

5

Judean Ethnicity in Q

5.1 INTRODUCTION

In the first chapter we attempted to demonstrate that scholarship on the historical Jesus fails to place Jesus' Judeanness into an overall interpretive framework. What kind of Judean Jesus was cannot be answered comprehensively. In chapter two we developed a model that attempts to correct this shortcoming, and in the process to set some guidelines for a common Judeanism, where Judeanism was primarily understood as an ethnic identity. In chapter 3 we did an overview of what Judean identity involved in the first century, and discussed some historical developments that led up to it. Chapter 4 saw a brief treatment of Galilee, and we came to the conclusion that there was a fundamental continuity between the people of Galilee and that of Judea. The Galileans were ethnic Judeans, and so would also have operated within that exclusive realm of covenantal nomism.

The previous chapters therefore served as preparatory, yet essential work for what we will attempt to accomplish here. We need to answer the question: What kind of Judeans were the Q people? Studies into Q, however, are complicated by proposed redactional stages and what to include in its overall reconstruction. It is therefore

necessary to first establish our approach to Q before we can proceed with our investigation.

5.2 THE APPROACH TO Q

The most commonly accepted solution for the Synoptic Problem is the Two Document hypothesis.¹ The solution proposes that Matthew and Luke independently made use of Mark, and a source mostly consisting of sayings of Jesus. This latter source is referred to as “Q” (from the German “*Quelle*”, “source”). The content of Q is therefore determined mostly by (1) material only found in Matthew or Luke (the double tradition), and by (2) material that has triple attestation but where the agreement of Matthew and Luke over and against Mark is substantial (Kloppenborg 2000:92). Some material found also in Mark has been suggested to be part of Q², and lastly, also some traditions that are singly attested (*Sondergut*) in either Matthew or Luke.³ What of these expansions should be included, however, varies amongst scholars. Kloppenborg (2000:99-100) argues that a judicious and rigorous application of principles to determine inclusion in Q would expand Q from 235 to 264 verses, although Kloppenborg himself regards some of these expansions to Q as doubtful. Here follows the generally proposed content of Q as taken from Kloppenborg:

¹ Alternatives to this are the Griesbach, “Augustine” and Farrer-Goulder hypothesis. The Griesbach (Two Gospel) hypothesis suggests that Luke is directly dependent on Matthew, and Mark is a conflation of both. The “Augustine” hypothesis suggests that Matthew is the earliest gospel, with Luke being dependent on both Matthew and Mark. The Farrer-Goulder solution agrees with Markan priority, but also that Matthew and Luke used Mark, and that Luke used Matthew (Kloppenborg 2000:38-43; Tuckett 1996:1-7).

² Lk 3:2-4; 3:21-22; 4:16-30; 10:25-28; 12:1b; 17:2; 17:31 (Kloppenborg 2000:93).

³ E.g. Lk 15:8-10; Mt 5:41.

The Content of Q (with Expansions)			
Sigla: 3:7b-9 = Highly Probable; 3:(3) = Probable; <3:21-22> = Doubtful			
3:(3)	Setting of John's Preaching	11:33-35 (36)	Lamp; Sayings on Light
3:7b-9	John's Preaching of Repentance	11:39-44, 46-52	Woes against Pharisees and Lawyers
3:16b-17	The Coming One	12:2-12	Fearless Confession
<3:21-22>	<The Baptism of Jesus>	12:(13-14, 16-21)	Divider; Rich Fool
4:1-13	The Temptations	12:22b-31, 33-34	On Anxiety over Life
4:(16a)	Reference to Nazara	12:<35-38>, 39-40	<Watch for the Son of Man>
6:20a	Introduction to Sermon	12:42b-46	Faithful and Unfaithful Servants
6:20b-23	Beatitudes	12:49, 51-53	On Divisions
6:(24-26)	Woes	12:54-56	Weather Signs/Signs of the Times
6:27-33	On Retaliation; Generous Giving; Golden Rule	12:58-59	Settle with a Creditor
(Q/Matt 5:41)	Go the Second Mile	13:18-19, 20-21	Parables of the Mustard Seed and the Leaven
6:(34-35b), 35c	Conclusion	13:24, (25), 26-27	The Two Ways; Closed Door
6:36-37b, 38c	On Mercy and Judging	13:28-29, 30	Many Will Come from East and West
6:39-45	On Self-Correction	13:34-35	Lament Over Jerusalem
6:46	Why Do You Call Me Lord?	14:<5>	<A Sheep Who Falls into a Pit on the Sabbath>
6:46-49	The Two House Builders	14:11/18:14	Exalting the Humble
7:1b-2, 6b-10	The Centurion at Capernaum	14:16-24	The Feast
7:18-19, 22-23	John's Question	14:26-27; 17:33	Three Discipleship Sayings
7:24-28	Jesus' Eulogy of John	14:34-35	Savorless Salt
7:(29-30)	John, Tax Collectors, and Prostitutes	15:4-7	The Lost Sheep
7:31-35	Children in the Agora	15:(8-10)	The Lost Drachma
9:57-60, (61-62)	Two (Three?) Volunteers	16:13	God and Mammon
10:2-16	Mission Instructions	16:16	The Kingdom Suffers Violence
10:21-22	Thanksgiving for Revelation	16:17-18	The Torah; Divorce
10:23b-24	Commendation of Disciples	17:1b-2	On Scandals
<Matt 10:5b-6, 23>	<Limiting the Mission to Israel>	17:3b-4	Forgiveness
<10:25-28>	<The Great Command>	17:6b	Faith like a Mustard Seed
11:2-4, <5-8>	The Lord's Prayer, <Midnight Friend>	17:<7-10>	<Unprofitable Servants>
11:9-13	Sayings on Prayer	17:(20-21)	(The Kingdom and Signs)
11:14-20	The Beelzebul Controversy	17:23-24, 37b	The Coming of the Son of Man
11:(21-22)	Binding the Strong Man	17:26-27	The Days of Noah
11:23	Whoever Is Not Against Me	17:(28-29), 30	The Days of Lot
11:24-26	Return of the Evil Spirit	17:34-35	Two in a Field; Two at the Grindstone
11:(27-28)	A Woman in the Crowd	19:12-13, 15b-26	The Entrusted Money
11:29-32	Request for a Sign	22:28-30	Judging the Twelve Tribes

It has basically been accepted that Q was a written document based on three observations: "(1) the near-verbatim agreement between Matthew and Luke in certain double tradition pericopae; (2) the significant amount of sequential agreement between Matthew and Luke in some portions of the double tradition; and (3) the use by Matthew and Luke of the same unusual phrases or words" (Kloppenborg

2000:56). This “written document” or “oral-derived text” (Horsley & Draper 1999), now embedded in Matthew and Luke, and the community it presupposes, will be the focus of study into the question of ethnic identity. It must be mentioned, however, that we will not do an investigation into the history and complexities of Q’s reconstruction. The literature is vast and will divert us from our principle aim where we seek to answer the following: What can the Q document tell us about the Judean ethnicity of the people for whom it was written? So our use of the hypothetical Q source will – in addition to the work of Kloppenborg – also be heavily reliant on the work of the International Q Project (IQP) (Robinson, Hoffmann & Kloppenborg 2002), and all Q texts referred to and quoted here are indebted to their important work that represents some form of broad consensus.

So the principle aim of our work on Q is to investigate the Judean ethnicity of the Q people. What kind of Judeans were they? Before we can answer this question in detail, however, we first will have a look at the issue of Q’s compositional history, investigating in particular the proposed stratification of Kloppenborg. This is necessary in order for us to define our approach to Q and to see whether a diachronic approach to our analysis is necessary, as opposed to a more “simple” synchronic analysis. Secondly, we will briefly investigate the proposed date of composition (or various stages of redaction) and Q’s provenance.

5.2.1 A Stratified Q?

There are a number of scholars that propose that Q was edited over various stages of its history before it made its way into Matthew and Luke. Kloppenborg likewise conceives of Q as consisting of various strata, that is, texts were added to the original document at various stages of redaction. For now we will focus on his stratigraphy since it seems to have been the most influential. This “stratigraphy” as Kloppenborg notes can be a bit misleading, since “the analogy of archaeology is not completely apposite”. Kloppenborg (2000:117) clarifies:

To be sure, the archaeologist discerns the history of the tell by proceeding from the top down, reconstructing the history of the tell by proceeding from its most recent stages of occupation to its most ancient, rather than working upwards from its earliest to its latest strata. Yet with literary documents we are not dealing with physically discreet layers but rather with the incorporation of smaller literary units or stages into larger ones.

Of course, to view the Q document as consisting of various layers or stratum, it presupposes an underlying diachronic approach to the text. 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 allusions to the story of Lot.⁴ 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 Q:

1. Q 3:(2-3), 7-9, 16b-17 contains allusions to the story of Lot (Gn 19); John announces the coming judgement; it issues a call to repentance; and it challenges the security of Israelite identity;
2. Q 7:1-10, 18-28, 31-35 uses a Gentile to shame Israel; it describes the rejection of John and Jesus as the prophets and envoys of Sophia;
3. Q 11:14-15, 16, 17-26, (27-28), 29-32, 33-36, 39b-44, 46-52 contains a number of examples where Jesus is not recognised; it has announcements of judgement; it represents the prophets as envoys of Sophia; it calls for recognition and repentance; and it uses Gentiles to shame Israel;

⁴ 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. But when seen in combination with Kloppenborg’s socio-rhetorical analysis of Q (see below), 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). Horsley (1999:62-75) has offered a critique of Kloppenborg’s (1987) approach and based on his own analysis of the texts argues that the “common features” used as criteria for Kloppenborg’s main redaction is difficult to find or it does not appear consistently enough across the various clusters. “Strictly speaking, only two short passages in Q, 11:29-32 and 11:49-51, actually attest the three common features used as criteria for the secondary, judgmental layer” (Horsley 1999:65). But it must be said, that Horsley questionably downplays the polemical or judgmental aspect of Q “against Israel/this generation” while *also the rhetorical tone of these clusters* played an important part in Kloppenborg’s literary analysis. Otherwise, Horsley (see also 1999:74, 81) exaggerates the “apocalyptic” element in Kloppenborg’s analysis since the major motif for Kloppenborg is judgement.

4. Q 17:23-24, 37b, 26-30, 34-35; 19:12-27; 22:28-30 has allusions to the story of Lot; it announces the coming judgement; it challenges prevailing apocalyptic scenarios; and contains the judgement of Israel.

Possibly, the following might be added:

5. Q 12:39-40, 42b-46, 49, 50-53, 54-59 that contains an announcement of coming judgement; admonitions to preparedness; and a call to recognition (and repentance?).

Kloppenborg proposes these redactional themes represent the perspective of the main redaction of Q. These themes tend to cluster together in the four or five subcollections listed above, and overall, Kloppenborg assumes the presence of 14 subcollections.⁵ Other clusters according to him are untouched or minimally influenced by such themes (e.g. Q 6:20b-49; 9:57-10:24; 11:2-4, 9-13; and 12:2-7, (8-9), 11-12; and 12:22b-31, 33-34). “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), who has shown that these clusters share a 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). In addition, these subcollections have a common structure, beginning with programmatic sayings, continued with second person imperatives, and concluding with a saying that underlines the importance of the instructions. “In other words”, Kloppenborg (2000:145) concludes, “in terms of thematic organization, rhetorical posture, and structure, the six ... clusters show themselves to cohere as a

⁵ Kloppenborg's (2000:115) 14 subcollections are set out as follows: (1) 3:3, 7-9, 16-17; (2) 4:1-13, (16); (3) 6:20b-23, (24-26), 27-33, (Q/Matt 5:41), (34-35b), 35c, 36-37b, 38c, 39-45, 46-49; (4) 7:1b-2, 6b-10, 18-19, 21-23, 24-28, 31-35; (5) 9:57-60, (61-62); 10:2-16, 21-24; (6) 11:2-4, 9-13; (7) 11:14-20, (21-22), 23-26, (27-28), 29-35, 39-44, 46-52; (8) 12:2-12; (9) 12:(13-14, 16-21), 22-31, 33-34; (10) 12:39-40, 42b-46, 49, 51-53, 54-56, 58-59; (11) 13:18-21; (12) 13:24, 26-30, 34-35; 14:11/18:14; 14:16-24, 26-27; 17:33; 14:34-35; (13) 15:4-7, (8-10); 16:13, 16-18; 17:1b-2, 3b-4, 6b; (14) 17:23-24, 37b, 26-27, (28-29), 30, 34-35; 19:12-13, 15b-26; 22:28-30.

group and, in all likelihood, as a discrete redactional stratum". The six clusters Kloppenborg (2000:146) speaks of actually looks as follows:

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.

The above are united by paraenetic, hortatory and instructional concerns. These sub-collections Kloppenborg argues constituted "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) 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.

We will now continue by doing an overview of Kloppenborg's understanding of Q, which was derived at through what he describes as a sociorhetorical approach.⁶ This approach looks at how the text as a whole is constructed to commend itself to its hearers/readers and thus it can help identify the social location/world that lies behind the text.

5.2.2 The Formative Stratum

Kloppenborg at first has a look at the formative stratum's genre and rhetoric. He argues that Q¹ is a good example of instructional literature. It offers topically organised instructions on several themes. Like instructions, Q contains sayings on

⁶ Kloppenborg (2000:196; cf 177-78) explains "sociorhetorical approaches ask what the genre of the text and the method of organization imply about its intended audience; how the author

the relationship between masters and students (Q 6:40, 46-49; 10:16; 14:26-27); on the importance of good guidance (Q 6:40, 41-42), good speech (Q 6:43-45), and good examples (Q 17:1-2). God and Jesus are held up as mimetic ideals (Q 6:35, 36; 9:58; 11:13; 12:3; 14:26-27). Q 12:2 is interested in those things hidden, and sees the process of revelation as grounded in the relationship of God to the world (Kloppenborg 2000:197-98).

Many sayings of Q¹ indicate a measure of disenfranchisement with local judicial mechanisms (e.g. 6:27-36 (+ Q/Mt 5:41), 37-38; 12:58-59⁷), some of which are juxtaposed with concerns about subsistence (Q 11:2-4, 9-13 and 12:4-7, 11-12, 22-31) (Kloppenborg 2000:193-95, 198). The bulk of the first stratum is concerned with local conditions: managing conflict (Q 6:27-28, 29; 12:2-7, 11-12, 17:3-4); lending and borrowing (Q 6:30); *corvée* (Q/Mt 5:41); divorce (Q 16:18); solidarity and reconciliation (Q 15:4-7, 8-10; 17:1-2, 3-4); attitudes toward wealth (Q 12:33-34; 16:13); and the conduct and support of “workers” (Q 9:57-62; 10:2-11, 16). So these sayings presuppose the audience to be on a low social level. The concern for subsistence and the assumption of Q/Mt 5:41 that Q’s community members are susceptible to forced labour suggest that they include smallholders or handworkers. Q 6:30 implies community members might make loans, but when money is mentioned, the denominations are small: a Roman *assarion* is mentioned (Q 12:6) and the Parable of the Lost Drachma (Q 15:8-10) apparently concerns the life savings of a woman. The Parable of the Lost Sheep describes a medium sized flock (Q 15:4-7) and the wealthy are held up as negative examples (Q 12:16-21); even nature can outdo their splendour (Q 12:27) (Kloppenborg 2000:198-99).

Kloppenborg then proceeds by looking at the construction of Q’s arguments or style of rhetoric. Proofs are drawn from the observation of nature and ordinary human transactions: these include the coming of rain (Q 6:35); cultivation of figs and grapes (Q 6:44); housebuilding (Q 6:47-49); parents providing for their children (Q 11:9-13); small purchases (Q 12:6-7); survival of birds (Q 12:22-24), field flowers (Q 12:26-27) and grass (Q 12:28); shepherds (Q 15:4-7) and poor widows (?) (Q 15:8-10); and simple planting and bread making (Q 13:18-21). What is absent is reference to “higher” forms of culture (e.g. major political and public institutions, kings, palaces, the

diagnoses the situation addressed; and how arguments are constructed [i.e. the selection of metaphors, the choice of evidence, the conduct of the arguments] so as to be persuasive”.

⁷ Kloppenborg refers to Piper’s (1995) research that includes 12:58-59 here, although Kloppenborg himself allocates these verses to the main redaction of Q (Q²).

agora, the gymnasium, the theatre, the assembly). There is no appeal to Israel's epic history apart from the appeal to Solomon's proverbial wealth (Q 12:27). Yet, the environment of Q¹ is largely Israelite – Q can easily give Gentiles as examples from whom one does not expect good behaviour (Q 6:33-34; 12:30). What is also absent from Q's repertoire of arguments is that the priesthood, Temple, purity distinctions, or the Torah is not the basis of argumentative appeals. Q¹ also lacks oracular appeals or prophetic speech and the mode of argumentation is predominantly persuasion (cf Piper 1989).⁸ According to Kloppenborg (2000:199), "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 Torah⁹ or the Temple or the priestly hierarchy, or that it is based on oracular disclosures or commands."

Based on the above Kloppenborg (2000:198, 200) draws some conclusions on the formative stratum's social location. The literary organisation of Q¹ does not display sophisticated or learned characteristics (repeated formula, sorites, chiasms, alphabetic acrostics, numeric patterns). This suggests that the authors of Q¹ were of limited skill, not coming from the upper reaches of the scribal establishment. They were probably village and town notaries and scribes. In the life of a village they were most keenly aware of the issues that are contained in Q – debt (Q 6:30; 11:4; 12:58-59), divorce (Q 16:18), lawsuits (Q 6:29) – since they wrote loan contracts, petitions, and bills of divorce. Q¹ is also framed as an instruction (a typical scribal genre) and it reflects the interests of scribes in the process as well as the content of learning. Kloppenborg maintains the first stratum of Q was formulated to address people living near or at subsistence level.¹⁰ They experienced conflict endemic to town and village life as well as occasional outside pressure in the form of *corvée*, the courts and other demands.

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

⁹ Here we are not entirely in agreement with Kloppenborg. As our analysis will show, particularly Q 6:20-49 engages in the reconstruction of the Torah.

¹⁰ Contrast Tuckett (1996:360, 365-66), who, when speaking of some passages Kloppenborg assigns to Q¹, argues the people addressed are, if not well off, at least not destitute. For example, the missionaries can expect to receive hospitality (Q 10:7-8); there are warnings

As an aside, we will mention that there are some scholars who have compared this stratum – which they have modified in their own way – with a Cynic-like Jesus movement, particularly drawing attention to the mission charge (Q 10:2-16) and various sayings that are claimed to be similar to Cynic ethos and ideology. According to them, the Q people were not interested in a program of renewal or reform, but like the Cynics, merely offered social critique (Vaage 1994; Mack 1993). Scholars, such as Tuckett (1989; cf 1996:368-91), for example, have questioned this idea. Vaage (1995a:228) in turn has responded that most of Tuckett’s “concerns and arguments against a ‘Cynic’ Q derive from the generalized confusion ... of comparison with genealogy, understood as a statement about origins.” Tuckett (1996:372, 385) evidently is aware of this methodological pitfall, but apparently seems to be concerned with possible attempts where the analogies between Cynicism and Q *are* interpreted to point to genealogical derivation, or as he puts it as “indicating a common background of thought”. According to Kloppenborg (2000:431), although there are some interesting and puzzling parallels with Cynicism, the “case for a cynic-like Q has yet to be made effectively.” Later on, however, Kloppenborg argues that “the cynic hypothesis underscores the possibility that at Q’s earliest layer the early Jesus movement adopted postures that were significantly deviant and socially experimental.” At the level of Q², Jesus, John and the Q people were aligned with the important figures of Israel’s past – the prophets – to defend the novelty of Q¹. “Even in this alignment”, Kloppenborg (2000:442) continues, “a memory of deviance is preserved, for the prophets themselves were remembered as similarly uncooperative persons, opposing kings, objecting to political strategies, and decrying the exploitation of the poor and dispossessed.”

Even if the Q people were Cynic-like (they were deviant or “counter-cultural” to a degree) we need not presume that they were anything other than Judeans and understood themselves as such. Kloppenborg (2000:256) asserts at all the redactional levels, “the document presumes a largely or exclusively Israelite audience.”¹¹ Q¹ takes for granted that the people addressed will know of Solomon’s proverbial wealth (Q 12:27). Q makes use of the Aramaic words Gehenna (γέεννα, Q 12:5) and mammon (μαμμωνᾶς, Q 16:13) without the need to translate it. Gentiles are

about storing treasures on earth (Q 12:33-34) and serving mammon (Q 16:13); and there are exhortations to lend without expecting a return (Q 6:30).

¹¹ It must be understood that Kloppenborg’s “Israelites” we understand to be Judeans, and we question the need for a third stratum, thus we propose to limit Q to two redactional layers (see arguments below).

twice referred to by what ethnicity theory describes as a “we-they” *oppositional* self-definition (Q 6:33-34; 12:30). They evidently were not part of Q’s “in-group”, or rather, co-ethnics. At the level of Q² numerous references are made to Israel’s epic history. Q’s spatial world has Capernaum, Chorazin and Bethsaida at its centre, and Jerusalem is a significant point on Q’s horizon. Gentiles, whether actual or imaginary make their appearance, but in Q’s rhetoric they are mainly used to shame a principally Israelite audience (Q 7:1-10; 10:12-15; 11:31-32; 13:28-29). Q also makes use of the Torah as a basis for argument (Q 4:1-13), and affirms the ongoing validity of the Torah (Q 11:42c; 16:17). These texts relating to the Torah Kloppenborg assigns to a *third* stratum (or Q³), but we will question the need for a third stratum, however. Q also nowhere challenges circumcision (unlike Paul) or Sabbath observance (unlike Mark), and along with certain dietary requirements would have regarded these as principal distinguishing marks of Israelite identity (Kloppenborg 2000:256).

5.2.3 The Main Redaction

Regarding the main redaction of Q (Q²), Kloppenborg (2000:201) again begins by having a look at the stratum’s genre and rhetoric. He argues that “there is a noticeable shift in formal characteristics of the collection as well as the types of rhetorical appeals” and the “changes are more likely due to a new rhetorical situation – the need to defend the practice of Q¹ and the character of Jesus in the face of challenges – than they are the result of a change in audience.” The most obvious formal shift are the increased density of chriae, that is, sayings furnished with a brief setting (e g Q 3:7a; 7:18-19, 24a; 10:21a; 11:14-15, 16 etc). What becomes important here is the characterisation of the speaker or of his interlocutors. It is at this stratum “that we first encounter allusion to the prophets and Sophia and Israel’s epic history, both in connection with the positive characterization of Jesus and John, and in connection with the Deuteronomistic theme of killing the prophets” (Kloppenborg 2000:201). Also here polemic against “this generation” appears in the rhetoric, referring to a group or type of persons that are opposed to the Q group.

The main redaction also contains woes, warnings of judgement and prophetic correlatives (e g Q 11:30; 17:24, 26, 30). It further includes chriae occasioned by a healing (Q 7:1-10), a question from John the Baptist (Q 7:18-23, 24-28, 31-35), and two challenges to Jesus (Q 11:14-23, 29-32). Although prophetic forms are present and the examples of prophets are called upon (Q 6:22-23; 7:26; 10:23-24; 11:32, 49-

51; 13:34-35), and while an Elijah-like figure is described in Q 3:16-17; 7:22, most sayings of Q² are framed as *chriae* rather than as direct oracles.¹² Here we also find a development from an instruction to a *bios*, as initial *chriae* are extended by additional *chriae* or sayings. So biographical elements are introduced to underline the reliable character (*ethos*) of Jesus. Jesus is placed in situations where he is able to defeat critics with a few well-chosen sayings (Q 7:31-35; 11:14-23, 29-32). He is quick to commend others (Q 7:1-10, 24-28; 10:21-22, 23-24) or rectify misplaced praise (Q 11:27-28). The inferiority of opponents is underlined (Q 7:31-35; 10:12-15; 11:39-52). Other sayings warn of potential dangers (Q 3:7-9, 16-17; 12:39-49, 51-59; 17:23-37; 19:12-27), or implicitly connect Jesus with the Elijah-like “Coming One” (Q 7:18-23 cf 3:16-17; 13:34-35) and Heavenly Wisdom (Q 11:49-51). Other sayings explicitly assert divine authorization both for Jesus (Q 7:35; 10:21-22) and John (Q 7:26, 27; 7:35) (Kloppenborg 2000:202-203).

By contrasting the *ethos* of John and Jesus over and against their competitors, it indicates that at this stage the rhetorical situation required a defence or legitimation of the Q people’s existence. Opponents are attacked and Jesus and John are associated with Sophia, prophetic figures, and characters of Israel’s epic history. Q² draws a sacred map of “Israel” (Q 7:9; 22:30), naming Abel (Q 11:51), Abraham (Q 3:8; 13:28), Noah (Q 17:26-27), Lot (Q 17:28-29 cf 3:3; 10:12), Isaac (Q 13:28), Jacob (Q 13:28), Solomon (Q 11:31), Jonah (Q 11:32), Zechariah (Q 11:51), and the prophets (Q 6:22-23; 11:49-51; 13:34-35). The authors of Q thus situated themselves within this company whereas their opponents are seen as the persecutors and killers of the prophets (Q 6:22-23; 11:49-51; 13:34-35). In Q, this is used against opponents who could regard themselves as representatives of the “great tradition”, and it brings out the irony that the forbears of those who now claim to honour the prophets actually killed them (Kloppenborg 2000:205-206, 210). Q also employs the strategy of shaming, saying that Gentiles have responded (or would respond) better to Solomon, Jonah and the Patriarchs than their opponents. The evil cities of Sodom, Tyre and Sidon will be better off at the judgement than Israelite towns that reject the Jesus movement. In addition, it “is perhaps significant that neither Moses¹³ nor David – associated with Torah and learning and kingship – appears in Q’s list of heroes” (Kloppenborg 2000:203).

¹² Cf Sato (1995), who argues that Q witnesses a prophetic movement and that Q as a whole is very similar to an Old Testament prophetic book.

¹³ Here we cannot entirely agree with Kloppenborg. Moses may not be explicitly mentioned, but he is a figure whose presence is taken for granted. He lurks behind the figure of Jesus

Kloppenborg also draws upon the work of Reed, who has suggested that Q² was associated with a larger population centre such as Capernaum. The authors of Q made frequent use of urban (Q 10:8, 10; 7:25; 7:31-35; 11:43; 13:26; 14:21; 12:3; 12:58-59; 13:24; 14:16-24; 19:23) and agricultural imagery but they had little first-hand experience of agricultural practices (Q 10:2, and based on the impersonal plural *they* in 6:44; 14:35), and most of the urban imagery used by Q has a negative cast and the city is viewed with suspicion (Reed 1995:26-29; 2000:189-95). Kloppenborg does not endorse Reed's suggestion of Capernaum itself, but he says that

it is appropriate to conclude with Reed that the Q people are associated with towns sufficiently large to have markets and a small scribal sector, and sufficiently proximate to the larger centers of Tiberias and Sepphoris to come into periodic contact with Pharisees and other representatives of the Judean hierarchy. Q's cultural allegiances, however, are with the Galilean country side and against the city, which is regarded with distrust and suspicion. In defense of the Jesus movement, the framers of Q construct a notion of Israel and its epic heroes which stand in opposition to Jerusalem,¹⁴ the Herodian dynasty, the Pharisees and lawyers, and the unbelief that is encountered in the marketplaces.

(Kloppenborg 2000:204)

The issues behind the apologetic stance of Q² are complaints about nonrepentance (Q 3:8; 10:13; 11:32) and accompanying threats of judgement. Failure to repent means a failure to recognise in Jesus and the Q people the presence of divine activity and authorisation – it does not seem to refer to a change in one's interior disposition. It has to do with the adoption of certain patterns of behaviour and group allegiance (Q 7:9-10; 7:22; 7:31-35; 10:10-12; 11:19-20; 11:29-32; 13:25-27). Jesus and the Q people are being attacked or ignored, but this serves an apologetic strategy since a few sayings in Q² continue to promote the ethos of Q¹ as it criticises the rich and those of high social standing (Q 7:25; 7:22; 10:21-24; 11:43, 47 and indirectly in 14:16-24).

who is the new Moses and leader of the new Exodus. See our analysis of the main redaction below.

¹⁴ Q 13:34-35, however, rather presupposes a positive attachment to the Temple and Jerusalem. The "opposition" of Q is conditional, and will disappear once the Temple accepts Jesus as Messiah. Again, see our analysis of the main redaction.

This stratum of Q also illustrates a struggle for influence and “place” in Galilean society. The Q people’s opponents (particularly Pharisees and lawyers) already have influence or are seen as likely to obtain it (Q 11:43; 11:46 cf 11:52; 11:47-51). Q’s lack of appeal to Moses may be due to the Pharisees and lawyers who claimed Moses as their authority¹⁵ – Q² looks to the memory of the prophets to counter. In the first-century Galilee, the Pharisees, understood as “retainers”, were a minor and new presence, and represented the interests of Jerusalem and its priestly rulers. At the same time, they placed emphasis on tithing and practices that promoted Judean identity. Kloppenborg (2000:205) argues that “Q’s conflict with the Pharisees and their hieratic practices (purity and tithing) thus represents a struggle between indigenous Galilean piety and an incursion of Judaeian and priestly influence”. Q’s selection of figures from epic history also deliberately excludes Jerusalem. The Patriarchs, Noah and Lot date to before the priesthood, the monarchy, and the centralisation of the Temple cult. David is ignored, Solomon is mentioned once as a negative example (Q 12:27), the sacrificial system is ignored and so is the Decalogue. Kloppenborg refers to Reed’s work who writes: “Indeed, in terms of Q’s temporal views, law has given way to the kingdom of God” (Q 16:16) (Reed 1996:137; cf 2000:209). Kloppenborg also follows Reed who adduced evidence of a late first-century tradition that Jonah, a northern prophet, spoke an oracle against Jerusalem – it would be destroyed (see LivPro 10:10-11). Galileans would probably have known about such local traditions and the Sign of Jonah (Q 11:29-30) “referred not just to the preaching of Jonah but contained a barb aimed at Jerusalem and its representatives” (Reed 1996:138-39; and see 2000:211).

As far as the second stratum’s social location is concerned, Kloppenborg again assumes that the framers of Q² are scribes but their interests did not coincide with the scribes and literati of Jerusalem. Q’s authors were not from the highest scribal levels or high on the social ladder, that is, from the urban retainer class – although Q² does illustrate a sophisticated level of organisation and makes use of repeated themes. When Q employs urban images it is in a negative manner. In its arguments against the Pharisees and lawyers Q² does not make use of the Torah. The strategy is rather one of burlesque and ridicule, something that may indicate that the authors of Q were not in a position to confront the Pharisees directly. Tithing and purity distinctions are matters for ridicule (Q 11:42ab, 39-41). The Temple is the place where the prophets are killed (Q 11:49-51; 13:34-35). Also, the people addressed

¹⁵ See note 13 above.

we know little about, but it is likely that they are not on a higher social level than the scribes that framed Q. Kloppenborg understands the Q people as a network of local groups and leaders, maybe household heads, and that the itinerant workers were dependent upon the households for food and lodging and for the legitimation of their roles (Q 10:6-7). But according to Kloppenborg, the role of these itinerants should not be exaggerated – they did not establish groups and neither were they in leadership positions (Kloppenborg 2000:209-11).

