

*The First Gospel, the Gospel of the Poor:
A New Reconstruction of Q and Resolution of the
Synoptic Problem based on Marcion's Early Luke*

Self-Archived Open Science and Open Access Book Proposal

Version 4: July 5, 2020

by Mark G. Bilby

The First Gospel, the Gospel of the Poor: A New Reconstruction of Q and Resolution of the Synoptic Problem based on Marcion's Early Luke

by Mark G. Bilby

Self-Archived Open Science and Open Access Book Proposal

Version 4: July 5, 2020

© 2020 by Mark G. Bilby

This work is self-archived as open access under a CC-BY-ND-NC 4.0 license. Readers may freely distribute and cite this work so long as attribution is given to the author and no derivatives or commercial use is made of its contents.

This self-archived open access research proposal is envisioned as a formal, public announcement of a rapid, collaborative book publication project, fully consistent with the principles of the Open Access movement and the practice of Open Science. The author hopes it will eventually be published formally by an academic press in an authoritative edition, complete with citable page numbers, extensive footnotes, bibliography, and indexing.

Prospective co-authors and/or co-editors (whether established faculty or graduate students) are welcome to contact the author, who believes that all worthwhile, scientific hypotheses should be tested rigorously and credit for whose analysis and proofs shared generously among an international team of outstanding critical scholars and researchers.

Open Science / Open Access Proposal Abstract

As principal investigator and project lead, Mark G. Bilby announces that he has retrieved for the first time in recorded history the original edition of the Lost Gospel of Q, the pre-70 CE Jewish Gospel about Jesus, reconstructed here in its full breadth and depth for the first time. This original Q, which Bilby calls the New Q (Qⁿ), is a major excision, expansion, correction and simplification of the Q text that many scholars have believed to be the earliest known Gospel created by Jesus followers in Judea. Bilby uncovered Qⁿ by putting the *Gospel of Marcion*, which has never been taken seriously as the primary and earliest textual basis for resolving Q and the Synoptic Problem, at the center of the puzzle of our earliest Jesus texts and traditions. The introduction lays out the heresiological and fideistic assumptions that have overshadowed prior reconstructions and analyses of *Gos. Marcion*, articulates an open-ended set of rival assumptions, and carefully elaborates a fivefold set of scaffolded hypotheses that lead to the shared rediscovery and full reconstruction of Qⁿ.

In part 1 of the book, Bilby begins with a careful analysis of the *Gospel of Marcion* to show that it was *the original two-source Gospel*, a modestly edited combination of Qⁿ and the Gospel of Mark. They next show how *Gos. Marcion* corroborates most of the previously established Q materials and confirms numerous Q sayings that have been debated (chapter 2) and restores several sayings sequences to their originally correct Lukan order (chapter 3). The most radical proposals for revising Q appear next (chapter 4), where the team calls for the removal of numerous passages that have long been incorrectly attributed to Q, most notably the introduction of John the Baptist, the Baptism of Jesus, and the Temptation. Equally revolutionary are the next set of proposals (chapter 5), where the team calls for numerous passages to be added to Q for the first time ever in history, most notably three sequential passages about women (Qⁿ 7.12-8.3), the story of the Rich Man and Lazarus (Qⁿ 16.19-31), and even a short form of the story of Zacchaeus near the conclusion of Qⁿ (19.2, 6, 8-10).

In part 2 of the book, Bilby provides an accessible, popular translation of Qⁿ (chapter 6), followed by a critical scholarly edition and translation the same. Bilby and his next put Qⁿ squarely into conversation with traditional Q scholarship, confirming that Q was in fact the earliest known Gospel, created between 50 and 65 CE, and representing the Judean community of Jesus followers known together as “the Poor”. This analysis demonstrates that Qⁿ was far more committed and coherent than scholars ever previously realized as a trenchant, beginning to end critique of social class divisions between the wealthy and the poor. This part concludes with a revolutionary contextualization of Qⁿ by comparing and contrasting it with the Gospel of Mark, showing how Qⁿ described women—not men—as the very first disciples and patrons of Jesus and that a woman—not John the Baptist or God depicted as a father—was the one who anointed Jesus as the Messiah! The Gospel of Mark is shown by contrast to be a subsequent literary program (70s CE) that sought to undermine and replace Qⁿ as the authoritative Gospel, in part through a misogynistic program of displacing Qⁿ traditions about women and replacing them with accounts sanctioning exclusively male leaders and authorities. The team is confident that

from here forward Qⁿ will be central to social-science, feminist, and post-colonial readings and reconstructions of the earliest Jesus texts and traditions.

In part 3 of the book, Bilby provides a complete, original, well-footnoted scholarly translation of Early Luke = *Gos. Marcion*. Thereafter a team member explores of Early Luke on its own terms, as a simple yet careful synthesis of Qⁿ and anti-Qⁿ made in the 80s CE.

In part 4 of the book, various team members shows the implications of these findings for several other Gospel sources and redactions. They first show definitively that the L Source is a scholarly fabrication that has mislabeled and misunderstood various narratives and insertions that are far better partitioned as either belonging to Qⁿ or as creations of the Late Luke Redactor. The team then provides assessments of other Gospels in terms of their respective Qⁿ / anti-Qⁿ syntheses and their newly appreciable compositional and redactional creativity, namely: Matthew, the two main editions of John, and finally Late Luke.

The final chapter throws down the gauntlet to call out the intellectual and technological apathy and weakness the besets the current models and modeling of the transmission of Gospel traditions. As a counterproposal and rapid prototyping of an alternative, our team maps examples of some twenty different paths that early Jesus traditions took in their various iterations. It thereby ultimately calls for the creation of a well-funded public, international and crowd-sourced Digital Humanities platform and project to allow for the dynamic modeling of the paths, meanings, and modifications involved in the transmissions of hundreds of early Jesus traditions among a dozen major Gospel redactors/compiler in the first and second centuries CE.

This rapid open access book project proposal brings to bear a revolutionary open science and open access approach fully for the first time upon the foundational texts and questions of Christian origins, specifically upon the earliest Jesus texts and traditions known as the Gospels. As the sole author of this proposal, Bilby (<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0100-6634>) openly invites international scholarly experts, newly minted PhDs, and students in PhD programs to apply to be co-editors or co-authors by emailing a letter of interest and current CV to mbilby@fullerton.edu. We welcome generous external funding that would allow us to expedite our team's rapid completion of the work and potentially compensate our contributors and/or the publisher. We welcome interested publishers to contact us about formalizing sponsorships, partnerships, and agreements, including the assignment of a managing editor. Our team pledges to work quickly, archive our work regularly with version control, and publish openly with free public access, all consistent with the principles of open access and open science, as well as the highest academic research and publication standards. New additions to our team and updates to our project will be announced via ORCID-connected deposit at Zenodo, on Bilby's blog (vocesanticae.com), and/or on a future official project site. Bilby retains copyright of the entire work and grants a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 international open access license to the final proposal (essentially a book draft), to the future published book, and to all of its iterations between final proposal and publication. The team commits to final book publication no later than October 2020.

Dedication

to my Love, my Muse, my Eurydice

τῆς φωνῆς μου ἀκολουθεῖ

Abbreviations

CEQ	Robinson et al, <i>Critical Edition of Q</i>
EJnR	Early John Redactor
ELkR	Early Luke Redactor (or the Redactor of <i>Gos. Marcion</i>)
EMkR	Early Mark Redactor
<i>Gos. Marcion</i>	<i>Gospel of Marcion</i>
<i>Gos. Thomas</i>	<i>Gospel of Thomas</i>
LJnR	Late John Redactor
LLkR	Late Luke Redactor
LMkR	Late Mark Redactor
MtR	Matthew Redactor
Q	Quelle (“Source”) as traditionally constructed
Q ⁿ	Quelle Neue (“New Source”) as reconstructed here for the first time
SQE	Aland et al, <i>Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum</i>

Introduction. A Brief History of Scholarship on Marcion and Q: Or, How Bad Assumptions Make Golden Asses of Us All

Prejudicial assumptions about Marcion of Sinope have led to the dismissal, denigration, and disintegration of him and his *Gospel (Euangelion)* for more than 1,800 years now. Early-orthodox Christian heresiologists and polemicists caricatured Marcion and his *Gospel* as frauds. In their telling, Marcion cut out the parts of the Gospel of Luke that he did not like and kept the parts he liked, then tried to pitch it, pass it off, and popularize it as if it were the original, canonical, apostolic Gospel of Luke. As part his fraud, he included a second volume in his collection, a similarly pen-knifed and incomplete version of only some of Paul's letters, which Marcion called the *Apostolikon*.

Several learned scholarly books in past decades and in recent years have challenged and dismissed the idea that Marcion himself should be defined or dismissed as a heretic. Still, the belief that Marcion's *Gospel* is essentially a later fraud or perversion of an earlier gospel is still the controlling, pervasive framework for modern scholarship on Marcion, his *Gospel*, and the early Christian Gospels more generally.

The way this stereotype nowadays persists among scholars is of course not outright accusations of Marcion's *Gospel* being fraudulent. It endures through the perpetuation of biased assumptions, including the unfounded belief that Marcion removed whole stories, altered sayings, and left out phrases or words that offended him from the canonical Gospel of Luke, and that he did so following his own theological biases:

- an anti-Jewish bias that Jesus, just like the Apostle Paul, did not practice the Jewish law
- an anti-Jewish bias that the God of the Old Testament was not the same as the God of the New Testament and the Father of Jesus Christ
- a docetic or gnostic bias that Jesus only appeared to be human, that he did not really die on the cross, and that he did not really rise bodily from the dead
- a Pauline bias that deplored and remove traditions about any apostles other than Paul
- a reformer's bias that made Marcion want to change the texts and the church of his day by retrieving sources from an idealized past that no longer existed

These overt accusations of Marcion's bias are thankfully becoming less frequent in scholarly discourse. However, the overarching scholarly bias against Marcion's *Gospel* continues, even in most of the critical academic treatments about that text and its relationships with other Gospel traditions. The way this anti-Marcion bias persists even in scholarship about Marcion's *Gospel* is through unfounded assumptions that have gone largely unchallenged:

1. If a text was attested as not present in *Gos. Marcion*, then it must have been removed or left out on purpose
2. If a word or a text is not attested in *Gos. Marcion*, then its absence means it cannot be taken seriously as evidence, even as evidence of its absence from *Gos. Marcion*
3. Witnesses to the *Gos. Marcion*, knowing or preferring Matthew better, tended to harmonize, blend, or combine traditions of Matthew into Marcion's version of Luke
4. Witnesses to the *Gos. Marcion*, knowing manuscripts, lectionaries and Latin translations of Luke, tended to superimpose those readings onto Marcion's version of Luke
5. When *Gos. Marcion* has a unique reading unrepresented in manuscripts, lectionaries and Latin translations of Luke, then such a reading cannot be trusted
6. More generally, *Gos. Marcion* cannot be understood, appreciated, or used as a reliable witness to an independent or early textual tradition
7. More generally, *Gos. Marcion* is an abridged and simplified version of the much longer, more elaborate text of canonical Luke
8. More generally, *Gos. Marcion* is a mid-second century text, while canonical Luke is a late first century text
9. More generally, *Gos. Marcion* is a piecemeal text, a hodgepodge that lacks coherence or integrity
10. More generally, *Gos. Marcion* is a poorly or haphazardly attested text, a distillation of a wide array of quotations, summations, and paraphrases by Church Fathers (i.e., early Christian writers), most of whom were writing against Marcion, and as such *Gos. Marcion* is on the whole less reliable as a critical edition than its canonical counterparts such as Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, because they are well-attested in manuscripts

For those with eyes to see, these assumptions ring of early-orthodox heresiological and fideistic bias. Sadly, they are still pervasive, even in most of the scholarship produced and published today about *Gos. Marcion*.

By way of equipping ourselves and our readers with a critical methodology of informed doubt and deliberate resistance to these prevailing assumptions, let us elaborate a set of competing assumptions, stated in the form of Socratic rhetorical questions:

1. What if texts that are attested as *not present* in *Gos. Marcion* were not excised but instead simply never part of the gospel tradition that he received?
2. What if texts that are *unattested* for *Gos. Marcion* were largely if not entirely missing from the gospel he received and should be taken seriously as evidence of their absence in that gospel?
3. What if when *Gos. Marcion* has unique parallels with Matthew against Luke, or when it has traditions attested partly by Matthew and partly by Luke, or when its traditions are used differently between Matthew and Luke, such examples actually show that *Gos. Marcion* was a source for Matthew and Luke independently of each other?
4. What if when *Gos. Marcion* aligns with manuscripts, lectionaries and Latin translations of Luke, then *Gos. Marcion* is the earlier source behind them?

5. What if when *Gos. Marcion* has a unique reading unrepresented in known manuscripts, lectionaries and Latin translations of Luke, then it is a highly reliable account of a distinctive and likely early textual tradition?
6. More generally, what if *Gos. Marcion* can be understood, appreciated, and used as a reliable witness to independent and early textual traditions about Jesus?
7. More generally, what if *Gos. Marcion* is an earlier, simpler version of Luke than the much longer and more creative reworking in Late Luke?¹
8. More generally, what if *Gos. Marcion* is a first century text, while Late Luke is second century text?
9. More generally, what if *Gos. Marcion* is an elegant even if reconstructed text, stands up on its own as a whole in its own right, displays ample narrative and thematic coherence as well as textual integrity?
10. More generally, what if *Gos. Marcion* is a richly, thoroughly and reliably attested text, drawing on multiple quotations, summations, and paraphrases, often from different witnesses, most of whom as critics of Marcion were careful to quote his exact words precisely so that they (following from their early-orthodox agenda) could show the ways they saw Marcion had eviscerated and changed their early-orthodox version of Luke?

Other scholars before us have had similar critiques of how Marcion and his *Gospel* have been caricatured.² Rather than rehearsing all of their points and arguments, we would simply like to start by recounting T.S. Eliot's counsel for reading: start afresh from a place of empathy and an open mind and avoid the tendency toward instantaneous, knee-jerk rejection based on pre-existing conceptual frameworks or biases. We invite readers to join us, at least experimentally and provisionally, for a genuinely new intellectual adventure into the earliest Jesus texts and traditions, starting from the ground up.

If our hypotheses really do lead to the optimal solution to the Synoptic Problem, the best possible assemblage of the myriad pieces of the intriguing puzzle of early Gospel texts and traditions, we do not expect that everyone will be persuaded, but we know that *many* will. If you do not find yourself among the convinced, we welcome you to let us know why and how after you have really thought it all through. If you do find yourself among the convinced, we ask you to let us know why and how, and more than that we invite you to join our work, build on it, nuance it, deepen its foundations, and expand it in new and creative directions.

Either way, we hope readers reserve judgment until after giving us the courtesy of a full and fair hearing. Our hypotheses will likely come across as deeply disruptive to most of our discipline's traditional scholarly frameworks. Yet, if these hypotheses are viable, if they elucidate the actual

¹ In this text, we intentionally use the phrase "Late Luke" in place of "canonical Luke" so as to sidestep the anachronistic, fideistic and historically false assumption that this text was uniform, consistent and unchanged between its composition and canonization, or that it was predestined to gain a spot in the future four-gospel canon. The text and the early-orthodox canonical status of Luke was not a foregone conclusion, even by the late second century when Irenaeus of Lyons in his treatise *Against Heresies* written around 180 CE became the first early-orthodox figure in extant texts to quote uniquely Lukan materials (see Andrew Gregory) and to define a canon of four and only four gospels. The Marcionite text of Luke was a viable and popular enough rival in the early third century to merit an extended polemic by Tertullian.

² F. C. Baur. Early Harnack. Knox. Tyson. BeDuhn. Lieu. Klinghardt.

historical transmission and interrelationships at play in the compilation/composition of these texts, then it is our hope and belief that this historical-critical reality will ultimately win out.

With so much of New Testament scholarship, moving one piece can reshuffle many, many others. Giving *Gos. Marcion* serious consideration and even pride of place as the collection of the earliest and most important textual materials for the solution of Q and the Synoptic Problem—this dramatically upends the tables upon which scholars have spent centuries gathering together to assemble numerous variations of the complicated, composite puzzle of the earliest Jesus texts and traditions. Our solution can only be modeled on a newly assembled table, one where we invite readers not also to visit but also to serve and to linger, and to eat and to drink as much as you'd like. You are our intellectual guests in this open access project.

The overarching question we put to the reader is to decide whether our overall reconstruction is superior, whether it actually does a better job making sense of the vast volume and intricate complexity of early Jesus texts and their relative relationships of indebtedness and interdependence than do other reconstructions, particularly the dominant schools of thought, i.e., the Q hypothesis or the Farrer-Goulder hypothesis as traditionally argued and defended.

In our view, the persistent and absurd debates back and forth in the scholarly literature between these two schools of thought perfectly illustrates the unsustainable impasse that both of them represent. Like sibling rivals, they cannot stop arguing with each other long enough to recognize that both have legitimate strengths and serious weaknesses, and that only a drastically different kind of approach can bring reconciliation and harmonious relations between them.

On the one hand, the Q hypothesis has shown tremendous value in making sense of how Luke and Matthew have so much shared content that is not found in Mark, how their authors use and edit that content in very different ways and independently of each other in most cases, and how their common source reflects an earlier stage in the social and literary reception and production of Jesus traditions. However, the Q hypothesis as previously argued simply fails to make sense of passages where Luke obviously depends on Matthew, nor can it effectively or elegantly explain away many of the overlaps between reconstructions of Q and the Gospel of Mark. Occam's razor is nowhere to be found in Q scholarship these days, where the literature only progresses by way of increasingly complicated, layered, esoteric reconstructions on an almost microscopic scale.

On the other hand, the Farrer-Goulder hypothesis is a vital counterwitness to the Q school. It has staying power precisely because the Gospel of Luke obviously *does* depend on Matthew in many passages. However, by focusing narrowly and obsessively on Matthean priority in a relative minority of passages, the bulk of the heavy lifting of the burden of proof in the Farrer-Goulder hypothesis never gets done. Its advocates know how difficult it is to explain how Luke's generally simpler sayings traditions and order of contents were somehow all reverse engineered from the involved sermonic compilations in the Matthew. Whether resigned to intellectual apathy or to Sisphyean scholarly labors, the Farrer-Goulder school can and will never surmount a slope whose gravity runs overwhelmingly toward the expansion of received sources and duplication of traditions and much more rarely toward their abridgement and simplification.

The repeated back and forth of debates in the scholarly literature between these two schools represents a sad, vicious, and self-reinforcing cycle that may serve academic careers, but not the advancement of historical-critical, scientific knowledge. To their credit, the Q school has admirably ventured out to explore additional sources, such as the *Gospel of Thomas*, as deserving consideration alongside the synoptic Gospels as independent carriers of early Jesus traditions. Proponents of Farrer-Goulder have predictably respond in kind with a dismissal of *Thomas* as a late text without any relevance because of its reliance on the synoptic gospels. Some members of the Q school have explored the possibility of progressive, redactional stages within Q as a text. Most scholars appreciate this effort as a determined exploration showing creativity and flexibility to build and nuance the leading scholarly hypothesis of the last two centuries. Farrer-Goulder proponents simply mock that Q is becoming more piecemeal and historically more late with each passing year.

Calling out this sad social dynamic among our fellow New Testament scholars is not done in the interest of personal insult, nor to create a false equivalency between these two schools. The Q school is far more rigorous, comprehensive, and serious in their arguments than the vocal remnant of the Farrer-Goulder school. Still, even the Q school is confined by the traditional, starting, and restrictive assumption that the Synoptic Gospels (Luke and Matthew together, especially when agreeing upon content *not* in Mark) provide the *primary, central* materials to tackle the Synoptic Problem.

We see a dual value and inadequacy characterizing both of these schools of thought as practiced today. We are certainly not the first to note this, but we hope we are the first to put forward a truly compelling alternative to them. Thus far, all the major proposed alternatives to both of these schools have not been taken seriously or gained a significant following in scholarship.³

The new solution this book envisions is a Hegelian *tertium quid*, a synthetic solution that honestly and fully reconciles both the traditional Q and Farrer-Goulder hypotheses. Both of these approaches are simultaneously *right and wrong* because they generally both share the same underlying problem, *the assumption of a single version of Luke and the proclivity to argue for a single direction of textual influence*. In the traditional Q hypothesis, that textual influence must run from Q to Luke *and* Matthew separately, but never from Matthew to Luke or from Luke to Matthew. In the Farrer-Goulder hypothesis, textual influence may only run from Matthew to Luke, but not from Luke to Matthew, and certainly never to Luke or Matthew from an earlier written text than Mark.

³ John Crossan has argued that the *Gos. Peter*, which he called the “Cross Gospel,” is the earliest known gospel and that it was appropriated as a source by Matthew, Mark, Luke and John. Matthias Klinghardt has recently published several articles arguing for *Gos. Marcion* as the earliest Gospel and as a source for all four canonical gospels. Matthean anteriority to the other three canonical Gospels was the view of most Christians through the centuries, including many scholarly commentators in the 19th and even 20th century, and it still occasionally resurfaces in scholarly books. A case for Matthean posteriority has also recently been made.

Keep Q, but split the composition and redactional history of Luke into two major stages, and suddenly textual influence can run in myriad directions, each following a different path:

- 1) from Q to Matthew to Late Luke
- 2) from Mark to Matthew
- 3) from Mark to Early Luke to Matthew to Late Luke
- 4) from Mark to Early Luke to late Luke

About the fluid multidirectionality of Gospel traditions, the best awaits, including (spoiler alert!), a very provocative last chapter to this book. But here, at the outset of our book, we do not want to get too far ahead of ourselves.

Our new reconstruction of Q (i.e., *Neue Quelle* or Qⁿ) is built on the very uncommon but not truly radical idea that Luke was in fact produced in two major versions: Early Luke and Late Luke, each compiled decades apart from the other. Once that two stage composition/redaction is acknowledged, then it becomes clearer than ever before that there is merit both to the Q school and the Farrer-Goulder school. Qⁿ was in fact a real text, used independently by both Early Luke and Matthew, and while Early Luke did not use Matthew, Late Luke certainly did.

The traditional two-source hypothesis (Q plus Mark) is absolutely viable and necessary to explain the production of the Gospel of Matthew. While the two-source approach cannot adequately explain the production of the Gospel of Luke in its later form, it very ably accounts for *almost all contents* found in Early Luke, i.e., the *Gos. Marcion*, particularly if one can conceive of Q having more content than was used in Matthew, which is entirely reasonable. Matthew was not under any obligation to use all of Q, and even most Q scholars agree that Luke evidences far more devotion to the text and order of Q than does Matthew.

As we will demonstrate, the gospel that Marcion received and shared is also a two source-Gospel. Indeed, it deserves to be considered *the ultimate two-source gospel*, closely recounting its two sources (Qⁿ and Mark) and alternating between them with very modest redactional stitching and minimal reordering. *Gos. Marcion* bears very few indications of the Matthean impulse to recompile and expand materials within involved sermons, nor does it show evidence of many of the extensive redactions and stories in Late Luke, including and especially the extensive infancy narratives. *Gos. Marcion* taken at face value does not show a destructive impulse to remove earlier, offending traditions; rather in its simplicity and brevity it points to a later, fresh, and rigorous round of redactional and compositional creativity that took hold in the second major edition of Luke, a version that took cues from the Matthean literary feat while attempting to rival and even surpass it.

Here at the start of our scholarly *vade mecum*, we will intentionally build up our hypotheses in a scaffolded way, with each one supporting the next. The first begins with fairly minor and (we hope) the least controversial reconstructions of Qⁿ. With each hypothesis, the alterations to Q become more and more profound and transformative. We ask our readers to test out the strength of our edifice from top to bottom and ultimately to climb as high with us as feel you can go.

Hypothesis 1. The vast majority of attested materials in *Gos. Marcion* consistently reflect a very simple, two source structure, drawing on Mark and Qⁿ, modestly editing and paraphrasing them, and rotating back and forth between them with minimal redactional stitching. Evaluating this hypothesis involves a *preliminary level of trust* in the reconstruction of *Gos. Marcion* as an accurate and thorough representation of Early Luke. Building this first layer of confidence will generate some excitement and momentum and likely lead some scholars to take *Gos. Marcion* seriously for the first time as of potentially significant value to the historical debates about Q.

