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ABSTRACT

Q 10:21–22 is the famous “Johannine Thunderbolt,” a passage whose precise meaning and role in Q have long been debated by New Testament scholars with seemingly no consensus reached to this date. This crux interpretum presents the readers with a thanksgiving prayer by Jesus that appears particularly puzzling in its present context in the reconstructed Q. In his prayer Jesus appears to express gratitude to God, whom he calls Father, for something that contradicts the very purpose of the immediately preceding mission discourse (Q 10:2–16). In a shocking turn of events, Jesus appears to rejoice over the selective disclosure of God to the group termed “children” and stresses his prerogative to reveal the Father to whom he wishes.

The placement of Q 10:21–22 at the conclusion of the mission discourse betrays its secondary compositional origin. As presently positioned, the couplet appears to provide a commentary which renders the mission’s failure—a major redactional theme in Q—a part of God’s original intention. Yet nowhere else in the document is such a retrospective change of heart on display. What is more, it clashes sharply with the redaction’s more typical castigation of the opposition on the apparent assumption that the Q group’s message should have been understood.

In the field of Q studies the work of John S. Kloppenborg constitutes the current Status Quaestionis on the document’s compositional history and redaction. Working with Kloppenborg’s stratification of the document, I make a literary-critical case to reassign Q
10:21–22 from its present location in the initial redactional layer (Q\(^2\)) to the document’s latest stratum (Q\(^3\)). In the process, I coordinate Q 10:21–22 with the Temptation Story to propose a new theological rationale for the Q\(^3\) stratum.
CHAPTER ONE

Q, THE SYNOPTIC SAYINGS SOURCE

Introduction

The subject of this dissertation is a passage in a reconstructed source document for the New Testament gospels of Matthew and Luke, called Q. That passage is Q (Lk) 10:21–22:

Q 10:21

εἶπεν·
At “that time” he said:

ἐξομολογοῦμαι σοι, πάτερ, κύριε τοῦ οὐρανοῦ και τῆς γῆς,
I thank you, Father, Lord of heaven and earth,

ὅτι έκρυψας ταῦτα ἀπὸ σοφῶν καὶ συνετῶν καὶ ἀπεκάλυψας αὐτὰ νηπίοις·
for you hid these things from sages and the learned and disclosed them to children.

ναι ὁ πατήρ, ὃτι οὕτως εὐδοκία ἔγένετο ἐμπροσθέν σου.
Yes, Father, for that is what it has pleased you to do.¹

Q 10:22

Πάντα μοι παρεδόθη ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς μου,
Everything has been entrusted to me by my Father,

καὶ οὐδεὶς γινώσκει τὸν ὦν εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ,
and no one knows the Son except the Father,

nor does anyone know the Father except the Son,

and to whoever the Son chooses to reveal him.²

The reader will notice that in this couplet Jesus is described as “the Son” of “the
Father,” and also as the sole source of access to God. While the elevated christology of
this couplet may not seem out of sync with Matthew and Luke’s descriptions of Jesus’
identity, it is unique in the reconstructed text of Q. The origin of such high christology in
Q and the purpose of its present location in the document comprise the subject of this
research. However, before our investigation of a passage in a reconstructed document
may proceed, a brief outline of the history of Q’s reconstruction is in order.

The Synoptic Problem

The Two-Source Hypothesis

The term “synoptic” is used in New Testament scholarship to describe the relationship of
mutual dependence that exists between the following three gospels: Matthew, Mark,
Luke. The term comes from the fact that these gospels can be viewed side by side or
“syn-optically.”³ New Testament scholarship recognized that these gospels share a high
degree of common material. The need to account for this relationship has come to be
known in New Testament scholarship as the “synoptic problem.” The modern solution to
this problem is embodied in the two-source hypothesis.

² The Greek reconstruction and the English translation of Q 10:21 are reproduced according to The Critical

The two-source hypothesis can be summarized in this way: the authors of the New Testament gospels of Matthew and Luke each used the same two sources. One of those sources was the gospel of Mark, and the other was a document designated by New Testament scholarship as Q (for German Quelle, “source”). The fact that the authors of Matthew and Luke independently of one another each used those two sources accounts for the name of this hypothesis.

The two-source hypothesis further employs the terms “triple tradition” and “double tradition.” The former term is used to describe the material which all three gospel writers—Matthew, Luke and Mark—have in common. According to the two-source hypothesis, the triple tradition is the result of Matthew and Luke independently appropriating the Markan material into their composition. Conversely, the term “double tradition” refers to the material which only Matthew and Luke have in common. According to the two-source hypothesis, this shared tradition is the result of Matthew and Luke each working with the document Q.

---

4 Johannes Weiss was the first to use ‘Q’ to designate the New Testament sayings source. Johannes Weiss, “Die Verteidigung Jesu gegen den Vorwurf des Bündnisses mit Beelzebul,” TSK 63 (1890): 555–69. There has been some criticism of the siglum’s choice; “Why Weiss used ‘Q’ instead of ‘R’ for Redenquelle remains a mystery” and “there is also the possibility that the use of this letter designation was purely arbitrary.” Ivan Havener, Q: The Sayings of Jesus (Good News Studies 19; Wilmington: Michael Glazier, 1987), 28–29.

In response to the critique of the siglum Q, see John Kloppenborg as representative of the modern consensus: “Only when confidence in Mark as a historical source was destroyed . . . could attention shift to the Sayings Source, by this time christened “Q” (for Quelle, “source”) by Johannes Weiss.” John S. Kloppenborg Verbin, Excavating Q (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2000), 329–30.
The Markan Priority and the Advent of the Two-Source Hypothesis:

Karl Lachmann, Christian Hermann Weisse, Heinrich Julius Holtzmann

Over the course of the 19th century a number of German scholars identified the basic tenets of the two-source hypothesis. In 1835 Karl Lachmann, a philologist who was also responsible for several German editions of the New Testament, made an early case for the Markan priority. This fundamental advance was appropriated by the research of Christian Hermann Weisse and Heinrich Julius Holtzmann who are responsible for the basic outline of the two-source hypothesis.

Where Lachmann had argued that Mark’s gospel was the source for the triple tradition material in Matthew and Luke, Weisse (1838) and Holtzmann (1863) identified a second source that accounted for the double tradition material. Weisse’s influential assessment reads as follows:

This leads us to reflect briefly on the mutual relationship of the two other Synoptics to one another a part from their shared connection to Mark. We have already noted that we regard this relationship as an independent one, independent, that is to say, in the use of the common sources shared by each of the two, but not in the sense that each of them, throughout or for the most part, had used sources that the other had not used. It is our most certain conviction that not only Mark but also Matthew’s collection of sayings is a source common to both.

The groundwork laid by Lachmann, Weisse and Holtzmann enabled New Testament scholarship to further inquire into the origin of Q. However, not all New Testament scholars were convinced of the existence of a second independent source contemporaneous to Mark.

---

Testament scholars accepted the two-source hypothesis and with it the existence of Q.

Before we turn to the advances made in the study of Q that form the foundation of this research, a brief mention of the alternate theories disputing the two-source hypothesis is in order.

Challenges to the Two-Source Hypothesis: W.R. Farmer, Farrer-Goulder, the “Augustinian” Hypothesis

Three alternate theories have attempted to solve the synoptic problem by rearranging the puzzle pieces and eliminating the need for Q. The most popular of these alternate solutions was advocated by William Farmer in 1964, and it came to be known as the Griesbach hypothesis. Farmer proposed that Mark’s gospel had access to the gospels of Matthew and Luke, and that Luke had access to Matthew.⁸ The former aspect of this hypothesis allowed Farmer to account for the triple tradition material, while the latter attempted to resolve the problematic double tradition.

The other challenges to the two-source hypothesis were put forth by the Farrer-Goulder and “Augustinian” hypotheses. Just like the Griesbach hypothesis, each of these solutions to the synoptic problem used a different combination of the synoptic gospels without engaging Q. The “Augustinian” approach retained the traditional sequence of the synoptic gospels in the New Testament canon by proposing the following source-critical development: Matthew was the earliest gospel, used as a source by Mark, and both were

used as sources by Luke.⁹ The Farrer-Goulder solution retains the notion of the Markan priority and affirms that Matthew used Mark as his source. However, it accounts for the double tradition by adopting the “Augustinian” position whereby Luke worked with Matthew as his other source, in addition to Mark.¹⁰

Neither of these alternate solutions was able to account for the synoptic problem in a satisfactory way.¹¹ The two-source hypothesis remains the consensus position of New Testament scholarship. Accordingly, so does the existence of the document Q.

Summary

Along with the gospel of Mark, the document commonly designated as Q constitutes one of the two sources shared by the gospels of Matthew and Luke. While in some circles it is still considered debatable whether such a document existed, or even that the two source hypothesis is correct, this study will presume such matters to have been proven beyond doubt. We now turn to an overview of the history of Q research, in order to demonstrate to the reader how biblical scholarship is currently able to study redaction in what remains a reconstructed document.

---


The Reconstruction of Q

Q: Written or Oral?

The process of reconstructing a document for which physical manuscripts are entirely absent may seem like a daunting task. One of the pertinent questions that must be answered prior to attempting a reconstruction is the possibility of an oral as opposed to the written nature of the source. The answer of New Testament and Q scholarship to this question has been an affirmation of the written nature of Q. According to John Kloppenborg, “the oral hypothesis must in fact be rejected.” Representative of the current consensus in New Testament scholarship, Kloppenborg’s justification of this position is as follows:

This is not because certain oral techniques could not in principle be faithful, but because there is no evidence that such techniques were in use in primitive Christianity (or in contemporary Judaism for that matter!). The thesis of Gerhardsson and Riesenfeld of a rabbinic-type transmission of tradition in early Christianity has been rejected decisively on the grounds that primitive Christianity was not Torah-centered but Christ- or Spirit-centered. There is no evidence that Jesus himself taught by memorization or that early Christians modeled themselves after rabbinic schools. Such a thesis would in fact be seriously anachronistic, representing the rabbinic techniques of the mid to late second century CE as those of pre-70 Judaism. Moreover, early Christian literature betrays no trace of the institutions and professional classes of memorizers which an accurate transmission of oral tradition would require and which later rabbinic Judaism presupposed.

---


13 Ibid., 44–45.
Furthermore, the degree of agreement between Matthew and Luke in the double tradition material is such that a common written source represents the most satisfactory solution. Kloppenborg lists the following types of evidence: 14

1. The presence of strong verbal agreements in the Matthaean reproduction of the double tradition;
2. The survival of peculiar formations in both versions;
3. Significant agreements in order of pericopae;
4. The phenomenon of doublets.

Based on the cumulative evidence, the view of Q as a written document is the majority consensus position of contemporary New Testament and Q scholarship.

The Language of Q

Ever since Schleiermacher’s hypothesis of apostle Matthew’s lost Aramaic source, Q scholarship witnessed repeated attempts to revitalize the possibility of an Aramaic Q. Following the birth of the modern two-source hypothesis in Weisse’s research, the language of Q was asserted by Holtzmann as Greek in 1863:

Rather, we stay with the quite simple assumption of a further Greek source shared by Matthew and Luke, which we, pending the demonstration of its more precise nature, want to indicate in what follows with the siglum Λ (λόγια). 15

While this has remained the majority position, attempts were made in subsequent scholarship to trace either a portion of Q or some early version of Q to an Aramaic

---

14 Ibid., 50; Excavating Q, 56–60.

original, most notably by Julius Wellhausen, Wilhelm Bussmann, T.W. Manson and Matthew Black. Black’s research presented a convincing case for the presence of Semitisms in Q. However, while an advocate of Q’s Aramaic origin, Black was strikingly led to make the following observation:

Certainly it seems clear that the most the Aramaic element can prove is an Aramaic origin, not always translation of an Aramaic original; and it is the Greek literary factor which has had the final word with the shaping of the Q tradition. The evidence from the Gospels themselves for the existence of an Aramaic document is necessarily speculative.¹⁹

The consensus position of modern day New Testament and Q scholarship is that the language of the Q document copies of which were used by Matthew and Luke was Greek. This hypothesis is confirmed by numerous instances of agreement between Matthew and Luke including the four types of evidence in support of a common written source listed in the previous section.²⁰

From Matthean to Lukan Sequence:

Adolph Harnack, Burnett Hillmann Streeter

The next question concers Q’s original order. Initially in their reconstructions of the document’s order scholars believed that Matthew’s gospel had remained more faithful to

---

¹⁶ Julius Wellhausen, Das Evangelium Lucae (Berlin: Georg Reimer, 1904); Einleitung in die drei ersten Evangelien (Berlin: Georg Reimer, 1911).


the text of Q. Accordingly the approach was to follow Matthew’s sequence of the sayings identified as Q. At the turn of the 20th century Adolph Harnack and James Moffatt each made a case for the Matthean priority. But the true merit of Harnack’s research lay elsewhere. Despite the fact that it continuously gave preference to the Matthean text, Harnack’s *Sprüche und Reden Jesu: Die zweite Quelle des Mattäus und Lukas* was the first known complete reconstruction of Q’s contents. As such, it may be credited with presenting Q for the first time as a literary work with unique individual characteristics.

The contemporary preference for the Lukan order in establishing the text of Q was given a definitive expression in the work of Burnett Hillmann Streeter. Streeter based his verdict on Luke’s significantly less liberal use of his Markan source, particularly Luke’s sequencing of the triple tradition material:

Matthew has entirely rearranged the order of practically every section in the first six chapters of Mark. If, therefore, he completely disregards the order of a document relating a series of events, narrated presumably in their historical sequence, we may assume that he would be still more indifferent to the original order of a document which was only plainly a loose collection of sayings. … It follows that we should *a priori* expect that where Matthew and Luke differ the original order of Q is to be presumed to be that of Luke.

As noted by J.M. Robinson, a number of dated presuppositions can be detected in the above statement, none more glaring than the notion of Q being “a loose collection of

---


23 It must be noted that the suggestion whereby of the two evangelists who made use of Q Luke preserves the original order of the source document better was first made before Streeter, by Paul Wernle. Paul Wernle, *Die Synoptische Frage* (Leipzig: Freiburg im Breisgau, 1899), 226.

sayings.”

Equally dated is Streeter’s hypothesis of individual unique $Q^M_t$ and $Q^L_k$ recensions of $Q$. Finally, as rightly noted by J.M. Robinson, Streeter’s argument for the order of $Q$ was in itself overly simplistic: in a number of instances Matthew too could be shown to follow the order of his Markan source faithfully, for example as demonstrated by a source critical analysis of Matthew 12–28.

Nevertheless, the Lukan sequence of $Q$, while critically evaluated in each separate case, today continues to be the standard for all $Q$ reconstructions. As summarized by John Kloppenborg, “even if some sayings ultimately defy placement, it can safely be said that $Q$ was a document with a largely discernible order, and that in general Luke best represents that order.”

The Order of the Reconstructed $Q$

The following is the contemporary reconstructed sequence of $Q$, based on the outline provided by John Kloppenborg in *Formation of Q*, but modified by taking into account the recent corrections made by *The Critical Edition of Q* (edited by James M. Robinson, Paul Hoffmann and John Kloppenborg):

---


Table 1. The Order of the Double Tradition (in Lucan Order)²⁹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Luke</th>
<th>Matthew</th>
<th>Mark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>John’s preaching (1)</td>
<td>3:7–9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>John’s preaching (2)</td>
<td>3:16b–17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Temptation story</td>
<td>4:1–13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Beatitudes (1)</td>
<td>6:20–21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Beatitudes (2)</td>
<td>6:22–23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Love your enemies</td>
<td>6:27–28, 35c-d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>On retaliation</td>
<td>6:29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Giving freely</td>
<td>6:30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Golden rule</td>
<td>6:31</td>
<td>7:12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Be sons of God</td>
<td>6:32,34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Be merciful</td>
<td>6:36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>On judging</td>
<td>6:37–38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Blind guides</td>
<td>6:39</td>
<td>15:14</td>
<td>7:1–23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Disciples and teachers</td>
<td>6:40</td>
<td>*10:24–25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>On hypocrisy</td>
<td>6:41–42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Good fruit and bad fruit</td>
<td>6:43–44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Treasures of the heart</td>
<td>6:45</td>
<td>12:35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Lord, Lord</td>
<td>6:46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Parable of the builders</td>
<td>6:47–49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Centurion’s son</td>
<td>7:1,3,6–9b,10?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>John’s question</td>
<td>7:18–19,21–23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Jesus’ eulogy</td>
<td>7:24–26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Quotation of Mal 3:1</td>
<td>7:27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>None born of woman…</td>
<td>7:28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Sophia saying</td>
<td>7:35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Discipleship chreia (1)</td>
<td>9:57–58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Discipleship chreia (2)</td>
<td>9:59–60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>“The harvest is great…”</td>
<td>10:2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Sheep among wolves</td>
<td>10:3</td>
<td>10:16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Carry no purse</td>
<td>10:4</td>
<td>10:9-10a</td>
<td>6:8–9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Greeting of peace</td>
<td>10:5–6</td>
<td>10:12–13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Luke</th>
<th>Matthew</th>
<th>Mark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>On support of missionaries</td>
<td>10:7</td>
<td>10:10b-11</td>
<td>6:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Activity of missionaries</td>
<td>10:8-9</td>
<td>10:7-8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Concerning rejection</td>
<td>10:10-11</td>
<td>10:14</td>
<td>6:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Threat</td>
<td>10:12</td>
<td>10:15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>“Whoever hears you…”</td>
<td>10:16</td>
<td>10:40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Jesus’ thanksgiving</td>
<td>10:21-22</td>
<td>10:25-27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>“Blessed are the eyes…”</td>
<td>10:23-24</td>
<td>13:16-17</td>
<td>4:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Lord’s prayer</td>
<td>11:2b-4</td>
<td>6:9-13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>On prayer (1)</td>
<td>11:9-10</td>
<td>7:7-8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>On prayer (2)</td>
<td>11:11-13</td>
<td>7:9-11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Beelzebul accusation</td>
<td>11:14-15</td>
<td>12:22-24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>A kingdom divided</td>
<td>11:17-18</td>
<td>12:25-26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Jewish exorcists</td>
<td>11:19</td>
<td>12:27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Exorcism</td>
<td>11:20</td>
<td>12:28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Binding the stronger one</td>
<td>11:29-30</td>
<td>12:29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>“He who is not for me…”</td>
<td>11:23</td>
<td>12:30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Return of the evil spirit</td>
<td>11:24-26</td>
<td>12:43-45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Demand for a sign</td>
<td>11:16</td>
<td>12:38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Sign of Johan</td>
<td>11:29-30</td>
<td>12:39-40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Jonah and Solomon</td>
<td>11:31-32</td>
<td>12:41-42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Light saying</td>
<td>11:33</td>
<td>5:15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Sound eye</td>
<td>11:34-35</td>
<td>6:22-23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Woe: cleansing the outside</td>
<td>11:39a-41</td>
<td>23:25-26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Woe: neglect of justice</td>
<td>11:42</td>
<td>23:23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Woe: cleansing the outside</td>
<td>11:39b,41</td>
<td>23:25-26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Woe: the best seats</td>
<td>11:43</td>
<td>23:6-7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Woe: unseen graves</td>
<td>11:44</td>
<td>23:27-28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Woe: you burden men</td>
<td>11:46</td>
<td>23:4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Woe: you lock the kingdom</td>
<td>11:52</td>
<td>23:13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Woe: murderers of prophets</td>
<td>11:47-48</td>
<td>23:29-31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Sophia’s oracle</td>
<td>11:49-51</td>
<td>23:34-36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Revelation of the hidden</td>
<td>12:2</td>
<td>*10:26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>What is said in the dark</td>
<td>12:3</td>
<td>*10:27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Do not fear</td>
<td>12:4-5</td>
<td>*10:28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Luke</td>
<td>Matthew</td>
<td>Mark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>You are worth more…</td>
<td>12:6–7</td>
<td>*10:29–31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Confessing Jesus</td>
<td>12:8–9</td>
<td>*10:32–33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Blasphemy of the Spirit</td>
<td>12:10</td>
<td>12:32</td>
<td>3:28–30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Treasures in heaven</td>
<td>12:33–34</td>
<td>6:19–21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Anxiety about daily needs</td>
<td>12:22–31</td>
<td>6:25–33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Parable of the householder</td>
<td>12:39–40</td>
<td>24:43–44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Parable of the faithful servant</td>
<td>12:42–46</td>
<td>24:45–51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>I cast fire on the earth</td>
<td>12:49,51</td>
<td>*10:34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>On divisions</td>
<td>12:53</td>
<td>*10:35–36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Agreeing with one’s accuser</td>
<td>12:58–59</td>
<td>5:25–26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Parable of leaven</td>
<td>13:20–21</td>
<td>13:32–33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Two ways</td>
<td>13:24</td>
<td>7:13–14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>I do not know you…</td>
<td>13:25–27</td>
<td>7:22–23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>They will come from east…</td>
<td>13:28–29</td>
<td>8:11–12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>First will be last</td>
<td>13:30 (a)</td>
<td>19:30</td>
<td>10:31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>Great supper</td>
<td>14:16–21,23</td>
<td>22:1–10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>Loving one’s parents</td>
<td>14:26</td>
<td>*10:37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Take up your cross</td>
<td>14:27</td>
<td>*10:38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>He who saves his life</td>
<td>17:33</td>
<td>*10:39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>Salt</td>
<td>14:34–35</td>
<td>5:13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>Serving two masters</td>
<td>16:13</td>
<td>6:24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>Law and prophets</td>
<td>16:16</td>
<td>11:12–13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>Endurance of the Law</td>
<td>16:17</td>
<td>5:18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>On divorce</td>
<td>16:18</td>
<td>5:32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>On scandal</td>
<td>17:1–2</td>
<td>18:7</td>
<td>9:42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>Lost sheep</td>
<td>15:4–5a,7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>[[The lost coin]]</td>
<td>15:8–10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>Forgiveness</td>
<td>17:3–4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>Faith as a mustard seed</td>
<td>17:6</td>
<td>17:20</td>
<td>9:28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Once the text and order of Q had been definitively reconstructed by New Testament scholarship, inquiries began to be made into the nature of Q’s message. As usually is the case with works of literature, that message appeared to have been conceived with a specific audience in mind. In this instance, the target audience was a community of followers of Jesus of Nazareth for whom a series of instructions, sayings, and a few stories were compiled into a single document with thematically grouped blocks of material. Essentially, the reconstructed document was a collection of sayings and

---

30 Ibid., lxxii.
parenetic material, with a few narratives suggesting a move toward the biography form. However, Q’s portrayal of Jesus Christ was not realized as a plot-driven biographical narrative the way it is found in the later New Testament gospels, and the passion material was absent. In absence of a conventional story arc or passion kerygma to unify a wide array of material the organizing principle of Q was to be sought elsewhere.

The Quest for Q’s Genre:

From Rudolph Bultmann to James A. Robinson

The work of Rudolph Bultmann, while not preoccupied with the study of redaction in Q, was responsible for a number of insights that would be employed by future scholarship and prove instrumental in achieving that goal. One of those insights was Bultmann’s suggestion of forensic material playing an important role in the framing of Q:

Q begins with the preaching of the Baptist and ends with an apocalyptic sermon. Thus eschatology is found at the beginning and at the end. Not only that, but eschatology is a pervasive motif in Q: as consolation for the present in the beatitudes, as motivation for admonishments concerning moral behavior, as the means by which to grasp the messiahship of Jesus, and as the keynote of the propaganda and the threat against the unbelieving generation.

The expectation of the end is not simply of a joyful hope; it can also take on the gloomy sound of threat. The threat is directed primarily at γενεὰ ἀοτη ("this generation"). The Q-community adopted the repentance sermon of the Baptist (Matt 3:7–10 / Luke 3:7–9) for this purpose.31

It is important to bear in mind that Bultmann did not produce a clear definition of Q’s genre. While calling eschatology a “pervasive motif in Q,” Bultmann’s research also left insights that highlighted the affinity of Q sayings to wisdom literature.32 The


multifaceted legacy of Bultmann’s statements was therefore ripe to cause some confusion, because without a clear tradition-historical profile for Q scholars could choose one of these two very different motifs and build analyses of Q around it.

A series of steps toward establishing the collection’s organizing principle was made in post–World War II Heidelberg, building on Bultmann’s insights. A tradition-historical hypothesis was put forth by Ulrich Wilckens in his 1956 dissertation and it drew attention to the sapiential (Wisdom) theme. Wilckens highlighted this motif as a recurring theme that in his view had the most prominent role in Q.\textsuperscript{33} He was joined by James M. Robinson who “participating in this Heidelberg discussion while on sabbatic leave in Heidelberg 1959–60, suggested that the literary genre of Q might be sapiential.”\textsuperscript{34}

Robinson’s 1964 essay “ΛΟΓΟΙ ΣΟΦΩΝ: Zur Gattung der Spruchquelle Q,” dedicated to the sapiential orientation of Q, would prove to be immensely influential for future Q scholarship.\textsuperscript{35} In that essay Robinson joined Bultmann’s insights concerning Q’s affinity to wisdom literature with the recent scholarly advances in the study of sayings collections:

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{33} Ulrich Wilckens, \textit{Weisheit und Torheit: Eine exegetisch-religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zu 1. Kor und 2 (BHTh 26; Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1959), 163–64, 197–200.}
\item \textsuperscript{34} Robinson, “Introduction,” lii.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
The history of the early Christian designation for the “sayings” *Gattung* came first into view in its gnostic variant, as “hidden sayings.”

This poses the question as to what there may have been in the tendency of the *Gattung* itself that contributed to the outcome. Bultmann provided a useful suggestion, when he sensed in Matt 23:34–39 (// Luke 11:49–51; 13:34–35) a speech by Sophia cited from some lost wisdom document, whose conclusion “you will not see me again until …” was explained in terms of “the myth of the divine Wisdom …, who, after tarrying in vain on earth and calling men to herself, takes departure from earth, so that one now seeks her in vain.” For this myth does seem to be presupposed in the *Gospel of Thomas*, to judge by Saying 38: “many times you have desired to hear these sayings that I say to you, and you have no one else from whom to hear them. There will be days when you will seek me (and) you will not find me” (cf. Q: Luke 10:24; 13:34–35 par.). Thus Bultmann’s suggestions of an early Christian association of Jewish wisdom literature’s personified Sophia with Jesus and of the absorption of part of a collection of wisdom sayings into a collection of Jesus’ sayings may in their way point to the prehistory of a *Gattung* that, though apparently not gnostic in origin, was open to a development in that direction, once a general drift toward Gnosticism had set in.

…the *Gospel of Thomas* shows the way in which the Sophia tradition used in Q ends in Gnosticism.

As was the case with Bultmann, we note that Robinson’s observations were not aimed at prioritizing one motif over the other. Rather, Robinson proposed that the genre of Q was on the same trajectory as that of the *Gospel of Thomas*, only in the tradition’s pre-gnostic stage. The elevation of the sapiential motif to define Q’s literary genre did, however, further stress the need to account for the eschatological motif of threat and judgment, also noted by Bultmann. Heidelbergian scholarship’s answer to the existence of this other, markedly different strand of material in Q produced the designation of it as a deuteronomistic view of history, a term that has endured to this day in Q studies.

To use the term “deuteronomistic” means to engage the rich legacy of classical Hebrew literature. For the Heidelbergian scholars, it meant to state definitively that the Q

---

36 Robinson used the germ “Gattung” as a synonym for “genre.” Robinson, “ΛΟΓΟΙ ΣΟΦΩΝ,” 37.

37 Ibid., 65–6.
material so designated held a prophetic view of history which condemned Israel and
sought to vindicate God whom Israel had rejected. The recognition by the Heidelbergian
scholars of this and the sapiential theme coexisting in Q, and the resulting need to relate
them to one another marked the beginning of the redaction criticism of Q. 38

Early Redaction Criticism: Odil Hannes Steck, Dieter Lührmann

The contemporary study of Q’s redaction begins with Odil Hannes Steck whose treatment
of Q 6:22–23, Q 11:47–51 and Q 13:34–35 highlighted what Steck described as examples
of the deuteronomistic view of history in the Bible. Since Steck’s 1964 Heidelberg
dissertation Israel und das gewaltsame Geschick der Propheten was dedicated to tracing
the deuteronomistic perspective throughout the Bible in general, his encounter with the Q
texts did not lead him to draw any specific conclusions with respect to Q’s redaction. In
fact, Steck felt that Q 13:34–35 did not belong to Q at all. 39 However, four years after
Steck’s dissertation his hypothesis of a deuteronomistic perspective would be put in the
service of Q redaction criticism by another Heidelbergian, Dieter Lührmann.

Where Steck highlighted what he recognized to be “das deuteronomistische
Geschichtsbild” exhibited by Q’s conceptual framework, 40 Lührmann spoke of “die

38 This is not to imply that the idea of redaction of Q had not been put forth before Heidelberg, but rather to
stress that concrete redaction-critical proposals flourished starting at that time. J.M. Robinson’s overview

39 Odil Hannes Steck, Israel und das gewaltsame Geschick der Propheten: Untersuchungen zur
Überlieferung des deuteronomistischen Geschichtsbildes im Alten Testament, Spätjudentum und
Uhrchristentum (WMANT 23; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1967), 283. See also Robinson,
“Introduction,” liii-lv.

40 Steck, Geschick, 286.
Redaktion von Q” and proceeded to date it in the 50s or the 60s of the first century. In his Habilitationsschrift of 1968, Die Redaktion der Logienquelle (published in 1969), Lührmann made a distinction between formative collections eventually arranged into a single composition in Q (Sammlung) and the document’s redaction (Redaktion). This distinction was a quarter of a century later lauded by Robinson as “a decisive turning point in the history of Q research.” Lührmann’s definition of Q’s redaction characterized that body of material as:

…a conscious formation under theological points of view, to be distinguished from ‘collecting’ according to catchword or topical arrangement.

Lührmann approached Q as a document that stood “at the end of a long process of tradition.” For him the redactional formation of new sayings was limited to a few sayings that functioned as editorial clasps: Q 10:12, Q 11:30 and possibly Q 11:19. Thus, the “conscious formation under theological points of view” took place in the process of arranging the traditional material. Accordingly, to use the term “Sammlung”

---


44 Lührmann, Redaktion, 84.

meant to refer to this process of editorial arrangement of larger sections of traditional material. With that in mind, Lührmann examined the following Q clusters (organized around three themes: (1) Jesus and “this generation,” (2) The Community, (3) Eschatology):  

Table 2. Q’s Clusters according to Dieter Lührmann

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>“This generation”</th>
<th>“The Community”</th>
<th>“Eschatology”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6:20–49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:1–10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:18–35</td>
<td>9:57–60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10:2–12</td>
<td>10:13–15, 21–22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12:39–40, 42–46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17:24, 37b, 26, 30, 34–35</td>
<td>19:12–27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lührmann’s analysis of these clusters of sayings highlighted a number of sayings that appeared to be secondary in their clusters. These were classified as redactional in the sense that they had been added to the clusters in the later stages of the tradition. To give an example, Lührmann viewed the Sophia texts Q 7:35, Q 10:21–22, Q 11:31–32, 49–51 and Q 13:34–35 as redactional in this sense.  

Lührmann’s analysis of these clusters of sayings highlighted a number of sayings that appeared to be secondary in their clusters. These were classified as redactional in the sense that they had been added to the clusters in the later stages of the tradition. To give an example, Lührmann viewed the Sophia texts Q 7:35, Q 10:21–22, Q 11:31–32, 49–51 and Q 13:34–35 as redactional in this sense. Note the use of the terms “layer” and “redaction,” as employed by Lührmann:

---

46 Lührmann, *Redaktion*, 90. The theme titles are from Neirynck, “Recent Developments in the Study of Q,” 421 n. 44. Neirynck also observes that “the original order of the Q sections remains uncertain.” Ibid., 453 n. 236.

As the latest and hence temporarily (even if not necessarily tradition-historically) nearest layer to the redaction of Q there has emerged a series of logia that are clearly shaped by late Jewish wisdom.48

This particular conclusion was indebted to Robinson’s ΛΟΓΟΙ ΣΟΦΩΝ. Writing in the context of the 1960s Heidelbergian discussion, Lührmann combined Steck’s deuteronomistic perspective with Wilckens’ and Robinson’s recent suggestions that Q’s genre was sapiential.49 However, at the time of Redaktion Lührmann did not attempt to relate these two strands of material to one another in the framework of Q’s redaction. The result could at times appear as what Robinson characterized in 1991 as “a history-of-religions hodge-podge without profile or directionality.”50

Lührmann’s model of Q’s redaction was a pioneering hypothesis that had a number of weaknesses, such as the aforementioned lack of profile for the collections or their redaction, and also his view of the collections as “a loose anthology of sayings.”51 Regardless of those shortcomings, it remains a milestone in Q studies. Modern inquiries into the redaction of Q must be traced to the foundation laid in the 1950s and 60s. Culminating in Lührman’s contribution, the Heidelberian scholars laid the groundwork for all future study of editorial activity drawing together the separate sayings found in Q and exhibiting its own (redactor’s) point of view.

49 “Lührmann appropriated my genre definition, ΛΟΓΟΙ ΣΟΦΩΝ.” Ibid., 296 n. 32.
50 Ibid., 296.
Arranging the Strata: From Dieter Lührmann to John Kloppenborg

As noted by Robinson in the wake of John Kloppenborg’s research several decades after Redaktion, a number of aspects of Lührmann’s work stood in need of improvement. One of these was the absence of a clear profile for the “preapocalyptic, sapiential collection of sayings behind Q.” While at the time of Redaktion Lührmann was aware of the existence of such collections, this notion was incorporated into his research “in a meaningful way.” Note that in Redaktion Lührmann cited Helmut Koester’s “interesting thesis” of a primitive version of Q:

The basis of the Gospel of Thomas is a Sayings collection which is more primitive than the canonical Gospels, even though its basic principle is not related to the creed of the passion and resurrection.

It must have been a version of Q in which the apocalyptic expectation of the Son of Man was missing and in which Jesus’ radicalized eschatology of the Kingdom and his revelation of divine wisdom in his own words were the dominant motives. Two studies published in the 1970s presented more concrete outlines of such a pre-apocalyptic version of Q. These works were Siegfried Schulz’ 1972 Q: Die Spruchquelle der Evangelisten and Dieter Zeller’s 1977 Die weisheitliche Mahnsprüche bei den Synoptikern. Both agreed on the content of the vast majority of the sapiential material in Q’s pre-apocalyptic stage.

While Schulz did not organize this early sapiential material into independent collections as Zeller would, his study distinguished between two different Q

53 Ibid.
communities, a younger Palestinian and a later Hellenistic Jewish-Christian one. By assigning mostly sapiential material to the Palestinian tradition, Schulz gave that material a profile it previously lacked. The profile was one of an early Q community with a non-apocalyptic kerygma. At the same time, by not assigning all of the wisdom material in Q to the Palestinian group, Schulz made a further distinction between the early sapiential material and the later Sophia christology in Q. These two types of sapiential material in Q could now be viewed as guided by their own separate kerygmas. With that distinction Schulz also located Lührmann’s “nearest level to the redaction of Q” in the later of his two stages of the Q tradition.

Dieter Zeller’s analysis was influential because it separated what Zeller had identified as pre-apocalyptic sapiential collections into six complexes of material. Zeller’s collections were as follows:

1. Conduct toward enemies: Q 6:(20–23), 27–33, 35b-37a, 38b, 41–42, (43–49)
2. Conduct of the messengers: Q 10:2–8a, 9–11a, 12 (+16?)
5. Attitude toward material things: Q 12:22–31, 33–34

The work of Schulz and Zeller prepared the foundation for the study of pre-apocalyptic sapiential material in Q in the framework of the document’s formative

---

55 Siegfried Schulz, Die Spruchquelle der Evangelisten (Zurich: Theologischer Verlag, 1972), 57–175.
56 Dieter Zeller, Die weisheitlichen Mahnsprüche bei den Synoptikern (FzB 17; Würzburg: Echter, 1977), 191.
stratum. Shortly after their contributions, the 1979 article and 1980 Lukan commentary by Walter Schmithals⁵⁷ and the 1981 research of Wolfgang Schenk⁵⁸ argued for new allocations of the title “Son of Man” in Q’s strata, including in the document’s redaction. Two important developments took place in those works. First, the term “Q¹” entered the active vocabulary of Q scholarship, henceforth used to refer to a “primitive stage of the sayings collection.”⁵⁹ It is important to keep in mind that Schmithals used this term to designate a primitive version of Q that was not used by Mark’s gospel, a hypothesis of Markan dependence on Q that has since been overturned by New Testament scholarship.⁶⁰ However, within that misplaced framework the fundamentally correct profiling of Q¹ as a non-christological formative stratum had taken another step toward its present shape.

The second important development was a direct consequence of the Q¹ hypothesis. What for Lührmann was editing of collections devoid of profile now became redaction of a primitive document already containing such collections. Furthermore, both the primitive Q¹ document and its redaction each had a unique profile. The treatment of the Son of Man sayings by Schmithals provides an example of such profiling: a distinction was made between the future eschatological Son of Man (a Q¹ theme) and the

---


⁵⁹ Neirynck, “Recent Developments in the Study of Q,” 423.

⁶⁰ “Mark’s Q source is not the final Q (the *Spruchquelle* used by Matthew and Luke) but a more primitive stage of the sayings collection, an unchristological *Logienüberlieferung* (Q¹).” Ibid.
christological identification of Jesus with the Son of Man (a redactional theme). While the Son of Man sayings’ allocation would be modified by subsequent scholarship, the process of defining the primitive Q (Q¹) and its redaction can be seen blossoming here. The stage was set for an all-encompassing redactional-critical analysis of Q, and that task would be undertaken by a North American scholar John Kloppenborg in the 1980s.

John Kloppenborg and the Current Consensus of Q Scholarship

Published in 1987, John Kloppenborg’s *Formation of Q* is largely responsible for the modern scholarly consensus with regard to Q’s history of composition. Building on the work of his German and North American post-World War II predecessors, in *Formation* John Kloppenborg presented a heuristic division of Q, guided by topical groupings of material:

1. John’s preaching of the Coming One: Q 3:7–9, 16–17
2. The temptation of Jesus: Q 4:1–13
4. John, Jesus and “this generation”: Q 7:1–10, 18–28; (16:16); 7:31–35
7. Controversies with Israel: Q 11:14–52
8. On fearless preaching: Q 12:2–12

As summarized by F. Neirynck in 1982: “The expectation of the future coming of the Son of Man and the eschatological judgment is an important theme in Q¹. In [Schmithals’] opinion not only the apocalyptic discourse, Lk 17,23–24,26–27,30.34–35.37 and 21,27 (Mk 13,26 Q¹), but also the sayings of 11,30; 12,8,10,40 belong to Q¹. The later christological redaction has identified the Son of Man with Jesus.” Ibid., 449–52, esp. 450 (my square brackets).

Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 92.