5.2.4 The Final Redaction of Q

Kloppenborg argues that it is only at Q³ that the Torah and the Temple appears in a positive light. In the temptation story (Q 4:1-13) Jesus and the devil refer to the Torah and the Psalms as if this was the appropriate way to make an argument. Q 11:42c and 16:17, which Kloppenborg regards as secondary intrusions, also take the validity of the Torah for granted. Q 11:42c insist on the importance of tithing; it is an obligation required by the Torah. Q 16:17 is a qualification and limitation of any possible antinomian interpretation of 16:16 (“The law and the prophets were until John”). 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” (Kloppenborg 2000:212). With regard to the Temple, where Q 11:49-51 and 13:34-35 view the Temple and its ruling elite in a negative light, the second temptation (Q 4:9-12) understands the Temple as a place where angels might be present to assist holy persons – compared with Q² the Temple is now again a holy place.

The three temptations also serve to exemplify and legitimate the ethics of the earlier strata. Jesus refuses to produce bread from stones – this picks up the language of Q 11:11 (bread/stone) and represents Jesus as one who, like Q 12:30-31 advises, does not seek food as a first priority. Jesus refuses to call on angelic support in a public display of power and self-protection – this mirrors Q’s avoidance of demonstrative signs (Q 11:29-30; 17:23-30) and the advice to fear God rather than those who can kill the body (Q 12:4). Jesus resists power, privilege and wealth – this mirrors the markarism concerning the poor (Q 6:20) and Q’s attitude that wealth becomes an obstacle to the service of God (Q 16:13). Thus the temptation story legitimates some aspects of Q’s praxis.

The use of Torah quotations in argument and the concern for the enduring validity of the Torah strongly suggests for Kloppenborg (2000:212-213) that scribes were responsible for its production. The level is somewhat higher and more learned than Q¹ and Q², but it is not a matter of discontinuity, but of a different scribal practice. Not enough evidence is available, however, to judge anything further about the addressees of the final stage of Q. It is similar to the letter of James, which shows important contacts with the Jesus tradition but also regards the Torah as a legitimate starting point in argumentation.

5.2.5 Refining Our Approach to Q

The above, in abbreviated form, constitutes Kloppenborg's understanding of Q through a sociorhetorical analysis. It is a development based on his overall understanding of Q's stratification, which is represented in the following table (interpolations, glosses and commentaries added during the main redaction (Q²) are written with emphasis):

Kloppenborg's Stratification of Q		
Q ¹	Q ²	Q ³
	3:3 Setting of John's Preaching	
	3:7-9 John's Preaching of Repentance	
	3:16-17 The Coming One	
		4:1-13 The Temptations
4:(16) Reference to Nazara (?)		
6:20b-23ab Beatitudes		
	6:23c <i>Reference to Prophets</i>	
6:(24-26) Woes		
6:27-33 On Retaliation; Generous Giving; Golden Rule		
(Q/ Go the Second Mile Matt 5:41)		
6:(34-35b), Conclusion 35c		
6:36-37b, On Mercy and Judging 38c		
6:39-45 On Self-Correction		
6:46-49 Why do You Call Me Lord?; The Two House Builders		
	7:1b-2, The Centurion at Capernaum 6b-10	
	7:18-19, John's Question 21-23	
	7:24-28 Jesus' Eulogy of John	
	7:31-35 Children in the Agora	
9:57-60, Two (Three?) Volunteers (61-62)		
10:2-11 Mission Instructions		
	10:12, <i>Reference to Sodom;</i> 13-15 <i>Woes on Chorazin and Bethsaida; Humiliation of Capernaum</i>	
10:16 Mission Instructions		
	10:21-24 <i>Thanksgiving for Revelation; Commendation for Disciples</i>	
11:2-4, The Lord's Prayer		
11:9-13 Sayings on Prayer		
	11:14-20 The Beelzebul Controversy	
	11:(21-22) Binding the Strong Man	
	11:23-26 Whoever Is Not Against Me; Return of the Evil Spirit	
	11:(27-28) A Woman in the Crowd	
	11:29-35 Request for a Sign; Lamp; Sayings on Light	
	11:39-42ab Woes against Pharisees	
		11:42c Tithing
	11:43-44 Woes against Pharisees	
	11: 46-52 Woes against Lawyers	
12:2-7 Fearless Confession		
	12:8-10 <i>Reference to Son of Man</i>	
12:11-12 Fearless Confession		

12:(13-14, Divider; Rich Fool 16-21)		
12:22-31, On Anxiety over Life 33-34		
	12:39-40 Watch for the Son of Man	
	12:42b-46 Faithful and Unfaithful Servants	
	12:49, On Divisions 51-53	
	12:54-56 Weather Signs/Signs of the Times	
	12:58-59 Settle with a Creditor	
13:18-21 Parables of the Mustard Seed and the Leaven		
13:24, The Two Ways		
	13:26-27 Closed Door	
	13:28-30 Many Will Come from East and West	
	13:34-35 Lament Over Jerusalem	
14:11/ Exalting the Humble 18:14		
	14:16-24 The Feast	
14:26-27; Three Discipleship Sayings 17:33		
14:34-35 Savorless Salt		
15:4-7 The Lost Sheep		
15:(8-10) The Lost Drachma		
16:13 God and Mammon		
16:16 The Kingdom Suffers Violence		
		16:17 Torah
16:18 Divorce		
17:1b-2 On Scandals		
17:3b-4 Forgiveness		
17:6b Faith like a Mustard Seed		
	17:23-24, The Coming of the Son of 37b Man	
	17:26-27 The Days of Noah	
	17:(28-29), The Days of Lot 30	
	17:34-35 Two in a Field; Two at the Grindstone	
	19:12-13, The Entrusted Money 15b-26	
	22:28-30 Judging the Twelve Tribes	

Although Kloppenborg's stratification has been widely influential, all scholars have not accepted it. For example, Allison (1997:3-8) offers a critique of Kloppenborg's stratification and then proceeds to propose a different stratification of Q after a section by section analysis. Allison assigns 9:57-11:13; 12:2-12, 22-32 to the earliest stratum of Q (Q¹) because it is addressed to itinerant missionaries. Allison then claims that 12:33-22:30 was added at the second stage (Q²), and finally

supplemented by 3:7-7:35 and 11:14-52 (Q³). Kloppenborg (2000:117) in response argues that Allison “provides no grounds for his assertion that 12:33-22:30 was added second or for 3:7-7:35 being added third, and no grounds for his initial choice of 9:57-11:13 as the starting point. It is not even clear that 11:2-4, 9-13, or 12:2-12 or 12:22-31 were addressed to itinerants. On the contrary, these materials speak of ‘debts’ (11:3) and parental relations (11:11-13), neither of which are relevant to homeless ‘missionaries’”. Thus Allison’s arguments, Kloppenborg claims, are weakened by an arbitrary construction of his compositional history.

There are also scholars who are totally against the idea of a stratified Q. Meier (1994:179) states that when it comes to Q’s community, geographical provenance, different stages of redaction and its theological vision “that exegetes are trying to know the unknowable”. Dunn (2003:156, 157) for example, argues that Kloppenborg “does not actually demonstrate that Q¹ ever functioned as a single document or stratum” and there is no reason “why this material [Q¹] should be taken as a single document”, and lastly that the “evidence is fully satisfied by the alternative hypothesis of a single compositional act”. Tuckett is another one of those scholars who is sceptical about a proposed stratification for Q. He argues that Kloppenborg’s “isolation of a specific strand stressing the threat of judgement against ‘this generation’ [Q²] is well taken” but the “postulated sapiential strand [Q¹] may be rather less secure ... [T]he question arises whether it is justified to regard the ‘Q¹’ material as a literary unity, existing as a self-contained entity at some stage in the pre-history of Q” (Tuckett 1996:71). In addition, Tuckett questions the need to separate a Q³ from a Q², since a strong nomistic outlook is more widespread in Q than Kloppenborg allows. Tuckett (1996:73-74) argues that if

it is unnecessary to postulate a Q³ subsequent to Q², and if the pre-Q² material is perhaps rather more disparate, and the alleged ‘Q¹’ stratum not necessarily capable of being shown to have existed as a literary unity in its own right before Q², then we may have a rather simpler model, viz. a Q-editor taking up and using (possibly a variety of) earlier material.

So both Dunn and Tuckett 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.

It must be added, however, that scholars have often misconstrued Kloppenborg's analytical approach to Q. For example, Tuckett (1996:71) alludes to the fact that the sections dominated by the polemical character of the Q² material (e.g. Q 3:7-9, 16f; 7:18-35) had a long pre-history – something that Kloppenborg's own analysis may suggest¹⁶ – hence the pre-Q² material clearly consisted of more than “sapiential” speeches. Also, Kloppenborg argues that it has been wrongly assumed, particularly by Collins (1993) and Horsley (1989:109-10), that he had piled the Q material into supposedly incompatible “sapiential” and “apocalyptic/prophetic” materials and based his stratigraphy on these theological themes. Also Sato (1995:140) contends that Kloppenborg's stratum “seems to follow a rather schematic conception”. Kloppenborg (1987:244-45; 2000:150-51) has always insisted that the stratigraphical analysis of the *literary history* of the Q document must not be confused with the tradition history or age of the materials. Also, the stratification of Q is based on *literary* – not theological or thematic – observations on how the various subcollections relate to one another. Thus one must not confuse the results of his stratigraphical analysis with the initial criteria.¹⁷ “The tracing of a compositional history of Q is not a matter of placing its sayings into two or more ‘piles,’ sorted by form or by supposed theological orientation ... Nor is there any assumption that hortatory materials are necessarily early, or authentic, or that the Jesus movement was originally ‘sapiential’ or ‘apocalyptic’ or ‘prophetic’” (Kloppenborg 2000:151). Importantly for our purposes is the fact that scholars do not seem to appreciate enough that part and parcel of Kloppenborg's *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 sapiential¹⁸

¹⁶ Tuckett (1996:71) writes: “Kloppenborg's own analysis makes clear that the source material used by any Q² redactor is more complex than a monolithic Q¹ and nothing more”.

¹⁷ In fairness, Horsley (1995:39-40; 1999:62-67) has recently looked at the *criteria* of Kloppenborg's stratigraphy. See also note 4 above.

¹⁸ A characterisation that has drawn strong criticism. Horsley (1999:67, 81) argues that much of the material in both the main strata would be described as prophetic, and questions the division into different “sapiential” and “apocalyptic” layers. Tuckett criticizes the use or description of texts allocated to Kloppenborg's first stratum (Q¹) as “sapiential” or as examples of “aphoristic wisdom” (e.g. Q 11:9-13; 12:2-9; 12:22-31; 6:37-41; 6:43-45) (cf Piper 1989). Tuckett argues that wisdom is a term that is used too loosely and which can mean almost anything in the work of scholars. He understands wisdom based on Von Rad's definition of wisdom as “a practical knowledge of the laws of life and of the world based upon experience” (von Rad 1962:418). Tuckett (1996:333-34) himself writes that above all “there is a belief in the regularity and order of the created world and that the task of wisdom is to

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 we suggest that prophetic elements are certainly present). The main redaction, on the other hand, is dominated by chriae and prophetic words,¹⁹ where the tone is primarily polemical and judgmental, and the Q material here demonstrates the need to defend the character of Jesus.

discover that order ... the basis for understanding is human experience, to be communicated and taught to others". Based on this, Tuckett argues the mission instructions (Q 10:2-16) can hardly be called "sapiential". The warnings at the end of the Q Sermon (Q 6:47-49) have far greater affinities with the warnings and threats of future judgement found in the main redaction (Q²) than Kloppenborg allows – in addition, Q 6:43-45 placed just before Q 6:46-49 becomes a warning backed up with threats of future judgement, thus context is determinative. Q 11:2-4, 9-13 and 12:22-31 is determined by a futurist eschatology and the latter's exhortation *not* to work and *not* to make provisions for the future contrasts with the Judean wisdom tradition (cf Catchpole 1993:35), as does Q 9:60 and 14:26 in relation to the family. In addition, primary Wisdom texts (Q 7:35; 11:49) are found in the main redactional stratum (Q²) (cf Jacobson 1992:51). Overall, the Q material cannot simply be described as an "instruction" and the use of Wisdom in Q is there to stress the *prophetic* aspect of Q much more, although Tuckett does agree that material in Q does contain "sapiential" material (e.g. Q 6:39; 14:34; and perhaps Q 6:31, 38, 40; 11:34; 12:25) (Tuckett 1996:72, 152, 346-354). Some of these criticisms are relevant, as Kloppenborg's literary approach may tend to underappreciate the prophetic element in Q, and as Horsley (1999:195-227) indicates, the material of the formative stratum is also engaged with the Torah and covenant renewal, an element missing from Kloppenborg's analysis. But as the above criticisms indicate, at times scholars such as Tuckett, thinking in primarily theological terms, can much like Collins (1993) and Horsley (1989; 1995; 1999) miss the point of (or ignore) Kloppenborg's *literary* analysis. To put it differently, when scholars, grounded in theological, thematic or social-scientific approaches criticise Kloppenborg's work, they are not on the same (literary-analytical) wavelength. The critique is not fully appropriate to the argument it opposes. The point is, Kloppenborg's characterisation of the formative stratum as "sapiential" points just as much as to *how* things are said than what is being said. Thus the "sapiential" material of the formative stratum must be seen in conjunction with its hortatory and instructional rhetorical style – "sapiential" here does not merely denote form, or theological or schematic content. Most of the above criticisms are as a result misplaced. Kloppenborg does admit that the mission instructions (and Q 12:11-12; 14:26-27; 17:33) go beyond sapiential admonitions; they are seen with the sapiential speeches since they cohere with the radical lifestyle and ethic of the admonitions and build on the theme of God's providential care. We will add that these instructions in rhetorical tone are not polemical or threatening, apart from the interpolations in Q 10:12-15. In addition, Kloppenborg (1987:239) does admit that proverbs and wisdom sayings are found in the main redaction of Q (7:35; 11:17b-18, 21-22; 11:33, 34a; 12:54-55; 17:37): "these function not to reinforce ethical imperatives, but to undergird the pronouncements of judgment." Thus the rhetorical tone of this wisdom material has determined its position in the main redaction and here one can therefore say that they are present to stress the prophetic aspect of Q (which we *pace* Kloppenborg and agreeing with Tuckett will extend to Q 6:47-49).

¹⁹ Jacobson (1992:51) argues that there are a number of sayings in Kloppenborg's first stratum which are commonly identified as prophetic (Q 10:2-26; 12:2-12), and chriae, also supposed to be characteristic of the second stratum, are also found in the formative stratum (Q 9:57-62). One can agree that Kloppenborg downplays the prophetic element in Q¹ (esp. Q 6:47-49), but Kloppenborg (1987:240), however, does admit to the presence of chriae in the formative stratum (Q 9:57-58, 59-60, 61-62 and 12:13-14).

It would seem, however, that there is reasonable agreement among scholars on other issues, particularly when it comes to the nature of the main redactional moment of Q. Jacobson (1992:76, 183, 253), although he proposes (with caution) his own stratigraphy for Q, argues that at the basic, compositional stage, the dominant theological perspective is the deuteronomistic (and wisdom) tradition.²⁰ Dunn (2000:152-53) states that “the case for seeing Q as structured round the motif of coming judgment and on the lines of Deuteronomistic theology is impressive.” Tuckett (1996:71) as we have seen, thinks along similar lines. Uro (1995:245) specifically states that “Q research has largely accepted the judgment of impenitent Israel as representing a significant and clearly recognizable redactional motif in the composition of the document.” Tuckett, however, seems to us to even create common ground with Kloppenborg by making observations that presuppose a more literary approach to Q in terms of its compositional history and the rhetoric it entails. To explain, Tuckett (1996:353) argues that “it would seem that any *sapiential elements* in the tradition *have been overlaid by a powerful eschatological/prophetic element* ... In one sense this might support Kloppenborg's thesis of a prophetic Q² succeeding a sapiential Q¹. I am however sceptical about how successfully we can reconstruct layers of the tradition behind our Q with such accuracy.” Nevertheless, he continues by saying that it “*would seem therefore that most of the sapiential elements in Q lie in the background for Q. The interest of Q (i.e. the ‘final’ form of Q) seems to have left behind the wisdom category and focuses more on prophetic warnings and eschatology*” (emphasis added). This view seems to focus more on *how* things are said and may lend support for the existence of two main strata (or strands of material or tradition) in Q akin to Kloppenborg's own approach. Kloppenborg's own understanding of Q's compositional history is basically that pre-existing polemical material or tradition was incorporated or added to a more “sapiential” document which came to be known as Q.

In connection with this both Tuckett (1996:71, 184, 410, 422) and Dunn (2000:153) support Kloppenborg's view which is also shared by others that earlier materials contain secondary additions or interpolations (Tuckett: Q 10:13-15; 11:42c; 16:17; Dunn: Q 6:23c; 10:12-15 12:8-10). In particular Q 6:23c; 10:12-15 and 12:8-10 Kloppenborg (2000:150) has been earmarked for its “*interruptive character*” and is identified as “stratigraphic markers”, which along with Q 13:26-27, 28-29, 34-35 and

²⁰ Jacobson (1992:76) identifies the Deuteronomistic-wisdom tradition in the following texts: most explicit in Q 11:47-51; 13:34-35, but also found in Q 6:23b; 7:31-35; 10:13-16; 11:29-32; 12:49-53, 54-56; 13:18-19, 21-22; 14:16-24, 26-27; 17:33; 14:34-35.

14:16-24 are seen as interpolations into the formative stratum. Tuckett and Dunn may not support a stratified Q, but in various ways they do say that the Q material has at least undergone some redactional development.

Considering all of the above, Kloppenborg's proposal of Q consisting of two main redactions appears to be a viable working hypothesis. Particularly convincing is the attention that Kloppenborg places on the predominant rhetorical tone of the material that has contributed towards its stratification and the interpolations or "stratigraphic markers" into the earlier material. One can hypothesise that as the sense of alienation between the Q people and their fellow Judeans increased, the more polemical material or tradition would be called upon more regularly in the Q group's assemblies, and eventually justified its inclusion into an already existing written document. Here we also see no contradiction between Kloppenborg's literary approach and Horsley's (1999) argument for Q being an oral derived text.²¹ In fact, Horsley's argument could lend better support to Kloppenborg's hypothesis of the literary development of Q, than the Q² (and Q³) material already having existed in written form (cf Tuckett's suggestion above that the Q editor could have taken up a variety of earlier and disparate (written?) material). The literary history of Q may broadly coincide with the most regular oral performances of the tradition, which with time, developed a strong polemical edge as the Q people found themselves ostracised, rejected or ignored. But it is important to mention in this regard that the history of the *literary document* Q itself must not be confused with the tradition history of the Q community. The relationship here is between the Q document, and most regular oral performance of the tradition as the circumstances required. Regular oral performances would have been written down, but the texts themselves were written to facilitate oral performances in itself. So to recapitulate, the more "sapiential" Q¹ that focuses on the teaching of Jesus, the sending of itinerant missionaries and so on, could reflect an earlier stage in the Q people's history. This more instructional material was derived from the oral tradition most regularly performed at that stage. The more polemical tradition (Q²) that places emphasis on judgement, polemic against "this generation", a Deuteronomistic understanding of history and alludes to the story of Lot was then incorporated into and framed this existing written document (Q¹).²² This more polemical material was likewise derived from the oral tradition most

²¹ Of course, caution should also be taken on whether the Q discourses were orally regularly performed or even at all as they now exist in Q. According to Vaage (1995b:90-92), this is not likely as oral performances varied.

regularly performed at this later stage, and the redactional interpolations were added as the Q editor(s) saw necessary.

The above “oral-derived” Q is a possible scenario, but our main point of reference, however, is Kloppenborg’s hypothesis on the stratification of Q, particularly with regards to the two main redactions and their rhetorical character. If there is one major modification we will make to it, it is that we question the necessity for a Q³, 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, as our analysis will show, 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”. Again, this constitutes an apologetic strategy where the character of Jesus and the Q people are defended. Overall, our main redaction (Kloppenborg’s Q² + Q³) we will propose serves *another* apologetic purpose as well – *it defends the Judean ethnic identity of Jesus and his followers*; but we shall also attempt to demonstrate, that *Jesus and his followers were Judeans of a different kind*. A fuller explanation of this and our incorporation of the Q³ material into the main redaction will follow in the next chapter.

Lastly, it must be mentioned that we do not agree with Kloppenborg’s understanding of the *Israelite identity* of the Galileans, and therefore the Q people. Kloppenborg (2000:221, 223, 229) similarly to Horsley understands the Galileans primarily as descendents of northern Israelites, and that Galilee had a substantial Israelite population before the period of the Hasmonean conquest. These Galileans would

²² We need to mention here that the presentation of Jesus as the eschatological prophet, and the Moses and exodus typology encountered in the main redaction we will add as another important redactional motif. See our analysis in the following chapter.

have had their own traditions and practices, and would not have been compliant in paying the Temple tax, their observance of tithing was irregular and they did not participate much in pilgrimage to Jerusalem. Centuries of separation of Galilee from Judea would also have led to a different understanding of the Torah, although it is likely that they observed basic practices such as circumcision of males, Sabbath and some purity distinctions. Thus their historical connections to the second Temple were tenuous and the Galileans were in essence not a Judean “Torah-true” people Kloppenborg (2000:218-234). He reads this religious and cultural separation of Galilee from Judea into the Q text. The critical points of Q’s rhetoric is aimed at issues such as purity distinctions (Q 11:39-41), tithing (Q 11:42), and the role of Jerusalem and the Temple in the social and religious economy of Galilee (Q 11:49-51; 13:34-35).

What we have here is a form of resistance to the extension of Judean forms of Temple-orientated practices to Galilee. The Q people did not reject purity distinctions entirely (cf Q 11:44) or reject tithing in principle, but the “topics of woes in 11:39-44, purity and tithing, are rooted in the economy of the Second Temple ... Q’s woes lampoon the highly specific purity practices of the Pharisees who adopted the articulated purity regime of the priestly caste in Judaea” (Kloppenborg 2000:257). This concern for a further articulation of purity distinctions and tithing requirements in reality translated into an increased symbolic (or actual) control of agricultural produce from the south, which the Galileans and people of Q resisted. 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).

In our opinion, this understanding of the Galilean/Q people is not correct. Evidence from archaeology is especially useful in this regard. As we saw in the previous chapter there is no archaeological evidence for an indigenous population in Galilee in the centuries after 733/2 BC. During the period of Hasmonean rule, however, Galilee experienced an overall growth in settlements and population. Combined with this is the cultural continuity that Galilee shows with Judea in terms of stone vessels, *miqva’oth*, lack of pork in the bone profile, and secondary burial with ossuaries in *kokhim* or *loculi* tombs. This strongly suggests that the inhabitants of Galilee during our period were Judeans (Reed 1999:95-102; 2000:23-55), and any reason for the ideological and cultural separation between the Q people and Jerusalem as such must be sought somewhere else.

So the Q people themselves were Judeans, but they were evidently Judeans of a different kind. According to Allison (1997:53), “we are looking at Jewish Christianity”, or rather, Judean Messianism. Whether the deviant Q group saw themselves as Messianist Judeans, as part of “eschatological” Judeanism, or whether they adhered to any form of (re)constructed covenantal nomism will be addressed later.

5.2.6 The Date and Provenance of Q

5.2.6.1 Date

As Kloppenborg (2000:81) explains it, one of the usual ways to set a *terminus a quo* for a document is to find a reference to the First Revolt. This we find in both Matthew (Mt 22:8) and Luke (Lk 21:20-23). The mention of Zechariah in Q (11:51), however, probably does not refer to Zechariah ben Barachiah who was murdered in 67/68 CE (War 4.335) – the way it is used in Matthew (Mt 23:35) – but probably refers to the murder of Zechariah ben Jehoida in 2 Chronicles 24:20-22 who was killed in the courtyard of the Temple. Kloppenborg (2000:87) argues that the late 50’s or early 60’s is a possible date for his proposed second redaction of Q that constitutes the bulk of the document. He further argues that the temptation story (Q 4:1-13) and two glosses (Q 11:43c; 16:17) are later additions, so Q did not reach its final form until slightly after the events of 70 CE. Allison argues along similar lines that Q does not exhibit knowledge of the war against Rome in 66-73 CE. Based on his understanding of Q’s stratification, Allison (1997:49-54) conjectures that Q¹ dates to the 30’s (aimed at missionaries) and Q¹ + Q² + Q³ to the 40’s or 50’s, with Q¹ + Q² dated to somewhere in-between. Tuckett’s (1996:102) more cautious approach leaves a possible date for Q within a broader time span of c. 40-70 CE. So based on the above, we can generalise and say that the bulk of Q or perhaps the entire document dates to around the 50’s or 60’s CE.

5.2.6.2 Provenance

We have already touched upon the location of Q when we questioned Kloppenborg’s understanding that the Galileans (and therefore the Q people) were descendents of northern Israelites, but in this regard there seems to be reasonable consensus that Q was located somewhere in Galilee. In the very least, due to Q’s lack of a Gentile mission, its use of place names, allusions and metaphors, we can conclude that Q was probably produced somewhere in Palestine (Allison 1997:52-53). Tuckett

(1996:103) argues that Q may possibly be located in Galilee/Syria, but more than that we cannot say. Reed has suggested that the social map (i.e. the use of place names and spatial imagery) of Q points to a Galilean setting for the community, particularly Capernaum, but with first hand knowledge of urban centres such as Sepphoris and Tiberias. Reed brings attention to the centrality of Capernaum, Chorazin and Bethsaida (Q 10:13-15). The nine different places named in Q Reed argues form a set of three concentric circles converging on Capernaum (Q 10:15). Within a short radius are Chorazin and Bethsaida; the second concentric circle is formed by Tyre and Sidon in the north (Q 10:13-14) and Jerusalem in the south (Q 13:34); the third and final concentric circle forms the mythical boundaries of the Q people's map made up of Sodom to the far south (Q 10:12) and Nineveh the far north (Q 11:32). Capernaum, Chorazin and Bethsaida "are not only geographically at the center of the place names in Q, the vehemence of their condemnation points to their centrality and distinguishes them from the other six places in Q" (Reed 2000:183; cf 1995; 1996). These three cities are thus of great importance to the Q community, but Capernaum in particular is singled out for special condemnation. This can be explained by the fact that Capernaum remained an important centre for Jesus' followers and the Q community (Reed 2000:184). Kloppenborg's basically concurs with Reed's analysis but is cautious to identify Q's origin specifically with Capernaum. "The unlikelihood of a Jerusalem provenance for Q,²³ combined with the focus of Q's map on the Lower Galilee and the local knowledge that Q assumes on the part of its addressees form the best basis for the assumption of a Galilean provenance for Q" (Kloppenborg 2000:175). Also, although itinerants may still have been present when Q was edited, they no longer were the controlling influence over the document or the group. The work reflects mostly that of a settled community (Kloppenborg 2000:183-184).

5.2.7 Summary

The Q document, now embedded in Matthew and Luke, was probably produced, or at least the bulk of it, in Galilee (particularly Capernaum) somewhere in the 50's or 60's CE. Following the hypothesis of Kloppenborg, the Q document consists of two major strata. The formative stratum was instructional in nature. It consists of a large number of sayings that are sapiential admonitions, and also present are beatitudes,

²³ Cf Pearson (2004:493), who suggests that Jerusalem may have been the location for the tradition in Q and further argues "there is absolutely no evidence to suggest that [Q] should be assigned to Galilee." In light of Reed's analysis Pearson's objections are not that convincing.

proverbs and wisdom sayings. The tone of this material is hortatory and instructional, and it employs the rhetoric of persuasion, instead of prophetic pronouncement or declamation, while not denying that prophetic elements are present, however. 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. At the same time we question the need for a third stratum since as we shall demonstrate, it properly belongs to the theological, polemical and apologetic strategy of the main redaction. Thus the main redaction will presently become the focus of study.

5.3 JUDEAN ETHNICITY IN Q

Having done our preliminary investigation into Q in the previous chapter, we will now shift our focus to the particular cultural features that are present in Q, but with each stratum analysed on its own. The investigation into the two strata is done to help clarify: What kind of Judeans were the Q people? At the end, we will draw a comparison between the two strata to trace noticeable developments within the Q document, which will more or less reflect the developments within the Q community, particularly relating to the Q group's ethnic identity. We will start our analysis concentrating on the main redaction.

5.3.1 The Main Redaction (Q²)

5.3.1.1 The Habitus/Israel

We may add here that based on the archaeological profile of Galilee and the literary evidence, the Q people would have found themselves in an environment that was essentially primordialist. The interrelationship between the *habitus*, or the habitual dispositions of Galileans, and the more tangible cultural features, would have been dominated by the endeavour to maintain covenant status or Judean ethnic identity ("staying in"). Galilean society, as it was informed by the same "Sacred Canopy", also constituted a highly integrated and uniform system of dispositions. For this reason, their ethnicity was highly congruent with the *habitus* and established cultural practices. But how did the Q people compare?

5.3.1.1.1 Name

Although the Q people were Judeans, Reed (2000:189) notes that “[Ἰουδαῖοι] never appears in Q, where instead ‘Israel’ is cited ... [I]t is conspicuous that this term with southern connotations was avoided, and that the old term used also for the descendants of Abraham and later the Northern Kingdom was preferred”. It must be said, however, that it was not a matter of Q avoiding the term Judea/Judeans since it was pre-occupied with a religious agenda. “Israel” represents an insider perspective related to the history of the covenant people and the land promised by God to their ancestors, and “Israel” with its symbolism and religious connotations was the almost universal self-designation for Judeans of our period (Dunn 2000:263-64; Schmidt 2001:30-31). “Israel” therefore most certainly also had “southern connotations”. Evidently the Q people identified themselves with this symbolic-religious usage and saw themselves as part of Israel, and as heirs of the ancestral land.

There are two instances where “Israel” appears in Q. When Jesus enters Capernaum a centurion demonstrates remarkable faith by requesting that Jesus heal his boy from a distance. Jesus replied: “Not even in Israel have I found such faith” (Q 7:9b). The centurion, although in geographical Israel, is evidently not part of “Israel” as a people. But the exceptional and unusual quality of his faith is emphasised, something that would normally be expected of the traditional people of Israel. The second and last appearance of Israel in Q is used in an eschatological context. The followers of Jesus are promised that they will sit on thrones to judge/liberate/establish justice for the “twelve tribes of Israel” (Q 22:30). So the people of Israel and the geographical area the name presupposes plays an important part even in the future perspective of the Q people.

