

“We are Judean”! The Sayings Gospel Q’s redactional approach to the Law

M Cromhout¹
(University of Pretoria)

ABSTRACT

“We are Judean”! The Sayings Gospel Q’s redactional approach to the Law

This article is focussed on Q’s treatment of the Law and what it can tell us about the Q community’s Judean ethnic identity. It is argued that part of the reason for the incorporation of the main redaction in Q (here Kloppenborg’s $Q^2 + Q^3$) was to defend the Judean ethnic identity of the Q people. This becomes evident in its conservative approach to the Law as opposed to that of the formative stratum where the Law was freely reconstructed. Q’s approach to the Law is also informed by its Moses/New Exodus typology encountered in the various strata.

1 INTRODUCTION

The Torah was central to Judean life in all its aspects. During the Maccabean revolt, the watchword for national resistance was “zeal for the law” (1 Mac 2:26-27, 50, 58; 2 Mac 4:2; 7:2, 9, 11, 37; 8:21). Paul refers to this zeal in reference to himself and fellow Judeans (Rom 10:2; Phlp 3:6). Traditionally, this kind of “zeal for the law” was primary understood in *religious* terms. As Stegemann (2006) has argued, however, the proper discourse within which to approach Judeanism (“Judaism”) is *ethnicity* (cf Cromhout & Van Aarde 2006)². This should change our understanding of the function of the Law as well. Most certainly the Law contains what we would understand as “religious” elements, but more accurately, when placed in its historical context, the Law can be understood as the “constitution” or “charter” of Judean *ethnic identity* (= covenant membership). It also contains information on how that ethnic

1 This article is a reworked version of the author’s PhD dissertation (2006), under supervision of Prof A G van Aarde, Faculty of Theology, University of Pretoria.

2 Recently, more and more attention has been given to the matter of ethnicity (e.g. Duling 2005, Esler 2003; Denzey 2002; Brett 1996), and hopefully this trend will continue.

identity came into being (i.e. Yahweh's election of a particular people, the "forefathers", and the covenant he made with them)³.

The people presupposed by the Q Gospel, and who probably lived in Galilee, were Judeans (referred to as "Jews" by Reed [1999; 2000])⁴. Their lives would therefore have been intertwined with the Law. Yet their allegiance to Jesus brought about serious consequences for their relationship to the traditional Torah, hence the nature of their ethnic identity as well. How the Q people understood the Law, influenced the way how they understood what it meant to be Judean. How they understood the Law was influenced by Jesus. For the Q community, Jesus ultimately determined what being Judean required. This article is dedicated to investigate Q's approach to the Law and what it can tell us about the community's Judean ethnic identity. In other words, if it can be accepted that the Law was something like a "constitution" of Judean ethnic identity, what does Q's treatment of the Law tell us about the community's self-understanding as Judeans?

Underlying the approach taken here to Q is the important work of Kloppenborg (1987; 2000). In essence, Kloppenborg views Q as an *expanded instruction*. He achieves this result by working "backwards", from the macro structural features of Q to the smaller sayings complexes and sayings clusters. Kloppenborg (2000:143; cf 118-22) at first identifies major redactional themes, and argues that Q was framed by motifs of judgement, polemic against "this generation", a Deuteronomistic understanding of history, and

3 When first-century Judeanism is approached as an ethnic identity, it must be understood as a form of social identity, referring to a group of people who themselves recognize, and are recognized by others, as having a common cultural tradition. This tradition may in various combinations involve things such as a common name, a shared ancestry, a shared historical tradition, having common phenotypical or genetic features, a link to a specific territory, a shared language or dialect, kinship patterns, shared customs, and a shared religion (cf Duling 2005). Apart from phenotypical features, these elements are well represented in the Torah.

4 I write this knowing full well that the Sayings Gospel Q and the community that lies behind it is a hypothesis. Despite objections to the arguments for Q (cf Goodacre 2002; Goodacre & Perrin 2004) I accept the postulation of Q (along with Markan priority) as the best solution for the "Synoptic Problem".

allusions to the story of Lot⁵. These motifs appear both at the beginning and ending of Q, but they are also the founding principles in four, or maybe five blocks throughout Q⁶. Kloppenborg proposes these redactional themes represent the perspective of the main redaction of Q. Other clusters according to him are untouched or minimally influenced by such themes⁷. “What unites these subcollections”, Kloppenborg (2000:144) explains, “is not only that they lack features of the main redaction; they also evince an interlocking set of concerns which have to do with the legitimation of a somewhat adventuresome social practice – including debt forgiveness, the eschewing of vengeance, and the embracing of an exposed and marginal lifestyle”. Kloppenborg also draws on the work of Piper (1989)⁸, who has shown that these clusters share a

5 Apart from the allusions to the story of Lot, the main redactional themes listed here were already incipient or explicit in Kloppenborg’s (1987) earlier work, yet there appears to be a shift in emphasis in his approach. Kloppenborg’s earlier analysis of Q’s stratification revolved around three features: projected audience, forms and motifs. Concentrating on the main redaction, the *projected audience* Kloppenborg argued consists of the impenitent and the opponents of community preaching. Thus the material of the main redaction is directed at the “out-group”, while it also functions to strengthen the identity of the “in-group”. In terms of *forms*, chriae are typical of the main redaction as well as prophetic sayings. They are there to criticize the response of “this generation” and to encapsulate various sayings of Jesus and John. Lastly, in terms of *motifs*, there are various motifs related to the theme of judgement. This includes the imminence of judgement, the parousia, and the negative response of Israelites as compared to that of the Gentiles (Kloppenborg 1987:166-70).

6 (1) Q 3:(2-3), 7-9, 16b-17; (2) Q 7:1-10, 18-28, 31-35; (3) Q 11:14-15, 16, 17-26, (27-28), 29-32, 33-36, 39b-44, 46-52; (4) Q 17:23-24, 37b, 26-30, 34-35; 19:12-27; 22:28-30. To this the following might possibly be added: (5) Q 12:39-40, 42b-46, 49, 50-53, 54-59.

7 There are six in total: (1) Q 6:20b-23b, 27-35, 36-45, 46-49; (2) Q 9:57-60, (61-62); 10:2-11, 16, (23-24?); (3) Q 11:2-4, 9-13; (4) Q 12:2-7, 11-12; (5) Q 12:22b-31, 33-34 (13:18-19, 20-21?); and probably (6) Q 13:24; 14:26-27; 17:33; 14:34-35.

8 Contrast Tuckett (1996:348-351) who questions Piper’s (1989) description of (1) sayings allocated to Q1 (Q 11:9-13; 12:22-31; 6:37-41; 6:43-45) as “aphoristic wisdom”, functioning to persuade and not to coerce; i e it does not operate in prophetic or eschatological categories; and (2) Piper’s analysis of isolated aphorisms (e g Q 3:9; 6:43-45; 13:24; 17:37). Tuckett argues these texts are eschatologically determined, or alternatively, when

common rhetoric, namely, the rhetoric of persuasion, instead of prophetic pronouncement or declamation. “This rhetoric focuses not on defending the ethos (character) of Jesus or those associated with him or on attacking opponents; that is the rhetorical strategy of the main redaction” (Kloppenborg 2000:144; cf 193-196). Overall Kloppenborg (2000:145) sees these sub-collections as a discrete redactional stratum. They are united by paraenetic, hortatory and instructional concerns. They constitute “the formative stratum” (Q¹), while the material of “the main redaction” (Q²) was added thereafter.

