Luke). Cf. Luke 18:14b

and Matt. 23:12, which are in almost verbatim agreement with Luke 14:11.

Luke 14:11 is attached loosely to the section on Table Manners (14:7-10) and similarly the doublet in Luke 18:14b is a pendant to the parable of the Pharisee and the Taxgatherer (18:9-14a). Matt. 23:12 stands at the end of an M section which condemns the habit of seeking respect from others, and Matt. 18:4, which is the passage under review, in an insertion in the story derived from Mark 9:33-7 on True Greatness.

Many scholars describe the passage as 'a floating saying'<sup>35</sup> or as 'a short proverbial saying' for which there is no need to postulate a written source at all.<sup>36</sup>

On the whole it seems best to assign Luke 14:11 = Matt. 18:4 to Q and to explain Luke 18:14b and Matt. 23:12 as repetitions of the saying. Hesitation to take this view is natural, for at first sight Mat. 18:4 seems widely different from Luke 14:11. But the differences, underlined above, are modifications due to the Markan context in which it appears (cf. Mark 9:34, 36). Thus, Matt. 18:4 is more than 'a reminiscence of Q';<sup>37</sup> it is a conscious modification of Q for editorial reasons.

2. *Matt. 18:12-14* (Luke 15:4-7, 10); The Lost Sheep.

This parable is widely assigned to Q,<sup>38</sup> but the opinion of Streeter,<sup>39</sup> endorsed by T. W. Manson,<sup>40</sup> that Matthew's version belongs to M and Luke's to L, is highly probable. The words common to both are those without which the story could not be told, and where the versions can differ, they do. Some of the differences are apparently translation variants.<sup>41</sup> The setting and the moral of the two versions are also different. In Matt. the parable is set in an M context and is related to the despising of 'little ones'; in Luke it precedes two other similar parables from L (The Lost Coin and the Lost Son) and its theme is the mercy of God in forgiving sinners. An inordinate amount of editorial modification has to be assigned to Luke if both versions are drawn from a common source, whereas the differences are intelligible if they come from different cycles of tradition.

If this view is taken, the variation in order is irrelevant. Just because this fact is consistent with the main contentions of this essay it is necessary to consider what follows if the common source

is Q. In this case the different order is the result of editorial adjustments with the other sources mentioned above on the part of one or both of the Evangelists.

3. *Matt. 18:6 f.* (Luke 17:1 f.); On Offences.

Matthew's version is widely held to be a conflation of Mark and Q, a view which accounts for the reverse form in which the saying appears in Matt. and Luke.<sup>42</sup>

4. *Matt. 18:15, 21 f.* (Luke 17:3 f.): On Forgiveness.

The verbal agreements are slight, and from these it is impossible to maintain that the two versions are derived from one common source. Moreover, the number of the acts of forgiveness differs (Matt., seventy times seven, or seventy-seven; Luke, seven times), and 'I repent' is peculiar to Luke. But there is agreement in the succession of themes (Offences and Forgiveness).<sup>43</sup> The presumption is that Matthew is giving the fuller M version in 18:15-22 in preference to that of Q for liturgical reasons.

*Conclusions regarding the Discourse on Discipleship*

Although the Q sayings used or reflected in the discourse are few, they follow without exception the Lukan order. It is possible that order of thought in Q, humility, offences, and forgiveness, is the clue to Matthew's disposal of Markan and M material in 18:1-9 (Mark) and 10-35 (M).

### THE ESCHATOLOGICAL DISCOURSE

Whether Matt. 23 (the Condemnation of the Scribes and Pharisees) should be separated from the Eschatological Discourse proper in Matt. 24-5 is a disputed question. Certainly 23 is self-contained, but it is not concluded by the formula, 'And it came to pass, when Jesus had finished all these words', which appears at the end of the five great discourses (cf. 26:1). It appears to be Matthew's intention to connect 23 with 24-5 (cf. 23:38). Since, however, it forms a whole, it will be useful to examine it separately.

Luke	Matt.
11:39-48	23:4-31
11:49-51	23:34-6
11:52	(23:13)
13:34 f.	23:37-9

Notes

1. It will be seen that there is a relative agreement of order broken, apparently, at Matt. 23:13.

2. The table, however, is delusive unless we consider Matt. 23:4-31 (to which verse 13 belongs) in detail, since M forms the backbone of this section. Mark 12:38b-40 is inserted in 23:6-7a and 13(f) almost verbatim. Several of the parallels in Luke xi, which presumably are from Q, are slight and not in the Lukan order. In these circumstances it will be helpful to set out the whole of Matt. 23 in a table indicating the parallel sayings in Luke and the extent to which they agree linguistically.

