

Before I move on to discuss other lost books from early Christianity that I would love to have discovered (I know, this thread could go on forever, since I would like \*every\* early Christian writing to be discovered) I need to answer a couple of queries that I have received about the Q source.

First, several people have asked me whether it is possible that the Q source is actually what we now call the Gospel of Thomas, one of the books discovered among the so-called Nag Hammadi Library in 1945. I don't want to go into great depth about the Gospel of Thomas here since, well, it has been discovered and this thread is about books that have \*not\* been discovered. But I do need to say some basics about Thomas and its relation to Q.

By way of background, let me say something a bit more about the Q-hypothesis. When 19<sup>th</sup> century German scholars established with a reasonable level of certainty that Mark was the first Gospel written and that Matthew and Luke had both used it as one of their sources (that is the view known as "Markan Priority" - Mark is prior to the other Gospels), they naturally had next to explain the parallel passages in Matthew and Luke that were not found in Mark.

Two things struck scholars about these other passages - such as the Lord's Prayer and the Beatitudes.

**THE REST OF THIS POST IS FOR MEMBERS ONLY. If you don't belong yet, JOIN!!! It doesn't cost much, and all the money we raise goes to charity.**

- You need to be logged in to see this part of the content. Please [Login](#) to access.



[Did Matthew Copy Luke or Luke Matthew?](#)

[Evidence that the Synoptics Are Copying \(one another? other sources?\)](#)