

Luke 3:1–4:30 – How Much Is from Q?

By David B. Sloan (Malone University; dsloan@neo.rr.com)

Presented at the 2013 Meeting of the Eastern Great Lakes Biblical Society

Introduction

Last year I argued that just as Mark is about twice as long as the Markan material copied by both Matthew and Luke, Q likely contained much more than the Q material copied by both Matthew and Luke. I suggested that Matthew's decision not to preserve the order of Q would lead Matthew to omit significant portions of Q, and I demonstrated based on the style of Greek and the outline of the Lukan travel narrative that Luke 9:56–18:14 was taken almost entirely from Q, the only major exceptions being the story of Mary and Martha and the story of the ten lepers. The rest of the travel narrative is primarily teachings of Jesus introduced with brief narrative settings or dialogs that we see elsewhere in Q.

With this paper I want to consider Luke 3:1–4:31, where I believe that Luke has taken almost nothing from Mark because he has used Q as his primary source for this material. *The Critical Edition of Q* (CEQ) suggests that Luke 3:2b-3a, 7-9, 16b-17, 21-22; and 4:1-13 are taken in part from Q, though it leaves the wording especially uncertain in vv. 2b-3a, 21-22. I will argue that Luke follows Q rather closely in these verses and that John's preaching in Luke 3:10-14; Jesus' genealogy in 3:23-38; and the Nazareth pericope in 4:14-30 as well as the mention of Capernaum in 4:31 are all taken from Q. Moreover I argue that the original introduction to Q, which is thought to be forever lost, is preserved almost word-for-word in Luke 3:1-3. If my thesis is correct this has implications for Luke's care in preserving his sources as well as for the theology of Q as new pericopes and a more precise introduction could be added to our reconstructions of Q.

1. Luke 3:1-3: The Original Introduction to Q

*Ἐν ἔτει δὲ πεντεκαδεκάτῳ τῆς ἡγεμονίας Τιβερίου Καίσαρος, ἡγ
εμονεύοντος Ποντίου Πιλάτου τῆς Ἰουδαίας,
καὶ τετρααρχοῦντος τῆς Γαλιλαίας Ἡρώδου,
Φιλίππου δὲ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ τετρααρχοῦντος τῆς Ἰουραίας
καὶ Τραχωνίτιδος χώρας,
καὶ Λυσανίου τῆς Ἀβιληνῆς τετρααρχοῦντος,
2 ἐπὶ ἀρχιερέως Ἄννα καὶ Καϊάφα,
ἐγένετο ῥῆμα θεοῦ ἐπὶ Ἰωάννην τὸν Ζαχαρίου υἱὸν ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ.
3 καὶ ἦλθεν εἰς πᾶσαν τὴν περιχώρον τοῦ Ἰορδάνου
κηρύσσων βάπτισμα μετανοίας εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν.*

*1 In the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius Caesar,
Pontius Pilate being governor of Judea,*

*Herod being tetrarch of Galilee,
Philip his brother being tetrarch of the regions of Ituraea and
Trachonitis,
and Lysanius being tetrarch of Abilene,
2 during the high priesthood of Annas and Caiaphas,
the word of God came upon John the son of Zechariah in the
wilderness,
3 and he went into the entire region surrounding the Jordan
preaching a baptism of repentance for forgiveness of sins.*

Luke 3:1-2a is often taken as an indication of Luke's own accuracy as a historian.¹ It is true that Luke elsewhere gives names of rulers during significant events, but nowhere else does Luke list who is ruling each region and nowhere else does Luke give a date in the reign of Caesar. While one could argue that this is where Luke would be most likely to place it, it is significant that his other time references give only one ruler and do not specify which year within the reign of that ruler ("in the days of Herod, king of Judea," Luke 1:5; "this was the first census when Quirinius was governing Syria," 2:2;² "which happened in the time of Claudius," Acts 11:28). If Luke himself were prone to the kind of specificity, one would expect Luke to give similar specificity to Jesus' birth or to his death or to Paul's conversion or to the spread of the gospel to a particular city. Instead we have 133 verses into Luke's narrative a historical precision that is unmatched elsewhere in Luke-Acts.

