

‘I Do Not Know You!’:

Reconsidering the Redaction of Q 13:25-27

Abstract

In *The Formation of Q*, Kloppenborg identifies three redactional layers in the Sayings Gospel Q: the ‘formative stratum’ (or Q¹), the ‘main redaction’ (or Q²), and the ‘final recension’ (or Q³). He ascribes Q 13:25-27 in its entirety to the main redaction. As an alternative, it will presently be argued that verse 25 belongs to the formative stratum, while verses 26-27 belong to the main redaction. To substantiate the preceding case, verse 25 will be measured against Kloppenborg’s own criteria for distinguishing between the formative stratum and the main redaction, namely those of ‘characteristic forms’, ‘characteristic motifs’ and ‘implied audience’.

Introduction

Although the reconstruction of Q 13:25-27 faces a number of difficulties, there is enough verbal and conceptual overlap between Luke 13:25-27 and Matthew 7:22-23; 25:10-12 to justify its place in the Sayings Gospel Q.¹ The Critical Edition of Q provides the following reconstruction and translation of Q 13:25-27, presented here with its literary context in Q 13:24, 28-29, [30,] 34-35:²

¹ I. Howard Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGTC; Exeter, UK: Paternoster, 1978), p. 563; William D. Davies and Dale C. Allison, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to Saint Matthew, Volume I: Introduction and Commentary on Matthew I-VII* (ICC; London, UK and New York, NY: T&T Clark, 1988), p. 714; *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to Saint Matthew, Volume III: Introduction and Commentary on Matthew XIX-XXVIII* (ICC; London, UK and New York, NY: T&T Clark, 1997), p. 393; Ulrich Luz, *Matthew 21-28: A Commentary*, trans. James E. Crouch, ed. Helmut Koester (Hermeneia; Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 2005), p. 228.

² James M. Robinson, Paul Hoffmann and John S. Kloppenborg (eds.), *The Critical Edition of Q* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 2000), pp. 406-413; *The Sayings Gospel Q in Greek and English with Parallels from the Gospels of Mark and Thomas* (CBET 30; Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 2002), pp. 130-131.

²⁴εἰσελάθατε διὰ τῆς στενῆς θύρας, ὅτι πολλοὶ ζητήσουσιν εἰσελθεῖν καὶ ὀλίγοι [εἰσὶν οἱ <εἰσερχόμενοι δι'> αὐτῆς]. ²⁵ἄφ' οὗ ἂν [ἐγερθῆ] ὁ [οἰκοδεσπότης] καὶ κλείσ[η τ]ῆ[ν] θύρα[ν καὶ ἄρξησθε ἔξω ἐστάναι καὶ κρούειν τὴν θύραν] λέγοντες· κύριε, ἄνοιξον ἡμῖν, καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ἐρεῖ ὑμῖν· οὐκ οἶδα ὑμᾶς, ²⁶τότε ἄρξεσθε λέγειν· ἐφάγομεν ἐνώπιόν σου καὶ ἐπίομεν, καὶ ἐν ταῖς πλατείαις ἡμῶν ἐδίδαξας· ²⁷καὶ ἐρεῖ λέγων ὑμῖν· οὐκ οἶδα ὑμᾶς· ἀπόστητε ἀπ' ἐμοῦ [οἱ] ἐργαζόμενοι τὴν ἀνομίαν. ²⁹[καὶ πολλοὶ] ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν καὶ δυσμῶν ἤξουσιν καὶ ἀνακλιθήσονται ²⁸μετὰ Ἀβραὰμ καὶ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ Ἰακώβ ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ, [ὑμ<εῖς>] δὲ ἐκβλ[ηθήσ<εσθε> εἰς τὸ σκότος τὸ] ἐξώ[τερον]· ἐκεῖ ἔσται ὁ κλαυθμὸς καὶ ὁ βρυγμὸς τῶν ὀδόντων. [.. ³⁰ἔσονται οἱ ἔσχατοι πρῶτοι καὶ οἱ πρῶτοι ἔσχατοι.] ³⁴Ἰερουσαλήμ Ἰερουσαλήμ, ἡ ἀποκτείνουσα τοὺς προφῆτας καὶ λιθοβολοῦσα τοὺς ἀπεσταλμένους πρὸς αὐτήν, ποσάκις ἠθέλησα ἐπισυναγαγεῖν τὰ τέκνα σου, ὃν τρόπον ὄρνις ἐπισυνάγει τ[ὰ] νοσσία αὐτῆς ὑπὸ τὰς πτέρυγας, καὶ οὐκ ἠθελήσατε. ³⁵ἰδοὺ ἀφίεται ὑμῖν ὁ οἶκος ὑμῶν. λέγω .. ὑμῖν, οὐ μὴ ἴδητε με ἕως [ἤξει ὅτε] εἴπητε· εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου.

²⁴Enter through the narrow door, for many will seek to enter and few [are those who <enter through> it]. ²⁵**When the [householder has arisen] and locked the door, [and you begin to stand outside and knock on the door], saying: Master, open for us, and he will answer you: I do not know you, ²⁶then you will begin saying: We ate in your presence and drank, and «it was» in our streets you taught. ²⁷And he will say to you: I do not know you! Get away from me, [«you» who] do lawlessness!** ²⁹[And many] shall come from Sunrise and Sunset and recline ²⁸with Abraham and 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. [.. ³⁰The last will be first and the first last.] ³⁴O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, who kills the prophets and stones those sent to her! How often I wanted to gather your children together, as a hen gathers her nestlings under «her» wings, and you were not willing! ³⁵Look, 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!

In his influential monograph *The Formation of Q*, Kloppenborg identifies three redactional layers in the Sayings Gospel Q: the ‘formative stratum’ (or Q¹), the ‘main redaction’ (or Q²), and the ‘final recension’ (or Q³).³ Out of these, only the first two are relevant to the current discussion. Kloppenborg ascribes Q 13:25-27 in its entirety to the main redaction.⁴ As an alternative, it will presently be argued that verses 25 belongs to the formative stratum, while verses 26-27 belong to the main redaction.

As the foregoing paragraph reveals, this article accepts the stratigraphy of Q proposed by Kloppenborg in 1987, thereby using it as a basis for further study. A number of other scholars have done the same.⁵ The present author has defended his acceptance and approval of Kloppenborg’s stratigraphy of Q at length elsewhere.⁶ This does not mean that every aspect and argument of Kloppenborg’s stratigraphy is simply taken over without question. In fact, the current article functions as an example of how one may accept Kloppenborg’s stratigraphy in

³ John S. Kloppenborg, *The Formation of Q: Trajectories in Ancient Wisdom Collections* (SAC; Philadelphia, PA: Fortress, 1987).

⁴ Kloppenborg, *The Formation of Q*, pp. 234-237.

⁵ E.g. Leif E. Vaage, *Galilean Upstarts: Jesus’ First Followers According to Q* (Valley Forge, PA: Trinity), pp. 7, 107; Wendy Cotter, ‘Prestige, Protection and Promise: A Proposal for the Apologetics of Q²’, in Ronald A. Piper (ed.), *The Gospel behind the Gospels: Current Studies on Q* (NovTSup 75; Leiden, NL, New York, NY and Cologne, DE: Brill, 1995), p. 117; William E. Arnal, *Jesus and the Village Scribes: Galilean Conflicts and the Setting of Q* (Augsburg, MN: Fortress, 2001), p. 5.

⁶ See Llewellyn Howes, *Judging Q and Saving Jesus: Q’s Contribution to the Wisdom-Apocalypticism Debate in Historical Jesus Studies* (Cape Town, ZA: AOSIS, 2015), pp. 61-89, 151: <http://books.aosis.co.za/index.php/ob/catalog/book/21>.

principle, but still question and critically re-examine some of the more specific arguments and conclusions that pertain to particular texts.

Kloppenborg's analysis

Kloppenborg is doubtful about the original presence of verse 25 in Q's version of this passage. At times during his discussion, he features verse 25 between brackets to indicate his uncertainty, but for the most part he features only verses 26-27. In a footnote, Kloppenborg explains that although Luke 13:25 and Matthew 25:10-12 probably drew on the same source, it is all but certain that this source text featured in the Sayings Gospel as an introduction to Q 13:26-27.⁷ In fact, Kloppenborg suggests that Matthew 7:22a provides a better introduction to verses 26-27. He clearly believes that the Third Evangelist relocated verse 25 from elsewhere in Q (or the wider Jesus tradition⁸) to its subsequent position in the Gospel of Luke between verses 24 and 26.⁹

Kloppenborg sees verse 24 as a wisdom saying.¹⁰ He follows Zeller in claiming that Q 13:24 is comparable to the sapiential logic and logia of Proverbs 1-4. As in the rest of the formative stratum, this logion calls for devotion to the radical expectations of discipleship.¹¹ To show that Q 13:24 and Q 13:[25,] 26-30 were originally two separate units, Kloppenborg draws attention to the abrupt shift from a narrow door to a locked door.¹² He also points out that the

⁷ Kloppenborg, *The Formation of Q*, p. 224, n. 217.

⁸ Kloppenborg fails to mention whether the source common to Luke 13:25 and Matthew 25:10-12 was Q or not. His larger discussion certainly suggests that he viewed it as part of Q. Most scholars agree that Luke 13:25 and Matthew 25:10-12 draw upon Q as a common source (Harry T. Fleddermann, *Q: A Reconstruction and Commentary* [Biblical Tools and Studies 1; Leuven, BE: Peeters, 2005], p. 680).

⁹ Cf. e.g. Franz Mussner, *Praesentia Salutis: Gesammelte Studien zu Fragen und Themen des Neuen Testaments* (Kommentare und Beiträge zum Alten und Neuen Testament; Düsseldorf, DE: Patmos, [1956] 1967), pp. 117, 120, 121.

