New Test. Stud. 50, pp. 476–494. Printed in the United Kingdom © 2004 Cambridge University Press
DOI:10.1017/S002868850400027X

A Q Community in Galilee?

BIRGER A. PEARSON
27345 E. Vine Ave, Escalon, California 95320, USA

It is often assumed, especially in North American scholarship, that the Q source used by Matthew and Luke reflects a special community different from those reflected in other writings of the NT. This community is located in Galilee, where the 'Q gospel' is supposed to have been composed. In this article it is argued that current theories regarding the composition and location of Q are untenable. It is also concluded that there was no significant difference in terms of beliefs and practices between Jesus-believing Jews in Galilee and in Jerusalem.

'Are not all these who are speaking Galileans?' So say the pilgrims gathered in Jerusalem for the Pentecost festival as they hear Peter and the rest of the Twelve speaking under the impulse of the Holy Spirit (Acts 2.7). Those Galileans were, in fact, busy gathering a messianic community of Jesus believers in Jerusalem. The early chapters of Acts portray something of the life of that community. But what about fellow Jesus followers who remained at home in Galilee? Acts provides no information about them, apart from the summary statement that 'the church throughout all Judea and Galilee and Samaria had peace and was built up' (Acts 9.31). That certainly implies that communities of Jesus believers existed in Galilee. But what were they like? We have no information at all about that.[1]

Paucity of information has not deterred scholars from attempting to delineate a particular kind of Christianity peculiar to Galilee, whose theology and religious practice is then set in contrast to that of the Jerusalem community. But do we have sources that can convincingly be traced to Galilee? The Gospel of Mark has sometimes been singled out as reflecting a Galilean orientation.[2] Even the Epistle of

1 I do not mean to argue for the historicity of the details in Acts 2, but that the founders of the Jerusalem church were 'men of Galilee' (cf. Acts 1.11; 13.31) cannot be denied. As for 9.31, that is a redactional summary, and does not necessarily tell us what, if anything, Luke knew of the Galilean situation. Nevertheless, I see no reason to doubt that some Jesus believers stayed at home in Galilee.

2 Ernst Lohmeyer, *Galiläa und Jerusalem* (FRLANT 52; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1936); Willi Marxsen, *Introduction to the New Testament: An Approach to its Problems* (trans. G. Buswell; Oxford: Blackwell, 1968) 143. For a good discussion of the issues, with additional references, see Jesper Svartvik, *Mark and Mission: Mk 7:1–23 in its Narrative and Historical Contexts* (Coniectanea Biblica, NT Series 32; Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 2000) 227–36.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S002868850400027X Published online by Cambridge University Press

James has been suggested as reflecting a Galilean type of Christianity.[3] Now more recently, particularly in North America, new theories have been put forward regarding a particular brand of Galilean Christianity lying behind the hypothetical 'Q' source used by Matthew and Luke in addition to the Gospel of Mark. John Kloppenborg's work has been particularly influential here, especially his arguments positing a literary development of the 'Q' source, with a 'sapiential' first edition (Q^1) overlaid by judgment-oriented and 'apocalyptic' material that marks 'Q' as we now know it (Q^2).[4]

Meanwhile, the 'Q' source has come to be defined as a 'sayings gospel',[5] concentrating on the teachings of Jesus, and is seen as representing an alternative type of gospel, i.e. an alternative to the narrative gospel type stressing the story of Jesus culminating in his passion, death, and resurrection, of which Mark is the earliest extant example. Theories of stratification in the development of Q have also come to play an important role in defining not only the nature of the message of the historical Jesus, but also the nature of what is called the 'Q community', for which 'Q' was supposedly the foundational gospel. It is argued that that community was resident in Galilee in the early decades of the Jesus movement, and therefore represents a distinctive Galilean form of Christianity, which was also chiefly responsible for the eschatological orientation of the Jesus tradition as it has come down to us.[6]

3 L. E. Elliott-Binns, *Galilean Christianity* (SBT 16; Chicago: Alec Allenson, 1956).

4 John S. Kloppenborg, *The Formation of Q: Trajectories in Ancient Wisdom Collections* (Studies in Antiquity and Christianity; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987). Kloppenborg regards the temptation story as the latest edition to Q. The final redaction can thus be labeled Q^3. See now his more recent work, John S. Kloppenborg Verbin, *Excavating Q: The History and Setting of the Sayings Gospel* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2000). There he insists that his analysis is purely literary, not thematic or form-critical (150f.). It should be noted that Kloppenborg's work was inspired in large measure by the seminal contributions of James M. Robinson and Helmut Koester. See esp. J.M. Robinson, 'LOGOI SOPHON: On the Gattung of Q', and H. Koester, 'GNOMAI DIAPHOROI: The Origin and Nature of Diversification in the History of Early Christianity' and 'One Jesus and Four Primitive Gospels', both in Robinson and Koester, *Trajectories through Early Christianity* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1971) 71–113, 114–57, 158–204; also H. Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels: Their History and Development* (Philadelphia: Trinity, 1990). Dale Allison has offered a completely different theory of a three-stage composition of Q; see D. C. Allison, Jr, *The Jesus Tradition in Q* (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity, 1997) 1–40. I find his theory just as problematic as that of Kloppenborg *et al.*

5 How the term 'gospel' came to be applied to the Q source is discussed by Kloppenborg, *Excavating Q*, 398–408. For a good critique of this terminology, see Frans Neirynck, 'Q: From Source to Gospel', in F. Neirynck, *Evangelica III: 1992–2000 Collected Essays* (BETL 150; Leuven: Leuven University/Peeters, 2001) 421–30.

6 For good critiques of this approach, see, e.g., Jens Schröter, 'Entscheidung für die Worte Jesu: Die Logienquelle in der Geschichte des frühen Christentums', *BK* 54 (1999) 70–4; Jean-Paul Michaud, 'Quelle(s) communauté(s) derrière la source Q?' *The Sayings Source Q and the Historical Jesus* (ed. Andreas Lindemann; BETL 158; Leuven: Leuven University/Peeters, 2001)

https://doi.org/10.1017/S002868850400027X Published online by Cambridge University Press

It should also be noted that much of the recent work on Q also deals with the *Gospel of Thomas*, often thought to represent the same genre as Q (sayings collection) but with a different tendency at work in its final redaction, i.e. a 'gnostic' or 'gnosticizing' tendency, in contrast to the 'apocalyptic' tendency of Q. Theories of stratification in the *Gospel of Thomas* also play a role here. The work of the 'Jesus Seminar' is probably the best-known example of such scholarship.[7] One can also mention here in passing theories arguing that the early Jesus movement in Galilee was a 'home grown variety of Cynicism'.[8]

The most ambitious work to date that relies on current Q scholarship to rewrite the history of early Christianity is that of John Dominic Crossan, *The Birth of Christianity*,[9] a sequel to his earlier work on the historical Jesus.[10] By the 'birth' of Christianity Crossan means the continuation of the kingdom of God movement of Jesus and his first companions (Christianity's 'conception') after Jesus' death, as those companions 'wrestled not only to imitate Jesus' life but also to understand Jesus' death' during the 30s and 40s of the Common Era.[11] In his book Crossan distinguishes between 'rural' and 'urban' Christianity, and between two distinctive traditions which he calls the 'Life Tradition' and the 'Death Tradition'.

