

CHAPTER 3

WALKING THE SECLUDED ALLEY OF Q: A VIEW OF THE PRE-MARKAN JESUS? R A HORSLEY

Checking our position in accordance with the North Star on the road with Horsley, we once more start our journey by determining which source(s) to use. We furthermore examine the reasons for the choice of the source(s) in question. Horsley chooses Q as source, because it reaches back in time behind both Paul and Mark to earlier strands of tradition. Quite some time is spent on an examination of the nature of the Q source, discussing the feasibility of the hypothesis that it consists of various layers. This is important to our discussion, as earlier layers, if they exist, can only shed additional light upon the freshest impressions made by Jesus upon the minds of spectators. If, in these impressions, Jesus had been perceived as a prophet, it would contribute generously to the discussion at hand.

In examining Q for the possibility of different tradition layers, we stumble upon the issue of orality in the traditioning process. Here we pause for a significant space of time as this part of the process could form an invaluable link between actual happenings and the written-down accounts thereof. This could once again impact upon the immediacy of the impact Jesus had made upon onlookers, and of the perception, or lack thereof, that he had been a prophet.

When we reach, at the end of Horsley's investigative route, the view he offers of Jesus, the apocalyptic prophet bent on covenant renewal, we have to compare this view with that of the typical prophet. This should enable us to determine whether Horsley's prophetic figure meets the requirements. When, for instance, Horsley finds the whole scope of the mission discourse to be prophetic in nature and its purpose to be the enlistment of prophetic representatives to spread and manifest the kingdom of God he was announcing, we have to ask whether it had been common for prophets of the olden days to enlist aid in such a way. When Horsley

[University of Pretoria etd – Dannhauser, E H \(2006\)](#)

seeks to reconstruct the political-economic-religious Sitz-im-Leben of the Q people, he discovers a cauldron of conflict between wealthy and powerful rulers and their “retainers” on one hand, and the common people on the other. This conflict was intensified by long-standing historical regional differences and by dissatisfaction with Jerusalem rule in particular. When these conclusions are examined in the light of the prophetic phenomenon, we shall attempt to ascertain whether this type of Sitz-im-Leben was common to prophecy in Old Testament times.

Horsley simplifies our task when he himself sets his study against the backdrop of the prophetic books of the Old Testament and as a comparative result discovers in Jesus a prophet not only as receiver and transmitter of oracles, but a prophet in the political-religious role of leader in the exodus and mediator of the covenant. He, along similar route, finds true prophetic timbre in Jesus’ message with its passionate concern for the social issues of his time and, in particular, the repression of the poor by the rich. He underlines his conclusion that the social aspect is sine qua non for the understanding of prophecy in general and even more intensely so for Jesus as prophet.

It seems as though we shall not deviate, but are indeed true to the guidance of our North Star.

3.1 Q

Richard Horsley concentrates on Q as the source of his study of the historical Jesus. The following are two of the reasons why he chose to single out this particular source notwithstanding the challenges and complications it holds for the researcher - if, as some New Testament scholars would have it, this source existed at all:

- It offers a very different view of Jesus from that found in either Paul or Mark.
- "...[I]t is intriguing to get behind the written Gospels to an earlier, more 'original' source through which Jesus might be understood" (Horsley, in Horsley & Draper 1999:1).

University of Pretoria etd – Dannhauser, E H (2006)

Study of Q has revealed that one after the other theological concept, presumably retrojected into the gospels in post-Easter, early-Christian times, cannot be applied to Q. So, for instance, would the researcher search in vain for a christology in this source for in Q Jesus is never accorded the title "Christ" nor does not appear in the source as a whole. In Q "*Kyrios*", used by Paul to denote the concept of "Lord", designates a form of address designating a master or authoritative teacher. "Son of God the Father" is used as title not only for Jesus but also for John and the Q people in general. Q does not appear to have a "wisdom christology" but Jesus is said to have been sent as prophet by Wisdom and is one of the children of Wisdom. In the past an apocalyptic Son of Man christology was identified in Q. However in most cases the title "'Son of Man'...refers indefinitely to a human and by implication to Jesus himself....The ability to use the term to refer to Jesus during his public ministry would seem...to be due to the term's use as an unimpressive Aramaic idiom with an implied reference to the speaker" (Robinson, in Horsley & Draper 1999:3). He furthermore points out that the Matthean portrayal of the Son of Man as a judge on the day of judgment does not apply here, but that the "son of man", just as the Queen of the South and the Ninevites, is more accurately "a defender or accuser at the divine court of judgment" (Horsley, in Horsley & Draper 1999:3). Q is lastly uninterested in the crucifixion and resurrection which are the dynamics behind Paul's writing.

He is not supportive of the Q Seminar's hypothesis that all Q-sayings can be sorted into either sapiential or apocalyptic strata, saying that the criteria used for this labelling are difficult to find within Q itself and would appear to be the results of modern scholarly concepts in the field of New Testament studies which have been superimposed on Q. Kloppenborg (2000:146) argues for an earlier sapiential layer and a secondary prophetic redactional layer but J D G Dunn disagrees saying that "...the attempt to classify and demarcate genre types has not proved very helpful in the discussion of Q" (Dunn 2003:155; see also pp 152-155).

3.1.1 A sighting by word of mouth

One of the major strongholds in his argumentation is that *Q must be dealt with as an oral tradition in the vein of "... the predominantly oral communication environment of antiquity, ...performed orally before groups of people."* (Horsley, in Horsley & Draper 1999:3) *and not as a written text*. Texts such as Q are believed by some to have been a copy or transcript of an oral performance before a group of people.

But recognizing the power and process of orality in research has proved difficult, if not impossible for scholars for whom reading the written word in countless ways through countless mediums is sine qua non. P F Craffert and P J J Botha (2005:5) explain: "Reference to 'criteria of authenticity' and 'historical reliability' in conventional scholarship ignore that such 'methodo-logical' aspects relate to culturally determined assumptions. Confusion with regard to multiple cultural realities leads to misleading criteria for historicity."

W H Kelber (1983:xv) confirms this:

I have written this book out of a concern for what seemed to me a disproportionately print-oriented hermeneutic in our study of the Bible. Walter J. Ong, who has amply documented the problem outside the field of biblical studies, has termed it the "chirographic bias" of Western intellectuals, and Lou H. Silberman has, in the words of Marshall McLuhan, drawn critical attention to the "Gutenberg galaxy" in which much of biblical scholarship is conducted. In New Testament studies the problem manifests itself in the inability of form criticism to produce an oral hermeneutic, our misconceived search for *the original* form of oral materials, the collaboration of form with redaction criticism in reconstructing tradition according to the paradigm of linearity, and a prevalent tendency to perceive the written gospel in continuity with oral tradition.

[University of Pretoria etd – Dannhauser, E H \(2006\)](#)

He joins the ranks of some of the most prominent biblical scholars of today, such as J D G Dunn, in regarding as a starting block for his use of this source "...the working hypothesis that Q was a carefully structured document" (Dunn 2003:153) and particularly expresses support and appreciation for the results of John S Kloppenborg's "...groundbreaking 'composition criticism'" (Horsley, in Horsley & Draper 1999:5) that Q was a coherent series of discourses and not a collection of sayings. On the topic of the composition of Q Kloppenborg writes:

The Synoptic Sayings Source is not, as is sometimes thought, a "random collection of sayings" but manifests a variety of types of literary organization. Not only are the sayings grouped into several topically coherent clusters, there is also a measure of unity and coherence among the clusters as well as logical and thematic development throughout the course of the entire collection.

(Kloppenborg 1987:89)

On the issue of the orality of Q though, their opinions diverge: Kloppenborg starts his discussion on the literary genre of Q by saying that it is necessary for Q to be shown to have been a document with an identifiable order and arrangement for any discussion on it to be meaningful. That this is indeed the case is, according to him, widely assumed by critics. Although the written nature of Q has in the past been disputed, it

...has been conceded by the majority of critics even if this conclusion was not always defended in a very systematic fashion....An oral Q, collapses in the face of four considerations: the presence of strong verbal agreements of Matthew and Luke, the use of peculiar or unusual phrases by both evangelists, agreements in the order of Q pericopae and the phenomenon of doublets.