Overall, when it comes to the name “Israel” the Q people fit in with the general usage and self-understanding of Judeans of our period. They occupy the geographical territory of Israel and saw themselves as part of its religious and symbolic paradigm. It is within this ancestral land where a Gentile centurion showed remarkable faith, and where the Q people at some time in the future will play a role in its restoration. And restoration implied only one thing: it must be occupied by the kind of people that God always intended. It is only in such a context, where land and people come together, where the name “Israel” can have legitimate meaning.

5.3.1.1.2 Language

What does the language of the Q document itself tell us about the Q people? Allison argues that the final form of Q was Greek but there is the presence of translation Greek in all the three strata (70 percent in what he assigns to Q¹; 58 percent in Q²; 60 percent in Q³). Dependent on the work of Raymond A Martin (1987), Allison thus argues that Q in its entirety was strongly Semitic and must at all three stages have drawn on materials that were originally composed in Aramaic. Particularly Q¹ has the strongest Semitic flavour – although Q 9:57-60; 12:22-32 according to Martin's statistics (1987:100-101; cf 1995:136) do not qualify as translation Greek, but Allison (1997:47-49) argues they contain Semitic features. So the possibility exists that his Q¹ was originally a collection of Aramaic traditions.

Kloppenborg (2000:73, 77-78) replies by saying since Q 9:57-60 and 12:22-31 (part of Allison's Q¹) is outside the translation Greek frequency it undermines Allison's case for assigning these pericopae to his possibly original Aramaic Q¹. Kloppenborg also refers to the work of Martin (1995), and Kloppenborg argues that Martin recognises that Aramaic speech patterns did influence Q's language but he falls short of concluding that Q as a whole was translated from Aramaic. This observation Kloppenborg uses in favour of his own view that Q was originally *written* in Greek. Kloppenborg (2000:80) admits that Q contains Aramaisms but argues that the "thesis of an Aramaic original of Q is extraordinarily weak." A similar view is also held by Tuckett (1996:92). Reed (2000:179) also suggests that the Q document was originally written in Greek and Q must therefore be located in an area "where at least some level of Greek literacy existed."

Kloppenborg (2000:168) asserts that due to the low rates of literacy in the ancient world it "meant that if the documents of a group were to be known at all, they had to be performed." The audience was present already at the time of composition, and ancient "rhetorical practice itself ensured a strong correlation between the values and interests of the audience and the shape of the text" (Kloppenborg 2000:169). A related issue is Horsley's suggestion that most texts from antiquity are "oral-derived" literature. This means that most ancient texts "originated in oral performance and continued to be recited or performed after they were written down. Literary texts were written and used primarily for the purpose of facilitating oral communication. Texts were transcripts of and/or aids to oral performances" (Horsley & Draper

1999:144).²⁴ In addition, this performance was a communal experience, and “recited discourses or communally read texts [Q being an example] were embedded in communities and their particular historical and social circumstances” (1999:147). So if Q was originally written in Greek as an oral-derived text, if a text at the moment of composition had a strong correlation between itself and shared values and interests of the audience, and if the performance was a communal experience, this all implies that the Q people had to understand Greek (or required the services of a translator into Aramaic?), or even, that they exclusively spoke Greek. Jacobson (1992:87) draws attention to the biblical quotations in the temptation narrative (Q 4:1-13), and says that these are remarkable for they “come from the LXX and so presumably from a primarily Greek-speaking community” and that “the use of the LXX is typical for Q”. Pearson (2004) has argued that Q cannot be easily placed in a Galilean setting for the reason that we know it only in Greek. The lingua franca of Judeans in first-century Palestine was Aramaic, the language in which Jesus’ teachings were handed down. Pearson (2004:492) thus suggests, that “the Jesus traditions of the Aramaic-speaking ‘Hebrews’ led by the twelve ‘apostles’ [Ac 6:1; 8:1] were translated in Jerusalem for the benefit of the Greek-speaking ‘Hellenists’ led by the group of seven named in Acts [6:5]. That could very well be the origin of what we know as Q. As to the provenance of Q as we now have it, a good argument could be made that it, too, originated in Jerusalem, though Antioch is also a strong possibility.” It must be said, that a Galilean provenance for Q is far more persuasive. And was Aramaic the predominant language of Judeans in Palestine, and in particular, Galilee, as Pearson believes?

We saw in the previous two chapters that use of the Greek language did penetrate into Galilee. Of course, this milieu would also have affected the Q group. Archaeological excavations have shown that the cultural character of Galilee at this period was predominantly Judean (Reed 2000; Chancey 2002), but there seems to have been a relatively widespread use of the Greek *language* throughout Palestine, including Galilee (Porter 1994; Fitzmyer 1992; Batey 2001). So it is important to emphasise that the use of Greek language by Judeans should not be confused with them adopting aspects of Hellenistic culture. Q’s probable provenance in Capernaum or immediate surrounds in any event places it in an area where at least some of the community’s people could speak both Aramaic and Greek. Capernaum

²⁴ Cf the results of Mournet’s study. “We illustrated that texts were often heard rather than read silently, composition was typically by means of dictation, and oral performance was an

was the gateway to the Golan Heights (Gaulanitis) that illustrates it would have had linguistic and cultural contact with a far more Hellenised territory (cf Porter 1994:135-36). A Greek speaking (or bilingual) community in Capernaum should therefore not come as a surprise. Either the Q people's preferred everyday language was Greek, or in the very least, they were bilingual (Porter 1994:133).

If the Q community was exclusively Greek speaking, this could have contributed towards the sense of alienation from their Aramaic speaking brethren. But taking into consideration the widespread use of Greek in Judea and Galilee, not too much must be made of Q and the Q people's language. Language was hardly a critical issue for Judean ethnic identity in our period.

5.3.1.1.3 Religion and Covenantal Praxis

Religion and covenantal praxis in Judeanism manifested itself in three primary areas: the Temple, the synagogue, and at home. It must be said from the outset that Q does not give much explicit information in this regard. We can assume that they shared much with their co-ethnics hence traditional covenantal praxis is not in dispute, and so was part and parcel of everyday life. There is one outstanding exception, however; the issue of immersion/baptism.

Q begins with the fiery preaching of John the Immerser (Q 3:7-9, 16b-17) who offers his listeners the rite of immersion in view of the imminent eschatological crisis.²⁵ According to Tuckett (1996:114), the prime object of John's attack are those who refuse to accept his preaching and baptism,²⁶ so the "fruit" his audience must produce refers to baptism itself. This view is not likely. John calls the Judeans to turn to God that will be evidenced by "fruit", that is, practical action, as will be elaborated in Jesus' sermon (Q 6:20b-49) (Jacobson 1992:81).

integral part of the process of writing a text. Oral traditions served both as a source for texts, and often served as the impetus for the initial inscription of the text itself" (Mournet 2005:289).

²⁵ Q may have mentioned the immersion of Jesus (Q 3:21b-22), but the IQP places the pericope in square brackets to indicate uncertainty, while Kloppenborg regards its inclusion in Q as doubtful.

²⁶ Tuckett (1996:116) argues that a significant portion of Q may be taken up with polemic against "Pharisees" and/or lawyers (11:39ff), thus it is possible that the Pharisees mentioned in Matthew 3:7 who come out to see John may reflect the original Q wording. The IQP has "the crowds" coming to be baptised (in square brackets to indicate a level of uncertainty).

What was the source of John's immersion? According to La Sor (1987), it is Judean ritual baths, or *miqva'ot*, that undoubtedly provide the background for John's baptism. John the Immerser was a Judean. "No person seeking to influence [Judeans] in any matter concerning religion would introduce something new ... [M]uch stress was laid by [Judeans] on the continuity of tradition. We may therefore reasonably conclude that John's baptism was not something new. It was something that grew out of [Judean] ritual immersion in *miqva'ot*" (La Sor 1987). According to La Sor, it may be possible that John and other immersers did not administer the rite, but rather witnessed it. Such was the case with immersion in the *miqveh*, since Judean law required for the rite to be witnessed, and it is clear that the person immersed him or herself (m.Mik 2:1, 2; 7:6). Q seems to imply, however, that John did administer the rite himself: "ἐγὼ μὲν ὑμᾶς βαπτίζω [[ἐν]] ὕδατι" (Q 3:16b).

Of course there is a difference between ritual immersion and the water rite in a Q/Messianist context. Judean ritual immersion is purificatory, while Messianist immersion was initiatory – it was a one-time ritual that initiated you into the Messianist movement. This was probably the meaning in Q as well. Now this initiatory immersion, according to La Sor (1987), had its parallel in Judean proselyte immersion. Immersion in the *miqveh*, along with circumcision and the offering of a sacrifice in the Temple were required of proselytes to Judeanism (cf Schürer et al 1986:173-174). After the destruction of the Temple, and after the expansion of the movement to Gentiles where circumcision was abrogated, ritual immersion in the *miqveh* was left as the only Judean requirement of conversion, and so became the central Messianist initiatory rite. In the end, La Sor (1987) suggests that Messianist immersion most probably derived from Judean proselyte immersion. But La Sor's analysis is ambiguous in various respects. Was the background of proselyte immersion also applicable to *Judean* Messianists? And why can John's rite not be the background for Messianist immersion which seems more likely (cf Ac 18:25; 19:3-4)? And is there any connection between John's rite and proselyte immersion?

We suggest that if immersion in the Q group was still performed, it was John's immersion – not proselyte immersion – that formed the immediate background. And we accept as historically plausible that John's rite was derived from Judean ritual immersion. The thing is, how did John's rite develop in a Q context? The initial context according to Q was repentance (Q 3:7-9). Now according to Acts, Messianists were immersed "in the name of Jesus Messiah" (Ac 2:38), or "in the

name of the Lord Jesus” (Ac 8:16). In Matthew 28:19, immersion was “in the name of the Father, the Son and of the Holy Spirit”. Paul also asks the Corinthians, “Were you immersed in the name of Paul?” (1 Cor 1:13). Now similar kind of developments could have occurred within the Q group, or did they still think of the rite as “the immersion of John”? (Mt 21:25; Mk 11:30; Lk 7:29; Ac 1:22; 18:25). We are not told anything in this regard.

Besides the above, what did John’s immersion mean in a Q context? Horsley (1999:95) explains it as a “prophetic covenantal exhortation to Israel to repent in the face of judgement”. At the same time, however, it clearly also had to do with the redefinition of God’s people (Uro 1995:243). Uro argues that Q 3:8bc interrupts the flow from v. 8a (“So bear fruit worthy of repentance ...”) to v. 9 and is likely to be a later addition. The criticism of the appeal to Abraham as father in v. 8bc, which appears to be a rejection of baptism altogether, compliments the redactional layer of Q dominated by the deuteronomistic motif “and by the conviction that Israel has lost her prerogative as covenant people [cf Q 13:28-30; 14:16-24]” (Uro 1995:244). For Q the appeal to Abraham has been replaced by repentance and baptism, and merit must now be required individually. Maintenance of covenant status requires something not ordinarily expected. The fact that immersion was an *initiatory rite* for the purpose of salvation, a *covenantal praxis* previously unheard of, indicates the Q people participated in a process where covenantal nomism was in (re)construction. Traditional covenantal nomism is left behind. Immersion therefore clearly separated the Q people from other Judeans. We clearly have an ideological conflict between “orthodox” Judeans and the Q people who have redefined Judean ethnicity.

When it comes to other matters of *covenantal praxis* Catchpole (1993:256) suggests that wherever legal material illustrates a conservative colouring (e g Q 11:37-52; 16:17), it “necessarily presupposes an appreciative attitude to the temple and its cult.” This may well be, but for the Q people the Temple is now “forsaken” (Q 13:35a). Q does not tell us whether the Q people participated in pilgrimages but it is certainly possible. In the very least, they hoped for the restoration of the Temple in its attitude towards Jesus (Q 13:35b) and the Temple still appears to benefit from the Q people’s tithing (Q 11:42). Matters of ritual purity are also presupposed (Q 11:39, 41, 44), so the Q people seem to be ordinary Judeans when it comes to traditional covenantal praxis. Here they shared the traditional aspects of the Judean symbolic universe, but more will be said when we discuss Q’s attitude towards the Torah.

5.3.1.1.4 Kinship

There are various issues that affect kinship, hence our investigation will be conducted by looking first at the Q people's relationship with fellow Judeans in general, and secondly, their relationship with family members.

5.3.1.1.4.1 The Q People and Broader Israel

One of the main themes that Kloppenborg has recognised of the main redaction of Q is polemic against "this generation" (ἡ γενεὰ αὕτη), appearing seven times. In Q 7:31-35, the ascetic John and sociable Jesus, both envoys of Wisdom, are rejected. "This generation" has thus showed itself not to be the true children of Wisdom (v. 35), since the acceptance of Jesus and John's message is the acceptance of Wisdom (Tuckett 1996:178-79). Q 11:29 speaks of "this generation" as evil for it requests for a sign, but the Son of humanity/man will be a sign to "this generation", as was Jonah to the Ninevites. In Q 11:31-32, "this generation" is unfavourably compared with Gentiles, the Ninevites and the queen of the South. The Ninevites repented at the preaching of Jonah, the queen of the South listened to the wisdom of Solomon, yet "this generation" has rejected a message that is qualitatively greater – the preaching of Jesus (and the Q group). Lastly, Q 11:50-51 says the blood of all the prophets, from Abel to Zechariah, will be required of "this generation".

The phrase "this (evil) generation" occurs only twice in the Tanak, speaking about the generation of Noah (Gn 7:1) and once of the time of Moses (Dt 1:35). These two generations became types of the last generation (Jub 23:14, 15, 16, 22; 1 En 93:9; 1QpHab 2:7; 1QpMic), so "this generation" in Q recalls the stories of primordial sins. Specifically Q 11:29-32 that speaks of this *evil* generation, compliments the exodus typology encountered in Q (the *evil* generation in the wilderness is referred to in Dt 1:35; Nm 32:13; cf Pss 94:10 and 78:8). Jesus, the prophet like Moses has initiated the new Exodus. The Q people are following. But in Q 11:29-32 the contemporaries of Jesus and the Q group have not heeded their message, so they resemble the generation of the wilderness "which grumbled and rebelled in the wilderness despite God's mighty salvific acts" (Allison 2000:59).

In agreement with Tuckett (1996:199) "this generation" refers to unresponsive Judeans. It does not just refer to the Pharisees alone (*pace* Horsley 1995:49). But in agreement with both Tuckett and Horsley, "this generation" does not refer to Israel as

a whole. It was the unresponsive contemporaries of Jesus and John, and of the Q community.

The tension that exists over and against “this generation” is reflected in Q 11:23: “The one not with me is against me, and the one not gathering with me scatters”. This saying is the counterpart of Mark 9:40, yet it is far more exclusive. In Mark, it is only those who actively oppose Jesus who are rejected. In Q 11:23, neutrality is taken as opposition (Tuckett 1996:290). Tuckett further suggests that the polemic of several texts, which we have assigned to the main redaction (Q 12:8-10, 51-53; 13:26-29; 14:16-23; 17:22-37; 19:12-29) is concerned to fight neutrality. The Q people are in a situation where those addressed are doing *nothing* in response to the Q people’s message. The Q people are surrounded by *apathy* (Tuckett 1996:296). This negative response is understood as “persecutions” (Q 6:22-23; 6:27-35; 11:47-51; 12:4-5; 12:11-12; 13:34-35; 14:27). According to Tuckett (1996:322):

Yet when we press the details, it seems hard to see the persecution as involving anything very systematic. There may have been hostility, taunts, verbal abuse, social ostracism. But there is no direct evidence of sustained physical attacks, nor of any deaths. The hostility may have become violent at times, but so much of the polemic in Q seems to presuppose a situation of silent ignoring.

There was certainly apathy towards the Q people’s message, but it is questionable that the Q people were predominantly the targets of silent ignoring (cf Horsley & Draper 1999:274; Kloppenborg 2000:193-95, 198). One can accept that the Q people at times experienced active opposition, discrimination and repression (e.g. Q 6:22-23; 11:39; 12:4-5, 8-9, 11-12, 58-59; 14:27; 17:33). This would explain the harsh tone of Q’s polemic. For example, “this generation” will also be held accountable for the death of the prophets (Q 11:49-51). The ἵνα (“so that”) in Q 11:50 probably denotes purpose, which means that Wisdom sends prophets to Q’s opponents (“them” in Q 11:49; “this generation” in Q 11:50-51) for the sole purpose of making them responsible for the blood of all the murdered prophets. If this is the case, “we would seem to have the perspective of a group radically alienated from its [Judean] heritage. Israel’s God has vanished in the darkness of a terrible necessity that lies upon ‘this generation’” (Jacobson 1992:180). It is assumed that the prophets – now members of the Q community – will be killed and persecuted. The reason for

this is that “this generation” is no different from its prophet-murdering forefathers (Q 11:47-48).

The Q community’s rejection and persecution is also seen through the experience of John and Jesus, both identified as envoys of Wisdom (Q 7:31-35; 11:49-51). Based on their failure to convert Israel, the Q people had recourse to the myth of Divine Sophia to provide a solution to their problems. “This generation”, reflecting the wider community of the people of Israel, has rejected Jesus, and his rejection “is a paradigm for the rejection of the Q community” (Hartin 1995:158-59).²⁷ This rejection has serious consequences for the future. Kloppenborg (1987:148) suggests that very little if anything in Q 11:14-52 “holds out to ‘this generation’ an opportunity for repentance and rehabilitation ... [N]othing remains but the inevitability of judgment and eschatological punishment”. According to Catchpole (1993:262), Q 11:52 “presupposes that entry into the kingdom, which is synonymous with ‘sharing in the age to come’ [m.Sanh 10:1], is not the automatic assumption for all Israelites ...”.

Also relevant here is the harsh polemic we find against the Galilean towns in Q 10:12, 13-15. This is quite relevant since Capernaum and its environs were probably the location of the Q community itself. In Q 10:12, the towns are warned that on the day of judgement, Sodom will fare better. In Judean tradition, Sodom was viewed as an extreme example of corruption and wickedness (Gn 13:13; 18:20; 19:13; Jr 23:14), and the typical example of what provokes God’s fiery judgement (Dt 29:23; Is 1:9; 13:19; Jr 50:40; Am 4:11). “To affirm that any town will fare *worse* than Sodom in the eschatological judgement is truly astonishing” (Catchpole 1993:175; emphasis original). According to Catchpole (1993:176) the towns are not accused of Sodom-like offences (Catchpole lists adultery, lying, pride, approval of evil, gluttony, prosperous ease, idolatry and a failure to help the poor and needy; cf Jr 23:14; Ezk 16:49; Jude 7; TLevi 14:6; TNaph 3:4; TBenj 9:1) but merely the rejection of the message of Jesus. But the dominant exegetical tradition identified arrogance and inhospitality as the Sodomites’ gravest sins – particularly affected were the poor.²⁸ According to Allison (2000:82), Q 10:12 in a similar fashion refers to the sin of inhospitality. This message along with Q 10:13-15 belongs to a mission exclusively

²⁷ Although Hartin (1995:159), speaking in reference to Q 10:21-22 and 11:49-51, states that “Sophia opposes those who hold authority [i.e. religious leadership] in Israel.” So in these passages “this generation” acquires a narrower frame of references for him. Particularly Q 11:49-51 holds Jerusalem, which represents the religious leadership, as responsible for the rejection of Sophia’s emissary (Jesus). But is such a narrower definition justified?

aimed at Israel, but clearly these passages illustrate a bitter resentment towards the towns for their inability to respond positively to the Q group's message. Tyre and Sidon it is said will fare better in the judgement, yet these cities were frequently singled out for condemnation²⁹ and were seen on various occasions as enemies of Israel.³⁰ It becomes evident that the Q people did not think much of their Judean neighbours!

The Q people's conflict with their co-ethnics is also evident in the polemic against the Pharisees and the lawyers. These Judean groups had influence over the people, and so act as representatives of the people and their spiritual state as well. Particularly the Pharisees – seen by Tuckett as part of the “retainer class” – pre-occupied themselves with issues of ritual purity and tithing (Tuckett 1996:442). Josephus testifies to the supposed popularity the Pharisees had amongst the populace (Ant 18.15, 17), although they did not seem to have much political influence in the first half of the first century. The Pharisees “more likely constituted a group that continually jockeyed for power and tried to gain power, though with varying degrees of success at different periods in history” (Tuckett 1996:444). Whatever their political influence, Q represents them as having considerable influence on the people. Now according to Tuckett, Q illustrates a strong concern to uphold the Pharisaic interpretation of the Law, and draws attention to the speculation that Jesus and his disciples had close links with the Pharisees.³¹ However, coupled with this is an intense hostility to non-Messianist Pharisees and/or (non-Messianist) scribes/lawyers (Tuckett 1996:424). Nevertheless, the accusations against the Pharisees never question their practice or rulings (Q 11:39-42). Purity laws and tithing are affirmed, and it is only in Q (as opposed to Mark) where Jesus is represented as affirming these links positively. Tuckett (1996:447) thus argues it would appear that “the community which preserved the Q material may also have preserved positive links with the Pharisaic movement in a way that most other primitive [Messianist] groups about which we have any evidence did not”. The woes in Q 11:39-42 suggest that the Q Messianists and the Pharisees they encountered

²⁸ Gn 19; Is 3:9-17; Ezk 16:49-50; WisSol 19:13-14; Josephus, Ant 1.194; SifDt 11:13-17; b.Sanh 109a-b; PRE 25.

²⁹ Is 23; Jr 25:22; 29; 47:4; Ezk 26; 27; 28:11-12, 22-23; Zch 9:2-4; Am 1:9-10; Jl 3:4-8.

³⁰ Ps 82:8; Am 1:9-10; 3:11 LXX; Jl 4:4-8; 1 Mac 5:15.

³¹ Cf Mark 7:2; 7:15; 2:15-17; 2:18-20, where it is expected that Jesus and his disciples should obey Pharisaic rules, or alternatively, the stipulations of the Associates/*haberim* (Schmidt 2001:235).

shared a large degree of overlap. Both groups were “reform” or “renewal movements”, which sought to influence others. So Tuckett (1996:449) suggests that the Q people may have been claiming to be a genuine part of the Pharisaic movement. The desire of the Q people was *not* to separate, but Q perhaps represents an early stage (earlier than Matthew) in the separation of Messianist communities from their Judean neighbours.

Such a view, however, is difficult to accept. There is obviously a degree of overlap – the Q people were Judeans after all – but there is no claim that the Q community is a part of the Pharisaic movement (Catchpole 1993:277). In Q 10:21 for example, which follows immediately after the missionary instructions, Jesus thanks the Father that he had kept “these things” from the “sages and the learned”. As Jacobson (1992:149) has noted, the bitter denunciations (Q 10:12-15) are followed by joyful praise, and anger and disappointment is followed by the view that God intended the failure of the mission. This actually contradicts the deuteronomistic motif, for nowhere in that tradition is their place for thanksgiving about Israel’s unbelief. In addition, it is said that Israel – under the spiritual guidance of the Pharisees and the lawyers – has no knowledge of God. This belongs exclusively to the Son and his followers (Q 10:22). According to Jacobson (1992:149), this “appears to be the expression of a radically sectarian group whose alienation from their own people exceeds anything found anywhere else in Q”. Covenantal nomism is in this context obliterated. The corporate notion of Israel as an elect people is denied, for how can you maintain your status within the covenant if you have no knowledge of God? Maintenance of status, it is implied, belongs to those who have responded positively to the message of Jesus.

“This generation” is clearly quite alienated from the Q group (or the Q group alienated itself). This might be taken as support that the Q group had given up hope on Israel in favour of the Gentiles. In connection with this, in Q 13:28-29, mention is made of the many that will come from “Sunrise and Sunset” to eat with the patriarchs in the kingdom of God, while Jesus’ (and therefore Q’s) unrepentant Judean contemporaries will be excluded. Tuckett understands this to refer to the many Gentiles that will replace the Judeans. He writes the saying (following the Matthean order of the verses (Mt 8:11-12; as does the IQP) “clearly contrasts the future fate of [Judeans] with that of Gentiles in the kingdom of God and claims that Gentiles will not only come into the kingdom but will actually replace [Judeans]” (Tuckett 1996:194). Tuckett (1996:194) argues this saying fits well with other sayings in Q where Gentiles

are favourably compared with Judeans, and where Judeans are warned that Gentiles will receive better treatment than they (Q 10:13-15) and will even judge them (Q 11:31-32).

With regards to Q 13:28-29, Allison (1997:117; cf 2000:166-69) argues that it “has nothing to do with Gentiles. It proclaims rather God’s judgment upon unfaithful [Judeans] in the land of Israel and the eschatological ingathering of [Judeans] from the Diaspora”. The directions from “Sunrise/East and Sunset/West” occur in Judean texts in connection with the return of Judeans to the land of Israel (Zch 8:7-8; Bar 4:4; 5:5; PsSol 11:2; 1 En 57:1). Also, Allison (1997:179-80) states that his research has not turned up a single text where the expression refers to the eschatological ingathering of Gentiles. There are parallel expressions where it is described that the exiles will return from Assyria/Babylon and Egypt (Is 27:12-13; Hs 11:11; Zch 10:10).³² It is not that all in Israel will be cast out of the kingdom. There are sayings that presuppose the presence of Judeans in the eschatological kingdom (Q 6:20; 13:28-29; 22:28-30). But many Judeans of the first century, including the Q people, looked forward to the future ingathering of scattered Israel, including the ten lost tribes.³³ Josephus gives evidence of speculation as to the number and whereabouts of the lost ten tribes (Ant 11.133). So Q looks forward to a blessed future for those in the Diaspora, while the Judeans resident in the land who refuse to accept their message will face eschatological punishment and exclusion. Parallels to this eschatological reversal are also found in the Tanak’s prophetic literature (Jr 24:1-10; 29:10-32; Ezk 11).

Q’s attitude towards fellow Judeans is typified by Q 13:34-35. Here mention is made of the Coming One, and Kloppenborg suggests that he is described in similar language found in MI 3:1-2: he will “come” with judgement to Jerusalem and its Temple (Kloppenborg 2000:123). This understanding of Q 13:34-35 is not likely, however. Admittedly, Jerusalem is accused as one who kills the prophets. As a result, she is told: “Look, your house is forsaken!” (Q 13:35a; cf Jr 12:7: God says, “I have abandoned my house ...”). Yet, v. 35 continues: “I tell you, You will not see me until [\llcorner the time \gg comes when]] you say: Blessed is the one who comes in the

³² For Luke’s longer version that includes “from north and south” cf Is 43:5-6; Zch 2:10 (LXX); PsSol 11:2-3.

³³ Cf 2 Mac 1:27-28; 2:18; Tob 13:13; PsSol 8:28. On the ten lost tribes, see Ec 36:11; 48:10; 1QM 2:1-3; 4QpIsa^d line 7; 11QTemple 57:5-6; 4 Ezra 13:32-50; 2 Bar 78:1-7; SibOr 2:170-73.

name of the Lord” (λέγω .. ὑμῖν, οὐ μὴ ἴδητέ με ἕως [[ῥῆξι ὅτε]] εἴπητε· εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου). According to Allison (1997:193), in the LXX and especially in Ps 117:26 that is cited in our Q text, εὐλογημένος (along with εὐλογεῖν and εὐλογημένος in the NT) “are often expressions of joy, and they consistently have a very positive connotation: ‘to praise,’ ‘to extol,’ ‘to bless,’ ‘to greet.’” He also suggests that v. 35 can be understood as a conditional sentence. “Until you say” means that when the people of Israel bless the Messiah, the Messiah will come. “In other words, the redemption will come when Israel accepts the person and work of Jesus” (Allison 1997:196). The Jerusalem and the Temple is “forsaken” precisely for the reason that those in the Temple do not bless Jesus (cf LXX Ps 117:26b: “We bless you from the house of the Lord”). Allison explains that ἕως can function to express contingency in Greek sentences; “the state in the first half of the sentence lasts only until the state depicted in the second half is realized. In such cases the meaning of ἕως is often not simply temporal (‘until’) but properly conditional, and thus close to ‘unless’” (Allison 1997:198). So a glimmer of hope is present for Jerusalem and the Temple. Q is saying that Jerusalem will be forsaken only until such a time when the people bless Jesus as the coming one and accept him as Messiah. So Q 13:35b functions similarly to Am 9:11-15: an oracle of doom is followed by hope of restoration. This is in line with other Q texts that look forward to the restoration of Israel (Q 13:29; 22:30). So Q 13:35b and its “optimism” is an integral part of the strong language used in Q to speak against “this generation” in order to arouse a positive response, and to warn of the severe consequences if it does not (Tuckett 1996:206).

So Q does entertain hopes for the restoration of Israel, even though it is only occasionally hinted at (Jacobson 1992:248). Jacobson says that Q 22:28-30 points to a ruling function and not the administration of justice. In this regard Horsley (1987:201-207; 1995:38; 1999:69, 105, 263) has persistently argued that the “judging (κρίνοντες) of the twelve tribes of Israel” in Q 22:30 has a positive meaning. Like the Hebrew *sapat*, the Greek points to grace and deliverance. So in Q 22:28-30 the Twelve/Q people (?) are portrayed not as judging (negatively) but as “liberating or establishing justice” for the twelve tribes (cf PsSol 17:28-32; 1QS 8:1-4: TestJud 24-25). “In Israelite tradition, God does not ‘judge’ but ‘delivers’ (‘liberates/saves/effects justice for’) the orphan, widow, poor, oppressed” or “even the whole people”.³⁴ We

³⁴ Cf Jdg 2:16; 3:10; 4:4; Pss 9; 10:18; 35; 58; 72:4; 76:9; 82:1-4; 94; 96:13; 98:9; 103:6; 140:12; 146:7; Is 42:1.

are in agreement with Horsley (1995:39; 1999:69) that based on an appropriate reading of Q 22:28-30, “Q envisages a renewal or restoration of Israel.” In relation to this stands Q 13:28-29, which refers to the restoration of the twelve tribes, “one of the principal images of the future renewal of Israel” (Horsley & Draper 1999:106).³⁵

But clearly it will only be the Diaspora and those local Judeans who respond to Q’s message that will be part of this Israel and one cannot agree with Horsley (1995:46-51) that Q’s polemical texts (e.g. Q 11:39-52; 13:28-29, 34-35; 14:16-24) are primarily aimed at the priestly leaders in Jerusalem and their supposed representatives (the Pharisees and scribes). The “you” these Diaspora Judeans will replace in Q 13:28-29 is therefore not just the Judean rulers or those who thought themselves to be the premiere families in Israel (*pace* Horsley 1995:47; 1999:119), but unresponsive Judeans in general. The principal conflict in Q is not that between the people and their rulers, but between the Q group and their co-ethnics in general who have refused to follow Jesus. As we saw, the lament over Jerusalem ends with a ring of hope, and it hints at the possibility that even Jerusalem *and its leaders* may participate in salvation if they accept Jesus and the Q people’s message. Jerusalem and the Temple should rather be seen as representative of non-responsive Israel as a whole, who like Jerusalem persecute God’s prophets, something which the Q people themselves experience from their local communities (Q 6:22-23; 12:10).