577–606; Harold Attridge, 'Reflections on Research into Q', *Semeia* 55: *Early Christianity, Q and Jesus* (Atlanta: Scholars, 1992) 223–34; Maurice Casey, *An Aramaic Approach to Q* (SNTSMS 122; Cambridge: Cambridge University, 2002) 15–50.

7 Robert W. Funk, Roy W. Hoover, and the Jesus Seminar, *The Five Gospels: The Search for the Authentic Words of Jesus* (New York: Macmillan, 1993). The *Gospel of Thomas* is, of course, the fifth gospel. For a detailed critique of this work see Birger A. Pearson, 'The Gospel according to the "Jesus Seminar": On Some Recent Trends in Gospel Research', Ch. 2 in Pearson, *The Emergence of the Christian Religion: Essays on Early Christianity* (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity, 1997) 23–57. See now also Svartvik, *Mark and Mission*, 65–74.

8 Burton L. Mack, *The Lost Gospel: The Book of Q and Christian Origins* (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1993) 120. For a critique, see James M. Robinson, 'The History and Religious Taxonomy of Q: The Cynic Hypothesis', *Gnosisforschung und Religionsgeschichte: Festschrift für Kurt Rudolph zum 65 Geburtstag* (ed. H. Preissler and H. Seiwert; Marburg: Diagonal-Verlag, 1994 [1995]) 247–65. See also Leif E. Vaage, *Galilean Upstarts: Jesus' First Followers According to Q* (Valley Forge, PA: Trinity, 1994). For a critique, see J. M. Robinson, '*Galilean Upstarts*: A Sot's Cynical Disciples', *Sayings of Jesus: Canonical and Non-Canonical: Essays in Honour of Tjitze Baarda* (ed. W. L. Petersen, J. S. Vos, and H. J. de Jonge; NovTSup 89; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1997) 223–49.

9 J. D. Crossan, *The Birth of Christianity: Discovering What Happened in the Years Immediately After the Execution of Jesus* (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1999).

10 J. D. Crossan, *The Historical Jesus: The Life of a Mediterranean Jewish Peasant* (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1991). In his latest book Crossan devotes a good deal of space to answering his critics, defending and clarifying the positions that he took in *The Historical Jesus*. Interestingly enough, he says nothing of the work of the Jesus Seminar, despite the fact that he was its co-chairman, with Robert Funk as the other co-chairman. See Pearson, *Emergence*, 31–2.

11 Crossan, *Birth of Christianity*, x.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S002868850400027X Published online by Cambridge University Press

He also refers to these two traditions as 'northern' and 'southern' traditions. The former is represented by the '*Q Gospel*', the *Gospel of Thomas*, and the *Didache*, 'which can all be plotted on geographical trajectories from Galilee into Syria'. The latter is represented by that variety of Christianity 'which moved from Jerusalem to Damascus and Antioch at a very, very early date. . . . The future of Catholic Christianity belonged to neither of them alone but to both of them together.'[12]

Crossan posits a 'common tradition' represented by what is taken as the earliest stratum of Q and *Thomas*, consisting mainly of sayings dealing with the kingdom of God, and then extrapolates from this common tradition a religiosity characterized by 'ethical eschatology'.[13] While the *Thomas* tradition developed into an 'ascetic' eschatology, the Q tradition developed into an 'apocalyptic' eschatology. The 'common tradition' knows of an apocalyptic eschatology associated with John the Baptist, but rejects it in favor of the 'ethical' eschatology that characterized Jesus' original message. It is only at a later stage of development that the Q community reimposes an 'apocalyptic' eschatology onto the Jesus tradition, a 'secondary apocalyptic eschatology' developing as a result of an increasing feeling of marginalization within the Q community. This 'secondary apocalyptic eschatology', represented, for example, by the judgment sayings attributed to Jesus in Q and by sayings featuring the coming of the Son of Man, is characterized by Crossan as 'a cosmic sanction . . . added on as one's primary and essential message is refused and rejected'. Apocalyptic eschatology in general, which is represented in the NT not only by the 'Q gospel' but also (with different emphases) by Mark and Paul, is ultimately incompatible with ethical eschatology, i.e. 'nonviolent resistance to systemic violence' as originally advocated by Jesus. In contrast to ethical eschatology, apocalyptic eschatology 'involves a God who uses force and violence to end force and violence', and advocates 'divine revenge' rather than 'divine justice'.[14] It can easily be seen that Crossan finds 'apocalyptic eschatology' not a little distasteful.

In my view there are serious problems with Crossan's reconstruction of early Galilean Christianity, and those problems have to do in large measure with Crossan's (and others') views regarding Q. It all boils down to the use (or misuse) of our sources, something that Crossan himself recognizes when he says: 'I also

12 Ibid., 415.

13 It is interesting to note that, in Crossan's 'Inventory of Common Sayings Tradition in the *Gospel of Thomas* and the *Q Gospel*', 41 per cent of the Common Sayings Tradition in *Thomas* has parallels in (the presumably later) Q^2 (ibid., 587). That the posited 'common sayings tradition' is eschatological in orientation is clear; *Thomas* as we know it has thoroughly de-eschatologized the earlier tradition. See esp. April D. DeConick, 'The Original *Gospel of Thomas*', *VC* 56 (2002), 167–99.

14 Crossan, *Birth of Christianity*, 265, 287.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S002868850400027X Published online by Cambridge University Press

take very seriously and am profoundly indebted to all of that recent Q scholarship. If it is wrong on Q, then so am I on the historical Jesus and earliest Christianity.'[15]

Well, let us see.

I do want to make clear here that I am not among those scholars who advocate 'dispensing with Q' altogether.[16] Christian Hermann Weisse proposed the Q hypothesis in 1838 to account for the non-Markan material shared in common by the gospels of Matthew and Luke,[17] and I count myself among those who regard the 'Two-Source Hypothesis' (Mark and Q), for all its problems, as still the best available solution to the problem of inter-Synoptic relationships. So let us concede that there was a document like the hypothetical Q, even if the problem of its delineation poses a formidable challenge to the efforts of the International Q Project to establish a critical edition of its Greek text.[18]

In what follows I want to discuss three issues or questions that bear upon our topic: (1) the shape of Q; (2) the function of Q; and (3) Q's supposed Galilean provenance.

1. 'Layers' and Q redaction

As I see it, the chief problem of current Q scholarship, affecting scholarly reconstructions of both the message of the historical Jesus and the nature and

15 Ibid., 111. Later on he says the same thing about his use of the *Gospel of Thomas* (239).

16 See e.g. Austin M. Farrer, 'On Dispensing with Q', *Studies in the Gospels: Essays in Memory of R. H. Lightfoot* (ed. D. E. Nineham; Oxford: Blackwell, 1955) 55–88. The Griesbach Hypothesis, advocating the priority of Matthew, is today the most important rival of the Two-Source Hypothesis. See David L. Dungan, *A History of the Synoptic Problem* (New York: Doubleday, 1999). See now also Mark Goodacre, *The Case Against Q: Studies in Markan Priority and the Synoptic Problem* (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity, 2001). Goodacre develops Farrer's position, dispensing with Q while acknowledging the priority of Mark. For a recent critique, see John S. Kloppenborg, 'On Dispensing with Q? Goodacre on the Relation of Luke to Matthew', *NTS* 49 (2003) 240–36.