(Kloppenborg 1987:42)

University of Pretoria etd – Dannhauser, E H (2006)

He addresses each of these four in turn. On the first he says that insufficient evidence from either Christianity in general or Q specifically exists for the techniques necessary to have preserved the words of Jesus as faithfully as they have been and as is shown in the said similarities. There is a lack of the mnemonics which appear in the presumably easily memorized units of tradition and would account for the verbatim or nearly verbatim similarities and there is no evidence that points to mnemonic practice in contemporary Christianity. Thus, according to him, only a written document can sufficiently explain these similarities. The second highlights some very unusual words and grammatical constructions which are very rare in the LXX and other early Christian literature. In oral transmission these would most probably have been dropped for more popular expressions in at least one of the Synoptic versions. On the matter of order Kloppenborg writes: "...[I]f little or no common order existed in the Matthean and Lucan reproduction of the sayings, or if the order which existed fell within the range of probabilities of random or accidental agreement, or again if all of the agreements could be explained on the basis of casual oral associations, then the case for a written Q would be greatly weakened (Kloppenborg 1987:47). However, this is not the case and he cites evidence that in vocabulary, selection and placement of particles, prepositions and other sentence elements which are highly likely to vary in such instances, such minute agreements occur that a choice for the alternative of a written Q is obvious.

He discerns three layers in the development of Q. Of these only the first, Q1, is oral and delivered by a performer. In the Q2-layer the material was already in written form and in Q3 the exegetical process had already begun.

He concludes without a doubt: "Q must be regarded as a written document, not simply a stratum of oral tradition" (Kloppenborg 1987:87) and even applies this conclusion as evidence: "The very fact that Q was *written* and not simply a set of oral folk sayings of a pre-literate group is evidence of use by Christians with access to literary technology" (Kloppenborg 1987:90). He describes Q as "...relatively well-organized, with clearly constructed arguments and with a degree of topical organization that places it among the best organized ancient sayings

University of Pretoria etd – Dannhauser, E H (2006)

collections....Q, then, is far from unreflective, unsystematic oral tradition” (Kloppenborg 1993:25).

Horsley disagrees. He directly responds to this last theory of Kloppenborg’s, saying:

Even before the intensive recent analysis of oral performance, we knew that the oral tradition is far from unreflective and unsystematic. Recent studies of oral performances in contemporary societies and of oral-derived literature are demonstrating just how complex and sophisticated oral composition and oral tradition can be....Thus, like most other literature extant from antiquity, Q must now be understood as orally composed and only written down by means of scribal technology.

(Horsley, in Horsley & Draper 1999:294, 295)

He considers it to be of paramount importance to be noted by whomever involves himself in biblical studies "...devoted as it is to the interpretation of sacred texts,...that the communication environment of Palestine in particular and Hellenistic Roman antiquity in general was oral" (Horsley, in Horsley & Draper 1999:5,6) and even more assuredly so in villages and towns among ordinary people. According to him the vast majority of people in any given historical situation was certain to be illiterate, literacy having been confined to the elite and maybe some of those employed by them and who formed a mere fraction of society. For him the correct approach to an orally derived text "...attempts to appreciate (1) the public performance (2) of a whole discourse or set of discourses focused on issues of common concern (3) to a community gathered for common purposes (4) who in the performance experience certain events verbally enacted and/or are affected by the performance (Horsley, in Horsley & Draper 1999:7).

On the subject of oral traditioning Dunn argues as follows: "I refer to the repeated failure to take seriously the fact that in the initial stages of the traditioning process the tradition must have been *oral* tradition; and thus also the failure to investigate

[University of Pretoria etd – Dannhauser, E H \(2006\)](#)

the character of the tradition in its oral phase, and to ask what its orality must have meant for the transmission of that material” (Dunn 2003:192).

Dunn (2003:149-158) grapples with Kloppenborg on this issue as follows:

- If identification of redaction is difficult in a case where the text of the document (Mark) is firm, how much more so would it be in the case of Q where the text is always a matter of argument and hypothesis.
- Moreover, how is one to distinguish redaction from (initial) composition?
- Dunn (2003:155, 156) poses the question of whether, if a redactor was not troubled by the presence of aporiae and tensions in his final text, an initial compositor of Q have felt any different?
- How can one both argue for the coherence and unity of Q (as proof of its existence), and at the same time argue that internal tensions indicate disunity, without the one argument throwing the other into question?
- “Textual tensions are no clear proof of redactional layers.... Clinical technique here is in danger of running ahead of common sense. That said, I do not deny the plausibility of detecting at least some redaction in the composition of Q....” (Dunn 2003:156).

Dunn (2003:237) finally concludes:

...again and again in the case of “q”/“Q” material we are confronted with traditions within different Synoptics which are clearly related (the same basic teaching), and which were evidently remembered and valued as teaching of Jesus. At the same time, in the cases examined above the relation is not obviously literary, each version derived by editing some written predecessor. The relation is more obviously to be conceived as happening at the oral level. That could mean that these traditions were known to the Evangelists not (or not only) in a written form, but in the living tradition of liturgy or communal celebration of the remembered Jesus. Or it could mean that they knew the tradition from Q, but regarded Q as a form of

University of Pretoria etd – Dannhauser, E H (2006)

oral retelling (that is, they had heard Q material being read/performed), so that their own retelling retained the oral characteristics of the traditioning process.

Dunn furthermore questions what Kloppenborg regards the status of his first layer of Q to be – oral or written, as well as the reason why this should be regarded as a single document, as opposed to different clusters of Jesus' teaching,²⁶ concluding that he would proceed using as a working hypothesis that of Q, as opposed to a stratified one as suggested by Kloppenborg.

Like Horsley he favours a theory of performance of the material, saying that it seemed to be teaching material which had been rehearsed in the regular gatherings of the Q-communities (see Dunn 2003:157). Orality in the transmission process of Q is a matter of importance to him:

What does emerge, however, is some sense of tradition history, of the process by which these traditions were transmitted. This is a process which Catchpole and Allison, for example, would suggest began with Jesus himself, which is indeed probably the case, though the fact that they think in terms of literary editing (rather than of oral transmission) is a further example of a blind spot which still needlessly restricts contemporary perspective on the earliest stages of the history of the Jesus tradition.

(Dunn 2003:160)

Public performances were probably repeated in more than one community. The performed messages were short and had as subject matter the concerns of the community to whom it was addressed. Sayings were embedded in speeches by repetition, at some stage were written down and were then transcribed into a manuscript that might have been used by Matthew and Luke. According to Kelber (In Horsley & Draper 1999:8) orally derived texts such as these "were viewed as

²⁶ In this regard see also Dunn (2003:156, 157).

University of Pretoria etd – Dannhauser, E H (2006)

constituents of a collective cultural enterprise or of a communal memory." These texts were probably repeatedly enacted before a community resonating with the subject matter, and some members of the movement would have repeated the sayings to others. Because of its enactment to a community experiencing conflict or concern, there is an immediate social and historical context. It is necessary to look for these contexts in order to understand the effect of the performative discourse. As examples of performative discourses he cites the renewal of a covenant, the commissioning of envoys for the expansion of the movement, prayer for the Kingdom in order to make it a social reality, pronouncement of woes against the Pharisees and a calling down of divine judgment upon them, as well as the reassurance of those anxious about the necessities of life as examples of performative discourses and says that all of these accomplish far more than the mere repetition of sayings to preserve them in the memory of the people. They also, through what lies behind the mere meaning of the words, consolidate communities of people and help them in times of crisis to hold on to their solidarity and purpose. This happens when oral performance fits in with cultural tradition in a particular context: "Performance is the enabling event, tradition the enabling referent" (Horsley & Draper 1999:8). Horsley says that scholars of oral-derived literature have detected the importance of the cultural tradition for the effectiveness of oral performance and the necessity, therefore, for the modern interpreter to immerse himself as thoroughly as possible in the tradition with which an oral-derived text resonates. In the words of Foley (1994:171):

Each work of verbal art is nourished by an ever-impinging set of unspoken but implicitly articulated assumptions shared among the discourse community. To remove the event from the biosphere of tradition is therefore to sap its cognitive lifeblood, to deprive it of very obvious potential for conveying meaning, to silence the echoes that reverberate through it...What will be required...is an informed audience alive to their illocutionary force, auditors who can invest the extended utterance with its due heritage of performative meaning. Without that experience and ability no reader or auditor can construe the map of textual signals in traditional context...Once such an audience has been "written out of

University of Pretoria etd – Dannhauser, E H (2006)
existence” by decades of exclusively textual discourse, ...it is left to scholars to re-establish analytically - and artificially – what we can of the lost context of oral tradition.