One last example also gives us insight into the Q people’s relationship with fellow Judeans. 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. “Thus the eschatological polemic in Q”, Tuckett (1996:204) goes on to argue, “may not be due to ‘this generation’ having been written off entirely, nor to the Q community strengthening its own group boundaries with a rigid ‘us/them’ sect mentality – rather, it is simply a way of reinforcing the seriousness of the call to ‘this generation’ to respond to the [Messianist] message, a call which may still be continuing.” 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” (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 streets.³⁶ But these Judeans will be told to get away from Jesus, reason being they do “lawlessness”.

³⁵ Cf Is 49:6; Sir 36:13; 48:10; PsSol 17:26-28.

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). We therefore suggest it is probable that these Judeans were Messianists that had given up performing some aspects of traditional covenantal praxis (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 apologise 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 addressing.³⁷ So in turn, the Q group rejects this sort of “lawlessness” and affirm their ethnic status as Judeans.

In concrete social terms, the Q people must have appeared to insiders and outsiders as a distinct group within Judeanism based on their focus on Jesus and his teaching. Although, the Q group like any Messianist group would have shown continuity with Judeanism as well. The fierce polemic in Q shows that a large amount of social and ideological overlap existed between Messianist Judeans and their “unrepentant” neighbours (Tuckett 1996:427). Tuckett further suggests that “we hear nothing in Q suggesting boundary creation by separate social or cultic practices.”³⁸ There is no explicit mention that the rite of baptism should be repeated by the Q group (it would be surprising if it was not) and it *may* be significant that there is no mention of the Eucharist (Tuckett 1996:435). Tuckett (1996:434-35) further suggests that based on this community consciousness of Q’s sayings, the divisions between the Messianists

³⁶ According to Tuckett (1996:192), it is widely agreed that Luke 13:26, which refers to Judean contemporaries of Jesus, is more original than Matthew 7:22, which refers to charismatics and prophets acting in Jesus’ name.

³⁷ See Tuckett (1996:427), who for other reasons argue that from the Judean side, the hostility shown towards the Messianists can be seen as based on the belief that the Messianists “constituted a threat from within to [Judeanism’s] self-identity.”

³⁸ But see Pearson (2004:488) who argues that Q 6:46 (cf 1 Cor 16:11; Did 10:6) may reflect something of the cultic life of the community.

behind Q and the Judean community were not that deep. From the Q group's side, it would appear that on the social level the split was as yet not that severe. They had not given up hope for Israel and they did not regard themselves as a separate community. In terms of their self-understanding, the important social divisions was Israel as a whole separated from the Gentiles – the Q Messianists placed themselves within the boundary of Israel, besides the tensions and the differences that existed. The Q people were striving to be “Messianist Judeans”, not “Judean Messianists”; there is “no indication that Q [Messianists] are being encouraged to separate themselves from the social and religious life of their [Judean] neighbours”, thus there is “little evidence of a specifically [Messianist] community consciousness or social self-awareness” (Tuckett 1996:435). So Q represents a stage prior to that of Matthew,³⁹ since it would seem that they have not reached that state of self-conscious “sectarian” differentiation from their Judean contemporaries.

This is difficult to accept, however, for Q does give evidence of a strong us/them outlook – the followers of Jesus, as opposed to “this generation”, have secured for themselves participation in the kingdom of God. *They* are destined to be part of eschatological Israel. Their opponents are headed for damnation. The eschatology and Christology of Q (see below) is quite telling in this regard. It is indirectly claimed in Q 10:22 that those who do not follow Jesus – the Son of God – have no knowledge of God – within the context of the Judean symbolic universe, this is a very pretentious and dismissive claim indeed! Their intention was not to break with Judeanism as such, but commitment to Jesus engendered a strong consciousness of difference vis-à-vis other *Judeans* (Q 10:12-15, 22; 11:49-52; 12:8-9; 13:34-35). The polemical attitude shows that the Q people are different kind of Judeans, but they are shaking their co-ethnics by the scruff of the neck trying desperately to make them as “different” as they are.

5.3.1.1.4.2 The Q People and the Family

In addition to the tension that existed between the Q people and their co-ethnics, obvious tension also existed within their families. One text in the main redaction is relevant for our discussion here. Family divisions were understood as signs of the

³⁹ Tuckett (1996:438) makes reference to Matthew 21:43; 22:7; 27:25. Matthew also speaks of “their” or “your” synagogues/scribes (Mt 4:23; 9:35; 10:17; 12:9; 13:54; 23:34; 7:29). There is clearly an element of self-awareness, where the Matthean Messianists distinguish and distance themselves from their Judean contemporaries.

coming end.⁴⁰ Q 12:49-53 implies the end is here, but note the apologetic introduction to this saying:

... [[Do you]] think that I have come to hurl peace on earth? I did not come to hurl peace, but a sword! For I have come to divide son against father, [[and]] daughter against mother, [[and]] daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law.

According to Cotter (1995a:127), in Q 9:59-62 it is the social system's expectations that are challenged, but in Q 12:49-53 "the examples suggest that the disciples is still at home or nearby, and the saying justifies the rifts that occur right within the larger family complex". Here the household is the primary focus of attention and the conflict is between the generations, and the source of the conflict is Jesus. Importantly, it is something he intended! According to Jacobson (1995:365), the saying may reflect "a situation in which it was the young who were most attracted to the Jesus movement, and this led to dissension." Oporto (2001:216, 221-22) is more cautious on whether it is the children who cause the division in Q⁴¹ (certainly implied in the IQP reconstruction of Q 12:53 and in Q 9:59-60) but generally the sayings in Q imply that following Jesus disrupts the family, and that the family conflict was mainly between the parents and their children. So Jesus it is said, intentionally undermined the structure of the patriarchal family, but more about this when we investigate the relevant texts of the formative stratum.

5.3.1.1.4.3 Summary

There is a strong sense of alienation between the Q people and "this generation" who are seen as guilty of primordial sins (Q 7:31-35; Q 11:29-51). This refers to unresponsive Judeans from whom the Q community is experiencing opposition, discrimination and repression. God/Wisdom will send them prophets to make them responsible for the death of all the prophets – the prophets will not be sent for their salvation. In fact, the Gentiles will fare better than them in the judgement. They are under the spiritual leadership of the Pharisees and lawyers, the blind guides,

⁴⁰ Mi 7:6; Is 19:12; Zch 13:3; Jub 23:16; 1 En 100:1; 4QTest 15-17.

⁴¹ Oporto believes that Luke has best preserved the form of Q here where the conflict is in both directions. Oporto's study is more relevant to the historical Jesus, nevertheless, it is argued that the sayings in Q (along with Mk 1:16-20; 10:28-30) seem to indicate that the origin of the family divisions lay in the attitude of the children and that these sayings could have been aimed at the younger generation. This, we suggest, could also be relevant to Q 12:53.

whereby their knowledge of God is denied (Q 10:21-22; 11:39-42). Even neutrality is seen as a sign of opposition (Q 11:23). The Diaspora will replace local Israelites (Q 13:28-29), yet there is a glimmer of hope that the Q people's fellow Judeans will accept Jesus and so participate in the restoration of Israel (Q 13:34-35). At the same time, Q disassociates itself from those who do “lawlessness” (Q 13:27), presumably from those Messianists who have given up aspects of covenantal praxis. Jesus also came to divide the family, especially causing separation between the parents and their children (Q 12:49-53).

Overall, Q does not reject kinship relationships with fellow Judeans, but clearly has a strong consciousness of difference in opposition to fellow Judeans and family members – as does from those guilty of “lawlessness”. The relationship of the Q people with their co-ethnics is therefore highly frustrated and one can hardly speak of a feeling of communal solidarity. Q is negotiating the position of its people within Israel but is clearly situated on the periphery. From Q's perspective, however, they properly belong within the Judean symbolic universe where kinship patterns are (re)constructed because of commitment to Jesus.

5.3.1.1.5 Land

After Catchpole's (1993) analysis of Q's attitude towards tradition and the Temple, he concludes that the Q community shows a continuing commitment to the covenant, the law and the Temple, but at the same time, had the expectation that Jerusalem and the Temple would be abandoned by God sometime in the future. Overall, as the Temple still stood in the present, “we have a picture of a community whose outlook was essentially Jerusalem-centred ... whose worship was temple-centred, and which saw ... no incompatibility between all of that and commitment to Jesus” (Catchpole 1993:279). But the lament over Jerusalem in Q 13:34-35 suggests that God has already abandoned the Temple, by implication the city as well: “Look, your house is forsaken!” (v. 35a). As Reed (2000:187) suggests, “the Q community's social map envisions Jerusalem as forsaken and deserted.” Otherwise we can agree that the Q community was Jerusalem and Temple-centred, although evidently that relationship was frustrated as well. Jerusalem is forsaken, yes, but v. 35b still clings on to hope for the city's salvation: “You will not see me until [[the time comes when]] you say: Blessed is the one who comes in the name of the Lord!” And also the twofold “Jerusalem, Jerusalem” in v. 34 and the disappointment it presupposes is more understandable if it continued to play a central role in the hopes and expectations of

Jesus' earliest followers (Freyne 2001:308-9). As Freyne hints at, a north/south polarity, or Q's supposed inherent anti-Jerusalem stance, is unwarranted. But what are the implications for Q's relationship to the *land*?

As already indicated above, Q 13:35b suggests an attachment to Jerusalem (and its Temple), and by implication, to the territorial land of Israel itself. This suggestion is supported by two other passages of the main redaction. The eschatological pilgrimage, where many will come from Sunrise/East and Sunset/West (Q 13:28-30) has territorial Israel as the locus of the coming Age. In Q 22:28-30, the followers of Jesus are promised that they will sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel. Q 22:28-30 presupposes the reconstitution of the twelve tribes, thus the restoration of Israel. Freyne (2001:310) argues this tribal symbolism is not related to geography at all as in the expansionist tendencies of Ezk 40-48. His argument is based on the opinion that Q demonstrates an "openness" to outsiders. Freyne (2001:310) states that the Q group

saw that Israel was different from the gentiles and that a greater holiness was called for [Q 6:27-35], but this did not preclude an openness to outsiders, as the story of the healing of the centurion's servant demonstrates [Q 7:1-10] ... Rather than expanding territorial boundaries, the sense of inclusion is represented by the arrival of the nations at the eschatological banquet [Q 13:28-30].

Freyne (2001:311) argues further that in Q we encounter a group who are deeply aware of their Judean identity but their openness to outsiders led to conflict with other Judean groups of a separatist bent. So what can be said for Gentile participation in the eschatological blessings of Israel? There seems to be widespread agreement that the Q group did not engage in a mission to Gentiles (see below), thus Q's "openness" to Gentiles must be approached with caution. Some sayings presuppose the presence of "righteous" Gentiles at the judgement (e.g. Q 11:31-32), but as to their further status nothing is said. As will be discussed later, Gentile faith is recognised, but the Gentiles are primarily present in Q as a polemical device to shame non-responsive Judeans. Gentile participation in the eschatological future is not a primary concern for Q. Nothing is said of contemporary Romans, Greeks and Samaritans. It is preoccupied with the restoration of Israel, with Jerusalem and the Temple welcoming Jesus, with the eschatological pilgrimage of Diaspora Judeans, and all these sayings presuppose some geographical area. What Q exactly

envisions for this geographical “Israel”, however, is uncertain. So whether Q endorsed an expansionist ideology or not cannot be established with certainty.

In sum, the sayings in Q evidently look forward to the restoration of Israel, and the ancestral land – of uncertain magnitude and scope – will feature prominently in the Age to come. But certainly the Jerusalem and the Temple will continue to play a central role, on the condition that it accepts Jesus. The Diaspora Judeans will return, and the Q people will sit on thrones to act as judges over the twelve tribes as in the days of old. Gentile participation in the land is at best ambiguous, since Q is preoccupied with the future destiny of eschatological Israel. Here a more primordialist approach to ethnicity is in evidence. Q shares the millennial dream of common Judeanism, yet it is redefined around the eschatological significance of Jesus.

5.3.1.2 The Sacred Canopy

We must remember that Judean ethnicity based on our model is also dependent on the interrelationship between the *habitus* and the “Sacred Canopy”. This dialectical interrelationship primarily has to do with the belief that Yahweh established/prescribes Judean ethnicity (“getting in”). So again the question must be asked: How did the Q people compare?

We suggest that our treatment of Q with regards to the “Sacred Canopy” needs some immediate modification and will be approached by looking at three primary features that are present in Q, namely, its Christology, the relationship between the Torah and the kingdom/reign of God, and its eschatology. Eschatology is very similar to the millennial aspect of our model, while the notion of Christology and the Kingdom of God, are of course, new elements. This adaptation to the Sacred Canopy of Q already suggests an element of (re)construction, yet, it is required by the evidence as set out below.

5.3.1.2.1 The Christology of the Main Redaction

The term Χριστός/Messiah does not appear in Q, so it may seem quite inappropriate to speak of Q’s “Christology”. But especially Q 13:34-35 seems to suggest that Q understood Jesus as the Messiah (Allison 1997:192-204), and in the very least,

Jesus is clearly understood by Q as the eschatological prophet, and a prophet like Moses who has initiated the new Exodus.⁴² Q 7:22-23 presupposes the anointed figure of Isaiah, so it does not seem inappropriate to speak of the Christology of Q.

As Tuckett (1996:210) notes, “the era of eschatological fulfilment is clearly seen in Q as inextricably linked with the person of Jesus”. Through Jesus’ actions, various Isaianic prophecies are fulfilled (Q 7:22; cf Is 29:18f; 35:5; 61:1f); Jesus also asserts that in the person of John the Baptist, the Tanak has been fulfilled (Q 7:27; cf Mi 3:1; Ex 23:20); the longed for future, looked forward to by the prophets, is now being experienced in the present (Q 10:23f); the eschatological kingdom is present in Jesus’ exorcisms (Q 11:20); the parables of the mustard seed and the leaven at a pre-redactional stage already implied that the future kingdom of God is already present (Q 13:18-21; 16:16); something greater than Jonah and Solomon in the form of Jesus is present (Q 11:31f); and eschatological turbulence in the form of family divisions are mentioned in Q 12:51-53 (cf Mi 7:6). Already at a pre-redactional stage, in the Great Sermon, a warning was issued that to ignore Jesus’ teaching will have severe eschatological consequences (Q 6:47-49). More examples can be called upon, but it is evident that for Q “Jesus has central significance” (Tuckett 1996:212). What did this significance entail?

5.3.1.2.1.1 Jesus, the Eschatological Prophet

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 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:

⁴² Q 10:5 may also suggest that the Q people understood Jesus to be the Davidic Messiah. See 1 Samuel 25:6, where David sends men to Nabal with a peace greeting, in the hope of receiving some food, motifs also found in Q 10:5, 7-8 (Allison 2000:147).

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 testing.⁴³

(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:

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).⁴⁴ If Israel was tempted to put God to the test, the same thing happens to Jesus (Exod 17:1-3; Q 4:9-12). And if Israel was lured to idolatry (Exodus 32), the devil confronts Jesus with the same temptation to worship something other than Israel's God (Q 4:5-8).

Q 4:4 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

⁴³ 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."

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 the idea developed that the latter things will be as the first. The future redemption will be like the redemption from Egypt.⁴⁵ 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).

The temptation narrative only hints at the identity of the “Coming One”. What is implicit becomes explicit in Q 7:18-23, where John’s envoys ask Jesus whether he is this expected figure spoken of in Q 3:16-17. Jesus’ answer is indirect but affirmative, and gives a list of events that constitute God’s reversal of status for the disabled and the poor that recall elements from the Psalms (146) and Isaiah (26:18-19; 29:18-19; 35:5-6; 42:7, 18; 49:1-2; 61:1-2). A text from Qumran (4Q521) which in some respects are similar to Q 7:22 has a list of deeds ascribed to the messiah.⁴⁶ In a similar manner the 11QMelch text illustrates that Isaiah 61:1-2 was used in the first century to refer to an “eschatological prophetic figure” (Tuckett 1996:221). So Q firmly stands within an exegetical tradition (cf Allison 2000:109-14). In Q itself, the poor are being evangelised (Q 7:22), indicating in particular that the anointed figure of Isaiah 61:1-2 is also finding its fulfilment. So Q’s Jesus connects John’s Coming One with the anointed prophet of Isaiah 61:1-2. The reference to Jesus raising the dead and cleansing the lepers in Q 7:22⁴⁷ may also have been influenced by the prophetic tradition. In the Tanak it is the prophets Elijah (1 Ki 17:1-24) and Elisha (2

⁴⁴ Ex 16:4; Dt 8:3; Neh 9:15; Ps 78:25; 105:40; WisSol 16:20; Jn 6:31-34 and other texts.

⁴⁵ 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.

⁴⁶ Q 7:22 refers to the blind seeing (cf Is 29:18; 35:5; 42:7, 18; 61:1), the lame walking (Is 35:6), the cleansing of lepers, the deaf hearing (cf Is 29:18; 35:5; 42:18), the dead being raised (cf Is 26:19), and the poor being evangelised (cf Is 29:19; 61:1). Parts of 4Q521 read: “... [the hea]vens and the earth will listen to His Messiah ... Over the poor His [i e the Lord] spirit will hover and will renew the faithful with His power. And He will glorify the pious on the throne of the eternal Kingdom. He who liberates the captives, *restores sight to the blind* ... For he will heal the wounded, and *revive the dead and bring good news to the poor* ...” (Vermes 1998:391-392; emphasis added).

Ki 4:18-37) who raised the dead and the prophet Elisha (2 Ki 5:8-10) who also healed leprosy. So these traditions of raising the dead and healing may have been mentioned here to show that Jesus, the eschatological prophet, is also continuing in the line of the prophets Elijah and Elisha (Tuckett 1996:222-23). In Q 6:20-21 (formative stratum) this prophetic theme is similarly present. In the Beatitudes, the “poor”, the “mourners” and the “hungry” are a single group who receive divine promises couched in the language of Isaiah 61:1-2, whereby Jesus is implicitly represented as the eschatological prophet (Tuckett 1996:226).⁴⁸

Forming part of this prophetic representation of Jesus is where he is understood as an envoy of Wisdom (Q 7:31-35; 11:49-51; 13:34-35). The “figure of Divine Sophia developed within the Hebrew writings as reflection upon Wisdom and her relationship to God developed. Proverbs 1-9 seems to have initiated this reflection” (Hartin 1995:151). Ben Sira and the Wisdom of Solomon continues this tradition. It is probable that behind this is an idea of Wisdom as a kind of personified being who, being rejected, fails to find a home in Israel. Several Judean texts (Pr 1, 8; Sir 24; Job 28; 1 En 42) speak of σοφία not just as an attribute of God, but almost as if she had a being of her own. An important part of this tradition speaks of Wisdom calling people to obedience, but they reject the call (e.g. Pr 1:20ff). In Sirach 24, Wisdom seeks a home in Israel, finding such in the Torah. In 1 Enoch 42, Wisdom is unable to find a home and so withdraws. “There seems then to have been a strand in [Judean] thought which could talk of Wisdom appealing to men and women to follow the ways of Yahweh, but experiencing only rejection and rebuttal” (Tuckett 1996:170). This theme is evidently very similar in substance to the idea of the rejected prophets.

In Q 7:31-35 Jesus alongside John is portrayed as those to whom Divine Sophia has communicated herself in this generation. But like the prophets of old, both are rejected. In Q 11:49-51, Wisdom’s role in salvation history is explained (cf WisSol 7:27; 10:1-4). She sends her messengers to Israel, but these envoys are rejected, persecuted and even killed. “Noticeable here is the theme of the rejection of God’s messengers, whereby the Deuteronomistic understanding of history has been joined

⁴⁷ The cleansing of lepers has no parallel in Isaiah, but Tuckett (1996:222) refers to Isaiah 26:19 which may possibly have influenced Q’s reference to the dead being raised. See also Allison (2000:110).

⁴⁸ Tuckett (1996:226-237) also argues that a substantial portion of Luke 4:16ff – the rejection scene in Nazareth where Isaiah 61 is explicitly quoted – was originally part of Q.

together with the Sophia motif" (Hartin 1995:157; cf Tuckett 1996:170). Q 13:34-35 is identified as an oracle of Wisdom where she wails her inability to "gather" the children of Jerusalem through the sending of prophets. This "gathering" is a call to repentance, something which Jesus himself, like the prophets of old, was involved with and is now being accomplished through the Q community (Q 11:23; 14:16-24) (Jacobson 1992:212-13). Tuckett (1996:175) also says that Q may have regarded the lament over Jerusalem in 13:34-35 as a Wisdom saying with the final sayings clause (v. 35b) being a secondary addition, it not being clear whether the latter saying requires a different speaker (in the form of Jesus) or not. Whatever the original reference, however, this addition with its allusion to LXX Psalm 117:26 now refers to Jesus as ὁ ἐρχόμενος (cf Q 3:16; 7:19).

Jesus is *the* representative of Wisdom, or alternatively, its eschatological emissary (Hartin 1995:159). Tuckett and Pearson (2004:488) notes that Q implicitly takes note of Jesus' death since it seems to be the case that his death is placed on par with the death of the prophetic messengers sent by Wisdom down the ages – Jesus is the final envoy of Wisdom, however, so it is appropriate to think of Jesus as an "eschatological prophet" (Tuckett 1996:220-21).

5.3.1.2.1.2 Jesus the Son of humanity/man

Jacobson (1992:123) understands the "son of man" in Q 7:34 as a circumlocution for "I". It cannot refer to an apocalyptic figure for in the apocalyptic texts it refers to a future figure, not one who "has come", and mundane activities such as eating and drinking are inappropriate for an apocalyptic figure. Similarly in the apocalyptic/eschatological discourse of Q 17:23-37b, the "son of man" does not necessarily refer to an individual figure or his parousia, or his involvement in the "rapture". Jacobson (1992:235) sees Q 17:23 with v. 37b, and the latter as a "sardonic comment on the suppression of [Judean] freedom movements by the Romans." Thus an attempt was made to separate the Q community from eschatological excitement in the Judean community at large. The "son of man" sayings were added later, but the connection of Q 17:24, 26-27, 30 with Daniel 7:13-14, Jacobson argues, is tenuous. The "son of man" in Q is not a redeemer figure, only a judgement figure and he will be "revealed" for the destruction of the heedless (Q 17:30). Nothing is said of the exaltation of the "son of man" or how he would rescue the righteous. Jacobson consequently proposes that the "son of man" is a symbol of the faithful people of God, amongst which the Q people would number

themselves. This indicates a new sense of identity and a sharpening of group boundaries. This implies they participate in judgement, a corporate image possibly also found in Q 11:31-32 and 22:28-30 (Jacobson 1992:237-38). The sayings of the “son of man” like Q 17:23, 37b reject apocalyptic watching and waiting, for the kingdom is present (something implied in Q 17:26-27, 30), and the level of messianic excitement has subsided, or even disappeared (Jacobson 1992:236, 238). In a similar vein Horsley (1999:65, 70-71) argues that “(the day of) the son of man” in Q 12:40; 17:24, 26, 30 is not a reference to an individual figure of redemption/judgment or his “coming” but is a symbolic reference to the judgement. This appears to be similar yet different to Daniel 7 where “the people of the saints of the Most High” (= “son of man”) appears at the divine judgement of the beastly empires. And when Jesus referred to himself with “the son of man” (Q 6:22; 7:34; 9:58; 11:30) it is not a title.

The above arguments are questionable, however. It is arbitrary how the Son of humanity/man sayings are categorised as being nothing more than a circumlocution for the speaker’s self-reference (“I/me”) on one hand, while in others it refers to the Q community or is merely a symbolic reference to the judgement. The fact of the matter is the Q text, when seen as a whole, strongly suggests that for Q the Son of humanity/man does refer to an individual, future apocalyptic figure, and that it does refer to Jesus in view of an imminent eschatological scenario. Jesus is identified as the Son of humanity/man in Q (6:22; 7:34; 9:58; 11:30; 12:8), even if it only serves there as a circumlocution for “I/me”. Particularly Q 12:8-9 probably refers to Daniel 7:13-14 and its context (Allison 2000:130-31). Both texts involve the last judgement, the central figure of the Son of humanity/man before the divine court, the presence of angels, and both texts involve persecution. So Q 12:8-9 may indirectly refer to the coming of Jesus as the Son of humanity/man and his role as judge before the divine court.⁴⁹ In the support of this connection with Daniel, Tuckett (1996:276) argues that both “the prophetic/wisdom category and the [Son of humanity/man] terminology are rooted in the idea of suffering and hence it is no coincidence that both appear together in Q.” So the Son of humanity/man, as the persecuted righteous sufferer, could be a reference to Daniel 7, where the usage of Q would fit in with Daniel 7 and

⁴⁹ Duling states that as Q now stands, it is dominated by apocalyptic, especially the return of Jesus as the Son of Man with power to execute the final judgement (in reference to Q 12:8-9). “In characteristic fashion, eschatological hopes in a time of alienation drew on prophetic and apocalyptic ideas and images from other apocalyptic and prophetic literature. It seems likely that the developing Q community was led, at least in part, by Spirit-filled, eschatological prophets who spoke for the now departed, but soon to return, Jesus” (Duling 2003b:120).

related texts (1 En 62; cf WisSol 2-5) as it was used in first century Judeanism (Tuckett 1996:276).

If Q 12:8-9 refers indirectly to the coming of Jesus, Q 12:40 is explicit with regards to the “coming” of the Son of humanity/man. Jesus has already been identified as the “Coming One” in Q 7:18-23, who in Q 3:16b-17 is given the task of a *future* immersion, be it in Spirit or in fire. When the Son of humanity/man is revealed, the eschatological separation of the elect will occur (Q 17:30, 34-35) (Kloppenborg 1987:163), and one is reminded of the Coming One’s function in Q 3:16b-17 who will gather the wheat and burn the chaff.⁵⁰ Q 7:18-23 where the Coming One’s identity is affirmed as Jesus, also anticipates Q 13:35 where the returning Jesus will be addressed as follows: “Blessed is the one who comes in the name of the Lord!” (Allison 2000:109). The point is that Jesus is identified in Q as both the Son of humanity/man and as the Coming One – it only makes logical sense that the “coming” or future role of the Son of humanity/man in Q 12:40 and 17:23-37 is relevant to Jesus himself.

In Q 17:24, the coming of the Son of humanity/man is associated with lightning, implying this figure’s appearance will be sudden and visible to all and Q 17:30 speaks of the day that he will be “revealed” – this imagery can hardly be applicable to the Q community! Kloppenborg (1987:161) argues that Q 17:24 serves as a positive counterpart for Q 17:23 in terms of Son of humanity/man eschatology: “do not attend to earthly messianic figures; the Son of Man will come as a heavenly figure!”⁵¹ In the very least it clearly refers to a heavenly figure who is described as “coming” at an unexpected hour (Q 12:40; cf Q 17:26-30). According to Pearson (2004:488), references “to the coming of the ‘Son of Man’ [Q 12:40 cf 12:37, 43; 17:23-37] clearly presuppose the resurrection and exaltation of Jesus”. He may have a point, for were the Q people merely expecting the return of a martyr?

⁵⁰ With regards to the eschatological separation of the elect, Allison (2000:83-84) suggests that Q 10:12 expects the resurrection of the just and the unjust. The same can be said for Q 10:14.

⁵¹ Kloppenborg (1987:160) also draws attention to the similarity between Q 17:24 and the fragmentary Daniel apocryphon (4QpsDan Aa [= 4Q246]) where it speaks of a “Son of God” and “Son of the Most High” – although it is not clear whether the text speaks of a Gentile pretender or an heir to the Davidic throne – and the mention of a kingdom that will like comets flash into sight.

5.3.1.2.1.3 Jesus the Lord/Master

Already at a pre-redactional stage (Q 6:46), Jesus is identified as Lord or Master (κύριε). This idea comes to fuller expression in the main redaction. Surprisingly, the Gentile centurion addresses Jesus as Lord/Master in Q 7:6. In the parables of Q 12:42-46 and 19:12-27, the Lord/Master is the one who gives instructions to his servants, goes away and upon his return, requires an account of how his instructions were obeyed. The κύριος figure in these parables has been identified in Q 12:39-40 as the coming Son of humanity/man (Catchpole 1993:99).

5.3.1.2.1.4 Jesus the Son of God

Lastly, Q also contains an explicit “Son” Christology in Q 10:21-22, which is similar to the sonship language of Wisdom 2-5, where the righteous sufferer, and perhaps the follower of Wisdom, is the son of God (WisSol 2:16; cf Sir 4:10). This son also claims to have knowledge of God (WisSol 2:13). It may therefore be that Q 10:21-22 must be seen as similar to other Q texts already mentioned that represent Jesus as an envoy of Wisdom (Tuckett 1996:279-80). Jacobson (1992:149) has a different but related view, as he argues that “the wisdom tradition here functions to absolutize the status of Jesus. Moreover, rather than being an emissary of Wisdom, Jesus is here said to mediate revelation directly”. So here we have the identification of Jesus with Sophia, and the “new status of Jesus is clearly reflected in the ‘father/son’ terminology, which is not found elsewhere in Q”. This high Christology is evidence for Jacobson that Q 10:21-22 is quite separate from the rest of Q. It is worthwhile having the text in front of us, especially v. 22:

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 text need not to be separated from the rest of Q as Jacobson sees no connection between this text and 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 lawgiver.⁵² 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 community.

Q 10:21-22 can also be an implicit reference to the heavenly status of Jesus. The tragedy of Ezekiel also has Moses saying the following, when speaking of a throne he sees atop Mt Sinai:

Upon it sat a man of noble mien,
becrowned, and with a scepter in one hand
while with the other he did beckon me.
I made approach and stood before the throne.
He handed o’er the scepter and he bade
me mount the throne, and gave me the crown;
then he himself withdrew from off the throne (EzekTrag 70-76)

Here evidently God vacates his throne for Moses! In a sense, Moses is conceived of as divine (cf Philo, Moses 1:55-58) (Collins 1997:89). There is a resemblance here to the divine exaltation of the son of man in Daniel 7. The Son of humanity/man in Q we have argued is Jesus, a heavenly figure whose coming is anticipated. Is Q 10:22 in reference to the usual status of Moses another indication of the heavenly status of Jesus?

