

MCAFEE SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY

Q AND THE PASSION – CHALLENGING THE CONSENSUS VIEW

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE FACULTY OF THE JAMES & CAROLYN MCAFEE SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE
MASTER OF THEOLOGICAL STUDIES

BY

STEVEN D. COLLIER

ATLANTA, GA

MARCH 30, 2023

Q AND THE PASSION – CHALLENGING THE CONSENSUS VIEW

BY

STEVEN D. COLLIER

Approved:

_____ Date: March ____, 2023
Angela N. Parker, Ph.D.
Director, Master of Theological Studies Degree Program

_____ Date: March ____, 2023
Angela N. Parker, Ph.D.
Thesis Advisor

_____ Date: March ____, 2023
C. Gregory DeLoach, D.Min.
Dean, School of Theology

Copyright 2023

Steven D. Collier

All Rights Reserved

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF APPENDICES	vi
ABSTRACT	vii
CHAPTER	
1. GENERAL INTRODUCTION	1
Limitations and Methodology	3
Main Thesis Question and Sub-questions	4
Review of Q Literature and the Passion	7
2. SOURCE UTILIZATION	12
Source Criticism vs. Source Utilization	12
Source Utilization Findings	14
Source Utilization Applied to Luke's Passion	18
A Second Written Source for Luke's Passion	24
3. NON-MARKAN PASSION SAYINGS	25
Theological Objections to a Q Passion	26
Q's Genre and the Passion	27
Thematic Similarities with Q	29
Source Utilization and Combining Two Sources	35
Passion Sayings in Q	38
4. MINOR AGREEMENTS	40
Minor Agreements in the Passion	40

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

Matthew’s Awareness of Non-Markan Passion Sayings	41
Minor Agreements and Lucan Order	43
Passion <i>Chria</i> Framing in Q	46
Minor Agreements Support a Q Passion	48
5. SCOPE AND IMPLICATIONS OF A Q PASSION	50
Proposed Scope of a Passion <i>Chria</i> Collection in Q	50
Implications of a Q Passion	52
Conclusion	54
REFERENCES	56
APPENDICES	59

LIST OF APPENDICES

APPENDIX

- A. DEVIATIONS IN ORDER BETWEEN MARK AND LUKE
- B. WHAT SOURCE UTILIZATION WOULD PREDICT – PULLING DENIALS FORWARD
- C. WHAT LUKE ACTUAL DOES – REVERSE ORDER FROM MARK
- D. NON-MARKAN SAYINGS IN LUKE’S PASSION
- E. CUMULATIVE DEVIATIONS FROM MARK
 - APPENDIX E.1 Luke 22:61-70 (End of Denials Through End of Sanhedrin Trial)
 - APPENDIX E.2 Luke 22:47-54 (Arrest)
- F. PROPOSED Q PASSION *CHRIA* COLLECTION

ABSTRACT

STEVEN D. COLLIER

Q AND THE PASSION – CHALLENGING THE CONSENSUS VIEW

Under the direction of REV. ANGELA N. PARKER, Ph. D.

This thesis challenges the consensus viewpoint of biblical scholarship that Q, the sayings source common to Matthew and Luke, contains no Passion account. Based on the absence of a Passion in Q (the Argument from Silence), the consensus view concludes Q's theology is divergent from the cross-centered theology of Matthew and Luke. The purpose of the present study is to refute the Argument from Silence, and show that Q did in fact contain Passion material. With a Passion, Q must have had a theology more congruent with Matthew and Luke. The research methodology is source utilization, the study of how ancient writers used sources based on the then available technology of document production. Based on deviations from Mark in content, but more importantly order, source utilization points to a second non-Markan written source in Luke's Passion, which source provided the alternative content and order. Q could be the second source because (a) the non-Markan portion of Luke's Passion contains numerous sayings of Jesus consistent with Q's genre as a sayings source, and (b) these non-Markan sayings also have thematic resonance with Q. The Minor Agreements of Matthew and Luke against Mark in their respective Passion accounts further support these findings. The Minor Agreements demonstrate Matthew's awareness of: (1) non-Markan sayings thematically related to Q, and (2) non-Markan material precisely at the point where Luke deviates from Markan order, and is therefore following the order of the second written source. Based on all of these results, I conclude Q is in fact the second written source for much of the non-Markan Passion material in Luke, and the

material is echoed to a lesser extent in Matthew. I will pull the analysis together and propose an addition to Q of about 300 words of Passion material drawn from Luke and Matthew. I will end with a brief discussion of the implications of a Q Passion. These include rebuttal of the Argument from Silence, consequences for the Synoptic Problem and ramifications for the theology of Q and the history of early Christianity.

CHAPTER 1 – GENERAL INTRODUCTION

I have been interested in the Sayings Source Q (herein, Q) for more than ten years. Q is a key element of the Two Source Theory of New Testament scholarship which seeks to explain how Matthew, Mark and Luke (the Synoptic Gospels) relate to one another (the Synoptic Problem). I am primarily interested in the theology of Q and its impact on studies of early Christianity. As discussed below in the Review of Q Literature, the general consensus of Q scholarship for nearly seventy (70) years holds that Q contains no Passion account of the death of Jesus. Many Q scholars use the absence of any Passion in Q to argue Q's theology is quite different from the cross-centered theology of the Synoptic Gospels (the Argument from Silence). Q is therefore seen as evidence of an early form of Christianity different from the Christianity represented by the Synoptic Gospels.

William Farmer criticized this direction of Q scholarship as “problematic” and in his view “producing ever more dubious reconstructions of early Christianity.”¹ He argued for a solution to the Synoptic Problem that eliminated the existence of Q altogether.² I share Farmer's concern about Q's effect on scholarship of early Christianity, but offer a different approach toward moving Q scholarship in a new direction. Unlike Farmer, the present thesis does not dispute the existence of Q,³ but will aim instead to rebut the Argument from Silence and show that Q did contain Passion material.

¹ William R. Farmer, “Preface,” in *Beyond the Q Impasse: Luke's Use of Matthew*, by Allan J. McNicol et al. (Valley Forge, Pa.: Trinity Press International, 1996), xii.

² Ibid.

³ The case for the existence of Q is beyond the scope of this paper, but a summary can be found at Christopher M. Tuckett, *Q and the History of Early Christianity: Studies on Q* (London: T & T Clark International, 2004), 7–11.

If Q contained Passion material and the Argument from Silence is invalid, then theological construals of Q based on the Argument from Silence are also invalid. Instead of exhibiting alternative theology based on something other than the death of Jesus, a Passion in Q strongly suggests Q's theology is more congruent with the cross-centered Synoptic Gospels and similar early Christian writings like the core letters of Paul.⁴ Put another way, Q would be another example of early Christian literature where the death of Jesus is significant. Q would be more aligned theologically with other first century texts which ultimately formed the canon of orthodox Christianity.⁵

If Q's theology is aligned with the Synoptic Gospels, then the scholarly view that Q is early evidence of a form of alternative Christianity like the Gospel of Thomas also becomes dubious. The existence of a Passion in Q would significantly differentiate it from Thomas (which contains no Passion). Q would instead be part of the (main?)stream of early Christianity that also produced Matthew, Mark and Luke.⁶

⁴ I am not suggesting the Synoptic Gospels (along with Paul) are theologically monolithic. I am, however, making the more general, and I believe non-controversial, point that the Synoptic Gospels (and Paul) share a theological emphasis on the death and cross of Christ as evidenced by the Passion. The absence of cross-centered theology in Q is precisely the point of the Argument from Silence that Q contained no Passion, which Argument this thesis aims to refute.

⁵ In an important sense this has always been true. Q was incorporated into the gospels of Matthew and Luke, and when those gospels became part of the canon so did Q.

⁶ Again to an important degree this has always been true. The very selection of Q as a source by Matthew and Luke implies some degree of commonality among those Evangelists and their sources Q and Mark. Luke's Prologue at Chapter 1:1-4 suggests as much, i.e., the prior accounts to which Luke refers, which must include Mark and Q, are drawn from a common well of tradition shared by Luke and Theophilus.

Limitations and Methodology

The theological and historical implications of a Q Passion are important and the main purpose for this study. Due to the space constraints of a master's thesis, however, the present paper takes only the first step of showing the evidence for Passion material in Q and thereby refuting the Argument from Silence. Once the case for a Q Passion has been made, subsequent work can delve more deeply into the theological and historical implications.

Another limitation is also important. Unlike some prior scholarship discussed below, I will not attempt to show Q includes a Passion **narrative**. Instead, my aim is narrower: I suggest Q contains a collection of Passion **sayings material** (along with limited narrative elements known as *chria*) consistent with the accepted genre of Q as a sayings source. I will propose a *chria* collection of Passion sayings material for inclusion in Q of about 300 words in length. Whether Q's Passion account might include additional Passion elements is not here precluded, but the present investigation will be so limited. The *chria* collection here proposed rebuts the Argument from Silence, and leads directly to the theological and historical implications of a more orthodox Q.

To accomplish this goal, the present study will move beyond traditional source **criticism** and deploy recent social **utilization** methodology. Prior to the twenty-first century, most work on the Synoptic Problem utilized methods of source criticism, which generally assumed the Evangelists consulted multiple source materials visually like modern writers.⁷ In the twenty-first century, research on the Synoptic Problem has focused on the utilization of sources based on

⁷ Robert A. Jr. Derrenbacher, "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. P. Foster et al. (Leuven: Utigeveru Peeters, 2011), 435.

more historically accurate ancient media practices (including working with scrolls).⁸ Scholars have specifically applied source utilization research to Q.⁹ Although source criticism will be consulted, source utilization will be the main methodology for this study.

Thesis Questions and Sub-Questions

A review of the existing research indicates scholars have not applied source utilization analysis to the Passion narratives in any detail.¹⁰ The present analysis will apply source utilization to the Passion especially with Q in mind. We will seek an answer to the following main question: how might recent research on ancient media practices of source utilization shed new light on the question of Passion material in Q? Using the new research, this thesis will demonstrate a significant body of Q material embedded in Luke's Passion with some additional material from Matthew.

Chapter Two will focus on sources in Luke's Passion narrative. A majority of source critics agree Luke used Mark as a source, but source **criticism** is divided over the question of whether Luke had a second written source besides Mark in the Passion.¹¹ Chapter Two will address the question: what does source **utilization** suggest about a non-Markan written source in Luke's Passion narrative? Per the analysis here presented, source utilization principles suggest a

⁸ Robert A. Jr. Derrenbacher, *Ancient Compositional Practices and the Synoptic Problem* (Leuven: University Press, 2005).

⁹ Alan Kirk, *Q in Matthew: Ancient Media, Memory, and Early Scribal Transmission of the Jesus Tradition*. (London: Bloomsbury, 2016).

¹⁰ For example, David Sloan gives a one sentence summary of Derrenbacher's analysis to set the stage for his own argument. David B. Sloan, "A Passion Narrative in Q?," 1, accessed March 24, 2021, <http://www.reconstructingq.com/>.

¹¹ Raymond E. Brown, *The Death of the Messiah: From Gethsemane to the Grave : A Commentary on the Passion Narratives in the Four Gospels, 2 Vols.* (New York: Doubleday, 1994), 66–67.

non-Markan written source influenced both the order and content of the Lucan account of the death of Jesus.

Based on Chapter Two's conclusion Luke does have a second written source besides Mark for the Passion narrative, Chapter Three will look to the possibility Q is in fact the second written source.¹² What evidence points to Q as the second written source in Luke's Passion narrative, and how would source utilization explain Luke's combination in the Passion of the Q and Markan sources? Since Q is a sayings source, Chapter Three will look at sayings material in Luke's Passion, and thematic similarities of such language to known Q material drawn from the leading scholarly re-construction of Q.¹³ Lastly, Chapter Three will propose possible source utilization explanations for Luke's combination of the two sources Mark and Q.

Chapter Four will examine the so-called "Minor Agreements" often cited as problematic by critics of the Q theory.¹⁴ In the Passion, Matthew follows Mark closely, but has a few striking agreements in wording with Luke.¹⁵ In light of Chapter Two's finding Luke had a second written Passion source based in part on differences in order from Mark, and Chapter Three's finding

¹² Matthew is proposed as a second written source for Luke's Passion by advocates of the Farrer Goulder Hypothesis, but this cannot explain most of the non-Markan material in Luke since the material is also non-Matthean.

¹³ James M. Robinson, Paul Hoffmann, and John S. Kloppenborg, *The Critical Edition of Q: Synopsis Including the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, Mark and Thomas with English, German, and French translations of Q and Thomas* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2000). (All citations to Q will be to *The Critical Edition of Q*.)

¹⁴ Mark S. Goodacre, *The Case Against Q: Studies in Markan Priority and the Synoptic Problem* (Harrisburg, Pa.: Trinity Press International, 2002), 152. If Luke had no knowledge of Matthew as Q advocates insist, and if Q had no Passion account, then the significant Minor Agreements of Luke and Matthew in the Passion are difficult to explain.

¹⁵ Michael D. Goulder, "Appendix: Michael Goulder Responds," in *The Gospels According to Michael Goulder: A North American Response*, ed. Chris A. Rollston (Harrisburg, Pa.: Trinity Press International, 2002), 142–43.

Luke's contains sayings material with thematic similarities to Q, Chapter Four will examine the question: how do the Minor Agreement provide supplemental evidence for these findings? Chapter Four will show the Minor Agreements in Matthew's Passion suggest Matthean knowledge of (1) a non-Markan sayings source with thematic resonance to Q, and (2) a second Passion source influencing Luke's non-Markan order. The Passion Minor Agreements thus suggest an echo in Matthew of the same non-Markan written source with genre and thematic similarities to Q influencing Luke. Chapter Four will also show the sayings material is embedded in *chria* formats again similar to Q. The results of Chapter Four thus confirm the thesis presented here of Q Passion material.¹⁶

Based on the arguments of Chapters Two, Three and Four, Chapter Five will assemble a proposed Q Passion. The proposed Q material will consist of non-Markan sayings material primarily in Luke, but also one section from Matthew, all with thematic resonance to Q. To this sayings material, Chapter Five will add the Minor Agreements and similar non-Markan *chria* elements in which the sayings are embedded. The resulting 300 word Passion *chria* collection in Q directly rebuts the Argument from Silence that Q contains no Passion. Chapter Five will briefly examine some of the implications of a Q Passion and suggest possible future research.

¹⁶ By suggesting the Passion Minor Agreements derive from Q, Chapter Four renders the Passion Minor Agreements consistent with the Q Theory and thereby eliminates one of the major objections against it.

Review of Q Literature Concerning the Passion

For more than two hundred years, modern scholarship has wrestled with the Synoptic Problem.¹⁷ For about 150 years, the leading theory has been the Two Source Theory (2ST),¹⁸ sometimes also called the Two Document Hypothesis.¹⁹ The 2ST posits Mark was written first, and Matthew and Luke wrote their gospels using Mark, but independently of each other.²⁰ The material common to Mark, Matthew and Luke is called the Triple Tradition (TT).²¹ The Passion occurs in all three (3) Synoptic Gospels and thus is TT material.