Kloppenborg (2000:146) further suggests that Q 15:4-7, 8-10; 16:13, 16, 18; 17:1-2, 3-4, 6 also belongs to the earliest level of Q. Besides the above, Kloppenborg (2000:120-121, 128, 147-150; cf Tuckett 1996:70-72, 184, 410, 422; Dunn 2003:153) points to several instances which are regarded as interpolations, commentaries or glosses to the formative stratum (Q 6:23c; 10:12, 13-15; 12:8-10; 13:26-27, 28-29, 34-35; 14:16-24) since they cohere with elements of the main redaction. Lastly, the temptation narrative (Q 4:1-13) and Q 11:42c and 16:17 are seen by Kloppenborg (2000:152-153) as additions subsequent to the main redaction and are treated together, since they share the view on the centrality of the Torah, a theme supposedly not encountered in other parts of Q. The need for a third stratum will be questioned here, however.

Although Kloppenborg’s stratification has been widely influential, all scholars have not accepted it. For example, Allison (1997) and Jacobson (1992) have offered their own proposals. There are also scholars who are totally against the idea of a stratified Q (Meier 1994:179; Horsley 1995a:39-40; Horsley & Draper 1999:62-67). Dunn (2003:156, 157) and Tuckett (1996:73-74) express doubts over Kloppenborg’s Q¹ in that it ever functioned as a single document/literary unity and both of them favour a simpler single compositional act for Q. Nevertheless, there seems to be wide consensus on the nature of the main redactional moment where the Deuteronomistic/judgement theme dominates (e.g. Jacobson 1992:76, 183, 253; Dunn 2003:152-53; Tuckett 1996:71; Uro 1995:245).

Importantly for our purposes is the fact that scholars do not seem to appreciate enough that part and parcel of Kloppenborg’s

viewed in its Q context, are forced into an eschatological mould (e.g. see 6:43-45 with 6:46, 47-49).

literary approach is the primary *rhetorical tone* of the two major strata, something that was already present in his earlier analysis (Kloppenborg 1987:168-169, 238-39, 322). Kloppenborg's approach focuses just as much on *how* things are said than on what is being said. The formative stratum consists of a large number of sayings that are sapiential admonitions. Also present are beatitudes, proverbs and wisdom sayings. The tone is hortatory and instructional, and it employs the rhetoric of persuasion, instead of prophetic pronouncement or declamation (although prophetic elements are certainly present, for example, in Q 6:47-49). The main redaction, on the other hand, is dominated by chriae and prophetic words, where the tone is primarily polemical and judgmental, and the Q material here demonstrates the need to defend the character of Jesus, and by implication, that of the Q people as well.

If there is one major modification that will be made to Kloppenborg's approach, it is that the necessity for a Q³ is questioned, since Q shows more interest in the Torah and Moses than Kloppenborg allows, and the material assigned to Q³ fits very well with the rhetorical character of the material found in the main redaction. Q 4:1-13 for example, plays an important part in Q's Christology and it serves more than merely to legitimate Q's praxis. It also forms part of the polemical and apologetic strategy of the main redaction that seeks to defend the character of Jesus and to legitimate the Q people's existence. It explains that Jesus as the "Coming One" has passed the test of a prophet, and indeed, has initiated the new Exodus within which the Q people are participating. This Moses and Exodus typology is also present in other parts of Q (Allison 2000). So although Moses may not be explicitly referred to in Q, he is certainly present in the form of Jesus, the new law giver. That is why Q also in many respects presupposes the Torah or takes it for granted – this is not merely applicable to the texts that Kloppenborg has assigned to Q³ (Q 4:1-13; 11:42c; 16:17). For example, Q 16:17 that attests to the ever abiding status of the Torah coheres well with Q 13:27 where Q distances itself from those who do "lawlessness". The latter also presupposes the centrality of the Torah. Together they also constitute an apologetic strategy where the character of Jesus and the Q people are defended. But there is more to this. As mentioned before, if the Torah can be understood as something like a "constitution" of Judean ethnic identity, what can Q's treatment of the Law tell us

about its community's self-understanding as Judeans? The main purpose of this article is to argue that the proposed main redaction (Kloppenborg's Q² + Q³) serves *another* apologetic purpose as well – *it defends the Judean ethnic identity of Jesus and his followers*. This is to counteract Q's quite "loose" approach to the Torah in the formative stratum. At the same time, however, Q's Christology demonstrates that tension continued to exist between the Torah of the Q people, and the Torah derived from Moses.

2 THE LAW IN THE FORMATIVE STRATUM (Q¹)

According to Kloppenborg, the Torah is not the basis of argumentative appeals in Q¹. As he puts it, "Q¹ is full of confidence in divine providence, in God's loving surveillance, and the possibility of transformed human relationships; *but there is no indication whatsoever that this is mediated by Torah* or the Temple or the priestly hierarchy, or that it is based on oracular disclosures or commands" (Kloppenborg 2000:199, emphasis added). The general thrust of his position is Galilean society, of which the Q people formed a part, had weak historical connections to the second Temple and the Galileans were in essence not a Judean-Torah observant people (Kloppenborg 2000:218-234). Overall Q is thus engaged in a struggle "in support of local forms of Israelite religion in the face of pressures from the hierocratic worldview of Judaea" (Kloppenborg 2000:261).

At first it must be mentioned that the archaeological evidence strongly suggests that the inhabitants of Galilee – including the Q people as well – during our period were Judeans. They were descendants of Judeans who moved to Galilee during the Hasmonean expansion to the north (Reed 1999:95-102; 2000:23-55; Reed actually speaks of "Jews"). It can therefore be questioned that the Q people were inherently ideologically opposed to Judea, which in some way translated into opposition to Judean-Torah observance. On the contrary, the Q people were Judeans themselves and their lives and identity centred on the Torah. This is quite evident in the redactional material of Q (e.g. Q 16:17) but also the formative stratum gives evidence that its teaching is mediated through *reconstructed Torah*, as will be explained below.

Let us initially do a brief overview of the sermon, particularly Q 6:27-45. Jacobson (1992:95-97) argues that the sermon is drawing on the Wisdom tradition. Similarly Kloppenborg's (1987:189)

analysis argued that the sermon is “overwhelmingly sapiential”. Catchpole (1993:101-34) has a different approach, as he argues that at the heart of the discourse is an explanation of Leviticus 19:17-18:

Do not hate your brother in your heart. Rebuke your neighbour frankly so you will not share in his guilt. Do not seek revenge or bear a grudge against one of your people, but love your neighbour as yourself (NIV).

Allison (2000:29) agrees that Leviticus 19, also known as the holiness code, is the chief intertext for Q 6:27-45. Horsley argues that the discourse is aimed at covenantal renewal, engaged with socio-economic matters in village communities. The sermon in Q 6:27-49 utilises traditional covenantal exhortation and popular wisdom (Horsley & Draper 1999:88, 195-227). In another instance he argues that Q 6:20-49 “makes numerous allusions to Israelite traditions, particularly to Mosaic covenantal laws and teachings in 6:27-36” (Horsley & Draper 1999:96)⁹. Therefore it is not denied here that the wisdom element is present, but this instructional discourse is engaged with the requirements of the covenant (or Torah), particularly with what the covenant requires in terms of social relationships between Israelites/ Judeans. In any event, for Judeans Wisdom and Torah were virtually synonymous, as in Sirach 24:23 Wisdom is identified as the “book of the covenant of the most high God, even the law which Moses commanded”.

