

OLLI HALLIKAINEN

The Lord's Prayer in the Sayings Gospel Q

To Joonas, Johannes and Jaakko,
who call me *Daddy*.

ISBN 952-91-8638-X
952-10-2435-6

© Olli Hallikainen

Printed by Tyylipaino 2005

OLLI HALLIKAINEN

The Lord's Prayer in the Sayings Gospel Q

ACADEMIC DISSERTATION

To be presented, with the permission of the Faculty of Theology,
University of Helsinki, for public examination in the Auditorium XII,
Unioninkatu 34, May 21st, 2005, at 10 a.m.

Helsinki 2005

Acknowledgements

The Lord's Prayer was familiar to me already in my childhood. My parents were religious and taught the prayer to the children. For a child it was difficult to understand the petitions of the prayer. However, praying the Lord's Prayer brought the feeling of safety and trust.

When starting my New Testament studies at the university I became interested in the Lord's Prayer again. I recognized that its roots went back to the Gospels and to early Christian generations. Questions arised concerning the origin of the Lord's Prayer and the meaning of its petitions. Due to my studies I had an opportunity to begin to find answers to my questions.

I want to thank my teachers and professors at the University of Helsinki for encouraging me in my studies. Professors Heikki Räisänen and Lars Aejmelaeus have given their kind support to me. Doctors Matti Myllykoski and Risto Uro have given helpful critique during my study. I am especially grateful to prof. Kari Syreeni for reading my texts and for giving feedback. Dr. Ismo Dunderberg has given advice in practical questions. I thank lic. Michael Cox for revising the text of this study.

I want to thank my family for keeping my feet on the ground. My wife Katriina has encouraged and supported me. My three sons, Joonas, Johannes and Jaakko have reminded me of my task as their father. I dedicate this study to them.

The Lord's Prayer in the Sayings Gospel Q

Acknowledgements	5
1. Introduction and Methodology	9
1.1. Literary and Rhetorical Methods: Q as a Gospel... 12	
1.2. Sociological methods: The Q people	25
2. Prayer in Q.....	35
2.1. Prayer Instruction Q 11:2-4, 9-13.....	35
2.1.1. The Structure and Composition of Q 11:2-4, 9-13	36
2.1.2. The Tradition History of Q 11:2-4, 9-13	43
2.1.3. The Argumentation and Rhetoric of Q 11:2-4, 9-13	51
2.1.4. Summary	58
2.2. Prayer Elsewhere in Q.....	61
2.2.1. Praying for Enemies Q 6:28	62
2.2.2. Petition for Workers for the Harvest Q 10:2	63
2.2.3. Thanksgiving for Revelation Q 10:21-22.....	65
2.2.4. Criticism of the Pharisees Q 11:39-52.....	65
2.2.5. Summary	66
3. The Lord's Prayer in the Q Context	67
3.1. The Address.....	67
3.1.1. The Lord's Prayer Q 11:2a	68
3.1.2. Q 6:35c-d	69
3.1.3. Q 6:36	75
3.1.4. Q 10:21-22	77
3.1.5. Q 11:13	83
3.1.6. Q 12:6	85
3.1.7. Q 12:30	86

3.1.8. Summary	90
3.2. Sanctification of the Name.....	91
3.2.1. The Lord's Prayer: Q 11:2b.....	92
3.2.2. Q 3:16	93
3.2.3. Q 6:36	95
3.2.4. Q 12:10, 12.....	95
3.2.5. Q 13:35	100
3.2.6. Summary	103
3.3. The Coming of the Kingdom.....	104
3.3.1. The Lord's Prayer: Q 11:2c	104
3.3.2. Q 6:20	106
3.3.3. Q 7:28	109
3.3.4. Q 10:9	112
3.3.5. Q 11:20	115
3.3.6. Q 11:52	119
3.3.7. Q 12:31	120
3.3.8. Q 13:18-19, 20-21	122
3.3.9. Q 13:29,28.....	125
3.3.10. Q 16:16.....	128
3.3.11. Summary	129
3.4. Bread.....	131
3.4.1. The Lord's Prayer: Q 11:3	132
3.4.2. Q 3:17	133
3.4.3. Q 4:3,4	133
3.4.4. Q 6:21	135
3.4.5. Q 7:33-34	135
3.4.6. Q 10:7	137
3.4.7. Q 11:11	138
3.4.8. Q 12:22, 23, 29.....	138
3.4.9. Q 12:42, 45.....	142
3.4.10. Q 17:27.....	144
3.4.11. Summary	144
3.5. Debt	146
3.5.1. The Lord's Prayer: Q 11:4a	147
3.5.2. Q 6:30, 34.....	149
3.5.3. Q 12:10	151

3.5.4. Q 12:58-59	153
3.5.5. Q 17:3-4	155
3.5.6. Summary	156
3.6. Testing.....	157
3.6.1. The Lord's Prayer: Q 11:4b.....	158
3.6.2. Q 4:1-2	159
3.6.3. Q 12:11-12	162
3.6.4. Q 17:1-2	164
3.6.5. Summary	165
4. Conclusions.....	166
5. Bibliography.....	173
Abbreviations	195
Abstract.....	197

1. Introduction and Methodology

The aim of this study is to examine the Lord's Prayer in the context of the Sayings Gospel known as Q. First, the prayer is taken as a literary composition in its literary context. The whole of the Sayings Gospel Q (henceforth Q) as an independent document is regarded as the context of the prayer. Special attention is paid to the immediate context of the Lord's Prayer, that is, the prayer instruction of Q 11:2-4, 9-13. The assumption is that Q presents deliberate literary means that betray distinctive rhetorical and theological intentions.

Second, another focus of this study is the sociological dimension(s) of the Lord's Prayer. I conclude that it was a real prayer that was prayed by the early Jesus movement, that is, by the Q people. I investigate their practice of prayer and, more precisely, what use they made of the Lord's Prayer. Further, I attempt to discover how the prayer mirrored the social reality in which the Q people lived. The prayer in Jesus' context is beyond the scope of this study.

Two presuppositions are taken as a starting-point in this study. The first concerns the (literary) sources. The existence of Q as one of the two major sources of Matthew and Luke, along with the Gospel of Mark, i.e. the two-document hypothesis, is taken for granted. I am aware that there are a few scholars who argue for Marcan priority or that of Mt and Lk.¹ Several scholars, however, have convincingly defended the two-document hypothesis as the most satisfying solution to the Synoptic Problem.²

¹ Among those who argue for Marcan priority are Austin Farrer, ("On Dispensing with Q"), John Drury (*Tradition and Design in Luke's Gospel*), Michael Goulder (*Midrash and Lection in Matthew*; idem, *Luke: A New Paradigm*; idem, "The Composition of the Lord's Prayer"; idem, "Is Q a Juggernaut?"), and Marc Goodacre (*The Case Against Q*).

The Griesbach (Two-Gospel) hypothesis argues for Mt and Lk as the sources of Mk. See Farmer, "Luke's Use of Matthew: A Christological Inquiry", idem, *Gospel of Jesus*.

² On the defence of the two-document hypothesis, see especially Kloppenborg Verbin, *Excavating Q*, 11-54. See also e.g. Fuchs, „Zum Umfang von Q“; Kloppenborg, "On Dispensing with Q?"; Tuckett, *Q and History*, 1-39.

The Lord's Prayer is in Mt and Lk but it is missing from Mk. Thus it is part of Q. I conclude that a single form of the prayer existed in Q. Mt and Lk adopted this as part of their gospels. However, as is apparent, they both redacted and modified the prayer.³ Thus its wording as it was in Q has to be reconstructed from the versions of Matthew and Luke.

The second presupposition concerns the definition of Q as an independent Gospel. The two-document hypothesis implies two literary sources. This means that Q should be regarded as a gospel in the same way as Mark. It is true that no manuscript of Q has been found so far. This, I think, does not weaken the Q hypothesis as it can be reconstructed from Matthew and Luke.

During the last decade the International Q Project (henceforth IQP) has reconstructed the text of Q and published, *The Critical Edition of Q* (henceforth *CEQ*).⁴ The text of *CEQ* with its English translation is adopted as the literary basis of this study. However, I leave the door open for my own conclusions concerning the reconstruction of the Q text. This is reasonable at least in those cases where Mt and Lk differ remarkably in the wording of the Q text, as well as where the reconstructions of IQP and *CEQ* do not match each other.

James Robinson states the task of the IQP as follows:

“The standard Q hypothesis today is indeed that Q was a written Greek text, two copies of which existed, one in the Matthean community and one in the Lukan community. The respective evangelists used each, perhaps in a form glossed by the ongoing proclamation of Jesus' sayings in that community. Nevertheless, both Matthew and Luke relied upon copies of that one Q archetype. That archetype is what the scholarly community means by Q and is what the International Q project is seeking to reconstruct”.⁵

Robinson further describes the undertaking of *CEQ* as follows:

³ See Mt 6:9-13; Lk 11:2-4. Matthew incorporated the Lord's Prayer as part of instruction on almsgiving, prayer and fasting (Mt 6:1-18) in the Sermon on the Mount (Mt 5-7). Luke, for his part, located the parable of the midnight friend (Lk 11:5-8) after the Lord's Prayer. On excluding the parable from Q, see n. 118 below.

⁴ Robinson-Hoffmann-Kloppenborg, *The Critical Edition of Q*. The work of IQP is published in *JBL* 109:499-501; 110:494-498; 111:500-508; 112:500-506; 113:495-499; 114:475-485.

⁵ Robinson, “A Written Greek Sayings Cluster Older than Q: A Vestige”, 61-62.

“The only presupposition (for the undertaking of *CEQ*) is the general outcome of the history of Q research that has rendered the undertaking possible at all, namely the conclusion that there was a written Greek text of Q which functioned as an archetype, copies of which were available to the Matthaean and Lukan communities and used by the Evangelists. It is that archetype which *The Critical Edition of Q* seeks to reconstitute and thus to make more readily available to scholarship”.⁶

The work of IQP and *CEQ* as the product of the reconstruction process provides a careful analysis of the Q text.⁷ The analysis is considered under three aspects: the extent of Q, the sequence of Q, and the wording of Q.⁸ A remarkable consensus has emerged concerning the order and extent of Q.⁹ To be sure, Q is a separate gospel with a beginning (Q 3:2b-3a)¹⁰ and end (Q 22:28-30).¹¹ Kloppenborg Verbin makes a case for calling Q a gospel: “To call Q ‘the Sayings Gospel Q’ rather than a source is to argue that the *analogy* with the canonical gospels is both reasonable and apt”.¹² According to the consensus, the order of the pericopes in Lk is taken as the starting point for the order of Q in this study.

The crucial methodological question for the present study is how to construct a holistic view concerning the texts and the social reality mirrored in the texts. What hints do the Q texts in general and the Lord’s Prayer and its context in particular provide for our knowledge of the

⁶ Robinson, “History of Q Research”, xix.

⁷ See the evaluation of the process in Neiryck, “The Reconstruction of Q”; Heil, „Die Q-Rekonstruktion des Internationalen Q-Projekts.“

⁸ Neiryck, “The Reconstruction of Q”, 56.

⁹ See Kloppenborg Verbin, *Excavating Q*, 88-91. On the analysis of the extent of Q in Broadhead, “The Extent of the Sayings Tradition (Q)”.

¹⁰ The IQP and *CEQ* place the beginning in Q 3:0 in double brackets. On the beginning of Q in 3:7-9, see Lindemann, „Die Logienquelle Q”, 4-6.

¹¹ On the criteria for including pericopes in Q, see Vassiliadis, “The Nature and Extent of the Q document”, 67 and the elaboration of these criteria in Kloppenborg Verbin, *Excavating Q*, 95-96.

¹² *Excavating Q*, 403, (italics orig.). Similarly, Robinson, “The Critical Edition of Q”, 28-33, criticising the tendency to give priority to the “Narrative Gospels”. Cf. Schlosser, “Q et la christologie implicite”, 289: “..l’évangile Q ou évangile des logia..” Otherwise Lindemann, „Die Logienquelle Q“, 17: „[D]ie Logienquelle war kein im Sinne etwa des Mk als „Evangelium“ zu bezeichnender Text, sondern eine redigierte schriftliche Dokumentation von Worten Jesu.“ Lindemann’s definition of “gospel”, however, is too narrow and seems to be restricted only to the Synoptic Gospels.

social reality, and what information do they give? What kind of rhetorical tools does the Q text use in presenting the social setting and the ethos of the people responsible for Q? What kind of symbolic world does the Lord's Prayer portray?

Gerd Theißen, who is one of the most influential scholars in the study of early Christianity, gives a two-edged method for examining a text:

„Ein Text kann entweder als literarisches Phänomen auf seine Strukturen, Bilder und Aussagen hin untersucht werden – und zwar so, daß diese allein aufgrund ihrer gegenseitigen Beziehungen eine sinnvolle „Welt“ erkennen lassen. Oder er kann in seinen realen Lebenskontext, in Raum und Zeit, Geschichte und Gesellschaft eingeordnet werden, so daß wir ihn als Ausdruck eines geschichtlich geprägten Lebensvollzug deuten können. Dabei wird die immanente Textwelt verlassen und der in eine umfassende „Real-Welt“ eingeordnet.“¹³

My starting point, however, is not to place the two points of view, i.e. the literary (and rhetorical) and the sociological, so antithetically together as Theißen does. My concern is to put into practice a method in which the two methodological aspects can be complementary, and not antithetical. I will allow the detailed analysis to show that the literary, rhetorical, symbolic and sociological approaches can be applied side by side, complementing and not excluding each other. As will be seen, a field somewhere between the text and the social reality does exist. This field consists of symbols, overarching themes and theological/ideological elements.

1.1. Literary and Rhetorical Methods: Q as a Gospel

For the present study it is remarkable that in the immediate context of the Lord's Prayer, i.e. in the prayer instruction Q 11:2-4, 9-13, the order of sayings is the same in both Matthew and Luke, indicating the

¹³ Theißen, *Lokalkolorit*, 22.

sequence of Q.¹⁴ Accordingly, the juxtaposition of pericopes and sayings betrays deliberate organization that has an impact on the understanding of individual sayings and sections.¹⁵ For the present study the context of the Lord's Prayer is of high value. Not only the immediate literary context but also the wider one and the whole of Q has to be taken into account when examining the context of the Lord's Prayer.

When reading Q as an independent gospel we can accept the methodological claim of Christopher Tuckett:

“If we are interested in the characteristic features, distinctive elements, or ‘theology’, of ‘Q’, then perhaps... we should give methodological priority to ‘Q’ in something like its ‘final’ form, i.e. that stage in the development of the tradition which Q reached when it was used by Matthew and Luke”.¹⁶

This claim is sound and accepted by many recent Q scholars.¹⁷ However, we need to be precise when speaking of the ‘final’ text of Q.

¹⁴ Mt interpolated the Lord's Prayer into the warnings against hypocritical almsgiving, prayer and fasting (Mt 6:1-18) and kept the admonitions and parable Q 11:9-13 together. Mt has inserted them later in his Sermon (Mt 7:7-11) with other Q material. Luke for his part has interpolated a parable (Lk 11:5-8) into the prayer instruction.

¹⁵ Kloppenborg Verbin, *Excavating Q*, 113-14, concludes that “[a]fter nearly thirty years of redaction critical analyses of Q there is general agreement that redactional intent can be perceived primarily in the arrangement and ordering principles of Q's component sayings, and secondarily in interpretative additions and glosses made on individual sayings and longer clusters”. See also Zeller, “Redaktionprozesse”. Kloppenborg Verbin, *Excavating Q*, 115-16, makes three kinds of observations: (1) the repetitive elements - recurring motifs, formulas, and words - give shape to the collection as a whole; (2) the argumentative progressions where a series of textual elements stretching over several blocks of sayings are taken together; (3) the structure and intent of the several sub collections where individual sayings are purposefully juxtaposed and framed.

Cf. Mack *Lost Gospel*, 106, who claims that “as soon as one sees that the (originally separate) sayings cluster and the clustering shows signs of purpose, a closer analysis is necessary... If one pays careful attention to shifts in features such as grammar, tenor, formal characteristics, and implied audience, strategies can be discerned that indicate compositional design rather than simple aggregation”.

¹⁶ Tuckett, *Q and History*, 77. He takes (ibid. 78) an analogy from the methodological discussion of the Fourth Gospel and admits that “no doubt the tradition developed in various ways before reaching this point, and we may be able to identify stages in that development”.

¹⁷ Cf. Lührmann, *Redaktion*, 17, 19, who states that the aim of Q research is the same as that of the other gospels:

Kloppenborg Verbin notes correctly: “Even though scholars speak as if there were a “final text” of Q, this should be seen as a convenient heuristic concept rather than as a description of an actual literary stage”.¹⁸

We may suppose that there once existed a form of Q that was fixed and written. Mt and Lk probably did not have access to the “original” Q form but had different versions (Q_{lk}, Q_{mt}) available.¹⁹ The reconstruction of these versions is beyond the scope of my study. The evaluation as concerns the differences in wording between Mt and Lk of the hypothetical “original” Q text has to proceed saying by saying, not assuming the existence of separate versions of Q.²⁰ Further, the recent discussion of the stratigraphy of Q²¹ has shown the importance of careful

„Es geht um den theologiegeschichtlichen und damit auch um den historischen Ort der Logienquelle innerhalb des Urchristentums, der nur auf analytischem Weg durch die exegetische Untersuchung der in Q vorliegenden Überlieferung gefunden werden kann... [E]s geht... um die Frage, ob sich innerhalb des für Q zu erschließenden Materials eine Absicht erkennen lässt, unter der die hier gesammelte Überlieferung zusammengestellt worden ist... Die Methoden der... Untersuchung sind damit nicht andere, als sie die redaktionsgeschichtliche Forschung mit Erfolg für die Bestimmung der Theologie der Evangelisten angewandt ist“.

¹⁸ Kloppenborg Verbin, *Excavating Q*, 130, n. 24.

¹⁹ Similarly Robinson, “A Written Greek Sayings Cluster Older than Q: A Vestige”, 61-62. Contra Havener, *Sayings*, 41; Lindemann, „Die Logienquelle Q“, 12-13. Cf. Tuckett, *Q and History*, 80: “If we are really interested in Q itself (rather than pre-Q stages) then perhaps we should look to Q in its ‘final’ form. And if we are interested in the specific concerns of Q and the Christians who preserved it, we should perhaps be ready to accept that the whole of the material in Q potentially has a contribution to make in this respect”. Tuckett is aware of the value of the traditional redaction-critical approach: “There may well be occasions when it is possible to identify conscious modifications in earlier traditions, and such instances will be extremely important in assessing the specific interests of the Christians responsible for Q”.

²⁰ Sato, *Q und Prophetie*, 47-65; Kosch, *Die eschatologische Tora*, 200-6, 248, 353, 423; idem, „Q: Rekonstruktion und Interpretation“.

²¹ The impetus for the discussion on the stratigraphy of Q was the study of Kloppenborg, *Formation*. Kloppenborg Verbin has explained and elaborated his stratigraphic model in “*The Formation of Q Revisited*”, and recently in *Excavating Q*, 143-151. Arnal, *Village Scribes*, Kirk, *Composition*, Mack, *The Lost Gospel*, and Vaage, *Galilean Upstarts*, take the stratigraphy as presented by Kloppenborg more or less for granted. See also Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels*, 134-35, 149-50. On the criticism toward the stratigraphic model of Kloppenborg, see Collins, “Wisdom, Apocalypticism, and Generic Compatibility”; Hoffmann, „Mutmassungen über Q“, 255-88; Horsley, “Questions about Redactional Strata”; idem, “*Logoi Propheton*”; idem, “Wisdom Justified in All Her Children”; idem, “The Contours of Q”; Järvinen, “Jesus as a Community Symbol in Q”, 525-526; Schröter, *Erinnerung*,

textual analysis based on the use of different methodological tools which corroborate and complement each other. Whether Q consists of two or several redactional strata or whether it is structured by “a sequence of discourses”²² is a matter of analysis which uses textual, literary, rhetorical and form-, composition- and redaction-critical methods. In the present study, however, I do not assume any stratigraphic model as a starting point.

When giving the methodological preference to the ‘final’ form of Q Tuckett suggests the need for ‘a balanced approach’. Like the other gospels, Q can bear traditions that the final editor modified and corrected in the redactional process or adopted without changes.²³ Kloppenborg has a similar view, as he postulates two kinds of redactional approach to the text: the “diachronic” and the “synchronic”. These approaches are

113-22, 445-451, 459-461; Tuckett, “On the Stratification of Q”; idem, *Q and the History*.

²² Horsley, “The Contours of Q”, 85-90.

²³ Tuckett, *Q and History*, 81. Kloppenborg Verbin, *Excavating Q*, 53-54, 116-17 also considers redaction- and literary-critical methods to be the most fruitful for solving the Synoptic problem and also in excavating Q. The starting-point here has to be the final form of the text. Then the “redactional analysis is to be accomplished *backwards* and *downwards*”. (p. 116 italics orig..) One has to “work in *reverse direction* that the collection was originally composed and, as it were, to ‘peel back the layers’” (p. 117 italics orig.). Cf. Uro, *Sheep*, 12-13.

Jacobson, *First Gospel*, 13, has developed a ‘compositional method’ which has a similar point of departure: “It is methodologically preferable to work backward from the “final form” of Q”. However, he notes a limitation in this method (ibid. 46): “This method (i.e. proceeding backward) is able to penetrate to that layer which was most extensively subjected to redaction; it does not necessarily provide entry into the oldest stages in the composition of Q”. However, it remains slightly obscure how one can determine “the oldest stages in the composition of Q”.

After analyzing the redaction of Q Lührmann, *Redaktion*, 89-90, concludes: „Die beherrschende Form dieser durch die Redaktion verbundenen Überlieferungsstücke ist die Spruchreihe, teilweise durch die Einleitung mit einer kurzen Szene in der Form des erweiterten Apophthegmas... Die Formen der in Q verarbeiteten Überlieferungsstücke sind die in der synoptischen Tradition üblichen; es überwiegt zwar der Spruch und die Spruchreihe, daneben finden sich aber auch Gleichnisse, kurze Szenen und Wundergeschichten.“

While Lührmann finds one stage of redaction in Q, Sato, *Q und Prophetie*, 46 sums up: „Q ist nicht auf einmal redaktionell fixiert worden, sondern durch einen längeren Prozess von Sammlungen, Addierungen, Redaktionen sowie Bearbeitungen zustande gekommen. *Eine sukzessive Fortgestaltung* charakterisiert die Quelle. Wir haben einige Etappen dieses Prozesses nachzeichnen können; eine genaue Beschreibung dieses Wachstumsvorgangs ist kaum möglich.“ (Italics orig.)

complementary since “[t]hey serve to corroborate, supplement, and correct each other, since, after all, both seek to understand the construction and intent of the gospels, merely from different perspectives”.²⁴

Alan Kirk argues for a compositional strategy in Q while “the multitude of compositional choices going into production of a text in all its specifics is governed by the communicative intention and the desire of the producer to achieve a certain effect upon its recipients, that is, the text in all of its details enacts a communicative strategy”.²⁵ That is to say that, in the case of Q, one can expect at least some coherence and cohesion since “the location of text production within interactive communicative situations entails that texts possess the property of intelligibility and hence manifest a *proclivity* towards coherence and cohesion”.²⁶ In the case of the prayer instruction of Q 11:2-4,9-12 there seem to be different kinds of structural elements that apparently form a coherent instructional composition. Whether these elements can be found is a matter of careful textual analysis.

It is not the aim of the present study to investigate the principle(s) according to which the whole of Q was redacted or compiled. However, seeing Q as a uniform literary document has an impact on the analysis of its constituent textual entities, i.e. the prayer instruction (Q 11:2-4; 9-13), and the Lord’s Prayer that forms part of it, in the present study. Thus we need to be aware of the overarching motifs or themes that run throughout Q.

Kloppenborg Verbin has found three ruling motifs in Q: *Coming Judgment, the Story of Lot* and *the Deuteronomistic Theology*.²⁷ According to him, “(t)hese three interrelated complexes.. lend Q a

²⁴ Kloppenborg Verbin, *Excavating Q*, 54.

²⁵ Kirk, *Composition*, 69.

²⁶ Kirk, *Composition*, 69 (*italics orig.*).

²⁷ Kloppenborg Verbin, *Excavating Q*, 118-22 (*italics orig.*) and the literature quoted there. The study by Lührmann, *Redaktion*, 93-94, notes that „[d]ie wichtigste redaktionelle Motive hatten sich zunächst der Gegensatz zu Israel und die Gerichtsankündigung abgehoben.“ He further argues that the apocalyptic expectation of judgment „ist in Q mindestens einseitig hervorgehoben und in der Redaktion zum entscheidenden Interpretament von Jesu basileia-Verkündigung geworden... Man kann also geradezu von einer „Re-apokalyptisierung“ der Verkündigung Jesu in Q sprechen; freilich weisen die deutlichen Spuren der Parusieverzögerung darauf hin, dass hier nicht das einzige Motiv der Redaktion von Q liegen kann.“

thematic unity, appearing at the beginning and the end at various strategic points throughout”.²⁸ It is to be noted, however, that the theme of the kingdom occurs in several parts of Q.²⁹ As Horsley notes, “the kingdom of God is virtually assumed or taken for granted as the focus of Q discourses as well as the comprehensive agenda of preaching, practice, and purpose in Q”.³⁰ Whether or not the motifs and themes presented by Kloppenborg and Horsley are reflected in the prayer instruction and in the Lord’s Prayer in particular remains to be seen. At least in the opening petitions (sanctification of the name and the coming of the kingdom), one has to ask about their connection with the overarching motifs of judgment and the Deuteromistic theology. Judgment and the kingdom are related in Q 10:9; 11:20 and 13:28-29. Furthermore, sanctification of Yahweh’s name is a recurring theme in Deuteromistic theology.³¹

It has become clear that it is the document in its ‘final’ form that has to be taken as the point of departure in the analysis of Q. The author of the document found the text and its contents coherent enough when giving it its present shape. That is not to say that the document is a uniform block of material. Indeed, there is a wide range of individual textual units that may differ greatly from each other in both form and content. But the (final) compiler of Q did not find them (too) contradictory in relation to each other. As Tuckett states:

“We should be ready to accept that, although at times redactional changes may have occurred so that traditions may have been adopted without change because the final editor agreed wholeheartedly with the ideas expressed. Presumably, the final product... made some kind of sense to someone”.³²

William Arnal has posed the question whether wandering itinerants might have composed such texts as the *Gospel of Thomas* and partly also Q. He continues: “Are itinerants literate? If so, what does this tell us about their original social location? Do itinerants, who claim to have given up all wealth and social connections, carry around just enough

²⁸ Kloppenborg Verbin, *Excavating Q*, 121-22.

²⁹ Q 6:20; 7:28; 10:9,11; 11:2,20; 12:31; 13:18-21, 28-29; 16:16; 22:28-30.

³⁰ Horsley, “The Contours of Q”, 87.

³¹ See e.g. Dtn 14:2; 28:9.

³² Tuckett, *Q and History*, 81.

money in their nonexistent purses (so Q 10:4) to buy paper and hire scribes?”³³ The answer to these questions is, according to Arnal, hardly!

Arnal notes that after an intensive period of scholarly study of Q “[w]e are no longer able to assume that Q specifically, or the sayings tradition in general, represents a deposit of mixed oral lore, communicated by largely illiterate yokels or by a bucolic, if disaffected, peasantry. Nor can we assume, in the face of such evidence of rhetorical deliberation, that the material preserved in Q is unselfconscious and transparent reflection of the behavior of the people who did the preserving. This incertitude might in fact suggest, at least on its face, that Q’s rhetoric of uprootedness is precisely that: rhetoric”.³⁴

Arnal further claims that “the rhetorical organization of the material does not reflect - at least not directly - its tradition-historical provenance... The compositions... were organized with a view toward subsuming these radical or inversionary sayings into coherent and persuasive arguments that asserted fairly commonplace conclusions... The inflammatory, mysterious, or inversionary aspects of the rhetoric of the constituent material were thus effectively domesticated: they became general principles supporting (relatively) conventional observations”.³⁵ The same may be the case in the prayer instruction of Q, too. It consists of several units that are melted together in order to achieve a persuasive argument for petitionary prayer. Thus the importance of the context will be underscored when analyzing the text.

Ronald Piper has pointed out the aphoristic tradition recorded in Q. He has argued for five similarly structured aphoristic collections that contain multiple aphoristic sayings.³⁶ Their rhetoric is based on a similar type of argumentation with a persuasive tone. They betray several

³³ Arnal, *Jesus and the Village Scribes*, 45. Downing, *Cynics*, proposes several Cynic parallels to some sayings of Q.

³⁴ Arnal, *Jesus and the Village Scribes*, 68.

³⁵ Arnal, *Jesus and the Village Scribes*, 186-87. This is because the other sayings in a cluster are no less attested than the radical opening sayings (see *ibid.*, 253, n. 48).

³⁶ Q 11:9-13; 12:22-31; 6:43-45; 6:37-42; and 12:2-9. Piper, *Wisdom*, 15. Cf. Crossan, “Lists in Early Christianity”, 238, who claims that Q betrays a development from oral communication toward literacy. The document is a product of listing the speeches of Jesus into dialogues and discourses. Crossan bases his view on the observations of Goody, *Domestication*, 80, 108. See also Horsley, “The Oral Communication Environment of Q”, 148-49.

common formal and structural characteristics:³⁷ 1. Each collection begins with a rather general aphoristic saying that is a maxim in statement form or a wisdom admonition. 2. A general maxim in statement form follows, providing support for the opening saying. 3. There is a change in presentation often marked by rhetorical question formulation. It is illustrated by concrete examples narrowing the focus and preparing for the concluding part. 4. The final unit provides the interpretative key to the collection. It is set in balance with the opening of the collection. Thus Piper concludes: “*These are not haphazard collections of aphoristic sayings; they display a design and argument unique in the synoptic tradition*”.³⁸

The notions of Arnal and Piper have important consequences for the present study. We need to be sensitive to the literary form and structure of the Lord’s Prayer as well as its context, the prayer instruction of Q in particular. The rhetorical organization of the prayer and its context has to be placed under careful literary scrutiny. Of course, it may be, and is even probable, that the prayer instruction contains material that is to be dated earlier than the (final) composition of Q. However, as will be seen, in the present form it betrays careful literary planning and organization. This literary planning has to be placed beside other clusters of Q. One task of the present study is to discover whether there are other parallel clusters that are similarly composed.

³⁷ See Piper, *Wisdom*, 62-63.

³⁸ Piper, *Wisdom*, 64 (italics orig.). Cf. Kirk, *Composition*, 150, who finds twelve examples of instructional speeches in Q: Love Your Enemies (6:27-36), Judge Not (3:37-42), Trees, Fruit and Speech (6:43-45), Confident Prayer (11:2-13), the Beelzebul Controversy (11:14-23), Request for a Sign (11:29-35), Courageous Witness (12:2-12), Do Not Be Anxious (12:22-31, 33-34), Be Watchful and Ready (12:35-46), Discerning the Times (12:49-59), Enter Through the Narrow Door (13:24-30; 14:11, 16-24, 26-27; 17:33; 14:34-35), and Discerning the Day of the Son of Man (17:23-37). According to Kirk (ibid., 150), each of these “displays the following defining features of the instructional speech genre: (a) *programmatic opening*, expressed either as an admonition, a maxim, or both, frequently followed by a *motive or rationale* clause; (b) a *course of argumentation* which motivates response to the programmatic theme, using an assortment of forms such as parables, rhetorical questions, paradigms, exempla, promise clauses, admonitions, threats of divine sanction, and supportive gnomes, maxims and aphorisms”. As the speeches share common stylistic features, all having a central saying, “*flanked by illustrative units*, expressed variously as parables, analogies, metaphorical gnomes, or paradigms, not infrequently in the form of *rhetorical question*, which concretize with vivid images and situations the programmatic wisdom expressed at the threshold of the speech”. (Italics orig.)

Werner Kelber has discussed the problem of orality and textuality in biblical scholarship.³⁹ He has challenged the paradigm of evolutionary trajectory and suggests that “Q seeks to resist the stabilizing effects of writing by fusing Jesus’ past with his present”, and thus it displays “a fundamentally oral disposition”.⁴⁰ He defines ‘tradition’ as “a circumambient contextuality or biosphere in which speaker and hearers live. It includes texts and experiences transmitted through or derived from texts. But it is anything but reducible to intertextuality”.⁴¹

Kelber has invented ‘biosphere’ as a broad metaphor for ‘tradition’. He states: “Tradition in this broadest sense is largely an invisible nexus of references and identities from which people draw sustenance, in which they live, and in relation to which they make sense of their lives. This invisible biosphere is at once most elusive and the foundational feature of tradition”.⁴² Then, “[i]f we take into serious account the extensive work done on speech and writing in the last few decades, we can no longer reduce tradition to a history of ideas abstracted from texts and disincarnated from contexts”.

Kelber’s notion, I think, also has relevance for the present study. We have the reconstructed text of Q available. However, it bears a vast number of references to the ‘biosphere’ in which it came into being and in which it was part of the ongoing and changing social and communicative process.⁴³ We have to consider the possible and even probable changes in the text during the process at the end of which the text emerged. We have to be aware of the probable modifications, omissions, enlargements, replacements, incorporations of new material within the process. And we have to ask the sense of these actions: Why did the changes happen? What was the impulse for using the words we now have available? How did the text mirror the social reality of the writer, of the Christian community and of the surrounding society?

³⁹ Kelber, “Jesus and Tradition”, 140-63. He benefited the literacy theory of Ong as presented in his works: *The Presence of the Word; Interfaces of the Word; Orality and Literacy*.

⁴⁰ Kelber, “Jesus and Tradition”, 156-57, referring to Tödt, *Son of Man*, 265; also Horsley, *Whoever Hears You*, 6; Kelber, *Gospel*, 201.

⁴¹ Kelber, “Jesus and Tradition”, 159.

⁴² Kelber, “Jesus and Tradition”, 159.

⁴³ Havener, *Sayings*, 31-40, and Vaage, “Composite Texts and Oral Mythology” also recognize traces of orality in Q.

Patterson's notion concerning the close relationship between some Thomasine sayings and their social context can be adapted to the study of Q. The 'legal sayings' or 'community rules' are "those sayings which identify a concrete behavior and practice as either desirable or undesirable, in such a way that they function to regulate the behavior of those who hear or read them as authoritative".⁴⁴ Pearson, for his part, notes that Q focuses "on the remembered tradition of Jesus' *teachings* as the norm for community life".⁴⁵ This may also be the case with the prayer instruction of Q.

Kloppenborg Verbin notes one important aspect in the ancient writing technique: All documents were written *scripta continua* without breaks. Thus reading was a performance and at the same time an act of interpreting the text. Kloppenborg Verbin continues:

"This implies that the written text was never a separate and discrete entity but always existed in the context of oral performance, functioning more like a musical script than a modern book".⁴⁶

Vernon Robbins has also pointed out the close relationship between writing and speaking in Antiquity. Oral and scribal traditions were performed in a transmission process that required reformulation. Thus, in the "rhetorical culture... speech is influenced by writing and writing is influenced by speaking. Recitation... is the base of a rhetorical culture.... all traditions, oral and written, need to be composed anew to meet the needs of the day".⁴⁷

⁴⁴ Patterson, *Gospel of Thomas*, 126. On wisdom sayings in Q and Thomas, see idem, "Wisdom in Q and Thomas".

⁴⁵ Pearson, "A Q Community in Galilee?", 489 (italics orig.).

⁴⁶ Kloppenborg Verbin, *Excavating Q*, 60.

⁴⁷ Robbins, "Oral, Rhetorical, and Literary Cultures: A Response". Cf. Dewey, "Textuality in an Oral Culture", 45: "Textuality, when it existed, existed as an aid to oral presentation". Ibid., 57: "Our reconstruction of early Christianity has been largely based on manuscript (and print) understandings. We need much more research on orality and literacy and their interaction in the first centuries of the common era in general and in early Christianity in particular". Cf. Achtemeier, "Omnes verbum sonat", 17: "Reading was... oral performance whenever it occurred and in whatever circumstances". Also Foley, "Words in Tradition", 171; Horsley, "The Oral Communication Environment of Q", 144-45; idem, *Whoever Hears You*, 6 with Kelber, "Jesus and Tradition", 162.

Risto Uro takes the cue from Robbins and adapts the method to the study of *Thomas*: “One has to imagine the composition of *Thomas* as a process in which literarily and orally transmitted traditions were continually performed, either from memory or by reading aloud, and composed anew”.⁴⁸ This notion has to be borne in mind when studying Q. It is probable that Q, too, consists of material that is “composed according to the methods similar to those taught in the Hellenistic rhetorical manuals”.⁴⁹ Traces of oral performance can be found in the written Q text.⁵⁰

Dell Hymes notes that “especially in an oral tradition performance is a mode of existence and realization that is partly *constitutive* of what the tradition is”.⁵¹ We may imagine that in Antiquity prayer was a performance. It was, at least mostly, a public action. Prayer customs were closely intertwined in the setting in which they were performed as well as in the content of prayer. This means that prayers were ostensibly open to change and development. Public performance gave a distinct colour and feature to prayer. Horsley notes that “teaching people to pray for the kingdom, and reassuring those anxious about the necessities of life also consolidate communities of people and enable them to maintain their solidarity and purpose through difficult life situations, in all of which the meaning of the words is only part of what is happening”.⁵² Whether traces of this kind of performance can be found in the prayer instruction of Q, will be seen in a detailed study of its rhetoric. In methodological terms, the traces of the oral phase in the prayer instruction and in the Lord’s Prayer ostensibly conform with their early social setting.

Social anthropologists have invented the pair “little” and “great” tradition in order to define the distinction between the tradition of the lower class and that of the upper class. The concept of little and great tradition was first and foremost developed by Robert Redfield, a cultural

⁴⁸ Uro, *Thomas*, 115.

⁴⁹ Uro, *Thomas*, 115. Cf. Race, *The Classical Priamel*.

⁵⁰ See the analysis of Q 12:49-59 in Draper, “Recovering Oral Performance from Written Text in Q”, 189-94, of 6:20-49 in Horsley, “The Covenant Renewal Discourse: Q 6:20-49”, 209-16, and of Q 9:57-10:16 in Horsley, “Prophetic Envoys for the Renewal of Israel: Q 9:57-10:16”, 234-37.

⁵¹ Hymes, *Essays*, 86 (italics orig.). Similarly Horsley, *Whoever Hears You*, 7.

⁵² Horsley, *Whoever Hears You*, 8.

anthropologist in the 1950s.⁵³ A great tradition corresponds with “a *learned* and *literate* tradition, preserving and developing the dominant systems of thought and value of a civilization”.⁵⁴ Accordingly little traditions are popular, rural and often conform with oral and illiterate traditions.⁵⁵

Some biblical scholars have exploited the concept of little and great tradition. Thomas Kazen has studied the traditions of purity *halakhah* according to literary and local traditions in Galilee. He points to tensions between the Pharisees as the retainers of great tradition and the common people representing little tradition.⁵⁶

Richard Horsley describes Q as a document aiming at the renewal of the people of Israel.⁵⁷ He promotes the division of great/official tradition and little/popular tradition as the heuristic tool for understanding the rhetoric and character of Q.⁵⁸ Thus, “[t]he little tradition is ‘the distinctive patterns of belief and behavior which are valued by peasantry’; the great tradition is the corresponding patterns among the society’s élite, sometimes embodied in written documents”.⁵⁹ I shall try to discover whether there are traits of popular, little tradition in Q and whether there are signs of great tradition.

When studying the tradition history of the Lord’s Prayer Douglas Oakman takes as his point of departure “the consideration that *Jesus’ religion spoke to an immediate need in concrete terms*”.⁶⁰ Further, he notes the development from concrete socio-political language to more abstract rhetoric:

“Once Jesus’ Prayer had assumed written form, in the language of commerce and to some extent empire, other interests

⁵³ Redfield, *Peasant Society and Culture*. See also Redfield and Singer, “The Cultural Role of Cities”.

⁵⁴ Singer, *When a Great Tradition Modernizes*, 55.

⁵⁵ Redfield, *Peasant Society and Culture*, 70-72; Redfield and Singer, “The Cultural Role of Cities”.

⁵⁶ Kazen, *Jesus and Purity Halakhah*, 273-299.

⁵⁷ Horsley, “The Pharisees and Jesus in Galilee and Q”, 138.

⁵⁸ Horsley, “Israelite Traditions in Q”, 98-104, referring to the theoretical and comparative study by Scott, “Protest and Profanation”. Idem “The Pharisees and Jesus in Galilee and Q”, 126-28. See also the study by Redfield, *Peasant Society and Culture*, esp. pp. 40-59.

⁵⁹ Horsley, “Israelite Traditions in Q”, 99.

⁶⁰ Oakman, “The Lord’s Prayer in Social Perspective”, 139 (*italics orig.*).

would become more significant than those of the originating context. “Social-textural” considerations (to use Vernon Robbins’ language) are more important at an earlier stage, “intertextual” considerations come into play at later stages. Whereas an illiterate Jesus was preoccupied with the immediate and concrete, *later tradents of Jesus tradition become more concerned with theological (christological, eschatological) abstractions or the articulation of the Jesus material with Israel’s great traditions*”.⁶¹

Oakman’s notion has to be taken into consideration when studying the rhetoric of the Lord’s Prayer in the Q context. It remains to be seen whether it betrays the kind of development from concrete towards abstract rhetoric.

Indeed, it seems that the Lord’s Prayer contains the kind of language that raises the question of metaphorical and even symbolic language. For example, the addressee is clearly a metaphor of God. For the present study the urgent issue is whether the whole prayer is to be considered metaphorically. Or does its tradition history reflect a development from concrete language toward metaphorical and even symbolic rhetoric?

When studying the meaning(s) of the petitions of the Lord’s Prayer it may be useful to look at its items and themes from the symbolic point of view. The hermeneutical three-world model is based on the studies of Kari Syreeni.⁶² Syreeni exploits the literary and sociology-of-science approaches and combines them in his three-world model. According to him, the human reality consists of the text world (the level of textuality), the symbolic world (the level of ideology), and the concrete world (the level of ‘real life’). The three-world model calls for a ‘balanced’ approach that takes the text(s) and the social reality equally into account. In this respect it resembles the socio rhetorical model of Robbins.⁶³

The symbols play a meaningful role between the texts and the social reality. Kloppenborg and Uro have studied the main symbols of

⁶¹ Oakman, “The Lord’s Prayer in Social Perspective”, 141, referring to Robbins, *Exploring the Texture*, 40, 71 (italics orig.).

⁶² See Syreeni, “Matthew, Luke and the Law”; idem, “Metaphorical Appropriation”.

⁶³ Robbins, “Oral, Rhetorical, and Literary Cultures: A Response”.

Q.⁶⁴ For the present study it is significant that the theme of the ‘kingdom’ occurs frequently in Q and also in the Lord’s Prayer. Thus it can be considered as a symbol that has more than one single referent in Q. Whether or not it is a mundane, apocalyptic or eschatological symbol remains to be seen.⁶⁵ In addition, this-worldly referents for the kingdom may also be found. The context of the single occurrences of the kingdom has to be studied carefully in order to find a precise meaning for the symbol.

In sum, the point of departure of the present study is the Q text in its final form, i.e. as it can be reconstructed in Mt and Lk. The prayer instruction (Q 11:2-4, 9-13) in particular is brought under careful scrutiny. The literary method is to work first with major blocks or clusters, then to search for smaller units. The rhetorical method is to look for constructions that provide clues to the themes, rhetorical intentions and symbolic or ideological/theological meanings of the text. It is essential to consider the rhetorical environment and setting in order to understand the speeches and texts.⁶⁶ Thus I shall turn now to the social setting in which Q emerged and was used.

1.2. Sociological methods: The Q people⁶⁷

⁶⁴ Kloppenborg, “Symbolic Eschatology”, 287-306; Uro, “Apocalyptic Symbolism in Q”, 67-118, who focuses on three major symbols or themes in Q: 1) the kingdom of God, 2) the language of judgement, and 3) the Son of Man.

⁶⁵ On the discussion on defining apocalypticism and eschatology, see Gager, “Functional Diversity”, 325-37; Borg, *Conflict*, 10-11; Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination*, 1-11; idem, “Apocalyptic Literature”, 353; Meeks, “Social Functions”, 688-89; Uro, “Apocalyptic Symbolism in Q”, 70-75.

⁶⁶ Horsley, “Recent Studies of Oral –Derived Literature and Q”, 160. He criticises New Testament scholars for the contrasting of oral tradition and written redaction or composition as separate stages and processes. Horsely bases his criticism on the implications of the studies of Mark by Dewey, “The Gospel of Mark as an Oral-Aural Event”, and Botha, “Mark’s Story”.

⁶⁷ I use the expression “Q people” instead of, say, “Q community” in order to leave room for defining the social setting of the people responsible for the emergence of Q. Allison, *Jesus Tradition*, 44, speaks of ‘community’. Horsley, *Whoever Hears You*, 8, speaks of ‘communities’.

It is important to note that when examining the social setting of the people behind Q and their prayer practice in particular, our main sources are literary.⁶⁸ Therefore, what is needed is a set of methodological tools that can provide means to achieve a many-sided view of the literary, rhetorical, symbolic and social setting of the Lord's Prayer.

Thus, Alan Kirk reminds us that “[s]ince both text producer and text recipient are embedded in concrete social relations, and since text production as linguistic, communicative activity is also social activity, the text will on the one hand reflect social relations and on the other be a catalyzing agent advocating a set of social interests. The capacity of a text to mesh with the dynamics of a given socio-historical situation represents another dimension of its coherence and also justifies application of analytical models drawn from other disciplines (in particular, social sciences)”.⁶⁹ It is to be noted that the point of departure of Kirk's own study is almost solely literary.

As for the sociological setting of the Q people, no consensus has been reached so far. The borderline seems to run between the itinerant and the settled lifestyle. Were the itinerant preachers responsible for the emergence of Q, or was it a product of people living in settled circumstances? Or does Q reflect a process of social and ethical radicalism moving towards a moderate and conventional lifestyle?

The studies by Paul Hoffmann⁷⁰ and Gerd Theißen⁷¹ concerning charismatic itinerant preachers as the *primus motor* of the Jesus movement have greatly affected Q scholarship in recent decades.⁷²

⁶⁸ The archaeological evidence provides some information on the first-century Galilean social context.

⁶⁹ Kirk, *Composition*, 85.

⁷⁰ Hoffmann, *Studien*.

⁷¹ Theißen, „Wanderradikalismus“, 245-71; “The Wandering Radicals”, 33-59. Theißen's study has influenced Q studies, especially in the 1980s. See Kim, *Trägergruppe*, 238-40; Uro, *Sheep*, 134: “The poverty of the Christian charismatics can be seen as a prophetic sign expressing this eschatological consciousness. One who wandered poorer than the poorest beggar manifested his total dependence on God and his promises and anticipated the New Order which was to come. This ethos... could attract those who were living on the periphery of the society, economically and socially distressed”.

⁷² The roots of the model of itinerant charismatics as the *primus motor* of the early Jesus movement can be found in the writings of Adolf Harnack on the *Didache*: Harnack, *Die Lehre der zwölf Apostel*, 94-95, 157; idem. *Entstehung und Entwicklung*; idem *Mission and Expansion of Early Christianity*, 319-68. See

According to Hoffmann the Q people were a small group of charismatics who wandered around and promoted their mission of anti-Zealotism.⁷³ Theißen adopted the basic view of Hoffmann and located the early Jesus movement within “the peace party” with an anti-violent ethos of love and reconciliation.⁷⁴ The theocratic message of the radical itinerants met with success only in cities where the theocratic ideals gained sympathy from Gentiles but not from people with a Jewish identity.⁷⁵ In his later study Theißen made a distinction between the itinerants and their sympathizers.⁷⁶ Furthermore he has recently softened his view and restricted the influence of the charismatics to the beginning of the Jesus movement.⁷⁷

There has been severe criticism of the itinerant hypothesis of Hoffmann and Theißen.⁷⁸ Theißen has been criticized for his point of departure, i.e. itinerancy and the local communities as the economic supporters of the wandering charismatics. He begins with this without

Draper, “Wandering Charismatics and Scholarly Circularities”, 34. Recently Zeller, „Jesus, Q und die Zukunft Israels”, 351-352, and Tiwald, „Der Wanderradikalismus als Brücke zum historischen Jesus”, have stressed the influence of *Wandermissionare* as the bearers of the Q tradition. Moxnes, *Putting Jesus in His Place*, 67, calls those who left their families (Jesus among them) “displaced persons”.

⁷³ Hoffmann, *Studien*, 74-79. The view of Hoffmann was adapted by Schottroff, „Schafe unter Wölfen“; Schottroff- Stegemann, *Jesus von Nazareth*, 63-64. Before Hoffmann Hengel, *Zeloten*, noted the anti-Zealot tendency in the speech on loving one’s enemy and reconciliation, Further, idem. *Nachfolge*, 37-38, he presented the prophetic-charismatic character of the early Jesus movement.

⁷⁴ Theißen, *Soziologie*, 19.

⁷⁵ Theißen, *Soziologie*, 19.

⁷⁶ Theißen, *Lokalkolorit*, 55-56, 306; idem *Studien*, 79-105. Also Kim, *Trägergruppe*, 361-63.

⁷⁷ Theißen, *Lokalkolorit*, 301-302. Cf. Blasi, “Role Structures”, 246; idem *Early Christianity*, 115; White, “Sociological Analysis”, 256. Similarly Zeller, *Mahnsprüche*, 93; „Redactional Processes”, 128-29; Uro, *Sheep*, 134.

⁷⁸ See Stegemann, “Vagabond Radicalism in Early Christianity?”, 148-68; Elliott, “Social Scientific Criticism of the New Testament and Its Social World”; Horsley, *Sociology*; Draper, “Wandering Radicalism or Purposeful Activity?”; idem “Wandering Charismatics and Scholarly Circularities”, 30-40, targeting his criticism on Theißen’s use of Hjalmar Sunden’s theory of religious role adoption (Sunden, *Die Religion and die Rollen*) and Max Weber’s theory of charismatic leadership (Weber, *Economy and Society* I-II).

further ado.⁷⁹ Furthermore, the role of the sympathizers is questionable when the (Jewish) socio-cultural tradition is taken into account.⁸⁰

Kloppenborg Verbin sums up the discussion of itinerancy as follows:

“[A]n alternative image of the Q people emerges, one which acknowledges the activities of the itinerant workers, but which implicitly restricts their activities to the early stages of group formation. Itinerants may still have been present when Q was edited, but they no longer exerted a controlling influence on the formation of the document. Nor did their interests dominate those of the entire group”.⁸¹

William Arnal takes a step forward and challenges the whole itinerant hypothesis. He notes that “Q takes for granted the legitimate existence of rich and poor, of creditors and debtors, as well as the more obvious distinctions between men and women, children and parents”.⁸² Further, “[t]he internal evidence provided by Q itself... suggests that the cultivation and composition of the Q traditions was undertaken by persons with the characteristics of the village scribes (κωμογραμματεῖς), that is, by the rural scribes who were moderately, but not spectacularly, educated”.⁸³ The skill of the village scribes is revealed in the compositional techniques of Q and the delicate rhetorical organization of clusters. Arnal concludes:

“We are thus dealing, in case of the Q tradents, with persons who are educated and who think of themselves as - and are - learned

⁷⁹ Draper, “Wandering Charismatics and Scholarly Circularities”, 32.

⁸⁰ Draper, “Wandering Charismatics and Scholarly Circularities”, 33, referring to the fact that “in the tradition of Israel, the whole people is the covenantal people, and religion is a public and obligatory aspect of a holistic understanding of life”.

⁸¹ Kloppenborg Verbin, *Excavating Q*, 183-84. Cf. Crossan, “Itinerants and Householders”.

⁸² Arnal, *Jesus and the Village Scribes*, 150

⁸³ Arnal, *Jesus and the Village Scribes*, 159. *Ibid.*, 154, Arnal argues that the role of village scribes came to be identified as those who exploited the peasantry. They were aware of the changes in the economic and political situation in first-century Galilee.

beyond the ancient norm but who, at the same time, do not occupy the pinnacle of the learning Antiquity had to offer”.⁸⁴

It may be that those who were responsible for Q were members of the scribal class.⁸⁵ It is still to be noted that Q betrays rhetoric that is appropriate to smallholders in an agricultural environment. This is apparent in John's preaching about the coming one (Q 3:16-17), where the agricultural rhetoric of harvesting is used. Further, in the parable of the builders (6:47-49) there is the threat of flooding, ostensibly a real one for the houses of the Q people. A wise builder built on the rock, while a foolish one did so on the sand.⁸⁶

Arnal proposes the social context of Q as follows:

“The specific social circumstances in which Q was composed primarily involve a set of political-economic and societal shifts brought about directly or indirectly by Roman domination and imperial policy. A description of these changes provides the concrete context in which Q arose and to which it was addressed”.⁸⁷

Arnal claims that the impetus for composing Q was provided by the changes in people's everyday lives. Thus, it is probable that “Q's production as a document is related to some kind of crisis, or at least perceived crisis”.⁸⁸ True, there was pressure on the inhabitants because of the double taxation⁸⁹ and the exploitation of the rural production by the foundation of two large cities, Sepphoris and Tiberias.⁹⁰ It may well be

⁸⁴ Arnal, *Jesus and the Village Scribes*, 170.

⁸⁵ Besides Arnal, Kloppenborg Verbin, *Excavating Q*, 200-1, also notes that the emergence of Q is to be located within the scribal class. Cf. White, “Sociological Analysis”, 256, who notes that “[t]he Q stratum bearers are already localized leaders (the *pater familias*?), who look *back* to the earlier itinerant missionaries as their 'source' for the words of Jesus”. (Italics orig.)

⁸⁶ For the reconstruction of the parable, see *CEQ*.

⁸⁷ Arnal, *Jesus and the Village Scribes*, 97.

⁸⁸ Arnal, *Jesus and the Village Scribes*, 98.

⁸⁹ Arnal, *Jesus and the Village Scribes*, 98; Horsley, *Spiral of Violence*, 29; idem, *Galilee*, 139-40, 201; Freyne, *Galilee*, 183-84; Kloppenborg Verbin, *Excavating Q*, 235.

⁹⁰ Arnal, *Jesus and the Village Scribes*, 101; Edwards, “First Century Urban/Rural Relations”; Freyne, “Herodian Economics in Galilee”; idem, “Galilean Questions”, 68, 70, 79-83; Moreland, “Q and the Economics of the Early Roman Galilee”, 562-568; Reed, “Population Numbers, Urbanization, and Economics”, 203-19.

that such threats in social and economic circumstances are also mirrored in the petitions of the Lord's Prayer, at least in the petitions concerning bread and debts. This issue will be discussed in detail later.