Hypothesis 2. When Luke has parallels with Matthew and/or *Gos. Thomas* and those parallels are explicitly corroborated by *Gos. Marcion*, then this confirms their existence in Qⁿ. This is especially helpful for passages that the Critical Edition of Q committee marked as uncertain or stricken. This hypothesis involves an *initial level of trust* in the reconstruction of *Gos. Marcion* as an accurate representation of Early Luke. Of special note here is that the wording within confirmed Qⁿ passages is often *very* densely and confidently attested in *Gos. Marcion*. Climbing to this second floor will open up genuinely many new views and insights about *Gos. Marcion* and its place in the composition and transmission history of early Jesus texts and traditions.

Hypothesis 3. When *Gos. Marcion* attests to the presence of passages and verses in Early Luke, the order of these materials is preferable to the ordering of Qⁿ materials in Matthew. The ordering of Qⁿ (or reordering of Q as it were) based on *Gos. Marcion* involves a *moderate level of trust* in its reconstruction as an accurate representation of Early Luke. This trust is only strengthened by Late Luke, which certainly inserts new content into *Gos. Marcion* but still takes almost all of it unchanged and in order as its base text. Matthew by comparison *extensively* recompiles and reorders the materials from its sources. This third floor rises above current notions about the order of Q and reconfigures the structural lines often followed today.

Hypothesis 4. When Matthew has a parallel with Late Luke that is *not present* or is *unattested* in *Gos. Marcion*, that material is *not Qⁿ*. This hypothesis involves a *high level of trust* in the reconstruction of *Gos. Marcion* as an accurate and thorough representation of Early Luke. This is where this solution to the Synoptic Problem dovetails profoundly with key passages and arguments outlined by proponents of the Farrer-Goulder hypothesis aiming to show how Luke did in fact depend on Matthew. While the view from here may be disconcerting for traditional Q scholars, feeling like nothing less than open surrender to sworn enemies, those who climb to this height will savor some truly stunning views and see the Synoptic Problem in a brand new way.

Hypothesis 5. When *Gos. Marcion* has a parallel in Late Luke that is not in Matthew or Mark, then these are *additions to Qⁿ*. This hypothesis involves *the highest level of trust* in the reconstruction of *Gos. Marcion* as an accurate and thorough representation of Early Luke. Essentially, this idea involves accepting that the Gospel of Matthew leaves out parts of Q that appear comfortably in both Early Luke and Late Luke. While there is no reason to think this would be problematic, it certainly runs counter to decades of scholarly habituation to consider Matthew and Late Luke as the primary bases for reconstructing Q. This is where the *Gos. Marcion* solution reaches its most astonishing and exhilarating peaks, where completely new horizons appear for the study of the Gospels and the earliest Jesus traditions and the earliest history of his followers.

Part 1. Five Hypotheses for a New Q (Q^n)

Chapter 1. Foundations of Qⁿ: A Two-Source Hypothesis for *Gos. Marcion*

Regarding the title of Part 1, by Quelle Neue, “New Q,” or Qⁿ we actually mean the old Q, i.e., the closest possible approximation to the original edition of Qⁿ as it was known and circulated. Based on the evidence that follows, we believe that Qⁿ was in fact an actual text evidencing both linguistic and thematic coherence, indeed far more such coherence than scholars up to this point have conceived. Qⁿ consisted of a compilation of Jesus’s sayings, teachings, and parables, but not just these sorts of materials. Qⁿ was a sayings source, but not *merely* a sayings source. That sapiential *a priori* assumption has overdetermined its contents in previous scholarship. Nevertheless, Qⁿ was indeed an *early and crucial source* in the production of both the Gospel of Matthew and the first major edition of the Gospel of Luke, i.e., the text that has come down to us as the *Gospel of Marcion*.

The above introduction and paragraph may cause inspiration for some and consternation for others. We set it all forth merely as a miniature model of the building plan that we aim to reconstruct. For us to be successful and convincing, for us to build something that truly inspires and lasts, it will take careful planning, detailed blueprints, rigorous labor, and even some artistry to realize our vision one floor at a time. First we must begin from the firmest of foundations.

We envision this first chapter in our book, the first stage in constructing our hypotheses, as requiring nothing less than the complete demolition of the condemned building of Synoptic Gospel and Q Studies, tearing it down to its foundations, only then starting to build it back up one floor at a time. (For Q scholars we have just offended, please know that the new building will still be a Q-type building in the end, just far more solid, elegant, and inviting.).

Now that the metaphorical work of demolition is done, we need to clean out the site and then inspect and test the foundations thoroughly, specifically to find out what foundations are really there in *Gos. Marcion*. The instrument we will use to carry out this inspection is a simple yet nuanced hypothesis, our first of five.

Hypothesis 1. The vast majority of attested materials in *Gos. Marcion* consistently reflect a very simple, two source structure, drawing on Mark and Q, modestly editing and paraphrasing them, and rotating back and forth between them with minimal redactional stitching.

The tables below present all of the passages attested in *Gos. Marcion* alongside their sources in Mark or Qⁿ. We begin each section with a quick inventory of passages, including for overall ease of reference a table of the specific verses that run parallel. Then each section proceeds into a close, word for word comparison of parallel passages in Greek. Underlining for the Greek words indicates when dependence is verbatim, indirect/paraphrastic, or nonexistent (no underline), and it is these underlined relationship are indicated not in the source text(s) but only in the receiving text(s). As you will notice, we place the columns in chronological order corresponding to our overall assessment of the relationship of these texts. If readers disagree with the dating of these texts or their ordering, the parallel presentation certainly still gives readers the means to make

their own comparisons and determinations about the relationships among these texts and to question and challenge our reconstructions.

English translations are left out of the tables for several considered reasons. The often subtle differences between these texts are fully appreciable only in Greek. Presenting dual texts might lead to confusion and obscuring the exact nature of parallels, and a simple scan of the underlining, italics, and bold font choices can provide a great overview even for those who do not read Greek. Additionally, the tables (and this book) would run far too long if such translations were included for all parallel Greek passages. Moreover, numerous quality scholarly translations are already readily available for the texts of Mark, Matthew, and Luke, and we provide a full translation of *Gos. Marcion* (= Early Luke) in chapter 10, so those who do not read Greek still have all the necessary resources at their disposal. That said, occasionally the accompanying analysis in the body or notes does offer selected translations of words or phrases.

As is well-known, *Gos. Marcion* begins with the phrase “in the fifteenth year of the rule of Tiberius Caesar in the times of Pontius Pilate,” which comes across in Luke as an odd, second introduction focused on the imperial setting of the story of Jesus. In the SQE Luke 3.1 belongs to parallel set A013 about “John the Baptist,” but it should be noted that *Gos. Marcion* does not mention John the Baptist here at all.

The subsequent section of attested material in *Gos. Marcion* very closely follows the content and order of the Gospel of Mark.

Table: Sources of *Gos. Marcion*: Markan Section 1

SQE Shorthand	Mark (70s)	<i>Gos. Marcion</i> (80s)	Matthew (90s)
A035 Teaching in Capernaum	1.21-22	4.31-32	4.13, 23; 7.28-29
A036 Healing of synagogue demoniac	1.24-25	4.34-35	-----
A033 Jesus in Nazareth	1.24 , 1.9	4.16⁴	-----
A038 Sick healed at evening	1.34, 3.11	4.40-41	8.16
A039 Jesus departs from Capernaum	1.35 , 5.34, 1.12, 1.38 , 1.15	4.42-43	4.1
A041 Calling of disciples	1.16 , 4.1-2, 1.16-18, 1.20	5.2, 5.9, 5.10-11	4.18-22
A042 Cleansing of leper(s)	1.40-44	5.12-14	8.1-4
A043 Healing of paralytic	2.3, 7	5.18, 5.21	9.1-8
A044 Calling of Levi	2.14, 16-17	5.27, 30-31	9.9-13
A045 Question about fasting	2.18-19, 20-22	5.33-35, 36-38	9.14-17
A046 Plucking grain on sabbath	2.23-26, 28	6.1-5	12.1-8
A047 Man with withered hand	3.1-2, 4	6.6-7, 9	12.9-14
A049 Choosing of the twelve	3.13-14, 16, 19	6.12-14, 16	10.1-4, /5.1
A050/077 Occasion of the sermon	3.7-8, 9-10	6.17, 19	4.24-5.2

⁴ Regarding the sequential order of this passage, see Roth 186, “According to the order in which Tertullian comments on Marcion’s Gospel, a shortened form of Luke 4:16-30 followed Luke 4:31-35.”

In the Markan section tables that follow, we do not include a column for (Late) Luke, because it is already commonly accepted that *Gos. Marcion* typically aligns with Luke and is some version of that text. We do, however, include footnotes explaining notable variations between the attested version of *Gos. Marcion* (= Early Luke) and Late Luke. Our main concern here is primarily to show whether and how *Gos. Marcion* derived its materials from Mark, and what relationship, if any, *Gos. Marcion* had with Matthew. *Italics* indicate places where *Gos. Marcion* follows Mark but where Matthew does not. **Bold text** indicates places where in our judgement Matthew more likely borrows or improvises on material from Early Luke / *Gos. Marcion* rather than pulling directly from Mark or independently improvising upon it.

Table: Sources of Gos. Marcion: Markan Section 1.1

Mark (70s)	Gos. Marcion (80s)	Matthew (90s)
1.21. εἰσπορεύονται εἰς Καφαρναοὺμ καὶ εὐθὺς τοῖς σάββασιν εἰσελθὼν εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν ἐδίδασκεν.	4.31. κατῆλθεν εἰς Καφαρναοὺμ πόλιν τῆς Γαλιλαίας... ἣν διδάσκων ⁵ ἐν τῇ συναγωγῇ ⁶	4.13. καταλιπὼν τὴν Ναζαρά ἐλθὼν κατώκησεν <u>εἰς Καφαρναοὺμ τὴν παραθαλασσίαν ἐν ὁρίοις Ζαβουλὼν καὶ Νεφθαλίμ</u> ⁷ 4.23. Καὶ περιῆγεν ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ <u>Γαλιλαίᾳ διδάσκων ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς</u> αὐτῶν
1.22. καὶ ἐξεπλήσσοντο ἐπὶ τῇ διδαχῇ αὐτοῦ· ἦν γὰρ διδάσκων αὐτοὺς ὡς ἐξουσίαν ἔχων	4.32. ἐξεπλήσσοντο ⁸ ἐπὶ τῇ διδαχῇ αὐτοῦ, ὅτι ἐν ἐξουσίᾳ ἦν ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ.	7.28. ἐξεπλήσσοντο οἱ ὄχλοι ἐπὶ τῇ διδαχῇ αὐτοῦ· 7.29. ἦν γὰρ διδάσκων αὐτοὺς ὡς ἐξουσίαν ἔχων
1.24. τί ἡμῖν καὶ σοί, Ἰησοῦ Ναζαρηνέ; ἥλθες ἀπολέσαι ἡμᾶς; οἶδ᾽ σε τίς εἶ, ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ. 1.9. Ναζαρετ	4.34. τί ἡμῖν καὶ σοί, Ἰησοῦ ⁹ ; ἥλθες ἀπολέσαι ἡμᾶς; οἶδ᾽ σε τίς εἶ, ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ. 4.16 <u>Ναζαρεθ</u>	-----
1.25. ἐπετίμησεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς	4.35. ἐπετίμησεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς	-----
1.34a. ἐθεράπευσεν πολλοὺς κακῶς ἔχοντας ποικίλαις νόσοις	4.40. τὰς χεῖρας ἐπιτιθεὶς ἐθεράπευεν αὐτούς.	8.16. καὶ ἐξέβαλεν τὰ πνεύματα λόγῳ ¹⁰ καὶ πάντας τοὺς κακῶς ἔχοντας ἐθεράπευσεν
1.34b. καὶ δαιμόνια πολλὰ ἐξέβαλεν καὶ οὐκ ἤφειεν λαλεῖν τὰ δαιμόνια 3.11. καὶ τὰ πνεύματα τὰ ἀκάθαρτα, ὅταν αὐτὸν ἐθεώρουν, προσέπιπτον αὐτῷ καὶ ἔκραζον λέγοντες ὅτι σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ.	4.41. ἐξήρχετο δὲ καὶ δαιμόνια ¹¹ κραυγάζοντα σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ. καὶ ἐπιτιμῶν οὐκ εἶα αὐτὰ λαλεῖν	7.22. τῷ σῶ ὀνόματι δαιμόνια ἐξεβάλομεν 16.16. ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ Σίμων Πέτρος εἶπεν· σὺ εἶ ὁ χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ζῶντος. ¹²
1.35. ἀπῆλθεν εἰς ἔρημον 5.34. ὄχλος πολὺς καὶ συνέθλιβον αὐτόν. 1.12. Καὶ εὐθὺς τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτόν ἐκβάλλει εἰς τὴν ἔρημον.	4.42. ἐπορεύθη εἰς ἔρημον ¹³ ... οἱ ὄχλοι κατεῖχον αὐτόν.	4.1. Τότε ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀνήχθη εἰς τὴν ἔρημον ὑπὸ τοῦ πνεύματος πειρασθῆναι ὑπὸ τοῦ διαβόλου
1.38. ἄγωμεν ἀλλαχοῦ εἰς τὰς ἐχομένας κωμοπόλεις, ἵνα καὶ ἐκεῖ κηρύξω· εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ ἐξῆλθον.	4.43. δεῖ με καὶ ταῖς ἐτέραις πόλεσιν εὐαγγελίσασθαι τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ ¹⁴	-----

⁵ LLkR may have added “them” / αὐτοὺς.

⁶ LLkR may have added “on the sabbath” / τοῖς σάββασιν but removed “in the synagogue.”

⁷ MtR here (4.13) may attempt to outdo the brief geographical notice about “Galilee” in Early Luke 4.31.

⁸ LLkR may have removed the phrase “but all” / δὲ πάντες.

⁹ LLkR may have added “Nazarene” / Ναζαρηνέ.

¹⁰ While MtR obviously uses Mark here, Matthew’s statement that Jesus healed “with a word” makes for an interesting possible disagreement with “laying on of hands” in Gos. Marcion.

¹¹ LLkR may have added “from many” / ἀπὸ πολλῶν.

¹² MtR, apparently following *Wisdom of Solomon*, turned this originally Markan phrase into a Satanic taunt (4.3, 6) later echoed by bystanders at the crucifixion (27.40, 43), before being inverted by a centurion (27.54).

¹³ LLkR may have added “place” / τόπον.

¹⁴ LLkR has an identical word cluster, just ordered quite differently: καὶ ταῖς ἐτέραις πόλεσιν εὐαγγελίσασθαι με δεῖ τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ, ὅτι ἐπὶ τοῦτο ἀπεστάλην. Note that this cluster is worded very differently in Mark and completely absent from Matthew, showing a significant variation in Lukan versions, even if only in word order.

Table: Primary Sources of Gos. Marcion: Markan Section 1.2

Mark (70s)	Gos. Marcion (80s)	Matthew (90s)
1.16. ἦσαν γὰρ ἁλιεῖς. Καὶ παράγων παρὰ τὴν θάλασσαν τῆς Γαλιλαίας εἶδεν Σίμωνα καὶ Ἀνδρέαν τὸν ἀδελφὸν Σίμωνος ἀμφιβάλλοντας ἐν τῇ θαλάσῃ· ἦσαν γὰρ ἁλιεῖς.	5.2. οἱ <u>ἁλιεῖς</u> ¹⁵	4.18. ἦσαν γὰρ ἁλιεῖς. <u>Περιπατῶν δὲ παρὰ τὴν θάλασσαν τῆς Γαλιλαίας εἶδεν δύο ἀδελφούς, Σίμωνα τὸν λεγόμενον Πέτρον καὶ Ἀνδρέαν τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ, βάλλοντας ἀμφίβληστρον εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν· ἦσαν γὰρ ἁλιεῖς.</u>
4.1-2. ¹⁶ ὄχλος πλεῖστος, πᾶς ὁ ὄχλος πρὸς τὴν θάλασσαν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἦσαν.	5.9. θάμβος γὰρ περιέσχεν αὐτὸν ¹⁷ ἐπὶ τῇ ἄγρᾳ τῶν ἰχθύων. ¹⁸	-----
1.16. Σίμωνα 1.17. εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς· δεῦτε ὀπίσω μου, καὶ ποιήσω ὑμᾶς γενέσθαι ἁλιεῖς ἀνθρώπων. 1.18. Ἰάκωβον τὸν τοῦ Ζεβεδαίου καὶ Ἰωάννην τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ	5.10. / <u>υἱοὺς Ζεβεδαίου</u> ¹⁹ τῷ Σίμωνι ... <u>εἶπεν πρὸς τὸν Σίμωνα</u> ... μὴ φοβοῦ· ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν ἀνθρώπους ἔσῃ <u>ζωγρῶν</u> .	4.19. καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς· δεῦτε ὀπίσω μου, καὶ ποιήσω ὑμᾶς ἁλιεῖς ἀνθρώπων. 4.21. ... εἶδεν ἄλλους δύο ἀδελφούς, <u>Ἰάκωβον τὸν τοῦ Ζεβεδαίου καὶ Ἰωάννην τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ</u> ... καὶ <u>ἐκάλεσεν αὐτούς</u> .
1.20. ἀφέντες τὸν πατέρα αὐτῶν Ζεβεδαῖον ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ ... ἀπῆλθον ὀπίσω αὐτοῦ.	5.11. <u>πλοῖα</u> ²⁰ ... <u>ἀφέντες</u> ²¹ ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ.	4.22. οἱ δὲ εὐθέως <u>ἀφέντες τὸ πλοῖον καὶ τὸν πατέρα αὐτῶν ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ</u> .
1.40. λεπρὸς ... λέγων αὐτῷ ὅτι ἐὰν θέλῃς δύνασαι με καθαρίσαι.	5.12. <u>λέπρας</u>	8.2. <u>λεπρὸς</u> ... αὐτῷ λέγων· κύριε, ἐὰν θέλῃς δύνασαι με καθαρίσαι.
1.41. καὶ σπλαγχνισθεὶς ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ ἤψατο καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ· θέλω, καθαρίσθητι. 1.42. εὐθὺς ἀπῆλθεν ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ ἡ λέπρα	5.13. <u>ἤψατο λέγων· θέλω, καθαρίσθητι· καὶ εὐθέως ἡ λέπρα ἀπῆλθεν ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ</u> .	8.3. καὶ <u>ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα ἤψατο αὐτοῦ λέγων· θέλω, καθαρίσθητι· καὶ εὐθέως ἐκαθαρίσθη αὐτοῦ ἡ λέπρα</u> .
1.43. ἐξέβαλεν αὐτόν. 1.44. ὅρα μηδενὶ μηδὲν εἶπης, ἀλλὰ ὑπαγε σεαυτὸν δεῖξον τῷ ἱερεῖ καὶ προσένεγκε περὶ τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ σου ᾧ προσέταξεν Μωϋσῆς, εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς.	5.14. <u>ἀπελθὼν δεῖξον σεαυτὸν τῷ ἱερεῖ καὶ προσένεγκε τὸ δῶρον</u> ²² <u>περὶ τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ σου καθὼς προσέταξεν Μωϋσῆς, ᾧ ἵνα εἰς μαρτύριον ὑμῖν</u> ²³ .	8.4. <u>ὅρα μηδενὶ εἶπης, ἀλλὰ ὑπαγε σεαυτὸν δεῖξον τῷ ἱερεῖ καὶ προσένεγκον τὸ δῶρον ὃ προσέταξεν Μωϋσῆς, εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς</u> .

¹⁵ While *Gos. Marcion* has no attestation of specific disciples here besides Simon and the sons of Zebedee, the polemical view that he removed names from his *Gospel* can easily be flipped on its head, that early-orthodox witnesses to Marcion did not want to produce a rival list of names of the (twelve) disciples, since this would impinge about their increasingly important notions of apostolic authority.

¹⁶ While *Gos. Marcion* has an original, distinctive story of a great catch of actual fish, the Markan seaside scene of the huge crowds of people (whom the disciples were to catch like fish) may have partly inspired the original, apparently very brief Lukan story.

¹⁷ LLkR may have added “and all who were with him” / καὶ πάντας τοὺς σὺν αὐτῷ.

¹⁸ LLkR may have added “which they caught” / ὧν συνέλαβον.

¹⁹ LLkR may have added “who were partners” / οἱ ἦσαν κοινωνοί.

²⁰ LLkR may have added “on the land” / ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν.

²¹ LLkR may have added “everything” / πάντα.

²² LLkR may have removed “the gift” / τὸ δῶρον.

²³ Either ELkR altered its Markan source or LLkR later corrected it back to Mark 1.44 or Matt 8.4, “to them” / αὐτοῖς.

Table: Primary Sources of Gos. Marcion: Markan Section 1.3

Mark (70s)	Gos. Marcion (80s)	Matthew (90s)
-----	5.17. [Attested but no wording can be gained]	-----
2.3. καὶ ἔρχονται φέροντες πρὸς αὐτὸν παραλυτικὸν αἰρόμενον ὑπὸ τεσσάρων.	5.18. <u>ἄνθρωπον ὃς ἦν παραλελυμένος</u>	9.2. καὶ ἰδοὺ προσέφερον αὐτῷ <u>παραλυτικὸν ἐπὶ κλίνης βεβλημένον.</u>
-----	5.20. [Attested but no wording can be gained]	-----
2.7. τίς δύναται ἀφίεναι ἁμαρτίας εἰ μὴ εἷς ὁ θεός;	5.21. <u>τίς δύναται ἀφεῖναι ἁμαρτίας εἰ μὴ ὁ μόνος ὁ θεός;</u>	-----
2.14. τὸ τελώνιον ... καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ· ἀκολούθει μοι.	5.27. <u>τελώνην ... εἶπεν αὐτῷ· ἀκολούθει μοι</u>	9.9. τὸ τελώνιον, Μαθθαῖον λεγόμενον, καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ· <u>ἀκολούθει μοι.</u>
2.16. καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς τῶν Φαρισαίων ἰδόντες ὅτι ἐσθίει μετὰ τῶν ἁμαρτωλῶν καὶ τελωνῶν ἔλεγον τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ· ὅτι μετὰ τῶν τελωνῶν καὶ ἁμαρτωλῶν ἐσθίει;	5.30. <u>μετὰ τῶν τελωνῶν καὶ ἁμαρτωλῶν</u>	9.11. καὶ ἰδόντες οἱ Φαρισαῖοι ἔλεγον τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ· διὰ τί μετὰ τῶν τελωνῶν καὶ ἁμαρτωλῶν ἐσθίει ὁ διδάσκαλος ὑμῶν;
2.17. οὐ χρειάν ἔχουσιν οἱ ἰσχύοντες ἱατροῦ ἀλλ’ οἱ κακῶς ἔχοντες·	5.31. <u>οὐ χρειάν ἔχουσιν οἱ ὑγιαίνοντες²⁴ ἱατροῦ ἀλλὰ οἱ κακῶς ἔχοντες</u>	9.12. <u>οὐ χρειάν ἔχουσιν οἱ ἰσχύοντες ἱατροῦ ἀλλ’ οἱ κακῶς ἔχοντες.</u>
2.18. διὰ τί οἱ μαθηταὶ Ἰωάννου καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ τῶν Φαρισαίων νηστεύουσιν, οἱ δὲ σοὶ μαθηταὶ οὐ νηστεύουσιν;	5.33. <u>οἱ μαθηταὶ Ἰωάννου νηστεύουσιν πυκνὰ καὶ δεήσεις²⁵ ποιοῦνται²⁶, οἱ δὲ σοὶ ἐσθίουσιν καὶ πίνουσιν.</u>	9.14. διὰ τί ἡμεῖς καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι νηστεύομεν ²⁷ , οἱ δὲ <u>μαθηταὶ σου οὐ νηστεύουσιν;</u>
2.19. μὴ δύνανται οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ νυμφῶνος ἐν ᾧ ὁ νυμφίος μετ’ αὐτῶν ἐστὶν νηστεύειν; ὅσον χρόνον ἔχουσιν τὸν νυμφίον μετ’ αὐτῶν οὐ δύνανται νηστεύειν.	5.34. <u>μὴ δύνανται νηστεύειν οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ νυμφῶνος, ἐφ’ ὅσον μετ’ αὐτῶν ἐστὶν ὁ νυμφίος²⁸</u>	9.15a. <u>μὴ δύνανται οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ νυμφῶνος πενθεῖν ἐφ’ ὅσον μετ’ αὐτῶν ἐστὶν ὁ νυμφίος;</u>
2.20. ἐλεύσονται δὲ ἡμέραι ὅταν ἀπαρβῇ ἀπ’ αὐτῶν ὁ νυμφίος, καὶ τότε νηστεύουσιν	5.35. <u>ὅταν ἀπαρβῇ ἀπ’ αὐτῶν ὁ νυμφίος... νηστεύουσιν</u>	9.15b. <u>ἐλεύσονται δὲ ἡμέραι ὅταν ἀπαρβῇ ἀπ’ αὐτῶν ὁ νυμφίος, καὶ τότε νηστεύουσιν.</u>
2.21. ἐπίβλημα ῥάκους ἀγνάφου 2.22. ὁ οἶνος	5.38. ὁ οἶνος ... 5.36. <u>τὸ ἐπίβλημα ῥάκους ἀγνάφου²⁹</u>	9.16. <u>ἐπίβλημα ῥάκους ἀγνάφου</u> 9.17. <u>ὁ οἶνος</u>

²⁴ This slight word change in *Gos. Marcion* has been adduced (almost comically so) as proof of the medical training and vocation of the redactor of Luke. Laughter is, as they say, the best medicine.