¹⁰ Kloppenborg, *The Formation of Q*, pp. 234-235.

¹¹ Cf. Davies and Allison, *Matthew I-VII*, p. 696.

¹² Kloppenborg, *The Formation of Q*, p. 235; cf. Rudolf Bultmann, *The History of the Synoptic Tradition*, trans. J. Marsh (New York, NY: Harper & Row, [1921] 1963), p. 130; Marshall, *Luke*, p. 565; Robert W. Funk and Roy W. Hoover (eds.), *The Five Gospels: The Search for the Authentic Words of Jesus; New Translation and*

focus shifts from the ‘few’ (ὀλίγοι) in verse 24 to the ‘many’ (πολλοί) in verse 29.¹³ The two units were superficially combined by means of both catchword connection, with the words ‘many’ (πολλοί) and ‘door’ (θύρα)¹⁴ featuring in both units, and ‘the common motif of successful and unsuccessful attempts to enter (the kingdom)’.

Kloppenborg further holds that both Q 13:[25,] 26-27 and Q 13:28-30 are prophetic in form and theme, being ‘prophetic pronouncements’ that turn away from the topic of discipleship to speak about ‘judgment and exclusion from the kingdom’.¹⁵ Within the Sayings Gospel, Q 13:[25,] 26-27 functions as a prophetic threat against those who would not respond to the preaching of early Christians,¹⁶ including the Q people. This threat is semantically very similar to other sayings in the main redaction. The threat of eschatological denial encapsulated by the phrase ‘I do not know you!’ (οὐκ οἶδα ὑμᾶς) in Q 13:[25,] 27 overlaps extensively with Q 12:9. Also, the veiled application of the threat to Galilean settlements in Q 13:26 with the phrase ‘you taught in our streets’ (ἐν ταῖς πλατείαις ἡμῶν ἐδίδαξας) overlaps extensively with Q 10:13-15. Kloppenborg further relates Q 13:[25,] 26-27 to the mission discourse (i.e. Q 10:4-10, 16). Although the latter text belongs to the formative stratum, Q 13:[25,] 26-27 presumably

Commentary by Robert W. Funk, Roy W. Hoover, and the Jesus Seminar (New York, NY: HarperOne, 1993), p. 347.

¹³ Cf. John D. Crossan, *In Fragments: The Aphorisms of Jesus* (San Francisco, CA: Harper & Row, 1983), p. 144.

¹⁴ Kloppenborg (*The Formation of Q*, pp. 223-224, 235) accounts for the possibility that Q featured the ‘road’ (ὁδός) and ‘city gate’ (πύλη) of Matthew 7:13-14, and not the ‘door’ (θύρα) of Luke 13:24, as well as the possibility that both evangelists altered the original wording of Q (cf. Marshall, *Luke*, p. 563; Hans D. Betz, *The Sermon on the Mount: A Commentary on the Sermon on the Mount, Including the Sermon on the Plain; Matthew 5:3-7:27 and Luke 6:20-49*, ed. Adela Y. Collins [Hermeneia; Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1995], p. 524; François Bovon, ‘Tracing the Trajectory of Luke 13,22-30 back to Q: A Study in Lukan Redaction’, in Jon M. Asgeirsson, Kristin de Troyer and Marvin W. Meyer [eds.], *From Quest to Q: Festschrift James M. Robinson* [BETL 146; Leuven, BE: Leuven University Press and Peeters, 2000], p. 288; Ulrich Luz, *Matthew 1-7: A Commentary*, trans. James E. Crouch; ed. Helmut Koester [Hermeneia; Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 2007], pp. 370-371). These options introduce the possibility that the word ‘door’ (θύρα) did not feature in Q 13:24, and could therefore not have functioned as a catchword connection between Q 13:24 and Q 13:25-27. Nonetheless, the Critical Edition of Q is in all probability correct in preferring Luke’s ‘door’ (θύρα) for Q 13:24 (see Arland D. Jacobson, *The First Gospel: An Introduction to Q* [Sonoma, CA: Polebridge, 1992], pp. 206-207; Christopher M. Tuckett, *Q and the History of Early Christianity: Studies on Q* [Edinburgh, UK: T&T Clark, 1996], pp. 189-190; Fleddermann, *Q*, pp. 677-679; cf. Funk and Hoover, *The Five Gospels*, pp. 156, 347).

¹⁵ Kloppenborg, *The Formation of Q*, pp. 235-237.

¹⁶ ‘Christians’ is Kloppenborg’s term.

perceives the efforts and subsequent failure of the Q preachers from a temporal distance. Finally, Kloppenborg points to an overlap with the pronouncements of condemnation that fall upon those who reject the Q message in Q 3:7-9 and Q 11:31-32.

Kloppenborg's analysis is for the most part convincing. I agree not only that Q 13:24 qualifies formally and thematically as a wisdom saying that belongs to the formative stratum,¹⁷ but also that Q 13:26-27 qualifies at least thematically as a prophetic threat that belongs to the main redaction. The point of contention is with verse 25. Whereas Kloppenborg, as we saw, argues that the Third Evangelist was responsible for relocating this saying to its subsequent position in the Gospel of Luke between verses 24 and 26, I follow the International Q Project in preferring the Lukan position of verse 25 for Q.¹⁸

Kloppenborg's arguments against the Lukan placement of verse 25 for Q draw exclusively on the editorial activity of Luke. The shifts from a narrow door in verse 24 to a locked door in verse 25, and from 'the exclusion of latecomers' in verse 25 to 'the rejection of evildoers' in verses 26-27 suggest to him that verse 25 represents a redactional interpolation, presumably by Luke. Yet, the former shift would be entirely explicable if these were two individual logia, merely placed one after the other on account of the catchword 'door' (θύρα).¹⁹ Equally, the latter shift could be explicable as a redactional addition on the level of Q itself. Kloppenborg further estimates that the comprehensive usage of second-person plural verbs could be Lukan.²⁰

¹⁷ Even if it might or might not develop the theme of discipleship.

¹⁸ At times it seems that Kloppenborg also acknowledges the likelihood that Q 13:25 stood in its Lukan position in Q. We have already seen that he occasionally features verse 25 in brackets when discussing Q 13:25-30. Perhaps more significant is Kloppenborg's (*The Formation of Q*, p. 235) argument that a shift in *Bildlogik* takes place after Q 13:24, where he not only considers as part of his argument the reference to a locked door in verse 25, but also refers explicitly to Q '13:25-30'. In references to this text appearing after 1987, Kloppenborg explicitly adds Q '13:25-27' to his lists of Q² material (e.g. John S. Kloppenborg, 'Redactional Strata and Social History in the Sayings Gospel Q', presented at the Q Seminar for the Society of Biblical Literature [1988], p. 5, n. 1).

¹⁹ Cf. Funk and Hoover, *The Five Gospels*, p. 347; Bovon, 'Tracing the Trajectory of Luke 13,22-30', p. 288.

²⁰ Cf. Bovon, 'Tracing the Trajectory of Luke 13,22-30', p. 286.

As Jacobson correctly notes, however, the very difficulty of Luke's second-person verbs testifies to their probable origination in Q.²¹ Even if Luke's second-person verbs were a result of his editing, such editorial activity would not qualify as an argument against either the Lukan placement of verse 25 in his source, or the presence of this logion in Q. Finally, he points out that the whole passage in Luke 13:22-30 is structured around the metaphor of a festive meal. Since only the introduction of this passage in Luke 13:22-23 does not derive from Q,²² the same claim could (and should) be made on the level of Q.²³ To Kloppenborg's arguments could be added the fact that Q 13:25 is the only text that interrupts the common order between Matthew and Luke in the larger complex of logia in Q 13:24, 25, 26-27, 28-29, [30,] 34-35.^{24, 25} Yet, there is no reason why Matthew could not have been responsible for relocating Q 13:25 to the end of his parable of the ten virgins, especially considering Matthew's general tendency to displace Q logia.²⁶ Matthew did, after all, separate all the sayings that make up this complex,²⁷ reapplying them to different contexts within his gospel.²⁸

There are, to be fair, a number of positive reasons for accepting Luke's position of Q 13:25. The mentioning of a 'householder' (οικοδεσπότης) links the parable in Q 13:25-27 with the parable in Q 14:16-21, 23.²⁹ This might have been a deliberate attempt at linking these two parables through catchword connection. Conversely, if Luke were responsible for adding Q

²¹ Jacobson, *The First Gospel*, p. 207.

²² Jacobson, *The First Gospel*, p. 206; Bovon, 'Tracing the Trajectory of Luke 13,22-30', p. 287; see Fleddermann, *Q*, pp. 676-677.

²³ Cf. Jacobson, *The First Gospel*, p. 208; Fleddermann, *Q*, p. 679.

²⁴ That is, Mat. 7:13-14 // Luk. 13:24; Mat. 25:10-12 // Luk. 13:25; Mat. 7:22-23 // Luk. 13:26-27; Mat. 8:11-12 // Luk. 13:28-29; Mat. 20:16 // Luk. 13:30].

²⁵ Ronald A. Piper, *Wisdom in the Q-Tradition: The Aphoristic Teachings of Jesus* (SNTSMS 61; Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1989), p. 108; cf. Alan Kirk, *The Composition of the Sayings Source: Genre, Synchrony, and Wisdom Redaction in Q* (NovTSup 91; Leiden, NL: Brill, 1998), p. 241; Fleddermann, *Q*, p. 694.

²⁶ Davies and Allison, *Matthew XIX-XXVIII*, p. 392; Tuckett, *Q and the History of Early Christianity*, p. 192; cf. Dan O. Via, *The Parables: Their Literary and Existential Dimension* (Philadelphia, PA: Fortress, 1967), p. 123.