Moreover, this historical detail reads similarly to the first words of an OT prophetic book. For example, Jer 1:1-2 reads:

*Τὸ ῥῆμα τοῦ θεοῦ, ὃ ἐγένετο ἐπὶ Ἰερεμیان τὸν τοῦ Χελκίου ἐκ τῶν
ιερέων, ὃς κατώκει ἐν Αναθωθ ἐν γῆ Βενιαμιν, 2 ὃς ἐγενήθη
λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις Ἰωσία υἱοῦ Ἀμώς
βασιλέως Ἰουδα ἔτους τρισκαιδεκάτου ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ αὐτοῦ.*

We see here six features that are common in introductions to prophetic books: (1) "the word of God" (here: ῥῆμα θεοῦ); (2) whom that word "came upon" (here: ἐγένετο ἐπὶ); (3) whose son that prophet is, (4) where the prophet resides when he receives the revelation, (5) who was reigning at the time, and (6) how many years into his reign the word first came. Earlier prophets add a mention of (7) who was reigning the other half of the divided kingdom. Luke 3:1-2 contains all seven of these elements, using many of the exact same words (ἐγένετο ῥῆμα θεοῦ ἐπὶ Ἰωάννην

¹ E.g., see Richard Belward Rackham, *The Acts of the Apostles: An Exposition* (8th ed.; London: Methuen, 1919), xlv; Robert G. Gromacki, *New Testament Survey* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 1974), 158; Francois Bovon, *Luke* (3 vols.; Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2002-2012), 1:83.

² It is true that Caesar Augustus is mentioned in the previous verse, but he is mentioned as the subject of the sentence, not as an indication of the date of this event.

τὸν Ζαχαρίου υἱὸν ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ). Thus what we have here is not merely an example of historical precision at the beginning of a new stage in Luke’s narrative but the opening words of a prophetic book. Is it possible that Luke has taken these words directly from the introduction to one of his main sources? Jeremias notes that the doubly anarthrous ῥῆμα θεοῦ is a “totally unlukan ... traditional Hebraism.”³ Luke regularly has an article with the word ῥῆμα, and when he creates a genitive construction like this, Luke uses two articles. Thus it seems that Luke is not composing here, but is copying the introduction of his source.

Most Q scholars agree that Luke 3:3 is dependent upon Q, since Matt 3:5 shares with Luke 3:3 the expression πᾶσαν τὴν περιχώρον τοῦ Ἰορδάνου (though Matthew places it in the nominative case). Most Q scholars also agree that Q must have said something before these words. Why not assume that Luke 3:1-2, which were clearly once the opening of a book, were the first words of Q? Matthew and Luke agree against Mark in beginning this section with a time reference and in mentioning John’s preaching in the wilderness before quoting Isaiah. Matthew’s Ἐν δὲ ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις (“In those days”) could be a simplified version of Q’s Ἐν ἔτει πεντεκαιδεκάτῳ τῆς ἡγεμονίας Τιβερίου Καίσαρος ... (“In the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius Caesar, ...”). Ἐκεῖνος with a time reference is a common Matthean redactional element (8:13; 9:22; 12:1; 13:1; 14:1; 15:28; 17:18; 18:1; 22:23, 46; 26:55 and possibly 7:22), and “in those days” is somewhat puzzling since thirty years have passed since what Matthew has just reported at the end of chapter 2. One would expect a phrase such as “after these things,” or “after many days,” but “in those days” might suggest that an expression beginning with ἐν was already in Matthew’s source.

Thus in roughly fifty words, the author of Q introduces his book. Luke has apparently preserved this introduction almost entirely word-for-word, while Matthew, not needing a new introduction, has summarized these words with the expression, Ἐν δὲ ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις. Streeter was correct to see Luke 3:1-2 as evidence that an earlier work began with these words, but there is no basis here for postulating that this source was anything other than Q.⁴

Unfortunately Luke does not seem to have preserved Q as closely in verse 3, unless Mark and Q were identical at this point:

ἐγένετο Ἰωάννης [ὁ] βαπτίζων ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ καὶ κηρύσσων βάπτισμα μετανοίας εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν. (Mark 1:4)

καὶ ἦλθεν εἰς πᾶσαν [τὴν] περιχώρον τοῦ Ἰορδάνου κηρύσσων βάπτισμα μετανοίας εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν. (Luke 3:3)

³ Joachim Jeremias, *Die Sprache des Lukasevangeliums: Redaktion und Tradition im Nicht-Markusstoff des dritten Evangeliums* (KEK; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1980), 103, translation mine.

⁴ Burnett Hillman Streeter, *The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins, Treating of the Manuscript Tradition, Sources, Authorship, & Dates* (New York: MacMillan, 1924), *.

