

A Passion Narrative in Q? (SBL 2015)

© 2015 by David B. Sloan

For the last four years I have been attempting to demonstrate that Q must have included more material than the portions of Q that have been simultaneously preserved by Matthew and Luke. I have argued that because Q contains narration of events [SLIDE] that Q was not a collection of sayings of Jesus but a full-blown narrative, and that we have only thought it to be a collection of sayings because Matthew primarily used it to craft the speeches of Jesus in his gospel. Luke, however, seems to have preserved the original narrative settings of these sayings.¹ At this summer's international conference on the Q Hypothesis in Denmark, one scholar responded: "It is one thing to say that Q contained narratives; another to say that Q as a whole was a narrative." The biggest problem with my thesis, it would seem, is that even if the Q passages we have identified contained Luke's narrative settings, there still seems to be little evidence that Q is more than an extended chreia collection or a series of episodes. For it to be more, one would expect to find a narrative climax, and it has long been assumed that Q did not narrate the death of Jesus.

But I want to raise a question: [SLIDE] If Q had a passion narrative, how would we know? Presumably we would find a significant amount of non-Markan material that is shared by Matthew and Luke in their passion narratives. But what if Q's passion narrative was similar enough to Mark's that Matthew did not feel the need to consult Q here and Luke did not feel the need to consult Mark? Mark and John have similar passion narratives; if someone used these narratives as sources, how much would she feel the need to consult the second source? Robert Derrenbacker has shown that the mechanics of conflating sources in antiquity forced writers to generally copy one source at a time, though memory of the second source might affect the way he redacts his primary source.²

Now if this has happened with the passion narrative, and Luke has followed Q but has supplemented it with components of Mark, while Matthew has followed Mark but supplemented it with components of Q, how would we know? I suggest that we would see the following [SLIDE]:

1. Luke's PN would often disagree with Mark's in order and wording.
2. Luke's PN would reflect the style, theology, and themes of Q.
3. Elements from Q's PN would occasionally appear in Matthew's PN.

In other words, if Mark and Q gave similar passion narratives and Matthew followed the former while Luke followed the latter, there would be (1) evidence that Luke is not following Mark as his main source; (2) evidence that Luke's source resembles Q; and (3) evidence that Matthew was also aware of this source. This is exactly what we find when consider the passion narratives in Matthew and Luke. In this paper I want to take us through a journey of Luke's passion narrative and demonstrate this in a series of passages.

Jesus' Entry into Jerusalem

We begin with Jesus' entry into Jerusalem [SLIDE]. In Luke this follows a Q passage, the parable of the entrusted money in Luke 19:11-27. Verse 28 serves as a transition, concluding the speech of

¹ John C. Hawkins, "Probabilities as to the So-Called Double Tradition of St. Matthew and St. Luke," in *Studies in the Synoptic Problem*, ed. William Sanday (Oxford: Clarendon, 1911), 95-138, esp. p. 124.

² Robert A. Derrenbacker Jr., "The 'External and Psychological Conditions under Which the Synoptic Gospels Were Written': Ancient Compositional Practices and the Synoptic Problem," in *New Studies in the Synoptic Problem*, ed. Paul Foster and Andrew Gregory (Leuven: Peeters, 2011), 435-458, esp. 441, 444.

Jesus in verses 11-27 and locating Jesus on the ascent to Jerusalem. Nothing in it reflects Mark except the words “to Jerusalem.” [You can see on the slide I have made words red if they are in Mark. If a synonym of a word is in Mark, I have made the first two letters of that word red.] Verse 28 is *either* a Lukian composition in order to change sources *or* the way Q transitioned out of the parable of the entrusted money; we do not know. What seems clear is that Luke follows Mark almost word-for-word in verses 29-36, on procuring the colt, but then is very different in verses 37-44 [**SLIDE**], the actual entry into Jerusalem. The story of procuring the colt in verses 29-36 is a secondary element tradition-historically and is not reflected in the parallel account in the Gospel of John.³ So it is not surprising that Luke would have gotten this information from Mark. But verses 37-44 are so different in wording that Luke appears to no longer be looking at Mark. Only in verse 38 does Luke reflect Mark, but this is in a traditional element that reads almost exactly the same in John. Luke gives details in verses 37-39 that are paralleled in John, but not in Mark: the memory of Jesus’ miracles, the title “king,” and the Pharisees’ negative reaction.⁴ Moreover, Luke is missing details from Mark’s account: the leafy branches, the shout of “hosanna,” and the statement that Jesus immediately went into the temple. So Luke appears to copy Mark only for the story that is unique to Mark, the procuring of the colt. When he reports the part of the story that is known elsewhere, he uses a non-Markan account.