²⁷ Except possibly for Q 13:34-35, which Luke might have relocated (see below).

²⁸ Jacobson, *The First Gospel*, p. 208; Tuckett, *Q and the History of Early Christianity*, p. 189; Bovon, 'Tracing the Trajectory of Luke 13,22-30', p. 287; cf. Funk and Hoover, *The Five Gospels*, pp. 160, 225.

²⁹ Kirk, *The Composition of the Sayings Source*, p. 247, n. 357.

13:25 to its current Lukan position, he could not have done so for the same reason, since the two units are separated by a lot of material in Luke's narrative sequence. This renders quite inexplicable Luke's motivation for adding Q 13:25 between Luke 13:24 and Luke 13:26-27. Also, when considering the complex of sayings in Q 13:24-30 as a whole, the structural harmony of the passage supports its unity in Q.³⁰ At any rate, if the overlap in vocabulary, syntax and content between Matthew 25:10-12 and Luke 13:25 are sufficient to postulate their origination in Q, as is generally agreed,³¹ then Luke provides the only Synoptic clue for its place in Q, since its Matthean position is so obviously secondary.³² Finally, Luke's propensity to treat Q 13:25-29 as a single unit suggests that he already had access to it as a unified text in his source, even if, and precisely because, internal connections between the constitutive sayings are fairly artificial.³³ We may therefore conclude that Matthew and Luke had access to a unified pericope in Q, which included verse 25 in its Lukan position.³⁴

Once it is accepted that Luke's position of verse 25 represents Q, it needs to be determined whether this logion belongs to the formative stratum or the main redaction. Even if between brackets, Kloppenborg features verse 25 when discussing verses 26-27, and not when discussing verse 24, suggesting that he would have added verse 25 to the main redaction if he had accepted its Lukan position in Q.³⁵ This is confirmed by his discussion of the shift in *Bildlogik* between Q 13:24 and the rest of the passage, since the content of verse 25 forms for Kloppenborg an integral part of this shift.³⁶ It is further confirmed by references to this text in

³⁰ See Fleddermann, *Q*, pp. 694-695; *pace* Paul Hoffmann, 'Πάντες ἐργάται ἄδικίας: Redaktion und Tradition in Lc 13,22-30', *ZNW* 58 (1967), pp. 188-214; Mussner, *Praesentia Salutis*, 113-124.

³¹ Fleddermann, *Q*, p. 680.

³² Via, *The Parables*, 123; John R. Donahue, *The Gospel in Parable* (Philadelphia, PA: Fortress, 1988), p. 104.

³³ William D. Davies and Dale C. Allison, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to Saint Matthew, Volume II: Commentary on Matthew VIII-XVIII*. (ICC; London, UK and New York, NY: T&T Clark, 1991), p. 26; Jacobson, *The First Gospel*, p. 208; cf. Marshall, *Luke*, p. 564.

³⁴ Cf. Tuckett, *Q and the History of Early Christianity*, pp. 189, 193.

³⁵ Kloppenborg, *The Formation of Q*, pp. 224-225, 235-236.

³⁶ Kloppenborg, *The Formation of Q*, p. 235.

subsequent publications, as in Kloppenborg 1988:5 n. 1, where he explicitly adds Q ‘13:25-27’ to his list of Q² material.

Kloppenborg is certainly correct that verses 24 and 25 were originally separate, but this inference does not necessarily support his stratigraphy. The two texts could just as easily have been combined during Q’s complex prehistory,³⁷ or they could have been placed back-to-back by those responsible for the final structure of the formative stratum. The practice of placing contradictory logia side-by-side was common and often intentional in ancient wisdom, so that contradiction is not always a useful criterion in the determination of diachronic development.³⁸ Moreover, despite the near certainty that Q 13:24 and Q 13:25 were originally separate, they do not necessarily contradict each other.³⁹ A narrow door can easily be locked. In fact, if the narrow door remained open indefinitely, it would contradict the claim in verse 24 that only a few would enter through it. This claim is made not because some of these individuals are overweight, but probably because entry is restricted by the householder.⁴⁰ Verse 25 confirms this interpretation by admitting that the householder has a tendency to lock the door.⁴¹ According to Kirk, the shift from a narrow door to a closed door represents ‘a clever development’ in the overall narrative sequence.⁴²

³⁷ Cf. Tuckett, *Q and the History of Early Christianity*, p. 71.

³⁸ Cf. Kirk, *The Composition of the Sayings Source*, pp. 211, 346; Ronald A. Piper 2000, ‘Wealth, Poverty, and Subsistence in Q’, in Jon M. Asgeirsson, Kristin De Troyer and Marvin W Meyer (eds.), *From Quest to Q: Festschrift James M. Robinson* (BETL 146; Leuven, BE: Leuven University Press and Peeters, 2000), p. 248; Dale C. Allison, *Constructing Jesus: Memory, Imagination, and History* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2010), p. 90; John P. Meier, ‘Basic Methodology in the Quest for the Historical Jesus’, in Tom Holmén and Stanley E. Porter (eds.), *Handbook for the Study of the Historical Jesus, Volume 1: How to Study the Historical Jesus* (Leiden, NL and Boston, MA: Brill, 2011), p. 321.

³⁹ Marshall, *Luke*, p. 565; cf. Darrell L. Bock, *Luke, Volume 2: 9:51-24:53* (Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament; Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1996), pp. 1235, 1236; Tuckett, *Q and the History of Early Christianity*, p. 145; Fleddermann, *Q*, 695.

⁴⁰ Richard Valantasis, *The New Q: A Fresh Translation with Commentary* (New York, NY and London, UK: T&T Clark, 2005), p. 181; cf. Tuckett, *Q and the History of Early Christianity*, p. 192.

⁴¹ Joachim Jeremias, *The Parables of Jesus* (rev. edn.; London, UK: SCM, [1947] 1963), p. 96; cf. Tuckett, *Q and the History of Early Christianity*, pp. 145, 191, 192.

⁴² Kirk, *The Composition of the Sayings Source*, p. 247 (n. 357), 249; cf. Jacobson, *The First Gospel*, p. 207.

An alternative proposal

I propose that verses 24 and 25 featured in the formative stratum as two individual logia, and that the main redactor added verses 26-27 after verse 25 as a secondary interpretation, altering its meaning in the process. This is in many respects the direct opposite of Kirk's suggestion that '13:25 may be a redactional creation of the Q-editor which does triple duty: connecting 13:26-27 with 13:24, preparing for the banquet-hall imagery of 13:28-29, and establishing a cross-cluster connection with the other banquet parable in 14:16-24'.⁴³ Nonetheless, Kirk and I do share the impression that Q 13:25 and Q 13:26-27 were combined secondarily. Bovon tables a very similar proposal to mine, but attributes the combination of verse 25 with verses 26-27 to Lukan redaction, as opposed to Q redaction.⁴⁴ The same is true of Funk and Hoover, who claim that 'Luke has linked the closed door saying [Q 13:25] with the non-recognition sayings [Q 13:26-27] that occur in Matthew in a different context (Mat. 7:22-23)'.⁴⁵ Tuckett claims that verses 26-27 cannot have been a later addition at all, since the identity of the addressees and the reason for their exclusion are for the first time revealed in these subsequent verses, not having been specified in verse 25.⁴⁶ Tuckett's logic is flawed here. In the development of the Jesus tradition, additions were made precisely to clarify, alter and dictate the respective interpretations of otherwise obscure, ambiguous and open-ended material.⁴⁷ The very fact that verses 26-27 elucidate an aspect of verse 25, thereby directing and controlling its meaning, qualifies as evidence of expansion.

My proposal is substantiated by a number of textual features. The exclamation 'I do not know you!' (οὐκ οἶδα ὑμᾶς) at the end of verse 25 is an appropriate conclusion, and entirely sufficient

⁴³ Kirk, *The Composition of the Sayings Source*, pp. 247-248, n. 357.

⁴⁴ Bovon, 'Tracing the Trajectory of Luke 13,22-30', pp. 288-289.

⁴⁵ Funk and Hoover, *The Five Gospels*, p. 348.

⁴⁶ Tuckett, *Q and the History of Early Christianity*, p. 192.

⁴⁷ Robert W. Funk, *Funk on Parables: Collected Essays*, ed. Bernard B. Scott (Santa Rosa, CA: Polebridge, 2006), p. 30.

to communicate the point of the saying.⁴⁸ Even on the face of it, verses 26-27 appear to be an elaboration of the concluding exclamation in verse 25. Although Fleddermann intends it as a synchronic observation, he agrees that a ‘brief initial dialogue’ is enlarged by a ‘more expanded second dialogue’ or ‘fuller exchange’.⁴⁹

A compelling piece of evidence supporting the original independence of verse 25 is the conspicuous use of the second-person plural. Valantasis might be correct that the narrator of Q 13:25-27 ‘observes the action from a distance’,⁵⁰ but the utilisation of the second-person plural inappropriately shatters the facade of distance and separation between the characters of the story and the audience listening to the story.⁵¹ On the one hand, it is customary for the parables of Jesus to remain within the constructed narrative world for the duration of the narrative itself, which is why characters within that world are typically referenced in the third person, as separate from the audience listening to the parable. On the other hand, it is normal for individual logia to address an audience directly in the second person. Both the presence of the second-person plural and the failure to identify the narrative characters behind the second-person plural strongly suggest that Q 13:25-27 was turned into a parable when the individual saying of verse 25 was elaborated by the addition of verses 26-27.⁵² It is not impossible that verses 26-27 circulated independently in the Jesus tradition before being attached to verse 25 by the main redactor. This possibility is supported by the Matthean usage and placement of Q 13:26-27 as a self-sufficient logion in the midst of other individual logia in his sermon on the mount.⁵³ As a side note, the potential authenticity of Q 13:26-27 is verified by its autonomy

⁴⁸ Leif E. Vaage 2001, ‘Jewish Scripture, Q and the Historical Jesus: A Cynic Way with the Word?’, in Andreas Lindemann (ed.), *The Sayings Source Q and the Historical Jesus* (BETL 158; Leuven, BE, Paris, FR and Sterling, VA: Leuven University Press and Peeters, 2001), p. 487.