And Kelber (1994:159) writes:

We must learn to think of a large part of tradition as an extratextual phenomenon [shared experiences, etc.]....Tradition in this encompassing sense is a circumambient contextuality or biosphere in which speaker and hearers live. It includes texts and experiences transmitted through or derived from texts. But it is anything but reducible to intertextuality. Tradition in this broadest sense is largely an invisible nexus of references and identities from which people draw sustenance, in which in which they live, and in relation to which they make sense of their lives. This invisible biosphere is at once the most elusive and the foundational feature of tradition.

He firmly believes in the case of Jesus addressing the people of Galilee that this tradition was definitely Israelite, although many arguments for a predominantly Hellenistic Greek cultural tradition have been made. Throughout his explanation of his views concerning Q he shows how this statement applies, and makes it clear that it was popular Israelite tradition over against the great Israelite tradition that had its origin in scribal circles.

The historical context is Hellenistic Judea and Galilee under Roman rule with the Herodians and wealthy and powerful high-priestly families of Jerusalem the rulers on behalf of the Romans. The Pharisees and scribes were mediators between these power-players and the people, most of who lived in agrarian villages and conducted their own community affairs according to Israelite traditions.

University of Pretoria etd – Dannhauser, E H (2006)

AJ Saldarini (1988:4, 5) states:

The Pharisees, scribes and Sadducees as a variety of Jew, as thinkers and as leaders must be seen as part of Palestinian Jewish society and accurately located and described in relationship with other Jewish leaders and social movements from 200 B.C.E. to 100 C.E. Jewish leaders included the high priest, the chief priests, elders and notables who were probably the recognized heads of prominent families at the local and national level. These leaders were assisted by several groups whom Gerhard Lenski identifies as retainers (see ch. 3). Retainers included the bureaucrats, soldiers and functionaries associated with the Hasmoneans, the Herods and the Romans as well as the Temple servants and officers associated with the chief priests. It is among the retainers that we shall find the scribes and most of the Pharisees. The Sadducees were members of the governing class, according to Josephus, but we know little more of their roles in society.

G Vermes (2003:10, 11) writes that circumstances in the first century had not been normal: “An eschatological and politico-religious fever was always close to the point of eruption, if it had not already exploded, an Galilee was a hotbed of nationalist ferment.” And later:

But for the representatives of the establishment – Herod Antipas in Galilee, and the chief priests and their council in Jerusalem – the prime unenviable task was to maintain law and order and thus avert a major catastrophe. In their eyes, revolutionary propaganda was not only against the law of the Roman provincial administration, but also murderously foolish, contrary to the national interest, and liable to expose to the vengeance of the invincible emperor not only those actively implicated, but countless thousands of their innocent

University of Pretoria etd – Dannhauser, E H (2006)

compatriots. They had to be silenced in one way or another, by persuasion or by force, before it was too late.

(Vermes 2003:11)

Apart from all these rifts between rulers and subjects, there furthermore existed regional differences between the Galileans and the Jerusalemites for whom the focus of their political, economic and religious lives centred around the Temple.

On this topic Vermes (2003:4,5) makes several illuminating remarks: The Galilean context is very important seeing that Jesus spent his early years as well as the greatest part of his public life there, leaving it, if the chronology of the synoptic gospels with their chronology of a one-year ministry is to be taken at face-value, only once for the fateful journey to Jerusalem at Passover. He writes that this was a rich and mostly agricultural region. “The inhabitants were proud of their independence and jealous of their Jewishness, in which regard, despite doubts often expressed by Judeans, they considered themselves second to none. They were also brave and tough. Josephus, the commander-in-chief of the region during the first Jewish War, praises their courage, and describes them as people ‘from infancy inured to war’ (BJ iii.41)” (2003:4).

In the mountainous regions of Upper Galilee rebellion against the government – any government, be it Hasmonean, Herodian or Roman – had been brewing from the middle of the first century BCE to 70CE. “In short, the Galileans were admired as staunch fighters by those who sympathized with their rebellious aims; those who did not, thought of them as dangerous hot-heads” (Vermes 2003:4).

In Jerusalem their reputation was not a good one: branded as an unsophisticated people and referred to in rabbinic parlance by the derogatory term “*Gelili shoteh*”, or “stupid Galilean”, perceived as “peasants”, “boors”, “*am ha-arez*”, they were cut off from the Temple and the study centres of Jerusalem, so that Galilean popular religion appears to have relied “not so much on the authority of the priests or on the scholarship of scribes, as on the magnetism of their local saints like Jesus, younger contemporary, Hanina ben Dosa...” (Vermes 2003:5).

[University of Pretoria etd – Dannhauser, E H \(2006\)](#)

In these three respects, politics, religion and economy, there existed complex structural divisions in ancient Roman Palestine and Israelite tradition was far from unitary. Horsley believes that Q discourses were grounded in the popular tradition of Israel and not the "official" Jerusalem-based tradition, which further complicates matters. Over against recent scholarly interpretation, especially American, of Q, which found important similarities with Hellenistic Greek literature, he reiterates the pervasive presence of Israelite tradition in Q. He categorically states that his studies of Q have led him to the conclusion that what we have in Q are performative speeches of the renewal of the covenant and mission in a popular movement and not sapiential teaching originating from sages and scribes which have partially solidified into this genre of literature. He says that because Q 6:20-49 and 9:57-10:16 are the longest and most schematic discourses and because their purpose as well as their performance context is inherent in them, he chose to begin with a scrutiny of these discourses. Starting off with Q 6:20-49 he immediately refutes the two main gripes he experiences with the findings of common scholarly assumptions, namely that:

- a) the contents of Q are overwhelmingly sapiential and
- b) the sayings of Jesus were separate aphorisms and admonitions saying that these can be supported by neither argument nor evidence.

Horsley joins Kloppenborg in opposing the first of these. Kloppenborg writes on the topic of the form of the beatitudes that it

...is common in sapiential literature. But...the beatitudes of Jesus are not simple moral or religious exhortations of wisdom; they are proclamations of eschatological salvation. And unlike both sapiential beatitudes and the majority of those found in apocalyptic books, the beatitudes do not function as conditions of salvation or admonitions concerning how one ought to act; instead they pronounce blessings upon a group defined by social and economic circumstances: poverty, hunger, sorrow and persecution. In Q they pronounce blessing upon the community. Even though the Q beatitudes should be

University of Pretoria etd – Dannhauser, E H (2006)
 considered as a development beyond both sapiential and
 apocalyptic beatitudes, they share many structural features of
 the sapiential beatitude....

(Kloppenborg 1987:188)

3.2 A prophet bent on covenant-renewal? Q 6:20-49

Form-critical considerations back up what Horsley concluded from the substance and tone of these texts, namely that we here encounter covenantal blessings rather than sapiential macarisms. He stresses the importance of the Mosaic covenant that seems to have functioned as an unwritten "constitution" that unified Israel and likens the key biblical texts of the Mosaic covenant in form to treaties from Hittite emperors to their subject kings and in the absence of a central government in Israel the purpose of the covenant is for the people to observe the stipulations on the grounds of God's gracious deliverance of his people. The Mosaic covenant thus had a very prominent role to perform and was renewed and recited repeatedly in biblical history, particularly in times of historical turmoil.

Dunn (2003:506) writes emotively on this topic:

If it is indeed the case that behind the Greek *metanoeo* is the Hebrew *sub...*, then it should not escape notice that the call to "repent" was a call to "return". This was a frequent appeal in the prophets, including but by no means only the return necessary if the scattered of Israel were to be restored to the land. Particularly poignant was the repeated call of Jeremiah 3: "return, apostate Israel", "return, apostate sons" (3.12, 14, 22). In all cases the appeal was to Israel as a whole to keep covenant with their God, ...Similarly, the call to "trust"...has covenantal overtones" to rely on Yahweh, on his commitment to his people. The covenantal implications are evident in all the biblical passages...and Deut. 32.20....We may conclude confidently, then, that any call of Jesus to "repent and believe"

University of Pretoria etd – Dannhauser, E H (2006)

would have been heard by his hearers as a reiteration of the prophetic call to the people of Israel to return to their God and trust him afresh.

