

**Annual Meeting, San Diego, November 22-25, 2014**

**Saturday, November 22, 9:00 am - 11:30 am, S22-135**

**Q: Open Session**

Presider: **GIOVANNI BAZZANA**, Harvard University

**ARNE BORK**, Johannes Gutenberg-Universität Mainz, Germany: *Moving to the Kingdom of God: The Intention of Q in Light of the Semantics of Room, Space and Characters* (25 min)

Discussion (5 min)

**AGNES CHOI**, Pacific Lutheran University: *Country Mouse Goes to the City: Situating Q 7:1-10 in Galilee* (25 min)

Discussion (5 min)

**INHEE PARK**, Ewha Womans University: *Metonymy in Q: Mothering Images of God from the Daily Lives of Women* (25 min)

Discussion (5 min)

**RONALD V. HUGGINS**, Midwestern Baptist Theological Seminary: *Q Never Goes Away, It Just Changes Shape* (25 min)

Discussion (5 min)

**LLEWELLYN HOWES**, University of Johannesburg: *Advice for Farm Workers: A Radical Rereading of the So-Called Mission Discourse* (25 min)

Discussion (5 min)

**ARNE BORK**, Johannes Gutenberg-Universität Mainz, Germany: *Moving to the Kingdom of God: The Intention of Q in light of the Semantics of Room, Space, and Characters*

In recent research, Q has often been understood as a literarily as well as theologically coherent text. Nevertheless, skepticism concerning the ability to reconstruct the precise text of Q persists and, at least in some cases, may even cast doubt upon the significance of Q-research in principle. In order to avoid this difficulty, I have chosen to pursue an intertextual approach to Q in order to demonstrate the theological and literary interest(s) of this text, not on the basis of a precise reconstruction, but rather by means of the semantics of room and space as well as characters and movement. For this purpose, I bring into contact New Testament research and literary theory which provides concrete illustrations on the specific intention of the Q-document. By means of the theories of space semantics of Jurij Lotman as well as George Lakoff and Mark Johnson, I point out first, that spatial oppositions in Q correspond to semantic oppositions, and second, that concepts of movement such as the coming of the Kingdom of God as a top down movement enlighten the metaphorical language of Q which refers to a certain social reality. Regarding the characters of Q, we have to admit that most of them can only obtain a very rudimentary characterization. Hence, I have chosen to analyze certain characters of Q by means of their relation to the narrated space. An important role is assigned not only to the movement of characters, but also to the function of significant characters and character groups within the reality of Q. A specific inventory of roles for the plot arises out of this analysis, an inventory which can then be organized and presented through the character analysis model of Jens Eder. The analysis of Room, Space and Characters finally leads to the perception that Q constructs the identity of a religious community literarily. This literary arrangement essentially results from an important change of scenery performed by the entry into the Kingdom of God, which is described in Q as a household and thus as the central room in Q. Altogether, this intertextual and literary criticism approach to Q provides an innovative access to the narration of Q which confirms and complements previous Q-research.

**AGNES CHOI**, Pacific Lutheran University: *Country Mouse Goes to the City: Situating Q 7:1-10 in Galilee*

A perennial question in the study of Christian origins has concerned the transition of the ministry of Jesus in the rural domain to the ministry of the early Jesus movement in the urban domain. While the construction of space within Q itself has been studied, less attention has been given to the redaction of Q in the real, or actual, space of Galilee. The transition of the early Jesus movement from the rural to the urban domain almost certainly occurred gradually, moving from smaller villages, to larger villages, before arriving in the city proper. Nevertheless, a typology of Galilee's space has not yet been introduced into the conversation about the redaction of Q. Many have argued that Q 7:1-10 was absent from Q1 and added to Q2. This paper will consider Q 7:1-10 within the redactional history of Q, with a focus on what might be revealed by the

introduction of this pericope into Q about Galilee's space and the movement of the early Jesus followers within that space.