²⁵ ELkR apparently adds the adverb “often” / πυκνὰ to characterize the fasting of John’s disciples and also mentions how they “make prayers” / δεήσεις ποιοῦνται.

²⁶ LLkR likely adds “similarly to the Pharisees” / ὁμοίως καὶ οἱ τῶν Φαρισαίων, bringing the early Lukan tradition closer to the Matthean tradition.

²⁷ Later manuscripts of Matthew add “many times” / πολλά.

²⁸ *Gos. Marcion* follows Mark closely, but ELkR has a unique tradition, picked up verbatim by Matthew. LLkR significantly reworded this verse, transforming it from a rhetorical question to a simpler aphorism or statement of custom: “You cannot make the sons of the wedding hall fast as long as the bridegroom is with them” / μὴ δύνασθε τοὺς υἱοὺς τοῦ νυμφῶνος ἐν ᾧ ὁ νυμφίος μετ’ αὐτῶν ἐστὶν ποιῆσαι νηστεύσαι.

²⁹ *Gos. Marcion* here attests to the Markan wording, which LLkR may have transformed: “patch of new cloth” / ἐπίβλημα ἀπὸ ἱματίου καινοῦ. *Gos. Marcion* also apparently placed the wine metaphor before the cloth metaphor, while Late Luke follows Mark/Matthew by putting the cloth metaphor before the wine metaphor. See Roth, 414.

Table: Primary Sources of *Gos. Marcion*: Markan Section 1.4

Mark (70s)	<i>Gos. Marcion</i> (80s)	Matthew (90s)
2.23. Καὶ ἐγένετο αὐτὸν ἐν τοῖς σάββασιν παραπορεύεσθαι διὰ τῶν σπορίμων, καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ἤρξαντο ὁδὸν ποιεῖν τίλλοντες τοὺς στάχους.	6.1. ἐν <u>σαββάτῳ διαπορεύεσθαι αὐτὸν διὰ σπορίμων, καὶ ἔτιλλον οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἤσθιον τοὺς στάχους</u> ψώχοντες ταῖς χερσίν. ³⁰	12.1. Ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ καιρῷ ἐπαρεύθη ὁ Ἰησοῦς τοῖς <u>σάββασιν διὰ τῶν σπορίμων· οἱ δὲ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ἐπείνασαν καὶ ἤρξαντο <u>τίλλειν στάχους</u></u> καὶ ἐσθίειν.
2.24. καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι ἔλεγον αὐτῷ· ἴδε τί ποιοῦσιν τοῖς σάββασιν ὃ οὐκ ἔξεστιν;	6.2. τῶν <u>Φαρισαίων</u> .	12.2. οἱ δὲ <u>Φαρισαῖοι</u> ἰδόντες <u>εἶπαν αὐτῷ· ἰδοὺ οἱ μαθηταὶ σου ποιοῦσιν ὃ οὐκ ἔξεστιν ποιεῖν ἐν σαββάτῳ</u> .
2.25. καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς· οὐδέποτε ἀνέγνωτε τί ἐποίησεν Δαυὶδ ... καὶ ἐπείνασεν αὐτὸς καὶ οἱ μετ' αὐτοῦ	6.3. οὐδὲ τοῦτο ἀνέγνωτε, τί ³¹ ἐποίησε <u>Δαυὶδ</u>	12.3. ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· οὐκ ἀνέγνωτε τί ἐποίησεν Δαυὶδ ὅτε ἐπείνασεν καὶ οἱ μετ' αὐτοῦ
2.26. πῶς εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ θεοῦ ἐπὶ Ἀβιαθάρ ἀρχιερέως ³² καὶ τοὺς ἄρτους τῆς προθέσεως ἔφαγεν	6.4. εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ θεοῦ... τοὺς ἄρτους τῆς προθέσεως	12.4. πῶς εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τοὺς ἄρτους τῆς προθέσεως ἔφαγον
2.28. κύριός ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου καὶ τοῦ σαββάτου.	6.5. ³³ κύριός ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου καὶ τοῦ σαββάτου. ³⁴	12.8. κύριος γάρ ἐστιν τοῦ σαββάτου ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.
3.1. Καὶ εἰσῆλθεν πάλιν εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν. καὶ ἦν ἐκεῖ ἄνθρωπος ἐξηραμμένην ἔχων τὴν χεῖρα.	6.6. χεῖρ... <u>ξηρά</u>	12.9. Καὶ μεταβάς ἐκεῖθεν ἦλθεν εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν αὐτῶν... 12.10. καὶ ἰδοὺ <u>ἄνθρωπος χεῖρα ἔχων ξηράν</u> .
3.2. παρετήρουν αὐτὸν εἰ τοῖς σάββασιν θεραπεύσει αὐτόν, ἵνα κατηγορήσωσιν αὐτοῦ.	6.7. παρετηροῦντο ³⁵ ... οἱ Φαρισαῖοι εἰ ἐν τῷ <u>σαββάτῳ</u> θεραπεύει, ἵνα εὐρωσιν <u>κατηγορεῖν αὐτοῦ</u> .	12.10. καὶ ἐπρώτησαν αὐτὸν λέγοντες εἰ ἔξεστιν <u>τοῖς σάββασιν</u> <u>θεραπεῦσαι; ἵνα κατηγορήσωσιν αὐτοῦ</u>
3.4. ἔξεστιν τοῖς σάββασιν ἀγαθὸν ποιῆσαι ἢ κακοποιῆσαι, ψυχὴν σῶσαι ἢ ἀποκτείνει;	6.9. ἔξεστιν <u>τῷ σαββάτῳ ἀγαθοποιῆσαι ἢ μὴ³⁶, ψυχὴν σῶσαι ἢ ἀπολέσαι;</u>	12.10. ἔξεστιν τοῖς σάββασιν <u>θεραπεῦσαι;</u> [same as above]

³⁰ LLkR apparently transformed this verse significantly from *Gos. Marcion*, which had followed Mark quite closely. Specifically, LLkR adds “journeying through the grainfields” / διαπορεύεσθαι αὐτὸν διὰ σπορίμων.

³¹ LLkR substitutes δ for τί.

³² While our purpose here is not to establish the early version/compilation/redaction of Mark, it is notable here that a historical notice appears here in Mark that does not appear in *Gos. Marcion* or in Matthew: “during the high-priesthood of Abiathar” / ἐπὶ Ἀβιαθάρ ἀρχιερέως. This may well reflect a later redaction of Mark.

³³ This verse in *Gos. Marcion* might be located after Luke 6.9.

³⁴ While *Gos. Marcion* perfectly matches Mark here, LLkR apparently reorders the syntax: “Lord of the sabbath is the son of man” / κύριός ἐστιν τοῦ σαββάτου ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.

³⁵ LLkR may have added “the scribes” / οἱ γραμματεῖς.

³⁶ LLkR may have clarified: “to do evil” / κακοποιῆσαι. Note here we have a close, dense, unique agreement of Early Luke with Mark for a word cluster that is *almost entirely absent* from Matthew and *yet still varies significantly* from the version in Late Luke.

Table: Primary Sources of *Gos. Marcion*: Markan Section 1.5

Mark (70s)	<i>Gos. Marcion</i> (80s)	Matthew (90s)
3.13. ἀναβαίνει εἰς τὸ ὄρος καὶ προσκαλεῖται οὓς ἠθέλεν αὐτός, καὶ ἀπῆλθον πρὸς αὐτόν.	6.12. ἀνέβη ³⁷ εἰς τὸ ὄρος ... διανυκτερεύων ἐν τῇ προσευχῇ	5.1b. ἀνέβη εἰς τὸ ὄρος, καὶ καθίσαντος αὐτοῦ προσῆλθαν αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ.
3.14. ἐποίησεν δώδεκα ... ἀποστόλους ³⁸	6.13. ἐκλεξάμενος ³⁹ ... δώδεκα ... ἀποστόλους	10.1. Καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος τοὺς δώδεκα μαθητάς αὐτοῦ
3.16. ἐπέθηκεν ὄνομα τῷ Σίμωνι Πέτρον	6.14. Σίμονα ... ὠνόμασεν Πέτρον	10.2. τὰ ὀνόματά ἐστιν ταῦτα· πρῶτος Σίμων ὁ λεγόμενος Πέτρος
3.19. Ἰούδαν Ἰσκαριώθ, ὃς καὶ παρέδωκεν αὐτόν	6.16. Ἰούδαν Ἰσκαριώθ, ὃς ἐγένετο προδότης	10.4. Ἰούδας ὁ Ἰσκαριώτης ὁ καὶ παραδούς αὐτόν.
3.7-8. πλῆθος ... ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰουδαίας καὶ ἀπὸ Ἱεροσολύμων ... πέραν ... Τύρον καὶ Σιδῶνα	6.17. κατέβη ἐν αὐτοῖς ⁴⁰ ... πλῆθος ... ἀπὸ πάσης τῆς Ἰουδαίας καὶ Ἱερουσαλὴμ καὶ ... Τύρον καὶ Σιδῶνος ... καὶ τῆς περαιάς	4.25. καὶ ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ ὄχλοι πολλοὶ ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας καὶ Δεκαπόλεως καὶ Ἱεροσολύμων καὶ Ἰουδαίας καὶ πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου.
3.9-10. τὸν ὄχλον ... πολλοὺς γὰρ ἐθεράπευσεν, ὥστε ἐπιπίπτειν αὐτῷ	6.19. καὶ πᾶς ὁ ὄχλος ἐζήτει ⁴¹ ἅπτεσθαι αὐτοῦ	5.1a. ἰδὼν δὲ τοὺς ὄχλους
1.35. ἀπῆλθεν εἰς ἔρημον τόπον κάκεϊ προσήχето. 3.13. Καὶ ἀναβαίνει εἰς τὸ ὄρος καὶ προσκαλεῖται οὓς ἠθέλεν αὐτός, καὶ ἀπῆλθον πρὸς αὐτόν. 6.46. ἀπῆλθεν εἰς τὸ ὄρος προσεύξασθαι.	6.20a. καὶ αὐτὸς ἐπάρας τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτοῦ ⁴²	5.1b. ἀνέβη εἰς τὸ ὄρος, καὶ καθίσαντος αὐτοῦ προσῆλθαν αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ.

³⁷ LLkR apparently substituted “he departed” / ἐξελεῖν αὐτόν in place of “he went up” / ἀνέβη. *Gos. Marcion* 6.12 does have a slightly different form of the verb “go up” and differs from Mark in mentioning prayer here, though Mark (1.35, 6.46, see the final row above) elsewhere mentions Jesus retreating to prayer. So even this idea is Markan in origin rather than from Q. The Markan narrative does not explicitly say that Jesus descended from the mountain after designating the twelve disciples there, only that afterwards he “went home” / ἔρχεται εἰς οἶκον (3.20). Nevertheless, the descent from the mountain in *Gos. Marcion* 6.17 could certainly be inferred from that expression in Mark or simply from its broader narrative.

³⁸ Mk 3.16 has several variants here, both with and without the word “apostles” / ἀποστόλους. One could either read *Gos. Marcion* as evidence for the word being present originally in Mark here or that the redactor of later Mark (LMkR) added the word to conform it to Matthean and/or Lukan tradition.

³⁹ The word “chose” / ἐκλεξάμενος remains in LLkR but differs from Mark and Matthew. It also appears in Acts 15.22, 25. Given its apparent presence in Early Luke, LLkR apparently took it as inspiration to create a parallelism between the initial calling of the apostles and the how the Jerusalem Council “chose” men as their own representatives to accompany Paul and Barabbas. It thus essentially coopts the very term in Marcion’s Gospel to turn it to early-orthodox purpose.

⁴⁰ LLkR instead has a differing, participial construction: “going down with them” / καταβὰς μετ’ αὐτῶν instead of “he went down to them” / κατέβη ἐν αὐτοῖς.

⁴¹ LLkR keeps the singular form “crowd” but does change the verb to plural: ἐζήτουν. Mark and early Luke (*Gos. Marcion*) seems apt to use the singular form for “crowd”, whereas Matthew and Luke are both more likely to speak of plural “crowds.”

⁴² The closing verse of this section (6.20a), just before the Qⁿ material begins, also recounts the theme of prayer. While this verse and 6.12a can be explained by its Markan source, it is here likely *Gos. Marcion* is engaging in some clever redactional stitching, using the theme of prayer to tie together Mark and Q.

Let us draw some conclusions about the above Markan sections by means of a dual-report on both the receptions of Mark and the sources of Matthew, evaluating the relative signal strength in both directions from both end-points: from Mark to both *Marcion* and Matthew; and to Matthew from both Mark and *Marcion*. In this report, we rank findings according to three types of signals: Strong, Weak, or Missing. A rank of Strong indicates a dense and distinct cluster of words was clearly transmitted and received. Strong signals do not have to match completely or perfectly in content or word order. Each node has the freedom and capacity to adapt, resequence, unpack, compress, or ignore signals. It should also be clarified that for two receptions be ranked as Strong does not necessarily indicate equal strength, just that neither is absent or weak. Mark 2:16, for example, is much more strongly received in Matthew 9.11 than in *Gos. Marcion* 5.30, but the latter still evidences a clear signal (a perfect sequence of five distinct words).

We also note the important distinction between first order (simple transmission and reception) and second order (direct and indirect transmission, or signal sending, resonance, and receiving). On the one hand, a well-received and re-transmitted signal in the first wave can make it more difficult to gauge the actual source of the signal in the second wave, yet the signal itself is intact, whatever its source. For example, Mark 1.44 was received clearly by *Gos. Marcion* 5.14 and by Matthew 8.4, yet because Matthew apparently picked up a new distinctive element from *Gos. Marcion* 5.14 (“the gift”), it is difficult to tell whether Matthew got the bulk of the Markan signal directly or secondarily as transmitted through *Gos. Marcion*. On the other hand, a weakly received signal in the first wave can make it nearly impossible to detect any resonance in the second wave. For example, the calling of the disciples in Mark 1.16-18 is weakly received in *Gos. Marcion* 5.10, and this fuzziness made it difficult for that signal echo to resonate in Matthew 4.19, 21. A good question to ask oneself when gauging signal resonance is, “If the text of the original source went missing (in the above case, Mark), and all we could do was compare *Gos. Marcion* to Matthew, would we still find a clear and distinctive cluster of words signalled between the two?” The answer to that question is signal resonance.

We also note that our parallel sets began simply with the attested text of *Gos. Marcion*, then with an effort find any relevant parallels in Mark and Matthew. Our goal was not to recreate a full synopsis, or gauge how much greater a quantity of Markan words and ideas are transmitted to Matthew than the attested *Gos. Marcion*. On that question, it is generally known there is a big difference in favor of Matthew. In any case, our focus is far more simple, to gauge the overall extent to which *Gos. Marcion* receives Markan tradition and to what extent it relays its own unique traditions (often slight or modest additions or transformations of Markan traditions) to Matthew. To put it a bit differently, we aim to gauge the general extent to which Matthew is not only a retelling a Mark, but also a retelling of *Gos. Marcion* as itself an earlier retelling of Mark.

Table: Inventory of Shared Signals in Mark, Gos. Marcion, and Matthew: Part 1

<i>Origin</i>	<i>Signal Reception</i>			<i>Mediator</i>	<i>Signal Resonance</i>			<i>Receiver</i>
Mark	<i>Marcion</i>	<i>Matthew</i>	<i>Closest</i>	<i>Marcion</i>	<i>Closest</i>	<i>Mark</i>	<i>Marcion</i>	<i>Matthew</i>
1.21	Strong	Weak	<i>Marcion</i>	4.31	<i>Marcion</i>	Weak	Strong	4.13, 23
1.22	Strong	Strong	Matthew	4.32	Mark	Strong	Strong	7.28-29
1.24	Strong	None	<i>Marcion</i>	4.34	-----	-----	-----	-----
1.25	Strong	None	<i>Marcion</i>	4.35	-----	-----	-----	-----
1.34a	Weak	Strong	Matthew	4.40	Mark	Strong	Weak	8.16
1.34b	Strong	Weak	<i>Marcion</i>	4.41	Mark	Weak	None	7.22, 16.16
1.35	Weak	None	<i>Marcion</i>	4.42	Mark	Strong	None	4.1
1.38	Weak	None	<i>Marcion</i>	4.43	-----	-----	-----	-----
1.16	Weak	Strong	Matthew	5.2	Mark	Strong	None	4.18
4.1-2	-----	-----	-----	5.9	-----	-----	-----	-----
1.16-18	Weak	Strong	Matthew	5.10	Mark	Strong	None	4.19, 21
1.20	Weak	Strong	Matthew	5.11	Mark	Strong	Strong	4.22
1.40	Weak	Strong	Matthew	5.12	Mark	Strong	None	8.2
1.41-42	Strong	Strong	Matthew	5.13	Mark	Strong	Strong	8.3
1.43-44	Strong	Strong	Matthew	5.14	Mark	Strong	Strong	8.4
2.3	Weak	Weak	Matthew	5.18				9.2
2.7	Strong	None	<i>Marcion</i>	5.21	-----	-----	-----	-----
2.14	Strong	Strong	Matthew	5.27	Mark	Strong	Strong	9.9
2.16	Strong	Strong	Matthew	5.30	Mark	Strong	Strong	9.11
2.17	Strong	Strong	Matthew	5.31	Mark	Strong	Strong	9.12
2.18	Strong	Strong	Marcion	5.33	Mark	Strong	Strong	9.14
2.19	Strong	Strong	Matthew	5.34	Marcion	Strong	Strong	9.15a
2.20	Strong	Strong	Matthew	5.35	Mark	Strong	Strong	9.15b
2.21-22	Strong	Strong	Matthew	5.38, 36	Mark	Strong	None	9.16-17
2.23	Strong	Strong	Matthew	6.1	Mark	Strong	Strong	12.1
2.24	Weak	Strong	Matthew	6.2	Mark	Strong	Weak	12.2
2.25	Strong	Strong	Matthew	6.3	Mark	Strong	Strong	12.3
2.26	Strong	Strong	Matthew	6.4	Mark	Strong	Strong	12.4
2.28	Strong	Strong	Marcion	6.5	Equal	Strong	Strong	12.8
3.1	Weak	Strong	Matthew	6.6	Mark	Strong	Weak	12.9-10
3.2	Strong	Strong	Matthew	6.7	Mark	Strong	Strong	12.10
3.4	Strong	Weak	Marcion	6.9	Mark	Strong	Weak	12.10
3.13	Strong	Strong	Matthew	6.12	Marcion	Strong	Strong	5.1b
3.14	Weak	None	Marcion	6.13	Marcion	Weak	Weak	10.1
3.16	Weak	Weak	Marcion	6.14	Mark	Weak	Weak	10.2
3.19	Weak	Weak	Marcion	6.16	Mark	Weak	Weak	10.4
3.7-8	Strong	Strong	Marcion	6.17	Mark	Strong	Weak	4.25
3.9-10	Weak	None	Marcion	6.19	None	None	None	5.1a
1.35, 3.13, 6.46	None	Strong	Matthew	6.20a	Mark	None	Strong	5.1b

Based on this completed inventory, we conclude that *Gos. Marcion* picks up Markan signals more strongly and consistently than Matthew does. Conversely, Matthew receives signals more strongly and consistently from Mark than it does from *Gos. Marcion*. Nevertheless, Matthew occasionally picks up a closer signal from Mark than *Gos. Marcion* does, and *Gos. Marcion* sometimes provides a closer signal source for Matthew than Mark did. New traditions in *Gos. Marcion*, often just a few words, occasionally piggyback on the Markan signal and are later received in Matthew. Also notable: while sometimes Markan signals received by *Gos. Marcion* match considerably with those received by Matthew (whether because of faithful independent or faithful dependent transmission), the norm is for signal receptions to differ in several ways and thus exhibit independent integrity.

In regard to sequence, *Gos. Marcion* overall comes across as a faithful listener to a single, extended airing of the Gospel of Mark who uses a lot of shorthand or cannot take notes fast enough. The order in Matthew, however, comes across as someone who frequently turns the radio dial or switches stations, but occasionally slows down to listen carefully to a few segments in order and then replays them on paper. While we will not here venture into a discussion of the interplay of orality and textuality in antiquity, it is fun to speculate about the different scribal methods and available resources of the compiler of *Gos. Marcion* compared with those of Matthew.

Let us translate these findings from signals analysis to source and redaction critical terms. Mark was a direct source independently for both *Gos. Marcion* and Matthew, but *Gos. Marcion* was truer to that Markan source, both in terms of verbal dependence and narrative sequence. Conversely, Matthew used both Mark and *Gos. Marcion* directly yet independently as sources, yet Matthew was much more apt to draw on Mark than on *Gos. Marcion* as a source, both in terms of content and order. The analysis of this first section also evidences some distinctive, repeated tendencies of the redactor of Early Luke (ELkR). Analyses of additional sections will provide more evidence, which will be presented together in chapter 11.

The above section strongly confirms the traditional Q position that Matthew was indeed at least a two-source gospel. In this section we will test and see, when it comes to *Gos. Marcion*, whether Matthew proves to be a three-source Gospel, i.e., whether Matthew got its Q materials directly from Qⁿ or from Early Luke.

When we come to the traditional Q materials, we begin to see occasional agreements in *Gos. Marcion* with Matthew *against* Late Luke. This recurring, distinctive tendency suggests that *Gos. Marcion*, while used as the base text for the production of Late Luke, is itself an independent, third witness to Qⁿ, a witness that can reasonably be considered to be earlier and more reliable than both Late Luke and Matthew.

Agreements between *Gos. Marcion* and Matthew aside, our main concern here is to show that *Gos. Marcion* adopts Qⁿ as its clear and consistent textual source in the second section of its composition. We endeavor to analyze in parallel sets all of the Q verses in CEQ that are attested for *Gos. Marcion*, including those considered as potential Q candidates by the International Q Project team that created CEQ.

