

Annual Meeting, Atlanta, November 22-25, 2003

Sunday, November 23, 1:00 pm - 1:30 pm, S23-66:

Matthew and Q

Presider: **CHRISTOPH HEIL**, Universität Frankfurt a. M., Germany

MARCO FRENSCHKOWSKI, Universität Duisburg, Germany: *What does "reading Q" and "reading Matthew" mean? Comparative reader response criticism and the genres of the gospel (20 min)*

Calling so very different books as Q, Mark, Matthew, Thomas or John by the generalizing term "gospels" does easily hide the basic difference of what manner of reading these texts expect from their readers. The implied act of reading is organized quite differently e.g. for a sayings collection or a kerygmatic biography. What can a perspective of reader-response criticism contribute to define more clearly the genres of the gospels? The focus is on Q and Matthew, though a few remarks are also made in John and Thomas. Special attention is given to the reorganizing of Q material by Matthew in structured sermons with clear thematic focus. This redactional process affects the general act of reading and tells us also something about Mt as reader of Q. Do we have clear hints whether the early gospels expected to be read or heard? How do they invite re-reading? This has been asked extensively about Mk but only to a small degree about Q. Or is Q a document that after all does not imagine an act of reading in a larger congregation? On the other side it is not at all evident what kind of private reading Q and Mt might have had in mind. The existence of Mt and Lk may have changed the "style" of reading Q to a degree that it became superfluous. Might there be basic differences compared with the devotional reading practiced by the early church and the exegetical reading practiced by theology? These questions are asked as a by-product of an ongoing extensive revision of the Kümmel Introduction to the NT, taking into account perspectives from recent research and widening the focus of defining the gospel genres.

ROBERT DERRENBACKER, Regent College, Vancouver, BC: *Greco-Roman Compositional Practices and Matthew's Use of Q (20 min)*

It has long been recognized that Luke's method of adapting Mark and Q on the Two-Document Hypothesis (2DH) is a relatively simple and straightforward technique of taking his sources in large blocks at a time, essentially preserving the order of the material as he finds it. Matthew's Gospel, on the other hand, presents a different set of problems for source critics and advocates of the 2DH. In Matthew's case, there is significant reworking of the order of the material in his sources, particularly when it comes to Q. This paper will analyze Matthew's use of Q in light of the compositional conventions of writers in the Greco-Roman world. This study will include the

techniques for adapting material from written sources and the role that ancient media (e.g., codices vs. scrolls) may have played in the production of Matthew.

JOSEPH VERHEYDEN, Catholic University Leuven, Belgium: *The Q^{Mt} - Q^{Lk} Hypothesis. Refining or Complicating the Q Hypothesis* (20 min)

A critical look at the Q-recension hypothesis as it has been developed in recent literature, esp. in the commentary on Matthew by U. Luz, who is its most prominent representative, and in the work of M. Sato. The paper discusses the general principles on which the hypothesis is built and some of the more important passages that are ascribed to Q recensions, as well as the consequences of the hypothesis for assessing the impact and delineation of Matthew's (and Luke's) redaction and for reconstructing the text of Q.

CLARE KOMOROSKE ROTHSCHILD, The University of Chicago, *The Dawn From On High: Täufer Traditions And Q* (20 min)