The material common to Matthew and Luke, but not found in Mark, is called the Double Tradition (DT).²² The 2ST theorizes that the DT derives from a source known to both Matthew and Luke, but unknown to modern scholarship.²³ The hypothetical source is called “Q” from the

¹⁷ Stefan Alkier, “Sad Sources: Observations From the History of Theology on the Origins and Contours of the Synoptic Problem,” in *Gospel Interpretation and the Q-Hypothesis.*, ed. Mogens Müller and Heike Omerzu (London: Bloomsbury Publishing Plc, 2018), 66.

¹⁸ Tuckett, *Q and the History of Early Christianity*, 1.

¹⁹ Mogens Müller, “Were the Gospel Authors Really ‘Simple Christians Without Literary Gifts’ (Albert Schweitzer)?: Arguments for the Question for Sources Behind the Gospels,” in *Gospel Interpretation and the Q-Hypothesis.*, ed. Mogens Müller and Heike Omerzu (London: Bloomsbury Publishing Plc, 2018), 86.

²⁰ John S. Kloppenborg, *Excavating Q: The History and Setting of the Sayings Gospel* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 2000), 12.

²¹ *Ibid.*, 18-19.

²² *Ibid.*, 29.

²³ Sarah E. Rollens, *Framing Social Criticism in the Jesus Movement: The Ideological Project in the Sayings Gospel Q.* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014), 1.

German word *Quelle* meaning source.²⁴ Because the DT mostly consists of sayings material of Jesus, Q is generally believed to be a sayings source.²⁵

The scope of Q could extend beyond the DT and overlap with TT material.²⁶ A broader scope could theoretically include the Passion, but the DT is the strongest evidence for Q and extending Q beyond the DT presents problems of proof.²⁷ The Passion is mostly narrative and does not include any large block of DT or sayings material common to Matthew and Luke. Accordingly, *The Critical Edition of Q* limits the scope of Q to the DT and excludes any Passion material.²⁸

Seeking to overcome the difficulties of proof, Walter Bundy and other scholars in the first half of the twentieth century argued Q might have a Passion narrative.²⁹ Two developments, however, led to the present consensus Q excluded any such narrative. First, the discovery at Nag Hammadi in 1945 of the *Gospel of Thomas* proved that ancient sayings sources about Jesus existed, and therefore validated the proposed *Gattung* (or genre) of Q as a sayings source consisting primarily of the wisdom of Jesus.³⁰ Second, in 1956, Heinz Tödt posited a theology

²⁴ Ibid.

²⁵ Kloppenborg, *Excavating Q*, 13.

²⁶ Kloppenborg, 91–111.

²⁷ Ibid.

²⁸ Robinson, Hoffmann, and Kloppenborg, *The Critical Edition of Q*.

²⁹ Walter Ernest Bundy, *Jesus and the First Three Gospels; an Introduction to the Synoptic Tradition*. (Cambridge, Ma: Harvard University Press, 1955), 481.

³⁰ James M. Robinson, “Logoi Sophon: On the *Gattung* of Q,” in *Trajectories Through Early Christianity*, by James M. Robinson and Helmut Koester (Eugene, Or: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 1971), 84–130.

for Q that did not focus on the death of Christ, but on the Son of Man sayings of the DT.³¹ As a result, with Q's genre and theology both differentiated from the narrative, cross-centered Synoptic Gospels, Q scholarship since Bundy generally holds that Q contains no Passion account.³²

Perhaps the only 20th Century scholar after Bundy advocating a Q Passion narrative is Eric Fisher, who relied mainly on the Minor Agreements for his evidence.³³ Arguments based primarily on the Minor Agreements, however, do not garner much acceptance. Frans Neiryck, perhaps the leading modern scholar on Minor Agreements, called a Minor Agreement-based argument for a Q Passion "extreme."³⁴ For this reason and others, I will build a case for Q Passion material on other grounds before turning to the Minor Agreements.

After Tödt, other scholars offered various theological construals of Q, but all generally exclude the Passion, and explain Q as a document without much interest in the death of Jesus.³⁵ Scholars such as James Robinson, Helmut Koester and John Dominic Crossan all generally believe Q is evidence of an early form of Christianity that did not share the cross-centered theology of the Synoptic Gospels, but focused instead on the sayings and teaching of Jesus.³⁶ In

³¹ Paul Hoffmann, "The Redaction of Q and the Son of Man: A Preliminary Sketch," in *The Gospel Behind the Gospels: Current Studies on Q*, ed. Ronald A. Piper (New York: EJB Brill, 1995), 159–98.

³² Kloppenborg, *Excavating Q*, 92, 363.

³³ Eric Franklin, "A Passion Narrative for Q," in *Understanding, Studying and Reading: New Testament Essays in Honour of John Ashton* (Sheffield, Eng: Academic Press, 1998), 30–47.

³⁴ Frans Neiryck, "The Minor Agreements and Q," in *The Gospel Behind the Gospels: Current Studies on Q*, ed. Ronald A. Piper (New York: EJB Brill, 1995), 50.

³⁵ Kloppenborg, *Excavating Q*, 345–52.

³⁶ *Ibid.*

the Introduction to his main study of Q, John Kloppenborg called Q a “‘different’ gospel” from Matthew and Luke, and stated its “existence poses significant theological questions about diversity and difference at the very foundational stages of the Jesus movement.”³⁷ This line of scholarship is undoubtedly what Farmer criticized as “ever more dubious reconstructions of early Christianity.”³⁸ My thesis aims to show Q did contain Passion material and thereby challenge Kloppenborg’s conclusions about Q’s theological divergence from Matthew and Luke and about diversity in earliest Christianity.

Writing at the end of the twentieth century, Kloppenborg acknowledged Q could have emplotted the death of Jesus, but did not do so.³⁹ Some scholars in the twenty-first Century suggest Q does in fact show interest in the death of Jesus.⁴⁰ For example, Alan Kirk challenged “Q dogma” and argued Q contained evidence of the Q community’s response to the death of Jesus.⁴¹ Q’s interest in the death of Jesus at least opens the door that Q Passion material is theologically possible.

Taking matters a step further, David Sloan argued for a Q Passion narrative in a paper presented to the Society of Biblical Literature in 2015.⁴² He referred to Alan Derrenbacker’s source utilization research suggesting the ancients used one source at time, and argued Luke may

³⁷ Ibid., 4.

³⁸ Farmer, “Preface to Beyond the Q Impasse,” xii.

³⁹ Kloppenborg, *Excavating Q*, 372–73.

⁴⁰ Rollens, *Framing Social Criticism*, 94 (citing Daniel A. Smith and Michael Labahn).

⁴¹ Alan Kirk, “The Memory of Violence and the Death of Jesus in Q,” in *Memory, Tradition, and Text: Uses of the Past in Early Christianity*, ed. Alan Kirk and Tom Thatcher (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2005), 191–206.

⁴² Sloan, “Passion Narrative in Q?,” 1–8.

have followed Q in the Passion while Matthew followed Mark.⁴³ Sloan then laid out three criteria for detecting a Q Passion: 1) divergence in order and wording between Mark and Luke, 2) similarities in style, theology and themes of Q and Luke and 3) Minor Agreements with Matthew.⁴⁴ Expanding on Sloan's necessarily brief treatment in a conference paper, the present thesis will examine source utilization in greater detail for: 1) the argument for a non-Markan source in Luke's Passion based on divergences in content and order, 2) the existence of non-Markan sayings material in Luke with thematic resonance to Q and how Luke might have combined Mark and Q, and 3) how the Minor Agreements suggest Matthean knowledge of (1) and (2) and also point to additional *chria* elements in Q's Passion.

Sloan used Passion material in Q as a test case to show Q as a whole was a "full-blown narrative" and not merely a "*chria* collection."⁴⁵ As noted above, this thesis does not challenge Q's sayings genre, but in fact aims to show a *chria* collection of Passion **sayings material** in Q.⁴⁶ The more important issue, however, is not genre but theology. Q Passion material refutes the Argument from Silence and theological analysis of Q based on it. This thesis is offered as an important first step toward aligning the theology of Q with the Synoptic Gospels, and thereby crafting a less dubious reconstruction of the early Jesus movement.

⁴³ Ibid., 1.

⁴⁴ Ibid.

⁴⁵ Sloan, "Passion Narrative in Q?," 1. Based on remarks at the Q Section of the Society of Biblical Literature in December, 2020 and again in November, 2022, Sloan has pulled back from some of his arguments in the 2015 paper, and focused on other lines of inquiry for expanding the scope of Q.

⁴⁶ Subsequent work by Sloan or others may develop additional evidence of Q material, but that is beyond the scope presented here.

CHAPTER TWO – SOURCE UTILIZATION

The first step in demonstrating my thesis that Q contained a collection of Passion sayings/*chria* is the proposition that Luke had a second written source for the in addition to Mark. Most (although not all) modern source critics believe Matthew and Luke both used Mark as a source for their gospels.⁴⁷ In the case of the Passion narrative, Matthew follows the Markan account closely, but Luke diverges considerably from Mark.⁴⁸ Is Luke redacting Mark more extensively than Matthew (perhaps enhanced by oral tradition), or is Luke combining Mark with another written source?⁴⁹ This Chapter Two will argue Luke had a second written source. Then Chapter Three will then posit evidence for Q as that second written source.

Source Criticism vs. Source Utilization

Source criticism has long divided over the question of whether Luke's Passion was based on one written source (Mark) or two (Mark plus another).⁵⁰ Opponents of a second non-Markan source stress the difficulty of reconstructing the source or showing how Luke combined the two

⁴⁷ Christopher M. Tuckett, "The Current State of the Synoptic Problem," in *New Studies in the Synoptic Problem*, ed. P. Foster et al. (Leuven: Utigeveru Peeters, 2011), 571–89.

⁴⁸ Bundy, *Jesus and the First Three Gospels*, 480.

⁴⁹ Scholars use "tradition" and "source" somewhat interchangeably for antecedent information, whether oral or written, available to the gospel writers. We will follow that practice. However, in certain cases, we will differentiate "oral tradition" to indicate prior material passed down by spoken modes of transmission from "written source" to refer to prior material in documentary form.

⁵⁰ Brown, *The Death of the Messiah*, 1994, I:66-67.

sources.⁵¹ Proponents of a non-Markan source emphasize how differently Luke treats Mark in the Passion compared to Luke's treatment of Mark in the rest of the gospel.⁵²

In his comprehensive two-volume commentary on the Passion narratives, Raymond Brown took a hybrid approach. Brown suggested Luke primarily used Mark as a written source, with Lucan deviation from Mark explained by a combination of creativity, oral tradition and parallelism to trials in the book of Acts.⁵³ Brown acknowledged certain issues concerning the composition of the Passion narratives "must be written off as examples of our ignorance of how ancient authors worked."⁵⁴ Such ignorance has since been ameliorated.

Scholarship has more recently developed a better understanding of ancient media practices and how ancient writers utilized their sources.⁵⁵ The research has specifically focused on the use of sources by ancient *tradents*, who transmitted important cultural traditions similar to the synoptic evangelists.⁵⁶ This body of work is called source **utilization** in contrast to the traditional source **criticism** cited by Brown.⁵⁷ Source utilization offers a new point of leverage to

⁵¹ Ibid. The stated objections really are not an argument against a second source *per se*, but rather an argument against the ability to delineate it with certainty. This thesis will directly address these objections by specifying a scope for a Q Passion and suggest source utilization methodologies for how Luke might have combined Mark and Q.

⁵² Ibid., 67.

⁵³ Ibid., 74. The third point deriving perhaps from Luke's knowledge of Pauline trials influencing his treatment of the trials of Jesus.

⁵⁴ Ibid., 82.

⁵⁵ Derrenbacher, *Ancient Compositional Practices*.

⁵⁶ Kirk, *Q in Matthew*, 40–42.

⁵⁷ At least one article challenged Derrenbacher's findings (but did not engage Kirk's research perhaps because the latter was published about the same time). James W. Barker, "Ancient Compositional Practices and the Gospels: A Reassessment," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 135, no. 1 (2016): 109–21.

examine the question of sources in Luke's Passion. Chapter Two will review source utilization findings and apply them to Luke's Passion. Analysis will show that Luke's use of Mark in the Passion deviates so much from typical ancient practices of source utilization that a second non-Markan written source must be influencing the composition. In contrast to Matthew whose account hews closely to the single source of Mark, source utilization strongly suggests Luke combined two written sources to create a new unique account of the death of Jesus.

Source Utilization Findings

Robert Derrenbacker wrote the first monograph-length treatment on source utilization.⁵⁸ He described book production in the ancient world including the use of scrolls prior to the introduction of writing desks.⁵⁹ He surveyed a limited sampling of ancient texts and their adaptation of sources.⁶⁰ These included Greco-Roman writers on India using common sources, and Josephus's history of the kings of Israel and Judah using the parallel accounts in 1 & 2 Samuel/1 & 2 Kings with 1 & 2 Chronicles.⁶¹ Derrenbacker cited Josephus as perhaps the closest exemplar among the works he examined to the Synoptic Gospels.⁶² His analysis demonstrated Josephus alternated between his sources in relatively large blocks, and the source then being utilized provided the wording.⁶³

⁵⁸ Derrenbacker, *Ancient Compositional Practices*.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, Chapter One.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, Chapter Two.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, Chapter Three.

⁶² *Ibid.*, 100-01.

⁶³ *Ibid.*, 113.

Derrenbacker drew three (3) conclusions from his review: (1) the authors follow one source at a time, i.e. they do not engage in “micro-conflation” of sources within episodes, but reproduce source material in blocks, which Derrenbacker attributed to the difficulty of working with scrolls especially in the absence of writing desks, (2) when following the order of a source, the writers will also adapt the wording of that source and not another source, and (3) the authors do not engage in radical reordering of source material, which Derrenbacker again attributed to the limits of working with scrolls.⁶⁴ From these findings, Derrenbacker criticized synoptic source theories based on extensive micro-conflation or on significant backward-moving reorganization of source material.⁶⁵

Derrenbacker cited earlier work by Gerald Downing concerning the utilization of sources by Josephus. Downing indicated Josephus rewrote material in his own words and added speeches, but otherwise “does not create events or incidents, either out of his head or by midrashic exposition.”⁶⁶ Per Downing, Josephus demonstrates no room for invention; “[t]he tradition remains in control.”⁶⁷ Applying these observations to Luke, Downing expects to find the same redactional flexibility to reword sources, but not “the creation ‘out of his head’ of any major incident.”⁶⁸ For new material, Luke would feel the need for a prior witness, whether oral

⁶⁴ Ibid., 116-17. Listed for completeness here, Derrenbacker’s point (2) will not be discussed until Chapter Three below.

⁶⁵ Ibid., Chapters Four and Five. Among others, Derrenbacker criticized the Q skeptic Michael Goulder’s theory that Luke moved backward through a significant portion of Matthew. Ibid., Chapter Five. See generally, Michael D. Goulder, *Luke : A New Paradigm* (Sheffield, England: JSOT, 1989).

⁶⁶ Derrenbacker, *Ancient Compositional Practices*, 93.

⁶⁷ Ibid, 94.

⁶⁸ Ibid., 96.

or written. From Downing's analysis of Josephus, we might add a fourth finding to Derrenbecker's three: (4) respect for the sources, i.e. flexibility in wording, but reluctance to go beyond the tradition in content.

