

**Annual Meeting, Toronto, November 23-26, 2002**

**Monday, November 25, 2002, 9:00 am – 11:30 am,  
Royal York Hotel – Tudor 7: Q and the  
Deuteronomistic View of History**

Presider: **RONALD A. PIPER**, University of St. Andrews, Scotland

**KLAUS BALTZER**, Universität München, Germany: *The Torah of Moses and the Book of Isaiah as Prophetic History*

When Deutero-Isaiah speaks of the Torah of the Servant of God (Isa 42:4), the reference is to the Torah of Moses in the Pentateuch. The four Servant-of-God texts relate four situations of the life of Moses. The Servant-of-God texts are "biography", following the prophetic Moses tradition. It is actualized exegesis of the Pentateuch. The book of Isaiah in its present three-fold form is a "Prophetic History". The "Scripture" as "Law and Prophets" is the prerequisite of the New Testament. As for the issue of tradition, genre and function of Q, the role of the prophetic Moses tradition in Q must be explored.

**WILLIAM SCHNIEDEWIND**, UC Los Angeles: *Deuteronomy and Its Legacy in Second Temple Literature*

This paper surveys the influence of Deuteronomy in Second Temple literature. Recent scholarship has criticized a pan-deuteronomism that has developed in Old Testament studies and even penetrated New Testament scholarship, as is evident for example in Q scholarship. This paper will defend a modified form of pan-deuteronomism, arguing that Deuteronomy was indeed a matrix through which much of subsequent religious orthodoxy was viewed—even when it was critiquing deuteronomistic orthodoxy. The influence of Deuteronomy extends into Dead Sea Scrolls literature and the New Testament. More problematic is the related question whether there is something we may term as a "Deuteronomistic view of history" (à la O.H. Steck) and whether such a view of history extends into Second Temple literature and ultimately influenced Q.

**ARLAND D. JACOBSON**, Concordia College, Moorhead, MN: *Q and the Deuteronomistic Tradition*

O.H. Steck's proposal regarding a deuteronomistic view of history, including the violent death of prophets, as lying behind some texts in Q has found remarkably broad acceptance among Q scholars. This paper will briefly review the reception of Steck's proposal by Q scholars and then raise several questions. Can we still speak of a deuteronomistic perspective in Q? If we can, what, if anything, does this tell us about

the relationship between Q and antecedent Jewish traditions or groups? What role does the deuteronomistic tradition play in Q? What is its extent in Q - is its influence limited to two or three passages in Q or can its influence be discerned elsewhere in Q?

**JOSEPH VERHEYDEN**, K.U. Leuven, Belgium: *The Killing of the Prophets in Q and the Deuteronomistic Tradition*

After briefly presenting some of the crucial issues in O.H. Steck's analysis of the relevant passages (Q 6:23; 11:47-51; also 13:34-35, which in his opinion does not belong to Q), the paper critically surveys the reception of Steck's views on the origin of the motif of the fate of the prophets and its function in Q in current interpretations of Q 11:47-51 and 13:34-35 which are strongly divided between a thoroughly negative and a more positive understanding. In the first one these sayings are said to express Q's conviction that Israel will not be saved, while in the other they are thought to carry a perspective of hope in a future restoration of Israel. The paper examines which interpretation is the most plausible one, how such concepts as "dtr view of history", "dtr pattern", or "dtr movement" play a role in the discussion, and in what sense this terminology should perhaps be adapted or nuanced in light of recent studies on the contents and the transmission of the Deuteronomistic literature.

**Tuesday, November 26, 2002, 9:00 am - 11:30 am,  
Royal York Hotel – Toronto, Luke and Q**

Presider: **MELANIE JOHNSON-DEBAUFRE**, Luther College, Decorah, IA

**HARRY FLEDDERMANN**, Alverno College, Milwaukee, WI: *Mid-Level Techniques in Luke's Redaction of Q.*

HARRY FLEDDERMANN, *Mid-Level Techniques in Luke's Redaction of Q*, in: ETL 79 (2003) 53-71.

Luke uses a variety of techniques to incorporate Q into his gospel. On the macro level - the level of the document as a whole - Luke follows a simple procedure. He peels off the first two Q pericopes (John's Preaching and Jesus' Temptations) and the last two pericopes (the Pounds and the Thrones) and fits them into Marcan contexts. Luke inserts the rest of Q in two windows that he opens up in the Marcan outline - the lesser interpolation (Luke 6:20-8:3) and the great interpolation (Luke 9:51-18:14). On the micro level - the level of the individual sentence - Luke intensively rewrites Q to conform the text to his own style and theology. On the mid-level - the level of the pericope - Luke uses a variety of techniques. Six mid-level techniques occur often enough to merit special attention: (1) Luke adds narrative and thematic summaries to turn Q speeches into events in Jesus' ministry and to develop Lucan themes; (2) Luke rearranges the order of the material within Q pericopes; (3) Luke inserts tiny dialogues

to break up Q pericopes and make them more narrative-like; (4) Luke expands Q by duplicating Q material or extending Q material or supplementing Q material; (5) Luke incorporates Marcan texts into Q pericopes; (6) Luke introduces a second story line into Q pericopes. Isolating each technique and studying it across Q shows the range of Luke's redaction. The Apocalyptic Discourse shows how Luke can combine all six techniques in his rewriting of Q.

