Society of Biblical Literature, Annual Meeting, November 23-26, 2024, San Diego

November 25, 4:00 pm - 6:30 pm, Q Section

Room: Aqua 310A (Third Level) – Hilton Bayfront

DIETER ROTH, Boston College, Introduction (5 min)

PRINCESS O'NIKA AUGUSTE, Dublin City University: *Echoes of Empires: Jesus' Dance with Roman Culture in Q 7:1-9* (25 min)

This paper delves into the narrative in Q 7:1-9, to examine Jesus' interactions with Roman culture and his stance on slavery. The texts provide insights into Jesus' engagements with a Roman centurion, raising questions about his accommodation or resistance to Roman cultural norms. The portrayal of a centurion's "boy"/slave in need of healing prompts an exploration of Jesus' perspective on slavery and the humanity of slaves within the context of his teachings. Suppose the pericope is taken as evidence for the historical Jesus. In that case, two primary questions arise from this investigation: To what extent and in which ways did the historical Jesus adhere to Roman culture in his interactions with non-Jewish Romans, such as the centurion? Did Jesus support or challenge the institution of slavery, as implied by his actions and teachings presented in this text? By critically analyzing these narratives and their socio-historical contexts, this study aims to shed light on these questions and contribute to a deeper understanding of Jesus' relationship with Roman culture and his views on issues such as slavery and human dignity.

IRENE BARBOTTI, Trinity College – Dublin: *Exploring Beatitudes and Woes in the Synoptic Tradition: The Hypothesis of an Apocalyptic Q-Catalogue of Opposite Sayings* (25 min)

This paper analyses the collections of beatitudes and woes attested by Matthew and Luke (Matt 5:3-12; 23:13-16; Luke 6:20-23; 11:39-52), developing the hypothesis of an original Q-catalogue which collected specular sets of opposite sayings. To date, the following relevant critical elements have been partially highlighted by the scholarship, thus providing the starting point for this research.
1. The several lexical and thematical agreements between Matt 5:3-12 and 23:13-36 (cf. Goulder 1974, 121).
2. The similar *Sitz im Leben* characterizing the Matthean collections of beatitudes and woes (cf. Hanson 1994; Newport 1995, 160).
3. The strategical placement of the collections of beatitudes and woes in the architecture of Matthew (cf. Frankemölle 1971, 64; Wright 1992, 386), respectively

opening the first and the last of Jesus' speeches and thus providing a literary framework for his public life.
4. The redactional structure of Luke 6:20-26, where four Q-beatitudes are counter-balanced by four woes which probably belong to the Lukan *Sondergut* (cf. Kloppenborg 1988, 26).
5. The frequent coupling of beatitude and woe is attested by the Jewish and Christian writings of the Second Temple period (cf. Pogor, 2022), often connected to the expectation of an eschatological Judgment (e.g., 1En. 99:10-15; 103:5; Did. 1:5).
The suggested hypothesis links for the first time all these elements, suggesting a new comprehensive reading of these literary sections. The paper argues that an original correlation of beatitudes and woes in Q would explain both the redactional antithetical structure of Luke 6:20-26 and the parallels between the Matthean beatitudes and woes. On the one hand, in the antithetical structure of Luke 6:20-26, the first and the final Q-beatitudes witness the expectation of the Kingdom of God and of the eschatological reward (Luke 6:20, 23), but these elements are ignored in the specular *Sondergut* (cf. Luke 6:24, 26). On the other hand, the comparative analysis of the beatitudes and woes in double attestation delineates a typically apocalyptic dualism, based on the specular promises of eschatological reward and punishment. This hypothesis posits indeed a Q-catalogue opened by the specular promises of the eschatological Kingdom to the poor (Q 6:20) and the exclusion from the same to the élites of Jerusalem (Q 11:52), and it concludes with the opposite announcements of eschatological reward (Q 6:23) and punishment (Q 11:50-51) heralded respectively to the recipients of the beatitudes and the woes. This observation may contribute to the debate about the *Sitz im Leben* of both Q and the collections of beatitudes and woes attested by the Synoptic tradition. Moreover, given the judicial dimension connoting the couplings of beatitudes and woes in the coeval literature, this hypothesis would also foster comparisons with the Second Temple Jewish literary traditions.