⁴⁹ Fleddermann, *Q*, pp. 680, 682, 697; cf. Bovon, ‘Tracing the Trajectory of Luke 13,22-30’, p. 286.

⁵⁰ Valantasis, *The New Q*, p. 181.

⁵¹ Bovon, ‘Tracing the Trajectory of Luke 13,22-30’, p. 286; cf. Jacobson, *The First Gospel*, p. 207.

⁵² Cf. Jeremias, *The Parables of Jesus*, pp. 95-96.

⁵³ Bock, *Luke 9:51-24:53*, p. 1237; cf. Davies and Allison, *Matthew I-VII*, p. 694; David R. Catchpole, *The Quest for Q* (Edinburgh, UK: T&T Clark, 1993), p. 39; see Luz, *Matthew 1-7*, pp. 369, 375-376.

in Matthew, irrespective of its possible identification as a redactional addition in the context of the Q document.⁵⁴

Another weighty indication that verses 26-27 were secondarily added to verse 25 is the clumsiness of the syntax in Q 13:25-26. A number of commentators and translators have struggled with this difficulty.⁵⁵ A popular solution has been to regard the last clause of verse 25⁵⁶ as the apodosis and conclusion of the sentence, so that the adverb ‘then’ (τότε) at the beginning of verse 26 introduces a new sentence.⁵⁷ Even the Nestle-Aland reconstruction of the Greek New Testament (28) has followed suit, placing a full stop at the end of verse 25. Yet, the combination of τότε in verse 26 and καὶ in the final clause of verse 25 indicates that verse 26 should be taken as the apodosis of a longwinded sentence.⁵⁸ Marshall is probably correct that the clumsiness is not attributable to Luke, but to his source.⁵⁹ This corroborates the International Q Project’s decision to feature Luke’s troublesome syntax in their reconstruction of Q. Even so, the syntactical difficulties discussed here suggest that verse 25 used to be an independent sentence, with its final clause featuring as the apodosis. The syntactical problems also suggest that this sentence was elaborated by the addition of verse 26, at which time the final clause of verse 25 was turned into a protasis (probably by replacing an original τότε with καὶ), and verse 26 was turned into the apodosis of this newly-created sentence. Now, if the clumsy sentence was already a feature of the Sayings Gospel when used by Luke, as the Critical Edition of Q has it, then the development sketched above must have happened at some earlier stage, probably at the occasion of Q’s main redaction.

⁵⁴ Cf. Kloppenborg, *The Formation of Q*, pp. 99, 244-245; *Excavating Q: The History and Setting of the Sayings Gospel* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 2000), pp. 150-151; Bock, *Luke 9:51-24:53*, pp. 1230-1231. Unfortunately, Q 13:26-27 reflects the concerns of the early church, which testifies against its authenticity (cf. Catchpole, *Quest for Q*, p. 40; see Funk and Hoover, *The Five Gospels*, pp. 158, 253-255, 347-348).

⁵⁵ Bock, *Luke 9:51-24:53*, p. 1241; e.g. Jacobson, *The First Gospel*, p. 207.

⁵⁶ That is, ‘and he will answer you: I do not know you!’ (καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ἐρεῖ ὑμῖν· οὐκ οἶδα ὑμᾶς πόθεν ἐστέ).

⁵⁷ E.g. Marshall, *Luke*, pp. 565-566.

⁵⁸ Cf. Bock, *Luke 9:51-24:53*, p. 1241.

⁵⁹ Marshall, *Luke*, p. 1978:566; cf. Jacobson, *The First Gospel*, p. 207.

If Q 13:25 were indeed an independent logion at an earlier stage, how should we interpret it? The fact that the householder is addressed as ‘master’ (κύριε) indicates that the people knocking on his door are inferiors, most likely slaves, day-labourers or household staff.⁶⁰ Taken on its own, Q 13:25 claims that if a worker arrives at his master’s house after the door has been locked, that worker will not be allowed inside. Would this have been a truism for a first-century Jewish audience? Or, would the master’s reply have been somewhat shocking and unexpected? I suspect that the former is closer to the truth, since ancient masters were notoriously callous.⁶¹ Harsh treatment was not only directed at slaves, but often also at non-servile workers.⁶² As a truism, the saying would have been well-suited to substantiate the preceding logion. Hence, the catchword ‘door’ (θύρα) might not have been the only factor that motivated the linking of these two sayings. Taken together, the two sayings instruct its audience to enter, or face the possibility of being locked out.⁶³ The fact that Q 13:24 references a ‘narrow’ (στενός) door in particular should not necessarily be taken to indicate that it is being favoured over a wider alternative, as Matthew (7:13-14) has it. In Q, as in Luke (13:24), there is no mention of either a wide door or a choice between two doors. The narrow door might be all that is available, and the audience is encouraged to enter through it or risk being locked out. Admittedly, describing the door as ‘narrow’ does complicate the imagery to some extent, causing damage to the overall

⁶⁰ Cf. William R. Herzog, *Parables as Subversive Speech: Jesus as Pedagogue of the Oppressed* (Louisville, KY: Westminster and John Knox, 1994), p. 157.

⁶¹ See Keith R. Bradley, *Slaves and Masters in the Roman Empire: A Study in Social Control* (Collection Latomus 185; Brussels, BE: Latomus, 1984), pp. 18, 121-123, 137, 140-141; Catherine Hezser, *Jewish Slavery in Antiquity* (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2005), pp. 58, 94, 97; Sandra R. Joshel, *Slavery in the Ancient World* (Cambridge, UK and New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 2010), pp. 40, 122-123, 152; Zvi Yavetz, *Slaves and Slavery in Ancient Rome* (New Brunswick, NJ and Oxford, UK: Transaction Books, 1988), pp. 158-159.

⁶² Cf. K. D. White, *Roman Farming* (Aspects of Greek and Roman Life; London, UK & Southampton, UK: Thames and Hudson, 1970), pp. 348, 360; Joshel, *Slavery*, p. 174.

⁶³ See Tuckett, *Q and the History of Early Christianity*, pp. 191-192.

argument,⁶⁴ but such imprecise logic is exactly what one should expect from the attachment of two previously independent logia.⁶⁵

Whether or not the reading proposed above is on target, verse 25 is concerned with the uncomplicated topic of the master-worker relationship. There are no signs in the saying itself to indicate or even suggest that it requires to be read non-literally. Nor are there any signs to suggest that the master is a veiled reference to Jesus.⁶⁶ It is only after the introduction of verses 26-27 that the saying is turned into a Christological parable of sorts.⁶⁷ Bock unintentionally reinforces the latter with his commentary on verse 26: 'It is significant that Jesus' identity as the householder is made clear by their appeal'.⁶⁸ What is more, it is only after the introduction of verses 26-27 that the saying is turned into a parable about the eschatological end.⁶⁹ Tuckett inadvertently supports the previous claim when he states that 'the continuation [after Q 13:25] makes it clear that the eschatological future is in mind [at Q 13:25]'.⁷⁰ The statement 'we ate and drank in your presence' (ἐφάγομεν ἐνώπιόν σου καὶ ἐπίομεν) might still be consistent with the literal imagery of verse 25, but the statement 'it was in our streets you taught' (ἐν ταῖς πλατείαις ἡμῶν ἐδίδαξας) transgresses beyond that imagery.⁷¹ No longer is verse 25 to be understood as a corporeal saying about the relationship between masters and their workers, but it is now to be applied unfittingly to the context of public instruction. The imagery changes without warning from the private sphere of an individual's house to the public sphere of

⁶⁴ Tuckett, *Q and the History of Early Christianity*, p. 192.

⁶⁵ Pace Tuckett, *Q and the History of Early Christianity*, p. 192.

⁶⁶ Cf. Detlev Dormeyer, 'Q 7,1.3.6b-9.?10? Der Hauptmann von Kafarnaum: Narrative Strategie mit Chrie, Wundergeschichte und Gleichnis', in Dieter T. Roth, Ruben Zimmermann and Michael Labahn (eds.), *Metaphor, Narrative, and Parables in Q; Dedicated to Dieter Zeller on the Occasion of his 75th Birthday* (WUNT 315; Tübingen, DE: Mohr Siebeck, 2014), p. 192.

⁶⁷ Cf. Jeremias, *The Parables of Jesus*, pp. 95-96.

⁶⁸ Bock, *Luke 9:51-24:53*, p. 1236.

⁶⁹ Cf. John D. Crossan, 'Paradox Gives Rise to Metaphor: Paul Ricoeur's Hermeneutics and the Parables of Jesus', *Biblical Research* 24 (1979), p. 34; Ruth Etchells, *A Reading of the Parables of Jesus* (London, UK: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1998), p. 172.

⁷⁰ Tuckett, *Q and the History of Early Christianity*, p. 192.