Luke seems to like this phrase from Mark, as he echoes it again in Luke 24:47; Acts 2:38; 5:31.⁵ The idea of “forgiveness (ἄφεσις) of sins” is not found anywhere else in Q, so it is not likely that this Markan/Lukan phrase was found in this prominent position in Q.⁶ It is not clear whether or not Matthew is following Q here either:

Ἐν δὲ ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις παραγίνεται Ἰωάννης ὁ βαπτιστής κηρύσσων ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ τῆς Ἰουδαίας 2 [καὶ] λέγων· μετανοεῖτε· ἤγγικεν γὰρ ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν. (Matt 3:1-2)

Matthew will repeat this phrase, ἤγγικεν γὰρ ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν, two more times in his gospel. In Matt 4:17 he seems to be getting the phrase from Mark 1:15, as the first words of Jesus after his temptation, though Matthew condenses Mark’s wording. In Matt 10:7 he gets the exact same phrase from Q 10:9, where the first missionaries are to say in each town, ἤγγικεν [ἐφ’ ὑμᾶς] ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ. Thus this phrase is found in both Mark and Q, but it is not possible to tell if Q was responsible for attributing the phrase to John as well as to the first missionaries. Therefore Q 3:3 cannot be confidently reconstructed, but it is clear that Q 3:3 mentioned either “all the region around the Jordan” going to John or John going to them, it is likely that Q 3:3 mentioned that John was baptizing and preaching, and it is possible that Q 3:3 had the phrase ἤγγικεν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ.

The next paragraph in Luke is a quotation of Isa 40:3-5. It is possible that Luke has taken this from Q, as Q has an interest in Isaiah (see the discussion of 4:14-31 below), but Luke may very well have known that Isaiah was quoted here by Mark and decided to include (and lengthen) the quotation. The fact that Luke follows Mark for Luke 3:3b makes it all the more likely that he takes the Isaiah quotation from Mark and not from Q. Luke returns to Q in 3:7-9, which is clearly from Q (cf. Matt 3:7-10). The next place where Luke’s source is uncertain is in John’s words to the crowds, the tax collectors, and the soldiers in Luke 3:10-14.

2. The Additional Preaching of John in 3:10-14

In Luke 3:10-14 John responds to the questions of three groups of people. The structure of this passage is remarkably similar to that of Q 4:1-13 and 9:57-62:

| Luke 3:10-14 | Q 4:1-13 | Q 9:57-62 |
|---|---|----------------------------------|
| 10 Καὶ ἐπηρώτων αὐτὸν οἱ ὄχλοι λέγοντες ... | Καὶ προσελθὼν εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ διάβολος ... | Καὶ προσελθὼν εἶπέν τις αὐτῷ ... |
| 11 ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ἔλεγεν | καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν [αὐτῷ] ὁ | καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ... |

⁵ Jeremias takes the presence of this phrase in Mark and in Luke-Acts to be evidence that it is early Christian (*Sprache*, 105). This is likely correct, but Luke’s awareness of the phrase seems to lead him to use the phrase here (which he finds in Mark) rather than to follow Q.

⁶ Christopher M. Tuckett, who holds that Luke 4:16-30 comes from Q, argues that in Q ἄφεσις has a broader meaning than in Luke (*Q and the History of Early Christianity: Studies on Q* [Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1996], 233).

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| αὐτοῖς ... | Ἰησοῦς ... | |
| 12 ἦλθον δὲ καὶ τελῶναι βαπτισθῆναι καὶ εἶπαν πρὸς αὐτόν ... | [Καὶ] παραλαμβάνει αὐτὸν ὁ διάβολος ... καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ ... | ἕτερος δὲ [τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ] εἶπεν αὐτῷ ... |
| 13 ὁ δὲ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς ... | καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ... | εἶπεν δὲ αὐτῷ ... |
| 14 ἐπρωτῶν δὲ αὐτὸν καὶ στρατευόμενοι λέγοντες ... | Πάλιν παραλαμβάνει αὐτὸν ὁ διάβολος ... καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ ... | Εἶπεν δὲ καὶ ἕτερος ... |
| καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ... | καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ... | εἶπεν δὲ [αὐτῷ] ὁ Ἰησοῦς ... |

Some of the differences are likely due to Lukan redaction, such as the use of ἔλεγεν instead of εἶπεν in 3:11 or πρὸς αὐτόν/αὐτούς instead of αὐτῷ/αὐτοῖς in 3:12, 13. These are common Lukan redactional changes.⁷ Jeremias also suggests that the pleonastic λέγοντες in vv. 10 and 13 is redactional.⁸ But even if we were not to postulate what Luke's source originally said, the similarities between Luke 3:10-14 and Q 4:1-13; 9:57-62 are clear. In each passage there is a three-part dialog with similar transition statements running throughout the passage. Thus the style, structure, and wording of Luke 3:10-14 resembles Q. This structure is likely designed for memorization, with its use of poetic measure, parallelism, and repetition (e.g., εἶπεν/εἶπαν; τί ποιήσωμεν; ἔχων; μηδέ/μηδέν/μηδένα). These features are characteristic of Q but not of Luke's own writing or of his other sources.⁹