If Luke is using a different source for verses 37-44, could that source be the same one he used in verses 11-27, namely Q? Notably, if the verses where he is clearly following Mark (verses 29-36) are removed from Luke 19, the text flows smoothly [**SLIDE**]. We have the parable of the entrusted money in Luke 19:11-27, followed by the words:

28 After he had said this, he went on ahead, going up to Jerusalem.

37 As he was now approaching the path down from the Mount of Olives, the whole multitude of the disciples began to praise God.

The word ἐγγίζω may have been a trigger for Luke to turn to the Markan account, knowing that Mark added details regarding the approach that are not present in Q. Luke uses the word at both verse 29 and at verse 36, revealing the seams of his redactional activity. In this case verse 28, like verses 11-27, is from Q, as are verses 37-44. Further suggesting this is Fitzmyer’s observation that verses 39-40 “may be an independent form of what Matt 21:15-16 has.”⁵ Matthew and Luke both add to the Markan account the fact that the people are praising God for “the marvels/miracles they had seen” and a negative reaction by the religious leadership. Matthew uses this addition as an opportunity to show Jesus fulfilling Psalm 8: “From the mouths of infants and nursing babies you have prepared praise.” Manson argues that Luke’s version is more original and that “the scripture quotation [in Matthew] has ousted the original reply as given in Lk. 19:40.”⁶

In Luke 19:39-40, the Pharisees’ comment sets up a witty response by Jesus expressed in parallelism (“I tell you, if these are silent, the stones will cry out”), followed by a lengthier Deuteronomistic speech of Jesus as he weeps over Jerusalem. This form is characteristic of Q. The vocative, the paratactic construction, and the enclitic pronouns are far more characteristic of Q’s style

³ Ernst, *Das Evangelium nach Markus*, 318; cf. Bultmann, *History*, 261–62*check.

⁴ Bovon, *Luke*, 3:5.

⁵ Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 2:1243. So Manson, *Sayings*, 221, 317.

⁶ Manson, *Sayings*, 221. Cf. Manson, *Sayings*, 317: “on the whole, the Lucan version is freer from difficulties and probably more reliable.” Manson, however, holds that while Matt 21:14-16 and Luke 19:39-40 are “two accounts of the same tradition, [they] have come down through separate lines of tradition” (317). On the contrary, is there any reason to assume that Matthew did not draw his material directly from a version very close to what Luke has here?

than of Luke's own style.⁷ The personification of stones is known elsewhere in the Gospels only in the preaching of John in Q 3:8. Our present verse continues the thought introduced in Q 3:8 that if the people of God will not serve the Lord, God will raise up stones to do it.

These words are followed by Jesus weeping over Jerusalem. The reference to "the time of your visitation" recalls Q 12:56 where Jesus laments that the people "do not know how to interpret the present time."⁸ Fitzmyer points to two parallels for this passage: Jesus' earlier lament over Jerusalem in Q 13:34-35 and Jesus' later lament over Jerusalem in Luke 23:27-31, which I will argue below is also from Q.⁹ In all three of these passages, Jesus laments not only Jerusalem, but also her "children." Nowhere else in the Gospels is Jerusalem said to have "children."

Thus we see evidence that Luke is following a non-Markan source here and that this source resembles Q. Matthew reflects the tradition in Luke 19:39-40, but he has so heavily redacted it to connect it to Psalm 8 that the parallel is now seen in ideas and not in specific wording. Matthew does not have verses 40-44, but he will include one of Jesus' laments over Jerusalem two chapters later. This one he may have seen as unnecessary to include.