17 C. H. Weisse, *Die evangelische Geschichte kritisch und philosophisch bearbeitet* (Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel, 1838).

18 The International Q Project, led by James M. Robinson, grew out of the Q Seminar of the Society of Biblical Literature (1985–9), and now consists of over 40 members who have regularly met at the Annual Meeting of SBL and at the project's centers, Claremont, California, Bamberg, Germany, and Toronto, Canada. A preliminary edition appeared in the fall issue of *JBL* (1990–5), and the final critical edition has appeared: J. M. Robinson, P. Hoffmann, J. S. Kloppenborg, eds, *Critical Edition of Q* (Hermeneia Supplements; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2000). An abbreviated and more user-friendly version has also appeared: J. M. Robinson, P. Hoffmann, J. S. Kloppenborg, eds, *The Sayings Gospel Q in Greek and English* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2002). Some 30 volumes are projected of *Documenta Q*, consisting of commentaries on the individual pericopes of Q and the history of research on them. The first volume, by S. Carruth and A. Garsky, ed. S. D. Anderson, on Q 11.2b–4 (the Lord's Prayer), appeared in 1996 (Leuven: Peeters).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S002868850400027X Published online by Cambridge University Press

history of the 'Q community', is the various theories put forward regarding the 'layering' of the Q document, with their assumption of a 'sapiential' layer overlaid by one or more 'apocalyptic' layers in the supposed stages of its composition. These theories have been challenged effectively, especially as a result of the recent work of Alan Kirk and Richard Horsley.[19] While Kirk and Horsley approach Q from very different vantage points, they both come to the same conclusion regarding the various theories of stratification growing out of the work of John Kloppenborg.[20] Kirk looks upon Q as a literary composition made up of four discourses, 'macro-compositions' made up of smaller speeches. These speeches consist of instructional material with mainly wisdom forms, but with prophetic elements as well. The redaction of Q is indebted to literary convention, and presupposes a comparatively high social level of the scribe or scribes responsible for its composition. Of the many important conclusions drawn by Kirk in his book, the one that interests us most here is this one: 'Q has no recoverable redaction *history* leading up to the redaction which gave its text the form it presently displays.'[21]

Horsley stresses more the oral features of Q, and sees Q as a transcription of a text that originated in oral performance. The text itself is made up of a series of discourses 'grounded in the Israelite popular tradition, over against the "official" tradition based in Jerusalem'.[22] Prophets in the Galilean communities in which Q originated would regularly perform, in a cultic context, the various discourses that make up the Q text, and it should be assumed that these performances would vary from one time to the next. Viewing the text of Q in that way leads Horsley to question the whole enterprise of the International Q Project, with its attempt to delineate a fixed text. The resultant text 'is a modern scholarly reconstruction' of a Greek text, often a 'bowdlerized' one owing to the differences between the Matthean and Lukan versions of Q. Moreover, there is no possibility of reconstructing an original text of the Galilean Aramaic in which the discourses were originally performed, even if the Koiné Greek of the discourses reflects Aramaic patterns of discourse.[23]

19 A. Kirk, *The Composition of the Sayings Source: Genre, Synchrony, and Wisdom Redaction in Q* (NovTSup 91; Leiden; Brill, 1998); R. A. Horsley, with J. A. Draper, *Whoever Hears You Hears Me: Prophets, Performance, and Tradition in Q* (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity, 1999); cf. R. A. Horsley, '*Logoi Propheton*? Reflections on the Genre of Q', *The Future of Early Christianity: Essays in Honor of Helmut Koester* (ed. Birger A. Pearson; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991) 195–209. Cf. also Christopher M. Tuckett, *Q and the History of Early Christianity: Studies on Q* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1996) 52–82.

20 Cf. n. 4 above. Kirk's book was originally a dissertation at Toronto directed by John Kloppenborg.

21 Kirk, *Composition*, 399. See also his review of Horsley's work (discussed next), *JBL* 120 (2001) 772–4.

22 Horsley, *Whoever Hears You*, 5.

23 Ibid., 187–8. Maurice Casey has recently attempted to reconstruct an Aramaic original of parts of Q: Casey, *Aramaic Approach*. Allison (*Jesus Tradition*, 48–9) also allows for an Aramaic original of part of Q; cf. also Tuckett, *Q and Early Christianity*, 85.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S002868850400027X Published online by Cambridge University Press

Horsley devotes a section of his book to a critical examination of the current theories of stratigraphy, and convincingly shows that modern attempts at defining a secondary, 'apocalyptic' level of Q are really theologically based, 'a way of attempting to save Jesus from perceived imprisonment in a seemingly fanatical ancient worldview'.[24] His work also has implications for a generic comparison between Q and *Thomas*. It turns out, in fact, that Q and *Thomas* do not share the same genre at all. It is only *Thomas* that can be labeled as a 'sayings collection'; Q, in contrast, is 'a sequence of speeches or discourses'.[25]

In his insistence on seeing Q as an 'oral derived text', Horsley has rightly relied on theoretical studies of the nature of orality and textuality in antiquity.[26] But 'what has been missing' heretofore in such discussions is 'a sufficiently close parallel to the oral traditioning which presumably was the initial mode of and vehicle for the Jesus tradition'. So says James Dunn in a recent study of considerable importance, 'Jesus in Oral Memory'.[27] Dunn calls attention to an important essay on oral transmission of tradition by Kenneth Bailey, based on over 30 years' experience of village life in the Middle East.[28] The villages studied 'have retained their identity over many generations, so that, arguably, their oral culture is as close as we will ever be able to find to the village culture of first century Galilee'.[29] Bailey refers to 'informal controlled tradition' consisting of proverbs, story riddles, poetry, parables or stories, and accounts of important figures in the history of the village, and distinguishes different levels of control or flexibility in the transmission of tradition, depending on the genres involved. Dunn goes on to apply the insights gained from Bailey's discussion to the role of oral tradition in NT narratives and teachings, including material usually attributed to Q.[30] In summarizing the results of his analyses, Dunn says:

24 Horsley, *Whoever Hears You*, 73.

25 Ibid., 85. On the genre of *Thomas* as we now have it, see the ground-breaking work of Hans-Martin Schenke, 'On the Compositional History of the Gospel of Thomas', *Forum* 10/1–2 (1994 [1998]), reprinted as number 40 of the 'Occasional Papers' of the Institute for Antiquity and Christianity (Claremont, CA: Claremont Graduate School, 1998). To be sure, *Thomas* contains a core of early material, especially the Kingdom sayings. Cf. n. 13 above.

26 Horsley, *Whoever Hears You*, 150–75.

27 J. D. G. Dunn, 'Jesus in Oral Memory: The Initial Stages of the Jesus Tradition', *SBLSP* 39 (2000), 287–326, here 294.

28 K. E. Bailey, 'Informal Controlled Oral Tradition and the Synoptic Gospels', *Asia Journal of Theology* 5 (1991) 34–54.