**INHEE PARK**, Ewha Womans University: *Metonymy in Q: Mothering Images of God from the Daily Lives of Women* (25 min)

Recent study of oral communication environments sheds light on both the text and context of Q, that is, its theological conceptions as well as its socio-historical context. One aspect of oral performance is the use of metonymy which has a distinctive rhetorical function. In Q, metonymy establishes a particular image of God that is distinctive from that of other dominant religious groups contemporary with Q. Q describes God using the imagery of compassionate parents in combinational metonymy, rather than a stand-alone selective metaphor of father. Many concrete images from various aspects of the lived world of Q establish this image of God, in connection with Q's oral culture. These small and commonplace images cannot represent the complete image of God in Q in separation, but rather they combine together to build the compassionate image of God that Q conveys. This paper explores the metonymic expressions of mothering from the daily activities of women in Q (13:20-21, 12:27, 14:34, 15:8-10, 17:35) regarding female labor in ancient agrarian small village settings as an essential element to God's image. Although Q's representative designation for God is most often one of fatherhood, the mothering images, especially images of a mother's caring and feeding, not only of a family but also of an entire village, are essential to the concept of God that Q conveys. Additionally, the God of Q consistently manifests as providing nourishment to beloved children, such as bread, fish, and sun and rain for farming. Also, the highlighted intimate portrayal of God as parents in Q invokes a relational image of mother to infant rather than ancient fatherhood. This metonymical use in Q of God's caring image portrayed through the routines of nurturing, most often conducted within the scope of female daily activity, contributes to an ever-widening scope of study of the theological foundations of Christian ethics which emphasizes compassion and mercy. Also, the investigation of mothering imagery in connection with the ancient economical context of Q indicates that positive roles of woman in Q community have important theological implications, which will be helpful both for feminist theology and the study of early Christian history.

**RONALD V. HUGGINS**, Midwestern Baptist Theological Seminary: *Q Never Goes Away, It Just Changes Shape* (25 min)

All attempts at dispensing with Q by the mere re-sequencing of the synoptic order ultimately fail. Although such solutions may succeed in dispensing with Q defined as Matthew's and Luke's shared non-Marcian material, they do so only at the expense of having to presuppose an assortment of new and different kinds of Qs. So, for example,

when I tried to dispense with Q by postulating Matthean Posteriority + Matthew's dependence on Luke for his double tradition material, the process resulted (among other things) in the materials traditionally defined as L and Q simply flowing together to become a new kind of Q consisting of both. Similarly, when the defenders of the Farrer/Goulder/Goodacre hypothesis try to dispense with Q by postulating Lukan Posteriority + Luke's dependence on Matthew for his double tradition material, M and Q similarly flow together to become a new kind of Q, again, consisting of both. The same kind of thing is true to a greater and lesser extent of all such attempts to dispense with Q by re-sequencing the synoptic order. Anyone claiming therefore that their particular Q-dispensing hypothesis serves the demands of Occam's Razor better than the dominant two-source theory should be given pause lest they speak prematurely, lest, that is to say, their solutions necessarily presuppose the existence of "lost" sources they are not adequately cognizant of. In this paper I will discuss the ways in which this process develops in relation to four different solutions to the Synoptic Problem, each of which is often regarded as not requiring appeals to additional "lost" source documents: (1) the Augustinian hypothesis, (2) the Owen-Greisbach (Two Gospel) hypothesis, (3) the Farrer (Goulder/Goodacre) Lukan Posteriority hypothesis, and (4) my own Matthean Posteriority hypothesis.

**LLEWELLYN HOWES**, University of Johannesburg: *Advice for Farm Workers: A Radical Rereading of the So-Called Mission Discourse* (25 min)

Ever since the "discovery" of the Sayings Gospel Q, the mission discourse has been read as a piece of instruction for missionaries. This tradition is so well-established that the various titles of the passage in Q 10:2-16 have all included the word "mission". Theissen's popular theory that the first followers of Jesus were itinerant radicals functioned to cement this text as a mission charge. The passage continues to be read as an instruction for missionaries even though it is generally accepted that the introductions (in Matthew 10:5-6 and Luke 10:1) were added by the evangelists, and even though the Critical Edition of Q reconstructs this text without those introductions. The words "mission" and "missionary" do not even appear in the Q text as it has been reconstructed by the International Q Project. It seems obvious that all past and present interpretations of Q 10:2-16 have been influenced by the meaning of this text in Matthew and Luke. This paper argues that the so-called mission discourse is not an instruction for missionaries at all, but rather a piece of wisdom that dispenses advice for farm workers. This is done by analysing each verse of Q 10:2-16 in turn, indicating, on the one hand, that it cannot be aimed at missionaries, and exposing, on the other, the sapiential advice it had for farm workers.