Covenantal tradition also underwent development. Already in Deuteronomy we see that teachings mention the way of death and the way of life as well as blessings and curses resulting from the way one chose. Scribal circles furthermore identified with Mosaic covenantal materials that formed part of what later became the Torah and identified their traditionally cultivated wisdom with the Torah. So Horsley detects both of these development-strains in the collection of wisdom discourses to be found in Proverbs 1-9 and in Sirach 24 where Wisdom is personified as a heavenly figure. In this way he argues that what seems to be purely sapiential material may have been shaped by covenantal teaching.

Notable are the socio-economic-political concerns of covenantal teaching and the numerous biblical references indicating that these weren't merely ideas and theory, but that the covenant was operative in the life of Israel, indeed, that its functioning in village life appears to be presupposed by the periodic *prophetic protests* about its violation by the ruling elite. Of primary importance for the motivation of his theory is also his argument that the Qumran texts contain many covenantal motifs and that the document in its totality displays the structure of the traditional Mosaic covenant and its renewal. This argument opens the way for him to conclude that the clear presence of covenantal influence as late as the Qumran document indicates "...both that Mosaic covenantal forms were alive and well in second-temple Judean society and that those forms were adapted in response to new historical crises to which Judean groups were responding" (Horsley, in Horsley & Draper 1999:207, 208).

Covenantal forms had, however, undergone an evolution in some important aspects. Firstly blessings and curses were no longer motivation for adhering to the covenant in an exclusive to God and the prescribed social relations among the people of Israel. Instead it had now become the distinguishing factor between those outside the group and those within to reassure them of their status as the

[University of Pretoria etd – Dannhauser, E H \(2006\)](#)

elect, as those favoured by his grace and redemption. And because of the latter's loyalty and total commitment to God and to the prescribed social relations among themselves, a declaration of present and/or future salvation by God replaces or complements his salvation in the past.

Secondly the opening statements of the Community Rule are, Horsley states, explicitly for ceremonial procedure and it is clear from other passages that oral enactments occurred regularly in the community. His conclusion drawn from this is that the renewal of the Mosaic covenant was undoubtedly ceremonially enacted and that the master and/or priests and Levites orally instructed the community in the covenant. "The priests and Levites were literally 'blessing' God and ceremonially 'blessing the men of the lot of God' and literally pronouncing 'curses on all the men of the lot of Belial'" (Horsley, in Horsley & Draper 1999:209). The yearly performed, orally enacted renewal of the covenant within the community had been preserved by literate scribes who had written it down.

Thirdly he detects a number of themes and features in the Community rule which resembles those in the covenant renewal discourse within Q. With regards to Q, connections, catchwords and the development of themes, all show coherency and refute the theory of independent, separate aphorisms. Parallels to Q in 1 Clement, Didache and Polycarp's Letter to the Philippians point to oral derivation and throw serious doubt on assumptions of original independence of these sayings. Close literary and compositional analyses furthermore show coherency in these discourses. And the beatitudes are no exception, thanks to the newly acquired availability of a document from Qumran, 4 Q 525, containing a series of five or more two-line blessings (Horsley, in Horsley & Draper 1999:197) indicating that this rhetorical pattern had become a standard one well before the time of Jesus. He subsequently analyses Q6: 20-49 as Covenant Renewal Discourse and points out that Jesus in this discourse pronounces blessings and curses before the covenantal teaching, a departure from the original Mosaic covenant in which blessings and curses formed the sanctioning closing step. This indicates to him how Jesus is simultaneously drawing upon, transforming and renewing the covenantal tradition. In the Mosaic covenant the reminder of God's deliverance in the past precedes and motivates the principles of socio-economic

University of Pretoria etd – Dannhauser, E H (2006)

relations. It was malleable enough to be used in the style of Nehemiah 9-10 for the centralization of religious-economic power as well as on the other side of the spectrum by the Judean and Galilean peasantry for the maintenance of Israelite families in economic viability on their ancestral land and their ongoing membership of the local village communities.

At whichever point in the social spectrum these covenantal requirements and ordinances functioned, the blessings and curses would motivate the observance thereof. Evidence is to be found in both Mark and Matthew that "...[I]n a well-intentioned attempt to encourage the people's keeping of the covenantal Torah, the scribes apparently pointed to the people's own suffering as evidence of their previous disobedience" (Horsley, in Horsley & Draper 1999:218). Horsley is of the opinion that Jesus, in the discourse under discussion, would have resonated with people blaming themselves for sickness, misfortune, poverty, the battle of daily subsistence and whatever was amiss in their lives and thinking themselves insignificant and unworthy. These people, the peasants, were the substance producers and as such had a multitude of oppressive revenue demands made upon them by the hierarchy of rulers lording it over them. It is to people such as these that Jesus offers blessings and the comfort of the kingdom of God.

The curses apply to those believed to be blessed; the rich, in a new and imminent act of deliverance by God to restore justice. This then provides the motivation for a renewal of the covenantal demands. *Of importance is also the reference to the prophets in the fourth pronouncement of blessing, obviously indicating that the participants in this movement identified with the prophetic tradition and saw the movement as a continuation of the prophetic movement.* When read within their literary and social context, the sayings beginning with "Love your enemies", the slap on the cheek which is an insult and not a physical attack and the seizure of the garment all refer to economic relations and not to non-resistance or non-violence to a foreign enemy.

The plight of the poor was a matter of utmost concern in the economic provisions of the Mosaic covenant, its law code, as well as ongoing teachings on the covenantal laws of which we find evidence in Leviticus and Deuteronomy. When

[University of Pretoria etd – Dannhauser, E H \(2006\)](#)

we read the "love your enemies, do good to those who hate you" of Q 6:29-36 these words echo the very essence of the traditional line of covenantal teaching, building on it and renewing it in a way that would recall the covenantal teachings of the past to the minds of those who listened to them, echoing Leviticus 19:18. Horsley cites the example of Exodus 23:4-5 and Deuteronomy 22:1-4 which commands that upon meeting the ox or donkey of the enemy lying down under its burden, one should help him lift it and refrain from simply leaving him with it. When we read in closing: "...be merciful as your Father is merciful", it immediately evokes the memory of Leviticus 19:2: "Be holy because I, the Lord your God, am holy." So for instance is "neighbour" the term used in both law code and covenantal teaching for a fellow member of the Israelite community and "enemy" or "the one who hates you" for a neighbour with whom you have developed a conflictual relationship.

Based on the promise that the listeners in Q would inherit the kingdom of God, Q's Jesus demands even greater rigor in these covenantal commands pertaining to economic relations than the traditional. In this vein he asks that if the creditor were to seize the outer garment of the debtor, the latter should relinquish the undergarment as well, so standing naked before him and embarrassing him. Loving one's brother also means not judging and good fruits of proper socio-economic interaction should flow from the heart, the source of behaviour. All of these stand in firm covenantal tradition and recall to mind well-known proverbs or metaphors.

To conclude: Q's Jesus addresses people in dire economic straits who, because of the heavy burdens of taxation and demands from rulers, barely subsist. He addresses villagers who are already in debt and unable to repay their creditors and others who are reluctant or unwilling to lend and eager to collect debts owed to them. To such as these last Jesus in Q addresses admonitions to carry economic responsibility for one another, to "do good" and to "lend", in short, to imitate their merciful Father, who gives to them, the poor and hungry, his kingdom. And, just as the covenant encouraged the keeping of the commandments by concluding with blessings and curses, so does Q 6:46-49, Q 6:20b-26, already having opened up this covenantal discourse, offer positive

University of Pretoria etd – Dannhauser, E H (2006)

results, just as a house built upon the rock, to those who adhere to these words of Jesus. However, disaster is spelled out for those who do not, just as a house built upon sand. The end is a sanction of the preceding covenantal teaching.

3.3 An image of a commissioning emissary

When Horsley focuses on the so-called "Mission Discourse" - Q 10:2-16, once again stressing the importance of reading it in its context and taking the whole of the discourse into consideration, he comes to the conclusion that neither the hypothesis of "...the homeless lifestyle of 'itinerant radicalism'", nor the similarities drawn between what is wanted from the persons addressed and the sedentary ancient Cynic philosophers are justified or grounded in contextual fact. One cannot interpret, as some scholars do, either this discourse or Q as a whole, as requirements for discipleship, nor can one label it a collection for charismatic missionaries and a new missionary direction, maybe even with inherent judgment, away from the Jews and towards the Gentiles.