SQE Shorthand	CEQ	Qⁿ / <i>Gos. Marcion</i>
A078 Beatitudes	6.20b-23	6.20b-23
A079 Curses	6.24-26	6.24-26
A080 Love your enemies	6.27-36	6.27-30a, 31-34a, 36
A081 On judging	6.37-42	6.37-42
A082 Tree known by its fruit	6.43-45	6.43, 45
A083 Houses built on rock	6.46-49	6.46
A085 Centurion	7.1-10; 13.28-29	7.2, 9
A086 Raising of widow's son at Nain	7.11-17	7.12, 14-15
A106 Messages about John the Baptist	7.18-23	7.18-20, 22-23
A107 Jesus's witness about John	7.24-35, 16.16	7.24, 26-28

Table: Primary Sources of *Gos. Marcion*: Qⁿ Section 1.1

Q ⁿ / <i>Gos. Marcion</i> (80s)	Matthew (90s)	Late Luke (117-138)
6.20b. Μακάριοι οἱ πτωχοί, ὅτι αὐτῶν ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ.	5.3. Μακάριοι οἱ πτωχοὶ τῷ πνεύματι, ὅτι αὐτῶν ἐστὶν ἡ <u>βασιλεία</u> τῶν οὐρανῶν.	6.20b. Μακάριοι οἱ πτωχοί, ὅτι <u>ὑμετέρα</u> ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ.
6.21a. μακάριοι οἱ πεινῶντες... ὅτι χορτασθήσονται* ⁴³ .	5.6. μακάριοι οἱ πεινῶντες καὶ διψῶντες τὴν δικαιοσύνην, ὅτι αὐτοὶ <u>χορτασθήσονται</u> .	6.21a. μακάριοι οἱ πεινῶντες νῦν, ⁴⁴ ὅτι <u>χορτασθήσεται</u> .
6.21b. μακάριοι οἱ κλαίοντες... ὅτι γελάσουσιν*.	5.4. μακάριοι οἱ πενθοῦντες, ὅτι αὐτοὶ <u>παρακληθήσονται</u> .	6.21b. μακάριοι οἱ κλαίοντες νῦν, ὅτι <u>γελάσετε</u> .
6.22 μακάριοί ἐστε ὅταν μισήσουσιν* ὑμᾶς οἱ ἄνθρωποι καὶ ὀνειδίσουσιν* καὶ ἐκβάλουσιν τὸ ὄνομα ὑμῶν ὡς πονηρὸν ἕνεκα τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.	5.11. μακάριοί ἐστε ὅταν <u>ὀνειδίσωσιν ὑμᾶς</u> καὶ διώξωσιν καὶ εἰπωσιν πᾶν <u>πονηρὸν</u> καθ' ὑμῶν <u>ἔνεκεν</u> ἐμοῦ.	6.22. μακάριοί ἐστε ὅταν <u>μισήσωσιν ὑμᾶς οἱ ἄνθρωποι</u> καὶ ὅταν ἀφορίσωσιν ὑμᾶς ⁴⁵ καὶ ὀνειδίσωσιν καὶ ἐκβάλωσιν τὸ ὄνομα ὑμῶν ὡς πονηρὸν ἕνεκα τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.
6.23. κατὰ [ταῦτα οἱ τὰ αὐτὰ] ἐποιοῦν τοῖς προφήταις οἱ πατέρες αὐτῶν.	5.12. χαίrete καὶ ἀγαλλιᾶσθε, ὅτι ὁ μισθὸς ὑμῶν πολὺς ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς· οὕτως γὰρ <u>ἐδίδωκεν</u> τοὺς προφῆτας τοὺς πρὸ ὑμῶν.	6.23. <u>χάρητε</u> ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ καὶ σκιρτήσατε, ἰδοὺ γὰρ ὁ <u>μισθὸς ὑμῶν πολὺς ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ</u> · κατὰ τὰ αὐτὰ γὰρ ἐποιοῦν τοῖς προφήταις οἱ πατέρες αὐτῶν.
6.24. Πλὴν οὐαὶ ὑμῖν τοῖς πλουσίοις, ὅτι ἀπέχετε τὴν παράκλησιν ὑμῶν.	-----	6.24. Πλὴν οὐαὶ ὑμῖν τοῖς πλουσίοις, ὅτι <u>ἀπέχετε τὴν παράκλησιν ὑμῶν</u> .
6.25. οὐαὶ [ὑμῖν] οἱ ἐμπεπλησμένοι, ὅτι πεινάσετε. οὐαὶ [ὑμῖν] οἱ γελῶντες νῦν, ὅτι πενήθησете καὶ κλαύσετε.	-----	6.25. οὐαὶ ὑμῖν, οἱ ἐμπεπλησμένοι νῦν, ὅτι <u>πεινάσετε</u> . οὐαὶ, οἱ γελῶντες νῦν, ὅτι <u>πενθήσετε καὶ κλαύσετε</u> .
6.26. οὐαὶ [ὑμῖν] ὅταν ὑμᾶς καλῶς εἰπωσιν οἱ ἄνθρωποι· κατὰ ταῦτα [γὰρ] ἐποιοῦν τοῖς ψευδοπροφήταις οἱ πατέρες αὐτῶν.	-----	6.26. οὐαὶ ὅταν ὑμᾶς καλῶς εἰπωσιν <u>πάντες οἱ ἄνθρωποι</u> · κατὰ τὰ αὐτὰ γὰρ ἐποιοῦν τοῖς ψευδοπροφήταις οἱ πατέρες αὐτῶν.

⁴³ In Qⁿ / *Gos. Marcion* and Matthew, this verb is third person plural, “they shall be filled.” LLkR apparently changed it to the second person plural, “you [all] shall be filled.” Essentially, the Qⁿ beatitudes bless the poor in the third person plural, inferring they are *not* among the addressees of this first speech/sermon of Jesus. When it comes to the woes/curses, however, Qⁿ condemns the audience directly, in the second person plural. Matthew jettisons the woes/curses, for reasons which other scholars have covered. Late Luke preserves the blessings and woes/curses, yet universalizes them by putting them all in the audience, in the second person plural. Note also that Late Luke preserves the Qⁿ (*Gos. Marcion*) woes word for word, yet readily modifies the conclusion of the beatitudes in 6.23 (“rejoice in that day and leap for joy, for behold your reward is great in the heaven”) to align more closely with Matthew 5.12 (“rejoice and be glad, for great is your reward in the heavens.”)

⁴⁴ LLkR may have added “now” / νῦν twice in 6.21 and once in 6.25 where early Luke (*Gos. Marcion*) may not have had it. Roth notes that the words was “likely not present” in *Gos. Marcion* 6.25, and thus not anywhere in the beatitudes or curses of Qⁿ. The addition of this adverb by the redactor of late Luke moves away from the entrenched and intractable social class distinction of Qⁿ and toward these statements becoming philosophical aphorisms about temporary states or conditions.

⁴⁵ LLkR adds “when they exclude you” / ὅταν ἀφορίσωσιν ὑμᾶς.

Table: Primary Sources of Gos. Marcion: Qⁿ Section 1.2

Q ⁿ / Gos. Marcion (80s)	Matthew (90s)	Late Luke (117-138)
6.27. Ἀλλὰ ὑμῖν λέγω τοῖς ἀκούουσιν· ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ὑμῶν,	-----	6.27. Ἀλλὰ ὑμῖν λέγω τοῖς ἀκούουσιν· ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ὑμῶν, καλῶς ποιεῖτε τοῖς μισοῦσιν ὑμᾶς,
6.28. εὐλογεῖτε τοὺς μισοῦντας ὑμᾶς καὶ προσεύχεσθε περὶ τῶν ἐπηρεαζόντων ὑμᾶς.	-----	6.28. εὐλογεῖτε τοὺς καταρωμένους ὑμᾶς, προσεύχεσθε περὶ τῶν ἐπηρεαζόντων ὑμᾶς.
6.29. *τὴν σιαγὸνα ἀρεχε* καὶ τὴν ἄλλην ... *ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵροντός σου* τὸν χιτῶνα *ἄφες αὐτῷ καὶ* τὸ ἱμάτιον.	5.39. ὅστις σε ραπίζει εἰς τὴν δεξιὰν <u>σιαγὸνα</u> , στρέψον αὐτῷ καὶ <u>τὴν ἄλλην</u> . 5.40. καὶ τῷ θέλοντί σοι κριθῆναι καὶ <u>τὸν χιτῶνά</u> σου λαβεῖν, <u>ἄφες αὐτῷ καὶ τὸ ἱμάτιον</u> .	6.29. <u>τὴν σιαγὸνα ἀρεχε καὶ τὴν ἄλλην</u> , καὶ <u>ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵροντός σου τὸ ἱμάτιον καὶ τὸν χιτῶνα</u> μὴ καλύσης.
6.30a. παντὶ αἰτοῦντί σε δίδου...	5.42. τῷ αἰτοῦντί σε δός, καὶ τὸν θέλοντα ἀπὸ σοῦ δανίσασθαι μὴ ἀποστραφῆς.	6.30. παντὶ αἰτοῦντί σε δίδου, καὶ <u>ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵροντος τὰ σὰ μὴ ἀπαίτει</u> . ⁴⁶
6.31. καὶ καθὼς ὑμῖν γίνεσθαι θέλετε παρὰ [τῶν] ἀνθρώπων, *οὕτως καὶ ὑμεῖς ποιεῖτε αὐτοῖς.*	7.12. Πάντα οὖν ὅσα ἐὰν θέλητε ἵνα ποιῶσιν ὑμῖν οἱ ἄνθρωποι, <u>οὕτως καὶ ὑμεῖς ποιεῖτε αὐτοῖς</u> · οὗτος γάρ ἐστιν ὁ νόμος καὶ οἱ προφῆται.	6.31. Καὶ καθὼς θέλετε ἵνα ποιῶσιν ὑμῖν οἱ ἄνθρωποι ποιεῖτε αὐτοῖς ὁμοίως.
6.32. [Unattested]	5.46. ἐὰν γὰρ ἀγαπήσητε τοὺς ἀγαπῶντας ὑμᾶς, τίνα μισθὸν ἔχετε; οὐχὶ καὶ οἱ τελῶναι τὸ αὐτὸ ποιοῦσιν;	6.32. καὶ <u>εἰ ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς ἀγαπῶντας ὑμᾶς, ποία ὑμῖν χάρις ἐστίν;</u> καὶ γὰρ οἱ ἁμαρτωλοὶ τοὺς ἀγαπῶντας αὐτοὺς ἀγαπῶσιν.
6.33. [Unattested]	5.47. καὶ ἐὰν ἀσπάσῃσθε τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς ὑμῶν μόνον, τί περισσὸν ποιεῖτε; οὐχὶ καὶ οἱ ἔθνικοι τὸ αὐτὸ ποιοῦσιν;	6.33. καὶ <u>ἐὰν ἀγαθοποιῇτε τοὺς ἀγαθοποιῶντας ὑμᾶς, ποία ὑμῖν χάρις ἐστίν;</u> καὶ οἱ ἁμαρτωλοὶ τὸ αὐτὸ ποιοῦσιν.
6.34a. καὶ ἐὰν *δανίσγητε* παρ' ὧν ἐλπίζετε [ὑμεῖς] ἀπολαβεῖν, ποία χάρις ἐστίν ὑμῖν; 6.34b. [Unattested]	-----	6.34. καὶ ἐὰν δανίσγητε παρ' ὧν ἐλπίζετε λαβεῖν, ποία ὑμῖν χάρις; καὶ ἁμαρτωλοὶ ἁμαρτωλοῖς δανίζουσιν ἵνα ἀπολάβωσιν τὰ ἴσα.
6.27. ... ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ὑμῶν, 6.35a. [Unattested] 6.35b. καὶ ἔσεσθε υἱοὶ *θεοῦ*, ὅτι αὐτὸς χρηστός ἐστιν ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀχαρίστους καὶ πονηροὺς.	-----	6.35. πλὴν <u>ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ὑμῶν καὶ ἀγαθοποιεῖτε καὶ δανίζετε</u> μηδὲν ἀπελπίζοντες· καὶ ἔσται ὁ μισθὸς ὑμῶν πολὺς, καὶ <u>ἔσεσθε υἱοὶ ὑψίστου, ὅτι αὐτὸς χρηστός ἐστιν ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀχαρίστους καὶ πονηροὺς</u> .
6.36. Γίνεσθε οἰκτίρμονες, καθὼς ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν *οἰκτίρμων ὑμᾶς*.	5.48. ἔσεσθε οὖν ὑμεῖς τέλει· ὡς ὁ <u>πατὴρ ὑμῶν ὁ οὐράνιος τέλειός ἐστιν</u> .	6.36. Γίνεσθε οἰκτίρμονες καθὼς ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν <u>οἰκτίρμων ἐστίν</u> .

⁴⁶ LLkR restates this Matthean financial parallelism, turning it from a willingness to lend money, “One who wishes to borrow from you, don’t turn away” (Matt 5.42) into forgiveness in cases of theft, “From the one who takes what is yours, do not demand” (Luke 6.30).

Table: Primary Sources of *Gos. Marcion*: Qⁿ Section 1.3

Qⁿ / <i>Gos. Marcion</i> (80s)	Matthew (90s)	Late Luke (117-138)
6.37.		6.37. Καὶ μὴ κρίνετε, καὶ οὐ μὴ κριθῆτε· καὶ μὴ καταδικάζετε, καὶ οὐ μὴ καταδικασθῆτε. ἀπολύετε, καὶ ἀπολυθήσεσθε·
6.38.		6.38. δίδετε, καὶ δοθήσεται ὑμῖν· μέτρον καλὸν πεπιεσμένον σεσαλευμένον ὑπερεκχυννόμενον δώσουσιν εἰς τὸν κόλπον ὑμῶν· ὃ γὰρ μέτρῳ μετρεῖτε ἀντιμετρηθήσεται ὑμῖν.
6.39. [Attested but no wording can be gained]		6.39. Εἶπεν δὲ καὶ παραβολὴν αὐτοῖς· μήτι δύναται τυφλὸς τυφλὸν ὁδηγεῖν; οὐχὶ ἀμφοτέρω εἰς βόθυνον ἐμπεσοῦνται;
6.40.		6.40. οὐκ ἔστιν μαθητὴς ὑπὲρ τὸν διδάσκαλον· κατηρτισμένος δὲ πᾶς ἔσται ὡς ὁ διδάσκαλος αὐτοῦ.
6.41. [Attested but no insight into wording can be gained]		6.41.
6.42. [Attested but no insight into wording can be gained]		6.42.
6.43.		6.43.
6.45. [Unattested]		6.45.
6.46.		6.46.

Table: Primary Sources of *Gos. Marcion*: Qⁿ Section 1.4

Q ⁿ / <i>Gos. Marcion</i> (80s)	Matthew (90s)	Late Luke (117-138)
7.2. [centurion] /	7.2. centurion /	
7.9. /	7.9. /	
7.12. [Attested but no wording can be gained]	7.12. /	
7.14. / [Attested but no wording can be gained]	7.14. /	
7.15. /	7.15. /	

Table: Primary Sources of *Gos. Marcion*: Qⁿ Section 1.5

Q ⁿ / <i>Gos. Marcion</i> (80s)	Matthew (90s)	Late Luke (117-138)
7.18. [Attested but no wording can be gained]	7.18. /	
7.20. [Attested but no wording can be gained]	7.20. /	
7.22. /	7.22. /	
7.23. /	7.23. /	
7.24. /	7.24. /	
7.26. /	7.26. /	
7.27. /	7.27. /	
7.28. /	7.28. /	

Table: Primary Sources of *Gos. Marcion*: Qⁿ Section 1.6

Q ⁿ / <i>Gos. Marcion</i> (80s)	Matthew (90s)	Late Luke (117-138)
7.36. /		
7.38. /		
7.44. /		
7.45. /		
7.46. /		
7.47. /		
7.48. /		
7.50. /		
8.2. /		
8.3. /		

Table: Primary Sources of *Gos. Marcion*: Qⁿ Section

Q ⁿ / <i>Gos. Marcion</i> (80s)	Matthew (90s)	Late Luke (117-138)
8.2. /		
8.3. /		

Chapter 2. Confirming Qⁿ from *Gos. Marcion*

Now that we have cleared out the basement, as it were, and thoroughly inspected its structure and strength, we are ready to move forward with the construction of the ground level of our building. In many ways, half of the first chapter, namely all of the Qⁿ sections, reflect all the hard work of close textual inspection of the foundations on which this chapter relies. Before we get to our main hypothesis for this chapter, we would like to start by summarizing our findings from the previous chapter in a form somewhat akin to an inspection report, specifically indicating the coverage and density in *Gos. Marcion* of verses commonly accepted as belonging to Q.

In making our rankings, we exclude words from Matthew and Late Luke when those words could have been composed first by Matthew and then transmitted to Late Luke. Q 6.23 // Mt 5.12 is a good example of this.

Q ⁿ / <i>Gos. Marcion</i>	Matthew	Late Luke
6.23. κατὰ [ταῦτα or τὰ αὐτὰ] ἐποιοῦν τοῖς προφήταις οἱ πατέρες αὐτῶν.	5.12. χαίρετε καὶ ἀγαλλιᾶσθε, ὅτι ὁ μισθὸς ὑμῶν πολὺς ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς· οὕτως γὰρ ἐδίωξαν τοὺς προφῆτας τοὺς πρὸ ὑμῶν.	6.23. <u>χάρητε</u> ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ καὶ σκιρτήσατε, ἰδοὺ γὰρ <u>ὁ μισθὸς ὑμῶν πολὺς ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ</u> . κατὰ τὰ αὐτὰ γὰρ ἐποιοῦν τοῖς προφήταις οἱ πατέρες αὐτῶν.

In our judgment, this should still count as *Gos. Marcion* 6.23 being ranked “Strong,” both because it has a definite cluster or string of words, and because that word cluster is reproduced quite clearly in Late Luke, even though Late Luke has additional materials not found in *Gos. Marcion* but found in Matthew. As we will discuss later, and as proponents of Goulder-Farrer have noted regularly about this parallel set, Luke likely adapts these words from Matthew.

We also do not downgrade the rating for a verse of *Gos. Marcion* for a cluster of words missing from its text but present in (Late) Luke, when those words are reasonably adjudged to be redactions to Late Luke. A good example of this is Q 6.27.

Q ⁿ / <i>Gos. Marcion</i>	Matthew	Late Luke
6.27. Ἀλλὰ ὑμῖν λέγω τοῖς ἀκούουσιν· ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ὑμῶν,		6.27. Ἀλλὰ ὑμῖν λέγω τοῖς ἀκούουσιν· ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ὑμῶν, καλῶς ποιεῖτε τοῖς μισοῦσιν ὑμᾶς,

Again, in our judgement, this should still count as *Gos. Marcion* 6.27 being ranked “Strong,” since *Gos. Marcion* has a substantive amount of words and the last phrase in Luke 6.27, “do good to those who hate you,” is reasonably understood to be a Lukan redaction.

Besides evaluating the signal strength for each reception, we also seek to evaluate which reception is the closer to the original source of the signal.

Q ⁿ	Matt Signal	Luke Signal	Closest
6.20b	Strong	Strong	Luke
6.21a	Strong	Strong	Matthew
6.21b	Strong	Strong	Luke
6.22	Strong	Strong	Luke
6.23	Weak	Strong	Luke
6.27	Missing	Strong	Luke
6.28	Missing	Strong	Luke
6.29	Strong	Strong	Luke
6.30a	Strong	Strong	Luke
6.31	Strong	Strong	Matthew
6.34	Missing	Strong	Luke
6.35	Missing	Strong	Luke
6.36	Strong	Strong	Luke

Now that we have shown the overall signal strength and density of Qⁿ with Luke and Matthew across a wide array of previously confirmed Q passages in Luke and Matthew, we are ready to complete the construction of the first floor and make our first original contribution to the content of Qⁿ. Thus we come to our second progressive hypothesis.

Hypothesis 2. When Luke has a parallel in Matthew and/or *Gos. Thomas* and those parallels are explicitly corroborated by *Gos. Marcion*, then this confirms their existence in Qⁿ. We regard this hypothesis as requiring only an *initial level of trust* in the critical reconstruction of *Gos. Marcion* as an accurate representation of Early Luke.

Our findings show that several passages about which Q scholars have gone back and forth are often attested densely and with high degrees of confidence in *Gos. Marcion*. We supplement each confirmation with word counts based on the current critical edition of *Gos. Marcion*.⁴⁷

⁴⁷ Some explanatory notes may be in order to guide the general reader in the interpretation of the tables in this chapter and following. We use the standard scholarly synopsis of the Gospels (*Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum* or SQE) for the numbering and designation of parallel gospel passages. If a relevant Matthean parallel with Luke/Q is in evidence and part of our analysis, then we list that in its own column. The *Critical Edition of Q* (CEQ) produced for the Hermeneia series by a team of scholars out of the International Q Project is our touchstone for the general state of the text of Q as maintained in current scholarship. Its numbering of Q verses uses the standard versification of the Gospel of Luke, and the references to parallels in the *Gos. Thomas* that occasionally appear are typically borrowed from CEQ as well. Here for the *Gos. Marcion* we rely on the reconstructed critical edition by Roth (2015) and do not make any effort to challenge, question, or simplify his assessments. Instead, we simply replicate and represent his nuanced categories as word counts for quick, independent evaluation:

- **bold** = secure
- ***bold italics*** = very likely
- regular type = probable
- *italics* = possible
- (parentheses) = precise wording not attested
- {curly brackets} are used by Roth as well, but only to indicate the uncertainty of the word order, not as an indication of the relative certainty of the words themselves
- [likely present] words within brackets as indicated by Roth are grouped with words otherwise rendered in regular type = probable
- [may have been present] words within brackets as indicated by Roth are grouped with words otherwise rendered in *italics* = possible

Words within brackets that Roth indicates as [likely not present] or [may not have been present] are absented from our word count altogether.

Table: Two Witness Parallel CEQ Candidates Confirmed as Qⁿ

SQE Shorthand	Matt	CEQ	Gos. Thom.	Gos. Marcion Words
A079 Woes	5.3-12 ⁴⁸	6.24-26		6.24-26 8 27 3 4
A085 Centurion				7.2, 9
A176 On following Jesus	8.18-22 ⁴⁹	9: [[61-62]]		9.61-62 1 4 (5)
A177 Commissioning Seventy				10.1
A190 True blessedness		11.??27-28??	79.1-2	11.27-28 8 15 1 (2)
A199 Warning against avarice		12.13-15	72.1-2	12.13-14 5 11
A200 Rich fool		12. [[16-20]], 21	63.1-3	12.16-20 17 1 1 2 (2)
A203 Slaves awaiting the master	24.46, 42; 25.1-13 ⁵⁰	12. [[35-38]]	21.7	12.35-38 14 3
A204 Division in household	10.34-36	12. [[49]]	10	12.49a 5 1
A216 Great supper parable	22.5 ⁵¹	14. ?19-20?	64.2-9	14.19-20 3 (1) (1)
A216 Great supper parable	22.10-14 ⁵²	14.22, 24		14.22, 24 4 1
A234 When comes the kingdom?		17: [[20]]	113.1-2	17.20 8 11
A234 Kingdom of god within	24.23	17: [[21]]	3.1-3, 113.3-4	17.21 14 1

[Future versions of the book may include more in-depth treatments of the above parallels.]

⁴⁸ Matthew's beatitudes (5:3-12), like Luke's (6:20b-23), are certainly not verbatim parallels to the Woes of Luke 6:24-26, but they are in fact *inverted* parallels to them. It is for this reason that the Woes have been treated ambiguously in Q scholarship, sometimes as authentic to Q and sometimes not, depending on whether a given scholar or committee opts for Matthew or Luke as more authoritative in reconstructing Q at this point.

⁴⁹ Matthew's account has Jesus responding to two people about the sacrificial commitment involved in being a follower of Jesus, whereas Luke has three people. While the third exchange in Luke does not have a direct textual parallel in Matthew, the confirmation of the overall back and forth conversation with multiple persons on the same subject has led to Luke 9:61-62 at least being considered as a candidate by Q scholars.

⁵⁰ See also Mark 13.33-34, 37, 35-36.

⁵¹ Matt 22.5 ("one to his farm, another to his business" / *μὲν εἰς τὸν ἴδιον ἀγρόν, ὃς δὲ ἐπὶ τὴν ἐμπορίαν αὐτοῦ*) reads well as an abridged summary of the fairly repetitive succession of persons in *Gos. Marcion* who make excuses as to why they cannot attend the banquet, including 14.18 (which CEQ accepts, "I bought a field" / *ἀγρόν ἡγόρασα*) and 14.19 (which CEQ does not accept, "I bought a yoke of oxen / *ζεύγη βοῶν ἡγόρασα*). It is not too far of a stretch to also include Matt 22.5 in Q as an abridged parallel that also knows of the next excuse, from 14.20: "I married a woman" / *γυναῖκα ἔγημα*.

⁵² Again, Matthew provides an indirect parallel, describing the wedding hall being filled with guests (22.10) while Qn 14.22 says "there is still room / *ἔτι τόπος ἐστίν*." Matt 22.11-14 describes the host's anger and punishment of a man not wearing wedding clothes, while Qn 14.24 has what may be either a selective or generalized statement of punishment, "no one ... will eat" / *οὐδεὶς ... γεύσεται*.