Kloppenborg’s fourteen complexes of Q texts included modified versions of Zeller’s six collections (complexes 3, 5, 6, 8, 9 and 10 above), and five complexes that “appear to be organized about the motifs of the coming judgment, the urgency of repentance, the impenitence of “this generation” and the ramifications of Gentile faith” (complexes 1, 4, 7, 12 and 14 above). The six sapiential clusters incorporated the research of Schulz and Zeller, while the five deuteronomistic complexes identified by Kloppenborg as redaction incorporated the work of Lührmann and took into account the recent inquiries into Q’s redaction. The remaining three complexes included the Temptation Story and two sets of parables (complexes 2, 11 and 13 above).

Kloppenborg’s *Formation* presented what would become the definitive investigation of the five deuteronomistic complexes (designated “The Announcement of Judgment in Q” by Kloppenborg), followed by an equally detailed overview of the six cluster of sapiential material (designated “Sapiential Speeches in Q”). Kloppenborg’s

---

63 Ibid., 101.
method was, by his admission, “similar to those employed by Lührmann, Jacobson and
Zeller.”\textsuperscript{66} Kloppenborg’s explanation of the method stressed the use of the following
three analytical tools:

The first analytical tool is the determination of the compositional principles which
guide the juxtaposition of originally independent sayings and groups of sayings. Naturally this presupposes and builds upon the results from form-critical analysis. Of course, one cannot assume that the compositional themes governing one Q section were those of the final redactor. It is entirely possible that several smaller compositions—each governed by a particular redactional interest—were assembled by a final redactor who had entirely different interests. Hence it is necessary to coordinate the results of the analyses of several Q sections and endeavor to reconstruct one or more redactional stages, each having a coherent set of thematic, tradition-historical and perhaps form-critical characteristics, and further, to stratify the redactional phases with respect to each other.

Second, redactional or compositional activity may be seen in insertions and glosses. … What is significant here is that we are dealing with materials which are secondary from a compositional perspective, irrespective of their age or ultimate provenance. For example, if a group of sayings “A,” displaying a coherent set of formal and material characteristics and resembling other Q compositions, has been modified by the insertion of a secondary expansion or commentary word displaying a theology or style characteristic of a set of glosses or compositions elsewhere in Q (“B”), then we may assume that the “A” compilation or redaction is antecedent to the “B” redaction.

And finally, Mark-Q comparison provides an additional criterion by which Q redaction can be set into relief.\textsuperscript{67}

Of these three analytical tools, the first two are the chief ones. The citation is important because it shows that while coordination with Q’s established redactional stages can be used to determine the stratification of the text(s) under investigation, it is by no means the point of departure. Rather, the points of departure are (a) juxtaposition of originally independent units and (b) attentiveness to interpretive expansions in Q. In this way, form-critical analysis provides the investigator with compositional “markers” that

\textsuperscript{66} Ibid., 98.

\textsuperscript{67} Ibid., 98–9.
signal redactional intervention in the existing text of Q. After this initial step each identified independent stratum of material is examined for common thematic features. This in turn makes it possible to coordinate specific themes in the framework of an isolated stratum. With this information at his/her disposal, a Q investigator revisits the document and verifies whether there are one or several redactional strata present in addition to the formative layer (Q¹).

Confining himself in this manner to literary evidence in adjudicating redaction and reconstructing the layers of tradition, Kloppenborg was able to avoid much of the confusion that had precluded his predecessors from achieving a consensus on the stratification of Q. By establishing the extent of the document’s redaction, Kloppenborg was able to prove that much of the pre-apocalyptic sapiential material in Schulz’ and Zeller’s research belonged to the document’s formative layer. Kloppenborg was then able to show that Q¹ was edited by a superimposed redactional stratum containing forensic polemic against “this generation.”

Once all of the material identified as redaction had been coordinated thematically, this layer was designated by Kloppenborg as the document’s main redaction, Q². At the time of Formation a further redactional stratum (Q³) was found to consist of the Temptation Story only, added by an editor who wished “to exploit the account for its paradigmatic potential.”

---

68 Such evidence as the “pride of place,” the introduction and the conclusion, being held by the forensic threats was compelling. Equally persuasive is the observation that while the aphoristic clusters sometimes end with a forensic thrust as in the case of Q 11:14–52, Q 12:39–59, Q 17:23–37, the forensic clusters are never turned towards a pacific resolution. Ibid., 121–148, 148–154, 154–170.

69 Ibid., 325.
Despite the resistance from some scholars, Kloppenborg’s stratigraphic theory has found steady acceptance “as a general assumption of the present status of Q scholarship.” It is also a general assumption of this dissertation.

Designations Employed for the Stratification of Q

Kloppenborg’s model of Q’s composition history presents evidence for three successive strata in composition history of Q and is responsible for the terms’ “Q¹,” “Q²,” and “Q³” emergence and wide use in post–1987 scholarship.

The formative stratum or Q¹ can be characterized as sapiential instruction, and features a consistent portrayal of Jesus as the Sage. Then, the first and main redactional stratum or Q² contains material that can be characterized as forensic in its combination of threats and judgment pronouncements. This stratum exhibits strong signs of editing the

---


71 The extent of Q¹ and its status of a formative stratum were first demonstrated by Kloppenborg in Formation, 171–245. Kloppenborg argued that this stratum included the following clusters or “speeches”: Q 6:20b-49; 9:57–62 + 10:2–16, 21–24; 11:2–4, 9–13; 12:2–12; 12:22–34; 13:24–30. Ibid., 171. Of course, not all of the material found in these clusters was to be attributed to the formative stratum of Q, as at the time of the formative layer’s redaction the original Q¹ clusters were edited by a number of interpolations. The Critical Edition of Q identifies the extent of Q¹ as the following six blocks of material: (1) Q 6:20b–23b, 27–35, 36–45, 46–49; (2) Q 9:57–60, (61–62); 10:2–11, 16; (3) Q 11:2–4, 9–13; (4) Q 12:2–7, 11–12; (5) Q 12:22b–31, 33–34; (6) Q 13:24; 14:26–27; 17:33; 14:34–35. Robinson, “Introduction,” lxiii.

Kloppenborg’s argument for the extent of Q¹, presented in Formation, drew on the work of Dieter Lührmann, Siegfried Schulz, and Dieter Zeller each of whom had by then already identified a number of the above blocks of material as sayings collections in the ir own right. Lührmann had identified the above blocks (1), (4) and (5) as pre-redactional “collections.” Lührmann, Redaktion, 84. Schulz partially identified five blocks but did not have (2). Schulz, Spruchquelle, 57–175. Zeller also partially identified five, but did not have (6). Zeller, Mahnsprüche, 191. Further agreement was exhibited by Ronald A. Piper’s dissertation, who partially identified clusters (1), (3), (4) and (5) as pre-Q collections of aphoristic sayings. R.A. Piper, Wisdom in the Q-Tradition: The Aphoristic Teaching of Jesus (SNTSMS 61; Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1989). Though an opponent of Kloppenborg’s stratigraphic theory, Migaku Sato nevertheless is in agreement on (1), (2), (3) and (5) as independent “sapiential collections,” as explained in J.M. Robinson, “Logienquelle,” 385, and “Introduction,” lxiv. See further ibid., lx-lxvi.

clusters of aphoristic material. The redaction is carried out through speeches composed of combined chreia, woes and prophetic threats against “this generation.” In this material Jesus is presented as the Coming One and the apocalyptic Son of Man.

Finally, in the last redactional stratum, Q\(^3\), a shift toward a biographical framework is indicated by the addition of the Temptation Story to the document (Q 4:1–13).\(^73\) As noted in Kloppenborg’s post-Formation research, in this smaller body of redactional material a more benign shift in the attitude toward the Torah and the Temple can also be discerned.\(^74\) Furthermore, the Temptation Story portrays Jesus as the Son of God, a title previously encountered only in the Q\(^2\) text 10:21–22 (as ὁ ἴιὸς, “the Son”).

Table 3. Q’s Strata

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>Q3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>John’s preaching (1)</td>
<td>3:7–9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>John’s preaching (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3:16b–17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Temptation story</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4:1–13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Beatitudes (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>6:20–21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Beatitudes (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6:22–23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Love your enemies</td>
<td>6:27–28,</td>
<td></td>
<td>35c–d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>On retaliation</td>
<td>6:29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Giving freely</td>
<td>6:30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Golden rule</td>
<td>6:31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


\(^73\) The extent of Q\(^3\) was first delineated by Kloppenborg in Formation, 246–62. Even before Kloppenborg, however, once the three chreia comprising the Temptation Story had been identified as Q, the majority of scholars had reached consensus that this narrative is late in Q. The primary reason for this agreement was the stark contrast the Temptation Story creates in comparison with the other sayings of Q. Kloppenborg, Formation, 246–62; Jacobson, First Gospel, 86–95.

\(^74\) Kloppenborg notes that Q 11:42c, 16:17 “take the validity of the Torah for granted.” This reflects the attitude exhibited by the Temptation Story and somewhat softens the polemic against “this generation” which at the Q\(^2\) stratum includes the Pharisees (Q 11:39b, 42–44) and ridicule of the purity and tithing laws (Q 11:42ab, 39–41). Kloppenborg, Excavating Q, 210–13. See also “Redactional Strata and Social History in the Sayings Gospel Q,” (paper presented to the Q Seminar of the Society of Biblical Literature, 1988), 5.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>Q3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Be sons of God</td>
<td>6:32,34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Be merciful</td>
<td>6:36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>On judging</td>
<td>6:37–38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Blind guides</td>
<td>6:39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Disciples and teachers</td>
<td>6:40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>On hypocrisy</td>
<td>6:41–42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Good fruit and bad fruit</td>
<td>6:43–44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Treasures of the heart</td>
<td>6:45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Lord, Lord</td>
<td>6:46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Parable of the builders</td>
<td>6:47–49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Centurion’s son</td>
<td>7:1,3,6–9b,10?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>John’s question</td>
<td>7:18–19,21–23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Jesus’ eulogy</td>
<td>7:24–26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Quotation of Mal 3:1</td>
<td>7:27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>None born of woman…</td>
<td>7:28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Children in the marketplace</td>
<td>7:31–34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Sophia saying</td>
<td>7:35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Discipleship chreia (1)</td>
<td>9:57–58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Discipleship chreia (2)</td>
<td>9:59–60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>“The harvest is great…”</td>
<td>10:2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Sheep among wolves</td>
<td>10:3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Carry no purse</td>
<td>10:4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Greeting of peace</td>
<td>10:5–6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>On support of missionaries</td>
<td>10:7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Activity of missionaries</td>
<td>10:8–9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Concerning rejection</td>
<td>10:10–11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Threat</td>
<td>10:12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Woe against Galilee</td>
<td>10:13–15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>“Whoever hears you…”</td>
<td>10:16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Jesus’ thanksgiving</td>
<td>10:21–22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>“Blessed are the eyes…”</td>
<td>10:23–24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Lord’s prayer</td>
<td>11:2b–4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>On prayer (1)</td>
<td>11:9–10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>On prayer (2)</td>
<td>11:11–13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Beelzebul accusation</td>
<td>11:14–15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>A kingdom divided</td>
<td>11:17–18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>Q3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Jewish exorcists</td>
<td>11:19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Exorcism</td>
<td>11:20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Binding the stronger one</td>
<td>11:[21–22]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>“He who is not for me…”</td>
<td>11:23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Return of the evil spirit</td>
<td>11:24–26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Demand for a sign</td>
<td>11:16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Sign of Johan</td>
<td>11:29–30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Jonah and Solomon</td>
<td>11:31–32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Light saying</td>
<td>11:33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Sound eye</td>
<td>11:34–35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Woe: cleansing the outside</td>
<td>11:39a–41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Woe: neglect of justice</td>
<td>11:42</td>
<td>11:42c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Woe: cleansing the outside</td>
<td>11:39b, 41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Woe: the best seats</td>
<td>11:43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Woe: unseen graves</td>
<td>11:44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Woe: you burden men</td>
<td>11:46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Woe: you lock the kingdom</td>
<td>11:52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Woe: murderers of prophets</td>
<td>11:47–48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Sophia’s oracle</td>
<td>11:49–51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Revelation of the hidden</td>
<td>12:2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>What is said in the dark</td>
<td>12:3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Do not fear</td>
<td>12:4–5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>You are worth more…</td>
<td>12:6–7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Confessing Jesus</td>
<td>12:8–9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Blasphemy of the Spirit</td>
<td>12:10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Assistance of the Spirit</td>
<td>12:11–12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Treasures in heaven</td>
<td>12:33–34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Anxiety about daily needs</td>
<td>12:22–31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Parable of the householder</td>
<td>12:39–40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Parable of the faithful servant</td>
<td>12:42–46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>I cast fire on the earth</td>
<td>12:49,51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>On divisions</td>
<td>12:53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Agreeing with one’s accuser</td>
<td>12:58–59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Parable of mustard seed</td>
<td>13:18–19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>Q3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Parable of leaven</td>
<td>13:20–21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Two ways</td>
<td>13:24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>I do not know you…</td>
<td>13:24–27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>They will come from east…</td>
<td>13:28–29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>First will be last</td>
<td>13:[[30]]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>Lament over Jerusalem</td>
<td>13:34–35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>Great supper</td>
<td>14:16–21, 23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>Loving one’s parents</td>
<td>14:26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Take up your cross</td>
<td>14:27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>He who saves his life</td>
<td>17:33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>Salt</td>
<td>14:34–35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>Serving two masters</td>
<td>16:13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>Law and prophets</td>
<td>16:16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>Endurance of the Law</td>
<td>16:17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>On divorce</td>
<td>16:18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>On scandal</td>
<td>17:1–2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>Lost sheep</td>
<td>15:4–5a, 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>[[The lost coin]]</td>
<td>15:[[8–10]]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>Forgiveness</td>
<td>17:3–4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>Faith as a mustard seed</td>
<td>17:6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>[[The invisible kingdom]]</td>
<td>17:[[20–21]]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Lo, here, 10, there”</td>
<td>17:23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>The day of the Son of Man (1)</td>
<td>17:24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>Where the corpse is</td>
<td>17:37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>The day of the Son of Man (2)</td>
<td>17:26–27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>The day of the Son of Man (3)</td>
<td>17:28–30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>Two in the bed</td>
<td>17:34–35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>Parable of the talents</td>
<td>19:12–24, 26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>Twelve thrones</td>
<td>22:28,30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary

It is important to state in no uncertain terms that the actual dating of the material that belongs to each stratum cannot be known. That is to say, material that occurs in secondary strata cannot simply be said to have been composed secondarily. It can, however, be demonstrated that this material was used secondarily with respect to Q’s composition history. At the end of the day what these strata show is not the history of the creation of sayings and chreia in early Christianity. Rather they allow one to discern the way in which a particular movement shifted focus by editing of the material. These shifts, we must presume, reflect the views of the particular groups performing the redaction.

---

75 This is particularly true since, as pointed out by Robinson, Q is largely a sayings gospel and not a narrative gospel. James M. Robinson, “The Critical Edition of Q,” in The Sayings Gospel Q: Collected Essays (eds. Christoph Heil and Joseph Verheyden; Leuven: Leuven Univ. Press, 2005), 664.
CHAPTER TWO

STATUS QUAESTIONIS

The Study of Q 10:21–22 Before and During the Advent of Q Redaction Criticism in Heidelberg

Rudolph Bultmann and the Absence of a Referent for ταῦτα in the Thanksgiving of Jesus (Q 10:21)

Long before redactional hypotheses began to emerge in the field of Q studies, Rudolph Bultmann already approached Q 10:21–22 as a redactional unit. With respect to Q 10:21 Bultmann was left with the impression that it “comes from a lost Jewish writing; it seems to be torn out of some context (to what does ταῦτα refer?).”¹ In his discussion of the couplet Bultmann also introduced a further distinction between Q 10:21 and 10:22 as originally independent sayings, combined at some point in the tradition.² He noted that Q 10:22 “sounds like a Hellenistic revelation saying” and opined that it “was originally handed down as a saying of the risen Lord.”³ While Bultmann’s traditio-historical profiling was an optimistic product of his era, the literary-critical implications of his analysis had a lasting impact and would be explored by future scholarship. By

---

¹ Bultmann, History, 159–60.
² “I am convinced that the three ‘strophes’ of this saying did not originally belong together.” Ibid., 159.
³ Ibid.
highlighting the abrupt transition from Q 10:16 to 10:21 in the reconstructed text of Q and the absence of a referent for ταῦτα (Q 10:21) in the immediate context, Bultmann’s comments laid the foundation for all future study of Q 10:21–22 as a redactional and composite text. In fact, no attempts have since been made to view the couplet as anything other than a late interpolation into the document.

James M. Robinson’s 1964 Essays “ΛΟΓΟΙ ΣΟΦΩΝ” and “The Hodayot Formula”

Redaction-critical study of Q flourished in the post–World War II University of Heidelberg’s Faculty of Theology. James M. Robinson, then a young American scholar, joined the dialogue while on a sabbatical in 1959–60. After he returned to the United States, Robinson published two influential essays addressing a prominent theme of the Heidelbergian intellectual discussion: Q’s sapiential genre.⁴

Robinson’s 1964 essays “ΛΟΓΟΙ ΣΟΦΩΝ” and “The Hodayot Formula” characterized Q 10:21–22 as sapiential. In “ΛΟΓΟΙ ΣΟΦΩΝ” Robinson described Q 10:21 as “Q’s association of Jesus with Wisdom, together with its criticism of the sages.”⁵ Robinson then situated Q 10:21 on a trajectory which “though apparently not gnostic in origin, was open to a development in that direction, once a general drift toward Gnosticism had set in.”⁶

In “The Hodayot Formula,” Robinson attempted to account for the tension produced by the contrast between the “sages and the learned” (σοφοὶ καὶ συνετοὶ) and the

⁵ Robinson, “ΛΟΓΟΙ ΣΟΦΩΝ,” 74.
⁶ Ibid., 66.
“children” (νηπιοι) in Q 10:21, a tension Robinson detected by reading the saying from an esoteric perspective. The argument was that in a properly esoteric text one expected a “sage” to be lauded rather than presented as in some sense inferior. The opposite, however, appeared to be the case in Q 10:21. Robinson’s solution was to take this tension as indicative of a debate within the Q movement against a Gnosticizing tendency exhibited by the group identified in Q 10:21 as σοφοι και συνετοι: “We have struck upon a similar debate with a movement tending toward Gnosticism as we find in 1 Cor 1–2.”

Dieter Lührmann’s “Late Jewish Wisdom” Texts in Q

In 1969 Dieter Lührmann allocated Q 10:21–22 to one of the document’s secondary layers. He agreed with Robinson on the couplet’s sapiential or, in Lührmann’s words, “shaped by late Jewish wisdom” character. Lührmann also identified as sapiential Q 7:35; 11:31–32, 49–51; 13:34–35, situating these passages in the same compositional layer of Q as 10:21–22. He described Q 7:35; 10:21–22; 11:31–32, 49–51; 13:34–35 as “the latest and hence temporarily (even if not necessarily tradition-historically) nearest layer to the redaction of Q.”

Lührmann’s conclusions were indebted to his Heidelbergian colleagues. He also appropriated Robinson’s recent suggestion that Q’s genre was sapiential. The redaction-
critical advance made by Lührmann, however, would enable Robinson to revisit his own earlier suggestion.

The Contents of Dieter Lührmann’s “Nearest Layer to the Redaction of Q”

At this point we provide the reader with the reconstruction of the texts assigned by Dieter Lührmann along with Q 10:21–22 to a late sapiential layer in Q:

Q 7:35
Καὶ ἐδικαίωθη ἡ σοφία ἀπὸ τῶν τέκνων αὐτῆς.
But Wisdom was vindicated by her children.\(^{13}\)

Q 11:31–32
(31) Βασιλείασσα νότου ἐγερθήσεται ἐν τῇ κρίσει μετὰ τῆς γενεᾶς ταύτης, καὶ κατακρινεῖ αὐτούς· ὃτι ἠλθεν ἐκ τῶν περάτων τῆς γῆς ἀκούσαι τὴν σοφίαν Σολομῶνος, καὶ ἰδού, πλεῖον Σολομῶνος ὄδε.
The queen of the South will be raised at the judgment with this generation and condemn it, for she came from the ends of the earth to listen to the wisdom of Solomon, and look, something more than Solomon is here!

(32) Ἀνδρεῖς Νινεύεται ἀναστήσονται ἐν τῇ κρίσει μετὰ τῆς γενεᾶς ταύτης, καὶ κατακρινοῦσιν αὐτῆν· ὃτι μετενόησαν εἰς τὸ κήρυγμα Ἰωνᾶ, καὶ ἰδοὺ, πλεῖον Ἰωνᾶ ὄδε.
Ninevite men will arise at the judgment with this generation and condemn it. For they repented at the announcement of Jonah, and look, something more than Jonah is here!\(^{14}\)

Q 11:9–51
(49) Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ἡ σοφία εἶπεν· ἀποστελῶ πρὸς αὐτούς προφήτας καὶ σοφοὺς, καὶ ἔξ αὐτῶν ἀποκτενοῦσιν καὶ διώξουσιν,
Therefore also Wisdom said: I will send them prophets and sages, and some of them they will kill and persecute,


\(^{14}\) Ibid., 252–5.
so that a settling of accounts for the blood of all the prophets poured out from the founding of the world may be required of this generation,

(51) ἀπὸ αἵματος Ἀβελ ἢως αἵματος Ζαχαρίου τοῦ ἀπολομένου μεταξὺ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου καὶ τοῦ οἴκου· ναὶ λέγω ὑμῖν, ἐκζητηθήσεται ἀπὸ τῆς γενεᾶς ταύτης.

from the blood of Abel to the blood of Zechariah, murdered between the sacrificial altar and the House. Yes, I tell you, an accounting will be required of this generation!\(^{15}\)

Q 13:34–35

(34) Ἰερουσαλήμ Ἰερουσαλήμ, ἢ ἀποκτείνουσα τοὺς προφήτας καὶ λιθοβολοῦσα τοὺς ἀπεσταλμένους πρὸς αὐτήν, ποσάκις ἤθελησα γαγεῖν τὰ τέκνα σου ὅπως τρόπον ὄρνης ἐπισυνάγει τὰ νοσσία αὐτῆς ὑπὸ τὰς πτέρυγας, καὶ οὐκ ἦθελήσατε.

O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, who kills the prophets and stones those sent to her! How often I wanted to gather your children together, as a hen gathers her nestlings under her wings, but you were not willing!

(35) ἰδοὺ ἀφιέται ὑμῖν ὁ ὀίκος ὑμῶν. λέγω ὑμῖν, οὐ μὴ ἴδητε με ἑως ἢξει ὁτε εἰπήτε: εὑλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἐν ὑμῶν τοῦ κυρίου.

Look, your house is forsaken! I tell you, you will not see me until the time comes when you say: Blessed is the one who comes in the name of the Lord!\(^{16}\)

Q 10:21–22

(21) εἶπεν· ἔξωμολογοῦμαι σοι, πάτερ, κύριε τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ τῆς γῆς, ὅτι ἐκρυψάς ταύτα ἀπὸ σοφῶν καὶ σιωπητῶν καὶ ἀπεκάλυψας αὐτὰ νηπίοις· ναὶ ὁ πατὴρ, ὅτι οὕτως εὐδοκία ἔγενετο ἐμπροσθέν σου.

At “that time” he said: I thank you, Father, Lord of heaven and earth, for you hid these things from sages and the learned and disclosed them to children. Yes, Father, for that is what it has pleased you to do.

(22) Πάντα μοι παρεδόθη ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρός μου, καὶ οὐδεὶς γινώσκει τὸν υἱὸν εἰ μὴ ὁ πατὴρ, οὐδὲ τὸν πατέρα τις ἐπιγινώσκει εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱὸς καὶ ὃ ἐὰν βούληται ὁ υἱός ἀποκαλύψαι.

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 whoever the Son chooses to reveal him.\(^{17}\)

---

\(^{15}\) Ibid., 284–9.

\(^{16}\) Ibid., 420–3.

\(^{17}\) Ibid., 190–3.
The reader can see that explicit references to Sophia, i.e. the mythical figure of Wisdom occur in Q 7:35 and Q 11:49–51. Meanwhile, Q 11:31–32 contains a reference to “the wisdom of Solomon” and a comparison between Solomon and Jesus. Q 13:34–35 had been described along with Q 11:49–51 already by Bultmann as presupposing the myth of the divine wisdom, an interpretation revisited in 1956 by a Heidelbergian scholar Ulrich Wilckens and subsequently in Robinson’s 1964 essay “ΛΟΓΟΙ ΣΟΦΩΝ.” Finally, in 1965 Q 11:49–51 and Q 13:34–35 were engaged by yet another Heidelbergian, Odil Hannes Steck. Like Wilckens and Robinson before him, Steck concluded that Lk/Q 13:34–35 was a saying of Sophia. In this way, although it did not contain an explicit reference to Sophia, Q 13:34–35 was taken to imply it for some time before Lührmann.

Robinson’s 1964 reading of Q 10:21–22 as “Q’s association of Jesus with Wisdom” in “ΛΟΓΟΙ ΣΟΦΩΝ” grounds Lührmann’s profiling of the text in the context of the 1950–60s Heidelbergian discussion. Guided by the Bultmannian insights repeated and developed by a number of scholars Lührmann combined the two sayings that contained explicit references to Sophia (Q 7:35; 11:49–51) with ones that did not

---

18 “The whole verse has to be understood in the light of the myth of divine Wisdom, in which, after Wisdom dwells on the earth and calls men to follow her in vain, leaves the world, and man now searches for her in vain.” Bultmann, History, 115.


20 Steck, Geschick, 230–2. Steck, however, did not engage a redaction-critical analysis of Q and had in fact excluded Q 13:34–35 from Q. Ibid., 283.

mention Sophia but were interpreted as featuring her nonetheless (Q 10:21–22; 11:31–32; 13:34–35). Together, these five sayings comprised for Lührmann a single secondary layer of traditional material in Q.

Siegfried Schulz and the Syrian (Hellenistic) Jewish-Christian Tradition in Q

In 1972 Lührmann’s findings were appropriated by Siegfried Schulz whose redaction-critical study allocated Q 7:35; 10:21–22; 11:31–32, 49–51; 13:34–35 to what Schulz perceived as a late, Syrian (Hellenistic) Jewish-Christian Q tradition originating presumably in the Transjordan-Decapolis area. In Schulz’s estimation, the earlier Q material had been predominantly sapiential, while the secondary Hellenistic tradition featured deuteronomistic and apocalyptic material. Allocated to that later tradition, Q 7:35; 10:21–22; 11:31–32, 49–51; 13:34–35 could now be seen as reflecting its framework. In this way, Lührmann’s entire late sapiential compositional layer was given a new profile by virtue of its new deuteronomistic and apocalyptic context.

James M. Robinson’s 1975 essay “Jesus as Sophos and Sophia”

Q 10:21–22 as a Sapiential Text in “the later layers of Q”

Prior to Lührmann’s Redaktion James M. Robinson had described Q 10:21–22 as a secondary and possibly esoteric Q text featuring an identification of Jesus with Sophia. In the wake of Lührmann’s and Schulz’s research, however, Robinson came to modify his position in two significant ways. First of all, Robinson reworked his original 1964

---

22 Schulz, Sprachquelle, 481–2.


profiling of Q 10:21–22 as indicative of a “debate with a movement tending toward Gnosticism.”

By 1975 Robinson had completely abandoned that early hypothesis, instead suggesting: “This falls within the wisdom group of sayings in Q, here with a polemic directed at the officially wise, the Jewish establishment, e.g. the scribes and rabbis.”

Robinson’s most significant contribution to the study of Q 10:21–22, however, was his further nuancing of the Jesus-Sophia identification in the context of a late Q tradition. In the 1975 essay “Jesus as Sophos and Sophia,” following the interim publications by Lührmann and Schulz, Robinson wrote:

The preeminence of Jesus in the Q tradition is derived conceptually from the identification of Jesus with the coming son of humanity who will determine mankind’s fate at the last judgment. In the later layers of Q, to which the main wisdom sayings belong, this futuristic christology is read back into the public ministry of Jesus.

Robinson’s allocation of “the main wisdom sayings” to “the later layers of Q” was indebted to the 1969 and 1972 works of Lührmann and Schulz respectively, each of

---


27 Robinson used the term “son of humanity” for what has since become the widely accepted expression “Son of Man.” Because “Son of Man” is the term more widely employed by contemporary New Testament scholarship, it is my term of choice throughout this study.

28 Robinson, “Jesus as Sophos and Sophia,” 123 (my bold highlights).
whom had identified Q 7:35; 10:21–22; 11:31–32, 49–51; 13:34–35 as secondary additions to the early, and in Schulz’s model, non-apocalyptic collections in Q. 29

Building on this new redaction-critical foundation Robinson presented the following profiling of “the later layers of Q,” acknowledging the work of Lührmann and Schulz:

Recent research on Q has recognized the most distinctively wisdom sayings of Q to belong to a later layer in the tradition, as the Q tradition moved out of its Palestinian mileu into the wider Hellenistic Jewish Christian environment where the final redaction itself took place…

…One may use this latest sapiential layer of Q as one’s point of departure for understanding the author of Q. This is confirmed by the fact that he chose a literary genre typical of wisdom literature. 30

One notes that Lührmann’s “nearest layer to the re
daction of Q” is described by Robinson as the “latest sapiential layer of Q,” thus distinguishing (with Lührmann) “the most distinctively wisdom sayings of Q” from other sapiential material in the document. 31 The “latest sapiential layer of Q,” however, is no longer just an isolated compositional layer in Robinson’s compositional model. It is indeed a sapiential layer in the sense that these five wisdom sayings have a different compositional origin from other Q wisdom sayings. However, in the compositional history of the document as a whole this “latest sapiential layer” of Q is defined by the “winder Hellenistic Jewish Christian environment” and “the final redaction” of Q, just as Schulz had it.

Sophia Christology in Q 10:21–22

As seen by Robinson, the intent of “the final redaction” was to turn the crucifixion into a positive event. The identification of Jesus with Sophia in 10:21–22, when superimposed


30 Robinson, “Jesus as Sophos and Sophia,” 124, 129 (my bold highlights).

31 Ibid., 122, 129.
onto the public ministry of Jesus, recast Jesus’ otherwise inexplicable and hence
disturbing rejection as that of God’s Sophia.\textsuperscript{32} In Robinson’s words:

In the later layers of Q, to which the main wisdom sayings belong, this futuristic
christology is read back into the public ministry of Jesus. He was already son of
humanity. Once the public ministry is defined as that of one already son of
humanity, then some conceptualization is needed for carrying through this new
positive christological assessment of the public ministry. It was the wisdom [=Sophia] conceptualization which provided such a category.\textsuperscript{33}

It was specifically the emergence of the Son of Man figure\textsuperscript{34} in the material
assigned by Schulz almost entirely to the later Hellenistic tradition\textsuperscript{35} that Robinson saw
as necessitating a new conceptualization of the earlier tradition. In other words, the
futuristic Son of Man persona projected a certain new perspective onto the public
ministry of Jesus which the public ministry with its known negative resolution did not
reflect. Given that most of the existing teachings of Jesus had already been given a
sapiential form in the earlier Q material, the conceptualization of his public ministry as
the incarnation of Sophia presented a logical solution.

The critique that can be posed to Robinson’s hypothesis is the absence of any text
in the reconstructed Q that would contain a clear identification of Jesus with Sophia.
Robinson, however, did not see it as a problem, apparently convinced that Q 10:21–22
was that text:

\textsuperscript{32} Ibid., 124, 129.
\textsuperscript{33} Ibid., 123 (my square brackets).
\textsuperscript{34} “Son of Man” is the most prominent christological title in the Q document. It occurs in Q 6:22; 7:34;
9:58; 11:30; 12:8, 10; 12:40; 17:24, 26, 30.
\textsuperscript{35} Schulz assigned all but Q 12:8 to the later Q tradition.
[In 10:21–22] Jesus is not simply cast in the role of one of Sophia’s spokesmen, even the culminating one, but rather is described with predications that are reserved for Sophia itself...the full identification of Jesus as Sophia incarnate...takes place in this passage.36

In the same essay Robinson employed the term “Sophia christology”37 to conceptualize the role of Jesus in Q 10:21–22 and other “most distinctively wisdom sayings” (Q 7:31–35, 11:49–51, 13:34–35) from the late layers of the Q tradition.38

Jesus as the Son of Man and Sophia in a Deuteronomistic Framework

The key to Robinson’s ability to locate Sophia Christology in Q—and the myth of Sophia’s rejection in its tradition—was the deuteronomistic framework of the document’s latest layers:

The judgmental apocalyptic context has appropriated the Deuteronomistic view of history as consisting of repeated rejection of the prophets until in the end Israel is itself rejected. The whole section of Q is dominated by the concept of the suffering prophet: “I will send them prophets …, so that a settling of accounts for the blood of all prophets poured out from the founding of the world may be required of this generation. … O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, who kills the prophets …” (Q 11:49–50; 13:34). John and Jesus and the Christians are in the line of these prophets. . . . Both in this Deuteronomistic tradition and in the sapiential tradition all the slain prophets and sages are much on the same level. Attention is actually not on the rejected spokesmen but on the rejected Israel. In such a context the death of Jesus has neither unique nor saving significance. Jesus himself has unique saving significance, because of the apocalyptic christology of the Q tradition that identified Jesus with the coming son of humanity. But his death was given theological interpretation first in the later stratum of Q where it is not interpreted on the basis of sacrificial traditions, but within the traditions that saw

36 Robinson, “Jesus as Sophos and Sophia,” 125, 130 (my square brackets).


38 Robinson, “Jesus as Sophos and Sophia,” 122, 129. Q 11:31–32, also assigned by Lührmann to the late sapiential layer and containing the reference to “the wisdom of Solomon” is not mentioned by Robinson in “Jesus as Sophos and Sophia.”
in his death only the culminating instance of the rejection of God’s spokesmen by Israel.  

Once Robinson had situated the Sophia Christology in the Deuteronomistic framework of Q’s later, “judgmental apocalyptic” tradition, it became possible to see how the contrasting portraits of Jesus as the Sophia and the Son of Man could be reconciled. According to Robinson, in the later layers of Q Jesus’ death was explained by appealing to the duality of his true identity, i.e. he was both the futuristic Son of Man and—especially during his historical incarnation—God’s rejected Sophia. While the former conceptualization looked forward to the eschaton, the imagery of Sophia served to redefine Jesus’ public ministry. Jesus’ death only seemed to be the humiliating demise of a prophet, whereas it was really a rejection of Sophia.

“Sophia Christology:” A Q Trajectory

An important feature of Robinson’s Sophia Christology is the fact that it forms a trajectory in the later layers of Q. Robinson recognized that in Q 7:31–35, 10:21–22; 11:49–51, 13:34–35 Jesus appeared to be presented as both the exclusive personification of Sophia and one of her envoys. The concept of a trajectory was therefore required, because otherwise the exclusive identification of Jesus as Sophia in Q 10:21–22 clashed with the inclusive portrayal of both him and John as Sophia’s envoys in Q 7:31–35, and with Q 11:49–51 and 13:34–35 in which Jesus spoke on Sophia’s behalf.

39 Ibid., 128–9 (my highlights).
40 Ibid., 125, 128–9, 130.
John Kloppenborg and the Current Consensus of Q Scholarship

Q 10:21–22 as a Q\(^2\) (Redactional) Text in the “Mission Speech” Section

Published a decade after Robinson’s essay “Jesus as Sophos and Sophia,” John Kloppenborg’s *Formation of Q* contained the next major step in the analysis of Q 10:21–22. Kloppenborg’s identification of Q 10:21–22 as a secondary text in Q relied on the analysis of originally independent units and interpretive expansions in the larger “mission speech” section of the document Q 9:57–10:24:

Naturally this presupposes and builds upon the results from form-critical analysis. Once the component units within a Q section have been ascertained, the order in which sayings were added to one another and the method by which the association was accomplished (e.g., catchword, thematic or formal association or syntactical connective) can be determined.\(^{42}\)

The formative block of traditional material immediately adjacent to Q 10:21–22 was outlined in 1977 by Dieter Zeller as Q 10:2–8a, 9–11a, 12 (+ 16?).\(^{43}\) Kloppenborg’s 1987 analysis added Q 9:57–62 to what became designated as the Q\(^1\) “mission speech cluster” and confirmed 10:16 to be a part of that section and a Q\(^1\) text.\(^{44}\)

Kloppenborg then identified Q 10:12, 13–15 and 10:21–22, 23–24 as Q\(^2\) additions to the mission speech section.\(^{45}\) While Q 10:12–15 constituted a “most readily

---

\(^{42}\) Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 98.


\(^{44}\) The addition of Q 9:57–62, which Kloppenborg further divides into three originally independent chraria (9:57–58, 59–60, 61–61), is dictated by thematic association since all three chraria concern discipleship. Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 190–2. With regard to Q 10:16: it “provides an apt legitimation and justification for the missionaries’ response to the rejection mentioned in 10:10–11” and furthermore “provides the counterpart to 10:3, resuming the motif of “sending.” Ibid., 196–7, 199–200.

\(^{45}\) Kloppenborg concluded that “verse 12 is the redactional clasp holding the two units [10:2–11 and 10:16] together.” Ibid., 199 (my parentheses). He notes that “10:13–15 and the redactional verse 10:12 cohere both materially and formally not with the sapiental portions of Q but with those sections characterized by the announcement of judgment (3:7–9, 16–17; 17:23–37), the call to repentance (3:7–9; 7:31–35; 11:29–32)
identifiable addition,” with regard to the latter Kloppenborg observed that “the relation of Q 10:21–22, 23–24 to the rest of the discipleship/mission sermon is more difficult to determine.”

When evaluated against the Q\textsuperscript{1} material in the mission speech section, the secondary origin of Q 10:21–22, 23–24 appeared evident. There was no clear referent for ταῦτα in Q 9:57–10:16, an indicator of the couplet’s misplaced context recognized since Bultmann. In addition to that, the thanksgiving (Q 10:21–22) and beatitude (Q 10:23–24) forms sat uneasily next to the judgment woes (Q 10:12, 13–15). Kloppenborg’s challenge thus was locating Q 10:21–24 in the correct redactional stratum. Not finding any reason to move the couplet to Q\textsuperscript{2}, Kloppenborg concluded that the “context of the group self-definition and polemics of cults under pressure,” i.e. the thematic agenda of the Q\textsuperscript{2} stratum was sufficient for a coordination with Q\textsuperscript{2}.\textsuperscript{48} The extent of Q\textsuperscript{2} activity in the mission speech cluster was thereby outlined by Kloppenborg as 10:12–15, 21–24, interrupting the original Q\textsuperscript{1} composition in two places (separated by 10:16).