Point (4) is confirmed by our next scholar Alan Kirk and his review of source utilization by ancient writers engaged in the transmission of material culturally significant to a community or class. In his book *Q in Matthew*, Kirk reviewed a larger scope of ancient materials than Derrenbecker, and examined source utilization across a broad spectrum of ancient practitioners including the literary, scholarly and scribal classes.⁶⁹ He zeroed in on *tradents*, writers transmitting culturally significant material, as the best analogy to the Synoptic Evangelists.⁷⁰ Accurate transmission of cultural significant manuscript sources by such authors was a moral and ethical commitment.⁷¹ Similar to Downing's findings on Josephus, our point (4), Kirk quoted from Jay Rover's work on transmission of Jewish traditions by "authors who were extremely conservative regarding their traditions, yet unabashedly creative in their overt manipulation of them."⁷² Again, we see flexibility in redaction, but the tradition remains in control for content.

Kirk also stressed the importance of trained memory for the ancients in source utilization of culturally significant documents.⁷³ Memorization was important because of the cultural

⁶⁹ Kirk, *Q in Matthew*, Chapter Two.

⁷⁰ Ibid., 40-42, 110-123. Kirk explored tradent transmission of Homeric literary traditions, maxims or *florilegium* (ethical material) of significant philosophers, Hippocratic medical knowledge and Jewish religious teaching.

⁷¹ Ibid., 117.

⁷² Ibid., 119.

⁷³ Ibid., Chapter Three.

significance of the documents, but also enabled the tradent to access and activate the work from memory for source utilization in new works.⁷⁴ For instructional works, the conventional sequencing of *topoi* (i.e., topics) served as mnemonic aids to cue the memory in utilization of sources.⁷⁵ Ancients knew by memory the traditional order of *topoi*, and thus could recall the sequence when incorporating source material into a new work. Similarly, in narrative works, the narrative sequence itself provided the mnemonic cues, since narrative “tolerates only limited reordering before its narrative coherence is destroyed.”⁷⁶ The sequence of events in the story was committed to memory facilitating recall when utilizing the source for a new work. Thus, based on the operation of memory, Kirk generally agreed with Derrenbacker’s point (3) that tradents did not radically reorder their sources.

Kirk further found that tradents incorporated sources into new works in the same forward sequence in which they were memorized.⁷⁷ Based on mnemonic cues, Kirk found that memory-based source utilization was not “random and haphazard,” but instead “will predicably reproduce material **forward in the order of the source**”⁷⁸ (emphasis added). Replication of the forward order of the source occurs both “horizontally” (across the pericope sequence of the work) and “vertically” (down through individual pericope).⁷⁹ Therefore, in looking for the influence of written sources in a subsequent work, “[s]hared order is a leading indicator of documentary

⁷⁴ Ibid., 97.

⁷⁵ Ibid., 134-5. The process is analogous to memorization in alphabetical order.

⁷⁶ Ibid., 136.

⁷⁷ Ibid., 141.

⁷⁸ Ibid., 142.

⁷⁹ Ibid., 136.

mediation.”⁸⁰ This conclusion generates point (5) of our source utilization findings: shared forward order is the key to confirming a written source in a subsequent work.

Based on his analysis, Kirk criticized synoptic theories involving frequent backward and forward movements in sources.⁸¹ Kirk also agreed with Derrenbacker’s point (1) that small-scale or micro-conflation of sources was unlikely given the difficulty of comparing two scrolls written in continuous script.⁸² Micro-conflation, when it does occur, is likely reminiscence, by which Kirk appears to mean ordinary memory not trained memory-based source utilization.⁸³

Source Utilization and Luke’s Passion

How do these source utilization findings apply to the question of one written source or two in Luke’s Passion? Derrenbacker’s point (1) was that ancient writers reproduced sources in blocks and did not engage in micro-conflation. Derrenbacker believed Luke’s gospel as a whole incorporated source material in alternating blocks similar to Josephus.⁸⁴ Kirk agreed.⁸⁵ Although block utilization of sources is true for most of Luke’s gospel, neither source utilization scholar addressed the fact long known to source criticism that Luke’s use of Mark significantly changes in the Passion. A sampling of source critics will illustrate the point.

⁸⁰ Ibid., 158.

⁸¹ Ibid., 149-50. In particular, Kirk criticized Q skeptic Francis Watson who offered a new theory of possible Lucan movements in Matthew. See generally, Francis Watson, *Gospel Writing: A Canonical Perspective* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2013).

⁸² Ibid., 146.

⁸³ Ibid.

⁸⁴ Derrenbacker, *Ancient Compositional Practices*, 212.

⁸⁵ Kirk, *Q in Matthew*, 174.

J.C. Hawkins wrote in 1911: “in Luke’s Passion Luke uses Mark with a freedom, as to details both of matter and order, to which there is no parallel elsewhere.”⁸⁶ In 1955, Walter Bundy wrote “[a]t no point in his Gospel, when covering the same material, is Luke more independent of Mark than in his death drama.”⁸⁷ Writing in 1994, Raymond Brown acknowledged that for the most part Luke uses Mark in blocks, but when Luke gets to the Passion “the end product is different. Mixed in with passages very close to Mark are passages that are different or absent from Mark.”⁸⁸ In particular, Brown noted that when using Mark elsewhere, Luke tends to use slightly over 50% of Markan wording, but in the Passion this drops to somewhere between 10% and 30%.⁸⁹ Luke’s use of Mark in the Passion is different from Luke’s use of Mark in the rest of the gospel.

The failure by Luke to utilize Mark’s Passion in block fashion deviates from Derrenbacker’s point (1). Something altered Luke’s block approach from earlier parts of the gospel. Another source would explain why in the Passion Luke appears to micro-conflate, i.e., use Mark in much smaller chunks interspersed with non-Markan material.⁹⁰

Luke’s non-Markan material in the Passion also deviates from our point (4) above concerning the respect of tradents for their sources. Luke is not merely showing flexibility with the wording of the Markan source, i.e., redacting Mark more extensively than Matthew. Instead,

⁸⁶ John C. Poirier, “The Composition of Luke in Source-Critical Perspective,” in *New Studies in the Synoptic Problem*, ed. P. Foster et al. (Leuven: Utigeveru Peeters, 2011), 213, fn 10.

⁸⁷ Bundy, *Jesus and the First Three Gospels*, 480.

⁸⁸ Brown, *The Death of the Messiah*, 1994, 1:64.

⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, 1:67.

⁹⁰ We will later examine how Luke might have combined two sources in this fashion.

Luke adds a considerable amount of new content with no parallel at all in Mark. In the Passion, Luke inserts several pericopae not found in Mark, namely, the Herod trial (Luke 23:6-12), the daughters of Jerusalem episode (Luke 23:27-31) and the “good” thief on the cross (Luke 23:39-43).⁹¹ Luke also inserts several notable details not found in Mark, including at the arrest Jesus speaking to Judas (Luke 22:48) and rebuking the sword-wielding disciple (Luke 22:51), Jesus turning and looking at Peter after the third denial (Luke 22:61), the Sanhedrin guards asking Jesus “who is it that struck you?” (Luke 22:64), and Jesus’ final words quoting Psalms 31 (Luke 23:46). As Downing suggested, Luke as tradent would not likely invent material, and so these additions point to non-Markan origin, whether oral or written.

Luke also does not follow Markan order in the Passion. The different order violates Derrenbacker’s point (3) that the ancients did not radically re-order their sources, as confirmed by Kirk’s finding that ancient writers followed the sequence of their sources based on memory. Mark’s order is arrest, Sanhedrin trial, Sanhedrin beating, Peter’s denials, Roman trial, Roman beating, crucifixion and death (Mark 14:43 - 15:41). Luke’s order is arrest, Peter’s denials, Sanhedrin beating, Sanhedrin trial, Roman trial part one, Herod trial, Roman trial part two, daughters of Jerusalem episode, crucifixion and death (Luke 22:47 - 23:49). The difference in order is illustrated on APPENDIX A.

Per Kirk’s analysis, any significant deviation in narrative order destroys coherence and undermines the memory cues necessary for ancient utilization of a scroll-based source.⁹²

Accordingly, for the order of events, Luke is most likely receiving mnemonic ordering cues from

⁹¹ *The Holy Bible: Containing the Old and New Testaments With the Apocryphal/Deuterocanonical Books: New Revised Standard Version*. (Philadelphia: American Bible Society, 1989). All Scriptural citations are from the NRSV.

⁹² Kirk, *Q in Matthew*, 136.

a non-Markan written source. Contrary to Raymond Brown's hybrid approach described above, Luke is not merely inserting oral traditions into the Markan narrative, or Luke would have preserved more of Mark's order. A non-Markan written source seems indicated.

Finally, Luke also does not follow source utilization point (5) - Kirk's finding that sources are incorporated into new works in forward order because of memory. The first major break in order between Mark and Luke occurs immediately following Peter's arrival at the high priest's house at Mark 14:54 = Luke 22:55. Luke then jumps forward to Mark 14:66-72 to draw the Petrine Denials pericope into the narrative at this point.⁹³ Pulling the Petrine Denials forward in the narrative relative to Mark is consistent with forward direction source utilization. Luke can scan forward using his mnemonic clues to find and relocate this material. However, ancient writers then typically return to absolute order and continue where they left off.⁹⁴ If Luke is using Mark as his primary written source, Luke should go back to Mark 14:55 (the Sanhedrin Trial)

⁹³ Brown believed Luke here was putting things "in an orderly manner" as promised in Luke's prologue at Luke 1:3 by narratively combining all of the Petrine material into one place. Brown, *The Death of the Messiah*, 1:422-23. This might make sense for the Petrine Denials, but Brown's "orderly" argument becomes more strained when, *contra* Mark, Luke places the Sanhedrin beating **before** the Sanhedrin trial (Luke 22:63-65) and **defers** the Sanhedrin trial to after the beating (Luke 22:66-71). Luke is not merely making changes at the narrative level of the gospels, but rather making changes at the underlying level of the historical sequence of events. *Ibid.*, 1:421, 581. Brown otherwise makes a clear distinction between the narrative level and the historical level and criticizes scholars who confuse the two. *Ibid.*, 1:22-24, 467, 572-73. Perhaps in this case he falls prey to that error himself. Luke, a tradent of the cultural significant Passion narrative, is unlikely to make historical changes to the Markan source absent another source.

⁹⁴ Kirk, *Q in Matthew*, 234. Illustrated alphabetically, a "pulled forward" sequence might run A, D, B, C, E, F (as suggested hypothetically by APPENDIX B). It would **not** run A, D, C, B, E, F (the **actual** Lucan sequence relative to Mark shown in APPENDIX C).

and resume the Markan narrative in a forward direction.⁹⁵ APPENDIX B illustrates how Luke **should** have utilized Mark according to forward direction source utilization.

In actuality, Luke does not return to absolute order and move forward in Mark, but rather moves **backward** in reverse order relative to Mark.⁹⁶ Following the Denials (Mark 14:66-72) Luke next describes the Sanhedrin Beating (Mark 14:65, which Luke expands to three verses). Luke then moves **backward again** relative to Mark from the Beating (Mark 14:65) to report the conclusion of Sanhedrin Trial (Mark 14:61-64.) The Markan verses re-arranged in Lucan order flow backwards: Mark 14:66-72, 65, 61-64. Luke's backward movements in reverse order relative to Mark are illustrated on APPENDIX C.

These backward movements in Luke in reverse order against the horizontal pericope sequence in Mark are inconsistent with point (5) - Kirk's finding that ancient source utilization moves in a forward direction based on memory.⁹⁷ Any theory Luke is using Mark here requires Lucan actions similar on a smaller scale to the backward movement theories of Goulder and Watson rejected by Derrenbacker and Kirk.⁹⁸ Such retrograde motion does not match how ancients used mnemonic cues to move forward through sources. The data suggests Luke is in fact **not** utilizing Mark as the primary written source at this point, but instead following the forward

⁹⁵ Luke never does return to absolute order at Mark 14:55-60, but instead omits these verses altogether.

⁹⁶ To be clear, "backward" here means moving physically backwards through a scroll and **not** reading a text theologically backwards to glean a "subversive" meaning against a more conventional one. Contrast Brigitte Kahl, "Reading Luke Against Luke: Non-Uniformity of Text, Hermeneutics of Conspiracy and the 'Scriptural Principle,'" in *A Feminist Companion to Luke*, ed. Amy-Jill Levine (New York: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002), 86.

⁹⁷ Kirk, *Q in Matthew*, 142.

⁹⁸ Derrenbacker, *Ancient Compositional Practices*, 197. Kirk, *Q in Matthew*, 150.

mnemonic ordering cues of a different written source. The non-Markan written source provided the Lucan pericopae order of Arrest/Denials/Beating/Sanhedrin Trial.

In addition to backward horizontal movement in reverse order from the Markan pericopae sequence, Luke also moves backward against Markan order when working “vertically” down through individual pericope. In the arrest pericope, Luke skips over the reference to chief priest, scribes and elders at Mark 14:43 only to reach back for this reference after the Lucan account reaches Mark 14:47. Similarly, Luke passes over the physical arrest of Jesus at Mark 14:46 only to reach back for this detail when the Lucan version arrives at the beginning of Mark 14:53. Similarly, at the cross, Luke defers the notice over the cross at Mark 15:26, and only reaches back for this detail later when the Lucan text reaches Mark 15:32. These backward movements within pericope in reverse order from Mark (rather than vertically downward in a forward direction) are also inconsistent with our point (5) of memory-based forward direction source utilization.⁹⁹

The data within pericopae suggests Luke’s use of Mark has been disrupted by another written source – presumably the same source which provided the non-Markan content in these pericopae. Luke inserts Markan details at different points in the narrative relative to their Markan location because the other source is influencing the composition. As suggested by Kirk for instances of micro-conflation, i.e., two sources blended in close proximity, Luke may be acting here by reminiscence and not memory-based source utilization. Other possible source utilization

⁹⁹ All of the examples of reverse order given above, whether the sequence of multiple pericopae or within individual pericope, go beyond mere transposition. By contrast, an example of transposition, simple swapping of the order of adjacent material, may be found where Luke moves the tearing of the curtain in the Temple immediately prior to the death of Jesus (Luke 23:45-46) rather than immediately after in Mark (Mark 15:37-38).

solutions to explain how Luke may have combined two written sources will be addressed in Chapter Three.

A Second Written Source for Luke's Passion

The theory of Raymond Brown and other source critics that Luke used Mark as the single written source for the Passion, supplemented by oral tradition, does not line up with typical ancient source utilization practices. Instead, the deviations from Mark suggest Luke combined Mark with a different written source. First, per Derrenbacher's point (1), Luke has not utilized Mark's Passion in block fashion like Luke did elsewhere in the gospel. Something altered Luke's compositional approach. Second, per point (4) from Downing, Luke - a tradent of culturally significant tradition reluctant to invent material - has inserted a considerable amount of non-Markan content. The data suggests a non-Markan influence which goes beyond mere redaction of Mark. Third, Luke deviated from Markan order contrary to both Derrenbacher's point (3) and Kirk's "leading indicator" of how documentary sources were accessed. A different written source explains Luke's order better than Brown's proposed addition of oral traditions where Markan order would have been preserved. Fourth and finally, contrary to our point (5) from Kirk, Luke moves in reverse order relative to Mark (both horizontally backwards against Mark's forward pericopae sequence, and vertically upward against the usual downward direction within individual pericope). Reverse order runs afoul of the typical forward direction of ancient memory-based source utilization based on mnemonic cues. Luke must instead be following the forward order of a non-Markan documentary source. Chapter Three will examine the evidence this other written source could be the sayings source Q.