29 Dunn, 'Jesus in Oral Memory', 294.

30 Q pericopes analyzed are: the Lord's Prayer (Matt 6.7–15/Luke 11.1–4); the Sermon on the Mount/Plain (Matt 5.13/Luke 14.34–5, Matt 5.25–6/Luke 12.57–9, Matt 5.39b–42/Luke 6.29–30, Matt 7.13–14/Luke 13.24); also Matt 10.34–8/Luke 12.51–3, 14.26–7; Matt 18.15, 21–2/Luke 17.3–4; and Matt 22.1–14/Luke 14.16–24. Dunn distinguishes between q (non-Markan material common to Matt and Luke) and Q (the hypothetical sayings source), and decries 'the curse of the literary paradigm' that has afflicted Synoptic scholarship (299, 309). Dunn also

https://doi.org/10.1017/S002868850400027X Published online by Cambridge University Press

> I have no wish to deny the existence of a Q document, any more than to deny the priority of Mark. But again and again in the case of Q/q material we are confronted with traditions within different Synoptics which are clearly related (the same basic teaching), and which were evidently remembered and valued as teaching of Jesus. At the same time, in the cases examined above the relation is not obviously literary, each version derived by editing some literary predecessor. The relation is more obviously to be conceived as happening at the oral level. That could mean that these traditions were known to the evangelists not in a literary form, but in the living tradition of liturgy or communal celebration of the remembered Jesus. Or it could mean that they knew the tradition from Q, but regarded Q as a form of oral retelling, so that their own retelling retained the oral characteristics of the traditioning process. The two alternatives are not mutually exclusive, of course, but it can hardly be denied that the consequences for the definition of the scope and content of the Q document are considerable. It is important that future Q research should take such considerations on board.[31]

It might be added that recent experiments in the psychology of human memory, as reported by Robert McIver and Marie Carroll, have strengthened Dunn's case. Applying this research to the study of the Synoptic gospels, they do find some cases of a process of copying texts, but 'the majority of the parallels in the Synoptic Gospels have characteristics that are more typical of a process of transmission that involves memory rather than straight copying'.[32]

These observations also bear upon the shape of written collections of Jesus' sayings. Such collections can be expected to have varied from community to community. Accordingly, it is unlikely that there ever was a single 'Documentum Q' used by the gospel writers. Luke's version probably differed from Matthew's,[33] and one can assume that written sayings collections or collections of Jesus' discourses were available to others beside the authors of Matthew and Luke, including the

---

dismisses as 'wrong-headed' the widespread assumption that the Jesus tradition was composed of a series of layers editorially superimposed on one another which can be stripped off by literary analysis as an archaeologist would in excavating an ancient tell (322), something explicitly recommended as sound method by Kloppenborg (*Excavating Q*, 116–18). Dunn takes up these issues again in his SNTS Presidential Address (2002), published as 'Altering the Default Setting: Re-envisaging the Early Transmission of the Jesus Tradition', *NTS* 49 (2003) 139–75; cf. also J. D. G. Dunn, *Jesus Remembered* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2003) 192–254.

31 Dunn, 'Jesus in Oral Memory', 316.

32 R. K. McIver and M. Carroll, 'Experiments to Develop Criteria for Determining the Existence of Written Sources, and Their Potential Implications for the Synoptic Problem', *JBL* 121 (2002) 667–87, esp. 687. See also Armin D. Baum, 'Experimentalpsychologische Erwägungen zur synoptische Frage', *BZ* 44 (2000) 37–55.

33 That is the position adopted by Hans Dieter Betz, who refers to Q^{Matt} and Q^{Luke}. See his commentary, *The Sermon on the Mount* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995) 42–4. For a critical discussion see Paul Hoffmann, 'Betz and Q', *ZNW* 88 (1997) 197–210.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S002868850400027X Published online by Cambridge University Press

author of Mark.[34] Of course, much of the Jesus tradition continued to be circulated and performed orally in community gatherings, as stressed by Dunn in his recent work.

Indeed, there can be no doubt that a collection of Jesus' sayings was already available to the author of the earliest Christian literature, Paul, whether or not we want to refer to it as a version of Q.[35] And Paul's collection included sayings concerning the coming of the Son of Man, sayings which current Q scholarship would assign to a later stage in the development of the sayings tradition.

In his earliest letter, 1 Thessalonians, Paul expounds his doctrine of the parousia of Christ and bases his exposition on a dominical saying, a 'word of the Lord' (1 Thess 4.15).[36] The actual saying is reflected in vv. 16–17, where Paul comments on it. In its original form the saying refers to the Son of Man's descent from heaven on heavenly clouds and the gathering of the elect, accompanied by an angelic trumpet blast. The closest parallel we have to this 'word of the Lord' is a saying in Matt 24.30–1, part of a discourse on 'the *parousia* of the Son of Man' (ἡ παρουσία τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, Matt 24.27). To see the relationships clearly we should view the two passages synoptically (using the RSV translation):

1 Thess 4.16–17

the Lord himself will descend from heaven with a cry of command, with the archangel's call, and with the sound of the trumpet of God (ἐν φωνῇ ἀρχαγγέλου καὶ ἐν σάλπιγγι θεοῦ). And the dead in Christ will rise first; then we who are alive, who are left, shall be caught up together with them in the clouds (ἐν νεφέλαῖ) to meet the Lord in the air.

Matt 24.30–1

they will see the Son of man coming on the clouds of heaven (ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ) with power and great glory; and he will send out his angels with a loud trumpet call (ἀποστελεῖ τοῦ ἀγγέλοῦ αὐτοῦ μετὰ σάλπιγγος μεγάλης), and they will gather his elect from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other.

34 That Mark used Q is argued, among others, by Harry T. Fledderman, *Mark and Q: A Study of the Overlap Texts* (BETL 122; Leuven: Leuven University/Peeters, 1995). That is a minority position, of course. In any case, it is clear that Mark had access to one or more collections of Jesus' sayings since a number of sayings are included in Mark. For a good discussion of the scholarly theories on Mark–Q relationships see Petros Vassiliadis, 'Prolegomena to a Discussion on the Relationship between Mark and the Q-Document', in Vassiliadis, ΛΟΓΟΙ ΙΗΣΟΥ*: Studies in Q* (Atlanta: Scholars, 1999) 71–84.

35 On the possibility that Paul knew Q, or at least material that found its way into Q, see Allison, *Jesus Tradition*, 54–60.

36 In Harm Hollander's recent study of Jesus' sayings in Paul, he finds only three (1 Cor 11.23–5; 7.10–11; and 9.14). See H. W. Hollander, 'The Words of Jesus: From Oral Traditions to Written Record in Paul and Q', *NovT* 42 (2000) 340–57. He rejects as a possible fourth instance 1 Thess 4.15–17, citing a 'prevailing trend' in the interpretation of that passage to interpret ἐν λόγῳ

https://doi.org/10.1017/S002868850400027X Published online by Cambridge University Press

Charles Wanamaker, in his commentary on 1 Thessalonians, suggests that the basic content of vv. 15–17 'stems from an apocalyptic discourse by Jesus concerning the end of the age'. Wanamaker also suggests that vv. 15b–17 constitute Paul's own 'midrash' on the tradition.[37] I think he is basically correct. The specific dominical saying can be seen reflected in vv. 16–17, but it is reinterpreted by Paul in the form of a midrash on it.