The rhetoric of Q indicates an agricultural environment (Q 3:17; 10:2; 12:24). This is in accord with the information provided by Josephus. According to his report (*Bell.* 3:42-44), Galilee was an agrarian society. People lived mostly in villages and were dependent on the productivity of the soil. The basic social and economical unit was the (multigenerational) family or household and village which were interrelated sets of households.⁹¹ In Q, too, the household (οἰκία) is seen as the basic social unit (10:2-12, 39, 51-53; 14:26,27; 16:18).⁹²

The fundamental presupposition in this study is that there really lived people who composed and used Q in first-century Galilee. In fact the location of Q has mostly focused on Galilee in Q scholarship.⁹³ There

⁹¹ Horsley, "The Historical Context of Q", 52, who notes that "[i]ndividual people in Galilee or any similar ancient agrarian society were thus embedded in and integral to both families and village communities".

⁹² Similarly Moxnes, *Putting Jesus in His Place*, 45.

⁹³ Arnal, *Jesus and the Village Scribes*, 159; Crossan, *Birth of Christianity*, 415; Freyne, "Galilean Questions to Crossan's Mediterranean Jesus", 87; Harnack, *The Sayings of Jesus*, 167-68; Horsley, "Social Conflict", 42; idem, *Galilee*, 71; idem, "The Historical Context of Q", 52; Kloppenborg, "Literary Convention, Self-Evidence and the Social History of the Q People", 85-86; idem, "The Sayings Gospel Q: Recent Opinions on the People behind the Document", 22-23; idem, *Excavating Q*, 167-71; Reed, "The Social Map of Q", 18; idem, "The Sign of Jonah (Q 11:29-32) and the Other Epic Traditions in Q", 130-31, 134-39; Robinson, "Judaism, Hellenism, Christianity", 241-50; idem, "The Critical Edition of Q", 27-28; Tiwald, „Der Wanderradikalismus als Brücke zum historischen Jesus“, 529; Tuckett, *Q and History*, 102-3; Uro, *Sheep*, 21-22 ("Palestinian"); Vaage, *Galilean Upstarts*, 1, 3.

Arnal, *Jesus and the Village Scribes*, 162, contends: "It... seems safe to assume that the use of an earlier version of Q, and indeed its treatment as a foundational document, by those who redacted Q, indicates that a single group was responsible for its various stages". Further (p. 164), he narrows the location of Q to Capernaum or any other town in the general region to the north of the lake.

Frenschkowski, „Galiläa oder Jerusalem“, 535-559, has challenged the consensus and claims that Q emerged within the *Urgemeinde* of Jerusalem and its final redaction took place in Pella by the Christians who emigrated there. Cf. Pearson, "A Q Community in Galilee?", 492-493, who locates Q in Jerusalem or Antioch. Cf. also Michaud, "Quelle(s) communauté(s) derrière la Source Q", 603: "la Syrie de Damas". Zeller, „Jesus, Q und die Zukunft Israels“, 352, moves the location of Q „in den Städten Phöniziens und/oder Syriens.“ Having little success on Palestinian territory the wandering missionaries moved north.

are clues to be found in Q for a quite precise location. The towns other than Ιηρουσαλήμ mentioned in Q lie in Lower Galilee near Lake Kinneret. Καφαρναούμ is mentioned twice (Q 7:1; 10:15), Χοραζίν and Βηθσαϊδά once (10:13). In addition, Jerusalem is mentioned in a fully negative context, as a place of prosecution and killing of the prophets (Q 13:34-35).

A coastal environment is implied in the account of the catch of fish (Q 11:11). Fishing rights were owned by the local rulers, and contracted out to brokers, who in turn employed wage labourers.⁹⁴ Fishing required some wealth because of the need for special equipment: nets, boats etc.⁹⁵ We may conclude that the environment of Q was located in Lower Galilee in the surroundings of Kefar Nahum, Bethsaida⁹⁶ and Khorazin beside Lake Kinneret.

In identifying the social formation mirrored in Q we need to maintain a wide view as there are no accounts concerning a “group” or “community” in Q. The gospel does not provide sufficient information for defining the matter.⁹⁷ However, according to common usage we may refer to the implied audience of Q and use the broad expression ‘the Q people’.⁹⁸

The institution of synagogue (συναγωγή) is mentioned in Q 11:43 and 12:11. As there is no archaeological evidence for synagogue buildings in first-century Galilee, ‘synagogue’ has to be understood as the village assembly which provided the form of ‘both self-governance and communal political and religious life.’⁹⁹ Seen as such an assembly, ‘synagogue’ fits well with the information provided by the saying

⁹⁴ Arnal, *Jesus and the Village Scribes*, 113 referring to Hanson, “The Galilean Fishing Economy and the Jesus Tradition”; Hanson – Oakman, *Palestine*, 106-9.

⁹⁵ Arnal, *Jesus and the Village Scribes*, 113.

⁹⁶ Meier, *Marginal Jew*, 738, n. 56, notes that “[t]he original Bethsaida was a small fishing village”. Cf. Fitzmyer, *Luke, I-IX*, 756.

⁹⁷ Cf. Lindemann, „Die Logienquelle Q”, 18; Michaud, ”Quelle(s) communauté(s) derrière la Source Q ?”, 603-606.

⁹⁸ See Kloppenborg Verbin, *Excavating Q*, 171

⁹⁹ Horsley, “The Historical Context of Q”, 52. Strange, “Archaeology and Ancient Synagogues”, 485-93, however, claims that the archaeological evidence points to buildings that existed in first-century Galilee. They were used both for declamation of Torah and also for community meetings, instruction of children, informal gatherings, sacred meals and the like.

concerning the hypocrisy of the Pharisees (11:43) and the saying concerning hearings before synagogues (12:11).

Horsley notes that the Lord's Prayer "references explicitly the Israelite covenantal tradition of economic principles ("thou shalt not covet, steal, bear false witness") and mechanisms (sabbatical cancellation of debts and release of debt slaves) intended to keep Israelite families economically viable on their land as members of the village communities in which Israel was constituted".¹⁰⁰

Debt is presented as a problem for the Q people (Q 11:4; 12:58-59). This is in accord with the accounts of debt archives that were kept in large towns.¹⁰¹ Probably not all loans were recorded in writing. Modest transactions were concluded orally in face-to-face interaction.¹⁰² Monetization increased in first-century Galilee because of the founding of large cities, and this encouraged lending. Thus "the poorer farmers... ran the danger of gradually slipping into reversable debt, leading to the loss of their land".¹⁰³

Kloppenborg Verbin concludes that "Josephus' account of conditions in the Galilee assumes that smallholders... lived close enough to the threshold of destitution that one failed harvest could drive large numbers from the land, producing a "harvest of banditry".¹⁰⁴ Further, "[t]he dangerous variability in income levels experienced by smallholders and tenants that are a combined result of the vicissitudes of nature and the extractions of the elite is counterbalanced by an appeal to God's reign and providential care as the appropriate sources of confidence and renewal. Understood in this context, Q's discourse on the kingdom of God represents resistance to the imposition of a political and economic culture that would benefit urban elites at the expense of the small producers".¹⁰⁵

¹⁰⁰ Horsley, "The kingdom of God as the Renewal of Israel", 267-68.

¹⁰¹ Note the account of Josephus concerning an attempt to destroy the debt archives in Jerusalem (*Bell.* 2:427-48) and an attack on Sepphoris (*Vita* 373-80).

¹⁰² Horsley, "The Oral Communication Environment of Q", 129, referring to Harris, *Ancient Literacy*, 198-99.

¹⁰³ Kloppenborg Verbin, *Excavating Q*, 238-39; Guijarro, "The Family in First-Century Galilee", 45-46. Note the account of Amos 8:4-6 concerning the exploitation of peasants.

¹⁰⁴ Kloppenborg Verbin, *Excavating Q*, 255. See also Freyne, "Herodian Economics in Galilee", 39-41.

¹⁰⁵ Kloppenborg Verbin, *Excavating Q*, 260. Freyne, "Herodian Economics in Galilee", 33, argues for the changes in land-owning patterns from small, family-run

When discussing ‘Social Characterizations in Theological Perspective’ Kloppenborg notes rightly that “[t]he focus (in social-historical studies) is not ideas but social practice, not in establishing antecedents for later ecclesial practices in other parts of the world but in understanding the practice and discourse of the Q people in their own environment”.¹⁰⁶ The aim of the present study is to gain a view of the prayer practice of Q and of the *Sitz im Leben* of the Lord’s Prayer in particular.

Further, it is supposed that these people had religious practices and were accustomed to praying. When praying they used the Lord’s Prayer. In any case, we need to be aware of the possibility of variety and changes in prayer practice and prayers. It is probable that the Lord’s Prayer was a fixed prayer before it was incorporated into Q.¹⁰⁷ It is highly improbable that it was composed by the (final) redactor of Q. This means that we need to be aware of the possible modifications, expansions or abbreviations which might have occurred during the life of the Lord’s Prayer. Its form, as recorded in Q, i.e. the vocative address, the two petitions in a similar form, and the set of three petitions, provides a prayer which is easy to remember, easy to recite and easy to pass on. In addition, the plural form (ἡμῶν, ἡμῶν, ἡμῶν) implies a public and social setting.

The Lord’s Prayer and the prayer instruction (Q 11:2-4, 9-13) contain some clues concerning the social reality and the practices of the Q people. First and foremost, they prayed. Q 11:9-10 indicates that their prayer was petitionary, i.e. they asked, sought and knocked. They asked for bread, cancellation of debts and deliverance from trial. Second, they lived in families. The account of 11:11-13 implies fathers and children. It was the *paterfamilias* who was responsible for providing bread and other

farms to larger estates in which the tenants work for the estate, often for an absentee land-owner under a manager, receiving a subsistence living in return for their labour. This kind of system is implied in Q 19:11-27. It is contrary to the Jewish ideal of private ownership in small holdings as expressed in Neh. 5:1-11 and Macc. 14:10.

¹⁰⁶ Kloppenborg Verbin, *Excavating Q*, 419.

¹⁰⁷ To be sure, Did. 8:2 shows that quite soon at least the Mt form of the Lord’s Prayer was used as a fixed (liturgical) prayer. Frenschkowski, „Welche Biographischen Kenntnisse“, 34, n. 90, suggests that the Lord’s Prayer „ist nicht einfach ein austauschbares exemplarisches Gebet, sondern gehört zu einen spezifischen sozialgeschichtlichen Prozess“.

good things for his family. Third, the family ate together. The *paterfamilias* led the blessing and delivered the food.¹⁰⁸

The Q people ate bread and fish, which were probably their staple food.¹⁰⁹ Fish was somehow ready-made, probably cooked over a fire.¹¹⁰ The rhetoric of stone and snake implies a setting in a rural village rather than that of a city. A 'snake' and 'stone' are put in contrast with 'bread' and 'fish'. Thus they are portrayed in terms of avoidance and danger. This is in accordance with the view that the places of snakes and stones, i.e. the desert, is portrayed in hostile and demonic terms.¹¹¹

A snake, viper, is also mentioned in John's preaching of repentance (Q 3:7-9) in a fully negative context. It is noteworthy that the same passage contains a stone in contrast to a living child. There is also a mention of Abraham as the forefather.

It is possible that the bread and fish were home-made or bought in the market. As there are references to the practice of agriculture (Q 10:2; 12:24) we may assume that the Q people grew grain and made bread. Direct references to fishing are lacking.¹¹² Thus it is probable that among the Q people there were no professional fishermen, but obviously at least some of them fished for their own needs.¹¹³

In sum, the portrait that emerges of the Q people is twofold. Those responsible for the literary shape of Q belonged to the scribal class. The rhetorical and literary phenomena of Q betray skilful organization and composing of the text.

However, the Q rhetoric mostly features a rural and agricultural environment. This points at a lower status of the Q people than that of the village scribes. Those who at least on the oral phase transmitted the Q tradition were ordinary people, smallholders and peasants living in

¹⁰⁸ Cf. Mk. 6:41; 14:22; Lk. 24:30. On meals in Antiquity, see Love, "Women and Men at Hellenistic Symposia Meals in Luke".

¹⁰⁹ Similarly Horsley, "The kingdom of God as the Renewal of Israel", 267.

¹¹⁰ Cf. Jn. 21: 9, 13

¹¹¹ Cf. the temptation narrative in Q 4:1-13.

¹¹² In Mark, fishing is mentioned as a profession in the Galilean context: Mk. 1:16,19

¹¹³ On fishing rights, see p. 31 above.

villages like Kefar Nahum, Bethsaida and Khorazin. Obviously they were illiterate and thus vulnerable to economic and social exploitation.¹¹⁴

2. Prayer in Q

2.1. Prayer Instruction Q 11:2-4, 9-13

The wording of the prayer instruction of Q 11 :2-4, 9-13 is as follows:¹¹⁵

2α προσεύχεσθε:¹¹⁶

¹¹⁴ According to Bar-Ilan, “Illiteracy in the Land of Israel in the First Centuries C.E.”.46-61, the literacy rate in Roman Palestine might have been as low as 3 %.

¹¹⁵ The wording follows that of *CEQ* unless otherwise indicated.

¹¹⁶ This wording is also attested by IQP 1989. *CEQ*, however, follows the Lucan reading Ὅταν προσεύχησθε λέγετε, There is a Mt-Lk agreement only concerning the verb προσεύχομαι. The imperative προσεύχεσθε is also attested in Q 6:28. This and the imperative αἰτέιτε after the Lord’s Prayer (11:9) makes the short imperative introduction to the prayer instruction plausible. See Easton, *Luke*, 176. Cf. Carruth, “Evaluations” in *Q 11:2b-4*, 68: “An introduction for the prayer using the verb ‘pray’

2b Πάτερ,

2c ἁγιασθήτω τὸ ὄνομά σου·

2d ἐλθέτω ἡ βασιλεία σου·

3 τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν τὸν ἐπιούσιον δὸς ἡμῖν σήμερον·

4a καὶ ἄφες ἡμῖν τὰ ὀφειλήματα ἡμῶν, ὡς καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀφήκαμεν τοῖς ὀφειλέταις ἡμῶν·

4b καὶ μὴ εἰσενέγκῃς ἡμᾶς εἰς πειρασμόν.

9 Αἰτεῖτε καὶ δοθήσεται ὑμῖν, ζητεῖτε καὶ εὕρησете, κρούετε καὶ ἀνοιγήσεται ὑμῖν·

10 πᾶς γὰρ ὁ αἰτῶν λαμβάνει καὶ ὁ ζητῶν εὕρισκει καὶ τῷ κρούοντι ἀνοιγήσεται.

11 τίς ἐστὶν ἐξ ὑμῶν ἄνθρωπος, ὃν αἰτήσῃ ὁ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ ἄρτον, μὴ λίθον ἐπιδώσει αὐτῷ;

12 ἢ καὶ ἰχθὺν αἰτήσῃ, μὴ ὄφιν ἐπιδώσει αὐτῷ;

13 εἰ οὖν ὑμεῖς πονηροὶ ὄντες οἴδατε δόματα ἀγαθὰ διδόναι τοῖς τέκνοις ὑμῶν, πόσω μᾶλλον ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς δώσει ἀγαθὰ τοῖς αἰτουσιν αὐτόν.

2.1.1. The Structure and Composition of Q 11:2-4, 9-13

The purpose of this chapter is to define the structure of the prayer instruction of Q. The section seems to be composite, and not a uniform

in some form is sufficient to serve as a transition from the material and to preface the Prayer”.

It is difficult to confirm whether Q’s introduction to the Lord’s Prayer contained the reference to John. The juxtaposition of John and Jesus in Q 3:16-17; 7:18-23; 7:31-35 seems to give some support to the Lucan introduction which attests the John-Jesus juxtaposition (Lk 11:1). Pro Kaut, “Father and Tempter”, 6; Schürmann, *Lukasevangelium*, 176-77; Zeller, *Kommentar*, 56. Con Ernst, *Lukas*, 269; Fitzmyer, *Luke X-XXIV*, 897-98; Jeremias, *Sprache*, 113; Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 203; Schulz, *Q*, 84, n. 185.

block.¹¹⁷ I ask: What kind of literary structure does the composition betray? What are the sub-units of which it consists? What are the literary means that connect the units?

As a suggestive starting-point, Q 11:2-4, 9-13 betrays the following structure:¹¹⁸

Introductory admonition for prayer 11:2a	
The Lord's Prayer	11:2b-4
Admonition with the promise concerning	
asking	11:9a
seeking	11:9b
knocking	11:9c
Repetitive argument concerning	
asking	11:10a
seeking	11:10b
knocking	11:10c
Argument concerning a double rhetorical question	

¹¹⁷ Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 203-6; Sato, *Q und Prophetie*, 39; Jacobson, *First Gospel*, 159. However, Allison, *Jesus Tradition*, 173-74, claims that “Q 11:9-13 appears to resist decomposition”.

¹¹⁸ Kirk, *Composition*, 177-78, structures the prayer instruction on the basis of ancient instructional composition parallels as follows:

- Programmatic Admonition (2-4)
- Example (5-8)
- Central Gnomonic sayings (9-10)
- Example (11-12)
- Closing application (13).

This structuring is perhaps sound on the Lukan level. Kirk includes the example of Lk 11:5-8 in Q arguing that “[i]t seems unlikely that this compositional similarity (between Q 11:2-13 and 6:37-42; 12:22-31) resulted from an *ad hoc* Lukan editorial intervention which inserted alleged *Sondergut* into a Q sequence of 11:2-4, 9-13”. (*Composition*, 177) However, there is no apparent reason why Mt would have omitted the whole example. In addition Lk 11:5-8 fits well with the rest of the gospel. When using the word ἄρτος, in 11:5-8 Luke omitted it from Q 11:11-12 and changed it to ἰχθύς. There is no need to include Lk 11:5-8 in Q in order to reach a sophisticated structure. In fact, Q 11:2-4, 9-13 forms a delicate instruction of its own.

bread and stone	11:11
fish and serpent	11:12
<i>A minore ad maius</i> conclusion	11:13

I shall attempt to ascertain whether this structure is literarily and thematically coherent enough to be regarded as a unit.

Mary Rose D'Angelo analyzes the discourse on prayer with a larger structure than the above. According to her, it consists of five sub-units: Q 10:21-22 thanksgiving; 10:23-24 revelation; 11:2-4 the Lord's Prayer as the response of those who have received revelation and 11:9-13 which encourages persistence in seeking and asking of "your father". She suggests that "the redactor of Q deliberately joined this saying (Q 10:21-22) to the prayer in a single unified speech that manifests the special, indeed, secret character of the community's knowledge of the father".¹¹⁹

D'Angelo's view has little support on the literary level of the text. The only connection between Q 10:21-22 and 11:2-4, 9-13 is the keyword πατήρ. The thanksgiving differs from the Lord's Prayer in respect of both form and content. In 10:21-22 only Jesus utters the thanksgiving, whereas in 11:2-4 the Lord's Prayer is assumed to be prayed by many people. In addition, in 11:2-4, 9-13 nothing indicates a special or secret knowledge on the part of those who pray. The argumentation there is purely rational and appeals to general experience and common sense, and not to any special revelation.¹²⁰ In addition, the sayings of Q 10:21-22, 23-24 fit well in the context of the preceding mission speech before (Q 10:2-16).¹²¹ The thanksgiving provides a rationale for the message of the Q workers and the beatitude 10:23-24 encourages missionary activity. The most convenient solution is to consider Q 11:2-4, 9-13 as a thematic whole under the theme of prayer. This view has support on the structural and compositional level of the text.

Dale Allison extends the prayer instruction even further than D'Angelo and includes it in his second section of Q. The section contains

¹¹⁹ D'Angelo, "Theology in Mark and Q", 171. Similarly Jacobson, *First Gospel*, 159, who argues that the Lord's Prayer was part of the secret teaching which consisted of Q 10:21-22, 11:2-4 and 11:9-13. Manson, *Sayings*, 78-80, includes three units (Q 10:21-22, 10:23-24 and 11:9-13) under the title "The privileges of discipleship". However, he omits the Lord's Prayer from this block.

¹²⁰ See in detail ch 2.1.3 below. Cf. Kloppenborg, "Literary Convention", 84.

¹²¹ Similarly Schlosser, "Q et la christologie implicite", 305.

stories of calling (Q 9:57-62), instruction for missionaries (10:1-16), teaching on eschatological revelation (10:21-24), the Lord's Prayer (11:2-4), and sayings on seeking and finding (11:9-13). The last three units belong together thematically. In addition, their focus is on the heavenly Father. Allison concludes: "The original *Sitz im Leben* of... 9:57-11:13 was the missionary work of itinerants. Q 9:57-62 offered them examples of what Jesus' demanding call to follow him could mean. Q 10:1-16 then contained directions on how to carry on their mission. And 10:21-11:13 followed with encouraging words which focused on prayer, which is to be addressed to the generous Father in heaven who provides for his children".¹²²

The argumentation of both D'Angelo and Allison seems to be based on the conviction concerning the social status of the Q people as itinerants. However, as noted above,¹²³ the itinerant ethos has forcibly been challenged in several recent studies. It cannot be taken as the interpretative key for the prayer instruction of Q 11:2-4, 9-13. Its rhetoric ('father', 'son', 'children', 'bread', 'fish') is promoted in terms of a settled household, not that of homeless itinerants. Furthermore, as will be seen,¹²⁴ the rhetorical mode is based upon common sense and experience. Teaching of and appealing to secret knowledge are totally missing.

Sato rightly notes that the prayer instruction Q 11:2-4, 9-13 is a *Spruchgruppe* of its own under the theme "prayer" and "asking". He further claims that „[j]edoch ist diese Stellung ganz unmotiviert und weder nach vorne noch nach hinten sinnvoll zu kombinieren. Welche kompositionelle bzw. redaktionelle Hand diese Spruchgruppe hierher gebracht hat, bleibt unklar.“¹²⁵

However, the location of the prayer instruction is not at all unmotivated in the wider context of Q. There are literary means that connect the prayer instruction with its context, thus motivating its location in a wider sequence of Q. There is a notable keyword connection between the thanksgiving of Q 10:21-22 and the prayer instruction in 11:2-4, 9-13. Both contain the vocative address: Πάτερ (10:21; 11:2) and the nominative ὁ πατήρ (10:21-22; 11:13). In addition, βασιλεία provides a link to the following Beelzebul controversy (11:20).

¹²² Allison, *Jesus Tradition*, 13-15 (quotation p. 15, italics orig.).

¹²³ See ch. 1.2 above.

¹²⁴ See ch. 2.1.3. below.

¹²⁵ Sato, *Q und Prophetie*, 39.

The initial admonition of the prayer instruction (προσεύχεσθε) (Q 11:2a) serves as a thematic heading which leads to the Lord's Prayer and to the argumentation of 11:9-13. Using an admonition to indicate a shift in the textual flow is a recurring means of introducing a new theme in Q.¹²⁶ In 11:2 προσεύχεσθε signals the beginning of the new theme, that of prayer. It is the heading that separates the block 11:2-4, 9-13 from the preceding saying 10:23-24. Thus it indicates a change in the thematic chain. Accordingly, there is a change of form. A beatitude in 10:23-24 turns into an admonition to pray with a model in prayer form.

The structure of Q 11:2-4, 9-13 illustrated above betrays several literary means which provide coherence to the literary composition.¹²⁷ The cluster is framed by the parallel verbs προσεύχομαι (11:2a) and αἰτέω (11:13). Further, the keyword πατήρ referring to God in Q 11:2 and 11:13 forms an *inclusio*. Another key-word ἄρτος, occurs in the Lord's Prayer (11:3) and in the following argument (11:11). This indicates that the block is composite and the keywords πατήρ, ἄρτος and προσεύχομαι - αἰτέω serve as the landmarks for the composition. The final *a minore ad maius* -argument provides a summary for the whole prayer instruction.

The new theme on prayer begins with a prayer model, i.e. the Lord's Prayer (Q 11:2-4). Its structure can be illustrated as follows:

The vocative address 11:2b

Two similar structured 'you' petitions concerning

sanctification of the name

11:2c

¹²⁶ Cf. Q 6:27, 36; 10:2; 12:22

¹²⁷ Piper, *Wisdom*, 16-19, notes the structure of Q 11:9-13 which accords to ancient instructional speech. However, he omits the Lord's Prayer from this structure. True, the prayer and its admonition fit well in the structure posed by Piper as an introduction to the whole prayer instruction.

Allison, *Jesus Tradition*, 173-74, argues that Q 11:9-13 and 12:4-7 are formally related: identification of the speaker and audience (11:9; 12:4), opening imperative (11:9; 12:4), supporting statement (11:10; 12:5), first illustration (11:11; 12:6), second illustration (11:12; 12:7a), conclusion (with *inclusio*) (11:13; 12: 7b). Thus, "[g]iven that Q 12:4-7 is a collection of once-independent sayings whereas Q 11:9-13 appears on the contrary to resist decomposition, it seems more that a good guess that the former was composed in order to resemble the latter. Both serve to encourage missionaries who lead hard lives, both argue from the lesser to the greater, and, in my compositional theory of Q, both were at one time adjacent units".

coming of the kingdom 11:2d

Three concretizing 'us' petitions concerning

bread	11:3
debt	11:4a
testing	11:4b

The first two petitions concerning sanctification of the name and the coming of the kingdom (Q 11:2c-d) bear a similar structure, thus belonging together. Further, they are linked with the address by the qualifying pronoun σου. The last three petitions concerning bread, debt and testing (11:3-4) are tied together by και. They differ structurally from each other as well as from the first petitions. The structuring seems to indicate a seam between the 'you' petitions and the 'us' petitions. In the first two petitions the possessive pronoun σου qualifies the subject. In the following petitions the qualifying pronoun is the plural ἡμῶν - ἡμῖν - ἡμᾶς, defining the bread and the debt as well as the object of the test.

The Lord's Prayer is followed by an admonition triplet (Q 11:9-10). The triple imperatives αἰτεῖτε - ζητεῖτε - κρούετε seem to open a new theme. True, there is no connecting copula between the Lord's Prayer and the following admonition. Still there are other literary links connecting the prayer and the admonition: the keyword δίδωμι (11:3, 9), the imperatives 'pray' (11:2a) and 'ask-seek-knock' (11:9).

The verbs of the first triplet Q 11:9 are in the imperative with the corresponding promises in the passive voice (11:9). The following triplet of sentences (11:10) are linked with the previous admonitions by γάρ. The triplet betrays the structure participle + predicate verb in the present tense λαμβάνει, εὑρίσκει or in the future tense ἀνοιγήσεται. The absolute πᾶς, though occurring only with ὁ αἰτῶν also refers to those who seek and knock.¹²⁸ The two triplets (11:9, 10) both use the copula και three times in linking the clauses together. The triplet 'asking-seeking-knocking' occurs in the same order in both 11:9 and 11:10.

¹²⁸ The construction πᾶς + participle also occurs in Q 3:9; 6:47; 11:17; 16:18; 19:26.

The structure and form of the triple clauses (Q 11:9-10) differ radically from the following rhetorical questions (11:11-12).¹²⁹ Accordingly, the rhetorical tenor moves from the general to the particular. This is indicated by the change from the all-embracing $\pi\hat{\alpha}\varsigma$ to the specifying $\tau\acute{\iota}\varsigma \acute{\epsilon}\xi \acute{\upsilon}\mu\hat{\omega}\nu$. While the implied audience of the aphoristic promises is unlimited (11:10, $\pi\hat{\alpha}\varsigma\dots$), only fathers are addressed in 11:11. The two pairs of arguments are structured similarly and tied closely together by $\eta\grave{\iota} \kappa\alpha\iota$ (11:12). The keywords which link the gnomic sayings on asking, seeking and knocking with the rhetorical questions are $\alpha\acute{\iota}\tau\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ (11:9, 10, 11, 12) and the qualifying $\eta\grave{\iota}\mu\hat{\iota}\nu - \eta\grave{\iota}\mu\hat{\omega}\nu$ (11:9, 11).

The structural change indicates a shift in the rhetoric. The admonitions with the absolute promises 11:9-10 expect unconditional acceptance. The argument of the rhetorical questions 11:11-12 appeals to the experience of the implied audience and is based on persuasion, not on demand and admonition. This will be discussed in detail in the next chapter.

The concluding statement Q 11:13 concludes the instruction. It begins with the conditional $\epsilon\acute{\iota} \omicron\upsilon\grave{\nu}$. The qualifying $\acute{\upsilon}\mu\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ and the reference to children ($\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma \tau\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\nu\omicron\iota\varsigma$) indicate that those addressed are the same as in the preceding rhetorical question in 11:11-12. The keywords that link 11:13 with the preceding are $\delta\acute{\iota}\delta\omega\mu\iota$ (11:3, 7, 13ab), $\pi\alpha\tau\eta\rho$ (11:2a, 13) and $\alpha\acute{\iota}\tau\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ (11:9, 10, 11, 12, 13).

The *a minore ad maius* -structure marks the climax of the prayer instruction. The following Beelzebul controversy begins with an apophthegmatic scene in Q 11:14. This is a structural sign for a new theme.

To sum up, the prayer instruction Q 11:2-4, 9-13 betrays a composition structured under the common theme of petitionary prayer. The choice of the verbs $\pi\rho\omicron\sigma\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\chi\omicron\mu\alpha\iota - \alpha\acute{\iota}\tau\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ and the use of the keywords $\pi\alpha\tau\eta\rho$ and $\acute{\alpha}\rho\tau\omicron\varsigma$ give literary coherence to the text.¹³⁰ The

¹²⁹ Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 204 notes that “[s]tructurally 11:9-10 provides an excellent example of a sapiential exhortation, consisting of imperatives with a carefully balanced motive clause”.

¹³⁰ Kirk, *Composition*, 177, claims: “Cohesion in the cluster is created by the recurrence of $\acute{\alpha}\rho\tau\omicron\varsigma$ and $\delta\acute{\iota}\delta\omega\mu\iota$. Additionally, the entire composition is dominated by motifs derived from the semantic field of patron-client relations: cultivation of patronage relations (2-4), cooperative friendship between households (5-8), and cooperative relations within the patriarchal household (11-13) constitute a complete

implied audience of the admonitions and the arguments is the same throughout the block Q 11:2-4, 9-13.

Despite the coherence explicated above, several sub-units can be seen within the block Q 11:2-4, 9-13. To start with, the Lord's Prayer clearly forms one unit. It is a prayer with an address to the Father. Two petitions in the beginning are structurally identical. Three others are connected with each other by the copula *καί*. To be sure, the structural diversity within the Lord's Prayer suggests compositional activity even within the prayer itself. This will be discussed in the next chapter (ch 2.1.2.).

The second unit Q 11:9-10 bears a carefully balanced structure that deviates both from the Lord's Prayer and the following unit on a double rhetorical question (11:11-12). These lead to the *a minore ad maius* statement concluding the whole prayer instruction (11:13).

The structural and literary observations presented above suggest that the prayer instruction is not a coherent section from the tradition historical point of view. Thus I shall now turn to study the composition history of Q 11:2-4, 9-13.

2.1.2. The Tradition History of Q 11:2-4, 9-13

I have studied above the structure of the prayer instruction of Q in its final form. I have found seams and divergence in structure, form and rhetorical means. These literary observations indicate that the material is not coherent from a tradition-historical point of view, either. In this chapter I shall investigate the compositional history of Q 11:2-4, 9-13. I shall also try to ascertain their location in relation to other traditions in Q.

I am aware of the recent criticism of the traditional historical-critical methods by Werner H. Kelber and others.¹³¹ This criticism based

list of the triad of survival strategies resorted to by subsistence-level peasants in agricultural societies”.

However, Lk 11:5-8 is not to be included in Q. Q 11:2-4, 9-13 forms a coherent composition in itself.

¹³¹ Kelber, *Gospel*; idem “Jesus and Tradition”; Dewey, “Textuality in an Oral Culture”; Uro, *Thomas*, 106-133.

on studies of orality and textuality in Antiquity has questioned such concepts as the “original form” as well as the idea of “growing tradition”.¹³²

In his recent study Risto Uro states that “[t]he “scribal” model that has dominated synoptic research should be replaced by a model in which the activity of early Christian authors is set against the background of the rhetorical/oral culture... According to the conventions of the dominant culture, the sayings of Jesus were continually performed anew to meet the needs of the community, and some of the new versions were acceptable for transcription”.¹³³ I can accept this methodological claim though it brings a great challenge for Q scholarship. How are the changes of the sayings tradition during the oral and performance process to be identified? As we have the plain text available at the moment, how can we trace the ‘redactional’ moments of the tradition process? The methodological findings of Kelber and others still assume that there were modifications and changes in the tradition.

The purpose of this study is not to attempt to find the ‘original’ form of the prayer instruction or the Lord’s Prayer. I still assume that traces of scribal editorial activity can be found within Q’s prayer instruction and that it is composed of several units that probably already existed in written form before being incorporated in Q. The rhetorical techniques of Antiquity point to deliberate structuring and modification of the pieces of tradition that were brought together in order to form a coherent document like Q. Probably all the sayings of the prayer instruction wandered through the oral and intertextual process before being written down. Thus the ‘editorial activity’ has to be understood in a wider sense than the ‘final redaction’ of Q. Editing and redacting took place throughout the tradition process.

As argued above, the block Q 11:2-4, 9-13 consists of five separate units: a brief introduction to the Lord’s Prayer and to the whole instruction at the same time (11:2a), the Lord’s Prayer (11:2-4), a gnomic maxim in triple form (11:9-10), argumentation on rhetorical questions (11:11-12) and concluding statement (11:13).¹³⁴ But what is their relation to each other? How did the units reach their present shape? In other words: What is the tradition history of the prayer instruction of Q?

¹³² Uro, *Thomas*, 107.

¹³³ Uro, *Thomas*, 132.

¹³⁴ Allison, *Jesus Tradition*, 173-74.

First, the Lord's Prayer can be considered as an entity of its own. True, it was an independent unit when it was incorporated into the prayer instruction. This is apparent from its different (prayer) structure and form when in comparison with its context. The short thematic admonition προσεύχεσθε (Q 11:2a) was attached as an introduction when the prayer was put together with other units of the prayer instruction. Accordingly, it provided a means of separating the Lord's Prayer from the preceding saying Q 10:23-24. This bears a different theme that is built in beatitude form.

What about the Lord's Prayer (Q 11:2b-4) itself? Is it a coherent unit from the tradition-historical point of view or is it composite? There seem to be literary hints that suggest that the prayer itself is composite and not a uniform unit of tradition.

Douglas Oakman has made a case for arranging the tradition history of the Lord's Prayer in chronological order as follows: "*Stage (1)* The form of the Prayer in Jesus' own usage, consisting of the address + petitions 4-6 (bread, debt, surveillance); *Stage (2)* the difficult-to-trace transition from oral-Aramaic to written-Greek forms of the Prayer; and *Stage (3)* the form of the Prayer reached by the latest stratum of Q (as seen in Luke), consisting of the address + Petitions 1-2 + Petitions 4-6".¹³⁵ Thus the two similarly-structured petitions dealing with the name and the kingdom (11:2c-d) should be regarded tradition historically as later than the address + the three petitions concerning bread, debt and testing (11:3-4).¹³⁶ Oakman notes the theological tension between the address and the first petitions of the Lord's Prayer. In addition, the name and kingdom petitions, i.e. "the first table stands in clear relationship to later synagogue prayer traditions and thus is an understandable accretion".¹³⁷

¹³⁵ Oakman, "The Lord's Prayer in Social Perspective", 155

¹³⁶ Oakman, "The Lord's Prayer in Social Perspective", 144-55, who takes the stratification of Kloppenborg as the model for locating the traditions within the Lord's Prayer. Thus the address and the petitions concerning bread, debt and surveillance belong to Q¹ while the petitions concerning sanctification the name and that of the kingdom belong to Q².

¹³⁷ Oakman, "The Lord's Prayer in Social Perspective", 152, referring to the proximity of the synagogal *Qaddish* prayer which is related to the late-synoptic forms of the Lord's Prayer. Cf. also Taussig, "Lord's Prayer", 33. Schneider, *Jesusüberlieferung*, 14, argues that the first two petitions can be understood as parallel, i.e. their content is similar.

To be sure, my concern is not to speculate about the authentic (Aramaic) version of the Lord's Prayer as taught by Jesus.¹³⁸ My aim is to trace the traditions as attested in Q. Oakman's notion has relevance for the present study in its effort to locate different traditions within the Lord's Prayer as attested by Q.

Indeed, from the literary point of view the first two petitions (Q 11:2c-d) seem to form a coherent unit in themselves. As noted above, they betray a similar literary structure which differs from that of the other petitions. Furthermore, there seems to be some inconsistency between the address and the first petition (Q 11:2b) that concerns the sanctification of the Father's name. The name, ὄνομα seems to refer to the address. But the question remains: what is the name of the Father? Further, the connotations of the Father elsewhere in Q and in the prayer instruction in particular (Q 11:13) do not point to the holiness of his name. Quite on the contrary, they point to the Father's care and generosity and to imitation of his goodness.¹³⁹

Sanctification of the name in the Lord's Prayer seems to have resonance in Q 10:21-22. The thanksgiving gives an epithet of the Father: κύριε τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ τῆς γῆς, (10:21). This epithet betrays an omnipotent and distant image of God that militates against the paternal images elsewhere in Q. The rhetorical tone of 10:21-22 points to a similar theological conviction as the first petition of the Lord's Prayer.

Also the petition of the coming of the kingdom (Q 11:2) can be placed in the context of the thanksgiving. Then the kingdom in the Lord's Prayer connotes with πάντα in Q 10:22. As in the thanksgiving 'all' (πάντα) is the realm of 'Father, Lord of heaven and earth' (πατήρ, κύριος τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ τῆς γῆς), likewise in the Lord's Prayer ἡ βασιλεία is the realm of πατήρ. In both places it is the Father who can provide all things and make his kingdom come.

Further, there seems to be a seam between the kingdom petition (Q 11:2d) and the bread petition (11:3). While the former (like the name petition) opens with the imperative verb (ἐλθέτω.. 11:2d), the latter takes the accusative object at the beginning (τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν... 11:3). In

¹³⁸ Oakman, "The Lord's Prayer in Social Perspective", 151-52, argues that stage 1 of the Lord's Prayer in Aramaic existed in the context of Jesus. On Semitisms in Q, see Marucci, „Sprachliche Merkmale der Q-Quelle“, 612-615.

¹³⁹ See Q 6:35, 36; 11:13; 12:30.

addition, the verb in 11:2d is in the present passive tense but the verbs in 11:3-4 δὸς - ἄφες - εἰσενέγκης are in the aorist active tense. Further, the qualifier of kingdom (and name) is σου while bread has the double ἡμῶν τὸν ἐπιούσιον. The plural qualifier ἡμῶν - ἡμῶν - ἡμᾶς occurs throughout Q 11:3-4.

These literary notions suggest that from the tradition-historical point of view the petitions of Q 11:2c-d belong to a different location from the rest of the Lord's Prayer.¹⁴⁰ If the first petitions are removed, the prayer has the address πατήρ (11:2b) and three petitions (11:3-4). These all provide concretizing rhetoric. There is little space for abstraction. This is well in accord with the argumentation of 11:11-13. There, as in 11:3-4, the concretizing rhetoric lies on the keywords πατήρ and ἄρτος. In the first petitions of the Lord's Prayer (11:2c-d), however, the rhetoric betrays more theological abstractions which lack a one-to-one referent in Q.¹⁴¹ Q presents a wide range of connotations for the kingdom¹⁴² and the referent of the name in the Lord's Prayer remains more or less vague. In 10:21 the epithet of the Father is κύριε τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ τῆς γῆς. In that context the name in the Lord's Prayer may refer to this. However, as noted above, the connection of the name and the thanksgiving may betray another origin compared with their context.

The above does not mean, however, that the Lord's Prayer in its present Q form is somehow clumsy or senseless. As a suggestive proposal there is to be seen a tendency to move from concretizing rhetoric toward flexible abstractions and symbolic language. It seems as if the name and kingdom petitions were added in order to soften the concreteness of the prayer. This issue has to be placed under careful scrutiny later in the detailed analysis of the Lord's Prayer in this study.

This suggested tendency toward abstraction can be seen in some other compositional additions elsewhere in Q.¹⁴³ This may betray changes

¹⁴⁰ Schneider, *Jesusüberlieferung*, 14, argues that the other part of the debt petition does not belong to the original prayer „aus formalen Gründen“.

¹⁴¹ Oakman, “The Lord's Prayer in Social Perspective”, 152, puts it as follows: “Theologically, there is a great tension between Jesus' own *Abba* -consciousness and Petitions 1, 2, or 3; as well, the abstractions of the first table (God's name, kingdom and will) militate against the concrete and mundane concerns in Jesus' prayer”.

¹⁴² On the different connotations of 'kingdom' in Q, see Uro, “Apocalyptic Symbolism”, 75-91.

¹⁴³ See Q 6 :23, 31 ; 10 :7b ; 11 :9-10 ; 11 :17 ; 12 :23, 25, 31. These are all to be considered as compositional enlargements.

in the Q people's social reality, in their identity and in their image of God. The almost infantile confidence in the Father seems to change toward the conviction of a remote and holy Lord. This question, too, needs to be investigated in detail.

The tradition history of Q 11:9-10 seems to betray the same kind of development from concrete to general rhetoric. Some scholars argue that these verses were originally a single saying.¹⁴⁴ This view needs to be challenged. There is reason to note that 11:10 serves as a precision for 11:9 (indicated by γαρ) and as a connecting saying between the admonitions of 11:9 and the rhetorical questions of 11:11-12. The categorical tone expressed by πᾶς + participle¹⁴⁵ and the present form of the verbs in 11:10 compared with the verbs in the future tense in 11:9 make it plausible that 11:10 was composed as an interpretative gloss to underscore the confidence in prayer. Thus the originally concrete admonitions of 11:9 providing begging and lodging rhetoric¹⁴⁶ received more abstract connotations when attached to 11:10 in the prayer context. In the absolute maxim 11:10 the argument runs on a general level and in fact is not very sound while it does not match everyday experience at all.¹⁴⁷

It may well be that Q 11:9 and 10 never circulated independently.¹⁴⁸ If the saying 11:10 is taken apart from its context, one can see that the saying of 11:9 can stand on its own. Thus there are grounds for concluding that the general maxim 11:10 was composed on the basis of the more concrete admonition 11:9. It was attached by γὰρ as a motive clause to the preceding admonitions. Its function was to underscore the confidence in prayer in general and in the Lord's prayer in particular. All that is asked there will be fulfilled.

The double rhetorical question (Q 11:11-12) forms one saying in the argument. It differs remarkably from the preceding context. The general argument of 11:9-10 (and especially 11:10) changes to the specific appeal to a human father's goodwill toward his son.

True, the rhetorical stance of Q 11:11-12 points to the same tradition-historical location as the address and the final petitions of the

¹⁴⁴ See Tuckett, *Q and History*, 153-55; Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 205.

¹⁴⁵ The construction πᾶς + participle also occurs in Q 6:47; 16:18.

¹⁴⁶ See p. 54 below.

¹⁴⁷ See in detail p. 55 below.

¹⁴⁸ Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 204; Schürmann, *Lukas*, 216.

Lord's Prayer (11:2b, 3-4). Both provide concretizing and mundane vocabulary that resists abstractions. Only in their context of prayer instruction and of God's paternal generosity are the rhetorical questions elevated to metaphorical use.

In the concluding statement Q 11:13 the argument is once again shifted to a general level. The term ἀγαθὰ does not refer only to the bread and fish attested in 11:11-12, but to all good things provided by the Father. Also the word τέκνα (11:13) widens the scope from the son (11:11-12) to children in general. The connective οὖν links with the preceding phrase and indicates that the conclusion is based on the rhetorical application of 11:11-12. True, the concluding statement is an essential part of the unit 11:11-13 with its specific argument. There is no reason to consider it as a separate saying originating in an independent tradition. The saying 11:13 was composed in order to provide a persuasive conclusion for the whole instruction. Two principal keywords of the whole instruction, πατήρ and αἰτέω, are included there.

In summary, I may note that the prayer instruction Q 11:2-4, 9-13 betrays several originally independent sayings that were brought together during the tradition process.¹⁴⁹ The Lord's Prayer itself contains two different traditions, the earlier of which consists of the address and the petitions concerning bread, debt and surveillance. This form was appended by two petitions on sanctification of the name and the coming of the kingdom. The prayer was in its present shape when it was attached to Q.¹⁵⁰ It was provided with a brief admonitory introduction. An independent maxim concerning asking, seeking and knocking with its enlargement was attached to the prayer. It was finally given an argument of a double rhetorical question and an *a minore ad maius* statement. A delicate instruction on the theme of prayer had emerged. Its sub-units, which originally provided distinct rhetoric, were forced into metaphorical use under a common theme, that of prayer.

¹⁴⁹ Schulz, *Q*, 162, argues that the Lord's Prayer Q 11:2-4 and the following „Weisheitssprüche“ 11:9-13 belong to the „Kerygma der judenchristlichen Q-Gemeinden“ that represents the oldest tradition of Q. This tradition is characterized by „der nachösterliche Enthusiasmus“, „die charismatisch-eschatologische Toraverschärfung“ and „die prophetische Botschaft vom nahen Schöpfergott“.

¹⁵⁰ It was also in written (Greek) form that becomes apparent from the verbatim agreement between Mt and Lk on the name and kingdom petitions.

What is the *Sitz im Leben* of the prayer instruction? The concrete rhetoric of the initial form of the Lord's Prayer seems to suggest a particular *Sitz im Leben*. The household vocabulary (Father, bread, debt) suggests that the oldest traditions were already known within the household setting.¹⁵¹ The setting is to be found in the everyday life of the Q households. This suggestion is confirmed by the argument based on the father-son metaphor in Q 11:11-13.¹⁵² The rhetoric indicates that the implied audience consists of heads of household.

But what about the absolute admonitions of Q 11:9-10? Their rhetoric seems to point to a different setting from the rest of the prayer instruction. Standing on their own they seem to betray the setting of a wandering beggar. However, it is beyond the scope of this study to penetrate into the hypothetical setting of the single sayings. It is remarkable that Q 11:9-10 is connected with the Lord's Prayer. Within that context the absolute admonitions can have a distinct meaning.

What conclusions can be drawn from what is written above? The placing of the sayings provides instruction as to whose *Sitz im Leben* is to be located within the communal environment. The most natural setting for the instruction is that of the household. Its vocabulary and the close familial relations are adopted for metaphorical use in prayer education. Robinson rightly suggests that "the triple formulation: ask, seek, knock, cannot only be interpreted as rough synonyms all exhorting to prayer, but also as distinct metaphors pointing to distinct facets of the Q stance". Thus "[o]ne not only 'asks' for the kingdom and bread in the Prayer (Q 11:2-4); one seeks the kingdom, rather than scrounging food and clothing by human means (Q 12:31)... One also 'knocks', of course on a door, which in Q is thought of as having food and lodging on the other side (Q 13:25-29)".¹⁵³

The rhetoric of Q's prayer instruction as a whole provides hints that its *Sitz im Leben* is within the discipline of the Q households. The admonitory heading (προσεύχεσθε Q 11:2a) provides the theme for the

¹⁵¹ This is also suggested by Robinson, "Evaluations" in *Q 11:2b-4*, 73-74. Oakman, "The Lord's Prayer in Social Perspective", 157, claims that "table fellowship... was the primary *Sitz im Leben* of the first petition of Jesus' Prayer".

¹⁵² Cf. Horsley, "The Renewal Movement and the Prophet Performers of Q", 296: "The exhortation in 11:9-13 confirms the relatively simple peasant household life indicated by the petition for subsistence bread. Indeed, the appearance of a "fish" among the illustrations indicates hearers in villages near the sea, a lake, or a stream".

¹⁵³ Robinson, "Jesus of Q", 264-65.

teaching. A model for prayer (11:2b-4) is presented with its address in terms of the *paterfamilias*. The appeal to his benevolence is attested in the argument based on the rhetorical question (11:11-12).

The *Sitz im Leben* of the Lord's Prayer, at least on its initial level (Q 11:2b, 3-4), is household as well. However, the enlargement of the prayer Q 11:2c-d and the triple maxims 11:9-10 have associations with contemporary Jewish prayers, thus pointing to a *Sitz im Leben* in a more cultic milieu. While the cultic setting cannot be defined, the abstractions in the first petitions of the Lord's Prayer (11:2c-d) and the gnomic maxims (11:9-10) at least suggest a public setting.¹⁵⁴ The prayer was not practised alone in a chamber (cf. Mt 6:6) but in public.

The above observations suggest that the compositional process within Q's prayer instruction was by no means haphazard. The rhetorical and literary arrangement of the sayings points to an intentional strategy in the composition of the prayer instruction. It seems that there was a guiding principle that was at work during the tradition process. What the guiding principle or rhetorical strategy was will be studied in due course.

2.1.3. The Argumentation and Rhetoric of Q 11:2-4, 9-13

As noted above, several originally separate traditions were brought together in Q 11:2-4, 9-13. The sayings came together during the tradition process and formed the prayer instruction. Now my question concerns the intentions of the instruction: What kind of rhetoric is at work within the prayer instruction? What is the strategy of argumentation? What are the rhetorical and literary means in promoting the rhetorical and compositional intentions?

There are several rhetorical shifts to be seen in the prayer instruction. To start with, in the admonitory heading Q 11:2a the theme of the whole cluster is presented. This is prayer, and more precisely, communal, petitionary prayer. This is indicated by the plural form. The admonition confirms that praying concerns the religious activity of the implied audience.

¹⁵⁴ Cf. Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 206: "an ecclesial rather than missionary *Sitz*"...

The second step in the instruction is to present the Lord's Prayer as a model of prayer, i.e. to whom and what to pray. The structure and concrete rhetoric of the prayer, at least on its initial level (Q 11:2b,3-4), suggest that it is not a fixed liturgical form.¹⁵⁵ It is presupposed that the implied audience know the prayer practice, i.e. on what occasions to pray and what kind of gestures to use. In Q 11:2-4 the focus is on the addressee of the prayer and on the things to be prayed. The things to be asked are placed in order so that the themes that concern the Father (name and kingdom) are located at the beginning. Those petitions that present the needs of those praying are placed at the end. Locating the bread at the beginning of the triple concrete petitions (Q 11:3-4) suggests that bread is a mayor concern in the life of the Q people.¹⁵⁶

The following step in Q's rhetorical strategy is to provide a supporting argument for prayer. The literary structure suggests that the argument does not concern the Lord's Prayer in particular but prayer in general. This becomes apparent from the thematic admonitions before the Lord's Prayer (προσεύχεσθε 11:2a), after it (αἰτέω 11:9) and from the concluding statement (11:13).

Ronald Piper has written an influential study of the rhetoric and argumentation of Q 11:9-13.¹⁵⁷ Piper's study has relevance for our present purpose, although he leaves the Lord's Prayer out of his construction. As I noted above,¹⁵⁸ the Lord's Prayer fits well in the structure of the prayer instruction. Several literary links that provide the instruction with coherence suggest that the Lord's Prayer should be considered as an essential part of the prayer instruction Q 11:2-4, 9-13.

It is worth repeating briefly the literary means that give coherence to the structure of Q 11:2-4, 9-13. The *inclusio* is provided by the keyword πατήρ and by the semantic equivalence between τοῖς αἰτοῦσιν αὐτόν (11:13b) and the opening προσεύχεσθε (11:2a).¹⁵⁹ Indeed, praying (Q 11:2) and asking (11:9, 13) are presented as synonyms. The encompassing framework units (11:2-4; 11:13), besides

¹⁵⁵ The incorporation of the petitions on sanctification of the name and the coming of the kingdom in the initial form Q 11:2b, 3-4 seems to indicate a step in the direction of liturgical use.

¹⁵⁶ Jeremias, *Abba*, 165, claims that the petitions of kingdom and of bread form the *Kernstück* of the Lord's Prayer.

¹⁵⁷ Piper, "Evidence of Design", 411-18.

¹⁵⁸ See ch 2.1.2.

¹⁵⁹ Kirk, *Composition*, 180-81 with Sato, *Q und Prophetie*, 39.

constituting the programmatic opening admonition and closing application to pray, supply the crucial divine reference point for the illustration and central aphorisms drawn from common scenes of human activity.¹⁶⁰ The *a minore ad maius* argument in 11:13 functions as a call to prayer and provides a link with the opening programmatic admonition and its model prayer. Further, giving, (ἐπι)δίδωμι occurs in the Lord's Prayer (11:3) and in the following argumentation (11:9, 11, 12, 13). Finally, the rhetorical questions (11:11-12), are linked with the Lord's Prayer by the keyword ἄρτος and by the topic of asking. Thus 11:9-13 forms a delicate instruction for prayer, the Lord's Prayer being an essential part of the structure.

According to Piper, the argument of Q 11:9-13 proceeds in four stages. The first step of the argument consists of a triple pair of admonitions and promises (11:9). Their absoluteness is embarrassing, setting no limits to what is encouraged or promised. The general tone of the admonitions does not immediately allow one to read them in terms of the context, i.e. prayer. Initially the appeal is wide and general.¹⁶¹ While 'asking' leads the illustration to prayer, 'seeking' and 'knocking' are more naturally understood without the prayer connotation. Accordingly, the original *Sitz im Leben* of 11:9 is to be sought elsewhere than in prayer.¹⁶² Persistence in asking, seeking and knocking, and the results of these actions are underscored, thus pointing more to human persistence than to God's generosity.¹⁶³

The admonition to ask in Q 11:9 betrays begging rhetoric. What is begged for is naturally food, i.e. bread. This becomes apparent from the context of the bread petition of the Lord's Prayer which attests the same verb δίδωμι as the admonition to ask.¹⁶⁴ The object of seeking remains open in the immediate context. The admonition to seek the kingdom attested in Q 12:31 suggests that in the context of the Lord's Prayer the goal of seeking is the kingdom. Knocking implies the desire to find lodging.¹⁶⁵ What is implied is a household setting where the *paterfamilias*

¹⁶⁰ Kirk, *Composition*, 180-81.

¹⁶¹ Piper, *Wisdom*, 16-17. Cf. Robinson, "Jesus of Q", 264-65, who claims that the setting of Q 11:9 was originally a concrete one.

¹⁶² Cf. Vaage, *Galilean Upstarts*, 57-59.

¹⁶³ Cf. Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 204.

¹⁶⁴ Cf. Q 6:30, an admonition to give to one who asks.