Catchpole treats the entire section of Q 6:27-35 under the rubric of “love your enemies” (Q 6:27). He argues that Q 6:27-28, 35 by general consensus, has as the underlying thought Leviticus 19:18b: “You shall love your neighbour as yourself”. In fact, Leviticus 19:18 is the underlying text for Q 6:27-35 as a whole (cf Tuckett 1996:431). The three elements of Leviticus 19:18b (“You

9 Horsley refers to Q 6:27 cf Lv 19:17-18; Ex 23:4-5; Dt 22:1-4; Sir 29:1; to Q 6:29 cf Ex 22:25-26; Dt 24:10-13; Am 2:8; to Q 6:36 cf Lv 19:2. Although for Horsley “Mosaic covenantal laws” is not the same as the Judean Torah. It must be remembered that Horsley believes that the Galileans and the Q people were not Judeans as such, since he argues that they were descendents of northern Israelites that remained after the Assyrian invasion. Only in the period of the Hasmonean expansion were they reluctantly subjected to “the laws of the Judeans” (cf Horsley 1995b; 1996). Nevertheless, what he argues is also support for the position taken here in that the sermon is engaged with the Torah.

shall love // your neighbour // as yourself”) can be related to all of Q 6:27-35 (Catchpole 1993:115; cf Allison 2000:31)¹⁰. Catchpole and the International Q Project (cf Robinson, Hoffmann & Kloppenborg 2002) reconstruct Q 6:27-28, 35 differently, but in general the thrust of the message encourages the love of enemies, and to pray for them so that they may receive God’s blessing in imitation of God’s own benevolent behaviour. Here is the IQP reconstruction of Q 6:27-28, 35:

Love your enemies [[and]] pray for those [[persecuting]] you, so that you may become sons of your Father, for he raises his sun on bad and [[good and rains on the just and the unjust]].

Catchpole (1993:107) maintains that this love is one that should be extended to fellow members of the community of Israel, who have become estranged and hostile – this is an intra-Israel situation. In Q 6:32-33 the sense of Israelite community continues. It encourages loving and lending without expecting anything in return. The Q group’s behaviour should not be like the tax-collectors and the Gentiles. Q 6:30 encourages similar behaviour; one should give without asking back (cf Sir 4:3-5; Tob 4:7-8). This may point to the Sabbath year legislation found in Deuteronomy 15:1-11, which lays down the cancellation of debts within the community of Israel. There is the golden rule (Q 6:31), and the teaching to experience shame and mistreatment at the hands of others (Q 6:29, 30; Q/Mt 5:41). The teaching comes from Jesus, whom the Q people confess as the Son of humanity/man. Catchpole (1993:115-16) also states that it is a “confession which must be maintained *within* the ancient community. Every effort is made therefore to be faithful simultaneously to the confession of Jesus and the command of Moses” (emphasis original). The latter part of Catchpole’s statement is a bit suspect since Jesus and the Q community were not in all

10 Kloppenborg also acknowledges that the core of Q 6:27-35 is the love command, but according to him it does not obviously recall Leviticus 19:18: “It is much closer in form and content to a host of admonitions from sapiential sources and from Hellenistic popular philosophy” and it is far from obvious that “these sayings are intended as reinterpretations or radicalizations of the Torah” (Kloppenborg 1987:178, 179). The closest parallels according to Jacobson (1992:97) in Judean (“Jewish”) texts are found in the wisdom tradition (e.g. Pr 24:29; 25:21-22; cf Sir 7:1-2; 31:15; Tob 4:15; LetAris 207).

respects faithful to the command of Moses (see below). It is agreed with him, however, that Q was interested to live within the confines of the Israelite community.

This sense of community continues in Q 6:36-45 that Catchpole (1993:116-133) treats under the rubric “reproof in mercy”. Here the underlying text according to him is Leviticus 19:17 where it encourages “You shall not hate your brother in your heart, but you shall reason with your neighbour”. There is the injunction to be merciful in imitation of the Father (Q 6:36; cf Ex 34:6; Lv 19:2). For Catchpole “mercy” is the keynote of the entire discourse. The persons addressed have responded to Jesus’ message of repentance and the offer of divine mercy in forgiveness, and the call to exercise compassion towards others. This must be seen in conjunction with the teaching not to pass judgement (Q 6:37-38) that builds on the “mercy” theme. In Q 6:41-42 (cf b.Arak 16b) it is encouraged to rather throw out the beam from your own eye before looking at the faults of your neighbour¹¹. It is what lies in your heart that comes to expression, for it is from the good treasure that good things are produced and from an evil treasure that evil is produced (Q 6:43-45). Overall Jesus’ teaching continues the familiar theme of this discourse, in that “the persons being addressed should bring to realization the existence of Israel as the covenant intended ... They are enabled, indeed obliged, to act mercifully because they have experienced in the past, and they know they will experience in the future, that mercy by which, as adherents of Jesus and members of the community of Israel, they bring to effect what it means to be the community of God” (Catchpole 1993:117, 134).

Yet the community of God should illustrate allegiance to *Jesus’ teaching* of what the covenant required. Jesus’ teaching centred on the notion of the kingdom/reign of God (Q 6:20; 9:60, 62; 10:9, 11; 11:2; 12:31; 13:18-21; 16:16). In the formative stratum the

11 Jacobson (1992:103-4) here sees a connection between Q 6:39 and 6:41-42. Q 6:41-42 was given a polemical character by Q. They took up the polemical stance of defiant Judeans (“Jews”) who refused rabbinic instruction (b.Arak 16b). These leaders are themselves blind (Q 6:39) and in need of instruction. But see Kloppenborg (1987:184) who questions that Q 6:39 was anti-Pharisaic polemic. “Q 6:39-45, of course, takes particular aim at teachers ... who do not follow Jesus in his radical lifestyle and ethic” (Kloppenborg 1987:185).

kingdom/reign of God evidently stands in tension with the received Torah, for as we shall see in the examples to follow, some of the teaching we encounter in the sermon and other parts of Q¹ modifies or runs counter to the Torah.

The love of enemies (Q 6:27), for example, runs counter to the “measure for measure” principle, although a precedent does exist in the way that Joseph treated his brothers (Gn 50:15-19; cf TZeb 5:3; TGad 4:2; TBenj 3:3-4) (Catchpole 1993:107-8). This love of enemies ran contrary to the general ethos of both the Greco-Roman world and Judeanism. Reiser (2001:426), while taking note of other texts, limits the background of Q 6:27 to Leviticus 19:18: “Jesus, who, taking [Lv 19:18] as a starting point, is the first to preach a general *commandment* to love one’s enemies” (emphasis added). The love of neighbour also requires that the disciples do more than the tax-collectors and the Gentiles, who only love their own (Q 6:32-33). Q 6:36 has the instruction: “Be full of pity” or “be merciful”, “just as your Father is full of pity”. This is close to Leviticus 19:2 that places emphasis on holiness in imitation of God’s holiness. If Q 6:36 is a reformulation of Leviticus 19:2, then Q places mercy above holiness, or alternatively, it is explaining that mercy is the true meaning of holiness. Either way, Leviticus 19:2 “is being reconstructed” (Allison 2000:30). Holiness within the context of first-century Judeanism was the equivalent of having the status of ritual purity. Q 6:36 is similar to Q 11:39-44 of the main redaction in that it places ethical concerns above requirements of the ritual law. Interestingly, the “mercy” above holiness theme is complimentary to Q 6:35; God makes the sun rise on the good and bad and gives rain to both the just and the unjust, an idea which runs contrary to evidence found in the Hebrew scriptures where God does not necessarily provide sunshine and rain for the wicked (Catchpole 1993:105)¹².