The Last Supper

From this point until Luke 22:14, Luke follows Mark pretty closely.¹⁰ As with the entry narrative, so with the Passover meal [SLIDE], Luke follows Mark closely for what is unique to Mark – the detail about preparing a room for Jesus to have the meal – but looks very different from Mark in the recounting of the meal itself. Where does Luke get his account of the actual supper? I want to jump into the middle of the pericope. [SLIDE. Where Luke parallels Matthew and not Mark is shown in green.] Verses 28 and 30 are typically assigned to Q because they are part of the double tradition. But in Luke these verses conclude the discussion in verses 24-27 regarding who is the greatest. Because these verses resemble a passage that is found elsewhere in Mark, many conclude that Luke has "displaced" this Markan passage. But this is not how Luke operates.¹¹ Luke 22:24-27 is in many ways more primitive than Mark 10:42-45, most notably in its omission of the Markan ransom saying. This shows that Luke is not dependent on Mark for these verses. What is Luke's source? Why not Q? It sets up verses 28-30, and Matthew's omission of this is easily explained by the fact that Matthew has already copied Mark's version earlier in his gospel. So verses 24-30 may very well be entirely from Q.

[SLIDE] This is immediately followed by Jesus' prediction of Peter's denials, something that does not occur in Mark's telling of the Last Supper, but after it, when they are at the Mount of Olives; and there are almost no words in common between Mark 14:27-31 and Luke 22:31-33. Verse 34 is very

⁷ Jeremias, *Sprache*, 281, notes in verses 39-44 seven clauses beginning with καὶ and eight enclitic pronouns.

⁸ Manson, *Sayings*, 321. Manson also connects this saying to the passages in Q in which the presence of the kingdom is announced (Q 10:9, 11; 11:20).

⁹ Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 2:1256. Further connecting our passage with Luke 23:48, Fitzmyer notes that in both passages "Jerusalem itself is alluded to as a mother" (1258). Dupont highlights other links between Luke 19:43–44 and Luke 23:27–31 in "Pierre sur pierre," 447–52.

¹⁰ It is possible that this was followed immediately by Luke 21:34-38 in Q, perhaps with a transition like this: "And turning to his disciples he said." Vassiliadis, *ΛΟΓΟΙ ΙΗΣΟΥ*, 57, argues that verses 34-36 "might have stood in Q." Tuckett also notes that "the sections 21.34-36 and 18.1-8 form similarly structured units (opening exhortation - parable - concluding SM saying)." I have elsewhere argued that Luke 18:1-8 is from Q. See Christopher M. Tuckett, "The Lukan Son of Man," in *From the Sayings to the Gospels* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014), 557-573, here p. 561; David B. Sloan, "Lost Portions." At the same time, it is possible that Luke comes to Mark 13:32-37 and sees that it is too similarly worded to Q/Luke 12:36-38, so Luke writes his own summary of the message without repeating the parable. I lean toward the latter solution.

¹¹ See, e.g., Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words*, 69.

similar, but no more similar to Mark than it is to John's account. In other words, this is a very traditional detail and Luke need not consult Mark to find a wording such as this. Could Luke have taken this from Q rather than from Mark? And if so, would Matthew have bothered to copy it if he was copying Mark's parallel account? The best explanation for Luke placing this at the Supper instead of where Mark placed it is that Luke is still copying the same source he was copying in 22:30.

As further evidence of this we can consider the next verses in Luke. Verses 35-36 are a clear allusion back to Q 10:4 [SLIDE]:

"See, I am sending you out like sheep into the midst of wolves. Carry no purse, no bag, no sandals; and greet no one on the road."

This cannot be from a source other than Q unless Luke has heavily redacted it to look like Q, but there are a couple problems with this. First, Luke makes Q 10 to be about the seventy-two, whereas Luke 22:24ff is clearly about the twelve. If verses 35-36 were in Q, they were more consistent there than in Luke. Second, these verses do not seem to be redactional. Jeremias notes a number of unlukan features in these verses: the beginning καί, εἶπεν + dative (2x), antithetical parallelism, the negated substantive participle.¹² Each of these features is common in Q. In addition, Manson notes that the mood of this passage resembles most that of Q 13:34-35.¹³ Matthew might have omitted verses 35-36 because he didn't like that the carrying of the sword was Jesus' idea. This emphasis on the swords continues through verse 38, so it may very well be that verses 24-38 are entirely from Q.

