Most critical studies of the Beatitudes have assumed the basic tenets of the two-document hypothesis. In particular it has been widely assumed that Matthew and Luke are independent of each other and that both depend on common source material (Q) for at least those beatitudes which are in both gospels.1 Within the broad terms of the Q hypothesis there is the possibility that the evangelists used slightly different versions of the Q source, a Qmt and a Qlk, but in general the independence of Matthew and Luke is not ques-

tioned. The purpose of this paper is to examine whether this assumption is indeed justified, and, if so, to investigate which form of Q hypothesis presents the fewest difficulties.

The close verbal agreement between Matthew and Luke in the four common beatitudes demands some form of literary relationship between the gospels: either both evangelists depend on common source material for these beatitudes, or one has made direct use of the other's work. The latter alternative is usually proposed with Luke being dependent on Matthew. (Matthean dependence on Luke is only rarely advocated.) The possibilities are therefore simple: either (1) Luke is dependent on Matthew for the common beatitudes; or (2) Luke and Matthew both depend on a prior source Q. In either case one must account not only for the similarities, but also for the differences, between Matthew and Luke. These include differences in the wording of the parallel beatitudes, as well as differences in content: Matthew has extra beatitudes which are not in Luke, and Luke has woes which are not in Matthew. The logical possibilities are either that all the differences are due to the redactional work of the secondary evangelist, or that at least some are due to a prior source. (However, option (1) above assumes by self-definition that all the differences in wording are due to LkR, although the woes could be either a redactional creation of Luke himself, or derived from a pre-Lukan source). The two theoretical possibilities above can therefore be sub-divided as follows:

2 The rejection of any Q hypothesis by Wrege, on the grounds that not all the variations between the gospels can be accounted for by the redactional activity of the evangelists, is allowed for here by the possibility of intervening stages between Q and the evangelists.

3 Theoretically, one should add (3) Matthew dependent on Luke. This possibility will be implicitly rejected in the following discussion by reference to the points where Luke's version is secondary and Matthew's is original. (See nn. 12, 23, 38, 43, 52 below and the discussion in the text at these points.) Another theoretical possibility, not considered above, is that Luke knew, but chose not to use, Matthew's version, using instead an independent tradition. (For this as a general possibility in the "double tradition", see W. R. Farmer, "A Fresh Approach to Q", Christianity, Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults (Festschrift for Morton Smith, Leiden, 1975), pp. 39-50.) Such a theory is, however, not easily provable from the examination of one pericope, since Luke's knowledge of Matthew must presumably be shown from other, independent considerations. If Luke and Matthew are both independently using earlier traditions, this effectively reduces to a form of the Q hypothesis. There is, however, the difficulty of explaining, in such a theory, why Luke should have left out Matthew's extra beatitudes: see p. 00 above.

4 LkR denotes Lukan redaction; similarly MattR denotes Matthean redaction. A set of figures in the form 2-3-4 + 5 by a word indicates that the word occurs 2 times in Matthew, 3 in Mark, 4 in Luke, and 5 in Acts.