In the very least, the comparison between Q 10:21-22 and traditions about Moses reveal that Jesus had immense status for the Q people. This high valuation of Jesus must be seen in connection with Q 12:8-10. The members of the Q community are expected to confess the Son of humanity/man presumably in the context of a trial before Judean elders (?) where they must renounce Jesus or admit that they are his followers (Jacobson 1992:188). Kloppenborg (1987:201) argues that Q 12:8-9 “makes confession of *Jesus* the definitive measure of salvation” (emphasis original). In this regard Q seems to be on par with general Messianist Judeanism. What is particularly relevant here is what Paul writes in Galatians. Paul writes that “we who are Judeans by birth”, that is, Judean Messianists, “know that a man is not justified by observing the law, *but/except* (ἐὰν μὴ) by faith in Jesus Messiah” (Gl 2:16a).⁵³ Here Paul is appealing it would seem to common ground between himself and Peter, and Messianist Judeans in general. Faith in Jesus is a *qualification* to justification by works of the law. The works of the law are not rejected, so faith in Jesus is one identity marker – indeed the primary identity marker – next to the works of the law. The works of the law, however, will have no effect if faith in Jesus is not in place (cf Dunn 1990:195-96). Covenantal praxis takes a backseat to the significance of Jesus. Of course, Paul continues by placing faith in Jesus and the works of the law as antithetical opposites (Gl 2:16b), a position rejected by the main redaction of Q (Q 13:27; 16:17). Nevertheless, Q displays similar thinking to other Messianist groups – salvation is dependent on confession of/faith in Jesus, the Son of humanity/man, in addition to the works of the law.

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 represented as the prophet like Moses – this compliments the connection to Moses identified in Q 10:22. Jacobson (1992:93-94) has also seen the connection between the second temptation (Q 4:9-12) and the Wisdom of Solomon 2:17-20, where it is assumed that God’s son can expect divine protection.

⁵² 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.

⁵³ Or should it be translated “by the faith of Jesus Messiah” (διὰ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ)? (cf Hooker 1990:165-86). If this is the case, then the parallel to Q fails.

5.3.1.2.1.5 Summary

For Q the arrival of Jesus inaugurated the eschatological age, already partly fulfilled, in part still expected to come to its full consummation. In the main redaction Jesus is at first identified as the “Coming One”. This figure is developed in two ways in Q. He is represented as the prophet like Moses who has initiated the new Exodus, and as the anointed prophet of Isaiah – overall, the Coming One is the eschatological prophet. Within this prophetic tradition Jesus is also understood as the final emissary of Wisdom. Secondly, the Coming One is the heavenly Son of humanity/man, whose future coming in judgement is still expected. Jesus is the Lord/Master who expects that his instructions be adhered to in his absence. As the Son of God, Jesus is placed on par or even above Moses – the Son has received the whole revelation of the Father. Jesus as an envoy of Wisdom, as the eschatological prophet, as the Son of humanity/man, and as a Son of God, all have in common the idea of conflict leading to rejection and suffering (Tuckett 1996:282). Knowledge of the suffering and death of Jesus (and his resurrection?) is presupposed throughout. We can see that the Christology of the main redaction of Q is naturally analogous to the main redactional themes of judgement, polemic against “this generation”, a Deuteronomistic understanding of history, and allusions to the story of Lot.

In a context where the Q document was orally performed, “the performer assumes the voice of the prophet himself” (Horsley & Draper 1999:168). Yet this was no ordinary prophet. Contrast Q’s high estimation of Jesus with Q 11:29-30 where “this generation” puts in a request for a sign (cf Mk 8:11-12; Jn 6:30). Jacobson (1992:169) understands that the dispute over the “signs” (and Jesus’ authority) were questions put to the early followers of Jesus, and not to Jesus himself. Most likely they originated from the religious leaders, and the general consensus that Jesus was no authentic religious authority, a view that reflected popular sentiment. What clearly separates the Q community from their co-ethnics is the heavenly status they afforded Jesus, his eschatological significance, and his rank which is on par or even higher than Moses. Although the Torah and traditional covenantal praxis plays an important role in Q’s covenantal nomism, it is *confession of Jesus that gives eschatological salvation*. Jesus in fact has become part of the Q people’s Sacred Canopy, being afforded a status that is only second to God. Q’s covenantal nomism is in (re)construction, and in quite a dramatic way.

5.3.1.2.2 The Torah and the Kingdom of God

According to Horsley (1999:87), the “principal, unifying theme of the whole document is clearly ‘the kingdom of God.’ Featured prominently at crucial points in most speeches (6:20; 7:28; 10:9, 11; 11:2, 20; 12:31; 13:18-21, 28-29; 16:16; 22:28-30), the kingdom of God is virtually assumed or taken for granted as the focus of Q discourses as well as the comprehensive agenda of preaching, practice, and purpose in Q”. Following a scheme of two main redactional strata for Q, we can see where the kingdom of God is mentioned explicitly it has strong representation in both strata. Thus overall it is clear that the kingdom of God – be it in a hortatory or polemical context – was a prominent religious identifier for the Q people, “virtually assumed or taken for granted” throughout the document, and supposedly the oral performances thereof as well. At the same time, it is quite obvious that some tension exists between the kingdom of God and the Torah, or rather, Jesus’ interpretation of it. So the validity of the law or the covenant itself is never questioned, what is questioned by opponents and defended by Q is Jesus’ eschatological status and his Torah interpretation, the latter being the equivalent of the requirements of the kingdom of God.

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. Tuckett (1996:423) argues the temptation narrative and the redactional additions in Q 11:42c and 16:17 more probably belong to the same (single) redactional moment hence a Q³ stage is not necessary. Catchpole (1993:229) refers to Q 7:27 and the temptation narrative (Q 4:1-12) where both use the introductory formula *γράφεται*, then proceed to cite scripture,⁵⁴ suggesting 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. Here Jesus’ Judean contemporaries – which we have argued refers to Judean Messianists in Q – are accused of doing “lawlessness” (*ἀνομίαν*). In this regard Tuckett (1996:406) says that “almost certainly the [Q 16:17] saying is asserting the abiding validity of the Law in the present”. We suggest 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). Both Q 13:27 and 16:17 can be said to modify any misunderstanding that

⁵⁴ 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 the main redaction of Q.

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 Messianists.⁵⁵ 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 not *that* orthodox, hence the need for this corrective and apologetic strategy.

In the temptation narrative, 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).

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

⁵⁵ Here we want to draw attention 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

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).⁵⁶ Alternatively, it simply refers to the Pharisees and their obsession to observe the law correctly.⁵⁷ 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 – the ceremonial law is just as important as the rest (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). Woes about the cup in Q presume a Shammaite distinction that was dominant before the First Revolt – it was to be replaced by the Hillelite position thereafter (Neusner 1976; Kloppenborg 2000:175). Based on Neusner’s analysis (cf m.Kel 25:1, 7-8; m.Ber 8:2; y.Ber 8:2), the Shammaites understood that impurity could be transferred to the entire cup by unclean hands touching liquid on the outside of the cup. For the Hillelites, this was irrelevant in one respect, for they deemed that the outside of the cup was in a permanent state of impurity, implying that the outside of the cup does not affect the status of the inside. So it was the status of the inside of the cup that was decisive – the inner part determines the state of the cup as a whole. That is why the polemic in Q coheres with the position of the Hillelites: “first cleanse the inside”, so that the whole cup will be in a state of cleanness; the outer part can never be clean anyway.

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

ideas (Tuckett 1996:82; emphasis original). Was Q here speaking to (a part of) the community?

⁵⁶ 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.

⁵⁷ Although the Tanak itself only specifies that farm and garden produce, especially corn, wine and oil be tithed.

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” impurity⁵⁸ to others, which may be using another Hillelite tradition, this time in relation to the purity classification of Gentiles (m.Pes 8.8). Based on Catchpole’s (1993:268) approach, however, here the same kind of (moral) impurity may be referred to which existed in their eating vessels.⁵⁹ The ἀρπαγή term and its cognates is often used in Judean literature “as a vivid metaphor for the predatory activities of wolves and lions,⁶⁰ 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 ‘judgment and mercy’” (Catchpole 1993:267). This concurs with Q 11:43, where the Pharisees are attacked for their love of high social standing; they “love [[the place of honor at banquets and]] the front seat in the synagogues and accolades in the markets”. Catchpole also draws attention to the ἄρπαξ word group (Q 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. So Q 10:3 + 11:39 + 16:16 must be seen in combination and they indicate the context of religious polarization; 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.

Q 11:39-44 therefore goes beyond a mere mockery of the Pharisees’ concern for cultic purity (Horsley & Draper 1999:114). Horsley (1995:47-9; Horsley & Draper 1999:114-15) argues that Q’s Jesus is indicting the Pharisees and the scribes for contributing towards the exploitation of the people. Q 11:39-52 focuses on their political-economic-religious role, part of it being their insistence that the people pay tithes to Jerusalem and its ruling priestly aristocracy in addition to the taxes that the Galileans were paying Antipas or Agrippa or to Caesar. Horsley (1995:42) understands the Pharisees to be “legal-clerical retainers” for the interpretation and application of official Judean laws initially delegated by Hasmonean rulers who from

⁵⁸ Cf Kloppenborg (1987:141): “The accusation that the Pharisees are ‘unmarked graves’ ... portrays them as a source of ritual defilement”.

⁵⁹ Cf Matthew 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)

⁶⁰ 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.

then on continued to impose these laws on behalf of Jerusalem. We understand the Q people to be Judeans themselves, however, and the Pharisees exploiting the Q people coheres well with Baumgarten's understanding of Judean sects. He suggests that members of sectarian groups were more likely to have come from the economic, social and educational elite, who could afford the "luxury" to be heavily involved in spiritual affairs. Members of sects would have regarded themselves as standing above society as a whole (Baumgarten 1997:47, 51, 66). "Ancient [Judean] sectarians ... were *not* lower class dissidents, shunned by the ruling powers. They were not an alienated and underemployed intelligentsia, searching for a place in society", they were, however, "elitist" (Baumgarten 1997:51). This, according to him, raises a question over the understanding of Pharisees as a retainer class in service of the ruling groups (cf Saldarini 1988). The rapacity of the elitist Pharisees (Q 11:43) seems to be somehow self-serving, rather than them acting on behalf of the Temple or Jerusalem aristocracy.

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). The Q people 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 (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).

Certainly at the stage of the main redaction, it is agreed that a new era ("the kingdom of God") has dawned, but some of the traditional demands of the law that shape and define Judean ethnic identity are still valid. The new era is to be lived within the confines of the Judean symbolic universe, where the requirements of purity, for example, are still taken for granted. Yet, there is also another dimension to the law

present in the main redaction. The Torah and the Kingdom of God are not that mutually complimentary in all respects. Here we agree with Tuckett⁶¹ (1996:418) who 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).⁶² 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 it 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). This is 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). Judean ethnic identity is strongly reclaimed or affirmed; hence, the Q people’s citizenship in the Judean symbolic universe is restored. Jesus is also a model Judean, for he can quote scripture at will, illustrates unwavering obedience to God, and so is a true son of God. Since Jesus quotes from Deuteronomy 6, it can be seen that Jesus takes his stand on the central Judean confession, the Shema (Jacobson 1992:92).

Even so, this does not stop Q from representing Jesus as equal to, or even greater than the law-giver of old himself. Q’s Christology places Jesus in tension with Moses, for 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? The Mosaic covenant was one of the main reference points in the life of Israel (cf. Horsley & Draper 1999:201). So Q wants to have its cake and eat it. It 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 tension exists between the Torah of the Q people, and the Torah derived from Moses. More will be said about this when we discuss the treatment of the law in the formative stratum.

⁶¹ 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.

⁶² Pace Catchpole (1993:277) who argues that there is no tendency to “re-Judaize” in Q.

5.3.1.2.3 Shared “Historical” Memories

As Allison’s (2000) intertextual analysis indicates, there are numerous examples in Q that can qualify as pertaining to *shared “historical” memories* as Q in its language and Biblical allusions persistently draws on the Tanak. For this we reason we will be selective, and concentrate on some examples which are important to Q. Also at times not all relevant examples are treated here, since they are touched upon in other parts of our current investigation. This is to avoid repetition as far as possible, so it must be understood that the *shared “historical” memories* present in Q is by no means exhausted in this section of our work, and in fact, can be found in every cultural feature investigated here.

Our first *shared “historical” memory* we will investigate as part of our main redaction is the temptation narrative (Q 4:1-13) and its allusion to Moses and the exodus. Jacobson (1992:88) is sceptical whether Q 4:1-13 clearly alludes to the exodus tradition. Similarly Reed (2000:209) argued that Moses, as well as the Mosaic covenant and the Mosaic laws, the law in general including the Decalogue, is not appealed to or found in Q. But what Jacobson and Reed states cannot be accepted as is. We saw that in terms of Q’s Christology and apologetic strategy that it shows more than a passing interest in the Moses traditions and the Torah, by implication, the covenant as well – often these are background references simply taken for granted. Particularly relevant here, is where Jesus in the temptation narrative is identified with Moses and as the new Exodus (Allison 2000:26-28). So Moses and the exodus are present in Q, and this historic figure and event serves as a foil to explain the eschatological role and status of Jesus. This Moses/exodus typology is also found in other parts of Q (e g 7:26-27; 10:21-24; 11:20).

As already alluded to, Kloppenborg suggests that the story of Lot is one of the motifs of the main redaction. The opening of Q probably placed John in “all the region/circuit of the Jordan” (Q 3:3). This phrase in the Tanak occurs mainly in connection with the story of Lot (Gn 13:10-12; 19:17, 25, 28). Kloppenborg (2000:119) explains this may be insignificant “were it not for the fact that the oracle of John that follows speaks of ‘fleeing’ the coming wrath, warns against reliance on kinship to Abraham, threatens a fiery destruction, and inverts the story of Lot’s wife by declaring God’s ability to fashion people out of stones or pillars”. It is questionable that John’s preaching has particularly Lot’s wife in view, but the Lot story recurs when it is threatened that it would be easier for Sodom than those towns not receptive to

the Q people's mission (Q 10:12). The destruction of Sodom is also represented as an example for the unexpected day of the Son of humanity/man (Q 17:28-30). This motif continues in Q 17:34-35 where co-workers will be separated, one being "swept away" (παραλαμβάνεται) and the other "spared" (ἀφίεται). The same pair of verbs is found in Genesis 18:26 and 19:17 where it describes the destruction of the wicked and the sparing of Lot's family. Kloppenborg (2000:119) explains that the story of Lot "already had a long history of exegetical use in the Tanak and the literature of Second Temple [Judeanism], being employed as the archetype of a divine judgment that was total, sudden, and enduring, and which occurred without human instrumentality". The dominant exegetical tradition identified arrogance and inhospitality as the Sodomites' gravest sins. Proud Sodom did not share its available food with the poor and needy (Ezk 16:49) and Isaiah 3:9-17 intimates that its inhabitants arrogantly oppressed the poor. "When Q threatens the 'children of Abraham' with Sodom's judgment", Kloppenborg (2000:120) elaborates, "it continues the tradition of Isaiah and when it suggests that Sodom will fare better in the judgement, it elaborates the exegetical tradition of Ezekiel [16:49-52]". The return of the Son of humanity/man is also compared to the days of Noah (Q 17:26-27, 30). The story of the flood and the destruction of Sodom (Q 17:28-29) were frequently brought together as examples of divine judgement (Tuckett 1996:159).

Q also employs other historical examples of divine judgement. Q 10:13-14 contains woes directed at the Galilean towns of Chorazin and Bethsaida, and is compared unfavourably with the Gentile cities of Tyre and Sidon. Tyre is denounced in Isaiah 23; Amos 1:9-10 and Joel 3:4-8, and both cities are assured of divine judgement in Ezekiel 28. Elsewhere in the Tanak the prophets speak of Tyre and Sidon "as surpassing embodiments of wickedness headed for destruction"⁶³ (Allison 2000:124).

Another motif of the main redaction pertaining to *shared "historical" memories* is the employment of Deuteronomistic theology. According to this theology "the history of Israel is depicted as a repetitive cycle of sinfulness, prophetic calls to repentance (which are ignored), punishment by God, and renewed calls to repentance with threats of judgment. Common in this schema is the motif of the rejection of the prophets and even of their murder ... [T]he prophets are represented primarily as preachers of repentance and, generally speaking, as rejected preachers" (Kloppenborg 2000:121). Q several times recalls the rejection, persecution and

⁶³ Jr 25:22; 47:4; Jl 3:4; Zch 9:1-4.

murder of the prophets (Q 6:23c; 11:47-51; 13:34-35). For Q Jesus' followers and their fate are of a piece with the prophets (Q 6:22-23). Tuckett (1996:180) also sees 6:23c as an addition to the earlier form of the beatitude for the persecuted (6:22-23b) and says "the suffering and hostility experienced by those addressed in the beatitude is said to be similar in kind to the hostility experienced by the rejected prophets of the past. The experience of the Q [Messianists] is thus equated with the experience of rejected prophets and their 'suffering' is interpreted as specifically prophetic suffering". John is represented primarily as a repentance preacher (Q 3:7-9), and he, along with Jesus, is rejected by "this generation" (Q 7:31-35). Jesus' role is also implicitly connected with repentance (Q 10:13-15; 11:29-32). The story of the prophet Zechariah who was murdered in the courtyard of the Temple (2 Chr 24:20-22) is mentioned (Q 11:51). Continuing the Deuteronomistic theology there is the threat that the Israelites will be expelled (Q 13:28-29) and a woe is spoken over Jerusalem (Q 13:34-35). Also present is the Parable of the Great Supper (Q 14:16-24), which functions as a commentary on Israel's rejection of God's spokesmen, and their eventual reception by others (Kloppenborg 2000:121).

According to Reed (1999:106; 2000:209), in contrast to the prophet, the priest and king as types became localised in Jerusalem. The prophets traditionally served as a moral and social critic of priests and kings, even of their centralisation in Jerusalem (Mi 3:9-12; Jr 26), so "the prophet as a model was the natural choice for a religious community in a Galilean setting" (Reed 2000:209). This may well be, but the Q community was critical of fellow Israelites in general (e.g. Q 10:12-13!), so not too much must be made their critique of Jerusalem, be it explicit (Q 13:34-35) or as Reed (2000:210-11) suggests, implicit in the sign of Jonah (Q 11:29-32; cf LivPro 10:10-11), or the critique of the Pharisees and the lawyers (Q 11:39-52). The fact of the matter is, be it inside or outside Jerusalem, God's prophets experience suffering and rejection. It is this paradigm that the Q people remember and identify themselves with.

Fitting in with the employment of a Deuteronomistic theology is Q's allusion to the Elijah tradition. In Q 7:18-23, Jesus, in response to the messengers of John, lists a series of events that occur in his ministry. The events listed in Q, particularly the raising of the dead evoke expectations associated with an Elijah-like figure (cf 1 Ki

17:1-24).⁶⁴ John's scenario of the future (Q 3:7-9, 16b-17) recalls Malachi's "coming day" (Ml 3:19) when Elijah will appear to bring repentance (Ml 3:22-23) and a figure associated with Elijah will "come to his temple" and "purify" the sons of Levi with fire, burning evil doers like stubble, where neither root nor branch will remain (Ml 3:19). John himself, however, is a preacher of repentance (Q 3:7-9) and even identified as Elijah (Q 7:27), and Jesus does not exactly fit John's picture of the "Coming One", that is, as a judge (Q 3:16-17). Nevertheless this role for Jesus is reserved by Q for the future. Thus in various ways both John and Jesus are associated with Elijah.

In connection with another main redactional theme, namely, the polemic against "this generation", reference is made to the Jonah and the Ninevites (Q 11:16, 29-30, 32). This is particularly relevant here as Jonah was a Galilean prophet. According to Reed (2000:208), drawing upon Rabbinic and early church traditions, it "seems probable that upon the resettlement of Gath-Hepher at the beginning of the Early Roman Period, its [Judean] inhabitants revived the tradition linking Jonah's hometown with theirs as recorded in 2 Kings 14:25, and at some point began to nurture traditions of his burial there". So it is likely that Jonah was venerated in Lower Galilee as a local hero. Gath-Hepher (in late antiquity called Gobebatha) was reportedly located on the road between Sepphoris and Tiberias, which today is identified as the modern village el-Meshed, where to this day visitors are shown the tomb of Jonah (Reed 2000:206). Thus Jesus and the Q community are related to an earlier Galilean prophet, Jonah, a preacher of repentance from Israelite epic history. Also within the context of polemic against "this generation", the Queen of the South who came to listen to the wisdom of Solomon is mentioned (Q 11:31; cf 1 Ki 10:1-13; 2 Chr 9:1-12). According to Josephus (Ant 8.165) she was the queen of Egypt and Ethiopia.

It is at once obvious, that figures and events of the past, as compared with the formative stratum, are ubiquitous in the main redaction. Mention is made of Abraham (Q 3:8; 13:28), Isaac and Jacob (Q 13:28), Jonah (Q 11:30, 32), the Queen of the South (Q 11:31), Solomon (Q 11:31), Abel (Q 11:51), Zechariah (Q 11:51), Noah (Q 13:26-27; 17:26-27) and Lot (Q 17:28), and the persecuted prophets (Q 6:23c; 11:47-51; 13:34-35). Reference is made to "this (evil) generation" (Q 11:29, 31-32) which alludes to the generation in the wilderness and in the time of Noah. Reference is made to the Twelve tribes of Israel (Q 22:28-30) and Q 13:28-29 presuppose their

⁶⁴ Of course, Elijah's successor, Elisha, also raised the dead (2 Ki 4:18-37) and healed

reconstitution. Also present but implicitly so is Moses and the exodus (Q 4:1-13; 7:26-27; 10:21-24; 11:20), the anointed figure of Isaiah (Q 7:18-23) and Elijah (Q 3:7-9, 16b-17; 7:27). Particular Gentile cities, such as Sodom (Q 10:12; 17:28-30, 34-35), Tyre and Sidon (Q 10:13-14) and the Ninevites (Q 11:16, 29-30, 32) are recalled as well. According to Cotter an important issue for the Q² stratum was the prestige of antiquity, that is, the community invoking its continuity with Judean religious tradition. Cotter (1995a:132) argues the

cultural values and perspectives which are disposed to recognize the credibility of religions and institutions depending on their rootedness in antiquity seems fully engaged in the Q² stratum. The clear, constant and various references to [Judean] sagas, [Judean] patriarchs and the prophets as well as the appeal to [Judean] scriptures for verifications plainly demonstrate that the community has consciously identified itself with an ancient recognized religion in a most deliberate and indeed necessary manner ... It is only in Q² where the deliberate identification of the community with Israel's tradition becomes not only prominent but indeed takes control of the document.

We can agree with Cotter that Q aims at ratifying “the authenticity of the community and its heroes”, but we question that Q was interested in gaining the prestige of antiquity or prestige “through their identification with a religion publicly known and recognized within the Greco-Roman world” (Cotter 1995a:133). We suggest that Q was not interested in the “antiquity” of its religion and also felt little for the opinion of the broader Greco-Roman world. The rhetoric of the main redaction is exclusively aimed at Judeans. Q is definitively rooted in the past, but is primarily concerned with the eschatological present and future, and its use of past traditions is aimed at affirming the eschatological status of Jesus and the community and denouncing non-responsive Israel. Other apologetic and polemical concerns are at work here. To elaborate, on the one hand, the Q community is *defending its Judean ethnic identity* or the “authenticity” of its identity *as eschatological Israel*. Q represents its hero Jesus as the anointed figure, the Moses-like prophet who has initiated the new Exodus. The Q community encapsulates (re)constructed Judean ethnic identity, since it lives and breathes eschatological newness, in short, the founding event of the Kingdom of God. Jesus and the Q community is replaying the Exodus and the giving of the law (Q 6:27-45). By no means is what the Q people stand for entirely new and the past is not rejected, but *based on recent events*, the “antiquity” of traditional

leprosy (2 Ki 5:8-10), another miracle listed in our Q text.

covenantal nomism has fulfilled its purpose and has been left behind (cf Q 3:8; 16:16). On the other hand, the *shared “historical” memories* – often involving Gentiles – are used *negatively* in most cases! The Q people associate themselves with the persecuted and rejected prophets, and past traditions are exploited in various ways in service of the motifs of the main redaction identified by Kloppenborg, all in some way related to judgement.

So the *shared “historical” memories* in Q are used to defend the eschatological identity of Jesus and his followers. Q actually flaunts its newness but it is a newness that can only be appreciated and communicated within a Judean context. The past is also used to denounce non-responsive Israel; it is threatened with judgement and is accused of rejecting God’s prophets. Thus Q is not pre-occupied with the prestige of antiquity. Q is more interested in the eschatological present and future than the past, and has little sympathy for nostalgic ethno-symbolism where the privileged status of Israel is affirmed. Call the Q people deviant, or counter-cultural, since for them the epic history of Israel only has meaning and is qualified by the newness of the Kingdom of God. Unfortunately for the Q people, this newness is not recognised by some of their Judean contemporaries.

5.3.1.2.4 Myths of Common Ancestry

At the beginning of Q, John the Immerser (Baptist) touches on the cultural feature of common ancestry in his preaching and rite of water immersion (the latter is discussed above). As Tuckett (1996:115) makes mention of, based on Q 3:8b John’s preaching is aimed at Judeans alone. He is warning them not to claim Abraham as their forefather, for God can produce children for Abraham from the rocks at their feet. John’s rejection of Judean pleas to the ancestor Abraham is quite significant. John rejects “any special exemption from divine judgement which can be claimed by [Judeans] *qua* [Judeans]. Something more is now required and anyone failing to produce that ‘more’ is threatened with destructive judgement” (Tuckett 1996:114). V 8b does not reject all value to Judeanness, “it simply says that appeal to [Judean] birth alone is in itself insufficient to escape what is coming soon” (Tuckett 1996:115). According to Jacobson (1992:82-83), Q 3:8 is a redactional addition, providing a new assessment of what is wrong with John’s audience, “not failure to produce fruits, but presumption upon their ancestry”. Although Israel’s election is not denied, it might be suggested that others might be created as children of Abraham. In the context of Q, “we are bound to think of instances in which non-Israelites are used to put Israel to

shame. That is also what seems to be implied here” (Jacobson 1992:83). It does not seem likely, however, that Gentiles are here in view, or that John’s audience is not failing to produce fruits. The Judeans *are* failing to produce fruits, that is exactly why John is subverting their appeal to Judean birth, or rather, the presumption attached with that ancestry.

What is this special link Judeans had to their ancestor Abraham that gave them a (now false) sense of security? According to Horsley (Horsley & Draper 1999:118-19, 253), Abraham had become a very important symbol from Hasmonean (3 Mac 6:3; 4 Mac 6:17, 11; 18:23; cf 2 Chr 20:7) and Herodian times as the Jerusalem elite emphasised their descent from Abraham. According to his interpretive paradigm that Q reflects a conflict between the rulers and the ruled, Horsley (Horsley & Draper 1999:119) argues that Q 3:8 (much like Q 13:28-29) “would have been understood as a sharp rejection of the Jerusalem elite and other pretentious wealthy and powerful families who, in the common people’s eyes, would have been the worst violators of the covenantal principles of nonexploitative economic social relations”. This interpretation is difficult to accept. Q 3:8 is relevant to *all* Judeans, all of whom were children of Abraham, and would have been part of the common stock of knowledge and self understanding. In this regard attention must be drawn to Isaiah 51:1-2:

Listen to me, you who pursue righteousness and who seek the LORD: Look to the rock from which you were cut and to the quarry from which you were hewn; look to Abraham, your father, and to Sarah, who gave you birth. When I called him he was but one, and I blessed him and made him many. (NIV)

Abraham is compared to a rock, and his descendents are cut out of this same rock. Now compare Q 3:8b:

... do not presume to tell yourselves: We have as <<fore>>father Abraham!
For I tell you: God can produce children for Abraham right out of these rocks!

In certain ways, the Judeans had a special kind of ancestry. Allison has here drawn attention to the concept of “merit” (*zekhut*). The Judeans benefit because of the merit of their ancestors (Ezk 33:24; Jr 9:24-25), who in Judean tradition were often associated with rocks or mountains.⁶⁵ We may also draw attention to other texts that make similar claims:

⁶⁵ Mekilta on Ex 17:12; TargCant 2:8; Frg. Targ. P on Gn 49:26; TargNeof 1 on Nm 23:9.

And unless you had received mercy through Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, our fathers, not a single one of your descendants would be left on the earth (TLevi 15:4).

But he [God] will have mercy, as no one else has mercy, on the race of Israel, though not on account of you but on account of those who have fallen asleep (Ps-Philo 35:3).

[The Judeans plea for deliverance] - And if not for their own sakes, yet for the covenants he had made with their fathers ... (2 Mac 8:15).

The Q text, however, denies that any benefit will be derived because of the ancestors and asserts that merit must now be earned individually by each person in his or her own life, and only then can they claim to be children of Abraham (Allison 2000:101-103). This shares with the Hellenistic spirit of individual decision (Hengel 1989:48-50) but this de-emphasis on the corporate selection of Israel and the individualisation of salvation was already an established feature of Judean apocalypticism (cf Stegemann & Stegemann 1999:146).⁶⁶

Nevertheless, it becomes clear that John's eschatological message of judgement is subverting, or alternatively, is (re)constructing covenantal nomism. What covenantal nomism has guaranteed up and to that moment – to be part of God's elect and saved people – can no longer be given. Maintenance of status as (righteous) Judeans has become an individual responsibility while the privileges of corporate Israel, which derives benefit from the ancestors, is de-emphasised, if not refuted.

The second issue that affects ancestry is in Q 11:47-48 where the lawyers are associated with their "forefathers" who are said to have killed the prophets. The Deuteronomistic view of Israel's history is thus employed, a major motif of the main redaction. Their guilt and association comes about, quite sarcastically, by them building the tombs of the prophets. But the real issue at stake is the opposition of the lawyers to the Q group's message. As the "forefathers" persecuted and killed the prophets, in a similar manner their descendents, the lawyers, are currently in opposition to the prophetic message of the Q people (Q 11:52). Here the aristocracy

⁶⁶ Cf 1 En, esp. chaps 1-36 & 83-90; 91-107; 2 En 41:1; 71:25 [J] (on Adam and ancestors) – parts of apocalyptic literature see Israel's history as a recurring cycle of sin and punishment, only the elect will be saved (cf Jub 1:29).

or retainers of the exegetical tradition is in view, and not the Israelite people as a whole.

In summary, while the value of Judean ancestry and birth is not denied, it receives a rather negative treatment in Q. Ancestry and birth is here connected with a false claim to privilege and presumption on the one hand, and with the persecution of the prophets on the other. In response Q constructs an ancestry emphasising individual religious, ethical and prophetic characteristics while de-emphasising corporate peoplehood and biological links. First, there is no claim to privilege or no presumption on the part of the Q people since they no longer claim to derive benefit from their ancestors, particularly Abraham, since they work on acquiring merit for themselves individually. It is through this individual effort that the Q people feel that they are the true descendents of Abraham. Second, the Q people align themselves with the persecuted prophets of the past, since they are persecuted themselves by the descendents of the prophet killers. It is because the Q community now finds itself within the orbit of the Kingdom of God. “The key factor for the community is repentance from sin, faithful vigilance and a confession of Jesus ‘before people’. The works of righteousness and not the state of being [Judean] take precedence” (Cotter 1995a:130). Thus overall, Judean ethnic identity is (re)constructed. Again, any form of ethno-symbolism where Israel’s privileged status is affirmed is absent. Here is nothing like the notion of the “covenant of our (fore)fathers”. The corporate and biological link with the ancestors, and the merit attached therewith is de-emphasised; the link can only be maintained through individual merit, that is, through response to the Immerser (and Jesus’ preaching), baptism and righteousness.