Chapter 3. Ordering Qⁿ according to the Lukan Traditions

This third chapter addresses our third hypothesis. When *Gos. Marcion* attests to the presence of passages and verses in Early Luke, the order of these materials is preferable to the ordering of Qⁿ materials in Matthew. This hypothesis requires a *moderate level of trust* in the reconstruction of *Gos. Marcion* as an accurate representation of Early Luke.

Admittedly the reconstruction of *Gos. Marcion*, which is attested across many diffuse witnesses, does not provide a precise overall order. Still, Marcion's most strident detractor, Tertullian, wrote a verse by verse rebuttal to Marcion's Gospel. Tertullian's rebuttal is inherently valuable for its order and also for its propensity to call attention to passages in *Gos. Marcion* that did not follow the same order as in Tertullian's preferred version of Luke.

These notable exceptions prove the rule. Most of the order of materials in *Gos. Marcion* was not different than in Late Luke. The redactor of Late Luke certainly did insert lots of new materials, including longer and shorter stories, narrative color and details, and terms intended to clarify, instruct, or transition smoothly between content. But the redactor of Late Luke very seldom shifted passages or sayings out of their original order in *Gos. Marcion*.

Furthermore, as we saw in the previous chapter, *Gos. Marcion* consistently follows the content and order of Mark with fairly modest editorial reworking of content. By comparison, *Gos. Marcion* is far closer to the wording and order of Markan materials than is Matthew.

The same can and probably should be maintained about the use of Qⁿ in *Gos. Marcion*. Besides the occasional editorial stitching together of sources in their transitional sections, *Gos. Marcion* treats Mark and Q as separate sources in separate sections. The Gospel of Matthew, by contrast, was engaged in a massive project of sorting, compiling, juxtaposing and repurposing materials to create an elaborate mosaic (pun intended) of powerful sermons and discourses. Matthew's astonishing creativity is also his undoing as a reliable source for the order of Q. Matthew's order should *almost never* be retroactively applied to Q.

The table below calls attention to the passages where the CEQ adopts a different order for Q sayings than the order of Luke (both *Gos. Marcion* and Late Luke). The call to revert to Luke as the primary basis for the order of Q in most passages should not be taken as very controversial, because scholars working on Q have almost always taken Late Luke as a closer reflection of the ordering of Q materials generally speaking. Scholars have long recognized that the Lukan presentation of Q materials is typically more linear and closer to its source, while Matthew reflects a more sophisticated exercise in recompiling and reordering Q materials into topically distinct sermons and extended discourses. In recent decades, it has become more customary in Q scholarship to question Luke and to prefer Matthew in regard to the ordering of some materials, especially *within* pericopes. This is somewhat understandable, given the amount of wrangling over the niceties of the precise words and sayings in Q, the framing of Q as a sapiential collection of essentially disparate sayings, and the assumption of Matthew as a source co-equal and even sometimes preferable to Late Luke for reconstructing Q.

Catalog of Passages to Reorder (or not to Reorder) in Q

[Do close comparison]

CEQ elaborately reshuffles the verses within Q 6.27-36 out of deference to the Matthean order:

1. Q 6.27-28 =
2. Q 6.35c-d =
3. Q 6.29-30 =
4. Q 6.31 =
5. Q 6.32 =
6. Q 6.34 =
7. Q 6.36 =

The order in *Gos. Marcion* and Late Luke is preferable and should be restored: Q 6.27-30a, 31-34a, 36. As described in the chapter below, 30b and 34b are candidates for removal.

[Do close comparison] CEQ places Q 12.22b-31 after Q 12.33-34 out of deference to the Matthean order (Q 12.33-34 = Matt; Q 12.22b-31 =). The order in *Gos. Marcion* and Late Luke is preferable and should be restored.

[Do close comparison] CEQ relocates Q 15.4-7 after Q 17.1-2 out of deference to the Matthean order (Q 15.4-7 = Matt 18.12-14). The order in *Gos. Marcion* and Late Luke is preferable and should be restored.

Q 11.16 is unattested in *Gos. Marcion*, thus there is no basis to question the decision within CEQ to relocate 11.16 (part of Luke's Beelzebub passage in A188) to sit within the Sign of Jonah passage (A191) in deference to the Matthean arrangement (Q 11.16 = Matt 12.38; Q 11.29-32 = Matt 12.39-42).

Chapter 4. What Q Was Not

Here we arrive at our fourth hypothesis. When Matthew has a parallel with Late Luke that is *not present* or is *unattested* in *Gos. Marcion*, that material is *not Qⁿ*. This hypothesis requires a *very high level of trust* in the reconstruction of *Gos. Marcion* as an accurate and thorough representation of Early Luke.

We have thus far demonstrated that *Gos. Marcion* is in fact a simply-structured two-source gospel (Qⁿ + Mark) *and* an earlier and more reliable witness to Qⁿ than either Luke (which uses yet transforms Qⁿ) or Matthew (which sometimes, but does not always share unique, common readings with Qⁿ). On that basis, we reordered Q passages according to the Lukan tradition. Now we come to an even more radical proposal.

Prior to this work, most scholars would probably have taken it as a given that *Gos. Marcion* does not follow Matthew *against* Luke, but this is precisely what we see *regularly* throughout *Gos. Marcion* in its Q sections, but *never* in its Mark sections. This evidence is absolutely crucial to show that Matthew is sometimes a more faithful witness to Qⁿ than is Late Luke, and also that *Gos. Marcion* is *not influenced* by Matthew. *Gos. Marcion* really is an earlier version of Luke and thus more deserving of trust as the basis for reconstructing Qⁿ than either Late Luke or Matthew are.

Essentially, this hypothesis and the following one extend this assessment of the reliability and applicability of *Gos. Marcion*, taking it from confirming previously viable candidates for Q or establishing word choice and now using it as the basis to remove content from Q that is not actually part of Qⁿ, which is, at its core, *Gos. Marcion* with Mark and some minor redactions removed. This excision cuts out not only verses here and there, but also whole passages that have been core to the understanding of Q from the inception of the theory.

Even between the this floor and its ceiling, we want to build out our steps progressively. Some scholars may only feel confident about removing passages from Q when Marcion's witnesses asserted that those passages were not present in his gospel. Other scholars may find their confidence in the recently reconstructed *Gos. Marcion* rising to the point where even its unattested passages should be taken seriously as candidates for removal from Q and reassignment to the work of the redactor of Late Luke and its dependence on Matthew and other sources.

Table: Passages and/or Verses Removed from Qⁿ (Not Present in *Gos. Marcion*)

SQE Shorthand	CEQ	<i>Gos. Marcion</i>
A013 John the Baptist introduced	3.:[0]], 3:1a, 3.2b-3a, 3b-4	Not present (indirectly)
A014 John preaches repentance	3.7-9	Not present (indirectly)
A015 John's messianic preaching	3.16b-17	Not present (indirectly)
A016 Baptism of Jesus	3.:[21-22]]	Not present
A017 Temptation of Jesus	4.1-4, 9-12, 5-8, 13	Not present
A191 Sign of Jonah	11.30-32	Not present
A194 Discourses against Pharisees and lawyers	11.? ³⁹ a?	Not present
A196 Exhortation to fearless confession	12.6	Not present
A213 Lament over Jerusalem	13.34-35	Not present

Table: Passages and/or Verses Removed from Qⁿ (Unattested in *Gos. Marcion*)

SQE Shorthand	CEQ	<i>Gos. Marcion</i>
A083 Houses built on rock or sand	6.47-49	Unattested
A107 Jesus' witness about John	7.:[29-30]]	Unattested
A178 Woes against Galilean towns	10.13-15	Unattested
A188 Beelzebub controversy	11.16, ⁵³ 17, 23	Unattested
A189 Return of unclean spirit	11.24-26	Unattested
A194 Discourses against Pharisees and lawyers	11.44	Unattested
A196 Exhortation to fearless confession	12.7	Unattested
A202 Treasures in heaven	12.33-34	Unattested
A217 Conditions of discipleship	14.34-35	Unattested

[The future edition of this chapter will analyze these texts in closer details, alongside relevant parallel passages in *Gos. Thomas* and/or other early Christian sources.]

Whether classed as “not present” or “unattested,” all of these passages should be very familiar to proponents of the Farrer-Goulder hypothesis. These passages are—by no coincidence in our view—the most repeatedly adduced and thoroughly investigated as demonstrations of Lukan dependence on Matthew.

As noted in our introduction, though, Qⁿ cuts both ways. Not only does it confirm the Q hypothesis at a fundamental level, it also comprises a text that is far less problematic and ambiguous when it comes to the presence of overlaps between Q and the Gospel of Mark. These overlaps have presented a challenge to traditional Q scholarship and led to theories about multiple redactional layers of Q, most notably by Lührmann and Kloppenborg. They have also been adduced by proponents of the Farrer-Goulder hypothesis to show that Q can be explained away simply by appeal to Mark being used by Matthew.

As seen in the chapter above, *Gos. Marcion* shows extensive evidence of using Mark as its overarching narrative frame, and yet at the same time it also shows a far more separation between Q and Mark. In the redactional stitches made between Mark sections and Qⁿ sections in

⁵³ CEQ lumps 11.16 in with A191 the Sign of Jonah out of deference to the Matthean order (Q 11.16 = Matt 12.38; Q 11.29-32 = Matt 12.39-42). As elaborated in the previous chapter, the Lukan order is more faithful to Qⁿ.

Gos. Marcion, there are overlaps. But besides those sections, the Q and Mark materials are presented distinctly in their own subsections.

Table: Separation of Mark-Qⁿ Overlaps

Many of the places where scholars have entertained an overlap of content between Mark and Q happen to be *not present* or *unattested* in Marcion's Gospel. Using *Gos. Marcion* as the primary basis to reconstruct Qⁿ shows what the two-source hypothesis initially aimed and endeavored to show, that Mark and Q are indeed almost entirely distinct, yet both used independently and in different ways by the authors of Matthew and Luke. Qⁿ is a truer expression of the two source hypothesis than traditional Q theories have ever been able to attain. It is just that Early Luke (*Gos. Marcion*) is a far more preferable witness to the two-source tradition than is Late Luke (because dependent on Matthew and John) or Matthew (because of its freedom in absenting, interweaving, recompiling, reworking, repeating, and expanding both Q and Markan materials).

Chapter 5. More of What Qⁿ Actually Was

Lastly we come to our fifth hypothesis. When *Gos. Marcion* has a parallel in Late Luke that never appears in Matthew or Mark, then these are *additions to Qⁿ*. This argument requires a *very high level of trust* in the reconstruction of *Gos. Marcion* as an accurate and thorough representation of Early Luke and its use of Qⁿ as one of its two sources.

Table: Additions to Qⁿ Previously Considered in CEQ

Passage	CEQ	<i>Gos. Marcion</i>
A186 Importunate friend	11.1[[5-8]]	11.5, 7-8 attested 12 (34)
A204 Division in households	12.1[[49]]	12.59a attested
A205 Interpreting the times	12.1[[56]]	12.56 attested
A206 Agreement with accuser	12.57	12.57 attested

Table: Brand New Additions to Qⁿ

Passage	<i>Gos. Marcion</i>	Other Parallels
A086 Raising of woman's son	7.12, 14-15 attested	
A114 Woman anoints Jesus feet	7.36-38, 44-48, 50 attested	Matt 26.6-13; Mark 14.3-9; John 12.1-8
A115 Ministering women	8.2-3 attested	Mark 16.9
A180 Authority granted	10.19 attested	Mark 16.18
A208 Healing crippled woman	13.14-16 attested	
A222 Parable of unjust steward	16.2, 4-7 attested	
A223 Faithfulness in small things	16.11-12 attested	
A225 Pharisees reproved	16.14-15 attested	
A228 Dives and Lazarus	16.19-31 attested [very densely!]	
A233 Cleansing of 10 lepers	17.11-12, 4.27, 17.14-19 attested	
A236 Parable of the unjust judge	18.1b-3 partly attested	
A237 Pharisee and publican	18.10-14 partly attested	Matt 18.4, 23.12
A265 Zacchaeus	19.2, 6, 8-10 partly attested	

This conclusion also entails that the Gospel of Matthew deliberately leaves out parts of Qⁿ that appear in both Early and Late Luke. While there is no self-evident reason to think this would be problematic, it certainly runs counter to decades of scholarly habituation to consider Matthew and (Late) Luke almost exclusively as the basis for reconstructing Q.

Part 2. Sources for the Study of the New Q (Qⁿ) and Early Luke (*Gos. Marcion*)

Chapter 6. The Gospel of the Poor: A Popular Translation of the New Q (Qⁿ) (c. 50-65 CE)

Sometimes it is with simple elegance that a case is best made, even an academic one. So, before we present our critical edition of Qⁿ in Greek with parallel critical translation, let us begin with an English translation that remains free of technical scholarly artifice and annotation and even free of modern chapter and verse reference numbers. The next chapter will follow the customary, rigorous scholarly habits of scholarly indication. Here our singular goal is to let nothing detract from the reader having a fresh encounter with a maximalist rendition of the earliest Gospel and to experience it as a coherent whole on its own terms.

Nazareth

Physician, heal yourself!

They cast him out, led him up to the mountain cliff.

He went through their midst.

Blessed are the poor, for theirs is the kingdom of god.

Blessed are the hungry, for they will be filled.

Blessed are you when the people hate you and revile you and cast out your name as evil because of the son of man, just as these things their fathers did to the prophets. However,

Cursed are you who are rich, for you have received your encouragement.

Cursed are you who are filled, for you will go hungry.

Cursed are you who rejoice now, for you will mourn and weep.

Cursed are you when the people speak well of you, just as these things their fathers also said to the false prophets.

But I say to you who hear, love your enemies. Bless those who hate you and pray for those who mistreat you, and offer the other cheek. About the one who takes your garment, give to him also your cloak. To everyone who asks you, give.

And just as you wish to be treated by people, thus likewise should you do for others.

And if you lend to those from whom you hope to receive, what sort of grace is that for you?

And be sons of god, for he is kind toward those who are graceless and evil. Be compassionate, just as your father has compassion for you.

[The forthcoming book will provide a complete translation.]

Chapter 7. A Critical Edition and Translation of the New Q (Qⁿ) (c. 50-65 CE)

The precision, rigor, and nuance of Roth's reconstruction of *Gos. Marcion* is impressive to say the least. By our count, it has no fewer than eleven (!) labels for the relative confidence of wording: 1) **secure**, 2) **very likely**, 3) probable, 4) *possible*, 5) (precise wording not attested), 6) [likely present], 7) [may have been present], 8) [likely not present], 9) [may not have been present], 10) [possibly not present], and 11) [readings with ambiguous options]. And this does not count the additional indication for {uncertain word order}. Or should that be {word uncertain order}?

For our purposes of providing a maximalist, reasonable and clear critical edition of Qⁿ, we do not need to replicate all of this technical acumen here. Our aim is more constructive and synthetic: to use Roth's critical edition of the *Gos. Marcion* as the starting basis for a serviceable and essentially reliable, even if not perfect reconstruction of Qⁿ. Despite the advice of Matthew 5.48, we refuse to let the perfect be the enemy of the good, or, if we might turn an Islamic phrase, to let the Mother of the Book keep us from the making of this book. We do this of course in conversation with the standard tools and resources available, such as CEQ and SQE.

While word order is interesting in its own right, we will not concern ourselves with trying to establish that with precision, but instead default to the word order as provided by Roth. We are far more interested in establishing and presenting with relative certainty and useful simplicity the words of Qⁿ itself to the greatest extent they can be retrieved or reconstructed. In our critical edition we thus distill down Roth's indications to three main categories for both the Greek text and English translation:

- Regular font represents: secure, very likely, probable, likely, or likely present
- [Bracketed words] represents: possible, possibly not present, may or may not have been present, where precise wording is not attested, or where ambiguous options are attested

Readings that Roth designates as [likely not present] are simply left out of this edition.

Based on our own fresh reading of the primary source texts attesting to *Gos. Marcion* that Roth so thoroughly and ably compiled, we do take occasional liberty to upgrade the confidence level of specific words from bracketed to regular font. Where we do this we provide an asterisk next to the Greek word, or on either side of the relevant group of upgraded words. More often than not, these upgraded words are *clearly* attested, often *word for word* in one or more witnesses to *Gos. Marcion*, whether in Greek or in a close Latin translation.

The stated reasons for Roth downgrading the reliability and certainty of these words vary, but the explanations often tend to convey different assumptions, including many of those elaborated in the introduction. We will instead hold to the introduction's competing set of assumptions about *Gos. Marcion*, and do so in ultimately an honest effort to allow the witnesses to *Gos. Marcion* to speak for themselves about the text they knew firsthand. We also provide a column of references to the technical discussion in Roth's critical edition so readers can quickly and easily check the evidence for themselves.

Roth	Q ⁿ	Greek	Translation
5.2; 8.3	4.16	Ναζαρέθ	Nazareth
5.2; 8.3	4.23	*ιατρέ, θεράπευσον σεαυτόν*	Physician, heal yourself!
5.2; 8.3	4.29	ἐξέβαλον αὐτόν... ἤγαγον αὐτόν ἕως ὄφρυος τοῦ ὄρους	They cast him out... led him up to the mountain cliff
5.2; 8.3	4.30	διὰ μέσου αὐτῶν ἐπορεύετο.	He went through their midst.
4.4.8; 6.4.9; 8.7	6.20	Μακάριοι οἱ πτωχοί, ὅτι αὐτῶν ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ.	Blessed are the poor, for theirs is the kingdom of God.
4.4.9	6.21	μακάριοι οἱ πεινῶντες... ὅτι χορτασθήσονται*. μακάριοι οἱ κλαίοντες... ὅτι γελάσουσιν*.	Blessed are the hungry... for they will be filled. Blessed are those who weep... for they will rejoice.
4.4.10	6.22	μακάριοί ἐστε ὅταν μισήσουσιν* ὑμᾶς οἱ ἄνθρωποι καὶ ὀνειδίσουσιν* καὶ ἐκβάλουσιν τὸ ὄνομα ὑμῶν ὡς πονηρὸν ἕνεκα τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.	Blessed are you when people hate you... and revile and cast out your name as evil because of the son of man.
4.4.11; 6.4.10	6.23	κατὰ [ταῦτα οἱ τὰ αὐτὰ] ἐποιοῦν τοῖς προφήταις οἱ πατέρες αὐτῶν.	... just as [these things or the same things] their fathers did to the prophets.
5.16; 8.7	6.24	Πλὴν οὐαὶ ὑμῖν τοῖς πλουσίοις, ὅτι ἀπέχετε τὴν παράκλησιν ὑμῶν.	But cursed are you who are rich, for you have received your encouragement.
4.4.12	6.25	οὐαὶ [ὑμῖν] οἱ ἐμπεπλησμένοι, ὅτι πεινάσετε. οὐαὶ [ὑμῖν] οἱ γελῶντες νῦν, ὅτι πενθήσετε καὶ κλαύσετε.	Cursed [are you] who are filled, for you will go hungry. Cursed [are you] who rejoice now, for you will mourn and weep.
5.17	6.26	οὐαὶ [ὑμῖν] ὅταν ὑμᾶς καλῶς εἴπωσιν οἱ ἄνθρωποι· κατὰ ταῦτα [γὰρ] ἐποιοῦν τοῖς ψευδοπροφήταις οἱ πατέρες αὐτῶν.	Cursed [are you] when the people speak well of you, [for] just as these things their fathers also said to the false prophets.
4.4.13; 7.4.4	6.27	Ἀλλὰ ὑμῖν λέγω τοῖς ἀκούουσιν· ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ὑμῶν,	But I say to you who hear, love your enemies,
4.4.13; 7.4.4	6.28	*εὐλογεῖτε τοὺς μισοῦντας ὑμᾶς* καὶ προσεύχεσθε περὶ τῶν ἐπηρεαζόντων ὑμᾶς.	bless those you hate you and pray for those who mistreat you.
4.4.14; 7.4.5	6.29	*τὴν σιαγόνα πάρεχε* καὶ τὴν ἄλλην ... *ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵροντός σου* τὸν χιτῶνα *ἄφες αὐτῷ καὶ* τὸ ἱμάτιον.	And offer the other cheek...from the one who takes your garment give to him also the cloak.
4.4.15	6.30a	παντὶ... αἰτοῦντί σε δίδου...	to everyone...who asks you, give...
4.4.16	6.31	καὶ καθὼς ὑμῖν γίνεσθαι θέλετε παρὰ [τῶν] ἀνθρώπων, *οὕτως καὶ ὑμεῖς ποιεῖτε αὐτοῖς.*	and just as you wish to be treated by people, thus likewise you do for others.
5.18	6.34a	καὶ ἐὰν *δανίσητε* παρ' ὧν ἐλπίζετε *ὑμεῖς* ἀπολαβεῖν, ποία χάρις ἐστὶν ὑμῖν;	And if you lend to those from whom you hope to receive, what sort of grace is that for you?
5.19	6.35b	καὶ ἔσεσθε υἱοὶ *θεοῦ*, ὅτι αὐτὸς χρηστός ἐστὶν ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀχαρίστους καὶ πονηροὺς.	And be sons of god, for he is kind toward those who are graceless and evil.
5.20	6.36	Γίνεσθε οἰκτίρμονες, καθὼς ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν *οἰκτίρμων ὑμᾶς*.	Be compassionate, just as your father has compassion for you.

[The forthcoming book will provide a complete critical edition and critical translation of Qⁿ.]

Chapter 8. Translation of Early Luke (*Gos. Marcion*) (80s)

[Bilby plans to author or co-author this translation, which overlaps with his above translation of Qⁿ.]

Though a combination of two sources, *Gos. Marcion* or Early Luke certainly has a coherence of its own in terms of structure, narrative flow, characterization, vocabulary, theme, and imagery. In many ways, this coherence is borrowed from Q and Mark. In others ways, it is produced through careful, albeit fairly modest editorial work and stitching.

In what follows, we have two goals: 1) to provide a smooth reading experience in what will be the first encounter many people have with this text; 2) to satisfy the standards and expectations of scholars in technical notes and indications. This will aim to provide by means of a well-footnoted translation that includes traditional chapter and verse numbers in the body of the translation.

We here avoid reproducing the Greek text of Early Luke, because it is already essentially provided in Roth's critical reconstruction of *Gos. Marcion*. Be that as it may, there is certainly now a pressing need for a new Gospel synopsis and critical edition of Q that sets the text and translation of *Gos. Marcion* alongside the texts and translations of Mark, Matthew, John, Late Luke, *Gos. Thomas*, etc.

Part 3. Rethinking Jesus and His Earliest Texts and Movement in Light of Qⁿ

Chapter 9: Rethinking the Historical Jesus in Light of Qⁿ

[We invite a specialist in Historical Jesus studies to author this chapter, mainly arguing the thesis that follows.]

As a major, intact (albeit reconstructed) text from Judea prior to 70 CE, Qⁿ significantly the case for the Historical Jesus, that he was from Nazareth, that he was known as a teacher and healer, that his teaching was conveyed and remembered as a coherent whole rather than disparate and disjointed sayings that circulated independently of each other, that he relied first and foremost on women supporters and patrons, that he started an actual community of practice that called for the radical redistribution of wealth, etc.

Chapter 10. Rethinking Q in the Light of Qⁿ

[We invite a specialist on the history of Q scholarship to author this chapter, roughly in keeping with the outline below.]

For many Q scholars, encountering the New Q here feels like meeting the old Q again for the very first time. In many respects Qⁿ is more Q-like, more true to Q, than any reconstruction of Q previously offered.

Qⁿ amidst the History of Q Scholarship

Classical Q Themes Strengthened, Clarified, and Expanded

- Compelling focus on inequality, on wealth/poverty, on begging and repentance, from beginning to end
- Prayer in sayings/stories, but note that prayer in the Gospel narrative is largely if not entirely the production the redactor of Early Luke (ELkR), and not original to Qⁿ
- Lepers

Transformations to Traditional Notions of Q

- Primary focus on women disciples and women as the patrons of the Jesus movement
- Secondary focus on male disciples and men as ambassadors of the Jesus movement
- More sayings and parables than previously thought
 - o Parable of the Rich Fool
 - o Rich Man and Lazarus
- More miracles/healings than thought
- More characters interacting with Jesus than thought
 - o Zacchaeus

Scriptural Modeling in the New Q

- Aesop!
- Prophet not accepted in his hometown
- Deuteronomistic ethicist, yes, but a prophet like Moses?