**Sunday, November 23, 9:00 am - 11:30 am, S23-138**

**Q**

Q's Difference: Social Context and Rhetorical Function This session explores the difference of Q, that is, its place within constructions of Christian origins and early Judaism, engaging basic questions about the document's social context and rhetorical function, and whether Q represents the views of a "Q Community".

Presider: **DIETER ROTH**, Johannes Gutenberg-Universität Mainz

**ROBYN FAITH WALSH**, Brown University / University of Miami: *Q and the 'Big Bang' Theory of Christian Origins* (25 min)

Discussion (10 min)

**HARRY T. FLEDDERMANN**, Alverno College, Milwaukee, WI: *Christian Apocalyptic Eschatology in Q and the Origin of the Gospel Genre* (25 min)

Discussion (10 min)

Break (10 min)

**SARAH E. ROLLENS**, University of Alabama: *Reflections on Q and Scribalism* (25 min)

Discussion (10 min)

**GIOVANNI BAZZANA**, Harvard University: *Q, Divine "Kingdom", and the Political Theology of Bureaucrats* (25 min)

Discussion (10 min)

**ROBYN FAITH WALSH**, Brown University / University of Miami: *Q and the 'Big Bang' Theory of Christian Origins*

This paper revisits the question of the dating of Q. Traditional approaches to the social context of Q's composition claim it was written before the Jewish War by communities of Jesus followers, scribes or redactor(s) invested in documenting the teachings of

Jesus. I propose that such approaches are based on ambiguous evidence and are informed by scholarly imagination about the so-called origins of early Christianity. Features of this scholarly imagination include that the early Jesus movement grew rapidly, was well established institutionally and its followers comprised relatively cohesive communities. Elsewhere, this has been called the "Big Bang" theory of Christian origins. This Big Bang theory is largely based on the origin story for early Christianity constructed by Acts. More plausible than the pre-War compositional theory is that Q was written post-War by an author interested in exploring the life of a notable Judean figure whose wonderworking and deuteronomistic teachings had particular purchase after the destruction of the Temple. This would place Q among a class of literate specialists constructing and exchanging lives of Jesus post-War, like the gospels writers. This proposed literary network for Q does not rely on assumptions about Q's social context, but utilizes known data (other extant stories about Jesus) and corresponds with what we know about ancient writing practices—namely that the composition and exchange of texts was an activity of literate, elite cultural producers. This alternative approach also challenges a number of problematic, yet pervasive, theories for understanding the social world of Q and other the first-century texts, including: the notion and reliability of oral tradition; Q's associations with the Historical Jesus; and that texts are composed by or for communities, which has a troubling association with Romantic-era thinking.

**HARRY T. FLEDDERMANN**, Alverno College, Milwaukee, WI: *Christian Apocalyptic Eschatology in Q and the Origin of the Gospel Genre*

To grasp the eschatology of Q we need to understand three distinctions: (1) The distinction between prophetic eschatology and apocalyptic eschatology; (2) The distinction between Jewish apocalyptic eschatology and Christian apocalyptic eschatology; and (3) The distinction between the first phase of Christian apocalyptic eschatology that looked to an imminent parousia and the second phase of Christian apocalyptic eschatology that recognized that the parousia had been delayed. This paper will explore all three distinctions to set the eschatology of Q in its proper context, and it will show how Q's Christian apocalyptic eschatology gave rise to the gospel genre. **SARAH E. ROLLENS**, University of Alabama: *Reflections on Q and Scribalism* An increasingly popular social identification for Q's authors is that they were (perhaps formerly) some sort of scribal or administrative figures. This follows from observations about the content and form of the text. This identification nevertheless remains difficult to flesh out. While there have been some noteworthy studies that try to outline the variety of scribes and their roles in antiquity, many of their typologies are at odds with one another, and importantly, few have considered the social experiences of different kinds of scribes. This paper explains that there are many challenges to the identification of the Q people as scribes, stemming from several interrelated factors, including (1) the lack of clear evidence for education or formal

training of these figures, especially when considered in all their varieties, (2) the fact that it interrupts idealized views of oral tradition being the driving force of the movement, and (3) the fact that scribes appear to have been figures of ambiguous social location, a realization which defies our attempts to sort Graeco-Roman society into neat horizontal categories. By recognizing the challenges inherent in studying scribes thus far, though, we can work towards a new understanding of how their social experiences may have affected the composition of Q.