Q 6:37-38 instructs the disciples not to judge (but cf Q 6:42 and 17:3!), which stands in contrast to Leviticus 19:15, that commands: “you will judge your neighbour”. So Q 6:37-38 is qualifying Leviticus 19:15 or “at least dissenting from a common

12 Catchpole draws attention to various biblical passages; especially relevant are Job 8:16; Ec 12:2; Is 13:10; Ezk 32:7; WisSol 5:6 (on sunlight); and Is 5:6; 1 Ki 17-18; Am 4:7-8 (on rain).

application of it” (Allison 2000:33). If one reads Q 6:27-38 with Leviticus 19 in view

Jesus is modifying and adding to the Mosaic demands. He substitutes mercy for holiness, enjoins his hearers not to judge, uses a positive form of the golden rule instead of a negative one, speaks of love of enemy rather than love of neighbor, and says it is not enough to have right fraternal relations (the subject of [Lv] 19:17), for even Gentiles do that¹³. (Allison 2000:33-34).

There are other examples where Jesus revises the holiness code. In Q 17:3-4, Jesus supports the injunction of Leviticus 19:17 that instructs that one should reprove your brother. But the emphasis of Jesus in Q lies on forgiveness, not reproof. What Jesus demands “is not repeated rebukes but repeated acts of forgiveness” (Allison 2000:67).

The demands of the kingdom also place the followers of Jesus in tension with what the Torah expects in terms of family relationships. In Q 9:60 there is the injunction that a potential disciple should “leave the dead to bury their own dead”. Q 9:59-60 “contravenes most radically the norms of the law, of moral conduct and of standard religious practice” (Oporto 2001:214). For example, in Mishnaic law, filial obligations towards one’s deceased parents took precedence over the recitation of the Shema or the Shemone Esreh (m.Ber 3:1) (Kloppenborg 1987:191). But the emphasis here is on discipleship and commitment to Jesus, not about Torah observance as such. According to Tuckett (1996:424), far reaching implications can be drawn, but Q does not suggest that it has consequences for Torah observance or that any such issues are at stake. Even so, it together with the injunction to “hate” father and mother (Q 14:26) runs contrary to the requirements of the fourth commandment (Ex 12:12; Dt 5:16). Allison (2000:63) treats Q 14:26 within a context where certain circumstances do not require the deconstruction of Torah but the subordination of one commandment to another, so the Jesus of Q 14:26 remains under the parental roof of

13 Allison (2000:34) also points out, however, that this kind of provocative inversion of Mosaic law is also found in the Tanak. Isaiah 56:1-8, for example, rewrites Pentateuchal language (Nm 16:9; 18:2-6) to promote a new idea in that foreigners and the physically maimed may serve in the temple of the future.

the law. The same principle can be relevant to Q 9:60, but overall, a certain amount of tension does exist.

Another text quite relevant to our investigation is Q 16:18. The text has difficulties of its own. The total ban on divorce (cf Mi 2:16) could either be seen as an attack on Deuteronomy 24:1-4, or as a stricter demand, hence a more rigorous obedience to the Law is required (Tuckett 1996:408; Catchpole 1993:237). The primeval will of God was for a union between a man and a woman (Gn 2-3), so Deuteronomy 24:1-4 could be seen as a divine concession to or compromise for human sin (Allison 2000:65). Jesus rejects it, and it is not just a matter here of Jesus requiring more rigorous obedience. What should be emphasised here is that Jesus disallows what Moses allowed. Allison (2000:65) asks appropriately: “what is Jesus doing to Moses?” Here is another example where Jesus is not that orthodox.

Overall, Jesus contradicts the great law-giver in one instance, freely reconstructs the holiness code, and places great strain on observing the fourth commandment. Q 16:16 offers an explanation (following the reconstruction of the IQP):

... The law and the prophets <<were>> until John. From then on the kingdom of God [that is already present] is violated and the violent plunder it.

It seems to suggest that in some sense the era of the Law and the prophets has come to an end. The kingdom/reign of God requires a reconstructed Torah or covenant, given by the eschatological prophet, Jesus. It is not that the Torah is entirely abandoned, but certainly there is a depreciation of the Law and the prophets (*pace* Catchpole 1993:237) – it is part of the “old” system. Allison approaches the issue from another angle. He argues that the rewriting or contradiction of the Torah in Q should not be seen that Q has abandoned the Torah:

Such an inference would fail to recognize that many [Judean] interpreters felt the independence and freedom not only to rewrite Scripture, but also to turn it upside down and even contradict it ... [Q’s] intertextual irony is not an example of Messianist antinomianism but an illustration of the interpretive freedom of [Judean] rhetoric. (Allison 2000:194, 197)

Horsley (Horsley & Draper 1999:115-16) argues that if “the law and the prophets” was a standard phrase for the Israelite tradition among both the people and scribal circles, “the kingdom of God means realization and practice of just covenantal relations, moreover, ‘the law’ not only is of enduring validity but is the authoritative guide for societal life, as stated in Q 16:17”. Alternatively, and an interpretation Horsley prefers, if “the law and the prophets” referred to the great tradition of the rulers and their representatives (the rich), then there is a polemical edge to Q 16:16.

One can rather agree that the kingdom of God means the realization and practice of just covenantal relations. But Q 16:16 clearly implies that a level of tension existed between the new and the old, hence the corrective strategy of Q 16:17. The freedom of Judean rhetoric may play a role here, but more so Jesus – a teacher with divine authority – has given his followers an eschatological identity and frame of reference. It is the kingdom/reign of God, which requires a (re)constructed Torah. The Judean “constitution” does look somewhat different. This means that Judean ethnic identity is somewhat different as well. (Re)constructed Torah inevitably leads to (re)constructed Judean ethnic identity.

In summary, in the formative stratum Jesus freely (re)constructs the Torah, even contradicts Moses on one occasion, places strain on observing the fourth commandment, and it is stated that a new era, the kingdom/reign of God has surpassed the old (the Law and the prophets). It is not that the Law has been left behind entirely, but what is important is the newness of the kingdom. There is no defence offered of this position in Q¹, it is a matter taken for granted. The rhetorical tone of Jesus’ teaching about the kingdom and covenant renewal is instructional. This hortatory tone therefore also tells us much about the Christology of the formative stratum (see below). The authority of Jesus and his eschatological status is largely assumed – Q¹ requires no developed apologetics, defence or explanation. But it is because of Jesus that the Q people are living according to eschatological Torah. Adhering to eschatological Torah translates into having eschatological Judean ethnic identity. It was this eschatological identity that in part required the polemical and apologetic strategy of the main redaction whereby the Judean ethnic identity of the Q people was defended. Nevertheless, it was an ethnic identity that was in (re)construction, which made things a little complicated for the Q people vis-à-vis other Judeans.

3 THE CHRISTOLOGY OF THE FORMATIVE STRATUM

As already suggested, the rhetorical tone of the formative stratum says a lot about its Christology. Arnal (2001:167-68) contends, however, that here we find the complete absence of Christological reflection (in consequence it points to an early dating). Q 6:46, where Jesus is addressed as “Lord, Lord” does show interest in the significance and status of Jesus, but Jesus is simply a wise man with no reflection on his supernatural significance or his relationship to God. In response the lack of a developed Christology in the formative stratum should not be seen that it lacked Christological reflection, or that the Q people merely saw Jesus as a “wise man”. For example, Jesus is already represented as the eschatological prophet and Son of humanity/man in Q 6:20-23, themes more developed and explicit in the main redaction¹⁴. In a similar vein the Moses typology is already present in the formative stratum. Jesus reconstructs Leviticus 19 (Q 6:27-45), and on one occasion even contradicts Moses by disallowing divorce (Q 16:18). Jesus’ (re)construction of the Torah is not challenged, however, indicating that Jesus’ eschatological status and authority was common knowledge and accepted by the Q people. The Moses and the new Exodus typology is probably also present in the mission instructions. The IQP reconstructs Q 10:4 as follows:

Carry no [[purse]] [presumably for money], nor knapsack [presumably for bread], nor shoes, nor stick; and greet no one on the road.