Chapter 11. Rethinking the L Source in the Light of Qⁿ

[We invite a specialist in Luke to supplement and footnote this chapter as needed.]

The significant excision, expansion, and editing of Qⁿ above throws the whole L source hypothesis directly into serious doubt. The following analysis will show that the entirety L source candidates are far better sorted and situated as either part of Qⁿ (as witnessed in *Gos. Marcion*) or part of the redaction of Late Luke. Most of the themes and rhetorical techniques highlighted as distinctive to the L source are largely missing from Qⁿ and reflect the unique style and concerns of the Late Luke Redactor (LLkR), as demonstrated thoroughly in the tables below. A smaller subset of themes attached to the L source are actually quite in keeping with Qⁿ (prayer, wealth/poverty, begging, patrons and beneficiaries, house-settings, son/daughter of Abraham, concluding pronouncement about faith/salvation/justification).

According to the standard edition of the L source, passages that can be confidently ascribed to the L source are Luke 3.10-14, 4.25-37, 7.11-15, 7.36-50, 10.30-37a, 10.39-42, 11.5b-8, 12.35-38, 13.1b-5, 13.6b-9, 13.10-17b, 13.31b-32, 14.2-5, 14.8-10, 14.12-14, 14.28-32, 16.1b-8a, 16.19-31, 17.7-10, 17.12-18, 18.2-8a, 18.10-14a, 19.2-10. Passages considered as possibly from the L source are [12.16b-20], [15.4-6], [15.8-9], and [15.11-32].

Table. L Source Texts Repartitioned, Part 1

SQE Shorthand	Qⁿ / Gos. Marcion	LLkR
A014 John's Protreptic	3.10-14 unattested, though indirectly attested as not present, along with all of 3.2-20	3.10-14 has ethical/philosophical dialogue with questions and answers and several additional groups characters, "crowds" (v10), "tax collectors" (v12), and "soldiers" (v14), who speak collectively
A033 Sermon at Nazareth	4.25-26 unattested; and 4.27 (which <i>only references Elisha, not Elijah, and Namaan the Syrian, not widows</i>) is found before 17.14	4.25-27 makes a complementary synkrisis between Elijah and Elisha, accentuates healing and kindness to foreigners, focuses on a widow, exhibits learned and creative use of the LXX to supply historical, geographical, and chronological details (v25) and makes an Elijah-Jesus parallel
A086 Widow's Son Raised	7.11, 13 unattested; 7.12, 14-15 attested "but no insight into wording can be gained;" ⁵⁴ apparently had a widow and a healing	7.11, 13 adds place reference (a town called Nain) and a "large crowd", and exhibits learned and creative use of the LXX to create or expand the Elijah-Jesus parallel
A114 Woman Anoints Jesus	7.36-38, 44-48, 50 has "Pharisee's house" (v36), "sinner woman" (v37) who is "standing by the feet" of Jesus and who "anoints them with her tears" (v38), a summation (v44-46), and a final pronouncement "your faith has saved you" (v50) as a conclusion	7.36-50 adds hospitality language (v36-37), healing oil / "alabaster jar of ointment" (v37), Pharisee's doubt (v39), ethical dialogue and synkrisis in two debtors story within a story (v40-43), ethical dialogue and synkrisis in story's lesson (v44-47), dialogical question about forgiveness of sins (v49), focus on a pious woman as a disciple of Jesus
A183 Good Samaritan	10.30-37 unattested, along with all of 10.29-42	10.30-37 has opening narrative journey and place (Jericho), dramatization, plot crisis, ethical character synkrisis, several characters, love in practice, healing oil, kindness to foreigners, a Samaritan positively portrayed, all framed as a parable narrated as a story within a story
A184 Mary and Martha	10.39-42 unattested, along with all of 10.29-42	10.39-42 has multiple characters, hospitality protocols, a complaint made to Jesus, ethical/philosophical dialogue, ethical character synkrisis, and a focus on women as disciples
A186 Importunate Friend at Midnight	11.6 unattested; 11.5, 7-8 has a story with one character begging food from a "friend", a house-patron who is shamed into giving	11.6 adds hospitality protocols and a third character as the reason for the request
A200 Rich Fool	12.17-18 unattested; 12.16b, 19-20 has story about a rich man whom god says will die	12.17-18 adds ethical/philosophical internal reflection and self-dialogue

⁵⁴ See Roth, 416.

Table. L Source Texts Repartitioned, Part 2

SQE Shorthand	Qⁿ / Gos. Marcion	LLkR
A203 Watchfulness and faithfulness	12.35-38 has readiness to receive and protect a house-patron	12.36 notes haste (to open the door); 12.37 describes the master serving the slaves, perhaps evoking John 13
A207 Repentance or destruction	13.1-5 not present, along with all of 13.1-9	13.1b-5
A208 Crippled woman healed	13.14-16 has “daughter of Abraham”	13.10-13, 17
A212 Warning against Herod		13.31b-32
A214 Dropsy man healed Dropsy		14.2-5
A215 Teaching on humility	14.12-14	14.8-10
A217 Conditions of discipleship		14.28-32
A219 Lost sheep parable	15.4-6	
A220 Lost coin parable	15.8-9	
A221 Lost son parable		15.11-32
A222 Unjust stewards parable	16.2, 4-7	16.1, 3

Table. L Source Texts Repartitioned, Part 3

SQE Shorthand	Qⁿ / Gos. Marcion	LLkR
A228 Dives and Lazarus	16.19-31 has synkrisis on ethics of wealth and poverty, begging food, afterlife depiction, and father/child language for Abraham/Lazarus	-----
A232 Unprofitable Servants	-----	17.7-10 has hospitality and slavery ethics
A233 10 Lepers Cleansed	17.11-12, 4.27, 17.14-19 has “Samaria” (v11) and “Samaritan” (v16), highlights gratitude (v18), concluding pronouncement “your faith has saved you” (v19)	17.11 adds opening narrative journey and place: “going to Jerusalem” and “Galilee”
A236 Unjust Judge Parable	18.1-3, 5, 7 has focus on prayer (v1), characters of judge (v2) and poor widow (v3), widow’s persistence (v5), God’s help (v7); v8 is not attested, but its climactic pronouncement about “justice” and question “when the son of man comes” fits Q ⁿ better than LLkR	18.4, 6, 8 adds ethical/philosophical dialogue, both internal (v4) and external (v6, 8), “fear of god” (v4),
A237 Pharisee and Publican	18.10-14a has “Pharisee” and “tax collector” characters (v10), synkrisis of contrasting prayers (v11-13), and concluding pronouncement about with tax collector “going down... justified” (v14)	18.9, 14b adds narrative ethical and explanatory introduction to parable (v9) and an ethical summation / climactic pronouncement (v14b)
A265 Zacchaeus	19.2, 6, 8-10 has “Zacchaeus” (v2) who “welcomed” Jesus (v6), made pledges of charity and restitution (v8), likely (though unattested) the “son of Abraham” reference (v9), and “son of man” “saving the lost” concluding pronouncement (v10)	19.1, 3-5, 7 adds narrative opening referring to “Jericho” (v1), dramatization about the crowd and climbing a tree to see Jesus (v3-4), focus on hospitality (v5) and hurrying (v5-6), complaint of onlookers against Jesus (v7)

Other passages in Luke that are conspicuously absent from *Gos. Marcion* only strengthen this case for the consistent work of the redactor of Late Luke, rather than a self-consistent underlying L source. This includes the entirety of the infancy and passion material that scholars have not included as part of the L source.

Table. Infancy/Introductory Narratives Not Present in *Gos. Marcion*

SQE Shorthand	<i>Gos. Marcion</i>	LLkR
A001 Prologue	Not present	1.1-4
A002 John's Birth Foretold	Not present	1.5-25
A003 Annunciation	Not present	1.26-38
A004 Visitation	Not present	1.39-56
A005 John's Birth	Not present	1.57-80
A007 Jesus's Birth	Not present	2.1-7
A008 Adoration of Jesus	Not present	2.8-20
A009 Circumcision/Presentation at Temple	Not present	2.21-38
A012 Boy Jesus at Temple	Not present	2.41-52
A019 Genealogy	Not present	3.23-28

Table. Late Luke Redactional Tendencies in the Infancy/Introductory Narratives

SQE	A001	A002	A003	A004	A005	A007	A008	A009	A012	A019
Feature Chapter.Verse	1.1-4	1.4-25	1.26-38	1.39-56	1.57-80	2.1-7	2.8-20	2.21-38	2.41-52	3.23-38
Climactic Pronouncement		X	X	X						
Complaint against Protagonist		X			X				X	
Crowds/Multitudes/Assemblies		X			X	X	X		X	
Deference to Authority/Procedure	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	
Dramatization		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Ethical/Philosophical Discourse		X	X						X	
Expanded Storytelling		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Female Disciple Piety		X	X	X	X	X	X	X		
Historiography/Genealogy	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Jewish Ritual/Temple Piety		X	X		X			X	X	X
Literacy of Jesus and Followers	X	X		X				X	X	X
LXX Devotion/Use	?	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Matthean Influence	?	X	X	?		X	X	X		X
Multiple Characters		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Narrative Journey and Place		X	X	X		X	X	X	X	
Oracular-Poetic Speech		X	X	X	X		X	X		
Salvation History Fulfillment	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Story within Story		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Synkrisis of Characters		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	

Table. Passion Passages/Verses Not Present or Unattested in *Gos. Marcion*

SQE Shorthand	<i>Gos. Marcion</i>	LLkR
A270 Jesus Weeps over Jerusalem	Not present (as part of 19.29-46)	19.41-44
A316 Two Swords	Not present	22.35-38
A337 Jesus before Herod	23.6, 10-12 unattested	23.6, 10-12
A338 Pilate Declares Jesus Innocent	23.13-16 unattested	23.13-16
A343 Road to Golgotha	23.27-31 unattested, 23.32 only “two criminals”	23.27-31
A344 Crucifixion	23.39-42 unattested; 23.43 not present	23.39-43
A355 Emmaus Road	24.17, 20, 22-24, 27-29, 32-35 unattested; 13-16, 18-19, 21a, 25-26, 30-31 attested minimally	24.13-35
A365 Last Words and Ascension	24.44-46, 48-53 unattested	24.44-53

Table. Late Luke Redactional Tendencies in the Passion and Resurrection Narratives

SQE	A270	A316	A337	A338	A343	A344	A355	A365
Feature Chapter.Verse	19.41-44	22.35-38	23.6-12	23.13-16	23.27-32	23.39-43	24.13-35	24.44-53
Climactic Pronouncement	X	X				X		
Complaint against Protagonist						X	X	
Crowds/Multitudes/Assemblies				X	X		X	
Deference to Authority/Procedure	X	X	X	X		X		X
Dramatization	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Ethical/Philosophical Discourse		X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Expanded Storytelling	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Female Disciple Piety					X		?	
Historiography/Genealogy	X		X	X	X			
Jewish Ritual/Temple Piety					X			X
Literacy of Jesus and Followers							X	X
LXX Quotations or Creative Use		X	X		X	X	X	X
Matthean Influence		X						X
Multiple Characters			X		X	X	X	
Narrative Journey and Place	X		X				X	X
Oracular-Poetic Speech	X				X	X	X	X
Salvation History Fulfillment	X	X	X		X	X	X	X
Story within Story		X	X			X	X	
Synkrisis of Characters			X	X		X	X	

Chapter. Rethinking the Historical Paul in the Light of Qⁿ

[We invite a specialist on Paul and Pauline scholarship to author this chapter, roughly in keeping with the outline below.]

Section and/or Table: Textual Connections between Paul's Writings and Qⁿ

Section: Paul's Portrayal of Himself, his Mission, and the Qⁿ Community

- Galatians:
 - Rebukes Peter for not being true to the vision of Qⁿ
 - Outdoes Jerusalem community's own practice of Qⁿ
-

Section: Women Leaders in Paul and Qⁿ

Section: Eucharistic Readings of Paul and Qⁿ

Qⁿ does not have any formal description of the ritual of the Lord's supper, as does Paul. Nevertheless, it does have a profound ethic of hospitality, generosity, and redistribution of food and wealth. While Paul's authentic writings contain the earliest account of the Lord's Supper, he inherited this tradition, apparently from the Jerusalem community. Paul's description of the Lord's Supper among his communities in Asia Minor and Greece certainly carried economic ramifications, even while Paul and his communities tended to recast the ritual as participation in a savior-cult more closely akin to those of Dionysus, Asclepius, or Mithras. While Qⁿ does not expressly describe the Lord's Supper of the Jerusalem community, *its entire Gospel can and should be considered a witness to the meaning and purpose of the central, dual symbolic and real practice of earliest followers of Jesus. Though Qⁿ lacks the Eucharistic ritual, it is the ultimate Eucharistic Gospel, not just in its sayings, but also its moral stories and calls to action.* This very same lived ethic is precisely what is described in Acts 2 as characteristic of the Jerusalem community of Jesus' first followers. Even the late 2nd or early 3rd century *Apostolic Traditions of Hippolytus* attests to the persistence of this economic ethic of collective aid and security as constitutive of the Lord's Supper.

Chapter. Rethinking the Epistle of James in Light of Qⁿ

[We welcome a specialist on James to author this chapter.]

Qⁿ as reconstructed now has more resonances with James (which is also likely a pre-70, pre-Markan text) than ever previously conceived...

Designation of Judean community of Jesus followers as the “Poor”

- Qⁿ is a textual appeal meant to circulate beyond the Jerusalem community and to bring back resources to that community

Chapter. Rethinking the Gospel of Mark in Light of Qⁿ (70s)

[Bilby welcomes a specialist on the Gospel of Mark to co-author this chapter, expanding it and providing editing and footnotes to the history of scholarship.]

Confirming and reordering a few passages from Qⁿ is one thing. It is something entirely different to call for the complete removal of numerous passages from Qⁿ and the inclusion of numerous passages within Qⁿ, all overturning long-held assumptions and conclusions in New Testament scholarship. We can only imagine that these excisions and additions, made not with a pen-knife or choir-stitchings but instead with detailed analysis and careful argumentation, come as a complete shock to many scholars. Even considered in isolation from any other texts, the historical and literary consequences of these changes to Qⁿ are truly monumental and far-reaching.

While Qⁿ should certainly be read and appreciated on its own terms by the general public and scholars alike—precisely what we aimed to facilitate in chapters 6 and 7—that does not mean it should be studied or interpreted in isolation from the other texts of its time and area. A fresh comparison of Qⁿ with the epistle of James, for example, would lend many new insights.

But our second focal text here must and will be the next known gospel written, the gospel that later went by the name of Peter's disciple Mark, a gospel composed around 70 CE or perhaps sometime later that decade. While chapter two above showed how *Gos. Marcion* draws upon Mark and Qⁿ as distinct sources, it is important to go one step further and ask about the relationship between Qⁿ and Mark apart from other later texts and traditions.

Now that Qⁿ is clearly in focus for the first time in history, we can set it cleanly alongside the Gospel of Mark and compare and contrast the two. The more carefully we consider specific narrative details and themes and patterns unique to each text, the more clear it becomes that Mark not only knew Qⁿ and borrowed from it in a positive way, but Mark also aggressively undermined and counter-programmed against Qⁿ in a composition that by turns masterful and misogynistic, creative and cunning.

Qⁿ had no preface about John the Baptist, nothing introducing him, nothing narrating his preaching of repentance, and nothing detailing his messianic proclamation. Qⁿ was, simply put, not a text about John the Baptist, nor one that indicated any felt need of explaining Jesus vis-à-vis John the Baptist. Qⁿ was simply, elegantly, and thoroughly a text about Jesus, first, last and foremost. Qⁿ thus evinces no impulse to stage or upstage John the Baptist as a rival (potential or real) to Jesus.

It is not that John the Baptist is completely absent from Qⁿ, nor that Marcion later deleted this figure from his version of Luke as part of an effort to carry out a of grudge against a figure from Jewish history. It is simply the case that John the Baptist is not a major player in the Qⁿ script; he actually does not do anything at all. He is simply a topic of discussion, a popular religious

and/or revolutionary figure whom the Jesus of Qⁿ presumes his audience knew and about whom they were curious, if not supportive. [Is the death of the Baptist narrated in Qⁿ?]

John specifically appears in Qⁿ materials in *Gos. Marcion*, just much later in the story than we might expect, specifically in Luke / Qⁿ 7.24, 26-28. Jesus first poses a question about John (v24), describes him as a “prophet” (v26) and declares that “there is no one born of women who is greater than John” (v28). If v27 was indeed part of *Gos. Marcion* and thus Qⁿ), Jesus also quotes LXX (a rarity in Qⁿ) to declare that Jesus is the lord’s “messenger” who will “prepare his way.”

This brief discussion of the Baptist’s significance likely inspired the Gospel of Mark using these motifs. Yet the Gospel of Mark takes the Qⁿ Baptist traditions in a completely new direction, adopting it as the opening salvo and structuring principle of its introduction. Thus in the history of extant Jesus traditions, it is not Q but the Gospel of Mark that pioneers the narrative presentation of John the Baptist as a potential rival whose identity and mission center on preparing the way for Jesus as the messiah, verifying his messianic identity, and participating in the start of his public ministry by administering baptism as a ritual of initiation, if not repentance.

Qⁿ, on the other hand, has no baptism of Jesus at all. Jesus is not introduced as a one-time follower of John the Baptist or as being part of a shared movement or as having any relationship to John to explain his ministry and teachings. Qⁿ is not only missing any baptism for Jesus, it also shows no indication of a felt need to explain this lack of baptism, a discomfort seen acutely in the Gospel of John and its elaborate portrayal of John the Baptist’s testimony to Jesus that steps daintily around saying that John had actually baptized Jesus. In Qⁿ Jesus is not expected to take part in any rite of initiation for himself or as a model for his followers. There is no public anointing or even recognition of Jesus as the Messiah before he begins his public teachings.

Qⁿ also has no temptation of Jesus. It shows no concern to narrate the life of Jesus as an overt replaying of the history of his ancient forebears in the wilderness. It has no solitary ascetic journey for him to take, no extended period of fasting, no combative dialogue with Satan, nor any spiritual challenge Jesus must surmount to demonstrate his messianic identity, prove his faithfulness, or realize his mission. The Jesus of Qⁿ is never described as a sinner, nor does it care a whit to defend him as sinless. Now that we have established that the extended, threefold temptation narrative is a originally

It was the Gospel of Mark, then, that pioneered a written account of the temptation of Jesus. This version is brief, yet it holds a lot of significance, illustrating perhaps several of the themes detailed in the paragraph above. The extended version of the temptation is not a pre-Markan, Q tradition, but instead a Matthean original creation that was closely followed yet also reworked by Late Luke.

Qⁿ also lacks lots of other content, but many of these smaller passages and sayings found across Luke 6-14 have already been questioned by other scholars in their effort to challenge Q in its entirety and argue for Luke’s dependence on Matthew as its source for such materials.

The addition of several passages to Q has probably already come as a shock to many. The significance of these additions becomes all the more astonishing and poignant when considered alongside the discussion above about the passages that were removed.

Qⁿ does have an opening, but it apparently takes place in Nazareth and involves some altercation between Jesus and the people of his hometown. It is fascinating that the opening line of this opening narrative in Qⁿ comes right out of the fables of Aesop, “Physician, heal yourself!” Equally fascinating is that the next scene in Qⁿ recalls the *Life of Aesop*, how the people of Delphi executed Aesop for blasphemy by throwing him off of a cliff.⁵⁵ The Jesus of Qⁿ is introduced straightaway as a new Aesop, someone whose offensive speech gets him (almost? actually?) thrown off a cliff. Mark, again likely showing a knowledge of Qⁿ, relocates the hometown rejection to much later into the ministry of Jesus, and Matthew follows suit.⁵⁶ Likely preferring not to begin the ministry of Jesus with a story of hometown rejection, but instead of spiritual warfare in a synagogue, the author of Mark puts Jesus first in the city of Capernaum. While Early Luke knows the Capernaum tradition and borrows it from Mark, it preserves the Qⁿ Nazareth story as well, relocating it after the Capernaum narrative. Interestingly, Late Luke proved more faithful to Qⁿ than did Early Luke in this regard, preserving the frame of the first scene of the ministry of Jesus as a confrontation in his hometown of Nazareth, even while tying it together with a later tradition in Qⁿ / Early Luke about the healing of lepers and expanding it amply from the LXX.

Several newly included stories about women followers and supporters of Jesus also stand out, especially toward the beginning of Qⁿ. After Jesus gives his opening, extended sermon, he raises a woman’s son from the dead (Qⁿ 7.12, 14-15), a woman anoints his feet with her tears (Qⁿ 7.36-38, 44-48, 50), and then notable women are said to support him (Qⁿ 8.2-3). Q scholars have often limited its materials—besides the preface about John—to sayings, teachings, and the rare miracle performed by Jesus, but not centered on other persons and their response to or support of Jesus. This has effectively, even if unintentionally excluded from our earliest Jesus texts and traditions some of the most important details we have about the earliest women followers of Jesus.

The raising of the woman’s son has been written off by scholars as not Q, but instead a later Lukan borrowing of the story of Elijah raising a widow’s son. While the LXX Elijah narrative details and sequence is certainly well in evidence in Late Luke, *Gos. Marcion* attests to a briefer and simpler version of this story, one perhaps still nodding to Jesus as a new Elijah, but not a story that takes pains to retell the LXX Elijah narrative in obvious detail. Let us briefly note here that this story has no clear parallel in the Gospel of Mark, perhaps because Mark endeavored to picture John the Baptist rather than Jesus as a new Elijah.

Qⁿ also fascinatingly next includes a shorter, simpler version of the woman anointing Jesus’s feet than what is found in Late Luke. In Qⁿ / *Gos. Marcion*, the woman only uses her own tears to wash the feet of Jesus. The woman is identified only as a sinner, and her action provokes

⁵⁵ Thomas E. Phillips and Margaret Froelich called attention to this Aesop imitation as evident in the Late Luke version of the inaugural sermon of Jesus in Nazareth.

⁵⁶ Mark 6.1-6a; Matt 13.53-58.

scandal. There is no alabaster jar of healing oil, no funerary language or setting, and no foreshadowing of a future death for Jesus.

In light of the lack of the Baptist or a baptism for Jesus, the significance of this Qⁿ story is mindblowing. Qⁿ has a *woman* as the one who anoints Jesus, i.e., *anoints him as the messiah*. She does so with her tears, not with a jar of oil customarily reserved for burial preparations, an idea that the Gospel of Mark introduced before it was copied by other gospels, including Late Luke. It was the redactor of Late Luke who imported the Markan/Matthean funerary-passion tradition back into its relatively early location in the Early Luke narrative. Late Luke essentially creates a composite narrative that expands the original story and material in new ways by tying it to broader salvation-historical themes, passion foreshadowing, and LXX antetexts.

The author of Mark, however, apparently knew this story from Qⁿ and sought to undermine, displace, and repurpose it entirely. In Mark, it is a man, John the Baptist, who baptizes and recognizes Jesus as the messiah, and it is God pictured as a father and a voice from heaven that declares Jesus the beloved son, the messiah. Mark apparently found it far too disruptable for Jesus to be anointed as the messiah by being washed in the tears of a “sinner woman.” Mark thus displaces this story from the beginning of Jesus’ ministry to the end, all the while recasting the story as a funerary preparation.

Qⁿ goes on in 8.2-3 to narrate a third successive passage focused on women, apparently a catalog of the names of women disciples and patrons, in particular mentioning the “wife of Herod’s foreman” (Qⁿ 8.3). Let the reader note, at this point in the Qⁿ narrative, no male disciples have been called, named, or mentioned, except perhaps the centurion of Qⁿ 7.2! The calling of male disciples certainly appears in *Gos. Marcion* 6.12-16, but that material as well as the descent from the mountain that follows (6.17, 19) is derived from Mark, not Q, though certainly reworked with some editorial skill by the redactor of Early Luke.

The Gospel of Mark not only leaves out this catalog of female disciples-patrons, but also counter-programs against it. Mark instead has Jesus, very early on in his ministry, calling and running through a catalog list of *twelve male* disciple names, all on a revelatory mountain and after a time of prayer no less. Mark thus forges a holy numerical connection between exclusively male leadership and divine revelation, solitary prayer, and salvation-history.