Furthermore, it is not only the style, structure, and wording that resembles Q, but also the characters involved in the narrative. A clear contrast is seen in Luke 3:7-14. Whereas the first group that comes to John is referred to as a "brood of vipers," John's tone toward the three groups that follow is not near as negative. According to Luke the first group was "the crowds" (3:7), but Matthew says it was "many of the Pharisees and Sadducees" (Matt 3:7). On the other hand it is "the crowds," "tax collectors," and "soldiers" that John addresses in Luke 3:10-14. According to Q 7:29, "all the people and the tax collectors" justified God because they had been baptized by John, whereas "the Pharisees and the lawyers rejected the purpose of God for themselves because they had not been baptized by John." Matthew consistently changes Q's οἱ νομοκῶντες and himself favors the expression "Pharisees and Sadducees"; Luke often uses the expression οἱ ὄχλοι in place of something else, so it is quite likely that those addressed as a brood of vipers in Q 3:7 were the Pharisees and the lawyers, making the allusion in Q 7:29-30 to Q 3:7-14 abundantly clear. But even if we cannot be certain who was addressed in Q 3:7-9 we can see that Q 7:29 almost requires Luke 3:10-14 to have been from Q. Those who justify God in Q 7:29 are those John instructs in Q 3:10-14 as he prepares the way for the Lord (cf. Q 7:27).¹⁰

⁷ On εἶπεν/εἶπαν πρὸς αὐτούς/αὐτόν, see Jeremias, *Sprache*, 33.

⁸ Jeremias, *Sprache*, 67-70.

⁹ On the poetic nature of Q, see Richard A. Horsley with Jonathan Draper, *Whoever Hears Me Hears You: Prophets, Performance and Tradition in Q* (Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 1999).

¹⁰ The two parties in Q 7:29 likely matched the first two in Q 3:10-13. It is not clear whether Q originally read οἱ ὄχλοι as in Luke 3:10 or πᾶς ὁ λαὸς as in Luke 7:29. Both are frequent in Lukan redaction. I am inclined to believe that both Q 3:10 and Q 7:29 read οἱ ὄχλοι (πᾶς ὁ λαὸς occurs a number of times in Luke-Acts but never in Q), even though I believe οἱ ὄχλοι in 3:7 is redactional. But even if Q had a

3. Jesus' baptism (Q/Luke 3:21-22)

Luke 3:16-17 is clearly from Q and so will not be addressed here. CEQ also includes that account of Jesus' baptism but places it in double square brackets indicating that the actual wording is especially uncertain. Here are a number of reasons to assume it is from Q:

1. Q 4:1-13 assumes a declaration that Jesus is God's Son.
2. Q 4:18 (defended below) assumes a statement that the Spirit has come upon Jesus.
3. Q likely contained some transition here from John (Q 3:1-17) to Jesus (Q 4:1-13).
4. Matthew and Luke agree against Mark in the use of the aorist passive participle referring to Jesus' baptism (Mark has an aorist passive indicative verb here).
5. Matthew and Luke agree in referring to the heavens "being opened" (ἠνεώχθησαν/ἀνεωχθῆναι), whereas Mark says they were split apart (σχιζομένους).
6. Matthew and Luke agree against Mark that the Spirit descended upon (ἐπί) Jesus rather than into (εἰς) Jesus. This choice of preposition also agrees with Q 4:18.
7. There are numerous poetic features here that resemble Q. Verse 21ab contains two parallel lines each with an aorist passive form of βαπτίζω, and verses 21c-22c contains three parallel lines, each with an aorist infinitive and an accusative of reference. These verses can be mapped as follows (with probable Lukan elements removed):

21a [Καὶ] ἐν τῷ βαπτισθῆναι [οἱ ὄχλοι]

21b καὶ Ἰησοῦ βαπτισθέντος

21c ἀνεωχθῆναι τὸν οὐρανὸν

22a καὶ καταβῆναι τὸ πνεῦμα ἐπ' αὐτόν,

22b καὶ φωνῆν ἐξ οὐρανοῦ γενέσθαι.

22c οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς μου.