In their Matthaean order the parallel sayings are as follows:

Matt. 23

Matt. 23	Luke	Agreement
1		
2 f.		
4	11:46	Small
5		
6-7a	11:43	Small
7b-10		
11		
12	(cf. 14:11)	Almost verbatim
<hr/>		
13 (f.)	11:52	Small
15-22		
23	11:42	Considerable
24		
25 f.	11:39-41	Considerable
27 f.	11:44	Negligible
29-31	11:47 f.	Small
<hr/>		
32 f.		
34-6	11:49-51	Considerable
37-9	13:34 f.	Almost verbatim

Note. The horizontal lines separate the seven 'Woes' in Matt. from the rest of the chapter.

From this table it can be seen that the first five parallels stand in a different order in Matt. and Luke. They appear to be cases in which a definite preference has been given to the order and text of M. Only Matt. 23:12 is a probable insertion from Q and 23:23 may be a conflation of Q and M. In these circumstances the difference or order in the five parallels is not in the least surprising.

All the more remarkable is the complete agreement of order in the last five parallels. Moreover, apart from Matt. 23:27 f. and 29-31 the linguistic agreement is much greater. Apparently in these two sayings Matthew is still dependent on M. The agreement in order might be accidental or due to the original tradition lying behind M and Q, but the considerable degree of linguistic agreement of 23:25 f., 34-6, and 37-9<sup>44</sup> with their Lukan counterparts suggests rather a knowledge of the order of the five sayings in Q, and 23:23 may well have drawn Matthew's attention to this series.

We must conclude that, although Matthew follows M in the main in 23, he is well aware of the order of Q and observes it in the latter part of the discourse.

#### *Matt. 24-25*

In the Eschatological Discourse proper the parallel passages in their Lukan order are:

<i>Luke</i>	<i>Matt.</i>
12:39 f.	24:43 f.
12:42-6	24:45-51
17:23 f.	24:26 f.
17:26 f.	24:37-9
17:34 f.	24:40 f.
17:37	(24:28)
19:12-27	25:14-30

#### *Notes*

1. There are two parallel series, the second of which is broken by Matt. 24:28 (The Gathering Vultures).

2. The questions to be discussed are why 24:43-51 (The Parables of the Thief and the Faithful and Unfaithful Servants) appears later in Matt., and why 24:28 is used earlier than in Luke.

1. *Matt. 24:43-51*

The first question is easily answered. The two parables are attached to the Markan saying (13:35) in *Matt. 24:42* to form the first and second of a group of five parables (the last three of which, the Ten Virgins, the Talents,<sup>45</sup> and the Sheep and the Goats, are from M) in *Matt. 24:43-25:46* (i.e. at the end of the Discourse).

2. *Matt. 24:28*: 'Wheresoever the carcase is, there will be the vultures gathered together' (*Matt.*); 'And they answering say unto him, Where, Lord? And he said unto them, Where the body is, thither will the vultures also be gathered together' (*Luke*).

In *Matt.*, without an opening question, it stands in a good connexion after the saying on the suddenness of the Coming of the Son of Man; in *Luke* it closes the Eschatological Discourse. In *Matt.* it affirms the inevitability of the Parousia; in *Luke* it amounts to a refusal to answer the question, 'Where, Lord?' Commentators are very divided on the question of its original position, and this is not strange since the saying is a proverbial utterance. The roughness of *Luke's* enigmatic form may be more original than *Matthew's* smoother version, but a certain decision is perhaps not possible. In any case the editorial activity of one or other of the Evangelists is responsible for the difference of position.

*Conclusions regarding the Eschatological Discourse*

As in 23 *Matthew* has used material from M and Mark with which he has connected extracts from Q. In the latter *Matthew* and *Luke* agree in order apart from editorial rearrangements in *Matt. 24:43-51* due to use of M, and perhaps also in 24:28 where Q alone is in question.

In all the five discourses we meet with the same features—respect in the main for the order of Q as it appears in *Luke* and editorial activity usually on the part of *Matthew* where the order is different. It remains now to ask if the same is true of the use of Q in the rest of *Matt.* outside the five great discourses.