DAVID SLOAN, Independent Scholar: *Matthew's Abbreviations of Mark and the Implications for Q's Account of the Centurion's Servant* (25 min)

Matthew and Luke have key differences in the narrative of the Centurion's Servant that are often taken as Luke narrativizing the Q version of this passage by adding verses 2, 4-6a, and 10. Various theories have been developed as to why Luke would have added, for example, a delegation in 7:3-6 (Talbert 1967, Jervell 1972, Crossan 1991, Jacobson 1992, Gagnon 1993, etc.), but each of these explanations falters for one reason or another, which suggests that the data may be better explained by Matthew having omitted 7:2, 4-6a rather than Luke having added it. After dealing with the problems with the predominant view, this paper takes a closer look at Matthew 8–9 and reveals that Matthew significantly abbreviates the narrative introduction of all eight Markan passages that follow this Q passage. In some places Matthew moves

details from the introduction to the direct discourse of the passage (Mark 2:18//Matt 9:14; cf. Mark 7:25//Matt 15:22; Mark 3:2//Matt 12:10), which is how Matthew differs from Luke in introducing the servant and his need. In many passages Matthew omits third-party characters (Mark 1:30//Matt 8:14; Mark 5:35//Matt 9:18; cf. Mark 10:49//Matt 20:32, etc.), having a person speak directly to Jesus rather than through a delegation (see esp. Mark 5:35//Matt 9:18). All of this suggests that Q lies behind Luke 7:2, 4-6a and that Matthew has abbreviated this passage. The situation is different, however, with Luke 7:10, where Luke says that the servant was found well when they returned to the house. This verse is paralleled in Matthew 8:13, but the parallel is so loose that *The Critical Edition of Q* suggests that the original Q wording is unknown. Here we find that Matthean and Lukan tendencies overlap: both can add endings to passages that they feel lack an appropriate conclusion. This suggests that Q does not lie behind Matthew 8:13//Luke 7:10, contrary to the opinion of many. These results suggest that a narrativizing tendency can be found in Luke's use of Q, but an abbreviating tendency can be found in both Matthew's and Luke's use of Q, which introduces challenges in considering both the extent and genre of Q. These challenges are exacerbated by Matthew's use of Q elsewhere to build out speeches, where narration cannot be taken up. We therefore conclude by suggesting other places where Matthew's abbreviation of narrative has given a wrong picture of Q that can be better seen through the lens of the Gospel of Luke.

SARA PARKS, Saint Francis Xavier University: *Q Is for Trauma: The Logia as Repository of Pain* (25 min)

Q is a site of tension, some of which is preserved from the time of Q's composition and redaction, and some of which goes back to the historical Jesus. "This generation," which mistreats prophets, is one of the most interesting points of tension in Q. Q's Jesus draws on martyr discourse to situate John the Baptist's apocalyptic message within the noble lineage of past ill-treated prophets vindicated only in hindsight. Q repurposes this discourse to lend gravitas to Jesus' own death, as well as to actively construct what makes "a good Jew".

DENNIS R. MACDONALD, Emeritus Claremont School of Theology: *Why Is Q in Intensive Care?* (25 min)

Recently I published *Must the Synoptics Remain a Problem?* in which I argued at length for my Q+/Papias solution to the Synoptic Problem and Mark's mimesis of the Homeric epics. I am proposing a paper that develops the primary argument: Luke knew Matthew and Mark knew Q, but the Two-Document Hypothesis is not the only way to reconstruct this lost Gospel. Better than a solo presentation would be a paper with rebuttal and discussion or a panel.

Discussion (10 min)