Now some of these elements also appear when the Israelites departed from Egypt. Exodus 12:11 explains that Moses instructed the Israelites to eat the Passover in a hurry, with sandals on their feet and staff in hand, while Exodus 12:34-36 (cf Gn 15:14; 1 Sm 4-6) recalls that they left Egypt with bread, silver and gold, and with clothing. Allison (2000:42-43) considers the text of Q 10:4 as

14 When it comes to the Son of humanity/man in Q 6:22-23, Jacobson argues that it is embedded in material that is rooted in the tradition of the suffering of the righteous. “The association of ‘son of man’ with the suffering of the righteous may indicate that the Q community did not understand the title ‘son of man’ as a reference to an apocalyptic figure of judgement” (Jacobson 1992:101). Yet again it is suggested here that based on Q 12:39-40 and 17:23-35 Q did understand Jesus as an apocalyptic figure of judgement, something which is as yet not developed in the formative stratum.

uncertain, although based on the IQP reconstruction, the text seems to be an inversion of Moses' instructions to the Israelites.

Attention must also be focussed on Q 6:46-49. In this parable of the houses built on rock or sand it is interesting to note how much emphasis is placed on the authority of Jesus' teaching. It is hearing and doing Jesus' teaching (no reference is made to the Torah as such) that secures stability in the present and the eschatological future. A similar motif is found in Q 10:16:

Whoever takes you in takes me in, [and] whoever takes me in takes in the one who sent me.

It is indirectly said that those who reject Jesus reject God. This is analogous to Q 10:22 where it is implied that those who do not hear Jesus have no knowledge of God. It is analogous to Q 12:8-9, where confessing Jesus is the definitive requirement for eschatological salvation (Kloppenborg 1987:201). Overall the authority and eschatological status of Jesus is assumed – not defended – in the formative stratum. It required the polemical and apologetic requirements of the main redaction to come to fuller expression.

4 THE LAW IN THE MAIN REDACTION (Q²)

Regarding the main redaction of Q (Q²), Kloppenborg (2000:201) argues that we find a new rhetorical situation, "the need to defend the practice of Q¹ and the character of Jesus in the face of challenges". Also, at this stage the rhetorical situation required a defence or legitimation of the Q people's existence (2000:202-203). Here we are going to build on this. The main redaction gives us important insight into how Q needed to place its community within broader Judean society. More specifically, at this stage, Q needed to defend the Judean ethnic identity of its people. Both its attitude to the Torah and its Christology is instructive in this regard.

In Q 13:24, Judeans are admonished to enter by the narrow door. In the succeeding verses (Q 13:25-29), it is spelled out what will happen if people do not. For Tuckett (1996:204) this call is extended to "this generation", non-responsive Judeans. But does Q 13:24-27 have to do with "this generation"? This does not seem likely. The Q people (or their scribes?) want to disassociate themselves from those who do "lawlessness" (*ἀνομίαν*) (Q 13:27; cf Ps 6:8). In Q 13:26 it is explained that they ate and drank in Jesus'

presence, and Jesus taught in their streets¹⁵. But these Judeans will be told to get away from Jesus, reason being they do “lawlessness”. We can paraphrase this sentence as follows: “You are not being Judean!” *Who* are these Judeans? What *kind* of “lawlessness” are they guilty of? They did not enter the “narrow door” (Q 13:24), which evidently at the stage of the main redaction, means they did not illustrate obedience to the Torah, or the Judean way of life. Here is evidence that there “seems to be division within the Q community or within the Jesus movement. At issue is the question of the boundaries of the movement – who is in and who is out” (Jacobson 1992:208). It is therefore suggested here that it is probable that these Judeans were Messianists that had given up performing some aspects of traditional covenantal praxis¹⁶ (a break-away Q group, the community of Mark or a Pauline-like movement?). These apostates evidently are followers of Jesus themselves. The interesting corollary of all this is that the Q people might be engaged in fierce polemic with non-responsive Judeans, and might be alienated from them, but the Q people also seem to be apologising for the sins of other Messianists. These apostates may have contributed towards the Q group – law-abiding as they are (see below) – being rejected. They are guilty by association. Thus the Q group through this association might have been seen as undermining Judean ethnic identity, something which Q’s polemic aims at addressing¹⁷. So in turn, the Q group rejects this sort of “lawlessness” and affirm their ethnic status as Judeans.

Kloppenborg, as we have seen, assigned the temptation narrative, Q 11:42c and 16:17 to his third stratum since it is pre-occupied with the Torah. Attention must be drawn to the work of Catchpole (1993:229), however, who refers to Q 7:27 and the temptation narrative (Q 4:1-12) where both use the introductory

15 According to Tuckett (1996:192), it is widely agreed that Luke 13:26, which refers to Judean (“Jewish”) contemporaries of Jesus, is more original than Matthew 7:22, which refers to charismatics and prophets acting in Jesus’ name.

16 Referring to Judean customs such as food and purity laws for example.

17 See Tuckett (1996:427), who for other reasons argue that from the Judean (“Jewish”) side, the hostility shown towards the Messianists (“Christians”) can be seen as based on the belief that they “constituted a threat from within to [Judeanism’s] self-identity.”

formula γέγραπται, and then proceed to cite scripture¹⁸. This would rather suggest that they belong to the same stratum in Q. Q 13:27 (part of Kloppenborg's Q²) also suggests that Q³ can comfortably belong to the main redaction. This text must be seen in close association with Q 16:17. Let us see these texts together. In the formative stratum it was said: "... The law and the prophets <<were>> until John" (Q 16:16a). Q 13:27 and 16:17 counters:

And he will say to you: I do not know you! Get away from me, [[<<you>> who]] do lawlessness! (Q 13:27)

[[But it is easier for]] heaven and earth [[to]] pass away [[than for one iota or]] one serif of the law [[to fall]] (Q 16:17).

Q 16:17 affirms the abiding validity of the Law (cf Tuckett 1996:406). It is suggested here that Q 13:27 makes the same assumption. But Q 16:17 clearly modifies Q 16:16, correcting any possible reading that the (traditional) Law was no longer to be applied (Tuckett 1996:407). According to Kloppenborg (2000:212) an earlier antinomian meaning was probably not the case, but "the addition of 16:17 betrays the hand of a 'nervous redactor' who is worried about any apparent rejection of Torah". Both Q 13:27 and 16:17 can be said to modify any misunderstanding that could have been caused at a pre-redactional stage (Q 16:16). So the main redaction is engaged with correction and apologetics. The Law is strongly affirmed, and Q attempts to create distance between its community and lawless Messianists¹⁹. So their own and Jesus' Judean identity is recovered. Catchpole (1993:94) argues in reference to Q 11:42 and 16:17 that "the Jesus of Q is through and through orthodox". But there are certainly instances where Jesus is

18 Other examples of scripture being cited are Is 14:13, 15 in Q 10:15; Mi 7:6 (modified) in Q 12:53; Ps 6:9 in Q 13:27; Ps 118:26 in Q 13:35. All of these Q texts are allocated by Kloppenborg to his main redaction (Q²).