⁷¹ Cf. Etchells, *A Reading of the Parables*, p. 172.

communal streets. The activity changes without precedence from knocking on a master's house to teaching in the streets. Funk and Hoover agree that Q 13:25 fits awkwardly in its literary context before Q 13:26-27.⁷² The changes in narrative background and activity represent a superficial attempt to redirect the meaning of verse 25. There should be little doubt that the intent was to associate the householder with Jesus.⁷³ The phrase 'it was in our streets you taught' clearly recalls the image of Jesus as a public teacher.⁷⁴ As a result, the imagery of Q 13:25 is turned into an allegorical parable.⁷⁵ The master becomes Jesus, and the excluded workers become either polemical outsiders or certain members of the Q people, depending on one's interpretation.⁷⁶

The clear intent behind the introduction of the phrase 'it was in our streets you taught' suggests that a similar intent lay behind the introduction of the phrase 'we ate and drank in your presence', even if the latter phrase is to some extent consistent with the literal imagery of verse 25. Firstly, table-fellowship was one of the most identifiable features of the public ministry of Jesus.⁷⁷ That the Q people were aware of this is indicated most clearly by Q 7:34, where Jesus is accused of being a glutton and a drunkard, while associating with tax collectors and sinners. Secondly, it seems unlikely that a master would have eaten with his workers, especially the callous and pitiless type of master described in verse 25. Conversely, Jesus was known for

⁷² Funk and Hoover, *The Five Gospels*, p. 348.

⁷³ Cf. Jacobson, *The First Gospel*, pp. 207-208; Kirk, *The Composition of the Sayings Source*, pp. 247-248.

⁷⁴ Bock, *Luke 9:51-24:53*, p. 1237.

⁷⁵ Cf. John S. Kloppenborg, 'Jesus and the Parables of Jesus in Q', in Ronald A. Piper (ed.), *The Gospel behind the Gospels: Current Studies on Q* (NovTSup 75; Leiden, NL, New York, NY and Cologne, DE: Brill, 1995), pp. 282, 289-290, 317, 319; Bovon, 'Tracing the Trajectory of Luke 13,22-30', p. 291.

⁷⁶ Cf. James M. Robinson, 'The Q Trajectory: Between John and Matthew via Jesus', in Birger A. Pearson (ed.), *The Future of Early Christianity: Essays in Honor of Helmut Koester* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1991), p. 189; 'The Son of Man in the Sayings Gospel Q', in Christoph Elsas *et al* (eds.), *Tradition und Translation: Zum Problem der interkulturellen Übersetzbarkeit religiöser Phänomene; Festschrift für Casten Colpe zum 65. Geburtstag* (Berlin, DE and New York, NY: Walter de Gruyter, 1994), p. 318; Jacobson, *The First Gospel*, pp. 207-208; Paul Hoffmann, 'Mutmassungen über Q: Zum Problem der literarischen Genese von Q', in Andreas Lindemann (ed.), *The Sayings Source Q and the Historical Jesus* (BETL 158; Leuven, BE, Paris, FR and Sterling, VA: Leuven University Press and Peeters, 2001), p. 275, n. 59.

⁷⁷ See e.g. Marcus J. Borg, *Conflict, Holiness and Politics in the Teachings of Jesus* (London, UK and New York, NY: Continuum, [1984] 1998), pp. 88-134.

extending his table-fellowship to include all kinds of undesirables. If the images of someone who teaches in public and eats with social inferiors are combined, the obvious result is a depiction of Jesus during his earthly ministry.⁷⁸

Instead of the dialogue in Luke 13:26, Fleddermann argues that the dialogue in Matthew 7:22⁷⁹ represents Q.⁸⁰ If this is correct, it would strengthen my case that Q 13:26-27 represents redactional addition, since the claims in Matthew 7:22 are even more disconnected from the imagery in Q 13:25, and even more obvious as references to the ministry of Jesus and his followers.⁸¹ For the following reasons, however, the International Q Project's reconstruction is preferable: (1) Matthew's version is much more clearly connected to his community situation than Luke's version is to the situation of *his* community; (2) Matthew's version describes behaviour typical of the early church; (3) Christological elaboration is decidedly apparent in Matthew's version, but not in Luke's version; (4) Luke's version is closely related in theme to Q 10:13-15, whereas Matthew's version has no thematic connection to the rest of Q; and (5) Luke's version seems to be more archaic.⁸² It is widely agreed by scholarship that Luke's version of the dialogue in verse 26 represents Q.⁸³

⁷⁸ Bock, *Luke 9:51-24:53*, p. 1237.

⁷⁹ All translations of biblical texts are from the English Standard Version, and all quotations of the Greek New Testament are from Nestle-Aland 28: 'Lord, Lord, did we not prophesy in your name, and cast out demons in your name, and do many mighty works in your name?' (κύριε κύριε, οὐ τῷ σῷ ὀνόματι ἐπροφητεύσαμεν, καὶ τῷ σῷ ὀνόματι δαιμόνια ἐξεβάλομεν, καὶ τῷ σῷ ὀνόματι δυνάμεις πολλὰς ἐποιήσαμεν;).

⁸⁰ Fleddermann, *Q*, pp. 683-684; cf. Vaage, 'Jewish Scripture, Q and the Historical Jesus', p. 487.

⁸¹ Cf. Davies and Allison, *Matthew I-VII*, pp. 701-702; Bock, *Luke 9:51-24:53*, p. 1237; Bovon, 'Tracing the Trajectory of Luke 13,22-30', p. 289.

⁸² Davies and Allison, *Matthew I-VII*, p. 714; Luz, *Matthew 1-7*, p. 376; see Catchpole, *Quest for Q*, pp. 41-43; Bovon, 'Tracing the Trajectory of Luke 13,22-30', p. 289; cf. Funk and Hoover, *The Five Gospels*, p. 158.

⁸³ Tuckett, *Q and the History of Early Christianity*, p. 192; e.g. Crossan, *In Fragments*, p. 142.

Few would disagree that verse 27 is a more forceful repetition of the phrase ‘I do not know you’ in verse 25.⁸⁴ As a repetition, it is semantically redundant.⁸⁵ Yet, its presence is necessitated by the introduction of verse 26. The main redactor correctly intuitively feels that the exchange needs to end with the master’s response, since this was the original climax of the saying in verse 25.⁸⁶ Thanks to the efforts of the redactor, the conversation ultimately ends with the master having the last word.⁸⁷ The redactor’s solution is to repeat the master’s response after verse 26, but to add the words ‘Get away from me, you who do lawlessness!’ The purpose behind this addition is twofold. Firstly, it elaborates on the master’s initial response so as to augment its potency and conceal the fact that it is a repetition.⁸⁸ Secondly, it explains the master’s harsh response as a reaction to the workers’ ‘lawlessness’ (ἀνομία) in particular.⁸⁹ Yet, this explanation contradicts the content of verse 25, where the workers are denied entry for the simple reason that the door has already been locked.⁹⁰ Given that the master has been turned into an allegory for Jesus, the main redactor judged it necessary to explain the master’s unflattering behaviour. By adding this explanation, the main redactor changed the characterisation of the householder from a cold and heartless master to a just and impartial judge.⁹¹ Ultimately, the expansion of Q 13:25 resulted in the creation of an eschatological parable about the final judgment.⁹²

⁸⁴ Bovon, ‘Tracing the Trajectory of Luke 13,22-30’, p. 292; cf. Dieter T. Roth, ‘“Master” as Character in the Q Parables’, in Dieter T. Roth, Ruben Zimmermann and Michael Labahn (eds.), *Metaphor, Narrative, and Parables in Q; Dedicated to Dieter Zeller on the Occasion of his 75th Birthday* (WUNT 315; Tübingen, DE: Mohr Siebeck, 2014), p. 383.

⁸⁵ Cf. Bock, *Luke 9:51-24:53*, p. 1237.

⁸⁶ Cf. Bock, *Luke 9:51-24:53*, p. 1241.

⁸⁷ Cf. Roth, ‘“Master” as Character in the Q Parables’, p. 382.

⁸⁸ Cf. Jacobson, *The First Gospel*, p. 208; Bovon, ‘Tracing the Trajectory of Luke 13,22-30’, p. 286.

⁸⁹ Roth, ‘“Master” as Character in the Q Parables’, p. 383; cf. Betz, *The Sermon on the Mount*, p. 544; Tuckett, *Q and the History of Early Christianity*, p. 193.

⁹⁰ Kloppenborg, *The Formation of Q*, p. 224, n. 217; cf. Etchells, *A Reading of the Parables*, p. 175.

⁹¹ Cf. Betz, *The Sermon on the Mount*, pp. 552-556; Bock, *Luke 9:51-24:53*, p. 1237.

⁹² Cf. Crossan, ‘Paradox Gives Rise to Metaphor’, p. 34; Funk and Hoover, *The Five Gospels*, pp. 347-348; Kloppenborg, ‘Jesus and the Parables of Jesus in Q’, pp. 289-290, 317, 319; Etchells, *A Reading of the Parables*, p. 172.

The changes made by the main redactor also assisted in linking verse 25 to the redactional material that follows. Q 13:28-29 has long been regarded as a redactional addition.⁹³ The present proposal submits that Q 13:26-27 formed part of the same editorial activity as part of an attempt to iron out the transition between Q 13:25 and Q 13:28-29.⁹⁴ Jacobson also allows for such editorial activity in the following statement: ‘The addition of 13:28-29 may have been accompanied by alterations in 13:25-27 and its attendant problems’.⁹⁵ As a result of such redaction, the logion in Q 13:28-29 now functions on the level of Q as a parable application.⁹⁶ The workers denied entry are to be associated with those outsiders who will be condemned at the final judgment.⁹⁷ Conversely, the workers allowed entry are to be associated with those who will recline with the Jewish patriarchs at the eschatological feast.⁹⁸ Depending on how one reads Q 13:28-29, the workers allowed entry are to be understood as either gentiles⁹⁹ or diaspora Jews.¹⁰⁰ Similarly, the workers denied entry are to be understood as either Israel *in*

⁹³ E.g. Jacobson, *The First Gospel*, p. 208; cf. Tuckett, *Q and the History of Early Christianity*, p. 194; Etchells, *A Reading of the Parables*, p. 172.