According to Horsley this discourse, as also the rest of Q, are not isolated sayings, but should be seen within the context of a discourse and discourse series which add up to Q in its totality. So the Mission Discourse actually commissions envoys for preaching and healing village by village. "Sending" is what holds together this discourse and he who sends them is also the sent. The sending statement is followed by instructions on what to take and what not, on where to stay and what to eat, and how to react to welcoming or rejection by towns and places on their journey.

The total focus and scope of the Mission discourse is prophetic: The new movement was passionately concerned with spreading through the villages and towns of Israel the news and manifestation of the kingdom of God. For this prophetic representatives of Jesus were needed and the Mission discourse commissions likely candidates: "This mission and the workers involved in it were understood in prophetic terms, a prophetic extension of Jesus' own prophetic mission by a prophetic movement" (Horsley, in Horsley & Draper 1999:248). *He compares this discourse to the prophetic movement aimed at the renewal of*

University of Pretoria etd – Dannhauser, E H (2006)

Israel which was led by Elijah but participated in by not only Elisha but hundreds of bene-nabi'im and which, as told of in 1 Kings 18, was repressed by the rulers.

The closing statement of this discourse seems to motivate and authorize it from the backdrop of the well-known Israelite tradition of the prophetic commissioning of Elisha by Elijah, to pass onto him the prophetic mission for the restoration of Israel. Horsley maintains that "...the early Jesus movement(s) were keenly aware of the similarities of both Jesus and John to Elijah, the great prophet of Israel's renewal" (Horsley, in Horsley & Hanson 1999:238).

The first introductory dialogue of the Mission Discourse refers, according to him, to the political-economic situation of ordinary people and/or Jesus in contrast to that of beasts and animals of prey and/or people's predatory oppressors. He warns on the one hand against the assumption of a christological meaning within the "son of man" used here, saying that it may refer to any number of things in Q, one of these being to the broader humanity. But on the other hand he says that within the wider context of Q with its references to Jesus through this title, it might here refer to Jesus himself. He therefore conflates the two, saying that the term here may refer to both humanity and Jesus or to Jesus as a representative figure. Foxes are the contrasting images, referring to prowling, invasive, destructive, "repugnant" creatures.

He also alludes to the reference in Luke where Jesus refers to Herod Antipas as "that fox". The birds he assumes to be birds of prey, devouring carcasses. Both of these parties have secure dwellings. By contrast Jesus/the people have no house or home whatsoever, depicting gross injustice. This introductory speech clearly echoes the opening of the preceding covenantal discourse: "blessed are the poor, ... woe to the rich, ..." and would without a doubt resonate with "...hungry and indebted Galilean villagers required to render up tax revenues to Herod Antipas, from which he had reconstructed the new city of Tiberias, with his own luxurious palace on the hill above the city" (Horsley, in Horsley & Draper 1999:240). It thus highlights the deep contrast between on the one hand Herod Antipas in his royal palace by implication and on the other hand the people and their prophet who have no home.

[University of Pretoria etd – Dannhauser, E H \(2006\)](#)

In the second and third dialogues he surmises that the statements "Leave the dead to bury their own dead" and "No one who puts his hand on the plough and looks back is fit for the kingdom of God" to refer to the calling of Elisha by Elijah as his assistant and successor in his prophetic endeavours to bring about renewal in Israel. In connection to the first of these he reminds the reader of the importance in the given context of the burial of the dead even cited in the Mishnah as of more importance than reciting the Shema. The burial of a deceased parent was a solemn obligation, implying in capital letters and by making use of hyperbole/metaphor, that this mission for which they are being called is of such importance and urgency as to be rendered to have precedence over that obligation of supreme importance and gravest urgency. Even more important is his following statement: "In both Jeremiah and Ezekiel we catch sight of how a violation of the sacred obligation to bury the dead was used as a prophetic sign" (Horsley, in Horsley & Draper 1999:241). He is referring here to Jeremiah 16:1-8 and Ezekiel 24:15-24. By contrast, in the call of Elisha by Elijah to which this dialogue alludes, Elisha is permitted by Elijah to go and kiss his father and mother. This mission however, supersedes the one of Elisha in importance, therefore the refusal in this case of a request to perform or comply with a filial obligation so important as to be sanctioned by the Mishnah. The reason for this urgency is not individually conceived discipleship but the mission of preaching and realizing the kingdom in Israel.

The third dialogue also alludes to the calling of Elisha by Elijah in which Elijah throws his mantle over Elisha in a symbolic gesture while the latter is ploughing. The Q-dialogue, however, uses the ploughing image to signify the mission to which then listeners are called instead of the activity that has been left behind, thus recalling but creating contrast. So furthermore is Elisha allowed to take leave of his family, whereas now the urgency of the mission is such that it is not even permitted to look back. What is required for this mission of Jesus is total dedication to the task (9:62), despite separation from the family (9:60) and travelling without permanent residence (9:58?; 10:4, 5-7)" (Horsley, in Horsley & Draper 1999:241).

University of Pretoria etd – Dannhauser, E H (2006)

Prophetic tradition as well as, in continuation, Jewish apocalyptic literature after the time of Jesus and Q, employs the imagery of a harvest in a long-standing tradition for judgment. "Harvesting" in the broader Q context and in this mission discourse in particular means that the ingathering would take place now that the right time has, at long last, dawned and the implication that those who reject the message of the kingdom and the healing of this mission in doing so bring judgment upon themselves. It is furthermore important that the movement/community that Jesus and John the Baptist have established, merely initiated the work, but that much remains as yet undone and that "workers" are required, (this being a term apparently used in Palestine for the expanders of the Jesus-movement, see 2 Cor 11:13, Phil 3:2, Mt 20:1-16.)

The mission is apparently to Israel with no extension to the gentiles implied. In lieu of this he considers it highly probable that Matthew 10:5b and possibly even 10:6 belonged to this discourse. He furthermore sees in Matthew's emphatic "I" in the parallel to Luke 10:3 in which the "I" had probably been deleted because it is obsolete in the Greek, an indication of a prophetic form in this sending or commission. The image of sheep among the wolves was a standard one within Israelite tradition and would have resonated with the audience. It was traditionally used to indicate the Jews among the hostile Gentiles and usually understood here to be a kind of inversion to indicate Christian emissaries among the hostile Jews or even a failed mission to Israel. Horsley understands it to mean the Jews straining under "oppressive, predatory rulers" (Horsley, in Horsley & Draper 1999:245). He cites several examples of extortion, violence, even murder charged to the address of rulers and Pharisees. This image expresses vulnerability, the potential political trouble that envoys might evoke on the possible success of their mission. For success could bring them to the attention of the rulers and might pose a threat to the powers that be. *Parallel to the prophets of the past who had been killed by the Jerusalem authorities, these prophetic messengers are sent out "as lambs among the wolves" and a similar fate may await them.*

These prophetic envoys are instructed to leave behind all the appropriate equipment in a prophetic sign that this movement for the renewal of Israel and

University of Pretoria etd – Dannhauser, E H (2006)

the kingdom it announces are for the poor. After the instructions on what not to take and the response to the welcoming or rejection by the household, there follow traditional prophetic forms introduced typically by "I tell you" and "Woe to", and the names of places which resonate with symbolic places of divine wrath, judgment and destruction from Israel's prophetic tradition, wherein God speaks through Jesus. Now, in an ironic hypothesis, these cities of ill-repute turn repentant while Bethsaida and Chorazin, two of the very cities that might have resented Tyre and Sidon for their exploitation of their peasant inhabitants, remains unrepentant. This stark irony serves to emphasize the shameful of their unrepentant, recalcitrant attitude.

In Q "Kyrios" mainly refers to Jesus, here it refers to God who is the Lord of the harvest, the "immediate sender of envoys" who has commissioned Jesus. However, there seems to be no discrepancy between these two names and functions, but rather a functional equivalent. The closing statement of the Q mission discourse in an antithetical parallelism is the summary and completion of the discourse, bringing the motifs of reception or rejection to a close. The primary concern here is not with the rejection of the envoys, but rather with their authority stemming from "... the intimate and direct representative relationship between Jesus and the prophetic Q envoys" (Horsley, in Horsley & Draper 1999:248).