¹⁶⁵ See Robinson, "Jesus of Q", 265.

opens the door and provides lodging.¹⁶⁶ Attached within the prayer instruction the concrete saying Q 11:9 is forced into the service of the argument for prayer.

The second unit (Q 11:10) consists of three aphorisms. They are constructed in parallel and according to the preceding admonitions. The universal aphorisms give the impression of strengthening what is promised in 11:9.¹⁶⁷ The information they add to 11:9 is slight.¹⁶⁸ When standing on its own the rhetoric of 11:10 proceeds on a general level and attempts to revive confidence that exceeds everyday experience.¹⁶⁹

Piper notes that “[w]hat is striking in these sayings (of Q 11:10) is the seemingly universal and categorical quality of the promises, demonstrated by the unqualified $\pi\hat{\alpha}\varsigma$, the predominance of habitual present ($\lambda\alpha\mu\beta\acute{\alpha}\nu\epsilon\iota$ - $\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\rho\acute{\iota}\sigma\kappa\epsilon\iota$) rather than future tenses and the continuing absence of clear reference to divine agency. The optimism of these maxims is remarkable”.¹⁷⁰ In 11:10 the stress is on the absolute $\pi\hat{\alpha}\varsigma$ that seems to underline the admonitions of 11:9. The tone is on the promises, not so much on the action of asking, seeking and knocking. If everyone who asks receives, the intensity of asking is not as crucial as is supposed in 11:9.

In their present context the gnomic sayings Q 11:9-10 are, in accordance with their character, hermeneutically open. Their present context recruits their gnomic insight to justify and motivate the cluster’s programmatic concern for boldness in prayer.¹⁷¹ Taken alone, the sayings assert the certainty of the desired result, which is in plain contradiction with reality: Surely not everyone who asks receives, not everyone who seeks finds and the door is not opened to everyone who knocks! The argument presents a take-it-or-leave-it situation. The rhetoric is based on the authority of the speaker and the admonitions thus claiming absolute confidence. Within the context of the prayer instruction in which the kingdom is expected (11:2) and in which the overwhelming goodwill of

¹⁶⁶ Cf. Lk 11:5-8 where a household setting with the *paterfamilias* as its head is apparent.

¹⁶⁷ Piper, *Wisdom*, 21.

¹⁶⁸ Catchpole, *Quest*, 220, considers that 11:10 is the weaker form of the saying.

¹⁶⁹ Cf. Piper, “Evidence of Design”, 413.

¹⁷⁰ Piper, *Wisdom*, 17.

¹⁷¹ Kirk, *Composition*, 180.

the divine Father compared with that of a human one is attested (11:11-13), the optimism of the gnomic sayings (11:9-10) becomes credible.¹⁷²

The passives in Q 11:9-10 do not inevitably indicate that the subject of the action is God. It is the human action that is presupposed, not divine agency. Piper rightly notes that “...the change from *δοθήσεται* to *λαμβάνει* diminishes any suggestion of the theological significance of the passive”.¹⁷³ Only within the context of the Lord’s Prayer 11:2-4 and the concluding saying 11:13 is the *passivum divinum* suitable.¹⁷⁴ Thus the rhetorical intention of 11:9-10 in its context of prayer instruction is to encourage the implied audience to concentrate on petitionary prayer and to establish confidence that they will receive what is asked of the Father.

The third unit (Q 11:11-12) of the argument is the double rhetorical question that marks a new departure in the rhetorical flow of the argumentation.¹⁷⁵ This is indicated by the limiting interrogative *τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν*. The attention of the audience is effectively caught. The focus turns to the self-evident goodwill of the human father whom the son is asking for food. By implication, the petition of the son to his father is: “Father, give me some bread!” and “Father, give me a fish!” The authority of the father is taken for granted.

The rhetoric implies the positive answer of the father to the son’s request. The optimistic tone of Q 11:9-10 continues, since the rhetorical questions leave no doubt as to their answer. What is new compared with the preceding maxims is the substance of asking, i.e. bread and fish. Also, the action is limited to asking alone. There is no interest in seeking or knocking. The change of verb (*δίδωμι* in 11:9, *ἐπιδίδωμι* in 11:11-12) corroborates the concretizing rhetoric of 11:11-12. The keywords *αἰτέω* and (*ἐπι*)*δίδωμι* provide the essential link to the *a minore ad maius* conclusion (11:13). The *τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν* formula strengthens the argument, though using a presentation of a hyperbolic and ridiculous situation.¹⁷⁶ The rhetorical question and the *a minore ad maius* conclusion anchor the

¹⁷² Kirk, *Composition*, 180-81.

¹⁷³ Piper, “Evidence of Design”, 413

¹⁷⁴ Schürmann, *Lukas*, 215 claims that „[d]as dreimalige Passivum divinum ist - wie meist - ein Passivum eschatologicum“. Manson, *Sayings*, 81 sees God as the subject of the action through the passives and the Kingdom as the object in 11: 9-10. Similarly Schenk, *Synopse*, 63.

However, the context of 11: 9 does not support this eschatological view.

¹⁷⁵ Piper, *Wisdom*, 17.

¹⁷⁶ Piper, *Wisdom*, 19.

gnomic admonitions and audacious claims of 11:9-10 in confidence in God's paternal love.

The fourth and final step in the argument is the *a minore ad maius* conclusion (Q 11:13). This provides the interpretational key to all the preceding, switching from an appeal to experience to an appeal to reason.¹⁷⁷ Now 'asking' is clearly connected with God and focused on prayer. Thus the argument moves from the general to the specific.¹⁷⁸ The conclusion translates the child's request for food, as well as the symbolic language of the central aphorisms, back to the specific admonition to prayer expressed at the outset.¹⁷⁹ The substance that the Father gives is 'good things'. This develops the father - son relationship, suggesting that ἀγαθά includes the real needs of those who ask and pray to the Father.¹⁸⁰ The argument is carefully detailed, extensive and persuasive.

Finally, in the concluding statement the focus shifts to the divine Father. The *a minore ad maius* argument directs the focus to his superabundance by ἀγαθά. Again, less attention is paid to the human action of asking.

There is a slight contradiction in scope between 11:11-12 and 11:13. In the former the human father is assumed to be generous and good to his son. There is no doubt that he gives what his son asks. And yet in 11:13 human fathers are characterized as 'evil' (πονηροὶ ὄντες). This characterization is reasonable in order to draw a contrast between the human father and the divine Father. But put in context with the double rhetorical question, calling a caring father 'evil' is inappropriate.¹⁸¹ However, in its context the characterization does not seem to refer to the moral nature of a human father. It amounts more to "a reflection on the general condition of mankind".¹⁸² This becomes apparent from the generalizing plural πονηροὶ ὄντες.¹⁸³

¹⁷⁷ Luz, *Matthäus*, 384.

¹⁷⁸ Piper, *Wisdom*, 19, notes: "Assent to the general argument is carefully won before the specific application is made". (italics orig.)

¹⁷⁹ Kirk, *Composition*, 180-81 with Tannehill, *Sword of His Mouth*, 133-34.

¹⁸⁰ Piper, *Wisdom*, 20.

¹⁸¹ Bailey, *Poet*, 140, misses the point when he argues that the saying Q 11:13 points to a hostile audience, i.e. the Pharisees.

¹⁸² Luz, *Matthäus*, 385; Piper, *Wisdom*, 20. Kirk, *Composition*, 181, claims that "[t]he promise that God gives ἀγαθά stands in antithetical relationship to the clause in the prayer μὴ εἰσενέγκῃς ἡμᾶς εἰς πειρασμόν. This view seems far-fetched. It is

The intention of Q 11:13 is to point to the overwhelming generosity of the divine Father compared with that of a human father.¹⁸⁴ True, the *a minore ad maius* comparison occurs elsewhere in Q.¹⁸⁵ Accordingly, pairing and juxtaposition appear throughout the gospel.¹⁸⁶ In the rhetorical questions 11:11-12 there is the paired juxtaposition of father-son, bread-stone and fish-snake.¹⁸⁷ Pairing and juxtaposition are obviously an indication of their use in the oral phase of the tradition process. When occurring in succinct sayings and sayings collections they were a good memory aid in repeating the sayings again and again.¹⁸⁸ The line between the oral and the textual phases with respect to the rhetorical means thus seems to be flexible. This, I think, is apparent in the argumentation of the prayer instruction in Q 11:9-13.

Kloppenborg Verbin sums up the rhetorical points of the prayer instruction as follows:

“When attached to 11,2-4, Q 11:9-13 highlights and develops several points in the prayer. First, it underscores the centrality of the filial relationship that is implied in the vocative “father” of 11,2 but left outside in the remainder of the prayer. Second, the implied characterization of God in the prayer as a generous provider of the necessities of life is reinforced by the illustration of parent-child relationship in Q 11,11-12 and the *qal wehomer* argument of 11,13. Third, the juxtaposition underscores the basis for confidence in such a God by means of the staccato

more appropriate to consider ἀγαθά as the summary of the petitions of the prayer, not connected with any single petition.

¹⁸³ Cf. Q 12:28 where the implied audience is characterized as ‘of little in faith’ (ὀλιγόπιστοι).

¹⁸⁴ Cf. Schenk, *Synopse*, 64: „Wenn selbst Böse Gutes geben können – wie viel mehr der Gute Gutes!“

¹⁸⁵ See Q 12:28. Cf. the passages about John and Jesus (Q 3:16-17; 7:26-28; 33-34), and the judgment speeches (Q 10:13-15; 13:34; 17:23-26). Kloppenborg Verbin, *Excavating Q*, 162.

¹⁸⁶ See e.g. Q 6:43-45; 47-49; 10:21-22; 11:19-20; 16:13; 17:34-35. Gender pairing in Q is noted by Derrenbacher and Kloppenborg, “Self-Contradiction”, 72.

¹⁸⁷ Note the paired rhetorical questions and juxtaposition in Q 6:32-33, (you-Gentiles), 41-42 (speck-beam).

¹⁸⁸ Note the similar features of Q and the *Gospel of Thomas* containing sayings collections which according to Robinson, “On Bridging the Gulf from Q to The *Gospel of Thomas*”, 167, indicate that “the *Gospel of Thomas*, like Q, depends primarily on the living oral tradition”. Similarly Kelber, *Gospel*, 23; Uro, *Thomas*, 115-118.

assurances of 11,9-10. Finally, even though the other items of the prayer – the thematic “Reign of God,” debt/sin forgiveness and preservation from testing – are not developed by 11,9-13, the characterization of God that 11,9-13 provides and its appeal to confidence create a rhetorical situation in which these expectations become believable”.¹⁸⁹

The view of Kloppenborg Verbin seems to be well in line with what I have written above.

2.1.4. Summary

I am now in a position to sum up the rhetoric and the mode of argument in the prayer instruction of Q 11:2-4, 9-13. Its overarching theme is prayer, and it has drawn together several originally independent sayings. Piper, though arguing only on the basis of Q 11:9-13, rightly notes that “[c]ommon to these varied sayings... is the suitability of each for persuasive argument and popular appeal through the use of wisdom admonition, maxim, rhetorical question and *a minore ad maius* comparison. Despite the imperative opening, all these sayings are suited to convince, not simply to demand or announce”.¹⁹⁰ These observations do not correspond only to Q 11:9-13 but also to the opening admonition of prayer (11:2b) and to the Lord’s Prayer (11:2b-4) itself.

The address Q 11:2b presents the imagery of a caring father thus appealing to the common experience of the implied audience. Its reality is taken seriously and identified by the concrete petitions of bread, debt and surveillance. This conforms with the oldest tradition of the Lord’s Prayer. It was later appended by two theologically elaborated petitions on sanctification of the name and the coming of the kingdom.

The study of the rhetoric of Q 11:2-4, 9-13 reveals the main motifs concerning prayer in Q. The means of using the keywords and structuring the units within the instruction suggest that two verbs and two nouns

¹⁸⁹ Kloppenborg Verbin, *Excavating Q*, 125.

¹⁹⁰ Piper, *Wisdom*, 16. Cf. Zeller *Mahmsprüche*, 128-30.

present themselves as the main items referring to prayer: (αἰτέω and δίδωμι and ἄρτος).¹⁹¹

‘Asking’ (αἰτέω) does not occur until the admonitions 11:9-10. Henceforth it is attested both in the rhetorical questions 11:11-12 and in the conclusion 11:13. In the gnomic aphorisms 11:9-10 ‘asking’ refers to begging, though in the context of the thematic admonition 11:2a (προσεύχεσθε) and the Lord’s Prayer 11:2-4 it is closely associated with prayer. In the rhetorical questions 11:11-12 and in the conclusion 11:13 the action of asking is in the background, and its results, the ‘good things’, are in the foreground.

‘Giving’ (δίδωμι) occurs in the bread petition 11:3, indicating the desired result of the prayer. In the admonitions 11:9 it is implied to be the result of begging, i.e. that someone will give bread to a person who begs.¹⁹² In the context of the Lord’s Prayer the giver is assumed to be the Father. In the rhetorical questions and in the conclusion 11:11-13 the natural caring of the human father’s giving what the son asks for serves as a metaphor for the generosity of the divine Father.

‘Father’ (πατήρ) is essentially the metaphor of God in the prayer rhetoric of Q. The Lord’s Prayer promotes the motifs of the institution of *paterfamilias*.¹⁹³ It includes the inevitable duty to take care of the household, to promote its economy, to provide surveillance and to feed the children and slaves. The absolute authority of the patron over his household is attested. He could give even a stone or a snake to his son if he so desired. However, the natural confidence in the care and generosity of the *paterfamilias* is taken for granted. In the prayer instruction *paterfamilias* is put to metaphorical use to describe the generosity of God, the divine Father. The intention of the metaphorical rhetoric is to promote confidence in his goodwill to give good things to his children.

Prayer is essentially the communicative vehicle between the Father and his children. What is remarkable is that the oral communicative line runs only from those who pray to the Father but not *vice versa*. By

¹⁹¹ Cf. Kirk, *Composition*, 177.

¹⁹² Cf. Q 6:30 where begging (αἰτέω) and lending (δανείζω) occur together.

¹⁹³ Oakman, “The Lord’s Prayer in Social Perspective”, 156, argues for the imagery of “a royal household”. Thus, in the prayer “[t]he generosity and benevolence of the King are invoked”. In the context of the prayer instruction the imagery points more to an ordinary household than to a royal court.

On the institution of *paterfamilias* in Antiquity, see Osiek-Balch, *Families*.

implication, the response of the Father does not occur in words but in action, i.e. giving what is asked. Confidence in the goodwill and generosity of the Father dominates the whole instruction.¹⁹⁴

It seems that the first petitions of the Lord's Prayer, i.e. those of sanctification the name and the coming of the kingdom provide a slightly different tone in the characterization of the Father as explicated above. They provide a higher rhetorical abstraction than the other prayer. The lordship of the Father as the ruler of his realm comes to the fore. As noted, this is in accord with the characterization of the Father as 'Lord of heaven and earth' in the thanksgiving Q 10:21-22. Further, the passives in the petitions of sanctification of the name and the coming of the kingdom seem to presuppose action on the part of those who pray the Lord's Prayer.

The other main item besides father is 'bread' (ἄρτος). This occurs in the main petition of the Lord's Prayer.¹⁹⁵ This is indicated by locating it at the beginning of the three petitions Q 11:3-4. Further, by implication, in the original (begging) context of 11:9-10, the thing that is asked for is bread. In the following rhetorical questions 11:11-12 the most basic needs are bread (and fish). No doubt the good things in the conclusion 11:13 refer to basic material needs, indeed primarily to bread. In this context the qualification of bread in the Lord's Prayer, ἐπιούσιος (11:3), refers to the loaf that is needed for subsistence 'today' (σήμερον).

Thus there is an apparent compositional plan in the prayer instruction. It proceeds by using keywords and literary structuring. The initial admonition to pray is repeated in the structurally similar

¹⁹⁴ Kloppenborg Verbin, *Excavating Q*, 125, notes that "even though the other items mentioned in the prayer - the thematic 'Reign of God', debt/sin forgiveness, and preservation from testing - are left undeveloped, the characterization of God that 11:9-13 provides and its appeal to confidence create a rhetorical situation in which these expectations also become believable. If the divine Father provides food more abundantly than human fathers, this God will surely also forgive debts and preserve his own, thus bringing about his Reign".

¹⁹⁵ Tuckett, *Q and History*, 154-55, asserts that the Lord's Prayer should be understood eschatologically from the view of *Naherwartung* because of the dominance of the kingdom petition. Thus the "good things' which the Father will give to those who ask Him are the gifts of the Eschaton. Further, this concern for the kingdom is one which overrides concern for material needs". This view does not take seriously enough the imminent context of the prayer, where material needs are pervasive.

admonitions of asking, seeking and knocking. The required argument is provided by an example from household setting and an *a minore ad maius* conclusion.

The argument of the prayer instruction Q 11:2-4, 9-13 confirms the absolute confidence in God's paternal generosity in material needs. The rhetoric, while appealing to the concrete circumstances of the implied audience, encourages prayer and confidence that the things asked for will surely be given. The originally independent sayings are forced into the service of the argument for prayer and for metaphorical argumentation of the Father's generosity. Doubts are effectively refuted by the persuasive rhetorical mode.

The tradition history and the delicate literary and rhetorical composition seems to support my suggestion that there is a tendency to move from the concrete and mundane towards abstract rhetoric within the compositional process. The result of this process is apparent in the prayer instruction. In terms of 'little' and 'great' tradition,¹⁹⁶ there occurs a shift from oral, 'little' tradition to literary sophistication, i.e. 'great' tradition.

2.2. Prayer Elsewhere in Q

As will be seen, the sayings concerning prayer outside of the prayer instruction Q 11:2-4, 9-13 are few in number in Q. In this chapter I shall study these instances and try to discover the additional information they provide concerning the ethos of prayer in Q.¹⁹⁷ The discovery will proceed by rhetorical and literary means in order to achieve a view of the location of prayer in the social setting of the Q people.

The verb 'pray' (προσεύχομαι) occurs twice in Q, in the prayer instruction (11:2a) and in the admonition to pray for one's enemies (6:28).

¹⁹⁶ See p. 23 above.

¹⁹⁷ In the temptation story the third temptation (Q 4:6-8) concerns worshipping (προσκυνέω) and serving (λατρεύω) God. This has nothing to do with petitionary prayer.

As for its parallels, ‘ask’ (αἰτέω) occurs six times and ‘pray’ (δέομαι) once.

2.2.1. Praying for Enemies Q 6:28

The admonition to pray for one’s persecutors occurs together with the admonition to love one’s enemies (Q 6:27). The paired structure indicates that the sayings should be considered as parallels. Thus praying is equated with loving. The admonition προσεύχεσθε (Q 6:28) in the plural is attested here and in the thematic admonition of the prayer instruction (11:2). The admonition is thus directed towards a multiple audience, not towards a single person as in the following admonitory context 6:29-31.

It is remarkable that the admonition to pray for one’s enemies occurs in a context where πατήρ referring to God is also attested.¹⁹⁸ Indeed, there are notable literary links between the prayer instruction and Q 6:27-28, 35b. Both attest to the admonition to pray (προσεύχεσθε 6:28; 11:2a), to the ‘Father’ (πατήρ 6:35b, 11:2b) and the ‘son’ (υἱὸν 6:35b, υἱὸς 11:11).¹⁹⁹ Further, the structure of paired sayings occurs in 6:27-28 as well as in 11:9-10 and 11:11-12.²⁰⁰

In Q 6:28, 35b it is implied that it is the Father who is to be prayed to. The rationale for becoming ‘sons of the Father’ is the Father’s equal goodwill toward the ‘good and bad’. This goodwill is apparent in the course of nature. The Father allows his sun to shine and the rain to fall equally on all. The argumentation is strikingly similar to that of the prayer instruction 11:2-4, 9-13.²⁰¹ The rhetoric in both Q 6:27-28, 35b and 11:2-4, 9-13 appeals to common experience and to the natural phenomena that

¹⁹⁸ *CEQ* follows Mt’s wording and locates the final statement Q 6:35 after the admonitions of 6:27-28.

¹⁹⁹ Also, the qualifying pair πονηρός - ἀγαθός occurs both in Q 6:35b and 11:13 though with different connotations.

²⁰⁰ This may indicate that the paired sayings were already units during the oral phase of the tradition.

²⁰¹ Appealing to the course of nature as an argument also occurs in Q 12:22-31. There, however, praying is not attested.

On the literary connections between the prayer instruction Q 11:2-4, 9-13 and the section on cares 12:22-31, see pp. 89-90.

are observable to all. The ethos of love of enemy and prayer is based on the creative and caring actions of the Father.

The rhetoric of Q 6:27-28, 35b thus runs on matters that are observable to all. This, I think, suggests that the actions of love of enemy and prayer are intended to proceed publicly. The admonition to pray for one's persecutors indeed implies their presence when praying. Further, this suggests that the persecution is not physical but in words.²⁰² Obviously the preceding context provides the adequate setting for persecution. There the beatitude Q 6:22 indicates public maltreatment, i.e. reproach and persecution by speech. This kind of setting is also implied in 6:28.²⁰³ I shall argue below that the petition of surveillance in the Lord's Prayer (11:4b) indicates such a setting.²⁰⁴

To sum up, there are several factors that suggest a close relationship between the prayer instruction Q 11:2-4, 9-13 and the section on love of enemy 6:27-28, 35b.²⁰⁵ Several keywords (προσεύχομαι - πατήρ - υἱός) link them together. The admonitory structure ending with a concluding statement that attests to the Father's goodwill is the same in both sections. Further, public praying and the father –metaphor provide common motifs. Both Q 11:2-4, 9-13 and 6:27-28, 35b share similar rhetoric based on natural phenomena observable to all and on the conviction of the Father's equal care and generosity.

The above notions provide some detailed suggestions for the prayer ethos of Q. First, prayer was a public action. Second, it concerned primarily concrete everyday matters, love of enemy, food, debt and surveillance. Third, prayer was directed to the Father. Fourth, it encouraged confidence in the Father's generosity.

2.2.2. Petition for Workers for the Harvest Q 10:2

²⁰² Cf. Ebner, „Feindesliebe“, 137: „Es ist also primär an *verbale* Verfolgungen zu denken.“ (italics orig.)

²⁰³ The setting could even be a public assembly or court, as attested in Q 12:11-12.

²⁰⁴ See below ch. 3.6.1.

²⁰⁵ Robinson, “The Critical Edition of Q”, 44-45, asserts that the prayer instruction (Q 11:2b-4,9-13) and the inaugural sermon (6:20-49) are the most archaic written collection of Q.

In Q 10:2, too, asking for workers implies a concrete social setting. The petition seems to be a means for recruiting workers for the Q mission. The plural form δεήθητε indicates a communal prayer, not that of an individual.

This saying serves as an introduction to the mission speech. The problem is the implied audience. The rhetoric seems to indicate a change between Q 10:2 and 10:3-12. The mission speech concerns the workers (10:7!) who are sent ‘like sheep among wolves’ (10:3). In the introduction (10:2) the audience is supposed to be larger while those addressed are asked to pray for workers (ἐργάται) to be sent into the harvest. This implies that only the ‘workers’, not all Q people were sent into the harvest. However, all are asked to pray for workers.

Further, the agricultural rhetoric reveals that those who were supposed to pray were at least acquainted with harvesting. The imagery is similar in the parable of the faithful and unfaithful servants Q 12:42-46. There, too, the master (κύριος 12:42) assigns duties to his servants. The rhetoric points to a large household with its master and servants. Further, in the judgment speech of John (3:16-17) there is an image of harvesting, which may refer to the eschatological division between the corn and the chaff.²⁰⁶

Prayer in Q 10:2 is addressed to the Lord of the harvest (..κυρίου τοῦ θερισμοῦ). This epithet obviously refers to God and not to Jesus.²⁰⁷ It is God who has the authority to send workers and give orders. The same kind of absolute authority is supposed in the thanksgiving (10:21-22) after the mission speech. There the authority of the Lord concerns the whole universe (κύριε τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ τῆς γῆς).

Thus I may conclude that praying was the custom and duty of ordinary Q people, not a privilege or task of the ‘workers’ who were sent ‘like sheep among the wolves’. Prayer is directed to God, the Lord of the harvest, and not to Jesus. Thus christological associations are limited to sending of the envoys and to the teaching of the right behaviour as well as the message of the kingdom. Any secret character of prayer is lacking and its exclusive possession by any nucleus group of the chosen is not implied. The Q people were to direct themselves toward outside. Prayer

²⁰⁶ Cf. Kim, *Trägergruppe*, 273-75; Robinson, “History of Q Research”, lxxi: “..referring to God’s apocalyptic action”..

²⁰⁷ Schlosser, “Q et la christologie implicite”, 304.

was intertwined with their open missionary activity. It served as a duty for all of the Q people.

2.2.3. Thanksgiving for Revelation Q 10:21-22

In this peculiar cry of exultation two expressions for God are combined: ‘Father’ (πατήρ) and ‘Lord of heaven and earth’ (κύριε τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ τῆς γῆς). They are both used in addressing God.

The singular form indicates that this thanksgiving is not meant to be a prayer for others than Jesus. The rhetoric serves as an argument for the things revealed to νηπίοις, i.e. the Q people. The intention of the thanksgiving seems to ground the identity of the babes as those who had been given the revelation.

2.2.4. Criticism of the Pharisees Q 11:39-52

It is worth taking a look at the section of harsh criticism of the Pharisees in Q 11:39-52. True, prayer is not mentioned here. The Pharisees are criticized for cleaning the outside of the cup (11:39), tithing vegetables while neglecting justice (11:42), loving front seats in the synagogues and salutations in market-places (11:43), and laying heavy burdens on people (11:46). Tuckett notes that “the Q sayings about purity and tithing (Q 11:39-41 and Q 11:42) portray Jesus as criticising some Pharisees but without ever questioning the fundamental importance of the Pharisaic practice of tithing itself or their concern for purity”.²⁰⁸ The same can be said of the practice of prayer. It is questioned nowhere in Q.

Q’s criticism of the Pharisees concerning their religious practices indicates that the Q people were aware of these practices. That prayer is not mentioned in the list of the subjects criticized may betray a positive

²⁰⁸ Tuckett, *Q and History*, 445. Horsley, “The Pharisees and Jesus in Galilee and Q”, 138, broadens the scope and claims that “the prophetic woes are directed not at Israel generally, but targeted at the Pharisees and the Jerusalem ruling house”. He makes the case on the apparent division between rulers and villagers in Judea and Galilee.

attitude toward its practise. It is remarkable that the Pharisees are accused of performing their practices in public.²⁰⁹ It was regarded as hypocritical. Perhaps the Q people did not regard the Pharisaic prayer customs as hypocritical. However, I suppose that the Q people were aware of these customs. They may have even observed them but giving them a fresh content and a distinct ethos.

2.2.5. Summary

The references to prayer in Q outside the prayer instruction are scanty. It is remarkable that all of them are admonitions to pray or ask. This indicates a positive attitude toward prayer. The custom of praying is taken for granted. The admonitions to pray and ask betray an ethos that is interested mainly in the concrete needs and setting of the Q people. Praying concerns the relation with other people and the material and social situation of those who pray. It has to do with the mission activity of the Q people. Prayer is presented as a communal activity, not as that of an individual. It is associated with familial and household rhetoric. God is thus addressed metaphorically as *paterfamilias*.

The thanksgiving (Q 10:21-22) and the Lord's Prayer (11:2-4) are the only prayers in Q. Formally and structurally they differ from each other. The thanksgiving is the prayer of an individual. The Lord's Prayer is a petitionary prayer of numerous people. What is its location in the entire Q context? How do the single petitions of the Lord's Prayer reflect the ethos and social setting of the Q people? These questions will be studied in the next chapter.

²⁰⁹ Moreland, "Q and the Economics of early Roman Galilee", 573.

3. The Lord's Prayer in the Q Context

3.1. The Address

In this chapter I shall study the occurrences of πατήρ in Q. My interest is in ascertaining how Q portrays God as the Father. The sayings that refer to the Father in the context of prayer will receive special scrutiny.

Πατήρ referring to God occurs eleven times in Q.²¹⁰ In the nominative case it is found in Q 6:35c, 36 (π. ὑμῶν); 10:21c, 22 (3x)²¹¹; 11:13; 12:6,²¹² 30 (π. ὑμῶν). In the vocative case (πάτερ) it is found in Q 10:21; 11:2. 'Father' is the main epithet for God in Q. There is no other designation of God attested in Q.²¹³ The frequent occurrence of 'Father' suggests that it occupies a central position in Q's rhetoric concerning God. Thus there is special interest in surveying the context and connotations of 'Father'. The institution of *paterfamilias* obviously reflects the identity of the Q people. This subject will also be studied in this chapter.

²¹⁰ By way of comparison, it is interesting to note that θεός occurs nine times in Q (3:8; 4:3, 8, 9, 12; 11:20[2x]; 12:28; 16:13), four of which in the temptation story alone. Further, κύριος as an epithet of God is found in Q 4:8, 12 (κύριος ὁ θεός σου); 10:2 (κύριος τοῦ θερισμοῦ) 10:21 (κύριος τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ τῆς γῆς) 13:35.

²¹¹ Πατήρ μου in Q 11:22a.

²¹² CEQ follows here the Mt reading.

²¹³ In Q 10:21 the address πατήρ is enlarged by the words κύριε τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ τῆς γῆς,

3.1.1. The Lord's Prayer Q 11:2a

The Lord's Prayer is the only case in Q where God is addressed plainly by the vocative *πάτερ*.²¹⁴ The prayer is introduced by the plural *προσεύχασθε*.²¹⁵ This and the plural petitions indicate that the address should be understood collectively. The Father metaphor implies that those who pray are considered to be members of the Father's household, i.e. they are 'sons' or 'children'.

The immediate context of the address is the petition of the sanctification of the name. The 'name' (*ὄνομα*) refers to the address. However, the focus of the first petition is 'sanctification'. While the address is understood collectively, sanctification accordingly concerns those who call God 'Father'. The same holds true in the petition concerning the kingdom. In connection with the address it has a collective, indeed familial connotation.

The tone of the address changes slightly in connection with the petitions concerning bread, debts and temptation. The concrete rhetoric shifts the focus to the material needs of those who pray the Lord's Prayer. The prayer reveals the conviction that it is the Father who gives bread, cancels debts and protects from being tested. The concretizing rhetoric is in accord with the admonitions of the inaugural discourse (Q 6:35c-d; 6:36) to become 'sons' of the Father by concrete actions, i.e. loving one's enemies, praying for them, renouncing one's own rights, lending without wishing to be repaid, and refraining from judging.

As noted above,²¹⁶ the prayer instruction of Q 11:2-4, 9-13 forms a coherent unit on the theme of prayer. The address of the Lord's Prayer, while considered in the context of the argumentation of the prayer instruction (11:9-13), asserts the conviction that the Father is the giver of 'good things' (11:13). The optimism that one receives what is asked for is striking. Absolute confidence in the generosity of the Father is expressed by the triple paired maxims (11:9-10). The argument (11:11-13) is based on the familial father-son rhetoric (11:11-12) and concludes with an *a minore ad maius* statement (11:13).

²¹⁴ In Q 10:21 the vocative *πάτερ* is appended by *κύριε τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ τῆς γῆς*,

²¹⁵ *CEQ* follows the Lk reading in double brackets. To be sure, the prayer undoubtedly had an introduction that included *προσεύχασθε*.

²¹⁶ See above, ch. 2.1.1.

Douglas Oakman asserts that “the prayer addresses as *pater familias*... the One who is also expected to rule as King. The petitioner acts as a royal personage and heir, a part of the royal household. The generosity and benevolence of the King are invoked, who acts as Patron”.²¹⁷ However, the context (Q 11:11-13) points more to ordinary household imagery than to a royal court, though in Antiquity the rule of the *paterfamilias* was absolute in every household. As will be seen,²¹⁸ the first petitions of the Lord’s Prayer, i.e. sanctification of the name and the coming of the kingdom together with the thanksgiving 10:21-22 betray an image of the Father as the Lord (of heaven and earth).²¹⁹

Jeremias has forcibly argued that *πάτερ* in the Lord’s Prayer refers to the intimate address “Daddy”.²²⁰ Many scholars have convincingly rejected this view.²²¹ Although the context of the Lord’s Prayer provides a father-son metaphor (11:11-12), this does not point to an intimate relationship in the prayer. The generosity and surveillance of the Father expected in the Lord’s Prayer point to the institution of *paterfamilias*. In Antiquity as head of the household he exercised almost absolute authority.²²²

3.1.2. Q 6:35c-d

35 ὅπως γένησθε υἱοὶ τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν, ὅτι τὸν ἥλιον αὐτοῦ ἀνατέλλει ἐπὶ πονηροὺς καὶ [ἀγαθοὺς καὶ βρέχει ἐπὶ δικαίους καὶ ἀδίκους].

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

²¹⁷ Oakman, “The Lord’s Prayer in Social Perspective”, 156. Similarly Fuchs, „Eschatologie in der Verkündigung Jesu,“ 61 with Meier, *Marginal Jew*, 299.

²¹⁸ See pp. 78-79.

²¹⁹ Similar imagery occurs in the parable of the talents Q 19:12-26.

²²⁰ Jeremias, *Abba*, 15-67.

²²¹ Barr, “Abba isn’t Daddy”, 28-47; Vermes, *Religion*, 180-83; Charlesworth, “A Caveat on Textual Transmission”, 5-11.

²²² This is apparent in Mk 14:36: Ἄββα ὁ πατήρ, πάντα δυνατά σοι. On the authority of *paterfamilias* in Antiquity, see Osiek-Balch, *Families*.

This saying is part of the inaugural discourse (Q 6:20-49), which is commonly considered a unit.²²³ It consists of several sub units with varying themes. *CEQ* reads the saying 6:35c-d after the admonitions to love one's enemies and pray for them (6:27-28).²²⁴ Hence 6:27-28, 35c-d forms a rhetorically coherent composition. The saying 6:35c concludes the sub-discourse 6:27-28, 35c-d on the theme of love of enemy.²²⁵

The admonitions of Q 6:27-28 are structurally parallel.²²⁶ The verb is in the imperative plural. The object is plural, too, a qualifying pronoun attached to it. The conjunction of manner (ὅπως) leads to the final maxim (6:35c-d).²²⁷ It has a ὅτι argument that appeals to the impartiality of the Father.²²⁸

In the opening admonition (Q 6:27-28) loving one's enemies and praying for them are linked. Likewise, the enemies (...τοὺς ἐχθροὺς... 6:27) and those who persecute (...τῶν διωκόντων... 6:28) are equated.

²²³ See Arnal, *Village Scribes*, 161; Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 187-90; Puig I Tàrregh, "Une parabole á l'image antithétique: Q 6:46-49", 684, 692.

²²⁴ Here *CEQ* follows the Mt sequence of the Q material instead of Lk.

²²⁵ Alan Kirk, *Composition*, 161-62, argues that the discourse Q 6:27-35 is a unity on the theme 'Love Your Enemies'. He structures it as follows:

- Opening Admonition (27-28)
- Concretizing Admonitions (29-30)
- Central Gnostic Admonition (31)
- Concretizing Questions (32-34)
- Closing Admonition (35a)
- Promise (35cd): Maxim; Paradigm.

²²⁶ This may reflect the oral phase in the tradition process.

²²⁷ Kirk, *Composition*, 161, analyzes the rhetoric of Q 6:27-35 as follows: "Appending a maxim conforms to a widely attested compositional practice in instructional speeches and to the recommendations of the rhetoricians. Though the promise of divine sonship in the Q context may have an eschatological tone, it blends without difficulty into the wisdom argumentation of this speech, both in terms of its conventional promise function and its orientation to the present order of nature, calling attention to the daily mercies shown by the Creator to all creatures. In this respect the final maxim... supplies the climactic wisdom motivation for the entire speech, for it grounds the programmatic admonition to "love your enemies" in the loving behavior of God even towards his enemies, a behavior observable in the recurring course of nature. Hence, the final maxim is cumulative, for (1) God's refusal to retaliate against his enemies grounds the non-retaliation commands of 6:29, and (2) his goodness even to those who spurn him supports the commands of 6:30, 32-33 to show kindness to those who cannot or will not reciprocate".

²²⁸ Cf. the concluding argument of the prayer instruction Q 11:13.

The implied audience of the discourse seems to be ‘insiders’ who have hostile opponents.²²⁹

There is, however, a contradiction in the course of the argument of Q 6:27-28, 35c-d. If the discourse is directed toward ‘insiders’, are they not already ‘sons’? How is the challenge to become sons of the Father to be understood? The interpretative key lies perhaps in the following context. The rhetorical questions of 6:32, 34 indicate the demand that the implied audience show a higher degree of morality than the ‘tax collectors’ (6:32) and the ‘Gentiles’ (6:34). The behaviour of the implied audience will be as apparent to all as that of the Father who shows his goodness to all without limits. Thus, the challenge to change is not so much in the status of the implied audience as in its behaviour. The rhetoric that appeals to common experience observed in the course of nature suggests that no clear group boundaries (yet) exist. The challenge to become ‘sons of your Father’ in Q 6:27-28, 35c-d seems to be universal, and not directed to a limited group. The sonship of the Father is available to everyone who follows the Q ethos.

In Q 6:27-28, 35c-d there is a divine legitimation for the ethos of the Q people. Eschewing violence is due to the conviction that God’s attitude is the same towards the ‘bad’ and the ‘good’ (6:35d). This conviction stems from nature. The Father is portrayed as the lord of nature. He rules the sun and the rain. He is equally disposed toward all his creatures. Equally his sun does not make a distinction between the good and the bad. This indicates that the activity of the Father can be seen in human relations and in the course of nature. To be sure, men are considered part of nature, as the Father allows the sun to shine and the rain to fall on both good and bad (men). However, it is implied that in order to become his ‘sons’ (υἱοὶ, 6:35) men have to obey his admonitions. Not all men are sons, only those who fulfil the ethical demands. The sonship of God is seen in connection with the way of life, i.e. with the ethos of the Q people. It is implied that the sons of the Father are the ‘good’ (ἀγαθούς 6:35d) and the ‘just’ (δικαίους 6:35d). *Vice versa*,

²²⁹ It is difficult to draw detailed conclusions as to the *Sitz im Leben* of the section. However, it is noteworthy that in the rhetoric of Q 6 the Father is not portrayed as the equal giver of ‘good things’, defender or guardian of his people. This suggests that the Q people did not face serious physical persecution but public verbal reproach as attested in 6:22.

those who do not obey the challenge to become ‘sons of God’ are portrayed as the ‘bad’ (πονηρούς 6:35d) and ‘unjust’ (ἀδίκους 6:35d).²³⁰

The action of God serves as a paradigm for love of enemy and prayer. Thus the paradigm seems to provide a rationale for the status as well as for the behavior of the Q people. The status of the implied audience is illustrated in familial terms. Those addressed are to become ‘sons’ of the Father.

The rhetoric of Q 6:27-28, 35b betrays no aggression. The hostility from outside is not only received as a reality. It is answered by action, i.e. by loving and praying. These are portrayed as public actions. This suggests that the agenda of the Q people is not to isolate themselves from the surrounding society. Still less is it a programme of violent resistance. It seems to imply a kind of non-violent programme. Its aim is not, at least primarily, a social change but ‘becoming sons of the Father’.²³¹ This reflects the identity of the Q people.

There is a striking similarity in the argumentation between Q 6:27-28, 35c-d and 12:22-31. Both sections contain an appeal to the Father (or God 12:28) as the ruler of nature. The sun is his (6:35c-d). He causes it to rise and sends rain on all his creatures, whether good or bad. He feeds the birds (12:24). He makes the grass and lilies grow and clothes them (12:27-28). Furthermore, those addressed in both discourses take priority over nature. They are given the challenge to become ‘sons’ of the Father by loving their enemies and praying for them (6:35c-d). By implication the sons of the Father are ‘good’ while their (hostile) opponents are ‘bad’. The same tone is found in Q 12:24-28. The rhetorical questions οὐχ ὑμεῖς μᾶλλον διαφέρετε πετεινῶν; (12:24) and οὐ πολλῶ μᾶλλον ὑμᾶς, ὀλιγόπιστοι (12:28) take it for granted that God awards a higher status to those addressed than to creatures like birds and lilies.

²³⁰ *CEQ* follows the Mt reading (Mt 5:45). Lk also knows δικαίος and uses it in Q passages (Lk 12:57; 15:7).

²³¹ Cf. Arnal, *Village Scribes*, 186, who notes that the assertions and imperatives of Q 6:27, 6:35b, 6:37, 6:43, 11:9, 12:4, 12:22 and their following clusters fail to state the circumstances explicitly and leave the hearer uncertain about them. Thus, “the modern exegete is left in the same position, unsure whether the implicit transformations required by the logic of these sayings are to be characterized in terms of an attitude (and are thus Cynic-like), a social program (and are thus reformist or revolutionary), or some kind of direct divine intervention (and are thus ‘eschatological’)”.

The final maxim (Q 6:35c-d) challenges the addressees to become ‘sons of your Father’ (ὅπως γένησθε υἱοὶ...). The rhetoric implies the idea of *imitatio Patris*. Even clearer is the admonition of imitation in Q 6:36. The challenge to imitate the Father concerns all. It is not limited to any inside group.

It is noteworthy that in the discourse prayer (προσεύχεσθε... Q 6:28) and the fatherhood of God occur together. The same Father who should be imitated, should also be prayed to. The context of the admonition to love one’s enemies promotes prayer as a positive activity. The matters to be prayed for concern enemies, not the needs of ‘insiders’. This indicates a somewhat positive attitude towards surrounding society, not aggression or withdrawal. Accordingly, prayer is presented as a public activity.²³² It is to be seen and heard by all, including the persecutors. The same tone is found in the arguments based on nature (Q 6:35c-d). The course of nature is observable to all. The creative activities of the Father are apparent to everyone. No secret wisdom is presupposed.

The universal tone of the rhetoric is confirmed by the argument of Q 6:35c-d. Sun and rain are available to everyone. The appeal to nature was used as a form of argument in ancient wisdom rhetoric.²³³ It can be found in the wisdom books of the Old testament, too.²³⁴

The appeal to nature portrays God as Creator who cares for the natural world, gives the sun and rain (Q 6:35c-d), makes the lilies and grass grow (12:27-28), and feeds the ravens (12:24). What is remarkable is that the Father even has the feminine features of a caring and nourishing mother of nature.²³⁵ The connotations of master and ruler are not to the fore. Furthermore, the parental rhetoric in 6:25c indicates that something of the Father’s essence can be achieved by *imitatio*, i.e. obeying the Q ethos.

The admonitions Q 6:27-28 are linked thematically with the preceding beatitudes 6:20-23. The maltreatment of those addressed in the inaugural discourse is attested in 6:22. The following admonitions 6:27-28

²³² On the social setting of prayer in Q, see in detail above ch. 2.2.1.

²³³ Seneca, *De ben.* 4.26.1., a Stoic rhetorician, appealed to nature (translation from Vaage, *Galilean Upstarts*, 53):

“If you are imitating the gods”, one says, “then bestow benefits also on the ungrateful; for the sun rises also on the wicked, and the sea lies open also to pirates”.

²³⁴ See Job 12:7-10; 37; Ps 19:2-7.

²³⁵ Cf. Ps 146:8, 9 LXX.

express how one is to behave toward one's enemies and persecutors. The maltreated are urged to love their enemies and pray for them. The implied audience is the same in 6:20-23 and 6:27-28, 35c-d. The literary links are the plural form continuing from 6:20 to 6:35c-d, and the keyword διώκω (6:22,28).

The admonitions Q 6:29-30 that follow the unit of love of enemy are in the singular, unlike the preceding ones (6:27-28,35c-d). Furthermore, they are constructed in concrete terms (slapping on the cheek, giving the shirt and coat, 6:29; conscripting for service, borrowing, 6:30). These literary means indicate the beginning of a new section. Probably 6:29-30 was originally an independent unit that was attached to the inaugural discourse as concretizing admonitions. The Golden Rule, a general gnomic admonition (6:31) in the plural was attached to the concretizing unit. The section 6:29-31 was completed by the pair of double rhetorical questions (6:32, 34²³⁶). Each pair begins with a conditional clause (εἰ... 6:32a, καὶ ἐὰν... 6:34a) containing a question (τίνα μισθὸν ἔχετε;) and ends with a rhetorical question which appeals to the (wrong) behaviour of 'tax collectors' (6:32) and 'gentiles' (6:34).

The concluding pairs of rhetorical questions Q 6:32, 34 are linked with the preceding by the keywords ἀγαπάω (6:27, 32), δανείζω (6:30, 34) and ποιέω (6:31, 34). The theme of loving is central and the reciprocal Golden Rule forms the general basis for the behavior of the implied audience. What is expected is more than the behaviour of 'tax collectors' (6:32) and Gentiles (6:34).²³⁷ There is an optimistic view of the human ability to fulfil the admonitions. The rhetoric is persuasive and based on the everyday experience of the implied audience: giving one's shirt and conscripting²³⁸ (6:29), asking and borrowing (6:30).

There is a slight contradiction between the Golden Rule Q 6:31 and its context, i.e. the admonitions of love of enemy 6:27-28 and those of renouncing one's own rights 6:32-33. In the Golden Rule the required action is considered reciprocally to be the same as can be expected from other people. However, in 6:32-33 a higher degree of morality is expected. The superior ethos is implied as meaning the same behaviour as

²³⁶ *CEQ* follows the wording of Lk, apparently because of the parallel of Gos. Thom. 95, where the keyword δανείζω appears.

²³⁷ The juxtaposition with Gentiles also occurs in Q 12:30.

²³⁸ *CEQ* reads according to Mt 5:41.

that of the ‘Father’. This suggests a different origin for 6:31 compared with its context.

There are several literary links that connect the units Q 6:27-28,35c-d; 6:29-30, 32, 34 and the prayer instruction 11:2-4, 9-13. All these are introduced by admonitions. Both 6:29-30 and 11:11-12 contain a pair of rhetorical questions. Q 6:27-28,35c-d and 11:2-4, 9-13 end with a final statement which appeals to the paternal righteousness and generosity of God. The connecting keywords are προσεύχομαι (Q 6:28; 11:2), αἰτέω (6:30; 11:9, 10, 11, 12, 13), δίδωμι (6:30; 11:3,9,13), υἱός (6:35; 11:11), ἀγαθός and πονηρός (6:35; 11:13), and πατήρ (6:35; 11:2, 13). Furthermore, there are thematic links. The exhortation to pray occurs in both 6:28 and 11:2. The theme of lending and debt occurs both in 6:30 and in the Lord’s Prayer 11:4. In both the generosity and care of the divine Father is attested: in 6:35c-d the Father lets nature flourish, in 11:13 he gives good things to those who ask him.

What is striking in the units Q 6:27-28, 35c-d and 6:29-30, 32, 34, is the mode of rhetoric. The admonitions and their arguments are presented in both general and concrete terms. The concrete admonitions to love and pray lead to a concluding promise that those who do so will become sons of the Father. The concrete admonitions to give up one’s rights lead to a general maxim, the Golden Rule. The rhetorical questions are formulated in concrete terms, i.e. in terms of love of enemy and lending without demanding repayment. All this indicates that the portrait of the divine Father is promoted in concrete terms that reflect the social circumstances of the Q people. The actions of the Father are presented as the basis of the *imitatio*.

3.1.3. Q 6:36²³⁹

36 Γίνεσθε οἰκτίρμονες ὡς .. ὁ πατήρ ὑμῶν οἰκτίρμων ἐστίν.

36 Be full of pity, just as your Father .. is full of pity.

²³⁹ CEQ follows the Lk reading.

The concretizing rhetoric continues in Q 6:36. The saying seems to serve as an introductory admonition to 6:36-38. Thematically and structurally, the admonition to show pity accords with the following exhortations to refrain from judging.²⁴⁰ The verbs are all in the plural imperative.

There is an apparent link between Q 6:35c-d and 6:36. In both verses God is called ὁ πατήρ ὑμῶν. However, there is a slight difference in the rhetoric. While in 6:35c-d those addressed are to become ‘sons’ of the Father by doing what is asked (...ὅπως γένησθε υἱοὶ...), in 6:36 they are asked to become like the Father (Γίνεσθε οἰκτίρμονες ὡς...). To be sure, in both the idea of *imitatio Patris* is attested; in 6:35c-d it is implied, while in 6:36 it is apparent. There is an optimistic view that those addressed are able to imitate the Father and to become at least in some respect (i.e. in their actions) like him.²⁴¹ The idea of imitation serves as a heading for the themes of judging (6:37-38), the relationship between teachers and pupils (6:39-40), and hypocrisy (6:41-42).²⁴²

There is, however, a rhetorical link between Q 6:37-38 and the Golden Rule 6:31. Both sayings display a rhetoric of reciprocity. In the Golden Rule it is explicated in an admonitory form by the καθὼς.. ὁμοίως structure. In the saying concerning refraining from judging the argument of the admonition contains reciprocal rhetoric: ἐν ᾧ γὰρ μέτρῳ μετρεῖτε ἀντιμετρηθήσεται ὑμῖν. (6:37-38). The argumentation is based on general experience. As in 6:35c-d, in 6:36, too, God is portrayed as a caring Father who is full of pity.

²⁴⁰ Cf. Kirk, *Composition*, 162, noting that the admonition to show mercy anticipates the Judge Not speech. Allison, “Q’s New Exodus and the Historical Jesus”, 415, notes structural and thematic similarities in Q 6:27-38 and Lev. 19.

²⁴¹ Manson, *Sayings*, 55, puts it: “It (the imitation) is the reproduction, in daily life and in relation with other men, of something which has come down to earth...”

²⁴² According to Kirk, *Composition*, 167-58 the discourse Q 6:37-42 is viewed as a specimen of instructional speech which is structured as follows: Admonitions and Motives (37-38); Gnostic Comparison (39); Central Gnostic Saying (40); Gnostic Comparison (41,42a); Closing Admonition and Promise (Maxim) (42b).

It is, however, odd that he drops 6:36 from this structure as he finds a connection between v. 36 and 40 in equating mimesis of Jesus (...ὡς ὁ διδάσκαλος αὐτοῦ) with mimesis of the Father (...καθὼς [καὶ] ὁ πατήρ ὑμῶν). In addition, familial illustration is visible in the heading (v. 36 .. ὁ πατήρ ὑμῶν...) as well as in the closing admonition (vv. 41-42 ... τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ σου...).

Furthermore, Q 6:36-38 is directed to people who have God as their Father. The expression ὁ πατήρ ὑμῶν serves as an attribute for the identity of those addressed. The identity achieved by the sonship is promoted by right conduct, that of the Q ethos.²⁴³

The final ἵνα –construction occurs in both the Golden Rule (Q 6:31) and the saying concerning judging (6:37). The theme of reciprocal behaviour is also found in the parable of the speck in the eye (6:41-42).

The rhetoric suggests that there is also reciprocity between God and men. The imagery of *mimesis* of the Father indicates that in order to become one of his sons (υἱοὶ Q 6:35) one has to love one's enemies (6:27), pray for them (6:28), give what the other asks and even more (6:29), lend without hoping to have one's property returned (6:30), and refrain from judging (6:37). The rationale for this is the righteousness (6:35) and mercy (6:36) of the Father. The same rationale is echoed later in the *a minore ad maius* argumentation of the prayer instruction (11:11-13) and in the section on cares (12:22-31). While the purely literary links between the sections 6:27-28, 35c-d and 12:21-31 are scant, the implicit conviction of the generosity of the Father is attested in both. A striking optimism based on the parental imagery of God dominates all three sections, 6:27-28, 35c-d; 11:2-4,11-13, and 12:21-31. The optimism concerns the conviction of becoming 'sons' of the Father by following the ethical demands. To be sure, the rhetorical mode is persuasive. An appeal to judgment and threats is completely lacking.²⁴⁴

3.1.4. Q 10:21-22

21 ἐν.. εἶπεν· ἐξομολογοῦμαί σοι, πάτερ, κύριε τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ τῆς γῆς, ὅτι ἀπέκρυψας ταῦτα ἀπὸ σοφῶν καὶ συνετῶν καὶ ἀπεκάλυψας αὐτὰ νηπίοις· ναί ὁ πατήρ, ὅτι οὕτως εὐδοκία ἐγένετο ἔμπροσθέν σου.

²⁴³ This is in accord with the harsh judgment saying of Q 3:7-8 where appealing to Abraham as the father is condemned.

In Q 10:21-22, however, it is the Son who is the mediator between the Father and man. The sonship is based on the Christological status of Jesus as the Son.

²⁴⁴ Otherwise in Q 3:7-8 where the thread of judgment is apparent.

22 πάντα μοι παρεδόθη ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρός μου, καὶ οὐδεὶς γινώσκει τὸν υἱὸν εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ, οὐδὲ τὸν πατέρα [τις γινώσκει] εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱὸς καὶ ᾧ ἐὰν βούληται ὁ υἱὸς ἀποκαλύψαι.

21 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 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 whomever the Son chooses to reveal him.

Many scholars consider that the ‘cry of exaltation’ (Q 10:21-22) belongs to a very late stage in the compositional history of Q.²⁴⁵ This is due to its apparently more developed ideas of ‘Son’ christology than in other parts of Q.²⁴⁶

It seems quite clear that Q 10:21 and 22 did not originally belong together.²⁴⁷ Q 10:21 has a form of prayer of thanksgiving and the focus is on the Father. Q 10:22 shifts the view from the Father to the ‘Son’. It expresses a self-recommendation of the revealer and discusses the mediation of revelation, thus motivating the preceding saying christologically.²⁴⁸ In addition, there occurs a remarkable change in the subject of revelation. In 10:21 it is the Father who reveals ‘these things’

²⁴⁵ Many scholars consider Q 10:21-22 to be a late creation which belongs to the second redactional layer, Q². See Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 243; Arnal, *Village Scribes*, 7; Vaage, *Galilean Upstarts*, 107. Brodie, “An Alternative Q/Logia Hypothesis”, 741-742, argues that Q 10:21-22 is based on the hymn of Sir 51.

²⁴⁶ See Tuckett, *Q and History*, 276-77; Schneider, *Jesusüberlieferung*, 12: „ein nachösterliches Logion“; Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 201-3. However, Manson, *Sayings*, 79, argues for the Palestinian origin and thus the authenticity of Q 10:21-22. Schenk, *Synopse*, 58 considers Q 10:21 authentic, while 10:22 „ist eine erklärende Weiterführung des ersten durch die Redaktion des Spruchbuches in der nachösterlichen Situation.“ Lührmann, *Redaktion*, 60, argues „[d]ass das Drohwort (Q 10:13-15) und der Jubelruf (10:21f) in Q zusammengehörten, zeigt sich daran, das beide sowohl bei Mt als bei Lk eng miteinander verbunden sind...“

²⁴⁷ Thus Lührmann, *Redaktion*, 65; Kim, *Trägergruppe*, 343. Schulz, *Q*, 215, argues that both sayings are „Gemeindebildungen“.