⁹⁴ Cf. Etchells, *A Reading of the Parables*, p. 172.

⁹⁵ Jacobson, *The First Gospel*, p. 208.

⁹⁶ Cf. Etchells, *A Reading of the Parables*, p. 172.

⁹⁷ Piper, *Wisdom in the Q-Tradition*, p. 108; cf. Tuckett, *Q and the History of Early Christianity*, p. 193; Hoffmann, ‘Mutmassungen über Q’, p. 283; Dieter Zeller, ‘Jesus, Q und die Zukunft Israels’, in Andreas Lindemann (ed.), *The Sayings Source Q and the Historical Jesus* (BETL 158; Leuven, BE, Paris, FR and Sterling, VA: Leuven University Press and Peeters, 2001), p. 353.

⁹⁸ Kirk, *The Composition of the Sayings Source*, pp. 248-249.

⁹⁹ À la Jeremias, *The Parables of Jesus*, p. 96; Marshall, *Luke*, p. 568; Tuckett, *Q and the History of Early Christianity*, pp. 194, 197, 394, 396, 400; Etchells, *A Reading of the Parables*, p. 173; Kloppenborg, *Excavating Q*, pp. 192-193; ‘Discursive Practices in the Sayings Gospel Q and the Quest of the Historical Jesus’, in Andreas Lindemann (ed.), *The Sayings Source Q and the Historical Jesus* (BETL 158; Leuven, BE, Paris, FR and Sterling, VA: Leuven University Press and Peeters, 2001), p. 168; Arnal, *Jesus and the Village Scribes*, p. 177; Ulrich Luz, *Matthew 8-20: A Commentary*, trans. James E. Crouch; ed. Helmut Koester (Hermeneia; Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 2001), pp. 9, 11; James M. Robinson, ‘The image of Jesus in Q’, in Marvin Meyers and Charles Hughes (eds.), *Jesus Then and Now: Images of Jesus in History and Christology* (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity, 2001), p. 8; ‘The Critical Edition of Q and the Study of Jesus’, in Andreas Lindemann (ed.), *The Sayings Source Q and the Historical Jesus* (BETL 158; Leuven, BE, Paris, FR and Sterling, VA: Leuven University Press and Peeters, 2001), pp. 38-39; Fleddermann, *Q*, pp. 698-699; Daniel A. Smith, *The Post-Mortem Vindication of Jesus in the Sayings Gospel Q* (The Library of New Testament Studies 338; London, UK and New York, NY: T&T Clark, 2006), p. 148; Arne Bork, ‘Moving to the Kingdom of God: The Intention of Q in Light of the Semantics of Room, Space and Characters’, presented at the Society of Biblical Literature Annual Meeting, San Diego, CA (2014), pp. 8, 9.

¹⁰⁰ À la Davies and Allison, *Matthew VIII-XVIII*, pp. 27-28; Richard A. Horsley ‘Social Conflict in the Synoptic Sayings Source Q’, in John S. Kloppenborg (ed.), *Conflict and Invention: Literary, Rhetorical and Social Studies on the Sayings Gospel Q* (Valley Forge, PA: Trinity, 1995), p. 38; Richard A. Horsley (with Jonathan A. Draper) 1999, *Whoever Hears You Hears Me: Prophets, Performance, and Tradition in Q* (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity, 1999), pp. 65, 69, 94-95, 97, 229, 242, 283; Dale C. Allison, *The Jesus Tradition in Q* (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity, 1997),

toto or the inhabitants and leaders of the geo-political centre.¹⁰¹ The content of Q 13:34-35 would suggest the latter understanding in each case.¹⁰² Interestingly, the reference to ‘our streets’ (ταῖς πλατείαις ἡμῶν) in Q 13:26 links to the woes against Jerusalem in Q 13:34-35. This association remains valid even if the phrase also references the Galilean towns of Q 10:13-15.¹⁰³

There is, of course, the genuine possibility that Q 13:34-35 appeared in its Matthean (23:34-39) context in the Sayings Gospel; that is, after Q 11:49-51.¹⁰⁴ The latter is supported not only by the presence of the catchword ‘house’ (οἶκος) in both Q 11:51 and Q 13:35, but also by the presence of the deuteronomic theme in both texts.¹⁰⁵ If the Matthean context of Q 13:34-35 is accepted, it would mean that both the reference to Galilean towns in Q 10:13-15 and the reference to Jerusalem in Q 13:34-35 preceded Q 13:24-27 in the overall sequence of Q. Hence, both the Matthean and the Lukan positions of Q 13:34-35 support an association between ‘our

pp. 176-191; *The Intertextual Jesus: Scripture in Q* (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity, 2000), pp. 166-169; Joseph Verheyden, ‘The Conclusion of Q: Eschatology in Q 22,28-30’, in Andreas Lindemann (ed.), *The Sayings Source Q and the Historical Jesus* (BETL 158; Leuven, BE, Paris, FR and Sterling, VA: Leuven University Press and Peeters, 2001), p. 702. Valantasis (*The New Q*, p. 184) makes room at the banquet for *both* gentiles and Jews (cf. Bock, *Luke 9:51-24:53*, pp. 1232-1233, 1239; John Nolland, *The Gospel of Matthew: A Commentary on the Greek Text* [NIGTC; Grand Rapids, MI and Cambridge, UK: William B. Eerdmans, 2005], p. 357).

¹⁰¹ Etchells, *A Reading of the Parables*, p. 173; cf. Jacobson, *The First Gospel*, p. 208.

¹⁰² Cf. Jacobson, *The First Gospel*, p. 212; *pace* Luz, *Matthew 21-28*, p. 164.

¹⁰³ Cf. Funk and Hoover, *The Five Gospels*, p. 348; James M. Robinson, ‘The Sequence of Q: The Lament over Jerusalem’, in Rudolf Hoppe and Ulrich Busse (eds.), *Von Jesus zum Christus: Christologische Studien; Festgabe für Paul Hoffmann zum 65. Geburtstag* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 93; Berlin, DE and New York, NY: Walter de Gruyter, 1998), p. 257.

¹⁰⁴ Dieter Lührmann, *Die Redaktion der Logienquelle* (WMANT 33; Neukirchen, DE: Neukirchener Verlag, 1969), p. 48; Marshall, *Luke*, pp. 502, 573; Frans Neirynck, ‘Recent Developments in the Study of Q’, in Joël Delobel (ed.), *Logia: Les Paroles de Jésus; The Sayings of Jesus; Mémorial Joseph Coppens* (BETL 59; Leuven, BE: Peeters and Leuven University Press, 1982), p. 66; ‘The Reconstruction of Q and IQP/CritEd Parallels’, in Andreas Lindemann (ed.), *The Sayings Source Q and the Historical Jesus*, (BETL 158; Leuven, BE, Paris, FR and Sterling, VA: Leuven University Press and Peeters, 2001), pp. 62, 63; James M. Robinson, ‘Very Goddess and Very Man: Jesus’ Better Self’, in Karen King (ed.), *Images of the Feminine in Gnosticism* (Studies in Antiquity and Christianity; Philadelphia, PA: Fortress, 1988), p. 121; Allison, *Constructing Jesus*, p. 85. For a more detailed discussion of this possibility, see Jacobson, *The First Gospel*, pp. 209-210; Bock, *Luke 9:51-24:53*, pp. 1243-1244; Tuckett, *Q and the History of Early Christianity*, pp. 173-174; Davies and Allison, *Matthew XIX-XXVIII*, p. 312; Robinson, ‘The Sequence of Q’, pp. 225-260; Luz, *Matthew 21-28*, pp. 158-159; Nolland, *Matthew*, p. 949.

¹⁰⁵ See Robinson, ‘The Critical Edition of Q’, pp. 36-39; cf. Charles E. Carlston, ‘Wisdom and Eschatology in Q’, in Joël Delobel (ed.), *Logia: Les Paroles de Jésus; The Sayings of Jesus; Mémorial Joseph Coppens* (BETL 59; Leuven, BE: Peeters and Leuven University Press, 1982), p. 105; Crossan, *In Fragments*, pp. 138-139; Vaage ‘Jewish Scripture, Q and the Historical Jesus’, p. 484; Smith, *The Post-Mortem Vindication of Jesus*, p. 102.

streets' and Jerusalem, probably in addition to the Galilean towns of Q 10:13-15. The Lukan position does so by mentioning Jerusalem within the same pericopal complex of logia (i.e. Q 13:24, 25-27, 28-29, [30,] 34-35). The Matthean position does so by mentioning Jerusalem before Q 13:25-27 (and after Q 10:13-15) in the overall sequence of Q. The strong thematic and structural linkage between Q 10:13-15 and Q 13:34-35 supports the likelihood that the phrase 'our streets' in Q 13:26 references both of these texts.¹⁰⁶ The linkage between 'our streets' and Jerusalem supports not only the claim that the main redactor formulated verse 26 in light of other Q material, but also the claim that Q 13:28-29 understands the distinction to be between diaspora Jews and those Jews at the geo-political centre.¹⁰⁷

In addition to being a parable application, Q 13:28-29 is turned into the conclusion of a short narrative sequence.¹⁰⁸ The quasi-narrative starts with a narrow door that allows entry (Q 13:25), continues with the door being closed (Q 13:25-27), and concludes with a banquet behind closed doors (Q 13:28-29).¹⁰⁹ Yet, three features of Q 13:25 indicate that it did not originally deal with the metaphorical image of guests arriving at a banquet. Firstly, it would have been wholly inappropriate for guests at a banquet to address their host as 'master' (κύριε), especially if we consider that ancient people typically invited dinner guests of an equal or higher social standing.¹¹⁰ Secondly, identifying the character who locked the door as a 'householder' (οικοδεσπότης) is unnatural in the setting of a banquet, since the other guests would presumably also have owned houses. For this type of setting, it would have been much more appropriate to introduce the character as 'a certain person' (ἄνθρωπός τις), as in Q 14:16,

¹⁰⁶ See Catchpole, *Quest for Q*, pp. 277-278.