\textsuperscript{46} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{47} Ibid., 201.
\textsuperscript{48} Ibid., 201–2.
The stratigraphic analysis of the “mission speech” section to which Q 10:21–22, 23–24 is allocated can be depicted as follows (based on John Kloppenborg’s 1987 analysis that represents the current consensus of Q scholarship):  

Table 4. Stratigraphy of the “Mission Speech”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q^1</th>
<th>Q^2</th>
<th>Q^3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The “Mission Speech” section</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Q 9:57–60, (61–62)  
(-discipleship sayings) | | |
| Q 10:2–11  
(the mission instruction) | | |
| Q 10:16  
(the mission instruction cont-d) | Q 10:12, 13–15 (woes) | |
| Q 10:21–22  
(thanksgiving) | Q 10:23–24 (beatitude) | |
| **Beginning of the next section** | | |
| Q 11:2–4  
(“Our Father”) | | |

We can see that inside this “episode” a discrete thanksgiving saying Q 10:21–22 appears to have been given its commentary in a separate beatitude (Q 10:23–24) which in the present, final version of Q is attached to the thanksgiving. Following that beatitude, the beginning of the next section in the document’s existing, final version is signaled by the Lord’s Prayer (Q 11:2–4), which also opens a new block of Q^1 material. Q 10:21–22 is preceded by Q 9:57–60, (61–62); 10:2–16, almost entirely Q^1 “mission speech” instructional material. The only secondary interruption is marked by Q 10:12, 13–15 or

---

49 Q^3, while not engaged by Kloppenborg in the analysis of the mission speech section, nevertheless is considered by Kloppenborg to constitute an independent Q stratum and therefore is reproduced as an empty column in Figure 3, highlighting its existence “behind the scene” as it were.

the “woes” section. These woes are sandwiched amidst $Q^1$ material which mostly precedes ($Q$ 9:57–60, (61–62); 10:2–11) and briefly ($Q$ 10:16) follows it.

Q 10:21–24 as a Composite Unit

The reason for the absence of $Q$ 10:23–24 in the discussions of 10:21–22 by Lührmann, Schulz and Robinson was that those authors had not attempted an all-encompassing stratigraphic analysis of $Q$ whereby every saying would be allocated to a particular stratum and all transitions would be explained. Because of the nature of the task endeavored in *Formation*, however, Kloppenborg needed to address the role of $Q$ 10:23–24. His conclusion was that $Q$ 10:23–24 was an originally independent unit joined to $Q$ 10:21–22 prior to the subsuming of $Q$ 10:21–24 into the $Q^2$ stratum:

Q 10:23–24

(23) μακάριοι οἱ ὁφθαλμοὶ οἱ βλέποντες ἃ βλέπετε

Blessed are the eyes that see what you see,

(24) ὅτι πολλοὶ προφῆται καὶ βασιλεῖς ἠθέλησαν ἵδεῖν ἃ ὑμεῖς βλέπετε καὶ οὐκ εἶδαν, καὶ ἀκούσατε ἃ ἀκούσατε καὶ οὐκ ἥκουσαν.

for I tell you: Many prophets and kings wanted to see what you see, but never saw it, and to hear what you hear, but never heard it.  

Kloppenborg recognized that $Q$ 10:21–22 and 10:23–24 were not connected by any literary device (e.g., catchword association, syntactical connective, etc.). Consequently, he argued for a thematic grouping of $Q$ 10:21–22 and 10:23–24, viz.

driven by the common motif of a hidden/disclosed mystery:  

---


Although the term “mystery” is not used, the same temporal distinction of “formerly hidden/now manifest” is explicit in 10:23–24 and presupposed in 10:21.  

According to Kloppenborg, Q 10:21–24 was interpolated into the document as a part of the larger Q^2 redactional effort.  

The Original and Secondary Referents of ταῦτα (Q 10:21)

Kloppenborg also addressed Bultmann’s old observation that Q 10:21 lacked a referent for “these things” (ταῦτα) in its immediate context. While essentially reprising Bultmann’s position, Kloppenborg made an important new distinction – between “the original referent of ταῦτα in Q 10:21” and the secondary referent of ταῦτα in the mission speech section.

It seems clear enough that the secondary referent of ταῦτα (Q 10:21), i.e. the referent given to the thanksgiving by the Q^2 framers, is the redacted (combined Q^1 and Q^2) mission speech material in Q 9:57–10:16 to which 10:21–24 was added.  

Kloppenborg, however, had the following to say regarding the thanksgiving’s original, now lost, and therefore only plausible referent:

Form-critical analysis shows that 10:21–24 is composed of two basic units: a thanksgiving and a beatitude. The basis for the juxtaposition of the two resides in the similarities in subject matter and in structure. In the beatitude, the disciples are pronounced blessed because they witness the events which are portents of the kingdom. The original referent of ταῦτα in 10:21 is probably the same: the events which signal the presence of the kingdom.

---

54 Ibid., 202.
55 Ibid., 197.
56 Ibid.
57 Ibid.
We have already seen that while Kloppenborg agreed with Bultmann that 10:21–22 and 10:23–24 were originally independent units, he also proposed that these units had been joined during the Q^2 redaction. Consequently, Kloppenborg found it likely that the referent of the τὰ ὑπ᾽ αὐτοῦ in 10:21 had to be in some way related to the now adjacent beatitude. By interpreting the mysterious τὰ ὑπ᾽ αὐτοῦ of Q 10:21 as sharing its original (i.e., non-Q) referent with Q 10:23–24 in “the events which are portents of the kingdom,” Kloppenborg also effectively gave Q 10:21–22 a profile that appeared to match that of the Q^2 stratum, viz. apocalyptic events signaling the presence of God’s kingdom.\(^5^8\) The stratigraphic location of 10:21–22 in Q^2 was thereby seemingly confirmed.

Q 10:21–22 and “Sophia Christology” in
Kloppenborg’s Research

Defending the Q^2 origin of 10:21–22, Kloppenborg responded in *Formation* to the hypotheses of Paul Meyer (1967) and Arland Jacobson (1978), put forth in their respective Ph.D. dissertations.\(^5^9\)

Meyer regards 10:21–22 as so foreign in its soteriological orientation that it must be deemed to be a very late accretion to Q. Whereas the rest of Q places the onus for repentance upon humankind, not God, 10:21–22 takes the opposite view. Jacobson’s point is similar: 10:21–22 should be relegated to a stage subsequent to the addition of 10:12, 13–15. Whereas 10:12, 13–15 and other pericopae

---

\(^5^8\) “In its tone and probable setting, this recension of Q falls within the parameters of other chriic collections, especially those current in Cynic circles. Not only is the radical ethical teaching carried over from the formative stage, but now confrontational and polemical anecdotes and sayings come to the fore…. The idiom of Q is controlled not by a philosophic notion of freedom, but by a historical and soteriological schema of God’s constant invitation of Israel to repent, and by the expectation of the imminent manifestation of the kingdom – an event which calls forth a radical response in its adherents, and which produces conflict and polarization in the world.” Ibid., 324.

belonging to this stage (e.g. 7:31–35) relativize the position of Jesus by placing him alongside other envoys of Sophia, 10:21–22 describes him as the sole mediator of divine knowledge.  

Because Kloppenborg’s Q² stratum contained the apocalyptic material featuring Jesus as the futuristic Son of Man—akin to Schulz’s late Hellenistic tradition and Robinson’s “later layers of Q”—he could not agree with Meyer and Jacobson that christology exhibited by 10:21–22 was of touch with that stratum’s “confession of Jesus as the definitive measure of salvation.” For Kloppenborg, precisely such christology was on display very clearly in the same stratum’s Q 12:8–9 and its theme of apocalyptic reward and punishment. Kloppenborg therefore responded to Meyer and Jacobson in the following manner:

> It must be said at once that 10:22 implies a Christology which surpasses the christological understanding evinced by 7:31–35 and 11:49–51. But to argue that this stratum of redaction relativized Jesus’ position by viewing him simply as another of Sophia's envoys does an injustice to 11:29–32, 33–36 and the christological ramifications of that Q composition and especially to 12:8–9 which makes confession of Jesus the definitive measure of salvation. . . . Jesus is not just a herald of the kingdom, but the final and definitive herald, and the coming Son of Man.  

This quote shows that Kloppenborg agreed with Robinson’s hypothesis of the futuristic Son of Man christology coexisting in the late Q tradition with Sophia christology. For Kloppenborg, as for Robinson before him, to view Jesus as the incarnate

---

60 Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 201

61 Ibid. (Kloppenborg’s italics).

62 Q 12:8–9: ἐὰν ὁμολογήσῃ ἐν ἔμοι ἐξαραξόντων τῶν ἀνθρώπων, καὶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ὁμολογήσῃ ἐν αὐτῷ ἐξαραξόντων τῶν ἄγγελων τοῦ θεοῦ. ὁ δὲ ἀρνήσεται μὲ ἐξαραξόντων τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀρνηθήσεται ἐξαραξόντων τῶν ἄγγελων. ἔνας ὁς δέ ἀρνηθῇ με ἐξαραξόντων τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἢ ἐκείνος ἀρνηθήσεται ἐξαραξόντων τῶν ἄγγελων.  

63 Ibid., 201 (my bold highlights).
Sophia in Q 10:22 does not contradict the promise of Q that Jesus is also the coming Son of Man. In fact, Q 10:22 “draws upon the mythologoumena associated with Sophia which represent her as God’s intimate.” This position is consistent with Kloppenborg’s 1984 dissertation in which the following observation was made:

While the association of the speaker of the wise words with a divine agent (Sophia or God) is present both in the initial formative stage, and in the second recension [of Q], the editing of Q strengthened the historicizing side of the dialectic.

In *Formation*, the objection to Jesus being viewed “simply as another of Sophia’s envoys” in Q, together with the deuteronomistic characterization of Jesus as “the final and definitive herald” of God’s kingdom point to Kloppenborg’s identification of Jesus with Sophia in Q 10:21–22. Kloppenborg’s analysis of Q 10:21–22 therefore both introduced new insights (most notably, the accounting for the original referent of ταῦτα by reading Q 10:21–22 together with 10:23–24) and solidified Robinson’s earlier hypothesis, viz. Sophia christology. The only significant modification of that hypothesis was that Robinson’s vaguely defined “later layers of Q” were instead consolidated into a single redactional stratum—Q—supported by a detailed compositional analysis of the entire document.

**Arland Jacobson: Jesus as Sophia in a Non-Deuteronomistic Framework**

The exchange between John Kloppenborg and Arland Jacobson shows that both scholars were influenced by James M. Robinson’s hypothesis of Sophia christology and 10:21–22 as its clearest instance in Q. Arland Jacobson’s 1978 dissertation “Wisdom Christology in

---

64 Ibid., 199.

Q” was written under Robinson and reflected many aspects of Robinson’s research. Just as Lührmann, Schulz, and Robinson before him, Jacobson approached Q 7:31–35, 10:21–22, 11:29–32, 11:49–51, 13:34–35 as sapiential texts that had been “introduced as part of a larger redactional effort.”  

Four of these texts (with the exception of Q 10:21–22) qualified for Jacobson as a “distinctive combination of Wisdom with the deuteronomistic tradition,” again reflecting Robinson’s position. 

With respect to Q 10:21–22 Jacobson again followed Robinson, reprising the hypothesis of an “identification of Jesus with Sophia, and thus the emergence of a “Sophia Christology” in the strict sense” and noting that “the wisdom tradition here functions to absolutize the status of Jesus.” In the wake of Kloppenborg’s rebuttal of his initial evaluation of Q 10:21–22 as late because of its unique christology, Jacobson modified his position in the following way: 

With regard to the figure of Wisdom, one may further speculate that it was a useful concept for a group which found itself, or placed itself, at odds with the majority of Jews. Wisdom provides direct access to the divine, quite apart from the institutionalized means of access to God. Because of this, a group bearing a distinctive message could claim legitimation by an authority superior to that of its distractors. At the same time, the Q group could claim continuity with the past, in that Wisdom had earlier sent prophets who were also rejected. 

---

66 Jacobson, First Gospel, 44. Cf. Robinson: “latest sapiential layer of Q,” “the later layers of Q.”  
Robinson, “Jesus as Sophos and Sophia,” 123, 129.  


68 “The question, why we have this distinctive combination of Wisdom with the deuteronomistic tradition, is not easily answered. No doubt some traditions lie behind it. The wisdom tradition, as noted earlier, is sometimes found in conjunction with the deuteronomistic tradition, so there is a precedent for what we find in Q. The two traditions have in common a concern to warn hearers of the fateful consequences of rejecting a message. This was a central preoccupation of the deuteronomistic tradition; Prov 1:20–33 illustrates the same concern with regard to Wisdom.” Ibid., 257.  

69 Ibid., 149.  

70 Jacobson, First Gospel, 257.
According to Jacobson’s revised argument, Q 10:21–22 reflected not so much a different christology as a new attitude,\(^1\) one that was so unique that it stood “virtually alone in Q.”\(^2\) It was this attitude that for Jacobson signaled “a quite new redactional stage.”\(^3\) With that in mind, in *The First Gospel* Jacobson separated Q 10:21–22 from Q 7:31–35, 11:29–32, 11:49–51 and 13:34–35, no longer finding it to reflect the deuteronomistic profile of those other texts. This development marked a departure from Robinson’s position, in whose work Sophia christology in Q functioned entirely in a deuteronomistic framework. As explained by Jacobson:

> It is noteworthy that the deuteronomistic perspective has been completely left behind in Q 10:21–22. More precisely, the deuteronomistic perspective is contradicted, since there is no place in the deuteronomistic tradition for a thanksgiving for Israel’s unbelief. The expectation of Israel’s repentance found elsewhere in Q presupposed Israel’s knowledge of God, which is here denied. Now God is thanked for withholding the divine revelation from the “wise and understanding” and for having reserved it for the “babes,” which presumably means the Q community.\(^4\)

Jacobson then revisited Kloppenborg’s objections. He pointed out that Kloppenborg had not fully accounted for the unique pathos of the Q group on display in 10:21–22:

> The sharp contrast between Q 10:21–22 and 10:2–16 is acknowledged by Kloppenborg, but he seeks to overcome this problem by setting it “in the context of the group self-definition and polemics of cults under pressure.” But this

---

\(^1\) Though Jacobson still maintained that “elsewhere in Q there is a tendency to relativize the status of Jesus by placing him in a series of prophets or messengers; but, to the extent that it is present, the wisdom tradition here functions to absolutize the status of Jesus.” Ibid., 149.

\(^2\) Ibid., 151.

\(^3\) Ibid.

\(^4\) Ibid., 149, 151.
solution does justice neither to the dramatic shift in vocabulary in Q 10:21–22 to something unlike anything else in Q, nor to the way that Q 10:21–22 seems designed as a comment on 10:2–16. If a parallel is to be sought, it would seem preferable to note the way in which the alienation of the Johannine community from their fellow Jews gave rise to, or was at least accompanied by, claims to be the exclusive recipients of divine revelation.

It would appear that the failure of the mission, presupposed directly by the stage of redaction which included the addition of Q 9:57b-58 and 10:2, 12–15, has ceased to be a matter of deep pain and anger. Q 10:21–22 reflects a very different attitude, one of having left that pain and anger behind to become a self-satisfied conventicle, a conventicle convinced that it alone had access to the truth and that all others vainly grope in the darkness.\(^75\)

We can see that in addition to emphasizing the unique thematic features of Q 10:21–22, Jacobson touched on such critical matters as vocabulary and juxtaposition of compositional units, in this case Q 10:21–22 and the preceding mission speech section. Unlike Kloppenborg, Jacobson did not engage Q 10:23–24, considering it a “transition from 10:13–16 to a new section” prior to the redactional insertion of 10:21–22.\(^76\) However, Jacobson acknowledged that it was “quite possible that the content of Q 10:23–24 prompted the insertion of Q 10:21–22.”\(^77\) Finally, Jacobson left “these things” (τὰ ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ) in Q 10:21 unattended, but his comment on “all things” (πάντα) in the companion verse 10:22 was noteworthy:

It is not likely that “all things” (πάντα) in 10:22 refers to the mission complex in Q 10:2–16, both because of its position – it would be more appropriate as a reference to 10:21 than to 10:2–16 – and because it is the logical basis for 10:22b and 10:22c: the son has received “all things” and therefore controls access to the father. Thus “all things” has to do with knowledge of God and mysteries of God. The reference cannot be to the kingdom of God or to eschatological secrets because of the radicality of the claim: there is no knowledge of God except through him to whom “all things” have been delivered.\(^78\)

\(^{75}\) Ibid., 150, 151.

\(^{76}\) Ibid., 152.

\(^{77}\) Ibid.
Jacobson’s proposed role of Q 10:21–22 in the mission speech section thus appears to be very different from Kloppenborg’s hypothesis in which Q 10:21–22, 23–24 formed a Q\(^2\) cluster comprised of a thanksgiving and a beatitude. For Jacobson 10:21–22 was the latest unit in the mission speech section, its insertion possibly prompted by the subject matter of the beatitude.

**Summary and Conclusion**

In this chapter we showed that the New Testament scholarship since Rudolph Bultmann has been in consensus with respect to the redactional origin of Q 10:21–22. It was signaled by the juxtaposition of 10:21–22 to the mission speech section Q 10:2–16 and the absence of a referent for τὰ ὕπατα (Q 10:21) in the couplet’s present context. Beyond that, however, there appears to have been little agreement.

James M. Robinson attempted to resolve the mystery of Q 10:21–22 by reading the couplet as the culmination of a Sophia christological trajectory in Q, *viz.* as a retrospective projection of the futuristic Son of Man christology onto Jesus’ historical ministry in a deuteronomistic framework. According to Robinson, the goal would be to give the historical ministry “a new positive christological assessment,”\(^79\) presenting Jesus as both the eschatological Son of Man and God’s rejected Sophia.

John Kloppenborg retained Robinson’s hypothesis of Sophia christology and the deuteronomistic framework as the background for Q 10:21–22, but further developed that hypothesis by situating the couplet in the Q\(^2\) redactional stratum. According to

---

\(^{78}\) Ibid., 150.

\(^{79}\) Ibid.
Kloppenborg, the couplet reflected the stratum’s christology that rendered Jesus the definitive measure of salvation, exhibited in Q² texts such as in 12:8–9.80 Meanwhile, the other major theme of Q 10:21–22, *viz.* the rejection of a group called σοφοὶ καὶ συνετοὶ seemed to reflect the polemic demeanor of Q².81

Arland Jacobson, on the other hand, located Q 10:21–22 in a “new redactional stage,” disconnecting the couplet from the deuteronomistic context of Robinson’s “later layers of Q” or Kloppenborg’s Q².82 While Jacobson retained Sophia christology in his assessment of 10:21–22, his hypothesis, however, had considerably weakened it. It was after all the Deuteronomistic context which had suggested the theme of Sophia’s rejection as the couplet’s possible background. Meanwhile, as noted by Jacobson, in Q 10:21–22 it was actually *Israel* that was rejected and subsequently excluded from the circle of revelation!83

The next chapter of our dissertation will focus on Jacobson’s suggestion of unique group self-definition in Q 10:21–22 and its implications for Kloppenborg’s allocation of the couplet to the Q² stratum. We will attempt to determine, by means of a literary-critical analysis, whether it is possible to view 10:21–22 as a Q² text or if indeed, as Jacobson had surmised, it must be later than the mission speech section 10:2–16.

---

80 Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 201.
81 Ibid., 201–2.
83 Ibid.
CHAPTER THREE
A LITERARY-CRITICAL ARGUMENT FOR Q 10:21–22 AS A POST–Q² ADDITION TO THE MISSION SPEECH MATERIAL Q 10:2–16

Introduction

In the previous chapter we showed that John Kloppenborg whose stratigraphic model forms the premise of our research allocated Q 10:21–22 to the Q² stratum. This chapter contains a literary-critical argument in favor of the couplet’s post-Q² origin. It will be shown that a change occurs in Q 10:21–22 that, not unlike the Q² additions 10:12–15, appears to be a reaction to the original mission’s failure. We will demonstrate, however, that Q 10:21–22 reacts to the mission’s failure in a new way and in a manner suggesting that this couplet belongs to a reality subsequent to the Q² redactional stratum.

Together Q 10:21 and 10:22 contain nine terms that are either entirely unique to the rest of Q or whose connotations in Q 10:21–22 are unusual. These nine words are: 1. ἀποκαλύπτω ("to disclose"), 2. κρύπτω ("to hide, conceal"), 3. εὐδοκία ("will, choice"), 4. σοφός ("sage"), 5. συνετός ("[a] learned, intelligent [individual]") , 6. νήπιος ("child"), 7. ὁ πατήρ ("the Father"), 8. ὁ υἱὸς (the Son) and 9. βούλομαι ("to wish, choose"). While that in itself is an unusual concentration of peculiar terminology, this chapter will show that, by using this language to make a number of specific points Q 10:21–22 exhibits an outlook secondary even to the Q² redaction of the mission speech, i.e. the woes in Q
10:12–15. Indeed, we will argue that in Q 10:21–22 all of the preceding mission speech material is effectively reinterpreted, including the redactional Q^2 material in 10:12–15.

In what follows, I use the term “author” to describe the individual or the group responsible for the composition of a stratum in Q. My intention is not to imply that the material found in any given stratum is a literary creation of such an “author.” Rather, I simply mean that a particular stratum’s “author” is responsible for that stratum’s arrangement and dictates its theological agenda.

**The Shifting Context of the Mission Speech Cluster**

Q 10:12–15: The Deuteronomistic Redaction of the Q^1 Mission Speech Cluster at the Time of the Q^2 Stratum

As currently outlined, the Q^2 stratum contains a strong reaction to the original mission’s failure.\(^1\) Texts such as Q 10:12–15, 11:31–32, 14:16–24 reflect the author’s disappointment in and, in the case of Q 12:8–9, concern with this state of affairs.\(^2\) Harsh language and woes castigating those who rejected the messengers occur several times in Q^2, as for example in the lengthy diatribe against the Pharisees and lawyers whom the author finds guilty of rejecting prophets and apostles (Q 11:39b–52). Like that text, albeit on a much smaller scale, Q 10:12–15 by virtue of its redactional interpolation into the Q^1 mission speech material (10:2–11, 16) serves to comment on the rejection of God’s messengers. With the invective of the Q^2 woes in Q 10:12–15, the context of the Q^1 mission speech thereby undergoes a major change:

---

\(^1\) Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 102–70

\(^2\) Ibid., 211.
Q 10:12–15

(10:12) λέγω υμῖν ὅτι Σοδόμοις ἀνεκτότερον ἔσται ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἑκείνη ἡ τῆ πόλει ἑκείνη.
I tell you: For Sodom it shall be more bearable on that day than for that town.

(10:13) Οὐαί σοί, Χοραζίν, οὐαί σοι, Βηθσαϊδά· ὅτι εἰ ἐν Τύρῳ καὶ Σιδώνι ἠγενήθησαν αἵ δυνάμεις αἵ γενόμεναι ἐν υμῖν, πάλαι ἂν ἐν σάκκῳ καὶ σποδῷ μετενόησαν.
Woe to you, Chorazin! Woe to you, Bethsaida! For if the wonders performed in you had taken place in Tyre and Sidon, they would have repented long ago, in sackcloth and ashes.

(10:14) πλὴν Τύρῳ καὶ Σιδώνι ἀνεκτότερον ἔσται ἐν τῇ κρίσει ἡ υμῖν.
Yet for Tyre and Sidon it shall be more bearable at the judgment than for you.

(10:15) καὶ σύ, Καφαρναοῦμ, μὴ ἔως οὐρανοῦ ὑψωθῇς; ἔως τοῦ ἀδοῦ καταβήσῃ.
And you, Capernaum, up to heaven will you be exalted? Into Hades shall you come down!5

These Q2 woes indicate that the mission, only envisioned at the time of the Q1 stratum (10:2–11, 16) has since been attempted and rejected by the towns mentioned in Q 10:12–15.4 In response to that rejection, in Q 10:12–15 the author threatens the movement’s detractors with the coming judgment, a feature that is characteristic of the Q2 stratum overall.5 Still, elsewhere in Q2 there appears to be room for the movement’s members to further testify in a public forum (12:8–9) and for the opposition to bear fruits of repentance (Q 3:8). Nowhere in the Q2 stratum do we encounter the notion that the

---

5 Ibid., 169–70.
actions of repenting, speaking out for Jesus, or indeed knowing God might be dependent on divine providence.

A New Redactional Stage?

The Reevaluation of the Mission in Q 10:21–22

We will now revisit the term ταῦτα (“these things”) which has led all scholars, beginning with Bultmann, to regard Q 10:21–22 as redactional:

Q 10:21–22

(10:21) εἶπεν· ἔξωμολογοῦμαι σοι, πάτερ, κύριε τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ τῆς γῆς, ὅτι ἐκρυψάς ταῦτα ἀπὸ σοφῶν καὶ συνετῶν καὶ ἀπεκάλυψας αὐτά νηπίοις· ναὶ ὁ πατήρ, ὅτι οὕτως εἰδοκία ἐγένετο ἐμπροσθέν σου.

At that time he said: I thank you, Father, Lord of heaven and earth, for you hid these things from sages and the intelligent, and disclosed them to children. Yes, Father, for that is what it has pleased you to do.

(10:22) Πάντα μοι παρεδόθη ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς μου, καὶ οὐδεὶς γινώσκει τὸν υἱὸν εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ, οὐδὲ τὸν πατέρα τις ἐπιγινώσκει εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱὸς καὶ ὁ ἐὰν βούληται ὁ υἱὸς ἄποκαλύψαι.

Everything has been entrusted to me by the 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.6

It seems clear that Q 10:21–22 as a couplet forms a commentary on the movement’s recent history—most notably, the failure of the missionary endeavor envisioned in Q1 and carried out since then. Kloppenborg correctly noted this, observing that “despite the apparently new beginning signaled by the prayer formula, 10:21–22 belongs with the preceding material.”7 Consequently, in the context of the mission speech

---

7 Kloppenborg, Formation, 197.
Q 10:2–16 ὑπάρχει designates the group’s proclamation, which apparently has fallen on deaf ears in certain towns (10:12–15). In other words, ὑπάρχει (10:21) stands for the divine truth which the movement has unsuccessfully attempted to share with the world and continues to possess in the mission’s aftermath. That truth in the present combination of 10:21 and 10:22 should probably be also understood as a measure of the πάντα, viz. the comprehensive fullness of divine truth entrusted to the Son.

As suggested by Robinson, the author’s intention in placing Q 10:21–22 following 10:2–16 thus signals an attempt to explain the mission’s failure in esoteric terms. What is truly remarkable is the manner in which that explanation is presented. In response to the movement’s rejection, in the closing statement of v. 22 the revelation of the Father—who, one presumes, was the subject of the mission’s proclamation and thus a part of ὑπάρχει—is rendered arbitrary and fully depending on the Son’s will. By positing the Son’s exclusive prerogative to reveal the Father the author suggests that the Son who discloses the Father to whom he chooses (βούλομαι in v. 22) has not yet wished to reveal God to anyone other than the movement itself. It is in this way that the movement’s failure is vindicated. What might have appeared as a failed endeavor is now presented as either premature or a part of a heretofore undisclosed bigger plan. As noted by Jacobson:

We have seen that Jesus’ thanksgiving followed immediately upon the mission charge (Q 10:2–16) in Q. This means that the change in mood is quite astonishing. We pass from the bitter denunciations in the mission complex to a joyful gratitude in Jesus’ thanksgiving. Whereas that portion of Israel which rejected the messengers has just been denounced and consigned to hell for their failure to respond, now it is said that God’s revelation was hidden from the “wise and understanding.” This sudden and total change of perspective can only be understood as a reinterpretation of the failure of the mission. Rather than anger and disappointment at the failure of the mission, we now have the view that God
in fact intended this failure, that the light was deliberately withheld from all but the little fellowship of “babes.”\(^8\)

Putting aside some of Jacobson’s unnecessary assumptions, such as reading “hell” into Q 10:12–15 or ascribing an attitude of “joyful” gratitude to Q 10:21–22, his last two statements highlight the literary-critical problem with 10:21–22 in its present context.

The author’s retrospective *rewriting of the movement’s recent history* by interpreting those events as God’s will creates a clear aporia between the Q\(^2\) material 10:12–15 and the mission’s reevaluation in 10:21–22.

Q 10:21–22 as a Composite Unit (Revisited)

In the previous chapter we noted that beginning with Rudolph Bultmann and as recently as in John Kloppenburg’s research Q 10:21–22 was considered to be composite, an assessment which is retained in this study. While Q 10:21–22 is clearly intended to function as a couplet in the present text of Q, several aspects indicate the sayings’ originally independent origin:

(10:21) At that time he said: I thank you, Father, Lord of heaven and earth, for you hid these things from sages and the intelligent, and disclosed them to children. Yes, Father, for that is what it has pleased you to do.

(10:22) Everything has been entrusted to me by the 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.

The most notable aporia is the contradiction between the concealment of “these things” executed by the Father in 10:21 and the concealment of the Father executed by

---

the Son in 10:22. Since one presumes that “these things” (10:21) include knowing God, in 10:22 the authority to disclose God has been relegated to the Son in a manner that 10:21 does not prepare the reader for. While the resulting theological construction seems clear enough—the Father withholds the knowledge of himself through the Son—that construction functions only because of 10:22 commenting on 10:21 in its present position, most specifically in 10:22a (“everything has been entrusted to me by the Father). It therefore seems very likely that 10:22 is either entirely a redactional creation or an individual saying affixed to 10:21.

In our view, it is indeed possible that some form of 10:22 had an independent existence before Q, but it most likely did not include 10:22a which now serves to create a setting in which 10:22b–d can function as a commentary on all of 10:21 (that is: the Son has the authority to reveal or conceal the Father—and has concealed the Father from σοφοὶ καὶ συνετοὶ—because the Father has entrusted authority over all things to him).

Because both 10:21 and 10:22 speak to the same theological outlook—in which the Q movement alone is uniquely privileged—in what follows we will treat Q 10:21–22 as a couplet. In our view, the joining of 10:21 and 10:22 happened at the same redactional stage in the document’s compositional history.

An Argument against the Coordination of Q 10:21–22 and Q 10:23–24 in the Same Redactional Stratum

Finally, we must attend to the coupling of Q 10:21–22 and 10:23–24 in the reconstructed text of Q.
Q 10:23–24

(10:23) μακάριοι οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ οἱ βλέποντες ἃ βλέπετε
Blessed are the eyes that see what you see,

(10:24) ὅτι πολλοί προφῆται καὶ βασιλεῖς ἤθελήσαν ἰδεῖν ἃ ύμεῖς βλέπετε καὶ οὐκ εἶδαν, καὶ ἀκοῦσαν ἃ ἀκούσετε καὶ οὐκ ἠκούσαν.
for I tell you: Many prophets and kings wanted to see what you see, but never saw it, and to hear what you hear, but never heard it.⁹

In the previous chapter we noted that John Kloppenborg had located both couplets in the Q² stratum, suggesting that “the basis for the juxtaposition of the two resides in the similarities in the subject matter and in structure.”¹⁰ The subject matter of Q 10:23–24, however, has nothing to do with God’s concealment of himself from the group’s opposition. In fact, in 10:23–24 there is no opposition whatsoever, because βασιλεῖς (who could be conceived as opposition) are mentioned in the same sentence with προφῆται, clearly a positive reference (cf. 6:22–23; 7:26–27; 11:47–49). Furthermore, the kings and the prophets are described as longing to hear what the reader now knows whereas, as we shall see, the wise and the learned (σοφοί καὶ συνετοί) in 10:21 designate those who had rejected the missionaries (10:12–15). It is more likely, then, that 10:23–24 was an earlier text already present in Q at the time when 10:21–22 was inserted into the document.


We now turn to the couplet’s unique or unusual terminology, examining the individual terms and the context in which these terms appear elsewhere in Q.


¹⁰ Kloppenborg, Formation, 197.
“...for you...disclosed them to children”:

The Use of ἀποκαλύπτω in Q 12:2; Q 17:30; and Q 10:21–22

*The Use of ἀποκαλύπτω in Q 12:2 (Q¹)*

In addition to Q 10:21–22, the verb ἀποκαλύπτω appears in 12:2 and 17:30. Q 12:2 is a prophetic saying in the Q¹ stratum, now contextualized as a part of the Q¹ cluster Q 12:2–7:

Q 12:2–7

(12:2) Οὐδὲν δὲ συγκεκαλυμμένον ἐστὶν ὃ ὑπὲρ ἀποκαλυφθῆσεται καὶ κρυπτὸν ὃ ὑπὲρ γνωσθῆσεται.

Nothing is covered up that will not be exposed, and hidden that will not be known.

(12:3) What I say to you in the dark, speak in the light; and what you hear “whispered” in the ear, proclaim on the housetops.

(12:4) And do not be afraid of those who kill the body, but cannot kill the soul.

(12:5) But fear the one who is able to destroy both the soul and body in Gehenna.

(12:6) Are not five sparrows sold for two cents? And yet not one of them will fall to earth without your Father’s consent.

(12:7) But even the hairs of your head all are numbered. Do not be afraid, you are worth more than many sparrows.¹¹

Kloppenborg’s analysis shows that Q 12:2 and 12:3 have been first joined together and then attached to the cluster as an introduction to and interpretation of vv. 4–7.¹² In this sayings cluster, Q 12:2 provides impetus to the disciples’ mission. The function of ἀποκαλύπτω is to introduce the motif of hidden truths becoming exposed. The
term ἀποκαλύπτω—here featured in a saying of Jesus—therefore participates in the task of legitimizing the movement’s outreach, an endeavor which at the time of the formative stratum’s composition was still a future event. The context of ἀποκαλύπτω in Q\textsuperscript{1} therefore is not esoterical.

**The Use of ἀποκαλύπτω in Q 17:30 (Q\textsuperscript{2})**

The next instance of ἀποκαλύπτω is in the Q\textsuperscript{2} stratum. It occurs in the discourse on the final days, the so-called Logia Apocalypse:

Q 17:26–27, 30

(17:26) As it took place in the days of Noah, so will it be in the day of the Son of Man.

(17:27) For as in those days they were eating and drinking, marrying and giving in marriage, until the day Noah entered the ark and the flood came and took them all…

(17:30) οὗτος ἔσται ἡ ἡμέρα ὁ νῦς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἀποκαλύπτεται.

…so will it also be on the day the Son of Man is revealed.\textsuperscript{13}

In keeping with the overall demeanor of the Q\textsuperscript{2} stratum in the aftermath of the mission’s failure, the verb ἀποκαλύπτω is featured here in a polemical context. The objective of Q 17:30 is to announce the Son of Man’s eschatological coming and threaten the movement’s detractors with judgment, a theme encountered throughout the Q\textsuperscript{2} stratum (Q 10:12, 14; 11:31–32, 49–51; 12:8–9). Once again, the context of ἀποκαλύπτω in this instance is not esoterical.

**The Use of ἀποκαλύπτω in Q 10:21–22**

(10:21) εἶπεν· ἔξομολογοῦμαι σοι, πάτερ, κύριε τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ τῆς γῆς, ὅτι ἐκρυψας ταῦτα ἀπὸ σοφῶν καὶ συνετῶν καὶ ἀπεκάλυψας αὐτὰ νηπίοις.

At that time he said: I thank you, Father, Lord of heaven and earth, for you hid these things from sages and the intelligent, and disclosed them to children. Yes, Father, for that is what it has pleased you to do.

(10:22) Πάντα μοι παρεδόθη ύπο τοῦ πατρός μου, καὶ οὐδεὶς γινώσκει τὸν υἱὸν εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ, οὐδὲ τὸν πατέρα τις ἐπιγινώσκει εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱὸς καὶ ὁ ἐὰν βούληται ὁ υἱὸς ἀποκαλύψαι.

Everything has been entrusted to me by the 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.14

The context of these revelatory acts mirrors neither of the previously discussed instances. Whereas in Q 12:2 the object of revelation was the forthcoming missionary proclamation and in 17:30 the Son of Man’s eschatological manifestation—both outward directed revelatory acts—in 10:21–22 the direction has been reversed. No longer directed to the outsiders, revelation is now limited to the movement alone. The object of revelation, furthermore, is the knowledge of God, which the movement has been exclusively entrusted with by the Son (10:22). As correctly noted by Robinson, this results in an esoteric framework and a use of ἀποκαλύπτω unique to the rest of Q.

The Use of κρύπτω in Q 12:2 and Q 10:21

The use of the verb κρύπτω in Q 10:21 is directly related to that of ἀποκαλύπτω, since the referent of revealing and concealing in the verse is the same: ταῦτα. The verb κρύπτω only appears once more in the remainder of Q, in the Q2 Parable of the Ten Talents, when a slave explains to the returning master why he hid his talent in the ground:

---

14 Ibid., 190–3.
Q 19:20–21

(19:20) And the other came saying: Master, I knew you, that you are a hard person…

(19:21) οὐκ ἔσπειρας καὶ συνάγων δόθεν οὐ διεσκόρπισας, καὶ φοβηθεῖς ἀπελθὼν ἐκρυψα τὴν μινᾶν ἐν τῇ γῇ· ἵδε ἔχεις τὸ σὸν

…reaping where you did not sow and gathering up from where you did not winnow; and, scared, I went and hid your mina in the ground. Here, you have what belongs to you. 15

We can see that the context here is non-esoteric. The related noun, however, is featured in Q 12:2, the Q1 saying in which the noun κρυπτός (“that which is hidden”) is used alongside the verb ἀποκαλύπτω. Q 12:2 marks the only instance in the document other than Q 10:21 where disclosure and concealment of knowledge are mentioned in the same sentence:

Q 12:2–3

(12:2) Οὐδὲν δὲ συγκεκαλυμμένον ἔστιν δὲ οὐκ ἀποκαλυφθήσεται καὶ κρυπτόν δὲ οὐ γνωσθήσεται.

Nothing is covered up that will not be exposed, and hidden that will not be known.

(12:3) What I say to you in the dark, speak in the light; and what you hear “whispered” in the ear, proclaim on the housetops. 16

Paired with ἀποκαλύπτω, the noun κρυπτός here designates revelation directed to the outside world. Fittingly, Kloppenborg notes the sense of inevitability in the mission’s description:

The mission of the Q disciples [in Q 12:2–7] is viewed not as a human undertaking but as an expression of God’s deliberate and inevitable revelation of what is hidden. . . . Moreover, Q 12:2 assumes a programmatic function with

15 Ibid., 544–5.

16 Ibid., 290–303.
respect to what follows: it asserts in proverbial form the “divine necessity” of the disciples’ preaching. The mission is controlled in every respect by divine providence, in its very inception and throughout its prosecution. A comparison with Q 10:21–22 in which ἀποκαλόπτω and κρύπτω are paired up again produces a very stark contrast. In the couplet’s retrospective reevaluation of the mission divine providence still controls the mission, but God’s objective no longer is to deliver the message to the outsiders. Rather, God’s revelation is now argued to have been arbitrarily withheld from the outsiders, viz. from the group called σοφοὶ καὶ σονετοὶ. The necessity of the disciples’ preaching is overridden and effectively cancelled in Q 10:21–22 by the authority of the Son’s exclusive revelation.

A comparison of Q 12:2–3 and 10:21–22 therefore highlights a strong reevaluation of God’s plan and the movement’s role in it. The primitive kerygma of Q has been by the time of 10:21–22 replaced by a sophisticated apocalyptic worldview and a new degree of esoteric self-awareness.

“…for that is what it has pleased you to do”: The Use of εὐδοκία in Q 10:21 and βούλομαι in Q 10:21–22

The inconsistency between the outlook of Q 10:21–22 and the preceding mission speech cluster Q 10:2–16 is further highlighted by the use of the terms εὐδοκία in Q 10:21 and βούλομαι in 10:22. To fully understand the significance of those two terms, we need to first review the entire reconstructed mission speech cluster Q 10:2–22.