²⁴⁸ Lührmann, *Redaktion*, 65-66; Tuckett, *Q and History*, 277; Schulz, *Q*, 215.

(ταῦτα) to ‘babes’ (νηπίοις). In 10:22, however, it is the Son who will reveal the Father to whom he wishes.²⁴⁹

Furthermore, within Q 10:21 a seam is visible. While the thanksgiving begins with the double vocative address πάτερ, κύριε τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ τῆς γῆς, (10:21a), at the end (10:21c) the address is in the nominative case ὁ πατήρ, though it is used in a vocative sense.²⁵⁰ Also, the affirmative particle ναί may indicate the attachment of 10:21c to 10:21a-b. This is because ναί is not preceded by a question.²⁵¹

Although the tradition history of Q 10:21-22 seems to be rather complicated, we need to bear in mind that in Q in its final shape the sayings occur together. The literary links between the verses are indeed several in number. The keyword πατήρ (twice in 10:21, three times in 10:22) forms the basic connection. Also the key verb in both verses is ἀποκαλύπτω. These connections make it difficult to conceive that the sayings ever circulated independently of each other.²⁵² It is more probable that Q 10:21c was added to 10:21a-b as its argument and 10:22 was formed as a commentary on 10:21.²⁵³ Thus πάντα in 10:22 refers back to ταῦτα in 10:21.

Some scholars have noted that Q 10:21-22 has a Wisdom background. Jesus is identified with Wisdom by virtue of many texts in Jewish tradition.²⁵⁴ However, Tuckett has shown that the Jewish parallels

²⁴⁹ Schulz, *Q*, 222 argues that Q 10:22a „steht vor allem im Horizont der apokalyptischen Menschensohn-Konzeption“, while 22b-c „dagegen weist Einflüsse der hellenistischen Sophia-Tradition auf“. Thus, he concludes (ibid., 228): „Die jüngere, hellenistische Q-Gemeinde hat zwar die apokalyptische Menschensohn-Christologie beibehalten und sogar die hellenistisch-jüdische Weisheit adaptiert...“.

²⁵⁰ Schneider, *Jesusüberlieferung*, 7, argues that it is a „semitizierende Vocative“ (referring to Blass-Debrunner-Rehkopf, *Grammatik*, 147.2.).

Robinson, “Evaluations” in *Q 11:2b-4*, 105, notes that πάτερ in Q 10:21 is “a secondary element... a Christianizing of the Hodayot formula”.

²⁵¹ Cf. Q 7:26 where ναί begins the answer to the preceding question.

²⁵² Thus Bultmann, *History*, 159f; Lührmann, *Redaktion*, 65.

²⁵³ Schulz, *Q*, 215; Schneider, *Jesusüberlieferung*, 12. Sato, *Q und Prophetie*, 38 argues that Q 10:22 „konnte die früher eingebettete Erzählung der Taufe Jesu mit der Himmelstimme (Q 3:22) zugrunde liegen.“ Manson, *Sayings*, 80, argues that “the clause about the Father knowing the Son is an interpolation”.

²⁵⁴ Uro, *Sheep*, 233; Kirk, *Composition*, 362; Perdue, “Wisdom Sayings”, 26-27; Tuckett, *Q and History*, 278. The parallels to God’s knowledge of Wisdom: Job 28:1-27; Sir 1:6,8; Bar 3:15-32, and to Wisdom’s knowledge of God: Prov 8:12; Wisd 7:25-27.; 8:3-4., 8-9.; 9:4,9,11.

are not very close to the sayings of Q 10:21-22. He argues that the equation of Wisdom with Jesus is at best implicit but not explicit, as the ‘title’ of Jesus is ‘Son’, not ‘Wisdom’. And “further, the first part of v. 22 is hard to parallel from the Wisdom tradition and has far closer links with apocalyptic thought, especially the SM tradition (cf. Dan 7:14)”.²⁵⁵

It is most reasonable to read Q 10:21-22 in its Q context in order to ascertain the rhetorical intentions of the saying. Thus Tuckett notes: “If the saying did indeed follow immediately after Q 10:16 in Q, then the context is surely significant”.²⁵⁶ The thanksgiving comes at the end of the mission discourse. In 10:13-15 there is a cry of judgment against the towns that have not repented. Q 10:16 implies that those whom Jesus had sent had the same authority as he had. So 10:21-22 forms an argumentation for the authority of those who have received the revelation. In reverse the passage “reflects the problem of the rejection of the gospel by the majority of the Jews”.²⁵⁷

After the thanksgiving there is a macarism for those who see and hear the things happening at the present time (Q 10:23-24). The imagery of seeing (βλέπω, ὁράω 10:23,24) and hearing (ἀκούω, 10:24) refers back to the revelation expressed in 10:22 by ἀποκαλύπτω. The key pronouns ταῦτα.. αὐτά (10:21) and ἃ (10:24) provide the literary links. There is no doubt that ταῦτα refers to the revelation in 10:21-22.²⁵⁸ What is remarkable is that 10:23-24 uses ‘seeing’ and ‘hearing’ as means of discovering the things that could previously not be seen and heard.²⁵⁹ This suggests that the revelation described in 10:21-22 was not esoteric but available to the normal human senses. In fact, the contrasting of the ‘sages

Allison, “Q’s new Exodus and the Historical Jesus”, 404-409, notes the link between the Son and Moses as the unique mediators of divine revelation (esp. Num. 12:6-8 and Dtn 34:40).

²⁵⁵ Tuckett, *Q and History*, 279 (SM = the Son of Man). Lührmann, *Redaktion* 65-68, claims that Q 10:21-22 betrays „eine bestimmte, apokalyptisch und weisheitlich geprägte Christologie“.

²⁵⁶ Tuckett, *Q and History*, 281.

²⁵⁷ Uro, *Sheep*, 229, noting a similar tone in Jn 1:11-12.

²⁵⁸ Schneider, *Jesusüberlieferung*, 11, notes that „*tauta* lässt sich kaum noch in seinem ursprünglichen Bezug deuten“. (Italics orig.)

²⁵⁹ Hünenburg, „Jesus als Wundertäter“, 642, argues that ‘seeing’ and ‘hearing’ in Q 10:23-24 refers to the healing miracles of Jesus.

and the learned' with 'babes' indicates that the revelation is not dependent on a higher level of wisdom.²⁶⁰

According to Mary Rose D'Angelo Q 10:21-22 forms an introduction to the prayer discourse Q 10:21-22; 23-24; 11:2-4, 9-13.²⁶¹ Her point is that the prayer speech "manifests the special, indeed, secret character of the community's knowledge of the father".²⁶² However, when read in context, the point is not in the secret teaching of Q but the reception of the Q messengers and their message (10:16) and the blessing of when seeing and hearing what is happening at the moment (10:23-24).

In the context of the mission discourse (Q 10:2-13) the sayings of 10:16, 21-22 and 23-24 are directed to those who have received the revelation and who have been sent to heal and to preach the kingdom (10:9). They live in a distinct moment in history as they see and hear something that many prophets and kings wished to see and hear but could not (10:23-24). Turned around this means judgment for those who are outside of the revelation. However, judgmental rhetoric is only implied in 10:21-22. The focus is on the revelation as well as on the revealer.

Tuckett notes that Q 10:21-22, when read in context, proposes that "the Q Christian, as the one who can address God as Father (cf. 11:2, 13; 12:30), is in a sense also 'son' of God, a person who can claim knowledge of God, and to be known by God, and hence charged with the task of making known to others what that knowledge involves".²⁶³ Also, the shift of subject from 'my Father' (10:22a) to 'the Son' (10:22d) supports this interpretation.

Kirk argues that Q 10:21-22 concludes the section of 'Mission Instruction' (9:57-60; 10:2-16, 21-22). The framework units (9:57-60 and 10:21-22) are connected by a thick weave of keyword recurrence (υἱὸς, πατέρα, πάτερ, νηπιοί, υἱὸς) and motifs on the semantic field of

²⁶⁰ Hoffmann, *Studien*, 114, argues that νηπιοί (Q 10:21) refers back to πτωχοί (6:20), thus indicating that the Q people were presented as the counterpart of σοφῶν καὶ συνετῶν.

²⁶¹ On the structuring of the prayer instruction see above ch. 3.1.1.

²⁶² D'Angelo, "Theology in Mark and Q", 171. Manson, *Sayings*, 78-80 includes three units (Q 10:21f, 10:23f and 11:9-13) under the title "The privileges of discipleship". However, he omits the Lord's Prayer from this block. Jacobson, *First Gospel*, 159 argues that the Lord's Prayer was part of the secret teaching which consisted of Q 10:21-22, 11:2-4 and 11:9-13. Thus they belonged together in Q.

²⁶³ Tuckett, *Q and History*, 280.

“family” (homelessness, home, familial obligations). Also, antitheses appear when Jesus first presents himself as the lowly, marginalized Son of Man (9:57-60), then as the glorious and exalted son of the heavenly Father.²⁶⁴

There is no reason to consider Q 10:23-24 as not belonging together with 10:21-22 and thus forming the end of the mission discourse.²⁶⁵ The concluding saying Q 10:23-24 is a macarism that continues the revelation theme of 10:21-22 and widens the audience of revelation from Jesus to those witnessing what happens in the present.²⁶⁶ The macarism thus motivates the efforts (as well as the drawbacks) in mission.

There is an apparent shift in presenting God as Father from Q 6:35c-d; 6:36 to 10:21-22. The inaugural discourse issues the challenge to become ‘sons’ of the Father and be like him. Human activity is presented as the criterion for *imitatio Patris*. According to 10:21-22, however, it fully depends on the Father as to whom he will reveal ‘these things’. The Father is portrayed as ‘Lord of heaven and earth’ in LXX terms.²⁶⁷ The position of the ‘Son’ is presented as the mediator between the Father and human beings (10:22).²⁶⁸ No doubt, ‘Son’ refers to Jesus.²⁶⁹

²⁶⁴ Kirk, *Composition*, 340.

²⁶⁵ Thus also Sato, *Q und Prophetie*, 37-38 Schenk, *Synopse*, 59-60; Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 197.

²⁶⁶ According to Schenk, *Synopse*, 60, Q 10:23-24 functions as limiting self-understanding of the Q group: „Wir sind die legitime Gemeinde des göttlichen Endzeitpropheten“. He notes that as the conclusion of the mission charge they also function as legitimation of the whole of Q. The same kind of „buchlegitimierenden Seligpreisungen“ are to be found e.g. in 4 Esdr 10:57. Schenk draws the (wrong!) conclusion concerning the social status of the Q-community „dass es eine Gruppe von Wanderpropheten war, die mit diesem Buch arbeitete“.

²⁶⁷ See Tob 7:17; 10:14 LXX. Cf. Jos *Ant* V. 93 (‘God, Father and Ruler’). It may be that the long address reminds one associatively of the LXX instances where κύριος is frequently associated with the creation of heaven and earth (e.g. Gen 1:1; 2:4; 14:19; Ex 31:17; 1 Esdr 6:12; Esth 4:19; Ps 123:8; 133:3; Jer 39:17; Dan 4:37; Od 12:1,2).

²⁶⁸ Arnal, *Village Scribes*, 171, refers to Q 7:8; 10:16, 22; 12:8-9, 42-46; 14:16-24; 14:16-24; 19:12-26 and claims that in Q² “the notion of one person speaking for or acting for another serves as the primary theological metaphor for the relationship between God, Jesus, and the Q people themselves”.

²⁶⁹ Hoffmann, *Studien*, 122, notes that in Q 10:21-22 Jesus is presented from his future standpoint: „Jesus wird also von seiner Zukunft her verstanden, die für Q schon begonnen hat“.

In Q 6:35c-d; 6:36 the persuasive argumentation is based on the essence and creative acts of the Father. In 10:21-22 the mode of argumentation is different. True, formally 10:21-22 is a *hodajot* hymn attested in contemporary Judaism,²⁷⁰ while 6:35c-d; 6:36 are admonitory sayings. The argumentative clause in 10:21c (...ὅτι οὕτως εὐδοκία ἐγένετο ἔμπροσθέν σου.) gives motivation to 10:21 a-b and is based on the conviction of the sovereignty and omnipotence of the Father. Nevertheless, his will is good (εὐδοκία ἐγένετο... 10:21).

No doubt, Q 10:21-22 gives some indication of the identity of the Q people. First, they considered themselves ‘babes’ who were given the revelation. This does not, however, at least primarily, indicate the social status of the Q people but their relationship with the Father (and the Son).²⁷¹ They thought of themselves in antithetical terms to ‘sages and the learned.’²⁷² Second, the Q people considered themselves to be fully dependent on the Father. They claimed to trust in his gracious will. Third, they thought of the Son, i.e. Jesus as the mediator between themselves and the Father. This marked a step toward a portrait of the remote Father as κύριος. The Son received the main locus in the process of revelation.

3.1.5. Q 11:13

13 εἰ οὖν ὑμεῖς πονηροὶ ὄντες οἴδατε δόματα ἀγαθὰ δίδοναι τοῖς τέκνοις ὑμῶν, πόσω μᾶλλον ὁ πατήρ ἐξ οὐρανοῦ δώσει ἀγαθὰ τοῖς αἰτουῦσιν αὐτόν.

13 So if you, though evil, know how to give good gifts to your children, how much more will the Father from heaven give good things to those who ask him!

²⁷⁰ See Robinson, „Die Hodajot-Formel“, 194-235; idem “Evaluations” in *Q 11:2b-4*, 105.

²⁷¹ The νηπιοί of Q 10:21 has been seen as parallel to πτωχοί (6:20) by Uro, *Sheep*, 234 and Hoffmann, *Studien*, 115.

²⁷² Cf. the sense of the designation in the LXX as ‘simple’, see Ps 18:8; 114:6; 118:130. In Qumran literature 1QH 2:9; 11Qps 18:2,4; 1QpHab 12:4.

Q 11:13 ends the prayer instruction of 11:2-4, 9-13. For the present purpose it is remarkable that it attests a juxtaposition of the divine Father and a human father. It provides the concluding *a minore ad maius* statement that employs a familial illustration. By implication those who ask of and pray to the Father are his children. The Father is portrayed as the generous giver of good things.

There is one detail in Q 11:13 which differs from the portrait of the Father attested in the inaugural discourse (6:35c-d; 6:36) and in the Lord's Prayer (11:2). The difference is the connotation of 'heaven' in 11:13. There is an issue whether the referent for ἐξ οὐρανοῦ is ὁ πατήρ or δώσει.²⁷³ In the first case the preposition ἐξ indicates the origin of the Father, i.e. that he is from heaven. However, it is also possible that ἐξ οὐρανοῦ refers to δώσει. Then the meaning would be: "...the Father will give from heaven..". This solution seems the most plausible. It may well be that there was the intention to point out the distance between the human father and the divine Father. This intention necessitated the reference to heaven.²⁷⁴ The local distinction between a human father and the divine Father became clear.

The reference to the locale of the Father, ἐξ οὐρανοῦ, suggests that the Q people understood that the Father lived in heaven but gave 'good things' from there. This view has support in Q's rhetoric, which appeals to nature. As noted above, nature imagery is apparent in the final statement Q 6:35b. It appeals to the Father who "lets his sun rise on bad and good and lets it rain rain on the just and unjust". The Father is the subject of both ἀνατέλλει and βρέχει. He rules both the sun and rain.²⁷⁵ This betrays the conviction that the home of the sun and rain is above, in 'heaven'. It is also the home of the Father.²⁷⁶

There is no need to interpret the future δώσει Q 11:13 eschatologically.²⁷⁷ Nothing in the context requires such an interpretation. True, the closest associations for ἀγαθά (11:13b) are the basic needs for

²⁷³ Robinson, "Evaluations" in *Q 11:2b-4*, 105, also notes this: "In Luke 11:13 it is textually uncertain whether the statement means that the Father who is from (!) heaven will give, or that the Father will give from heaven (Acts 2:33), which in effect seems more obvious".

²⁷⁴ Robinson, "Evaluations" in *Q 11:2b-4*, 105.

²⁷⁵ The conviction that the Father (or God) rules nature is apparent in Q 12:6, 24, 27-28. Cf. Job 5:10; 9:5-8; Ps 19:1-5; Acts 14:17.

²⁷⁶ Cf. Q 6:23 (reward in heaven); 10:15; 12:33 (treasure in heaven).

²⁷⁷ Thus Tuckett, "Q, Prayer and the Kingdom", 372-376.

bread and fish (11:11-12). Thus, what the Father gives are things that primarily concern everyday life and the needs of existence.²⁷⁸ This is in accord with the petitions for bread, cancellation of debt and surveillance in the Lord's Prayer. The Father was to take care of the needs of his people by growing seed and providing fish and other food. Q 11:13 displays absolute confidence in the generosity of the Father.

3.1.6. Q 12:6²⁷⁹

6 οὐχὶ [πέντε] στρουθία πωλοῦνται ἄσσαρι[ων δύο]; καὶ ἐν ἑξ αὐτῶν οὐ πεσεῖται ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν ἄνευ τοῦ [πατρὸς ὑμῶν].

6 Are not [five] sparrows sold for [two] cents? And yet not one of them will fall to earth without [your Father's] «consent».

Q 12:6 belongs to a unit 12:4-7 that deals with fear of the physical death. The saying provides the basis for the preceding admonition 12:4. It is structured by a rhetorical question that appeals to everyday experience (the price of sparrows) and an observation from nature (the sparrows do not fall to the ground without 'your Father's consent').²⁸⁰ The following saying 12:7 repeats the initial admonition (μὴ φοβεῖσθε·) and provides an *a minore ad maius* conclusion (πολλῶν στρουθίων διαφέρετε).²⁸¹

For the present purpose it is noteworthy that the Father occurs once again in nature rhetoric.²⁸² Q 12:6 indicates that the Father rules nature and even the life of sparrows. Like other passages that attest nature

²⁷⁸ Similarly Catchpole, *Quest*, 213.

²⁷⁹ *CEQ* follows the Matthaean reading ἄνευ τοῦ [πατρὸς ὑμῶν]. *IQP* reads ἄνευ τοῦ θεοῦ.

²⁸⁰ Cf. Q 11:11-12; 12:23, 25, where the argumentation contains rhetorical questions.

²⁸¹ An *a minore ad maius* conclusion also occurs in Q 11:13; 12:28.

²⁸² Cf. Q 6:25b; 12:22-31.

rhetoric, 12:6-7 also betrays absolute confidence in the care of the Father. Men are provided with priority over nature and creatures. This view is in accord with the Q sayings in the saying on love of enemy (6:35), in the prayer instruction (11:13) and in the section on cares (12:28).

3.1.7. Q 12:30

30 πάντα γὰρ ταῦτα τὰ ἔθνη ἐπιζητοῦσιν· οἶδεν / [γὰρ] ὁ πατήρ / ὑμῶν ὅτι χρήζετε τούτων [ἀπάντων].

30 For all these the Gentiles seek; for [your] Father knows that you need them [all].

It is striking that the last instance of πατήρ in Q occurs immediately after the mid-point of the entire gospel. Thus πατήρ referring to God is lacking in the rest of Q.²⁸³ This may suggest that in the final passages which mainly concern judgment and the coming of the Son of Man, God was deliberately portrayed as Lord (κύριος).²⁸⁴

Q 12:30 belongs to the section on cares 12:22-31.²⁸⁵ Alan Kirk notes that it is structurally framed by the opening admonition (12:22) and the concluding admonition (12:31) with its two motive clauses (12:29-

²⁸³ However, θεός is attested in Q 13:18, 20, 28; 16:13, 16.

²⁸⁴ Cf. Q 13:25, 35; 14:21 (οἰκοδεσπότης) 16:13; 19:15, 16, 18, 20.

²⁸⁵ Kirk, *Composition*, 217-18, notes the structural parallels of Q 6:27-35; 6:37-42; 11:2-13; 11:14-23; 11:29-35 and 12:22-32. He argues that the rhetoric used in the cluster under the theme “Courageous Witness” (Q 12:2-12) continues in the following discourse Q 12:22-32 that can be entitled “Do not be anxious”. The cluster Q 12:22-31 exhibits the following structure:

Programmatic Admonition (22)

Motive, Rationale (23)

Example (24)

Central Gnostic Saying (25)

Example (26-28)

Concluding Admonition (29)

Motive Clauses (30)

Admonition and Promise (31).

30).²⁸⁶ These form an *inclusio* indicating a coherent cluster. The motive clauses 12:29-30 paraphrase the opening admonition, expressing the concerns for adequate nourishment and covering as though quoting an anxious listener.²⁸⁷ Kirk further argues for the unity of the two motive clauses 12:30, while “the ancient instructions frequently attach two, three, or even four motive clauses to a single admonition”.²⁸⁸ The Gentiles motif (12:30) sets a negative example illustrating behaviour contrary to that counselled by the instruction. The second motif refers to the previous arguments about God’s paternal care (12:30).

The chain of thought in the section on cares (Q 12:22-30) bears a resemblance to the cluster of love of enemy (6:27-28, 35c-d). There, in 6:35c-d the ‘unjust’ are mentioned in the same breath as the ‘Father’ who lets the sun shine and the rain fall on the just and unjust alike.²⁸⁹ In the section on cares, too, the argument is taken from the course of nature (ravens 12:24; lilies 12:27; grass 12:28). Further, there is a structural connection between 6:33 and 12:30. In 6:33 the Gentiles (ἔθνικοι) are juxtaposed with the implied audience. The same kind of juxtaposition is found in Q 12:30 (ἔθνη), too. The juxtaposition of the Gentiles with those who rely on the Father’s care, i.e. the Q people, is thus clearly part of Q’s rhetoric. In fact, Q admits that the needs of both groups are the same. The Gentiles ‘seek all these things’ (12:30) and it is implied that they will receive them. The Q people have the same needs, but they are asked not to be anxious about them. The Father is aware of the needs of his people and will supply them in his kingdom (2:30-31). Thus the Father and kingdom provided concepts (or symbols²⁹⁰) and served as factors of identity for the Q people.

The prayer instruction (Q 11:2-4, 9-13) ends with a similar notion to the beneficent Father as does the section on cares (12:22-31). Thus “[w]e may infer from this that the Q editor liked to bring at least some instructions to a close with a direct application which invokes the heavenly Father and the elect family relationship with him which the Q

²⁸⁶ Kirk, *Composition*, 223.

²⁸⁷ Kirk, *Composition*, 223 with others.

²⁸⁸ Kirk, *Composition*, 223-24.

²⁸⁹ Kirk, *Composition*, 224 with Douglas, “Family, Power, Religion”, 182.

²⁹⁰ On the symbolic use of Q’s rhetoric see Uro, “Apocalyptic Symbolism”.

community enjoys, thereby assuring the recipients in a promissory manner of the Father's provident care".²⁹¹

In Q 12:30 πατήρ occurs with the relative pronoun ὑμῶν as in the inaugural speech (6:35c-d; 6:36). There and in the prayer instruction 11:13 parental illustration is apparent. In 11:13 the Father is concerned about the needs of his people. The same motif is found in Q 12:30. The Father knows what the needs of his people are: οἶδεν [γὰρ] ὁ πατήρ ὑμῶν ὅτι χρεῖστε τούτων [ἀπάντων]. He feeds them and provides them with clothing. Here, as in 6:35c-d, the image of God has parental, even feminine features referring to nurturing and caring for nature.²⁹²

An *a minore ad maius* construction appears in the argument of 12:24: οὐχ ὑμεῖς μᾶλλον διαφέρετε τῶν πετεινῶν. and of 12:28: ... οὐ πόλλω μᾶλλον ὑμᾶς.. In 11:13 the *a minore ad maius* construction is found in the concluding statement (...πόσῳ μᾶλλον..).

The structural connections suggest that the implied audience of the section on cares Q 12:22-31 is supposed to be the same as in the inaugural speech (6:20-49) and in the prayer instruction (11:2-4, 9-13). These clusters betray similar rhetorical structuring. All include admonitions (Q 6:27-28; 6:36, 37; 11:2, 9; 12:22). All have rhetorical questions as means of argumentation (Q 6:32, 34; 11:11-12; 12:25). All include concluding statements (Q 6:35c-d; 11:13; 12:31). Accordingly, structural similarities indicate that the ethos of these sections is coherent.

In Q 12:30-31 ὁ πατήρ and ἡ βασιλεία occur together as in the Lord's Prayer. To be sure, in Q 12:31 the kingdom is a matter of seeking (ζητεῖτε). Action is expected from the audience while in the Lord's Prayer the coming of the kingdom is to be prayed for. The close relationship between the Father and his kingdom suggest that both should be interpreted in familial terms having social connotations.²⁹³

Q 12:22-31 ends with an admonition and promise in 12:31. The motive clauses of 12:30 leave open the question as to how the Father will supply the needs of the Q people. Q 12:31 attests that their needs will be met in the Father's kingdom. Kirk notes that Q 12:31 offers "a positive

²⁹¹ Kirk, *Composition*, 224 with Piper, *Wisdom*, 28; Catchpole, "Ravens, Lilies", 81, and Hoffmann, „Verbot des Sorgens“, 117. Similarly Heil, „Gleichnisrede Jesu in Q“, 653.

²⁹² Cf. Ps 146:8, 9 LXX (...χόρτον.. τροφήν.. κοράκων.).

²⁹³ On the connotations of the kingdom, see below, ch. 3.3.11.

alternative to wrongful acquisition and promises God's provision to those who act rightly in this regard".²⁹⁴ While traditional wisdom urges hard work in order to make adequate provision,²⁹⁵ Q urges his readers to seek the kingdom of God in order to receive their material needs, too.

Kirk draws some consequences with the social status of the Q people in mind:

“The Do Not Be Anxious instruction has in view the hopelessly poor whose best hope and greatest need is acquisition of subsistence levels of bread and covering... Strikingly, God's fatherhood is assured only to the poor, while the rich are threatened with loss of their wealth (in Q 12:33-34)".²⁹⁶

Kirk, however, misses the point. The argument of Q 12:22-31 (as well as of 6:20-49 and 11:2-4, 9-13) seems to concentrate on promoting the Q ethos. The social state or programme of the Q people is not to the fore. The rhetoric challenge is to imitate the Father and trust him completely. God's fatherhood is the guarantee and basis for the ethos of the Q people.²⁹⁷

It is striking how lightly the Q editor seems to take material human needs. In the ears of a poor and destitute person Q 12:22-31 would surely sound something like blasphemy. The social setting of the Q people suggested in 12:22-31 seems to be far from that of wandering beggars or poor destitutes as proposed by Kirk. For the present purpose it is remarkable that the focus of 12:22-31 is, at least primarily, not on the urgent lack of food and clothing. The scope of the rhetoric is in the issue of anxiety about them. Confidence in the Father and seeking his kingdom

²⁹⁴ Kirk, *Composition*, 226 with others. Otherwise Sato, *Q und Prophetie*, 218-19, who argues that „[d]ieses Bild passt nicht auf Leute, die ohnehin im Existenzminimum leben. Die Armen haben schon kaum genug, wenn sie arbeiten.“

²⁹⁵ Kirk, *Composition*, 226.

²⁹⁶ Kirk, *Composition*, 227.

²⁹⁷ Mack, *Lost Gospel*, 128, notes that, in Q, “the father (i.e. God) is merely a guarantor of the better way of life demonstrated by the movement... God is emphasized as being a father because the members of the movement are in need of a father's care. The Q people are not yet thinking of themselves as a family, but they are getting close”. This conviction, however, seems to be based on Mack's view of the Q people as Cynic itinerants. As we have noted above, most of the Q people lived a settled life in households. Thus there was no special need for familial illustration, but indeed an urgent need to conceive of themselves as the people of God.

are primary. The Father will surely provide sufficient food and clothing for those who trust in him.

3.1.8. Summary

The analysis of the Q sections above (except of Q 10:21-22) seems to reveal a fairly coherent portrait of God. He is presented in terms of *paterfamilias* and as the ruler of nature. He takes care of even the sparrows (12:6). He is the Creator who makes his sun shine and who lets the rain fall (6:35c-d). He feeds the ravens (12:24), makes the lilies grow (12:27) and clothes the grass (12:28). His deeds are apparent to everyone. He is righteous and gives his goodness to the good and bad alike. In order to become his ‘son’ one has to love one’s enemies and pray for them (6:27-28).²⁹⁸ One has to be full of pity and not judge (6:36). *Imitatio Patris* is the basis of the Q ethos. The Father provides an essential concept for the identity of the Q people. They are children of the Father while they pray to him and have confidence in his generosity.

The Father is to be prayed to (Q 11:2). The form of address for prayer is the simple *πάτερ* (11:2b). Q does not allow the meaning of ‘Daddy’. The context of the Lord’s Prayer, the prayer instruction (11:2-4, 9-13), points to the providential care and generosity of the Father, not to the intimacy of the father-son relationship. The address of the Lord’s Prayer has the connotations of *paterfamilias*. This becomes apparent from the matters that are to be prayed for. One is to pray for the sanctification of his name and the coming of his kingdom. One is to ask for basic needs, food, release from debt and surveillance (11:2-4). One is also to pray for one’s enemies (6:28). Confidence in prayer is based on the conviction that the Father gives much more than a human father to those who ask him (11:13). What the Father gives is good.

The Father has absolute authority within his realm, i.e. in his kingdom. As will be seen below, the kingdom has communal as well as

²⁹⁸ Robinson, “The Critical Edition of Q”, 40, refers to Bauer, „Das Gebot der Feindesliebe und die alten Christen,“ 39-40, and notes “the substantive tension between the emphasis to love of enemies in Q’s archaic collection, the Inaugural Sermon, and the condemnation of enemies in what we now recognize as the core of Q’s deuteronomic redaction (Q 11,49-51; 13,34-35)”.

material connotations.²⁹⁹ The Father is aware of the needs of his people. In his kingdom material things will be added (Q 12:31). One need not worry about material needs, food and clothing (Q 12:22-30). One must seek the kingdom of the Father.

Q makes a distinction between the divine Father and a human father. The distinction is made by the association of the Father with heaven. It is from there that he provides his children with good things. The ‘good things’ refer to material needs, food and clothing.

There is also a slightly different portrait of the Father in Q compared with that presented above. In Q 10:21-22 the Father is called ‘Lord of heaven and earth’. He is the master and ruler of the universe. In accordance with to his good will he has given the revelation to ‘babes’ but hidden it from ‘sages and the learned’ (10:21). Also, he has given a special status to the ‘Son’, who alone knows the Father and who alone has the authority to reveal him to whom he wishes (10:22).

In Q 10:21-22 the Father and the Son seem to have a group-defining position. They are the central figures in the identity of the Q people. The boundaries of the group are made clear indeed. Those who have the revelation know the Father and are called ‘babes’. The Son is the mediator between them and the Father. Q 10:22 suggests that there is no longer direct access to the Father. The Father has ‘handed all things over to the Son’. In the rhetoric of 10:21-22 he is given remote connotations of ‘Lord’. The Father’s activity is shown by his authority and by the revelation, and not by his generosity and parental care as attested in 6:35c-d; 11:13; 12:30. The closeness of the mission discourse suggests that the *Sitz im Leben* of the thanksgiving is the motivating of the mission activity of the Q people.

3.2. Sanctification of the Name

The first petition of the Lord’s Prayer seems somewhat alien in Q and within the prayer itself. The verb ἀγιάζω is attested only here in Q.

²⁹⁹ See below, ch. 3.3.11. Cf. Q 6:20; 7:28; 13:28-29.

Further, the noun ἅγιος occurs in all instances in Q 3:16 and 12:10, 12 as a qualification of ‘spirit’ (πνεῦμα).³⁰⁰ The ‘name’ (τὸ ὄνομα) occurs in the Lord’s Prayer and in Q 13:35,³⁰¹ where it appears in the idiom ὄνομα κυρίου. The urgent questions are: Is the petition to be considered to be like the other petitions or does it have a distinctive meaning? Who is the subject of sanctification? What kind of associations does ‘name’ have? These questions I shall attempt to answer in this chapter.

3.2.1. The Lord’s Prayer: Q 11:2b

The petition concerning sanctification the name occurs immediately after the address in the Lord’s Prayer. This indicates that the petition occupies a special position in the prayer. True, the ‘name’ refers back to ‘Father’. This is indicated by the qualifying possessive adjective σου. At least in principle it is possible that the name might refer to a proper name of the Father.³⁰² While there are no such references in Q, it is most reasonable to consider that it is the Father who is the referent in the first petition of the Lord’s Prayer.³⁰³

The petition of the kingdom is structurally identical with the first petition beginning with the predicate verb in the imperative aorist + subject. This raises the question whether the first petition should be considered together with the address or the petition of the kingdom apart from the address.

Norman Metzler argues that ‘hallowed be thy name’ should be considered together with the address. Thus it serves as “a doxological honorific qualifier”.³⁰⁴ In fact, it should not be considered as a petition but as a similar parenthetical phrase of the address. Metzler appeals to the evidence of the synagogue Qaddish prayer where a doxological phrase

³⁰⁰ Cf. ‘unclean spirit’ (τὸ ἀκάθαρτον πνεῦμα) occurs immediately after the prayer instruction in Q 11:24.

³⁰¹ There seems to be a LXX quotation (Ps 117:26) behind Q 13:35.

³⁰² Cf. the use of Yahweh’s name in the OT, ὄνομα κυρίου in the LXX. Sanctification the Lord’s name occurs in Ezek 36:23 LXX: καὶ ἀγιάσω τὸ ὄνομά μου τὸ μέγα τὸ βεβηλωθὲν ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν,

³⁰³ Similarly Gundry, *Matthew*, 105-6.

³⁰⁴ Metzler, “The Lord’s Prayer. Second Thoughts of the First Petition”, 189.

serves as a qualifier of the mention of God.³⁰⁵ We have to note, however, that the Qaddish begins with praise, sanctification God's name:

Exalted and hallowed be His great name in the world which he created according to His will.³⁰⁶

It is noteworthy that in the Qaddish the conviction is expressed that hallowing of the name should take place 'in the world'. Thus it is not a mere 'doxological honorific qualifier' but an expression of praise that has parallels in the Psalms.³⁰⁷ In addition, the dating and wording of the Qaddish prayer is highly problematic and thus we have to be cautious in using it as a parallel when studying the Lord's Prayer.³⁰⁸

Metzler is correct in that the closest referent to the first petition is the address of the Lord's Prayer. It is noteworthy that the verb ἁγιάζω is in the passive while ἐρχόμαι in the second petition is in the active voice. However, the question of who makes the name holy remains unanswered. Is it the Father? Or is it those who pray the Lord's Prayer? In the context of the prayer itself it is difficult to decide.

The argument of the prayer instruction (Q 11:9-13) underscores the confidence in prayer. This may also suggest the meaning of the first petition. Those who make the Father's name holy pray the Lord's Prayer and trust that the Father will give good things to those who ask him. Thus confidence in praying makes the name holy. In order to obtain a more detailed view it is necessary to study another Q text that has links with the issue at hand.

3.2.2. Q 3:16

³⁰⁵ Metzler, "The Lord's Prayer. Second Thoughts of the First Petition", 194, noting the use by Paul (Rom 1:25). Zeller, *Kommentar*, 57. Oakman, "The Lord's Prayer in Social Perspective", 161-63 also claims the connection of sanctification with the Judean-Jerusalem interests which are attested in the *Qaddish* prayer and in rabbinic traditions.

³⁰⁶ Text from Petuschkowsky-Brocke, *The Lord's Prayer*, 37.

³⁰⁷ See e.g. Ps 18:47; 99:2, 3; 100:4; 135:1.

³⁰⁸ See Vaage, *Galilean Upstarts*, 58-59, who challenges the conviction of Jeremias, *New Testament Theology*, 198, that Jesus formed the Lord's Prayer on the basis of the Qaddish.

16 ἐγὼ μὲν ὑμᾶς βαπτίζω [ἐν] ὕδατι, ὁ δὲ ὀπίσω μου ἐρχόμενος ἰσχυρότερός μου ἐστίν, οὗ οὐκ εἰμὶ ἱκανὸς τ[α] ὑποδήματ[α] [βαστα]σαι· αὐτὸς ὑμᾶς βαπτίσει ἐν πνεύματι [ἁγίῳ] καὶ πυρί·

16 I baptize you [in] water, but the one to come after me is more powerful than I, whose sandals I am not fit to [take off]. He will baptize you in [holy] Spirit and fire.

‘Holy Spirit’ occurs in Q 3:16 (...ἐν πνεύματι [ἁγίῳ]..). The saying belongs to a section of John’s preaching of repentance (3:7-9) and the coming one (3:16-17).³⁰⁹ The section contains several metaphors of judgment (good and bad trees; baptizing with water and fire; threshing floor). These are connected together by the recurring keyword ‘fire’ (πῦρ Q 3:6, 16, 17).³¹⁰ The eschatological figure of ‘the Coming One’ rules the section. He will baptize with the Holy Spirit and fire.

The Holy Spirit has here judgmental connotations when it occurs together with ‘fire’, which is an evident metaphor of judgment. Thus the judgmental speech of Q is closely connected with the Spirit. Accordingly, baptism in the Holy Spirit and fire causes division between those who accept the Q message and those who reject it. True, the implied audience of Q 3:16-17 are those who are addressed as a ‘brood of vipers’ (3:7) and who may appeal to Abraham as their ancestor (3:8).³¹¹ Thus the speech is not directed towards ‘insiders’ but ‘outsiders,’ i.e. those who have not (yet) repented. Baptism in the Holy Spirit (and fire) indicates a need to find out whether one accepts or rejects the message of repentance of the Coming One. Spirit is closely connected with the Q message. It is to be considered holy.

The preceding context provides the saying of John’s announcement of judgment (Q 3:7-9). It underscores the need ‘to bear fruit worthy of repentance’ (3:7). Thus ‘baptism in the Holy Spirit’ conforms the way of life according to the Q ethos.

³⁰⁹ Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 323, locates the section in Q².

³¹⁰ Uro, “Apocalyptic Symbolism in Q”, 95.

³¹¹ Horsley, “Israelite Traditions in Q”, 95, notes that “Q thus begins with a prophetic covenantal exhortation to Israel to repent in the face of judgment, including not to trust in descent from Abraham as any guarantee of God’s favor”.

3.2.3. Q 6:36

36 Γίνεσθε οἰκτίρμονες ὡς .. ὁ πατήρ ὑμῶν οἰκτίρμων ἐστίν.

36 Be full of pity, just as your Father .. is full of pity.

The themes of ‘sanctification’ or ‘name’ are not attested in Q 6:36. However, in ancient Jewish thinking the ‘name’ is closely associated with its bearer.³¹² The name and its owner were intimately related.

As argued above,³¹³ the challenge to be like the Father, i.e. *imitatio Patris* is attested in Q 6:36. The qualification of the Father is ‘full of pity’ (οἰκτίρμων). Thus, associatively ‘hallowing the name’ is linked with ‘becoming like the Father who is full of pity’.³¹⁴

3.2.4. Q 12:10, 12

10 καὶ ὅς ἐάν εἴπῃ λόγον εἰς τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, ἀφεθήσεται αὐτῷ· ὅς δ’ ἂν [εἴπῃ] εἰς τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα, οὐκ ἀφεθήσεται αὐτῷ.

12 [το] γὰρ [ἅγιον πνεῦμα διδάξει] ὑμ[ᾶς] ἐν ...ἡ τῆ ὥρα τί εἰπ<νητε>.

10 And whoever says a word against the son of humanity, it will be forgiven him; but whoever [speaks] against the holy Spirit, it will not be forgiven him.

³¹² Cf. the commandment not to use the Lord’s name wrongly Ex 20:7. In many OT passages ‘name’ is used instead of mentioning Yahweh. ‘The holy name’, see 1 Chr 16:10; Ps 30:5; 105:3; 106:47; 111:9; The people make God’s name holy: Isa 29:23; The Lord sanctifies his name: Ez 36:23

³¹³ See above ch 3.1.3.

³¹⁴ Cf. Lev 19:2 LXX: Λάλησον τοῖς υἱοῖς Ἰσραὴλ καὶ λαβέτωσαν πρὸς σὲ δάμαλιν πυρρὰν ἄμωμον, ἥτις οὐκ ἔχει ἐν αὐτῇ μῶμον καὶ οὐκ ἐπεβλήθη ἐπ’ αὐτὴν ζυγός.

12 When they bring you before synagogues, do not be anxious about how or what you are to say; for [the holy Spirit will teach] you in that... hour what you are to say.

‘Holy Spirit’ (τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα) occurs twice in Q 12:10, 12 in close proximity.³¹⁵ The sayings belong to a cluster that deals with the hidden and revealed (12:2-3), fear (12:4-7), confession (12:8-9), blasphemy (12:10) and the Spirit’s assistance (12:11-12).³¹⁶

The section begins with a saying on ‘hidden and revealed’ matters (Q 12:2) which marks a shift in the argument compared with the preceding judgment discourse against ‘this generation’ (11:49-51³¹⁷). Q 12:2-12 is a hortatory discourse that is directed towards ‘insiders’. It deals with the problem of public witness. The concluding motive clause 12:11-12 promises the assistance of the Holy Spirit.

The sayings in Q 12:2-12 betray structural similarities. Succinct paired clauses occur throughout the cluster.³¹⁸ Some clauses are connected by και (12:2, 3). Some use repetitive structuring (12:2: .. ὁ οὐκ.. ὁ οὐ...; 12:8-9: ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ἀνθρώπων... ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ἀγγέλων; 12:10: ...εἶπη εἰς... εἶπη εἰς; 12:11-12: τί εἶπητε... τί εἶπ<η>τε). Repetition of keywords also occurs throughout the cluster (12:4-7: μὴ φοβεῖσθε... φοβεῖσθε μὴ φοβεῖσθὲ 12:8-9: ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ἀνθρώπων... ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ἀγγέλων.. ἐνώπιον τῶν ἀνθρώπων.. ἐνώπιον τῶν ἀγγέλων; 12:10: ... εἶπη ... ἀφεθήσεται εἶπη ... ἀφεθήσεται...). These rhetorical means provide coherence to the cluster and also suggest a common theme for it.

³¹⁵ ‘Unclean spirit’ (τὸ ἀκάθαρτον πνεῦμα) occurs in Q 11:24. There is an antithetical juxtaposition between the prayer instruction (11:2-4, 9-13) and the following Beelzebul controversy + the saying of the return of the unclean spirit (11:17-26).

³¹⁶ Kirk, *Composition*, 214-17 (italics orig.), structures Q 12:2-12 as follows:

General Maxim (2)

Programmatic Admonition (3)

Double-unit Motives (4-7)

Double-unit Motives (8-10)

Final Admonition (11)

Promise Motive Clause (12).

³¹⁷ CEQ locates Q 11:52 between 11:46b and 11:47-51.

³¹⁸ This may reflect their circulation already in the oral phase of the tradition.

The saying of Q 12:10 has proved a very difficult one for scholars. Its relationship with the previous verses is “a critical problem of long standing”.³¹⁹ Tuckett suggests that “the least problematic interpretation may be that the contrast intended is one between the pre-Easter situation, where rejection of the Christian cause (=speaking against the SM) is forgivable, and the post-Easter situation, where such rejection is culpable”.³²⁰ This interpretation suggests that the Holy Spirit is equated with the (post-Easter) message of the Q community, i.e. the risen Jesus speaking through the Q Christians.³²¹ It is the last chance for the audience to repent. Rejecting the Q-message (and its messengers) means blasphemy against the Spirit and judgment.

However, Tuckett’s solution seems to suffer from theological presuppositions. There are no explicit remarks of distinctions between the ‘pre-Easter’ and ‘post-Easter’ situation in Q.³²² Kloppenborg rightly reminds us that the problem still remains, though the popular solution is intelligible on tradition-historical grounds.³²³ Thus a solution that takes the rhetorical context into account should be found.

Kirk suggests that “[t]he fact that wisdom compositions from time to time deliberately juxtapose apparently contradictory sayings in order to cultivate the capacity to determine the situational “fittingness” of the contrasting proverbs points a way out of the problem... Verses 8-9 are directed toward group members and invoke the threat of divine sanction to motivate them to lay down a courageous public witness even when their lives are at stake. Verse 10 is directed toward outsiders, more particularly, toward the hostile judges and threatens them with

³¹⁹ Kirk, *Composition*, 211.

³²⁰ Tuckett, *Q and History*, 204 (SM=the Son of Man). Also idem “The Son of Man and Daniel 7: Q and Jesus”, 374. Similarly Schulz, *Q*, 247-48.

³²¹ Cf. Tuckett, *Q and History*, 108. Similarly Schulz, *Q*, 249; Schenk, *Synopse*, 88 and Sato, *Q und Prophetie*, 135-36, who argues that „den Terminus Sohn des Menschen generisch zu verstehen haben: „ein Mensch“.. Die Verneinung dem irdischen Jesus gegenüber, die nach Q 12:9 nur noch die Verdammung mit sich bringen soll, sei doch vergebbar. Dies bedeutet theologisch: Der erhöhte Jesus hat sein früheres Wort selber umgeprägt und lies es die Q-Träger zugunsten des Volks nochmals aufgreifen“. Similarly Manson, *Sayings*, 110: “The difficulties disappear when it is recognized that ‘the Son of Man’... should be ‘a man’”.

³²² Cf. Uro, “Apocalyptic Symbolism of Q”, 103-4.

³²³ Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 213.

condemnation if they reject the charismatic witness of those standing before them”.³²⁴

When Q 12:10 is seen as directed towards insiders, it functions as a motivation to obey the programmatic admonition of 12:3, “for it attributes to their bold confession cosmic, charismatic power of life and death for those who hear it. So, while 12:10 is ostensibly directed at outsiders, within this instruction it functions as a motivation for insiders. The saying tells the disciples that their coerced witness in the hostile court is in truth a charismatically endowed oracle signifying salvation or perdition for those upon whose ears it falls”.³²⁵

Although Kirk’s argument is much too complex, his notion that Q 12:8-9, 10, 11-12 promotes court language is remarkable. The setting seems to be a public assembly, indeed perhaps a court.³²⁶

The interpretative clue can be found in the preceding context Q 12:4-7, 8-9. There, in the double-structured sayings, the juxtaposition body - soul (12:4, 5) and men - angels (12:8, 9) is attested. Men can kill the body but not the soul. God can destroy the soul, too. This indicates that the soul belongs to the divine realm but the body to the earthly one. Further, acknowledging the Son of Man publicly gains divine acknowledgement by the angels.³²⁷ The Son of Man belongs to the human realm while the angels belong to the divine one.

In Q 12:10 the juxtaposition is between the Son of Man and the Holy Spirit. In the context of 12:4-7, 8-9 the Son of Man bears physical and mundane connotations while the Holy Spirit has divine and heavenly

³²⁴ Kirk, *Composition*, 211.

³²⁵ Kirk, *Composition*, 212-13. Sato, *Q und Prophetie*, 135, argues that „[d]er Vers ist formal eine bedingte Ankündigung, funktional aber eine unbedingte Unheilsankündigung (i.e. against the opponents of Jesus) bzw. schwere Drohung (i.e. for the Q people)“.

³²⁶ According to Järvinen, “Son of Man and his Followers”, 173, the unit (12:2-12) presupposes some kind of persecution, probably by the synagogue institution.

Arnal, *Village Scribes*, 171, notes that “[p]erhaps the most prominent single motif in Q² (with the possible exception of that of judgment), the theme of representation or delegation forms the most common basis of the appeals to experience one finds in the constituent material of Q²... This emphasis (of delegation)... accords well with the experience and perhaps worldview of the village scribe - a retainer who habitually acts on behalf of the law, the state, and powerful patrons”.

³²⁷ Cf. Uro, “Apocalyptic Symbolism of Q”, 103: “[H]e (the Son of man) is an advocate and witness for those who confess Jesus in public”.

connotations. It is forgivable to speak against Jesus, the Son of Man but culpable to speak against the Holy Spirit. Further, according to the court rhetoric of 12:12 the Holy Spirit is portrayed as a teacher and as an assistant advocate. The Spirit is the bearer of the Q message. True, there is no reason to consider it otherwise in 12:10. What is unforgivable is the rejection of the call to repent. The Holy Spirit is the guarantor and mediator of the message.³²⁸

The following context provides clues for the understanding of the saying Q 12:10. In 12:11-12 the human question of how and what to speak is presented as the cause of anxiety. The aid of the Holy Spirit is promised for human weakness and fear. Further, in 12:22-31 there is a similar point of view. The soul is more important than the body. The kingdom is to be sought instead of bodily needs. In 12:33-34 there is an exhortation to store up treasures in heaven, and not on earth.

The material and physical things and needs are juxtaposed with those of soul and spirit. The Holy Spirit (Q 12:12), life ($\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$ 12:22,23), the kingdom of God (12:31) and heaven (12:33) are set in contrast with human anxiety (12:12), physical and material needs (12:22, 26, 29), the Gentiles (12:30) and the earth (12:33). This juxtaposition strongly suggests that the Son of humanity (12:10) is associated with material things and earth while the Holy Spirit connotes with life, the kingdom of God and heaven.

Both in Q 12:10 and 12:12 the Holy Spirit acts as a person in his own right. Nevertheless, he has abilities that exceed human potentials. Thus, his status seems to be even above that of the Son of Man. Resisting the Son of Man is forgivable but whoever rejects the call blasphemes against the Holy Spirit and cannot be forgiven. Whoever receives the call of the Q message and its messengers will be saved.

Mack appeals to the long and strong tradition of thought about the 'spirit of wisdom', a metaphor that combined the notion of effective speech with that of special insight into the deep structures of the world. Thus in a trial situation the Q people could trust in the aid of wisdom. Defending oneself would be 'a holy spirit speech.' Mack concludes: "So the holy spirit was a term used by the people of Q to make the connection between mythology and their situation. As a concept it differed from

³²⁸ Cf. Robinson, "History of Q Research", lxxi, who claims that the Spirit in Q 12:10,12 "would refer to the Spirit present with Jesus and his followers".

Jesus, wisdom, and the son of man in that it did not have a status of a primary agent. Instead, it served as a manifestation of the primary agent wisdom”.³²⁹

Mack may be on the right track in noting the connection between wisdom and the Holy Spirit. There is a wisdom oracle³³⁰ in Q 11:49-51 which precedes the cluster 12:2-12. The judgmental speech is directed against ‘this generation’. Probably the same kind of judgmental witness is implied in the court/synagogue setting in 12:11-12. The ‘teaching’ of the Holy Spirit (τὸ γὰρ ἅγιον πνεῦμα διδάξει 12:12) seems to refer to the activity of wisdom.³³¹

In conclusion we may note the close connection between the Holy Spirit and the Q message of judgment and repentance in the rhetoric of Q. The Holy Spirit is closely connected with the wisdom. This connection occurs in sections where judgmental rhetoric is apparent (Q 3:16; 12:10, 12). Rejection of the Q call to repentance means speaking against the Holy Spirit and is unforgivable. And *vice versa*, receiving the Q message and welcoming its messengers bring acceptance before the angels.

3.2.5. Q 13:35

35 ἰδοὺ ἀφίεται ὑμῖν ὁ οἶκος ὑμῶν. λέγω .. ὑμῖν, οὐ μὴ ἴδητέ με ἕως [ἤξει ὅτε] εἴπητε, εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου.

35 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!

³²⁹ Mack, *Lost Gospel*, 169-70.

³³⁰ Cf. Robinson, “The Critical Edition of Q”, 37: “a secondarily Christianized Jewish sapiential text”.

³³¹ Teaching and wisdom occur together in the LXX in 1 Esdr 8:23; Job 32:7-8, 33; Prov 4:11; Wis 6:9, 10; 7:21; 9:18. Note the connection between πνεῦμα and σοφία in Job 32:7-8; 33:4; Ps 50:8, 13 (τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον); Wis 9:17 (τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον).

This saying is part of a lament over Jerusalem (Q 13:34-35). It seems to presuppose a supra-historical figure, i.e. Wisdom, as the speaker.³³² Those addressed are the representatives of ‘this generation’, i.e. impenitent Israel.³³³

The saying contains Jewish wisdom images³³⁴ and Q 13:35b contains an obvious LXX quotation of Ps 117:26a.³³⁵ Why is the LXX citation incorporated into Q? It is probably because of the keyword ἐρχομαι and the strong thematic link with the parable of the coming master in Q 12:42-46.³³⁶ There ὁ κύριος (12:42, 43, 45, 46) is supposed to be the Son of Man (cf. 12:40). Furthermore, the saying (13:35b) provides an introduction to the following section concerning the day of the Son of Man (17:23-24).³³⁷ It refers to Jesus as the ‘coming one’ (ὁ ἐρχόμενος).³³⁸

³³² Tuckett, *Q and History*, 175; Schulz, *Q*, 351; Bultmann, *Tradition*, 120; Havener, *Sayings*, 82; Schenk, *Synopse*, 81; Uro, *Sheep*, 236-37.

³³³ The tone is similar to that of Q 11:49-51, where wisdom is mentioned *expressis verbis*.

Reed, “The Social Map of Q”, 23, puts it as follows: “This oracle challenges Jerusalem’s claim..., that it houses the divine presence and is the focal point of sacred geography”.

Schulz, *Q*, 359, asserts that „[w]ir haben hier ohne Zweifel den Höhepunkt der hellenistisch-judenchristlichen Gerichtspredigt gegen Israel vor uns“.

Horsley, “The Renewal of Israel over against Its Rulers”, 283, presents the saying Q 13:29-28 as a prophetic oracle directed ostensibly against the aristocracy in Jerusalem and as a statement immediately preceding the lament in 13:34-35.

³³⁴ Tuckett, *Q and History*, 175, notes that “the image of the hen gathering its brood has its parallels in Sir 1:15 (LXX). Further, the motif of the withdrawal of the speaker (Q 13:35a) has a parallel in the idea of Wisdom withdrawing (to heaven) when she cannot find a dwelling place on earth (1 *En* 42)”.

³³⁵ Q 13:35b may be a secondary addition appended to an earlier saying. See Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 228; Tuckett, *Q and History*, 175; Uro, “Apocalyptic Symbolism”, 96; Vaage, “Jewish Scripture, Q and the Historical Jesus”, 484. Contra Sato, *Q und Prophetie*, 157-59, who considers that Q 13:34-35 „ist in fast klassischer Strenge nach der Gattungsstruktur des Unheilwortes gebaut“.

³³⁶ Cf. Reed, “The Social Map of Q”, 34, n. 27: “The quotation of Ps. 117:26 LXX, which had been resignified as an acclamation of the priests to the pilgrims at the Feast of Booths (*m. Sukk* 3:9), was added to mock the Jerusalem religious activities: until Jesus and his message are recognized, the priest’s performances will ring hollow”.