## THE REST OF MATTHEW

The Q passages in the Lukan order are as follows:

<i>Luke</i>	<i>Matt.</i>
3:7-9, 12, 16f.	3:7-12
3:21 f.	3:16 f.
4:1-13	4:1-11
6:39	(15:14)
6:43-5	(12:33-5)
7:1-10	8:5-10, 13
7:18-23	11:2-6
7:24-8	11:7-11
7:31-5	11:16-19
9:57-60	(8:19-22)
10:13-15	11:21-3
10:21 f.	11:25-7
10:25-7	(22:34-9)
11:14-23	12:22-30
11:24-6	12:43-5
11:29-32	12:38-42
12:10	(12:32)
13:28 f.	(8:11 f.)
13:30	(20:16)
14:15-24	[22:1-10]
16:16	(11:12 f.)
17:5 f.	17:20
22:28, 30b	19:28

*Notes*

1. It is a remarkable fact that, with the exception of the passages in brackets and the inversion of Matt. 12:43-5 and 38-42, all the sayings stand in the same order in Matt. and Luke.

2. The passage in square brackets is the parable of the Marriage Feast (Matt. 22:1-10, Luke 14:15-24, the Great Supper). It is included for the sake of completeness. Linguistically Matt. and Luke have very little in common and conflation in Matt. of Q with another parable is a probable explanation.<sup>46</sup>

3. Of the remaining passages in brackets Matt. 12:32 (cf. Mark 3:28 f.) and 22:34-9 (cf. Mark 12:28-34) are conflations of Q and Mark which, as many examples have shown, result in a difference of order.

4. The passages left for discussion are Matt. 15:14, 12:33-5, 8:19-22, 8:11 f., 20:16, and 11:12 f.

*The inversion of Matt. 12:43-7, 38-42 and Luke 11:24-6, 29-32*

Editorial rearrangement is the cause of the inversion. In Matt. the sections on the Sign of Jonah and the Ninevites are brought together because they relate to Jonah and the addition, 'Even so shall it be also unto this generation', brings the saying on Demon Possession (12:43-5) into harmony with the whole. In Luke the saying on Demon Possession stands first after the section on Colusion with Beelzebul, presumably because both deal with exorcism. Opinions will differ regarding the original order of Q. Matthew, I think, is responsible for the inversion, but in either case a common order is presupposed.

1. *Matt. 15:14* (Luke 6:39): 'Let them alone: they are blind guides. And if the blind guide the blind, both shall fall into a pit' (Matt.); 'And he spoke also a parable unto them, Can the blind guide the blind? shall they not both fall into a pit?' (Luke).

It will be recalled that the saying which follows (Luke 6:40 = Matt. 10:24 f.) was discussed earlier, and that the view taken was that Luke 6:39 f. preserves the order of Q, Matt. 10:24 f. owing its position to the M context in which it stands. A similar explanation accounts for the position of Matt. 15:14 which reflects editorial rearrangement.<sup>47</sup>

2. *Matt. 12:33-5* (Good and Corrupt Trees). Cf. Matt. 7:16-20 and Luke 6:43-5 discussed earlier.

The relationships between Matt. 7:16-20 and 12:33-5 are difficult to determine. Easton<sup>48</sup> suggests different forms in which the saying was spoken. With greater probability Hawkins<sup>49</sup> suggests that Matthew uses the saying twice, adapting it to the context in which he places it, in 7:16-18 to bring out the criterion of true and false teachers, in 12:33-5 to bring out the importance of words as proofs of the state of men's hearts.<sup>50</sup> If this is so, editorial activity accounts for the fact that 12:33-5 is not in the Lukan order.

3. *Matt. 8:19-22* (Candidates for Discipleship). Cf. Luke 9:57-60.

Why does Matthew place these sayings at an earlier point than that of Luke? Easton<sup>51</sup> gives the answer when he says that in both Matt. and Luke this is the last discourse section before the Mission Charge. *After* the Charge Matthew places those relating to the Baptist (11:2-6, 7-11, 16-19), while Luke has the parallel sayings

before it (7:18-23, 24-8, 31-5). Further, Matthew has used 8:19-22 as a preface to a considerable group from Mark and M containing many miracle-stories. The purpose of this arrangement is to prepare the way for 11:5 f. (Luke 7:22 f.), which is the message to John about the mighty works being wrought by Jesus. Luke meets the same need by the editorial passage, 7:21, 'In that hour he cured many of diseases and plagues and evil spirits; and on many that were blind he bestowed sight.' Both Evangelists exercise editorial freedom, but in Matt. the order of Q is affected.

4. *Matt. 8:11 f.* (Luke 13:28 f.): 'Many shall come from the east and the west. . . .'

Matthew has used the saying earlier by inserting it into the story of the Centurion's Servant (8:5-10, 13) and has inverted the sentences in order to get a better connexion.

5. *Matt. 20:16* (Luke 13:30) (The Last First and the First Last).

The transposition of No. 4 (above) left the saying<sup>52</sup> isolated and Matthew has attached it to the parable of the Labourers in the Vineyard (20:1-15).