5.3.1.2.5 The Eschatology of the Main Redaction

5.3.1.2.5.1 Judgement

One of the important themes of the main redaction is the theme of a coming judgement. This section is analogous to the *shared “historical” memories and kinship* already discussed, and Q’s Christology with reference to the coming of the Son of humanity/man (see further below), so our treatment here will be brief. At the beginning of Q, John warns of an imminent and fiery judgement and admonishes his listeners to repent (Q 3:7-9) in view of a “Coming One” spoken of thereafter (Q 3:16-17). Tuckett (1996:114) explains that the call to his countrymen “must be to change their ways, to accept the validity of John’s call to repentance in the face of a coming

potential catastrophe and to undergo the rite that makes visible their commitment to his cause". John challenges their sense of national security (Q 3:8), and "every tree not bearing healthy fruit is to be chopped down and thrown in the fire". Whether John's message is aimed at the unresponsive in Israel, or those coming to be immersed, we agree that clearly "one is in the thought world of [Judean] eschatology, with a vivid expectation of an imminent End culminating in some judging process" (Tuckett 1996:115).

John proclaims that a "Coming One" βαπτίσει ἐν πνεύματι [[ἁγίῳ]] καὶ πυρί (Q 3:16b). According to Jacobson (1992:84) the baptism with πνεῦμα does not refer to the "holy spirit", but simply "wind", which like fire, is an agent of judgement. Kloppenborg (1987:106-7) argues along similar lines, in that it seems unlikely that "spirit" and "fire" refers to alternative baptisms and Q's main interest lies in the destructive side of the Coming One's role. We agree with Tuckett (1996:122-23), however, that this passage refers to the Coming One who will give a two-fold baptism/immersion; a Spirit-immersion for those who respond, and a fire-immersion for those who do not. Those who were baptised by John will not undergo the destructive or "fire"-immersion, but the Coming One will immerse them in the Spirit. Q's John clearly is speaking of two groups: the wheat that will be gathered into the granary, and the chaff that will be burnt in the fire, imagery typical of divine judgement.⁶⁷

The threat of judgement runs throughout the main redaction. Galilean towns are threatened with a more severe judgement than Sodom and the Gentile cities of Tyre and Sidon (Q 10:12-14). Capernaum is especially lampooned with a text from Is 14:13, 15 – instead of being exalted to heaven the town will be brought down to Hades (Q 10:15). But judgment has already in a sense begun. Jerusalem and its Temple are declared as "desolate" (Q 13:34-35; cf Jr 12:7). According to Allison (2000:149-51) Q 11:49-51 + 13:34-34 draws heavily on 2 Chronicles 24:17-25 that pertains to the stoning of Zechariah, and God forsaking Judah and Jerusalem in consequence. In a similar vein, the rejection of Jesus means the rejection of Jerusalem – although it is conditional, since Q still hopes for Jerusalem to accept Jesus (Q 13:35b), just as 2 Chronicles 24 looks forward to a restoration at the end. Threats of judgement are also directed at "this generation" (Q 11:31-32, 49-51) or "you" (pl.), who stand in contrast to "the many" that will "come from Sunrise/East and

⁶⁷ Is 17:13; 29:5; 33:11; 41:15; Jr 13:24; Dn 2:35; Hs 13:3; Mi 4:12; Zph 2:2.

Sunset/West” that will sit down at table with the patriarchs (Q 13:28-29). The rebellious generation that seeks a sign will only be given the Sign of Jonah (Q 11:16, 29-30), which refers to his preaching of judgement⁶⁸ (Jacobson 1992:165; Kloppenborg 1987:133). The eventual judgement will be sudden and will come without warning (Q 12:39-40; 17:23-34) having terrible results (Q 12:42-46; 19:12-27).

5.3.1.2.5.2 The End Has Arrived!

There are various passages in the main redaction that understands the End has arrived. In our investigation into Q’s Christology we saw that the End is inextricably bound up with the person of Jesus. The “Coming One” it is said will immerse people in the Spirit (Q 3:16b). The Spirit may be seen in connection with JI 2:28-29 that promises that God will pour out his Spirit onto all people in the last days. The fire-immersion is evidently in the future in Q’s perspective, but based on Q 12:10, it may well be that the Spirit-immersion was in part a matter of experienced fulfilment on the Q-group’s part (Tuckett 1996:124). Certainly this was the case with Jesus. In the fulfilment of various Isaianic texts (e.g. Is 35:5-6; 61:1-2) in Q 7:22, Jesus identifies himself with the final End-time prophet of Isaiah 61 who has been anointed by the Spirit (Tuckett 1996:222). A sense of realised eschatology is present in Q 7:22 in other ways as well. The emissaries of John “hear and see” what was looked forward to by the prophets. Q 7:18-23 therefore continues the thought of Q 3:16, and John’s prediction of a Coming One is confirmed, this figure being none other than Jesus himself who is “fulfilling” the Old Testament dispensation by the eschatological events that are occurring (Kloppenborg 1987:108; Tuckett 1996:128).

John himself also has eschatological significance, since he is identified as the Elijah *redivivus* in Q 7:27, where Jesus quotes both Exodus 23:20 and Malachi 3:1 in relation to the Immerser. Thus the new age inaugurated by John is the “kingdom/reign of God”, which at a pre-redactional (or Q¹) stage was already recognised as a present reality (Q 16:16). John is therefore regarded as more than a prophet (Q 7:26), since he is the inaugurator of the new age forecast by Malachi. Yet, in Q 7:28 his significance is placed in perspective: “the least significant in God’s kingdom is more than he”. He is now placed outside of the kingdom. Overall, John’s relationship to the kingdom is ambivalent, as he is sometimes placed within its orbit

⁶⁸ Cf LamR Proem 31; Mekilta Pisha 1.80-82.

(Q 7:27; 7:31-35) and sometimes placed without (Q 7:18-23; 7:28) (Kloppenborg 1987:109, 115). But importantly, the kingdom/reign of God has arrived. Jesus himself says 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.

Q 12:51-53 alludes to the breakdown of the social order expected as part of End-time events (Mi 7:6 cf 1 En 100:1f; Jub 23:19; 4 Ezra 6:24). Here is also an implicit claim that the events of the End-time have already started. Similar ideas are expressed in Q 12:54-56; those who have eyes to see can see the signs of the times, being none other than the signs of the End (Tuckett 1996:158). As Kloppenborg (1987:153) says, "Q repeatedly implies that there is little time left, since the signs of the end are already in evidence."

5.3.1.2.5.3 The Coming of the Son of humanity/man

Horsley (1999:71) is of the view that "there appears to be no basis whatever in Q itself for positing the concept of 'the parousia' in Q, let alone to believe that two whole sections of Q (12:39-59; 17:23-37) deal with it". His argument is difficult to accept since Q shows clear interest in the coming of the Son of humanity/man, which we understand to refer to Jesus (see above).

The parables in Q 12:39-46 aim at arousing a belief in an imminent "coming" of the Son of humanity/man, whether such a belief had waned or never existed at all (Tuckett 1996:156-57). According to Kloppenborg (1987:153) Q 12:39-59 "is unified by the motifs of the nearness and unexpectedness of the parousia and of judgment". In particular Q 12:40 (cf Q 12:43) warns:

You ... must be ready, for the Son of Humanity is coming at an hour you do not expect.

The theme of the return of the Son of humanity/man is taken up again in Q 17:23-37. In Q 17:23-24 the image of lightning is employed, a recurrent theme of judgement, and often divine *theophany* is involved as well (Ex 19:16; Dt 32:41; Pss 18:14; 144:6). Catchpole (1993:254) also brings attention to traditions in Josephus (Ant 1.203) and Philo (Abraham 43; Moses 2.56) which import lightning into the events of

the flood and the judgement of Sodom, two themes taken up in Q 17:26-30. Q 17:37 speaks of vultures that will gather around a corpse (cf Job 39:30). Vultures/eagles are used in the Tanak as images of divine judgement (Pr 30:17; Jr 4:13; Hs 8:1; Hab 1:8), and the saying in Q becomes a metaphor for the parousia (Kloppenborg 1987:162).

When the Son of humanity/man will be revealed it will be as in the days of Noah and Lot⁶⁹ (Q 17:26-30). Ordinary and everyday activities are referred to such as eating, drinking and marrying. This may refer to gluttony and the questionable marriages of the Giants to the daughters of men (Gn 6:1-4) but such a view is questioned by Catchpole (1993:250). He points to traditions in Josephus (Ant 1.374), Philo (QGenesis 1.91; 2.13) and the Targums⁷⁰ which testify that the days of Noah and Lot were days of opportunity for repentance. The flood in particular became a prototype of the last judgement and the end of the world.⁷¹ In this regard Allison argues that Q 17:26-27 could help explain Q 17:34-35, where it explains that one will be taken (παραλαμβάνεται) and another left (ἀφίεται). “This probably envisages, not the wicked being removed and condemned, but rather the righteous being taken to meet Jesus in the air” (Allison 2000:94). Allison also refers to ἀφίημι in Q 9:60 and 13:35, which means “abandon” or “forsake”. “If this is the correct interpretation, then those left behind (ἀφίεται) are like the people who were left behind to perish in the flood” (Allison 2000:94). As we saw already, Kloppenborg had a different approach to the text. He understands that in Q 17:34-35 the co-workers will be separated, one being “swept away” (παραλαμβάνεται) and the other “spared” (ἀφίεται). The same pair of verbs are found in Genesis 18:26 and 19:17 where it describes the destruction of the wicked and the sparing of Lot’s family. The interpretation of Q 17:34-35 is not easy, since both verbs can either have a positive or a negative import. Q 17:34-35 is in closer proximity to Q 17:28-29 that refers to the story of Lot, so Kloppenborg may have the better approach. Q 17:27 also speaks of the unrighteous that the “flood came and *took* them all”, while Q 13:28 speaks of the unresponsive Judeans that will be *thrown out* of the kingdom. When also seen with Q 22:28-30, this seems to be the better solution. The Q people looked forward to a *this*-worldly kingdom where Israel will be reconstituted. Those who will not participate in the Kingdom will be “swept

⁶⁹ The IQP does not include Q 17:28-29 that refers to Lot.

⁷⁰ TargOnk on Gn 6:3; 7:4, 10; TargPsJon on Gn 19:24; TargNeof on Gn 18:21.

⁷¹ Is 24:18; Jub 20:5-6; 1 En 1-16; 67:10; 93:4; 2 En (J) 70:10; ApAd 3:3; Ec 16:7; 2 Mac 2:4; LAB 3:1-3, 9-10; 49:3; Josephus, Ant 1.72-6; 2 Pt 2:5; 3:6-7.

away”, and the Q people themselves will be “spared”, that is, they will remain within Israel.

Thus the situation points to an imminent crisis. The Q people are, as in the days of Noah and Lot, in a position of safety as compared to their compatriots. If the latter do not use this opportunity to repent and divorce themselves of complacency, unrepentant Israel will be overcome with a sudden and disastrous judgement when the Son of humanity/man finally comes. The Q Apocalypse brings emphasis to the visible and swift nature of the return of the Son of humanity/man (Q 17:23, 24, 37b) and its unexpectedness (Q 17:26-27, 28-30) (Kloppenborg 1987:164).

5.3.1.2.5.4 Summary

The eschatology of Q is focussed on the imminent judgement of Israel (Q 3:7-9, 16-17; 10:12-15; 13:34, 28-29; 11:16, 29-51) that will be sudden and without warning (12:39-40; 17:23-34). It will have terrible results for Israel (Q 12:42-46; 19:12-27). The Q people also find themselves in an area of eschatological fulfilment, for John the Immerser has inaugurated the new age (Q 7:27) and Jesus, the “Coming One” has arrived (Q 7:18-23). The kingdom has arrived through his exorcisms, and the End is here for those who can recognise it. Family divisions and the Spirit, assumed to be present in some way, are all evidence of this (Q 12:10, 51-53, 54-56). Q is also waiting for the coming of the Son of humanity/man who will bring judgement (Q 12:39-59; 17:23-37). The Q people are in a position of safety for they have made use of this opportunity for repentance.

Overall we can agree with Tuckett (1996:163) that “large parts of Q are dominated by ideas of a futurist eschatology.” Here it is particularly relevant to the main redaction, but it also gives examples of realised eschatology, especially when it comes to the activities and teaching of Jesus.

5.3.1.2.6 The Gentiles

Participation in the Judean symbolic universe naturally also influenced the Q people’s relationship to the Gentiles. There are passages in the main redaction that appear at first to have a positive view of Gentiles. The centurion had a faith which could not be matched anywhere in Israel (Q 7:1-10). Tyre and Sidon would have repented if the signs performed in Chorazin and Bethsaida had taken place there (Q 10:13).

The Queen of the South listened to Solomon's wisdom (Q 11:31) and the Ninevites repented at Jonah's preaching (Q 11:32), and they will rise to judge "this generation" for their non-repentance since something greater than Solomon or Jonah is here.⁷² In Q 10:12-14 it says that Sodom, Tyre and Sidon will fare better in the judgement than the unresponsive Galilean towns. Thus in Q, the Queen of the South, the Ninevites, the cities of Sodom, Tyre and Sidon, all with Gentile associations, are in various ways compared favourably with Judeans. According to Reed (2000:188), the

use of distant ethnic groups to shame one's own group is a common *topos* in literature of the Greco-Roman period. Many geographical writers in antiquity envisioned an "inverse ethnocentric" scheme, in which peoples were more virtuous in proportion to their distance from the author's place of writing, with the author's audience the target of moral shame.

It must be said, however, that in Q it is not that the other ethnic groups are more virtuous; it is rather assumed that they will hypothetically respond to the preaching of repentance.

Other texts have also been identified that may involve the Gentiles (Tuckett 1996:397-98). The image of the "harvest" (Q 10:2) may refer to the judgement of Gentiles (cf JI 3:13-14; Is 27:11; Hs 6:11), so missionaries sent to gather the harvest may point to the existence of a Gentile mission. The parable of the Great Supper (Q 14:16-24) could point to the failure of the Judean mission, with threats that the mission will be sent to the Gentiles instead (cf Kloppenborg 1987:230). The parable of the mustard seed, where all the birds will find a home in the tree could maybe refer to Gentiles coming into the kingdom (Q 13:18-19). Both these parables, however, are ambiguous. If the association is pressed, the birds nesting in the tree could point to the eschatological future, and not a present reality. In the case of the parable of the Great Supper, the emphasis may be on those refusing to repent, not on possible Gentile replacements. It has also been argued that Luke 10:8b ("eat what is set before you" cf Q 10:7) was in Q – this instruction makes sense in an environment of a Gentile mission where Judean food laws are not followed (see Tuckett 1996:398). A crucial factor is whether Matthew 10:5-6 at a pre-redactional stage was originally part of Q. This is the argument of Catchpole (1993:165-171) and Horsley

⁷² Cf TBenj 10:10, where it is stated that God will judge Israel by the chosen Gentiles, just as God tested Esau by the Midianites.

(1999:244), but they are representative of a minority position. It is probably better not to make judgements based on these texts.

Catchpole (1993:280-308) has argued that in Q 7:1-10 the centurion does not necessarily refer to a Gentile (since ἑκατοντάρχης in the LXX and Josephus often does not); rather, he is ethnically neutral. So the story does not intend to draw a contrast between Gentile faith and Judean faith. The centurion is merely an example of extraordinary faith within the setting of the mission of Jesus to Israel. Jacobson (1992:109) sees it quite differently, as he says “on one important point there is no disagreement: the figure in the story is a gentile centurion”. We must agree, for the reference to “Israel” in v. 9 is hard to explain if no Judean/Gentile distinction ever existed. The ἑκατοντάρχης functions as other Gentiles do in the main redaction – he is a useful way to launch a rebuke at unresponsive Judeans (Tuckett 1996:396). But this was no Roman centurion, as evidence for Roman Legionnaires stationed at Capernaum dates to well after the First Revolt. In the first century, the *Legio X Fretensis* was stationed in Syria, and it is not until the second century CE that Roman troops were stationed in and around Galilee. Herod Antipas adopted common Greek terms used for Roman officials, thus the centurion was likely an official in Antipas’ administrative and military apparatus, “which apparently also included non-[Judeans]” (Reed 2000:162).

Reed also brings attention to a possible significance in the connection between Jesus and the prophet Jonah, that is, their openness to Gentiles. According to Reed (2000:211),

Q 11:29-32 clearly is designed to shame Israel, this generation, with the positive response of both the Ninevites and the Queen of the South. That Gentiles recognized what is here, their repentance and quest for wisdom respectively, is contrasted with this generation’s obstinacy. In Q’s perspective, the gentile centurion is beyond anyone’s faith in all Israel (Q 7:1-10), the gentile cities of Tyre and Sidon would have reacted more favorably than the Galilean villages (Q 10:11-13), and people from the ends of the earth will replace the supposed heirs at the in-gathering (Q 13:28-29).

The question therefore is, exactly “how open” were the Q people to the Gentiles? According to Kloppenborg, the story of the centurion’s servant emphasises both the *fact* of the centurion’s faith, and its *exceptional quality*. “Such a narrative undermines

the notion that Gentile participation in the kingdom is restricted to an eschatological pilgrimage and would undoubtedly serve as useful ammunition in support of the Gentile mission ... It may be that 7:1-10 by itself does not evidence the involvement of the Q community in the Gentile mission, but the frequency with which the theme of Gentile response and faith occurs in Q [cf Q 7:9; 10:13-15; 11:31-32; 13:29, 28; 14:16-24] suggests that such faith was no longer regarded as quite so unusual as the story by itself suggests” (Kloppenborg 1987:119). Overall, Kloppenborg (1987:236) argued that Q 13:28-29 when seen in conjunction with Q 7:1-10 and 11:31-32, which speaks of actual Gentile belief, and Q 10:13-15 that predicts potential Gentile belief, has in view an actual Gentile mission. Cotter (1995a:126) in reference to Q 12:8-9 and 22:28-30 argues that “it is clear that the community of Q² is open to Gentile membership”, and she even speaks of the “displacement” of Israel by Gentiles in reference to Q 3:8 and 22:28-30 (1995b:137-38). Cotter (1995a:126) also argues that there “is no exclusivity on the basis of either [Judean] birth or observance of laws. The Law is recognized (Q 16:17) but Q² does explain how it is observed.”

Tuckett (1996:399) approaches this issue from another angle and argues that the Gentiles mentioned “are generally not people who are present for Q”. The people mentioned are either in the past (e.g. Q 11:31-32) or in the future (Q 10:13-15; 13:28-29). The story of the centurion’s servant has a Gentile reacting to Jesus positively, but this occurred in Jesus’ own day. This was certainly also relevant for Q’s present (Gentiles reacting positively), but the centurion is evidently an exceptional case. The centurion is used to put faithless Israel to shame (cf Jacobson 1992:110) and nothing “indicates that the centurion stands at the head of a long line of other Gentiles who are responding positively, either to Q’s Jesus or to later Q [Messianists]” (Tuckett 1996:399). As can be seen, Q 13:28-29 and 22:28-30 is often seen in connection with the displacement of Judeans with Gentiles. As our analysis already argued above, these texts have nothing to do with Gentiles. Q 13:28-29 refers to the eschatological pilgrimage of Diaspora Judeans, and the “judging” of the Q people over the twelve tribes of Israel in Q 22:28-30 has a positive meaning. Q demonstrates it is pre-occupied with the fate of ethnic and territorial Israel – the conversion of the Gentiles is not a primary concern.

According to Meyer (1970), Q uses the Gentile mission to urge Israel to repent, but does not engage in such missionary activity itself. The natural inclination of the Q group – evident at a pre-redactional level (Q 6:34; 12:30) – is that the Gentiles are the “others”. There is no discussion it would seem of how a Gentile mission would

create problems with regards to the law or how far Gentile Messianists are expected to obey the Law – although, we suggest, that Q 13:27 does indicate that Q disassociates itself from those Messianists who have Gentile associations and have given up aspects of covenantal praxis. In addition, the redactional woes on the Galilean towns (Q 10:12-15) indicate a (failed) mission to Israel alone (Catchpole 1993:171-76) since they are not willing to convert (Uro 1987:172-73). Overall, we must agree with the position that Q was not engaged with a Gentile mission (Tuckett 1996:404; Jacobson 1992:256). They are used in a polemical strategy to intensify the appeal to other Judeans.⁷³ In addition, based on the polemical and apologetic strategy of the main redaction in general, Q is far too busy to affirm their own status as Judeans which any contact with Gentiles would undermine. Allison (1997:121) also notes that Isaiah is often quoted or alluded to in support of the Gentile mission,⁷⁴ but Q, which interacts often with Isaiah,⁷⁵ never uses the prophetic book in such a way.

5.3.2 The Formative Stratum (Q¹)

5.3.2.1 The Habitus/Israel

5.3.2.1.1 Religion and Covenantal Praxis

There is not much in the formative stratum that concerns *religion* and *covenantal praxis*. Catchpole (1993:152, 176-8) argues that Q did not contain the instruction to eat whatever food is provided (Lk 10:8b). It encourages conduct that is not restricted by Judean food laws so it belongs to context of the Messianist mission expanding into the Gentile world. In Matthew (Mt 10:7-13) no such instruction is given. The IQP accepts Luke 10:7 as part of Q while Q10:8b (“eat what is set before you”) is placed in brackets to indicate a level of uncertainty. If the instructions were in Q, it does not have to presuppose a mission to the Gentiles anyway. It probably had to with the

⁷³ In Matthew 10:5-6 the mission of the disciples is restricted to Israel, while in Matthew 28:19 the mission is to both Judeans and non-Judeans (Van Aarde 2005). Did Matthew derive his universal mission from the rhetorical strategy of Q²?

⁷⁴ Mt 4:12-16 (Is 9:1-2); Mt 12:18-21 (Is 42:1-4); Mt 21:13 = Mk 11:17 = Lk 19:46 (Is 56:7); Lk 1:79 (Is 9:1); Lk 2:30, 32 (Is 42:6); Ac 13:47 (Is 49:6); Ac 26:18 (Is 42:7); Rm 10:20-21 (Is 65:1-2); Eph 2:17 (Is 57:19) etc.

⁷⁵ Q 3:8 (Is 51:1-2); Q 6:20-23 (Is 61:1-2); Q 6:29-30 (Is 50:6, 8); Q 7:22 (Is 26:19; 29:18-19; 35:5-6; 42:18; 61:1-2); Q 10:15 (Is 14:13, 15); Q 10:23-24 (Is 6:9-10); Q 12:33-34 (Is 51:8); Q 17:26-27 (Is 54:9-10).

fact that the missionaries should not pre-occupy themselves with purity concerns at the meal table. After all, Jesus himself came “eating and drinking”, at times with Judean “tax-collectors and sinners” (Q 7:34). Lastly Q 6:46, where Jesus is addressed as “Lord, Lord”, may have to do with the cultic life of the community (Pearson 2004:488). No firm conclusions can be reached in this regard, however. But here we will conclude our survey of the formative stratum that does not reveal much. At best, the evidence suggests that the Q people were willing to sacrifice aspects of ritual purity to bring the kingdom into the homes of others.

5.3.2.1.2 Kinship

5.3.2.1.2.1 The Q People and Broader Israel

The first element we will investigate with regards to kinship is the sermon (Q 6:20b-49 – the markarisms will be discussed later). Jacobson (1992:95-97) argues that the sermon is drawing on the Wisdom tradition. Similarly Kloppenborg’s (1987:189) analysis argued that the sermon was “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). Therefore we do not deny the wisdom element being present here, 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. 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 shall love // your neighbour // as yourself”) can be related to all of Q 6:27-35 (Catchpole 1993:115; Allison 2000:31).⁷⁶ Catchpole and the IQP reconstructs 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, so the editor and his readers “are primarily conditioned by their [Judeanness] and their sense of separateness from other nations. They share a concern to live according to the covenant” (Catchpole 1993:109). 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). So the teaching of Jesus is not there to bring about a separation within the Israelite community, although it provoked serious opposition, since the Q people confessed Jesus as the Son of humanity/man. Nevertheless, Catchpole (1993:115-16) states it is a “confession which must be maintained *within* the ancient community. Every effort is made therefore to be faithful simultaneously to

⁷⁶ 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 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).

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 was not in all respects faithful to the command of Moses. We do agree 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 neighbour.⁷⁷ 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). But the community of God, as we shall demonstrate later, should illustrate allegiance to Jesus’ teaching of what the covenant required.

The Q sermon is concerned with renewing relationships between the covenant people. But what it intended, and what actually happened, is glaringly different. There is clearly at the level of the formative stratum enough evidence that tension existed between the Q people and fellow Judeans. Q 6:22-23 speaks of those who are persecuted (cf Q 6:28) and experience verbal abuse because of the Son of

⁷⁷ 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 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).

humanity/man. Catchpole (1993:94) understands that the opposition is due to the conviction that the Son of man is Jesus, an identification made with care elsewhere in Q (7:18-23). This identification points to the heavenly status that was afforded to Jesus, and his future coming in judgement. He also argues that Q 6:22-23ab which echo's the deuteronomistic motif of the persecution of the prophets, indicates that there was a strong sense of estrangement between the Q people and their fellow Judeans, but as yet, no separation has yet occurred (Catchpole 1993:94). But the evidence in Q does suggest that a form of separation has already occurred (Q 6:22-23; 12:2-12; 14:27; 16:16; 17:33). Horsley (Horsley & Draper 1999:274) says that "it seems difficult to conclude that the trials anticipated are utterly imaginary. The situation of the community hearing this speech appears to be one of actual repression or the threat of repression". In disagreement with Horsley (Horsley & Draper 1999:272-73), however, this repression does not come from the rulers as such, but from fellow Judeans. In addition, there are also sayings that show the local judicial systems cannot be trusted, "each of its component parts concerns institutionalized or ongoing violence and exploitation" (see esp. 6:22-23, 27-36 (+ Q/Mt 5:41), 37-38; 12:4-7, 11-12, 22-31, 58-59) (Kloppenborg 2000:193-95, 198).

This division between the Q people and their co-ethnics is also evidenced in the mission charge (Q 10:2-16). Uro (1987:208-9) argues that Q 10:2 illustrates an optimism which is difficult to explain if it was aimed at Judeans at the time of the writing of Q. Comparing it with Acts 13:1-3, he argues for a Hellenistic setting, thus Q 10:2 points to a later Gentile mission, while Q 10:3, 12-16 represents an earlier stage of the tradition. But Q 10:2 should rather be seen in conjunction with Q 10:3-16 that clearly as a whole refers to a mission to Israel. The Q missionaries, however, are sent out as "lambs in the midst of wolves" (Q 10:3). This saying implies an element of danger, possibly because of the rejection of their message. According to Tuckett, here may be also an element of sarcastic inversion in the imagery employed, a rationalisation of what is already happening, or has happened, in the experience of the Q missionaries. In some Judean texts (e.g. 1 En 89:13-27; 90:1-27), the imagery of lambs and wolves is used to characterise the position of Israel surrounded by a hostile Gentile world. In Q, the wolves refer to unresponsive cities in Israel, and Q 10:3 "now ascribes to these [Judean] groups the derogatory image (of wolves threatening lambs) previously applied to Gentiles" (Tuckett 1996:185; cf. Kloppenborg 1987:194). It is suggested that the saying is rather a metaphor for vulnerability (Jacobson 1992:146) but as already mentioned above, Catchpole draws attention to the ἄρπαξ word group (Q 11:39; 16:16). It involves opposition to the

kingdom and to the rapacious behaviour of the Pharisees. Q 10:3 + 11:39 + 16:16 must be seen in combination and they point to religious polarization between the envoys of Jesus and the Pharisees. Thus the warning in Q 10:3 has fellow Judeans or particularly the Pharisees in view, not Herod Antipas (*pace* Horsley 1999:245), and “in the context of bringing to Israel a disturbing call not to presume on the covenant as the sure and sufficient basis for security and the enjoyment of the grace of God, sober realism would dictate the need to be prepared for rejection” (Catchpole 1993:163). Overall the ethnic horizon in Q 10:2 does not go beyond Israel, and from the context of the formative stratum of Q, Q 10:3 implies that rejection was already experienced, be it a past or present reality. The imagery of Judeans being “wolves” indicates that the Q group’s view of their co-ethnics, particularly the Pharisees, left a lot to be desired, as wolves “habitually feature in contexts which highlight rapacity, destruction and devastation” (Catchpole 1993:180).⁷⁸

Nevertheless, when it comes to the issue of ethnic identity, the Q people are not estranged from their Judean contemporaries. When the Q people uses an outside group to contrast the behaviour expected of them, it is the “Gentiles”, not Judeans who are used (Q 6:34; 12:30). In these two texts, Q uses what ethnicity theory describes as a “we-they” *oppositional* self-definition. “Thus in terms of social boundaries, Q’s consciousness seems much more determined by the distinctiveness of Q [Messianists] from Gentiles than from [Judeans]” (Tuckett 1996:202). Yet, as we argued before, the Q people also had a strong consciousness of difference in relation to fellow Judeans. This is also evident in the formative stratum. The Q people experience repression and verbal insults, and according to Q 10:16, it is only those Judeans who receive Jesus who receive God.

5.3.2.1.2.2 The Q People and the Family

Other tensions are in evidence, such as the Q people’s relationship towards their families. This aspect is downplayed by Arnal (2001) who argues that the missionary discourse (treated below) was not aimed at homeless itinerant missionaries, but constituted the program of disenfranchised scribes who lost their local status in the villages due to the construction of Tiberias. They took their program, aimed to

⁷⁸ Cf Gn 49:27; Pr 28:15; Jr 5:6; Ezk 22:27; Zph 3:3; TGad 1:3; TBenj 11:1-2; Mt 7:15; Jn 10:12; Ac 20:29. See also Jacobson (1992:146, n. 50): “... the image can also be used to speak of the treachery of leaders”; and Horsley (Horsley & Draper 1999:245): “... the standard image was one of oppressive, predatory rulers” (cf Ezk 22:23-27; Zph 3:1-3; Pr 28:15).

counter the influence from the city or the outside, from village to village by making contact with other scribes who are seen to represent the village as a whole. In support of his argument, Arnal dismisses the idea of “homelessness” and family divisions as present in Q. For example, Q 9:59-60 “is not an exhortation literally to leave one’s parents unburied”, but the would-be follower is to “value his commitment to Jesus over basic filial responsibility” (Arnal 2001:93, 176). Similarly, Q 9:57-58 has more to do with absolute commitment than with literal homelessness. The saying is opaque and when detached from its literary context, the point of this “Wisdom saying” is that all human beings have no natural sanctuary (Arnal 2001:176-77). Overall Q 9:59-62 and 14:26 actually suggests the opposite of an antifamilial ethos: “the texts work in a rhetorically effective way only on the supposition that family relations continue within the group to whom Q is addressed” (Arnal 2001:174). These texts illustrate that following Jesus requires unconditional commitment, and family connections are of less importance, but the rhetoric of these sayings imply that the Q people have close family relationships and persist in maintaining them.