Horsley concludes that we have here a mission discourse that was performed to communities within a movement, a fundamental concern of which was expansion. God's kingdom had to be announced and manifested and this meant that helpers had to be enlisted as "prophetic representatives" of Jesus in the conveyance of his message, his acts of healing and the support given to the community. *The healing aspect of this mission stands firmly rooted in the tradition of the renewal of Israel by the great northern Israelite prophets of history, Elijah and Elisha. The whole discourse is infused and saturated with prophetic allusions, clearly in continuation with the classic prophets and prophecies of old.*

He peruses several more passages, concluding that they similarly resonate with Israelite tradition of covenant-making and the prophetic mission of renewal for

[University of Pretoria etd – Dannhauser, E H \(2006\)](#)

Israel. In a conflation they can be seen as addressing problematic relations and concerns in the fields of politics, economy and religion in the Palestine communities of the movement in the late second Temple. They condemn the Jerusalem rulers and their representatives and announce and realise the kingdom of God in the village communities. An interesting example of pertinence to this is Q 7:18-35 with its metonymic references to the exodus and covenant and the prophetic tradition. He sees in the list of images in 7:23 a possible reference to the preaching and healing activities of Jesus, but to a far greater extent a definite echoing of the tradition of longing for God's new action to end oppression and bring restoration to his people.

From what he calls the "prophetic anthology that comprises the book of Isaiah" (such as Is 26:19, 29:18- 21, 42:6-7, and 61:1) he cites several passages. The allusions to the wilderness similarly speaks of prophetic déjà vu recalling escape from oppression in Egypt and the subsequent wonder-filled trek through the wilderness, place of purification and preparation where the covenant had been given to Moses. He refers to Josephus reporting that several "Moses-like and/or Joshua-like prophets" (Horsley, in Horsley & Draper 1999:264) emerged in villages of Judea in the middle of the first century, who led their followers out into the wilderness "...to experience the anticipated new deliverance by God.... In 'going out into the wilderness' the crowds would clearly have been seeing and hearing a prophet like Moses and/or Elijah, the paradigmatic founder and restorer of Israel as a covenantal society under its divine ruler whose main concern was to free them from unjust and oppressive human rulers" (Horsley, in Horsley & Draper 1999:265).

These prophets were contemporaries of John the Baptist and Jesus and there were a sufficiency of them to justify the assumption that an act of going out into the wilderness such as is mentioned here, would be interpreted by hoi polloi as prophetic in the tradition of Moses and/or Elijah, founders and restorers of Israel as people of the covenant and therefore free from social injustice and oppressive rule. This is underlined by statements such as "A prophet, indeed more than a prophet" and "Behold, I am sending my messenger in front of you, who will prepare your way before you." The "Lord's Prayer" and "...the accompanying

University of Pretoria etd – Dannhauser, E H (2006)

exhortation to petition God boldly for the kingdom” (Horsley, in Horsley & Draper 1999:267) focus on concrete day-to-day economic necessities such as bread, the staple food of the peasant, and the cancellation of debt, while the following mini-parable mentions bread and fish, another of the most basic foods consumed by the peasants. "The Q discourse on prayer...is instruction of whole communities to petition God, in precisely the short prayer in 11:2-4, to effect the kingdom by providing for the most concrete concerns of villagers: food for subsistence and the cancellation of debts, which threatened the viability of the peasant household in the moral economy of the peasantry" (Horsley, in Horsley & Draper 1999:267). So 11:2-4 as well as the admonitions in 6:27-35 are direct and explicit references to the Israelite covenantal tradition of economic principles which had as their aim keeping Israelite families economically viable on their land and remaining members of the village communities constituting Israel.

Another important aspect of Horsley's thinking is that he believes the Q-communities to have been under attack. In Q 12:2-12 he believes evidence is to be found that the movement was under attack and embroiled in intense political-religious conflict with the rulers/representatives of Israel. Typical of leaders threatened by the popularity and increasing influence of another leader under the people, this latter person is vilified and slandered by the leaders, this of course being the case of the Pharisees accusing Jesus of being an emissary of the devil. When the communities are urged not to fear those who could kill the body, it means by implication that they are to bear witness of Jesus' tidings flying fearlessly in the face of the judgment, threats and (he believes very real) attacks from the powers that be and trusting in the evidence of God's unwavering care for the lesser creatures.

Community members may well be sent out as sheep among wolves (this of course being a metaphor for the rulers) as we have on good authority that retribution and punitive action was swift to quell those dangerous popular movements of prophetic or messianic nature which could easily incite a restless people. Isaiah 40 and 1 Kings 22 describe prophetic visionary experiences in which historical political interactions and altercations were mirrored in God's court in heaven, just as Q 12:8-9 mirrors a human judgment scene. These acted as

[University of Pretoria etd – Dannhauser, E H \(2006\)](#)

incentives to persevere in the resistance against rulers even to the point of enduring martyrdom until the day in which God would resolve their historical crisis in judgment of those oppressive rulers and the vindication of his people.

It does not seem likely that the trials mentioned were fictitious. Not all "prophetic" or "apocalyptic" sayings were directed against outsiders. Mention is made of sudden judgment, symbolizing the day of the Son of man and this is directed at members of the Q community itself to urge them to maintain community discipline and adhere to their purpose in the renewal of Israel; the renewal of Israel over against its rulers. In the Galilee and Judea of Jesus' time a chasm existed on socio-economic level between the rulers and the ruled. Moreover there was a pronounced historical regional as well as a political-economic-religious divide between Jerusalem and Galilee where the Q-document originated.

Layers of rulers; Roman, Herodian and Jerusalem high-priestly, imposed cumbersome tributes, taxes and tithes on villages and families, threatening their viability, ancestral heritage and participation in community life. Q's prophetic overtones against high-priestly aristocracy can be discerned in the Q prophetic materials, condemning them for their injustices perpetrated against the people and mirroring the general dissent in Palestine against the Jerusalem rulers, the scribes and the Pharisees. The Lord's Prayer addresses this when it mentions a cancellation of debts by implication incurred when demands from ruling classes could not be met. Other passages urging people to cancel debts, to love enemies and to be prepared to lend are related to this issue, as are curses against the "sons of the pit" and the "wicked priest". He furthermore sees them, like the covenant renewal discourses, as performative utterances.

The chasm that existed between these regions and groupings pertained not only to their status-quo, but also to their visions for the future restoration of Israel. There was a commonality in their dreams, namely the restoration of the twelve tribes and the establishment of a just society. The rulers and Pharisees envisioned themselves as playing an integral part in the governing of society together with their king, whereas Israelite peasantry were longing to be free and sovereign to operate their own communities according to the principles of the Mosaic covenant.

[University of Pretoria etd – Dannhauser, E H \(2006\)](#)

For the latter the rulers and their representatives were not only redundant but undesirable as perceived "agents of injustice".

In prophetic woes and laments against the Pharisees, Horsley sees a continuation with earlier Israelite prophets and a reverberation of generations of covenantal tradition. He categorically denies that they could be abstract discussions of piety and ethics, but interprets them to be an indictment on Pharisees and scribal elite "...that had been entrusted (since the Hasmoneans, according to Josephus) with the guardianship, cultivation, and interpretation of the 'great' or official tradition based in Jerusalem...." (Horsley, in Horsley & Draper 1999:288) and were abusing this trust in social-political issues. These were grave charges, meant to be taken seriously and referring regularly to the slaying of prophets in history and the "...contemporary cultivation of memorials to martyred prophets of the past" (Horsley, in Horsley & Draper 1999:291).

3.4 The backdrop: A sweeping scope: Reflections on genre, context and origin

The fervour among scholars to define and exercise control over Q as a written document when it was still considered to be a collection of sayings has, according to Horsley, inspired incorrect deductions that its germination genre was a collection of sayings from the sages and this in turn led to the assumption that it may be compared to Near Eastern instructional collections originating from scribal and palace schools. It is, however, clear that Q was definitely counter-establishment in its attack on scribes and Pharisees of the Judaeen Temple-state establishment. This implies that the genre of this collection must rather be sought in the more elite instructional literary types ordinarily associated with Near-Eastern scribal schools and furthermore that the composers had to have been not-establishment yet literate intellectuals. The wealth of agricultural imagery found in Q initially suggests a peasant audience, but if this relatively learned genre of a characteristically scribal nature is to be selected, a different social location for the germination and forming of this document will have to be found.