**SARAH E. ROLLENS**, University of Alabama: *Reflections on Q and Scribalism*

An increasingly popular social identification for Q's authors is that they were (perhaps formerly) some sort of scribal or administrative figures. This follows from observations about the content and form of the text. This identification nevertheless remains difficult to flesh out. While there have been some noteworthy studies that try to outline the variety of scribes and their roles in antiquity, many of their typologies are at odds with one another, and importantly, few have considered the social experiences of different kinds of scribes. This paper explains that there are many challenges to the identification of the Q people as scribes, stemming from several interrelated factors, including (1) the lack of clear evidence for education or formal training of these figures, especially when considered in all their varieties, (2) the fact that it interrupts idealized views of oral tradition being the driving force of the movement, and (3) the fact that scribes appear to have been figures of ambiguous social location, a realization which defies our attempts to sort Graeco-Roman society into neat horizontal categories. By recognizing the challenges inherent in studying scribes thus far, though, we can work towards a new understanding of how their social experiences may have affected the composition of Q.

**GIOVANNI BAZZANA**, Harvard University: *Q, Divine "Kingdom", and the Political Theology of Bureaucrats*

The basileia of God plays a very peculiar role in the Sayings Gospel Q. While Q does not present any instance of the traditional Jewish acclamation of God as "king", the abstract basileia becomes personalized in a way that is at the very least unusual. The basileia appears almost appears to acquire an agentive character, so that it might seem that is bringing about on its own the eschatological reward and relief that constitutes one of the central theological themes of Q. How to explain this peculiarity? Is it in any way linked to the specific socio-cultural profile of the village scribes behind Q and to their theological-political ideology? The present paper tackles this question by arguing that the emergence of the notion of an abstract divine basileia should be understood against the backdrop provided by the changes in the discourse on sovereignty that impacted several eastern Mediterranean intellectual elites at the moment when Greco-Roman imperialism brought about the disappearance of native

monarchies. Confronted with such momentous developments, local elites (and sub-elites, as in the case of Q) tried to cope with the new situation and to protect their social prestige by detaching the ideal notion of "sovereignty" (basileia) from the concrete human figures of their contingent rulers. As several texts present the abstract "sovereignty" acting in the form of a political agent, likewise - in a theological-political perspective - the abstract divine basileia performs the salvific activities that one would have expected from God and opens up the space for the bureaucrats to play a significant role in the divine governmental ordering of the cosmos.

## **Sunday, November 23, 4:00 pm - 6:30 pm, S23-337 Q**

**Q's Difference: Contents, Silences, and Perspectives** This session, sponsored jointly by the Extent of Theological Diversity in Earliest Christianity Section and the Q Section, revisits the question of how "different" Q seems to be given its contents, silences, and perspectives, especially where issues evidently crucial to other groups (such as the death and resurrection of Jesus) are concerned. Does Q make a difference to constructions of Christian origins?

Presider: **WILLIAM ARNAL**, University of Regina

**DANIEL A. SMITH**, Huron University College: *What Difference Does Difference Make? Q's Place within Christian Origins in Recent Research* (30 min)

**JOHN KLOPPENBORG**, University of Toronto, Respondent (10 min)

**MARK GOODACRE**, Duke University, Respondent (10 min)

Discussion (20 min)

Break (10 min)

**JOSEPH VERHEYDEN**, Katholieke Universiteit Leuven: *Is There a Place in the Inn? Some Reflections on How to Take Care of Q* (30 min)

**JOHN KLOPPENBORG**, University of Toronto, Respondent (10 min)

**MARK GOODACRE**, Duke University, Respondent (10 min)



Discussion (20 min)

**DANIEL A. SMITH**, Huron University College: *What Difference Does Difference Make? Q's Place within Christian Origins in Recent Research*

With the possible exception of the larger question of Q as the source of the Double Tradition agreements between Matthew and Luke, probably the most debated issue pertaining to Q is the question how it fits (or does not fit) within Christian Origins. Contested issues relate to the documentary status of Q and its compositional history (and what that represents); its failure (?) to show an interest in the death and resurrection kerygma typically held to be universal among early Christian groups; the taxonomy of Q in relation to the categories of "wisdom" and "apocalyptic"; and Q's status among its authors and original recipients, and in the study of Christian Origins. The present study tracks the reception of the notion of Q's "difference" in recent scholarship, engaging questions about Q's genre, community origin and orientation, and religious and rhetorical perspectives.