(10:2) λέγετε τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτῶν· ὁ μὲν θερισμός πολύς, οἱ δὲ ἐργάται ολίγοι· δεῦτε ὕπαγε· ἵνα ἀποστέλλω ὑμᾶς ὡς πρόβατα ἐν μέσῳ λύκων.

(10:3) ιδοὺ ἀποστέλλω ὑμᾶς ὡς πρόβατα ἐν μέσῳ λύκων.

17 Kloppenborg, Formation, 210–11 (my parentheses).
(10:4) μη βαστάζετε βαλλάντιον, μη πήραν, μη ύποδήματα, και μηδένα κατά την οδόν ἀσπάσηθε.

(10:5) εἰς ἥν δ’ ἂν εἰσέλθητε οἰκίαν, πρῶτον λέγετε: εἰρήνη τῷ οίκῳ τούτῳ.

(10:6) καί ἐάν ἐκεῖ ἢ υἱὸς εἰρήνης, ἐλθάτω ἢ εἰρήνη υμῶν ἐπ’ αὐτόν· εἰ δὲ μή ἢ εἰρήνη υμῶν, ἑφ’ ύμᾶς ἐπιστραφήτω.

(10:7) ἐν αὐτῇ δ’ ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ μένετε ἑσθίοντες καὶ πίνοντες τὰ παρ’ αὐτῶν· ἁξίος γάρ ὁ ἐργάτης τοῦ μισθοῦ αὐτοῦ. μή μεταβαίνετε ἐξ οἰκίας εἰς οἰκίαν.

(10:8) καί εἰς ἥν ἂν πόλιν εἰσέρχησθε καὶ δέχονται ύμᾶς, ἐσθίετε τὰ παρατιθέμενα υμῖν.

(10:9) καὶ ἔρωτατε τοὺς ἐν αὐτῇ ἁσθενείς καὶ λέγετε αὐτοῖς· ἡγγικεν ἑφ’ ύμᾶς ἢ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ.

(10:10) εἰς ἥν δ’ ἂν πόλιν εἰσέλθητε καὶ μή δέχονται ύμᾶς, ἑξερχόμενοι ἔξω τῆς πόλεως ἑκείνης.

(10:11) ἐκτινάξατε τὸν κονιορτὸν τὸν ποδόν υμῶν.

As noted before, the woes Q 10:12–15 have been interpolated into the mission speech during the Q^2 redaction and form a response to what was surely the opposition of certain towns to the people we might call the Jesus followers:

(10:12) λέγω υμῖν ὅτι Σωδόμοις ἄνεκτότερον ἔσται ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἑκείνη ἢ τῇ πόλει ἑκείνη.

(10:13) Οὐάι σοι, Χοραζίν, οὐάι σοι, Βηθσαϊδά· ὅτι εἰ ἐν Τύρῳ καὶ Σινών ἐγενήθησαν αἱ δυνάμεις αἱ γενόμεναι ἐν υμῖν, πάλαι ἂν ἐν σάκκῳ καὶ σποδῷ μετενόησαν.

(10:14) πλὴν Τύρῳ καὶ Σινών ἄνεκτότερον ἔσται ἐν τῇ κρίσει ἢ υμῖν.

(10:15) καὶ σύ, Καφαρναοῦμ, μή ἔως οὐρανοῦ ψυχήσῃ; ἐως τοῦ άδου καταβήσῃ.

Prior to the woes’ interpolation during the Q^2 redaction, the verse that now follows (Q 10:16) concluded the original Q^1 mission speech with a reassurance to those
going out to spread the word that the response these messengers would receive was a response or rejection of Jesus himself. In this way the missionaries were empowered by the author of $Q^1$ as representatives of Jesus himself:

(10:16) Ὅ δεχόμενος ύμᾶς ἐμὲ δέχεται· καὶ ὁ ἐμὲ δεχόμενος δέχεται τὸν ἀποστείλαντά με.

Because of its subject matter, i.e., responding to the possibility of rejection, $Q 10:16$ made for an equally good postscript to the $Q^2$ woes as it originally did in the $Q^1$ instruction. The shift in perspective from $Q^1$—which anticipated the mission and the possibility of its rejection—to $Q^2$ whose author reacted to the mission’s failure in specific towns grounded $10:16$ in actual historical events, rendering it prophetic. Along with the woes in $Q 10:12–15$ this older saying was therefore employed by the author of $Q^2$ to comment on the mission’s failure which was understood to indeed have constituted a rejection of Jesus and God. For this reason the woes in $Q 10:12–15$ are interpolated into the mission speech between $Q 10:11$ and $10:16$, instead of being attached to the mission speech after $10:16$.

Meanwhile, in the now following $Q 10:21–22$ the mission’s failure suddenly receives a new, additional explanation. Notice the use of the terms εὐδοκία ($10:21$) and βούλομαι ($10:22$):

(10:21) εἶπεν· ἔξωμολογοῦμαι σοι, πάτερ, κύριε τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ τῆς γῆς, ὅτι ἐκρυψας ταῦτα ἀπὸ σοφῶν καὶ συνητῶν καὶ ἀπεκάλυψας αὐτὰ νησίοις· ναὶ ὁ πατήρ, ὁτι οὕτως εὐδοκία ἐγένετο ἐμπροσθέν σου.

(10:22) Πάντα μοι παρεδόθη ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς μου, καὶ οὐδεὶς γινώσκει τὸν υἱὸν εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ, οὐδὲ τὸν πατέρα τις ἐπιγινώσκει εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱὸς καὶ ὁ ἐὰν βούληται ὁ υἱὸς ἀποκαλύψαι.  

We have already seen that by virtue of its redactional placement Q 10:21–22
serves as a commentary on the rejection suffered by the movement (Q 10:2–15). Because
the couplet follows directly after Q 10:16, however, it also seems to comment on the
rejection of Jesus and ultimately of God himself, equated in 10:16 with the missionaries’
rejection. It is here that an important aporia is encountered, because Q 10:21–22 seems to
be reflecting back on the rejection of God and Jesus—the mission’s failure—as a product
of divine providence. To make matters even more confusing, that rejection is attributed in
10:22 to the Son’s presumed decision to withhold revelation from σοφοὶ καὶ συνετοί, viz.
the movement’s detractors and quite possible specific individuals in the towns listed in
10:12–15. In other words, the rejection of God and Jesus in those towns happened
because Jesus, the Son, had wished so!

The redactional placement of Q 10:21–22 immediately after 10:16 thus raises a
number of logical questions. If to reject the messengers means to reject God (Q 10:16),
then did God by concealing “these things” (ταῦτα) from the sages (Q 10:21) doom the
mission to a failed outcome before it took place? Likewise, if to the reject the messengers
means to reject Jesus who commissioned them (Q 10:3, 16), then did the Son by
arbitrarily disclosing the Father only to the movement (Q 10:22) destine the missionaries’
proclamation to fall on deaf ears? And if so, then did the Son commission the
missionaries (Q 10:3–11, 16) knowing that their proclamation would not find a
responsive audience (Q 10:21), because he himself would not enable the audience to
respond (Q 10:22)? The placement of Q 10:21–22 in the context of the mission speech
10:2–16 strongly suggests an affirmative answer to all of these questions.
Of course, this explanation would make no sense in the Q$^1$ stratum. It makes equally little sense in Q$^2$, for what is the purpose of polemics and judgment threats if not an anticipation of the other party’s repentance? According to Q 10:21–22, however, it was God’s own choice to withhold revelation from those most expected to take it in, and this choice is being enacted through Jesus, who is the Son and sole mediator of God. The terms εὐδοκία ("will, choice") and βούλομαι ("to wish, choose") which occur only here in Q serve to introduce that new notion into the mission speech cluster. By pointing to the divine mystery of the presently unfolding events, the author is able to explain the resistance by those socially recognized as σοφοὶ καὶ συνετοὶ. They have been, at least for the time being, deliberately excluded, while the “babes” least suspected of being given God’s revelation, are gifted with it instead.$^{19}$

“…for you hid these things from sages and the intelligent”: The Use of σοφοὶ καὶ συνετοὶ in Q 10:21

The Use of σοφοὶ καὶ συνετοὶ in Q 10:21

In Q 10:21, we see that the coupling of “σοφοὶ” with “συνετοὶ” is used in a context that suggests that wisdom belongs to the world of human learning, of accomplishments that ordinarily win the admiration of others and result in these people being regarded as the ones most surely representing God’s truth. The saying attributed to Jesus draws on that coupling to make a contrast which indicates God’s own wisdom in choosing those who are simple, and childlike (νηπιώτι).  

$^{19}$ Jacobson, First Gospel, 149.
The mission speech context of Q 10:21–22 indicates that the author used the term νηπίοι to describe the movement (whose mission had suffered rejection at the hands of the collective entity designated as σοφοὶ καὶ συνετοὶ). As we have noted, the mission’s failure is here attributed to God’s will to conceal the truth about himself (Q 10:21) from σοφοὶ καὶ συνετοὶ, an action executed by the Son who is the sole mediator of God (10:22). This raises the question whether the term σοφοὶ καὶ συνετοὶ might have a specific background. It is noteworthy that the only other occurrence of σοφοὶ is in Q 11:49 where the term is coupled with προφήται and used in a positive sense:

Q 11:49

διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ἡ σοφία ἔπειν· ἀποστελῶ πρός αὐτοὺς προφήτας καὶ σοφοὺς, καὶ ἐξ αὐτῶν ἀποκτενοῦσιν καὶ διάξοισιν

Therefore also … Wisdom said: I will send them prophets and sages, and some of them they will kill and persecute.20

In this combination the kind of wisdom indicated suggests a possession of God’s truth, such as one supposes for the prophets. Indeed, the context in which this saying occurs supports just such a meaning. Q 11:49 belongs to the larger Q2 speech 11:39b-52, in which the Pharisees and later the scribes (11:52) are castigated for their hypocrisy, building tombs for the prophets their ancestors killed (11:47). The context for σοφοὶ is linked to that of martyrs for God.

Meanwhile, the context for σοφοὶ in Q 10:21 a kind of worldly acclaimed experience and lauded wisdom, which proves in the end to be unimpressive to God. Indeed, it is precisely the sort of worldly wisdom that the Q2 speech 11:39b-52 attributes

to Pharisees. It seems that the contexts of σοφοί in Q 10:21 and in Q 11:49 could not be more different.

To further probe the unexpectedly negative appraisal of the sages in Q 10:21 we will now examine the use of the coupling of “σοφοί” with “συνετοί” in the Septuagint.

**The Use of σοφος and συνετος in the Septuagint**

In Hebrew Bible, wisdom and intelligence are qualities that have uniformly positive overtones. In the Septuagint, wise (σοφοί) and intelligent or discerning (συνετοί) individuals are those who follow God’s commandments. When these terms or their derivatives occur as a coupling, the referents include those in position of leadership (LXX Deut 1:13; 1 Sam 16:18; 1 Kgs 3:9, 12; 1 Chr 22:12; 2 Chr 1:10–12; 2:11; Jer 4:22; Dan 1:4), wise men (LXX Prov 16:21; Hos 14:10), and even skilful artisans (LXX Ex 31:2–3; Isa 3:3).21 There does not, however, seem to be a singular context for this specific coupling in the LXX.

Of interest in light of Q 10:21–22 is LXX Jer 4:22 where the author laments the demise and loss of the special kind of wisdom once associated with Israel’s rulers:

LXX Jer 4:22

διότι οἱ ἡγούμενοι τοῦ λαοῦ μου ἐμὲ οὐκ ἠδείσαν νῦν ἁφρονεῖς εἰσιν καὶ οὐ συνετοί σοφοί εἰσιν τοῦ κακοποιήσας τὸ δὲ καλὸς ποιήσαι οὐκ ἐπέγνωσαν 22

For the rulers of my people have not known me, they are sons of foolishness and not at all intelligent: they are wise to do evil, but how to do good they have not known.23

---

21 One of the nuances of the term συνετός in the LXX is to convey a high degree of professional skill (e.g., LXX Ex 31:2–3 which suggests skillful craftsmanship).


23 My translation.
Here, in the Septuagint of Jeremiah’s judgment speech the rulers of Judah are accused of exemplifying the opposite of true wisdom which, as we have seen, was a quality traditionally associated with those in position of leadership. This text, however, still does not constitute a critique of the wise—it merely laments the loss of wisdom. The only text in the LXX that approaches the peculiar nuance of Q 10:21 is Isa 29:14.

*LXX Isa 29:14: The Punishment of Ariel*

LXX Isa 29:1–8 is a judgment pronouncement directed against the “town where David encamped,” cryptically designated as Ariel. The referent clearly is Jerusalem as the mention of David in v. 1 and v. 3, festivals in v. 1, and the substitution of Ariel with Jerusalem in v. 7 and Zion in v. 8 suggest. The section following LXX Isa 29:1–8 contains three short paragraphs addressing the nation’s blindness. The final paragraph (29:13–14) contains a judgment pronouncement which bears several similarities to Q 10:21:

*LXX Isa 29:13–14*

(29:13) καὶ ἔπειν κύριος ἐγγίζει μοι ὁ λαός οὗτος τοῖς χείλεσιν αὐτῶν τιμῶσιν με ἢ δὲ καρδία αὐτῶν πόρρω ἀπέχει ἀπ’ ἐμοῦ μάτην δὲ σέβονται με διδάσκοντες ἐντάλματα ἀνθρώπων καὶ διδασκαλίας

And the Lord has said: “This people approach me with their mouths and honor me with their lips but their heart is far from me, and in vain do they worship me, teaching the commandments and doctrines of men…

(29:14) διὰ τούτο ἱδοὺ ἐγὼ προσθήσω τοῦ μεταθέναι τὸν λαὸν τούτον καὶ μεταθῆσον αὐτοὺς καὶ ἀπολῶ τὴν σοφίαν τῶν σοφῶν καὶ τὴν σύνεσιν τῶν σωτετῶν κρύσων 24

---

Therefore behold I will proceed to remove this people, and I will remove them: and I will destroy the wisdom of the wise, and will hide the understanding of the intelligent.  

Q 10:21

eἰπὲν· ἔξομολογομαί σοι, πάτερ, κύριε τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ τῆς γῆς, ὅτι ἐκρυψας ταῦτα ἀπὸ σοφῶν καὶ συνετῶν καὶ ἀπεκάλυψας αὐτά νηπίοις· ναὶ ὁ πατήρ, ὅτι οὕτως εὐδοκία ἐγένετο ἐμπροσθέν σου.

At that time he said: I thank you, Father, Lord of heaven and earth, for you hid these things from sages and the intelligent, and disclosed them to children. Yes, Father, for that is what it has pleased you to do.

In both LXX Isa 29:14 and Q 10:21 σοφοὶ and συνετοὶ are used as plural nouns, and a statement is made concerning the things God chooses to hide from these individuals. LXX Isa 29:14 and Q 10:21 thus have three terms in common: σοφοὶ, συνετοὶ, and κρύπτω. In both texts God is the person hiding knowledge from those most expected to have it: σοφοὶ and συνετοὶ. The Isianic text therefore sets a biblical precedent for the use of the titles σοφοὶ and συνετοὶ in the context of God punishing the wise by concealing their wisdom.

The Use of ὁ πατήρ in Q 10:21–22

Introduction

The anomalous nuance of the title ὁ πατήρ in Q 10:21–22 becomes apparent when compared to elsewhere in Q. This title occurs thirteen times in the document. Outside of Q 10:21–22 there are eight additional instances: Q 3:8; 9:59; 11:2, 13, 47; 12:30, 53; 14:26. These eight instances can be divided into two categories: the term ὁ πατήρ is either (1) used of a human being who is a father, or (2) it is used of God as a

25 My translation.
metaphorical father figure. We will begin with an overview of these two categories, and then compare them to the unique nuance of ὁ πατήρ in Q 10:21–22.

**The Use of πατήρ in Q 3:8; 9:59; 11:47; 12:53; 14:26**

These five instances of πατήρ are encountered across both Q¹ and Q². Q 9:59 and 14:26 belong to Q¹, while Q 3:8, 11:47, and 12:53 occur in three different Q² judgment speeches (Q 3:7–9, 16–17, Q 11:39b-52, and Q 12:49–53 respectively). In all of these instances the term is used in a literal sense to describe either a biological father (Q 9:59; 12:53; 14:26) or ancestor (Q 3:8; 11:47), never with a definite article. The term’s usage in these five texts therefore has no christological dimension.

**The Use of ὁ πατήρ in Q 11:2, 13; 12:30**

In three further instances the term πατήρ is applied to God. Q 11:2 and 11:13 belong to the Lord’s Prayer (Q 11:2–4) and the immediately following discourse on prayer (11:9–13) respectively. Q 12:30 is featured in the discourse about anxiety (12:22–32). In each of these three instances a relationship between God and the faithful is described using the analogy of God as a father. Two of the texts place the readers in such a relationship by means of a literary device: the Lord’s Prayer is cast in a 1st person plural, and in Q 12:30 God is referred to as πατήρ ὑμῶν, “your father.” Meanwhile, in Q 11:13 the title is used with the definite article and an additional qualification “from heaven,” ὁ πατήρ ἐξ οὐρανοῦ. There is no esoteric undercurrent here, however, as the context of 11:13 is informed by “the common motif of God’s provision of material needs.”

---

26 Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 205. See also Kloppenborg, *Excavating Q*, 125.
Once again, then, it seems that no christological implications should be drawn from Q 11:2, 13 and 12:30. The author of Q\(^1\) describes God as (ὁ) πατήρ in order to illustrate God’s benevolence in terms most readily intelligible to a regular reader, and to emphasize that God cares for them in a fatherly fashion. Neither is Jesus a part of the context—Kloppenborg rightly notes that these sayings “do not attempt an argument in defense of Jesus as a reliable teacher”\(^27\)—the focus is exclusively on the relationship between God and his followers. Finally, all three of these instances belong to Q\(^1\) and therefore predate 10:21–22 in Q’s compositional history.

**The Use of (ὁ) πατήρ in Q 10:21–22**

We now turn to the use of (ὁ) πατήρ in Q 10:21–22, where five of the term’s thirteen instances occur:

(10:21) εἶπεν· ἐξομολογοῦμαι σοι, πάτερ, κύριε τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ τῆς γῆς, ὅτι ἔκρυψας ταῦτα ἀπὸ σοφῶν καὶ συνετῶν καὶ ἀπεκάλυψας αὐτὰ νηπίοις· ναὶ ὁ πατήρ, ὅτι οὗτος εὐδοκία ἐγένετο ἐμπροσθόν σου. At that time he said: I thank you, Father, Lord of heaven and earth, for you hid these things from sages and the intelligent, and disclosed them to children. Yes, Father, for that is what it has pleased you to do.

(10:22) Πάντα μοι παρεδόθη ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρός μου, καὶ οὐδεὶς γινώσκει τὸν υἱὸν εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ, οὐδὲ τὸν πατέρα τις ἐπιγινώσκει εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱὸς καὶ ὁ ἐὰν βούληται ὁ υἱὸς ἀποκαλύψαι. Everything has been entrusted to me by the 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.\(^28\)

In this couplet God is described as in an exclusive and unique relationship with Jesus his Son; a nuance not found in any of the term’s other eight instances in Q. Our

\(^{27}\) Kloppenborg, *Excavating Q*, 129.

overview of term’s use has shown that (ὁ) πατήρ, when used of God elsewhere in Q, only places him in a relationship with the collective entity of those who considered themselves God’s children, presumably the Q movement. Meanwhile, in Q 10:21–22 God is not only in a unique for Q relationship with just one individual (Jesus), but that relationship is also rendered very intimate because Jesus is “the Son,” using the definite article. This has a reciprocal effect, as noted by Jacobson:

The new status of Jesus is clearly reflected in the “father/son” terminology, which is not found elsewhere in Q. Further, the identity of the son is now said to be hidden: no one knows who the son is except the father.29

The use of ὁ πατήρ in Q 10:21–22 therefore is unique for Q. The identity of “the Son” and the precise degree to which it is or is not unique to Q will form the subject of chapter five of this dissertation.

An Argument against the Coordination of Q 10:21–22 and Q 10:23–24 in the Same Redactional Stratum (Continued)

Revisiting the origin of Q 10:23–24 in the document and its relationship to 10:21–22, it is now possible to revisit the hypothesis of the beatitude’s Q² origin. In light of our analysis of 10:21–22 and its role in the mission speech section it seems possible to conclude that the beatitude 10:23–24 is earlier than the post-Q² redactional text 10:21–22, reflecting neither its unique esoteric theology, nor its peculiar language, nor its role as a comment on 10:2–16 and on the mission’s failure. Q 10:23–24 must therefore either be coordinated with 10:12–15 at the Q² stage or relocated to the Q¹ stratum as the continuation of 10:2–

29 Jacobson, First Gospel, 149.
11, 16. The former option —10:23—24 as a Q² text—results in the following reconstruction:

Q¹

(10:2) λέγε τοις μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ· ὁ μὲν θερισμὸς πολὺς, οἱ δὲ ἐργάται ολίγοι· δεῖ δῆσθε οὖν τοῦ κυρίου τοῦ θερισμοῦ ὅπως ἐκβάλῃ ἐργάτας εἰς τὸν θερισμὸν αὐτοῦ.

(10:3) ὑπάγετε· ἵδον ἀποστέλλω ὑμᾶς ὡς πρόβατα ἐν μέσῳ λύκων.

(10:4) μὴ βαστάξετε βαλλάντιον, μὴ πήραν, μὴ ὑποδήματα, καὶ μηδένα κατὰ τὴν ὄδον ἀσπάσησθε.

(10:5) εἰς ἢν δὲ ἢν εἰσέλθητε οἰκίαν, πρῶτον λέγετε· εἰρήνη τῷ οἴκῳ τούτῳ.

(10:6) καὶ εὰν ἐκεῖ ἢ υἱὸς εἰρήνης, ἐλθάτω ή εἰρήνη υμῶν ἐπ’ αὐτὸν· εἰ δὲ μὴ ἡ εἰρήνη υμῶν, ἔρ’ υμᾶς ἐπιστραφήτω.

(10:7) ἐν αὐτῇ δὲ τῇ οἰκία μένετε ἐσθίοντες καὶ πίνοντες τὰ παρ’ αὐτὸν· ἄξιος γὰρ ὁ ἐργάτης τοῦ μισθοῦ αὐτοῦ. μὴ μεταβάينετε εξ οἰκίας εἰς οἰκίαν.

(10:8) καὶ εἰς ἢν ἢν πόλιν εἰσέρχησθε καὶ δέχονται υμᾶς, ἐσθίετε τὰ παρατιθέμενα υμῖν.

(10:9) καὶ θεραπεύετε τοὺς ἐν αὐτῇ ἁσθενεῖς καὶ λέγετε αὐτοῖς· ἡγγικεν ἐφ’ υμᾶς ἢ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ.

(10:10) εἰς ἢν δὲ ἢν πόλιν εἰσέλθητε καὶ μὴ δέχονται υμᾶς, ἐξερχόμενοι ἔξω τῆς πόλεως ἐκείνης

(10:11) ἐκτίναξατε τὸν κοινωτὸν τῶν ποδῶν υμῶν.

Q²

(10:12) λέγω υμῖν ὅτι Σοδόμοις ἄνεκτότερον ἔσται ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ ἢ τῇ πόλει ἐκείνῃ.

(10:13) Οὐάι σοι, Χοραζίν, οὐάι σοι, Βηθσαϊδα· ὅτι εἰ ἐν Τύρῳ καὶ Σιδῶνι ἐγενήθησαν αἱ δυνάμεις αἱ γενόμεναι ἐν υμῖν, πάλαι ἂν ἐν σάκκῳ καὶ σποδῶ μετενόησαν.

(10:14) πλὴν Τύρῳ καὶ Σιδῶνι ἄνεκτότερον ἔσται ἐν τῇ κρίσει ἢ υμῖν.
καὶ σὺ, Καφαρναούμ, μή ἔως οὐρανοῦ ὑψωθήσῃ; ἐως τοῦ ἀδονισμικαταβήσῃ.

Q¹

(10:16) Ὅ δεχόμενος ὑμᾶς ἐμὲ δέχεται· καὶ ὁ ἐμὲ δεχόμενος δέχεται τὸν ἀποστείλαντά με.

Q²

(10:23) μακάριοι οἱ όφθαλμοι οἱ βλέποντες ἄναλποι ἄνατεν

(10:24) ὃς πολλοὶ προφήται καὶ βασιλεῖς ήθέλησαν ίδεῖν ἃ ὑμεῖς βλέπετε καὶ οὐκ εἶδαν, καὶ ἀκούσαι ἄν ακούετε καὶ οὐκ ἠκούσαν.

We can see that if Q 10:23–24 was a Q² insertion along with 10:12–15 then the Q² editor had allowed the earlier Q¹ text 10:16 to separate 10:12–15 from 10:23–24. While that is possible, the purpose of 10:23–24 after 10:16—if 10:23–24 comes from the same editor as 10:12–15—is unclear. Surely the reader is not supposed to be marveling at the group’s rejection? Nor is it easy to imagine that the group’s failures in Chorazin, Bethsaida and Capernaum constitute that which the prophets and kings had longed to see.

If, however, 10:23–23 is located in the Q¹ stratum, the following sequence emerges:

(10:2) λέγει τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ· ὁ μὲν θερισμὸς πολὺς, οἱ δὲ ἔργαται ολίγοι· διήθητε οὖν τοῦ κυρίου τοῦ θερισμοῦ ὃπως ἐκβάλῃ ἔργατας εἰς τὸν θερισμὸν αὐτοῦ.

(10:3) ὑπάγετε· ίδοὺ ἀποστέλλω ὑμᾶς ως πρόβατα ἐν μέσῳ λύκων.

(10:4) μὴ βαστάζετε βαλλάντιον, μὴ πίραν, μὴ ύποδήματα, καὶ μηδένα κατὰ τὴν ὥδον ἀσπάσησθε.

(10:5) εἰς ἤν δὲ ἀν εἰσέλθητε ὑιίαν, πρῶτον λέγετε· εἰρήνη τῷ οἴκῳ τούτῳ.

(10:6) καὶ ἐὰν ἢ ἢ ἡ πρόνοια τῆς εἰρήνης, ἐλθάτω ἡ εἰρήνη ὑμῶν ἐπ’ αὐτῶν· εἰ δὲ μὴ ἡ εἰρήνη ὑμῶν, ἐφ’ ὑμᾶς ἐπιστραφήτω.
(10:7) ἐν αὐτῇ δὲ τῇ οἰκίᾳ μένετε ἐσθίοντες καὶ πίνοντες τὰ παρ΄ αὐτῶν· ἢξιος γὰρ ὁ ἐργάτης τοῦ μισθοῦ αὐτοῦ. μὴ μεταβάνετε ἐξ οἰκίας εἰς οἰκίαν.

(10:8) καὶ εἰς ἣν ἄν πόλιν εἰσέρχησθε καὶ δέχωνται ύμᾶς, ἐσθίετε τὰ παρατιθέμενα ύμῖν.

(10:9) καὶ θεραπεύετε τοὺς ἐν αὐτῇ ἁσθενεῖς καὶ λέγετε αὐτοῖς· ἠγγίκεν ἐφ´ ύμᾶς ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ.

(10:10) εἰς ἣν δ´ ἄν πόλιν εἰσέλθητε καὶ μὴ δέχωνται ύμᾶς, ἐξερχόμενοι ἐξω τῆς πόλεως ἑκείνης.

(10:11) ἐκτινάζατε τὸν κονιορτὸν τὸν ποδὸν ύμῶν.

(10:16) ὁ δεχόμενος ύμᾶς ἐμὲ δέχεται· καὶ ὁ ἐμὲ δεχόμενος δέχεται τὸν ἀποστείλαντά με.

(10:23) μακάριοι οἱ ὀφθαλμοί οἱ βλέποντες ἀ βλέπετε.

(10:24) ὅτι πολλοὶ προφήται καὶ βασιλεῖς ἠθέλησαν ἰδεῖν ἃ ύμεῖς βλέπετε καὶ οὐκ εἶδαν, καὶ ἀκούσαι ἃ ἀκούετε καὶ οὐκ ἤκουσαν.

This sequence appears more plausible. Located in Q¹, 10:23–24 no longer clashes with the overall perspective of the mission speech section. The things which the reader is supposed to be seeing—which the prophets and kings longed to see—are the miraculous signs of the kingdom’s presence, about to unfold as the Q group takes its message about God’s kingdom on the road. The Q¹ origin of the beatitude therefore makes the most sense.

**The Shifting Context of the “Mission Speech” Cluster: Summary and Conclusion**

Among the many elements that remained unchanged in John Kloppenborg’s research is the strict use of literary “controls,” i.e. compositional criteria that preclude one from arbitrarily assigning the individual sayings and clusters to a particular stratum based on their thematic content. Kloppenborg has consistently emphasized that it was only when
certain literary criteria were met indicating that a textual unit was foreign in its present context that a scholar should proceed to coordinate that unit with other equally independent units based on their thematic content:

Among literary criteria and procedures I include the following: (1) attention to the order of sayings, (2) the treatment of Q in reverse compositional order, that is, from its latest stage to its earliest, (3) attention to the “compositional effect” of the collocation of individual sayings and clusters of sayings, (4) attention to literary and theological aporiae caused by the juxtaposition of sayings and clusters of sayings and (5) consciousness of shifts in Sitz im Leben, addressees and rhetorical stance.\(^{30}\)

To conclude the literary-critical analysis of Q 10:21–22 we adopt Kloppenborg’s five literary criteria as outlined above, to examine whether based on the investigation conducted in this chapter Q 10:21–22 indeed meets those criteria.

Criterion 1: Attention to the Order of Sayings

It would seem that the redactional placement of Q 10:21–22 at the conclusion of the mission speech cluster 10:2–16 indicates the stratum author’s intention to comment on the preceding material. This is confirmed by the fact that the subject matter of Q 10:21–22 is the manner in which revelation takes place, rendering 10:21–22 a commentary on the missionaries’ rejection (10:12–15) and the rejection of God and Jesus (10:16).

Criterion 2: The Treatment of Q in Reverse Compositional Order, That Is, From Its Latest Stage to Its Earliest

When one considers the individual compositional stages in the final version of the mission speech cluster (Q 10:2–22), it appears that Q 10:21–22 constitutes the latest of the three identifiable stages or strata. In the Q\(^2\) stratum the formative mission speech

\(^{30}\) Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 57.
cluster (Q 10:2–11, 16) was supplemented by the woes directed against the towns that presumably had rejected the missionaries (10:12–15). The thanksgiving in Q 10:21–22, however, betrays the lateness of the author’s outlook with respect to even the Q^2 woes 10:12–15 by relativizing the mission’s failure which in 10:21–22 is ascribed to the mystery of divine providence.

Criterion 3: Attention to the “Compositional Effect” of the Collocation of Individual Sayings and Clusters of Sayings

(Combined with Criterion 5: Consciousness of Shifts in Sitz im Leben, Addressees and Rhetorical Stance)

The mission speech cluster as it currently stands, i.e. Q 10:2–22, serves the retrospective reassessment of the mission dictated by 10:21–22. In that reassessment, the mission’s failure (Q 10:12–15) is vindicated by ascribing its outcome to divine mystery. Informed by the full force of 10:21–22 the referent of ταῦτα is located in all of Q 10:2–16, i.e. the missionaries’ proclamation of the truths of God exclusively revealed to them. The secondary addition of Q 10:21–22 to the mission speech material 10:2–16 appears to have changed its previous meaning entirely. Whereas the Q^2 author (10:12–15) looked forward to the future day of judgment and vindication, the author of 10:21–22 views the group’s vindication as already brought about by the Son’s arbitrary revelation of the Father to them.
Criterion 4: Attention to Literary and Theological Aporiae Caused by the Juxtaposition of Sayings and Clusters of Sayings

The juxtaposition of Q 10:21–22 with the mission speech material 10:2–16 creates a number of contradictions. According to the logic of 10:21–22, by concealing “these things” (ταῦτα) from the sages (Q 10:21) God has doomed the mission to a failed outcome before it took place. This reading of Q 10:2–22 clashes with the angry reaction to the mission’s failure in 10:12–15. More difficult yet is the implication of Q 10:21–22 for 10:3, suggesting in the present context of the mission speech (10:12–15) that Jesus, when he commissioned the messengers, knew about the outcome (v. 21), enacted it on God’s behalf (vv. 21–22), and praised God for it (v. 21). The most obvious contradiction, however, is exhibited by the juxtaposition of Q 10:21–22 with the immediately preceding 10:16. According to Q 10:16 to reject the missionaries meant to reject Jesus and God who sent him. Since in 10:21–22 the reader learns that God and the Son are entirely responsible for the mission’s outcome, this resulting reading means that the Father and the Son caused not only the missionaries’ but also their own rejection!

Kloppenborg’s remaining criteria apply to the stage in the analysis subsequent to the literary-critical argument exhibiting the secondary origin of the unit under investigation:

Such analysis will permit (6) the reconstruction of compositional or redactional strata based on a controlled application of the principle of stratigraphic coherence, that is, that each stratum should be coherent in terms of its constituent forms, presumed Sitz im Leben and theological deportment. Ideally it should also have a discernible structure and genre.31

31 Ibid.
It is to that stage of the analysis that we now turn as we look to coordinate the thematic outlook of Q 10:21–22 with the rest of Q.
CHAPTER FOUR:
IN WHICH ENOCHIC JUDAISM AND ITS SIGNIFICANCE FOR Q STUDIES ARE INTRODUCED

Introduction

In the previous chapter of this dissertation we demonstrated that Q 10:21–22 is the latest addition to the mission speech cluster 10:2–16 and that its outlook appears to be secondary to the Q² redaction of the mission speech. To account for the presence and role of 10:21–22 in Q, the following chapters will engage certain mythological motifs encountered across Q in general. It will be shown that the redactional material in Q shares a number of features with a particular form of second temple Judaism contemporaneous with Q, viz. Enochic Judaism. In order to properly evaluate the parallels between Q and certain Enochic documents, in this chapter we will present the contours of Enochic Judaism as it is currently outlined by contemporary biblical scholarship.

The Enochic Myth and Documentary Corpus

The Myth of the Watchers as the Foundation of Enochic Judaism

At the core of Enochic Judaism lies the myth of the Watchers, angels who disrupted God’s created order by mingling with humankind and committing the sin of the mixing of blood. Since its conception this myth would undergo a series of developments resulting in a significant refocusing of the Enochic mythological tradition by 1 CE.
Genesis 6 as the Inspiration for the Enochic Myth of the Watchers

The inspiration for the idea of a forbidden mixing of angelic and human blood comes from Gen 6:1–4 which contains the following brief story about the antediluvian “sons of the gods:”

Gen 6:1–4

(1) And then, when humankind began to increase on the face of the earth and daughters were born to them,

(2) then the sons of the gods saw that the daughters of humankind were beautiful; and so they took wives for themselves from among them all, just as their fancy chose.

(3) And Yahweh said: “my spirit shall not remain forever in humankind, because indeed they are flesh. Its lifespan shall cover 120 years.”

(4) The giants were in the land in those days, and afterwards too, when the sons of the gods came to the daughters of humankind, and they bore children to them, these are the heroes, the men of renown, who were there of old.¹

Originating in one of the Pentateuchal sources, in its present context Gen 6:1–4 serves as an introduction to the narrative about Yahweh’s corrective intervention in history by means of the flood. The story about “the sons of the gods” receives no further development in the Pentateuch or elsewhere in the Old Testament. This lack of interest is probably to be attributed to the underlying myth’s polytheistic dimension sitting rather uneasily with the monotheistic framework of Second Temple Judaism. Nonetheless, Gen 6:1–4 would receive an unexpected second lease on life in the Enochic intellectual tradition.

The Date and Original Provenance of the Myth of the Watchers

The myth of the Watchers was a major interpretive expansion of Gen 6:1–4. In this interpretation of the Genesis story the heavenly antagonists ceased to be “the sons of the gods” and instead became a group of angelic rebels who in primordial times deliberately disrupted God’s created order by mating with humankind’s daughters (1 En 6:1–7:6). As a result of this forbidden union monstrous and violent giants were born, and they began to wreak havoc on God’s creation (1 En 15:6–10). Even though the physical bodies of the giants were slain by God’s angels (1 En 10:9, 12; 16:1), their souls by virtue of being immortal continued to linger in the inhabited world as demons, tormenting humankind until the eagerly anticipated final consummation (1 En 15:11–12).

George Nickelsburg locates the original setting of the Watchers myth and its underlying tradition in the early Hellenistic period:

[The emphasis on the violence that directly results from the birth of the giants and that triggers divine intervention] suggests a setting in the wars of the Diadochi (323–302 B.C.E.). A large cast of Macedonian chieftains corresponds to the giants. . . . Such a context may allow for a more specific definition of the myth’s message and function. The image of divine begetting is reminiscent of claims that some of the Diadochi had gods as their fathers. If this similarity is to the point, the myth [in its initial iteration] would be an answer to these claims in the form of a kind of parody. The author would be saying, “Yes, their fathers were divine; however, they were not gods, but demons—angels who rebelled against the authority of God.” If the author began with already proffered claims of divine parentage, the stories in Genesis 6 would provide a natural starting point for his response to these blasphemous claims.3

---

2 “There is broad consensus concerning the nature of the relationship between 1 Enoch 6–11 and Genesis 6–9: the Enochic text is, in some sense, an interpretation of Genesis.” George W. E. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch* 1 (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001), 166.

If Nickelsburg is correct, the origin of the Watchers myth may lie in an intermediate stage between Gen 6:1–4 and the myth’s later appropriation by Enochic Judaism. At the time of its inception the Watchers myth may therefore have been a non-Enochic reaction to the changing political climate in Judah and a nationalistic critique of the Hellenistic outsiders, rather than an esoteric polemic against certain forms of Judaism which is what the myth would become in the Enochic tradition.

The Book of Watchers:

The Earliest Documented Enochic Expression Of The Myth

The Book of Watchers (henceforth BW) is a literary work currently found in 1 Enoch 1–36. Either in its present form or as underlying ur-document BW is considered to be the earliest of the Enochic compositions. The present version of BW contains the amalgamated Watchers myth (which merges two separate traditions into a single narrative), situated in the apocalyptic framework of Enoch’s heavenly journeys.

In the Enochic tradition, the myth’s principal message is focused on the ontological implications of the Watchers’ crime, namely that already in the ancient times the inhabited world underwent a dramatic change which could not be undone by the flood. The human realm is understood as an abode of chaos perpetuated by immortal demons eager to do harm:

1 En 15:11–12

---

4 “The earliest traditions in the book [of Watchers] may predate the Hellenistic period, and the book as a whole was completed by the middle of the third century B.C.E.” Nickelsburg, 1 Enoch 1, 7 (my square brackets). See also ibid., 25–26, 46–47.
(11) And the spirits of the giants lead astray, do violence, make desolate, and attack and wrestle and hurl upon the earth and cause illnesses. They eat nothing, but abstain from food and are thirsty and smite.