University of Pretoria etd – Dannhauser, E H (2006)

He reminds his reader of Kloppenborg's description of Q as much more than sayings strung together, but rather as a collection which speaks of literary organization, gathered into coherent groupings (see Kloppenborg 1987:89,90).

This underlines the importance of not abstracting or isolating sayings or clusters of sayings from their concrete communication situations for their meaning in themselves only, but questions as to their function or significance in those very situations should be asked and answered as far as possible with the help of the key aspects of communication, namely the communication context, the register and the cultural tradition out of which the text can be understood. He suggests that the scholar find the key to the situation of the receptors and the nature of the performers who recited these words within the text itself: The key to determining the situation of the people who heard and resonated to the text recited or performed at its register, analysed according to its key features in the communication context: its field (what is happening), its tenor (between whom), as well as its mode.

Attending to cues of the registers of Q discourses should enable us to obtain a sense of the more general communication contexts, such as covenant renewal and prayer. The texts of particular discourses then may provide more detailed indications of the particular situation of the Q people who heard them. By reviewing the discussion of Q discourses in the preceding chapters, it should be possible to develop a composite sketch of the situation of the Q people who listened and resonated to those discourses, before considering the performers who recited them.

(Horsley, in Horsley & Draper 1999:295)

Thus he sees Q 11:2-4, 9-13 as instruction in prayer for the kingdom of God to the people. The contents of the prayer and the admonitions that follow, tell of an urgency in the situation of the people being thus instructed. The principal prayer is for the kingdom of God, but is paralleled in the second and third petitions by prayer for simply the means to subsist; bread and the cancellation of debts. This once

University of Pretoria etd – Dannhauser, E H (2006)

again tells of people hungry and indebted, initially marginalized economically but now in desperate straits and longing for the meagre means to enable them to live the simple life of the peasant, people already so poor that they worry about basic necessities such as food and clothing. There is no indication that these are exhortations to voluntary poverty. "The Q discourses are addressed to and are concerned not simply (or primarily) with individual piety and morality but with community social-economic life....The communities of Q understood themselves as part of a larger movement of renewal of Israel" (Horsley & Draper 1999:297).

What endures in oral tradition is what is really pertinent to the situation of the hearers, therefore the discourse encouraging the hearers to fearless confession when being led to the test of standing trial before authorities with the jurisdiction to have them executed, speaks of a real threat in their circumstances. The Q-people's stance over against the Jerusalem rulers and their scribal-Pharisaic representatives formed part of their sense of identity and mission of the Q people as communities in a movement for the renewal of Israel. "In all of this material the register is that of prophetic condemnation of rulers or their officers for exploitation and oppression of the people" (Horsley & Draper 1999:298).

A reading of Q as setting itself over against all Israel in condemnation of their lack of faith and its rejection of Jesus and/or the Q-people's message is determined, according to Horsley, by a standard Christian theological view of the separation of Christianity as a universal religion from Judaism as a parochial religion. The true political-economic-religious situation of the Q-people is, however, one of conflict between opulently wealthy and powerful rulers and their "retainers" on the one hand and the *hoi polloi* on the other, compounded by historical regional differences and a long-standing cultural heritage of northern Israelite conflict with Jerusalem rule.

The Q-discourses are addressed to members of a movement for the renewal of Israel over against the Jerusalem rulers and their scribal representatives who feel themselves to be secure and superior because of their lineage and privileged position, articulated in a set of woes against the scribes and Pharisees for their extortion of the people and the heavy burdens with which they weighed them down.

[University of Pretoria etd – Dannhauser, E H \(2006\)](#)

"This generation" is being condemned for their killing of God's prophets and his other envoys in a way reminiscent of prophetic oracles or laments in biblical books indicating abusive power relations. The prophets of the imminent fulfilment of God's promises, namely John and Jesus, will vindicate the wisdom of God in spite of the attacks on them.

The performers of the Q discourses were spokesmen for Jesus (and John) and also spoke about them. This is clear to Horsley from Q 10:16: "[W]hoever hears you, hears me." And as they were speaking for Jesus (and John), so the envoys were being commissioned by them to become new prophetic delegates. In these performative speeches the Q-performers enact what was spoken; renew the covenant, pronounce condemnation over the Pharisees, lament the imminent desolation of Jerusalem, commission envoys, admonish to bold confession under trial and exhorts to cease worrying about the necessities of/for daily life, etc. He considers these performers to be "early Christian prophets" (Horsley & Draper 1999:301). Horsley emphasizes that in no case was Q material transmitted from individual to individual, rather were the discourses repeatedly performed before the same audiences, probably by local leaders residing within the communities, rather, he says, like the assemblies (*synagogai*) of village communities in Galilee and elsewhere.

He adds that the Q-document has recently come to be understood as having come from a Jesus-movement distinct from the mission of Paul or the community or movement connected with the Gospel of Mark. This has led to more particular focus on Q and its distinguishing traits and has brought to light an absence of Jesus' death, resurrection and heavenly exaltation in this document. Jesus as the exalted Lord simply does not feature in Q. The Jesus that speaks through the Q-performer(s) speaks with the authority given him by the Father, is called *kyrios* and proclaims the kingdom and the renewal of Israel, but the *kyrios* is not a christological title for Jesus nor is he a transcendent emperor exalted to heaven.

Jesus continues to speak with authority through the performer(s) of the Q discourses. Whatever dichotomy may have been felt by Paul or another Jesus movement between

University of Pretoria etd – Dannhauser, E H (2006)

the remembered and recited words of Jesus as a historical figure of the past and the “word of the Lord” as a revelation in the present, no such dichotomy appears in the Q discourses. But there is a third alternative: Jesus still speaks in the recitation of his speech by his spokesperson. Through the performer(s) of Q discourses Jesus continues as proclaimer of the kingdom and the renewal of Israel, with authoritative presence effective in his recited speech. The remembered speech of Jesus comes alive again in the performer’s recitation.

(Horsley & Draper 1999:302, 303)

Kelber (1983:20) writes that, in oral culture, words exhibit the power of manifesting the “presentness” and “personal authority” of the person for whom they speak/act. In this way, speakers in early Christian culture who spoke in Jesus’ name, thereby manifested his authority. The name itself was like an incantation, effecting wonder-working. So, through the medium of the spoken word, they became vehicles to carry the voice of Jesus, so that he could continue to speak through him.

As seems obvious to Horsley, the Q performers may be easily identified as prophetic in nature and office in imitation of Jesus the prophet condemning the oppression by the rulers. He deduces that certainly the role of Jesus and the performers were prophetic from their use of the speech of Moses, seen by Israel as the great prototype of all later prophets. By enacting the covenant renewal, they were enacting the role of the new Moses. Elijah, another great prophet from tradition, renewer among the northern tribes of Israel, leader of scores of *bene-nabi'im* in a renewal movement, commissioned his follower Elijah. His renewal movement is remembered and revived by the discourse in Q12:2-12 which threatens and exhorts to “fearless confession in the face of persecution and oppression” (Horsley, in Horsley & Draper 1999:305). The commissioning is remembered in the mission discourse.

3.5 A sighting in Q: The reflection of a prophet

Horsley, in studying the prophetic role of the Q-performers, as well as the macro- and micro-*Gattungen* of Q as literary document and of the individual sayings, *discovered that there was more to the prophetic role than had previously been supposed. With as backdrop the prophetic books of the Hebrew Bible, consisting mainly of collections of oracular fragments, the model of a prophet as receiver and deliverer of oracles emerged. Q was found to represent "an atavism in terms of the history of the genre' of the prophetic period, especially of Elijah and Elisha"* (Horsley, in Horsley & Draper 1999:305). Extra-biblical evidence indicates however, that another type of prophecy had dominance over oracular prophecy in the late second-temple period, especially among the people. Under the influence of the Enlightenment, Liberal Christian theology and New Testament studies tended to push narratives on the actions of Jesus to the background because the miraculous nature of these accounts were foreign concepts to the modern mind, and tended to focus on the teachings of Jesus. An examination of the great prototype of prophet, Moses, reveals that not only did he deliver oracles revealing the will of God, but that he played a much broader political-religious role as leader in the exodus and mediator of the covenant.²⁷ It is obvious furthermore from a perusal of the lives of Israelite liberators (*sophetim*) and prophets (*nabi'im*), from Joshua to Deborah, from Gideon to Samuel, that they not only announced the will and action of God to the people but as the charismatic leaders of their people founded and led renewal and even military campaigns often in protection against the threat of outside rule. Elijah and Elisha both became known as prophets of renewal against oppressive domestic rule. Thereafter a great prophetic tradition emerged in Jerusalem but only individual oracular prophets came forward to pronounce the judgment and sentencing of God against oppressive rulers and officials.