³³⁷ Uro, “Apocalyptic Symbolism”, 97.

³³⁸ Cf. Q 3:16; 7:19. Tuckett, *Q and History*, 175, claims that “Q 13:35b receives a powerful redactional addendum in Q, looking forward to the future. In this case it is in terms the coming of the SM, and elsewhere in Q such coming is clearly associated with judgment...”. Cf. Schulz, *Q*, 360: „Längst... hat die Q-Gemeinde, wie aus dem

Uro suggests that the image of the ‘coming one’ is an important organizing factor in Q, as it occurs at the beginning of the gospel in the preaching of John (3:16), in the middle of the question asked by John’s disciples as to whether Jesus is the “coming one” (7:19) and near the end in the judgment oracle over Jerusalem (13:35). Thus “Jesus’ status as an apocalyptic figure, who is described in terms of divine Wisdom but whose *parousia* is beyond the realm of traditional language, is one of the main thrusts of the document”.³³⁹

The tone of the quotation is positive, filled with joy and praise.³⁴⁰ So this saying seems to be in contrast with those that predict unavoidable judgment on ‘this generation’. It “opens a chink of light and seems to envisage the prospect of future salvation for those addressed”.³⁴¹

We may note in Q 13:35 that the name gives authority. ‘In the name of the Lord’ thus indicates that the coming one has the authority of the Lord. The saying 13:34-35 implies that the ‘coming one’ bears the wisdom with him and that the wisdom is from the Lord.

ἦξει und ὁ ἐρχόμενος hervorgeht, die Identifizierung des Endzeitpropheten und Gesandten der Sophia Jesus mit dem apokalyptischen Menschensohn vollzogen“. Zeller, „Jesus, Q und die Zukunft Israels,“ 358, argues for the unity of Q 13:34-35 which is „die Bildung eines Urchristlichen Prophetes.“

³³⁹ Uro, “Apocalyptic Symbolism”, 95-97. Cf. Horsley, “The Renewal of Israel over against Its Rulers”, 281, suggests that Q 13:34-35 resonates the tradition of prophetic dirge and lament as apparent in Amos 5:2-3; 16-17.

³⁴⁰ Tuckett, *Q and History*, 204-5. with Uro, *Sheep*, 237 and Allison, “Matt. 23:39=Luke 13:35b”, 75.

³⁴¹ Tuckett, *Q and History*, 205 with Horn, „Christentum und Judentum in der Logienquelle“, 362. Manson, *Sayings*, 128, however, reads the saying on the background of ‘the final consummation’ and concludes that “[t]he preceding passages suggest that the meaning is: “The time will come when you will be ready to say to me, “Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord”; but then it will be too late”. Cf. Sato, *Q und Prophetie*, 157-59, who notes that in its context Q 13:35 is a saying of judgment and disaster stemming „von einem prophetischen Jesusjünger, der jesuanische „Meistersprache“ spricht“.

3.2.6. Summary

‘Holy’, ἅγιος, is essentially the qualifier of the Spirit in Q.³⁴² It refers to the message of Q, i.e. the call to repentance. The Holy Spirit connotes with judgment in that speaking against him is culpable. However, he serves as the advocate in a judicial setting. He gives the right words to be spoken before the court. Thus the Holy Spirit is the mediator and guarantor of the Q message. His aid emerges in settings of controversy.

The name is essentially equated with its bearer in Q. Thus, making the Father’s name holy means sanctifying God himself. This conforms with exorcisms and the coming of the kingdom of God. In the context of the Holy Spirit saying the petition concerning sanctification conforms with the Q message and the Q ethos as a whole.

It is worth taking a look at the following context of the prayer instruction. There is the Beelzeboul controversy that deals with the kingdom of God and the rule of Satan (Q 11:14-23). The two powers are juxtaposed antithetically. There then follows the saying concerning the return of the unclean spirit (11:24-26). What is remarkable is the associative juxtaposition of the name of the Father and his kingdom (11:2) with the rule of Satan and its unclean spirit(s) (11:18). The literary link is restricted to the key-word ἡ βασιλεία. However, associatively the sanctification of the name and the coming of the kingdom in the Lord’s Prayer are equated with exorcisms in the Beelzebul controversy. The name of the Father is holy when the rule of Satan is no longer in existence and the unclean spirits are cast out. ‘Holy’ ἅγιος and ‘unclean’ ἀκάθαρτος are contradictory. In a wider Q context this becomes apparent when considering the epithets of spirit (πνεῦμα). As noted above, ‘Holy Spirit’ (τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα) occurs in 3:16; 12:10,12. The idiom ‘unclean spirit(s)’ (τὸ ἀκάθαρτον πνεῦμα) occurs in 11:24. Thus the following context of the prayer instruction provides exorcisms and the struggle against Satan for the setting of the sanctification of the name (as well as for the coming of the kingdom).³⁴³

³⁴² This is also attested in Q 12:10, 12.

³⁴³ On the coming of the kingdom of God and the struggle against the rule of Satan, see ch. 3.3.5. below.

3.3. The Coming of the Kingdom

The word ‘kingdom, realm’ (ἡ βασιλεία) occurs 13 times in Q.³⁴⁴ Q 4:5 and 11:17 speak generally of worldly kingdoms. Q 11:18 speaks of Satan’s kingdom. ‘Kingdom of God’, ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ is attested in Q 6:20; 7:28; 10:9; 11:20, 52³⁴⁵; 13:18, 20, 28; 16:16. Connected with πατήρ, βασιλεία occurs in Q 11:2 (β. σου) and 12:31 (β. αὐτοῦ,). In the present chapter I shall concentrate on instances where βασιλεία has reference to God (or to the Father).

3.3.1. The Lord’s Prayer: Q 11:2c

In the prayer instruction of Q 11:2-4, 9-13 βασιλεία occurs in the second petition of the Lord’s Prayer (11:2c). It has the qualifying pronoun σου that refers to the address. Thus it is the coming of the Father’s kingdom that is to be prayed for. The verb ἐρχόμαι is in the active voice, unlike in the first petition which has the verb in the passive voice. There is no reference to a vehicle or to a mediator that brings the kingdom or causes it to come. Thus the rhetoric portrays it as an active power that is coming.

Norman Perrin assumes that Jesus modified the Lord’s Prayer on the basis of the synagogal Qaddish prayer. The use of these prayers by a group, that is, by those gathered for synagogue worship “means that the form of the expectation expressed by the petition, ‘May he establish his kingdom,’ will have varied from individual to individual”.³⁴⁶

There are several objections that can be raised against Perrin’s view. First, as we have noted, the use of the Qaddish as a precursor and parallel to the Lord’s Prayer is highly problematic.³⁴⁷ Second, although in the context of Q’s prayer instruction there is no one-to-one referent for

³⁴⁴ CEQ includes Lk 17:20-21 in Q in double brackets. There βασιλεία is attested twice.

³⁴⁵ CEQ follows the conjectural Mt reading and places it in double brackets.

³⁴⁶ Perrin, *Jesus and the Language*, 29. For criticism of Perrin’s view, see Räisänen, “Exorcisms and the Kingdom”, 137; Sanders, *Jesus and Judaism*, 125-129.

³⁴⁷ See pp. 94-95 above.

the kingdom, it is still not open to any “form of expectation expressed in the petition” as Perrin thinks. True enough, in the context of Q 11:2-4, 9-13 the kingdom has referents that I shall examine in due course.

The kingdom is closely connected with the Father by the word σου (Q 11:2). This indicates, first, that the kingdom is associated with the institution of *paterfamilias*. The Father is the head of his ‘household’. However, the petition implies that the kingdom is not present, but is a future realm. This points to an eschatological event.³⁴⁸

The coming of the kingdom bears similar connotations to the actions of the Father. He is the giver of ‘good things’ (11:13). The context of the Lord’s Prayer gives the kingdom material connotations. The petition following that of the kingdom concerns bread. The context suggests that the needs that are asked for, i.e. bread, cancellation of debts and surveillance, will be fulfilled by and in the kingdom. This optimistic view is confirmed in the argument of Q 11:9-13. While the Father gives ‘good things’ (ἀγαθά 11:13) to those who ask him, the kingdom can also be characterized as ‘good’. Its coming fulfils the existential, and in fact all needs of those who pray to the Father.³⁴⁹

As noted above,³⁵⁰ the prayer instruction Q 11:2-4, 9-13 and the section on cares 12:22-31 bear similar rhetorical features: the need of food and other material things (11:2; 12: 22, 29), and the generosity of the Father (11:13; 12:30). The main literary links are provided by the keywords πατήρ (11:2; 12:30) and βασιλεία σου / αὐτοῦ (11:2; 12:31).

There is, however, a slight difference in how the kingdom is portrayed in Q 12:31 as compared with 11:2. In the section on cares the kingdom is a matter of seeking (ζητεῖτε τὴν βασιλείαν.. 12:31). Thus it needs personal activity for it to be found. By implication ‘finding’ the kingdom means that the needs of the body, food and clothing, are fulfilled. Indeed, the admonition to ‘seek’ is also attested in the prayer instruction (11:9), but there its primary referent is not the kingdom.³⁵¹ The petition concerning the coming of the kingdom refers to an event that

³⁴⁸ Hoffmann, „Mutmassungen über Q“, 270.

³⁴⁹ Cf. Uro, “Apocalyptic Symbolism”, 89: “The kingdom... seems to be a kind of abstraction of all the good things expected from God by the group”.

³⁵⁰ See above ch 3.1.7.

³⁵¹ Contra Tuckett, *Q and History*, 154.

should be realized in the near future. However, any catastrophic overtones are lacking.³⁵²

Leif Vaage views the kingdom of the Lord's Prayer in the context of the Beatitudes, the mission discourse and the section on cares: "The kingdom here (in Q 11:2) is a matter of bodily sustenance, just as in 6:20b having a share in 'God's kingdom' means being happy and in 10:9 the experience of renewed health. For the persons whom Q represents, without a beggar's bag or any other visible means of support (10:4), depending on the hospitality of strangers (10:5-6), hoping that the good fortune of the ravens and the lilies would be theirs as well (12:22-31), regular meals could reasonably be called a kingdom come".³⁵³

Vaage correctly views the links between the prayer instruction, the Beatitudes and the section on cares. However, he does not take into account the immediate context of the Lord's Prayer. The setting of the prayer instruction Q 11:2-4, 9-13 does not refer to an itinerant life-style with its poverty and lack of 'regular meals', but to a household meal setting where father and son (in fact the whole household) are having a meal of bread and fish (Q 11:11-12). The rhetorical appeal τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν (11:11) implies the institution of *paterfamilias*. They, together with the *a minore ad maius* conclusion (11:13), also give the kingdom social and indeed household connotations.³⁵⁴

3.3.2. Q 6:20

20 μακάριοι οἱ πτωχοί, ὅτι [ὑμετέρα] ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ.

20 Blessed are [«you»] poor, for God's reign is for [you].

³⁵² Kloppenborg Verbin, "Discursive Practices", 165-66.

³⁵³ Vaage, *Galilean Upstarts*, 59. Rengstorff, *Lukas*, 134, claims a connection between the command to pray for more workers to go into the harvest (Q 10:2) and the kingdom petition. However, the literary basis for such a connection is vague.

³⁵⁴ Similarly Moxnes, "What is Family?", 33.

Q 6:20b commences a set of four beatitudes, three of which are similar in structure.³⁵⁵ Q 6:20b-21 does not contain references to the eschatological event despite the future tenses in 6:21.³⁵⁶ Only the last beatitude 6:22-23, which is structurally and thematically³⁵⁷ different, expresses the expectation of an eschatological reward (...ὁ μισθὸς ὑμῶν πολὺς ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ). In the first three beatitudes οἱ πτωχοί, (6:20b), οἱ πεινῶντες (6:21a) and οἱ κλαίοντες (6:21b) are juxtaposed. Material needs, first and foremost food, are to the fore. The adjective πτωχός indeed refers to a poor man or a beggar who lacks even the basic material necessities.³⁵⁸ This indicates that poverty and hunger characterize those who are πτωχοί, that is, the Q people. Thus πτωχός and βασιλεία seem to have implications for their social identity.³⁵⁹ The kingdom seems to

³⁵⁵ The beatitudes of the poor, hungry and mourning begin with the formula μακάριοι and end with an argumentative ὅτι -clause. The fourth beatitude Q 6:22 breaks this structure and probably betrays a later origin. See Robinson, “Building Blocks in the Social History of Q”, 99-100.

Arnal, *Village Scribes*, 190, presents the development of the Beatitudes Q 6:20-23 in six stages: 1) three loose beatitudes; 2) serialization of the beatitudes; 3) addition of an original persecution beatitude; 4) modification of the persecution beatitude: addition of a ἔνεκα / ἔνεκεν (on account of) clause (Q 6:22c); 5) association of four beatitudes with the discourse concerning love of enemies (Q 6:27ff.); 6) the addition of Q 6:23c, “for so their fathers did to the prophets”. Thus stage 5 accords with the Q¹ redaction and stage 6 with the Q² redaction.

Schulz, *Q*, 57, argues that the Beatitudes belong to the earliest stratum of Q under the title „Eschatologischer Geistbesitz im Leben und Apokalyptische Naherwartung“.

Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 219-20, has pointed out that the structure and content of Q 6:20b come close to the sapiential idiom. According to Schulz, *Q*, 80, „[d]ie letzten Seligpreisungen sind keine Weisheitssprüche, sondern prophetischer Zuspruch und Zuruf vor dem nahen Ende / wie in Apokalyptik.“

³⁵⁶ Contra Tuckett, *Q and History*, 142-43; Hoffmann, *Studien*, 38-39.

Tuckett, *Q and History*, 226, argues that there is a link between Q 6:20b-21 and Isa 61 (as well as Q 7:22-23). This link claims that the promises of OT prophecy are now being articulated afresh in the preaching of Jesus. He is the one anointed by the Spirit to evangelize the poor, i.e. the eschatological prophet.

³⁵⁷ Q 6:22-23 implies public insult and some kind of persecution.

³⁵⁸ In Greek πένης is distinguished from πτωχός and means ‘a day-labourer’.

³⁵⁹ Manson, *Sayings*, 47, argues that the imagery of hunger is not to be taken literally but in the same way as in Mt. He notes that in Ps. Sal. 10:7 and the Talmud (Ber 6b) the word ‘poor’ is a synonym for ‘pious’ and in Q also it is used in the same sense. However, the context refers to hunger (Q 6:21) and thus points to concrete poverty, not piety. Thus also Schenk, *Synopse*, 25. For a concrete social setting of the beatitudes, see Neyrey, “Loss of Wealth, Loss of Family and Loss of Honour”.

have communal connotations. The present ἐστὶν (6:20b) indicates a realm that is a present reality.³⁶⁰ The kingdom is already here.

The need of food connects the beatitudes of the poor and the hungry (Q 6:20-21) with the prayer instruction (11:2-4, 9-13). There the implied audience are to pray for their daily bread and to trust in the superabundance of the Father. In both sections the main issue is material necessities and, to put it precisely, the need of food. By implication this need is to be fulfilled in the kingdom.

In the beatitude of the poor the question is one of real poverty. It speaks of people who live „an der Grenze des Existenzminimum“. ³⁶¹ This becomes clear from the context of the saying. In Q 6:21a the hunger is real and will be really satisfied. However, Sato notes „eine gewisse Trennungslinie zwischen dem ersten und den nächsten zwei Makarismus erkennbar“. ³⁶² The first beatitude is not as concrete as the others. However, in the context of the prayer instruction (11:2-4, 9-13) and the section on cares (12:22-31) the connotations of the kingdom are the material and existential needs of men and women.

Indeed, the first beatitude Q 6:20b promises the kingdom to the poor. It is understood as the present property of a group, not of an individual. In the context of the following beatitudes the kingdom can be seen as something to become fully real in the future. As Kloppenborg Verbin puts it, “in the rhetoric of Q 6,20b-35 the beatitude (6:20b) does not in the first place invoke an apocalyptic fantasy of reversal of economic states, but belongs to the elaboration of a critique of existing social states and the proposal for an experiment in transformative behavior”. The conviction of Horsley may be on the right track, as he associates 6:20b with ideas of jubilee and sabbatical debt-cancellation and concrete strategies for local co-operation. ³⁶³

Vaage takes a parallel from a Cynic writing by pseudo-Crates (ep. 18) and argues that “a position of dominance could be achieved over life’s vicissitudes and misfortunes precisely by assuming up-front the predictable and proverbial trials of an impoverished life and thereby

³⁶⁰ Contra Meier, *Marginal Jew II*, 330.

³⁶¹ Sato, *Q und Prophetie*, 255. Similarly Schulz, *Q*, 81. Sato (*Q und Prophetie*, 255) argues that the ὅτι clause is eschatological (‘ὅτι eschatologicum’).

³⁶² Sato, *Q und Prophetie*, 255.

³⁶³ Horsley, *Jesus and the Spiral of Violence*, 248-55.

approximating the unperturbed felicity characteristic of divine aseity”.³⁶⁴ He does not recognize, however, the difference in comparison with Q’s rhetoric, where poverty is surely not seen as voluntary.³⁶⁵ The one who asks for bread and cancellation of debts wants to escape from his oppressive situation.

3.3.3. Q 7:28

28 λέγω ὑμῖν, οὐκ ἐγήγερται ἐν γεννητοῖς γυναικῶν μείζων Ἰωάννου· ὁ δὲ μικρότερος ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ μείζων αὐτοῦ ἐστίν.

28 I tell you: There has not arisen among women’s offspring «anyone» who surpasses John. Yet the least significant in God’s kingdom in more than he.

Q 7:28 ends the passage 7:24-28 concerning John. The passage is structured by three rhetorical questions: Τί... (7:24), ἀλλὰ τί... (7:25), ἀλλὰ τί... (7:26). These are strengthened by somewhat ironic comments. The rhetorical questions aim at the answer given in 7:26: John is ‘more than a prophet’. The characterization περισσότερον προφήτου, obviously refers to an eschatological figure.³⁶⁶ This is interpreted by a LXX quotation attesting that John was a precursor of Jesus (7:27).³⁶⁷ The concluding saying (7:28) begins with the λέγω ὑμῖν formula and is structured by the repetitive comparative μείζων + genitive. Further, the parts of the saying are connected by similar expressions: ἐν γεννητοῖς γυναικῶν.. ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ. This structure seems to juxtapose two groups, all who are born naturally and those who are in the kingdom.

³⁶⁴ Vaage, *Galilean Upstarts*, 57

³⁶⁵ Similarly Järvinen, “Jesus as a Community Symbol in Q”, 518.

³⁶⁶ Cf. Schenk, *Synopse*, 43, who puts it: „Damit meint die Q-Redaktion: Ist der engelhaftige Endzeitbote von Mal 3 auf getreten, dann ist die Endzeit angebrochen“.

³⁶⁷ The quotation seems to combine Ex 23:20 and Mal 3:1 LXX.

Many have postulated different layers in Q 7:27-28, assuming that 7:28 is a correction to 7:27.³⁶⁸ Lührmann argues that „[d]ie letzte relativierende Aussage klingt in diesem Zusammenhang befremdlich, da sie eigentlich alle vorausgehenden aufhebt“.³⁶⁹ So he considers the antithetically formed 7:28 to be an interpolation. Further, he argues that Q 16:16 (=Mt 11:12f) is the end of the unit 7:24-28; 16:16, and that the arrival of the Kingdom and the coming of John have been linked together.³⁷⁰ Taken the parable of the playing children (7:31-35) into account, 7:35 attests that not only John and Jesus, but also those who accept the message of the kingdom are in contrast with “this generation”.³⁷¹

The preceding passage (Q 7:18-23) deals with the question of John concerning ‘the coming one’. The answer is given in a LXX quotation from Isaiah.³⁷² The passage is concluded by the beatitude concerning those who are not offended ‘by me’. This saying (7:23) seems to be an interpretative gloss while it changes the preceding plural form to the singular.

It may well be that both sayings Q 7:23 and 7:28 were added to their contexts in order to draw a borderline between the activity of John and the ministry of Jesus. In the section 7:24-28 the original conclusion could have been 7:27, as there seems to be a seam between 7:27 and 7:28 expressed by λέγω ὑμῖν. However, there is no need to separate the parts of 7:28. The tightly structured form of the verse with its antithetic parallelism suggests that the verse is a unit and should not be split up.³⁷³ There is inevitably no anti-Baptist polemic to be seen, although John’s status is downgraded slightly.³⁷⁴ Schulz, however, notes that Q 7:28

³⁶⁸ Bultmann, *History*, 165; Lührmann, *Redaktion*, 27. Contra Schulz, *Q*, 233. Manson, *Sayings*, 69 removes 7:26 from Q.

³⁶⁹ Lührmann, *Redaktion*, 27.

³⁷⁰ Lührmann, *Redaktion*, 28.

³⁷¹ Lührmann, *Redaktion*, 30.

³⁷² Q 7:22 may have used several passages from Isaiah: 26:19; 29:18-19; 35:5-6; 42:6-7, 18; 61:1. See the detailed analysis by Neiryneck, “Q 6:20b-21; 7,22 and Isaiah 61”, 129-66. Also Kim, *Trägergruppe*, 190; Hüneburg, „Jesus als Wundertäter“, 638.

³⁷³ Tuckett, *Q and History*, 134.

³⁷⁴ Tuckett, *Q and History*, 132,135. Similarly Klostermann, *Mt*, 96. Schulz’s interpretation (*Q*, 235) is forced: „Auch der kleinste Jünger, Lehrer und Prophet der Q-Gemeinde überragt sowohl in der jetzt schon angebrochenen Basileia als heilvoller Endzeit wie in der in Kurze machtvoll diesen Äon beendenden Basileia bei der Menschensohn-Parusie den eschatologischen Umkehrprediger und Täufer Johannes“.

„schliesst allerdings eine Polemik gegen die konkurrierende Täufergemeinde nicht aus, sondern ein!“³⁷⁵

However, as Tuckett reminds us, the ‘final’ editor of Q did not consider contradictory views with respect to John insuperable. If he had seen them as conflicting we would have a different kind of text.³⁷⁶ And in the concluding section Q 7:31-35 John and Jesus are preachers on the same side against ‘this generation’.

Kirk argues for the unity of Q 7:24-28 on genre-critical grounds. Parallels from ancient literature “to the paradoxical sayings as well as its manifest functional unity counsel against partition of 7:28ab into tradition-history fragments derived from alleged social-history and christological shifts affecting the community’s view of John”.³⁷⁷ Further, “[u]sing a combination of comparatives and superlatives it establishes the greatness of John to introduce as a climax the surpassing greatness of the Kingdom and those privileged to belong to it”.³⁷⁸

Kirk further notes that Q 3:16-17 and 7:24-28 share the same motifs and structural devices. He states that “[c]omparison of rank and role as well as a corresponding effort at *hierarchalization* characterize both of these units”. Thus “both units conclude with a reference to those in the Kingdom: the wheat in the granary (συνάξει τὸν σῖτον αὐτοῦ εἰς τὴν ἀποθήκην) and the “least in the Kingdom” (μικρότερος...)”.³⁷⁹ Considering “εἰς τὴν ἀποθήκην” as a metaphor of the Kingdom is convincing, since 3:16 contains a promise of the Coming One who will baptize with the Holy Spirit and fire. This means division, separating the wheat from the chaff. As we shall see, the idea of division in the nearness of the kingdom also appears in the mission discourse (10:9, 11).³⁸⁰

Q 7:28 displays the conviction that any human relationship that exists outside the kingdom is put aside in the kingdom. This seems to provide a thematic link from 7:28 to John’s speech of repentance (3:7-9).

³⁷⁵ Q, 235. Similarly Hoffmann, *Studien*, 224.

³⁷⁶ Tuckett, *Q and History*, 130-131.

³⁷⁷ Kirk, *Composition*, 373 refers to *Ptahhotep* 15:2-5 and Isocrates, *Panathenaicus*, 41.

³⁷⁸ Kirk, *Composition*, 374. He argues that Q 7:24-28 has a form of *priamel* consisting of two parts: “foil” and “climax”. See Race, *Priamel*, ix-x and Berger, “Hellenistische Gattungen”, 1205-06.

³⁷⁹ Kirk, *Composition*, 378-79 (italics orig.).

³⁸⁰ See below, ch. 3.3.4.

In 3:8 John questions human blood ties. One cannot appeal to the ancestry of Abraham in order to avoid judgment. 7:28 contains a similar conviction of the downgrading of status based on human relations.³⁸¹ Those born of women are all lower in status than John. And yet even the least in the kingdom is greater than he. Both sayings are embedded in passages that include criticism of the present generation. The λέγω ὑμῖν -formula provides the literary link between the sayings.

So in Q 7:28 the kingdom is seen as a communal realm subsequent to John.³⁸² Its sympathizers are estimated on the scale ‘small’ to ‘great’. This (μικρότερος.. μείζων) seems to refer to some quality or status. To be sure, not only the colleagues of John, i.e. the envoys of Q, are meant but a larger group of people.³⁸³ Seen in the context of 7:24-25 some kind of status within the implied audience is indicated.

In addition, the kingdom is seen as a present realm. This is clear from the present tense of the verb ἐστίν and also by the preceding context of Q 7:22-23.³⁸⁴ In 7:23 ἐν ἐμοί implies the criterion for being inside the Kingdom: He who is not offended by Jesus (but not inevitably by John!) is blessed and thus an advocate of the Kingdom. However, the temporal aspect is not the main point in the saying. Instead, the communal aspect is far more prominent.³⁸⁵

3.3.4. Q 10:9

³⁸¹ The whole passage Q 7:24-28 contains criticism of those who go out to see something special.

³⁸² Uro, “Apocalyptic Symbolism”, 85. Manson, *Sayings*, 70, puts it like this: “This saying implies that the kingdom is in some real sense a present reality, and bound up with Jesus and his followers”.

³⁸³ It is unnecessary to see Jesus as the μικρότερος. Thus Hoffman, *Studien*, 221; Catchpole, *Quest*, 69; Schulz, *Q*, 234; Schenk, *Synopse*, 43. Cf. Q 17:2, where μικρός is clearly an advocate of the community. See the arguments of Uro, “Apocalyptic Symbolism”, 84, n. 52. Kim, *Trägergruppe*, 130-32, notes the link in the characterization of the Q people between the beatitudes (6:20 πτωχοί) and the saying about John (7:28 μικρότερος).

³⁸⁴ Thus also Uro, “Apocalyptic Symbolism”, 85, n. 54 who argues against the futuristic interpretation of the saying by Catchpole, *Quest*, 68.

³⁸⁵ Uro, “Apocalyptic Symbolism”, 86.

9 καὶ θεραπεύετε τοὺς ἐν αὐτῇ ἀσθεν[οῦντας] καὶ λέγετε [αὐτοῖς], .. ἠγγικεν ἐφ' ὑμᾶς ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ.

9 And cure the sick there, and say [to them]: The kingdom of God has reached you.

The kingdom saying Q 10:9 is part of the mission discourse 10:2-12 which consists of an introductory exhortation (10:2), a sending formula (10:3), instructions about the equipment (10:4-5), instructions about appropriate behaviour should the workers be received (10:6-7), the content of the mission (10:9), instructions about behaviour should the workers be rejected (10:10-11) and a concluding judgmental saying (10:12).³⁸⁶

Uro has reconstructed a basic mission charge with instructions about equipment and about correct behaviour in the case of acceptance or rejection of the mission (Q 10:4-7ab).³⁸⁷ The saying concerning the kingdom of God coming near is an addition to the basic instruction. This may be the case, but for us it is noteworthy that the kingdom saying is an elementary part of Q's mission instruction as we have it. The action of the workers (healing and preaching) and the kingdom coming near are closely connected.³⁸⁸ Exorcisms and the kingdom occur together elsewhere in Q (11:20). Thus the kingdom can be characterized as a manifestation of God's ruling activity that is realized in healing and exorcisms.³⁸⁹

The message of the workers is found in Q 10:9: ἠγγικεν ἐφ' ὑμᾶς ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ. It is connected with an admonition to heal

³⁸⁶ There is an apparent interpolation after the mission discourse in Q 10:13-15. The implied audience is changed from insiders to those outside and the textual flow is interrupted. See Arnal, *Jesus and the Village Scribes*, 178.

³⁸⁷ Uro, *Sheep*, 115. Manson, *Sayings*, 74, considers that 10:2-3, 8-12 stem from Q but 10:4-7 "form an extract from L (Lukan special source)".

³⁸⁸ Sato, *Q und Prophetie*, 130f, argues similarly for the prophetic nature of Q 10:9: „Dieser Spruch ist eine unmittelbare Zusage des Heils an die konkret Betroffenen...-diejenigen einmalig, die von den Krankheiten geheilt worden sind. Solche Deutungsworte nach der Handlung sind bei den Propheten gelaufig (Z.B. Jer 32:6-15; Ez 37:15-19; u.o.).“

³⁸⁹ Uro, "Apocalyptic Symbolism", 80, notes that this view makes it "unnecessary to ask whether the kingdom has already "arrived" or only "come near", since it is clear in both cases (Q 10:9; 11:20) that people are assumed to be under the influence of its realm".

the sick. In 10:4-11 miracles accompany the proclamation of the arrival of the Kingdom, either to encourage acceptance of the message or as a result of acceptance.³⁹⁰ The unit 10:4-11 indicates that the Kingdom has come near when its messengers have arrived. Where they are accepted, the Kingdom is accepted (10:5-9). Where the messengers are rejected, the Kingdom is also rejected (10:10-11). The conclusion to be drawn from this is that the kingdom is manifested in the preaching and healing activity of the Q messengers.³⁹¹ The speech presents the Kingdom in its twin aspects of restoration (10:9a) and judgment (10:10-11, 12, 12-15).³⁹² The saying (10:9) in the context of the threat of judgment (10:12-15) suggests that the coming of the kingdom means division.³⁹³ Those who welcome the message (and the messengers) *will* be saved on that day (ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ). Those who reject it *will* be rejected on that day.³⁹⁴ This apparently points to the eschatological event that is attested by other judgment sayings elsewhere in Q.³⁹⁵ The kingdom in 10:9 does not primarily bear eschatological connotations. It has already come near with its envoys and is manifested in exorcisms and healings.³⁹⁶

Horsley notes that “[t]he messengers’ lack of appropriate equipment for travel strongly suggests that their appearance is itself a prophetic sign that the kingdom and the movement of renewing Israel are for the poor, the villagers whose social life were threatening to disintegrate under the extreme pressures of Roman and Herodian rule in Galilee”.³⁹⁷ The lack of copper, a purse and sandals conforms to the

³⁹⁰ Schulz, *Q*, 408; Schürmann, *Lukasevangelium*, 2.74; Kirk, *Composition*, 351.

³⁹¹ Cf. Uro, *Sheep*, 155: “[T]he miracles and the missionary activity belonged together in early Christianity”.

³⁹² Horsley, “Q and Jesus”, 188; Kirk, *Composition*, 364.

³⁹³ Polag, *Christologie*, 70, 72; Schürmann, „Zeugnis“, 150; Schulz, *Q*, 411; Laufen, *Doppelüberlieferung*, 287. Kloppenborg Verbin, “Discursive Practices”, 167 claims that “Q 10,12 is almost certainly Q redaction, created on the pattern of Q 10,13-14 in order to join together the mission speech with the oracles against the Galilean towns”.

³⁹⁴ Lührmann, *Redaktion*, 59-60, considers healings as eschatological signs and the content of the preaching as having an eschatological accent that already belongs to the tradition of Q.

³⁹⁵ See Q 11:29-32; 13:29,28; 17:23-37.

³⁹⁶ Similarly Kim, *Trägergruppe*, 289. Cf. Lührmann, „Die Logienquelle und die Leben-Jesu Forschung“, 202: „In der Zeitform des Perfekts ist also formuliert, dass das Reich Gottes (in der Vergangenheit) nahe gekommen und daher jetzt nahe ist. Und das ist es, was die Ausgesandten zu verkündigen haben.“

³⁹⁷ Horsley, “Prophetic Envoys for the Renewal of Israel: Q 9:57-10:16”, 249, noting the link to the traditions of the northern Israelite prophets Elijah and Elisha.

apparent tone of urgency in the rhetoric of the mission discourse.³⁹⁸ The final judgment is expected to come in the near future, as it is already realized in the activity of the Q envoys.³⁹⁹

Arnal argues that “the reference in the Mission Speech to entering houses (Q 10:5) is almost certainly not an indication that lodging is sought but instead that these individuals are seeking a general welcome and table hospitality (a supposition supported by 10:7b, which imagines food offerings as an indication of acceptance)”.⁴⁰⁰

Arnal’s conviction receives support from the household rhetoric that is promoted in the mission speech. The kingdom is presented in household terms. The salutation of peace (10:5-6) and table fellowship (10:7-8) link the kingdom. Receiving the workers indicates the receiving of the kingdom.⁴⁰¹ The illustration of entering a house (...εἰς ἣν δ’ ἂν εἰσέλθητε οἰκίαν,... 10:5) corresponds to entering the kingdom. And *vice versa*, the symbolic gesture - shaking off dust from the feet – indicates the leaving of the kingdom and portends judgment.⁴⁰² In the mission of the Q envoys God, “the lord of the harvest”, brings and establishes the kingdom. When the messengers leave, the kingdom leaves, too.

The tone at the end of the mission speech (Q 10:11-12) is pessimistic and suggests setbacks in the success of the mission.⁴⁰³ Thus the idea of the Kingdom coming near indicates division at the same time. However, judgment is also portrayed in eschatological terms.

3.3.5. Q 11:20

20 εἰ δὲ ἐν δακτύλῳ θεοῦ ἐγὼ ἐκβάλλω τὰ δαιμόνια, ἄρα ἔφθασεν ἐφ’ ὑμᾶς ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ.

³⁹⁸ Horsley, “Prophetic Envoys for the Renewal of Israel: Q 9:57-10:16”, 249.

³⁹⁹ Similarly Hoffmann, „Mutmassungen über Q“, 270.

⁴⁰⁰ Arnal, *Jesus and the Village Scribes*, 178.

⁴⁰¹ Similarly Robinson, “The Critical Edition of Q,” 50.

⁴⁰² Sato, *Prophetie*, 306, 313; Schürmann, *Lukasevangelium*, 2.76; Uro, *Sheep*, 157-158; Hoffmann, *Studien*, 63; Laufen, *Doppelüberlieferung*, 259; Berger, *Formgeschichte*, 68; Bovon, *Lukas*, 459; Schulz, *Q*, 418.

⁴⁰³ Tuckett, *Q and History*, 187.

20 But if it is by the finger of God that I cast out demons, then God's reign has come upon you.

The *apophthegm*⁴⁰⁴ Q 11:14-23 is to be considered a composite unit.⁴⁰⁵ The keywords δαιμόνιον (11:14, 15, 19, 20), βασιλεία (11:17, 18, 20), Βεελζεβοὺλ (11:15, 19), ἐκβάλλω (11:15, 19, 20) and μερίζω (11:17, 18) occur throughout the section and give it coherence. Further, the beginning of clauses with the conditional εἰ δὲ.. (11:18, 19, 20) provides the recurring structure.⁴⁰⁶ The first two cases are connected with a rhetorical question.

The section begins with a double *chreia*.⁴⁰⁷ First, in Q 11:14 there is an action of Jesus. Second, “some” level an accusation of witchcraft, to which Jesus responds with an apt retort (11:15, 17). According to Kirk, this structure suggests that these verses constitute the core *chreia* that has formed the starting point for the elaboration.⁴⁰⁸ He compares the narratives of Q and Mark and assumes that “the Q redactor did not find the *chreia* in this stripped-down form but after it had undergone an initial elaboration (if indeed it ever existed without this expansion) by the addition of the first specifying comment in 18a... (compare Mark 3:26)

⁴⁰⁴ Bultmann, *Geschichte*, 10-12; Sato, *Q und Prophetie*, 134; Schulz, *Q*, 208: „ein erweitertes Apophthegma“. Kloppenborg, *Excavating Q*, 161, considers it as an ancient *chreia*. Similarly Humphries, *Christian Origins*, 27-45.

⁴⁰⁵ Kirk, *Composition*, 188-89 structures the passage as follows:

Programmatic Maxim (11:15, 17)

Rhetorical Questions (11:18, 19)

Central Aphorism (11:20)

Final Maxim (11:23).

Ibid., 190-91, incorporates Lk 11:21-22, an example of the Strong Man, into Q. His overcoming metaphorically describes an exorcism, with Satan presented as the vanquished Strong Man. The parable sustains the exorcism as the central motif of the cluster and rebuts the opening accusation by asserting Jesus' exorcisms to be an assault on Satan's kingdom. The defeat of the opposing kingdom and its ruler is demonstrated in Jesus' exorcisms and illustrated in the parable.

According to Manson, *Sayings*, 84-85 Q 11:17-26 is “a collection of sayings on demons and demon possession”.

⁴⁰⁶ The conditional εἰ δὲ -structure also occurs in the temptation story (Q 4:3, 9), in the inaugural speech (6:32 uncertain, see *CEQ*), in the woes against the Galilean towns (10:13), in the prayer instruction (11:13), in the section on cares (12:28) and in the saying of the householder and the thief (12:39).

⁴⁰⁷ On *chreia* in the literature of Antiquity, see Hock-O'Neil, *Chreia*.

⁴⁰⁸ Kirk, *Composition*, 184-85.

and by a version of the Strong man analogy (Mark 3:27, compare Q 11:21-22)".⁴⁰⁹ That verses 19-20 are not in Mark indicates that they were added by the Q redactor.⁴¹⁰ It is, however, improbable that Lk 11:21-22 belong to Q, though many consider so.⁴¹¹

Räsänen is correct in claiming that Q 11:20 should be read in its context and that 11:19, 20 belong together in the compositional history of Q.⁴¹² Thus, they "seem to have a *common origin*", which "*is to be sought in the Q community*".⁴¹³ There "the basic tradition" 11:(14), 15, 17-18a was "elaborated successively by vv. 19 and 20".⁴¹⁴ Räsänen concludes that "[i]n view of the literary composition of the section, the almost universally assumed authenticity of Q 11:20 must be deemed unlikely".⁴¹⁵ I agree that 11:19-20 is later material. The above notion concerning the high christology apparent in 11:20 supports its late date though the question of the authenticity of the saying is beyond the scope of this study.⁴¹⁶

The developed christological portrait of Jesus occurs in the marvelling reaction of the people after the healing (11:14: καὶ ἐθαύμασαν οἱ ὄχλοι). Jesus knows (εἰδὼς...) the thoughts of the people (11:17).⁴¹⁷ He speaks of himself as the one who has authority over

⁴⁰⁹ Kirk, *Composition*, 186.

⁴¹⁰ Sato, *Q und Prophetie*, 132, argues that Q 11:20 and 11:19 were originally separate from each other, as „[d]er Gedankengang von 11:19 zu 11:20 ist nicht deutlich“.

⁴¹¹ E.g. Fitzmyer, *Lk*, 918, 922 (“probably”); Manson, *Sayings*, 85 (“with hesitation”); Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 125; Polag, *Fragmenta*, 52; Schmithals, *Lukas*, 134 (“perhaps”); Zeller, *Kommentar*, 59.

Not in Q: e.g. Crossan, *In Fragments*, 189; Jacobson, “Wisdom Christology in Q”, 158; Lührmann, *Redaktion*, 33; Schenk, *Synopse*, 136; Schulz, *Q*, 203.

⁴¹² Räsänen, “Exorcisms”, 141. Contra Sato, *Q und Prophetie*, 132. Piper, “Jesus and the Conflict of Powers in Q”, relies on Räsänen’s contribution against Joel Marcus. Also Humphries, *Christian Origins*, 27-45.

⁴¹³ Räsänen, “Exorcisms”, 131 (*italics orig.*).

⁴¹⁴ Räsänen, “Exorcisms”, 129. Contra Labahn, „Jesu Exorzismen (Q 11,19-20)“, 624-626.

⁴¹⁵ Räsänen, “Exorcisms”, 133.

⁴¹⁶ Cf. Labahn, „Jesu Exorzismen (Q 11,19-20)“, 617-626, who argues for the authenticity of Q 11:19-20.

⁴¹⁷ Cf. Q 12:30: The Father knows the needs of his people.

Beelzebul and demons. He uses ‘the finger of God’ in exorcisms. He is the bearer of the kingdom that is almost personified in him (11:20).⁴¹⁸

In Q 11:14-23 βασιλεία occurs in three different contexts. The first is a general aphorism (11:17b) which in Kirk’s words betrays a “proverbial form of everyday wisdom about the disastrous results of dissension, filling the role of *programmatically general maxim* which forms the starting point for the elaboration”.⁴¹⁹ True, the kingdom in the aphorism has a neutral sense. This is expressed by the unqualified πᾶσα (11:17).⁴²⁰

The second instance is a rhetorical question (Q 11:18) that focuses on the kingdom in relation to Satan’s realm. The issue is how Satan’s kingdom can stand. The kingdom here has connotations of organized rule. Satan is portrayed as the head of his kingdom that still stands and is at war with God’s rule.

The third instance is God’s kingdom, which is portrayed as the contrast to Satan’s rule. The verb φθάνω, a *hapax* in Q, indicates that God’s kingdom has overtaken those who witness or experience the exorcisms. It is portrayed as an active power on the opposite side to Beelzebul and the demons. It has ‘come upon you’ in the exorcisms of Jesus.

Here the kingdom is portrayed as a present realm and the audience are presumably the same as in Q 11:19, i.e. unrepentant Israel. The exorcisms of Jesus’ opponents also seem to be accepted. As Uro notes, “[t]he exorcisms by the opponents only serve as a rhetorical means to point out the argument *a minore ad maiorem*”.⁴²¹ So the meaning is: “If it is a serious matter... to mistake the workings of God in lesser phenomena (Jewish exorcisms), how much more is it to misapprehend the

⁴¹⁸ Cf. Kirk, *Composition*, 192, who concludes that “[t]he sapiential topos of political cohesion and the folly of internal conflict is appropriated by Q for a deliberative speech demanding solidarity with Jesus, the inaugurator of the kingdom”. Cf. Sato, *Q und Prophetie*, 134: „Später ist dieser Spruch (Q 11:20) wohl zunächst mit 11:19 kombiniert, sodann dem Apophthegma der Auseinandersetzung (11:14-18) hinzugefügt worden, wobei das „euch“ auf die Gegner bezogen worden ist. Das Wunder als Erweis des Anbruches der Basileia gewinnt dadurch den Character einer polemischen - und indirekt: belehrenden - Demonstration“.

⁴¹⁹ Kirk, *Composition*, 185-86 (italics orig.) with Humphries, “Kingdom of God”, 130.

⁴²⁰ The unqualifying πᾶς also occurs in Q 11:10.

⁴²¹ Uro, “Apocalyptic Symbolism”, 82.

manifestation of the presence of the kingdom in Jesus' activity".⁴²² Piper puts it like this: "[T]here is a judgment made by *the ultimate judge*, and it is this which is signified in Q 11,20".⁴²³

It is noteworthy that the opponents can also witness Jesus' exorcisms. The kingdom is not a secret entity that is only visible to insiders. Even its opponents can witness it and participate in its activities, though to a lesser degree.

Compared with the preceding context, viz. the prayer instruction Q 11:2-4, 9-13, the Beelzebul controversy Q 11:14-23 betrays some common rhetorical features. Rhetorical questions occur as means of argumentation (Q 11:11-12). An *a minore ad maius* argument is employed explicitly in 11:13 and implicitly in 11:19-20. The connecting keyword between the sections is βασιλεία σου / τοῦ θεοῦ. (11:2; 11:20). Its coming is prayed for in the Lord's Prayer and confirmed in 11:20. The kingdom is portrayed as an active entity and power. It is a universal realm and apparent to all. The different features occur in context. In the prayer instruction the kingdom has connotations of material, good gifts. In the Beelzebul controversy the exorcisms and the conflict with Beelzebul and the demons are in the foreground.⁴²⁴ Moreover, christological speculations are far more apparent in 11:14-23 than in 11:2-4, 9-13.

3.3.6. Q 11:52

52 οὐαὶ ὑμῖν τοῖς [νομικ]οῖς, ὅτι κλείετε [τὴν βασιλείαν] τ[<οῦ θεοῦ> ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ἀνθρώπων]. ὑμεῖς οὐκ εἰσέρχεσθε [οὐδὲ] τοὺς εἰσερχομένους ἀφίετε εἰσελθεῖν.

⁴²² Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 124f. Cf. Schenk, *Synopse*, 68: „Der Argumentationszusammenhang mit der voranstehenden rhetorischen Frage zwingt jedoch zu der Konsequenz, dass auch die Tätigkeit der rabbinischen Dämonenaustreiber dann auf das Kommen Gottesherrschaft hinweist.“

⁴²³ Piper, “Jesus and the Conflict of Powers in Q”, 336 (*italics orig.*)

⁴²⁴ The activity of demons is portrayed in the following section on the return of the unclean spirit Q 11:24-26.

52 Woe to you, [exegetes of the Law], for you shut the [kingdom of <God> from people]; you did not go in, [nor] let in those «trying to» get in.

While the attestation of βασιλεία is uncertain in Q 11:52,⁴²⁵ it is sufficient for the present purpose to note the context of the saying. It belongs to a large cluster of woes (11:41-48) against the Pharisees (οἱ Φαρισαῖοι 11:39, 42, 43) and against ‘exegetes of the law’ (οἱ νομῖκοι 11:46b, 52). The kingdom is presented as a realm that can be seized and taken as property. By implication one has to enter it. The Pharisees are accused of preventing others from entering the kingdom. The rhetorical tone is the same as in the Beelzebul controversy (11:14-23). There the exorcisms are possible for the opponents of Jesus, too.

Preventing people from entering the kingdom has to do with the (false) behaviour of the Pharisees, that is, cleansing the outside of the cup (11:39), tithing but neglecting justice (11:42), loving the front seats in the synagogues and salutations in the market places (11:43), loading people with heavy burdens (11:46), and building the tombs of the prophets (11:47). These actions are in accord with rejecting the call of prophets and sages, and killing and persecuting them (11:49-51). In sum, the unrepentance of ‘this generation’ is the reason for not entering the kingdom. Respectively, accepting Q’s call indicates entering the kingdom. Right behaviour is justice and mercy (11:42), that is, cleansing the inside of the cup.

3.3.7. Q 12:31

31 ζητεῖτε δὲ τὴν βασιλείαν αὐτοῦ, καὶ ταῦτα πάντα προστεθήσεται ὑμῖν.

31 But seek the kingdom, and [all] these shall be granted to you.

⁴²⁵ *CEQ* incorporates the saying in the woes between Q 11:46 and 11:47-48.

The admonition to seek the kingdom concludes the speech on cares Q 12:22-31. The structure of the speech is illustrated above.⁴²⁶ For the present purpose it is noteworthy that βασιλεία occurs in the concluding admonition 11:31 that follows two motive clauses 11:29-30. The motive clauses contrast the “Gentiles” and the implied audience. The crucial question is the concern for material needs, food and clothing. Q is confident that the Father knows (and will supply) the needs. The aim of the speech is to encourage the Q people to seek something else than the “Gentiles”. These seek material things (πάντα γὰρ ταῦτα). Q focuses on the kingdom of God. By implication this is more than human needs. Material things, food and clothing are added as results of seeking the kingdom.

In Q 12:22-23 the soul (ψυχή) and the body (σῶμα) are ranked higher than food (τροφή) and clothing (ἔνδυμα).⁴²⁷ This comparison is associated in the juxtaposition of the needs of Gentiles with the kingdom (12:30-31). The kingdom is primary and ‘all these things’ (12:30) are secondary. Thus the kingdom connotes with soul and body, and only secondarily with food and clothing. Soul and body belong to the realm of the kingdom. The hard work of sowing and harvesting (12:24), toiling and spinning (12:27) is, if not ignored, at least put aside. Instead the kingdom is to be sought. The present imperative ζητεῖτε portrays this seeking as an ongoing activity. The seeking of the kingdom should precede and replace all other activities.

This kind of rhetoric implies that the Kingdom is something other than food or clothing.⁴²⁸ It is something that is lacking from the ‘Gentiles’ who seek (ἐπιζητοῦσιν, 12:30) material needs. It has to do with ‘your Father’ who knows (οἶδεν) all needs. The parental imagery suggests that the kingdom is portrayed as a household, a realm of *paterfamilias* who is the supplier of ‘all these things’.

The household illustration is also apparent in the prayer instruction (Q 11:2-4; 9-13). There the address with the petition of the kingdom (11:2), the examples in the form of rhetorical questions (11:11-12) and the

⁴²⁶ See ch 3.1.7. above. Sato, *Q und Prophetie*, 173, argues that v. 32 also belongs to Q, i.e. Q-Luke. However, there is no reason why Mt would have dropped v. 32 from Q.

⁴²⁷ On comparison as a rhetorical means in Q, see above p. 58.

⁴²⁸ Kirk, *Composition*, 226 with Piper, *Wisdom*, 29.

closing application (11:13) illustrate a father-son relation. There, too, the kingdom has communal connotations.

Further, the rhetoric of Q 12:22-31 implies that the kingdom of God is to be sought. Accordingly, it is to be found. The present temporal aspect is apparent.

Sato discovers an eschatological impact in Q 12:22-31: „[D]as Wissen um die wirksame Gegenwart der Basileia gehört schwerlich zur Weisheit... In diesem Mahnwort weisheitlicher Gestalt zeigt sich also ein unweisheitliches Gegenwartsverständnis. Dieses dürfte am ehesten aus der prophetischen Eschatologie stammen.“⁴²⁹ However, the gnomic future προστεθήσεται (Q 12:31) does not refer to an eschatological reversal but to the conviction that material needs are constantly added with the kingdom.

3.3.8. Q 13:18-19, 20-21

18 τίτι ὁμοία ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τίτι ὁμοιώσω αὐτήν;

19 ὁμοία ἐστὶν κόκκῳ σινάπεως, ὃν λαβὼν ἄνθρωπος ἔβαλεν εἰς [κῆπ]ον ἑαυτοῦ, καὶ ἠῤῥησεν καὶ ἐγένετο εἰς δένδρον, καὶ τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ κατεσκήνωσεν ἐν τοῖς κλάδοις αὐτοῦ.

20 [καὶ πάλιν]: τίτι ὁμοιώσω τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ;

21 ὁμοία ἐστὶν ζύμη, ἣν λαβοῦσα γυνὴ ἐνέκρυψεν εἰς ἀλεύρου σάτα τρία ἕως οὗ ἐζυμώθη ὅλον.

18 What is the kingdom of God like, and to what am I to compare it? 19 It is like a seed of mustard, which a person took and threw into his [garden]. And it grew and developed into a tree, and the birds of the sky nested in its branches.

20 [And again]: With what am I to compare the kingdom of God? 21 It is like yeast, which a woman took and hid in three measures of flour until it was fully fermented.

⁴²⁹ Sato, *Q und Prophetie*, 222.

The ‘kingdom’ is attested twice in Q 13:18-21, which contains the parables of the mustard seed and the leaven. They are structurally similar, which suggests that they have a common origin, probably in the oral phase of the tradition.⁴³⁰ Both parables begin with the introductory question τίνι ὁμοία ἐστίν.. τίνι ὁμοιώσω.. The implied speaker is Jesus. The question is answered by a clause that links the question by ὁμοία ἐστίν.. The relative clause has a participle structure (13:19: ὄν λαβῶν ἄνθρωπος.., 13:21: ἦν λαβοῦσα γυνη..).⁴³¹

The parables employ agricultural and household rhetoric, sowing (Q 13:19) and baking (13:21). Nature is portrayed as the locus and motor of growing and leavening.⁴³² The rhetoric presents the process in great contrasts. The size of the mustard seed and the leaven is tiny but the outcome of growing and leavening is huge. The rhetoric underscores the miraculous aspect of the growing and the leavening process. Human activity is needed only in the initial phase of the growing and leavening process. The focal point of the parables is the process. The mustard seed and the leaven contain the changing power(s) in themselves. As Schulz states: „Auf diesem fortlaufenden Prozess, diesem unbeirrbaren, unaufhaltsamen und kontinuierlichen Wachstum vom winzigen Senfkorn zu einer ausgewachsenen Staude, zum Baum der Basileia, liegt der Akzent.“⁴³³

The eschatological nature of the parables has been widely accepted. However, some scholars see the process of growth as a description of nature.⁴³⁴ But the tall tree at the end of the growing process, and the vast amount of dough express rather a divine miracle.⁴³⁵ So there is no need to attempt to ascertain whether the kingdom is coming immediately or over a long period of time.⁴³⁶ Alan Kirk argues that “[t]he

⁴³⁰ Q’s tendency to pair and juxtapose the sayings may confirm their origin in the oral phase of tradition.

⁴³¹ A similar structure occurs in Q 7:31-32: τίνι ὁμοιώσω... ὁμοία ἐστίν..

⁴³² Cf. Vaage, *Galilean Upstarts*, 63, who asserts a connection with Cynic nature rhetoric that aimed at “following nature”. He admits, however, that in Q 13:18, 19 “no *imitatio sinapis* is proposed”. Cf. idem “Jewish Scripture, Q and the Historical Jesus”, 486.

⁴³³ Schulz, *Q*, 302.

⁴³⁴ Kloppenborg, “Symbolic Eschatology”, 297; Mack, *Lost Gospel*, 124.

⁴³⁵ Jeremias, *Parables*, 31-32, 147 with Tuckett, *Q and History*, 143-44.

⁴³⁶ Manson, *Sayings*, 123.

growth images of a tiny seed becoming a large tree and a pinch of leaven permeating a large batch of dough express the self-understanding of the Q group; that is, they metaphorically express the sect's belief that it is the vanguard of the Kingdom about to be fully and suddenly revealed as the elect eschatological community. Though its present status is one of smallness and insignificance, even hiddenness, the group marvelously (and as ineluctably as the course of nature evident in the growth of plants and the leavening power of yeast) will be elevated to rule".⁴³⁷

Kloppenborg and Kirk argue that the parables are part of the Eschatological Discourse of Q beginning with a programmatic maxim of 12:2 and concluding with the illustration of the final judgment in 22:30.⁴³⁸ The dominant feature of the discourse is "the cohesive, coherent *linear elaborative movement from "hidden" to "revealed" which enacts a unified rhetorical (simultaneously protreptic and paraenetic) strategy*".⁴³⁹ Thus it can be classified as an extended instruction that utilizes the threat of judgment to motivate people to enter the kingdom and live there responsibly in anticipation of the revelation of the Son of Man from heaven.⁴⁴⁰

Some scholars have raised the issue of the Gentile mission within Q, arguing that Q 13:19 supports it. The birds nesting in a great tree symbolize the Gentiles coming into the Kingdom.⁴⁴¹ Tuckett is careful when noting that "one could still argue that this is part of the eschatological future, and not a feature of present reality".⁴⁴² There is an eschatological saying of people coming from all parts of the world and reclining in the kingdom (13:28-29). This apparently points to the Gentiles, but we may note that the scope of the parables of the mustard

⁴³⁷ Kirk, *Composition*, 303 with Schottroff, „Wanderprophetinnen“, 336-37; Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 223, note 214; idem, "Parables of Jesus", 309; Cotter, "Parables", 45; Hoffmann, *Studien*, 41; Manson, *Sayings*, 123; Laufen, *Doppelüberlieferung*, 178; Zeller, *Kommentar*, 82; Schenk, *Synopse*, 101; Schulz, *Q*, 302-305; Schürmann, „Zeugnis“, 162-163; Jacobson, *First Gospel*, 203-205.