4. The Genealogy of Jesus (Q/Luke 3:23-38)

Between Jesus' baptism and temptation we find in Luke the genealogy of Jesus. If Luke was responsible for this material or if he is drawing it from an independent source, we would expect it in the birth narrative.¹¹ Therefore its placement here immediately suggests that Luke draws it from the same source he draws the baptism and temptation narratives. This position in Q is the most logical place for a genealogy – Jesus was just introduced in Q 3:21 and declared to be "the Son of

different phrase in Q 7:29 from Q 3:10, it is clear that Q 7:29-30 alludes back to Q 3:7-14. The lack of a reference to στρατευόμενοι in 7:29 is not problematic. Q may have not included all three groups in the second reference, or it may have been in Q and dropped by Matthew and Luke. Q does have a preference for threes (three temptations in Q 4:1-13; three groups of people who are blessed/cursed in 6:20-22/23-26; three actions commanded to the disciples in 6:32-35; three rhetorical questions in 7:24-26; three potential followers in 9:57-62; three items not to take on the missionary journey in 10:4; three cities lamented in 10:13-15; three actions involved in prayer in 11:9-10; three woes spoken over the Pharisees in 11:42-44 and three over the lawyers in 11:46-52; three hostile leaders in 12:11 and in 12:58; three guests who refuse to come to the banquet in 14:16-20; and three servants entrusted with minas in 19:11-27).

¹¹ Streeter, *Four Gospels*, 209.

God” in 3:22. This genealogy further highlights Jesus’ connection to God, tracing his genealogy all the way back through David and Abraham and Adam to God. Jesus’ sonship to God is also a key theme of the following pericope in Q, as Satan twice addresses Jesus with the words, “If you are the Son of God.” Thus if this passage is from Q a theme pervades from Q 3:21 to 4:13. Jesus is God’s Son via the heavenly voice, via the Holy Spirit’s presence in him, via his connection through David all the way back to God, and via his ability to overcome Satan’s temptations that are reminiscent both of the temptations that Israel failed in the wilderness and of the temptations that Adam failed in the garden. This genealogy is carefully crafted in eleven groups of seven.¹² The first two groups begin and end with people of the same name (Joseph to Joseph, then Mattathias to Mattathias). The third group ends with Zerubbabel the son of Shealtiel. The fourth and fifth group end with the names familiar from the beginning of the genealogy: a Jesus and then a Joseph. The sixth group ends with David, the eighth with Abraham, the tenth with Enoch, and the eleventh with God. These features assist in the memorization of a list like this, and memorability is important in Q. The eleven groups of seven “may reflect a division of world history into 11 ‘weeks’, to be followed by the 12th ‘week’ of the messianic era (cf. 4 Ez. 14:11; SB IV:2, 986f.)”¹³ The fact that sevens end with key figures and the eleventh seven ends with God suggests that τοῦ θεοῦ was included in this genealogy from its original composition, which suggests that it was designed to fit with other passages in Q that emphasize Jesus as the Son of God.¹⁴ At the same time, Luke does not seem to have constructed this genealogy. His apparent addition of ὡς ἐνομίζετο (“as it was thought”) is disruptive to the simple genealogy and softens the connection that is fundamental to the rest of the genealogy. There is no explanation for the placement of the genealogy in Luke’s narrative, for the memorability of this genealogy, or for the climax of the genealogy at τοῦ θεοῦ other than that this genealogy was already in this position in Q. The only strong objection to including this genealogy in Q is that Matthew has an entirely different genealogy, but one can imagine that Matthew, with his interest in the connection between Jesus and the Davidic line, would have been dissatisfied with a genealogy that did not trace Jesus’ ancestry through Solomon. In fact, it is possible, though by no means certain, that a Nathanic genealogy in Q would have inspired Matthew to find a genealogy that traced Jesus’ ancestry through Solomon. Luke 3:21–4:13 appears to be entirely from Q with the exception of minor redactions.

¹² I. Howard Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGTC; Exeter: Paternoster, 1978), 160-161; Eduard Schweizer, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas* (NTD 3; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982),

52; Darrell L. Bock, *Luke* (2 vols.; BECNT; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 1994), 1:350-362.

¹³ Marshall, *Luke*, 160.

¹⁴ There is a textual variant that may alter this arrangement, but the support for the reading in NA28 is broad.

On another note, Marshall argues that the genealogy originally ran from Adam to Jesus and was later reversed and expanded to include τοῦ θεοῦ (*Luke*, 160-161), but there is no evidence for this and numerous Jewish and Hellenistic genealogies follow the pattern exhibited here of running from the descendant to the ancestor (cf. William S. Kurz, “Luke 3:23-38 and Greco-Roman and Biblical Genealogies,” in *Luke-Acts: New Perspectives from the Society of Biblical Literature Seminar* [ed. Charles H. Talbert; New York: Crossroad, 1984], 169-187).