(12) These spirits will rise up against the sons of men and against the women, for they have come from them.\(^5\)

The practical implication of BW is that the Jerusalem temple with its Mosaic legacy was introduced after the angelic trespass and the ensuing catastrophe into an already corrupted world. The necessary cleansing and overhaul can only happen with the consummation of the present cancer ridden age (1 En 16:1). The framework in which the Enochic tradition situates the myth of the Watchers therefore appears to render the Jerusalem temple institution misguided and ineffective. Two developments in particular seek to subvert the legitimacy of the second temple and its priesthood.\(^6\) First, the choice of the antediluvian patriarch Enoch as the seer and mediator of the primordial and future events supersedes the postdiluvian authority of Moses. Secondly, the description of the Watchers in priestly terms as “the watchers of heaven,” guilty of forsaking “the highest heaven” and “the sanctuary of their eternal station” to have intercourse with women (1 En 12:4; 14:5), is laden with polemical overtones. As noted by Nickelsburg:

The presence of elements that are at home over a long time in antipriest polemics from known historical situations suggests that the author of this mythic account is himself concerned about the pollution of the temple and/or priesthood. That is, he nuances his description of the primordial rebellion with references to what he considers to be a particularly egregious sin in his own time. A similar concern is evident in later developments in the [Enochic] tradition. The author of the Apocalypse of Weeks does not even mention the building of the Second Temple. Although the Animal Vision does describe its construction, it asserts that the sacrifices on its altar have been polluted since the beginning, a claim that is

\(^5\) Ibid., 267.

\(^6\) Gabriele Boccaccini, Beyond the Essene Hypothesis: The Parting of the Ways between Qumran and Enochic Judaism (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 74.
worded in language drawn from the polemics of Malachi. If this analysis is correct, the author of [1 En 12–16] stood in a tradition that was, for various reasons, critical of the Jerusalem temple and/or priesthood.7

At the end of the day, because the Jerusalem cult was understood to be defiled, a new channel had to be established for God to communicate the knowledge of the past, present, and future events to the lost and victimized humanity below. The author’s framing of BW around Enoch’s visions placed the followers of that antediluvian hero on the receiving end of God’s truths.

What Documents May be Considered Enochic
Since no historical accounts of the Enochic movement survive, the hypothesis of its existence rests on a set of features shared across a sufficiently large array of ideologically related documents. The designation “Enochic” stems from the fact that the documents identified with this form of Judaism feature the antediluvian sage Enoch as the ultimate revealer of God’s truths, superior to Moses.

The development of the Enochic tradition is most notably exhibited across the five books comprising the composite document known as the Enochic corpus or simply as 1 Enoch. Along with BW (1 En 1–36) this corpus includes: the Book of Parables or Similitudes (1 En 37–71), the Apocalypse of Weeks (1 En 72–82), the Book of Dreams or Animal Apocalypse (1 En 85–90), and the Epistle of Enoch (1 En 92–105).8 All five are

---

7 Nickelsburg, 1 Enoch 1, 231. Cf. Collins: “…Nickelsburg also sees polemic against the priesthood in chaps. 12–16, which he regards as a separate redactional stage. At least the citations from T. Levi 14:1–8 and 4QTLevia show that this myth could indeed be applied to the Jerusalem priesthood in the second century B.C.E. whether it was originally composed for that purpose or not.” Collins, The Apocalyptic Imagination, 50.

8 Chaps. 83–84 and to some extent chaps. 81–82 are sometimes considered a late addition to the Enochic corpus. Nickelsburg suggests that 81:1–82:4a-c are “tied to the material that precedes and follows it in the Book of the Watchers and the last chapters of the corpus . . . part of a running text that includes the Book of
independent compositions that presently form a collection, one whose literary
development has been outlined most recently by George Nickelsburg. Of these five, the
latest addition to the corpus is *Similitudes*, which the scholarly consensus dates during or in close proximity to the reign of king Herod the Great in Judea (37–4 BCE).  

In addition to featuring the legendary antediluvian character Enoch, all five compositions presently located in *1 Enoch* show a strong ideological and conceptual continuity:

I think the writings comprised by *1 Enoch* reflect some sort of ongoing communal existence. I find this a probable inference from the fact that the traditions in this corpus evolved and built on one another over the long course of three centuries. The traditions and the texts were transmitted through some sort of channel or channels, which had some sort of Enochic identification. For the most part, with the exception perhaps of the Astronomical Book (or Book of the Luminaries), there was a self-understanding of being the eschatological community of the chosen, constituted by revelation. This is evident in the Animal Apocalypse, the Apocalypse of Weeks, the body of the Epistle, and the Book of the Parables. That there was some sense of community is indicated by collective terms like “the chosen,” “the pious,” “the houses of his congregation” (*1 En* 46:8). . . . As to the identity of this group or these groups, we know little beyond their Enochic

Watchers, chap. 91, and the beginning and conclusion of the Epistle.” Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 335. Chaps. 83–84 are usually considered a secondary addition to the Enochic corpus, designed “for the purpose of providing a companion piece to what is now the second dream vision [the *Animal Apocalypse* in *1 En* 85–90].” Ibid., 347. A case against the original connection between *1 En* 81–82 and the Book of Watchers is made by VanderKam, who nevertheless agrees that chap. 81 “may indeed be an editorial insertion.” James C. VanderKam, *1 Enoch 2* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2012), 530–36.


10 Adela Yarbro Collins, *Cosmology and Eschatology in Jewish and Christian Apocalypticism* (Leiden: Brill, 1996), 30; Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination*, 178. George W. E. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 2* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2012), 62–3. The argument in favor of the dating during the reign of Herod the Great is based on *1 En* 67:8–13, usually interpreted as a reference to the hot springs of Kallirrhoë, the site of the thermal bath complex constructed by Herod. Ibid., 61, 290–1. Nickelsburg further notes that “it would be odd indeed if in pseudepigraphic disguise one predicted after 70 C.E. that the walls of Jerusalem would not be breached by the Parthians and Medes [1 En 56:5–8, esp. v. 7] but ignored the fact that the Romans devastated the city.” Ibid., 60 (my square brackets).

identity. . . . For myself, I imagine some sort of reform movement in Judaism in the Hellenistic period…

We do not know what this party was called, or what it called itself in antiquity. However, since the priestly opposition to the Zadokites first coalesced around myths with Enoch as their hero, the term “Enochic Judaism” seems quite appropriate and satisfactory as a modern label.

Another document engaged by contemporary scholarship in the context of the Enochic traditions is *Jubilees*, dated by a wide scholarly consensus around 160 BCE, *vìz.* in the wake of the Maccabean revolt. This pseudepigraphal document reprises and further develops the myth of the Watchers, in addition to featuring Enoch as a figure of authority. In a recent summary of the available evidence James C. VanderKam writes:

*Jubilees* is referred to in the ancient texts and must therefore have existed, at least in some form, before the texts that quote from or allude to it were written. . . . In the paragraph about Enoch (4.16–25) [the author] summarizes or alludes to several compositions by Enoch. His words do seem to indicate in several places (e.g. 4.19) that he knows the Enochian ‘Book of Dreams’ (1 En 83–90)—an apocalyptic work written a short time after 164 BCE. Taking these various points into consideration, one may conclude that *Jubilees* was written after c. 164 and before 100 BCE. It is also an established position among scholars today that *Jubilees* was an older, authoritative work inherited and cherished by the community associated with the Dead Sea Scrolls. *Jubilees* gives no indication that its author had separated from the Jewish community of his day, while a number of the scrolls do express such a schism. . . . *Jubilees*, therefore, was probably written before this period. It seems best to say, in view of all the evidence, that the author


composed *Jubilees* in the period between 160–150 BCE. One cannot exclude a slightly earlier date, but it was probably not written at a later time.\(^{15}\)

While the discussion of the precise nature in which the traditions reflected in *Jubilees* are related to those found in the Enochic corpus is still ongoing, the general affinity of *Jubilees* to the Enochic intellectual milieu seems undeniable:

We should not minimize the significance of the fact that Jubilees underscores that Enoch left written works behind. They included astronomical (4:17, 21), chronological (4:18), and predictive information (4:19). Enoch as even pictured as continuing his scribal labors after his removal from human society to the Garden of Eden. We may not have all the Enochic texts written in antiquity, but when the ones we do have correspond quite closely in theme if not in wording with the descriptions in passages such as Jubilees 4:17–26, it seems more economical to assume dependence on these written sources than to appeal to unknown ones.\(^{16}\)

Recent scholarship has further identified elements of the Enochic tradition in *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, as well as in a number of Qumran texts. The sectarian Qumran texts, however, significantly reshape the foundational Enochic myth and ideology, in addition to severing ties with Enoch as a figure of authority. As a result, it does not seem possible to identify the Qumran texts as properly Enochic.

Consequently, the point of departure for defining “Enochic Judaism” are certain apocalyptic and esoteric traditions in second temple Judaism between the advent of the Hellenistic era and the temple’s destruction by the Romans.\(^{17}\) These traditions featured a common mythology and held the figure of Enoch in high esteem. There further appears to

\(^{15}\) VanderKam, *The Book of Jubilees*, 19, 21 (my square brackets).


\(^{17}\) “If Judaism was to survive the events of the year 70, reflection had to be accompanied by reconstruction. Since the temple was not rebuilt, as it had been in the sixth century, the nature of reconstruction was radically different. The Torah, its study, definition, and observance, began to fill the vacuum created by the annihilation of the Jewish cultic centers.” George W. E. Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah* (2nd ed; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2005), 265.
have been a sense of community comprised by those who viewed themselves as chosen on the basis of having received a special revelation.

Relevance of Enochic Judaism to the Study of Q

Relevance of Enochic Judaism as Perceived by New Testament and Q Scholarship

Since the study of Enochic Judaism is still a relatively new area of research, biblical scholarship began to draw comparisons between the Enochic and Judeo-Christian forms of Judaism only recently. These comparisons, however, are now encountered on both sides of the scholarly aisle. We will begin by summarizing two recent studies in the New Testament field.

In 1985 Dieter Zeller made a case for a possible parallel between Q (which presented Jesus as someone who following his earthly life was elevated to heaven) and the book of Similitudes (in which the same resolution is applied to Enoch, cf. 1 En 70–71).¹⁸ A decade later, in 1996 Christopher M. Tuckett attempted to account for the notorious challenges posed by the Son of Man sayings in Q. In his analysis Tuckett engaged a variety of Second Temple texts, including Isa 53, Wis 2–5, and, like Zeller before him, Similitudes.¹⁹ Noting that “the SM sayings in Q in toto represent a

---


¹⁹ Christopher M. Tuckett, Q and the History of Early Christianity (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1996), 239–82.
remarkable homogeneity and consistency,” Tuckett concluded that “Q undoubtedly produces what is at times a somewhat idiosyncratic ‘blend’ of the various traditions.”

Besides the work of Zeller and Tuckett, the Enochic writings have also been occasionally engaged by Arland Jacobson and John Kloppenborg. That engagement, however, has been only sporadic and did not involve a significant comparison of the Enochic writings and Q.

Relevance of Q as Perceived by Scholars of Second Temple Judaism

On the other side of the disciplinary divide, scholars of the second temple period have likewise begun to engage early Judeo-Christianity and Q as one of its principal documents. In his 2012 commentary on Similitudes George Nickelsburg listed a number of conceptual parallels between Similitudes and specifically the Son of Man sayings in what Nickelsburg called “the “Q” tradition:” Q 12:8–9; 12:39–40; 17:22–30.

Shortly before that, in a 2007 essay Gabriele Boccaccini observed the following similarity between the outlook of “the earliest origins of the Jesus movement”—which, as Boccaccini made clear in the same essay, included Q—and Similitudes:

The Book of Parables (including chaps. 70–71) ignores the identification between Wisdom and Torah that will become normative in rabbinic Judaism as well as the identification between Wisdom and the Messiah, which will become normative in early Christianity. The document as a whole therefore testifies to a stage in which the encounter and merging of the Sapiential, Messianic, and Apocalyptic Paradigms were still at their inception)—a stage that parallels the earliest origins

20 Ibid., 276.
21 Ibid., 282.
23 Kloppenborg, Formation of Q, 208–9.
24 Nickelsburg, 1 Enoch 2, 71.
of the Jesus movement and is the logical premise for the theological developments in Paul and the later Christian tradition.25

In the same essay, Boccaccini engaged Q as containing a particular christological development or trajectory:

It is widely recognized by scholars that the earliest Christian traditions present Jesus not as the embodiment of the divine Wisdom, but as the messenger and teacher of Wisdom. With language reminiscent of the Wisdom of Solomon, Q introduces Jesus along with John the Baptist, in a series of children of wisdom, maintaining that “Wisdom is vindicated by all her children” (Luke 7:35; cf. Matt 11:19). Yet Jesus is claimed to be the greatest revealer, wiser than Solomon (Q: “Something greater than Solomon is here!” Matt 12:42; Luke 11:31).26

Boccaccini then drew a parallel between this christological trajectory and the messianic trajectory involving Enoch in the Enochic tradition. Notice that Boccaccini carefully distinguishes between “early Enoch literature” and the substantially later book of Similitudes in his analysis:

The superiority of Jesus does not derive, as in the case of the early Enoch literature or Daniel, simply from his being chosen by God as the mediator of secret knowledge, but primarily from his messianic status. . . . The identification of Jesus with the Messiah Son of Man is a result of the same dynamics that produced the identification between Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man, namely, the idea that the eschatological Messiah is the most proper revealer of Wisdom and that such a function cannot be divided among two different and equally important mediators.27

“The identification between Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man” takes place in the concluding section of Similitudes in chapters 70–71. Along with the entire book of Similitudes, this identification represents a very late stage in the Enochic tradition and—if


26 Ibid., 277 (my italics).

27 Ibid., 277–78 (my italics).
the evidence of 1 En 67:8–13 indeed points to Kallirrhoë—it occurs within several decades of Q’s composition. By approaching Enochic Judaism as a set of traditions whose major tenets continued to evolve over an extended period of time until they finally overlapped with the emergence of early Judeo-Christianity, Boccaccini was able to highlight a second temple messianic trajectory shared by Similitudes and Q.

While we must postpone the detailed analysis of Boccaccini’s findings until Chapter Six of our dissertation in which we will engage the Son of Man christology of the Q² stratum, Boccaccini’s essay and Nickelsburg’s commentary clearly demonstrate the value of Q as perceived by scholars of second temple Judaism.

Q 10:21–22 in the Recent Studies of
C. Tuckett and G. Boccaccini

Remarkably, both Tuckett and Boccaccini have suggested that the mythological figure of the Son of Man, as opposed to Sophia, may to some degree stand behind the christology of Q 10:21–22. Hesitant to adopt the (by 1996 virtually consensus) hypothesis of Q scholarship that 10:21–22 contains an identification of Jesus and Sophia, Tuckett made the following observation: “it is wrong to look for a single Christological schema reflected in Q 10:21f., or even in v. 22 alone.”

Nonetheless, the schema which Tuckett actually proceeded to outline as his alternative was a logical extension of his analysis of the Son of Man sayings in Q:

As we have seen, v. 22a may reflect SM ideas and terminology. The reference to Jesus as ‘son’ may be closer to the sonship language of Wisd 2–5 (itself not unconnected with SM as we have seen), where it is the righteous sufferer, and perhaps the follower of Wisdom, who is the ‘son’ of God (Wisd 2:16; also Sir

28 Tuckett, Q and the History of Early Christianity, 279.
4:10) and, perhaps significantly, who is also thought to be claiming to have knowledge of God (cf. the taunt in Wisd. 2:13: ‘he claims to have knowledge of God’).

On his part, Boccaccini emerged from the comparison of Similitudes and Q 10:21–22 convinced of a common ground for Jesus and the Enochic SM. The reader will notice that Boccaccini abbreviates his citation of Q 10:21–22, yet his parentheses clearly indicate that in the second of his two examples he is referring to the Q (as opposed to the Matthean or Lukan) text:

Like Enoch in the Parables, Jesus also has a mission to accomplish on earth before the end of times – to be the revealer of the secrets of the kingdom of God. “You have been given the secret [mysterion; Matt 13:11 and Luke 8:10, mysteria, secrets] of the kingdom of God” (Mark 4:11). Before the end of times, this knowledge is reserved to a group of chosen among the chosen: “God has hidden these things from the wise . . . and revealed them to the little ones . . . through his Son (Q: Matt 11:25; Luke 10:21).

The identification of Jesus with the Messiah Son of Man is a result of the same dynamics that produced the identification between Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man, namely, the idea that the eschatological Messiah is the most proper revealer of Wisdom…

Tuckett and Boccaccini, then, appear to be in relative agreement that the Son of Man figure, and for Boccaccini specifically its mythological development in Similitudes, provides a background for the christology of Q 10:21–22. Neither of these scholars, however, attempted to coordinate Q 10:21–22 with the document’s redactional strata (either Kloppenborg’s or anyone else’s).

---

29 Ibid., 279–80.

30 Boccaccini, “Finding a Place for the Parables of Enoch within Second Temple Jewish Literature,” 278 (my bold highlights).
Movements and Groups in Second Temple Judaism: Terminological Considerations

Second Temple Judaism as a Pluralistic Phenomenon

An overview of the literature produced by second temple Judaism reveals a considerable variety of material. Modern scholarship distinguishes a number of ideologically distinct traditions. In addition to what may be called a mainstream, temple-centered form of second temple Judaism, there appear to be a number of non-temple-centric traditions that actively opposed the mainstream oligarchy. Before we proceed, it is necessary to address the manner in which in the remainder of our dissertation we will define the boundaries of not only Enochic, but indeed any form of second temple Judaism, including early Judeo-Christianity.

The Terms “Movement” and “Group” in This Dissertation

The emergence of Enochic Judaism as a distinct subdiscipline in second temple studies has given rise to the following question: in light of the available evidence, is it really possible to speak of any unified movement in (or a form of) second temple Judaism, whether Enochic or any other? James VanderKam’s recent essay “Mapping Second Temple Judaism” voices legitimate concerns for overly restricted categories, listing multiple contradictions within the bodies of texts assigned to the traditions in question.

31 “The issue, how to define Judaism, is now settled: we do not. We define Judaisms. . . . There never was, in real, social terms, that single Judaism, there were only the infinite and diverse Judaic systems, as various social entities gave expression to their way of life, worldview, and theory of the social entity they formed.” Jacob Neusner, The Judaism the Rabbis Take for Granted (Atlanta: Scholars, 1994), 12, 18.

32 “Earlier in the modern period, especially in the Protestant world, it was possible to prescind from such efforts because a large swath of the period was denigrated as 400 years of silence, stretching from Malachi to John the Baptist or Jesus.” James C. VanderKam, “Mapping Second Temple Judaism,” in The Early Enoch Literature (eds. Gabriele Boccaccini and John J. Collins; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 1.

33 Ibid., 15–20.
Along the way VanderKam expresses his suspicion of the perhaps overly tight scholarly definitions, alluding to the theological fluctuations within, for example, the body of literature ascribed to Enochic Judaism:

If the scholars’ categories are correct, there must have been a lot of good will within the groups such that they could embrace people who held diametrically opposed views.  

We agree with VanderKam that the language one adopts must be sufficiently nuanced to accommodate the complexity of the intellectual and ideological categories under investigation. Because in this dissertation we make considerable use of the term “movement” (e.g. Enochic, Judeo-Christian, etc.), it is important at this time to define its referent. For that we adopt George Nickelsburg’s use of the term “movement” as he recently employed it to describe Enochic Judaism:

For myself, I imagine some sort of reform movement in Judaism in the Hellenistic period, implied by the Animal Apocalypse, the Apocalypse of Weeks, the book of Jubilees, the Damascus Document, 1QS 8, and of course, other Qumran texts. I use the term “movement” advisedly. I do not imply an organized, coordinated movement, but a proliferation of individuals and groups, some of whom had some connection with one another. Among them I see a mentality that believes that things were not right in Israel and, specifically to some degree, in the temple. This mentality led in some cases to the formation of groups, though we know little about most of them.

In our view, Nickelsburg’s suggestion of a “proliferation of groups,” objection to the notion of “an organized, coordinated movement,” and language of “a mentality” as that which defines each particular category help account for the variety of views that appear to have coexisted under a number of ideological umbrellas in the second temple

---

34 Ibid., 17.
period. Along with Nickelsburg, in this dissertation we will therefore approach intellectual movements in second temple Judaism from the standpoint of a mentality. For example, just as there was an Enochic mentality that in a number of diverse ways professed a belief that the apocalyptic community centered around the revelations of Enoch was uniquely privileged, so the early Judeo-Christian mentality professed an analogous belief, only with the more recent figure of Jesus as its channel of revelation. These and other second temple mentalities defined the era’s various movements, comprised of individual groups (such as the Q group).

**Enochic Judaism and the Concept of Personalized Evil in the Inhabited World**

The Shemihazah and Asael Traditions in the Book of Watchers

When the myth of the Watchers was appropriated by the Enochic author of BW, in that strand of the Watchers’ narrative that was based on Gen 6:1–4 the chief rebel angel’s name was identified as Shemihazah. This was the tradition that, if Nickelsburg is correct, may have had a pre-Enochic origin as an anti-Hellenistic expansion of Gen 6:1–4. In BW this tradition was adopted to function in the composition’s priestly polemical framework.

At some point near its incorporation into the Enochic BW the Watchers myth furthermore became merged with, or absorbed into itself, an alternate explanation of the origin of evil upon the earth. According to that rival tradition (based on an independent myth closely approximating the Greek myth of Prometheus) at the core of the rebellion against God was a forbidden revelation, rather than a sexual crime:36

---

1 En 8:1–2

(1) Asael taught men to make swords of iron and weapons and shields and breastplates and every instrument of war. He showed them metals of the earth and how they should work gold to fashion it suitably, and concerning silver, to fashion it for bracelets and ornaments for women. And he showed them concerning antimony and eye paint and all manner of precious stones and dyes. And the sons of men made them for themselves and for their daughters, and they transgressed and let astray the holy ones.

(2) And there was much godlessness upon the earth, and they made their ways desolate.37

In BW the Asael plotline not only remained secondary to the composition’s main narrative about the forbidden mixing of blood, but, as shown by multiple aporiae, was also somewhat poorly incorporated into the Shemihazah myth.38 Yet it was a part of the composition all the same, and by its presence the Asael tradition informed the conceptualization of the inhabited world as also corrupted by forbidden knowledge, and humankind as also led astray by what the heavenly rebels revealed to them.

Both the Shemihazah and Asael traditions were equally subversive in their original cultural context. At the time when the Book of Watchers was composed evil was professed by the Jerusalem temple institution to be a product of human disobedience, viz. sinful actions that disrupted the divine order by trespassing the Mosaic ordinances of which the temple priesthood was the ultimate custodian. In a dramatic departure from this worldview, the author of BW attributed the evils of the present age to the ongoing activity of demonic spirits which included antediluvian disclosure of destructive knowledge.

37 Ibid., 188.

38 Ibid., 190–93.
The Evolution of “Satan” in Jubilees

Jubilees as an Important Intermediate Link between the Book of Watchers and Similitudes

As we mentioned, the scholarly consensus locates Jubilees’ provenance in the tumultuous aftermath of the Maccabean revolt ca 160 BCE. While this Enochic document builds on the foundation laid by BW, it also predates Similitudes (ca 37–4 BCE) by approximately a century and a half. Consequently, even though within the Enochic corpus Similitudes is more properly a sequel to BW, we must first address the interim development of the Watchers myth in Jubilees.

The Enochic Myth in Jubilees: From the Watchers to Their Children

The author of BW had little to say regarding the identity of the original devils’ children, viz. the immortal souls of the Watchers’ demonic progeny. The author’s main concern was to describe their destructive activity (1 En 14:8–16:1) and leave the reader with a promise of the evil spirits’ future destruction (1 En 10:10, 15; 16:1). The pseudepigraphal book of Jubilees shows, however, that as the Enochic movement carried on the need arose for a present day arch nemesis, a figure that could be identified as the enemy of the righteous. The Watchers’ children presented a logical direction for the myth’s evolution.

According to Jubilees, the faithful have an archdemonic nemesis who presides over a band of evil spirits. This chief of the demonic kingdom, alternately referred to as (the prince of) Mastema (Jub 10:8; 11:5, 11; 17:16; 18:9, 12; 19:28; 48:2, 9, 12–18;
49:2), the (spirit of) Beliar (1:20; 15:33)\(^{39}\) and Satan (10:11; 23:29; 40:9; 46:2; 50:5), however, is not introduced until after the author’s retelling of the Watchers myth and the flood story.\(^{40}\) In this way Jubilees’ author retained the earlier Enochic myth (Jub 5:1–11) and, by further expanding it, made it relevant for a new generation of believers.\(^{41}\) The new events are presented as having occurred in the immediate aftermath of the flood (Jub 10:7–13): following Noah’s petition for protection, God issues the command to imprison the remaining evil spirits, but his command is carried out only partially:

Jubilees 10:7–13

(7) And the Lord our God spoke to us so that we might bind all of them.

(8) And the chief of the spirits, Mastema, came and he said, “O Lord, Creator, leave some of them before me, and let them obey my voice. And let them do everything which I tell them, because if some of them are not left for me, I will not be able to exercise the authority of my will among the children of men because they are (intended) to corrupt and lead astray before my judgment because the evil of the sons of men is great.

(9) And he said, “Let a tenth of them remain before him, but let nine parts go down into the place of judgment.”

(10) And he told one of us to teach Noah all of their healing because he knew that they would not walk uprightly and would not strive righteously.

(11) And we acted in accord with all of his words. All of the evil ones, who were cruel, we bound in the place of judgment, but a tenth of them we let remain so that they might be subject to Satan upon the earth.

\(^{39}\) “As there are only two places where the word occurs, it is possible that in Jubilees it has a meaning similar to its usage in the Hebrew Bible where it is a noun meaning ‘worthlessness, ruin, destruction’ (so BDB) so that ‘men of Belial’ are ‘worthless men’ (see, eg., 1 Sam 25.5). This is suggested by the context of Jub. 1.20 where ‘the spirit of Belial’ is contrasted with a just spirit.” VanderKam, Jubilees, 128.

\(^{40}\) The apparent exception of Jub 1:20 is misleading, as the mention of Beliar occurs in an intercessory prayer by Moses, an event chronologically taking place after the postdiluvian events of Jub 10:7–13.

\(^{41}\) Collins, The Apocalyptic Imagination, 83.
(12) And the healing of all their illnesses together with their seductions we told Noah so that he might heal by means of herbs of the earth.

(13) And Noah wrote everything in a book just as we taught him according to every kind of healing. And the evil spirits were restrained from following the sons of Noah.42

As we can see, the author of Jubilees argued that an exception was made for a tenth of the spirits, permitted to abide at large with Mastema/Satan, their leader, in order to tempt and corrupt humanity (Jub 1:20; 10:8; 11:4–5; 15:31; 19:28; 50:5), cause illnesses (10:10, 12) and destruction (11:5, 11; 23:29; 40:9; 46:2; 48:2, 9; 49:2). This exception was argued to have been sanctioned by God (Jub 10:9; 15:31–32) who immediately upon allowing it made sure that the demons would not be able to harm Israel (10:13; 15:31–32).

According to Jub 10:7–13, the evil spirits’ activity must continue “because the evil of the sons of men is great” (Jub 10:8). A further reason is given in Jub 15:30b-32:

Jub 15:30b-32

(30b) But he chose Israel that they might be a people for himself.

(31) And he sanctified them and gathered them from all the sons of man because (there are) many nations and many people, and they all belong to him, but over all of them he caused spirits to rule so that they might lead them astray from following him.

(32) But over Israel he did not cause any angel or spirit to rule because he alone is their ruler and he will protect them and he will seek for them at the hand of his angels and at the hand of his spirits and at the hand of all of his authorities so that he might guard them and bless them and they might be his and he might be theirs henceforth and forever.43

---

42 English translation of Jubilees here and henceforth by O. S. Winternute, unless indicated otherwise. Winternute, “Jubilees,” 76.

43 Ibid., 87.
The author’s worldview is one in which, in the aftermath of Mastema’s request, God causes (Jub 15:31) evil spirits to reign over all of the earth’s nations with the sole exception of Israel. The reason for Israel’s privileged status is that God wishes to keep it as “a people for himself” (Jub 15:30), as indeed has been his intention since the creation of the Sabbath (Jub 2:21). Consequently, all other nations are doomed to a life of sin:

The nations are judged in accord with what was ordained for them and they are a lost cause, but the Lord chose Israel from the beginning to be his people and with them he deals graciously (15.30–32).

By designating Israel as a safe zone within what was imagined by the earlier Enochic tradition to be a hopelessly polluted world, the author of Jubilees dramatically reshaped the earlier contours of Enochic Judaism. Not only did the Enochic worldview morph here into a more traditional second temple conceptualization of the universe as divided into the holy and profane zones, but the author of Jubilees also introduced a new ethical dimension. The world’s seemingly chaotic state of affairs was now not only viewed as fully sanctioned by God, it actually appeared to be underscored by a palpable sense of justice.

The Assimilation of Satan by the Enochic Tradition

We have seen that in Jubilees God grants Mastema’s request to remain at large because the author presents the entire humankind, as opposed to just the gentile portion of it, as ontologically sinful:

44 “In Jubilees the separation between Jews and Gentiles belongs not to the history of humankind but to the order of creation.” Boccaccini, Beyond the Essene Hypothesis, 94.

45 VanderKam, Jubilees, 122.
Jub 10:8

And the chief of the spirits, Mastema, came and he said, “O Lord, Creator, leave some of them before me, and let them obey my voice. And let them do everything which I tell them, because if some of them are not left for me, I will not be able to exercise the authority of my will among the children of men because they are (intended) to corrupt and lead astray before my judgment because the evil of the sons of men is great.\(^\text{46}\)

The phrasing of Jub 10:8 is crucial. Nowhere does the author indicate that “the great evil of the sons of men” applies exclusively to the sinfulness of the outsiders, \textit{viz.} the gentile nations, whereas Israel is blameless. Likewise, Mastema’s request to exercise his will engages the universal entity “the children of men,” rather than the gentiles alone.

The context of Jub 10:8 strongly suggests that Israel should also be affected: God is depicted as acting immediately upon granting Mastema’s request, shielding Israel from the devil’s deadly exercise of his will (Jub 10:9–13). Indeed, that Israel’s need for protection is among Jubilees’ central themes is indicated by Moses’ intercessory prayer in the book’s opening sequence (Jub 1:19–20). The author furthermore seems to suggest that the need for divine protection stems from Israel’s inability to withstand the devil’s attacks if the nation were left to its own devices:

Jub 10:10

And he told one of us to teach Noah all of their healing because he knew that they would not walk uprightly and would not strive righteously.\(^\text{47}\)

The notion of humankind’s inherent weakness, universal sinfulness and just punishment explains how the author of \textit{Jubilees} was able to incorporate the figure of

\(^{46}\) Wintermute, “Jubilees,” 76.

\(^{47}\) Ibid.
Satan, originally a mythological figure foreign to Enochic Judaism, into the evolution of the Watchers myth.\(^4\) The function of Satan in non-Enochic writings was to act as a heavenly prosecutor of sorts, with God as a judge (Job 1–2; Zech 3:1–2).\(^4\) In *Jubilees* the Enochic prince Mastema absorbs that role.

A good example of the merging of the two traditions is the rewriting of the Exodus legend (Jub 48:1–19). Here Mastema is portrayed by the author as attempting to correctly execute the traditional function of Satan, *viz.* accuse the Israelites for plundering the Egyptians on their way out. However, a divine intervention then obstructs what legally appears to be an act of justice:

\[
\text{Jub 48:18}
\]

And on the fourteenth day we bound him so that he might not accuse the children of Israel on the day when they were requesting vessels and clothing from the men of Egypt—vessels of silver, and vessels of gold, and vessels of bronze—so that they might plunder the Egyptians in exchange for the servitude which they subjected them to by force.\(^5\)

The author of *Jubilees* even appears to borrow the most famous non-Enochic myth featuring Satan, the story of Job. In Jub 17:15–18:16 the story of Isaac’s sacrifice (Genesis 12) is rewritten in a manner that closely parallels Job 1–2. Mastema learns that Abraham is “faithful in everything” (Jub 17:15), approaches God, and invites him to test Abraham by offering his son Isaac as a burnt offering (17:16). God accepts the challenge, tests Abraham, and commands his angel to stop the sacrifice in the last moment (18:9).


\(^4\) But see 1 Chr 21:1 in which there is a possibility of Satan acting contrary to Yahweh’s will. Finally, in Num 22:22, 32 he is an angel acting on Yahweh’s behalf.

\(^5\) Wintermute, “Jubilees,” 140.
As shown by the titles’ interchangeable use in Jub 10:7–13 (Mastema in v. 8, Satan in v. 11), it is virtually certain that the author understands Mastema and Satan to represent the same arch-demonic personage.⁵¹

The innovative aspect of Jubilees with respect to both its Enochic heritage, i.e. the myth of the Watchers, and the concept of a prosecutor angel from non-Enochic Jewish mythology is the way in which the author merges these traditions. In Jubilees the end product is an all-encompassing figure, at once the tempter and accuser of those whom he successfully misleads, who furthermore is appointed as the de facto ruler of the gentiles.

By introducing a present day arch-demonic figure into the Enochic worldview and merging the Enochic mythology with the older concept of Satan as the heavenly prosecutor, Jubilees’ author ushered in a revolutionary dynamic, summarized by Boccaccini:

While Zadokite Judaism claims that there were no rebellious angels,⁵² the satan also being a member of the heavenly court, Enochic Judaism would be ultimately responsible for the creation of the concept of the devil.⁵³

Boccaccini’s assertion is especially true of the concept’s evolution in Jubilees. At this juncture, the contours of the arch-demon’s role and sphere of influence began to mirror those of the devil/Satan in formative Judeo-Christianity.

---

⁵¹ VanderKam, Jubilees, 128; Nickelsburg, 1 Enoch 2, 203.

⁵² “Zadokite” is Boccaccini’s term of choice for those second temple traditions that were centered around the temple and its Mosaic legislation.

⁵³ Boccaccini, Beyond the Essene Hypothesis, 73.
The Merging of “Satan” and the Myth of the Watchers in

_Similitudes_

In spite of the interim development of the Enochic tradition attested to by _Jubilees_, the author of _Similitudes_ remained in close proximity to BW. Familiar aspects included the emphasis on the Watchers’ primordial sin, a reprise of the Asael tradition, and an eschatological focus on the day of the judgment as the ultimate, and only, resolution of the perceived challenges. Nevertheless, the influence of the interim developments is especially evident in _Similitudes_’ treatment of the devil.

Partly retaining the tradition of BW, the author of _Similitudes_ reintroduced the primordial rebel angel Asael (1 En 8:1–2; 10:4–8). Spelling the angel’s name as Azazel, the author presented this demonic figure as chiefly responsible for the evil observed and experienced in the world (1 En 54:1–6; 55:3–4). The legend about the angels’ sexual transgression was not abandoned completely (1 En 39:1; 69:4–5), but in terms of any real significance by the time of _Similitudes_’ composition it became something of an historical footnote. As far as the author was concerned, the demonic opposition’s primary threat to humankind had little to do with a forbidden mixing of blood. Rather, as the author of _Jubilees_ before him, this author saw the danger in the demons’ ability to lead humanity astray by eliciting sinful activity.

In 1 En 54:1–56:4 the author presents Enoch’s vision of the valley in which the antediluvian rebel angels and their associates will meet their final punishment. The vision

---

54 Nickelsburg, _1 Enoch_ 2, 201–202.
contains the clearest synthesis of *Similitudes*’ conceptualization of the inhabited world as a place corrupted by the primordial revelation of forbidden knowledge:

1 En 54:1–6

(1) And I looked and turned to another part of the earth, and I saw there a deep valley with burning fire.

(2) And they brought the kings and the mighty and threw them into that deep valley.

(3) And there my eyes saw them making their instruments, iron chains of immeasurable weight.

(4) And I asked the angel of peace who went with me, “For whom are these chains being prepared?”

(5) And he said to me, “These are being prepared for the host of Azazel, that they might take them and throw them into the abyss of complete judgment, and with jagged rocks they will cover their jaws, as the Lord of Spirits commanded.

(6) And Michael and Raphael and Gabriel and Phanuel will take hold of them on that great day, and throw them on that day into the burning furnace, that the Lord of Spirits may take vengeance on them, for their unrighteousness in becoming servants of Satan, and leading astray those who dwell on the earth.”

1 En 55:4

“Mighty kings who dwell on the earth, you will have to witness my Chosen One, how he will sit on the throne of glory and judge Azazel and all his associates and all his host, in the name of the Lord of Spirits.”

1 En 56:1–4

---

55 Nickelsburg notes that the motif of binding in chains has a counterpart in the section of BW that relates the judgment of Asael. Cf. 1 En 10:4 (To Raphael he said, “Go, Raphael, and bind Asael hand and foot, and cast him into darkness; And make an opening in the wilderness that is in Doudael.”) Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch* 2, 201; *1 Enoch 1*, 215, 222.

56 Cf. 1 En 10:5 (“There cast him, and lay beneath him sharp stones and jagged stones. And cover him with darkness, and let him dwell there forever. Cover up his face, and let him not see the light.”) Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch* 2, 201; *1 Enoch 1*, 215, 222.

57 Cf. 1 En 10:6 (“And on the day of the great judgment, he will be led away to the burning conflagration.”) Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch* 2, 201; *1 Enoch 1*, 215, 222.
(1) And I saw there hosts of the angels of punishment going, and they were holding chains of iron and bronze.

(2) And I asked the angel of peace who went with me, “To whom are these who are holding the chains going?”

(3) And he said to me, “To their chosen and beloved ones, that they may be thrown into the chasm of the abyss of the valley.

(4) And then that valley will be filled with their chosen and beloved ones, and the days of their life will be at an end, and the days of their leading astray will henceforth not be reckoned.58

We can see that in this version of the Watchers myth the place of punishment is prepared for “the host of Azazel,” and that they, “the host,” are expected to be thrown into “the burning furnace” for “their unrighteousness in becoming servants of Satan.” Nickelsburg notes that the context “seems to identify Satan with Azazel” and footnotes a reference to Jub 10:8–16.59 He also references the mythological framework of Jubilees as helpful in interpreting the identity of the group described as “their chosen and beloved ones” in 1 En 56:3–4:

Although the Parables, unlike the Shemihazah myth, mention the coupling of the angels and the women elsewhere only three times (39:1; 69:4, 5) and nowhere else mention the offspring of these illegitimate unions, the motif fits here. According to 1 Enoch 12–17, the death of the giants sets their spirits loose in the world as a horde of demons who wreak havoc on humankind (15:8–16:1), and according to the version of the myth in the book of Jubilees, the spirits of the giants lead humanity astray, to make and worship idols and to commit all manner of other sins (see especially Jub 10:1–11; 11:1).60


59 Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 2*, 203.