¹⁰⁷ See Davies and Allison, *Matthew VIII-XVIII*, pp. 27-29.

¹⁰⁸ Cf. Etchells, *A Reading of the Parables*, p. 172.

¹⁰⁹ Kirk, *The Composition of the Sayings Source*, p. 249; cf. Jacobson, *The First Gospel*, pp. 207-208. One could start the narrative earlier, with the preparation of a meal before the door is opened (Q 13:20-21); or even earlier still, with the cultivation of ingredients before the meal is prepared (Q 13:18-19).

¹¹⁰ Cf. Luz, *Matthew 21-28*, p. 235; Nolland, *Matthew*, p. 1009.

where the other characters are likewise dinner guests.¹¹¹ Thirdly, if Q 13:25 is about a dinner party, why is this not stated at the beginning? It is unprecedented in the parables of Jesus, and highly unusual in general, for the narrative background to be expressly revealed for the first time at the moment of its consummation or application.

One final action by the main redactor deserves mention. By quoting the Septuagint's version of Psalm 6:9¹¹² word for word in Q 13:27, the main redactor strengthened the linkage with the subsequent material, since Q 13:29 quotes LXX Psalm 106:3¹¹³ verbatim, and Q 13:35 quotes LXX Psalm 117:26¹¹⁴ verbatim.¹¹⁵ In fact, the presence in Q 13:26-27 of a direct quotation from the Septuagint is in itself suggestive of redactional activity.¹¹⁶

At this point, it seems justified to conclude that the generic saying in verse 25 was secondarily elaborated by the addition of verses 26-27, thereby turning it into a parable about Jesus. In the process, the meaning of verse 25 was forcefully delimited.¹¹⁷ Significantly, verse 25 appears on the boundary between a cluster of sayings from the formative stratum (Q 13:18-19, 20-21, 24) and a cluster of sayings from the main redaction (Q 13:26-27, 28-29, [30,] 34-35). The decision of which layer verse 25 belongs to could therefore go either way, depending on how

¹¹¹ Cf. Funk, *Funk on Parables*, p. 123. The character is only identified as a 'householder' (οικοδεσπότης) at Q 14:21, 23, where his relationship to his slave and the homeless is in view.

¹¹² Psalm 6:8 in English translations.

¹¹³ Psalm 107:3 in the Masoretic Text and English translations.

¹¹⁴ Psalm 118:26 in the Masoretic Text and English translations.

¹¹⁵ See Allison, *The Intertextual Jesus*, pp. 163-164, 165-171. It is widely acknowledged by commentators that these Q texts quote the identified Psalms: Marshall, *Luke*, pp. 567, 577; Davies and Allison, *Matthew I-VII*, pp. 717, 718; *Matthew VIII-XVIII*, p. 26; *Matthew XIX-XXVIII*, pp. 322, 323; Jacobson, *The First Gospel*, p. 211; Funk and Hoover, *The Five Gospels*, p. 349; Betz, *The Sermon on the Mount*, pp. 544, 552; Bock, *Luke 9:51-24:53*, pp. 1250-1251; Tuckett, *Q and the History of Early Christianity*, pp. 175, 193, 204-205, 423; Etchells, *A Reading of the Parables*, pp. 173-174; Horsley, *Whoever Hears Me*, p. 282; Bovon, 'Tracing the Trajectory of Luke 13,22-30', p. 289; Vaage, 'Jewish Scripture, Q and the Historical Jesus', pp. 484, 486-487; Fleddermann, *Q*, p. 685; Melanie Johnson-DeBaufre, *Jesus Among Her Children: Q, Eschatology, and the Construction of Christian Origins* (Harvard Theological Studies 55; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2005), p. 110; Nolland, *Matthew*, p. 341; Valantasis, *The New Q*, p. 187; Luz, *Matthew I-7*, pp. 376, 380; *Matthew 21-28*, pp. 160, 162-164.

¹¹⁶ Cf. Vaage, 'Jewish Scripture, Q and the Historical Jesus', p. 487; Jeremias, *The Parables of Jesus*, pp. 31-32.

¹¹⁷ Cf. Funk, *Funk on Parables*, p. 30.

well it is taken to match each respective layer. If I am correct that verses 26-27 were added to verse 25 at a later stage, it would certainly endorse the attribution of verse 25 to the formative stratum. The last section of this article will defend the attribution of verse 25 to the formative stratum by appealing to Kloppenborg's criteria for distinguishing between Q¹ and Q², namely those of 'characteristic forms', 'characteristic motifs' and 'implied audience'.

Kloppenborg's Criteria

Characteristic Forms

There are no formal indicators of genre in Q 13:25. Even so, four non-formal features seem to support the identification of this logion as a sapiential micro-genre. Firstly, the saying is 'parabolic' in nature, even if it does not seem to qualify as a parable when considered in isolation. Secondly, like most sapiential logia, verse 25 deals with an aspect of everyday life. Thirdly, despite the master's harsh response, the saying is very neutral and matter-of-fact in tone. Lastly, the saying follows directly after a series of wisdom sayings (i.e. Q 13:18-19, 20-21, 24). These four features not only support the identification of this logion as a sapiential small form, but also speak against it being a prophetic small form. In other words, to the extent that the logion is not straightforward, hyperbolic, threatening or preceded by prophecy, it fails to qualify as a prophetic micro-genre. Considered on its own, there is no indication whatsoever that verse 25 deals with the prophetic, eschatological or apocalyptic future of Israel.¹¹⁸ The future tense verb 'will say' (ἐπεῖ), which appears after the pleonastic participle 'answering' (ἀποκριθείς), is probably not used to reference future time, but rather to indicate that the act of the apodosis, namely the master's reply, happens *after* the acts of the protasis, namely the locking of the door and the pleading of the worker. Taken at face value, Q 13:25 is not about

¹¹⁸ Pace Tuckett, *Q and the History of Early Christianity*, p. 155.

Israel at all, but about a master and some of his workers. In essence, this is an entirely appropriate topic for sapiential consideration, but not really for prophetic application.

Perhaps more importantly, Q 13:25 qualifies as a maxim or aphorism, depending on how typical or subversive the saying is deemed to be. Either way, the saying is of the sort commonly featured in ancient instruction collections. By the same token, the saying shows absolutely no sign of being or belonging to a *chreia*.¹¹⁹ Unlike *chreiai*, the saying is not uttered as an anecdote in response to a specific situation. The identification of Q 13:25 as a maxim or aphorism is strong evidence that this saying belongs to the formative stratum, especially since Kloppenborg has argued convincingly that Q¹ should be seen as an instruction collection, and Q² as a *chreia* collection.¹²⁰ The non-prophetic and non-apocalyptic nature of the logion only adds to the latter conclusion.

Characteristic Motifs

Superficially considered, Q 13:25 links thematically with both the preceding logion and the subsequent material. Both verses 24 and 25 are about gaining access through a ‘door’ (θύρα). Verse 25 might also have been intended as motivation for the instruction in verse 24 (see above). Narrative progression links Q 13:25 with the subsequent material. The initial exchange between the householder and the workers leads into another exchange.¹²¹ Both exchanges begin with the workers trying to convince the householder to open the door for them,

¹¹⁹ Cf. Ronald F. Hock and Edward N. O’Neil, *The Chreia in Ancient Rhetoric: The Progymnasmata, Volume 1* (Texts and Translations 27 and Graeco-Roman Religion Series 9; Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1986), p. 26; Vernon K. Robbins, *The Tapestry of Early Christian Discourse: Rhetoric, Society and Ideology* (London, UK and New York, NY: Routledge, 1996), p. 61; Loveday Alexander, ‘What Is a Gospel?’, in Stephen C. Barton (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to the Gospels*, (Cambridge Companions to Religion; Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2006), p. 24; Charles W. Hedrick, *The Wisdom of Jesus: Between the Sages of Israel and the Apostles of the Church* (Eugene, OR: Cascade, 2014), p. 3, n. 12.

¹²⁰ Kloppenborg, *The Formation of Q*, pp. 263-328.

¹²¹ Bovon, ‘Tracing the Trajectory of Luke 13,22-30’, p. 286; Fleddermann, *Q*, pp. 680, 682, 697.

and end with the master rudely refusing to do so. Most visibly, both exchanges feature the master's phrase: 'I do not know you!' (οὐκ οἶδα ὑμᾶς). We have further seen that there are discontinuities between Q 13:25 and both its preceding and subsequent material. Thus, as far as thematic continuity is concerned, the syntagmatic context of Q 13:25 is not very helpful in determining the redactional placement of this logion; at least not on a superficial level.

A more promising endeavour is to consider Q 13:25 in isolation, and search its *paradigmatic* context for thematic continuity. I have suggested elsewhere that the formative stratum's mission discourse (Q 10:2-11, 16) is not directed at missionaries at all, but at non-servile farm workers and day-labourers.¹²² Whether or not this is correct, both Q 13:25 and Q 10:2-11, 16 deal on the most literal semantic level with workers. Significantly, like the logion currently under discussion, Q 10:5-6 is about gaining entrance to a house. The same topic is also treated in Q 11:9-10, and by extension in Luke 11:5-8, if the latter text is attributed to Q.¹²³ Interestingly, Q 13:25 functions to describe circumstances opposite to those of Q 10:5-9 and Q 11:[5-8,] 9-10. In the latter texts, householders welcome workers and the needy into their houses. By contrast, the householder of Q 13:25 refuses to open the door for his workers, even disavowing any knowledge of their identity. Crucially, signs of the potentiality of such opposite behaviour also feature in the foregoing texts, especially in Q 10:3, 6b, 10-11 and Q 11:[8a,] 11-12.