**JOSEPH VERHEYDEN**, Katholieke Universiteit Leuven: *Is There a Place in the Inn? Some Reflections on How to Take Care of Q*

The paper wishes to address two issues. First, I will briefly revisit some earlier attempts at giving Q a place in the earliest development of Christian theology. Then it will explore some of the (perceived) difficulties scholars have had with Q, dealign more specifically with three categories: the status of Q, the things it says, the things it does not say.

**Monday, November 24, 1:00 pm - 3:30 pm, S24-205**

## **Bible in Ancient and Modern Media**

Orality, Textuality, and the Synoptic Problem: This joint session, cosponsored by the Bible in Ancient and Modern Media section, Synoptic Gospels section, and Q section, will explore how ancient media can inform our understanding of the relationships between the Gospels and the Synoptic Problem. Presenters have been invited in advance.

Presider: **HOLLY HEARON**, Christian Theological Seminary

**TOM THATCHER**, Cincinnati Christian University: *So What's the "Problem"?: Reframing the Question of the Relationships between the Gospels* (30 min)

**ROBERT DERRENBACHER**, Thorneloe University: *Ancient Literacy, Ancient Media and the Production of the Gospels* (30 min)

**ALAN KIRK**, James Madison University: *Ancient Scribal Practices and the Order of the Double Tradition in Matthew* (30 min)

**WERNER KELBER**, Rice University: *Synoptic Questions: Intertextuality, Stemmatology, Archetype* (30 min)

Discussion (30 min)

**TOM THATCHER**, Cincinnati Christian University: *So What's the "Problem"?: Reframing the Question of the Relationships between the Gospels*

This paper will introduce the session by setting broad parameters for the discussion of the relationships among the Gospels in terms of ancient media culture. Historically, questions surrounding the "Synoptic Problem" have been conceived primarily in literary terms, with focus on the relationships between the print texts of Mark, Matthew, and Luke. Recent research on the workings of, and interfaces between, memory, orality, and writing in antiquity has raised a number of fresh perspectives on ways to approach the problem. After briefly reviewing the traditional approaches to the Synoptic Problem, the paper will restate the essential questions in terms of oral-memorial processes and the relationships between "tradition" and writing in antiquity. The remaining papers in the session will apply these broad methodological concerns to more specific problems in the study of the Synoptics.

**ROBERT DERRENBACHER**, Thorneloe University: *Ancient Literacy, Ancient Media and the Production of the Gospels*

This paper will bring the studies of ancient media, ancient literacy and ancient literary dependence into a dialogue, with particular focus on the question of Matthew's and Luke's use of Mark in Synoptic theories that posit Markan priority.

**ALAN KIRK**, James Madison University: *Ancient Scribal Practices and the Order of the Double Tradition in Matthew*

Analysis of synoptic source relationships in the framework of ancient compositional practices has relied mainly upon the literary practices of elite Greco-Roman circles for its comparative material. Though well-documented and illuminating, these are only part of the spectrum of expert writing practices in antiquity, and important aspects of the synoptic gospels and synoptic relationships resist explanation on the Greco-

Roman authorial model. This paper widens the field to incorporate what, for lack of a better term, might be called ancient scribal practices, understood as including the activities of ancient grammarians and scholars in the cultivation and transmission-including source utilization-of cultural texts of various sorts. It draws upon Michael Haslam's analysis of source utilization in Apollonius Sophista's Homer Lexicon to illuminate the intractable problem (for the 2DH) of the ordering of the double tradition in Matthew, making additional reference, time permitting, to Diogenes Laertius' use of Favorinus and to evidence from some ancient florilegia. Matthew's ordering of Q material is shown to be completely intelligible and in accord with ancient practices. This neutralizes a key line of criticism of the 2DH.

**WERNER KELBER**, Rice University: Synoptic Questions: *Intertextuality, Stemmatology, Archetype*

This presentation will be a response to the previous papers concerning the Synoptic Problem and ancient media culture.