CHAPTER THREE – NON-MARKAN PASSION SAYINGS

As the first step in demonstrating Q has a Passion account, Chapter Two used source utilization research to show Luke had a second written source for the Passion in addition to Mark based on substantial content and order deviations from Mark. Chapter Three will provide evidence this second source is in fact Q. Source criticism generally points to either Matthew or Q as the source for the Double Tradition elements of Luke not found in Mark.¹⁰⁰ Matthew, however, cannot be the second source for Luke's content and order deviations from Mark in the Passion because Matthew simply does not contain most of those deviations.¹⁰¹ Accordingly, as the other major written source proposed for Luke by source criticism, Q should at least be considered as Luke's second Passion source to avoid multiplicity of sources per Occam's Razor.¹⁰² Chapter Three will first consider theological and genre-based objections to a Q Passion account, and then examine positive evidence for it. The evidence examined will first be contextual and then thematic elements pointing to Q. Lastly, this Chapter will examine how source utilization might explain Luke's combination of Mark and Q.

¹⁰⁰ Tuckett, "The Current State of the Synoptic Problem."

¹⁰¹ Put another way, Matthew's Passion closely follows Mark; Luke's does not. Bundy, *Jesus and the First Three Gospels*, 480. The fact Matthew cannot be the source of most of the Lucan deviations from Mark in the Passion is often obscured by Synoptic Problem debates over the significance of the Passion Minor Agreements of Matthew and Luke against Mark. The Minor Agreement debate overlooks the sheer magnitude of Lucan deviations from Mark in the Passion discussed in Chapter Two above. The Lucan deviations swamp the relatively limited data of the Minor Agreements and point to a non-Matthean source. Chapter Four below will examine the Minor Agreements in the new light of the findings of Chapters Two and Three.

¹⁰² Raymond Brown appealed to Occam's razor, and thereby resisted appeal to written Passion sources other than Mark. Brown, *The Death of the Messiah*, 1994, 1:68. He nonetheless agreed with the existence of Q and acknowledged certain scholars cite Q as a source for Luke's Passion. *Ibid.*, 1:66. He failed to consider whether appeal to Luke's existing source Q might satisfy Occam's razor better than his own *ad hoc* appeal to oral tradition. *Ibid.*, 1:75.

Theological Objections to a Q Passion

Since the 1950s, Q scholarship generally holds that Q contains no Passion account since the Double Tradition (DT) on which Q is based, i.e., material found in Matthew and Luke, but not in Mark, does not include Passion material.¹⁰³ The scope of Q may theoretically extend further than the DT, but this presents evidentiary problems.¹⁰⁴ Accordingly, the leading re-creation of Q, *The Critical Edition of Q*, limits Q to the DT and thus excludes any Passion material.¹⁰⁵

Summarizing Q research at the end of the 20th Century, John Kloppenborg concluded Q could have emplotted the Passion, but did not do so.¹⁰⁶ For Kloppenborg, Q lacks any knowledge of the salvific interpretation of Jesus death found in Mark or Paul, and in fact shows “absolute silence on Jesus’s death.”¹⁰⁷ The “Argument from Silence” leads to the conclusion Q’s theology is quite distinct from orthodox Christianity based on the canon.¹⁰⁸

More recently, however, scholars such as Daniel A. Smith and Michael Labahn have suggested Q does in fact show interest in the death of Jesus.¹⁰⁹ Alan Kirk in a 2020 essay reviewed this research and, breaking with Kloppenborg, concluded that “Jesus death is emplotted

¹⁰³ Kloppenborg, *Excavating Q*, 92, 363.

¹⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, 91-111.

¹⁰⁵ Robinson, Hoffmann, and Kloppenborg, *The Critical Edition of Q*.

¹⁰⁶ Kloppenborg, *Excavating Q*, 372–73.

¹⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, 374.

¹⁰⁸ *Ibid.*

¹⁰⁹ Rollens, *Framing Social Criticism*, 94. See also, Kirk, “The Memory of Violence and the Death of Jesus in Q.”

in Q, but not narrated.”¹¹⁰ If Q is concerned with the death of Jesus, no theological barrier exists to Passion material in Q. As Kirk suggested by his reference to narration, the issue becomes whether a Passion account is consistent with the genre of Q.

Q’s Genre and the Passion

Based on the sayings-rich nature of the DT, Q has generally been considered a sayings source.¹¹¹ In each of the Synoptic Gospels (and John), however, the Passion account is narrative and not a collection of sayings like the DT material assigned to Q. In his 2020 essay, Kirk found the sayings or instructional genre designation for Q “unassailable” and criticized scholarship which tried to apply a narrative genre to Q.¹¹² As noted above, Kirk agreed with contemporary scholarship demonstrating Q’s awareness of Jesus death, but he believed the Passion could not receive narrative treatment in Q (like it does in the canonical gospels) because the genre framework requires Jesus be the primary speaker.¹¹³

Although genre conventions might not permit Q **narrate** Jesus death, Q’s genre could nonetheless allow **sayings** from the time of his death. In his 2020 essay, Kirk also discussed “intense cults of commemoration” that surround the death of a significant person, especially a martyr.¹¹⁴ The deaths of martyrs establish urgent moral claims and are occasions for both

¹¹⁰ Alan Kirk, “Q,” in *From Paul to Josephus Literary Receptions of Jesus in the First Century CE*, ed. Helen K. Bond, vol. 1, The Reception of Jesus in the First Three Centuries Series (London: T & T Clark, 2020), 102.

¹¹¹ Kloppenborg, *Excavating Q*, 13.

¹¹² Kirk, “Q,” 86–91.

¹¹³ *Ibid.*, 102.

¹¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 100-101.

narrative and instructional activities.¹¹⁵ Therefore, sayings of Jesus from the time of his death could be vital to his commemoration even in an instructional work like Q. In light of the recognition by Kirk and other contemporary scholars of Q's awareness of Jesus death, Passion sayings in Q seem entirely plausible, perhaps even probable.

Based on the assumption of a non-Markan written source for Luke's Passion from Chapter Two, and the foregoing limitation of Q's genre as a sayings source, the remainder of Chapter Three will focus on non-Markan sayings in Luke's Passion (and one grouping in Matthew) as the best possible evidence for Q Passion material. To start with the obvious, Luke adds about 120 words of Jesus not found in Mark's Passion as shown on APPENDIX D. Luke's second source apparently provided a fair amount of Passion sayings not found in Mark, similar to how Q provides Matthew and Luke the non-Markan sayings material embedded in the DT. Theology on the death of Jesus since the Second World War has neglected Luke's Passion account, and how the words of Jesus reported by Luke affect the portrayal of Jesus, and focused instead on the significance of Jesus cry of dereliction in Mark.¹¹⁶ Luke's willingness to deviate thematically from Mark's Passion, especially the cry of dereliction, could be explained by the influence of a non-Markan source such as Q.¹¹⁷ The next section of Chapter Three will focus on possible thematic linkage between the non-Markan sayings material and Q.

¹¹⁵ Ibid., 101.

¹¹⁶ R. W. L. Moberly, *The Bible, Theology, and Faith a Study of Abraham and Jesus*, Cambridge Studies in Christian Doctrine (Cambridge, U.K. ; Cambridge University Press, 2000), 58–59.

¹¹⁷ Bundy, *Jesus and the First Three Gospels*, 481.

Thematic Connections to Q

In classic source criticism, the criteria for identifying source material can be divided into 3 categories: (1) thematic, (2) stylistic and (3) contextual.¹¹⁸ Generally speaking, contextual factors and thematic factors provide the best probative value for the existence of a source, with stylistic factors the least probative and best deployed only when the other two factors have tentatively identified source material.¹¹⁹ Focusing on the non-Markan sayings material in Luke is a contextual argument, i.e., this material creates *aporia* or disjunctions within Luke's Passion from the Markan content. The material is obviously not derived from Luke's Markan source, but instead shares the genre characteristics of Luke's other major source Q. We now turn to thematic factors to test whether the non-Markan words of Jesus in Luke's Passion demonstrate further linkage with Q. We will also note a few stylistic similarities, but a full stylistic analysis is beyond the scope of this paper.¹²⁰

In his 2015 presentation to the Society of Biblical Literature, David Sloan argued for Q Passion material based in part on thematic and stylistic similarities between elements of Luke's Passion and Q.¹²¹ In his comprehensive Passion commentary, Raymond Brown attributed some non-Markan material in Luke's Passion to Luke's own creativity based on thematic and stylistic connections to material elsewhere in Luke.¹²² What Brown generally failed to notice is that

¹¹⁸ Robert Tomson Fortna, *The Gospel of Signs: A Reconstruction of the Narrative Source Underlying the Fourth Gospel*. (London: Cambridge UP, 1970), 15.

¹¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 15-24.

¹²⁰ *Ibid.*, 203-218 (example of stylistic approach for signs source in the Gospel of John).

¹²¹ Sloan, "Passion Narrative in Q?," 1.

¹²² Brown, *The Death of the Messiah*, 1:74.

several of the connections he identified to other material in Luke are to DT passages assigned to Q. Brown also attributed some of Luke's non-Markan material to a collection of Jesus sayings, which he never identified as Q, but a pre-Lucan sayings collection is certainly suggestive of Q. Accordingly, Brown (albeit unintentionally) linked many of the non-Markan Passion sayings in Luke (and to a lesser extent in Matthew) to Q. We will now examine each of the non-Markan sayings of Jesus in Luke's Passion (and one cluster in Matthew) for thematic connections to the DT/Q primarily using Sloan and Brown. Stylistic similarities will also be noted.

The first non-Markan saying of Jesus in Luke's Passion is his remark to Judas at the arrest "is it with a kiss that you are betraying the Son of Man?" (Luke 22:47). Thematically, Son of Man (SM) sayings have been a staple of Q scholarship since Heinz Tödt in 1956.¹²³ Christopher Tuckett, in his analysis of SM sayings in Q, determined that SM sayings which refer to Jesus in the present (in contrast to eschatological SM sayings) are "primarily concerned with hostility, suffering and rejection."¹²⁴ The SM saying to Judas fits Tuckett's Q category of a present SM saying concerned with hostility and rejection. Thematically, this saying is a strong candidate for inclusion in Q. Stylistically, admonitions in the form of rhetorical questions also occur in Q.¹²⁵

The second non-Markan saying of Jesus is the rebuke of the disciple who cuts off the ear of the slave of the high priest (Luke 22:51). This rebuke has a parallel in Matthew, who adds considerably more non-Markan saying material (Matt 26:52-54). Sloan asserted Matt's version

¹²³ Hoffmann, "Son of Man."

¹²⁴ Tuckett, *Q and the History of Early Christianity*, 266.

¹²⁵ Examples include Q 6:32 & 34, 6:39, 6:46.

shared thematic resonance with Q's SM sayings about non-retaliation (and also listed several stylistic similarities).¹²⁶ Similarly, Brown identified thematic connections to Matt 5:39 and 10:39 (which derive from Q 6:39 and Q 17:33, respectively), and suggested "a plausible source from which Matt may have derived it is Christian moral teaching reflecting Jewish moral teaching."¹²⁷ This characterization of Matthew's source by Brown could easily describe the instructional work Q. Accordingly, based on these thematic (and stylistic) connections, Matthew's non-Markan rebuke could derive from Q, and Luke may have provided an abbreviated version.

The third non-Markan saying is Jesus final word to the arresting crowd, "But this is your hour and the power of darkness!" (Luke 22:53b). Brown here made a thematic connection to Luke 4:13 (where the devil leaves Jesus until an opportune time), which time Jesus now announces has come in the person of Judas (whom Satan entered at Luke 22:3).¹²⁸ Luke 4:13 derives in part from Q 4:13, and is the conclusion of the Temptation Narrative - most of which is from Q Chapter 4. Therefore, this power of darkness saying could derive from Q.

The fourth cluster of non-Markan sayings are Jesus responses to the Sanhedrin at Luke 22:67-70. Based on significant omissions from Mark's trial, Sloan asserted most of Luke's trial is from Q.¹²⁹ Brown agreed at least verses 67-68 derive from "another tradition" and cited with

¹²⁶ Sloan, "Passion Narrative in Q?," 5. For non-retaliation connections, Sloan cited Davies and Allison's commentary on Matthew. Stylistically, Sloan listed (1) equally balanced lines, (2) imperative supported by an aphorism followed by rhetorical question, (3) rhetorical question begins with conjunction ἦ, and (4) use of the verb δοκεῶ + ὄτι.

¹²⁷ Brown, *The Death of the Messiah*, 1:275-76.

¹²⁸ *Ibid.*, 293.

¹²⁹ Sloan, "Passion Narrative in Q?," 6-7. Omissions from Mark in Luke include the night-time interrogation, false witnesses, Jesus' initial silence, the high priest tearing his garment and the death sentence.

approval scholars advancing various arguments against Markan dependence.¹³⁰ Thematically, Brown connected the hostility of the authorities to Jeremiah 38:15 (where Jeremiah answers King Zedekiah with words similar to Jesus response to the Sanhedrin: “If I tell you, you will put me to death, will you not?”).¹³¹ Tuckett identified in Q a similar connection of violence against the prophets with the impending violence against Jesus in Q 11:47-51 and Q 13:34.¹³² Brown also made two thematic connections to the Temptation Narrative. Brown linked the time element in Luke’s Son of Man statement “from the present (ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν)” back to Jesus statement at his arrest concerning the “hour and the power of darkness!” (which, as noted above, Brown linked to the Temptation Narrative).¹³³ More significantly, he observed the title “Son of God” used in Luke 22:70 is also used by Satan in the Temptation Narrative at Luke/Q 4:3.¹³⁴ Thematically and stylistically, the Sanhedrin exchange is like the Temptation Narrative, i.e., a dialogue between Jesus and his adversary/ies about Jesus claim to be the Son of God. All of this evidence makes the non-Markan words of Jesus to the Sanhedrin another strong candidate for Q.

The fifth block of non-Markan sayings is Jesus address to the Daughters of Jerusalem at Luke 23:28-31. Thematically, Sloan asserted “the Deuteronomistic focus is as clear in this passage as in any other [passage definitely assigned to Q]” and also listed several stylistic/vocabulary similarities with Q.¹³⁵ Brown made similar findings: “how in vocabulary and

¹³⁰ Brown, *The Death of the Messiah*, 472, 485–86.

¹³¹ *Ibid.*, 486.

¹³² Tuckett, *Q and the History of Early Christianity*, 166–75.

¹³³ Brown, *The Death of the Messiah*, 1994, 1:505.

¹³⁴ *Ibid.*, 1: 482. Satan uses the title again in Luke/Q 4:9.