Horsley is of the opinion that both John and Jesus were of the earlier prophets, not the oracular prophets of the great Jerusalem tradition but of the popular tradition

²⁷ See also Van Aarde (2003:453-467).

University of Pretoria etd – Dannhauser, E H (2006)

cultivated among the Judean, Samaritan and Galilean people²⁸. He names Jesus ben Hananiah the peasant prophet, as an example of oracular prophets and Theudas as an example of a prophetic leader of a movement from the time of Jesus and the origins of Q, the mid-first century. And as he had examined the resonance of individual Q passages with Israelite tradition, so he examines the whole discourse series in Q to see how it references and resonates with the pattern of prophetic leaders of renewal movements in popular Israelite tradition, using both biblical books and accounts of popular movements as sources. From this examination he concludes that both Jesus and the Q-performers unquestionably worked from the oracular prophetic tradition as is seen clearly in the woes against the Pharisees (Q 11:39--52) and the prophetic lament over the imminent destruction of Jerusalem in Q 13:34-35. He points out that the lament of Jesus over Jerusalem and its imminent destruction has long been noted to bear striking similarities with those of Jesus ben Hananiah.

But the Jesus depicted in Q is, according to Horsley, more than simply an oracular prophet. Right from the start John depicts him as burning chaff and gathering grain into the granary, as the one who will baptize with the fire of judgment but also with the Spirit of renewal. Jesus enacts a covenant renewal as the new Moses in Q 6:20-49, in his actions age-old longings for a new era of restoration and wholeness are fulfilled (Q 7:18-35), as the New Elijah (Q 9:57-10:16) he commissions prophetic envoys to expand his program of announcing the kingdom and healing to the village communities to bring about renewal. He performs exorcisms as manifestations of the kingdom (Q 11:14-26) which are portrayed as the new exodus and Horsley here quotes from Exodus 8:16-19: "...if, by the finger of God, I cast out demons...". Not only does he and the Q-performers enacting his words condemn the rulers and their representatives for the unjust and oppressive treatment of their people, but they offer encouragement to the people, exhorting them to work together in peace and solidarity, to put their faith in the renewal and reversal of fortunes that God is inaugurating through his coming kingdom and to remain committed in solidarity to the movement even under threat of persecution or death.

²⁸ See above: Wright in Chapter 2 on types of prophecy.

[University of Pretoria etd – Dannhauser, E H \(2006\)](#)

He furthermore points out that there was a tendency for the work and words of the prophets inaugurating movements of renewal to be carried on by the "...protegés of the head of the movement": For example as Elijah had commissioned Elisha to continue his program of renewal, so Jesus commissioned envoys to continue and expand his program of renewal by acts of healing and the proclamation of the kingdom of God among the people. In assuming the prophetic mantle of Jesus the final prophet, the whole movement takes on a prophetic identity.

He says that this is evident from three connections: Firstly Jesus and John are depicted throughout as prophets of renewal, with John being called "a prophet and more than a prophet", preparing the way for the new exodus in 7:26-27, and Jesus declaring himself to be the prophet that would fulfil the longings of the people expressed by the earlier prophets. When Jesus commissions envoys in Q 9:57-62, he is represented as a prophet in the mould of Elijah. In Q 11:29- 32 his prophetic action is an analogy to that of Jonah. Secondly there is a marked tendency in Q to refer to the many persecuted and executed prophets of the past, forming eventually the grounds for the punitive action against Jerusalem and its Pharisaic representatives. And thirdly the receptors of the Q message hear themselves being addressed as successors in the long line of prophets under siege and co-commissioned in an Elijah-Elisha typology.

Horsley also finds clues as to the sweeping scope of the prophetic mantle he believes to have been worn by the Q-performers and communities as followers of Jesus, the leader of their movement, with the nomenclature and functions of leadership employed by other movements of Jesus' believers. So for example did Paul distinguish "apostles", "prophets", "teachers", "deeds of power", "gifts of healing" and "forms of leadership" in 1 Corinthians 12:27-28. He calls himself an apostle, but portrays his own calling as prophetic, bearing similarities to the commissioning of Jeremiah and also functions as one, receiving and communicating the word of God. By the same token he functions as a teacher instructing assemblies in the tradition he had received (1Cor 11:23-26; 15:1-5).

University of Pretoria etd – Dannhauser, E H (2006)

Horsley's (in Horsley & Draper 1999:309) conclusion after this brief perusal is as follows:

Were we to examine how Paul's nomenclature would apply to Jesus as portrayed in Q discourses, he would be 'all of the above.' That is, Q's Jesus was an 'apostle' of God, a 'prophet' receiving and declaring the will of God, a 'teacher' of the people in the movement, and a healer and performer of deeds of power (exorcisms), as well as an organizer of a movement. And Moses and Elijah, the two principal paradigmatic prophetic leaders of movements in Israelite tradition, had also performed all of the same functions.

He compares the functions of prophet and teacher as applied in Q to those in the Didache and Acts 13:12 and reaches the conclusion that in all of these cases of application these two functions seem to be undivided and adds that in the Qumran-documents left by their scribal-priestly movement, their leader, although being referred to as the "teacher", clearly plays a prophetic role as founder-leader of the movement.

In a reference to Max Weber's use of the concept "charisma" (Horsley, in Horsley & Draper 1999:310) and says that sociologists are in agreement that "individual charismatic" would be an individualistic abstraction. He reminds his readers that particular historical social relationships such as dislocation, conflict and distress lead to charismatic relationships. All people, and that includes people of the present-time as well as the times of Jesus and the origins of the Q discourses, are embedded in a network of social and power relations and charisma and are part of just such social and power relationships between leaders and their followers.

He maintains that, in the study of orally derived literature, another factor should be taken into consideration, namely that "...leaders and followers who form a movement in struggling to deal with their particular historical situation are also working out of a particular cultural tradition and the crisis into which it has come in their historical situation" (Horsley, in Horsley & Draper 1999:310). He concludes

University of Pretoria etd – Dannhauser, E H (2006)

finally that any approach to the Q-discourses and any orally derived texts have to consider four essential analytical factors: The leaders or performers, the followers or hearers, their historical situation and the cultural tradition in which the leaders and followers are interacting in response to the situation in which they find themselves.

3.6 The message of the prophet in view

Through a careful and detailed analysis of what lies behind the earliest written gospel material, evidence of profuse and deliberate prophetic referencing and alluding is to be found emitting from a main character or subject who displays in his being and words distinctly prophetic characteristics. It is of paramount importance that here, in an unbiased and unpremeditated study of the traces of the earliest Jesus traditions, the banner of prophecy is found to be flying so clearly over the heads of Jesus, his followers, his words and their activities.

What is found, furthermore, is that, like with the prophets of old, there is a passionate concern for the social issues of the day with repression of the poor by the rich topping the bill. This social aspect is of paramount importance for the understanding of Jesus – also and especially in his role as prophet as is further expounded in the work of Max Weber as is referred to below.

However, with Horsley focusing his attention on the Q-material, although he discovers there an undoubtedly prophetic Jesus complete with the concern for the social welfare of his people, a thorough examination of the phenomenon of prophecy and what exactly it entails is sorely missed, just as in the case of Wright.

One more image of Jesus, from the point of view of J DG Dunn must be examined before we pay due attention to the essence and scope of prophecy. Dunn, like Horsley looks behind the Gospel of Mark and delves into the memories of all who saw, heard and was affected by Jesus in their renditions, both oral and written of the images he so clearly imprinted there. He poses the question whether in looking for the historical Jesus as a flesh and body person with biographical details of his

[University of Pretoria etd – Dannhauser, E H \(2006\)](#)

life, one may be chasing a phantom and in a wonderfully detailed, meticulous and enlightening exposition, reaches some interesting and encouraging conclusions.