⁴³⁸ Kloppenborg, "Antique Instructional Genres", 151; Kirk, *Composition*, 305.

⁴³⁹ Kirk, *Composition*, 306 (italics orig.).

⁴⁴⁰ Kirk, *Composition*, 306.

⁴⁴¹ Thus Manson, *Sayings*, 123, referring to apocalyptic and rabbinic literature. Vaage, "Jewish Scripture, Q and the Historical Jesus", 486, asserts that there is an allusion to Dan 4:20-21.

⁴⁴² Tuckett, *Q and History*, 400.

seed and leaven (13:19,21) is a divine miracle, not (at least primarily) a human (missionary) action.⁴⁴³

The kingdom is portrayed as a self-sustaining power. It is an active force that acts without human aid. The result is apparent to all. The certainty of growing and leavening is underscored. Optimism and confidence is striking. However, a similar tone is found in the rhetoric of Q 12:30-31 and 11:2-4, 9-13. There the generosity of the Father is connected with the kingdom. What is notable in the Lord's Prayer, in the section on cares and in the parables of the kingdom, is the rhetoric containing images of baking or eating bread. This suggests that the kingdom had connotations of food and table fellowship in Q's symbolic universe.⁴⁴⁴

The parables of Q 13:18-21 fit well in the following context, the eschatological banquet 13:28, 30.⁴⁴⁵ A keyword connection (βασιλεία) occurs between 13:18, 19 and 13:29. Further there may be an intentional association between the parable of the birds nesting in a huge tree and the eschatological banquet where people gather from the four corners of the earth.⁴⁴⁶

3.3.9. Q 13:29,28

29 [καὶ πολλοὶ] ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν καὶ δυσμῶν ἤξουσιν καὶ ἀνακλιθήσονται μετὰ Ἀβραὰμ καὶ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ Ἰακώβ ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ,

28 [ὕμ<εῖ>ς] δὲ ἐκβλ[ηθήσ<εσθε> εἰς τὸ σκότος το] ἐξώ[τερον]: ἐκεῖ ἔσται ὁ κλαυθμὸς καὶ ὁ βρυγμὸς τῶν ὀδόντων.

⁴⁴³ Schulz (*Q*, 304) adds (against Schniewind, *Mt*, 170): „Dieses Gleichnis erzählt weder vom Werden der Gottesherrschaft zur universalen Volkerkirche noch von der ‚allmähliche(n) Durchdringung der Welt mit den Kräften des Evangeliums.“

⁴⁴⁴ Cf. Q 13:28-30. See Uro, “Apocalyptic Symbolism”, 87: “[T]he feasting kingdom in 13:28-29 could also symbolize the meals of the Q group and non-Jewish persons participating in the community, although the primary referent is the great eschatological banquet”.

⁴⁴⁵ The immediate context, the parables of the narrow gate and closed door Q 13:24-27, gives βασιλεία connotations of a festal banquet.

⁴⁴⁶ März, „Q Rezeption“, 183; Kirk, *Composition*, 30.

29 [And many] shall come from Sunrise and Sunset and recline 28 with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob in the kingdom of God, but [you will be] thrown out [into the] out[er] darkness], where there will be wailing and grinding of teeth.

Q 13:29,28 forms a bi-partite saying. The parts appear in a different order in Mt and Lk, though that of Mt is to be followed.⁴⁴⁷

In Q 13:29,28 the kingdom is portrayed as an eschatological community.⁴⁴⁸ But who are its participants with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob? The issue as to whom πολλοὶ (Q 13:29) refers to, has not reached consensus thus far.

Tuckett suggests that “[t]he saying clearly contrasts the future fate of Jews with that of the Gentiles in the Kingdom of God and claims that Gentiles will not only come into the Kingdom but will actually replace Jews”.⁴⁴⁹ Zeller has pointed out the similar rhetorical tone in Q 13:28-30 and in the following parable of a festal banquet 14:16-24.⁴⁵⁰ The rhetoric of the banquet saying is well in accord with other Q sayings that indicate polemic against ‘Israel’ and ‘this generation’.⁴⁵¹ The parable 14:16-24 implies that ‘Israel’ was first invited to the festal banquet but rejected the call. Then it is replaced by the Gentiles.

⁴⁴⁷ CEQ follows the Mt order. Cf. Tuckett, *Q and History*, 194, who argues that the Lk order, where the weeping and the gnashing of teeth on seeing Abraham and others in the Kingdom preceding the claim that many will come from the east and the west, is probably not original. He refers to the opening ἐκεῖ, which does not fit in the Lk version (Lk 13:28) but is very much at home in Mt (8:12b).

⁴⁴⁸ Theißen, *Lokalkolorit*, 49: „Erfüllung der Sehnsucht ist ein gutes Essen im Gottesreich, das nicht als Opfermahlzeit im Tempel vorgestellt wird, sondern als Festessen im Kreis der Familienväter.“ Cf. Dahl, *Matteusevangeliet*, I, 113.

⁴⁴⁹ Tuckett, *Q and History*, 194. Schenk, *Synopse*, 105, notes that here there is „die Völkermission der Jesu-Boten im Blick und nicht eine generelle Volkerwallfahrt.“

⁴⁵⁰ Zeller, *Jesus*, „Q und die Zukunft Israels“, 361. Horsley, “Q and Jesus”, 195-96, finds a contrast between the ruling class of Israel and the Q people as attested in Q 13:28-30 and 14:16-24.

⁴⁵¹ See Q 3:7-9; 7:1-10, 31-35; 11:16-32, 39-52; 13:34-35. Cf. Tuckett, *Q and History*, 405-6; Sato, *Q und Prophetie*, 137. Schulz, *Q*, 328, claims that by ὑμεῖς „[g]emeint ist im Kontext von Q das von den Pharisäern repräsentierte, ungläubige und unbussfertige Israel...“ Weren, “From Q to Matthew 22,1-14”, argues that “the story does not concern actions of an ordinary host, but the way in which God is manifested in Jesus’ ministry”.

The metaphor of a banquet illustrating the kingdom is not at all coincidental. As we have noted above, at least some of the Q people were socially and economically marginalized. They were to pray for their daily bread beside the coming of the kingdom. The fulfilment imagery of the prayer conformed to the expectation of an eschatological banquet. This was a communal feast. Again the kingdom is portrayed in communal terms.⁴⁵²

A connection can be observed between the Lord's Prayer and the saying concerning the eschatological banquet.⁴⁵³ Both deal with the kingdom. In both food plays a central role. Both in the Lord's Prayer and in Q 13:29 the kingdom is portrayed as a future realm. The literary link is provided by the keyword βασιλεία.

It is noteworthy that in Q 13:28-30 figures from epic history, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, recline in the kingdom banquet. The kingdom is thus rooted in the Jewish epic traditions. In the context of a judgmental speech the rhetorical intention is to shun impenitent Israel, that is, those who claim to be the descendants of Abraham.⁴⁵⁴

Horsley presents the saying Q 13:29-28 as a prophetic oracle directed ostensibly against the aristocracy in Jerusalem and as a statement immediately preceding the lament in 13:34-35.⁴⁵⁵ He further notes that "[b]ecause the prophetic saying in Q 13:29-28 references Israelite tradition, "the kingdom of God" means among other things the banquet in which dispersed Israel will finally, as prophesied again and again, come from all directions to sit at table with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob – yet another vivid indication that the kingdom of God in Q is the renewal of Israel".⁴⁵⁶

What is the relation of the banquet saying to the prayer instruction? There seems to be a slight difference in the connotation of the kingdom in Q 13:28-30 as compared with 11:2-4, 9-13. In the former a festal banquet of patrons is presupposed. In the latter the associations of the kingdom refer to the ordinary food needed 'today' (11:3) and to an ordinary

⁴⁵² Thus also Uro, "Apocalyptic Symbolism", 86. Cf. Mk. 6:21 where it is supposed that only men participated in the festal meals.

⁴⁵³ De Jonge, *Christology*, 76-77.

⁴⁵⁴ Cf. the judgment speech of John at the beginning of Q (3:7-9). In other writings Abraham, Isaac and Jacob occur together in Mk 12:26 par and Acts 3:13.

⁴⁵⁵ Horsley, "The Renewal of Israel over against Its Rulers", 283

⁴⁵⁶ Horsley, "The Renewal of Israel over against Its Rulers", 283.

household meal setting with *paterfamilias* and children (11:11-12). While in 13:28-30 the kingdom is portrayed in terms of a special occasion, i.e. a festal banquet, in 11:2-4, 9-13 it is portrayed in terms of ordinary, everyday life. This difference is reasonable with respect to the implied audience. The prayer instruction is directed toward an inside group but the saying on the festal banquet is, at least in its rhetorical shape, addressed to outsiders.⁴⁵⁷

3.3.10. Q 16:16

16 ὁ .. νόμος καὶ οἱ προφῆται [ἕως] Ἰωάννου· ἀπὸ τότε ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ βιάζεται καὶ βιασταὶ ἀρπάζουσιν αὐτήν.

16 .. The law and prophets «were» until John. From then on the kingdom of God is violated and the violent plunder it.

For the present purpose it is sufficient to note that according to Q 16:16 the kingdom is somehow already a present reality. It seems to be a realm subsequent to ‘the law and the prophets.’ It is not “an actively in-breaking force, but a passive entity receiving violent attack from outside”.⁴⁵⁸

The kingdom suffers violence, but from whom? Schulz argues: „Diese gewalttätigen Feinde der Basileia, die damit als Feinde ihrer Botes verstanden werden, sind weder dämonische Geistermächte noch die Zeloten, von den Tauferjungen ganz abgesehen, sondern diese letzte, böse Generation in Israel überhaupt.“⁴⁵⁹ This view is well in accord with the critique of this generation elsewhere in Q (13:34-35). In particular, the Pharisees (11:52) are accused of closing the kingdom to those who want to enter it. Moreover, the violent fate of the prophets (11:49-51) suggests that the kingdom, too, would suffer violence. In the Q context the

⁴⁵⁷ It may be, as Zeller, „Jesus, Q und die Zukunft Israels“, 361, argues that in Q 13:28-29; 14:16-24 ‘Israel’ is the “projected audience” and the function of the cluster is to sharpen the group boundaries of the Q people. Thus ‘Israel’ is not addressed directly in the present form of the text.

⁴⁵⁸ Uro, “Apocalyptic Symbolism”, 83

⁴⁵⁹ Schulz, *Q*, 266-67.

plundering of the kingdom attested in 16:16 points to the impenitent generation, that is, those who reject Q's call. *Vice versa*, by implication the kingdom is associated with the Q ethos, its envoys and sympathizers.⁴⁶⁰

3.3.11. Summary

In sum, there are roughly two lines in the understanding of the kingdom symbol⁴⁶¹ in Q. The first line is closely connected with the existing material world of Q and the Q people.⁴⁶² The second line has to do with the eschatological and judgmental expectations of Q. This categorization is, of course very general and in many cases these two lines are intertwined.

First, the kingdom is closely connected with the Father. The kingdom is his (Q 11:2; 12:31), thus having connotations of the household and *paterfamilias*.⁴⁶³ It has to be sought and its coming is to be prayed for. In these sayings the kingdom is presented in terms of material needs. In the kingdom these needs, food and clothing, are added. Further, the kingdom of God belongs to the poor whose needs will be met (6:20-21). It is a group where birth does not play a role and even the least is greater than John, the greatest man born of woman (7:28). The kingdom is

⁴⁶⁰ The context of Q 16:16 underscores the importance of serving God rather than mammon (16:13) and the status of the law (16:17).

⁴⁶¹ 'Kingdom' can be called a symbol in Q while a symbol has by definition several referents and different connotations. See Uro, "Apocalyptic symbolism", 75-91.

⁴⁶² Cf. Kloppenborg, *Excavating Q*, 392, 395, who sums up from his stratigraphical point of view: "The kingdom sayings of Q¹ are connected with exhortations to a countercultural lifestyle that includes love of enemies, nonretaliation, debt forgiveness, and a willingness to expose oneself to danger, all undergirded by appeals to the superabundant care of a provident God... In both strata of Q Jesus is represented as intimately associated with the reign of God and not merely as its messenger".

⁴⁶³ Moxnes, *Putting Jesus in His Place*, 123, goes further: "Therefore, we may characterize the images of the kingdom of God as a household as countercultural. The images broke not only with expectations of God as king, but also with the traditional picture of a householder. The image of the father who provided for his children was emphasized, while the role of the patriarch was downplayed. He was even portrayed as a father whose authority was questioned, who was denied honor".

manifested in the healing and preaching activity of the Q workers (10:9) and in exorcisms (11:20). It is apparent to all.

Second, the kingdom has eschatological and judgmental connotations.⁴⁶⁴ Its growth from tiny to great size is a divine miracle (13:18-20). It is an eschatological festal banquet where the Gentiles gather together with the Patriarchs (13:28-30). Respectively, it indicates judgment on the impenitent generation who plunder the kingdom (16:16) and who do not enter the kingdom but close it to others, too (11:52).⁴⁶⁵

Uro poses two general characterizations of the kingdom symbolism of Q: “1) The kingdom is almost always understood positively. Images of judgment and destruction of enemies are not an integral part of the kingdom language... Basically... the kingdom is an in-group term. It is like a flag, representing at one and the same time the group, the power of its domain and the ideal order of its ethos. 2) The characterizations of the kingdom are extremely scarce in detail. Not only negative definitions, but also positive apocalyptic symbols or metaphors, such as resurrection, eternal life etc, are notable by their absence”.⁴⁶⁶

It seems to me that Uro’s characterizations are in accord with what I have written above. The ‘kingdom of God’ clearly has more than one referent in Q. It can be considered as a symbol.

⁴⁶⁴ Cf. Mack, *Lost Gospel*, 123, who notes that the kingdom of God “connotes both the power and authority of God to rule and execute a judgment, as well as a realm or domain within which God’s rule was fully actualized. The rule of God is what the Q people were representing in the world”.

⁴⁶⁵ In Q 22:28,30 there is a promise to the followers of Jesus that they would sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel. IQP reads (according to Luke 22:30) ἐν τῇ [βασιλείᾳ], while CEQ omits the reference to the kingdom. Zeller, „Jesus, Q und die Zukunft Israels“, 363-365, reads the saying in connection with the speech of the hearings before the synagogue 12:11-12 (and perhaps 6:22) noting the reversal of roles. The judged Q people will become judges.

As the reference to the kingdom in 22: 28, 30 is vague we may note the eschatological tone of the saying. It is in line with the judgment sayings against those who reject the call of Q envoys, that is, against impenitent Galilean towns (10:13-15 with a keyword link to 22:30 κρίσις - κρίνοντες and ‘this generation’ (11:31,32 κρίσις -κατακρινεῖ). See Verheyden, “The Conclusion of Q (22:28-30)”, 713-176.

⁴⁶⁶ Uro, “Apocalyptic Symbolism and Social Identity of Q”, 90-91. See the critical note of Räisänen, “Exorcisms and the Kingdom”, 141 (*italics orig.*): “Even if the symbol character of “kingdom” for the Q people is stressed, one still has to ask questions concerning the referent which *cannot* be entirely vague”.

Räsänen views the issue from a somewhat different angle, i.e. from the tradition-historical point of view. He contends: “The basileia sayings in the gospels cannot be reduced into one single conception of kingdom, but this may be caused by a number of different factors. Jesus may have used the word in more than one sense in different contexts. Different usages may also belong to different layers of tradition, whether or not we are still able to distinguish between them with any probability”.⁴⁶⁷

3.4. Bread

Bread (ἄρτος) occurs four times in Q. It is mentioned twice in the temptation story (Q 4:3, 4) and twice in the prayer instruction (11:3, 11). Further, there are several references to food and eating. Food as wages occurs in the mission speech (Q 10:7) and feeding (τρέφω) is mentioned in the section on cares (12:23, 24) and in the parable of the faithful and unfaithful servants (12:45). Eating (ἐσθίω) appears in the passage on the children in the agora (Q 7:33-34), in the mission speech (10:7), in the section on cares (12:2, 29), and in the parable of the faithful and unfaithful servants (12:45). Another verb for eating (τρώγω) occurs in the section on the coming of the Son of Man (Q 17:27).

In addition, there are references to baking bread. In Q 13:20-21 using leaven in baking provides a parable of the kingdom of God. Also, the story of the sudden coming of the Son of Man (17:35) contains an image of women grinding grain, and in 3:17 separating the wheat from the chaff provides a metaphor of judgment.

⁴⁶⁷ Räsänen, “Exorcisms and the Kingdom”, 139.

3.4.1. The Lord's Prayer: Q 11:3

Bread occurs twice in the prayer instruction Q 11:2-4, 9-13. It is found in the third petition of the Lord's Prayer (11:3) and in the argumentation of the rhetorical questions (Q 11:11). In 11:3 it has a double qualification, the possessive pronoun ἡμῶν and the attribute ἐπιούσιον. It is the singular that seems to give it a somewhat general sense. Bread seems to refer to more than to a plain loaf of bread. It seems to contain all food, that is, what is needed for subsistence.

The Lord's Prayer implies that it is the *paterfamilias* who supplies the daily ration for members of his household. This suggests that those who prayed the Lord's Prayer did not identify themselves as patrons but as members of the household who were fully dependent on the patron.

In Q 11:3 the petition of bread follows that of the kingdom. This suggests that the kingdom is associated with the basic needs of those who pray. The coming of the kingdom indicates receiving the needed bread.⁴⁶⁸

The attribute of bread, ἐπιούσιον, is an interpretational problem of long standing. The interpretations have varied from future-eschatological⁴⁶⁹ to concrete⁴⁷⁰ ones. Some suggest a balanced view that combines both aspects.⁴⁷¹ In the present study it is most reasonable to consider the word in its context, that is, in the Lord's Prayer and in the prayer instruction. Here it seems to refer to things that are needed, i.e. current material needs, especially food. The definition 'today' (σήμερον, 11:3) points in the same direction. Thus the *hapax legomenon* ἐπιούσιον

⁴⁶⁸ The same conviction is also found in the Beatitudes Q 6:20-21, and in the section on cares 12:30-31.

⁴⁶⁹ See Jeremias, *Prayers*, 99-102; Meier, *Marginal Jew II*, 301.

⁴⁷⁰ See Catchpole, *Quest*, 224: "The bread petition in the Lord's Prayer is the first of the noneschatological trio.."; Kloppenborg Verbin, "Discursive Practices", 176-77: "[I]t deals with daily subsistence"; Piper, "Wealth, Poverty and Subsistence", 247: "And the needs appear to be real"; Robinson, "Jesus of Q", 263: "The petition of bread is meant literally"; Schulz, *Q*, 91: „...das notwendige Existenzminimum“. Allison, "Q's New Exodus and the Historical Jesus", 399, argues for the probable allusion to the story of Manna in Ex. 16.

⁴⁷¹ Jeremias, *Abba*, 166-67: „Im Bereich der Königsherrschaft Gottes sah er (Jesus) alles Irdische als geheiligt an.“

should be interpreted in the same context as “just enough, in other words, to get by on”.⁴⁷²

3.4.2. Q 3:17

17 οὐ τὸ πύον ἐν τῇ χειρὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ διακαθαριεῖ τὴν ἄλωνα αὐτοῦ καὶ συναξει τὸν σῖτον αὐτοῦ εἰς τὴν ἀποθήκην αὐτοῦ, τὸ δὲ ἄχυρον κατακαύσει πυρὶ ἀσβέστῳ.

17 His pitchfork «is» in his hand, and he will clear his threshing floor and gather the wheat into his granary, but the chaff he will burn on a fire that can never be put out.

The raw material of bread, the seed of wheat σῖτον is attested in Q only in the passage concerning John’s preaching of the coming one (Q 3:16-17). The metaphor of separation of the wheat from the chaff promotes judgmental rhetoric. Gathering the wheat into the granary refers to baptism in the Holy Spirit (3:16). The rhetoric implies that those to be saved are the wheat and those to perish are the chaff. Hence the high value of wheat is attested. ‘The coming one’ is portrayed as a farmer or a householder who uses his winnowing fork for threshing. Ordinary agricultural imagery is in evidence.

The image of gathering into the granary occurs almost *verbatim* in Q 12:24. Here, however, the context is different. The theme is not judgment but anxiety about food and clothing.

3.4.3. Q 4:3,4

3 καὶ εἶπεν ὁ διαβόλος· εἰ υἱὸς εἶ τοῦ θεοῦ, εἶπὲ ἵνα οἱ λίθοι οὗτοι ἄρτοι γένωνται. 4 καὶ ἀπεκρίθη [πρὸς αὐτὸν] ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Γέγραπται ὅτι Οὐκ ἐπ’ ἄρτῳ μόνῳ ζήσεται ὁ ἄνθρωπος

⁴⁷² Vaage, *Galilean Upstarts*, 59. He refers to the Cynic texts of Dio Chrysostom, *Or.* 36.36 and Epictetus, *Diss.* 3.12.13.

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.

In the first temptation the devil asks Jesus to transform a stone into bread. Bread is presented as the first means to test the loyalty of Jesus. The need of food is by no means ignored. However, the quotation from Dt 8:3 LXX states the hierarchy: "No one can live by bread alone".⁴⁷³ The initial status of the bread temptation may reflect the ethos of the Q people. Loyalty to God is primary. Physical needs should come after obedience to what God speaks.⁴⁷⁴

The first temptation suggests the legitimation of the existing status of the Q people. When the temptation story is seen as a paradigm for the behaviour of the Q people, there is a hidden critique of any attempt to change the status by appealing to God. The quotation from Dt 8:3 LXX expresses the reasoning for the behaviour. In all the temptations the idea is the same, i.e. to avoid the change of the existing status by means of divine intervention.

There are several literary links between the temptation story and the prayer instruction. The couplet ἄρτος - λίθος occurs together in Q 4:3 and 11:11. The verb πειράζω is found in 4:2, πειρασμός in the Lord's Prayer 11:4.

In the Lord's Prayer the verb εἰσφέρω implies that the temptation is understood spatially, i.e. one may go into (εἰς) it. In the temptation story Jesus goes into the wilderness, that is, the place of testing. As will be seen, the testing place that is implied in the Lord's Prayer is the public assembly.⁴⁷⁵

⁴⁷³ On the use of Dt. 8:3 in Q 4, see Hieke, „Schriftgelehrsamkeit“, 46-51.

⁴⁷⁴ Obedience to God is underscored in other temptations also tempting the Lord (Q 4:9-12) and the temptation of glory and power (4:5-8).

Manson, *Sayings*, 43, notes that this "challenge to the Messiah... may best be explained by reference to the current belief that the Messianic Age would be marked by a miraculous abundance of material goods".

⁴⁷⁵ See ch. 3.6.3. below.

3.4.4. Q 6:21

21 μακάριοι οἱ πεινῶντες, ὅτι χορτασθήσ[εσθε]. μακάριοι οἱ [πενθ]ο[υ]ντες, ὅτι [παρακληθήσ<εσθε>].

21 Blessed are [«you»] who hunger, for [you] will eat [your] fill. Blessed are [«you»] who [mourn], for [<you> will be consoled].

Q 6:20-21 provides three beatitudes of similar structure. In the second one the theme is hunger, which is expressed by the participle πεινῶντες. The promise of being filled is in the future voice and the implied audience is narrowed by the second plural [παρακληθήσ<εσθε>].⁴⁷⁶

The reference to the poor in the first beatitude (Q 6:20) provides the context for the beatitude of hungering. First, those who hunger are associated with the poor, πτωχοί. The most urgent need of those addressed is the shortage of food. However, the rhetoric seems to imply that they receive some food but not enough. They cannot be satisfied. Second, the context suggests that their hunger will be satisfied in the kingdom of God. The promise is that the hungry will receive sufficient sustenance when the kingdom of God belongs to them. Basic material needs are connoted with the kingdom.

Thematically the narrative of the eschatological banquet (Q 13:29, 28) draws near to the Beatitudes. The eschatological banquet implies a future state of being filled. This is promised explicitly in 6:21. Further, being filled and reclining at the banquet are to be realized in the kingdom of God. Thus the kingdom refers in both instances to a future state where material needs are met.⁴⁷⁷

3.4.5. Q 7:33-34

⁴⁷⁶ CEQ follows the Lk reading.

⁴⁷⁷ The same conviction occurs in the section on cares (Q 12:30-31).

33 ἦλθεν γὰρ Ἰωάννης μὴ .. ἐσθίων μήτε πίνων, καὶ λέγετε·
δαιμόνιον ἔχει.

34 ἦλθεν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐσθίων καὶ πίνων, καὶ λέγετε·
ἴδου ἄνθρωπος φάγος καὶ οἰνοπότης, τελωνῶν φίλος καὶ
ἁμαρτωλῶν.

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

Eating occurs in the passage concerning the children in the agora Q 7:31-35, where John and Jesus, the Son of Man, are contrasted. John is characterized as an ascetic who does not eat or drink. Jesus, on the contrary, is portrayed as ‘a glutton and drunkard’ (φάγος καὶ οἰνοπότης, 7:34).

It is noteworthy that Q portrays the juxtaposition of John and Jesus in terms that promote communal meal imagery. According to his opponents, the Son of Man is presented in terms of gormandizing and drinking. These are associated with the friendship of ‘tax collectors and sinners’. The friendship is manifested in shared meals.⁴⁷⁸ This seems to indicate that the Q people had a moderate attitude towards eating and drinking. At least ascetism is not recommended or required. The focus is on the obedience of the ethos of John and Jesus, the inaugurators of the kingdom. According to 7:31 they are set on the same side against ‘this generation’.

The rhetorical strategy of Q 7:31-35 uses the accusations of the opponents of Jesus and John ironically. The parable of the children in the agora (7:31-32) presents two groups. One group calls the other to dance and to mourn but they refuse to accept the call. Accordingly, the call of John and Jesus is rejected due to their exceptional behaviour. These artificial accusations are placed ironically in the mouths of the opponents. The focus is on the hopeless state of ‘this generation’. It does not receive

⁴⁷⁸ Holmén, “Knowing about Q and Knowing about Jesus”, 506. Koch, *Tischgemeinschaft*, 64, argues for the unity of Q 7:34, as both double characterizations, ‘glutton and drunkard’ and ‘friend of toll collectors and sinners’, stand in contrast to John.

John or Jesus the Son of Man. They are both messengers of ‘wisdom’ (ἡ σοφία, 7:35).

3.4.6. Q 10:7

7 [ἐν αὐτῇ δὲ τῇ οἰκίᾳ] μέν[ε]τε «ἐσθίουντες καὶ πίνοντες τὰ παρ’ αὐτῶν»· ἄξιός γάρ ὁ ἐργάτης τοῦ μισθοῦ αὐτοῦ.

7 [And at that house] remain, «eating and drinking whatever they provide», for the worker is worthy of one’s reward.

The mission speech Q 10:2-12 contains instructions to stay in the house that receives Q workers. The instruction advises them to ‘eat and drink whatever they provide’ (10:7). This is based on a general wisdom maxim ‘for the worker is worthy of his reward’.

Staying in a house and eating there indicate table fellowship under the leadership of the *paterfamilias*. Further, Q 10:9 attests that the arrival of the Q workers (and the curing of the sick) indicates the coming of the kingdom. It seems that a common meal was connoted with the kingdom.⁴⁷⁹

The instructions as to what to do in houses suggest that common meals played a crucial role in the social intercourse of the Q people. On the symbolic level, table fellowship has connotations of the kingdom.⁴⁸⁰ Moreover, the instruction to eat and drink what is offered indicates that Q was not anxious about the purity rules concerning food.⁴⁸¹

The liberal relationship toward food and drink implied in the mission speech (Q 10:7) is attested elsewhere in Q. As noted above, in 7:34 Jesus is accused of being a glutton and drunkard. To be sure, the purity rules are nowhere explicitly ignored. However, they do not play a

⁴⁷⁹ Cf. Q 13:28-30, where the kingdom is presented in terms of a festal banquet with the Patriarchs.

⁴⁸⁰ Cf. Uro, “Apocalyptic Symbolism”, 87, referring to Q 13:28-30.

⁴⁸¹ Note the critique of the Pharisees for cleansing only the outside of the cup in Q 11:39-40.

major role in Q ethos. The focus is on promoting the message and ethos of the kingdom, that is, healing and preaching.

3.4.7. Q 11:11

11 ... τίς ἐστὶν ἐξ ὑμῶν ἄνθρωπος, ὃν αἰτήσῃ ὁ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ ἄρτον, μὴ λίθον ἐπιδώσῃ αὐτῷ;

11 ... what person of you, whose child asks for bread, will give him a stone?

I have already discussed the keyword and thematic connection of the Lord's Prayer and the following argument.⁴⁸² As in Q 11:3 in 11:11, too, bread is in the singular. It occurs in a concrete meal setting and is juxtaposed with a stone. The household setting implied in 11:11 suggests that bread (and fish) was the staple food in the Q households.⁴⁸³ Further, the concrete rhetoric of 11:11-12 suggests that ἀγαθά in 11:13 refers to the material needs of the implied audience and not to eschatological blessings.⁴⁸⁴ Accordingly, 'bread' does not contain such future connotations.

3.4.8. Q 12:22, 23, 29

22 διὰ τοῦτο λέγω ὑμῖν· μὴ μεριμνᾶτε τῇ ψυχῇ ὑμῶν τί φάγητε, μηδὲ τῷ σώματι ὑμῶν τί ἐνδύσηθε. 23 οὐχὶ ἡ ψυχὴ πλείον ἐστὶν τῆς τροφῆς καὶ τὸ σῶμα τοῦ ἐνδύματος.

29 μὴ [οὖν] μεριμνήσητε λέγοντες· τί φάγωμεν; [ἢ]· τί πίωμεν; [ἢ]· τί περιβαλώμεθα;

⁴⁸² See ch 2.1.1. above.

⁴⁸³ Cf. Catchpole, *Quest*, 212.

⁴⁸⁴ Catchpole, *Quest*, 214. Contra Tuckett, "Q, Prayer and the Kingdom", 472-76; idem, *Q and History*, 349.

22 Therefore I tell you, do not be anxious about your life, what to eat, nor about your body, with what you are to clothe yourself. 23 Is not life more than food, and the body than clothing?

29 [So] do not be anxious, saying: What are we to eat? [Or:] What are we to drink? [Or:] What are we to wear?

The section Q 12:22-31 is a block where, according to some scholars, there are sayings that do not match each other. Many scholars agree that 12:23 has a different emphasis than 12:22, 24 and 26-28.⁴⁸⁵ 12:23 contains a contrast between the pairs soul - body (ψυχή - σῶμα) and food – clothing (τροφή – ἐνδύμα). The former are to be preferred over the latter. In 12:22, 24, 26-28 the motive is the assurance that God will provide everything needed. It is more plausible that 12:23 was added to the earlier tradition than *vice versa*.⁴⁸⁶

Also, Q 12:25 seems to interrupt the chain of argument. There are the twin appeals to examples from nature (ravens and lilies) in 12:24, 26-27.⁴⁸⁷ In 12:25 the mode of argument is changed. Now it is based on the human inability to solve the problems of anxiety. The diverging tone in the argumentation suggests that 12:25 is a later interpolation in earlier material.⁴⁸⁸

In addition, there seems to be an insertion in Q 12:30a, 31.⁴⁸⁹ The former has a reference to the Gentiles and the latter to the kingdom. It shifts the argument from the natural order and God's care to the contrast between the implied audience and the Gentiles.⁴⁹⁰

Thus the original tradition seems to have comprised Q 12:22, 24, 26-28, 29, 30b.⁴⁹¹ The argument is later concluded by an exhortation to 'seek the kingdom of God' with its promise of receiving 'these things' (ταῦτα).

⁴⁸⁵ Catchpole, *Quest*, 31-32; Tuckett, *Q and History*, 149 and others.

⁴⁸⁶ Tuckett, *Q and History*, 149.

⁴⁸⁷ It is unnecessary to see two originally separate sayings in vv. 24-28, as does Schenk, *Synopse*, 91-92.

⁴⁸⁸ Schulz, *Q*, 152.

⁴⁸⁹ Thus Schenk, *Synopse*, 92.

⁴⁹⁰ Catchpole, *Quest*, 34.

⁴⁹¹ Catchpole, *Quest*, 34; Tuckett, *Q and History*, 149.

As Tuckett states, “this stratification now has important consequences to the whole section at the level of Q”.⁴⁹² The twin appeal to ravens and lilies and the exhortation to trust in God’s provision is the kernel that is completed by the appeals to human experience and by the exhortation to seek the kingdom. The connecting keyword in the early text is μεριμνάω (Q 12:22, 26). On the final level the focus is placed on the kingdom. And as Tuckett notes, the appeal not to worry is not only a matter of thought but also of action.⁴⁹³

Alan Kirk has strongly defended the unity of the cluster on form-critical grounds. He has pointed out that the structure of Q 12:22-31 fits extremely well with the ancient instruction speeches and with those elsewhere in Q.⁴⁹⁴ While the section 12:22-31 will be considered as a coherent unit in its present (final) form, this by no means ignores the possible diversity of tradition behind the cluster. Indeed, during the tradition process the selection of material formed a coherent unity according to the theme of cares.

The whole cluster Q 12:22-31 concerns the issue of food and clothing. The programmatic admonition in 12:22 has maxim-like properties and makes a general observation about human behaviour.⁴⁹⁵ The motif in 12:23 expresses a maxim in the form of a rhetorical question.⁴⁹⁶ It is aphoristic and somewhat enigmatic, thus leaving undefined what the more of life may be and opening the door for further deliberation.⁴⁹⁷ The keyword, μεριμνάω, is repeated throughout the composition (12:22, 25, 26, 29). The theme expressed by the keyword is discussed in sequence, first food in 12:24, then clothing in 12:26-28.

The ravens/lilies illustration takes an analogy from nature supporting the programmatic admonition of Q 12:22, thus conforming to conventional wisdom argumentation.⁴⁹⁸ It concludes with an *a minore ad maius* argument in the form of a rhetorical question, thus bringing home

⁴⁹² Tuckett, *Q and History*, 150.

⁴⁹³ Tuckett, *Q and History*, 150-51.

⁴⁹⁴ Kirk, *Composition*, 218. Cf. Allison, *Jesus Tradition*, 24: “We can be fairly confident that the common structure is due to deliberate editorial factory”.

⁴⁹⁵ Kirk, *Composition*, 218 with Betz, *Commentary*, 461, 471.

⁴⁹⁶ Kirk, *Composition*, 218 and others.

⁴⁹⁷ Mack, *Rhetoric*, 51.

⁴⁹⁸ Kirk, *Composition*, 219 with Kloppenborg, *Formation* 217; Zeller, *Mahnsprüche*, 84-85.

the point of the illustration for human life (12:28: πόλλω μᾶλλον...)⁴⁹⁹ The same kind of argument is found in the prayer instruction (Q 11:2-4, 9-13), where an *a minore ad maius* argument is taken from the relation between children and parents (11:13: πόσω μᾶλλον...). The illustration of ravens (12:24) taken from nature gives justification to the programmatic admonition not to be anxious for basic necessities. It demonstrates the providential care of God for his creatures. This care is observable to all in the course of nature.⁵⁰⁰ The rhetoric does not allow finding any eschatological expectations in 12:22-31.⁵⁰¹ Indeed, the kingdom is presented as a present entity that is to be sought and that can be found at the present time. It is associated with material needs, food and clothing.

In Q 12:22-32 there is a strong reliance that God fulfils the necessities of his creatures one day at a time. True, the ravens do not have storage for long-term needs (12:24). In any case, God feeds them one day at a time. And the grass of the field is growing today (σήμερον, 12:28), but tomorrow will be thrown into the oven. These arguments taken from nature indicate that it is enough to have food and clothing one day at a time. This suggests that the petition for τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν τὸν ἐπιούσιον in the Lord's Prayer (11:3) also concerns the subsistence of "today" (σήμερον), that is, the bread which is needed today.

Q 12:22-32 implies that it is, if not impossible, very hard for the Q people to receive *more* than is needed for subsistence. Toil does not add material requirements. This being so, Q argues, whether intentionally or not, for the economic *status quo* of the Q people. The aim of the Q rhetoric is the acceptance of the present material status, because the most urgent issue is the kingdom of God, and not seeking prosperity. To be sure, poverty is not implied. Q does not represent rigourism or ascetism but moderation. Necessary daily subsistence is promised to those who seek the kingdom.⁵⁰²

There is no need to view the cluster Q 12:22-32 against an eschatological background.⁵⁰³ Accepting material needs, using arguments

⁴⁹⁹ Kirk, *Composition*, 219; Zeller, *Mahnsprüche*, 84-85; von Lips, *Weisheitliche Traditionen*, 207.

⁵⁰⁰ Kirk, *Composition*, 219; Piper, *Wisdom*, 28; Schulz, *Q*, 155, note 131.

⁵⁰¹ Contra Tuckett, *Q and History*, 150-51.

⁵⁰² Manson, *Sayings*, 111, puts it as follows: "Material things are not, however, despised or rejected. They are put in their place".

⁵⁰³ Thus Schulz, *Q*, 154-55.

from the ever-continuing course of nature, comparing the brevity of life with growing grass (12:28) and the admonition to seek the kingdom indicate a this-worldly ethos. No eschatological enthusiasm is attested.⁵⁰⁴ The Kingdom is supposed to be found by seeking it.

Many have argued that the speech Q 12:22-31 is addressed to wandering itinerants who had left everything and were living “under the harshness of the free existence of the wandering charismatics”.⁵⁰⁵ However, the rhetoric does not support such an interpretation. Quite on the contrary, the setting implied in the section on cares seems to point to people with settled living conditions. They sow, harvest and gather into the granary (12:24). They toil and spin (12:27). Thus they perform ordinary household duties. The rhetoric of Q 12:22-31 betrays “ordinary people’s realistic anxieties about the basic necessities of life, food and clothing”.⁵⁰⁶

Kirk suggests that the implied audience of Q 12:22-30 is really poor.⁵⁰⁷ However, nothing in the section supports this conviction and it seems that it is based on the itinerant hypothesis. Arnal has pointed out that the rhetoric of 12:22-30 does not make sense for the poor and destitute. It by no means implies poverty. Quite on the contrary, ‘considering the ravens’ does make sense only if those addressed can afford more than the basic daily necessities. Thus, “Q addresses itself, at least in part, to the relatively wealthy”.⁵⁰⁸

3.4.9. Q 12:42, 45

42 τίς ἄρα ἐστὶν ὁ πιστὸς δοῦλος [καὶ] φρόνιμος ὃν κατέστησεν ὁ κύριος ἐπὶ τῆς οἰκετείας αὐτοῦ τοῦ δο[ῦ]ναι [αὐτοῖς] ἐν καιρῷ τὴν τροφήν.

⁵⁰⁴ Contra Schulz, *Q*, 157.

⁵⁰⁵ Theissen, *Sociology*, 13. Cf. Allison, *Jesus Tradition*, 22-23; Luz, *Matthäus*, 366-67; Tuckett, *Q and History*, 390-91.

⁵⁰⁶ Horsley, “Q and Jesus”, 203. Contra Jacobson, “Jesus against the Family”, 195.

⁵⁰⁷ See Kirk, *Composition*, 224.

⁵⁰⁸ Arnal, *Jesus and the Village Scribes*, 174.

45 ἐὰν δὲ εἴπῃ ὁ δοῦλος ἐκεῖνος ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ· χρονίζει ὁ κύριος μου, καὶ ἄρξεται τύπτειν τοὺς [συνδούλους αὐτοῦ], ἐσθί[η] δὲ καὶ πίν[η] μετὰ τῶν μεθυ[όντων]..

42 Who then is the faithful [and] wise slave whom the master put over his household to give [them] food on time?

45 But if that slave says in his heart: My master is delayed, and begins to beat [his fellow slaves], and eats and drinks [with the] drunk[ards]..

The parable of the faithful and unfaithful slaves follows the parable of the householder and the thief (Q 12:39-40). It concerns readiness for the unexpected coming of the Son of Man. Q 12:42-46 continues the theme of the unexpected arrival of the master.

The keywords δοῦλος (Q 12:42, 43, 45, 46) and κύριος (12:42, 43, 45, 46) occur throughout the parable and give it coherence. In the present state the parable serves as an exhortation to the implied audience. The focus is on the right behaviour for the unexpected coming of the Son of Man.

The rhetoric portrays this focus by presenting an ideal follower who is obedient to his master (Q 12:42-43). His task is to give those in the household their food (12:42: τὴν τροφήν) on time. The wise slave is blessed (μακάριος, 12:43) and he will be appointed over all the master's possessions (12:44). Food is by implication the basic provisions, no more, no less.

The other part of the parable (Q 12:45-46) portrays an unfaithful slave. The reasoning for his behaviour is expressed in terms of delay of the master. The wrong behaviour is beating fellow-slaves, eating and drinking. These occur in a fully negative context. They are presented as the condemned kind of behaviour.

The rhetoric of Q 12:42-46 portrays an intentional contrast between the food in 12:42 and eating/drinking in 12:45.⁵⁰⁹ The previous instance presents a moderate consumption of food (ἐν καιρῷ τὴν τροφήν) while the latter uses terms of gormandizing.⁵¹⁰

⁵⁰⁹ The pair eating-drinking also occurs in Q 7:34.

⁵¹⁰ Cf. the moderate attitude towards food (and drink) in Q 7:31-35; 12:22-31.

The parable implies a settled household with the master and slaves. Its setting was thus known to the Q people. By implication they identified with the servants and not with the master. This probably reflects their social status. The Q people were from the lower social classes and dependent on the benevolence of the rulers. No hint of a change of status is implied.

3.4.10. Q 17:27

27 [ὡς γὰρ ἦσαν ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις] τρώγοντες καὶ πίνοντες, γαμοῦντες καὶ γαμι[ζοντες], ἄχρι ἧς ἡμέρας εἰσῆλθεν Νῶε εἰς τὴν κιβωτόν, καὶ ἦλθεν ὁ κατακλυσμὸς καὶ ἦρεν ἅπαντας,

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..

For the present purpose it is sufficient to note that in the passage on the coming of the Son of Man (Q 17:23-27) eating (17:27: τρώγω) and drinking (πίνω) occur in a negative context, as in 12:45. They are presented as the signs of the coming of the Son of Man, i.e. judgment. The Noah story is taken from the epic history of Israel.

The passage implies a settled, indeed safe life. The normal activities of life, eating, drinking and marrying continue. From this description of normal life some scholars have drawn conclusions as to the setting of Q and its date of composition before or after the Jewish revolt.⁵¹¹

3.4.11. Summary

⁵¹¹ Arnal, *Village Scribes*, 165; Moreland, “Q and the Economics of Early Roman Galilee”, 562; Myllykoski, “Social History of Q”, 192; Tuckett, *Q and History*, 362.

The food and eating rhetoric of Q promotes a moderate ethos in relation to food and eating. Gormandizing and drinking are condemned as behaviour that brings judgment. The focus is on obedience to God. The temptation of hunger is to be resisted because it can lead to disobedience. Jesus is portrayed as a moderate when consuming food and drink, though his opponents accuse him of being a ‘glutton and drunkard’.

Bread and eating are closely connected with the kingdom in Q’s rhetoric. Those who hunger now are blessed because they will be satisfied in the kingdom of God. One must not worry about what to eat while the basic needs, food and clothing, are added with the kingdom. One has to pray to the Father for the bread that is needed for today. One is urged to trust in the Father who will give much better things than any human father. The workers of the kingdom are asked to share table fellowship with the household they enter.

Finally, the eschatological kingdom is described in terms of a festal banquet. The banquet gathers people from east and west. They share the festal table with the Patriarchs while ‘this unrepentant generation’ is thrown out.

Concerning the bread petition, James Robinson suggests that “[o]riginally the petition seems addressed to a specific instance of need at the moment, but then became generalized into a constant repetitive need inherent to a lifestyle. This may reflect a secondary stage in which concrete experiences merge into a pattern for a community”.⁵¹²

Indeed, there seems to be a slight development in the food and eating ethos within Q. The view that emerges from the apparently oldest layers of tradition seems to be concerned more with the problem of the shortage of food and even poverty. The programmatic beatitude Q 6:20-21 speaks of the poor who are hungry. The petition of bread in the Lord’s Prayer (11:3) asks for today’s subsistence and no more. The mission speech presents sympathetic households that can afford table fellowship, the necessary food and drink for the workers. The arguments of the prayer (11:11-13) underscore the generosity of the Father. Worrying about food and drink is useless, as the Father’s kingdom is primary, and all that is needed will be added with it.

⁵¹² Robinson, “Evaluations” in Carruth, *Q 11:2b-4*, 136. Idem in “Jesus of Q”, 263: “The petition of bread is meant literally”.

In the apparently later sections that display judgmental rhetoric, the need of food and eating does not seem so urgent. Jesus the Son of Man, unlike John, observes the ordinary customs. He eats and drinks like others (Q 7:34). The parable of the faithful and unfaithful servants (12:42-46) describes a household that can afford enough food even for slaves. There, as well as in the passage of the coming of the Son of Man (17:26-27), eating and drinking are a part of normal everyday life. However, gormandizing and drunkenness are condemned (12:45).

In the latest tradition of Q, bread is presented as a means of temptation (Q 4:3, 4). It is a tool in the struggle between Jesus and the devil. Nowhere else in Q is fasting attested. In the temptation story hunger is a deliberate choice, and not a consequence of poverty as in the Beatitudes (6:20-21). Indeed, the temptations imply that it is surely possible for Jesus to find enough food.

3.5. Debt

The verb ἀφίημι in the sense ‘release’ or ‘forgive’ occurs five times in Q: 11:4 [2x]; 12:10 [2x]; 17:4.⁵¹³ ‘Debt’, ὀφείλημα,⁵¹⁴ as well as ‘debtor’, ὀφειλέτης occurs only in the Lord’s Prayer (11:4).⁵¹⁵ In addition, debt rhetoric is attested in 6:30, 34 by the verbs δανείζω ‘lend’, ἀπαιτέω ‘demand back’ and λαμβάνω ‘receive’.⁵¹⁶

⁵¹³ In the sense ‘let’ or ‘leave’ ἀφίημι occurs in Q 6:42; 9:60; 13:35; 17:34, 35.

⁵¹⁴ The Greek ὀφείλημα may represent an Aramaism, as argued by many scholars, e.g. Jeremias, *Abba*, 76; Oakman, “The Lord’s Prayer in Social Perspective”, 168.

⁵¹⁵ Kloppenborg Verbin, *Excavating Q*, 77, argues that “Luke knows very well that “debt” can be used as a metaphor for “sin”. That he chooses “sin” in the Lord’s Prayer probably only means that Luke is also aware that in Koine Greek ὀφείλημα normally refers to monetary debts, not moral failings... The Semitism is used, but only when the context makes it clear that it in fact serves as a metaphor for sin rather than a statement about monetary debt”.

⁵¹⁶ *CEQ* places these verbs in double brackets.

3.5.1. The Lord's Prayer: Q 11:4a

The fourth petition of the Lord's Prayer concerns debt. It is linked with the preceding petition of bread (Q 11:3) as well as to the following petition of testing (11:4b) by καὶ. This indicates that the petition triplet (11:3, 4b, 4c) forms a coherent unit. The imperative ἄφες is in the aorist, like δός, in the petition of bread. Also the object is structurally similar (τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν.. τὰ ὀφειλήματα ἡμῶν).

The petition of debt is structured by two parallel clauses which are connected together by ὡς καὶ ἡμεῖς.. This expresses the idea of reciprocity. The two juxtaposed clauses are constructed by a similar pair of words: ἄφες ἡμῖν τὰ ὀφειλήματα ἡμῶν, ὡς καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀφήκαμεν τοῖς ὀφειλέταις ἡμῶν.

The petition of bread (Q 11:3) presents concrete rhetoric by ἄρτος and σήμερον. It deals with daily material needs. This suggests that the debt petition should also be understood primarily in material terms and not metaphorically.⁵¹⁷ The object of the petition is in the plural (ὀφειλήματα). Accordingly, 'debtors' (ὀφειλέταις) occur in the plural. The plural points to a concrete setting where those who prayed owed money to several creditors. This with the preceding concrete petition of bread suggests that the debt petition is also to be interpreted in concrete terms.

⁵¹⁷ Both Robinson and Kloppenborg argue for the metaphorical use of debt in the Lord's Prayer. However, Robinson, "Evaluations", in *Q 11:2b-4*, 170, seems to give a concrete meaning to debt in the latter part of the petition: "The aorist (ἀφήκαμεν) in Matthew may be... original, reflecting the renunciation of *all worldly security* at the time of conversion". (Italics mine.)

Cf. also Robinson, "Evaluations", in *Q 11:2b-4*, 136, who evaluates the wording of the petition of bread and concludes: "Originally the (bread) petition seems addressed to a specific instance of a need at the moment, but then became generalized into a constant repetitive need inherent in a lifestyle. This may reflect a secondary stage in which concrete experiences merge into a pattern for a community". I think that the same happened to the debt petition: it received its metaphorical use of 'sin' in a secondary stage of the tradition process.

Cf. Q 17:3-4 where an admonition to forgive one's brother's sins (ἐὰν ἀμάρτη ὁ ἀδελφός σου...) is attested.

Douglas Oakman finds “two concrete situations in which God might be petitioned to achieve debt forgiveness for the advantage of the petitioner: (1) A court system, perhaps one in which the *prozbul* held sway, and (2) the temple debt-system”.⁵¹⁸ The *prozbul* institution “was a legal device whereby debts were secured by means of immovable property and foreclosure accomplished through a court proceeding”.⁵¹⁹ Further, the temple also collected taxes, as is mentioned in Mt 17:24-27. Thus, the debt petition “could request of the “owner of the house” (i.e. the Temple) for release from the onerous obligations requisitioned each year by the Judean authorities”.⁵²⁰ Respectively, it could request of God as the “owner of the land” for release from loans that were secured by patrimonial land.⁵²¹ Thus Horsley may be correct in claiming that “the petition to ‘cancel debts’ in the Lord’s Prayer... appeals to Mosaic covenantal ideas”.⁵²²

Thus the focus of the debt petition is on the (vertical) need of debt release as well as on the (horizontal) reciprocal readiness to forgive the debtors. There seems to be little room for a metaphorical or eschatological interpretation, at least in the context of the petition of bread.⁵²³ The metaphorical understanding indeed reflects a later stage of the tradition process.

It is noteworthy that both the petition of bread and the debt petition imply the need of something. In the former it is bread (or food) that is needed. In the latter the question is the lack of money (or possessions). In fact, both petitions imply a situation where those who prayed could not

⁵¹⁸ Oakman, “The Lord’s Prayer in Social Perspective”, 168.

⁵¹⁹ Oakman, “The Lord’s Prayer in Social Perspective”, 166-67. Cf. Arnal, *Jesus and the Village Scribes*, 140-41; Horsley, *Galilee*

⁵²⁰ Oakman, “The Lord’s Prayer in Social Perspective”, 168-69, who notes the case of the widow putting her money in the box at the Temple (Mk 12:41-44 par Lk 21:1-4) and the criticism of the Pharisees and scribes for exploiting widows (Mk 7:11-12; 12:38, 40).

⁵²¹ See Lev 25:23, 25-28; Dt 8; Ps 24:1; Ez 11:15.

⁵²² Horsley, “Israelite Traditions in Q”, 96.

⁵²³ Cf. Kloppenborg Verbin, “Discursive Practices”, 177, pointing to the imagery of the sabbatical or jubilee debt release attested in the writings of Qumran (1QDM [1Q22] iii 5-7 quoting Dtn 15:1-3). Marucci, „Sprachliche Merkmale der Q-Quelle”, 614, referring to Black, *An Aramaic Approach*, 203-208, argues for the Aramaic *mahar* (= ‘for tomorrow’) behind ἐπιούσιος.

Luke clearly widens the scope of the petition by changing ‘debts’ to the abstract ‘sins’.

afford daily subsistence and purchase of the land for cultivation.⁵²⁴ Further, like bread, debt release is asked of the Father. The conviction that the Father can and will release debts is confirmed by the arguments in Q 11:9-13. The ‘good things’ (ἀγαθά 11:13) that the Father surely gives include debt release.

3.5.2. Q 6:30, 34

30 τῷ αἰτοῦντί σε δός, καὶ [ἀπὸ] τ[οῦ δανι<ζόμενου>, τὰ σ[ὰ] μὴ ἀπ[αίτει].

34 καὶ ἐὰν [δανίσητε παρ’ ὧν ἐλπίζετε λαβεῖν, τί<να μισθὸν ἔχε>τε]; οὐχὶ καὶ [οἱ ἔθνικ]οὶ τὸ αὐτὸ ποιοῦσιν;

30 To the one who asks of you, give; and [from the one who borrows], do not [ask] back [«what is»] yours.

34 And if you [lend «to those» from whom you hope to receive, what <reward do> you <have>? Do not even [the Gentiles] do the same?

The sayings in the inaugural speech concerning lending are difficult to reconstruct. The theme of lending is attested by both Mt and Lk as they agree on the verb δανείζω, though in different contexts.⁵²⁵

Q 6:29-30 consists of two (or three⁵²⁶) admonition sayings that use the singular, unlike the sayings in their context.⁵²⁷ The cluster is also rhetorically coherent while the sayings use concrete terms of reciprocal behaviour (slapping on the cheek, giving the shirt and the coat, giving to one who asks, lending).

⁵²⁴ On the loss of patrimonial land owned by smallholders to creditors, see pp. 32-33 above.

⁵²⁵ Mt 5:42 has it before the admonition of love of enemy (5:43-44). Lk has it in the last of a triple set of conditional clauses (6:32-34). *CEQ* follows (mostly) the Mt reading (...[ἀπὸ] τ[οῦ δανι<ζόμενου>...) in Q 6:30 and that of Luke (...[δανίσητε...]) in Q 6:34.