5. Jesus in Nazareth (Q/Luke 4:14-30)

After the temptation narrative, which Matthew and Luke clearly take from Q, both Matthew and Luke mention Jesus going to Ναζαρά (Matthew 4:13; Luke 4:16). This is significant because everywhere else Matthew and Luke refer to Nazareth they spell it Ναζαρέθ/Ναζαρέτ. Therefore Q must have said something about Nazareth after the temptation narrative, but what? Matthew’s version is very brief:

12 Ἀκούσας δὲ ὅτι Ἰωάννης παρεδόθη ἀνεχώρησεν εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν. 13 καὶ καταλιπὼν τὴν Ναζαρά ἐλθὼν κατώκησεν εἰς Καφαρναοὺμ τὴν παραθαλασσίαν ἐν ὄροις Ζαβουλὼν καὶ Νεφθαλίμ· 14 ἵνα πληρωθῇ τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ Ἡσαΐου τοῦ προφήτου λέγοντος· ...

12 Hearing that John was arrested he withdrew into Galilee. 13 And leaving Nazareth he went and settled down in Capernaum, which is beside the sea in the regions of Zebulun and Naphtali, 14 that what was spoken through Isaiah the prophet might be fulfilled, saying, ... (Matt 4:12-14)

Just as Matthew switched to his Markan source at the end of the temptation narrative when he said, “Behold, the angels came and were ministering to him” (4:11), in verse 12 Matthew continues to follow Mark (cf. Mark 1:14). What Matthew may be taking from Q is the references to Galilee, Nazareth, and Capernaum. Matthew’s mention that Capernaum is “in the regions of Zebulun and Naphtali,” maybe a set up for his quotation of Isa 9:1-2 that follows and therefore may not have been in Matthew’s source.

Like Matthew, Luke says that Jesus went εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν (Luke 4:14), then proceeds to tell of an encounter in Ναζαρά (Luke 4:16-30), followed by an encounter in Καφαρναοὺμ (Luke 4:31-41).¹⁵ Like Matthew, Luke adds detail about where Capernaum is located, but in Luke it is “Capernaum, a city of Galilee” (Luke 4:31). One can see imagine that if Luke took this from Q, Matthew could have seen the same description and decided to connect it with prophecy, changing “a city of Galilee” to “in the regions of Zebulun and Naphtali.” Thus it is likely that Q 4:14-41 contained: (1) εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν; (2) Ναζαρά; and (3) Καὶ κατήλθεν/κατώκησεν εἰς Καφαρναοὺμ πόλιν τῆς Γαλιλαίας, but

¹⁵ It is true that Mark 1:14 also contains the words εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν, but Luke is clearly not following Mark here. Whereas Matthew incorporates elements from Mark in the last sentence of the temptation narrative (“and angels ministered to him”) and in the first sentence that follows (“John was arrested”), Luke borrows nothing. This is somewhat surprising, as Mark’s account mentions not only the arrest of John, but also the time being “fulfilled” and the kingdom of God having drawn near. Mark then gives his first words of Jesus, “Repent, and believe in the gospel.” None of these elements are in the Lukan account, though these are concepts that Luke takes a great interest in. So far in Luke’s account the only influence Mark has had in Luke is apparently the Isaiah quotation in the John the Baptist narrative (unless this is a Mark-Q overlap), thus it is unlikely that Luke here turns to his Markan source and drastically rewrites it. Luke 4:14-15 is not from Mark at all.

it is unclear whether Matthew has greatly condensed Q's account, which is closer to Luke 4:14-41, or Luke has greatly expanded Q's account, which is closer to Matthew 4:12-13. A number of observations suggest that Q 4:14-41 (or at least through verse 31) was closer to the lengthy Lukan version than to the brief Matthean version.

- (1) We have already seen that Matthew omits large components of Q.
- (2) Luke thus far has been faithfully copying Q. Here he has a pericope for which we do not know the source. The most likely source is the one Luke has been using from almost all of Luke 3:1-4:13.
- (3) Luke begins copying Mark in the Capernaum pericope in Luke 4:31 (= Mark 1:21), but to do so Luke must skip over the call of Simon, Andrew, James, and John, even though the mention of Simon in the Capernaum narrative is then strangely placed before the call of Simon. Why would Luke copy Mark 1:21-38 before discussing the call of the four disciples, which is narrated in Mark 1:16-20? If Luke is switching sources anyway, moving from Q to Mark, it would be natural to make the move from Q to his special source for the call of the 4 disciples (which is not Mark or Q!) to Mark – or to move from Q to Mark 1:16-20 to Mark 1:21-38. Instead Luke jumps straight into Mark 1:21-28 because it overlaps what he finds in Q. At the same time the Markan account must give more detail for the Capernaum pericope than the Q account, because Luke's wording follows Mark's.
- (4) Despite a number of Lukanisms in this pericope, Jeremias has noted numerous non-Lukan phrases and syntactical features that demonstrate that Luke cannot be composing this as a severely edited version of Mark 3:1-6.¹⁶ He begins by saying, "Our pericope can immediately be recognized as pre-Lukan tradition by its 18 uses of καὶ to connect sentences."¹⁷ According to Jeremias, other Lukanisms and non-Lukanisms can be identified as follows:

| Lukanisms | Non-Lukanisms |
|---|--------------------------------|
| ὑπέστρεψεν | φήμη ἐξῆλθεν |
| καθ' ὅλης τῆς περιχώρου περὶ αὐτοῦ | ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς αὐτῶν |
| καὶ αὐτὸς | Ναζαρά |
| οὗ ἦν τεθραμμένος | ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῶν σαββάτων |
| κατὰ τὸ εἰωθὸς αὐτῶ | βιβλίον |
| ἦσαν ἀτενίζοντες αὐτῶ | ἦν γεγραμμένον |
| ἐθαύμαζον ἐπὶ τοῖς λόγοις | ἤρξατο |
| πρὸς αὐτοῦς | σήμερον |
| πάντως ἐρεῖτέ μοι τὴν παραβολὴν ταύτην | πεπλήρωται |
| ὅσα ἠκούσαμεν γενόμενα εἰς τὴν Καφαρναοῦμ | καὶ ἔλεγον |
| εἶπεν δέ | υἱὸς Ἰωσήφ |
| ἐπὶ ἔτη τρία | καὶ εἶπεν |
| ἐπλήσθησαν πάντες θυμοῦ | ᾧδε |
| ἀναστάντες | οὐδεὶς προφήτης |
| ὥστε | ἐπ' ἀληθείας |
| | πολλὰ χίρα ... καὶ ... ἐπέμφθη |

¹⁶ Jeremias, *Sprache*, 118-128.

¹⁷ Jeremias, *Sprache*, 119.

ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις Ἥλιου
 ὅτε
 the divine passive ἐκλείσθη
 ἐγένετο λιμὸς μέγας
 ἐπέμφθη
 εἰ μὴ
 the concessive parataxis πολλοὶ λεπροὶ ἦσαν
 the pleonastic ἀναστάντες

- (5) Many of the non-Lukanisms in this passage are typical of Q.
- (6) There are connections here with what precedes this pericope in Q. These could be due to Luke's response to what he has already copied from Q, but the fact that this pericope is coming from a source suggests against this. The statement, "the Spirit of the Lord is upon (ἐπί) me," alludes to Q 3:21 (Mark has εἰς there, but Matthew and Luke both adopt Q's ἐπί). Also Jesus' miraculous deliverance from the attempt of the Nazarenes to throw him off the cliff further addresses the interpretation of Ps 91 given in Q 4:9-12, in which Satan claims that Jesus would be miraculously delivered from untimely death.
- (7) Most importantly, however, we must notice that a later passage in Q alludes back to this passage. Just as the John and Jesus pericope in Q 7:18-35 alludes to the preaching of John in Q 3:7-14 (see Section 2 of this paper), the same pericope alludes to the preaching of Jesus here. When John's disciples ask if Jesus is the Coming One, Jesus responds with an allusion to Isa 61:1-2, the passage quoted in Luke 4:18-19. Jesus' response climaxes with the poor having good news preached to them. Aside from Luke 7:22 = Matt 11:5, πτωχός and εὐαγγελίζω occur together once in the LXX and once in the NT: Isa 61:1 and Luke 4:18. Thus Luke 4:18-19 is likely the basis on which Q 7:22 is built. Furthermore, Tuckett has noted that the various components of Q 7:22 (the blind receiving sight, the lame walking, the deaf hearing, etc.) are all allusions to Isaianic eschatological prophecies, except for the lepers being cleansed and possibly for the dead being raised. Tuckett then comments:

It is however possible that both references are influenced by the prophetic tradition: the one who raised the dead in the OT is the prophet Elijah (1 Ki 17), and the one who healed leprosy, whilst no doubt heavily influenced by traditions of the historical Jesus' own activity, may also have been explicitly mentioned here to show Jesus, as the eschatological prophet, continuing in the line of the prophets Elijah and Elisha. The text here thus provides a significant link with another part of the story in Luke 4:16-30, viz.

vv. 25-27 where Jesus' activity is also compared with that of Elijah and Elisha.¹⁸

Thus Luke 4:14-30 has too many non-Lukan elements to be a Lukan creation and its placement suggests that it is either taken from Q or used by Luke to expand a reference in Q to Ναζαρά. The former is far more likely in light of the facts that Luke 4:14-30 stylistically and thematically resembles Q and that Q 7:22 likely alludes back to Luke 4:18-19, where Isa 61 is quoted, and Luke 4:25-27, where Elijah and Elisha are referenced.