What about verses 14-23 that we skipped over until now? Luke's decision to place verses 24-38 at the end of the Last Supper suggests that it had a similar setting in Q. Notably, Luke's wording and order are very different from Mark's here: [SLIDE]

If Luke is following Mark he adds his own beginning then goes to Mark 14:25, 22 (plus additions), 24, 18/20, 21, 19. He also rewords some of these verses quite significantly [SLIDE], using expressions and constructions that Jeremias notes are unlukan.¹⁴ Verses 18-22 look a lot like Mark, but in a liturgical text we could expect a lot of uniformity in wording. In verse 18, Luke edits Mark's expression in the same way that Matthew does [on your handout, this is Minor Agreement #1].

Matt 26:29	οὐ μὴ πίω	<u>ἀπ' ἄρτι</u>	ἐκ τούτου	τοῦ γενήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου
Mark 14:25	<u>οὐκέτι</u>	οὐ μὴ πίω	ἐκ	τοῦ γενήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου
Luke 22:18	οὐ μὴ πίω	<u>ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν</u>	ἀπὸ	τοῦ γενήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου

At first this may not seem very significant, but with Mark's other six uses of οὐκέτι, not once does either Matthew or Mark replace it with ἀπὸ + ἄρτι/νῦν. In fact, ἀπὸ + ἄρτι/νῦν occurs elsewhere in the Gospels only in Matthew 23:39 (Q) and in Matthew 26:64//Luke 22:69 [minor agreement #9 on your handout]. Furthermore, the eschatological focus in verses 16 and 18 would be very much at home in Q. Matthew here betrays his knowledge of Luke's source for the Last Supper narrative.

Verses 19-20 are similar to Mark 14:22, 24, but they are far more similar to 1 Cor 11:23-25, so Luke's source here is clearly not Mark but a tradition he shares with 1 Corinthians. Whether Luke knows this tradition through Q or through liturgical practice is not clear, so in my reconstruction of Q I have placed these verses in brackets.

This leaves only verses 21-23. Verse 22 seems to be a rewriting of Mark, but Luke's decision to place this here is best explained if the source Luke has been using contained something like verse 21 here. This would also set up the dispute that arises next in 22:24. So verse 22 is from Mark, verses 19-

¹² Jeremias, *Sprache*, 292.

¹³ Manson, *Sayings*, 341.

¹⁴ Jeremias, *Sprache*, 286-290.

20 may be from Q or may be from liturgical practice, but otherwise Luke 22:14-38 appears to all be from Q.

Jesus' Arrest and Peter's Denial

[SLIDE] The account of Jesus at Gethsemane reads in Luke like a condensed version of Mark's account. There is no evidence that this was in Q. But in the following episode, that of the arrest of Jesus, Luke diverges much more from Mark [SLIDE]. There are also a number of minor agreements between Matthew and Luke here. Matthew and Luke both add the word ιδού at the appearance of Judas. Matthew and Luke both have Jesus directly address Judas with a rhetorical question, while Mark has nothing here [see Minor Agreement #2 on your handout]:

Matt 26:50 ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῷ· ἐταῖρε, ἐφ' ὃ πάρει;
Luke 22:48 Ἰησοῦς δὲ εἶπεν αὐτῷ· Ιούδα, φιλήματι τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου παραδίδως;

Matthew and Luke use the same formula to introduce the quote. The rhetorical questions are quite different and there is debate over whether Matthew's words should be read as a question, but Luke's question may be an attempt to clarify what is ambiguous in Matthew's version.¹⁵

Then in verse 50 one of the disciples strikes the high priest's servant. Luke shares with John the tradition that it is the servant's *right* ear. Matthew seems to know whatever tradition Luke is reflecting, because Matthew agrees with Luke in using the word πατάσσω instead of Mark's παίω. [SLIDE] In both Matthew and Luke Jesus rebukes the person who drew the sword. Matthew's version is long and Luke's version is short. Jeremias notes that Luke's version is redactional. Matthew's version shares a number of features of Q: (1) equally balanced lines, (2) an imperative supported by an aphorism which is followed by a rhetorical question, (3) beginning the rhetorical question with the conjunction ἢ, and (4) use of the verb δοκέω + ὅτι. Davies and Allison note that Matt 26:52 reflects the Son of Man sayings about non-retaliation and that Matthew uses the word ἀποστρέψω only here and in 5:42, which is from Q.¹⁶ Matthew 26:53 has Jesus refusing angelic help, recalling the temptation narrative (Q 4:1-13).¹⁷ Luke follows this with verses 52-53, which he seems to have taken from Mark.