It might be objected that Paul does not use the term 'Son of Man'. That is true, and there is a good reason for it: Paul prefers to refer to 'the Lord' in his midrash simply because the term 'Son of Man' is meaningless in ordinary Greek. Paul certainly knew of the term 'Son of Man' as applied to Jesus, as is clearly evident in his reference to the 'man from heaven' in his discussion of the resurrection in 1 Corinthians (15.47–9).[38] He probably also knew other 'Son of Man' sayings besides the one specifically cited in 1 Thess 4.[39] That one was undoubtedly a 'Son of Man' saying which, in turn, constituted a reinterpretation of the vision in Dan 7.13 wherein 'one like a son of man' 'comes' 'with the clouds of heaven'. The 'trumpet of God' may also reflect influence of the theophany in Exod 19:16.[40] Of course, in

---

κυρίου as referring to 'an oracle originating with Paul himself' (346–57, n. 13). In support he cites Frans Neirynck, 'Paul and the Sayings of Jesus', *L'Apôtre Paul: personalité, style et conception du ministère* (ed. A. Vanhoye; BETL 73; Leuven: Leuven University/Peeters, 1886) 265–321, esp. 281. I am only too happy to sail against prevailing winds.

37 C. A. Wanamaker, *The Epistles to the Thessalonians: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans/Exeter: Paternoster, 1990) 171. Wanamaker adopts the view of Lars Hartman that 1 Thess 4.15–17 is a 'parenetic midrash', based on Jesus tradition which itself was developed as midrash on Daniel. See L. Hartman, *Prophecy Interpreted: The Formation of Some Jewish Apocalyptic Texts and of the Eschatological Discourse, Mark 13 Par.* (ConBNT 1; Lund: Gleerup, 1966) 180–93. See now also Seyoon Kim, 'The Jesus Tradition in 1 Thess 4.14–5.11', *NTS* 48 (2002) 225–42. Note that Paul interprets the reference in the saying to the gathering of the elect as a reference to the general resurrection and the assumption of the elect into heaven.

38 That Paul was familiar with Synoptic-like 'Son of Man' traditions is shown quite persuasively by George Nickelsburg in his valuable article on 'Son of Man' in *ABD* 6.137–50, esp. 147. The daring reconstruction of Paul's *Vorlage* in 1 Thess 4.16–17 by Willi Marxsen also envisions it as a tradition featuring the 'Son of Man' (ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου); see W. Marxsen, 'Auslegung von 1 Thess 4,13–18', *ZTK* 66 (1969) 22–7, esp. 30.

39 Paul's exhortations in 1 Thess 5.1–11 probably reflect other 'words of the Lord', such as Jesus' parable of the thief (Matt 24.42–4; Luke 12.39–40, a Son of Man saying found in Q); the parable of the watchmen (Mark 13.33–7), the parable of the steward (Matt 24.45–7; Luke 12.42–4, another saying found in Q); and the warning in Luke 21.34–6 (another Son of Man saying). See Kim, 'Jesus Tradition', 231–3; cf. also David Wenham, 'Paul and the Synoptic Apocalypse', *Gospel Perspectives: Studies of History and Tradition in the Four Gospels*, vol. 1 (ed. R. T. France and D. Wenham; Sheffield: JSOT, 1981) 345–75, esp. 347–9; Hartman, *Prophecy Interpreted*, 190–3.

40 Wolfgang Harnisch, *Eschatologische Existenz: Ein exegetischer Beitrag zum Sachanliegen von 1. Thessalonicher 4,13–5,11* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1973) 43.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S002868850400027X Published online by Cambridge University Press

the dominical saying the direction of the 'coming' of the Son of Man is reversed, not from earth to heaven (as in Daniel) but from heaven to earth.

That Paul already knew 'apocalyptic Son of Man' sayings certainly has a bearing on how we view the shape of Q, whether or not we identify Paul's collection with Q. That Matt 24.30–1 is not usually included in the 'official' reconstruction of Q is of no particular consequence. What matters is that Paul had a collection of dominical sayings which included one that looked a lot like Matt 24.30–1, and that saying was one which featured the parousia (coming) of 'the Son of Man'. That is clear from its content, with its allusions to Dan 7.13. Thus, arguments for assigning 'apocalyptic Son of Man' sayings to a late stratum of Q fall to the ground.

I would add that the Son of Man saying reflected in 1 Thess 4 can hardly be attributed to the historical Jesus, but developed early on as part of a growing collection of sayings attributed to Jesus, perhaps mediated by early Christian prophets and recorded by early Christian teachers (cf. Acts 13.1). Jesus taught the coming of the kingdom of God, not the coming of the Son of Man. Indeed, the two concepts are incompatible, as Philip Vielhauer showed many years ago.[41] I assume here the correctness of Norman Perrin's arguments that all of the apocalyptic Son of Man sayings, those referring to the 'coming of the Son of Man', are 'products of the early church' arising 'on the basis of an interpretation of the resurrection'.[42]

2. The purpose and function of Q

Was Q the foundational document of a community that took no interest in the death and resurrection of Jesus? This is often assumed nowadays, by Crossan and many others, including even Horsley, since the Q document lacks a narrative of the passion, death, and resurrection of Jesus. Crossan stresses this point in his discussion of what he calls 'a divided tradition'.[43] In that discussion he relies heavily on the work of Helmut Koester, and quotes the following statement:

41 P. Vielhauer, 'Gottesreich und Menschensohn in der Verkündigung Jesus,' *Festschrift für Gunther Dehn* (Neukirchen: Verlag des Buchhandlung des Erziehungsvereins Neukirchen, 1957) 51–79. Cf. Norman Perrin, *Rediscovering the Teaching of Jesus* (London: SCM/New York: Harper & Row, 1967) 187, and literature cited there. To see clearly how the early church replaced some of Jesus' references to the kingdom of God with Son of Man in the transmission of some of his sayings, compare Mark 9.1 ('the kingdom of god has come with power') and Matt 16.28 ('the Son of man coming in his kingdom').

42 Perrin, *Rediscovering*, 201. The imminence of the Son of Man's coming is part of that tradition, given expression in a saying found only in Matthew: 'you will not have gone through all of the towns of Israel, before the Son of man comes' (10.23), a saying which is 'directed to the early days of the Church's mission to the Jews when the imminent expectation was at its height' (ibid., 202). In my view, some of the NT scholarship from the mid-twentieth century is still valid, and often sounder than what is being produced nowadays.

43 Crossan, *Birth of Christianity*, Ch. 22 (407–17).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S002868850400027X Published online by Cambridge University Press

> The Synoptic Sayings Source (Q), used by Matthew and Luke, also does not consider Jesus' death a part of the Christian message. And it likewise is not interested in stories and reports about the resurrection and subsequent appearances of the risen Lord. The *Gospel of Thomas* and Q challenge the assumption that the early church was unanimous in making Jesus' death and resurrection the fulcrum of Christian faith. Both documents presuppose that Jesus' significance lay in his words, and in his words alone.[44]

How could the communities in which the 'Q gospel' circulated have had no interest in what happened to Jesus in Jerusalem? Or no information about the healings and other deeds performed by him in Galilee and Judaea before his death? That, to my mind, is very difficult to imagine. My contention is, on the contrary, that the people among whom Q circulated were also familiar with narratives about Jesus, his passion, his death, and his resurrection. Why, then, does Q lack the narratives we find in Mark and other gospels? The answer to that question has to do with the purpose and function of Q in those communities in which it circulated, as well as with its genre.