This pericope likely ended with a reference to Jesus settling down in Capernaum, as we find in Matthew, and this reference led Luke to copy the Capernaum pericope from Mark, even though Luke had not yet copied the call of Simon, Andrew, James, and John. Luke remedied this by supplying his information about their call once he had finished copying the Markan material about Capernaum.

The likelihood that Luke 4:14-30 is from Q raises the question of why Matthew did not include this material from Q. It appears that Matthew and Luke have a different approach to Mark and Q. Matthew copies Mark and fills it out with sayings from Q but typically not with entire Q pericopes. The few places where he does include a Q pericope are all in the first half of the gospel. Whereas Matthew is very expansive of the material in Mark 1-3, to which 12 chapters is devoted in Matthew, once Matthew copies the parables of the kingdom from Mark 4 he becomes much less likely to expand Mark, perhaps recognizing that his gospel will be too long if he continues expanding as he has been. Clearly Mark is Matthew's primary source, and Q is supplementary. We have seen, on the other hand, that Luke begins by copying Q rather than Mark. It is widely recognized that Luke follows the order of the Q material, whereas Matthew does not. Luke seems to be using Q as his primary source, adding Markan pericopes as room allows, which explains the great omission in Luke. Thus we would expect Matthew to drop entire pericopes from Q just as Luke drops entire pericopes from Mark. If Matthew were to insert the Nazareth pericope from Q into his gospel, he would likely place it either after the temptation narrative or with the Markan Nazareth pericope. Matthew is very intentional about placing five key speeches of Jesus at pivotal points of his gospel, and he quickly moves from the temptation narrative to his preferred first speech of Jesus – the Sermon on the Mount. All Matthew is willing to place between Jesus' temptation and the Sermon on the Mount is the note about Jesus settling in Capernaum and the brief reports of Jesus calling his first disciples and of crowds following Jesus and being healed. Thus the first potential location for the Nazareth pericope from Q is ruled out. By the time Matthew comes to the Nazareth pericope in Mark, he has already stopped filling out his narrative with material from Q (though he will still use Q material in the later speeches). Thus it appears that Matthew would find that there is no room for the extra details about Nazareth from Q in his gospel, and he only briefly mentions Nazareth and Capernaum at Matt 4:13.

¹⁸ Tuckett, *Q*, 222-223. Tuckett also notes that Isa 61 is significant for Q 6:20-26 (*ibid.*, 223-226). Therefore Tuckett concludes that Luke 4:16-30 is taken from Q. For more of his evidence, see *ibid.*, 226-237.

Conclusion

It appears that Luke 3:1-4:30 is almost entirely taken from Q. The likely (though not certain) exceptions are the Isaiah quotation in Luke 3:4-6, the transitional verse in 3:15, and the report of John's arrest in 3:18-20. If this is the case, we now know how Q began, and we know more of the material that was in Q, including the additional preaching of John in 3:10-14, the genealogy in 3:23-38, and the Nazareth pericope in 4:14-30. In addition we can better approximate the wording of Q at key points, such as the baptism of Jesus. This has implications both for Lukan studies and for Q studies. For Lukan studies, we can first see that Luke takes greater care than we have sometimes assumed in preserving his sources. And second, we can see that we should exhibit more caution in arguing that Luke has displaced and expanded particular pericopes, such as the Nazareth pericope, out of theological motives. For Q studies, we can first recognize the genre of Q in its introduction – it is written according to the generic structure of biblical prophecy. Second, we can see more clearly the lines drawn between the Pharisees and the lawyers on the one hand, and the crowds and the tax collectors on the other hand. Third, we can see more of the poetic nature of Q, furthering the theory that it was designed for oral performance. Fourth, we must consider the implications of the Nazareth sermon on Q's theology. Does this disprove Arnal's thesis that Q does not presuppose a Gentile mission? Fifth, we can see the centrality of Isa 61 for Q's Christology. Sixth, we have more evidence that Q is longer than is typically assumed. Finally, it is more clear that Q's view of Jesus is in line with the proto-orthodox views of Matthew and Luke, which should not be surprising in light of their great interest in Q but has been questioned in several studies of Q.