19 Here attention must be drawn to what Tuckett (1996:83-92) suggests. One must perhaps be aware of the distinction that must always exist between any text's author and the people it addresses. They might not have shared the same views, and it may be in the case of Q that the "person(s) responsible for producing Q intended the ideas expressed not only to articulate the views of the community but also to speak to the community, perhaps to change existing ideas (Tuckett 1996:82; emphasis original). Was Q here speaking to (a part of) the community?

not *that* orthodox, hence the need for this corrective and apologetic strategy.

Let us now focus on the temptation narrative. Here we encounter the testing of a prophet and the demonstration of his proficiency in the sacred tradition (Horsley & Draper 1999:257), but within the context of the main redaction, it also serves an apologetic purpose along with the other passages already identified. Jesus is portrayed as obedient to scripture (Tuckett 1996:422). Jesus is tempted by the devil in various ways. After he had nothing to eat, the devil told Jesus to turn stones into bread. Jesus answers by citing Deuteronomy 8:3: “It is written: A person is not to live only from bread” (Q 4:4). In the second temptation, the devil (citing LXX Ps 90:11-12) tempts Jesus to throw himself down from the Temple. Jesus retorts citing Deuteronomy 6:16: “It is written: Do not put to the test the Lord your God” (Q 4:12). In the last temptation, the devil takes Jesus to a high mountain and says he will give all the kingdoms of the world to Jesus if he bows down before him. The reply is emphatic citing Deuteronomy 6:13: “It is written: Bow down to the Lord your God, and serve only him” (Q 4:8). Jesus, by being obedient to the Torah, by being an Israelite prophet, would naturally be a most extraordinary Judean.

Specific matters pertaining to the Law are mentioned in Q. In Q 11:42, the tithing practices of the Pharisees are spoken of. Catchpole (1993:264) argues that it does not attack Pharisaic teaching or principles, and it is widely agreed that there is no question of an attack on the Law (Lv 27:30-33; Nm 18:12; Dt 14:22-23). The final clause (“But these [i.e. tithing] one had to do, without giving up those [i.e. justice, mercy, faithfulness]”) appears to be a secondary comment, correcting any possible understanding that tithing was not important or necessary (Tuckett 1996:410; Kloppenborg 1987; 2000, who assigns v. 42c to his Q³). Although the principle of tithing may not be in doubt, the meaning of the initial part of v. 42 is not that clear. The Matthean version (“tithing mint and dill and cumin”) is normally accepted as representing Q (also IQP), as it fits our knowledge of Judeanism better (cf m.Maas 4:5; m.Dem 2:1, which mention dill and cumin)²⁰. Alternatively, it

20 The items mentioned by Luke (mint, rue and every herb) does not cohere with later Rabbinic tradition. In m.Sheb 9:1, for example, rue is excluded from liability to tithing and mint is never mentioned in m.Maas 4:5; m.Dem 2:1.

simply refers to the Pharisees and their obsession to observe the Law correctly²¹. If Luke 11:42 is original (“mint, rue and every herb”), it suggests that the Pharisees voluntarily do more than what the Law requires (Tuckett 1996:412). Whatever the first part of v. 42 meant, for Q justice, mercy and faithfulness should not undermine the principle of tithing. So at level of the main redaction, the Q people were like the Pharisees expected to continue the practice of tithing – ritual aspects of the Law need to be observed just as the rest (cf Tuckett 1996:410, 412).

A second matter pertaining to the Law referred to in Q is ritual purity (Q 11:39-41, 44). The Pharisees are accused that they “purify the outside of the cup and dish”, while inside “[they are]] full of plunder and dissipation” (Q 11:39b). If a metaphorical understanding is followed, the Q saying points only to the bad character traits of the Pharisees. Catchpole (1993:266-67) argues that the imagery is not metaphorical at all. The food and drink satisfies Judean food laws, but it has been obtained by ἀρπαγή (plunder, robbery), and so have made the vessels “unclean”. So the cleanness of the vessels is not just dependent on ritual law, but also on the conduct that produced the food. In a similar manner, Q 11:44 attacks the moral character of the Pharisees. They are like unmarked graves, who transfer “corpse” impurity²² to others. Based on Catchpole’s (1993:268) approach here the same kind of (moral) impurity may be referred to which existed in their eating vessels²³. The ἀρπαγή, term and its cognates is often used in Judean literature “as a vivid metaphor for the predatory activities of wolves and lions²⁴, and in a transferred sense for injustice done by the rich and powerful to the poor and vulnerable. It represents the unprincipled grasping of the self-seeking who prosper, enjoy good food and high living, and do not give priority to

21 Although the Tanak itself only specifies that farm and garden produce, especially corn, wine and oil be tithed.

22 Cf Kloppenborg (1987:141): “The accusation that the Pharisees are ‘unmarked graves’ ... portrays them as a source of ritual defilement”.

23 Cf Mt 23:27: “Woe to you, teachers of the law and Pharisees, you hypocrites! You are like whitewashed tombs, which look beautiful on the outside but on the inside are full of dead men's bones and everything unclean” (NIV).

24 Cf Gn 49:27; Pss 7:2; 22:13; 104:21; Ezk 19:3, 6; 22:25, 27; Hs 5:14; Mi 5:8; TDan 5:7; TBenj 11:1, 2; Mt 7:15; Jn 10:12.

‘judgment and mercy’” (Catchpole 1993:267). This concurs with Q 11:43, where the Pharisees are attacked for their love of high social standing (cf Baumgarten 1997:47, 51, 66); they “love [[the place of honor at banquets and]] the front seat in the synagogues and accolades in the markets”. Catchpole collectively draws attention to the ἄρπαξ word group (Q 10:3; 11:39; 16:16) where it is used to describe the opposition to the kingdom-centred mission and to where the Pharisees alienate themselves from the principles of the covenant. They indicate the context of religious polarization where the envoys of Jesus and the Pharisees are engaged in conflict. But this conflict evidently has led to the financial exploitation or oppression of the Q people (cf Horsley 1995a:47-9; Horsley & Draper 1999:114-15).

When reviewing the above the practice of tithing is taken for granted and even protected. Tuckett (1996:412-23) says that there is no affirmation of purity rituals (as there is of tithing in Q 11:42c) but neither are they condemned. One must concur that Q never questions aspects of ritual law (cf Kloppenborg 1987:140), and this is especially true of the main redaction. Matters of tithing and ritual purity (also presupposed in Q 11:44) are conveniently used to attack the Pharisees, and are not the target of the attack itself. What is at issue here is that obligations of justice, mercy (Mi 6:8; Hs 4:1; 12:7; Zch 7:9) and concern for the poor are seen as primary and aspects of ritual law should be subordinated to those primary concerns (cf Catchpole 1993:275; Horsley & Draper 1999:97). This forms part of an inner-Judean debate, and the “validity of the Law is assumed, and the only issue is its correct interpretation” (Jacobson 1992:177). This is also relevant to Q 11:46 where we find mention of “burdens” that are loaded onto people by the lawyers and their multiplication of the rules. What is at issue here is the scribal interpretation of the Law that is brought into question (Kloppenborg 1987:141). It is these scribes or “exegetes of the Law” that prevent people from entering the kingdom (Q 11:52).