6. *Matt. 11:12 f.* (Luke 16:16): 'From the days of John the Baptist.'

In the interests of a better order Matthew has transferred the saying to an earlier point after the testimony of Jesus to John (11:7-11). Luke would hardly have moved it from this position if Q had so placed it.<sup>53</sup>

### *Conclusions regarding the Rest of Matthew*

The use of Q in its Lukan order is as pronounced as in any of the five great discourses. It may be conjectured that, if the discourses were constructed first, the Q sayings were left standing as they appear in Luke. The changes of order are editorial or due to conflation with Mark. They arise from the necessity of inserting the sayings in the Markan framework and the desire to bring together and to adjust those relating to the Baptist.

## III

### CONCLUSIONS REGARDING Q AS A WHOLE

The investigation has confirmed the view that Luke has preserved the order of Q and has followed it with great fidelity. It

has shown further that Matthew knew the same order and was aware of it when he made editorial adjustments and conflated Q with Mark and M. If we reject, as we must, the hypothesis of Luke's dependence on Matt., the result of a comparison of the order of the sayings in Matt. and Luke is to demonstrate the existence of Q, so far as this is possible in the case of a source known to us only from its use in the two Gospels. Q is not 'an unnecessary and vicious hypothesis', but a collection of sayings and parables which actually existed when Matthew and Luke wrote. Its earlier history is a matter for conjecture; it is not excluded that earlier groups of sayings and parables have been combined in it. But this stage was past when the Gospels were compiled, and what we are able to recover is the form in which Q was current at least as early as the decade A.D. 50-60 and perhaps even earlier. It is probable that some of the sayings peculiar to Luke belong to it, including 6:24-6, 9:61 f., 12:35-8, 47 f., and 54-6, but not sayings found only in Matt.

It is desirable that M should be investigated more closely. This task has been waiting for a generation,<sup>54</sup> and it will always prove difficult, since the M sayings are found in Matt. only.

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup> *How Luke was Written* (1915).

<sup>2</sup> *The Origin of the Synoptic Gospels* (1922).

<sup>3</sup> *The Originality of St. Matthew* (1951).

<sup>4</sup> *A Study in St. Mark* (1951).

<sup>5</sup> *Op. cit.*, 170.

<sup>6</sup> See the important essay of C. K. Barrett, 'Q: A Re-examination', ET vol. liv, 320-3.

<sup>7</sup> *Einleitung in das Neue Testament* (1953), 162-82.

<sup>8</sup> Vol. IV, N.S., 27-31.

<sup>9</sup> The passages omitted were the Great Commandment (Luke 10:25-8, Matt. 22:34-9), the Signs of the Times (Luke 12:54-6, Matt. 16:2 f.), the Narrow Gate (Luke 13:23 f., Matt. 7:13 f.), the Shut Door (Luke 13:25-7, Matt. 25:10-12), the Great Supper (Luke 14:15-24, Matt. 22:1-10), the Lost Sheep (Luke 15:4-7, 10, Matt. 18:12-14), and the Pounds (Luke 19:12-27, Matt. 25:14-30).

<sup>10</sup> *Die synoptischen Streitgespräche* (1921), 146-9. The hypothesis is discussed in my *Formation of the Gospel Tradition* (1933), 97-9.

<sup>11</sup> *The Sources of the Synoptic Gospels*, II (1957), 19-25.

<sup>12</sup> T. W. Manson, *The Sayings of Jesus* (1949) [first published as Part II of *The Mission and Message of Jesus*, 1937], 162, suggests that the original arrangement was: introduction, 17 and 20, No. 1, 21 f., No. 2, 27 f., No. 3, 31 f., No. 4, 33 f., No. 5, 38 f., No. 6, 43 f., Conclusion, 48.

<sup>13</sup> Dr. Manson, *op. cit.*, 18 f., suggests that 'whatsoever' (Matt.) and 'as' (Luke) may be alternative renderings of an Aramaic original, and that 'all things' and 'therefore' are probably editorial.

<sup>14</sup> Cf. Manson, *op. cit.*, 50; C. F. Burney, *The Poetry of our Lord*, 113, 169; M. Black, *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts*, 137 f.

<sup>15</sup> *The Gospel according to St. Matthew*, 91.

<sup>16</sup> *Op. cit.*, 60 f.

<sup>17</sup> Matthew is probably nearer to the original in his use of the impersonal plural *καίτοι*.

<sup>18</sup> It is noteworthy that if the differences of position of 7:7-11, 5:15, 6:20 f., 5:25 f. are editorial, the agreement in order extends from 6:9-13 to 7:22 f.