We accept that there probably were those who refused to break with their families, but the sayings also presuppose that there were examples (at least for some) where family relationships had broken asunder and where homelessness was an issue. According to Kloppenborg (1987:192) in Q the “Son of Man” came to be used as a Christological title, and in Q 9:57-58 he is used as a pattern for Messianist discipleship. We agree, but one must wonder, however, whether this saying does not also relate to family tensions in addition to the issue of discipleship. The “Son of humanity does not have anywhere he can lay his head”, so was the historical Jesus asked (to put it politely) to leave home? If this is the case, then Q’s Jesus might be telling the would-be follower yes, you can follow me, but be prepared for rejection at home.⁷⁹ This interpretation makes sense when seen in conjunction with the other sayings on the family. In Q 9:59-60 Jesus is asked by the potential disciple if he could first bury his father (cf Elisha’s request to Elijah in 1 Ki 19:20). Jesus refuses and answers quite bluntly: “Follow me, and leave the dead to bury the dead”. Thus commitment to Jesus and the kingdom carries priority over family obligations, particularly here, the father, and inevitably, one must be prepared to lose the support structure of family as a consequence of following Jesus. This mirrors the “Ego-

⁷⁹ It is important to realise that in antiquity religion was embedded in kinship and politics. According to Duling (2001:144-45) “those ancients who affiliated with a deviant movement, especially one considered by the state as subversive, experienced a much greater break with trusted family, friends, and work associates, thus a more immediate social, not to mention political, risk than in modern Western society.”

centred network faction” model developed by Duling (2001:135, 145, 159-60) where personal recruitment by an Ego, and where total commitment is required as well, will more likely involve a stranger or casual acquaintance and takes place in public or directly. Duling, commenting on Q 9:57-60 (61-62), also states that Q clearly “emphasizes a sharp break with family”. This is particularly relevant to the “intimate network” that formed around the Ego, Jesus. Thus overall, Q 9:59-60 constitutes a radical break from traditional kinship patterns, as the family was “the firmest pillar of Israelite society” (Oporto 2001:216).

When seen in context of the first century society and the importance that was attached to the father-son relationship, one can appreciate the radical nature of this saying even more. As we discussed already, based on the intrinsic attributes (that define the roles) of the father-son relationship, it came to be the dominant relationship. The father saw in their sons another “I”, and in antiquity “the relationship between father and his male offspring was the closest and most lasting of all relationships because the whole continuity of the family was based on it” (Oporto 2001:229). The father exercised his authority over his son throughout his life. In turn, the son had responsibilities towards his father. The son was expected to “honor and obey [cf Ex 20:12; Dt 5:16] his father as long as he lived, to assist and care for him in his old age and to give him burial and carry out the funeral rites when he died” (Oporto 2001:228). It was at the father’s death where the son demonstrated his respect towards his father in the most visible way, and he was supposed to bury him according to the established rites (Gn 25:9-11; 35:29). At burial the deceased father became one of the family ancestors (Sir 30:4; 44:10-11; 46:12), and the heir’s role was important here to insure the continuity of the household. Oporto (2001:229) explains:

In the burial rite the heir was presented and recognized as the new paterfamilias and from then on one of his principal functions would be to venerate the remains of the ancestors to whom the living still felt themselves bound as members of the same family. This obligation was one of the most sacred that a son had towards his father, and it did not finish on the day of burial but was prolonged in a series of funeral ceremonies after the burial and in the annual commemorations whose celebration was also entrusted to the son.⁸⁰

⁸⁰ Cf Gn 49:29-32; 50:25; Jos 24:32; Tob 4:3-4; 6:15; 14:9, 11-12; Jub 23:7; 36:1-2, 18; 2 Mac 5:10; Josephus, War 5.545; TReu 7:1; TLevi 19:5.

Also 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). In Q 9:59-60 Jesus places requirements of the kingdom above standard filial piety, and the son's request to bury his father may have also referred to his responsibility to feed and take care of the aged father (Oporto 2001:230). And for the son not to bury his father would be an act of impiety that would stain the family honour, and it would have had economic consequences as Jesus' request would threaten the continuity of the household.

Burial it would seem took place as soon as possible (cf Ac 5:6, 7-10; 8:2), and leaving a body unburied through the night was regarded as sinfully disrespectful. Jacobson (1995:362) explains:

Among the various tasks a son was expected to perform was that of obligatory grief and mourning and the rending of garments. But the call of Jesus would require the son to trample on all of these family pieties, including the most solemn one of all, the duty of burying one's father ... Jesus' call is, in any context but especially that of first-century Palestine, utterly insensitive. It is an insult to the most inviolate of all bonds, those of the family.

The second important anti-family saying in the formative stratum is Q 14:26. It is worth having the text in front of us:

[[<The one who>]] does not hate father and mother <can>not <be> my <disciple>; and [[<the one who>]] <does not hate> son and daughter cannot be my disciple.

Q assumes that both men and women left home and family for the sake of following Jesus. "Q 14:26 is not just radical; it would have been profoundly offensive" (Jacobson 1995:363). "Hate" is here not a prerequisite for following Jesus, however, and here probably refers to a willingness to "sever one's relationship with" the family. Jacobson (1995:364) explains that "love" and "hate" can mean something like "recognise one's obligation to someone" or refusing to do so. Similarly Oporto (2001:230) explains that "love" and "hate" are "attitudes coupled with behaviour which expressed group, rather than individual, values and were related to belonging and fidelity (love) or division and infidelity (hate)" (cf Dt 21:15-18; Gn 29:31-33; Mt 1:2; Josephus, Ant 6.255-256, 324; 7.254). The Q people, therefore, illustrate a scant regard for the continuity of the traditional household and the household

economy and the continuity from generation to generation. There is no concern over issues of inheritance, for the veneration of the deceased father and family ancestors, nor a concern that a son take up his role as the new paterfamilias. The importance of biological ancestral links are denied.

Tension with the family by following Jesus also existed because following Jesus required imitating his lifestyle, and his lifestyle by the standards of the day was scandalous and invoked rejection from his co-ethnics. Some traces are present in Q. By enacting the Kingdom of God, Jesus had no fixed abode (Q 9:58); his exorcisms it was said were performed by Beelzebul, the ruler of demons (Q 11:15); he was called a “glutton and a drunkard” (cf Jr 5:21-24; 11QTemple 64:5), and his inclusive approach made him a friend of “tax-collectors and sinners” (Q 7:34). Particularly by being accused as a “glutton and a drunkard”, in Israelite tradition reference could be made to the rebellious son that through his behaviour brought dishonour to his family and who should be stoned to death (Dt 21:18-22).⁸¹ “To follow Jesus, imitating his life-style, meant for his disciples acquiring this bade name which not only affected those who had decided to follow him, but also the rest of the family” (Oporto 2001:234). This association is present in Q 11:19-20, where Jesus is accused of casting out demons by Beelzebul. Jesus retorts: “... if I by Beelzebul cast out demons, your sons, by whom do they cast <<them>> out?”, thereby turning the accusations of the parents against themselves.

The reference to the πτωχοί is also relevant here (Q 6:20). Catchpole interprets it as referring to those who are poor economically. He also argues that the first three markarisms concerning the poor, hungry and the mourning (Q 6:20b-21) should not be seen as three different statements aimed at three different groups, but as a “single declaration which was amplified or paraphrased by two others” (Catchpole 1993:86). In Judean tradition, the poor in all times experience what others know in time of bereavement (Sir 4:1-2; 7:32-34; 38:19) and struggle to obtain food (Pr 22:9; Sir 4:1; 34:25). For these people, the God of the covenant’s concern has not changed. But is there not another dimension to the poverty in question? Oporto argues convincingly that these poor could also refer to disciples of Jesus who had been rejected by their parents. Those who lacked family support was πτωχός, a person

⁸¹ Allison (2000:40-41) notes that Deuteronomy 21:18-21 is found just before vv. 22-23, that instructs that bodies of executed criminals are to be hung on a tree, a penalty which at the time was associated with crucifixion. This Q’s allusion here to Deuteronomy 21:20 might have had implicit reference to Jesus’ crucifixion (cf Q 14:26).

who could not survive without begging. Oporto (2001:235) explains that in “Hellenistic society poverty was not defined principally by economic criteria but rather by kinship because kinship was the main way of accessing economic resources and all other goods.” This argument is convincing when seen in connection with the fourth markarism (Q 6:22-23) that describes the social ostracism and repression of the disciples. Jesus also gave instructions that are proper to beggars. The disciples are encouraged to make requests with confidence (Q 11:9-13); they should not be concerned with material things (Q 12:22-32); and not to store up earthly treasures (Q 12:33-34). “The foundation for this confidence is a God who is father, not family, which was then the social institution that supplied all these things” (Oporto 2001:235).

According to Jacobson (1992:222-24), the cross saying (Q 14:27) points to suffering entailed in the division of families and loss of community. The cross is a metaphor for rejection and alienation and in a similar manner to Q 14:26, it functions as a principle for exclusion (cf Mk 8:34 where the saying is formulated as a principle for inclusion). In Q 17:33 “life” is to be found where it seems to be lost, that is, in following Jesus. So following Jesus is not in vain – it justifies the loss of one’s family and community and finding life in a new community.⁸²

It is not clear whether the cross saying refers to family divisions as such, but overall the formative stratum has sayings that represent a strong attack on the traditional (patriarchal) family, that is, if following Jesus becomes a problem. According to Oporto (2001:215-216, 222) in the original tradition the split was between parents and children, but caused by the latter – Q represents the first stage of the tendency where the divisions between family members are widened, but the Q sayings do not specify who cause the division. It is quite possible, however, that in Q it is the children who are the cause of the family divisions (see Q 9:59-60; 12:53). But similar to our analysis of Q 12:49-53 (the main redaction), the sayings in the formative stratum imply that following Jesus disrupts the family, and that the family conflict was

⁸² Jacobson (1995:367-73) also discusses Q 16:13 and 16:18 as anti-family sayings. He argues that Q 16:13 probably stood just before Q 12:22-31 so Mammon in this context was probably intended to refer to “money”, “property”, or “making a living”, not amassing wealth as such. Since the “economy” of the first-century was primarily an economy of the household, the saying seems to imply that serving God must be preferred over serving the household economy (whether based on agriculture, crafts, fishing and so on). As far as Q 16:18 is concerned, Jacobson argues the saying primarily concerns *remarriage*. People that might have left their families might now wish to marry a “believer”, and Q 16:18 Jacobson suggests, stigmatises any who would do that. The saying prohibits the formation of new families within the new community to facilitate communal life.

mainly between the parents and the children. This is not to say this happened in all instances since the itinerants on their mission were sent to households (Q 10:5-7). Where all family members accepted Jesus' message of the kingdom, no divisions were caused. The family remained intact in these circumstances, but at the same time, they formed a fictive kinship group with other followers of Jesus, including those who needed support since they had to abandon their homes. According to Jacobson (1995:375), evidence "of fictive family formation is not strong, but not entirely absent ... Religious symbolism in Q is consistent with fictive family formation". But the evidence for fictive family formation is sufficient, and this is especially true for the first stratum. God is addressed as "Father" (Q 6:36; 11:2, 13; 12:30). The Q people are "sons" (Q 6:35) and addressed each other as "brothers" (Q 6:41-42; 17:3). These fictive kinship patterns could easily have been accommodated in first-century Galilee. The primary locus of religious life outside of the Temple and synagogue/assembly was the household. The architecture of our period indicates that the courtyard house was the dominant style, where several rooms were arranged around internal courts. The courtyard house could be expanded or contracted according to need, so "it would have been ideal for communal living, with individual rooms for sleeping and for cooking and so on" (Jacobson 1995:379). The early Messianist movement was a house-church movement, Q being no exception. But the Q people were now part of the household of God, where the Divine Patriarch will look after their needs.

5.3.2.1.2.3 Summary

The Q sermon is aimed at covenant renewal whereby relationships within the Israelite community can be restored (Q 6:27-45). Yet, the Q people's association with Jesus had the opposite effect. They themselves are persecuted (Q 6:22-23); they are the targets of ongoing violence and exploitation from their co-ethnics (Q 6:22-23, 27-36 (+ Q/Mt 5:41); 12:2-12, 22-31, 58-59; 14:27; 17:33) where the Pharisees seem to be singled out (Q 10:3; 11:39; 16:16). The Q mission itself did not go beyond Israel (Q 10:2), but evidently it failed. It is the Gentiles whom are identified (Q 6:34; 12:30) as the "others" from whom the Q people primarily distinguish themselves, yet, a certain distance also existed between them and fellow Judeans.

Tension also existed between the Q people and their families (Q 9:57-60; 14:26), although this was not the intention (Q 10:5-7). The main division was between parents and their children. Jesus himself is regarded as a "glutton and a drunkard"

(Q 7:34; main redaction), associating him with the tradition of the rebellious son. What we find as a result is a fictive family formation. God is the Divine Patriarch (Q 6:36; 11:2, 13; 12:30); the Q people are his sons (Q 6:35) and they are brothers (Q 6:41-42; 17:3). This “spiritual” family is no longer characterised by blood or ethnic ties, but by positive response to Jesus and imitating his lifestyle. This new household will provide what is needed, and is a substitute for the traditional patriarchal family. Evidently, the Q people were not that concerned over the continuity of the household and the household economy, matters of inheritance, or maintaining biological ancestral links to the family forefathers. It was a matter of leaving the dead to bury the dead. In this respect, Q has “emigrated” from the Judean symbolic universe in a radical way.

5.3.2.2 The Sacred Canopy

5.3.2.2.1 The Christology of the Formative Stratum

When it comes to the Christology of the first stratum, Arnal (2001:167-68) contends 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” it 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. 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).

We suggest, however, that the Christology of the main redaction is already present in the formative stratum. The difference here is that the Christology is assumed – it needs little defence and no overt apologetics are involved as we encounter in the rhetorical strategy of the main redaction. Jesus is already represented as the eschatological prophet in Q 6:20-21. In addition, the Moses typology, encountered regularly in the main redaction, is already present in the formative stratum; Jesus reconstructs Leviticus 19 (Q 6:27-45), inverts Moses’ instructions to the Israelites (Q 10:4), and on one occasion even contradicts Moses by disallowing divorce (Q 16:18).

As we saw earlier, Catchpole (1993:94) understands that the opposition to the Q people (Q 6:22-23) is due to the conviction that the Son of humanity/man is Jesus (see also Q 9:58). This identification referred to the heavenly status that was afforded to Jesus, and his future coming in judgement. In Q 6:46 Jesus is addressed as “κύριε κύριε”, a context which demands absolute obedience (see with Q 6:47-49).⁸³ Pearson (2004:488) argues that Q 6:46 may reflect something of the cultic life of the community, with Jesus being addressed as the exalted lord (cf 1 Cor 16:11; Did 10:6). Catchpole (1993:100) argues that the Q sermon is both deliberately designed and Christologically controlled. Only on two occasions does explicit Christology make its appearance, at the start (Q 6:22) and at the end (Q 6:46). It exists to articulate the conviction that the coming “son of man” is the authoritatively speaking Jesus. Catchpole identifies both texts as expressing an intense longing for the coming of the “son of man”. In addition, he argues that from Q 6:46 onwards that κύριος becomes the dominant Christological category. Thus in Q 10:2 for example, ὁ κυρίος τοῦ θερισμοῦ may refer to the “exalted and returning one who during the present interval authorizes those who continue and expand upon his own mission” (Catchpole 1993:161). Catchpole also argues that Q 10:2 demands a functional equivalence between God and Jesus (see with Q 10:3). God’s authority is experienced in the authority of Jesus, and God’s harvest is experienced in Jesus’ harvest. So the meaning is the same as that found at the conclusion of the mission charge where it states that those who receive (or reject) Jesus receive (or reject) God himself (Q 10:16).

It is questionable that Jesus as Lord/Master is the dominant Christological category in Q, for it stands alongside the others. But Catchpole is right to bring attention to the authority of Jesus. In the parable of the houses built on rock or sand (Q 6:47-49), it is interesting to note how much emphasis is placed on the authority of Jesus’ teaching. It is hearing and doing (Q 6:46) 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.

⁸³ Based on our analysis above, Q 6:47-49 must be understood in an eschatological context, that is, Jesus’ teaching has eschatological consequences. This calls for an implicit Christology being present in this pericope. We therefore disagree with Jacobson (1992:106) who argues that the emphasis here is on doing Jesus’ words; “there is no reference here to confessing Jesus before people or to any christological assertion”.

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. But 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.

5.3.2.2.2 The Torah and the Kingdom of God

The kingdom/reign of God and its nearness is an important religious theme in the formative stratum (Q 6:20; 9:60, 62; 10:9, 11; 11:2; 12:31; 13:18-21; 16:16). But similarly to the main redaction, the kingdom/reign of God stands in tension with the received Torah. Horsley (Horsley & Draper 1999:96) that Q 6:20-49 “makes numerous allusions to Israelite traditions, particularly to Mosaic covenantal laws and teachings in 6:27-36”.⁸⁴ As we saw already, Leviticus 19 is the chief intertext of the sermon, but it is important to bring attention to the fact that some of the teaching we encounter in the sermon modifies or runs counter to the Torah. Here are the examples.

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).⁸⁵

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 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 that.⁸⁶

(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). But the emphasis of the teaching is on

⁸⁴ 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.

⁸⁵ 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).

⁸⁶ 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

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, also the injunction to “hate” father and mother (Q 14:26) runs contrary to 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 the law. The same is relevant for Q 9:60.

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. Jesus contradicts the great law-giver in this one instance and freely reconstructs the holiness code. Q 16:16 offers an explanation:

... 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. In our discussion of the sermon when treating kinship, we saw that Catchpole argued that Jesus’ teaching (based on Lv 17) emphasises what the people of the covenant should live like. This is true, but we illustrated above that the kingdom/reign of God requires a reconstructed Torah or covenant, given by the eschatological prophet, Jesus. Similarly in Q 16:16 it is simply assumed that a new era has surpassed the old. No defence or apologetics are required here. 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

(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.

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 reconstructed Torah, and this new combination forms part of Q's sacred canopy.

As an aside, the rhetorical tone of Jesus' teaching in the formative stratum, aimed at covenant renewal, is instructional. The authority of Jesus is simply taken for granted and no apologetic stance towards the Torah is present. A lack of a developed Christology in the formative stratum should not therefore be seen that it lacked Christological reflection, or that the Q people merely saw Jesus as a “wise man”. Jesus' reconstruction of the Torah is not challenged, indicating that Jesus' eschatological status and authority was common knowledge and accepted by the Q people.

In summary, in the formative stratum Jesus freely reconstructs the Torah, even contradicts Moses on one occasion, and it is stated that a new era, the kingdom/reign of God as 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. This is closely related to the rhetorical tone of Jesus' teaching about the kingdom and covenant renewal. It is instructional. This hortatory tone also tells us much about the Christology of the formative stratum. The authority of Jesus and his eschatological status is assumed – Q¹ requires no apologetics, hence its hortatory nature. It is because of Jesus that the Q people are living according to eschatological Torah, or one can say that for Q covenantal nomism is in (re)construction. It is somewhat like a hypothetical group of patriotic Americans coming together, and acting as founding fathers by writing a new declaration of independence – somewhat the same, somewhat different from the original – for a renewed America. Q's sacred canopy now boasts a heavenly Jesus, a reconstructed Torah, and the kingdom/reign of God. This eschatological identity later on required the polemical and apologetic strategy of the main redaction whereby the Q people were given affirmation and legitimation of their (re)constructed Judean ethnic identity.

5.3.2.2.3 Shared “Historical” Memories

Most examples that recall traditions of the past in the formative stratum are implicit, rather than explicit. As we shall see later, the Moses typology encountered in the main redaction is also encountered in the formative stratum. This is relevant, for example, to Jesus reconstructing the holiness code of Leviticus 19 in Q 6:27-45. What we will discuss here, is that 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 uncertain, although

based on the IQP reconstruction, the text there seems to be an inversion of Moses' instructions to the Israelites. In line with this prophetic typology are the markarisms (Q 6:20-21) where Jesus is represented as the anointed eschatological prophet of Isaiah 60:1-2.

Q 9:61-62 alludes to Elijah calling Elisha (1 Ki 19:19-21), but in addition, it may also recall the story of Lot's wife. Those who look back are not fit for the Kingdom of God. Lot's wife "looked back" (Gn 19:26) in disobedience to the divine command not to (Gn 19:17). The targums suggest that she looked back "because she was sentimentally attached to her family and past" (Allison 2000:80).⁸⁷ Thus in similar fashion the disciple of Q 9:61-62 is attached to his old life – this disqualifies him from being a disciple of Jesus.

The only explicit example relevant to *shared "historical" memories* in the formative stratum is when reference is made to Solomon and his "glory" in Q 12:27. "Glory" (δόξα) was often associated with Solomon's reign.⁸⁸ Also the κρίνον usually translated as "lilies" appears twenty-two times in the LXX, with more than half having to do with Solomon (cf Allison 2000:153-54).

Based on the above we can see that *shared "historical" memories* is not an important cultural feature of the formative stratum. Probably most important here is not what is explicitly being said, but what is assumed. Jesus stands within the prophetic tradition. As a prophet like Moses, he is reconstructing Leviticus 19 (discussed above) in Q 6:27-45, and inverts Moses' instructions to the Israelites (Q 10:4). In Q 6:20-21 Jesus is identified with the eschatological prophet of Isaiah. Elijah and Elisha is present as well, but not in an important way (Q 9:61-62). These themes, as we saw, were further developed in the main redaction.

5.3.2.2.4 The Eschatology of the Formative Stratum

Our first area of investigation into the eschatological character of the formative stratum is the sermon (Q 6:20b-49). Kloppenborg (1987:188), although he laid emphasis on the sapiential nature of the beatitudes he also stated that "they are proclamations of eschatological salvation." Alternatively he described them as

⁸⁷ TargPsJon on Gn 19:26; TargNeof 1 on Gn 19:26; cf Philo, Abraham 164.

⁸⁸ 1 Chr 29:25; 2 Chr 1:12; 5:13, 14; 7:1-3; Josephus, Ant 8.190; TSol 5:5.

“radical wisdom of the kingdom” or as “sapiential forms infused with eschatological content” (1987:189). Tuckett (1996:141) argues that the beatitudes (Q 6:20-23) as a whole are eschatologically orientated: the poor, hungry and the mourning in the present are promised future reversal of their present and less than desirable state in an eschatological future. For Catchpole (1993:86), the future reversal predicted in *χορτασθήσονται* (IQP: *χορτασθήσεσθε*) and *παρακληθήσονται* (IQP: *[[παρακληθήσεσθε]]*) enables the verb *ἐστίν* in Q 6:20b to be interpreted as a Semitic future-type present and *ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ* as the totality of God’s design for the poor. This draws on the vision promoted by apocalyptic, specifically Isaiah 61:1-2, as Jesus’ answer to John in Q 7:22 indicates.

We argued previously that “the poor” is also applicable to Jesus’ followers who had lost the support of their families. They are promised eschatological reversal, and this is something verified in Q 6:22-23 where they as the “persecuted” and “insulted” are promised a great reward in heaven. At the end of the Sermon (Q 6:47-49; see also Q 12:4-5) the listeners are warned “of the (eschatological) consequences which will result from their attitudes to the teaching of Jesus as just set out: those who hear and obey Jesus’ teaching will be secure against the onslaughts of flood and storm; those who do not will perish” (Tuckett 1996:142). In Q 6:47-49 a contrast is made between houses built on rock (cf Ps 27:5; 40:2; Is 22:16; 33:16) or sand (cf Sir 18:10; Gn 13:16; Ps 78:27; Jdt 2:20). With the onset of a severe storm, they either collapse or stand. In contrast with Tuckett, Jacobson (1992:96-97 cf Kloppenborg 1987:186) argues that the sermon is predominantly sapiential in character. The parable of the two builders/houses has its closest parallels in the wisdom parables of the rabbinic tradition (m.Ab 3:22; ARN 24). Also, the parable conforms to the typical practice of the wisdom tradition, where a “ruined house” occurs at the end of a number of collections (Pr 1-9; 10-15; 22:17-24:22; Job 3-27). Catchpole (1993:96-97) agrees with Tuckett’s eschatological interpretation, however. The parable when viewed in isolation is concerned with how to live in the present. By listening to Jesus and by doing what he says, you will have firm stability or security and will be ready for any threat. But based on Q 6:46, which displays an intense longing for the return of the Son of humanity/man⁸⁹ (cf Q 6:22), the parable of the builders/houses following immediately thereafter now had to be read eschatologically. “In Q, and only in Q, its imagery would as a result have recalled the imagery of theophanic texts in the biblical tradition” (Catchpole 1993:100). These texts referred to rain (Ps 68:9) and

flood (Job 22:16; Pss 93:3; 98:8; Hab 3:10) and wind (Is 17:13; 57:13; 64:6) to warn about “the ultimate storm-like appearance of God in judgment”.⁹⁰ So the “coming of the Lord and Son of man” must be anticipated in a spirit of obedience and must be a time of “dedicated ‘doing’” (Catchpole 1993:100-101).

Likewise the parables of the mustard seed and the leaven (Q 13:18-21) also refer to an eschatological future (Tuckett 1996:143). But Tuckett, in his attempt to make some Q material *un-sapiential*, also seems prone to read eschatology in some traditions where its presence is questionable. On the teaching about anxiety (Q 12:22-31), Tuckett (1996:152) argues it is “thoroughly impregnated with a powerful eschatological awareness and expectation.” Here Tuckett claims to draw on the view of Catchpole, who is understood to argue that this material involves a strong clash with wisdom literature’s expectation that human beings should work to sustain themselves (e.g. Pr 6:6-8; 10:21; 12:24, 27). The situation this Q material belongs to is special in character and short in duration and is “conditioned by the expectation of an imminent eschatological crisis” (Catchpole 1993:35). But Tuckett fails to take notice that Catchpole was here commenting on these sayings with regards to their original life setting (*viz.* charismatic itinerants), and not on their function in Q. In addition, Tuckett (1996:152-55) also argues that Q 11:2-4, 9-13, a possible unit devoted to prayer, is dominated by the prayer for the kingdom in an eschatological sense. The Lord’s Prayer itself has a dominant theme of eschatology and the kingdom of God. The Q people are then assured their prayers will be answered: they may ask, search and knock. The “good things” that will be given in Q 11:13 by the Father are gifts of the Eschaton. Overall, the Q people, Tuckett (1996:155 cf 347-354) maintains, “are exhorted to work and strive for the establishment of the kingdom of God”, a concern which overrides a concern for material needs. The urgency of the appeals are explained by the rationale that the kingdom will arrive in the *near* future (Q 12:39-46; 17:23-37⁹¹). Catchpole (1993:211-28) does not agree, and he suggests that Q 11:2-13 (*incl.* Lk 11:5-8) *in association with* Q 12:22-31 refers to a situation where although they proclaimed the imminence of the kingdom of God, the Q people were in socio-economic need (*cf* Kloppenborg 1987:220-21), since they needed insistent teaching about the Father’s provision of food and clothing. Both Tuckett

⁸⁹ Cf Jacobson (1992:95-96) who argues that it is by no means clear that Q 6:46 is a “prophetic saying”.

⁹⁰ Catchpole (1993:100) also refers to other texts related to this idea: WisSol 4:19; Sir 43:16; 5:22-23; Jdg 5:5; Pss 18:7; 77:17-18; 97:4; Mi 1:4; Jdt 16:15.

(1996:360, 365-66) and Kloppenborg (1987:251), however, also rightly refer to other passages where it suggests that the people addressed are not destitute and where it seems to imply that possessions were real options (Q 6:30; 9:57-62; 10:7-8; 12:29-31, 33-34; 16:13). Thus Q must have consisted of members who were on various levels of the socio-economic scale. In fact, Q 12:31 might be an instruction to join/remain with the Q community where the necessary provisions can be provided in the household.

The formative stratum also contains elements of realised eschatology. Q 6:20-21 implies the anointed one of Yahweh has arrived. Jacobson (1992:144, 147) argues that eschatology is clearly present in the mission charge. This is present in the idea of the harvest metaphor (Q 10:2; cf 3:9, 17) since it is frequently used to refer to judgement/the End (cf Catchpole 1993:164).⁹² Similarly Kloppenborg (1987:125) argues that Q 10:2 describes missionary work as eschatological gathering. Even the parables of the mustard seed and the leaven imply that the future kingdom of God is already present (Q 13:18-21). This is supported by Q 16:16, for the kingdom is already violated and plundered, implying it is already here. When curing the sick, the envoys of Jesus must tell them that the kingdom/reign of God has reached them (Q 10:9). Jesus' followers are encouraged to seek the Father's kingdom (Q 12:31). If the Holy Spirit is mentioned in Q 12:12, it is promised that he will help those who face interrogation before the assemblies.

In summary the formative stratum looks towards an eschatological future. They are expecting the arrival of the kingdom (Q 6:46; 11:2; 13:18-21) and judgement (Q 6:47-49; cf 12:4-5). The future, as opposed to the main redaction, is couched in positive language in hope of a blessed future existence (Q 6:20-21, 22-23). It also makes the claim that the kingdom is present through the teaching and presence of Jesus and healing (Q 6:20-21; 10:9; 12:31; 13:18-21) and suggests that judgement is already in progress (Q 10:2). It is interesting to note that in the formative stratum there is a reasonable balance between futurist and realised eschatology, and a few texts contain both ideas at the same time. In the main redaction, where judgement on unrepentant Israel predominates, there is a shift in emphasis towards a more futurist eschatology.

⁹¹ These two texts are assigned by Kloppenborg to the main redaction of Q.

⁹² Cf Is 18:3-6; 24:13; Jr 51:33; Jl 3:13; Mi 4:11-13; 4 Ezra 4:28-32; 2 Bar 70:2.

5.4 THESIS: THE RECONSTRUCTION OF JUDEAN ETHNICITY IN Q

Now it is time to review our analysis above by comparing the two stratum. One will see that in the formative stratum the main issues that occupy Q are *kinship*, and relevant to the Sacred Canopy, the eschatological identity of the Q people because of the teaching of Jesus, and the tension that existed between the “old” system (the law and the prophets) and the newness of the kingdom/reign of God. In the main redaction basically all the relevant cultural features identified by ethnicity theory are represented. This shows that the issue of ethnic identity was given more attention in the later development of Q. We will now do a review of how this development took place.