¹³⁵ Sloan, “Passion Narrative in Q?,” 7. Style/vocabulary overlaps include antithetical parallelism (Q 12:4-5), two word vocative opening of a lament (Q 3:7 and Q 13:34), the word

theme what Jesus says to the Daughters of Jerusalem is consistent with sayings of the Lucan Jesus to and about Jerusalem during the ministry.”¹³⁶ A closer look reveals many of Brown’s examples are not merely from the Lucan Jesus, but are in fact from the DT and hence the Q Jesus. Brown tied the Daughters of Jerusalem address thematically to the warnings of Luke/Q 11:49-50 and Luke/Q 13:34-35 (which is presumably also what Sloan meant by Deuteronomistic).¹³⁷ Brown also cited vocabulary/stylistic similarities to the DT.¹³⁸ Most tellingly, Brown noted Luke 23:29 is similar to Logion 79 in the Gospel of Thomas, and “thus it is not unlikely that . . . Luke 23:29 came from a collection of Jesus’ sayings.”¹³⁹ Although Brown does not name it, a collection of Jesus sayings in common with Thomas surely points to Q. These thematic (and stylistic) connections to the DT/Q make a strong case the Daughters of Jerusalem speech derives from Q.

κλαίω (ubiquitous in Q), “the days are coming” (Q 17:22 and Q 19:43), “begin to say” (also ubiquitous) and saying ending in a rhetorical question (frequent occurrence in Q).

¹³⁶ Brown, *The Death of the Messiah*, 2:922.

¹³⁷ Ibid, 2:921. Other scholars have drawn thematic connections between Q 11:49-50 and Q 13:34-35. Olegs Andrejevs, *Apocalypticism in the Synoptic Sayings Source: A Reassessment of Q’s Stratigraphy*. (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2019), 200. Others have also drawn a thematic connection between Luke 13:34-35 and the Daughters of Jerusalem address at Luke 23:27-31. Caryn A. Reeder, *Gendering War and Peace in the Gospel of Luke* (Cambridge: University Press, 2018), 20–21.

¹³⁸ Ibid., 2:922-24. Vocabulary: Luke/Q 13:35 (ἰδοὺ before an oracle of woe) and Luke/Q 17:22-23 (“coming days” and “they will say”). Antithetical parallelism: Luke 6:20-26, where at least verses 20-23 are from Q.

¹³⁹ Ibid., 924.

The next saying examined here is Jesus statement to the “good” thief on the cross at Luke 23:43.¹⁴⁰ Although Brown was himself skeptical of a non-Lucan source,¹⁴¹ he listed several factors that could point to such a source and indeed to Q. He connected the reference to “this day” back to the Sanhedrin statement “from the present” and to the arrest statement about the “hour.”¹⁴² As noted above, Brown linked the “hour” back to the Temptation Narrative’s “opportune time,” thus demonstrating a train of time references anchored in DT material running through three (3) of the non-Markan sayings in Luke’s Passion. Brown also indicated the word “paradise” is non-Lucan and could point to independent tradition.¹⁴³ Finally, he noted this “Amen” (ἀμήν or truly) saying could derive, or be adapted, from a collection of Jesus sayings, which again he does not name but is suggestive of Q.¹⁴⁴ These factors make Jesus saying to the thief a possible candidate for Q.

¹⁴⁰ Omitted from this paper is Jesus prayer of forgiveness (Luke 23:34) because it is missing from early manuscripts and considered a late addition by many scholars. Bundy, *Jesus and the First Three Gospels*, 540. On the other hand, some scholars argue the saying was in the original text of Luke, but omitted by anti-Semitic copyists because it pronounces forgiveness on the Jews. See Brown, *The Death of the Messiah*, 2:971-81. Also, R. Alan Culpepper, “Luke,” NIB 9:455. In Chapter Five below, I suggest perhaps this textually uncertain prayer originally appeared in Q as the response of Jesus to the Sanhedrin guards.

¹⁴¹ Brown, *The Death of the Messiah*, 2:1002.

¹⁴² *Ibid.*, 1:505. “Today” is a common Lucan expression (Luke 2:11; 4:21; 5:26; 12:28; 13:32; 19:5, 9; 22:34, 61; 23:43) and does not by itself suggest a non-Lucan origin. Nonetheless, the linkage by Brown of time references from the Temptation Narrative through 3 non-Markan Passion sayings suggests a potential cluster of related sayings that might derive from Q even allowing for some Lucan redaction.

¹⁴³ *Ibid.*, 2:1001. Q also doesn’t include the word paradise and thus the argument for Q origin here is not terribly strong. However, the reconstruction of Q is incomplete (unlike the strong textual witness for Luke/Acts), and thus it remains at least possible Q is the origin of this otherwise non-Lucan term.

¹⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 2:1001-2.

The last saying of Jesus in Luke's Passion are his final words in the form of a Father prayer quoting Psalms 31 (Luke 23:46). Walter Bundy thought most of Luke's crucifixion scene seemed to originate from a non-Markan source, and in particular:

“This appears especially in the wholly new tradition on the **words of Jesus** from the cross . . . these utterances breathe a different spirit and give a very different picture of Jesus in the hour of his death (emphasis added).”¹⁴⁵

Brown also found something quite different from Mark in the final words of the Lucan Jesus:

“Luke has dramatically shifted the theological tone of the death scene by preferring Ps 31:6 for Jesus last words over Mark's Ps 22:2 [and] another significant shift is visible when we compare the Marcan Jesus' address “My God” to the Lucan Jesus' “Father” (also **Luke 10:21; 11:2**) (emphasis added).”¹⁴⁶

The two earlier Father prayers in Luke cited by Brown here (highlighted above in **bold**) come from Q 10:21 and Q 11:2.¹⁴⁷ Therefore, we have in this final prayer a theological shift away from Mark and a thematic connection to Q. The prayer is a good candidate for Q.

Source Utilization and Blending of Sources

The foregoing review of non-Markan sayings of Jesus in Luke's Passion (and one set in Matthew) suggests several thematic connections to Q. Some of the sayings also seem to be derived from a pre-Lucan collections of Jesus' sayings, which also points to Q. Accordingly, in support of Q Passion material, we have the two most probative source critical factors discussed above: (1) thematic linkage with Q; and (2) *aporia*, or disjunctions from the Markan material, which in genre form are also similar to Q. Luke nonetheless contains considerable material very

¹⁴⁵ Bundy, *Jesus and the First Three Gospels*, 536.

¹⁴⁶ Brown, *The Death of the Messiah*, 2:1068.

¹⁴⁷ If the prayer of forgiveness from Luke 23:34 was original to Luke, see fn 133 above, that prayer would also potentially link to the Father prayers in Q.

close to Mark, and thus appears to be drawing simultaneously on the Mark and Q sources.

Assuming then Luke has combined Mark and Q in the Passion, how would source utilization explain the composition process?

In Chapter Two, we noted that for the most part Luke follows source utilization principles of one source at a time and avoids radical reordering. To a certain degree, Luke may continue this practice in the Passion where the pericopae show greater and lesser degrees of reliance on Mark. However, as we also noted in Chapter Two, much of the Passion resists this explanation. The Markan material is intermixed with the non-Markan source material within individual pericope. How could source utilization explain Luke's blending of sources in such close proximity?

Without the actual definitive text of Q to compare with Mark, answering this question with certainty is difficult. However, several source utilization solutions are possible for blending of sources closely together. The first was already discussed in our review of Alan Kirk in Chapter Two. He indicated when intermixing of sources occurs, i.e. "micro-conflation," the writer may be primarily following one source using trained scribal memory to access the scroll, but elements of the other source may be included through "reminiscence," i.e. ordinary memory.¹⁴⁸ For example, Luke may be primarily using Q in the Sanhedrin Beating and Sanhedrin Trial, but elements of Mark are included from ordinary memory.

Kirk's reminiscence solution may still be inadequate for certain pericopes of Luke's Passion such as the Arrest and the Crucifixion where substantial elements of both Mark and non-Mark (i.e., Q) exist side by side and where Markan order is also disrupted. Derrenbacker

¹⁴⁸ Kirk, *Q in Matthew*, 146.

believed when following the order of a source, ancient writers also adapted the wording of that source since in the absence of desks the writer could access only one scroll at a time.¹⁴⁹ His approach makes the blending of sources in the Arrest and Crucifixion pericopes difficult to explain. Building on the memory work of Alan Kirk, however, Kai-Hsuan Chang believed a writer could access the order and content of one source from trained scribal memory without consulting the scroll, but at the same time consult the scroll of a second source and thereby add precise wording from that source.¹⁵⁰ Chang's approach could explain the Arrest and Crucifixion pericopes where Luke may be generally following Q by trained scribal memory, but at the same time included material closely tracking Mark by Lucan consultation of the Markan scroll.

A final source utilization solution involves a team of more than one literate persons in the composition of Luke's Passion. James Barker suggested this solution for the Gospels generally as part of his criticism of Derrenbacker.¹⁵¹ In Barker's approach, the primary author consults one source, and a second reader consults and dictates from the second source.¹⁵² The primary writer is thereby able to combine two sources closely together. Luke apparently did not see any need for this approach throughout most of his gospel, and followed the one source at a time principle laid down by Derrenbacker. In the Passion, however, the desire to blend elements of the two sources

¹⁴⁹ Derrenbacker, *Ancient Compositional Practices*, 116–17. His point (2) from our list in Chapter Two above.

¹⁵⁰ Kai-Hsuan Chang, "Questioning the Feasibility of the Major Synoptic Hypotheses: Scribal Memory as the Key to the Oral–Written Interface," *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 41, no. 4 (2019): 407–32.

¹⁵¹ Barker, "Ancient Compositional Practices," 121.

¹⁵² *Ibid.*

Mark and Q in close proximity could have led Luke to enlist the aid of a second reader.¹⁵³ The presence of a second reader could explain any combination of Mark and Q in the Passion.

Passion Sayings in Q

Substantial evidence exists for Passion sayings in Q. Chapter Two above suggested a second non-Markan written source for Luke's Passion. Matthew doesn't qualify as a candidate because it closely follows Mark and does not contain most of the Lucan deviations from Mark. Luke's DT source Q should at least be considered for this second source to avoid multiplying sources per Occam's Razor. Recent research showing Q's interest in Jesus death, along with the importance of commemorating martyrs' final words, renders plausible the presence of Passion sayings even in an instructional work like Q.

Source criticism uses contextual and thematic criteria as the most probative to identify sources. Based on the assumption of a second written source for Luke's Passion and on the accepted genre of Q as a sayings source, this Chapter Three focused on non-Markan sayings in Luke's Passion (and a single grouping in Matthew) as the best contextual evidence for Q Passion sayings. The words don't come from Mark, but share the genre characteristics of Q. Luke's Passion in fact contains about 120 words of Jesus not found in Mark, all or a substantial portion of which could constitute a Q fragment similar to the DT.

The present Chapter next looked at thematic connections. The review of most of the non-Markan sayings of Jesus in Luke's Passion (and one set in the arrest pericope of Matthew) demonstrated numerous thematic (and stylistic) connections to the DT, and hence to Q. The

¹⁵³ From a personal conversation on 11/20/22 with Barker at 2022 SBL/AAR Annual Meeting in Denver, Colorado, he agreed Luke appears to follow one source at a time for most of the gospel, but then adopts a different approach in the Passion. Thus in the Passion Luke could be using a second reader. Barker continued to dispute, however, most of the findings of Derrenbacker and Kirk.

connections suggest most of the non-Markan sayings of Jesus in Luke's Passion (and one cluster in Matthew's) are serious candidates for addition to the accepted text of Q. Finally, Chapter Three reviewed source utilization solutions for how Luke may have combined the two sources Mark and Q in close proximity in a new and unique Passion account.

Chapter Four will examine Minor Agreements (MAs) in the Passion, i.e., the agreements of Matthew and Luke against Mark. I will show the Passion MAs confirm the findings in Chapters Two and Three. The MAs thus provide supplemental evidence for a Q Passion.

CHAPTER FOUR – MINOR AGREEMENTS

As the first step in demonstrating Q has a Passion account, Chapter Two used source utilization research to show Luke had a second written source for the Passion in addition to Mark based on substantial deviations from Mark, with deviations from order being the most significant. As the next step toward showing Q had a Passion account, Chapter Three pointed to contextual and thematic arguments the second source is in fact Q. Chapter Three focused on the 120 words of non-Markan sayings of Jesus in Luke's Passion (and one additional grouping in Matthew), which share the genre characteristics of Q, as the best possible evidence for Q Passion material. Chapter Three further demonstrated that most of these non-Markan sayings show thematic (and stylistic) connections to the DT. Some of them also appear to derive from a pre-Lucan collection of Jesus sayings. The foregoing evidence suggests the non-Markan sayings derive from Q. This Chapter Four will look to the Minor Agreements against Mark in the Passion accounts of Matthew and Luke for supplemental evidence supporting the conclusions of Chapters Two and Three.

Minor Agreements in the Passion

We will utilize the list of Passion Minor Agreements generated by Franz Neiryneck - perhaps the leading scholar on Minor Agreements.¹⁵⁴ Prior scholars have suggested the Minor Agreements could be evidence of Q, i.e., the overlap of Luke and Matthew against Mark in the Passion might be explained by the influence of Q on both Evangelists.¹⁵⁵ These scholars,

¹⁵⁴ F. Neiryneck, Theo Hansen, and Frans van Segbroeck, eds., *The Minor Agreements of Matthew and Luke against Mark: With a Cumulative List*, Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 37 (Leuven: University Press, 1974). In his book, Neiryneck reviewed prior scholarship identifying Minor Agreements. He then compiled a list of each Minor Agreement and the scholars who include that Minor Agreement on their lists.

¹⁵⁵ Franklin, "A Passion Narrative for Q." Sloan, "Passion Narrative in Q?"

however, argued for a Passion **narrative** in Q, and Neiryneck, however, considered such an attempt “extreme.”¹⁵⁶ Chapters Two and Three above, however, focused on a non-Markan written source with Passion **sayings** not narrative. The present Chapter aims to show how the Minor Agreements provide supplemental evidence for the arguments of the prior Chapters. First, the Minor Agreements suggest Matthew’s awareness of the non-Markan sayings tradition influencing Luke discussed in Chapter Three. Second, the Minor Agreements also suggest Matthew’s awareness of the written source which provided Luke’s non-Markan order discussed in Chapter Two. A non-Markan written sayings source shared by Matthew and Luke points to Q, the common source of the sayings-rich DT for both gospels.

As demonstrated in prior Chapters, source utilization suggests Luke’s Passion in some fashion combined elements of both Mark and Q. On the other hand, Matthew’s Passion primarily used Mark. Based on the Minor Agreements, however, Chapter Four suggests some elements of Q’s Passion bled into Matthew’s otherwise Markan account, perhaps in most cases from ordinary memory.

Matthew’s Awareness of Non-Markan Passion Sayings

Chapter Three argued that many of the non-Markan Passion sayings of Jesus in Luke have thematic connections to the DT and hence Q. Matthew seems aware of these non-Markan Passion sayings. The first non-Markan saying cited above was Jesus speaking to Judas at the arrest (Luke 22:48). *Contra* Mark, Matthew also has Jesus speaking to Judas (Matt 26:60a). Neiryneck lists Matt 26:60a = Luke 22:48 as a Minor Agreement citing 17 scholars.¹⁵⁷ The

¹⁵⁶ Neiryneck, “Minor Agreements,” 51.