The importance of John the Baptist traditions to our understanding of the Synoptic texts is frequently underestimated in scholarship. Though many studies have undertaken to explain the "Täufer" traditions, the goal of these studies is usually a better understanding of John in terms of the historical Jesus. Recently, however, in her book, *The Immerser: John the Baptist Within Second Temple Judaism* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1997), Joan Taylor examines traditions concerning John the Baptist on their own terms, in particular separating John from purported Essene connections. In line with Taylor's project this paper addresses the question of the relationship between the traditions concerning John the Baptist and the Q source. According to Christopher Tuckett, "One of the more surprising features of Q is the amount of space devoted to John the Baptist. ... The reasons for devoting so much space to John are not clear. Much of this material probably had a complex pre-history behind it before it ever reached Q it seems clear that there is also in Q wholehearted support for John's teaching and a willingness to incorporate the tradition of his teaching into Q itself with no hint that John's message had been superseded, or rendered in any way invalid, by the ministry of Jesus himself," (Christopher Tuckett, *Q and the History of Early Christianity: Studies on Q* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark; and Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1996) 108-9). In this paper I argue that Tuckett is correct. Indeed that on the basis of the following four observations: 1) propagandistic determination to subjugate John, somewhat anomalously as a mere "immerser," to Jesus in all four gospels; 2) double attribution of Q sayings to John and to Jesus (e.g., Q 3:9; cf. Mt 7:19); 3) attribution of Q sayings to Jesus that contradict other Jesus traditions, (e.g., fasting/feasting, familial/afamilial, itinerant/urban, didactic/charismatic, etc.); and 4) significant thematic continuity between Täufer traditions (canonical Gospels, Acts, and Josephus) and Q sayings, current models of Q suggest that not only did Q "incorporate the tradition of

his [John's] teaching," (Tuckett) but in the undoubtedly complex pre-history of its various redactions, Q existed at some point as a source containing Täufer traditions exclusively. The implications of this thesis are particularly relevant to Matthean studies as many of the examples of competition, double attribution, contradiction, and thematic continuity between Täufer and Jesus traditions feature prominently in the First Gospel.

LINDEN YOUNGQUIST, Claremont Graduate University, *Matthew and Q: The Composition of Matt 8-9* (20 min)

Scholars have long argued that Matthew and Q stand in some kind of continuity. One problem with these claims is the perception that Matthew's composition was primarily influenced by the Gospel of Mark. This paper takes the opposite approach: Matthew is better understood as an adaptation of Q, with Markan material used to support and expand the story implied in Q. As an example, I consider the composition of Matt 8-9. Three issues are discussed. First, the order of the Markan material found in Matt 8-9 is analyzed. Rather than being an arbitrary collection of stories that ignores Mark's sequence, these chapters are composed out of two sequences of Markan stories, each of which preserves Mark's order. Second, each Markan sequence is bound by a common thread. Sequence A is made up of stories that illustrate statements made by Jesus about himself and John in Q 7. Sequence B provides examples of Jesus' mission practices, which the disciples are instructed to imitate in Q 10. Matthew's selection of Markan materials in Matt 8-9 has been determined, therefore, by the desire to illustrate sayings of Jesus found in Q. Finally, the question of the arrangement of the two sequences is explored. The answer is that once the two sequences of material were isolated, their arrangement in Matt 8-9 was determined by what made the most narrative sense.

Plenary Discussion (15 min)

Monday, November 24, 1:00 pm - 3:30 pm, S24-64: Isaiah in Early Judaism and in Q

Joint session of the Scripture in Early Judaism and Christianity Section and the Q Section

Presider: **ALAN KIRK**, James Madison University, Harrisonburg, VA

EUGENE C. ULRICH, University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, IN: *The Text and Canon of the Bible in the First Century* (30 min)

The traditional and prevailing view of the text of the Hebrew Bible is that it was basically that of a 'purified' Masoretic Text. Accordingly, most Bible translations translate 'the MT except where there is a problem,' at which point they look to the Samaritan or Septuagint or other versions for emendation. Although the above view is valid for Judaism sometime after the Second Revolt (132-135), it describes a second stage of the text and ignores an earlier and richer stage which included the composition and creative development of the Scriptures which lasted until the second century. The biblical scrolls from Qumran are not 'sectarian' but display the Scriptures of general Judaism. They are the oldest, most valuable, and most authentic evidence for the shape of the Scriptures as they circulated in Jerusalem and Palestine in the late Second Temple period. They demonstrate that the text was pluriform: that many of the books circulated in variant literary editions simultaneously, each of which apparently enjoyed equal status. The evidence of the biblical scrolls also fits perfectly with the remaining evidence for the text of the Scriptures at the time of Hillel and Jesus: the Samaritan Pentateuch, the Septuagint, the biblical quotations in the New Testament, and Josephus's recasting of the biblical narrative in the Jewish Antiquities. Moreover, there was no centralized and dominant group within Judaism that possessed the attention and concern as well as the power to establish a 'standard text,' nor is there any evidence until the Revolts of any effort to establish a 'standard text.'