⁵²⁶ *CEQ* includes the saying on conscription (Mt 5:41) with double brackets in Q.

⁵²⁷ The singular form may be a reminiscence of the original setting in which the saying was used. The singular form in admonitions is also attested in 6:41-42; 17:3-4.

Q 6:32, 34 are structured similarly by conditional clauses (εἰ / ἐάν...) and rhetorical questions (τί<να μισθὸν ἔχε>τε]; ⁵²⁸). Further, the argumentation of the sayings is based on rhetorical questions (οὐχὶ καὶ...). The double structuring may reflect the oral phase in the tradition history of the sayings. They provide the juxtaposition of the implied audience with ‘tax collectors’ (Q 6:32) and ‘the Gentiles’ (6:34). The ethos of those addressed has to be superior to that of others.

From the sociological point of view, it is noteworthy that Q 6:30, 34 use the rhetoric of lending. This indicates, first, that lending was a common practice in economic transactions.⁵²⁹ Second, the lending rhetoric indicates that the Q people included those who were wealthy enough to lend to others - and even without hoping to be repaid!⁵³⁰ True enough, the rhetoric of 6:30, 34 is not concerned with indebtedness. This is astonishing since above in the Beatitudes (6:20-21) poverty and hunger imply economic deprivation.

The rationale for the admonition of giving and lending (Q 6:30, 34) is found in its context. The superior ethos compared with ‘tax collectors’ and ‘Gentiles’ is based on an admonition of *imitatio Patris*. This is apparent in 6:36: Γίνεσθε οἰκτίρμονες ὡς.. ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν οἰκτίρμων ἐστίν.) and implied in 6:35c-d (ὅπως γένησθε υἱοὶ τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν...⁵³¹ In 6:36 the Father is characterized as οἰκτίρμων, which may indeed refer to renouncing one’s right to demand repayment of the debt.⁵³² Further, those addressed are asked to forgive the debts of others because they also wish to have their debt cancelled. This becomes clear from the additional argument in the form of a general admonitory maxim, the Golden Rule (6:31).

⁵²⁸ CEQ here follows the Mt reading.

⁵²⁹ This is confirmed by the debt archives that were located in large towns, e.g. Sepphoris and Tiberias. See the attestation of Josephus, *Bell* 2.17.6 §427. On the problem of debt in the first century, see Horsley, *Galilee*, 219-20; Arnal, *Jesus and the Village Scribes*, 140-42; Goodman, “The First Jewish Revolt: Social Conflict and the Problem of Debt”, 417-27; Guijarro, “The Family in First-Century Galilee”, 46; Kloppenborg Verbin, *Excavating Q*, 254-55; Oakman, *Jesus and the Economic Questions*, 72-77.

⁵³⁰ It may well be that the saying Q 6:30 was originally directed to a creditor. Cf. *GThom* 95: “If you have money, do not lend it at interest”. An attempt to settle with a creditor is attested in Q 12:58-59. See below ch. 3.5.4.

⁵³¹ On the unit Q 6:27-28,35, see ch 3.1.2. above.

⁵³² In its context οἰκτίρμων also refers to renouncing the right to pass judgment (Q 6:37).

3.5.3. Q 12:10

10 καὶ ὃς ἐὰν εἴπῃ λόγον εἰς τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, ἀφεθήσεται αὐτῷ· ὃς δ' ἂν [εἴπῃ] εἰς τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα, οὐκ ἀφεθήσεται αὐτῷ

10 And whoever says a word against the son of humanity, it will be forgiven him; but whoever [speaks] against the holy Spirit, it will not be forgiven him.

The saying concerning blasphemy against the Spirit is part of a discourse Q 12:2-12 on the theme of public witnessing.⁵³³ This saying is problematic when seen in its context of 12:8-9.⁵³⁴ There is a well-known aporia between the saying (12:8) about the present attitudes toward Jesus that are of eschatological significance and the saying (12:10) about forgiving those who speak against the Son of Man. Järvinen explains the tension by arguing that the time for forgiveness had run out with the destruction of Jerusalem. However, he admits that, read in context, 12:10 underlines the importance of preaching and not denying the Q message.⁵³⁵ So, the preaching of the Q envoys was the final chance for Israel to repent. Denying this was blasphemy against the Spirit and thus unforgivable. As noted above, the most convenient solution to the contrast is to see 12:10, as a later comment appended to 12:2-9 partly on the basis of a keyword connection.⁵³⁶

However, the saying is not coincidentally in its present context. True, several originally independent sayings were linked together on the theme of public witnessing. The rhetoric of the cluster Q 12:2-12 served to motivate the Q people to fearless witness in the contradictory situation of conflict. Especially 12:10 functioned as an assurance for their message and provided the authority of the Holy Spirit. Surely in the whole cluster

⁵³³ See pp. 93-97 above.

⁵³⁴ Cf. e.g. Fuchs, „Die Sünde wider den Heiligen Geist“, 116-17, claiming that Lk added the saying 12:10 in the present context.

⁵³⁵ Järvinen, “Son of Man and His Followers”, 177.

⁵³⁶ Tuckett, *Q and History*, 249.

the question is one of reacting to the preaching of the Q people. Those who do not receive its message will face judgment.

Q 12:4-10 reveals court language. The passives in 12:10 indicate that it is God who judges those who have spoken against the Son of Man and the Holy Spirit. The future tenses refer to the eschatological judgment. This is confirmed by the preceding context, which refers to acknowledging him before the angels (12:8-9). However, 12:10 indicates that the criteria of the judgment are already apparent. Thus the present reaction to the witness of the Q community has eschatological significance.

The logic of the saying goes along with an *a minore ad maius* argument. Thus, as Uro puts it, “a word against the Son of man (e.g. by reviling those who confess him) is bad enough, but blasphemy against the Spirit is an ultimate sin without forgiveness”.⁵³⁷ Further, it may be that it is God who speaks through the Holy Spirit (see 12:11-12) and the Son of Man is a human figure.⁵³⁸ This view has support from the preceding context, where body and life (12:4: σῶμα - ψυχή), earth and heaven (12:9: ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ἀνθρώπων - ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ἀγγέλων) are juxtaposed.

Mack rightly sees the connection between the Holy Spirit and the message of Q. He argues that “(t)o ‘make a speech against’ was a technical description for presenting evidence and arguments in a trial setting... (I)t was quite possible to have some difference of opinion on the topic of the son of man... It was forgivable if one had to disclaim the community’s talk about the son of man... (T)he Q people were aware of the mythological or symbolic status of the term son of man even while they used it to picture the final judgment... One might be forgiven for fudging a bit, should the subject of the judgment and the son of man come up”.⁵³⁹

It is noteworthy that Q 12:10, though containing the verb ἀφίημι like the Lord’s Prayer (11:2-4), gives a very different context to

⁵³⁷ Uro, “Apocalyptic Symbolism”, 106.

⁵³⁸ This interpretation, suggested by Uro, (“Apocalyptic Symbolism”, 106-7), comes close to the view that rejecting the Q message is unforgivable but speaking against Jesus can be forgiven. Contra Fuchs, „Die Sünde wider den Heiligen Geist,“ 117.

⁵³⁹ Mack, *Lost Gospel*, 167-68

forgiveness.⁵⁴⁰ In the debt petition (11:4) the context points to a concrete economic setting. In 12:10 the theme is the relation to the Q message, i.e. either accepting or rejecting it. However, both the debt petition of the Lord's Prayer and the saying concerning blasphemy against the Spirit imply a public setting and the rhetoric is promoted in terms of credit and court processes.⁵⁴¹

3.5.4. Q 12:58-59

58 [ἕως ὅτου] ... μετὰ τοῦ ἀντιδίκου σου ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ δὸς ἐργασίαν ἀπηλλάχθαι ἀπ' αὐτοῦ μήποτε σε παραδῶ [ὁ ἀντίδικος] τῷ κριτῇ καὶ ὁ κριτῆς τῷ ὑπηρέτῃ καὶ [ὁ <ὑπηρέτης> σε] β[α]λ[εῖ] εἰς φυλακὴν.

59 λέγω σοι, οὐ μὴ ἐξέλθῃς ἐκεῖθεν, ἕως τὸ[ν] ἔσχατον [κοδράντην] ἀποδῶς.

58 [While] you «go along» with your opponent on the way, make an effort to get loose from him, lest [the opponent] hand you over to the judge, and the judge to the assistant, and [the <assistant>] throw [you] into prison.

59 I say to you: You will not get out of there until you pay the last [penny]!

⁵⁴⁰ Contra Allison, *Jesus Tradition*, 173-74, who argues that Q 11:9-13 and 12:4-7 are formally related: identification of speaker and audience (11:9; 12:4), opening imperative (11:9; 12:4), supporting statement (11:10;12:5), first illustration (11:11; 12:6), second illustration (11:12; 12:7a), conclusion (with *inclusio*) (11:13; 12: 7b). Thus (ibid. 174), “(g)iven that Q 12:4-7 is a collection of once-independent sayings whereas Q 11:9-13 appears on the contrary to resist decomposition, it seems more that a good guess that the former was composed in order to resemble the latter. Both serve to encourage missionaries who lead hard lives, both argue from the lesser to the greater, and, in my compositional theory of Q, both were at one time adjacent units”.

⁵⁴¹ The use of advocacy and court rhetoric is noted by Arnal, *Jesus and the Village Scribes*, 171.

Q 12:58-59 contains several *hapax legomena* in Q: ἀντιδίκος,⁵⁴² ‘plaintiff’, ἀποδίδωμι, ‘pay the debt’, ὑπηρέτης, ‘assistant’, φυλακή, ‘prison’ and κοδράντη, ‘*quadran*’. The saying is an exhortation to agree with one’s plaintiff. It betrays court and debt rhetoric, although ‘debt’ is not mentioned here. The opponent in the court, ἀντιδίκος, indeed refers to a creditor and ‘paying the last *quadran*’ implies debt.⁵⁴³

From the sociological point of view, it is remarkable that Q 12:58-59 betrays suspicion of the court administration. The admonition to seek an agreement with one’s creditor is based on the experience that one could never be certain of the justness of the judge. As the complaint documents about court processes reveal, the suspicion was justified.⁵⁴⁴ The indebted smallholder did not expect a fair verdict from the court. Thus it was better to attempt to settle with the creditor before going to court.⁵⁴⁵

Q 12:58-59 provides a concrete setting for the debt petition of the Lord’s Prayer. Although the literary links are missing, the thematic connection is apparent. Debt was a real threat, not only for the economy of the Q smallholders. It concerned their identity as well. Loss of patrimonial land deeply affected their self-determination and self-understanding. Those who incurred debt could not expect release from creditors, and even less from human administrators or religious authorities.⁵⁴⁶ Thus they turned their eyes to the Father. Their prayer was that the Father would release them from debt. At the same time they were bound to mutual solidarity and were ready to forgive another’s debts. However, the saying implies that it was possible to settle with the creditor. One may assume that the agreement was reached at the expense of the debtor.

⁵⁴² In the parable of the talents Mt 18:23-35 ὀφειλέτης / ὀφείλω and ἀποδίδωμι occur together. Cf. Lk 16:1-9 ἀποδίδωμι in v. 2; ὀφείλω in v.5). Cf. also Hdt 2.136: ἀποχρεός

⁵⁴³ In Lk 18:3, as in Q 12:57, ἀντιδίκος occurs in a court context and refers to a creditor.

⁵⁴⁴ See Piper, “The Language of Violence”, 60; Kloppenborg Verbin, *Excavating Q*, 194. Cf. Q 6:37-38: “Judge not and you will not be judged”.

⁵⁴⁵ Kloppenborg Verbin, *Excavating Q*, 195.

⁵⁴⁶ On the criticism of the religious establishment, see Q 11: 39-52.

3.5.5. Q 17:3-4

3 ἐάν ἁμαρτήσῃ [εἰς σέ] ὁ ἀδελφός σου, ἐπιτίμησον αὐτῷ, καὶ ἐὰν [μετανοήσῃ] ἄφες αὐτῷ. 4 καὶ ἐὰν ἐπτάκις τῆς ἡμέρας ἁμαρτήσῃ εἰς σέ καὶ ἐπτάκις ἀφήσεις αὐτῷ.

3 If your brother sins [against you], rebuke him; and if [he repents], forgive him. 4 And if seven times a day he sins against you, also seven times shall you forgive him.

This saying is difficult to reconstruct.⁵⁴⁷ There is, though, Mt-Lk verbal agreement of keywords ‘to sin’ ἁμαρτάνω, ‘brother’ ἀδελφός,⁵⁴⁸ and ‘to forgive’ ἀφίημι. The verb ἁμαρτάνω is a *hapax* in Q.⁵⁴⁹ The apparent familial rhetoric is directed to insiders, those who call each other ‘brothers’. The theme is how to behave in a situation where a ‘brother’ has trespassed against another brother.

The concrete referent of sinning is difficult to ascertain. It seems to concern the mutual relationship of ‘brothers’. The rhetoric implies ongoing intercourse. Thus we may conclude that the sin is not fatal but something that may occur repeatedly. The tone is different from that of the saying about speaking against the Holy Spirit, Q 12:10, where the trespass is fatal and unforgivable.

The recurring character of the trespassing indicates that sinning refers to occurrences in everyday life.⁵⁵⁰ The condition for forgiveness is repentance. The admonition to forgive is directed to those who have been sinned against.

The preceding context attests a warning against scandals (Q 17:1-2). Leading astray the ‘little ones’ (ἐνα τῶν μικρῶν τούτων, 17:2)

⁵⁴⁷ *CEQ* follows mainly the Lk reading.

⁵⁴⁸ ‘Brother’ also occurs in the saying on hypocrisy Q 6:41-42 [3x].

⁵⁴⁹ The noun ἁμαρτωλός is attested in the section on John and Jesus Q 7:34.

⁵⁵⁰ Robinson, “The Critical Edition of Q”, 39-40. According to Schenk, *Synopse*, 118, this saying is the last „Konkretisierung des „schmalen Weges““. Schulz, *Q*, 322, notes that „[i]n der eschatologischen Q-Gemeinde vor der nahen Menschensohn-Parusie soll die brüderliche Pflicht des Vergebens keine Grenze kennen“.

deserves a dreadful punishment, casting into the sea with a millstone around the neck. This harsh saying implies that someone (...δι' οὐ... 17:1) brings stumbling-blocks and 'leads astray the little ones'. The characterization of the Q people as μικροί is also attested in Jesus' eulogy of John (7:24-28) and there is a keyword link to 7:23 by σκανδαλίζειν - σκάνδαλον. The context of 17:1-2 provides a severe tone to the following admonition to mutual forgiveness (17:3,4).

Like Q 17:3-4, a somewhat similar saying is attested in 6:41-42. The 'speck and beam' saying also concerns the relationship between 'brothers'. The literary links between the sayings are the keyword ἀδελφός (6:41-42; 17:3-4) and the singular form. Further, like the second part of the debt petition in the Lord's Prayer (11:4), both contain the idea of reciprocity.

3.5.6. Summary

Releasing and forgiving occur in three different contexts in Q. First, they concern the mutual relationship within the Q people. Q demands forgiveness of the trespasses of 'brothers' without limits. Second, forgiving concerns the relation to the Q message. Speaking against man, even against Jesus the Son of Man, is forgivable. However, speaking against the Holy Spirit is culpable. He who rejects Q's call to repentance will not be forgiven.

Third, 'releasing' occurs in the context of debt and lending rhetoric. One is asked to give and lend to others without wishing to be repaid. One has to be ready to forgive one's debtors, too. The admonition to lend to others is based on the Golden Rule and on *imitatio Patris*.

Lending rhetoric implies that there were Q people who were wealthy enough to lend to others.⁵⁵¹ However, indebtedness was an urgent concern, at least for some Q people, as attested in the Lord's Prayer (Q

⁵⁵¹ Cf. Arnal, *Village Scribes*, 173, who notes that "[d]ifferent socioeconomic classes are assumed to be present among the document's addressees, with the result that exhortation is made about both giving (Q 6:30) and receiving (10:7), both borrowing (12:57-59) and lending (6:34-35); the wealthy are directly addressed (12:33-34; 16:13), as are the poor (6:20-21; 12:22-31)". Also Arnal, "Rhetoric of Marginality", 481, 484.

11:4) and in the saying on agreeing with one's creditor (12:57-59). For the debtor it was better to attempt to settle with the creditor before going to court. There was no guarantee that the judge would bring the case to a just verdict. Quite on the contrary, in the court the debtor could expect a catastrophe, being sent to prison and ordered to pay every single *quadran*.

The Q people were asked to pray for debt release. At the same time they were asked to forgive their debtors. It is remarkable that the rhetoric of lending and debt occurs in close connection with familial rhetoric and that of the Father. This seems to imply the conviction that it is the Father who owns everything. The Father can provide bread and other material needs. He can also cancel debts.⁵⁵² The earlier setting of the debt petition is to be sought in the loan-securing system of *prozbul* and in the temple taxation. This may reflect the Mosaic covenantal ideas of debt cancellation. Later 'debt' turned into a metaphorical and religious reference to 'sin' (as attested in Luke).⁵⁵³

3.6. Testing

The noun *πειρασμός* occurs in Q only in the Lord's Prayer (Q 11:4).⁵⁵⁴ The verb *πειράζω* appears in the temptation narrative (4:2). The verb *εἰσφέρω* occurs along with the Lord's Prayer in a passage concerning hearings before the synagogue (12:11).⁵⁵⁵

⁵⁵² Meadors, *Jesus*, 189, suggests that "the forgiveness which is sought here is forgiveness from the wrath to come at the final judgment", but this is unconvincing. He adds that "the present forgiveness sought in the Lord's Prayer, is a present manifestation of eschatological forgiveness".

⁵⁵³ This is attested in Mk 11:25 by *παραπτώματα*. There it is noteworthy that forgiveness occurs in the context of prayer and is connected with an admonition to forgive others. Forgiveness of 'sins' (*ἁμαρτίαι*) is attested in Mk 2:5, 7, 9, 10; 3:28.

⁵⁵⁴ Elsewhere in the NT it occurs 19 times. In the Gethsemane pericope it is connected with watching and praying (Mk 14:38 par Mt 26:41; Lk 22:40, 46).

⁵⁵⁵ *CEQ* follows the Mt reading.

3.6.1. The Lord's Prayer: Q 11:4b

The test petition concludes the Lord's Prayer (Q 11:4). It is the last of the triple set of petitions (11:3-4) that have common structures. According to the bread and debt petitions, the verb in the temptation petition is in the imperative aorist (δός - ἄφες - εἰσενέγκης). All the petitions imply that the Father can provide the things needed. The test petition is connected with the preceding one by the copula καὶ. However, the last petition is essentially shorter than the others, not including their double structure. It is the only petition with a negative imperative (μὴ). Further, the definitive article is missing (εἰς πειρασμόν).

Douglas Oakman notes that “the *crux* of the matter has to do with the meaning of πειρασμός”.⁵⁵⁶ The noun occurs 14 times in the LXX.⁵⁵⁷ There its sense is ‘testing’. The rhetorical context of the prohibitive imperative (μὴ εἰσενέγκης... 11:4) indicates that πειρασμός is something to be avoided. While bread and debt release are viewed positively, the test has a fully negative context.

The context of the last petition dealing with bread and debt release contains rhetoric which refers to the material and economic situation of the Q people. The petitions of bread and debt release point to survival in everyday life. The same is to be expected in the test petition, too. Thus its setting is not to be sought in abstract, ‘religious’ rhetoric.⁵⁵⁸ Instead, the connotations of πειρασμός seem to point to the same kind of settings where ‘bread’ and ‘debt’ occur.⁵⁵⁹ As suggested with the petitions of bread and debt release they have connotations of basic material needs as well as urgent threats facing the implied audience. While the rhetoric of the last petition is structured in negative terms, I may affirm that πειρασμός entailed a threat to the Q people. Indeed, it concerned the

⁵⁵⁶ Oakman, “The Lord's Prayer in Social Perspective”, 175.

⁵⁵⁷ In Ex 17:7; Dt 4:34; 6:16; 7:19; 9:22; 29:2; Ps 94:8 πειρασμός alludes to the wandering of Israel in the wilderness. In 1 Macc 2:52 the allusion is to the test of Abraham's loyalty. In Sirach it occurs in the sense of testing: 2:1 (serving the Lord): 6:7; 27:5, 7; 33:1 (fear of the Lord); 44:20 (fulfilling the law). In non-biblical Greek it occurs only three times in the sense of ‘to attempt’ or ‘to put to the test’. See Seesemann, “Πειρά”, 26.

⁵⁵⁸ The popular eschatological interpretation of πειρασμός has been questioned e.g. by Vögtle, „Der ‚eschatologische‘ Bezug der Wir-Bitten des Vater-Unser“.

⁵⁵⁹ Cf. Oakman, “The Lord's Prayer in Social Perspective”, 173.

relationship with the (hostile) surrounding society. The test petition implies that being led “into test” (εἰς πειρασμόν) was to be avoided. The fear of being put to the test thus affected the external security of the Q people. Moreover, the prohibitive petition implies that their identity was threatened.

One detail seems to be apparent when comparing the debt and the temptation petitions in the Lord’s Prayer. By implication, debt seems to be a present and existing reality in the life of the Q people. This becomes clear from the qualification of debt. Praying for the release of ‘our debts’ (τὰ ὀφειλήματα ἡμῶν, Q 11:4) implies that it was a present reality for the Q people.

The last petition of the Lord’s Prayer, however, does not betray any such dominant reality. The Q people prayed that they would not be led into test (εἰς πειρασμόν). The rhetoric refers to an occasion or location that was somehow strange and threatening for them. The rhetoric implies that the Q people were somehow acquainted with πειρασμός. They were aware that it should be avoided. It was not within their everyday life and experience but was a threatening possibility. However, by implication it was the Father who could lead the addressees to the test. Avoiding this was the aim of the petition. Thus the ‘test’ was an occasion where one could not be safe. One’s security was threatened by someone or something from outside. What such an occasion or setting might have been will be studied below.

The argument in Q 11:9-13 that follows the test petition provides it with a confident tone. The conviction that the Father will give good things to his children also concerns the test petition. In the context of 11:13 πειρασμός has connotations that are the opposite of ‘good things’. Surveillance pertains to the ‘good things’ that the Father will surely give.

3.6.2. Q 4:1-2

1 ὁ δὲ / Ἰησοῦς [ἀν]ή[χθη] [εἰς] τῆ[ν] ἔρημ[ον] / ὑπὸ τ[οῦ] πνεύμα[τος] 2 πειρα[σθῆναι] ὑπὸ τοῦ διαβόλου. καὶ ... ἡμέρας τεσσαράκοντα, .. ἐπέινασεν.

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.

The structure of the temptation narrative is as follows: introduction (Q 4:1-2), a triple set of temptations (4:3-4, 9-12, 5-8) and a concluding statement (4:13).⁵⁶⁰

The verb *πειράζω* occurs at the beginning of the temptation narrative Q 4:2. The Spirit leads (*ἀνάγω*) Jesus into the wilderness. The final infinitive construction (*πειρασθῆναι*) expresses the purpose of going there. The rhetoric indicates that Jesus himself was passive. He was led into temptation by the devil (4:2).

It is commonly argued that the temptation narrative belongs to the latest stratum in the compositional history of Q.⁵⁶¹ This may be the case, but one may note that the narrative fits in well with the rest of Q.

Before the temptation narrative there is John's announcement of judgment (Q 3:7-9, 16-17, 21-22).⁵⁶² The literary links are provided by the key-words *υἱός* the theme of sonship (3: of Abraham, 4: of God)

The first temptation 4:3-4 criticizes the concern for food and material necessities. The critique matches the sentiments expressed in the cares section (12:22-31) and the instruction on prayer (11:2-4, 9-13).⁵⁶³ On the literary level the connection between the food temptation of 4:3

⁵⁶⁰ CEQ follows the Mt order in the temptations.

⁵⁶¹ See Bultmann, *Geschichte*, 40; Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 323; idem, "Sayings Gospel Q: Literary and Stratigraphic Problems", 13; Luz, *Matthäus*, 160; Schenk, *Synopse*, 22. Tuckett, *Q and History*, 419-22, however, argues that the key themes of the temptation narrative fit in well with the rest of Q and thus does not consider Q 4:1-13. This does not imply that Q 4:1-13 does not contain different incorporated traditions. Idem. "Temptation Narrative", 479-507. Similarly Hieke, „Schriftgelehrsamkeit“, 66; Catchpole, *Quest*, 229; Draper, "The Announcement and Testing of the Prophet", 250-51; Pieper, "Jesus and the Conflict of Powers in Q", 341: "„the *function* of the unit may not differ radically from what we have been describing for the other Q passages that refer to demonic collusion and Satan". (italics orig.)

Lührmann, *Redaction*, 56, excludes the narrative from Q.

⁵⁶² Draper, "The Announcement and Testing of the Prophet", 250-59, links Q 3:7-9, 16-17, 21-22 and 4:1-13 on the basis of their coherence and consistent structure.

⁵⁶³ Tuckett, *Q and History*, 420.

and the argument on prayer 11:11-12 is striking: both have the pair of keywords λίθος - ἄρτος.⁵⁶⁴ Further, there are additional keyword connections in ἄνθρωπος and υἱός.

In the temptation narrative the devil appeals to the sonship of Jesus: Εἰ υἱὸς εἶ τοῦ θεοῦ.. There is no need to see a Christological title here, as the action of Jesus shows what true divine sonship really entails and thus provides a paradigm for those who share the same relationship with God.⁵⁶⁵ This is expressed in the prayer instruction 11:11-13 by the *a minore ad maius* argument. The relationship between ‘sons’/‘daughters’ and God whom they address as ‘Father’ (Q 11:2) is implied here.

The setting of the temptation narrative reveals a literary connection with the Lord’s Prayer, though the connection is limited to the introduction and the first temptation concerning bread. In Q 4:2a the verb πειράζω expresses the contents of the narrative. In 11:4 πειρασμός is something that one needs to pray to be delivered from. As these words, πειράζω - πειρασμός, are extremely rare in Q (in addition only in 11:16) one may conclude that Q associated the temptations of Q 4 with the final petition of the Lord’s Prayer (11:4). The latter is apparently to be considered earlier in the tradition process of Q. As noted above, the test petition of the Lord’s Prayer is presented in concrete terms while the temptation narrative provides more elaborated theological abstractions.⁵⁶⁶

According to Kloppenborg, the temptation narrative has a paraenetical function, using Jesus as a paradigm for certain behaviour.⁵⁶⁷ In accord with other ancient didactic narratives or didactic passages, the temptation fulfils the specific function of testing and thereby legitimizing

⁵⁶⁴ In Q 11:11-12 the Mt wording is considered to be that of Q.

⁵⁶⁵ Tuckett, *Q and History*, 420.

⁵⁶⁶ The abstractions concern pneumatology (the activity of the Spirit) and Christology (the paradigm of Jesus as Son of God).

⁵⁶⁷ Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 250, 256; Schulz, *Q*, 188-89 who also defines the matter as follows: „Gottessohnschaft heisst für die Q-Gemeinde positiv: 1. Leben aus dem Gotteswort, indem sein Wille rigoros getan wird; 2. vollmächtige Auslegung des Schriftwortes im Wissen um das Zentrum, und schliesslich 3. Anbetung und Dienst gegenüber dem alleinigen Gott.“

the seer.⁵⁶⁸ The content of Jesus' behaviour contains obedience to God and full devotion to him, but not the ability to perform „Wundertaten“.⁵⁶⁹

The setting of the temptations is the wilderness (ἐρημος Q 4:1). The narrator thus presented the place of temptation and the tempter. It is the διαβόλος who tempts Jesus in the desert. The temptation thus takes place outside the community in isolation, Jesus being alone.

3.6.3. Q 12:11-12⁵⁷⁰

11 ὅταν δὲ εἰσφέρωσιν ὑμᾶς [<εἰς>] τὰς συναγωγὰς, μὴ μεριμνήσητε πῶς ἢ τί εἶπητε· 12 [το] γὰρ [ἅγιον πνεῦμα διδάξει] ὑμ[ᾶς] ἐν ...ἡ τῆ ὥρᾳ τί εἰπ<ητε>.

11 When they bring you before the synagogues, do not be anxious about how or what you are to say; 12 for [the holy Spirit will teach] you in that .. hour what you are to say.

We have already examined this saying above.⁵⁷¹ For the present purpose it is remarkable to note the keyword connection (εἰσφέρω εἰς) between the last petition of the Lord's Prayer (Q 11:4) and the saying concerning hearings before the synagogue (12:11). This becomes evident when we note that εἰσφέρω does not occur elsewhere in Q. Further, the qualifying pronoun in the test petition is ὑμᾶς and in 12:11 ἡμᾶς. These literary links lead us to consider more closely the thematic connection.

Q 12:11-12 is preceded by a saying concerning speaking against the Holy Spirit (12:10). The keywords εἶπον (12:10, 11, 12) and ἅγιον πνεῦμα (12:10, 12) form the literary link between the sayings in 12:10 and 12:11-12. We have noted already that the section 12:8-10 promotes

⁵⁶⁸ Kirk, *Composition*, 384-85. He refers to Prov 7:6-23, Sir 44:1-50:24 and T. Jos 2:4-10:3. See also Kloppenborg, "Easter Faith", 87, idem, "Antique Instructional Genres", 153, idem, *Formation*, 325-27; Zeller, „Versuchungen“, 63-64.

⁵⁶⁹ Schenk, *Synopse*, 22.

⁵⁷⁰ IQP reads the whole saying Q 12:11-12 in double brackets and omits εἰς.

⁵⁷¹ See ch. 3.2.4.

court rhetoric.⁵⁷² Indeed, 12:11-12, too, presents a public assembly (συναγωγὰς, 12:11). The rhetoric (ὅταν δὲ εἰσφέρωσιν ὑμᾶς εἰς...) sets the scene of bringing persons before synagogues, not voluntarily but by coercion. Some kind of threat is implied.⁵⁷³ However, while one has the right to speak and thus to defend oneself, a reference to violence and persecution is perhaps reading too much into 12:11-12. Further, 12:12 indicates that the Holy Spirit is the advocate before the synagogue. Otherwise one stands there alone.

Horsley proposes that in the context of Q 12:4 (an admonition not to fear those who kill the body) the possibility of being delivered up to the authorities (12:11-12) refers to the setting of a trial, apparently on a charge for which one could be executed. The authorities were thus the rulers, and not local village “synagogues”.⁵⁷⁴ The context, however, points to a setting where the subject is confessing or denying (12:8-9) and speaking against the Holy Spirit (12:10). These do not entail the threat of being killed but of denying the Q message in words.

In sum, Q 12:11-12 attests to a trial before the synagogue. While synagogue buildings are vaguely attested in first-century Galilee,⁵⁷⁵ it is more probable that the synagogue in 12:11 refers to a public assembly in the village setting. Further, there is no hint of a court trial.⁵⁷⁶ Q 12:11-12 and its context indicate that the issue is that of publicly acknowledging Jesus the Son of Man. The whole section 12:2-12 encourages the Q people to speak fearlessly, telling them not to be anxious. This is strengthened by the promise of the help of the Holy Spirit (12:11-12). On the other hand, the rhetoric warns of the fatal consequences of rejecting the call to repentance. Rejecting the Q message means speaking against the Holy Spirit.

⁵⁷² See ch. 3.2.4. above.

⁵⁷³ Cf. Q 12:57-59 that displays suspicion of court administration. The same kind of threat is implied in 12:11-12. Similarly, Järvinen, “Son of Man and His Followers”, 212.

⁵⁷⁴ Horsley, “The kingdom of God as the Renewal of Israel”, 272, referring to the mission discourse (Q 10:3) where “wolves” is a traditional metaphor for rulers. The context of the mission discourse, however, speaks of hostile towns (10:13-15) in general, and not of rulers in particular.

⁵⁷⁵ See Kloppenborg, *Excavating Q*, 222.

⁵⁷⁶ Contra Zeller, „Jesus, Q und die Zukunft Israels“, 364, who argues for the reversal of judging roles from 12:11 to 22:28,30.

3.6.4. Q 17:1-2

1 ἀνάγκη ἐλθεῖν τὰ σκάνδαλα, πλὴν οὐαὶ δι' οὗ ἔρχεται. 2 λυσιτελεῖ αὐτῷ [εἰ] λίθος μυλικὸς περίκειται περὶ τὸν τράχηλον αὐτοῦ καὶ ἔρριπται εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν ἢ ἵνα σκανδαλίση τῶν μικρῶν τούτων ἓνα.

1 It is necessary for enticements to come, but woe «to the one» through whom they come! 2 It is better for him [if] a millstone is put around his neck and he is thrown into the sea, than that he should entice one of these little ones.

There is no direct literary link between this saying and the Lord's Prayer. However, the rhetoric of Q 17:1-2 seems to point to a similar 'Sitz im Leben' as in the last petition of the Lord's Prayer. 'Leading astray one of these little ones' suggests that there is a thematic connection.

'Enticements', σκάνδαλα is a *hapax* in Q and the verb σκανδαλίζω occurs here and in Q 7:23, where it appears in the concluding statement of the section of John's enquiry about the coming one (7:18-19, 21-23): 'And whoever is not offended by me is blessed.'

'Enticements' in Q 17:1 are presented as imminent phenomena that are brought by an agent (δι' οὗ).⁵⁷⁷ They are inevitable and directed to 'these little ones (...τῶν μικρῶν τούτων...)'. The rhetoric underscores the seriousness of enticing the little ones. The preceding saying concerning God and mammon (16:13) points out that enticements and mammon have similar functions. Both lead people away from God. The immediate context, the sayings on divorce (16:18), the parable of the lost sheep (15:4-5a)⁵⁷⁸ and on forgiveness (17:3-4) suggest that enticements have

⁵⁷⁷ The 'coming' of the enticements probably does not refer to the eschatological temptation that is portrayed in cosmic terms in Q (17:23-37). Against Schenk *Synopse*, 117, who argues for the eschatological temptation that connects this saying with the Lord's Prayer. Also, Viviano, *Matthew*, 645 (on Mt 6:13).

⁵⁷⁸ *CEQ* locates the parable of the lost sheep Q 15:4-5a, 7 (and that of the lost coin 15:8-10 in double brackets) between Q 17:1-2 and 17:3-4.

ecclesiological connotations, that is, they lead the little ones out of the group of ‘brothers’ (17:3-4).⁵⁷⁹

3.6.5. Summary

The immediate context of the test petition of the Lord’s Prayer referring to bread and debt suggest that the ‘test’, at least in the early phase of the tradition process, is also to be considered in concrete social terms and not metaphorically or eschatologically.⁵⁸⁰ At a later phase of tradition, the metaphorical understanding came to the fore.

Douglas Oakman argues that the original setting of the test petition was the “unjust judge”, as attested in Q 12:58-59 and Lk 18:1-7.⁵⁸¹ However, in the Q context, literary and rhetorical hints at such a setting are lacking. But, as noted above, the literary and rhetorical connections between the test petition (11:4) and the saying concerning hearings before synagogues (12:11-12) suggest a common setting. Thus *πειρασμός* alludes to a test setting before a public assembly, indeed a synagogue. Thus it had to do with testing loyalty to the Q ethos and Q message. It was a threatening occasion that was to be avoided. The test petition thus reflects the conviction that the Father was able to keep his people from

⁵⁷⁹ The woe formula may be a literary link to the woes against the Pharisees (Q 11:39-52), who are accused of wrong and hypocritical behaviour and of preventing entry into the kingdom.

Cf. Manson *Sayings*, 139, who argues that the original saying supposedly was to this effect: “He who shows the smallest kindness to a child will surely be rewarded. He who harms a little child will surely be rewarded”. Q 17:1-2, however, probably had a wider group in view than ‘little children’.

⁵⁸⁰ Cf. Oakman, “The Lord’s Prayer in Social Perspective”, 176: “It is highly probable that Jesus’ Prayer originally expressed a concrete and tight-knit integrity: It is a vivid request for deliverance from hunger, debt, and trials in rigged courts before evil judges. The social system of Roman Palestine, with debt relations reinforced by temple religion, had left many hungry and marginalized. Jesus’ Prayer directly addressed their plight, and held out hope that God would hear their prayer as God had heard the cry of the Israelites in Egypt”.

⁵⁸¹ Oakman, “The Lord’s Prayer in Social Perspective”, 173-36, alluding also to Sir 35:12-15; Job 9:23-24, and to later Jewish tradition (*Lev Rab* 3.2). One has to note that the LXX does not have the words *πειράζω* - *πειρασμός* in Sir 35:12-15; Job 9:23-24.

being tested. Further, the assistance of the Holy Spirit was promised in the test (12:11-12).

Q contains a test narrative (4:1-12) that provides a paradigm for loyalty to God. The narrative betrays theological aspects and elaborations, like the authority of Jesus over the devil and the allusions to the Scriptures. Thus testing has moved from the concrete to the religious sphere. The narrative is undoubtedly of late origin in Q.

In sum, the test petition of the Lord's Prayer betrays a similar development from concrete to metaphorical and religious connotations, as in the case of the debt petition. Its original setting was in the concrete social experience of the Q people. Later it moved towards more metaphorical use. This is reflected in the literary context of the test petition. The prayer instruction (Q 11:2-4, 9-13) provides a rhetorical context where the connotations of the test petition are lifted to a level that promises the Father's surveillance in all threatening situations. In that sense the metaphorical use of the petition is visible already on the literary level of Q.

4. Conclusions

In this study I have attempted to locate the Lord's Prayer in the context of the Sayings Gospel Q. First I, have examined the prayer as a

literary entity in its literary context, especially in its immediate context, the prayer instruction Q 11:2-4, 9-13. Then I have sought the literary, rhetorical and symbolic setting within the overall context of Q. Finally, I have looked for the social setting of the Q people and the Lord's Prayer in particular as attested in Q.

I have used a set of methodological tools in order to find a comprehensive view of the setting of the Lord's Prayer in Q. Literary, rhetorical, symbolic and sociological approaches have been used to complement one another. As the sources are mostly literary, i.e. primarily the sayings gospel Q itself, I have looked for symbolic and ideological/theological traits between the text(s) and the social reality. Additional literary and archaeological evidence is used, complementing the view of the social setting where Q, and the Lord's Prayer as part of it, emerged and was used.

The portrait that Q provides to the social setting of the Q people is twofold. Those responsible for the literary shape of Q belonged to the scribal class. The rhetorical and literary phenomena of Q betrays skilful organization and composition of the text.

However, the Q rhetoric mostly features a rural and agricultural environment. This points to the lower status of the Q people than that of the village scribes. Those who at least during the oral phase transmitted the Q tradition were ordinary people, smallholders and peasants living Galilee in villages like Kefar Nahum, Bethsaida and Chorazin. Obviously they were illiterate and thus vulnerable to economic and social exploitation.

In terms of 'little' and 'great' tradition, Q provides for an apparent moving from 'little' tradition that lies close to the oral phase of tradition process to 'great' tradition with literary elaboration and sophisticated rhetoric. This shift is reflected in the literary shape of the prayer instruction as well as in the whole Sayings Gospel Q.

The Lord's Prayer is part of the prayer instruction of Q. The instruction (Q 11:2-4, 9-13) contains several units which have been attached to each other under a common theme, that of prayer. The units have been linked together with key words and recurring structures. The rhetorical tone is positive. It promotes optimism as to the Father, giver of all good things. The rhetoric serves the confidence to get what is promised in the Lord's Prayer.

Prayer is essentially the communicative vehicle between the Father and his children. What is remarkable is that the oral communicative line runs only from those who pray to the Father but not *vice versa*. By implication the response of the Father does not occur in words but in action, i.e. giving what is asked. Confidence in the goodwill and generosity of the Father dominates the whole instruction.

There is an apparent compositional plan in the prayer instruction. It proceeds by using keywords and literary structuring. The initial admonition to pray is repeated in the structurally similar admonitions of asking, seeking and knocking. The required argument is provided by an example from the familial and the household setting and an *a minore ad maius* conclusion which presents God the Father far more generous than an ordinary father.

The references to prayer in Q outside the prayer instruction are scanty. It is remarkable that all of them are admonitions to pray or ask (praying for enemies: Q 6:28; asking for workers for the harvest: Q 10:2). This indicates a positive attitude towards prayer. The habit of prayer is taken for granted. The admonitions to pray and ask betray an ethos that is interested mainly in the concrete needs and setting of the Q people. Prayer concerns the relationship with other people and the material and social situation of those who pray. It has to do with the mission activity of the Q people. Prayer is presented as a communal activity, not as that of an individual. It is associated with familial and household rhetoric. God is thus addressed metaphorically as *paterfamilias*. By implication those who pray are children.

The thanksgiving (Q 10:21-22) and the Lord's Prayer (11:2-4) are the only prayers in Q. Formally and structurally they differ from each other. The thanksgiving is a prayer of an individual, i.e. that of Jesus. The Lord's Prayer is a petitionary prayer of numerous people.

From the tradition historical point of view the Lord's Prayer is not a coherent unit. Its older form was the address and three petitions concerning bread, cancellation of debts and surveillance. This form provides concretizing rhetoric referring to the fundamental existential needs of the Q people. The address and the triple set of petitions was later enlarged by the petition concerning sanctification of the name and the coming of the kingdom.

Thus there is an apparent development from concrete rhetoric toward metaphorical use of the petitions, already on the Q level. While originally the bread petition concerned daily subsistence, in the context of the prayer instruction it received metaphorical and even symbolic connotations of all 'good things' provided by the caring Father. The same occurred to the debt and test petitions. At first they spoke the language of concrete settings, indebtedness, lack of security and the threat of losing identity as Q people. The metaphorical impact was vague. Later the metaphorical, ideological/theological and religious connotations that were associated with the relationship between God and man, that is, 'sin' and 'temptation', came to the fore. This development obviously reflects the development of social setting of the Q people. The metaphorical understanding was relevant for any of the Q people who were not poor and destitute. The concrete petitions of the Lord's Prayer thus also spoke to an audience that did not share the same social problems and threats as the majority of the Q people.

The petitions of the name and kingdom obviously betray a later origin than those of bread, debt and being put to the test. The idea of sanctification the Father's name betrays a more remote portrait of God than the context of the prayer instruction Q 11:9-13. There, as in the section on cares (Q 12:22-31), the generosity and care of the Father are in the foreground. Furthermore, 'kingdom' has several connotations on the Q level. It is associated with the 'good things' provided by the Father at the present moment as well as having a connection with the eschatological banquet.

The Lord's Prayer is incorporated into the prayer instruction as a pattern of petitionary prayer. The instruction (Q 11:2-4, 9-13) is directed to an audience that consists of heads of households and points to the institution of *paterfamilias*. Probably the *Sitz im Leben* of the Lord's Prayer was the communal meals of the Q households. This can be seen in the prayer instruction that provides an *a minore ad maius* argument (Q 11:11-13) which betrays a familial meal setting with an appeal to the natural goodwill of the human father.

God is presented in Q in terms of *paterfamilias* and as the creator and the ruler of nature. He takes care of even the sparrows (12:6). He is the Creator who makes his sun shine and who lets the rain fall (6:35c-d). He feeds the ravens (12:24), makes the lilies grow (12:27) and clothes the grass (12:28). His deeds are apparent to everyone. He is righteous and

gives his goodness to the good and bad alike. In order to become his ‘son’ one has to love one’s enemies and pray for them (6:27-28). One has to be full of pity and not judge (6:36).

Imitatio Patris is the basis of the Q ethos. The Father provides an essential concept for the identity of the Q people. They are the children of the Father while they pray to him and have confidence in his generosity.

In Q the name is essentially equated with its bearer. Thus, making the Father’s name holy means sanctification of the Father himself. This conforms with exorcisms and the coming of the kingdom of God. In the context of the Holy Spirit sayings the petition concerning sanctification conforms with the Q message and the Q ethos as a whole.

Associatively, the sanctification of the name and the coming of the kingdom in the Lord’s Prayer are equated with exorcisms in the story of the Beelzebul controversy Q 11:14-23, which is located immediately after the prayer instruction. The name of the Father is holy when the rule of Satan no longer exists and when the demons unclean spirits are cast out by the action of Jesus. This means the realization and the coming of the kingdom at the same time.

The ‘Kingdom’ is closely connected with the Father in Q. The kingdom is his (Q 11:2; 12:31) thus having connotations of the household and *paterfamilias*. It has to be sought, and its coming is to be prayed for. In these sayings the kingdom is presented in terms of material needs. In the kingdom these needs of food and clothing are added. Further, the kingdom of God belongs to the poor whose needs will be met (6:20-21). It is a group where birth does not play a role and even the least in the kingdom is greater than John, the greatest man born of woman (7:28). The kingdom is manifested in the healing and preaching ministry of the Q workers (10:9) and in exorcisms (11:20). It is not a secret entity but apparent to all.

The Kingdom also has eschatological and judgmental connotations in Q. Its growth from tiny to great size is a divine miracle (13:18-20). It is an eschatological festal banquet where the Gentiles gather together with the Patriarchs (13:28-30). Respectively, it indicates judgment on the impenitent generation who plunder the kingdom (16:16) and who do not enter the kingdom but close it to others, too (11:52).

The food and eating rhetoric of Q promotes a moderate ethos in relation to food and eating. Gormandizing and drinking are condemned as a behaviour that brings judgment. The focus is on obedience to God. The temptation narrative Q 4:1-13 presents the temptation of hunger which is to be resisted because it can lead to disobedience. Jesus is portrayed as a moderate when consuming food and drink, though his opponents accuse him of being a 'glutton and drunkard'.

Bread and eating are closely connected with the kingdom in Q's rhetoric. Those who hunger now are blessed because they will be satisfied in the kingdom of God. One must not worry about what to eat while the basic needs, food and clothing, are added with the kingdom. One has to pray to the Father for the bread that is needed for today. One is urged to trust in the Father who will give much better things than any human father. The workers of the kingdom are asked to share table fellowship with the household they enter.

In the latest tradition of Q, bread is presented as a means of temptation (Q 4:3, 4). It is a tool in the struggle between Jesus and the devil. Fasting is attested nowhere else in Q. In the temptation story hunger is a deliberate choice, and not a consequence of poverty as in the Beatitudes (6:20-21). Indeed, the temptations imply that it is surely possible for Jesus to find enough food.

Releasing and forgiving occur in three different contexts in Q. First, it deals with the relationships among the Q people. Q demands forgiveness of the trespasses of 'brothers' without limits. Second, forgiving concerns the relation to the Q message. Speaking against man, even against Jesus the Son of Man, is forgivable. However, speaking against the Holy Spirit is culpable. He who rejects Q's call to repentance will not be forgiven.

The Q people were asked to pray for debt release. At the same time they were asked to forgive their debtors. It is remarkable that the rhetoric of lending and debt occurs in close connection with familial rhetoric and that of the Father. The familial rhetoric points to the problems of the Q households in indebtedness. The petition of the Lord's Prayer concerning the cancellation of the debts seems to imply the conviction that it is the Father who owns everything. The Father can provide bread and other material needs. He can also cancel debts. The earlier setting of the debt petition is to be sought in the loan-securing system of *prozbul* and in the temple taxation. This may reflect the Mosaic covenantal ideas

of debt cancellation. On a later tradition-historical phase 'debt' experienced a shift from the material connotations to a metaphorical and religious setting reference to 'sin' (as attested in Luke).

There are literary and rhetorical connections between the test petition (11:4) and the saying concerning hearings before synagogues (12:11-12). This suggests a common setting. Thus πειρασμός alludes to a test setting before a public assembly, indeed a synagogue. Asking for surveillance during the test had to do with testing loyalty to the Q ethos and the Q message. It was a threatening occasion that was to be avoided. The test petition thus reflects the conviction that the Father was able to keep his people from being tested. Further, the assistance of the Holy Spirit was promised in the test (12:11-12).

Q contains a test narrative (4:1-12) that provides a paradigm for loyalty to God. The narrative betrays theological aspects and elaborations, like the authority of Jesus over the devil and the allusions to the scriptures. In comparison with the Lord's Prayer the testing has moved in the test narrative from the concrete to the religious sphere, i.e. to the relation of God and man. The test narrative is undoubtedly of late origin in Q.

In sum, the Lord's Prayer in Q presents an ethos that mirrors the social setting of the Q people and obviously its development. The prayer reflects the needs and the threats with which the Q people had to live. The threats concerned the existential needs of food, cancellation of debts and surveillance. First, the question of daily bread was the most urgent for many Q people. Second, the problem of debt concerned economic conditions. Third, the Q people experienced some degree of public shame and insult. These existential needs and threats were explicated in prayer form. The petitions were directed to the Father, who was presented in terms of *paterfamilias*, as the ruler of nature and giver of all good things.

5. Bibliography

Achtemeier, Paul J. "Omnes verbum sonat: The New Testament and the Oral Environment of Late Western Antiquity". *JBL* 109 (1990): 3-27.

Allison, Dale C. Jr. "Matt. 23:39=Luke 13:35b as a Conditional Prophecy". *JSNT* 18 (1983), 75-84.

---. *The Jesus Tradition in Q*. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 1997.

---. "Q's New Exodus and the Historical Jesus". In *The Sayings Source Q and the Historical Jesus*, 395-428. Ed. Andreas Lindemann. BETL 158. Leuven: Peeters/Leuven University Press, 2001.

Arnal, William E. "The Rhetoric of Marginality: Apocalypticism, Gnosticism, and Sayings Gospels". *HTR* 88 (1995): 471-94.

---. "Making and Re-Making the Jesus-Sign: Contemporary Markings on the Body of Christ". In *Whose Historical Jesus*, 308-19. Ed. William E. Arnal and Michel Desjardins. ESCJ 7. Waterloo, Ontario: Canadian Corporation for Studies in Religion/Corporation Canadienne des Sciences Religieuses. Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1997.

---. *Jesus and the Village Scribes. Galilean Conflicts and the Setting of Q*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001.

Arnal, William E. and Michel Desjardins (ed.). *Whose Historical Jesus*. ESCJ 7. Waterloo, Ontario: Canadian Corporation for Studies in Religion/Corporation Canadienne des Sciences Religieuses. Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1997.

Asgeirsson, Jon MA., Kristin De Troyer and Marvin W. Meyer (ed.). *From Quest to Q. Festschrift James M. Robinson*. BETL CXLVI. Leuven: University Press, 2000.

Auvinen, Ville. *Jesus' Teaching on Prayer*. Åbo: Åbo Akademis förlag Pargas, 2003.

Avery-Peck, Alan J. Daniel Harrington and Jacob Neusner (ed.). *When Judaism and Christianity Began. Essays in Memory of Anthony J. Saldarini*. Volume 1 : Christianity in the beginning. Supplements to the Journal for the study of Judaism 85. Leiden : Brill Boston, 2004.

---. *When Judaism and Christianity Began. Essays in Memory of Anthony J. Saldarini*. Volume 2 : Judaism and Christianity in the beginning. Supplements to the Journal for the study of Judaism 85. Leiden : Brill Boston, 2004.

Bailey, Kenneth E. *Poet and Peasant and Through Peasant Eyes. A Literary-Cultural Approach to the parables of Luke*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1994.

Bar-Ilan, Meir. "Illiteracy in the Land of Israel in the First Centuries C.E".. In *Essays in the Social Scientific Study of Judaism and Jewish Society*, 46-61. Ed. Simcha Fishbane and Stuart Schonefeld. Hoboken, New Jersey: Ktav, 1992.

Barr, James. "Abba isn't Daddy!" *JTS* 39 (1988): 28-47.

Berger, Klaus. „Hellenistische Gattungen im Neuen Testament“. *ANRW* II, 25.2. Berlin-New York: de Gruyter, 1984.

Bauer, Walter. „Das Gebot der Feindesliebe und die alten Christen“. *ZTK* 27 (1917): 37-54.

Betz, Hans Dieter. *The Sermon on the Mount: A Commentary on the Sermon on the Mount*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995.

Black, Matthew. *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967.

Blasi, Anthony J. "Role Structures in the Early Hellenistic Church". *SA* 47 (1986): 226-48.

---. *Early Christianity as a Social Movement*. Toronto Studies in Religion 5. New York: Peter Lang, 1989.

Blass Friedrich & Albert Debrunner, bearbeitet von Friedrich Rehkopf. *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1976.

Borg, Marcus J. *Conflict, Holiness & Politics in the Teaching of Jesus*. Studies in the Bible and Early Christianity. New York, NY: Edwin Mellen, 1984.

Borg, Marcus J., Mark Powellson & Ray Riegert (ed.) *The Lost Gospel Q: The Original Sayings of Jesus*. Soho Press, 1996.

Botha Pieter J.J. "Mark's Story as Oral Traditional Literature: Rethinking the Transmission of Some Traditions about Jesus". *Hervormnde Teologiese Studies* 47 (1991): 304-31.

Broadhead, Edwin K. "The Extent of the Sayngs Tradition (Q)". In *The Sayings Source Q and the Historical Jesus*, 719-728. Ed. Andreas Lindemann. BETL 158. Leuven: Peeters/Leuven University Press, 2001.

Brodie, Thomas L. "An Alternative Q/Logia Hypothesis: Deuteronomy-based, Qumranlike, Verifiable". In *The Sayings Source Q and the Historical Jesus*, 729-743. Ed. Andreas Lindemann. BETL 158. Leuven: Peeters/Leuven University Press, 2001.

Bultmann, Rudolf. *Die Geschichte des Synoptischen Tradition*. 2. Auflage. FRLANT 29. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht; 1. Auflage 1921; 8. Auflage 1970; 10. Auflage 1995, mit einem Nachwort von Gerd Theißen.

---. *The History of the Synoptic Tradition*. Rev. ed. Transl. John Marsh. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1968.

Cameron, Ron (ed). *The Apocryphal Jesus and Christian Origins*. Semeia 49. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990.

Carruth, Shawn, and Albrecht Garsky. *Q 11:2b-4. The Lord's Prayer*. Ed. Stanley D. Anderson. In *Documenta Q: Reconstructions of Q Through Two Centuries of Gospel Research Excerpted, Sorted and Evaluated*. Leuven: Peeters, 1996.

Carruth, Shawn, and James M. Robinson. *Q 4:1-13, 16. The Temptations of Jesus – Nazara*. Ed. Christoph Heil. In *Documenta Q: Reconstructions of Q Through Two Centuries of Gospel Research Excerpted, Sorted and Evaluated*. Leuven: Peeters, 1996.

Castelli Elisabeth A. and Hal Taussig (ed.). *Reimagining Christian Origins. A Colloquium Honoring Burton L. Mack*. Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press International, 1996.

Catchpole, David R. *The Quest for Q*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1993.