¹⁵⁷ Neiryneck, Hansen, and Segbroeck, *The Minor Agreements*, 175.

introductory phrase “Jesus said to him” is virtually identical in Greek: ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῷ in Matthew and Ἰησοῦς δὲ εἶπεν αὐτῷ in Luke.¹⁵⁸ The actual quoted words of Jesus are different, and Chapter Three argued the Lucan version (a Son of Man saying) shows a thematic connection to Q.¹⁵⁹

Chapter Three also cited the rebuke of the sword wielding disciple absent from Mark but found at Matt 26:52 = Luke 22:51. Neiryneck included this in his list citing 3 scholars.¹⁶⁰ Similar to the statement to Judas, the introductory phrase “Jesus said” is common to Matthew and Luke. Although only the 2 introductory words are identical in Matt and Luke (perhaps explaining why so few scholars count this as a Minor Agreement), the non-retaliatory substance of the rebuke in each gospel is similar (“Put your sword back into its place” in Matt, and “No more of this!” in Luke). The similar substance lends weight to the argument Matt and Luke are drawing on a common source. As pointed out in Chapter Three, Matt adds additional non-Markan words of Jesus with thematic connections to non-retaliatory statements in the DT and hence Q. Perhaps here Matt consulted the Q scroll and preserved the more complete excerpt from Q. Luke may have abbreviated perhaps from memory.

The next set of non-Markan words of Jesus in Luke with thematic connections to Q are his statements to the Sanhedrin at Luke 22:67-70. In Mark, when questioned if he is the Christ, the Son of the Blessed, Jesus answers with the ringing “I am” - ἐγώ εἰμι (Mark 14:62a). Both

¹⁵⁸ All Biblical quotations in Greek are from NA²⁸.

¹⁵⁹ Matthew has a more positive portrayal of Judas than Luke; in Matt 27:3 Judas repents, but at Luke 22:3 Satan enters Judas. Matthew therefore may have preferred the “friend” statement of Matt 26:50. The “friend” statement may have come from another tradition known to Matthew, or Q may have included both the Matthean and Lucan statements and each Evangelist selected the saying most suited to their respective portrayal of Judas.

¹⁶⁰ Neiryneck, Hansen, and Segbroeck, *The Minor Agreements*, 176.

Matt (“You have said so” - σὺ εἶπας) and Luke (“You say” - ὑμεῖς λέγετε) change the Markan statement by adding a second person pronoun plus the verb for “say.” Neiryneck lists this as a Minor Agreement citing 11 scholars.¹⁶¹ Then Mark adds a future Son of Man saying (Mark 14:62b). Both Matt (ἀπ’ ἄρτι) and Luke (ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν) add temporal qualifiers indicating the Son of Man statement applies from the present moment (the NRSV translates both “from now on”). Neiryneck also includes this in his list citing 17 scholars.¹⁶² Matthew thus appears to show knowledge of Luke’s non-Markan sayings at the Sanhedrin Trial.

The foregoing Minor Agreements tend to confirm Chapter Three’s conclusion that Luke had a non-Markan source of sayings thematically related to Q. Based on the Minor Agreements at the Arrest and the Sanhedrin Trial, Matthew appears to be aware of the non-Markan saying tradition influencing Luke. Matthew in fact adds additional non-Markan sayings of Jesus with thematic resonance with Q. Matthew and Luke seem to share a Passions sayings source, and Q is the most likely candidate both due to its genre as a sayings source and the thematic connections.

Minor Agreements and Lucan Order

Chapter Two above argued for a second written Passion source for Luke with the strongest evidence being deviation from Markan order. Ancient writers tended to follow the forward order of their scroll-based sources,¹⁶³ and a different order (especially backwards) suggests a different written source. APPENDIX C shows the point where Luke most deviates from Markan order, and in fact moves in reverse order from Mark. A different written source is

¹⁶¹ Ibid., 178.

¹⁶² Ibid.

¹⁶³ Kirk, *Q in Matthew*, 142.

likely providing Luke’s forward order. Matthew shows awareness of this second written source because two of the strongest Minor Agreements in the entire gospel tradition occur close together in Luke precisely at this point.

At the end of the Petrine denial pericope, Mark 14:72c indicates Peter “broke down and wept” - καὶ ἐπιβαλὼν ἑκκλαιεν. Matt 26:75 and Luke 22:62 both deviate from Mark and substitute “and he went out and wept bitterly” – an identical five (5) word phrase in Greek: καὶ ἐξεληθὼν ἔξω ἑκκλαυσεν πικρῶς. Neiryck includes this in his list of Minor Agreements citing 24 scholars.¹⁶⁴ He further indicates this Minor Agreement was the second most important on S. McLaughlin’s short list of the six (6) most important Minor Agreements in the entire gospel tradition.¹⁶⁵ John Kloppenborg similarly included this Minor Agreement on his short list of the seven most difficult.¹⁶⁶

Only a few words later in Luke appears another Minor Agreement – the most infamous one of all. During the Sanhedrin beating at Mark 14:65, both Matt 26:68 and Luke 22:64 add “who is it that struck you?” – another five (5) word phrase in Greek: τίς ἐστὶν ὁ παΐσας σε;. This Minor Agreement has no parallel in Mark at all. Neiryck includes this Minor Agreement in his list again citing 24 scholars, and reports McLoughlin put this Minor Agreement first on his list of

¹⁶⁴ Ibid., 182.

¹⁶⁵ Ibid., 48.

¹⁶⁶ John S. Kloppenborg, “Goulder and the New Paradigm: A Critical Appreciation of Michael Goulder on the Synoptic Problem,” in *The Gospels According to Michael Goulder: A North American Response*, ed. Chris A. Rollston (Harrisburg, Pa.: Trinity Press International, 2002), 45 fn 35.

the six (6) most important.¹⁶⁷ Kloppenborg also included it on his similar short list.¹⁶⁸ Often considered the single greatest difficulty with the Two Source Theory, numerous attempts have been made to explain this “striking” Minor Agreement without any consensus.¹⁶⁹

Because synopsis usually follow the order of Mark, sometimes overlooked is how closely these two strong Minor Agreements appear together in Luke as shown in **bold** below:

61 καὶ στραφεὶς ὁ κύριος ἐνέβλεψεν τῷ Πέτρῳ, καὶ ὑπεμνήσθη ὁ Πέτρος τοῦ ῥήματος τοῦ κυρίου ὡς εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὅτι πρὶν ἀλέκτορα φωνῆσαι σήμερον ἀπαρνήσῃ με τρίς 62 **καὶ ἐξελθὼν ἔξω ἐκλαυσεν πικρῶς.**

63 Καὶ οἱ ἄνδρες οἱ συνέχοντες αὐτὸν ἐνέπαιζον αὐτῷ δέροντες, 64 καὶ περικαλύψαντες αὐτὸν ἐπηρώτων λέγοντες· προφήτευσον, **τίς ἐστὶν ὁ παῖσας σε;** 65 καὶ ἕτερα πολλὰ βλασφημοῦντες ἔλεγον εἰς αὐτόν.

The proximity is important because verses 62 and 63 occur precisely at the seam where Luke begins moving in reverse order from Mark. Luke moves from the Petrine Denials to the Sanhedrin Beating, which is reverse order from Mark’s movement from the Beating to the Denials. Luke also deviates significantly from Mark in content at this point. Only 3 of Luke’s 27 words in verses 63-65 agree with Mark.¹⁷⁰ This becomes only 5 of 32 words if verse 62 is included. By contrast, 10 of Luke’s 32 words agree with Matthew in the Lucan verses 62-65. Divergence of both order and content strongly suggest a different written source than Mark is influencing Luke at this point. The two strong Minor Agreements also suggest Matthew is aware

¹⁶⁷ Neiryck, Hansen, and Segbroeck, *The Minor Agreements*, 48.

¹⁶⁸ Kloppenborg, “Goulder and the New Paradigm,” 45 fn 35.

¹⁶⁹ Steve D. Black, “One Really Striking Minor Agreement ΤΙΣ ΕΣΤΙΝ Ο ΠΑΙΣΑΣ ΣΕ in Matthew 26:68 and Luke 22:64,” *Novum Testamentum* 52, no. 4 (2010): 313–33.

¹⁷⁰ Darrell L. Bock, *Luke 9:51 - 24:53* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Publishing Group, 1996), 1789. In the entire sequence of Petrine Denials, Sanhedrin Beating and Sanhedrin Trial, only 63 of Luke’s 263 words match Mark. *Ibid.*, 1775.

of this other source. Matthean order follows Mark and therefore Matthew is not a likely candidate for the second Lucan source. A non-Markan written source common to Matthew and Luke seems indicated, which points to Q.

Luke moves next from the Beating to the Sanhedrin Trial, again in reverse order from Mark's movement from Trial to Beating.¹⁷¹ As noted above, the Trial also includes Minor Agreements suggesting Matthean knowledge of the non-Markan sayings source influencing Luke. The cumulative Lucan content deviations from Mark from the end of the Denials through the end of the Sanhedrin trial (22:61-70) is significant as illustrated by APPENDIX E.1. This dense combination of deviations from Markan order and content strongly suggests another written source. And the non-Markan sayings with thematic resonance to the DT, together with the Minor Agreements indicating Matthean knowledge, all point to Q.¹⁷²

Passion *Chria* Framing in Q

The above analysis pushes beyond pure sayings to include narrative elements in the argument for Q's Passion material. I am not thereby suggesting Q has a full-blown Passion narrative, but rather Q's Passion sayings might have narrative framing in the form of *chria*. Per Kloppenborg: "The furnishing of sayings with a brief setting is the characteristic of the *chria*, a well-known didactic and rhetorical form in the ancient Mediterranean world."¹⁷³ *Chria* can

¹⁷¹ It is possible to harmonize Mark and Luke and suggest two different trials are in view, a nighttime one in Mark before the chief priest and an early morning one in Luke before the Sanhedrin. Ibid., 1777, 1780-81. Nonetheless, even if Luke is reporting a different event altogether than Mark, that would still suggest Luke is relying on a non-Markan source.

¹⁷² Attempting to explain the Minor Agreements by Lucan knowledge of Matthew ignores the larger pattern of Lucan deviation from both Mark and Matthew at this point.

¹⁷³ Kloppenborg, *Excavating Q*, 160.

appear in isolation, but can also be collected and serialized.¹⁷⁴ Kloppenborg cited several *chriae* in Q,¹⁷⁵ and designated the genre of Q a *chriae* collection.¹⁷⁶ Q is more than a random collection of sayings, although not a full-blown narrative like Matthew or Luke.¹⁷⁷

In this light, the entire Sanhedrin exchange, its setting and the questions, as well as Jesus answers, can be understood as a *chria*. As I argued in my prior paper, the Sanhedrin exchange is thematically and stylistically similar to the Temptation Narrative in Q. Kloppenborg found the Temptation Narrative consistent with Q's genre as a *chriae* collection.¹⁷⁸ The entire Sanhedrin exchange would be a similar *chria* candidate for inclusion in Q.

The end of the Petrine Denial pericope could also be a *chria*, in this case centered on the remembered saying of Jesus predicting the denial. The saying itself is very close to Mark, but it could be a traditional element common to more than one Passion rendering (the wording of John 13:38b is also close). In Luke, the saying is surrounded by non-Markan material, including a strong Minor Agreement with Matthew. It also occurs at a place where Luke begins to deviate from Markan order. This all points to a non-Markan source known to Matthew, and therefore a plausible Q *chria*.

¹⁷⁴ Ibid.

¹⁷⁵ Ibid., 126, 161, 201.

¹⁷⁶ Ibid., 209. This genre designation was for Q² (and would also apply to Q³), but the exact composition history of Q is not relevant to this paper. Whatever its origins, Q was a *chriae* collection by the time it was incorporated into Matthew and Luke.

¹⁷⁷ Ibid.

¹⁷⁸ Ibid., 161.

The beating by the Sanhedrin guards in Luke contains no sayings material, but is otherwise almost entirely non-Markan. It features the “striking” Minor Agreement with Matthew. The pericope is also out of sequence from Markan order. All of which strongly indicates a non-Markan source. If Q is the source of Lucan order and content for surrounding pericopae, Q is also the likely source of this pericope. Two possibilities might explain the lack of a saying: 1) Q had a saying here perhaps in response to the mocking question, but Luke chose not to include it,¹⁷⁹ or 2) the pericope serves as narrative *chria* framing the Sanhedrin interrogation.

Other Q sayings in the Passion might have similar *chria* narrative framing. The statements of Jesus to Judas and the sword-wielding disciple in the arrest pericope both have Minor Agreements of the introductory phrase “Jesus said,” which are often characteristic of *chria*.¹⁸⁰ Chapter Three argued the Daughters of Jerusalem pericope is a strong candidate for Q. Jesus words there form a natural response to the narrative framing found in Luke of weeping women.¹⁸¹ Sayings as comments to particular situations are also typical of *chria*.¹⁸²

Minor Agreements Support a Q Passion

Chapters Two and Three argued that 1) source utilization points to a second written source for Luke’s Passion especially due to deviations from Markan order, and 2) many of the

¹⁷⁹ Perhaps the textually uncertain “Father, forgive them” prayer of Luke 23:34 actually belongs here. As noted above in Chapter Three’s discussion of Luke 23:46, “Father” prayers are found in Q. Even as Q faded from the scene, the memory of this powerful prayer may have lingered and found a new place in Luke in subsequent manuscripts.

¹⁸⁰ Kloppenborg, *Excavating Q*, 160.

¹⁸¹ Even though available from Q, Matthew may have chosen to omit the Daughters of Jerusalem pericope since Matthew seems less interested than Luke in interactions of Jesus with women. For example, Matthew omits the widow’s offering from Mark 12:41-44, but Luke includes it at Luke 21:1-4.

¹⁸² Kloppenborg, *Excavating Q*, 160.

non-Markan sayings in Luke's Passion have thematic connections to the DT and hence Q. The present Chapter Four has shown the Minor Agreements of Matthew and Luke against Mark support these earlier arguments. Matthew is aware of the non-Markan, DT-themed, sayings tradition influencing Luke. In addition, Matthew is aware of the written Passion source influencing Lucan order. Opponents of the Q theory have explained the Minor Agreements by positing Lucan knowledge of Matthew, but such knowledge is inadequate to explain the much larger body of Lucan deviations from Mark in which the Minor Agreements are embedded. Added to these insights is the recognition the non-Markan Passion sayings could be part of a *chria* collection explaining even more of the non-Markan material found in Luke's Passion. The foregoing evidence all points to a sayings source common to Matthew and Luke, i.e., to Q. Chapter Five will pull together all of the foregoing evidence and generate a proposed addition to Q of Passion material. Chapter Five will also briefly consider the implications of Passion material in Q and suggest further research of the ramifications.

CHAPTER FIVE – SCOPE AND IMPLICATIONS OF A Q PASSION

Building on all of the earlier Chapters, Chapter Five will propose a collection of Passion *chriae* for inclusion in Q. Future work might develop additional arguments in favor of a Q Passion. In this Chapter, we will also consider some preliminary implications of a Q Passion. First and foremost, a Q Passion refutes the Argument from Silence which bases Q analysis on the absence of a Passion. The implications also include impact on the Synoptic Problem, theological ramifications for Q and consequences for the study of the history of early Christianity. These implications could also be the subject of further work on this topic.