[SLIDE] Luke 22:54 relates the seizing of Jesus, which had been related seven verses earlier in Mark (14:46). Matthew has the seizing of Jesus in both places – in Matt 26:50 and in Matt 26:57 – showing Matthew's attempt to bring together Mark and Luke's main-source. Luke's version is missing Mark's reference to the gathering of the chief priests, the elders, and the scribes, an element of Markan redaction.¹⁸ Luke also has what is likely the more primitive account of the sequence of events, as Matthew and Mark's focus on Peter, then Jesus, then Peter seems to be an example of Markan intercalation. We also have minor agreements #4, 5, and 6 here, the most significant being #6: the phrase ἐξελθὼν ἔξω occurs only here in the Gospels, and the word πικρῶς occurs only here in the Gospels, and yet both Matthew and Luke have these details.¹⁹ We could also note that both Matthew and Luke have the rooster crow once rather than twice. The fact that Peter went "outside" in Matt

¹⁵ Alternatively, Franklin argues that Matthew meant for ἐφ' ὃ πάρει to be understood as a command and that Matthew had seen in Q a question like the one in Luke but gave a different form "because Matthew's following of Mark means that Judas has already kissed him" ("Passion Narrative," 34).

¹⁶ Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3:512.

¹⁷ Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3:513.

¹⁸ Yarbro Collins, *Mark*, 699.

¹⁹ The omission of Luke 22:62 in some Latin manuscripts is almost certainly a later, accidental omission (Metzger's *Textual Commentary* gives this an A). As Goulder notes, Luke's statement that the Lord turned and looked at Peter demands a response such as this within the text ("On Putting Q," 228-229).

26:75 and Luke 22:62; contrasts the fact that Peter went “inside” in Luke 22:54, so Matt 26:75 assumes the earlier Lukan narrative and even reads awkwardly apart from it, since Matthew, following Mark, already has Peter *outside* (ἔξω) in Matt 26:69.²⁰ We could also note that the second accusation in Matthew (“this one was with Jesus”) is closer in wording to the first accusation in Luke than to any of the accusations in Mark. Thus it seems that Matthew and Luke share a non-Markan tradition for this material. The possibility that both Q and Matthew would contain the threefold denial of Jesus by Peter is not surprising, since John also contains this tradition.

Matt 26:58	ό	<u>δὲ</u>	Πέτρος	<u>ἡκολούθει</u> αὐτῷ	ἀπὸ μακρόθεν
Mark 14:54	<u>καὶ</u>	ό	Πέτρος		ἀπὸ μακρόθεν
Luke 22:54	ό	<u>δὲ</u>	Πέτρος	<u>ἡκολούθει</u>	μακρόθεν.

Matt 26:58			<u>ἐκάθητο</u>	μετὰ τῶν ὑπηρετῶν
Mark 15:54	καὶ	ἢν συγκαθήμενος		μετὰ τῶν ὑπηρετῶν
Luke 22:55	καὶ	συγκαθισάντων	<u>ἐκάθητο</u> ο Πέτρος	μέσος αὐτῶν

Matt 26:75	καὶ	<u>ἐξελθὼν ἔξω</u>	<u>ἐκλαυσεν πικρῶς</u>
Mark 14:72	καὶ	ἐπιβαλὼν	ἐκλαιεν
Luke 22:62	καὶ	<u>ἐξελθὼν ἔξω</u>	<u>ἐκλαυσεν πικρῶς</u>

Jesus Beaten and Then Questioned

In Luke 22:63-65 Jesus is mocked and beaten. This parallels the mocking in Mark 14:65, but unlike in Mark it happens before Jesus is brought before the Sanhedrin. And while Mark and Luke both say that Jesus was blindfolded and struck, Matthew and Luke have the same five-word phrase that is not in Mark: “Who is the one who struck you?” [Minor Agreement #7]