<sup>19</sup> Cf. Burney, *op. cit.*, 115.

<sup>20</sup> Cf. Manson, *op. cit.*, 132.

<sup>21</sup> *The Four Gospels*, 285-9.

<sup>22</sup> *The Gospel according to St. Luke*, 246.

<sup>23</sup> For this reason they were omitted with five other sayings in the JTS article mentioned at the outset (Group A).

<sup>24</sup> See the table on p. 249. The correspondences (with the Matthaean passages on the left) may be represented as follows:

Matt.	Luke	Luke
7:13 f.		13:23 f.
7:16-20	6:43 f.	
7:21	6:46	
7:22 f.		13:26 f.

<sup>25</sup> This passage is considered later in the section headed 'The Rest of Matthew', p. 264 f.

<sup>26</sup> Cf. Manson, *op. cit.*, 57. Manson also suggests that Matt. 10:9-16 is a conflation of material from Mk, Q, and M, *op. cit.*, 180.

<sup>27</sup> *The Gospel according to St. Luke*, 97.

<sup>28</sup> *Op. cit.*, 92.

<sup>29</sup> The opinion that 'He spake also a parable to them' (Luke 6:39) is editorial is supported by Luke 5:36, 8:4, 12:16, 13:6, 14:7, 15:3, and 18:1; but Bussmann, *Synoptische Studien*, ii, 48, n. 1, suggests that perhaps it is original and lost through Matthew's change of position. It may be a necessary connecting link in the sense of 'Take an illustration'.

<sup>30</sup> *Op. cit.*, 78, 183.

<sup>31</sup> *Op. cit.*, 280.

<sup>32</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>33</sup> Cf. Streeter, *op. cit.*, 246-8.

<sup>34</sup> *Op. cit.*, 168.

<sup>35</sup> Cf. Manson, *op. cit.*, 312.

<sup>36</sup> Cf. Streeter, *op. cit.*, 285.

<sup>37</sup> Easton, *op. cit.*, 227.

<sup>38</sup> Cf. Bussmann, *op. cit.*, II, 86 f.; Easton, *op. cit.*, xix, 235 f.; Creed, *op. cit.*, lxxv; G. D. Kilpatrick, *The Origins of the Gospel according to St. Matthew*, 28 f.; S. E. Johnson, *The Interpreter's Bible*, vii, 471.

<sup>39</sup> *Op. cit.*, 244 f.

<sup>40</sup> *Op. cit.*, 283.

<sup>41</sup> Cf. Manson, *op. cit.*, 208; J. Jeremias, *The Parables of Jesus*, 29, 106.

<sup>42</sup> Cf. Streeter, *op. cit.*, 265, 281 n.; Easton, *op. cit.*, 256; Creed, *op. cit.*, 214; Klostermann, *Das Lukasevangelium*, 170.

<sup>43</sup> Cf. Streeter, *op. cit.*, 281, 'Seeing there is no very obvious connection of thought between the two topics, the connection (Offences-Forgiveness) must have been made in the common source Q'.

<sup>44</sup> Dr. Manson, *op. cit.*, 102, points out that, taking Luke's shorter version as the standard, the amount of agreement in Matt. 23:34-6 = Luke 11:49-51 is under 50 per cent and in Matt. 23:37-9 = Luke 23:34 f. it is near 90 per cent.

<sup>45</sup> The parable of the Talents (in Luke the Pounds) appears to be a conflation of M and Q (cf. Matt. 25:24-9 and Luke 19:20-6).

<sup>46</sup> Cf. Manson, *op. cit.*, 129, 225.

<sup>47</sup> Cf. Manson, *op. cit.*, 57

<sup>48</sup> *Op. cit.*, 92.

<sup>49</sup> *Horae Synopticae*, 85.

<sup>50</sup> Cf. Manson, *op. cit.*, 59, 'It is difficult to resist the conclusion that the Q material given here (Luke 6:43-5) in Luke has been freely adapted in Matt. to other purposes'.

<sup>51</sup> *Op. cit.*, 155.

<sup>52</sup> The source of the doublet in Matt. 19:30 is Mark 10:31 where, as in Matt., the clauses are inverted (the First Last and the Last First).

<sup>53</sup> Cf. Streeter, *Oxford Studies in the Synoptic Problem* (ed. W. Sanday), 156 f.

<sup>54</sup> An important contribution has been made by Professor Pierson Parker in *The Gospel before Mark* (1953), who has shown that 'since Q has not been assimilated to Matthaean types of expression', and 'the style of Q does not pervade M, therefore Q and M have different origins' and that 'Q is really from an autonomous source' (p. 30 f.).