The scope of the proposed Q Passion *chria* collection is drawn from material in Luke, and to a smaller degree from Matthew, based on the criteria set forth in earlier Chapters. Based on the conclusion of Chapter Two that Luke has a second written source, we focus primarily on non-Markan material in Luke's Passion. As discussed in Chapter Three, since the genre of Q is generally sayings material, we look first to non-Markan Passion sayings in Luke. Again from Chapter Three, because source critical analysis also looks to thematic factors to find source linkage, we will look for thematic resonance with Q for the non-Markan sayings material in Luke. Finally, from Chapter Four, we look to Passion Minor Agreements as further evidence of proposed Q material found in Luke based on Matthean knowledge of the same material. The Minor Agreements also expand the scope of potential Q Passion material to include *chria* framing elements consistent with *chriae* found in Q. The resulting 300 word proposal for a Q Passion makes Q's witness to the Passion far from silent, but very loud indeed.

Proposed Scope of a Passion *Chria* Collection in Q

The first Passion *chria* proposed here is Jesus speaking to Judas at his arrest. The saying is non-Markan, the Lukan version is a Son of Man sayings thematically consistent with similar

sayings in Q and the *chria* framing contains a Minor Agreement with Matthew. The Lucan version of the kiss by Judas also differs from Mark since the Lucan Judas only approaches Jesus to kiss him, and the saying appears to interrupt the process. We include the Lucan non-Markan introductory language as additional *chria* stage-setting for the actual saying. APPENDIX SIX delineates the proposed “kiss” *chria*, along with each of the Q additions proposed below.

The second proposed Q Passion *chria* is the non-Markan rebuke of the sword-wielding disciple. The rebuke is a Minor Agreement between Matthew and Luke. Matthew provides a larger piece of non-Markan sayings material with thematic resonance to the non-retaliation theme in Q. In this case, we use the longer Matthean version.

The next proposed Q saying is the statement by Jesus in Luke to the arresting crowd about the power of darkness. The non-Markan saying has thematic resonance to the Temptation Narrative in Q, including a temporal element which also links it to other non-Markan Passion sayings. The sayings immediately precedes the physical arrest of Jesus, a retrograde Markan detail suggesting disruption of Markan order by another source.

The fourth proposed Q *chria* is the end of the Petrine denial pericope. Here Luke inserts the stark non-Markan detail of Jesus looking at Peter across the courtyard. Then Luke adds the remembered saying of Jesus predicting the denial (a traditional Passion element appearing in very similar wording in all 4 canonical gospels). Finally, the saying is bracketed by a strong Minor Agreement of five (5) words with Matthew. Immediately following the *chria*, Luke begins deviation from Markan pericopae order again suggesting another source.

The fifth proposed Q element is the beating of Jesus by the Sanhedrin guards. The Lucan pericope is virtually devoid of Markan vocabulary, but at the same time contains the single most significant Minor Agreement with Matthew of five (5) words with no Markan parallel at all.

Luke is also here moving in reverse order from the Markan account. The pericope contains no saying by Jesus, but perhaps Luke omitted the Q saying or perhaps the entire segment is *chria* framing for the Sanhedrin trial.

The sixth proposed Q *chria* is the Sanhedrin Trial in Luke. The Lucan trial deviates significantly from the Markan version, and includes both non-Markan sayings and Minor Agreements with Matthew. The Minor Agreements include a temporal element linking to the other temporal elements in the non-Markan Passion sayings. The pericope resembles the Temptation Narrative from Q both structurally as a dialogue with Jesus enemies and thematically with the skepticism concerning his claim to be the Son of God.

The seventh block of proposed Q Passion material is the Daughters of Jerusalem pericope. The passage is introduced by non-Markan *chria* framing. The pericope primarily consists of a large block of non-Markan sayings with strong thematic resonance with Q. The passage also contains an overlap with the Gospel of Thomas.

The penultimate *chria* proposed for Q is Jesus exchange with the good thief on the cross. The material is entirely non-Markan. The saying has elements pointing to another tradition. The saying includes a temporal element linking it to the Minor Agreement temporal qualifier in the Sanhedrin Trial. Also included is the thief's request to Jesus as *chria* framing for Jesus answer.

Finally, the last proposed Q saying is Jesus Father prayer quoting Psalms 31. The non-Markan prayer is theologically divergent from Mark, but thematically resonant with other Father prayers in Q. The prayer makes a fitting conclusion for a Q Passion account.

Implications of a Q Passion

A Q Passion has direct impact for the Synoptic Problem. Positing Q as the source for the Passion Minor Agreements blows a hole in one of the main arguments of the Farrer Goulder

Hypothesis that Luke must have used both Mark and Matthew for the composition of the Third Gospel. The centerpiece of Michael Goulder's argument against the Q theory was the difficulty posed by Passion Minor Agreements.¹⁸³ Because Q theorists since the 1950s have believed Q contained no Passion account, the presence of strong Minor Agreements between Luke and Matthew in the Passion are hard to explain since Q theory assumes no Lucan knowledge of Matthew. Scholars resorted to difficult solutions like conjectural emendation (all known manuscripts of Matthew are corrupt) or coincidental redaction (both Matthew and Luke independently made the exact same changes to Mark). If the Minor Agreements derive from Q, these difficult explanations are not necessary. Goulder's objection is resolved in favor of Q and thereby bolsters the larger Two Source Theory of which Q is a part.¹⁸⁴

More importantly, Passion material in Q eliminates the Argument from Silence as a building block for Q analysis. A new approach is necessary to explain Q's theology. With a Q Passion, Q's interest in Jesus death becomes significant and must be taken into account. Q would seem to be more theologically aligned with Matthew and Luke, and not on a theological trajectory of Wisdom material toward the Passion-free Gospel of Thomas.¹⁸⁵

¹⁸³ Goulder, "Appendix: Michael Goulder Responds," 142–43. See also Goodacre, *The Case Against Q*, 152–60.

¹⁸⁴ The 300 word Passion account for Q proposed hereby also explains a much larger portion of Luke's deviation from Mark in the Passion than Goulder's argument in favor of Lucan knowledge of Matthew. Knowledge of Matthew can only explain the 20 or so words constituting the Minor Agreements. The balance of the substantial Lucan deviation from Mark is typically explained by Goulder and his adherents by Lucan creativity to a degree not seen elsewhere in Luke's dealing with Markan material.

¹⁸⁵ *Contra* Robinson, "Gattung of Q." Of course Q was always on a trajectory toward Matthew and Luke since both of those gospels incorporated Q, and presumably each Evangelist felt some affinity toward it. Perhaps it was never plausible to suggest that Matthew and Luke independently chose a theologically alien Q as a source, and then each "covered their own tracks" by suppressing its alleged divergent theology. *Contra* Kloppenborg, *Excavating Q*, 2.

A Q Passion is also significant for the history of early Christianity. As quoted from William Farmer at the beginning of this thesis, advocacy of a theologically divergent Q led to “ever more dubious reconstructions of early Christianity.”¹⁸⁶ If Q is in fact more theologically aligned with the Synoptic Gospels, the argument for such reconstructions is undermined. Q is no longer evidence of an early layer of alternative Christianity, but rather aligned with other early canonical works emphasizing the importance of his death like Paul and Mark. The common emphasis on Jesus death of this early layer then flowed into the later canonical works such as Matthew and Luke. Evidence of first century documents expressing divergent Christianity not centered on the cross becomes thin.

Conclusion

This thesis built a case for a collection of Passion *chriae* in Q. Chapter Two put forth source utilization evidence pointing to a second written source influencing Luke’s Passion. Chapter Three focused on non-Markan sayings material in Luke’s Passion (consistent with the genre of Q) and pointed to thematic linkage between the sayings and Q. Chapter Three also deployed source utilization to show how Luke may have combined the Mark and Q sources. Chapter Four examined the Minor Agreements in the Passion, and concluded they confirm the findings of Chapters Two and Three. Matthew had knowledge of the non-Markan Passion sayings tradition influencing Luke including thematic resonance with Q. Matthew also had knowledge of the second written source which influenced Lucan order away from Mark. Chapter Four also described how the ancient notion of *chria* could have provided brief narrative framing for the non-Markan Passion sayings. Based on the earlier Chapters, this Chapter Five then

¹⁸⁶ Farmer, “Preface to Beyond the Q Impasse,” xii.

assembled a proposed Passion *chria* collection for Q of about 300 words. The proposed Q insert rebuts the Argument for Silence which has long been a staple of Q scholarship. Chapter Five also considered implications for further research. The conclusions of this thesis challenge the conventional understanding of Q, and are offered as the next step in recent trends acknowledging Q's interest in the death of Jesus.

REFERENCES

- Alkier, Stefan. "Sad Sources: Observations From the History of Theology on the Origins and Contours of the Synoptic Problem." In *Gospel Interpretation and the Q-Hypothesis*, edited by Mogens Müller and Heike Omerzu. London: Bloomsbury Publishing Plc, 2018.
- Andrejevs, Olegs. *Apocalypticism in the Synoptic Sayings Source: A Reassessment of Q's Stratigraphy*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2019.
- Barker, James W. "Ancient Compositional Practices and the Gospels : A Reassessment." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 135, no. 1 (2016): 109–21.
- Black, Steve D. "One Really Striking Minor Agreement ΤΙΣ ΕΣΤΙΝ Ο ΠΑΙΣΑΣ ΣΕ in Matthew 26:68 and Luke 22:64." *Novum Testamentum* 52, no. 4 (2010): 313–33.
- Bock, Darrell L. *Luke 9:51 - 24:53*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Publishing Group, 1996.
- Brown, Raymond E. *The Death of the Messiah: From Gethsemane to the Grave : A Commentary on the Passion Narratives in the Four Gospels, 2 Vols*. New York: Doubleday, 1994.
- Bundy, Walter Ernest. *Jesus and the First Three Gospels; an Introduction to the Synoptic Tradition*. Cambridge, Ma: Harvard University Press, 1955.
- Chang, Kai-Hsuan. "Questioning the Feasibility of the Major Synoptic Hypotheses: Scribal Memory as the Key to the Oral–Written Interface." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 41, no. 4 (2019): 407–32.
- Derrenbacker, Robert A. Jr. *Ancient Compositional Practices and the Synoptic Problem*. Leuven: University Press, 2005.
- . "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*, edited by P. Foster, A. Gregory, J.S. Kloppenborg, and J. Verheyden, 571–89. Leuven: Utigeveru Peeters, 2011.
- Farmer, William R. "Preface." In *Beyond the Q Impasse: Luke's Use of Matthew*, by Allan J. McNicol, David L. Dungan, David Barrett Peabody, and International Institute for the Renewal of Gospel Studies, xi–xiii. Valley Forge, Pa.: Trinity Press International, 1996.
- Fortna, Robert Tomson. *The Gospel of Signs: A Reconstruction of the Narrative Source Underlying the Fourth Gospel*. London: Cambridge UP, 1970.
- Franklin, Eric. "A Passion Narrative for Q." In *Understanding, Studying and Reading: New Testament Essays in Honour of John Ashton*, 30–47. Sheffield, Eng: Academic Press, 1998.

- Goodacre, Mark S. *The Case Against Q: Studies in Markan Priority and the Synoptic Problem*. Harrisburg, Pa.: Trinity Press International, 2002.
- Goulder, Michael D. "Appendix: Michael Goulder Responds." In *The Gospels According to Michael Goulder: A North American Response*, edited by Chris A. Rollston, 140–49. Harrisburg, Pa.: Trinity Press International, 2002.
- . *Luke : A New Paradigm*. Sheffield, England: JSOT, 1989.
- Hoffmann, Paul. "The Redaction of Q and the Son of Man: A Preliminary Sketch." In *The Gospel Behind the Gospels: Current Studies on Q*, edited by Ronald A. Piper, 159–98. New York: EJB Brill, 1995.
- Kahl, Brigitte. "Reading Luke Against Luke: Non-Uniformity of Text, Hermeneutics of Conspiracy and the 'Scriptural Principle.'" In *A Feminist Companion to Luke*, edited by Amy-Jill Levine, 71–88. New York: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002.
- Kirk, Alan. "Q." In *From Paul to Josephus Literary Receptions of Jesus in the First Century CE*, edited by Helen K. Bond, 1:73–106. The Reception of Jesus in the First Three Centuries Series. London: T & T Clark, 2020.
- . *Q in Matthew: Ancient Media, Memory, and Early Scribal Transmission of the Jesus Tradition*. London: Bloomsbury, 2016.
- . "The Memory of Violence and the Death of Jesus in Q." In *Memory, Tradition, and Text: Uses of the Past in Early Christianity*, edited by Alan Kirk and Tom Thatcher, 191–206. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2005.
- Kloppenborg, John S. *Excavating Q: The History and Setting of the Sayings Gospel*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 2000.
- . "Goulder and the New Paradigm: A Critical Appreciation of Michael Goulder on the Synoptic Problem." In *The Gospels According to Michael Goulder: A North American Response*, edited by Chris A. Rollston, 29–60. Harrisburg, Pa.: Trinity Press International, 2002.
- Moberly, R. W. L. *The Bible, Theology, and Faith a Study of Abraham and Jesus*. Cambridge Studies in Christian Doctrine. Cambridge, U.K. ; Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- Müller, Mogens. "Were the Gospel Authors Really 'Simple Christians Without Literary Gifts' (Albert Schweitzer)?: Arguments for the Question for Sources Behind the Gospels." In *Gospel Interpretation and the Q-Hypothesis.*, edited by Mogens Müller and Heike Omerzu. London: Bloomsbury Publishing Plc, 2018.