60 Ibid., 207.
The devil’s mythologoumena in *Jubilees* and *Similitudes* have another principal component in common. Both compositions find little use for the once dominant Shemihazah tradition in the Enochic myth of the Watchers. That is, the sin of the mixing of blood recedes and the concept of forbidden knowledge as responsible for the evil in the world assumes the forefront:

Taken in their totality, chaps. 6–16 [in BW] emphasize the rebellious mating of the watchers and the women rather than the revelation of forbidden secrets. In the Parables, the situation is reversed. . . . The chief sin in the Parables is the angelic revelation of forbidden secrets. . . . Here the text states simply that the host of Azazel and their “chosen and beloved ones” led humanity astray (54:5–6 and 56:3–4). The attribution of this demonic activity is, thus, consonant with the portrayal of Asael in chaps. 8–16 [of BW].

*Similitudes*, then, shows several signs of continuity with *Jubilees*, indicating that the author rewrites the myth of the Watchers through an interim prism in the Enochic tradition—possibly that of *Jubilees*. The differences between the two compositions’ respective mythologies, however, are equally significant. Most notably, in *Similitudes* there is no present day arch-devil along the lines of *Jubilees*’ Mastema/Satan. The phrasing in 1 En 54:5–6 indicates that the author, along with BW, understood the Watchers, including Azazel/Satan, to be imprisoned and awaiting their final punishment.

**The Community and Salvation in Similitudes**

The Son of Man as the Definitive Criterion of Salvation

One of the indispensible attributes of the eschatological judgment day in *Similitudes* is the presence of the figure called variously as “the Righteous One,” “the Chosen One,”

---

61 Ibid., 201, 203 (my square brackets).
“the Son of Man,” and the Lord’s “Anointed One.” The multiple attributes and general role of this personage have been recently summarized by George Nickelsburg:

As his four titles indicate, this heavenly being is the embodiment of three parallel figures of high status celebrated in Israel’s religious tradition. Transformed in a significant way, these figures are: (a) the Davidic king, YHWH’s Anointed, the opponent of the malevolent kings of the earth (Psalm 2; cf. 1 Enoch 48:8–10) endowed by the Spirit to administer justice (Isa 11:1–5; cf. 1 Enoch 49:3–4b; 62:2–3); (b) Second Isaiah’s Servant of YHWH and Chosen One, also endowed by the Spirit to establish justice (Isa 42:1–4; 49:1–7; cf. 1 Enoch 49:4cd; and 48:1–6), the Righteous One (Isa 53:11; cf. 1 Enoch 38:2), who is highly exalted over against the kings and the nations (Isa 52:13–15; cf. 1 Enoch 62); and (c) the heavenly “one like a son of man” to whom – after the judgment of the royal oppressors of the people of the holy ones of the Most High – the Ancient of Days gives dominion, glory, and kingly power (Dan 7:13–14; cf. 1 Enoch 46:1–3).

Through his conflation of these traditions, the author of the Parables transforms all three of them. The Davidic monarch is replaced by a heavenly figure, enthroned for judgment. The exalted suffering righteous Servant becomes the exalted heavenly patron of the suffering righteous. The one like a son of man, who according to Daniel is enthroned after the judgment of the last kingdom and its king, is now the one who is enthroned in order to execute judgment against the kings and the mighty who have oppressed the righteous and chosen.

Nickelsburg’s analysis shows that in Similitudes the Son of Man assimilated the messianic and forensic functions that had been previously associated with a variety of personages from within and outside the Enochic mythological milieu. Over the course of Similitudes’ compositional development the Son of Man personage would undergo at

---

62 The forensic role of Similitudes’ Son of Man appears to be equally indebted to the Isaianic Servant and the judicial function of God’s chief angels in the Enochic BW: “The final transformation of tradition attested in the Parables’ portrayal of [the Son of Man] is evident in a comparison with the Book of the Watchers. In the earlier text, divine judgment is executed by the deity (1:3c-9; 25:3) and by three of the four high angels, Raphael, Gabriel, and Michael (10:4–15). In the Parables, these four are scarcely mentioned (chaps. 40; 54; and 71), and with one exception (54:6), they are depicted only in and around the heavenly throne room, where they utter praise and intercede for humanity (chap. 40). Their judicial functions have been transferred to the Chosen One/Son of Man/Anointed One, who dominates the action in a way that is not the case for the four in the Book of the Watchers (or the Animal Vision, chaps. 85–90). Similarly, the author of the Parables ascribes the eschatological judicial epiphany not to the deity (1:3c-9), but to God’s agent, “the Righteous One” (38:2), the “Anointed One” and the “Chosen One” (52:4, 6, 9).” Ibid., 44–45 (my square brackets).

63 Ibid., 44.
least one more change, when in the closing chapter (1 En 71) he became identified with
Enoch: 64

1 En 71:1a, 13–14

(1a) And after that, my spirit was taken away, and it ascended to heaven.

(13) And that Head of Days came with Michael and Raphael and Gabriel and
Phanuel, and thousands and tens of thousands of angels without number.

(14) And he came to me and greeted me with his voice and said to me, “You are
that Son of Man who was born for righteousness, and righteousness dwells on
you, and the righteousness of the Head of Days will not forsake you.” 65

Once the heavenly Son of Man was identified as Enoch in Similitudes’ tradition,
not only was the importance of Enoch’s historical incarnation elevated, but his teachings
acquired a new, salvific, dimension. Consequently, the followers of the Enochic group
behind Similitudes gained access to knowledge that did much more than reveal secrets
about the earth’s dire predicament and the Jerusalem cult’s futility. Originating with the
eschatological judge himself (1 En 45:3–4; 46:1–8; 48:2–10; 51:1–5; 52:6; 61:1–13;
62:1–16; 63:1–12; 69:26–29), the things revealed to the group became the definitive
criterion for the group members’—and the entire creation’s—salvation. Already prior to
the Son of Man’s identification with Enoch the author had intimated that on the last day
the faithful would be saved in the name of the Son of Man, who is “the vindicator of their
lives” (1 En 48:7). The identification with Enoch offered an authoritative set of
teachings—along with, most probably, sectarian allegiance—on which that salvation
would be based.

64 Ibid., 18–19.

65 Ibid., 320–21.
In *Similitudes* the composition’s presumed audience is designated by a variety of titles, all of which seem to collectively describe a sectarian group or community:

The terms “the righteous,” “the chosen,” and “the holy,” employed separately and in various combinations, are this author’s designations for the individuals and/or group(s) who constitute one set of major characters in the Parables and who presumably constitute the book’s audience. . . . Of the triad of terms, “the righteous” is the most frequently used and occurs twenty-five times *by itself* [1 En 38:1, 2, 3; 41:8; 45:6; 47:1, 2, 4; 48:4, 7, 9; 50:2; 53:7; 58:4; 60:2, 23; 65:12; 70:4; 71:17]. The combination “the righteous and the chosen,” whether as a word-pair or in parallelism, occurs fifteen times [38:2, 3; 39:6, 7; 51:5; 56:6–7; 58:1, 2; 60:8; 61:3–4, 14; 62:12, 13, 15]. . . . “The chosen” alone occurs only seven times [40:5; 45:3, 5; 56:8; 62:7, 8, 11]. “The holy ones” . . . occurs as a separate designation for the author’s people only three times, once with the qualification, “the holy ones who dwell on the earth (43:4), and one each in the context of “the holy, the righteous, and the chosen” (38:4) and “the holy and the chosen” (50:1).

George Nickelsburg’s analysis leads him to conclude that the use of the title “the chosen” in particular describes the group’s relationship to God.67 Twelve of the title’s occurrences furthermore appear in “contexts that refer to God’s agent, “the Chosen One” (40:5; 45:3, 5; 62:7, 8, 11),” including the title’s use as a combined form “the righteous and chosen” (39:6, 7; 51:5; 62:12, 13, 15).68 The force with which the author of *Similitudes* emphasizes the group’s election and links it to the messianic Son of Man suggests that the author views the group’s privileged status as based on receiving a comprehensive revelation of God’s wisdom,69 mediated through Enoch the Son of Man:

---

66 Nickelsburg, *I Enoch* 2, 98 (my square brackets).
67 Ibid., 99.
68 Ibid., 100.
69 “The centrality of revelation here is evident in the fact that the whole of the Book of Parables is presented as a comprehensive and unequaled revelation of heavenly wisdom (chap. 37).” Ibid., 100–1.
The issue that divides the righteous and the wicked is belief in the heavenly world of the Lord of Spirits and the Son of Man, and in the judgment where they will prevail. Those who lack such a belief put their trust in such power as is available in the present. . . . Yet powerlessness in itself is no virtue and does not constitute righteousness. Righteousness is rather an attitude of rejecting this world and having faith in the Lord of Spirits and the Son of Man. Faith here involves both belief in the existence of the Lord of Spirits and the Son of Man, and trust and dependence on them for salvation. . . . It is probable that “righteous” refers to a much narrower group than the Jewish people.  

The *Sitz im Leben* of the group represented by *Similitudes* furthermore appears to involve some sort of a persecution. Here, the traditionally Enochic demonic backdrop is only of interest to the author insofar as it helps explain the cause behind the present state of affairs in the world, *viz.* evil knowledge that has corrupted humankind (*1 En* 69:2–12). Instead of demons, however, the chief present-day offender in the composition is the group described alternately as “the kings and the mighty” or simply “sinners:”

Their power is supported by their wealth (52:7), which has been acquired by unrighteous means (63:10) and is exercised through the wars they wage (52:8). Of more existential concern is their oppression of the righteous (53:2, 7) and their persecution of “the houses of the congregation” of the Lord of Spirits and the shedding of the blood of the righteous (chap. 47). These political, social, and economic concerns have a religious dimension. They are a function of the defiance of the Lord of Spirits, which is blatantly evident in their idolatry (45:1–2; 46:5–7).  

In *1 En* 47:2 and 48:7 the Enochic group’s endurance in the face of this adversity is described in the past tense, as Enoch witnesses the events of the last day. These fragments collectively constitute a good summary of the expectation which the author had for the community of the chosen:

---


71 Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch* 2, 47.
(2a) In those days, the holy ones who dwell in the heights of heaven were uniting with one voice,

(2bd) and were interceding and praying in behalf of the blood of the righteous that had been shed and the prayer of the righteous, that it might not be in vain in the presence of the Lord of Spirits, that judgment might be executed for them, and endurance might not be their lot forever.\textsuperscript{72}

1 En 48:2a, 7

(2a) And in that hour, that son of man was named in the presence of the Lord of Spirits…

(7) And the wisdom of the Lord of Spirits has revealed him to the holy and the righteous; for he has preserved the lot of the righteous. For they have hated and despised this age of unrighteousness. Indeed, all its deeds and its ways they have hated in the name of the Lord of Spirits. For in his name they are saved, and he is the vindicator of their lives.\textsuperscript{73}

We have already noted that one of the critical attributes of the Son of Man in \textit{Similitudes} is the salvific significance attached to his name. Just as importantly, however, as a name that has been revealed to a community whose members have “hated and despised this age of unrighteousness” with “all its deeds and its ways”—even to the shedding of their blood—the Son of Man also serves as a promise of an eschatological status reversal. On the last day the tables would be turned for those who (as the author’s polemic against the worldly powers and the theme of persecution seem to indicate) were possibly underprivileged and certainly felt marginalized.

\textsuperscript{72} Ibid., 162.

\textsuperscript{73} Ibid., 166.
Conclusion

Once the Son of Man became identified with Enoch, the stream of apocalyptic traditions bearing Enoch’s name acquired a new significance. In the late compositional layers of *Similitudes*—itself a late addition to the Enochic corpus—the personage of Enoch and belief in the heavenly origin of his revelation became salvific. A similar development can be observed in Q, whose formative clusters of instructional sayings (Q¹) acquired a new meaning with the addition of the redactional layer (Q²) presenting Jesus the Son of Man as the sole criterion of salvation. The similarities between Q’s redaction and *Similitudes* furthermore include the presence of a hostile demonic populace in the inhabited world (cf. 1 En 56:3–4) and the view of the community as in some sense persecuted by the worldly powers.

In the following chapters we will attempt to account for the presence of Q 10:21–22 in the document’s redaction by examining the manner in which the couplet reflects and parallels a number of themes and concepts found in *Similitudes*. We will, however, begin by examining the Temptation Story (Q 4:1–13) which in our view contains a number of significant parallels with the Enochic tradition. These parallels will form the basis for our coordination of Q 10:21–22 and 4:1–13 in the Q³ stratum.
CHAPTER FIVE

A NEW ARGUMENT FOR THE THEOLOGICAL RATIONALE OF THE Q^3 STRATUM

Introduction

In Chapter Three of this dissertation we employed a set of John Kloppenborg’s literary-critical criteria, designed to determine whether a saying or a group of sayings in question might be secondary in their present compositional context. Our analysis demonstrated that Q 10:21–22 was secondary not just to the basic kernel of the Q^1 mission speech cluster (10:2–11, 16), but that the couplet also exhibited aporiae with respect to the local Q^2 redaction of that material (10:12–15). Indeed, we found the Sitz im Leben of Q 10:12–15 and 10:21–22 sufficiently divergent to single out 10:21–22 as a further shift in outlook caused by a christological focus quite unlike either the sage/teacher of Q^1 or the coming Son of Man in Q^2.

As we look to coordinate Q 10:21–22 with a known redactional stratum in the document, Q^3 presents itself as the most logical option. It is, after all, the document’s only known redactional stratum to postdate Q^2, a fact that has enticed scholars working with Kloppenborg’s stratigraphic model—in addition to Kloppenborg himself, also James M. Robinson and Burton Mack—to frequently describe it simply as “the final stratum.” Yet, as this chapter will show, the stratum’s theological rationale as proposed by Kloppenborg leaves no room for Q 10:21–22, forcing him to reconcile the couplet with
the Q² stratum instead. As part of our coordination of 10:21–22 with Q³ we will show that Kloppenborg’s characterization of the final stratum as a scribal, minimalistic, and pro-nomian revision of the document has significant problems.

Most importantly, to coordinate 10:21–22 with Q³ we will engage the Second Temple and especially Enochic mythological elements introduced in Chapter Four, which we will argue are present in a number of Q texts, including Q 10:21–22 and the Q³ Temptation Story. This chapter will show that the heretofore either unnoticed or underemphasized polemical overtones of the Temptation Story contain mythologoumena that have much in common with the devil’s conceptualization in Enochic Judaism. At the end of this chapter’s discussion, a new rationale will be proposed for the Temptation Story, the thematic coherence of Q 10:21–22 and 4:1–13 will be highlighted, and the need to reevaluate the Q³ stratum as a whole will be stressed.

The Current Outline of the Q³ Stratum according to John Kloppenborg

Rudolph Bultmann’s Legacy: The Temptation Story (Q 4:1–13) as a Late Redactional Text in Q

Before the advent of the modern redaction-critical study of Q, the Temptation Story (Q 4:1–13) was found to be one of the latest texts in Q by Rudolph Bultmann who famously located the account’s origin in Hellenistic Christianity. Puzzled by the concept of “the temptation of Messiah,” which he perceived as discordant with “the Jewish tradition,” Bultmann concluded that “the work of Christian scribes made the story in Q and gave it

---

the form of a controversy dialogue on the Jewish model."² Bultmann also suggested that Q 4:1–13 was composite in nature.³ While Bultmann’s skepticism regarding the compositional homogeneity of the Temptation Story did not make permanent waves with subsequent scholarship, his analysis of the account’s very late, advanced christology resulted in consistent allocation of 4:1–13 to Q’s latest layer in post-WWII Q redactional criticism.⁴

John Kloppenborg’s Stratigraphic Model: Q 4:1–13 as a Q³ Text

Q 4:1–13 as the Latest Addition to Q

As we noted in Chapter One, at the time of John Kloppenborg’s *Formation of Q* the document’s final redactional stratum (Q³) was found by Kloppenborg to consist of only the Temptation Story:

The temptation story, which has been seen as something of an anomaly, is probably the latest addition to Q. The most likely reason for its addition was that an editor wished to exploit the account for its paradigmatic potential for showing that when that when faced with demonic temptation to do otherwise, Jesus himself conformed to the ethic of self-denial, voluntary poverty, refusal of means of self-defense or self-preservation and refusal to participate in power and wealth.⁵

Kloppenborg’s allocation of Q 4:1–13 to a post-Q² redactional layer reflected the prior research of those Q scholars who had retained the Temptation Story in their

² Ibid., 256.
³ Ibid.
⁵ Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 325.
reconstructions of the document.⁶ As Siegfried Schulz and Dieter Zeller before him, Kloppenborg appeared to be persuaded by Rudolph Bultmann’s influential pre-WWII assessment of Q 4:1–13. Namely, he agreed with Bultmann’s allocation of the account to the latest layers of formative Christianity because of—specifically—the account’s advanced christology.⁷ To explain the addition of the Temptation Story to Q Kloppenborg turned to the genre of hero biography:

Temptation stories are pregnant with meaning for the material which surrounds them. The testing story so to speak projects a “heroic career” for which it will serve as an explanation or anticipatory confirmation. . . . Testing stories have a function comparable to that of qualifying and ordeal stories which are found in Graeco-Roman biography, though the latter are usually cast in a realist rather than in a fantastic or mythic mode. The function of the ordeal or test is to confirm the presence of virtue or valor or wisdom. . . . The special character and especially the placement of the testing story after the predictions of John and just before the beginning of Jesus’ main activity (preaching) conforms the opening sequences of Q to the narrative pattern shared by the legends about Abraham and Job, and the Graeco-Roman hero biographies.⁸

Kloppenborg’s observations indicate his recognition of christology as the account’s dominant motif. In other words, if the Temptation Story was a programmatic opening sequence setting the stage for a hero biography, then who was its hero? With recurring emphasis on Jesus’ status as the son of God, Q 4:1–13 exhibited a predominantly christological focus.

---


⁸ Kloppenborg, Formation, 261–62.
John Kloppenborg’s Updated $Q^3$ Stratum: The Case of a “Nervous Redactor”

By 1996 John Kloppenborg had joined Burton Mack in identifying Q 11:42c and 16:17, two texts featuring a positive appraisal of the Torah and previously assigned to $Q^3$ by Mack,\(^9\) as post-$Q^2$ additions to the document:\(^10\)

- Q 11:42a–b, c
  - (a–b) Woe to you, Pharisees, for you tithe mint and dill and cumin, and give up justice and mercy and faithfulness.
  - (c) But these one had to do, without giving up those.\(^11\)

- Q 16:16–17
  - (16) The law and the prophets were until John. From then on the kingdom of God is violated and the violent plunder it.
  - (17) But it is easier for heaven and earth to pass away than for one iota or one serif of the law to fall.\(^12\)

Following the inclusion of these sayings Kloppenborg’s updated version of the $Q^3$ stratum was expanded to accommodate a total of three texts. In *Excavating Q*

Kloppenborg attempted to synthesize these three texts into a thematically coherent “final stage” of Q, giving it to a “nervous redactor” who was worried about the possibility of the Torah’s rejection:

---


\(^12\) Ibid., 464–69.
The point of 11:42c in fact is not to insist that the items in 11:42a be tithed; rather, it is to assert the necessity of tithing as a general obligation of Torah. Similarly, 16:17 is obviously a qualification and limitation of any possible antinomian interpretation of 16:16 (“The law and the prophets were until John”). Whether an earlier edition of Q intended an antinomian meaning is beside the point, but probably not the case (Kosch 1989a:433–40). But the addition of 16:17 betrays the hand of a “nervous redactor” who is worried about any apparent rejection of Torah. . . . Both the use of Torah quotations in argument and the evident concern for the enduring validity of the Torah strongly suggest a scribal provenance for Q3. . . . Not enough text is available to be able to judge anything further about the audience of the final stage of Q, but it might be noted that the letter of James likewise displays important contacts with the Jesus tradition (Hartin 1991) but also evinces a view of the Torah as a legitimate starting point in argument (James 2:1–13, 14–26).13

Kloppenborg’s updated rationale for the Q3 stratum thus deemphasized christology in favor of a new theological agenda. Given the document’s overall length after the Q2 redaction—and the extreme brevity of Kloppenborg’s Q3 stratum—it is, however, hardly apparent that the Q3 “nervous redactor” carried out a considerable antinomian redaction. Consequently, Kloppenborg has difficulty showing how the severely limited in its scope “concern for the enduring validity of the Torah” might have justified another rewriting of Q. Kloppenborg’s appeal to a scribe or “a nervous redactor” perhaps signals his own awareness of this difficulty. Yet, argued on purely literary grounds, Kloppenborg’s updated stratigraphic model has been to date the most convincing Q3 hypothesis.

13 Kloppenborg, Excavating Q, 212–13 (my italics). Variants of a scribal hypothesis to account for the origin of Q 4:1–13 have been also presented by Bultmann, History, 254, 256; Ernst Haenchen, Der Weg Jesu. Eine Erklärung des Markus-Evangeliums under der kanonischen Parallelen (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1968), 64–72; Schulz, Spruchquelle, 184; Jacobson, First Gospel, 92, 94.
The Significance of a Pro-Nomian Q 4:1–13 to Kloppenborg’s Q³ Hypothesis

Given the final stratum’s brevity in Kloppenborg’s reconstruction of the document’s redactional layers, the Temptation Story easily stands out as the most extensive and theologically loaded of the Q³ additions. In *Excavating Q* Kloppenborg made the following observations with regard to the pro-nomian overtones of Q 4:1–13:

Q³, by contrast [with the earlier strata, *i.e.* Q¹, Q²], attempts to ground [Q’s ethical] practice in the Torah through a learned assemblage of texts. The *technique of quotation and counterquotation*, though not quite to the standards of rabbinic argument, is redolent of Matthew’s argumentative practices. Both *the use of Torah quotations in argument* and the evident concern for the enduring validity of the Torah strongly suggest a scribal provenance for Q³.¹⁴

Kloppenborg’s appeal to quotations and counterquotations, *viz.* “the use of Torah quotations in argument” in the Temptation Story is of significance. Because in Kloppenborg’s updated Q³ hypothesis the pro-nomian concern is the theme connecting Q 4:1–13 and Q 11:42c; 16:17, his proposed theological rationale of the Q³ stratum effectively hinges upon that theme’s presence in the Temptation Story, the stratum’s most extensive and by all accounts dominant pericope. That is, the pro-nomian outlook of Q 4:1–13 forms the foundation of Kloppenborg’s updated Q³ hypothesis. Without that foundation, one is left with the well-documented late redactional origin of Q 4:1–13¹⁵ and two pro-nomian additions elsewhere in Q (11:42c; 16:17) that appear to be secondary in their respective contexts.

¹⁴ Kloppenborg, *Excavating Q*, 213 (my square brackets and italics).

An Argument against the Current Theological Rationale for the Q3 Stratum

Christological and Soteriological Undercurrents of Q 4:1–13

When in his comments on Q 4:1–13 Rudolph Bultmann dismissed “the Jewish messianic conception of the Son of God” in favor of a Hellenistic one, he effectively severed the link between the Temptation Story and what he considered to be the native sphere of Q, viz. “the Palestinian Tradition.” We already noted that Bultmann’s hypothesis of the later Christian, viz. Hellenistic scribal activity as responsible for the origin of Q 4:1–13 subsequently proved to be very influential. It is on display in the redactional analyses of Q 4:1–13 by Siegfried Schulz and Dieter Zeller, as well as in Kloppenborg’s suggestion of a “movement in the direction of biography” via a legitimating sequence “comparable to that of qualifying and ordeal stories which are found in Graeco-Roman biography.”

Given the recognition of the account’s christological focus by scholars prior to and including Kloppenborg, it then seems downright anticlimactic that in Kloppenborg’s revised Q3 stratum the Temptation Story should find itself in the service of a pro-nomian agenda. After all, here is a mythic drama ripe with implications both christological and—as noted by a number of Q scholars since Bultmann—soteriological.

16 Bultmann, History, 257.

17 Kloppenborg, Formation, 261.

18 “The dialogic and polemic form makes it probable that the Sitz im Leben is the controversy with Judaism, and that the theme is christology, not merely ethics.” Francois Bovon, Luke 1 (Minneapolis, Fortress Press: 2002), 140.

19 “…three temptations of the Son of God, i.e. the people of God…” Bultmann, History, 256. “It served to illustrate and legitimate the mode of behavior and the ethos of the Q group.” Kloppenborg, Formation, 256, 250–53. “The central thrust of the temptation story is a call for obedience to Yahweh, a call issued in the context of expectations that Yahweh will intervene dramatically to deliver the elect from their troubles and hand them the kingdoms of the world.” Jacobson, First Gospel, 94–95.
Q 4:1–13

(1) And Jesus was led into the wilderness by the Spirit (2) to be tempted by the devil. And he ate nothing for forty days; he became hungry. (3) And the devil told him: If you are God’s Son, order that these stones become loaves. (4) And Jesus answered him: It is written: A person is not to live only from bread.

(9) The devil took him to Jerusalem and put him on the tip of the temple and told him: If you are God’s Son, throw yourself down. (10) For it is written: He will command his angels about you (11) and on their hands they will bear you, so that you do not strike your foot against a stone. (12) And Jesus in reply told him: It is written: Do not put to the test the Lord your God.

(5) And the devil took him along to a very high mountain and showed him all the kingdoms of the world and their splendor, (6) and told him: All these I will give you, (7) if you bow down before me. (8) And in reply Jesus told him: It is written: Bow down to the Lord your God, and serve only him.

(13) And the devil left him. 20

Indeed, Q 4:1–13 contains no fewer than four LXX citations. However, these texts’ origin hardly overshadows the story’s theological focus, viz. the elevated christology of Jesus as God’s Son, and his—therefore likely also his followers’—triumph over the demonic prince of this world. The latter theme, the motif of an apparent victory over the devil, has in fact been frequently underemphasized, if not outright overlooked, in the Temptation Story’s analysis as a redactional text in Q. In what follows we will argue that in addition to serving as a vehicle for the account’s christology and soteriology, that motif may also hold clues to the identity of the group behind Q 4:1–13.

The Polemical Undercurrent of the “Temple” Temptation

Two Problematic Aspects of Q 4:9–12

In the context of Q⁴ as it is currently outlined by Kloppenborg and especially in light of the stratum’s proposed theological rationale as centered around an affirmation of the Torah’s validity, Q 4:9–12 presents two notable challenges:

(9) The devil took him to Jerusalem and put him on the tip of the temple and told him: If you are God’s Son, throw yourself down. (10) For it is written: He will command his angels about you (11) and on their hands they will bear you, so that you do not strike your foot against a stone. (12) And Jesus in reply told him: It is written: Do not put to the test the Lord your God.

The first problematic aspect is the concept of the devil using the scriptures himself. The text in Q 4:10–11 comes from Ps 91:11–12, as opposed to the other three citations all of which are from the Torah (Deut 8:3; 6:13; 6:16). Because, as will be shown below, the devil’s use of Ps 91:11–12 is by no means inaccurate, viz. is not a distortion of the source text’s wording,²¹ one is forced to choose between the following options: either the author of Q 4:1–13 wished to make a specific point regarding the superior value of the Torah versus other scriptures, or the exchange between the devil and Jesus has little to do with the Torah’s validation and the author’s actual intention lies elsewhere.

If indeed the author’s intention was to stress the Torah’s superiority, a rather awkward reading emerges. Could the author of the Temptation Story be implying that prophetic literature is somehow less valid than the Torah and for that reason endowed the devil with a very accurate citation from the book of Psalms? Nothing in the Temptation Story or indeed Q as a whole suggests this meaning. This leaves the other option, and it is

one that appears to be confirmed by the christological and soteriological overtones of Q 4:1–13. That is, the use of any and all scriptures in the Temptation Story, while not insignificant, most likely forms the backdrop for a larger point or points that the author wished to make.

The second feature of Q 4:9–12 that is problematic for the current Q³ hypothesis has to do with the temple as the location of a temptation sequence. In his analysis of the Temptation Story Kloppenborg draws attention to this theme:

In Q³ a shift in the attitude toward the Temple is also seen. While [the Q² stratum texts] Q 11:49–51 and 13:34–35 offer a rather bleak interpretation of the Temple and its ruling elite, the second temptation (4:9–12) takes for granted that the Temple is a place where angels might naturally be present to assist holy persons. From a narrative point of view, all that the second temptation requires is altitude. Placing Jesus on any cliff or precipice or tall building would have done. The deliberate choice of the Temple location (which requires Jesus being mysteriously transported from the desert locale of the first temptation to Jerusalem) betrays a view of the Temple that is not impeded by the critique of Q². The Temple is now (again) a holy place.²²

Q 4:9–12 poses significant problems to such a positive assessment of the temple. If Kloppenborg is correct that for this temptation “any cliff or precipice or tall building would have done” then the author’s choice of specifically the Jerusalem temple (τὸ πετρύγιον τοῦ ἱεροῦ) as the setting must be of some significance.²³ If, however, the temple’s depiction in Q 4:9–12 is as optimistic as Kloppenborg finds it to be, then some accounting appears necessary for the fact that the devil can be present within the temple’s

---

²² Kloppenborg, Excavating Q, 212 (my square brackets).

²³ Hermann Mahnke attempted to solve this problem. He proposed that the devil might be inviting Jesus to act as a messianic High Priest, in addition to the first temptation’s role of an “eschatological prophet” and the third temptation’s “messianic king.” Hermann Mahnke, Die Versuchungsgeschichte im Rahmen der synoptischen Evangelien: Ein Beitrag zur frühen Christologie (BBET 9; Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1978), 113–26, esp. 122–26. This proposal, however, does not address the problem of the devil’s presence in the Temple’s confines—a issue left unattended in spite of a detailed discussion of τὸ πετρύγιον τοῦ ἱεροῦ by Mahnke.
sacred confines. For it is not only Jesus that is being mysteriously transported from the
desert to the temple; on the contrary, the wording of v. 9 gives every indication that the
devil is located by Jesus’ side in what would seem to be a most holy place. Once this
peculiar paradox is recognized, the scripture which the devil proceeds to quote in order to
tempt Jesus acquires further significance.

*LXX Ps 91:11–12*

In LXX Psalm 91 one finds a tripartite composition which appears to be tailor
made for a liturgical setting.24 The three sections represent three “voices.” In vv. 1–2 a
petitioner (1st person pronoun “I”) confesses his trust in YHWH, and in vv. 14–16 YHWH
responds in a benevolent fashion by referring to the petitioner with a 3rd person masculine
pronoun. The middle section (vv. 3–13), however, is what occupies the bulk of the psalm
and this section features yet another, a third point of view. This third participant refers to
YHWH in the 3rd person, as though representing him, and to the original petitioner in the
2nd person. What is more, when YHWH responds in vv. 14–16, the response is only
indirectly to the petitioner. Because YHWH refers to the petitioner in the 3rd person, the
impression that the psalmist creates is of a dialogue between YHWH and the third
participant, the one who had previously represented YHWH and on his behalf had
delivered the lengthy response to the petitioner in vv. 3–13:

Psalm 91

(1) As one who dwells in the protection of the Most High, abides by night in the
shadow of the Almighty, (2) I say to YHWH: “My refuge and my fortress, my God
in whom I trust.”

(3) “Yes he, he will rescue you out of/from the snare of the fowler, out of/from the thorn (pestilence?) of destruction. (4) With his pinion he will shelter you, and under his wings you will find refuge. Shield and sheltering wall are his faithfulness: (5) you need not fear a terror in the night, an arrow that flies by day, (6) the pestilence that walks about in darkness, the plague that lays waste at noonday. (7) There fall a thousand at your side and ten thousand at your right hand, it will not come near you, (8) you will only see it with your eyes, and you will behold the reward of the wicked. (9) Yes—‘You, YHWH, are my refuge,’ (thus) have you made the Most High your fastness. (10) No evil will befall you, and no plague will come near you in your tent. (11) For/Indeed, he will command his messengers for you, to guard you in all your ways, (12) on their hands they will bear you, so that you will not dash your foot against a stone. (13) You will tread upon lions and adders, you will trample down young lions and (sea) serpents.”

(14) “Because he has bound himself to me I will rescue him, I will protect him, because he has known my name. (15) He will call me, and I will answer him, I will be with him in trouble, I will draw him out and honor him, (16) with length of days I will satisfy him, and I will let him see/behold my rescue/salvation.”

In a recent commentary on the book of Psalms, Erich Zenger notes that liturgical motifs comprise much of this psalm’s background:

The Temple motifs that echo at a number of points in the psalm (see below), as well as the shifting “voices” or “roles” (promise by a speaker to the petitioner – divine speech) point to a background for the psalm in the Temple liturgy. . . . With this psalm, in imitation of a cultic (“sacramental”) action, the petitioner receives through the “voice” of the authoritative speaker for God (vv. 3–13), and ultimately from the “voice” of God’s own self (vv. 14–16) both rescue and life.26

It is unfortunately no longer possible to be certain about the concrete liturgical procedures in the Jerusalem temple during the second temple period, because in this psalm a mediator figure occupies the space between the petitioner and God that figure likely belonged to the personnel of the temple. This is especially suggested by the fact

---

25 Translation by Erich Zenger. Ibid., 426.

26 Ibid., 428–29.
that in vv. 14–16 YHWH addresses the petitioner through the mediator, in a manner that
echoes and confirms the mediator’s message to the petitioner in vv. 3–13.

The Use of LXX Ps 91:11–12 in Q 4:10–11

In Q 4:10–11 the devil, whom the Q author has located within the Temple’s
confines, not only quotes the scriptures, but specifically (and accurately) cites from
precisely what Erich Zenger describes as the “authoritative speaker for God” portion of
LXX Ps 91:

Q 4:10–11

(10) γέγραπται γὰρ ὅτι τοῖς ἀγγέλοις αὐτοῦ ἐντελεῖται περὶ σοῦ
(11) καὶ ἐπὶ χειρῶν ἁρουσίν σε, μήποτε προσκόψης πρὸς λίθον τὸν πόδα σου

LXX Ps 91:11–12

(11) ὅτι τοῖς ἀγγέλοις αὐτοῦ ἐντελεῖται περὶ σοῦ τοῦ διαφυλάξαι σε ἐν πάσαις
tαῖς ὀδοῖς σου
(12) ἐπὶ χειρῶν ἁρουσίν σε μήποτε προσκόψης πρὸς λίθον τὸν πόδα σου27

The Psalm’s tripartite structure is made clearer in the LXX than in the MT. The
LXX clearly identifies the speaker in vv. 1–13 as distinct from the petitioner (who is
referred to as “he” in vv. 1–2) and YHWH (the 1st person “I” in vv. 14–16). In all, the
resemblance between LXX Ps 91:11–12 and Q 4:10–11 is sufficiently close to suggest
that the author of the Temptation Story was working with the LXX text of Ps 91 not
much different from ours.

Contextualizing Q 4:9–12 within the Temptation Story: The Enochic Overtones of Q 4:5–8

Whether Q 4:9–12 is sequentially the last temptation (as per the Lukan order) or falls in the middle as in Matthew and in the Critical Edition of Q, it appears to be the one that most obviously contains polemical overtones. To fully appreciate its potential impact, we must now consider Q 4:5–8 in which the devil is depicted as the demonic ruler of the inhabited world:

(5) And the devil took him along to a very high mountain and showed him all the kingdoms of the world and their splendor, (6) and told him: All these I will give you, (7) if you bow down before me. (8) And in reply Jesus told him: It is written: Bow down to the Lord your God, and serve only him.

The devil’s depiction as controlling the world’s kingdoms hearkens back in some degree to the book of Jubilees and its evolution of the Enochic myth of the Watchers. As depicted in Q 4:5–8 the devil indeed appears to have much in common with Jubilees’ Mastema who was granted a permission to do as he pleased with the gentile kingdoms.

Reinstating Q 4:1–13 in the Jewish Milieu: Polemic against the Jerusalem Temple in Q 4:9–12

The polemical dimension of the temple sequence becomes clearer when the devil’s choice of the much-discussed τὸ πτερύγιον τοῦ ἱεροῦ and the related motif of jumping are relegated to a secondary role. Indeed, the elevation motif leads us to a dead end: as Kloppenborg rightly notes, any tall building would have sufficed—so why the author’s choice of the temple? When coupled with the devil’s use of LXX Ps 91:11–12, however, the temple setting suggests a possible answer:
In a series of intensifying worlds of imagery the [psalm’s] second section (vv. 3–13) makes concrete, in its two analogous subsections (vv. 3–8 and 9–13), that and how YHWH shows himself to be a saving refuge and a powerful protector of the petitioner. Dramatic pictures of a world full of treacherous, monstrous, indeed demonic dangers are contrasted with powerful images of protection and of victorious battle against this world.\(^{28}\)

In light of the Psalm’s context, the great irony of the temple temptation appears to be that the very embodiment of “the pestilence that walks about in darkness”—LXX Ps 91:6 δακμονίου μεσημβρινοῦ!\(^{29}\)—from whom the priestly mediator in LXX Ps 91:1–13 had so solemnly guaranteed the petitioner YHWH’s protection is now depicted as standing in the place one would imagine to epitomize that protection, *viz.* YHWH’s earthly dwelling. Adding insult to an apparent injury, the devil furthermore cites the climactic portion of the psalm’s priestly response section. It is very hard to see how anyone who had a positive assessment of the Jerusalem temple could have conjured up this image, and then reinforced it—of all the scriptural texts that discuss the concept of divine protection—with this particular Psalm. The end product recommends itself as at least partly a polemic against the Jerusalem temple establishment, a theme that is indeed supported by other texts in Q such as 11:49–51; 13:34–35.

Contrary to Bultmann’s assessment of the account’s thematically disjoined nature, the Enochic undercurrent of the adjacent mountain temptation (Q 4:5–8) in fact demonstrates how the author’s anti-temple polemic in vv. 9–12 might have functioned from the mythological standpoint. Today scholars agree that there existed a strong intellectual opposition to the Jerusalem temple institution in certain forms of late Second

\(^{28}\) Zenger, *Psalms 2*, 430 (my square brackets).

\(^{29}\) LXX Ps 91:6: ἀπὸ πράγματος διαπορευομένου ἐν σκότει ἀπὸ συμπτώματος καὶ δακμονίου μεσημβρινοῦ (lit. “[nor be afraid of] the demon at noon-day”).
Temple Judaism. As we showed in Chapter Four, one of the movements that belonged to that intellectual milieu was Enochic Judaism. While Q is not an Enochic text and obviously belongs to the Judeo-Christian movement, its well-attested negative attitude toward the temple (11:49–51; 13:34–35) largely overlaps with that of the Enochic and other dissenting movements. Consequently, Q welcomes a mythology such as existed, for example, in Enochic Judaism as a worldview in which the temple is irrelevant and devoid of the channels of salvation.

The Temptation Story shows that the Enochic mythology, or rather that aspect of it that was based on the myth of the Watchers and its subsequent evolution, offered an attractive explanation as to how the temple could be deemed no longer relevant. This explanation could easily have been divorced from other tenets of Enochic Judaism. That is what happens here: akin to much of Enochic literature, in Q the Jerusalem temple with its priesthood is located in a demonically infested world, and as such is left out of the uniquely privileged circle of those who had received special divine revelation. In other words, the temple is viewed as just another among many types of property within the devil’s domain, by and large no different from the kingdoms offered to Jesus in Q 4:5–7. The end product behind all of Q 4:1–13 appears to be an empowering self-affirmation by those who derived their revelation from a source that bypassed the temple institution altogether. In the context of the Temptation Story and Q as a whole, that source could only be Jesus in his ultimate capacity as God’s Son.