So at the stage of the main redaction, it is agreed that a new era (“the kingdom/reign of God”) has dawned, but some of the traditional demands of the Law that shape and define Judean ethnic identity are still valid. Overall the validity of the Law or the covenant itself is never questioned. Jesus and the Q people could have been accused of undermining Judean ethnic identity, since they are associated with a movement where “lawlessness” does happen

(Q 13:27), and Jesus' own behaviour and teaching is at times suspect for he makes the Law less significant, if not irrelevant (Q16:16), and contradicts Moses in some respects (e g Q 7:34; 16:18). But any tendencies "in the tradition which might be interpreted in a way that would challenge the authority of the Law are firmly countered" (Tuckett 1996:424). Tuckett²⁵ (1996:418) also argues that Q "shows a deep concern that the Law should be maintained; it is aware that Jesus could be seen as antinomian, and *Q appears to represent a strong movement to 'rejudaise' Jesus*" (emphasis added)²⁶. What Tuckett argues here is for the purposes of this article the apologetic strategy of the main redaction where Jesus – and therefore the Q community – on one level are represented as unwaveringly obedient to the Torah (Q 4:1-13; 11:39-44, esp. 11:42c; 13:27; 16:17). This translates into the endeavour where Judean *ethnic identity* is strongly reclaimed or affirmed²⁷. In the main redaction Q therefore sends the following intended message: "We *are* Judean!" This does not stop Q from representing Jesus as equal to, or even greater than the law-giver of old himself. Q's Christology continues to place Jesus in tension with Moses, something more fully explored below. Briefly, Jesus is a prophet like him who has initiated the new Exodus. As the Son of God, he has authority and alone has received the whole revelation of God (Q 10:22). If so, then what room is left for Moses? So Q is adamant: Jesus is a law-abiding Judean, and so are its people. It is also adamant, Jesus, the eschatological prophet, has divine authority and is a law-giver like Moses. It therefore becomes clear that despite efforts to the contrary that tension still exists between the Torah of the Q people, and the Torah derived from Moses.

4 THE CHRISTOLOGY OF THE MAIN REDACTION

In Q 3:16 the reader/audience is introduced to the "Coming One". The identity of this figure is not revealed, but the temptation narrative (Q 4:1-13) that sets Jesus over and against the temptations

25 Tuckett (1996:414-18) argues that behind Lk 14:5 // Mt 12:11 and Mt 22:34-40 // Lk 10:25-28 lies a Q source.

26 Pace Catchpole (1993:277) who argues that there is no tendency to "re-Judaize" in Q.

27 Since Jesus quotes from Deuteronomy 6 (Q 4:8, 12), it can be seen that Jesus takes his stand on the central Judean confession, the Shema (Jacobson 1992:92).

of the devil gives a hint of who this figure might be. More is involved here than just a defence of the ethos of the Q group in that “Jesus provided an example of the absolutely dependent, non-defensive and apolitical stance of his followers”. More is involved here than a test to demonstrate Jesus’ virtue and to legitimate Jesus’ authority as a sage who has endured temptation, thus to “legitimate and guarantee the reliability of his teachings or revelations” (Kloppenborg 1987:256, 327, 261). It is all that but what we also have here is a “testing of an Israelite prophet being commissioned to lead the people, patterned after that of Moses and Elijah” (Horsley & Draper 1999:96). Prophets of Israel were also tested in the wilderness for forty days before their missions. Draper explains:

Moses spent two forty-day fasts on Mount Sinai. In the first, before the giving of the Torah and the renewed covenant in Deut. 9:9-11, his prophetic status was confirmed and he was prepared for his authoritative presentation and interpretation of the word of God inscribed in text. Again in Deut. 9:18-19, after the disobedience of Israel with the golden calf, Moses lay prostrate and fasted for forty days and nights to avert the wrath of God against Israel. The paradigmatic prophet of Israel’s renewal, Elijah, moreover, was tested and commissioned in the wilderness in 1 Kings 19:1-18 ... If Jesus is to succeed as a prophet, he must successfully complete the forty days of testing²⁸.

(Horsley & Draper 1999:256).

In addition, Q recounts a new Exodus. According to Josephus, there were a few Moses and Joshua-like figures that emerged in the first century that led their followers into the wilderness (Ant 20.97-98, 169-71; War 2.261-63). Q’s representation of Jesus fits this same pattern. Allison (2000:26) explains:

28 Draper (Horsley & Draper 1999:259) sees the Q discourses as dedicated to different aspects of Jesus as the prophet spearheading the renewal of Israel in the following sequence: “the announcement of the prophet, the testing of the prophet, the prophet enacting the covenant renewal, the confirmation of the prophet’s authority, the prophet fulfilling the age-old longings for renewal, and the prophet commissioning envoys to broaden the movement of renewal of Israel”.

If Israel was in the wilderness for forty years (Deut 8:2), Jesus is there for forty days (Q 4:2; forty days symbolizes forty years in Num 14:34 and Ezek 4:56). If Israel was tempted by hunger and fed upon manna (Exod 16:2-8), so is the hungry Jesus tempted to turn stones into bread (Q 4:2-3; manna, one should recall, was spoken of as bread)²⁹. If Israel was tempted to put God to the test, the same thing happens to Jesus (Ex 17:1-3; Q 4:9-12). And if Israel was lured to idolatry (Ex 32), the devil confronts Jesus with the same temptation to worship something other than Israel's God (Q 4:5-8).

Q 4:4 also quotes Deuteronomy 8:3, and the context (Dt 8:2-5) has elements similar to the temptation narrative, "being led, the wilderness, the number forty, temptation, hunger and sonship ... Q 4:1-13 appears to present Jesus as one like Moses" (Allison 2000:27). There could be more allusions, as Jesus is taken up to a mountain (Q 4:5-7), so Moses went to the top of Pisgah (Nm 27:12-14; Dt 3:27; 32:48-52; 34:1-4). But a clearer allusion to Moses is present in Q 11:20: "But if it is by the finger of God that I cast out demons, then there has come upon you God's reign". The phrase "the finger of God" appears three times in the Tanak (Ex 8:19; 31:18; Dt 9:10) and they have to do with the miracles of Moses before Pharaoh and God giving the Law to Moses on Mount Sinai. So in Q 11:20 the miracles of Jesus are set beside the miracles of Moses (Allison 2000:53). As Allison explains, in Judeanism ("Judaism") the idea developed that the latter things will be as the first. The future redemption will be like the redemption from Egypt³⁰. For some the idea developed of an eschatological prophet like Moses based on Deuteronomy 18:15, 18, as well as the idea that the Messiah might be like Moses. Q 11:20 is an illustration of such kind of typology (Allison 2000:56). In addition, John has according to Q fulfilled the prophecy of a messenger preparing the way for a new Exodus (Q 7:18-35; cf Ex 23:20; Mi 3:1).

What is also relevant here is the "Son" Christology in Q 10:21-22. It is worthwhile having the text in front of us, especially v. 22:

29 Ex 16:4; Dt 8:3; Neh 9:15; Ps 78:25; 105:40; WisSol 16:20; Jn 6:31-34 and other texts.

30 Is 40:3-5; 41:17-20; 43:1-3, 14-21; 48:20-21; 51:9-10; 52:11-12; Jr 16:14-15; Ezk 20:33-38; Hs 2:14-16; 11:10-11; Mi 7:14-15.

Everything has been entrusted to me by my Father, and no one knows the Son except the Father, nor [[does anyone know]] the Father except the Son, and to whomever the Son chooses to reveal him.