Matt 26:68	<u>λέγοντες•</u>	προφήτευσον ἡμῖν, χριστέ,	<u>τίς ἐστιν ὁ παίσας σε;</u>
Mark 14:65	λέγειν αὐτῷ•	προφήτευσον	
Luke 22:64	<u>λέγοντες•</u>	προφήτευσον,	<u>τίς ἐστιν ὁ παίσας σε;</u>

While it could be argued that this question is implied by the word “prophesy” in Mark, the decision of both to add this is remarkable, especially since they use the exact same phrase. In narrating the striking of Jesus just before this Matthew uses the words κολαφίζω and ῥαπίζω, and Luke uses the word ἐμπαίζω, but both agree in using the word παίω (as an aorist participle) in this saying, *even though neither of them uses the word παίω anywhere else in his gospel.*²¹ So it appears that Luke 22:63-65 is also from Q.

Next in Luke we have a trial before the Sanhedrin. Whereas Mark has this occur at night, a detail that Yarbro Collins takes as redactional, Luke has this take place the next morning. Numerous other elements of Mark’s account are missing here: the false testimonies (Mark 14:55-59), the high

²⁰ Franklin, “Passion Narrative,” 33.

²¹ Goodacre, *Synoptic Problem*, 146. See also Franklin, “Passion Narrative,” 32-33. Franklin argues that Matthew does not merely try to explain Mark here but is using this saying – which Franklin argues to have been in Q – to transform Mark’s depiction of this as an attack on Jesus’ claim to a special relationship with God into a depiction of the Jewish leaders as entirely undignified.

priest's first question to Jesus and Jesus' silence (Mark 14:60-61a), the high priest's tearing of his garment (Mark 14:63a), and the decision that Jesus is worthy of death (Mark 14:64b). These too Yarbro Collins argues that are Markan embellishments to the story.* What Luke *does* parallel from Mark is traditional and is given in a different sequence than in Mark.

Once again Matthew betrays here his knowledge of Luke's source. [See here Minor Agreements 8, 9, and 10.] It appears that Luke has added only one thing from Mark in this entire pericope, and that is the last verse, regarding testimonies against Jesus which are not actually narrated in Luke's account. The rest of the passage is from Q.

Matt 26:63 ἡμῖν εἴπης εἰ σὺ εἶ ὁ χριστὸς ὁ οὐίος τοῦ θεοῦ.

Mark 14:61 σὺ εἶ ὁ χριστὸς ὁ οὐίος τοῦ εὐλογητοῦ;

Luke 22:67 εἰ σὺ εἶ ὁ χριστός, εἰπὸν ἡμῖν.

Matt 26:64 ἀπ' ἄρτι ὅψεσθε τὸν οὐίον τοῦ ἀνθρώπου καθήμενον ἐκ δεξιῶν

Mark 14:62 καὶ ὅψεσθε τὸν οὐίον τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐκ δεξιῶν καθήμενον

Luke 22:69 ἀπὸ τοῦ γῦν δὲ ἔσται ὁ οὐίος τοῦ ἀνθρώπου καθήμενος ἐκ δεξιῶν

Matt 26:64 λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· σὺ εἶπας

Mark 14:62 ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν· ἐγώ εἰμι

Luke 22:70 ὁ δὲ πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἔφη· ὑμεῖς λέγετε ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι

The Trial before Pilate and Herod

I am going to skip over Luke 23:1-25 where Luke is clearly independent of Mark. There are a few elements of Q style, but nothing definitive.

Jesus' Crucifixion

[SLIDE] Looking at the crucifixion of Jesus, note how Luke 23:27-31 clearly resembles Q's style and not Luke's own style. The words κόπτω and θρηνέω (Luke 23:27) occur together elsewhere in the NT only in Matt 11:17, which is from Q. The word στραφείς before Jesus speaks (Luke 23:28) is a regular feature of Q (Q 7:9; 10:23; 14:25; cf. Q 22:61).²² The antithetical parallelism in verse 28 is reminiscent of Q 12:4-5. The two-word vocative opening to a lament is also typical of Q (Q 3:7; 13:34). The word κλαίω is ubiquitous in Q. The expression, "the days are coming" in verse 29 is a Q expression (cf. Q 17:22; 19:43; cf. Luke 21:6*).²³ This is followed by a beatitude that is clearly intended to echo Luke 11:27, which has been attributed to Q by many scholars. Next, verse 30 contains the "begin to say" expression we find repeatedly in Q (3:8; 7:24; 11:29; 12:45; 13:25-26; 14:18; 22:23; etc).²⁴ Finally, the saying ends with a rhetorical question, which is a regular feature of Q. There are as many stylistic tendencies of Q visible in these five verses as in any five verses that are definitely assigned to Q. Furthermore, the Deuteronomistic focus is as clear in this passage as in any other.