Q and other sayings collections which probably circulated in the church from very early on contain teachings attributed to Jesus, and those teachings clearly have a halakic or paraenetic purpose in community life since they provide instructions on how members of the community are to behave vis-à-vis God and their neighbors, and how to order community life in view of the coming divine kingdom.[45] The messianic halakah in many of the sayings in Q is grounded in the teaching authority of Jesus, which is exemplified and underscored in other dominical sayings in Q that present his message of what the divine kingdom is like. It is patently absurd to think that the Jesus of Q had no story, or that the groups whose community life was governed by the teachings of Jesus in Q had no narrative tradition of Jesus' deeds, death, and resurrection. Indeed, Q can hardly have existed without the story.

In fact, this is borne out by the text of Q itself and its structure.[46] It begins with the preaching of John the Baptist, followed (possibly) by the baptism of Jesus, and then by the temptation narrative. Jesus' entry into Capernaum and his healing of the centurion's son is recorded (Q 7.1–10).[47] Oblique references to the death of

44 Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels*, 86.

45 Martin Dibelius, one of the twentieth century's leading form critics, certainly got that right. See esp. ch. 9, 'Exhortations', in his ground-breaking work *From Tradition to Gospel* (trans. B. L. Woolf; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1935, repr. 1965, first published in German in 1919) 233–65. His observations do not deserve the oblivion into which they seem to have fallen, at least among many Q scholars now at work.

46 For this paragraph I use the text of Q published in J. S. Kloppenborg, *Q Parallels* (Sonoma, CA: Polebridge, 1988). Q citations are conventionally given in their Lukan version, even where Q scholars think that the Matthean version is more original.

47 See Dunn's analysis of that pericope, 'Jesus in Oral Memory,' 298–301.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S002868850400027X Published online by Cambridge University Press

Jesus can also be seen, probably at Q 11.47–51 (killing the prophets) and probably at Q 14.27 (bearing the cross). References to the coming of the 'Son of Man' (Q 12.40; cf. 12.37, 43; 17.23–37) clearly presuppose the resurrection and exaltation of Jesus.[48] And the text concludes with the eschatological prophecy of his disciples' future role in his kingdom, administering justice for the twelve tribes of a restored Israel (Q 22.28–30).[49] The text may also reflect something of the cultic life of the Jesus community, with a reference to its acclamation addressed to the exalted 'lord' (Q 6.46).[50]

In his most recent work, Kloppenborg takes up the question of possible references to Jesus' death and resurrection in Q, with special attention to arguments made by Arland Hultgren, and acknowledges that Q is 'not as silent' on that as some have supposed.[51] Kloppenborg adds Q 6.22–3 to the list of texts which may reflect Jesus' death. He also invokes George Nickelsburg's study of the narrative structure of the Markan passion narrative, framed on the pattern of the 'wisdom tale' depicting the persecution, death, and vindication of the righteous one, and acknowledges that Q not only includes most of the narrative functions of that tale but 'also assumes a "narrative world" in which the death of Jesus could have appeared as an emplotted element'.[52]

Kloppenborg concludes his discussion of this issue with the following comment: 'The conclusion to be drawn is not that Q was oblivious to the issues of the death and vindication of Jesus but that Q's approach to these issues *is significantly different* from those of Paul (and his immediate predecessors) and the Markan and post-Markan gospels.'[53] That may be granted. Nevertheless, it cannot be taken for granted that the communities in which Q circulated were ignorant of, or indifferent to, the basic events reflected in the 'kerygma' summarized by Paul in 1 Cor 15.3–4, even if they did not share his particular interpretation of those events.

48 This is granted by Horsley, *Whoever Hears You*, 153. Detlev Dormeyer can even refer to Q as a 'sayings biography'. See D. Dormeyer, *The New Testament Among the Writings of Antiquity* (trans. R. Kossov; The Biblical Seminar 55; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1998) 229–34.

49 On that passage see Horsley, *Whoever Hears You*, 262–3.

50 This may reflect the cultic cry *marana tha*, 'our Lord, come!' (1 Cor 16.11; *Did.* 10.6). On the early cult of Christ see Birger A. Pearson, 'Early Christianity and Gnosticism in the History of Religions', *Studia Theologica* 55 (2001) 81–106, esp. 92–7. An expanded version of that article has been published by the Institute for Antiquity and Christianity as no. 42 in its 'Occasional Papers' series (Claremont, CA, 2001).

51 Kloppenborg, *Excavating* Q, 369–79. Cf. A. Hultgren, *The Rise of Normative Christianity* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1994) 31–41.

52 Kloppenborg, *Excavating Q*, 370–2. Cf. G. W. E. Nickelsburg, 'The Genre and Function of the Marcan Passion Narrative', *HTR* 73 (1980) 153–84. Kloppenborg's use of the term 'narrative world' is derived from Norman Petersen's discussion in *Literary Criticism for New Testament Critics* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1978) 49–80.

53 Kloppenborg, *Excavating Q*, 379.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S002868850400027X Published online by Cambridge University Press

That a passion-resurrection narrative does not appear in Q is simply a function of Q's genre and purpose, focusing as it does on the remembered tradition of Jesus' *teachings* as the norm for community life.

Before we leave this discussion of the function and purpose of Q, one other question needs to be addressed: To what extent is it justifiable to extrapolate a particular 'community' from a particular text? Does each document we have belong only to one community? Is it methodologically sound to posit a 'Matthew community', a 'Mark community', or a 'Q community' and then assume that the differences between documents represent different 'Christianities'?

Dunn addresses such questions in a provocative way in his essay already discussed. Regarding Q he says, 'The assumption is that Q, for example, somehow *defines* its community: it is a "Q community" in the sense that the Q material is its *only* Jesus tradition; it holds to this material in distinction from (defiance of?) other communities who are similarly defined by their document'.[54] Dunn is, in my view, certainly correct to argue, to the contrary, that

> the first churches were by no means as isolated from one another and at odds with one another as has been so often assumed. If Paul's letters (and Acts) are any guide, the first churches consisted rather of 'a network of communities in constant communication', linked by messengers, letters and visits by leading figures in the new movement. ... In short, the suggestion that there were churches who knew only one stream of tradition – Jesus only as a miracle worker, or only as a wisdom teacher, etc. – has been given far too much uncritical credence in scholarly discussions on the Gospels and ought to have been dismissed a lot sooner.[55]

That is not, of course, to deny that tensions existed among leaders of the early Jesus movement from the beginning, e.g. between Paul and James, and Paul and Peter, and that documents can also reflect such tensions, e.g. James vs. (a misunderstood) Paulinism. The point here is, simply, that such tensions had to do with interpretation of common early tradition, and not with early traditions in isolation from one another.

3. Q's supposed Galilean provenance

It is usually assumed nowadays by Q scholars, at least most of them,[56] that Q was written and redacted somewhere in Lower Galilee. Kloppenborg devotes

54 Dunn, 'Jesus in Oral Memory', 324.

55 Ibid., 325. Dunn cites here Richard Bauckham, 'For Whom Were the Gospels Written?', *The Gospels for All Christians: Rethinking the Gospel Audiences* (ed. R. Bauckham; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998) 13–22; cf. also S. Barton, 'Can We Identify the Gospel Audiences?', ibid., 173–94. Dunn makes the same point in his more recent article, 'Altering the Default Setting', esp. 173.