Viewed in the light of Qⁿ, the Markan project comes across as more profoundly misogynistic than ever imagined. Women’s stories are excluded and displaced. Their initiative and ingenuity and authority is dismissed. Their names and deeds of patronage are forgotten. They are no longer disciples nor apostles. They are either pictured as crazy, like Jesus’s own mother, or they play a sanctioned, prescribed role as devotees of the righteous deceased, not real disciples. In the original, shorter ending of Mark, the women who witness the empty tomb only flee in terror. The women followers of Jesus are not real disciples, and certainly not apostles. They are scared and silenced.

Given what war does to female bodies and the radical displacement of the Jerusalem community of Jesus followers during the Jewish War, the historical setting of the Gospel of Mark is significant, but such redactional work goes well beyond mere social and environmental factors.

Through its thoroughly anti-Qⁿ composition, the Gospel of Mark endeavored to displace and even erase the memory of the early women leaders, disciples and patrons of Jesus. Scholars frequently downplay the *Gospel of Mary* as apocryphal and filled with fictive dialogue (as if the so-called canonical Gospels and Acts are free of this!), but in light of the Qⁿ-Mark relationship, *Mary* certainly has a kernel of historical truth.

Chapter. Rethinking Early Luke in Light of Qⁿ

[We invite a specialist in the Gospel of Luke to author this chapter, making use of the basic outline of contents below.]

Early Luke's opening may seem meager alongside Matthew, John, or Late Luke, but it is still meaningful and coherent. It begins with its own distinctive statement of historical setting (3.1). It then defers to Mark by having Jesus begin his public ministry in a Capernaum synagogue (4.31-35). Apparently the redactor of Early Luke preferred the Markan setting of Capernaum for Jesus' first sermon instead of the rejection at Nazareth in Qⁿ.

Immediately after that, Early Luke reverts back to Qⁿ, to Jesus is in his hometown of Nazareth (4.16). In essence, the compiler/redactor of Early Luke (*Gos. Marcion*) announced its two sources at the outset: Mark and Qⁿ. As we saw in chapter two, the remainder of *Gos. Marcion* follows those sources closely. Still, it is fascinating that the redactor of Late Luke restored the Nazareth rejection as the opening of Jesus' public ministry. Apparently its value in modeling Jesus as a dual Aesop-Elijah figure was paramount for the redactor of Late Luke. To reply tongue in cheek to Sandmel's critique of MacDonald, we can conceive of no better advertisement of literary modeling and antetextual hybridity than what Late Luke offers in the inaugural Nazareth sermon. But we digress.

Table: Early Luke's Deliberate Neglect of Mark (Not Present)

- No Elijah introduction
- No Baptist preface: no baptism, no temptation, no preaching by John, no ministry in Galilee
- No temptation
- Withering of fig tree A275
- Jesus mocked by soldiers A342
- Jesus derided on the cross A345

Table: Early Luke's Deliberate Neglect of Mark (Unattested)

Table: Early Luke's Use of Mark

Section: The Sources, Models, Frames, and Redactional Tendencies of Early Luke

- Preserves order in sources (A048 and A049 in Early Luke quite likely follows Markan order)
- Does careful redactional work to stitch Mark into Q, then Q back into Mark, and so on; Luke 6:12-20a // Mark 3:7-19a is a great example of this
- EL redactor adds little original material or creative content of his own; reproduces his two sources closely, alternating back and forth; to put it differently, all the creative storytelling in Luke is either Q or CLR
- Prayer / vigil keeping

Section: Synthesizing Qⁿ and Mark (Anti-Qⁿ)

- Does not follow Mark in adopting John the Baptist frame
- Does follow Mark in putting Capernaum before Nazareth
- Keeps the Nazareth/Aesop tradition
- Follows Mark in putting calling of male disciples first, but keeps Qⁿ female disciple/patron traditions
- Etc.

Chapter. Rethinking the Gospel of Matthew (90s) in Light of Qⁿ

[We invite a specialist in the Gospel of John to author this chapter, making use of the basic outline below.]

Section: Did Matthew Use Qⁿ on its Own or via Early Luke?

Early Luke was certainly a two-source Gospel, a combination of Mark and Qⁿ. Early Luke harmonizes these sources, but in a fairly minimal and rudimentary way. Matthew is also a harmonization of Mark and Qⁿ, but in what way? Is Matthew engaged in its own new harmonization of Mark and Qⁿ apart from early Luke or in dependence on early Luke? To put it differently, is Matthew a fresh and unique recombination of Mark and Qⁿ, or is Matthew a massive retelling, representation, and expansion of Early Luke? To put a fine point on it, does Matthew show clear evidence of using Early Luke?

Section and/or Table: Matthew's Radical Harmonization of Qⁿ Mark

Matthew is essentially a massive program radically harmonizing Qⁿ and Mark. It adopts the majority of Markan narrative frame, but then thoroughly recompiles Qⁿ material and reorganizes its content. In keeping with our proposal in chapter three, it is all the more clear now that Matthean order should hardly ever be retroactively imposed on Q, nor should its many doublets and repetitions overly complicate the reconstruction of the text of Qⁿ.

Section and/or Table: Matthew's Use of Qⁿ vs. Use of Early Luke: Adoptions, Dismissals, Transformations

- Adoption: beatitudes, etc; Dismissal: woes, etc.; Transformations

Section: Matthew as Rival to Early Luke's Qⁿ-Mark Harmonization

Section and/or Table: Original Matthean Creations

- Major Creations:
 - o Genealogy
 - o Infancy Narrative
 - o Adoration of Infant Jesus
 - o John Preaching Repentance

- Threefold Temptation Narrative! (Wisdom of Solomon and Assumption of Moses influences)
- Smaller Redactions: House on the Rock, Language about treasure, heaven, God as father

Section: Reconsidering Matthean Parables in Light of Qⁿ Parables

- Sheep and the Goats as Rival to Dives and Lazarus, etc.

Section: How Qⁿ Helps Us Appreciate Matthean Creativity w/out Matthean Priority

Chapter. Rethinking the Gospels of John (100s-110s) in Light of Qⁿ

[We invite a specialist in the Gospel of John to author this chapter, making use of the basic outline below.]

Section and/or Table: Early John's Use of Qⁿ?

Section and/or Table: Early John's Use of Mark (Anti-Qⁿ)?

Section and/or Table: Early John's Use of Early Luke

- Miraculous Catch of Fish
- Healing of Centurion's Boy
- Feeding of Five Thousand?
- Washing of Disciples Feet?

Section and/or Table: Early John's Use of Matthew

Section and/or Table: Late John's Socratic Response to Pliny

- Tempering Bacchic images and tropes with Socratic ones: Socratic/Platonic introduction, Socratic discourses, Socratic passion (*mors philosophi*)

Chapter. Rethinking the Late Gospel of Luke (117-138) in Light of Qⁿ

[Bilby invites a co-author for this chapter who will handle history of research and footnotes.]

Many of the Late Luke redactions we have noted correspond to those already pointed out by Tyson, particularly those for which Marcion's detractors say no text or tradition is present. The redaction to Late Luke in our view is certainly a early-orthodox and almost certainly an anti-Marcionite undertaking that took place, together with the composition of Acts, sometime during the reign of emperor Hadrian. It transforms the story of Jesus into a model of Hadrian's Panhellenion, an exemplar of historical, tribal, ethnic, and ecclesiastical reconciliation through education. It is surpassingly erudite and literarily brilliant. Transcending all previous Gospel compositions and versions, it draws on an enormous variety of Greco-Roman philosophical, epic and dramatic sources, elevating Jesus and his implied audience of followers to an elite status in Greco-Roman provincial settings.

Section: Hadrianic Setting for Acts and the Lukan Redactions

- Summarize recently history of scholarship calling for dating Acts well into the 2nd century; some scholars have included Luke in this, and some not; aim to show that the Lukan Redactions clearly belong in the same literary and historical framework as Acts
- Use of Josephus in Acts
- Use of a collection of Paul's letters in Acts
- Use of Pliny the Younger in Acts
- Use of Euripidean drama in Lukan Redactions and Acts
- Use of Plinian tropes and counter-Plinian responses: Bacchic to Socratic pattern
- Gospel sources (below)

Table: High Confidence Later Lukan Redactions (= Not Present in *Gos. Marcion*)

- Infancy Narratives
 - o Priestly family and ancestry; John the Baptist as cousin; signals of aristocracy, yet born in humility and secrecy as a political rival
 - o John's priestly lineage; // Josephus' Essenes, priests in the desert
 - o Jewish ritual and temple piety; circumcision of Jesus
 - o Ion-like birth
 - o Augustus-like mother, virgin birth, and double-divine paternity
 - o Brilliant child and literate, educated adult
 - o Step beyond Matthew and toward *Infancy Gospel of Thomas* and *Protoevangelium of James*
- Iphigenia-like resurrection, recognition, and ascension

- Apostles' Jewish temple piety

Table: Moderate Confidence Lukan Redactions (= Unattested in Marcion)

Research redaction-critical studies of Luke; see how much of their findings align with the two major versions of Luke hypothesis

- Imprisonment for preaching the gospel, happens immediately to John the Baptist apparently in consequence for his preaching about Jesus
- Philosophical instruction and modeling
 - o Dionysian to Socratic antetextual patterns
 - o Baptismal mystagogy/instruction; similar to Justin and Apostolic Traditions
- Jesus as New Elijah
- Socrates-like death
- Officially Declared Innocent; declaration makes the crucifixion illegitimate, Pilate gave into mob justice after knowing he should have followed proper legal proceedings, makes Pilate look like an inept or weak Roman official, capitulates to mob rule instead of standing up for Roman law and justice

Section and/or Table: The Reception of Matthew in Late Luke and Acts

- Genealogy
- John the Baptist
- Nativity
- Adoration of Infant Jesus
- Childhood in Nazareth
- Temptation
- House on the Rock
- Cursed Death of Judas (Matthew // Acts)
- Look up additional problematic passages noted by scholars and see how they are resolved, and perhaps note paraphrases and verbatim parallels w/out doing full synopsis.

Section and/or Table: Neglect of or Disagreements with Mark and Matthew in Late Luke

- Some are continuation of EL's neglect of Mark
- Matthean Flight to Egypt
- Markan and Matthean Withering of Fig Tree A275
- Markan and Matthean mocking of soldiers A342
- Markan and Matthean ridiculing of Jesus A346

Section and/or Table: Late Luke's and Acts' Use of the Gospel of John

- See my CMG chapter
- Judas and Satan
- Socratic account of Jesus' death
- Peace be with you
- Tangible post-resurrection body
- Imparting of Holy Spirit
- Three Sayings on the Cross
- Retelling of Bandit Story; also influenced by EvPet

Section and/or Table: Ambiguous Source Relationships

- Emmaus Road and Ascension: Longer Ending of Mark dependent on Early Luke or Late Luke? Or is Late Luke dependent on the longer ending of Mark? More likely the first

Part 4. Rethinking Everything Else in Light of These Reconstructions

Chapter: Rethinking History from 70 to 138 in Light of These Reconstructions

[We invite a specialist in first and second century Christian history to author this chapter.]

Chapter: Rethinking Early Characterizations of the Gospels and Their Writers in Light of These Reconstructions

[We invite a specialist in 2nd century Christian history to author this chapter.]

Section: Papias

Section: Justin Martyr

Section: Irenaeus

Section: Muratorian Fragment

Section: The Anti-Marcionite Prologues

Chapter: Rethinking Early Gospel Manuscripts in Light of These Reconstructions

[We invite a specialist in 2nd and 3rd century Gospel manuscripts to author this chapter.]

Chapter: Rethinking Gospel Studies in These Reconstructions

[We invite a specialist on the Gospels to author this chapter.]

Chapter: Rethinking the History of Marcionism and Anti-Marcionism in Light of These Reconstructions

[We invite a specialist in Marcionite texts and traditions to author this chapter.]

Future Books: Rethinking All of Christian History in Light of These Reconstructions

[Unfortunately, we have to end our book somewhere, so this serves as the cutoff point as well as an open invitation for anyone and everyone to write books, articles, and chapters about Q^n .]

Rethinking the Future of Gospel Studies in Light of These Reconstructions

A Digital Humanities Proposal for Dynamic Synoptic Modeling

[We invite graduate students to contribute Greek/English parallel sets to include in this chapter. We also welcome software developers, web designers, and graphic designers to contact us about building this DH platform and contributing to this chapter.]

Let us end where our introduction said we would, by noting how textual influence can run in myriad directions. What follows is a partial list of possible transmission paths that a tradition (a textual signal) could take across the various Gospels, a list that does not include Early John (100s), Late John (110s), or Late Mark (date?).

Qⁿ-Originated Traditions

1. Qⁿ (50-65) to Early Luke (80s) (not in Matthew, Late Luke, or John)
2. Qⁿ (50-65) to Matthew (90s) (not in Late Luke)
3. Qⁿ (50-65) to Early Mark (70s) (not in Early Luke, Matthew or Late Luke)
4. Qⁿ (50-65) to Early Mark (70s) to Matthew (90s) (not in Late Luke)
5. Qⁿ (50-65) to Early Mark (70s) to Matthew (90s) to Late Luke (117-138)
6. Qⁿ (50-65) to Early Mark (70s) to Early Luke (80s) (not in Matthew or Late Luke)
7. Qⁿ (50-65) to Early Mark (70s) to Early Luke (80s) (not in M
8. Qⁿ (50-65) to Early Early Luke (80s) to Matthew (90s) (not Late Luke)
9. Qⁿ (50-65) to Early Early Luke (80s) to Late Luke (117-138) (not in Matthew)
10. Qⁿ (50-65) to Early Early Luke (80s) to Matthew (90s) to Late Luke (117-138)
11. Qⁿ (50-65) to Late Luke (117-138)

Early Mark-Originated Traditions

12. Early Mark (70s) to Early Luke (80s) (not in Matthew or Late Luke)
13. Early Mark (70s) to Early Luke (80s) to Matthew (90s) (not in Late Luke)
14. Early Mark (70s) to Early Luke (80s) to Matthew (90s) to Late Luke (117-138)
15. Early Mark (70s) to Early Luke (80s) to Late Luke (117-138) (not in Matthew)
16. Early Mark (70s) to Late Luke (117-138) (not in Early Luke or Matthew)
17. Early Mark (70s) to Matthew (90s) (not in Early Luke or Late Luke)
18. Early Mark (70s) to Matthew (90s) to Late Luke (117-138) (not in Early Luke)

Early Luke-Originated Traditions

19. Early Luke (80s) to Matthew (90s) to Late Luke (117-138)
20. Early Luke (80s) to Matthew (90s) (not in Late Luke)
21. Early Luke (80s) to Late Luke (117-138) (not in Matthew)
22. Matthew (90s) to Late Luke (117-138)

Concept Board Prototyping

It may help to envision the earliest Gospels as a gravity-bound Plinko-board, but one where the sides are open and a new tradition can enter at any level. As the most general level, here is what that Plinko board looks like:

Qⁿ (50-65)

Mark (70s)

Early Luke (80s): Qⁿ + Mark

Matthew (90s): Qⁿ + Mark + Early Luke

Early John (100s): Qⁿ + Mark + Early Luke + Matthew

Late John (110s): Qⁿ + Mark + Early Luke + Matthew

Late Luke + Acts (117-138): Qⁿ + Mark + Early Luke + Matthew + Early/Late John

Late Mark (130s-140s?): Mark + Matthew + Early Luke + Early/Late John + Late Luke + Acts

Late Late John (130s-140s?): Qⁿ + Mark + Early Luke + Matthew + Early/Late John + Late Luke
+ Acts (add. *Adulturae*)

Each tradition then takes on a life of its own in the history of the reception of these texts as they are individually and collectively taken as sacred. To be fully immersed in this eclectic conversation, yet to contribute something new, that is how new receptions are created, preserved, and later expanded.

Articulating the Problem

We have catalogued and demonstrated dozens of different paths a tradition could take through the various, winding paths of the first hundred years or so after Jesus. The fluidity in these textual transmissions certainly owes something to orality and the relative reliability of human memory. By the same turn, orality does not fully explain and certainly does not explain away the efforts and motivations of the redactors and compilers who produced these texts in their time, place, and historical and cultural setting. These traditions were indeed oral, but simultaneously textual (obviously, since we are reading and discussing them today). In antiquity there was little meaningful distinction between textuality and orality, since reading was done aloud, and copies were made by reading aloud. This was all the more the case in synagogues and early Christian churches, where most people encountered a text through hearing, not looking upon a page. Depending on their quality and annotation, texts were variously secure forms of orality, both in terms of performance and preservation.

One of the most profound deficiencies in studies of the Synoptic Problem and the interrelationships of the Gospels and their sources is the reliance on static models of textual transmission and static parallel visualizations and annotations of textual traditions. Given the training of Bible scholars in text criticism, it makes sense that we are inclined to draw genealogical relationships among these texts and map their genes, as it were, in a single downward direction. Some versions of the Gospel family tree, as it were, are simplistic, and some are for more complicated.

Even the standard online and software-based tools of our trade are massively deficient. Aligning and synchronizing texts in parallel columns (Logos, BibleWorks, Toronto Synopsis, etc.) is better than nothing, but it is wholly inadequate in terms of what is needed and what technology can make possible in this day and age.

The recent application of statistical analysis to Gospel studies and the Synoptic Problem is an important step, but it is still woefully inadequate, because it is too often confined by the naïve and unnuanced assumption of the integrity of these texts that were *very much still in flux* (both for reasons of orality and redactional freedom between one compiler/transmitter and the next).

Grammatical statistical analyses cannot overcome this, especially if the underlying historical reconstruction is wrong and the base texts themselves are pastiches. Genealogical relationship mapping can be useful on whole texts, but only if they are static and correctly defined.

Genealogical analyses of micro-traditions can be far more fruitful, so long as they are correctly located. These analyses could be machine-automated eventually, once the modeling is well-developed. But human participation and curation, input and testing will be necessary, at least for the first few years of the project.

Digital Humanities Proposal for Dynamic Synoptic Modeling

The overall approach that has to be adopted is a dynamic way of modeling and accounting for the variegated flow of textual information from one textual compiler to the next. It needs to go far beyond typical font-type indications (bold, italics, underlining) presented in static columns. Instead it needs to take a multivalent, dynamic, object-oriented approach to each tradition. The platform could gamified on Zooniverse or a comparable platform to allow for crowd-participation and perhaps even crowd-sourcing of inputs.

In our view, this could be readily and rapidly achieved through a formal Digital Humanities project with \$1M-\$2M in funding. Christianity is a religion with two billion adherents. In the US, Christian Fundamentalists are too often the ones driving and funding the popular narrative, but doing so on false premises, whether to further Young Earth Creationism, to seek after the mythical Original Autographs of Biblical Manuscripts, or to use public dollars to fund private confessional Christian education, which only perpetuates ignorance, both about science and about Christianity. These multi-million dollar boondoggles and multi-billion dollar allocations of taxpayer money only serve to spread disinformation and encourage fraud, as shown in the exposé in the *Atlantic* by Ariel Sabar about the Green (Hobby Lobby) family's millions spent to acquire stolen, falsified papyri. These kinds of highly public tourist traps are bad for Christianity and especially bad for society. Competing investments in a technologically and scientifically equipped platform that can analyze and elucidate the very earliest Jesus texts and traditions, promote global public education and involvement in a typically isolated scholarly discourse, and integrate social justice, feminist, and post-colonial perspectives fully into the conversation about textual transmission—all this would revolutionize the study and practice of Christian origins while meaningfully serving the common good.

Now we speak to our fellow scholars. We, too, have distinguished academic pedigrees, faculty positions, reputations for solid academic work, and many well-reviewed, linguistically adept and technically sophisticated scholarly publications. But, our kindred in the guild, we are burying ourselves and our work in absurdly overcomplicated modes of discourse and publication. We need to shed light on the earliest Jesus texts and traditions, not obscure them in scholarly jargon that does more to veil real ignorance, feign intelligence, and mask insecurity than to open up these materials for the whole world to see aright. We need to make our discourse accessible to the whole world, not confine it to invitation only (white male primarily) elite institutions with endowed chairs, large research budgets, gangs of research assistants, privileged conferences, expensive dinners, publisher connections, and unaffordable volumes. Our habits of academic socialization are wholly out of step with the texts we devote our lives to studying, especially Qⁿ.

It's time to toss aside our old, worn old religious technocracies and instead bring new, shared, digital wineskins and barrels that Bacchus (or Jesus) can fill to the full. So, what grant-funder or venture capitalist is going to bring the wine or water needed to get this party started?

Last Word: Preaching Qⁿ for the Sake of Justice

[We invite a pastor/preacher, preferably a woman or trans person and a member of the LGBTQ community to author a closing sermon for our volume. We also plan to set up a webpage giving testimonials of impressions from people who have read Qⁿ for the first time and what it meant to them.]

Qⁿ is almost certainly a pre-70, pre-Markan text composed in Israel/Palestine, a text cherished by and representative of the community of Jesus' earliest followers there. Part of the reason for the title of this book and of Qⁿ as the "Gospel of the Poor" is that there was an actual social community of Jesus-followers in Jerusalem before 70 CE, a community whom Paul expressly calls "the poor." It is in their honor and their memory that this scholarly labor is offered.

If you see Qⁿ for what it is, your heart will be broken and never be the same again, because you will see the whole world filled with real people alienated from each other. If you see Qⁿ for what it is, you will see how health, wealth, status, ethnicity, religiosity, sex, gender, and power are so often arbitrary, artificial, mean, and destructive barriers that people use to cut themselves off from loving other people. In doing so, they are cut off from themselves in their own humanity and their own mortality, which is to be cut off from god, who is love, and who is worshipped simply and truly only when we love others, people made in the divine image. If you see Qⁿ for what it is, you will see the deepest humanistic text and vision ever composed.

If you have the eyes to see, then see. Believe the good news, the Gospel of the Poor.

Bibliography

[We invite graduate students to assist with the compilation of the bibliography and with standardizing bibliographic entries and footnotes according to our chosen manual of style.]

- Abakuks, Andris. 2012. "The Synoptic Problem: On Matthew's and Luke's Use of Mark." *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series a (Statistics in Society)* 175 (4): 959–75. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-985X.2011.01026.x>.
- Adams, Sean A, and Michael W Pahl, eds. *Issues in Luke-Acts: Selected Essays*. Gorgias Handbooks, 26. Piscataway, New Jersey: Gorgias Press, 2012.
- Barker, James W. *John's Use of Matthew*. Emerging Scholars. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2015.
- Batovici, Dan. 2009. "The Oxford Conference on the Synoptic Problem." *Currents in Biblical Research* 7 (2): 245–71. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1476993X08099544>.
- BeDuhn and Clivaz on P69 as a fragment of Marcion's Gospel
- BeDuhn, Jason. *The First New Testament: Marcion's Scriptural Canon*. Salem: Polebridge, 2013.
- Beers, Holly. *The Followers of Jesus As the Servant: Luke's Isaianic Model for the Disciples in Luke-Acts* (version First edition.). First ed. LNTS, 535. New York: Bloomsbury T & T Clark, 2015.
- Bilby, Mark G. "Pliny's Correspondence and the Acts of the Apostles: An Intertextual Relationship?," *Luke on Jesus, Paul and Christianity: What Did He Really Know?* Ed. J. Verheyden and J. S. Kloppenborg. BTS 29 (Leuven: Peeters, 2017), 147–69.
- Bilby, Mark G. "The First Dionysian Gospel: Imitational and Redactional Layers in Luke and John" In *Classical Models of the Gospels and Acts: Studies in Mimesis Criticism*, Claremont Studies in New Testament & Christian Origins 3, eds. Mark G. Bilby, Michael Kochenash, and Margaret Froelich (Claremont, CA: Claremont Press, 2018), 49-68.
- Bovon, François. 2002. *Luke: A Commentary on the Gospel of Luke 1:1-9:50*. Edited by Helmut Koester. Translated by Christine M Thomas. Vol. 1. Hermeneia--A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press.
- Bovon, François. 2013. *Luke 2 : A Commentary on the Gospel of Luke 9:51-19:27*. Edited by Helmut Koester. Translated by Donald S Deer. Hermeneia--A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press.
- Bredenhof, Reuben. *Failure and Prospect : Lazarus and the Rich Man (Luke 16:19-31) in the Context of Luke-Acts*. LNTS, 603. London, England: Bloomsbury Publishing, 2019.