This high Christology is evidence for Jacobson (1992:149) that Q 10:21-22 is quite separate from the rest of Q. But this text need not to be separated from the rest of Q as it connects to the traditional status of Moses, a role we have already identified to be fulfilled by Jesus as the leader of the new Exodus. Jesus is represented as the exclusive revealer of divine knowledge, and must be seen against the backdrop of Exodus 33:11-23 and other traditions (e g Nm 12:6-8; Dt 34:40) where this privilege is afforded Moses. It was Moses who knew God “face to face” (Dt 34:10), and the tradition also refers to the reciprocal knowledge between God and the lawgiver (Allison 2000:43-48). Jesus has received “everything”, or the whole revelation from the Father, which is another Mosaic trait, “for the Moses of the haggadah came to enjoy practical omniscience” (Allison 2000:47). The second-century BCE *Exagoge* of Ezekiel has Moses saying:

I gazed upon the whole earth round about;
things under it, and high above the skies.
Then at my feet a multitude of stars
fell down, and I their number reckoned up (EzekTrag 77-80)

It is later on explained to Moses that he will see things present, past and future (EzekTrag 89). Other traditions also attest to supernatural knowledge of the lawgiver³¹. According to Allison (2000:48), Q 10:22 makes the same claim for Jesus, thus “it is setting him beside Moses”. Setting him *beside* Moses or rather, is Q 10:22 not placing Jesus, the new lawgiver, *above* Moses? When seen in conjunction with Q 6:27-45 where Jesus reconstructs Leviticus 19, Q 10:22 seems to suggest that Jesus, the Son of God, is afforded a higher status than Moses in the Q community³².

31 Jub 1:4; LetAris 139; 2 Bar 59:4-11; Sifre 357 on Nm 12:8; b.Meg 19b; Midr Ps 24:5; Memar Marqah 5:1.

32 Jesus is also recognised as God’s Son in the temptation narrative (Q 4:3, 9). It is interesting to note that it occurs within the context where Jesus is

In summary, part of the main redaction's Christology explains that Jesus passed the test of a prophet, indeed is a prophet like Moses who has initiated the new Exodus. What is a better way to affirm your Judean ethnic identity than by saying you are experiencing anew the founding event of God's people, Israel? Q places Jesus beside or even above Moses in this respect, while at the same time it needed to defend its allegiance to the traditional Torah, despite Jesus' reconstructive and at times indifferent approach to it in Q¹. This contradictory position that Q found itself in, where the kingdom and Torah, and Jesus and Moses stood both side by side and in opposition, could only exist because of Jesus' eschatological status. As the new Moses, the Son of humanity/ man, and the Son of God, he required that everything else in Q's field of vision be arranged according to that pattern, although all the pieces did not quite fit as the Q redactor(s) would have hoped for.

5 FINDINGS

It is evident that Q had difficulty to position its people within traditional Judeanism. In the formative stratum Q is living and breathing eschatological newness, as the traditional Torah is (re)constructed, if not undermined in favour of Jesus' teaching about the kingdom/reign of God. The kingdom/reign of God therefore requires a (re)constructed Judean ethnic identity for participation. It can be assumed that Q's approach to the Law and that of other Messianists was attacked by other Judeans, as it undermined and brought into question traditional Judean ethnic identity. Some were even accused of "lawlessness". Nevertheless, the community's Judean ethnic identity is something that Q set out to defend in the main redaction by affirming the traditional Torah's enduring status. It explains that its people are still participating in the covenant, they are Judeans, yet it did not sacrifice Jesus' eschatological status as the prophet like Moses. Somehow the Torah of Moses and the kingdom teaching of Jesus must live side by side. Q needs to be part of the new Exodus, the new order, while being compelled by its Judean environment in Galilee to defend the identity of its people, and that of Jesus as well. It is quite probable that Q hints at the possibility that some Judean Messianists with time minimised some of the more radical elements

represented as the prophet like Moses – this complements the connection to Moses identified in Q 10:22.

of Jesus' teaching to both defend their identity and to make the message of the kingdom more palatable for other Judeans.

Consulted literature

Allison, D C 1997. *The Jesus tradition in Q*. Harrisburg: Trinity Press International.

-, C 2000. *The intertextual Jesus: Scripture in Q*. Harrisburg: Trinity Press International.

Arnal, W E 2001. *Jesus and the village scribes: Galilean conflicts and the setting of Q*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

Baumgarten, A L 1997. *The flourishing of Jewish sects in the Maccabean era: An interpretation*. Leiden: Brill.

Brett, M G (ed) 1996. *Ethnicity and the Bible*. Leiden: EJ Brill.

Catchpole, D R 1993. *The quest for Q*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.

Cromhout, M & Van Aarde, A 2006. A socio-cultural model of Judean ethnicity: A proposal. *HTS* 62(1), 69-101.

Denzey, N 2002. The limits of ethnic categories, in Blasi A J, Duhaime, J & Turcotte, P (eds), *Handbook of Early Christianity. Social science approaches*, 489-507. Walnut Creek; Lanham; New York; Oxford: Altamira Press.

Duling, D C 2005. Ethnicity, ethnocentrism, and the Matthean *ethnos*. *BTB* 35(4), 125-143.

Dunn, J D G 2003. *Christianity in the making: Jesus remembered*. Grand Rapids; Cambridge: Eerdmans.

Esler, P F 2003. *Conflict and identity in Romans: The social setting of Paul's letter*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

Goodacre, M S 2002. *The case against Q: Studies in Markan priority and the Synoptic Problem*. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International.

Goodacre, M S and Perrin, N (eds) 2004. *Questioning Q*. London: SPCK.

Horsley, R A 1995a. Social conflict in the synoptic sayings source Q, in Kloppenborg, J S (ed), *Conflict and invention: Literary, rhetorical and social studies on the sayings gospel Q*, 37-52. Valley Forge: Trinity Press International.

-, 1995b. *Galilee: History, politics, people*. Valley Forge: Trinity Press International.

-, 1996. *Archaeology, history and society in Galilee: The social context of Jesus and the Rabbis*. Valley Forge: Trinity Press International.

Horsley, R A and Draper, J A 1999. *Whoever hears you hears me: Prophets, performance, and tradition in Q*. Harrisburg: Trinity Press International.

Jacobson, A D 1992. *The first gospel: An introduction to Q*. Sonoma: Polebridge Press.

- Kloppenborg V J S 1987. *The formation of Q: Trajectories in ancient wisdom collections*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.
- , 2000. *Excavating Q: The history and setting of the sayings gospel*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
- Meier, J P 1994. *A marginal Jew: Rethinking the historical Jesus*. New York: Doubleday.
- Oporto, S G 2001. Kingdom and family in conflict: A contribution to the study of the historical Jesus, in Pilch, J J (ed), *Social scientific models for interpreting the Bible: Essays by the Context Group in honor of Bruce J Malina*, 210-38. Leiden: Brill.
- Piper, R A 1989. *Wisdom in the Q-tradition: The aphoristic teaching of Jesus*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Reed, J L 1999. Galileans, “Israelite Village Communities”, and the Sayings Gospel Q, in Meyers, E M (ed), *Galilee through the centuries: Confluence of cultures*, 87-108. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.
- , 2000. *Archaeology and the Galilean Jesus: A re-examination of the evidence*. Harrisburg: Trinity Press International.
- Robinson, J M, Hoffmann, P & Kloppenborg, J S 2002. *The Sayings Gospel Q in Greek and English with parallels from the Gospels of Mark and Thomas*. Fortress Press: Minneapolis.
- Stegemann, W 2006. The emergence of God’s new people: The beginnings of Christianity reconsidered. *HTS* 62(1), 23-40.
- Tuckett, C M 1996. *Q and the history of early Christianity: Studies on Q*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.
- Uro, R 1995. John the Baptist and the Jesus Movement: What does Q tell us?, in Piper, R A (ed), *The Gospel behind the Gospels: Current studies on Q*, 231-57. Leiden: EJ Brill.