56 Helmut Koester has recently challenged this assumption, quite rightly. See H. Koester, 'The Sayings of Q and Their Image of Jesus', *Sayings of Jesus*, ed. Petersen *et al.*, 137–54, esp. 138–40.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S002868850400027X Published online by Cambridge University Press

considerable space to this issue in his latest book, first in using 'socio-rhetorical' approaches to the study of 'the Q document and the Q people' in Galilee, and then situating Q in the larger context of the history of first-century Galilee.[57] More specifically, Jonathan Reed, in an interesting study of the place names in Q, argues that 'the region around Capernaum on the northern shore of the Sea of Galilee suggests itself as the provenance of the Q community'.[58] He concludes that contact with the cities of Sepphoris and Tiberias (unnamed in Q) is obliquely indicated in sayings dealing with market and judicial imagery, but that the Q community 'looked at the major cities of the Galilee with some apprehension'. That community was 'more at home in larger Galilean villages such as Capernaum'. Reed presumably assumes that Capernaum meets the important criterion of language: 'Q . . . must be located in an area where at least some level of Greek literacy existed.'[59]

On that criterion, Tiberias might be a safer place to locate Q. Tiberias has also been suggested on other grounds as the provenance of Q.[60] But, as is well known, Tiberias is conspicuously absent from the Synoptic tradition.

As we have seen, Horsley also situates Q in a Galilean context, and regards it as 'a document from a distinctive community with its own distinctive views of Jesus', remaining firmly within Israelite tradition with no reference to a Gentile mission.[61] He sets Q firmly 'in the context of a traditional agrarian society sharply divided between an urban elite and a struggling peasantry', invoking the distinctions anthropologists make between the 'great tradition' and the 'little tradition', 'what in certain societies would have been the elite and possibly "official tradition(s)" and the "popular tradition(s)"'. He refers in this connection to the 'considerable gap' that existed 'between the official tradition in Jerusalem and the popular tradition in Judean and Galilean villages'. Furthermore, 'differences in regional

---

Koester's article as a whole is a salutary corrective to much of current Q scholarship and its assumptions regarding the historical Jesus and the early Jesus movement.

57 Kloppenborg, *Excavating Q*, Ch. 4, 'The Q Document and the Q People' (166–213), and Ch. 5, 'Reading Q in the Galilee' (214–61).

58 J. L. Reed, *Archaeology and the Galilean Jesus: A Re-examination of the Evidence* (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity, 2000) 182–3.

59 Ibid., 196, 179. Cf. William E. Arnal, *Jesus and the Village Scribes: Galilean Conflicts and the Setting of Q* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001). Arnal attributes to his 'village scribes' a much higher degree of literary sophistication in the use of Greek than is believable for scribes in Galilean villages.

60 Wolfgang Schenk, 'Die Verwünschung der Küstenorte Q 10,13–15: Zur Funktion der konkreten Ortsangaben und zur Lokalisierung von Q', *The Synoptic Gospels: Source Criticism and New Literary Criticism* (ed. Camille Focant; BETL 110; Louvain: Peeters, 1993) 477–90, esp. 489f. Cf. the discussion in Kloppenborg, *Excavating Q*, 171–5.

61 Horsley, *Whoever Hears You*, 74–5.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S002868850400027X Published online by Cambridge University Press

history would have compounded the class differences, which created the gap between the official Jerusalem tradition and the local popular tradition'. Historically, argues Horsley, 'the bulk of Israel, including the Galilean tribes, were in rebellion against Jerusalem rule since the death of Solomon'; so the Galilean version of the 'little tradition' would reflect a northern Israelite heritage.[62] It should be recalled that Horsley has consistently argued that 'during second-temple times most inhabitants of Galilee were descendents of the northern Israelite peasantry'.[63]

Horsley's distinction between North Israelite and Jerusalem/Judaean traditions has rightly been called into question on the basis of archaeological findings in Galilee. Settlement patterns of Iron Age and Roman-Period Galilean sites show that the region was almost completely abandoned at the close of the Iron Age, a fact which would rule out any direct continuity between the northern Israelites and first-century Galileans. During the Late Hellenistic Period there is a sudden rise in the number of sites and an increase in material culture. The material culture itself, e.g. *miqvaoth*, stone vessels, animal bones, and burials, can only be linked to a Judean colonization of Galilee during the Late Hellenistic Period, promoted by the Hasmoneans as part of their annexation of the region. All of this is spelled out in considerable detail in Jonathan Reed's recent book.[64] What this means is that one can no longer legitimately argue for a strong distinction between Galilean and Judaean religious beliefs and practices. If a distinction between a 'great tradition' and a 'little tradition' in Second Temple Judaism is to be made, those traditions would be essentially the same in Galilee and in Judaea.

So now the question must be addressed: how 'Galilean' is Q, really? Two answers can be given to that question: (1) Q is *thoroughly Galilean* in terms of its content, for the very good reason that Q consists of traditions of the teachings of Jesus, whose public activity took place mainly in the rural towns and villages of Lower Galilee. Those teachings were preserved in their original Aramaic by his Galilean followers. (2) Q, as we now know it, cannot so easily be placed in a Galilean setting for the very good reason that we know it only in Greek. While it can probably be assumed that the Jesus movement persisted in Galilee after Jesus' death (though we have little or no evidence of it), it can also safely be assumed that its members handed down their traditions of Jesus' teachings in Aramaic,

62 Ibid., 99, 102.

63 R. A. Horsley, *Galilee: History, Politics, People* (Valley Forge, PA: Trinity, 1995) 40.

64 Reed, *Archaeology*, 23–61; cf. also *idem*, 'Galileans, "Israelite Village Communities", and the Sayings Gospel Q', *Galilee through the Centuries: Confluence of Cultures* (ed. Eric M. Meyers; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1999) 87–108. Reed refers to 'kinship ties' uniting people in Galilee and Jerusalem (*Archaeology*, 58), and I would add that it is quite probable that Jesus' family had relatives in Jerusalem.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S002868850400027X Published online by Cambridge University Press

which was the lingua franca of Jews in first-century Palestine.[65] Arguments that such traditions would circulate also in Greek in the urban communities of Tiberias or Sepphoris are based on no evidence whatsoever.

What the available evidence does show is that the Galilean followers of Jesus brought their Jesus traditions with them to Jerusalem, where they founded what we know from the book of Acts as the Jerusalem 'church' (Acts 5.11, *passim*). I would suggest, furthermore, that the Jesus traditions of the Aramaic-speaking 'Hebrews' led by the twelve 'apostles' (Acts 6.1; 8.1) were translated in Jerusalem for the benefit of the Greek-speaking 'Hellenists' led by the group of seven named in Acts (6.5).[66] That could very well be the origin of what we now know as Q. As to the provenance of Q as we now have it, a good argument could be made that it, too, originated in Jerusalem, though Antioch is also a strong possibility.[67]

An argument for the Jerusalem origin of Q has recently been put forward by Marco Frenschkowski.[68] Frenschkowski points out that the Galilean place names in Q are no indicators of the place of Q's redaction, or of places where 'Q people' might have lived. As to Capernaum, for example, we have no evidence whatsoever of a Christian community there in the entire ante-Nicene period. And, though early Christian prosopography is in general quite rich, no names of early leaders of Galilean Jesus communities are preserved. All of the first-century Galileans we know by name are associated with the Jerusalem church. In short, there are no indices at all for the existence of early Christian groups in Galilee. Frenschkowski also argues that the prominence of the Pharisees in Q are indicators, not of a Galilean, but of a Judaean provenance. He concludes: '*Q is a document of the*

65 Sean Freyne, *Galilee, Jesus and the Gospels: Literary Approaches and Historical Investigations* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988) 171. Greek would have been a second language of some first-century Jews in Palestine. See esp. Joseph A. Fitzmyer, SJ, 'The Languages of Palestine in the First Century A.D.', in *idem, A Wandering Aramaean: Collected Aramaic Essays* (Missoula, MT: Scholars, 1979) 29–56; Casey, *Aramaic Approach*, 51–60.