Once this basic premise is understood, the role of τὸ πτερύγιον and the devil’s invitation to jump become more intelligible as well. As Q scholars have pointed out since
Bultmann, here is a request for a sign.\textsuperscript{30} In a manner that, in contrast to modern interpreters, would have likely seemed significantly less subtle to the original audience, the author of the Temptation Story probably attributes this request to the Jerusalem temple authorities whom in Q 4:9–12 he renders the devil’s representatives.\textsuperscript{31}

Revisiting Q 11:42c; 16:17

Without disputing the validity of Kloppenborg’s literary-critical analysis of Q 11:42c and 16:17 as secondary in their respective contexts, it is now necessary to restate a question raised earlier in this chapter. Given that after the main (Q\textsuperscript{2}) redaction stage Q morphed into a fairly extensive written composition, what is the likelihood that a pro-nomian rewriting of that document could have had as its theological objective the addition of two glosses (11:42c; 16:17) and a mythic narrative (4:1–13) containing polemic against the Jerusalem temple? It may of course be that Q 11:42c; 16:17 were added by a zealous pro-nomian scribe copying a Q\textsuperscript{2} scroll. Without the help of Q 4:1–13, however, Q 11:42c; 16:17 seem to constitute a very limited pro-nomian redaction of a document either neutral in stance or already pro-nomian.\textsuperscript{32} For the time being this discussion must remain open.

**Conclusion: A New Argument for the Theological Rationale of the Q\textsuperscript{3} Stratum**

Our examination of the final stratum’s theological rationale as proposed by John Kloppenborg reveals an important implication for the redactional allocation of Q 10:21–22. Even as the scholarly opinion to the contrary mounted (Jacobson, Mack), Q 10:21–22

\textsuperscript{30} Bultmann, *History*, 256.

\textsuperscript{31} At this point it must be noted that although no definitive argument can be presented in favor of either sequence, because of its near chritic character, \textit{viz.} as a highly polemically charged sequence Q 4:9–12 seems to be a better fit as the conclusion of the tripartite temptation cycle, as per the Lukan order.

\textsuperscript{32} “Whether an earlier edition of Q intended an antinomian meaning is beside the point, but probably not the case…” Kloppenborg, *Excavating Q*, 212.
was retained by Kloppenborg in the Q² stratum for a sound reason. Since a stratigraphic coordination of redactional units which are identified by literary clues must be based on some thematic coherence, assigning 10:21–22 to the Q³ stratum did not appear possible. As we have seen, Kloppenborg had come to define the final stratum as pro-nomian apologetic, and this resulted in Q³ being a priori incompatible with the themes displayed in Q 10:21–22. Accordingly, Kloppenborg was forced to maintain his earlier position, viz. that the couplet’s christology was reflective of the Q² stratum.

Working with the insights from the intellectual milieu of Enochic Judaism, in this chapter we questioned the rationale of Q³ as pro-nomian. While the matter of the secondary glosses Q 11:42c; 16:17 must for the time being remain open to discussion, the Temptation Story Q 4:1–13 has little to do with the defense of the Torah or a positive assessment of the Jerusalem temple. In fact, in addition to portraying Jesus as God’s Son, the account’s polemic against the temple serves to affirm the status of Jesus’ followers as a uniquely privileged group of the elect, much along the lines of a mentality such as observed in Q 10:21–22.

The value of this reevaluation of the Temptation Story to our research is twofold. First and most importantly, the themes exhibited by the anti-temple polemic in Q 4:1–13 allow for a coordination of the Temptation Story and 10:21–22 in Q³. Secondly, this new coordination reopens the discussion of Q³ as a stratum with its own unique agenda, suggesting an esoteric and exclusivist theological rationale.

The task to which we now turn is to show how christology of Q 4:1–13; 10:21–22 is different from the Son of Man christology of the Q² stratum. To engage that task, in
Chapter Six we will once again draw on the insights from the intellectual and mythological milieu in the late Second Temple era attested by Enochic Judaism.
CHAPTER SIX
THE IMAGERY OF SOPHIA AS THE REASON BEHIND THE CHRISTOLOGICAL SHIFT FROM THE SON OF MAN (Q²) TO THE SON OF GOD (Q³)

Introduction

Having established the thematic connection between Q 10:21–22 and the Temptation Story at the Q³ level, in this chapter we will revisit the christological hypothesis of an identification of Sophia and Jesus in Q. While confirming previous scholarship’s suggestion that this identification was indeed present in Q, we will nevertheless argue against the presence of Sophia christology in 10:21–22. Instead, we will show how the status of Jesus as God’s Son in Q 4:1–13; 10:21–22 both differs from his Q² role as the incarnate Sophia and remains in continuity with it as the logical next step in the development of early Christology.

The purpose of this concluding chapter is to provide a tradition-historical model in support of the Q³ stratum’s apparent christological shift, which we have by now demonstrated on literary-critical grounds. In other words, it will be shown just why another rewriting of the document and the shift to describing Jesus as the Son of God in 4:1–13; 10:21–22 might have been necessary.

In keeping with our previous analysis we will continue to engage parallels between Q and Similitudes of Enoch. It will be shown that, just as in Similitudes, Q’s Son of Man and Sophia are related and because of their identification with a known historical
personage should not always be viewed as distinct mythological figures. In fact, in at least one instance a complete merging of these mythological figures can be observed.

The Son of Man and Sophia in Similitudes and Q

The Son of Man as Sophia’s Incarnation in Similitudes

As we noted in Chapter Four, George Nickelsburg’s analysis shows that in Similitudes the mythological figure of the Son of Man absorbed some messianic and forensic functions that had been previously associated with a variety of personages from outside the Enochic mythological milieu. One of those mythological personages was Sophia, God’s personified Wisdom. In 1 En 42, an unexpected interpolation into a series of Enoch’s visions presents an abbreviated, alternate version of the older, pre-Enochic myth of Wisdom’s short-lived incarnation:¹

1 En 42:1–3

(1) Wisdom did not find a place where she might dwell, so her dwelling was in the heavens.

(2) Wisdom went forth to dwell among the sons of men, but she did not find a dwelling. Wisdom returned to her place, and sat down in the midst of the angels.

(3) Iniquity went forth from her chambers, those whom she did not seek she found, and she dwelt among them like rain in a desert and like dew in a thirsty land.²

While there is no mention of him in 1 En 42:1–3, in Similitudes the figure of Sophia is nevertheless closely linked to the eschatological Son of Man. The Enochic

¹ Sir 24:7–11. Nickelsburg notes that the poem in Similitudes “reads very much like a negative counterpart to Sir 24:7–11. In both cases, the personified Wisdom’s home is in heaven, but she descends to earth seeking a dwelling among humans. For Ben Sira, she becomes embodied in the Mosaic Torah and finds her home in Jerusalem. . . . In 1 Enoch 42, Wisdom finds no home among humans…” Nickelsburg, 1 Enoch 2, 138.

² Ibid.
mythology situates both personages in heaven, their dwelling (1 En 42:1–2; 48:6).

Because of the Son of Man’s salvific function in Similitudes this seems to have resulted in something of a rivalry between the two. If the Son of Man is the definitive warrant of salvation, then what might Sophia’s role be? Similitudes’ author appears to have sought to resolve this tension by first presenting the myth of Sophia’s incarnation in 1 En 42 and then depicting the Son of Man as Sophia’s envoy to the chosen (1 En 48:6–7b). The tradition’s subsequent development, however, seems to have prioritized the Son of Man personage in a more decisive way. In Chapter Four we cited Gabriele Boccaccini’s observation regarding the late second temple intellectual milieu’s tendency to merge rival mythologies in apocalyptic contexts. It now bears repeating:

The identification of Jesus with the Messiah Son of Man is a result of the same dynamics that produced the identification between Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man, namely, the idea that the eschatological Messiah is the most proper revealer of Wisdom and that such a function cannot be divided among two different and equally important mediators.³

To develop Boccaccini’s line of arguing, just as the function of revealing Wisdom resisted a bifurcation between the eschatological Messiah and the historical personages identified as that Messiah in Similitudes and Q (Enoch and Jesus), this function could ultimately not be shared even by Sophia herself and the Son of Man. Consequently, in Similitudes the Son of Man personage eventually absorbed the myth of Sophia’s legendary visitation, effectively becoming a historical incarnation of Sophia in all but name. To appreciate this trajectory we must consider the following two fragments:

³ Gabriele Boccaccini, “Finding a Place for the Parables of Enoch within Second Temple Jewish Literature,” 278.
1 En 48:6–7b

(6) For this reason he was chosen and hidden in [God’s] presence, before the world was created and forever.

(7a-b) And the wisdom of the Lord of Spirits has revealed him to the holy and the righteous; for he has preserved the lot of the righteous. 4

1 En 71:1a, 13–14

(1a) And after that, my spirit was taken away, and it ascended to heaven.

(13) And that Head of Days came with Michael and Raphael and Gabriel and Phanuel, and thousands and tens of thousands of angels without number.

(14) And he came to me and greeted me with his voice and said to me, “You are that Son of Man who was born for righteousness, and righteousness dwells on you, and the righteousness of the Head of Days will not forsake you.” 5

1 En 48:6 shows that in Similitudes the Son of Man was understood to have existed before the world’s creation. This idea is indebted to the second temple traditions featuring Sophia as present at the world’s creation. 6 Meanwhile, 1 En 71:1a, 13–14 comes from Similitudes’ concluding and compositionally secondary chapter, in which the Son of Man is identified with the historical (and by now ascended) Enoch. 7 As explained in Chapter Four, this identification occurs in a very late stage of Similitudes’ tradition. Once, however, it occurred and the preexistent Son of Man was given a historical incarnation as Enoch, this resulted in a mythological trajectory resembling the myth of the heavenly Sophia’s preexistence and historical incarnation. Just like Sophia, in the

---

4 Nickelsburg, 1 Enoch 2, 166 (my square brackets).
5 Ibid., 320–21.
6 Job 28:12–28; Prov 8:22–31; Wis 7:22a, 9:9.
7 Nickelsburg, 1 Enoch 2, 18–19.
final iteration of *Similitudes*—the version containing chapter 71—the preexistent and eschatological Son of Man was claimed to have become incarnate in history as the antediluvian sage Enoch.

Nevertheless, Boccaccini cautioned against the identification of the incarnate Son of Man (Enoch) with Sophia in *Similitudes*:

> Although the language of wisdom may have influenced the concept of the preexistence and role of the Son of Man, in the Parables neither the Messiah Son of Man nor Enoch is identified with the divine Wisdom of God. The heavenly Enoch is the herald and messenger of the divine Wisdom, not its incarnation. ⁸

Boccaccini is certainly correct to note that 1 En 48:7a provides a strong case against the identification of the Son of Man with Sophia *in that particular instance*, since the author describes a relationship between two distinct personages:

> (1 En 48:7a) And the wisdom of the Lord of Spirits has revealed him to the holy and the righteous…

However, the lack of an identification of the Son of Man with Sophia in 1 En 48:7a does not prevent Sophia’s mythologoumena from already contributing to the Son of Man’s portrayal in that very text, as demonstrated by the immediately preceding verse:

> (1 En 48:6) For this reason he was chosen and hidden in [God’s] presence, before the world was created and forever.

In other words, while there is not a proper identification, in *Similitudes* the Sophia narrative appears to have been taken over by the Son of Man mythology. It is important to stress, however, that this merging of traditions was not complete: in the Enochic tradition, nothing is said of the historical Enoch’s rejection.

---

⁸ Ibid., 277.
Similarities between the Son of Man Personage in Q and in *Similitudes*

Many aspects of the Son of Man mythology occurring in *Similitudes* are found also in Q. We will begin by listing the similarities between the portrayal of the Son of Man as the eschatological agent in *Similitudes* and in the Q\(^2\) redactional stratum. Examining these conceptual parallels will allow us to gain a better appreciation for the identification of the eschatological Son of Man with Sophia in Q\(^2\), to which we will subsequently turn.

**Similarities between the Eschatological Son of Man in Q\(^2\) and in Similitudes**

In Q the Son of Man is not featured in an eschatological context outside the material identified as the Q\(^2\) stratum. The association of the Son of Man with the arrival of the day of judgment (Q 12:40;\(^9\) 17:23, 26, 30\(^10\)) is also featured in 1 En 45:3–4; 61:5; 62:3, 13 (employing the singular “on that day”), and in 1 En 48:8; 51:1, 5a, 3–4; 52:7; 63:1 (employing the plural “in those days”). This context is also implied (without the use of the terms “day” or “days”) in 1 En 69:26–29. The eschatological judgment day is described as “the day of distress” (1 En 50:1–5) and “the day of affliction and tribulation” for “the kings and the mighty” (1 En 45:2; 62:8), the *Similitudes*’ perceived opposition. Likewise, in Q\(^2\) the future coming of the Son of Man is likened to the days of Noah (Q 17:26–27) and Lot (Q 17:28–32).

---

\(^9\) “In Matt 24:43–44 || Luke 12:39–40, the Son of Man’s sudden, unexpected appearance is likened to a thief’s break-in, and the admonitory function of the saying indicates that the context of the Son of Man’s parousia is judgment (as in the Parables) rather than Israel’s salvation (as in Daniel 7).” Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch* 2, 71.

\(^10\) “Matthew 24:37–39 || Luke 17:22–30 compares the days of the Son of Man with the days of the flood and thus parallels the Enochic form of the tradition, in which the flood/final judgment typology is a commonplace.” Ibid.
The Son of Man’s future judicial role as found in Q 6:22–23 and 12:8–9 is also present in 1 En 45:3; 61:8; 62:1–6; 69:27, 29. In that document he is described as seated on God’s throne by the Lord of Spirits (1 En 45:3; 62:2, 3, 5; 69:27, 29). In 1 En 62 the Son of Man’s enthronement is said to produce terror and pain in “the kings and the mighty”—the composition’s villains—when they see him “on that day” (1 En 62:3–12).

Meanwhile, to those who know the name of the Son of Man the author of Similitudes promises that “the righteous and the chosen will be saved on that day” (1 En 62:13; cf. Q 6:22–23), describing their celebration with the Son of Man as enduring forever (1 En 62:14; cf. Q 22:28–30). Shorter descriptions of the judgment day along the same lines are found in 1 En 48:1–49:4; 69:26–29. In this future role, the Son of Man is sufficiently similar in 1 Enoch and also the Q² stratum to suggest a possible similarity also in Sitz im Leben. In fact, both documents address a situation in which evil opponents try to, or indeed do, persecute the group. In this, both 1 Enoch and Q² see in the eschatological judgment day the ultimate

---

11 “Another passage from Q, Luke 22:28–30//Matt 19:28, refers to sitting in judgment. In the Lukan version the disciples who have endured Jesus’ trials will be sitting at table, eating and drinking in his kingdom, and sitting on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel. In this passage Jesus refers to himself with the first-person pronoun, not as the “Son of Man.” . . . When compared to the Parables, one similarity may be noted. The image of eating and drinking in his kingdom in the Lukan passage bears some similarity to the image of feasting and dwelling under the benevolent rule of the Son of Man in 1 En 62:15. Outside of the Parables, the image of being seated on thrones participating in judgment is similar to 1 En 108:12. Here those envisioned as being given thrones are not only leaders, but also the restored righteous, placed on thrones one by one.” Leslie W. Walck, “The Son of Man in the Parables of Enoch and the Gospels,” in Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables (ed. Gabriele Boccaccini; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007), 322–23 (Walck probably means 1 En 62:14, because it is the preceding v. 14, not v. 15, that contains the reference to feasting and dwelling with the Son of Man).

12 Ibid., 321.

13 Kloppenborg’s “polemics of cults under pressure” is a perfect definition for this. Kloppenborg, Formation of Q, 202.
punishment of those who have obstructed and opposed God’s message, and the ultimate reward of those who have remained faithful to God:

1 En 47:2a, 2c, 2bd

(47:2a) In those days, the holy ones who dwell in the heights of heaven were uniting with one voice, (47:2c) and they were glorifying and praising and blessing the name of the Lord of Spirits, (47:2bd) and were interceding and praying in behalf of the blood of the righteous that had been shed and the prayer of the righteous, that it might not be in vain in the presence of the Lord of Spirits, that judgment might be executed for them, and endurance might not be their lot forever.14

1 En 48:2a, 7

(48:2a) And in that hour, that son of man was named in the presence of the Lord of Spirits…

(48:7) And the wisdom of the Lord of Spirits has revealed him to the holy and the righteous; for he has preserved the lot of the righteous. For they have hated and despised this age of unrighteousness; Indeed, all its deeds and its ways they have hated in the name of the Lord of Spirits. For in his name they are saved, and he is the vindicator of their lives.15

Q^2^ 6:22–23

(6:22) Blessed are you when they insult and persecute you, and say every kind of evil against you because of the son of humanity.

(6:23) Be glad and exult, for vast is your reward in heaven. For this is how they persecuted the prophets who were before you.16


15 Ibid., 166.

16 While in Kloppenborg’s initial analysis 6:22–23 was located in the document’s formative stratum (Q^1^), it was subsequently moved to Q^2^*. Already in *Formation* Kloppenborg recognized in 6:22–23 an appeal “to a group which is not simply “poor” but also persecuted, i.e., to a group of early Christian preachers.” Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 173; “*The Sayings Gospel Q*,” 62.
Q² 12:8–9

(12:8) Anyone who may speak out for me in public, the son of humanity will also speak out for him before the angels…

(12:9) But whoever may deny me in public¹⁷ will be denied before the angels…

In each of the above four fragments the eschatological vindication of the righteous is in focus. In three fragments (1 En 47:2–3a; 48:2a, 7; Q 12:8–9) it is described as taking place in the heavenly courtroom. Two of the fragments feature angels (1 En 47:2–3a; Q 12:8–9) as heavenly participants in the vindication process. In all four fragments the respective authors’ communities are placed in a position of confrontation with the world at large, either being ridiculed or having to endure persecution (1 En 47:2bd; 48:7; Q 6:22–23; 12:8–9).

The most important element that Similitudes and the Q² redaction have in common with regard to the Son of Man’s eschatological role, however, is the salvific significance attached to his name. In Q 6:22–23 the Son of Man is presented as the reason for the group’s persecution. In Q 12:8–9 acknowledging or denying the Son of Man becomes a criterion of eschatological salvation. As in 1 En 48:7, it seems clear that the Q² stratum’s soteriology operates on the premise of the Son of Man’s name having been made known to the author’s community:

…to argue that this stratum of redaction [Q²] relativized Jesus’ position by viewing him simply as another of Sophia’s envoys does an injustice to 11:29–32, 33–36 and the christological ramifications of that Q composition and especially to 12:8–9 which makes confession of Jesus the definitive measure of salvation.¹⁸

¹⁷ Q 12:4–7 shows that the context for this anticipated denial is likely the pressure of persecution and death.

¹⁸ Kloppenborg, Formation of Q, 201 (my square brackets).
…12:8–9 announces that rejection of Jesus—who in Q is clearly identified with the Son of Man—will bring about decisive eschatological rejection!19

To summarize, the similarities between the eschatological Son of Man personage in Q2 and Similitudes are sufficiently numerous to suggest at the very least a shared tradition in the second temple intellectual milieu. As we will now show, both compositions further developed that tradition in a very similar fashion, as their authors looked to identify the eschatological Son of Man with a known historical figure.

The Eschatological and Historical Son of Man in Q2

One of the main challenges posed by the title’s use in Q is the apparent inconsistency of its referent. As we have seen, the title “Son of Man” is used of an eschatological agent in 12:8, 10, 40; 17:24, 26, 30, and possibly in 11:30. The eschatological Son of Man, however, is not the title’s sole christological application in Q. One encounters it also in the context of Jesus’ earthly period—seemingly without any eschatological overtones—in 7:34 and 9:58.

Currently Q 9:58 constitutes the only mention of the Son of Man in Kloppenborg’s Q1 stratum. It is the so-called “vagabond” or “vagrant” Son of Man saying:

Q 9:57–58

(9:57) And someone said to him: I will follow you wherever you go.

(9:58) And Jesus said to him: Foxes have holes and birds of the sky have nests; but the son of humanity does not have anywhere he can lay his head.20

19 Ibid., 212.

Meanwhile, in Q 7:34 Jesus the Son of Man is placed alongside John as one of Sophia’s children:

Q 7:34–35

(7:34) The son of humanity came, eating and drinking, and you say: Look! A person who is a glutton and drunkard, a chum of tax collectors and sinners!

(7:35) But Wisdom was vindicated by her children.²¹

Together 7:34 and 9:58 represent the two instances in Q where the context in which the title Son of Man occurs is clearly non-eschatological. Not much has been done to account for this anomaly since Kloppenborg’s model became the Status Quaestionis of Q scholarship. In what follows we will propose the influence on Q² by the myth of Sophia’s legendary incarnation, viz., a development akin to the one in Similitudes as the likely explanation for these texts.

The Historical Son of Man in Q² as an Enoch-esque Phenomenon

As we noted above, a fusion of two originally independent mythologies—Son of Man’s and Sophia’s—takes place in Similitudes. A similar process can be observed in Q. Akin to Similitudes, in Q the identification of the eschatological Son of Man with an historical personage—namely, with the historical Jesus—appears to have resulted in an appropriation of the myth of Sophia’s incarnation.

In Q 7:18–35 we encounter Jesus’ famous reply to John’s disciples regarding whether Jesus is “the one to come” or if they are “to expect someone else.” That reply concludes with the following statement featuring John and Jesus the Son of Man:

²¹ Ibid., 146–49.
Q 7:31–35

(7:31) To what am I to compare this generation and what is it like?

(7:32) It is like children seated in the market-place, who, addressing the others, say: We fluted for you, but you would not dance; we wailed, but you would not cry.

(7:33) For John came, neither eating nor drinking, and you say: He has a demon!

(7:34) ἦλθεν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἄνθρωπον ἐσθίων καὶ πίνων, καὶ λέγετε: ἰδοὺ ἄνθρωπος φάγος καὶ οἴνοπτής, τελωνῶν φίλος καὶ ἁμαρτωλῶν.

The son of humanity came, eating and drinking, and you say: Look! A person who is a glutton and drunkard, a chum of tax collectors and sinners!

(7:35) καὶ ἐδικαιώθη ἡ σοφία ἀπὸ τῶν τέκνων αὐτῆς.

But Wisdom was vindicated by her children. 22

Here, Jesus’ response to John’s disciples includes a lament over the rejection of John and Jesus the Son of Man by “this generation” (vv. 31–35). When read as concluding with v. 35, this response seemingly rules out the possibility of an identification of the Son of Man, and therefore Jesus, with Sophia. Instead, the Son of Man and Sophia share a relationship: along with John, Q2’s Jesus is one of Sophia’s children (7:35). Much like the Enochic Son of Man in 1 En 48:7a, Jesus the Son of Man in Q 7:34 therefore would appear to be strictly an envoy of Wisdom.

In a development altogether foreign to the Enochic Son of Man tradition, however, in Q2 Jesus epitomizes a long line of Sophia’s rejected prophets and sages:

Q 11:49–51

(11:49) Therefore also Wisdom said: I will send them prophets and sages, and some of them they will kill and persecute,

22 Ibid., 118–49.
(11:50) so that a settling of accounts for the blood of all the prophets poured out from the founding of the world may be required of this generation,

(11:51) from the blood of Abel to the blood of Zechariah, murdered between the sacrificial altar and the House. Yes, I tell you, an accounting will be required of this generation!  

This new development has no parallel in Similitudes because, unlike Q, in the Enochic tradition there was no reminiscence of the historical Enoch’s rejection. Q’s Jesus, on the other hand, had recently suffered an ignominious fate which had to be stigmatizing to the Q group and detrimental to their missionary efforts. That this reminiscence had indeed proven to be problematic is attested by the fact that the Q group’s initial missionary endeavor, apparently undertaken in the wake of the Q\(^1\) stratum and its discipleship instruction, had met with ridicule and rejection precisely on account of Jesus:

Q 6:22–23

(6:22) Blessed are you when they insult and persecute you, and say every kind of evil against you because of the son of humanity.

(6:23) Be glad and exult, for vast is your reward in heaven. For this is how they persecuted the prophets who were before you.  

As shown in John Kloppenborg’s research, the Q group’s defensive attitude and the apologetic shift in the Q\(^2\) stratum toward a judgment oriented discourse—engaging the eschatological Son of Man mythology—go a long way toward accounting for the rationale of the Q\(^2\) redaction. By itself, however, the shift toward judgment day rhetoric


\[\text{\textsuperscript{24} Ibid., 50–53 (my bold highlights).}\]
would still have been insufficient to address the logical gap between Jesus’ known historical fate and his supposed future coming as the eschatological Son of Man. In other words, it is hard to see how simply identifying Jesus as the eschatological judge would have solved the problem of the very embarrassing end met by the historical Jesus. It is to that end that the assimilation by Q’s Son of Man of the myth of Sophia’s incarnation appears to have presented a viable theological solution, as noted by James M. Robinson:

> We have sketched a trajectory of wisdom tradition beginning late in the Old Testament and moving, via participation in Jewish and primitive Christian apocalypticism, into a prominent role in the late stages of the Q tradition. By this time the identification of the apocalyptic Son of Humanity with Jesus applied not only to the future but already to his public ministry. This called for some theological category for comprehending his public ministry as a positive category in its own right. The final emissary of Sophia becomes this category.  

25 As we noted in Chapter Two, however, Robinson locates the latest stage of this trajectory in Q 10:21–22:  

> The association of this final emissary of Sophia with the unique apocalyptic Son of Humanity made it easy to heighten the christology in the wisdom sayings of Q by according to the Son Sophia’s unique relation to the Father, in effect identifying Jesus with Sophia herself.  

26 In the remainder of this chapter we will develop and nuance Robinson’s suggestion, showing that christologically 10:21–22 radically departs from the apologetic concern of the Q² stratum. We will, however, also confirm Robinson’s hypothesis of Sophia christology as a positive apologetic category in Q. To accomplish that, as our next step we will coordinate Q 9:57–58 with the Q² stratum. It will be shown that it is in Q² and not in a later stratum that Q’s Son of Man, in his capacity as Sophia’s *ultimate*
emissary in history, assimilates into his mythological trajectory the myth of Sophia’s incarnation.

**Jesus as the Son of Man and Sophia in Q 9:57–58**

The So-Called “Vagrant” Son of Man: 9:57–58 as a Q\(^1\) Text

Following the relocation of 6:22 to the Q\(^2\) stratum by Kloppenborg, Q 9:58 remained as the only occurrence of the Son of Man title in the document’s formative stratum. It appears in a saying situated in a particular chriic setting:

Q 9:57–58

(9:57) Καὶ εἶπεν τις αὐτῷ· ἀκολουθήσω σοι ὅπου ἐὰν ἀπέρχῃ.

And someone said to him: I will follow you wherever you go.

(9:58) καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· ἀλώπεκες φωλεοῦς ἔχουσιν καὶ τὰ πετεινά τοῦ οὐρανοῦ κατασκηνώσεις, ὅ δὲ νίκτα τοῦ ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἔχει ποῦ τὴν κεφαλὴν κλίνῃ.

And Jesus said to him: Foxes have holes and birds of the sky have nests; but the son of humanity does not have anywhere he can lay his head.\(^27\)

In Q 9:57 a statement by an unidentified individual (τις) seemingly abruptly follows on Jesus’ response to John’s disciples (7:18–35) which had culminated with the lament over the rejection of Sophia’s children (vv. 31–35). This change in speaker has been taken by a number of Q scholars including Kloppenborg to signal the beginning of a new compositional unit.\(^28\) However, Arland Jacobson suggested that in its present literary context 9:58 still retained the motif of rejection carrying over from 7:31–35:

---


It is interesting to observe that, given the context of Q 9:57–58 (i.e. immediately following Q 7:31–35), it is entirely possible Wisdom’s futile search for rest may stand in the background (cf. 1 Enoch 42). At the very least, the notion that Wisdom sends prophets and messengers who are rejected may lie behind this saying, especially since it is a notion attested elsewhere in Q (11:49–51; 13:34–35).\(^{29}\)

Notice that Jacobson engages *Similitudes*’ version of the myth of Wisdom’s descent (1 En 42).\(^{30}\) Kloppenborg’s response to Jacobson is equally noteworthy in that regard:

Several authors have suggested that there is an allusion [in Q 9:58] to the heavenly Sophia who could find no dwelling place on earth (cf. 1 Enoch 42:1–2). Jacobson opines that its position in Q recommends this interpretation: following 7:35, which describes the rejection of the Son of Man, one of the τέκνα σοφίας, 9:57–58 likewise employs sapiential motifs to describe the rejection of the Son of Man. Accordingly he assigns 9:57–58 to the stage of Q redaction which reflects the opposition between Jesus and “this generation,” as well as the strong presence of wisdom motifs. This interpretation seems far-fetched. Q 9:57–58 says nothing of rejection and it does not state that the Son of Man could not find a place of rest or that he subsequently found one among the angels (as in 1 Enoch 42). Instead the saying describes the vagrant existence of the Son of Man.\(^{31}\)

Of course, Kloppenborg’s objection to Jacobson has much to do with the absence of a literary-critical justification for 9:57–58 being a continuation of 7:31–35 at the Q\(^2\) level. In what follows we will provide the literary-critical case lacking in Jacobson’s otherwise correct interpretation of 9:57–58.

\(^{29}\) Jacobson, *First Gospel*, 136 (my bold highlights).

\(^{30}\) 1 En 42:1–3: (1) Wisdom did not find a place where she might dwell, so her dwelling was in the heavens. (2) Wisdom went forth to dwell among the sons of men, but she did not find a dwelling. Wisdom returned to her place, and sat down in the midst of the angels. (3) Iniquity went forth from her chambers, those whom she did not seek she found, and she dwelt among them like rain in a desert and like dew in a thirsty land.

\(^{31}\) Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 192 (my square brackets and bold highlights).
The “Vagrant” Son of Man as Sophia’s Incarnation: Q 9:57–58 as a Q^2 Text

(a Literary-Critical Argument)

The Critical Edition’s Reconstruction of Q 9:57–60

We begin with the reconstruction of 9:57–60 by the Critical Edition of Q. In what follows we examine each of the four Q verses individually, first listing Matthew and Luke and then (if there are serious differences) the Q reconstruction as determined by and presented in the Critical Edition. Comments on the reconstruction are included after each of the four verses.

Q 9:57:

(Mt 8:19) καὶ προσελθὼν εἷς γραμματεύς εἶπεν αὐτῷ· διδάσκαλε, ἀκολουθήσοι ὅπου ἐὰν ἀπέρχῃ.

And approaching, a scribe said to him: teacher, I will follow you wherever you go.

(Lk 9:57) Καὶ πορευομένων αὐτῶν ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ εἶπέν τις πρὸς αὐτόν· ἀκολουθήσοι ὅπου ἐὰν ἀπέρχῃ.

And as they were going along the road someone said to him: I will follow you wherever you go.

(Q 9:57) Καὶ εἶπέν τις αὐτῷ· ἀκολουθήσοι ὅπου ἐὰν ἀπέρχῃ.

And someone said to him: I will follow you wherever you go.

The reader can see that in this instance the reconstruction of Q sides with Luke on the undisclosed identity of the individual approaching Jesus with the intention of becoming his follower. The term τις (“someone”), adopted by the Critical Edition, comes from Luke’s gospel whereas Matthew features a scribe, a character nowhere encountered.

in Q and very likely a product of Matthean redactional activity. This appears to be a most probable reconstruction.

Q 9:58:

(Mt 8:20) καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· αἷ ἐλώπεκες φωλεοῦς ἔχουσιν καὶ τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ ὑώρανοῦ κατασκηνώσεις, ὁ δὲ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἔχει ποῦ τὴν κεφαλὴν κλίνῃ.

And Jesus said to him: Foxes have holes and birds of the sky have nests; but the son of humanity does not have anywhere he can lay his head.

(Q/Lk 9:58) καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· αἵ ἐλώπεκες φωλεοῦς ἔχουσιν καὶ τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ ὑώρανοῦ κατασκηνώσεις, ὁ δὲ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἔχει ποῦ τὴν κεφαλὴν κλίνῃ.

And Jesus said to him: Foxes have holes and birds of the sky have nests; but the son of humanity does not have anywhere he can lay his head.

The similarity between the Matthean and Lukán versions of Jesus’ response is virtually identical and needs no comment.

Q 9:59:

(Mt 8:21) ἔτερος δὲ τῶν μαθητῶν [αὐτοῦ] εἶπεν αὐτῷ· κύριε, ἐπιτρέψον μοι πρῶτον ἀπελθεῖν καὶ θάψαι τὸν πατέρα μου.

Another of [his] disciples then said to him: Lord, first allow me to go and bury my father.

(Lk 9:59) Εἶπεν δὲ πρὸς ἐτερον· ἀκολούθει μοι. ὁ δὲ εἶπεν· [κύριε,] ἐπιτρέψον μοι ἀπελθόντι πρῶτον θάψαι τὸν πατέρα μου.

He then said to another: follow me. But that one replied: [Lord,] first allow me to go and bury my father.

(Q 9:59) ἔτερος δὲ εἶπεν αὐτῷ· κύριε, ἐπιτρέψον μοι πρῶτον ἀπελθεῖν καὶ θάψαι τὸν πατέρα μου.

But another said to him: Master, permit me first to go and bury my father.  

---

With the opening section of the second chria, the reconstruction of Q once again needs to choose between two gospel versions. Here again the reconstruction sides with Luke, allowing for a more natural, unspecified \( \text{τις} (v. 57 / \text{Lk}) / \text{ἕτερος} (v. 59 / \text{Lk}) \) sequence, rather than \( \text{τις} (v. 57 / \text{Lk}) / \text{ἕτερος τῶν μαθητῶν} (v. 59 / \text{Mt}) \). While this decision is understandable insofar as it allows for a balanced and elegant solution, it is nevertheless the one which we will question in the next section of this chapter and to which we will provide an alternative. Indeed, we will side with the \( \text{τις} (v. 57 / \text{Lk}) / \text{ἕτερος τῶν μαθητῶν} (v. 59 / \text{Mt}) \) reconstruction.

Q 9:60:

(Mt 8:22) ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς λέγει αὐτῷ· ἀκολούθει μοι καὶ ἄφες τοὺς νεκροὺς θάψαι τοὺς ἑαυτῶν νεκροὺς.

But Jesus said to him: follow me and let the dead bury their dead.

(Lk 9:60) εἶπεν δὲ αὐτῷ· ἄφες τοὺς νεκροὺς θάψαι τοὺς ἑαυτῶν νεκροὺς, σὺ δὲ ἀπελθὼν διάγγελῃ τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ.

But he said to him: let the dead bury their dead, but you go and proclaim the kingdom of God.

(Q 9:60) εἶπεν δὲ αὐτῷ· ἀκολούθει μοι καὶ ἄφες τοὺς νεκροὺς θάψαι τοὺς ἑαυτῶν νεκροὺς.

But he said to him: follow me and let the dead bury their dead.\(^{34}\)

As in Q 9:58, Jesus’ second reply lends itself to a fairly straightforward reconstruction. Jesus’ basic response in Q 9:60 is agreed upon by both gospels.

\(^{34}\) Ibid.
Several Objections against the Reconstruction of Q 9:59 in the Critical Edition

Our objection to the Critical Edition’s omission of the Matthean τῶν μαθητῶν [αὐτοῦ] in Q 9:59 rests on several observations.

To begin with, the compositional arrangement of Lk 9:59–62, viz., the second and third chriae in Luke’s gospel, in general is of a rather suspicious nature. As we have shown, Lk 9:61–62 was not accepted for Q in the Critical Edition. While the main reason for this decision probably was the fact that this third chria is found only in Luke’s gospel, there is also something to be said for its redundant nature. The reader will notice that Lk 9:61–62, including Jesus’ second response in 9:62, seems closely modeled after the previous chria (Lk 9:59–60, which actually does come from Q), and also that Lk 9:61 is essentially a second objection to Jesus’ original invitation posed in Lk 9:59a:

(Lk 9:59a) Εἶπεν δὲ πρὸς ἐτερον· ἀκολούθει μοι.

[Jesus’ invitation] He then said to another: follow me.

(Lk 9:59b) ὁ δὲ εἶπεν· [κύριε,] ἐπίτρεψόν μοι ἀπελθόντι πρῶτον θάψαι τὸν πατέρα μου.

[Reply #1] But that one replied: [Lord,] first allow me to go and bury my father.

(Lk 9:60) εἶπεν δὲ αὐτῷ· ἠφες τοὺς νεκροὺς θάψαι τοὺς ἐαυτῶν νεκροὺς, σὺ δὲ ἀπελθὼν διάγγελε τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ.

But he said to him: let the dead bury their dead, but you go and proclaim the kingdom of God.

(Lk 9:61) Εἶπεν δὲ καὶ ἐτέρος· ἀκολουθήσω σοι, κύριε· πρῶτον δὲ ἐπίτρεψόν μοι ἀποτάξασθαι τοῖς εἰς τὸν οἶκον μου.

[Reply #2] Yet another one then said: I will follow you, Lord, but first allow me to say goodbye to those at my home.
(Lk 9:62) εἶπεν δὲ [πρὸς αὐτὸν] ὁ Ἰησοῦς· οὐδεὶς ἐπιβαλὼν τὴν χεῖρα ἐπ’ ἀρτοῦ καὶ βλέπων εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω εὐθετῶς ἐστιν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ.

And Jesus said to him [to him]: no one who puts a hand to a plow and looks back is fit for the kingdom of God.\(^{35}\)

One observes that in Luke’s gospel two objections—one in the second (9:59b) and another in the third (9:61) chriae—are initiated by Jesus’ invitation to follow him in Lk 9:59a. Consequently, Jesus’ invitation functions as the setting for both the second and third Lukan chriae, creating an instructional opportunity for Jesus to twice correct the would-be disciples (9:60, 62). Meanwhile, in Matthew’s gospel—which does not feature Luke’s third chria—Jesus never initiates the action and in both Q chriae as preserved by Matthew, he merely responds to a statement by some individual. Lk 9:59a therefore is suspect, even more so since this new introduction (unattested by Matthew’s gospel) appears to serve not just Q/Lk 9:59b-60 but also the third, uniquely Lukan chria. When the reconstruction of Q as found in the Critical Edition sides with Luke’s unspecified ἕτερος against Matthew’s ἕτερος δὲ τῶν μαθητῶν [αὐτοῦ] in Q 9:59, it sides with what appears to be a heavily edited Lukan reception.

Related to the above observation is the contrast which the first chria in all of its existing renditions (Mt 8:19–20; Lk/Q 9:57–58) forms with the second (Lk 9:59–60) and third (Lk 9:61–62) chriae in Luke’s gospel. Notice how in the first chria the action is consistently (Q, Mt, Lk) initiated by a petitioner approaching Jesus:

\(^{35}\) My translation of Lk 9:61–62.
Mt 8:19; Lk/Q 9:57

(Mt 8:19) καὶ προσέλθὼν εἶς γραμματεύς εἶπεν αὐτῷ· διδάσκαλε, ἀκολουθήσω σοι ὅπου ἔαν ἁπέρχη.