- Neiryneck, F., Theo Hansen, and Frans van Segbroeck, eds. *The Minor Agreements of Matthew and Luke against Mark: With a Cumulative List*. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 37. Leuven: University Press, 1974.
- Neiryneck, Frans. “The Minor Agreements and Q.” In *The Gospel Behind the Gospels: Current Studies on Q*, edited by Ronald A. Piper, 49–72. New York: EJB Brill, 1995.
- Poirier, John C. “The Composition of Luke in Source-Critical Perspective.” In *New Studies in the Synoptic Problem*, edited by P. Foster, A. Gregory, J.S. Kloppenborg, and J. Verheyden, 571–89. Leuven: Utigeveru Peeters, 2011.
- Reeder, Caryn A. *Gendering War and Peace in the Gospel of Luke*. Cambridge: University Press, 2018.
- Robinson, James M. “Logoi Sophon: On the Gattung of Q.” In *Trajectories Through Early Christianity*, by James M. Robinson and Helmut Koester, 84–130. Eugene, Or: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 1971.
- Robinson, James M., Paul Hoffmann, and John S. Kloppenborg. *The Critical Edition of Q: Synopsis Including the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, Mark and Thomas with English, German, and French translations of Q and Thomas*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2000.
- Rollens, Sarah E. *Framing Social Criticism in the Jesus Movement: The Ideological Project in the Sayings Gospel Q*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014.
- Sloan, David B. “A Passion Narrative in Q?” Accessed March 24, 2021. <http://www.reconstructingq.com/>.
- The Holy Bible: Containing the Old and New Testaments With the Apochryphal/Deuterocanonical Books: New Revised Standard Version*. Philadelphia: American Bible Society, 1989.
- Tuckett, Christopher M. *Q and the History of Early Christianity: Studies on Q*. London: T & T Clark International, 2004.
- . “The Current State of the Synoptic Problem.” In *New Studies in the Synoptic Problem*, edited by P. Foster, A. Gregory, J.S. Kloppenborg, and J. Verheyden, 571–89. Leuven: Utigeveru Peeters, 2011.
- Watson, Francis. *Gospel Writing: A Canonical Perspective*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2013.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

MARKAN VS. LUCAN ORDER

<u>Markan Order</u>	<u>Lucan order</u>
Arrest	Arrest
Sanhedrin Trial	Peter's Denials
Sanhedrin Beating	Sanhedrin Beating
Peter's Denials	Sanhedrin Trial
Roman Trial	Roman Trials
Roman Beating	Daughters of Jerusalem
Crucifixion and death	Crucifixion and death

APPENDIX B

WHAT SOURCE UTILIZATION WOULD PREDICT

PULLING PETER'S DENIAL'S FORWARD

<u>Mark's Order</u>		<u>Luke's Predicted Order</u>
Arrest		Arrest
Sanhedrin trial		Peter's denials
Sanhedrin beating		[Sanhedrin Trial]
Peter's denials		[Sanhedrin beating]
Roman trial		Roman trials
Roman beating		Daughters of Jerusalem
Crucifixion and death		Crucifixion and death

APPENDIX D

NON-MARKAN SAYINGS OF JESUS IN LUKE'S PASSION

Citation	Greek	English
22:48	Ἰούδα, φιλήματι τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου παραδίδως;	Judas, is it with a kiss that you are betraying the Son of Man?
22:51	ἔατε ἕως τούτου·	No more of this!
22:53	ἀλλ' αὕτη ἐστὶν ὑμῶν ἡ ὥρα καὶ ἡ ἐξουσία τοῦ σκότους.	But this is your hour, and the power of darkness!
22:67-9	67 ἐὰν ὑμῖν εἴπω, οὐ μὴ πιστεύσητε· 68 ἐὰν δὲ ἐρωτήσω, οὐ μὴ ἀποκριθῆτε. 69 ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν δὲ ἔσται	67 If I tell you, you will not believe; 68 and if I question you, you will not answer. 69 But from now on . . . will be
22:70	ὕμεῖς λέγετε ὅτι	You say that
23:28-31	28 θυγατέρες Ἰερουσαλήμ, μὴ κλαίετε ἐπ' ἐμέ· πλὴν ἐφ' ἑαυτὰς κλαίετε καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ τέκνα ὑμῶν, 29 ὅτι ἰδοὺ ἔρχονται ἡμέραι ἐν αἷς ἐροῦσιν· μακάριαι αἱ στεῖραι καὶ αἱ κοιλίαι αἱ οὐκ ἐγέννησαν καὶ μαστοὶ οἱ οὐκ ἔθρεψαν. 30 τότε ἄρξονται λέγειν τοῖς ὄρεσιν· πέσετε ἐφ' ἡμᾶς, καὶ τοῖς βουνοῖς· καλύψατε ἡμᾶς· 31 ὅτι εἰ ἐν τῷ ὑγρῷ ξύλῳ ταῦτα ποιοῦσιν, ἐν τῷ ξηρῷ τί γένηται;	28 Daughters of Jerusalem, do not weep for me, but weep for yourselves and for your children. 29 For the days are surely coming when they will say, "Blessed are the barren, and the wombs that never bore, and the breasts that never nursed." 30 Then they will begin to say to the mountains, "Fall on us"; and to the hills, "Cover us." 31 For if they do this when the wood is green, what will happen when it is dry?
23:43 ¹⁸⁷	ἀμὴν σοι λέγω, σήμερον μετ' ἐμοῦ ἔσῃ ἐν τῷ παραδείσῳ.	Truly I tell you, today you will be with me in Paradise.
23:46	πάτερ, εἰς χεῖράς σου παρατίθεμαι τὸ πνεῦμά μου.	Father, into your hands I commend my spirit.

¹⁸⁷ 23:34 is omitted since it is often regarded as a later addition based on manuscript evidence. Bundy, *Jesus and the First Three Gospels*, 540.

APPENDIX E

CUMULATIVE LUCAN DEVIATION FROM MARK IN SELECT PERICOPE

Reverse pericope order from Mark is shown with an up arrow, Minor Agreements are shown in **bold**, non-Markan sayings material in **bold underline**, other non-Markan material is shown in regular underline and Markan parallels are shown in regular text with no underlining. There are also omissions from Mark not identified (e.g., all of Mark 14:55-61 is missing in Luke).

APPENDIX E.1 - Luke 22:61-70 (End of Denials through End of Sanhedrin Trial)

61 καὶ στραφεὶς ὁ κύριος ἐνέβλεψεν τῷ Πέτρῳ, καὶ ὑπεμνήσθη ὁ Πέτρος τοῦ ῥήματος¹⁸⁸ τοῦ κυρίου ὡς εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὅτι πρὶν ἀλέκτορα φωνῆσαι σήμερον ἀπαρνήσῃ με τρίς 62 **καὶ ἐξελθὼν ἔξω ἐκλαυσεν πικρῶς.**

↑ [Markan order]

63 Καὶ οἱ ἄνδρες οἱ συνέχοντες αὐτὸν ἐνέπαιζον αὐτῷ δέροντες, 64 καὶ περικαλύψαντες αὐτὸν ἐπηρώτων λέγοντες· προφήτευσον, τίς ἐστὶν ὁ παῖσας σε; 65 καὶ ἕτερα πολλὰ βλασφημοῦντες ἔλεγον εἰς αὐτόν.

↑ [Markan order]

66 Καὶ ὡς ἐγένετο ἡμέρα, συνήχθη τὸ πρεσβυτέριον τοῦ λαοῦ, ἀρχιερεῖς τε καὶ γραμματεῖς, καὶ ἀπήγαγον αὐτὸν εἰς τὸ συνέδριον αὐτῶν 67 λέγοντες· εἰ σὺ εἶ ὁ χριστός, εἰπὸν ἡμῖν. εἶπεν δὲ αὐτοῖς· ἐὰν ὑμῖν εἴπω, οὐ μὴ πιστεύσητε· 68 ἐὰν δὲ ἐρωτήσω, οὐ μὴ ἀποκριθῆτε. 69 ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν δὲ ἔσται ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου καθήμενος ἐκ δεξιῶν τῆς δυνάμεως τοῦ θεοῦ. 70 εἶπαν δὲ πάντες· σὺ οὖν εἶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ; ὁ δὲ πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἔφη· ὑμεῖς λέγετε ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι.

¹⁸⁸ Minor Agreement based on text of NA²⁸. Neiryneck shows Luke here as τοῦ λόγου and lists the genitive case shared with Matthew as a Minor Agreement citing 11 scholars. He acknowledges the alternative textual tradition favored by NA²⁸ of τοῦ ῥήματος (exactly matching Matthew) and cites one scholar listing that reading as a Minor Agreement. Neiryneck, Hansen, and Segbroeck, *The Minor Agreements*, 182.

APPENDIX E.1 - Luke 22:47-54 (Arrest)

47 Ἐτι αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος ἰδοὺ ὄχλος, καὶ ὁ λεγόμενος Ἰούδας εἷς τῶν δώδεκα προήρχετο αὐτούς καὶ ἤγγισεν τῷ Ἰησοῦ φιλήσαι αὐτόν 48 Ἰησοῦς δὲ εἶπεν αὐτῷ· Ἰούδα, φιλήματι τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου παραδίδως; 49 Ἰδόντες δὲ οἱ περὶ αὐτόν τὸ ἐσόμενον εἶπαν· κύριε, εἰ πατάξομεν ἐν μαχαίρῃ; 50 καὶ ἐπάταξεν εἰς τις ἐξ αὐτῶν τοῦ ἀρχιερέως τὸν δοῦλον καὶ ἀφείλεν τὸ οὖς αὐτοῦ τὸ δεξιόν. 51 ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν· ἔατε ἕως τούτου· καὶ ἀνάμενος τοῦ ὠτίου ἴασατο αὐτόν.

52 Εἶπεν δὲ Ἰησοῦς πρὸς τοὺς παραγενομένους ἐπ' αὐτόν [↑ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ στρατηγούς τοῦ ἱεροῦ καὶ πρεσβυτέρους]· ὡς ἐπὶ ληστὴν ἐξήλθατε μετὰ μαχαίρων καὶ ξύλων; 53 καθ' ἡμέραν ὄντος μου μεθ' ὑμῶν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ οὐκ ἐξετείνατε τὰς χεῖρας ἐπ' ἐμέ, ἀλλ' αὕτη ἐστὶν ὑμῶν ἡ ὥρα καὶ ἡ ἐξουσία τοῦ σκότους.

54 [↑ Συλλαβόντες δὲ αὐτόν ἤγαγον] καὶ εἰσήγαγον εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν τοῦ ἀρχιερέως· ὁ δὲ Πέτρος ἠκολούθει μακρόθεν.

APPENDIX F

PROPOSED Q PASSION *CHRIA* COLLECTION

Citation	Greek	English
Luke 22:47b-48	47b και ἤγγισεν τῷ Ἰησοῦ φιλησαι αὐτόν 48 Ἰησοῦς δὲ εἶπεν αὐτῷ· Ἰούδα, φιλήματι τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου παραδίδως;	47b He approached Jesus to kiss him, but Jesus said to him, "Judas, is it with a kiss that you are betraying the Son of Man?"
Matt 26:52-54	52 τότε λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· ἀπόστρεψον τὴν μάχαιράν σου εἰς τὸν τόπον αὐτῆς· πάντες γὰρ οἱ λαβόντες μάχαιραν ἐν μαχαίρῃ ἀπολοῦνται. 53 ἢ δοκεῖς ὅτι οὐ δύναμαι παρακαλέσαι τὸν πατέρα μου, καὶ παραστήσει μοι ἄρτι πλείω δώδεκα λεγιῶνας ἀγγέλων; 54 πῶς οὖν πληρωθῶσιν αἱ γραφαὶ ὅτι οὕτως δεῖ γενέσθαι;	52 Then Jesus said to him, "Put your sword back into its place; for all who take the sword will perish by the sword. 53 Do you think that I cannot appeal to my Father, and he will at once send me more than twelve legions of angels? 54 But how then would the scriptures be fulfilled, which say it must happen in this way?"
Luke 22:53	53 ἀλλ' αὕτη ἐστὶν ὑμῶν ἡ ὥρα καὶ ἡ ἐξουσία τοῦ σκότους.	"But this is your hour, and the power of darkness!"
Luke 22:61-62	61 καὶ στραφεὶς ὁ κύριος ἐνέβλεψεν τῷ Πέτρῳ, καὶ ὑπεμνήσθη ὁ Πέτρος τοῦ ῥήματος τοῦ κυρίου ὡς εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὅτι πρὶν ἀλέκτορα φωνῆσαι σήμερον ἀπαρνήσῃ με τρίς. 62 καὶ ἐξελθὼν ἔξω ἔκλαυσεν πικρῶς.	61 The Lord turned and looked at Peter. Then Peter remembered the word of the Lord, how he had said to him, "Before the cock crows today, you will deny me three times." 62 And he went out and wept bitterly.
Luke 22:63-65	63 Καὶ οἱ ἄνδρες οἱ συνέχοντες αὐτὸν ἐνέπαιζον αὐτῷ δέροντες, 64 καὶ περικαλύψαντες αὐτὸν ἐπηρώτων λέγοντες· προφήτευσον, τίς ἐστὶν ὁ παῖσας σε; 65 καὶ ἕτερα πολλὰ βλασφημοῦντες ἔλεγον εἰς αὐτόν.	63 Now the men who were holding Jesus began to mock him and beat him; 64 they also blindfolded him and kept asking him, "Prophecy! Who is it that struck you?" 65 They kept heaping many other insults on him.

<p>Luke 22:67- 70</p>	<p>67 λέγοντες· εἰ σὺ εἶ ὁ χριστός, εἰπὸν ἡμῖν. εἶπεν δὲ αὐτοῖς· ἐὰν ὑμῖν εἴπω, οὐ μὴ πιστεύσητε· 68 ἐὰν δὲ ἐρωτήσω, οὐ μὴ ἀποκριθῆτε. 69 ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν δὲ ἔσται ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου καθήμενος ἐκ δεξιῶν τῆς δυνάμεως τοῦ θεοῦ. 70 εἶπαν δὲ πάντες· σὺ οὖν εἶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ; ὁ δὲ πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἔφη· ὑμεῖς λέγετε ὅτι ἐγὼ εἰμι.</p>	<p>67 They said, "If you are the Messiah, tell us." He replied, "If I tell you, you will not believe; 68 and if I question you, you will not answer. 69 But from now on the Son of Man will be seated at the right hand of the power of God." 70 All of them asked, "Are you, then, the Son of God?" He said to them, "You say that I am."</p>
<p>Luke 23:27- 31</p>	<p>27 Ἦκολούθει δὲ αὐτῷ πολὺ πλῆθος τοῦ λαοῦ καὶ γυναικῶν αἱ ἐκόπτοντο καὶ ἐθρήνουν αὐτόν. 28 στραφεὶς δὲ πρὸς αὐτάς [ὁ] Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν· θυγατέρες Ἱερουσαλήμ, μὴ κλαίετε ἐπ’ ἐμέ· πλὴν ἐφ’ ἑαυτάς κλαίετε καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ τέκνα ὑμῶν, 29 ὅτι ἰδοὺ ἔρχονται ἡμέραι ἐν αἷς ἐροῦσιν· μακάριαι αἱ στεῖραι καὶ αἱ κοιλίαι αἱ οὐκ ἐγέννησαν καὶ μαστοὶ οἱ οὐκ ἔθρεψαν. 30 τότε ἄρξονται λέγειν τοῖς ὄρεσιν· πέσετε ἐφ’ ἡμᾶς, καὶ τοῖς βουνοῖς· καλύψατε ἡμᾶς· 31 ὅτι εἰ ἐν τῷ ὑγρῷ ξύλῳ ταῦτα ποιοῦσιν, ἐν τῷ ξηρῷ τί γένηται;</p>	<p>27 A great number of the people followed him, and among them were women who were beating their breasts and wailing for him. 28 But Jesus turned to them and said, "Daughters of Jerusalem, do not weep for me, but weep for yourselves and for your children. 29 For the days are surely coming when they will say, 'Blessed are the barren, and the wombs that never bore, and the breasts that never nursed.' 30 Then they will begin to say to the mountains, 'Fall on us'; and to the hills, 'Cover us.' 31 For if they do this when the wood is green, what will happen when it is dry?"</p>
<p>Luke 23:42- 43</p>	<p>42 καὶ ἔλεγεν· Ἰησοῦ, μνήσθητί μου ὅταν ἔλθῃς εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν σου. 43 καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ· ἀμὴν σοι λέγω, σήμερον μετ’ ἐμοῦ ἔσῃ ἐν τῷ παραδείσῳ.</p>	<p>42 Then he said, "Jesus, remember me when you come into your kingdom." 43 He replied, "Truly I tell you, today you will be with me in Paradise.</p>
<p>Luke 23:46</p>	<p>46 πᾶτερ, εἰς χεῖράς σου παρατίθεμαι τὸ πνεῦμά μου.</p>	<p>Father, into your hands I commend my spirit.</p>