**KY-CHUN SO**, Presbyterian College and Theological Seminary, Seoul, Korea: *Jesus and the God of the Q Community*

Regarding to Q and Luke, this paper will show the theology of Jesus as well as the Q community which was founded by the followers of Jesus after his death and resurrection. Considering the God of Jesus, we can trace the trajectories of early Christian churches through the Q community in Galilee because the Q text willingly shows us the theology of the fatherhood, which was mainly influenced by the Old Testament and which had critically affected the Matthean and Lukan concept of God. For this purpose, this paper argues that the theology of Jesus and the Q community is based on the God of compassionate love (Q 12:24, 28), of the heavens and earth (Q 10:21; 16:13; cf. 10:2), and of the father (Q 10:21-22; 11:2, 13; 12:30).

**MARCO FRENSCHKOWSKI**, Universität Mainz, Germany: *Demons, Mary Magdalene and Q 11:24-26*

Demonology is a major concern of the Sayings Source. Whatever model we choose for the possible genesis of Q, demons seem to be present on all levels (e.g., Q 4:1-13; 10:9; 11:14-23, 24-26, 35; 12:5, 10; 16:13, 16; 17:1-2 with varying degrees of demonological explicitness). Especially Q 11:24-26 - a text with almost complete verbal agreement between Matthew and Luke - is a complex piece of demonological and exorcistic wisdom. The paper gives an outline of the demonological aspects of the Q group's religious ideas contrasting them with Mk and other early sources. It proceeds to ask whether Q 11:24-26 might in the light of Luke 8:2 have a much more concrete meaning than is usually supposed and might originally have been an allusion to Mary Magdalene. Some attention is also given to semantic questions regarding demons in Q.

**ALEX DAMM**, University of Toronto: *Chreiai and Aptum: An Application of Rhetoric to the Synoptic Problem*

In the study of the Synoptic Problem, relatively little attention has been paid to the role of Classical rhetoric as a means to detect the synoptic gospels' editorial procedures. In this paper, I shall employ rhetoric to suggest and explain the editing sequence between Mark and Luke in the so-called Beelzebul Controversy (Mk 3:22-27/Lk 11:14-23), with reference to the Two-Gospel Hypothesis and the Two-Document

Hypothesis. Building on recent source-critical studies of this pericope guided by rhetoric (for example, by R. Meynet [1973] and V.K. Robbins [1989]), I shall focus on two features of rhetoric in the gospels' pericopae. The first is their use of the chreia (a brief, often humorous statement by a specific person, intended to impart knowledge; Mk 3:22-27/Lk 11:14-23). Because composition with a chreia (for example, expanding or refuting it), was common in Greco-Roman education, it can help describe how each gospel might edit the other. Allowing, however, for creativity on each evangelist's part, we should not conclude their editing sequence strictly from use of chreiai. We shall therefore examine the gospels' chreia usage in light of their adherence to a second feature of rhetoric: the quality of appropriateness (or *aptum*). Recognized in ancient rhetoric as essential to all compositions, *aptum* denoted appropriateness between a text's content and style, and between these and their context (for example, their audience). Focusing on specific aspects of *aptum*, we shall ask which sequence of chreia reception (Mark's reception of Luke, or Luke's reception of Mark and Q), would build this quality more strongly.

**CHRISTOPH HEIL**, Universität München, Germany: *François Bovon on Luke and Q*

François Bovon's landmark commentary on Luke, already published in French and German up to Luke 19:27, has now begun to appear in the Hermeneia series (Commentary on the Gospel of Luke 1:1-9:50, 2002). Bovon accepts the Two Document Hypothesis and uses it to illustrate Luke's literary art and narrative theology. The present paper begins with remarks on Bovon's criteria for reconstructing Q, its extent and its relation to the Gospel of Thomas. Then, as test cases, it will be examined how Bovon explains Luke's reception of Q 6:27-38 (ethics) and Q 7:18-35 (relation of John and Jesus). As a conclusion, the promising contribution of Bovon's approach to Lukan studies as well as open questions for further research will be pointed out more strongly.

**FRANÇOIS BOVON**, Harvard University: Response