And approaching, a scribe said to him: teacher, I will follow you wherever you go.

(Lk 9:57) Καὶ πορευομένων αὐτῶν ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ εἶπέν τις πρὸς αὐτόν· ἀκολουθήσω σοι ὅπου ἔαν ἁπέρχη.

And as they were going along the road someone said to him: I will follow you wherever you go.

(Q 9:57) Καὶ εἶπέν τις αὐτῷ· ἀκολουθήσω σοι ὅπου ἔαν ἁπέρχη.

And someone said to him: I will follow you wherever you go.

Meanwhile, as we already mentioned, in the immediately adjacent Lukan second chria the initiator suddenly is Jesus, who in Lk 9:59a extends an invitation and receives two excuses (to which he subsequently responds):

Lk 9:59, 61

(Lk 9:59a) Εἶπεν δὲ πρὸς ἕτερον· ἀκολούθει μοι.

[Jesus’ invitation] He then said to another: follow me.

(Lk 9:59b) ὁ δὲ εἶπεν· [κύριε,] ἐπίτρεψόν μοι ἀπελθόντι πρῶτον θάψαι τὸν πατέρα μου.

[Reply #1] But that one replied: [Lord,] first allow me to go and bury my father.

(Lk 9:61) Εἶπεν δὲ καὶ ἕτερος· ἀκολουθήσω σοι, κύριε· πρῶτον δὲ ἐπίτρεψόν μοι ἀποτάξασθαι τοῖς εἰς τὸν οἶκον μου.

[Reply #2] Yet another one then said: I will follow you, Lord, but first allow me to say goodbye to those at my home.
Without a doubt, the authors of the Critical Edition eliminated Lk 9:59a from the reconstruction of Q 9:59 precisely because they had recognized the artificiality of Jesus’ invitation to follow in Luke’s gospel. Consequently, they sided with Matthew’s author whose ἕτερος τῶν μαθητῶν [αὐτοῦ] in the second chria is a petitioner (Mt 8:21) initiating the action akin to the scribe in the first chria (Mt 8:19), and not a respondent which is how Luke’s author casts his ἕτερος in Lk 9:59a. Nevertheless, the authors of the Critical Edition dismissed Matthean τῶν μαθητῶν [αὐτοῦ] in Q 9:59:

(Mt 8:21) ἕτερος δὲ τῶν μαθητῶν [αὐτοῦ] ἔπεν αὐτῷ· κύριε, ἐπίτρεψόν μοι πρῶτον ἀπελθεῖν καὶ θάψαι τὸν πατέρα μου.

(Q 9:59) ἕτερος δὲ ἔπεν αὐτῷ· κύριε, ἐπίτρεψόν μοι πρῶτον ἀπελθεῖν καὶ θάψαι τὸν πατέρα μου.

But another of his disciples said to him: Master, permit me first to go and bury my father.

Now, it is apparent that the reason for the reconstruction of Q 9:59—which finally chooses Luke’s unspecified ἕτερος, even though all indications are there that Luke’s rendition of Q 9:59–60 bears signs of heavy editing)—was the perceived need to follow the unspecified τις of Q 9:57 with an equally unspecified ἕτερος in Q 9:59, thus harmonizing the two chriae. In other words, it is the assumption that the two chriae must be harmonized in Q that explains the dismissal of Matthean τῶν μαθητῶν [αὐτοῦ] as belonging to Q. However, such harmonization only appears necessary due to the lack of literary evidence in support of Matthean τῶν μαθητῶν [αὐτοῦ] as a logical fit in Q 9:59. We will now present such literary-critical evidence.
Q 9:59–60 as a Q¹ “Redactional Clasp” Connecting the First and Second Formative Sayings Clusters

The opening lines of the presently identified Q¹ stratum (Q 6:20) are reconstructed in the Critical Edition of Q in the following way:

(Mt 5:1) ἰδὼν δὲ τοὺς ὄχλους ἀνέβη εἰς τὸ ὄρος, καὶ καθίσαντος αὐτοῦ προσήλθαν αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηται αὐτοῦ.

And seeing the crowds he went up the mountain, and after he sat down his disciples came to him.

(Lk 6:17a-b) Καὶ καταβὰς μετ’ αὐτῶν ἐστὶ ἐπὶ τόπου πεδινοῦ, καὶ ὄχλος πολὺς μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ.

And having come down with them he stood in a level place, with a great crowd of his disciples...

(Mt 5:2) καὶ ἀνοίξας τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ ἐδίδασκεν αὐτοὺς λέγων·

And opening his mouth he taught them, saying...

(Lk 6:20) Καὶ αὐτὸς ἐπάρας τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτοῦ εἰς τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ ἔλεγεν.

And he, raising his eyes to his disciples, said...

(Q 6:20a) Καὶ ἐπάρας τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτοῦ εἰς τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ ἔλεγεν.

And raising his eyes to his disciples, he said...36

The decision to retain τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ in Q 6:20a is an easy one: Jesus’ disciples are featured in the setting of the great sermon in both Matthew and Luke and at least in Luke’s gospel it seems clear that the sermon is addressed to the disciples, with Mt 5:2 (ἐδίδασκεν αὐτοὺς λέγων·) indicating the same. This creates a choice between two possible implications for the opening sayings cluster of Q¹ (6:20b–49): (a) the disciples

may have been already featured in the sayings cluster which was inherited by the author of Q¹ with 6:20a in it, or (b) the author of Q¹ prefaced the opening sayings collection by creating a particular setting for it with Q 6:20a, viz., one that addressed the sermon to the disciples. The key to choosing between these two possible options may lie in Q 9:57–60.

The two chriae in 9:57–60 constitute a well-known form-critical anomaly in Q¹. It is the only place in Q¹ where this form occurs (according to Kloppenborg’s analysis), interrupting the stratum’s sequence with two brief exchanges between Jesus and would-be followers. It is, in our view, hardly a coincidence that this form-critical anomaly should occur in a seam between two collections of aphorisms. The two chriae in 9:57–60 appears to signal the presence of a recurring structure technique, connecting the first and second clusters of Q¹ aphorisms.

Furthermore, it is likely not coincidental that the use of chriae addressing the mode of discipleship should follow a collection which is addressed to Jesus’ disciples (6:20a) and that it should serve to introduce another collection (10:2–11, 16) whose main concern is the manner in which the upcoming missionary effort is to be conducted by the disciples (10:2: λέγει τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ). In other words, if we may suppose that the order of the Q¹ clusters of aphorisms now reflects their order before the redaction, that order suggests a logical progression from a cluster of aphorisms addressing the disciples’ necessary attitude of holy wisdom (6:20b-49), followed by the cluster which directs the manner in which the disciples are expected to take the proclamation of the kingdom into the world (10:2–11, 16). In fact, the remaining four Q¹ clusters could very well have been sequenced with an intention to develop the “follower” theme as well, providing
encouragements to prayer (11:2–13), perseverance (12:2–12), trust in God as a remedy for anxiety (12:22b-34), and the radical choice faced by the disciples (13:24–14:35).

To return to the stratigraphic identity of Q 9:57–60, if the Q$^1$ stratum was comprised of the aphorism clusters addressed discipleship and its responsibilities, the use of an unusual form such as chriae between the collections seems inherently possible. Accordingly, in Q 9:59–60 the Matthean parallel in which we find the use of τῶν μαθητῶν [αὐτοῦ], presents what would be a convenient way for the Q$^1$ compiler to have segued from the opening aphoristic cluster—already addressed in 6:20a to τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ—to the second, “mission speech” collection, by having a disciple pose here a discipleship question to Jesus, and in this way have Jesus turn his attention to the subject matter of the mission speech. In other words, the use of a disciple figure in the Matthean reception of Q 9:59 (Mt 8:21) appears to fit the reconstructed Q$^1$ exceptionally well:

(Mt 8:21) ἔτερος δὲ τῶν μαθητῶν [αὐτοῦ] εἶπεν αὐτῷ· κύριε, ἓπτρεψόν μοι πρῶτον ἀπελθεῖν καὶ θάψαι τὸν πατέρα μου.

But another of his disciples said to him: Master, permit me first to go and bury my father.

(Q 9:60) εἶπεν δὲ αὐτῷ· ἀκολούθει μοι καὶ ἀφες τοὺς νεκροὺς θάψαι τοὺς ἑαυτῶν νεκροὺς.

But he said to him: follow me and let the dead bury their dead.

The immediately arising question, however, is how such a reconstruction of Q 9:59 (i.e., siding with Mt 8:21) and especially the use of ἔτερος τῶν μαθητῶν [αὐτοῦ] in Mt 8:21 could be coordinated with Q 9:57 and the use of an unspecified τίς to designate the previous petitioner there. Because it is indeed very unlikely that the Matthean εἷς γραμματεύς should be found in Q 9:57, since after all Q does not feature scribes, our
proposed Q sequence of τίς (v. 57 / Lk) and ἕτερος τῶν μαθητῶν [αὐτοῦ] (v. 59 / Mt) requires an explanation.

The answer requires us to revisit the presumption that the first (Q 9:57–58) and second (Q 9:59–60) Q chriae must be reconciled in the text of Q. Above we have demonstrated on literary-critical grounds that the Matthean use of some form of τῶν μαθητῶν [αὐτοῦ]—whether ἕτερος or not—indeed appears to be a logical Q1 fit in the second chria (9:59–60). This means that, in fact, the far more likely Q reconstruction is one in which Q 9:57–58 and 9:59–60 would segue upon each other in an awkward manner, first introducing an unspecified petitioner in 9:57–58, and then adding a specified, disciple petitioner in 9:59–60, thus signaling an aporia and presence of redactional activity:

(Q 9:57) Καὶ εἶπέν τις αὐτῷ· ἀκολουθήσω σοι ὅπου ἐὰν ἀπέρχη.

And someone said to him: I will follow you wherever you go.

(Q 9:59) [. . .] δὲ τῶν μαθητῶν [αὐτοῦ] εἶπεν αὐτῷ· κύριε, ἐπίτρεψόν μοι πρῶτον ἀπελθεῖν καὶ θάψω τὸν πατέρα μου.37

But [. . .]38 of his disciples said to him: Master, permit me first to go and bury my father.

In light of this literary aporia we can conclude that the two chriae in Q 9:57–58 and Q 9:59–60 did not originate in the same compositional stratum.

37 My reconstruction.

38 While there is little data to go on beyond the presence of the term “his disciples” in Q 9:59, for myself I see “one of his disciples” (τις δὲ τῶν μαθητῶν [αὐτοῦ]) as the most likely original form of Q 9:59–60 at the Q1 level. It would be changed to ἕτερος τῶν μαθητῶν [αὐτοῦ] by the Q2 compiler upon the addition of 7:18–9:58 (see below), which most likely resulted in the text received by Matthew and Luke.
Q 9:57–58 as the Original Conclusion of 7:18–38 in $Q^2$

The initial clue is provided by removing each of the possibly secondary chriae, viz., 9:57–58 and 9:59–60 from the text of the $Q^1$ stratum and surveying the text of $Q^1$ for cohesiveness. Removing Q 9:59–60 results in the following reconstruction of (a) the conclusion to the first sayings cluster, (b) the redactional (chriic) transition to the second sayings cluster, and (c) the beginning of the second sayings cluster at the $Q^1$ level:

[Concluding verse of the first sayings cluster] (Q 6:49) ὁ δὲ ἀκούων μου τοὺς λόγους καὶ μὴ ποιῶν αὐτοὺς ὁμοίως ἔστιν ἀνθρώπῳ δόκοδόμησεν αὐτῷ τὴν οἰκίαν ἐπὶ τὴν ἀμοῖν. καὶ κατέβη ἡ βροχή καὶ ἤλθον οἱ ποταμοὶ καὶ ἔπνευσαν οἱ ἄνεμοι καὶ προσέκοψαν τῇ οἰκίᾳ ἑκείνῃ, καὶ εὐθὺς ἔπεσεν καὶ ἦν ἡ πτώσις αὐτῆς μεγάλη.

And everyone who hears my words and does not act on them is like a person who built one’s house on the sand; and the rain poured down and the flash-floods came, and the winds blew and battered that house, and promptly it collapsed, and its fall was devastating.\(^\text{39}\)

[redactional “filler” sequence] (Q 9:57–58) Καὶ εἶπέν τις αὐτῷ· ἀκολουθήσω σοι ὅπου ἔναν ἄπέραχ. Καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· αἱ ἀλώπεκες φωλεοὺς ἔχουσιν καὶ τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ κατασκηνώσεις, ὁ δὲ υἱὸς τοῦ ἄνθρωπος οὐκ ἔχει ποῦ τὴν κεφαλήν κλίνῃ.

And someone said to him: I will follow you wherever you go. And Jesus said to him: Foxes have holes and birds of the sky have nests; but the son of humanity does not have anywhere he can lay his head.

[opening verse of the second sayings cluster] (Q 10:2) λέγει τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ· ὁ μὲν θερισμὸς πολὺς, οἱ δὲ ἐργάται ὁλίγοι· δεὴ ἐργάτες οὖν τοῦ κυρίου τοῦ θερισμοῦ ὅπως ἐκβάλη ἐργάτας εἰς τὸν θερισμὸν αὐτοῦ.

He said to his disciples: The harvest is plentiful, but the workers are few. So ask the Lord of the harvest to dispatch workers into his harvest.\(^\text{40}\)

Meanwhile, removing Q 9:57–58 from the $Q^1$ stratum results in the following reconstruction:

---


\(^{40}\) Ibid., 160–61.
Concluding verse of the first sayings cluster] (Q 6:49) ὁ δὲ ἀκούον μου τοὺς λόγους καὶ μὴ ποιῶν αὐτοὺς δημοῖς ἔστιν ἀνθρώπων ὄς φιλοδομήσειν αὐτοῦ τὴν οἰκίαν ἐπὶ τὴν ἁμοῦν. καὶ κατέβη ἡ βροχὴ καὶ ἤλθον οἱ ποταμοὶ καὶ ἔπνευσαν οἱ ἄνεμοι καὶ προσέκοψαν τῇ οἰκίᾳ ἐκείνῃ, καὶ εὐθὺς ἔρρησαν καὶ ἤν ἡ πτώσις αὐτῆς μεγάλη.

And everyone who hears my words and does not act on them is like a person who built one’s house on the sand; and the rain poured down and the flash-floods came, and the winds blew and battered that house, and promptly it collapsed, and its fall was devastating.

redactional “filler” sequence] (Q 9:59–60) . . . δὲ τῶν μαθητῶν [αὐτοῦ] εἶπεν αὐτῷ· κύριε, ἐπὶ τὸν ἁμοῦν ἐπέλθειν καὶ ἤλθον τὸν πατέρα μου. εἶπεν δὲ αὐτῷ· ἀκολουθεῖ μοι καὶ ἄφες τοὺς νεκροὺς θάψαι τοὺς ἐαυτῶν νεκροὺς.

But [. . .] of his disciples said to him: Master, permit me first to go and bury my father. But he said to him: follow me and let the dead bury their dead.

opening verse of the second sayings cluster] (Q 10:2) λέγει τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ· ὃ μὲν θερισμὸς πολύς, οἱ δὲ εργάται ὁλίγοι· δεήθη δὲ οὖν τοῦ κυρίου τοῦ θερισμοῦ ὡς ἐκβάλῃ ἐργάτας εἰς τὸν θερισμὸν αὐτοῦ.

He said to his disciples: The harvest is plentiful, but the workers are few. So ask the Lord of the harvest to dispatch workers into his harvest.

The reader can see that the second of the above two possible reconstructions of the Q	extsuperscript{1} stratum is considerably more cohesive in segueing from the great sermon to the “mission speech” cluster and its opening statement (10:2) via a redactional “filler” sequence that features a disciple asking Jesus a question. In fact, thus reconstructed, Q 9:59 features the technique of catchword association, latching the “filler” sequence to the opening verse of the second sayings cluster (I. . .]. δὲ τῶν μαθητῶν [αὐτοῦ] εἶπεν αὐτῷ· / εἶπεν δὲ αὐτῷ· / λέγει τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ·).

It would seem, then, that Q 9:57–58 is secondary with respect to 9:59–60. On the Q	extsuperscript{1} level 9:57–58 actually seems to interrupt the otherwise smooth transition between the first and second sayings collections, clashing with 9:59–60 which in all likelihood indeed

41 My reconstruction.
is a Q¹ chria and a redactional “clasp” connecting the collections. The key literary clue here is the unspecified nature of the petitioner in 9:57, which clashes with a disciple petitioner figure in 9:59:

[Concluding verse of the first sayings cluster] (Q 6:49) ὁ δὲ ἄκοινον μου τοὺς λόγους καὶ μὴ ποιῶν αὐτοὺς ὁμοίως ἔστιν ἀνθρώπως ὡς ὕψωσέν αὐτοῦ τὴν οἰκίαν ἐπὶ τὴν ἀμμοῦ καὶ κατέβη ἤ βροχή καὶ ἦλθον οἱ ποταμοὶ καὶ ἔπνευσαν οἱ ἄνεμοι καὶ προσέκοψαν τῇ οἰκίᾳ ἐκείνη, καὶ εὐθὺς ἔπεσαν καὶ ἦν η πτώσις αὐτῆς μεγάλη.

And everyone who hears my words and does not act on them is like a person who built one’s house on the sand; and the rain poured down and the flash-floods came, and the winds blew and battered that house, and promptly it collapsed, and its fall was devastating.

[secondary addition] (Q 9:57–58) Καὶ εἶπεν τις αὐτῷ· ἀκολουθήσω σοι ὅπου ἔδην ἀπέρχῃ. Καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· αἱ ἀλαπέκες φωλεύς ἔχουσιν καὶ τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ κατασκηνώσεις, ὁ δὲ νῦς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἔχει ποῦ τὴν κεφαλήν κλίνῃ.

And someone said to him: I will follow you wherever you go. And Jesus said to him: Foxes have holes and birds of the sky have nests; but the son of humanity does not have anywhere he can lay his head.

[redactional “filler” sequence] (Q 9:59–60) [. . .] δὲ τῶν μαθητῶν [αὐτοῦ] εἶπεν αὐτῷ· κύρε, ἐπιτρέψων μοι πρῶτον ἀπελθεῖν καὶ θάψαι τὸν πατέρα μου. εἶπεν δὲ αὐτῷ· ἀκολούθει μοι καὶ ἄφες τοὺς νεκροὺς θάψαι τοὺς ἐαυτῶν νεκροὺς.

But [. . .] of his disciples said to him: Master, permit me first to go and bury my father. But he said to him: follow me and let the dead bury their dead.

[opening verse of the second sayings cluster] (Q 10:2) λέγει τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ· ὁ μὲν θερισμὸς πολὺς, οὐ δὲ ἐργάται ὁλίγοι· δεήθητε οὖν τοῦ κυρίου τοῦ θερισμοῦ ὅπως ἐκβάλῃ ἐργάταις εἰς τὸν θερισμὸν αὐτοῦ.

He said to his disciples: The harvest is plentiful, but the workers are few. So ask the Lord of the harvest to dispatch workers into his harvest.

My reconstruction.
To locate Q 9:57–58 in Q’s strata we will now examine the possibility of it being a continuation of the pericope immediately preceding this chria in the final text of Q. That pericope is the Q² text 7:18–35, viz., Jesus’ extended response to John’s disciples. To examine these two units for compatibility, we now attach 9:57–58 to 7:31–35 which also features the Son of Man figure:

Q 7:31–35 + 9:57–58

(7:31) To what am I to compare this generation and what is it like?

(7:32) It is like children seated in the market-place, who, addressing the others, say: We fluted for you, but you would not dance; we wailed, but you would not cry.

(7:33) For John came, neither eating nor drinking, and you say: He has a demon!

(7:34) ἦλθεν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἔσθιον καὶ πίνων, καὶ λέγετε: ίδοὺ ἀνθρώπος φάγος καὶ οίνοπότης, τελωνάν φίλος καὶ ἀμαρτωλόν.

The son of humanity came, eating and drinking, and you say: Look! A person who is a glutton and drunkard, a chum of tax collectors and sinners!

(7:35) καὶ ἑδικαίωθη ἡ σοφία ἀπὸ τῶν τέκνων αὐτῆς.

But Wisdom was vindicated by her children.

(9:57–58) Καὶ εἶπεν τις αὐτῷ· ἀκολουθήσω σοι ὅπου ἔαν ἀπέρχῃ. Καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· αἱ ἀλώπεκες φωλεοὺς ἔχουσιν καὶ τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ κατασκηνώσεις, οὗ δὲ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου οὔκ ἔχει ποῦ τὴν κεφαλῆν κλίνῃ.

And someone said to him: I will follow you wherever you go. And Jesus said to him: Foxes have holes and birds of the sky have nests; but the son of humanity does not have anywhere he can lay his head.

Q 7:18–35 opened with John’s question regarding Jesus’ identity: “Are you the one to come, or are we to expect someone else?” (7:19). If 9:57–58 is read as the section’s actual conclusion, then by the time Jesus concludes his response—including the
closing exclamation point in 9:58—the Q2 author has answered John’s question in a most affirmative fashion. Jesus is indeed “the one to come,” viz. the futuristic Son of Man (7:34, 9:58), the one who will come again to vindicate the faithful at the eschaton (11:30; 12:8, 40; 17:24, 26, 30) and who therefore meets John’s expectation of just such a judgment day agent (3:16–17). In other words, according to the Q2 author’s logic Jesus was not accepted by “this generation” (7:34) because he is not of this world (9:58), akin to Sophia’s legendary rejection. Consequently, John and his disciples should understand that Jesus—as the Son of Man who is not of this world (9:58)—is also the one to come (7:19) into this world again in the future, this time as the world’s judge at the eschaton.

To put it in another way, the point of Q 9:57–58 seems far from saying that the Son of Man is just another vagrant prophet, wandering about from door to door and sleeping on cold hard ground. Rather, the point is to explain to all who wonder, represented here with a possibly fictional device as “John’s disciples,” whether such a vagrant prophet could also be the futuristic Son of Man and consequently someone worth dying for. Introduced in the Q2 opening segment 3:16–17 John’s expectation immediately creates a category for Jesus to be God’s eschatological champion and vindicator of the faithful, but as noted by Robinson, the lingering doubts raised by Jesus’ known historical fate can only be dispelled once his rejection becomes seen in a positive light. It is the Son of Man as Sophia incarnate connection shared with Similitudes and now developed into a full-blown christological apologetic by Q2 7:18–9:58 that creates just such a positive category.
Our reconstruction of the Q² stratum’s section 7:18–9:58 therefore answers several important questions. First, it explains the otherwise unattested reference to a non-eschatological Son of Man figure in late second temple literature. Not only is such a reference strange for the late second temple milieu, but first of all it seems strange in Q which itself is otherwise entirely dedicated to an eschatological (apocalyptic, judicial, etc.) Son of Man. Secondly, and this point is related to the previous one, the Q² origin of 9:57–58 eliminates the difficulty presented by the anomalous presence of the Son of Man title only here in Q¹. Third, it sheds further light on the Q² group’s apologetic by demonstrating precisely how the positive category for Jesus’ rejection might have been intended to function in the Q² stratum, viz., by presenting his historical rejection as that of Sophia. Fourth and related to the previous point, it highlights the conceptual connection between Q and Similitudes via a similar futuristic Son of Man/Sophia incarnate identification as applied in that composition to Enoch. Fifth, it highlights a new development of the Son of Man mythology in 1 CE Jewish apocalyptic literature by rendering the futuristic Son of Man/Sophia incarnate identification into a vehicle for apologetic, placed in the service of one historical individual’s personal rejection. In other words, though the Q² author’s community may have been waver ing in their hope, along with “John’s disciples,” that Jesus could be their eschatological vindicator, 9:57–58 seeks to dispel their doubt via precisely that which gave rise to doubt in the first place—Jesus’ rejection—by casting his rejection as Sophia’s legendary incarnation!

Finally, locating 9:57–58 in Q² locates Sophia christology proper in the document’s second stratum. This allows us to turn to our dissertation’s most pressing
question: why was a new christological shift—exhibited, as we have shown on literary-
critical grounds, by the Q^3 stratum’s texts 4:1–13, 10:21–22—truly necessary?

The Next Christological Stage in Q^3 (4:1–13; 10:21–22): God’s Son as the Most
Appropriate Category for Sophia’s Incarnation

It is hard not to notice the somewhat cautious if not outright hesitant nature of the Sophia
and Son of Man identification. Both in Q 9:57–58 and in Similitudes the identification
remains strictly conceptual, lurking between the lines, never explicitly stated and thus
begging the question why nothing more concrete is found in either document. Sophia’s
gender suggests the most likely answer. In her manuscript Consider Jesus Elizabeth A.
Johnson writes:

One of the figures in the Jewish scriptures with which [the early Christians]
identified [Jesus] very early on (some think it was the first) was “Sophia,” or
Wisdom. The figure is a female personification of God in outreach to the world.
Sophia creates, redeems, establishes justice, protects the poor, teaches the
mysteries of the world, and most especially gives life (see the Book of Wisdom).
From Paul, who calls Jesus the wisdom of God (1 Cor 1:24), to John who models
Jesus in his long discourses upon Sophia, wisdom christology offers the
possibility of affirming the significance of Jesus Christ and of confessing even his
divinity in a non-androcentric framework. As Sophia incarnate Jesus can be
discerned as a coincidence of opposites in every respect: crucified yet glorified;
God’s own being yet made flesh; a man yet the prophet and very presence of
Sophia herself.\footnote{Elizabeth A. Johnson, Consider Jesus: Waves of Renewal in Christology (Crossroad: New York, 1997), 111–12.}

It is not difficult to recognize how, attractive though it may have been in its
apologetic dimension, the Jesus/Sophia identification of Q^2 had a limited shelf life. At
some point its insights and potential implications would inevitably be found dangerous by
an androcentric religion that sought to assign women a secondary role within its
hierarchy (1 Tim 2). With that, we now can revisit and nuance James M. Robinson’s suggestion regarding Q 10:21–22 and Sophia christology:

The association of this final emissary of Sophia with the unique apocalyptic Son of Humanity made it easy to heighten the christology in the wisdom sayings of Q by according to the Son Sophia’s unique relation to the Father, in effect identifying Jesus with Sophia herself.44

In our view, in the Q3 redaction and especially in Q 4:1–13 and 10:21–22 the already existing conceptualization of Jesus as Sophia incarnate receives something other than a christological heightening, which seems too positive a term to describe the phenomenon under discussion. Instead, what it receives is rather a christological narrowing that helps avoid a potentially dangerous and unwanted identification with a female figure. It is true that the portrayal of Jesus that emerges in Q 4:1–13 and 10:21–22 retains some of Sophia’s traditional features, e.g., the intimate closeness of Jesus and God (10:21–22), the conceptualization of Jesus as the comprehensive fullness of God’s wisdom (10:21), and possibly an association of Wisdom with Torah (4:1–13). Still, the new christological category of God’s Son decisively—and by virtue of its clear linguistic emphasis on Jesus’ masculine gender, almost certainly correctly—renders the Sophia motif merely an undercurrent, a distant echo from ultimately fictional writings.

That this new, safer christological category sacrificed neither the grand indictment of “this generation” (see the polemical attack against the Temple in Q 4:9–12), nor the anticipated vindication of Jesus’ followers (10:21–22) probably best explains its success in formative Christianity. Virtually every aspect previously afforded by the concept of

44 James M. Robinson, “Jesus as Sophos and Sophia,” 130.
Sophia’s rejection was retained in the imagery of God’s exclusive offspring, outlining a relationship that was by default as intimate as that previously ascribed to Sophia.
CHAPTER SEVEN
CONCLUSION

Our inquiry into the redactional origin and purpose of Q 10:21–22 began with an overview of the couplet’s assessment by Rudolph Bultmann and the scholarly hypotheses of James M. Robinson, John S. Kloppenborg, and Arland Jacobson. The research of James M. Robinson summarized the post-World War II Heidelbergian discussion of Q and made considerable use of the works of Dieter Lührmann and Siegfried Schulz. Robinson’s hypothesis of a Sophia christological trajectory in Q—with 10:21–22 presumably as its climax—was retained by Kloppenborg and Jacobson. Each of those scholars agreed with Robinson’s allocation of 10:21–22 to “the later redactional layers of Q,” though Kloppenborg gave the couplet a very specific stratigraphic location in his Q² redactional stratum. Meanwhile, Arland Jacobson could not find a specific stratigraphic location for 10:21–22, maintaining only that the couplet was “unlike anything else in Q” and compositionally very late.

Along with Arland Jacobson we questioned Kloppenborg’s coordination of 10:21–22 with the Q² edition. It seems that Kloppenborg’s appeal to the alignment of the couplet’s christology with other Q² texts (such as 12:8–9) was only one of the factors influencing his decision. We suggested that Kloppenborg’s profile of the next redactional stratum, Q³, also played a major role in preventing him from considering the possibility of 10:21–22 being later than Q². For Kloppenborg the Q³ edition was a scribal rewriting
of the document, notable for its insertion of three texts (Q 4:1–13; 11:42c; 16:17) affirming the validity of the Torah. Given that particular thematic agenda, Kloppenborg found no place in Q\(^3\) for what he saw, along with Robinson, as an identification of Jesus with Sophia.

Kloppenborg, however, left unanswered Jacobson’s comments on the couplet’s unique pathos, which certainly seemed to stand out against the rest of the Q\(^2\) stratum. That is, the group’s attitude in 10:21–22 appears to be very different from the preceding mission speech section 10:2–16. This is made very clear by the couplet’s esoteric theology, whereby God is said to have revealed his truths exclusively to the Q group, even as his Son concealed that knowledge from the rest of the world. Our examination of the way in which 10:21–22 functions in the mission speech section 10:2–22 has confirmed Jacobson’s suggestion of the couplet’s very late compositional perspective. We have, however, confirmed Jacobson’s suspicions by working with Kloppenborg’s stratigraphic analysis of the mission speech section and of the document as a whole, something Jacobson (who did not subscribe to Kloppenborg’s theory) did not do.

In our view, two major features set 10:21–22 apart from Kloppenborg’s Q\(^2\). The first and most notable difference is the emphasis on the status of Jesus’ followers as a community of elect. According to our analysis in Chapter Three, in the mission speech section (10:2–22) both 10:21–22 and the Q\(^2\) redactional insertion 10:12–15 serve to comment on the formative, Q\(^1\) mission speech material 10:2–11, 16 (in which the mission was still only anticipated as a future event). Unlike the Q\(^1\) material, these two comments reflect on the mission as something that has already taken place and was met with
rejection. But while the \(Q^2\) comment (10:12–15) reacts to the rejection with anger, castigating the group’s opposition, in 10:21–22 a suggestion is made that the mission’s failure was a part of God’s bigger plan all along (for which God is actually praised) and that God is the one concealing the truth about himself from the sages and the educated, \textit{viz.} the movement’s detractors! Thus, the reason for the mission’s failure in \(Q\) 10:21–22 is different from that found in 10:12–15. The couplet’s author also uses language and imagery otherwise foreign to \(Q^2\) to express this idea.

That the perspective of 10:21–22 is secondary to the \(Q^2\) material in the mission speech section (10:12–15) is further highlighted by the aporia created by the redactional placement of the couplet after 10:16. In that saying the missionaries’ rejection was equated with the rejection of God and Jesus. But in 10:21–22 the movement’s rejection is argued to have been a product of the concealing work of God and Jesus. This new take on the mission’s failure not only clashes with 10:16 (is God causing his own rejection?), it also renders the \(Q^1\) mission instruction in 10:2–11 and the angry woes of \(Q^2\) pointless by rendering the mission an \textit{a priori} doomed endeavor. This contradicts the polemical and deuteronomistic framework of the \(Q^2\) edition whose author consistently lamented the fact that the movement’s proclamation had fallen on deaf ears. Finally, from the form-critical perspective it also seems odd for a prophetic denunciation to be followed by the speaker’s thanksgiving. To sum up our literary-critical findings, the sudden “twist” in the plot of the mission speech section introduced by 10:21–22 seems to originate in a post-\(Q^2\) redactional stage.
What redactional stage, then, does 10:21–22 belong to? To answer that question we turned to the second major aspect setting 10:21–22 apart from Q^2. Here, the initial clue is offered by the fact that the title reserved for Jesus in 10:22 is no longer Q^2’s “Son of Man” but rather simply the Son (ὁ υἱὸς) of God. This direct identification and special underlining of the close, intimate relationship between Jesus and God signals a major shift in Q’s Christology, presenting Jesus as someone far elevated above the holy sage (Q^1) and even above the coming Son of Man (Q^2).

Jesus is called Son (υἱὸς) only in one other place in Q, the Temptation Story (4:1–13). In Chapter Five we demonstrated that 10:21–22 can be seen as thematically coherent with 4:1–13—that is, belonging to Q^3—but only when one also sees the way in which both 10:21–22 and the Q^3 Temptation story display a critique of a temple-focused Judaism, judging it as unreliable and false in contrast to God’s new revelation through his Son. This point is conveyed by locating the devil in the temple, reciting a climactic section of LXX Ps 91 (which corresponds in the Psalm to the priestly response to a petitioner). This highly ironic and irreverent imagery in Q 4:10–11 appears to have been ignored in all previous analyses of the Q Temptation Story. In our view, it is consistent with the esoteric “us vs. them” sectarian mentality of Q 10:21–22. In both texts the Q group appears to assert itself as superior to traditional forms of Judaism (σοφοὶ καὶ συνετοὶ in 10:21, the temple in 4:10–11), no doubt because of the group’s unique revelation deriving from ὁ υἱὸς.

We find something similar in Enochic tradition. Well before Christian polemic, Enochic mythology (and specifically the myth of the Watchers) offered an attractive
explanation as to how the Jerusalem temple was no longer relevant. While Q is not an Enochic text and obviously belongs to the Judeo-Christian movement, its negative attitude toward the temple (11:49–51; 13:34–35) largely overlaps with that of Enochic and other dissenting movements. It shares with these a worldview in which the temple is regarded as corrupt.

Furthermore, one notes that in latest stages of the Enochic tradition (such as in the mythological universe of Similitudes) the eschatological Son of Man largely takes over the Sophia narrative. As such, in Similitudes Sophia’s preexistence becomes a clear attribute of the Son of Man (1 En 48:6). Just as importantly, following the identification of the Son of Man with the once earthly (and now heavenly) Enoch (1 En 71), the historical Enoch’s lifetime on earth begins to overlap with Sophia’s legendary historical visitation.

This dynamic in Q is widely known as “Sophia christology.” As we showed in Chapters Two and Four, there has been much discussion among scholars of the precise christological paradigm at work in Q 10:21–22. Many Q scholars—especially those doing redaction analysis, such as James M. Robinson, Arland Jacobson and John Kloppenborg—were convinced that 10:21–22 features an identification of Jesus and Sophia. Meanwhile, Christopher Tuckett and Gabriele Boccaccini suggested that the mythological figure of the Son of Man—not Sophia—may be behind the couplet’s christology.

In the closing chapter of our dissertation we proposed that the reimagining of Q’s Son of Man as Sophia incarnate occurs prior to 10:21–22, in the Q² stratum. We
demonstrated that it was in Q 7:31–9:58 (esp. 9:57–58)—not 10:21–22—that Robinson’s “culminating instance of the rejection of God’s spokesmen by Israel” actually takes place. Just as Robinson had surmised, in Q^2 a new christological category is provided to account for what appears to have been the reason for the group’s rejection and ridicule (6:22–23) in places such as Chorazin, Bethsaida and Capernaum (10:12–15). That new category is created by the appropriation of the Sophia narrative by Jesus the Son of Man, who is affirmed as the true future vindicator of the faithful (7:18–19) precisely because his shameful historical fate is vindicated by the imagery of Sophia’s rejection (9:57–58).

Meanwhile, in Q^3 Jesus as the uniquely privileged Son of God needs little validation. In fact, the intense focus on Jesus’ divine person in Q 4:1–13 and 10:21–22 serves as the warrant for the group’s self-affirmation. It appears that in reconsidering Jesus’ origin and essence, the Q group—only recently ridiculed and dismissed by the σοφοὶ καὶ σοφετοὶ—came to understand the revelation with which it had been entrusted as setting it apart from the rest of the world. In the process, as the Temptation Story shows, the institutions of the second temple and those most expected to be wise and discerning came under sharp critique.

We find the masculine language and the imagery of sonship employed in 4:1–13 and 10:21–22, along with the absence of Sophia imagery, convincing enough to question the presence of Sophia in the christological background of Q^3. We hasten to stress, moreover, that we do not see the Q^2 dynamics behind 9:57–58 as an identification of Jesus with Sophia either. Rather, what takes place in the Q^2 edition is a mythological appropriation of Sophia’s attributes in service of an apologetic agenda. As we suggested
in Chapter Six, however, that appropriation could not proceed without some adjustment of the gendered imagery. Having been used in the creation of a positive christological category, the Sophia figure needed to be replaced by an appropriately masculine one. That figure was created using the language of sonship found in Q³.

To conclude, we would like to stress the broader implications of this research. It is well known that in spite of the different concerns and agendas the various second temple era movements shared many of the same ideas, even if they frequently developed these in their own unique way. Regardless of movement and group-specific developments, these ideas comprised a sort of an intellectual public domain in second temple Judaism. Our dissertation has shown that an early Judeo-Christian group represented by the redactional stages of Q synthesized ideas that had previously existed in the Enochic movement to create a number of its own christological categories. The true purpose of this work—and its implications for future research—theory extends beyond literary criticism and the adjudication of the various editions of Q. At the end of the day, we hope to contribute to a better understanding of the interaction among various second temple groups and movements, both those that are sectarian and those affiliated with the temple cult, along with the mythological trajectories of their principal conceptions.
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This dissertation represents the culmination of an educational path begun on a different continent and with a very different purpose. It was in fact not until the second year of my Ph.D program at Loyola University Chicago that I developed a keen interest in the Synoptic Sayings Source, a change in direction—or rather, an act of finding direction!—that I readily attribute to the course on Q taken with Dr. Wendy Cotter, CSJ in the spring of 2008. While a detailed inquiry into Q’s more problematic sections (one of which would eventually give rise to this dissertation) had to be postponed for the time of the comprehensive examination, there was little doubt in my mind that I wished to conduct a Q investigation for my doctoral work.

Under the steady guidance of Dr. Wendy Cotter, CSJ, I was able to expand my inquiry into Q 10:21–22 to exhibit parallels with literature from the late Second Temple era in Judaism. As further similarities between Q and that literature emerged a more holistic thesis became possible, resulting in a series of unexpected and exciting findings. During the last year and a half of my dissertation work multiple subthemes not directly related to the main thesis—but certainly stemming from my dissertation research—became conference papers, including two back to back appearances at the Loyola/Marquette Colloquium, as well as papers given at the 2013 Midwest Society of the Biblical Literature Meeting, the St. Ambrose Conference on Bible and Justice, and the
2013 Society of the Biblical Literature Annual Meeting in Baltimore, MD. Further work, including publications, is currently under way.