---. "The Ravens, the Lilies and the Q Hypothesis". *SNTU A/6-7* (1981-82): 77-87.

Chancey, Mark A. *The Myth of a Gentile Galilee: the Population of Galilee and New Testament Studies*. SNTSM 118. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Charlesworth, James H. "A Caveat on Textual Transmission and the Meaning of *Abba*. A Study of the Lord's Prayer". In *The Lord's Prayer and Other Prayer Texts from the Greco-Roman Era*, 1-14. Ed. James H. Charlesworth with Mark Harding and Mark Kiley. Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press International, 1994.

Charlesworth, James H. with Mark Harding and Mark Kiley (ed.). *The Lord's Prayer and Other Prayer Texts from the Greco-Roman Era*. Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press International, 1994.

Chilton, Bruce and Graig A. Evans. *Authenticating the Words of Jesus*. NTTS 28/1. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1999.

Collins, John J. *The Apocalyptic Imagination. An Introduction to the Jewish Matrix of Christianity*. New York, NY: Crossroad, 1984.

---. "Apocalyptic Literature". In *Early Judaism and Its Modern Interpreters*, 345-69. Ed. Robert A. Kraft and G.W.E. Nickelsburg. Philadelphia, PA; Atlanta, GA: Fortress Press; Scholars Press, 1986.

---. "Wisdom, Apocalypticism, and Generic Compatibility". In *In Search of Wisdom: Essays in Memory of John. H. Gammie*, 165-87. Ed. Leo G. Perdue, Bernard Brandon Scott, and William J. Wiseman. Louisville: Westminster / John Knox, 1993.

Cotter, Wendy J. "The Parables of the Mustard Seed and the Leaven: Their Function in the Earliest Stratum of Q". *TJT* 8 (1992): 38-51.

Crossan, John Dominic. *Fragment: The Aphorisms of Jesus*. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1983.

---. "Lists in Early Christianity," *Semeia* 55 (1991): 235-243.

---, "Itinerants and Householders in the earliest Kingdom Movement". In *Reimagining Christian Origins. A Colloquium Honoring Burton L. Mack*, 113-29. Ed. Elisabeth A. Castelli and Hal Taussig. Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press International, 1996.

---. *The Birth of Christianity: Discovering What Happened in the Years Immediately After the Execution of Jesus*. San Francisco: Harper, 1998.

D'Angelo, Mary Rose. "Theology in Mark and Q: Abba and "Father" in Context". *HTR* 85 (1992), 149-174.

de Jonge, Marinus. *Christology in Context. The Earliest Christian Response to Jesus*. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1988.

Delobel, J. Logia. *Les Paroles de Jesus - The Sayings of Jesus: Mémorial Joseph Coppens*. BETL 59. Leuven: Uitgeverij Peeters; Leuven University Press, 1982.

Derrenbacker Robert A. and J. S. Kloppenborg, "Self-Contradiction in the IQP? A Reply to Michael Goulder". *JBL* 120 (2001): 57-76.

Dewey, Joanna. "Textuality in an Oral Culture," *Semeia* 65 (1994): 37-65.

---. "The Gospel of Mark as an Oral-Aural Event: Implications for Interpretation". In *The New Literary Criticism and the New Testament*, 148-57. Ed. Elizabeth Stutes Malbon and Edgar V. McKnight. JSNTSup 19. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994.

Downing, F. Gerald, *Cynics and Christian Origin*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1992.

Draper, Jonathan A. "Wandering Radicalism or Purposeful Activity? Jesus and Sending of Messengers in Mark 6:6-56". *Neotestamentica* 29, no. 2 (1995): 187-207.

---. "Wandering Charismatics and Scholarly Circularities". In *Whoever Hears You Hears Me. Prophets, Performance and Tradition in Q*, 29-45. By Richard A. Horsley with Jonathan Draper. Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: Trinity Press International, 1999.

---. "Recovering Oral Performance from Written Text in Q". In *Whoever Hears You Hears Me. Prophets, Performance and Tradition in Q*, 175-194. By Richard A. Horsley with Jonathan Draper. Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: Trinity Press International, 1999.

---. "The Announcement and Testing of the Prophet". In *Whoever Hears You Hears Me. Prophets, Performance and Tradition in Q*, 250-259. By Richard A. Horsley with Jonathan Draper. Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: Trinity Press International, 1999.

Drury, John. *Tradition and Design in Luke's Gospel: A Study in Early Christian Historiography*. London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1976.

Easton, Burton S. *The Gospel According to St. Luke: A Critical and Exegetical Commentary*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1926.

Ebner, Martin. „Feindesliebe - Ein Ratschlag zum Überleben? Sozial- and Religionsgeschichtliche Überlegungen zu Mt 5,38-47 par Lk 6,27-35“. In *From Quest to Q. Festschrift James M. Robinson*, 119-42. Ed. Jon MA. Asgeirsson, Kristin De Troyer and Marvin W. Meyer. BETL CXLVI. Leuven: University Press, 2000.

Edwards, Douglas R. "First Century Urban/Rural Relations in Lower Galilee: Exploring the Archaeological and Literary Evidence". *SBLSP* 27 (1988): 169-182.

Elliott, John H. "Social Scientific Criticism of the New Testament and Its Social World". *Semeia* 35 (1986): 1-33.

Eltester, W. (ed.). *Apophoreta: Festschrift für Ernst Haenchen*. BZNW 30. Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1964.

Ernst, Joseph. *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*. RNT 3. 6th rev. ed. Regensburg: Pustet, 1993.

Esler, Philip F. (ed.) *Modelling Early Christianity. Social-scientific Studies of the New Testament in its Context*. London and New York: Routledge, 1995.

Farmer, William R. "Luke's Use of Matthew: A Christological Inquiry". *Perkins Journal* 40 (3):39-50.

---. *The Gospel of Jesus: The Pastoral Relevance of the Synoptic Problem*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1994.

Farrer, Austin M. "On Dispensing with Q". In *Studies in the Gospels in Memory of R. H. Lightfoot*, 57–88. Ed. D. E. Nineham. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1955. Repr. in *The Two-Source Hypothesis: A Critical Appraisal*, 321–56. Ed. A. J. Bellinzoni. Macon, GA: Mercer University, 1985.

Fitzmyer, Joseph A. *The Gospel According to Luke, I-IX: Introduction, Translation and Notes*. AB 28. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1981.

---. *The Gospel According to Luke, X-XXIV: Introduction, Translation and Notes*. AB 28A. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1985.

Foerster, Werner. Ἐπιούσιος. ThWNT II (1935): 587-95.

Foley, John M. "Words in Tradition, Words in Text: A Response." *Semeia* 65 (1994): 169-180.

Frenschkowski, Marco. „Welche Biographischen Kenntnisse von Jesus setzt die Logienquelle voraus. Beobachtungen zur Gattung von Q in Kontext Antiker Spruchsammlungen“. In *From Quest to Q. Festschrift James M. Robinson*, 3-42. Ed. Jon MA. Asgeirsson, Kristin De Troyer and Marvin W. Meyer. BETL CXLVI. Leuven: University Press, 2000.

---. „Galiläa oder Jerusalem? Die topographischen und politischen Hintergründe der Logienquelle.“ In *The Sayings Source Q and the Historical Jesus*, 535-560. Ed. Andreas Lindemann. BETL 158. Leuven: Peeters/Leuven University Press, 2001.

Freyne, Sean, *Galilee, Jesus and the Gospels. Literary Approaches and Historical Investigations*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988.

---. "Herodian Economics in Galilee. Searching for a Suitable Model." In Esler, Philip F. (ed.) *Modelling Early Christianity. Social-scientific Studies of the New Testament in its Context*, 23-46. London and New York: Routledge, 1995.

---. "Galilean Questions to Crossan's Mediterranean Jesus." In *Whose Historical Jesus*, 63-91. Ed. William E. Arnal and Michel Desjardins. ESCJ 7. Waterloo, Ontario: Canadian Corporation for Studies in Religion/Corporation Canadienne des Sciences Religieuses. Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1997.

Fuchs, Albert. „Die Sünde wider den Heiligen Geist. Mk 3,28-30 par Mt 12,31-37 par Lk 12,10.“ *SNTU* 19 (1994): 113-30.

---. „Zum Umfang von Q. Anfragen an eine neue Arbeit zur Logienquelle.“ *SNTU* 21 (1996): 188-210.

Gager, John G. "Functional Diversity in Paul's Use of End-Time Language." *JBL* 89 (1970): 325-37.

Gielen, Marlis. „„Und führe us nicht in Versuchung.' Die 6. Vater-Unser Bitte – eine Anfechtung für das biblische Gottesbild?“ *ZNW* 89 (1998): 201-16.

Goodacre Mark S. *The Case Against Q: Studies in Marcan Priority and the Synoptic Problem*. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 2002.

Goodman, Martin. "The First Jewish Revolt: Social Conflict and the Problem of Debt." *JJS* 33 (1982): 417-27.

Goody, Jack. *The Domestication of the Savage Mind*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977.

Goulder, Michael. "The Composition of the Lord's Prayer." *NTS* 14 (1963): 32-45.

---. *Midrash and Lection in Matthew*. London: SPCK, 1974.

---. *Luke: A New Paradigm* JSNTSup 20. Sheffield: JSOT, 1989.

---. "Is Q a Juggernaut?" *JBL* 115 (1996): 667-81.

Guijarro, Santiago. "The Family in First-Century Galilee." In *Constructing Early Christian Families. Family as Social Reality and Metaphor*, 42-65. Ed. Halvor Moxnes. London: Routledge, 1997

Hanson, K. C. "The Galilean Fishing Economy and the Jesus Tradition." *BTB* 27 (1997): 99-111.

Hanson, K. C., and Douglas E. Oakman, *Palestine in the Time of Jesus: Social Structures and Social Conflicts*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1998.

Harding, Mike, "The Lord's Prayer and Other Prayer Texts from the Greco-Roman Era: A Bibliography." In *The Lord's Prayer and Other Prayer Texts from the Greco-Roman Era*, 101-257. Ed. James H. Charlesworth with Mark Harding and Mark Kiley. Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press International, 1994.

Harnack, Adolf von. *Die Lehre der zwölf Apostel*. TU 2, 1-2. Leipzig: Hinrichse, 1884.

---. *Sprüche und Reden Jesu: Die zweite Quelle des Matthäus und Lukas*. Beiträge zur Einleitung in das Neue Testament 2. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1907.

---. *The Sayings of Jesus: The Second Source of St. Matthew and St. Luke*. Transl. John R. Wilkinson. NTS 2. London: Williams & Norgate; New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1908.

---. *The Mission and Expansion of Early Christianity in the First Three Centuries*. London: Williams & Norgate, 1908.

---. *Entstehung und Entwicklung der Kirchenverfassung und des Kirchenrechts in den zwei ersten Jahrhunderten*. Leipzig : Hinrichs, 1910.

Harris, William V. *Ancient Literacy*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1989.

Havener, Ivan. *The Sayings of Jesus*. Good News Studies 19. Wilmington, Delaware: Michael Glazier, 1987.

Hedrickand, Charles W. and Robert Hodgson, Jr. (ed.). *Nag Hammadi, Gnosticism and Early Christianity*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1986.

Heil, Christoph. „Die Q-Rekonstruktion des Internationalen Q-Projekts: Einführung in Methodik und Resultate.“ *NovT* 43 (2001): 128-143.

Hellholm D. (ed.). *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East: Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Apocalypticism, Uppsala, August 12-17, 1979*. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1983.

Hengel, Martin. *Die Zeloten. Untersuchung zur jüdischen Freiheitsbewegung in der Zeit von Herodes I. bis 70 n. Chr.* Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1961.

---. *Nachfolge und Charisma. Eine exegetisch-religionsgeschichtliche Studie zu Mt 8, 21 f. und Jesu Ruf in die Nachfolge*. BZNW 34. Berlin: A. Töpelmann, 1968.

Heil, Christoph. „Beobachtungen zur theologischen Dimension der Gleichnisrede Jesu in Q.“ In *The Sayings Source Q and the Historical Jesus*, 649-660. Ed. Andreas Lindemann. BETL 158. Leuven: Peeters/Leuven University Press, 2001.

Hieke, Thomas. „Schriftgelehrsamkeit in der Logienquelle. Die alttestamentlichen Zitate in der Versuchungsgeschichte Q 4:1-13.“ In *From Quest to Q. Festschrift James M. Robinson*, 43-71. Ed. Jon MA. Asgeirsson, Kristin De Troyer and Marvin W. Meyer. BETL CXLVI. Leuven: University Press, 2000.

---. *Q 6:20-21. The Beatitudes for the Poor, Hungry, Mourning*. Ed. Thomas Hieke. In *Documenta Q: Reconstructions of Q Through Two Centuries of Gospel Research Excerpted, Sorted and Evaluated*. Leuven: Peeters, 2001.

Hock, Ronald F. and Edward N. O'Neil. *The Chreia in Ancient Rhetoric. Volume I. The Prosgymnasmata*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986.

Hoffmann, Paul. „Die Versuchungsgeschichte in der Logienquelle.“ *BZ NF* 13 (1969): 207-23.

---. *Studien zur Theologie der Logienquelle*. NTAbh NF 8. Münster: Aschendorff, 1972.

---. „Jesu Verbot des Sorgens und seine Nachgeschichte in der synoptischen Überlieferung.“ In *Jesu Rede von Gott und ihre Nachgeschichte im frühen Christentum: Beiträge zur Verkündigung Jesu und zum Kerygma der Kirche: Festschrift für Willi Marxen zum 70. Geburtstag*. Ed. Dietrich-Alex Koch, 116-41. Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1989.

---. „Mutmassungen über Q. Zum Problem der literarischen Genese von Q.“ In *The Sayings Source Q and the Historical Jesus*, 255-288. Ed. Andreas Lindemann. BETL 158. Leuven: Peeters/Leuven University Press, 2001.

Hoffmann, Paul, Josef E. Amon, Ulrike Brauner, Thomas Hieke, M. Eugene Boring and Jon Ma. Asgerisson. *Q 12:8-12. Confessing or Denying – Speaking against the Holy Spirit - Hearings before the Synagogues*. Ed. Christoph Heil. In *Documenta Q: Reconstructions of Q Through Two Centuries of Gospel Research Excerpted, Sorted and Evaluated*. Leuven: Peeters, 1997.

Hoffmann, Paul, Stefan H. Brandenburger, Ulrike Brauner and Thomas Hieke. *Q 22:28, 30. You Will Judge the Twelve Tribes of Israel*. Ed. Christoph Heil, In *Documenta Q: Reconstructions of Q Through Two Centuries of Gospel Research Excerpted, Sorted and Evaluated*. Leuven: Peeters, 1998

Holmén, Tom. “Knowing about Q and Knowing about Jesus. Mutually Exclusive Undertakings?” In *The Sayings Source Q and the Historical Jesus*, 497-514. Ed. Andreas Lindemann. BETL 158. Leuven: Peeters/Leuven University Press, 2001.

Horn, F.W. „Christentum und Judentum in der Logienquelle.“ *EvT* 51 (1991): 344-64.

Horsley, Richard A. *Jesus and the Spiral of Violence: Popular Jewish Resistance in Roman Palestine*. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1987.

---. “Questions about Redactional Strata and the Social Relations Reflected in Q.” In *Society of Biblical Literature 1989 Seminar Papers*, 186-203. Ed. David J. Lull. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989.

---. “*Logoi Propheton?* Reflections on the Genre of Q.” In *The Future of Early Christianity: Essays in Honor of Helmut Koester*, 195-209. Ed. Birger Pearson et al. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991.

---. “Q and Jesus: Assumptions, Approaches, and Analyses.” *Semeia* 55 (1992): 175-212.

---. “Wisdom Justified in All Her Children: Examining Allegedly Disparate Traditions in Q.” In *Society of Biblical Literature 1994 Seminar Papers*, 733-51. Ed. Eugene H. Lovering. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994.

---. "Social Conflict in the Synoptic Sayings Source Q." In *Conflict and Invention. Literary, Rhetorical, and Social Studies on the Sayings Gospel Q*, 37-52. Ed. John S. Kloppenborg. Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press International, 1995.

---. *Galilee. History, Politics, People*. Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press International, 1995.

---. "The Historical Context of Q." In *Whoever Hears You Hears Me. Prophets, Performance and Tradition in Q*, 46-60. By Richard A. Horsley with Jonathan Draper. Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: Trinity Press International, 1999.

---. "The Contours of Q." In *Whoever Hears You Hears Me. Prophets, Performance and Tradition in Q*, 61-93. By Richard A. Horsley with Jonathan Draper. Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: Trinity Press International, 1999.

---. "Israelite Traditions in Q." In *Whoever Hears You Hears Me. Prophets, Performance and Tradition in Q*, 94-122. By Richard A. Horsley with Jonathan Draper. Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: Trinity Press International, 1999.

---. "The Oral Communication Environment of Q." In *Whoever Hears You Hears Me. Prophets, Performance and Tradition in Q*, 123-149. By Richard A. Horsley with Jonathan Draper. Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: Trinity Press International, 1999.

---. "Recent Studies of Oral –Derived Literature and Q." In *Whoever Hears You Hears Me. Prophets, Performance and Tradition in Q*, 150-174. By Richard A. Horsley with Jonathan Draper. Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: Trinity Press International, 1999.

---. "The Covenant Renewal Discourse: Q 6:20-49." In *Whoever Hears You Hears Me. Prophets, Performance and Tradition in Q*, 195-227. By Richard A. Horsley with Jonathan Draper. Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: Trinity Press International, 1999.

---. "Prophetic Envoys for the Renewal of Israel." In *Whoever Hears You Hears Me. Prophets, Performance and Tradition in Q*, 228-249. By Richard A. Horsley with Jonathan Draper. Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: Trinity Press International, 1999.

---. "The Kingdom of God as the Renewal of Israel." In *Whoever Hears You Hears Me. Prophets, Performance and Tradition in Q*, 260-276. By Richard A. Horsley with Jonathan Draper. Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: Trinity Press International, 1999.

---. "The Renewal of Israel over against Its Rulers." In *Whoever Hears You Hears Me. Prophets, Performance and Tradition in Q*, 277-291. By Richard A. Horsley with Jonathan Draper. Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: Trinity Press International, 1999.

---. "The Renewal Movement and the Prophet Performers of Q." In *Whoever Hears You Hears Me. Prophets, Performance and Tradition in Q*, 292-310. By Richard A. Horsley with Jonathan Draper. Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: Trinity Press International, 1999.

---. *Jesus and Empire: The Kingdom of God and the New World Disorder*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2002.

---. "The Pharisees and Jesus in Galilee and Q." In *When Judaism and Christianity Began. Essays in Memory of Anthony J. Saldarini*, 117-45. Ed. Alan J. Avery-Peck, Daniel Harrington and Jacob Neusner (ed.). Volume 1 : Christianity in the beginning. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 85. Leiden : Brill Boston, 2004.

Horsley, Richard A. with Jonathan Draper. *Whoever Hears You Hears Me. Prophets, Performance and Tradition in Q*. Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: Trinity Press International, 1999.

Humphries, M L. *Christian Origins and the Language of the Kingdom of God*. Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press, 1999.

Hünenburg, Martin. „Jesus als Wundertäter. Zu einem vernachlässigten Aspekt des Jesusbildes von Q.“ In *The Sayings Source Q and the Historical Jesus*, 635-648. Ed. Andreas Lindemann. BETL 158. Leuven: Peeters/Leuven University Press, 2001.

Hymes, Dell. *'In Vain I Tried to Tell You': Essays in Native American Ethnopoetics*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1981.

International Q Project. "The International Q Project Work Session 17 November 1989." By J.M. Robinson. *JBL* 109 (1990): 499-501.

---. "The International Q Project Work Session 16 November 1990." By J.M. Robinson. *JBL* 110 (1991): 494-498.

---. "The International Q Project Work Sessions 12-14 July, 22 November 1991." By J.M. Asgeirsson and J.M. Robinson. *JBL* 111 (1992): 500-508.

---. "The International Q Project Work Sessions 31 July-2 August, 20 November 1992." By M.C. Moreland and J.M. Robinson. *JBL* 112 (1993): 500-506.

---. "The International Q Project Work Sessions 6-8 August, 18-19 November 1993." By M.C. Moreland and J.M. Robinson. *JBL* 113 (1994): 495-499.

---. "The International Q Project Work Sessions 23-24 May, 22-26 August, 17-18 November 1994." By M.C. Moreland and J.M. Robinson. *JBL* 114 (1995): 475-485.

Jacobson, Arland D. *The First Gospel. An Introduction to Q*. Sonoma: California, 1992.

---. "The Literary Unity of Q." *JBL* 101 (1982): 365-89.

---. "Jesus against the Family. The Dissolution of Family Ties in the Gospel Tradition." In *From Quest to Q. Festschrift James M. Robinson*, 189-218. Ed Jon MA. Asgeirsson, Kristin De Troyer and Marvin W. Meyer. BETL CXLVI. Leuven: University Press, 2000.

Järvinen, Arto. "Son of Man and His Followers In *Characterization in the Gospels: Reconceiving Narrative Criticism*. Ed. David Rhoads and Kari Syreeni. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.

---. "Jesus as a Community Symbol in Q." In *The Sayings Source Q and the Historical Jesus*, 515-522. Ed. Andreas Lindemann. BETL 158. Leuven: Peeters/Leuven University Press, 2001.

Jeremias, Joachim. *Abba. Studien zur neutestamentlichen Theologie und Zeitgeschichte*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966.

---. *The Prayers of Jesus*. SBT 2/6. London: SCM, 1967.

---. *New Testament Theology*. London: SCM Press, 1971.

---. *The Parables of Jesus*. London : SMC press, 1972.

---. *Die Sprache des Lukasevangeliums: Redaktion und Tradition im Nicht-Markusstoff des dritten Evangeliums*. MeyerK Sonderband. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1980.

Josephus, Flavius. *Flavii Iosephi Opera*. Edidit et apparatu critico intruxit Benedictus Niese. Vol. 1 : *Antiquitatum Iudaicarum libri I-V*. Berolini : Weidmannos, 1955 (1887).

---. Vol. 2 : *Antiquitatum Iudaicarum libri VI-X* . Berlin : Weidmannsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1955.

---. Vol. 3 : *Antiquitatum Iudaicarum libri XI-XV*. Berlin : Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1955.

---. Vol. 4 : *Antiquitatum Iudaicarum libri XVI-XX et vita*. Berlin : Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1955.

---. Vol. 6-7 : *De bello iudaico. Index*. Berlin : Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1955.

Kaut, Thomas. "Father and Tempter? The Lord's Prayer to the One and Only God." *Melita Theologica* 56:1 (2003): 3-30.

Kazen, Thomas. *Jesus and Purity Halakhah. Was Jesus Indifferent to Impurity?* Coniectanea Biblica New Testament Series, 38. Diss. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International, 2002.

Kelber, Werner H. *The Oral and Written Gospel: The Hermeneutics of Speaking and Writing in the Synoptic Tradition, Mark, Paul, and Q*. Philadelphia: Fortress. 1983.

---. "Jesus and Tradition: Words in Time, Words in Space." *Semeia* 65 (1994): 139-67.

Kim, Myung-Soo. *Die Trägergruppe von Q. Sozialgeschichtliche Forschung zur Q-Überlieferung in den synoptischen Evangelien*. Wissenschaftliche Beiträge aus

Europäischen Hochschulen 01:1. Ammersbeck bei Hamburg: Verlag an der Lottbek, 1990.

Kirk, Alan. *The Composition of the Sayings Source. Genre, Synchrony, and Wisdom Redaction in Q*. NovTSuppl 91. Leiden, Boston, Köln: Brill, 1998.

Kloppenborg, John S. "The Formation of Q and Antique Instructional Genres." *JBL* 105 (1986): 443-462.

---. *The Formation of Q: Trajectories in Ancient Wisdom Collection*. Studies in Antiquity and Christianity. Philadelphia, PA: Fortress, 1987.

---. "Symbolic Eschatology and the Apocalypticism of Q." *HTR* 80 (1987): 287-306.

---. *Q Parallels. Synopsis, Critical Notes & Concordance*. Sonoma, CA: Polebridge Press, 1988.

---. "The Formation of Q Revisited: A Response to Richard Horsley." In *Society of Biblical Literature 1989 Seminar Papers*, 204-15. Ed. David J. Lull. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989.

---. "'Easter Faith' and the Sayings Gospel Q." In *The Apocryphal Jesus and Christian Origins*. Ed. Ron Cameron. Semeia 49. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990.

---. "Literary Convention, Self-Evidence, and Social History of the Q People." *Semeia* 55 (1991): 77-102.

---. "The Sayings Gospel Q: Recent Opinion on the People behind the Document." *Currents in Research: Biblical Studies* 1 (1993): 9-34.

---. *The Shape of Q: Signal Essays on the Sayings Gospel*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1994.

--- (ed.). *Conflict and Invention. Literary, Rhetorical, and Social Studies on the Sayings Gospel Q*. Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press International, 1995.

---. "Jesus and the Parables of Jesus in Q." In *The Gospel behind the Gospel. Current Studies on Q*, 275-319. Ed. Ronald A. Piper. Leiden, New York, Köln: E.J. Brill, 1995.

---. "The Sayings Gospel Q: Literary and Stratigraphic Problems." In *Symbols and Strata. Essays on the Sayings Gospel Q*, 1-66. Ed. R. Uro. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996.

---. "On Dispensing with Q?: Goodacre on the Relation of Luke to Matthew." *NTS* 49 (2003): 210-236.

Kloppenborg, John S. with Michael G. Steinhauser, Stephen Patterson, and Marvin W. Meyer. *Q-Thomas Reader*. Sonoma and Santa Rosa: Polebridge Press, 1988.

Kloppenborg Verbin, John S. *Excavating Q. The History and Setting of the Sayings Gospel*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2000.

---. "Discursive Practices in the Sayings Gospel Q and the Quest of the Historical Jesus." In *The Sayings Source Q and the Historical Jesus*, 149-190. Ed. Andreas Lindemann. BETL 158. Leuven: Peeters/Leuven University Press, 2001.

Klostermann, Erich. *Das Matthäusevangelium*. HNT 4. 2., völlig neuarbeitete Auflage. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1927.

Koch, D.-A. „Jesu Tischgemeinschaft mit Zöllnern und Sündern: Erwägungen zur Entstehung Mk 2,13-17.“ In *Jesu Rede von Gott und ihre Nachgeschichte in frühen Christentum. Beiträge zur Verkündigung Jesu und zum Kerygma der Kirche*, 57-73. Ed. D.-A. Koch, G. Sellin and A. Lindemann. Gütersloh: Mohn, 1989.

Koch, D.-A., G. Sellin and A. Lindemann (eds.). *Jesu Rede von Gott und ihre Nachgeschichte in frühen Christentum. Beiträge zur Verkündigung Jesu und zum Kerygma der Kirche*. Gütersloh: Mohn, 1989.

Koester, Helmut. *Ancient Christian Gospels: Their History, and Development*. Philadelphia: Trinity Press International; London: SCM, 1990.

Kosch, Daniel. *Die eschatologische Tora des Menschensohnes: Untersuchungen zur Rezeption der Stellung Jesu zur Tora in Q*. NTOA 12. Freiburg/Sw.: Universitätsverlag; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989.

---. „Q: Rekonstruktion und Interpretation: Eine Methodenkritische Hinführung mit einem Exkursus zur Q-Vorlage des Lk.“ *FZPT* 36:409-25.

Labahn, Michael. „Jesu Exorzismen (Q 11:19-20) und die Erkenntnis der Ägyptischen Magier.“ In *The Sayings Source Q and the Historical Jesus*, 617-633. Ed. Andreas Lindemann. BETL 158. Leuven: Peeters/Leuven University Press, 2001.

Laufen, Rudolf. *Die Doppelüberlieferung der Logienquelle und des Markusevangeliums*. BBB 54. Bonn: Hanstein, 1980.

Lindemann, A., ed. *The Sayings Source Q and the Historical Jesus*. BETL 158. Leuven: Peeters/Leuven University Press, 2001.

---. „Die Logienquelle Q. Fragen an eine gut begründete Hypothese.“ In *The Sayings Source Q and the Historical Jesus*, 3-26. Ed. Andreas Lindemann. BETL 158. Leuven: Peeters/Leuven University Press, 2001.

Lips, Herrmann von. *Weisheitliche Traditionen im Neuen Testament*. WMANT 64. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1990.

Love, Stuart L. "Women and Men at Hellenistic Symposia Meals in Luke." In Esler, Philip F. (ed.) *Modelling Early Christianity. Social-scientific Studies of the New Testament in its Context*, 198-223. London and New York: Routledge, 1995.

Lührmann, Dieter. *Die Redaktion der Logienquelle*. WMANT 33. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1969.

---. „Die Logienquelle und die Leben-Jesu-Forschung.“ In *The Sayings Source Q and the Historical Jesus*, 191-206. Ed. Andreas Lindemann. BETL 158. Leuven: Peeters/Leuven University Press, 2001.

Luz, Ulrich. *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus*. I-II. EKKNT 1/1-2. Zürich: Benzongler; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1985-90.

Mack, Burton L. *Rhetoric and the New Testament*. Guides to Biblical Scholarship. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990.

---. *The Lost Gospel. The Book of Q & Christian Origins*. San Francisco: Harper, 1993.

Malbon, Elizabeth Stutes and Edgar V. McKnight, eds. *The New Literary Criticism and the New Testament*, 148-57. JSNTSup 19. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994.

Manson, T.W. *The Sayings of Jesus*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1957 (First published 1937).

Maruzzi, Corrado. „Sprachliche Merkmale der Q-Quelle als Hilfe für deren geschichtlichen Einordnung.“ In *The Sayings Source Q and the Historical Jesus*, 607-616. Ed. Andreas Lindemann. BETL 158. Leuven: Peeters/Leuven University Press, 2001.

März, Claus-P. „Zur Q-Rezeption in Lk 12:35-13:35 (14,1-24).“ In *The Synoptic Gospels. Source Criticism and the New Literary Criticism*, ed. C. Focant. BETL 110. Leuven: Leuven University Press & Peeters, 1993.

Meadors, Edward P. *Jesus the Messianic Herald of Salvation*. WUNT 2/72. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1995.

Meeks, Wayne A. “Social Functions of Apocalyptic Language in Pauline Christianity.” In *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East: Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Apocalypticism, Uppsala, August 12-17, 1979*, 687-705. Ed. D. Hellholm. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1983.

Meier John P. *A Marginal Jew: Rethinking the Historical Jesus*. Vol. 2: *Mentor, Message, and Miracles*. Anchor Bible Reference Library. New York, London and Toronto: Doubleday & Company, 1994.

Metzler, Norman. “The Lord’s Prayer. Second Thoughts of the First Petition.” In *Authenticating the Words of Jesus*, 187-202. Ed. Bruce Chilton and Craig A. Evans. NTT 28/1. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1999.

Michaud, Jean-Paul. “Quelle(s) communauté(s) derrière la Source Q?” In *The Sayings Source Q and the Historical Jesus*, 577-606. Ed. Andreas Lindemann. BETL 158. Leuven: Peeters/Leuven University Press, 2001.

Moreland, Milton C. "Q and the Economics of Early Roman Galilee." In *The Sayings Source Q and the Historical Jesus*, 561-576. Ed. Andreas Lindemann. BETL 158. Leuven: Peeters/Leuven University Press, 2001.

Moxnes, Halvor, ed. *Constructing Early Christian Families. Family as Social Reality and Metaphor*. London: Routledge, 1997.

---. "What is Family? Problems in Constructing Early Christian Families." In *Constructing Early Christian Families. Family as Social Reality and Metaphor*, 13-41. Ed. Halvor Moxnes. London: Routledge, 1997.

---. *Putting Jesus in His Place: A Radical Vision of Household and Kingdom*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2003.

Myllykoski, Matti. "The Social History of Q and the Jewish War." In *Symbols and Strata. Essays on the Sayings Gospel Q*, 143-199. Ed. R. Uro. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996.

Neiryck, Frans. *Evangelica III: 1992-2000 Collected Essays*, 419-431. BETL 150. Leuven : University Press; Leuven-Paris-Sterling, VA: Uitgeverij Peeters, 2001.

---. "Q 6,20b-21; 7,22 and Isaiah 61." In *Evangelica III: 1992-2000 Collected Essays*, 129-166. BETL 150. Leuven : University Press; Leuven-Paris-Sterling, VA: Uitgeverij Peeters, 2001.

---. "The Reconstruction of Q and IQP/ CritEd Parallels." In *The Sayings Source Q and the Historical Jesus*, 53-148. Ed. Andreas Lindemann. BETL 158. Leuven: Peeters/Leuven University Press, 2001.

Neyrey, Jerome H. "Loss of Wealth, Loss of Family and Loss of Honour. The Cultural Context of the Original Macarisms in Q." In *Modelling Early Christianity. Social-scientific Studies of the New Testament in its Context*, 139-58. Ed. Philip F. Esler. London and New York: Routledge, 1995.

Oakman, Douglas E. *Jesus and the Economic Questions of His Day*. SBAC 8. Lewinston and Queenston: Edwin Mellen, 1986.

---. "The Lord's Prayer in Social Perspective." In *Authenticating the Words of Jesus*, 137-186. Ed. Bruce Chilton and Craig A. Evans. NTTS 28/1. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1999.

Ong, Walter. *The Presence of the Word*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1967.

---. *Interfaces of the Word*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1977.

---. *Orality and Literacy: The Technologizing of the Word*. London: Methuen, 1982.

Osiek, Carolyn - Balch, David L. *Families in the New Testament. Household and House Churches*. Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster John Knox Press, 1997.

Patterson, Stephen J. *The Gospel of Thomas and Jesus*. Foundations & Facets: Reference Series. Sonoma, California: Polebridge, 1993.

- . "Wisdom in Q and Thomas." In *In Search of Wisdom: Essays in Memory of John G. Gammie*, 187-221. Ed. Leo G. Perdue, Bernard Brandon Scott, and William J. Wiseman. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1993.
- Pearson, Birger A. "A Q Community in Galilee." *NTS* 50/4 (October 2004): 476-494.
- Pearson, Birger et al., eds. *The Future of Early Christianity: Essays in Honor of Helmut Koester*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991.
- Perdue, Leo G., Bernard Brandon Scott, and William J. Wiseman, eds. *In Search of Wisdom: Essays in Memory of John G. Gammie*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1993.
- Perrin, Norman. *Jesus and the Language of the Kingdom. Symbol and Metaphor in New Testament Interpretation*. London: SCM Press, 1976.
- Petuschowsky J. J. and M. Brocke. *The Lord's Prayer and Jewish Liturgy*. New York: Seaury Press, 1978.
- Piper, Ronald A., "Matthew 7,7-11 Par Lk 11,9-13: Evidence of Design and Argument in the Collection of Jesus' Sayings." In *Logia. Les Paroles de Jesus - The Sayings of Jesus: Mémorial Joseph Coppens*, 411-418. Ed. J. Delobel. BETL 59. Leuven: Uitgeverij Peeters; Leuven University Press, 1982.
- . *Wisdom in the Q-tradition. The Aphoristic Teaching of Jesus*. SNTSMS 61. Cambridge, New York, New Rochelle, Melbourne, Sydney: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- . "The Language of Violence and the Aphoristic Sayings in Q." In *Conflict and Invention. Literary, Rhetorical, and Social Studies on the Sayings Gospel Q*, 53-72. Ed. John S. Kloppenborg. Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press International, 1995.
- (ed.). *The Gospel behind the Gospel. Current Studies on Q*. Leiden, New York, Köln: E.J. Brill, 1995.
- . "Wealth, Poverty & Subsistence in Q," In *From Quest to Q. Festschrift James M. Robinson*, 219-64. Ed. Jon MA. Asgeirsson, Kristin De Troyer and Marvin W. Meyer. BETL CXLVI. Leuven: University Press, 2000.
- . "Jesus and the Conflict of Powers in Q: Two Q Miracle Stories." In *The Sayings Source Q and the Historical Jesus*, 317-349. Ed. A. Lindemann. BETL 158 Leuven: Peeters/Leuven University Press, 2001.
- Puig I Tàrrach, Armand. "Une parabole à l'image antithétique: Q 6,46-49." In *The Sayings Source Q and the Historical Jesus*, 681-694. Ed. Andreas Lindemann. BETL 158. Leuven: Peeters/Leuven University Press, 2001.
- Race, William H. *The Classical Priamel from Homer to Boethius*. Leiden : E. J. Brill, 1982.

Räsänen, Heikki. "Exorcisms and the Kingdom. Is Q 11:20 a Saying of the Historical Jesus?" In *Symbols and Strata. Essays on the Sayings Gospel Q*, 119-142. Ed. R. Uro. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996.

Redfield, Robert. *Peasant Society and Culture: An Anthropological Approach to Civilization*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965.

Redfield, Robert and Singer, Milton C. "The Cultural Role of Cities." *Man in India* 36:161-194, 1956.

Reed, Jonathan L., "The Social Map of Q." In *Conflict and Invention. Literary, Rhetorical, and Social Studies on the Sayings Gospel Q*, 17-36. Ed. John S. Kloppenborg. Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press International, 1995.

---. "Population Numbers, Urbanization, and Economics: Galilean Archaeology and the Historical Jesus." In *Society of Biblical Literature 1994 Seminar Papers*, ed. Eugene H. Lovering, 203-19. SBLSP 33. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994.

---. "The Sign of Jonah (Q 11:29-32) and Other Epic Traditions in Q." In *Reimagining Christian Origins. A Colloquium Honoring Burton L. Mack*, 130-143. Ed. Elisabeth A. Castelli and Hal Taussig. Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press International, 1996.

Reiser, Marius. „Eschatologie in der Verkündigung Jesu.“ *SNTU* 27 (2002): 155-77.

Rengstorf, Karl H. *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*. 14th ed. NTD 3. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1969.

Robbins, Vernon K. "Oral, Rhetorical, and Literary Cultures: A Response." *Semeia* 65 (1994): 75-91.

---. *Exploring the Texture of Texts: A Guide to Socio-Rhetorical Interpretation*. Valley Forge: Trinity Press International, 1996.

Robinson, James M. „Die Hodajot-Formel in Gebet und Hymnus des Frühchristentums.“ In *Apophoreta: Festschrift für Ernst Haenchen*, 194-235. Ed. W. Eltester. BZNW 30. Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1964.

---. "Judaism, Hellenism, Christianity. Jesus' Followers in Galilee until 70 C.E." In *Ebraismo, Ellenismo Christianesimo*, 241-50. Ed. V. Mathieu. *Archivio di Filosofia*, 53,1. Cedam: Padova, 1985.

---. "On Bridging the Gulf from Q to The *Gospel of Thomas* (or vice versa)." In *Nag Hammadi, Gnosticism and Early Christianity*. Ed. Charles W. Hedrick and Robert Hodgson, Jr. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1986.

---. "Building Blocks in the Social History of Q." In *Reimagining Christian Origins. A Colloquium Honoring Burton L. Mack*, 87-112. Ed. Elisabeth A. Castelli and Hal Taussig. Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press International, 1996.

---. "The Jesus of Q as Liberation Theologian." In *The Gospel behind the Gospel. Current Studies on Q*, 259-274. Ed. Ronald A. Piper. Leiden, New York, Köln: E.J. Brill, 1995.

---. "A Written Greek Sayings Cluster Older than Q: A Vestige." *HTR* 92 (1999): 61-62.

---. "History of Q Research." In *The Critical Edition of Q: A Synopsis, Including the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, Mark and Thomas, with English, German and French Translations of Q and Thomas*, xix-lxxi. Eds. James M. Robinson, Paul Hoffmann and John S. Kloppenborg. Managing Editor, Milton C. Moreland. Louvain: Peeters; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2000.

---. "The Critical Edition of Q and the Study of Jesus." In *The Sayings Source Q and the Historical Jesus*, 27-52. Ed. Andreas Lindemann. BETL 158. Leuven: Peeters/Leuven University Press, 2001.

Robinson, James M., Paul Hoffmann and John S. Kloppenborg (eds.). *The Critical Edition of Q: A Synopsis, Including the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, Mark and Thomas, with English, German and French Translations of Q and Thomas*. Managing Editor, Milton C. Moreland. Louvain: Peeters; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2000.

Sanders, E. P. *Jesus and Judaism*. London: SCM Press, 1985.

Sato, Migaku. *Q und Prophetie*. WUNT 2.29. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1988.

Schenk, Wolfgang. *Synopse zur Redenquelle der Evangelien: Q-Synopse und Rekonstruktion. Ein deutscher Übersetzung mit kurzen Erläuterungen*. Düsseldorf: Patmos Verlag, 1981.

Schneider, Gerhard. *Jesusüberlieferung und Christologie. Neutestamentliche Aufsätze 1970-1990*. NovTSup 69. Leiden, New York, Kobenhavn, Köln: E.J. Brill, 1992.

Schlosser, Jacques. "Q et la christologie implicite." In *The Sayings Source Q and the Historical Jesus*, 289-316. Ed. Andreas Lindemann. BETL 158. Leuven: Peeters/Leuven University Press, 2001.

Schottroff, Luise. „Schafe unter Wölfen: Die Wanderpropheten der Logienquelle.“ In *Jesus von Nazareth: Hoffnung der Armen*, 54-88, by Luise Schottroff and Wolfgang Stegemann. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1978.

---. "Sheep among Wolves: The Wandering Prophets of the Sayings Source." In *Jesus and the Hope of the Poor*, 38-66, by Luise Schottroff and Wolfgang Stegemann, transl. M.J. O'Connell. Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis, 1986.

---. „Wanderprophetinnen: Eine feministische Analyse der Logienquelle.“ *EvT* 51 (1991): 332-344.

---. "Itinerant Prophetesses: A Feminist Analysis of the Sayings Source Q." In *The Gospel behind the Gospel. Current Studies on Q*, 347-60. Ed. Ronald A. Piper. Leiden, New York, Köln: E.J. Brill, 1995. German: „Wanderprophetinnen: Eine feministische Analyse der Logienquelle.“ *EvT* 51 (1991): 332-44.

Schottroff, Luise and Wolfgang Stegemann, *Jesus von Nazareth: Hoffnung der Armen*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1978.

---. *Jesus and the Hope of the Poor*, transl. M.J. O'Connell. Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis, 1986.

Schröter, Jens. *Erinnerung an Jesu Worte. Studien zur Rezeption der Logienüberlieferung in markus, Q und Thomas*. WMANT 76. Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1997.

Schulz, Siegfried. *Q: Die Spruchquelle der Evangelisten*. Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1972.

Schürmann, Heinz. „Das Zeugnis der Redenquelle für die Basileia-Verkündigung Jesu.“ In *Logia. Les Paroles de Jesus - The Sayings of Jesus: Mémorial Joseph Coppens*, 121-200. Ed. J. Delobel. BETL 59. Leuven: Uitgeverij Peeters; Leuven University Press, 1982.

---. *Das Lukasevangelium. Zweiter Teil, Erste Folge, Kommentar zu Kap. 9,51-11,54*. HTKNT 3/2a. Freiburg, Basel, Wien: Herder, 1994.

Scott, James C. "Protest and Profanation: Agrarian Revolt and the Little Tradition." *Theory and Society* 4 (1977): 1.38, 211-46 .

Seesemann, J. "Πειρά." *TDNT* 6 (1968): 23-36.

Singer, Milton C. *When a Great Tradition Modernizes: An Anthropological Approach to Indian Civilization*. London: Pall Mall, 1972.

Stegemann, "Vagabond Radicalism in Early Christianity? A Historical and Theological Discussion of a Thesis Proposed by Gerd Theissen." In *God of the Lowly: Socio-Historical Interpretations of the Bible*, 148-68. Ed. Willy Schottroff and Wolfgang Stegemann. Maryknoll, N.Y.: Orbis Books, 1984.

Strange, James F. „Archaeology and Ancient Synagogues up to about 200 C.E.“ In *When Judaism and Christianity Began. Essays in Memory of Anthony J. Saldarini*, 483-548. Ed. Alan J. Avery-Peck, Daniel Harrington and Jacob Neusner. Volume 2: Judaism and Christianity in the beginning. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 85. Leiden : Brill Boston, 2004.

Sundén, Hjalmar. *Die Religion und die Rollen: Eine psychologische Untersuchung der Frömmigkeit*. Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1966.

Syreeni, Kari. "Matthew, Luke and the Law: A Study in Hermeneutical Exegesis." In *The Law in the Bible and in its Environment*, 126-155. Ed. Timo Veijola. PFES 51. Helsinki-Göttingen, 1990.

---. "Metaphorical Appropriation." Tannehill, Robert C. *The Sword of His Mouth*. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1975.

Taussig, Hal. "The Lord's Prayer." *Foundations and Facets Forum* 4/4:25-41 (1988).

Theißen, Gerd. „Wanderradikalismus: Literatursoziologische Aspekte der Überlieferung von Worten Jesu im Urchristentum.“ *ZTK* 70:245-71, 1973.

---. *Soziologie der Jesusbewegung: Ein Beitrag zur Entstehungsgeschichte des Urchristentums*. Theologische Existenz Heute 194. München: Chr. Kaiser, 1977.

---. *Sociology of Early Palestinian Christianity*. Transl. John Bowden. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1978.

---. *Lokalkolorit und Zeitgeschichte in den Evangelien: Ein Betrag zur Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition*. NTOA 8. Göttingen und Fribourg: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht ; Universitätsverlag, 1989.

---. "The Wandering Radicals: Light Shed by the Sociology of Literature on the Early Transmission of the Jesus Sayings." In *Social Reality and the Early Christians: Theology, Ethics, and the World of the New Testament*, 33-59 by Gerd Theissen. Transl. Margareth Kohl. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992

Tiwald, Markus. „Der Wanderradikalismus als Brücke zum historischen Jesus.“ In *The Sayings Source Q and the Historical Jesus*, 523-534. Ed. Andreas Lindemann. BETL 158. Leuven: Peeters/Leuven University Press, 2001.

Tuckett, Christopher M. "Luke 4, 16-30, Isaiah and Q:" In *Logia. Les Paroles de Jesus - The Sayings of Jesus: Mémorial Joseph Coppens*, 343-54. Ed. J. Delobel. BETL 59. Leuven: Uitgeverij Peeters; Leuven University Press, 1982.

---. "The Temptation Narrative in Q." In *The Four Gospels 1992: Festschrift Franz Neirynck*, 479-507. Ed. Frans Van Segbroeck, Christopher M. Tuckett, G. Van Belle, and J. Verheyden. BETL 100, 479-507. Louvain: Peeters; Louvain University Press, 1992.

---. *Q and the History of Early Christianity. Studies on Q*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1997 (First published 1996).

---. "The Son of Man and Daniel." In *The Sayings Source Q and the Historical Jesus*, 371-394. Ed. Andreas Lindemann. BETL 158. Leuven: Peeters/Leuven University Press, 2001.

Uro, Risto. *Sheep among the Wolves: A Study on the Mission Instructions of Q*. AASF 47. Diss. Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1987.

---. "Apocalyptic Symbolism and Social Identity of Q." In *Symbols and Strata. Essays on the Sayings Gospel Q*, 67-118. Ed. R. Uro. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996.

---. (ed.). *Symbols and Strata. Essays on the Sayings Gospel Q*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996.

---. *Thomas: Seeking the Historical Context of the Gospel of Thomas*. London: T&T Clark, 2003.

Vaage, Leif E., "Composite Texts and Oral Mythology." In *Conflict and Invention. Literary, Rhetorical, and Social Studies on the Sayings Gospel Q*, 75-97. Ed. John S. Kloppenborg. Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press International, 1995.

---. *Galilean Upstarts. Jesus' First Followers According to Q*. Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press International, 1994

---. "Jewish Scripture, Q and the Historical Jesus: A Cynic Way with the Word?" In *The Sayings Source Q and the Historical Jesus*, 479-496. Ed. Andreas Lindemann. BETL 158. Leuven: Peeters/Leuven University Press, 2001.

Van Segbroeck, Frans, Christopher M. Tuckett, G. Van Belle, and J. Verheyden. *The Four Gospels 1992: Festschrift Franz Neirynck*. BETL 100. Louvain: Peeters; Louvain University Press, 1992.

Vassiliadis, Petros. "The Nature and Extent of the Q-Document." *NovT* 20 (1979): 49-73.

Verheyden, J. "The Conclusion of Q: Eschatology in Q 22,28-30." In *The Sayings Source Q and the Historical Jesus*, 695-718. Ed. Andreas Lindemann. BETL 158. Leuven: Peeters/Leuven University Press, 2001.

Vermes, Geza. *The Religion of Jesus the Jew*. London: SCM Press, 1993.

Viviano, B.T. *The Gospel According to Matthew*. NJBC. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1990.

Vögtle, Anton. „Der ‚eschatologische‘ Bezug der Wir-Bitten des Vater-Unser.“ In *Jesus und Paulus: Festschrift W.G.Kümmel*, 344-62. Ed. E.E. Ellis and E. Grässer. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1975.

Weber, Max, *Economy and Society: An Outline of Interpretive Sociology* I-II. Transl. and Ed. Guenther Roth and Claus Wittich. New York : Bedminster Press, 1968.

Weren, Wim J.C. "From Q to Matthew 22,1-14. New Light on the Transmission and Meaning of the Parable of the Guests." In *The Sayings Source Q and the Historical Jesus*, 661-680. Ed. Andreas Lindemann. BETL 158. Leuven: Peeters/Leuven University Press, 2001.

White, L. Michael. "Sociological Analysis of Early Christian Groups: A Social Historian's Response." *SA* (1986): 249-66.

Zeller, Dieter. *Die Weisheitlichen Mahnsprüche bei den Synoptikern*. FzB 17. Würzburg: Echter, 1977.

- . „Die Versuchungen Jesu in der Logienquelle.“ *TTZ* 89 (1980): 61-73.
- . “God as Father in the Prayers of Jesus.” In *Standing before God. Studies on Prayer in Scripture and in Tradition with Essays (Festschrift John M. Oesterreicher)*, 117-29. Ed. A. Finkel & L. Frizzell. New York: Ktav, 1981.
- . „Redaktionsprozesse und wechselnder ‚Sitz im Leben‘ beim Q-material.“ In Delobel Joël. *Logia: Les Paroles de Jésus-The Sayings of Jesus: Mémorial Joseph Coppens*, 395-409. BETL 59. Louvain: Peeters; Louvain University Press, 1982.
- . *Kommentar zur Logienquelle*. Stuttgarter kleiner Kommentar, Neues Testament 21. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1984.
- . “Redactional Processes and Changing Setting in the Q Material.” In *The Shape of Q: Signal Essays on the Sayings Gospel*, 116-30. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1994.
- . „Jesus, Q und die Zukunft Israels.“ In *The Sayings Source Q and the Historical Jesus*, 351-370. Ed. Andreas Lindemann. BETL 158. Leuven: Peeters/Leuven University Press, 2001.

Abbreviations

AASF	Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fenniae
AB	The Anchor Bible
ANRW	Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt
BBB	Bonner biblische Beiträge
BETL	Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologiarum lovaniensium
<i>BTB</i>	<i>Biblical Theology Bulletin</i>
<i>BZ NF</i>	<i>Biblische Zeitschrift Neue Folge</i>
BZNW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für neutestamentliche Wissenschaft
EKKNT	Evangelisch-katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament
ESCJ	Études sur le christianisme et le judaïsme
<i>EvT</i>	<i>Evangelische Theologie</i>
FRLANT	Forschungen zur Religion and Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments
FzB	Forschung zur Bibel

FZPT	Freiburger Zeitschrift für Philosophie und Theologie
HNT	Handbuch zum Neuen Testament
HTKNT	Herders theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament
<i>HTR</i>	<i>Harvard Theological Review</i>
<i>JBL</i>	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
<i>JJS</i>	<i>Journal of Jewish Studies</i>
<i>JSNT</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the New Testament</i>
JSNTSup	Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplements
<i>JSOT</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the Old Testament</i>
<i>JTS</i>	<i>Journal of the Theological Studies</i>
NJBC	New Jerome Bible Commentary
<i>NovT</i>	<i>Novum Testamentum</i>
NovTSup	Supplements to Novum Testamentum
NTAbh NF	Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen Neue Folge
NTD	Neues Testament Deutsch
NTOA	Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus
<i>NTS</i>	<i>New Testament Studies</i>
NTTS	New Testament Tools and Studies
PFES	Publications of the Finnish Exegetical Society
RNT	Regensburger Neues Testament
SA	Social Analysis
<i>SBAC</i>	<i>Studies in Bible and Early Christianity</i>
<i>SBLSP</i>	<i>Society of Biblical Literature Sources for Biblical Study</i>
SBT	Studies in Biblical Theology
SNTSM	Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series
<i>SNTU</i>	<i>Studien zum Neuen Testament und seiner Umwelt</i>
<i>SNTU A</i>	<i>Studien zum Neuen Testament und seiner Umwelt/ Abhandlungen</i>
<i>TDNT</i>	<i>Theological Dictionary of the New Testament</i>

<i>ThWNT</i>	<i>Theologische Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament</i>
<i>TJT</i>	<i>Toronto Journal of Theology</i>
<i>TTZ</i>	<i>Trier Theologische Zeitschrift</i>
TU	Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Kirche
<i>ZTK</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche</i>
WMANT	Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament

Abstract

The aim of this study is to locate the Lord's Prayer in the context of the Sayings Gospel Q. The prayer is examined from the literary, rhetorical, symbolic and social point of view in the Q context. Methodologically literary, rhetorical, symbolic and sociological approaches are used complementing each other.

The social setting of the Q people is twofold. Those responsible for the literary shape of Q belonged to the scribal class. However, Q's rhetoric betrays agricultural and village setting where people suffered from indebtedness and lack of economic resources.

The Lord's Prayer is part of Q's prayer instruction, which contains several sub units. These have been attached to each other under a common theme, that of prayer. The rhetorical tone promotes optimism as to the Father, giver of all good things. The prayer instruction underscores the confidence to get what is promised in the Lord's Prayer. Prayer is presented as a communal activity in Q, not as that of an individual. It is associated with familial and household rhetoric. God is addressed metaphorically as *paterfamilias*.

From the tradition historical point of view the Lord's Prayer is not a coherent unit. Its older form was the address and three petitions concerning bread, cancellation of debts and surveillance. This form provides concretizing rhetoric referring to the fundamental existential needs of the Q people. The address and the triple set of petitions was later enlarged by the petition concerning sanctification the name and the coming of the kingdom. Originally the bread petition concerned daily subsistence. In the context of the prayer instruction it received metaphorical and symbolic connotations of all 'good things' provided by the caring Father. The same occurred to the debt and test petitions. At first they spoke the language of indebtedness and lack of security. Later the metaphorical and religious connotations of 'sin' and 'temptation', came to the fore. This development obviously reflects the development of the social setting of the Q people.