- Burkett, Delbert Royce. 2009. *Rethinking the Gospel Sources*. Vol. 2, the Unity or Plurality of Q /. Society of Biblical Literature Early Christianity and Its Literature, No. 1. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.
- Burkett, Delbert. 2018. *The Case for Proto-Mark : A Study in the Synoptic Problem*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen Zum Neuen Testament, 399. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Burridge, Richard. 2013. *Four Gospels, One Jesus? : A Symbolic Reading*. New York: SPCK.
- Byrne, Brendan. 2015. *The Hospitality of God : A Reading of Luke's Gospel*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press.
- Carey G. 2013. "Moving Things Ahead: A Lukan Redactional Technique and Its Implications for Gospel Origins." *Biblical Interpretation* 21 (3): 302–19.
<https://doi.org/10.1163/15685152-1071A0002>.
- Carroll, John T, and Jennifer K Cox. *Luke : A Commentary*. New Testament Library. Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster John Knox Press, 2012.
- Catchpole, David R. 1993. *The Quest for Q*. Bloomsbury Academic Collections. Biblical Studies. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.
- Cowan, J. Andrew. 2019. *The Writings of Luke and the Jewish Roots of the Christian Way : An Examination of the Aims of the First Christian Historian in the Light of Ancient Politics, Ethnography, and Historiography*. LNTS 599. London: T & T Clark.
- Crabbe, Kylie. *Luke/Acts and the End of History*. Beihefte Zur Zeitschrift Für Die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, Volume 238. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2019.
- Crook, Zeba A. *Parallel Gospels: A Synopsis of Early Christian Writing*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- Damgaard, Finn. 2016. *Rewriting Peter As an Intertextual Character in the Canonical Gospels*. Copenhagen International Seminar. London: Routledge.
- Derico, T. M. 2016. *Oral Tradition and Synoptic Verbal Agreement : Evaluating the Empirical Evidence for Literary Dependence*. Eugene: Wipf and Stock.
- Dicken, Frank. *Herod As a Composite Character in Luke-Acts*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen Zum Neuen Testament. 2. Reihe, 375. Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck, 2014.
- Donaldson, Terence L. 1985. *Jesus on the Mountain : A Study in Matthean Theology*. JSNTSS 8. Sheffield, Eng.: JSOT Press.
- Dowling, Elizabeth V. 2007. *Taking Away the Pound : Women, Theology and the Parable of the Pounds in the Gospel of Luke*. The Library of New Testament Studies. London: Continuum International Pub. Group.

- Dupertuis, Ruben R, and Todd Penner. *Engaging Early Christian History : Reading Acts in the Second Century*. Bible World. London: Routledge, 2014.
- Engelbrecht, J. 1996. "Challenging the Two-Source Hypothesis: How Successful Are the Commentaries?" *Neotestamentica* 30 (1): 89–101.
- Eve, Eric. 2014. *Behind the Gospels: Understanding the Oral Tradition*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press.
- Foster, Paul, Gregory, Andrew F., Kloppenborg, John S., and Joseph Verheyden. 2011. *New Studies in the Synoptic Problem: Oxford Conference, April 2008: Essays in Honour of Christopher M. Tuckett*. BETL 239. Leuven: Peeters.
- Garrow A. 2016. "An Extant Instance of 'Q'." *New Testament Studies* 62 (3): 398–417. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688516000072>.
- Garrow A. 2016. "Streeter's 'Other' Synoptic Solution: The Matthew Conflator Hypothesis." *New Testament Studies* 62 (2): 207–26. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688515000454>.
- George, David G. 2009. "Jesus' Lack of Emotion in Luke : The Lukan Redactions in Light of the Hellenistic Philosophers." Dissertation. University of Notre Dame.
- Goodacre M. 2014. "Did Thomas Know the Synoptic Gospels? A Response to Denzey Lewis, Kloppenborg and Patterson." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 36 (3): 282–93. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0142064X14523523>.
- Goodacre, Mark S. 1996. *Goulder and the Gospels : An Examination of a New Paradigm*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament. Supplement Series, 133. Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Goodacre, Mark S. and Nicholas Perrin, eds. *Questioning Q: A Multidimensional Critique*. Grand Rapids: InterVarsity Press, 2005.
- Goodacre, Mark S. *The Case against Q: Studies in Markan Priority and the Synoptic Problem*. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 2002.
- Goodacre, Mark S. *The Gospel of Thomas: A Short Introduction*.
- Goodacre, Mark S. *The Synoptic Problem: A Way through the Maze*. Understanding the Bible and Its World. London: T&T Clark, 2001.
- Goodacre, Mark S. *Thomas and the Gospels: The Case for Thomas's Familiarity with the Synoptics*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2012.
- Harnack, Adolf von. *Marcion: Das Evangelium vom fremden Gott: Eine Monographie zur Geschichte der Grundlegung der katholischen Kirche*. 2nd ed. TU 45. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1924.
- Harris, Sarah. *The Davidic Shepherd King in the Lukan Narrative*. LNTS 558. New York: Bloomsbury T & T Clark, 2016.

- Hays, Christopher M. "Marcion vs. Luke: A Response to the *Plädoyer* of Matthias Klinghardt." *ZNW* 99.2 (2008): 213-32.
- Hays, Christopher M. *Renouncing Everything : Money and Discipleship in Luke*. New York: Paulist Press, 2016.
- Head, Peter. "The Foreign God and the Sudden Christ: Theology and Christology in Marcion's Gospel Redaction." *TynBull* 44 (1993): 307-21.
- Horman, John. 2011. *A Common Written Greek Source for Mark and Thomas*. Studies in Christianity and Judaism Series, 20. Waterloo, Ont.: Wilfrid Laurier University Press.
- Howell, Justin R. *The Pharisees and Figured Speech in Luke-Acts*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen Zum Neuen Testament. 2. Reihe, 456. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2017.
- Howes, Llewellyn. 2013. "'Placed in a Hidden Place' : Illuminating the Displacement of Q 11:33, 34-35." *Neotestamentica* 47 (2): 303–32.
- Howes, Llewellyn. 2015. "'Whomever You Find, Invite' : The Parable of the Great Supper (q 14:16-21, 23) and the Redaction of Q." *Neotestamentica* 49 (2): 321–50.
- Johnson, Luke Timothy. *Septuagintal Midrash in the Speeches of Acts*. The Père Marquette Lecture in Theology, 2002. Milwaukee, WI: Marquette University Press, 2002.
- Jones, Brice C. *Matthean and Lukan Special Material: A Brief Introduction with Texts in Greek and English*. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2011.
- Keith, Chris. 2009. *The Pericope Adulterae, the Gospel of John, and the Literacy of Jesus*. New Testament Tools, Studies and Documents, V. 38. Leiden: Brill.
- Kirk, Alan. 2012. "Orality, Writing, and Phantom Sources: Appeals to Ancient Media in Some Recent Challenges to the Two Document Hypothesis." *New Testament Studies* 58 (1): 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688511000257>.
- Kirk, Alan. 2016. *Q In Matthew : Ancient Media, Memory, and Early Scribal Transmission of the Jesus Tradition*. Library of New Testament Studies, 564. New York: Bloomsbury T & T Clark.
- Klinghardt, Matthias. "Markion vs. Lukas: Plädoyer für die Wiederaufnahme eines alten Falles." *NTS* 52 (2006): 484-513.
- Klinghardt, Matthias. 2008. "The Marcionite Gospel and the Synoptic Problem: A New Suggestion." *Novum Testamentum* 50 (1): 1–27.
- Klinghardt, Matthias. *Das älteste Evangelium und die Entstehung der kanonischen Evangelien*, 2 vols.. TANZ 60. Tübingen: Francke, 2015.
- Kloppenborg J.S. 2014. "A New Synoptic Problem: Mark Goodacre and Simon Gathercole on Thomas." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 36 (3): 199–239. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0142064X14520653>.

- Kloppenborg, John S, and Jozef Verheyden. 2014. *The Elijah-Elisha Narrative in the Composition of Luke*. Library of New Testament Studies, 493. London: Bloomsbury.
- Kloppenborg, John S. 2014. *Synoptic Problems : Collected Essays*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen Zum Neuen Testament, V. 329. Mohr Siebeck.
- Kloppenborg, John. 2014. "Gospel Parallels/Parallel Gospels." *Biblical Theology Bulletin: Journal of Bible and Culture* 44 (3): 156–61. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146107914540490>.
- Kloppenborg, John. *Q Parallels: Synopsis, Critical Notes, & Concordance*. Sonoma, CA: Polebridge Press, 1988.
- Kloppenborg, John. *Q, the Earliest Gospel: An Introduction to the Original Stories and Sayings of Jesus*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2008.
- Kyrychenko, Alexander. *The Roman Army and the Expansion of the Gospel : The Role of the Centurion in Luke-Acts*. Beihefte Zur Zeitschrift Für Die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, Volume 203. Boston: De Gruyter, 2014.
- Lehtipuu, Outi. 2007. *The Afterlife Imagery in Luke's Story of the Rich Man and Lazarus*. Supplements to Novum Testamentum, V. 123. Leiden: Brill.
- Licona, Mike. 2016. *Why Are There Differences in the Gospels? : What We Can Learn from Ancient Biography*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Lieu, Judith. *Marcion and the Making of a Heretic: God and Scripture in the Second Century*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015.
- Ling, Timothy J. M, and Society for New Testament Studies. 2006. *The Judean Poor and the Fourth Gospel*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series, 136. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- MacDonald, Dennis R. *Luke and the Politics of Homeric Imitation : Luke-Acts As Rival to the Aeneid*. Fortress Academic, 2018.
- MacDonald, Dennis Ronald. 2012. *Two Shipwrecked Gospels : The Logoi of Jesus and Papias's Exposition of Logia About the Lord*. Early Christianity and Its Literature, No. 8. Boston: Brill.
- MacDonald, Dennis Ronald. *Luke and Vergil : Imitations of Classical Greek Literature*. The New Testament and Greek Literature. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 2015.
- MacEwen, Robert K. 2015. *Matthean Posteriority : An Exploration of Matthew's Use of Mark and Luke As a Solution to the Synoptic Problem*. LNTS 501. New York: Bloomsbury T & T Clark.
- Malan, Gert J. 2014. "Is Rewritten Bible/Scripture the Solution to the Synoptic Problem?" *Hts Theologiese Studies/Theological Studies* 70.1:1-10. <https://thedtl.on.worldcat.org/oclc/7180313318>

- Mallen, Peter. 2007. *Reading and Transformation of Isaiah in Luke-Acts*. The Library of New Testament Studies. London: Continuum International Pub. Group.
- Massey, Michael Brandon, and David W Pao. 2016. "Did Luke Know Matthew? : A Source Critical Study of the Sermon on the Plain." Dissertation, ProQuest. Trinity Evangelical Divinity School.
- Matthews, Shelly. *First Converts : Rich Pagan Women and the Rhetoric of Mission in Early Judaism and Christianity*. Contraversions. Palo Alto: Stanford University Press, 2001.
- McCabe, David R. *How to Kill Things with Words : Ananias and Sapphira Under the Prophetic Speech-Act of Divine Judgment (Acts 4.32-5.11)*. Library of New Testament Studies, 454. London: T & T Clark International, 2011.
- McConnell, James R. *The Topos of Divine Testimony in Luke-Acts*. Eugene, Oregon: Pickwick Publications, 2014.
- McWhirter, Jocelyn. *Rejected Prophets : Jesus and His Witnesses in Luke-Acts*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2013.
- Metzger, James A. 2007. *Consumption and Wealth in Luke's Travel Narrative*. Biblical Interpretation Series, V. 88. Leiden: Brill.
- Miller, Amanda C. 2014. *Rumors of Resistance : Status Reversals and Hidden Transcripts in the Gospel of Luke*. Emerging Scholars. Minneapolis Minnesota: Fortress Press.
- Moll, Sebastian. *The Arch-Heretic Marcion*. WUNT 250. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010.
- Monaghan, Christopher John. 2017. "The Synoptic Problem: Where to from Here?" *Pacifica* 30.1:72–87. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1030570X17731796>.
- Mosbø, Thomas J. 2017. *Luke the Composer : Exploring the Evangelist's Use of Matthew*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press.
- Newsom, Carol A., Sharon H. Ringe, and Jacqueline E. Lapsley. *Women's Bible Commentary*. 3rd. ed. Louisville, Ky: Westminster John Knox Press, 2012.
- Nielsen, Jesper Tang, and Müller Mogens, eds. *Luke's Literary Creativity*. International Studies in Christian Origins. New York: Bloomsbury T & T Clark, 2016.
- Norelli, Enrico, and Averil Cameron. 2016. *Markion Und Der Biblische Kanon*. Hans-Lietzmann-Vorlesungen, Heft 11/15. Boston: De Gruyter.
- Norelli, Enrico. "Marcion et les disciples de Jésus." *Apocrypha* 19 (2008): 9-42.
- Parsons, Mikeal C. *Luke*. Paideia: Commentaries on the New Testament. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Academic, 2015.
- Phillips, Thomas E. *Reading Issues of Wealth and Poverty in Luke-Acts*. Studies in Bible & Amp; Early Christianity, V. 48. Lewiston: Edwin Mellen Press, 2000.

- Poirier, John C, and Jeffrey Peterson, eds. 2015. *Marcian Priority Without Q : Explorations in the Farrer Hypothesis*. Library of New Testament Studies, 455. London: Bloomsbury T & T Clark.
- Poirier, John C. 2008. "Statistical Studies of the Verbal Agreements and Their Impact on the Synoptic Problem *." *Currents in Biblical Research* 7 (1): 68–123.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1476993X08094025>.
- Poirier, John C. 2009. "The Synoptic Problem and the Field of New Testament Introduction." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 32 (2): 179–90.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0142064X09350960>.
- Reich, Keith A. 2011. *Figuring Jesus : The Power of Rhetorical Figures of Speech in the Gospel of Luke*. Biblical Interpretation Series, V. 107. Leiden: Brill.
- Roth, Dieter T. "Did Tertullian Possess a Greek Copy or Latin Translation of Marcion's Gospel?" *Vigiliae Christianae* 63, no. 5 (2009): 429–67.
- Roth, Dieter T. "Marcion's Gospel and Luke: The History of Research in Current Debate." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 127, no. 3 (2008): 513–27.
- Roth, Dieter T. "Matthean Texts and Tertullian's Accusations in 'Adversus Marcionem.'" *The Journal of Theological Studies* 59, no. 2 (2008): 580–97.
- Roth, Dieter T. *The Parables in Q*. Library of New Testament Studies, Volume 582. New York: Bloomsbury T & T Clark, 2018.
- Roth, Dieter. "Marcion/Marcionites," in *Encyclopedia of Ancient History*, ed. Roger Bagnall, et al., 12 vols. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2013.
- Roth, Dieter. "Marcion's Gospel and the History of Early Christianity: The Devil is in the (Reconstructed) Details." *ZAC* 21 (2017): 25-40.
- Roth, Dieter. "Marcion's Gospel and the Synoptic Problem in Recent Scholarship," in *Gospel Interpretation and the Q-Hypothesis*, ed. Morgens Müller and Heike Omerzu, International Studies in Christian Origins, LNTS 573 (London: T&T Clark, 2018), 267-82.
- Roth, Dieter. "Marcion's Gospel: Relevance, Contested Issues, and Reconstructions," *ExpTim* 121.6 (2010): 287-294.
- Roth, Dieter. "Prophets, Priests, and Kings: Old Testament Figures in Marcion's Gospel and Luke." In *Connecting Gospels: Beyond the Canonical/Non-Canonical Divide*. Ed. Francis Watson and Sarah Parkhouse (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018), 41-56.
- Roth, Dieter. "The Link between Luke and Marcion's Gospel." In *Luke on Jesus, Paul, and Christianity: What Did He Really Know?* Ed. Joseph Verheyden and John Kloppenborg. BTS 29. Leuven: Peeters, 2017.
- Roth, Dieter. *The Text of Marcion's Gospel*. NTTSD 49. Leiden: Brill, 2015.

- Rusam, Dietrich. 2003. *Das Alte Testament Bei Lukas*. Beihefte Zur Zeitschrift Für Die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft Und Die Kunde Der Älteren Kirche, Bd. 112. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110891386>.
- Schmid, Ulrich. 1995. *Marcion Und Sein Apostolos : Rekonstruktion Und Historische Einordnung Der Marcionitischen Paulusbriefausgabe*. Arbeiten Zur Neutestamentlichen Textforschung, Bd. 25. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Segovia, Fernando F, and R. S Sugirtharajah. *A Postcolonial Commentary on the New Testament Writings*. The Bible and Postcolonialism. London: T & T Clark, 2009.
- Sloan D.B. 2016. "The Similitudes and the Extent of Q." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 38 (3): 339–55. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0142064X15621655>.
- Sloan, David B. 2016. "The Τίς Ἐξ Ὑμῶν Similitudes and the Extent of Q." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 38 (3): 339–55. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0142064X15621655>.
- Soards, Marion L. *The Passion According to Luke : The Special Material of Luke 22*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament. Supplement Series, 14. Sheffield, England: JSOT Press, 1987.
- Somov, Alexey. *Representations of the Afterlife in Luke-Acts*. International Studies on Christian Origins. New York: Bloomsbury T & T Clark, 2017.
- Spencer, F. Scott. 2013. *Salty Wives, Spirited Mothers, and Savvy Widows : Capable Women of Purpose and Persistence in Luke's Gospel*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing.
- Spencer, F. Scott. *The Gospel of Luke and Acts of the Apostles*. Interpreting Biblical Texts. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2008.
- Strelan, Rick. 2008. *Luke the Priest : The Authority of the Author of the Third Gospel*. Aldershot, England: Ashgate Pub.
- Strickland, Michael. 2014. *The Evangelicals and the Synoptic Problem*. American University Studies. Series VII, Theology and Religion, Volume 336. New York: Peter Lang Publishing.
- Stroik, Casimir B. 2010. "The Benedictus, Lucan Narrative, and Poetic Discourse." Dissertation. Catholic University of America
- Swanson, Tessandra, and University of Ottawa. Department of Classics and Religious Studies. 2010. "The Son of Man in the Gospel of Luke." Dissertation.
- Talbert, Charles H. *Reading Luke-Acts in Its Mediterranean Milieu*. Supplements to Novum Testamentum, V. 107. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- Tobias, Hägerland. 2019. "Editorial Fatigue and the Existence of Q." *New Testament Studies* 65 (2): 190–206. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688518000371>.
- Tuckett, C. M. 2014. *From the Sayings to the Gospels*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen Zum Neuen Testament, 328. Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck.

- Tuckett, Christopher M. 1995. *Luke's Literary Achievement : Collected Essays*. The Library of New Testament Studies. London: Continuum International Pub. Group.
- Tuckett, Christopher M. 2015. *Synoptic Studies : The Ampleforth Conferences of 1982 and 1983*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament. Supplement Series, 7. London, England: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Tyson, Joseph. *Marcion and Luke-Acts: A Defining Struggle*. Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 2014.
- Vinzent, Markus. *Marcion and the Dating of the Synoptic Gospels*. StPatr Supplement 2. Leuven: Peeters, 2014.
- Watson, Francis. 2009. "Q As Hypothesis: A Study in Methodology." *New Testament Studies* 55 (4): 397–415. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688509990026>.
- Weeks, Joseph Allen. 2010. "Mark Without Mark : Problematizing the Reliability of a Reconstructed Text of Q." Dissertation, Texas Christian University. Brite Divinity School, Texas Christian University.
- Wills, Lawrence M. 1997. *The Quest of the Historical Gospel : Mark, John, and the Origins of the Gospel Genre*. London: Routledge.
- Wolter, Michael. *The Gospel According to Luke*. Baylor-Mohr Siebeck Studies in Early Christianity. Waco, Texas: Baylor University Press, 2016.

Appendix: Some Creative Accompaniments, Perhaps for a Few Book Plates

Past Public Performances of Aesop's Fables

Babylon: The Sheep and the Wolves

Egypt: The Rooster Always Crows Twice

Samos: The Woman with Two Apostolic Suitors

Delphi: Momus Criticizes the Gods

Sayings Attributed to Marcion

One man's arch-heretic is another eunuch's hero. — Ps-Origen

Heretic (*noun*). A person who tried too hard to be consistent. — Ps-Tertullian

Devotion to heretics and tall men are both dangerous things. — Ps-Epiphanius

Logoi Spermatikoi, or Christiane, temet nosce

Just how did a revolutionary Jewish teacher become a Greek god? – D. Strauss

Just how did an apocalyptic Jewish preacher become the only Roman god? – A. Schweitzer

Just how did a pouch of Paul's mail become a voluminous *Festschrift*? – F. Schleiermacher

What are Christians except Jews who forgot Hebrew and only quote the Greeks? – E. P. Sanders

Koans

Give him a mask, and he will tell you the truth. – Oscar Wilde

William Blake was right... about a lot of things. – Dylan | So was Zevi. – Paul

All scriptures are apocrypha, all apocrypha scriptures, and all of it myth and cult. – NASSCAL

Sayings of Bacchus-Jesus Overheard in Diverse Settings

Bethlehem: "Hey, who wrote 'Ion' on my blanket and crib?"

Cana: "You seriously call that a Bacchanalia? I'll show you a Bacchanalia!"

Lake Gennesaret: "That's my boat you're standing on, bro!"

Jerusalem: "Now you recognize me, now you... Oh, hey Iphigenia! Is that an elevator?"

Ephesus: "I love Timothy. He's not *akrobustia*, but he is Pylades: half-Greek, half-Jew, all man."

Rome: "Fine, keep me in this prison. Wait and see what happens."

Aphorisms, by the Author

The spark of creativity, whence does it arise? From certainty of extinguishment, my child.

Pandemic—a writer's constant friend.

The love of Bacchus-Jesus compels me.

Tannaitic Aggadah of Marcianus and the Four Evangelists

Marcianus heard a group of rabbis debating about Rabbi Shaoul, whether he was the son of Gamliel or not, whether he was a citizen or not, and whether he ever got to speak to Caesar or not. And Marcianus thought to himself it was strange that the rabbis said Rabbi Shaoul was not named for a father but for a city, and that later Rabbi Shaoul went to the City, never to be heard from again. But Marcianus did not say anything to anyone about it. Another day he heard the rabbis debating about who was the greater follower of Yose, whether Rabbi Shaoul or whether Rav Cepha. And Marcianus said, "Why do you debate amongst yourselves? Rabbi Shaoul taught us Torah and gave us a family, Rav Cepha taught us a trade and gave us a home, and Yose became our prayer and our shared security." And then Marcianus said, "I have a ship! Who wants to go to Rome with me?" But no one wanted to go, because they heard the voyage was treacherous. So Marcianus found a few trusted friends and they went on without their rabbis. When they reached Rome, they went to Trastevere and saw wealthy men gathered solemnly around the tomb of Cepha and mumbling among themselves in hushed voices no one else could hear. Then they visited Shaoul's house-prison, but they only saw a solitary, destitute, foreign slave-woman busy cleaning. Then Marcianus and his friends realized they could never be at home with Yose there.

Decades later Rav Shlomo traveled to Rome and there heard that Marcianus and his friends had visited for a short while and then left, and that they had never bothered to return. And Shlomo said to himself, "Baruch atah." Rav Shlomo used to say a lot of things. One day he said in the name of Rabbi Levi that Yose should never be called Yose ben Pantera, but rather Yose ben Yose ben Moshe. The next day he said in the name of Rabbi Yohanam in the name of Rav Cepha that it was forbidden to speak of Yose visiting Migdal or bathing with women in its mikvah. Instead we should say that Yose flew over Migdal on his journeys like an angelic Son of Man, like Enoch. The next day he said in the name of the Greek grandson of Luca in the name of Rabbi Shaoul that the Torah is for both men and women, but he also said that the Torah is for chewing, not swallowing, lest we grow fat and lazy. The next day he said in the name of Rabbi Carpi in the name of Rabbi Yochanan that Yose should not be called Yose ben Miryam or Yose ben Ruach, but instead Yose ben Abba or Yose ha-Torah, because it would be shameful to speak of Yose being born of a woman or to call him by a woman's name.

In the name of Rabbi Akiva it was said that Rav Cepha also did not have a father.

RaBoNaV says Ephraim d'Assisi also went to Rome, but he was wise enough to prostrate himself to the chief Rabbi.

Bat Rashi says the ancestors of Claire d'Assisi were also from Migdal.