Unfortunately, sorting through Luke's source material in verses 33-48 is not as easy. Luke may have derived verses 33-34 from Mark. At the same time, the three things reported in these verses are

²² Jeremias notes that this is not Luke's style. He never adds it to words of Jesus in Mark, and in Acts he writes ἐπιστρέψας, not στραφείς (Acts 9:40; 16:18). Jeremias, *Sprache*, 155.

²³ Jeremias notes that the present tense is unlukan and is a Septuagintalism (*Sprache*, 266).

²⁴ On this expression, see Jeremias, *Sprache*, 105-106.

all standard components of the passion story, so the agreements with Mark may be mere coincidence. Luke has them in a different order from Mark and one that agrees with John. Matthew shows an awareness of the tradition behind Luke 23:35 [Minor Agreement #11]. Matthew's wording may better reflect Q's, as it is the only place in the Gospels other than the temptation narrative in which the words, "If you are the Son of God" occur.

Matt 27:40	σῶσον σεαυτόν, εἰς υἱὸς εἰς τοῦ θεοῦ
Mark 15:30	σῶσον σεαυτόν
Luke 23:35	εἰς σὺ εἰς ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ιουδαίων, σῶσον σεαυτόν.

Matthew and Luke also both add the word οὗτος to the inscription. [Minor Agreement #12] Luke also mentions the inscription at a different point in the narrative than Mark does, probably because Luke is not following Mark for this account.

Matt 27:37	οὗτός ἐστιν Ἰησοῦς	ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ιουδαίων.
Mark 15:26		ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ιουδαίων.
Luke 23:38		ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ιουδαίων <u>οὗτος</u> .

Then verses 39-43 report a conversation between the men on the cross. Here we have a dialogue, which is typical of Q. The first quotation contains a rhetorical question followed by an imperative. The second quotation is another rhetorical question, ending with a ὅτι clause and containing the word ἄξιος. The speaker then changes his addressee, and then we have a καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ transition to Jesus' speech. All of this is typical of Q's style. Because the passage conflicts with Mark's account of the men both reviling Jesus, Matthew probably just omitted this and copied Mark here, while Luke followed Q's version.

[SLIDE] Verses 44-49 have a number of overlaps with Mark, but some of these are traditional elements. It is hard to separate out Q here, but Minor agreement #13 might be significant, and verse 48 was probably the original Q ending to this account.

Matt 27:54	Ο δὲ <u>έκατόνταρχος</u> ... ιδόντες ...	τὰ γενόμενα	έφοβήθησαν σφόδρα,	λέγοντες
Mark 15:39	Ιδὼν δὲ ὁ κεντυρίων ...	ὅτι οὕτως ἔξεπνευσεν		εἶπεν
Luke 23:47	Ιδὼν δὲ ὁ <u>έκατοντάρχης</u>	τὸ γενόμενον	ἐδόξαζεν τὸν θεὸν	λέγων

Conclusion

There is more work to be done here, especially regarding the vindication of Jesus. Was there an empty tomb narrative? Does the ascension account in Acts 1:9-11 – which has a few overlaps with the Great Commission narrative in Matthew, and which reflects the assumption language that we would expect Q to use based on Q 13:34-35 – derive from Q. It is beyond the scope of this paper to address these issues. What I believe I have done here is demonstrated that Luke is primarily using a non-Markan source for the PN; that this source resembles the style, theology, and themes of Q; and that Matthew repeatedly betrays his knowledge of this source, even if he is not making use of this source to the extent that he is using Mark here. These three things suggest that Q had a passion narrative that is still largely visible in the Gospel of Luke.