5.4.1 The Habitus/Israel

- **Name:**

Primordialist tendencies: The name “Israel” does not feature in the formative stratum. One can accept that it was the accepted self-identification of the Q people, however, and it appears on two occasions in the main redaction. They regard themselves as part of Israel and identify themselves with its religious and symbolic usage. They are heirs of the ancestral land and are part of a privileged people. It is within Israel that a Gentile’s faith is acknowledged. Nothing like it was found in Israel (Q 7:9). The Q people look forward to the future restoration of Israel when they will judge/liberate/effect justice for the twelve tribes of Israel (Q 22:28-30). Thus Israel will finally become what it is supposed to be, where God’s people and God’s land will come together and where the eschatological kingdom will become a full reality. Israel, both as a geographical region and as a people is therefore part and parcel of the Q people’s vision for the future.

- **Language:**

Constructionist tendencies: Not much can be said for the cultural feature of language. Accepting that Q was most probably originally written in Greek in or near Capernaum, it implies that Q was written for a primarily if not exclusively Greek speaking community. This may have contributed towards the Q people and their separation from other Aramaic speaking Judeans, but based on the widespread use of Greek in Judea and Galilee, not too much must be read into Q’s use of the Greek language. Here the Q people shared in the (re)construction of Judean ethnicity along with other Judeans.

- **Religion and Covenantal Praxis:**

Q¹:

Constructionist tendencies: The formative stratum does not reveal much concerning these cultural features. Q 10:7-8 instructs that the missionaries should eat whatever is set before them (cf Q 7:34). This suggests that they should not be concerned over matters of ritual purity at the meal table through which the message of the kingdom can be jeopardised.

Q²:

Primordialist tendencies: In the main redaction the Q people are in some respects represented as normal Judeans. Tithing and matters pertaining to ritual purity are accepted as a valid part of the law (Q 11:39-44). Q hopes that the Temple will accept Jesus, therefore it hopes for its future restoration, although for now the Temple is “forsaken” (Q 13:35).

Constructionist tendencies: It is with John’s rite of immersion where a radical discontinuity with Judean rites is present. This is an *initiatory* rite necessary for eschatological salvation (Q 3:7-9), something previously unheard of. Here we have the redefinition of God’s people, and the divine election of corporate Israel is denied. Covenantal nomism is in this one instance radically (re)constructed. Covenant status is no longer a birth right, but must be individually earned through immersion and response to the message of the kingdom.

- **Kinship:**

Q¹:

Primordialist tendencies: The Q sermon (6:27-45) is aimed at covenant renewal and the rehabilitation of relationships between Judeans. The people of the covenant should be characterised by forgiveness, love, mercy and justice, and so on. Q’s mission was only aimed at Israel (Q 10:2), and Gentiles are clearly the primary outside group from whom the Q people distinguish themselves (Q 6:34; 12:30).

Constructionist tendencies: Following Jesus often brought about a rift between his disciples and their co-ethnics and family. The followers of Jesus, also identified as “the poor” (Q 6:20), since they no longer enjoy family support, are insulted and persecuted. The Q people also are the victims of ongoing violence and exploitation and the local judicial systems are regarded with suspicion (Q 6:22-23, 27-36 (+ Q/Matt 5:41); 12:2-12, 22-31, 58-59; 14:27; 16:16; 17:33). They seem in particular to

be the targets of the rapacity of the elitist Pharisees (Q 10:3; see with Q 11:39; 16:16).

In the formative stratum severe tension with the family is already evident. Following Jesus and imitating his lifestyle may bring about rejection at home (Q 9:57-58). A son is refused permission to bury his father, and must immediately follow Jesus (Q 9:59-60). Q 14:26 instructs that belonging and fidelity to the Jesus movement is more important than belonging and fidelity to the patriarchal family – although it was not the intention of the Q mission to divide the family, since Q itinerants are sent on their mission to households (Q 10:5-7). Nevertheless, the Q mission did bring about division, and the split was mainly between the parents and the children. If the choice must be made, Q shows little sympathy for the continuity of the traditional household and household economy, and the continuity of generation to generation. There is little concern for issues of inheritance, for the veneration of the family ancestors, and for the new paterfamilias to take up his role. As a result we find the formation of fictive kinship patterns. Loss of traditional family is replaced by a spiritual household bonded by a commitment to Jesus and the kingdom/reign of God. At the head of the household is the Divine Patriarch, reverently addressed as “Father” (Q 6:36; 11:2, 13; 12:30). The household members are sons (Q 6:35) who address each other as brothers (Q 6:41-42; 17:3).

Q²:

Constructionist tendencies: It is noticeable in the main redaction that *kinship* indicators in Q shifts in emphasis towards the Q people’s frustrated relationship with broader Israel. One can accept that family divisions were already an established fact, but presumably still going on (Q 12:49-53). Here it is actually said that it was the intention of Jesus to bring about family division, justifying the actions of those who had left home, while probably also aimed at those who had difficulty in staying away from their homes or who had difficulty leaving. It should come as no surprise that Jesus is called a “glutton and a drunkard”, where he is associated with the tradition of the rebellious son (Q 7:34). Following Jesus and imitating his lifestyle negatively affects the family honour, something which Jesus exploits in Q 11:19-20.

The main redaction’s focus is on Q’s attitude towards broader Israel. It is negatively referred to as “this (evil) generation”, which refers to unrepentant Israelites (Q 7:31-35; 11:29-51). They are guilty of the primordial sins of the generations in the times of Noah and Moses, and when the time comes, they will be judged by the Gentiles who

responded to Jonah's preaching and the wisdom of Solomon (Q 11:31-32). Evidence of active opposition and repression of the Q people is also evident in the main redaction (Q 11:39; 12:8-10, 58-59; 17:33). Opposition is even present in the form of neutrality (Q 11:23). The alienation between the Q group and their co-ethnics is evident in Q 11:49-51, where it is explained that God/Wisdom will send them prophets only to make "this generation" guilty for their death. The Galilean towns are denounced (Q 10:12-14), and it is said that Gentiles will fare better than them in the judgement. Israel, under the spiritual guidance of the so-called wise and learned (Pharisees and lawyers) (Q 10:21), has no knowledge of God (Q 10:22; 11:39-44; 11:46-52). It is Jesus who has received the whole revelation of the Father and communicated it towards his followers. Also, the Diaspora Judeans will replace non-responsive local Israelites (Q 13:28-29) at the time when the Q people will help with Israel's restoration (Q 22:28-30). The attitude of Q towards broader Israel is typified by Q 13:34-35, where an oracle of doom is followed by the hope of restoration. Q has as yet not written off Israel and a glimmer of hope is present for Jerusalem and the Temple (and broader Israel) to accept Jesus and join the Q community. Also, and this is important, the Q people disassociate themselves from those Messianists who presumably have given up aspects of traditional covenantal praxis (Q 13:27). The Q people's ethnic status as Judeans is confirmed, as Q walks a tightrope between broader Israel and that branch of the Jesus movement that appears to have Gentile associations.

Overall, Q demonstrates a strong consciousness of difference vis-à-vis other Judeans. Non-responsive Judeans are headed for destruction (cf Q 10:16; 12:8-9). Although Q hopes for a restored Israelite community, as things now stand, one can hardly talk of a feeling of communal solidarity with co-ethnics. Q feels that it properly belongs to the Judean symbolic universe, where kinship patterns are (re)constructed around commitment to Jesus and the resultant kingdom/reign of God.

- **Land:**

Primordialist tendencies: Insight into Q's attitude towards the *land* may be implied in Jesus' teaching aimed at covenant renewal (Q 6:27-45), but it is only in the main redaction where we are given some explicit information of Q's position. Overall, the scant evidence suggests that Q had a positive attitude and relationship with territorial Israel. They had hope for Jerusalem and the Temple's future restoration, that is, if they accepted Jesus as the Coming One (Q 13:35b). In a similar vein Q 22:28-30 has in view the restoration of Israel and the eschatological ingathering of the

scattered Israelites, or the twelve tribes. So Q shows strong attachment to ethnic and territorial Israel, and the land plays an important role in Q's vision of the future kingdom, although we are given no information as to its magnitude and scope. But it is particularly the *land*, in combination with the Q people's self-identification as part of Israel (*name*), where an essentially primordialist approach to ethnicity is evident.

5.4.2 The Sacred Canopy

- **Christology:**

Q¹:

Constructionist tendencies: The present era of eschatological fulfilment and the future is inseparable from the person of Jesus. The Christology of the formative stratum is largely assumed, however. There is no explanation or background to it. Jesus is the eschatological prophet (Q 6:20-21), and the Moses typology is suggested by Q 6:27-45 where Jesus reconstructs the Torah; by Q 10:4 where Jesus appears to invert Moses' instructions to the Israelites; and by Q 16:18 where Jesus contradicts an instruction of Moses. Jesus is addressed as "Lord, Lord" in Q 6:46, and is referred to as the "Lord" of the harvest in Q 10:22. He is identified as the Son of humanity/man in Q 6:22-23, which may indirectly refer to Jesus' heavenly status. The high status Jesus had for the Q people is evidenced by Q 10:16; those who receive (or reject) Jesus receive (or reject) God himself.

Q²:

Constructionist tendencies: Where the Christology of the formative stratum is assumed or implicit, it comes to fuller expression within the polemical context of the main redaction. Taking our analysis above into account, the Christology of Q must be read in close association with its attitude towards the law as well, but more will be said about this later. The Christology of the main redaction serves both a polemical and apologetic purpose. It is there to defend and explain the eschatological status and authority of Jesus. Jesus is strongly identified with the Judean prophetic tradition, whereby the Q people attest to their own Judean ethnic identity as well. This is especially so when Jesus is identified as the prophet like Moses who has initiated the new Exodus. The Q people identify themselves with the first founding event of Israel, and with the first law-giver, Moses.

How is this prophetic motif developed with regards to Jesus himself? Jesus is at first referred to as the "Coming One" (Q 3:16). This coming figure is developed in two

ways. First, this coming one is the eschatological prophet, the prophet like Moses who has initiated the new Exodus (Q 4:1-13). He, as in the days of old, as passed the test of a prophet by rebuking the temptations of the devil in the wilderness. Jesus, like Moses, performs miracles by the finger of God (Q 11:20). John himself was the messenger who had prepared the way for the new Exodus (Q 7:18-35). In Q 7:18-23 the identity of Jesus as the “Coming One” is affirmed, and the fact that he raised the dead and cleansed the lepers also places him within the prophetic tradition of Elijah and Elisha. Lastly, Jesus as a prophet is also an envoy of Wisdom. Indeed, he is the final emissary of Wisdom who like the prophets of the past was rejected and persecuted (Q 7:31-35; 11:49-51; 13:34-35). Second, Jesus as the “Coming One” also points forward to the coming of the Son of humanity/man in judgement who already now enjoys heavenly status (Q 12:8-9, 40; 17:23-37).

Jesus is also the Lord/Master, who expects that his instructions will be obeyed in his absence (Q 12:42-46; 19:12-27). Even a Gentile – who demonstrated extraordinary faith – addressed Jesus as Lord/Master (Q 7:6). For the main redaction Jesus is also the Son of God (Q 4:3, 9; 10:22). This is complimentary to the Moses typology in Q, for this identification appears where Jesus enacts a new Exodus, and where it is said that Jesus alone has received the whole revelation from the Father, a privilege that was reserved for Moses in Judean tradition. Based on Q 10:22, it can also be seen that for Q, Jesus enjoyed a higher status than Moses. The absolute status of Jesus is affirmed in Q 12:8-9, where it is explained that confession of Jesus is the definitive measure of salvation (cf Q 10:16). So Jesus has become part of the Q people’s Sacred Canopy, and in terms of importance, ranks second to God. Jesus dominates all the other aspects of the traditional Sacred Canopy. Covenantal nomism is being (re)constructed in a radical way. This high regard for Jesus separated the Q people quite sharply from other Judeans. They must have been baffled: how can this person with questionable authority, who seems to undermine the Torah, a glutton and a drunkard, a friend of tax-collectors and sinners be afforded the eschatological and heavenly status afforded to him by the Q community? Q responded by designing the polemical and apologetic strategy reviewed above.

- **The Torah and the Kingdom/Reign of God:**

Q¹:

Constructionist tendencies: The kingdom/reign of God and its nearness is an important religious theme in the formative stratum (Q 6:20; 9:60, 62; 10:9, 11; 11:2; 12:31; 13:18-21; 16:16). Yet, tension with the Torah is already evident. Jesus freely

reconstructs the holiness code of Leviticus 19 (Q 6:27-45), where for example, mercy is regarded as more important than holiness or as the proper meaning of holiness. Jesus' teaching on the relationship with the family (Q 9:59-60; 14:26) also has implications for perfect Torah obedience – children in some respects need not honour their parents, for the kingdom carries greater priority. On one occasion Jesus even contradicts Moses – divorce is not allowed (Q 16:18). Note should be taken of the rhetorical tone of this material, particularly Q 6:27-45. Jesus freely reconstructs the Torah without any defence being offered. The tone is hortatory and instructional. This gives evidence that Jesus' eschatological authority was already assumed by Q, and generally recognised by the Q people. In a similar vain the kingdom is simply assumed to be present – it has replaced the “old” era of the law and the prophets (Q 16:16).

Q²:

Primordialist tendencies: In the main redaction, the kingdom of God appears in primarily a polemical context (Q 7:28; 11:20; 13:28-29; 22:28-30) and Jesus' eschatological status and Q's attitude towards the law requires explanation. Q apologises for the sins of other Messianists who are guilty of “lawlessness” (Q 13:27). Q affirms its allegiance to the Torah (Q 16:17). Even Jesus himself is a model Judean, for he demonstrates an unwavering obedience to scripture (Q 4:1-13). Tithing and various aspects of ritual purity is accepted as part of the law although it was a helpful tool to criticise the questionable character of the Pharisees (Q 11:39-44). So Q explains, its community has not abandoned the Torah. By recognising the everlasting validity of the law, Q reclaims or affirms the Judean identity of the community and of its hero, Jesus. Their citizenship in the Judean symbolic universe is restored. At the same time, however, Q is living according to the Torah given by the eschatological prophet like Moses, Jesus. What is also at stake is the correct interpretation of the law (Q 11:46b, 52), for more ethical concerns such as justice, mercy and faithfulness is more important than the ritual law (Q 11:39-44).

Constructionist tendencies: Q's approach to the law in the main redaction is not that simple as the polemical and apologetic approach aimed at achieving, and must be qualified by its Christology. Jesus as the eschatological prophet has the status and authority to teach what the law within the context of the kingdom requires. The Q people are participating in the newness of the kingdom/reign of God, a new Exodus, led by Jesus, the new law-giver. So the Q people might not have abandoned the Torah, but they live according to reconstructed or eschatological Torah. So what

room is left for Moses? He is there, but the reconstructed Torah of Jesus only points to one thing: the kingdom/reign of God requires the (re)construction of covenantal nomism. There is both continuity and discontinuity with what has gone before.

- **Shared “Historical” Memories:**

Q¹:

In the formative stratum, this cultural feature does not play a prominent role and for the most part is implicit. Moses typology is present (Q 6:27-35; 10:4) and Jesus is placed within the context of the Judean prophetic tradition (Q 6:20-21). Q 9:61-62 alludes to Elijah calling Elisha and possibly to Lot’s wife who looked back to her past. The only explicit example is where reference is made to Solomon and his glory (Q 12:27).

Q²:

Constructionist tendencies: In the main redaction *shared “historical” memories* are quite prevalent. It is used to affirm and explain the eschatological status of Jesus. In the temptation narrative (Q 4:1-13), allusion is made to Moses and the exodus. This typology is also present in other parts of Q (7:26-27; 10:21-24; 11:20). Jesus is also connected to the anointed figure of Isaiah (Q 7:18-23). Both Jesus and John are associated with Elijah. Jesus raised the dead (Q 7:18-23) and John himself is identified as the coming Elijah (Q 3:7-9, 16b-17; 7:27).

Apart from the above, traditions of the past are predominantly used negatively to denounce non-responsive Israel. They are referred to as “this (evil) generation”, recalling the primordial sins of the generation in the wilderness and the time of Noah (Q 7:31-35; 11:29, 31-32; 11:50-51). The evil Gentile cities of Sodom, Tyre and Sidon are called upon – they will fare better in the judgement than the Galilean town who have not responded to Q’s message of the kingdom (Q 10:12-14). Particularly Tyre and Sidon, it said, would have responded positively to the working of miracles. The Ninevites and the Queen of the South is similarly favorably compared – the Ninevites repented at the preaching of Jonah, the Galilean prophet; the Queen of the South listened to the wisdom of Solomon (Q 11:16, 29-32), while Q’s contemporaries failed to listen to something that was qualitatively greater, the message of the kingdom. The days of Noah and Lot are also held up as examples future judgement (Q 17:26-30), when the eschatological separation of the elect will occur (Q 17:34-35). The region of the Jordan – also associated with the Lot story – is the setting of John’s fiery preaching of repentance and judgement (Q 3:3). Q employs the

Deuteronomistic theology and so recalls the rejection and persecution of the prophets (Q 6:23c; 11:47-51; 13:28-29; 14:16-24). Particularly Abel – regarded as a prophet in Q – and Zechariah are mentioned (Q 13:28-29). Abraham, Isaac and Jacob will be present in the future kingdom, along with the reconstituted twelve tribes (Q 13:28-29; 22:28-30), but unrepentant Israelites will be thrown out (Q 13:28).

One can see that within the polemical context of the main redaction, Q illustrates little or no sentimental attachment to the past. Ethno-symbolism is not employed to affirm Israel's privileged status. Q is pre-occupied to use the past traditions in service of the eschatological present and future. The past is qualified or only has meaning when you participate in the eschatological newness of the kingdom.

- **Myths of Common Ancestry:**

Constructionist tendencies: This cultural feature is prominent only in the main redaction of Q and it is used rather negatively. It is accepted that Abraham, Isaac and Jacob will be present in the future kingdom (Q 13:28). Otherwise, Q attacks the presumption attached with Judean ancestry. It is denied that Judeans benefit from the merit of Abraham (Q 3:8). Now it is time where merit must be required by each individual in his/her own lifetime. Maintenance of status is no longer the prerogative of corporate Israel and the notion of divine election is denied. The lawyers are said to be just like their forefathers, who have killed the prophets (Q 11:47-48). So where ancestry is used in Q, it is used to attack the now false claim to privilege attached therewith, and lastly, the murder of the prophets.

- **Eschatology:**

Q¹:

Constructionist tendencies: The eschatological character of the formative stratum is not that pronounced as in the main redaction, but it is present. The Q people look forward to the arrival of the kingdom, and their future is couched in positive language (Q 6:20-23, 46; 11:2; 13:18-21). Accepting or rejecting the teaching of Jesus will have eschatological consequences (Q 6:47-49 cf 12:4-5). But the present is also a time of eschatological fulfilment. The ingathering of the harvest and judgement is already underway (Q 10:2). The Holy Spirit will teach those what to say if brought before the assemblies (Q 12:12). The kingdom/reign of God has arrived (Q 12:31; 13:18-21), present through the activity and healing of Jesus (Q 6:20-21; 10:9).

Q²:

Constructionist tendencies: This era of eschatological fulfilment is also represented in the main redaction. Sin against the Holy Spirit will not be forgiven (Q 12:10), implying he is present in some way. The emissaries of John “hear and see” what was looked forward to by the prophets of old in the person of Jesus (Q 7:22), and if present in Q, those who have eyes to see will recognise in the signs that the End has arrived (Q 12:54-56). In Q 7:18-23 Jesus is identified as the “Coming One” through the activities of his ministry. The kingdom/reign of God is also present through his exorcisms (Q 11:20). That the End has arrived is also supported by the fact that families are experiencing divisions (Q 12:49-53). John himself is recognised as the Elijah *redivivus* who has inaugurated the new time period (Q 7:27).

The main redaction, however, is dominated by a futurist eschatology and often speaks of the judgement of non-responsive Israel (Q 3:7-9, 16-17; 10:12-15; 11:16, 29-32, 49-51; 13:28-29, 34). This judgement will be sudden and without warning (Q 12:39-40; 17:23-34), and will have dire consequences (Q 12:42-46; 19:12-27). Closely related to this is the future coming of the Son of humanity/man in judgement (Q 12:39-59; 17:23-37). The Q people are in a position of safety and security since they have made use of the current opportunity for repentance. Broader Israel, if it remains unrepentant, is facing serious judgement and punishment.

5.4.3 The Gentiles

Although not strictly a part of our model, some remarks are in order in terms of Q’s relationship to the Gentiles. In the formative stratum the Gentiles are identified by what ethnicity theory describes as a “we-they” *oppositional* self-definition (Q 6:34; 12:30). In the main redaction the Q people’s relationship to the Gentiles does change, but mainly to form part of the polemical rhetoric characteristic of that stratum. Some passages have been identified that may suggest a mission to the Gentiles (e.g. Q 10:2, 7-8b; 13:18-19; 14:16-24), but the evidence is not strong enough to suggest that the Q people were participating in such a mission, although that such a mission exists is implicitly acknowledged. Rather, the Gentiles are used as a polemical device to shame Israel and to bring it to repentance. The faith of a Gentile centurion is contrasted with the lack of faith in Israel (Q 7:1-10). The Ninevites and the Queen of the South will judge “this generation” for its inability to respond to the message of the kingdom (Q 11:31-32). The Gentile cities of Sodom, Tyre and Sidon will fare better in the judgement than the Galilean towns – also it is assumed that they would have responded positively if the miracles of the kingdom

were performed there (Q 10:12-14). Gentiles are either in the past or future perspective of Q, and Q generally is pre-occupied with the fate of ethnic and territorial Israel. Any contact with Gentiles would also have undermined the polemical and apologetic strategy of the main redaction where Q affirmed its allegiance to the Torah, hence, reaffirming the Judean ethnic identity of its community. Overall, the Gentiles do not properly belong to Q's symbolic universe.

5.4.4 Findings: So What Kind of Judeans Were the Q People?

In chapters 1 and 2 we analysed *interpretations* of the historical Jesus. Here, our own interpretation of the Q source attempts to improve our understanding of the Judean ethnic identity of the *community* it presupposes. Thus again, we are not making any claims with regards to the historical Jesus, although admittedly, the results may have implications for historical Jesus research.

Overall, where does the Q community fit on the scale mentioned by Holmén (see chapters 1 and 2) from the commonly Judean to the marginally Judean? In a few respects, the Q people appear to be profoundly Judean, while being different kind of Judeans in others. Based on the above overview, there is both continuity and discontinuity between the Q people and established Judean ethnic identity. Their essentially primordialist tendencies are restricted to the cultural features of *name* and *land*. They identify themselves as part of Israel, and look forward to its restoration. Other features of primordialism are also present, however. Ironically the polemic of the main redaction shows that Q is concerned over the eschatological future of all Israel, including Jerusalem and the Temple. They claim to be Torah obedient and accept tithing and ritual purity as part of everyday life. The Gentiles are still seen as “the others”. In some respects, the Q people fit in comfortably within the Judean symbolic universe. But *apart from name and land, all the cultural features in Q are essentially constructionist as they display strong elements of discontinuity with traditional covenantal nomism.*

5.4.4.1 The Habitus/Israel:

The Q people, but as the many Judeans around them, are speaking the Greek *language*. Eschatological salvation requires the new initiatory rite of water immersion. All traditional *religion* and *covenantal praxis* must be qualified by this rite and commitment to the message of Jesus. The Q people are alienated from their co-

ethnics, for as things now stand, they are headed for destruction. The continuing viability of the patriarchal family is undermined through alternative *kinship* patterns where God is Father.

It must be remembered that Judean ethnicity is grounded in the *habitus*, the shared habitual dispositions of Judean social agents, or in short, “Israel”, which shape and are shaped by objective common cultural practices. This interrelationship is dominated by the endeavour to respond to God’s divine election and to maintain covenant status or Judean ethnic identity (“staying in”). In Q therefore, noticeable developments are taking place. Here the interrelationship between the *habitus* or “Israel”, and the immediate cultural features, were not successful in regenerating traditional covenantal nomism. In other words, in the Q community Judean ethnicity was not that congruent with the *habitus* and established cultural practices, even though they found themselves within a highly integrated system of habitual dispositions. Evidently, they were “jolted” out of a primordialist mode by accepting the message and eschatological status of Jesus, which demanded a (re)construction of the *habitus* and common cultural practices. The latter (re)construction, in its turn, set new requirements for the maintenance of covenant status or Judean ethnic identity (“staying in”). Their identity as individuals, and sense of belongingness and self-esteem, were determined by finding a place within the eschatological Judean symbolic universe, in short, the kingdom/reign of God.

5.4.4.2 The Sacred Canopy:

Again, discontinuity with traditional covenantal nomism dominates. Jesus has become part of the Sacred Canopy, their cosmic and all-embracing frame of reference. It is no longer the notion of divine election, the covenant and the gift of the Torah this gives salvation. Confession of Jesus gives eschatological salvation, and serves as a qualification to the other aspects of the Sacred Canopy. The *shared “historical” memories* are used predominantly to speak of the future judgement of Israel. Otherwise it is their as a foil to explain the eschatological status of Jesus and the community. The Q community is more concerned with the present and future than to create a positive link with the past. The Q people now find themselves within the orbit of the kingdom/reign of God, partly fulfilled, partly to be completed. The End has arrived. All of this was due to the person of Jesus, the eschatological prophet, who is afforded a higher status than Moses, and who has given a (re)constructed Torah. Israel should also no longer claim to benefit from the merit of Abraham

(*myths of common ancestry*). You only become a child of Abraham by individual acceptance of the message of Jesus, who as the heavenly Son of humanity/man, will return in judgement to separate the wheat from the chaff.

The *habitus* not only shape, and are shaped by common cultural practices, but they also shape and are shaped by Israel's common beliefs; i e the "Sacred Canopy". This dialectical interrelationship primarily has to do with the belief that Yahweh established/prescribes Judean ethnicity ("getting in"). Here also, noticeable differences are present as the Q community's theological identity was not that congruent with the *habitus* or common beliefs. As already stated above, the Q people were "jolted" out of a primordialist mode by accepting the message and eschatological status of Jesus. This also required the (re)construction of the *habitus* and common beliefs. This (re)construction involved the Divine Patriarch, who through Jesus, established/prescribes eschatological Judean ethnicity ("getting in"). For the Q people therefore, the interrelationship between both the *habitus* and the immediate cultural features on the one hand, and the interrelationship between the *habitus* and the Sacred Canopy on the other, *produced eschatological Judean ethnic identity*, which involved the objectification of cultural practices in the recognition and communication of affinity *and* difference vis-à-vis the Gentiles, *and* fellow Judeans.

5.4.4.3 A Last Word

The evidence is therefore conclusive: *the covenantal nomism or symbolic universe of the Q people was in (re)construction*. The effect was that on the social level *the Q people were Judean ethnicity in (re)construction*. On that scale of Holmén they were Judeans of a different kind, or marginal, given their identity by their commitment to Jesus and the requirements of the kingdom/reign of God. Although this was never their intention, the Q people were part of a reform movement *within* Judeanism that was *destined from the start* to become a movement *outside* of Judeanism. The Q community, although their scribes argued to the contrary in the main redaction, undermined Judean ethnic identity, which in the historical context of the first century was *essentially* primordialist. Other reasons, of course, can also be given for the failure of the Messianist mission to Judeans. But it would seem that the question of ethnic identity was a primary factor for determining the success (or failure) of that mission. The Judean attachment to land, religion, covenantal praxis, family, the traditions that linked it to the past and which inspired hopes of future restoration, and the attempt to maintain the Judean symbolic universe in the face of Roman-

Hellenistic intrusion, all these factors were not conducive for the Messianist mission, even those of a more conservative nature, to succeed. The fundamental difference between the Q group and other Judean sects and renewal movements was that Q (and other Messianist groups) participated in eschatological renewal that (re)constructed covenantal nomism, while the other Judean movements had an eschatological vision that aimed at the renewal of traditional covenantal nomism.

5.4.4.4 Resumé

This thesis focussed on the matter of Judean ethnic identity in the first century CE. At first we pointed out that New Testament scholarship lacks an overall interpretive framework to understand Judean identity. There is not an appreciation of what informed the *entire process* of Judean ethnic identity formation in the first century, or at any period for that matter. This lack of interpretive framework is acute in scholarship on the historical Jesus, where the issue of Judeanness is most strongly debated. We investigated the reconstructions of John P Meier and John D Crossan, and attempted to identify what content, be it explicitly or implicitly, or by omission, do they assign to Jesus' Judean identity. But as yet, we were not in a position to say just what kind of Judean Jesus was.

We then proceeded by developing a Socio-Cultural Model of Judean Ethnicity. At first Sanders' notion of covenantal nomism was explored and redefined to function primarily as an ethnic descriptor. We combined the notion of covenantal nomism with Berger and Luckmann's theories on the sociology of knowledge, and saw that covenantal nomism could function as the Judean construction of reality. It is a convenient way to define the Judean "symbolic universe". Dunn's "four pillars of Second Temple Judeanism" was then reviewed, which looked at the importance of the Temple, God, Election and the Torah. The "new perspective" on Paul as developed by Dunn also proved useful, as he brought attention to the importance of traditional customs (e.g. circumcision and food laws), and how it served as "badges" for Judean identity. The approaches of Sanders and Dunn, however, lacked the insights of ethnicity theory. Ethnicity theory has identified two primary alternatives when it comes to ethnicity formation: constructionism and primordialism. We looked at the attempt of Jones to integrate the various approaches by her incorporation of the concept of the *habitus*. An overview of Duling's Socio-Cultural Model of Ethnicity followed, which lists all the relevant cultural features and which emphasises the predominant constructionist approach. We integrated all of the above into our own

proposed model, which we termed covenantal nomism. It is a pictorial representation of the Judean symbolic universe, which as an ethnic identity, was proposed to be *essentially* primordialist.

The model was then given appropriate content, by investigating what would have been typical of first century Judean ethnic identity. It was also demonstrated that there existed a fundamental continuity between Judea and Galilee, as Galileans were ethnic Judeans themselves and they lived on the ancestral land of Israel.

Attention was then focussed on the matter of ethnic identity in Q. We investigated the stratification of Kloppenborg and suggested that the third stratum which refers to the Torah properly belongs to the polemical and apologetic strategy of the main redaction. After analysing the two strata it was concluded that Q points to a community whose Judean ethnic identity was in (re)construction. Apart from the cultural features of name and land, all cultural features demonstrated strong elements of discontinuity with traditional covenantal nomism. The Q people were given an eschatological Judean identity based on their commitment to Jesus and the requirements of the kingdom/reign of God.