66 There is no reason to doubt the historicity of the 'Hebrew' (Aramaic-speaking)–'Hellenist' (Greek-speaking) division in the early Jerusalem church reflected in the traditions used by the author of Acts. See, e.g., Gerd Lüdemann, *Early Christianity according to the Traditions in Acts: A Commentary* (trans. John Bowden; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989) 73–93.

67 Helmut Koester does not suggest a place of composition for Q, but does argue that 'the employment of Greek implied necessarily that those who transmitted these sayings participated in a wider cultural context' ('Sayings of Q', 140).

68 See Frenschkowski, 'Galiläa oder Jerusalem? Die topographischen und politischen Hintergründe der Logienquelle', *Sayings Source Q*, ed. Lindemann, 535–59. A Jerusalem provenance for Q has been posited before. See e.g. J. M. C. Crum, *The Original Jerusalem Gospel: Being Essays on the Document Q* (New York: Macmillan, 1927). Crum simply assumes a Jerusalem origin, and does not attempt to mount an argument for it. See also John Painter, *Just James: The Brother of Jesus in History and Tradition* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1999) 263: 'In all probability both Q and M emanated from the Jerusalem church. M may well emanate from James, while it is likely that Q is a Petrine tradition.'

https://doi.org/10.1017/S002868850400027X Published online by Cambridge University Press

original Jerusalem church, indeed its most decisive. In other words, Q was collected and composed in Jerusalem, even if out of Galilean traditional material.'[69] The history of the Q tradition is therefore to be understood as bound up with the history of the Jerusalem community. '*Q is the theological heritage of the most ancient Christian community*.'[70]

Some of Frenschkowski's arguments are stronger than others. For example, even if we have no external evidence of Christians in first-century Capernaum, I do not doubt that there were Jesus-believers there. Moreover, Pharisees were certainly not confined to Judaea in the first century; they existed in Galilee as well, even if in smaller numbers.[71] A good case could also be made for an Antiochene provenance for Q, even if, as I consider likely, a core collection of dominical sayings in Greek was brought there from Jerusalem. However that may be, whether Q as we know it is assigned to Jerusalem or to Antioch, there is absolutely no evidence to suggest that it should be assigned to Galilee.

Conclusions

As I have tried to show here, attempts made by Q scholars to delineate a special brand of early Galilean Christianity distinguishable from that of Jerusalem or other areas of Jewish Palestine have failed. That is because the Q scholarship on which such attempts are based is untenable. Theories of compositional layering of Q are not convincing. Equally unconvincing is the argument that Q represents a community tradition that had no interest in the crucifixion and resurrection traditions. That Q had no passion narrative has to do with its function and genre. It is also specious to attribute to a late stage of development in Q sayings which feature the coming of the Son of Man, for such sayings developed very early and are reflected already in Paul's first letter. Additionally, the level of sophistication in the use of Greek by Q editors is such as can hardly be attributed to Galilean village scribes, whose first language was Aramaic. This means that Q itself can hardly have been penned in Galilee. Finally, all of the available evidence indicates that Jews in Galilee and in Judaea did not differ significantly in terms of beliefs and practices. The same point can be made regarding Jesus-believing Jews.

I assume here that Jesus-believers existed in first-century Galilee, but I do not believe that they existed in isolation. I consider it likely that the Galilean leaders of

69 '*Q ist ein, vielleicht sogar das entscheidende Dokument der Jerusalemer Urgemeinde*. Anders gesagt: Q wurde in Jerusalem gesammelt und zusammengestellt – wenn auch aus galiläischem Traditionsgut': Frenschkowski, 'Galiläa oder Jerusalem', 549.

70 '*Q ist das theologische Erbe der ältesten christlichen Gemeinde*': ibid., 559. Frenschkowski dates the final redaction of Q to just before the destruction of the Temple in AD 70.

71 Anthony J. Saldarini, *Pharisees, Scribes and Sadducees in Palestinian Society: A Sociological Approach* (Wilmington: Michael Glazier, 1988) 291–7.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S002868850400027X Published online by Cambridge University Press

the Jerusalem church stayed in close contact with the Jesus communities of Galilee, thus maintaining and expanding 'networks' of fellow believers.[72] I also consider it likely that in such communities relatives of Jesus would probably have played a prominent role. We know that, after the death of James in 62 CE, his (and Jesus') Galilean cousin Simeon, son of Clopas, became the leader of the Jerusalem church (Eusebius, *H.E.* 3.11). Of course, we do not know how long he had been in Jerusalem, or if he had been a leader in a Galilean community. Unfortunately, our evidence on such points is too scanty.

The second-century writer Hegesippus refers to grandsons of Jesus' brother Jude who were interrogated by agents of the emperor Domitian. When it became clear that those avowed followers of Jesus were only simple hard-working farmers, they were released (Eus. *H.E.* 3.19–20). To be sure, the reliability of Hegesippus's report is open to question. In any case Hegesippus does not report where they lived at the time, but Galilee would certainly be a possibility if his account can be trusted. Julius Africanus (*fl.* 3rd century) is quoted by Eusebius (*H.E.* 1.7.14) to the effect that relatives of Jesus (referred to as δεσποσύνοι, 'of the Lord') spread their family traditions from the Jewish villages of Nazareth (in Galilee) and Cochaba (in the Golan) throughout the land. There is not the slightest hint in these tantalizing references to the activities of Jesus' relatives and spiritual heirs that their traditions differed in any way from those of the early Jerusalem community.

Thus, we can legitimately conclude that the religion believed and practiced by early Galilean Christians was essentially the same as that of the mother church in Jerusalem, at least until the Second Jewish Revolt (132–5 CE), when leadership of the Jerusalem church was taken over by Gentiles. Pagan writers could even refer to Christians in general as 'Galileans'.[73] But as for the Galileans of current Q scholarship, they are merely a figment of scholarly imagination, a figment which has ironically become a tenet of scholarly orthodoxy in much of North American scholarship. Perhaps it is time for a 'heretical' voice from North America to be heard.

72 The use of network theory in research on early Christian history is, in my view, very important. See e.g. L. Michael White, ed., *Social Networks in the Early Christian Environment: Issues and Methods for Social History, Semeia* 56 (1992).

73 Epictetus, in Arrian, *Epict. diss.* 4.7.6; Julian, *Against the Galileans*, *passim*.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S002868850400027X Published online by Cambridge University Press