KENNETH E. POMYKALA, Calvin College, Grand Rapids, MI: *The Interpretation of Isaiah in Qumran Literature* (30 min)

In documents from Qumran, Isaiah is one of the most frequently cited biblical books: five of the fifteen continuous pesharim are devoted to it (the only major prophet subject to such commentary); thematic pesharim quote it often (e.g., 4QFlor; 11Q Melch); many other writings - sectarian and non-sectarian - appeal to it (e.g. 1QS; CD; 4Q521). Indeed, it was a text from Isaiah (40:3) that legitimated the Qumran community's separation from other Jews, departure to the desert, and penitential mission (1QS 8:12-14). Then again, given the rich mix of themes about judgment and salvation found in Isaiah, along with their potential for eschatological application, perhaps this is not surprising. In contrast, the Synoptic Sayings Source Q rarely cites Isaiah explicitly. Accordingly, this paper first presents a survey of Qumran texts citing the Book of Isaiah, and then investigates how Isaiah was interpreted in these texts by considering characteristic hermeneutical approaches and patterns of interpretation. In so doing, this paper seeks to offer a profile of how one Second Temple Jewish community, the Qumran Community, used the Book of Isaiah, in order to provide a context for assessing how another Second Temple Jewish community, the Q Community, may have appropriated this prophetic book.

RICHARD A. HORSLEY, University of Massachusetts, Boston: *Q and Israelite Popular Tradition: Allusions to What We Know from Isaiah* (30 min)

Important developments in scholarly research into the condition of the Judean Scriptures, limited literacy, and the structure of society in late-second temple times require some serious re-thinking of the relation of Q and other synoptic Gospel literature to those Scriptures. Most decisively, close examination of the Qumran scrolls of the books of the Torah and Prophets shows that different textual traditions that were all still fluid and developing existed among scribal circles. Thorough examination of all available evidence now indicates not only that scrolls were expensive, cumbersome, and of extremely limited availability, and that literacy was extremely limited, confined virtually to professional scribal circles. These investigations make all the more compelling recent explorations of how, as in other traditional agrarian societies, so also in ancient Judea, Galilee, and surrounding areas, ordinary people, being non-literate, would have cultivated their own cultural tradition in a popular version (what anthropologists and others call "little tradition") parallel to the official version ("great tradition," which often has a written as well as oral form). Once we abandon now unwarranted assumptions about widespread literacy and the availability of scrolls, this is what we find exhibited in the Jesus-speeches known as Q. These speeches do not literally quote the Scripture (even in Q 4:1-13), but make dozens of references and allusions to Israelite tradition (e.g., "the Law and the Prophets," Q 16:16), many of which we find also in the books of Scripture known to us in manuscript form. To understand these references and allusions, we must frame the investigation in terms of the Israelite popular tradition that parallels but differs somewhat from the official scrolls kept in Jerusalem. This can be pursued in a focus on the allusions to prophecies of "Isaiah," primarily in Q 7:18-35 and 13:28-29.

THOMAS HIEKE, Universität Regensburg, Germany: *Q 7:22 - A Compendium of Isaian Eschatology* (30 min)

Q 7:18-22 deals with the relationship between Jesus and the preaching of John. The question of whether Jesus is the Coming One whom John announced in Q 3 is answered in Q 7:22 by allusions to several eschatological texts from the Book of Isaiah, especially Isa 26:19; 29:18-19, 35:5-6, 42:7, and 61:1. In the inner logic of the Q text, Jesus is the Coming One, because he fulfills the announcements of "Isaiah." This paper, however, demonstrates that these allusions serve another pragmatic purpose in the preaching situation of the Q community: The promises are not just fulfilled in the sense that one can cross them off the list. The text rather declares that these expectations are still valid and provide a living hope for the community. Q shares this eschatological hope with Early Judaism in which the Isaian texts were prolific and well-known, as several texts from Qumran (e.g., 4Q521) show.

Recess (5 min)

Plenary Discussion (20 min)