It is important to realise that entry into someone's house equals survival for those at the bottom of the socio-economic ladder. It goes without saying that a house offers refuge from the

¹²² See Howes, *Judging Q and Saving Jesus*, pp. 80-81, 103, 171-172.

¹²³ Cf. Etchells, *A Reading of the Parables*, p. 171. If Luke 11:5-8 were in Q, it would almost certainly have belonged to the formative stratum, not least of all because it would have featured between Q 11:2-4 and Q 11:9-13, and shows complete continuity with the themes discussed in these two passages. It should perhaps be noted that Q 11:52, which belongs to the main redaction, also treats the topic of 'entry' (cf. Borg, *Conflict, Holiness and Politics*, p. 131). Yet, in this case the topic does not reference entry into someone's house.

elements, and the possibility of receiving lodging, clothing and food (cf. Q 10:5-9).¹²⁴ This was even more true in antiquity, since the ancient social value of hospitality required people to offer such things to those who came knocking, even if everyone did not always oblige (cf. Q 10:5-9; 11:[5-8,] 9-10). The theme of daily corporeal survival appears throughout the formative stratum,¹²⁵ but is almost entirely absent in the main redaction¹²⁶ and final recension.¹²⁷ The following generic statement by Robinson about redactional development in Q applies particularly to the elaboration of Q 13:25 with the addition of verses 26-27 and 28-29: ‘The Q people had been led to expect that trust in the coming of the kingdom would involve daily bread, a hope which was ultimately reduced to the eschatology of the Messianic banquet’.¹²⁸

I argued in the previous section that there is no reason to read Q 13:25 non-literally. This is surely true when considering the logion by itself, but the immediate literary context of Q 13:24-25 must now also be contemplated. Even if I am correct that Q 13:24-25 belongs to the formative stratum, these two sayings would still follow directly after two parables on the kingdom of God (Q 13:18-19, 20-21), indicating that they deal in some way with the non-literal topic of entering God’s kingdom.¹²⁹ Even so, one does well to remember that the ‘kingdom of God’ refers in Q to tangible, corporeal circumstances that enable and constitute the healing of

¹²⁴ James M. Robinson, ‘The Jesus of Q as Liberation Theologian’, in Ronald A. Piper (ed.), *The Gospel behind the Gospels: Current Studies on Q* (NovTSup 75; Leiden, NL, New York, NY and Cologne, DE: Brill, 1995), p. 265.

¹²⁵ Cf. Q 6:20-21, 29-30; 9:58; 10:2-11, 16; 11:2-4, 9-13; 12:4-7, 22-31, 42-44 (see Llewellyn Howes, “‘Cut in Two’”, Part 2: Reconsidering the Redaction of Q 12:42-46’, *HTS Theological Studies* 71/1 [2015], 7 pages: <http://www.hts.org.za/index.php/HTS/article/view/2938>); 15:4-5, 7, [8-10].

¹²⁶ Cf. Q 7:22. Yet, here the themes of healing the sick and evangelising the poor do not feature for their own sake, but rather to prove that Jesus is the ‘coming one’ (ὁ ἐρχόμενος).

¹²⁷ Cf. Q 4:2-4. Yet, here the theme of eating bread does not feature for its own sake, but rather in the midst of a forty-day fast as the content of a temptation. In fact, the claim in verse 4 that a person is not to live from bread alone contradicts the preoccupation of Q¹ with the procurement of daily bread.

¹²⁸ Robinson, ‘The Jesus of Q as Liberation Theologian’, 264; cf. ‘Jesus’ Theology in the Sayings Gospel Q’, in David H. Warren, Ann G. Brock and David W. Pao (eds.), *Early Christian Voices: In Texts, Traditions and Symbols; Essays in Honor of François Bovon* (BibInt 66; Leiden, NL and Boston, MA: Brill, 2003), p. 31; cf. Jacobson, *The First Gospel*, p. 208.

¹²⁹ Jacobson, *The First Gospel*, p. 206; cf. Hoffmann, ‘Mutmassungen über Q’, p. 283.

the sick¹³⁰ and the feeding of the poor¹³¹.¹³² As such, the proposed literal meaning of Q 13:25 is not harmed by its association with the metaphor of God's kingdom. One way for the poor to be fed is for them to gain entry into someone's house, probably as a slave or a worker, and to then rely on the householder's hospitality.¹³³ When this happens in the literal, tangible sense, the kingdom of God comes into being. The same association between the metaphor of God's kingdom and actual, literal events is made throughout the rest of Q. For example, in Q 11:2-4, 9-13, the metaphor of God's kingdom is related to actual sustenance through hospitality, and in Q 11:20 the metaphor of God's kingdom is linked to actual healing through exorcism. Speaking of concrete events in terms of the kingdom metaphor does not turn the events themselves into metaphors. For Q, God's kingdom appears wherever and whenever people are actually being fed.

It follows that Q 13:25 fits very well in its immediate literary context in the formative stratum. The parable of the yeast anticipates a large meal, and relates it to the kingdom of God. Q 13:24-25 discusses entry to such a meal as the realisation of God's kingdom. Verse 25 describes a situation where entry is denied, and the kingdom of God prevented from realising (cf. Q 10:3, 6b, 10-11 and Q 11:[8a,] 11-12). The setting of verse 25 is in itself appropriate for discussing

¹³⁰ Cf. Q 10:9; 11:20.

¹³¹ Cf. Q 6:20-21; 10:8-9; 11:2-3; 12:31; 13:28-29.

¹³² James M. Robinson, 'The Jesus of the Sayings Gospel Q', presented at the Institute for Antiquity and Christianity Occasional Papers 28, Claremont, CA (1993), p. 15; 'The image of Jesus in Q', p. 16; 'The Critical Edition of Q', p. 33; 'What Jesus Had to Say', in Robert W. Hoover (ed.), *Profiles of Jesus* (Santa Rosa, CA: Polebridge, 2002), p. 15; cf. Piper, 'Wealth, Poverty, and Subsistence in Q', pp. 241, 251, 259; Richard A. Horsley, *The Prophet Jesus and the Renewal of Israel: Moving Beyond a Diversionary Debate* (Grand Rapids, MI and Cambridge, UK: William B. Eerdmans, 2012), p. 127; *Jesus and Empire: The Kingdom of God and the New World Disorder* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 2003), pp. 30-33, 35; Kloppenborg, 'Discursive Practices in the Sayings Gospel Q', p. 166; cf. Arto Järvinen, 'Jesus as a Community Symbol in Q', in Andreas Lindemann (ed.), *The Sayings Source Q and the Historical Jesus* (BETL 158; Leuven, BE, Paris, FR and Sterling, VA: Leuven University Press and Peeters, 2001), p. 521.

¹³³ Cf. Herzog, *Parables as Subversive Speech*, p. 157.

God's kingdom, since the elite household was in antiquity a microcosm for the larger kingdom.¹³⁴

Implied Audience

When considering Q 13:25 in isolation, there is not much evidence to assist in determining its implied audience. If verses 24 and 25 were originally two separate and autonomous logia that appeared back-to-back, it stands to reason that they were directed at the same audience. Seeing as verse 24 has a decidedly positive intent to direct the behaviour of insiders,¹³⁵ the same audience may be assumed for verse 25, especially if the latter operated as justification for the former. Although verse 24 features in the imperative mood, and verse 25 in the indicative mood, both logia are 'parabolic' in essence, inviting further contemplation as to their precise meanings.¹³⁶ In this way, they cohere with the preceding two parables (Q 13:18-19, 20-21).¹³⁷ In antiquity, such 'parabolic' wisdom is characteristically aimed at the in-group. If we are correct that Q 13:25 was originally about workers, then it is justified to view the second-person plural as directed at those in the audience who were workers themselves. Such rhetoric must have been aimed at insiders. When verse 25 is read together with verses 26-27, however, the implied threat is certainly aimed implicitly at outsiders.

These considerations suggest that Q 13:25 was originally intended for contemplation by insiders, but was subsequently elaborated to serve a polemical purpose against outsiders as part of a process of boundary demarcation.¹³⁸ This is supported by the three scriptural quotations

¹³⁴ Hezser, *Jewish Slavery*, p. 129; Keith R. Bradley, *Slavery and Society at Rome* (Key Themes in Ancient History; Cambridge, UK and New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 1994), p. 81; Herzog, *Parables as Subversive Speech*, p. 156; Joshel, *Slavery*, pp. 113, 128.

¹³⁵ See Piper, *Wisdom in the Q-Tradition*, pp. 109-110.

¹³⁶ See Valantasis, *The New Q*, pp. 182-183.

¹³⁷ Cf. Jacobson, *The First Gospel*, p. 206.

¹³⁸ Cf. Jacobson, *The First Gospel*, p. 208; Kloppenborg, 'Jesus and the Parables of Jesus in Q', p. 319; Tuckett, *Q and the History of Early Christianity*, pp. 194, 203-207.

in Q 13:27, 29, 35 (see above), since the Sayings Gospel Q typically employs tacit quotations of scripture in support of its polemic.¹³⁹ The resultant metaphor of Q 13:25-27 (together with Q 13:28-29) is essentially divisive, creating a definite boundary between ‘inside’ and ‘outside’.¹⁴⁰ True enough, verse 25 also creates this boundary between ‘inside’ and ‘outside’, without the help of verses 26-27. Even so, one gets the distinct impression when reading verse 25 in isolation that this boundary is only meant spatially and literally, as opposed to polemically and metaphorically. It is the addition of verses 26-27 that turns the imagery into a polemical metaphor that distinguishes between flawless insiders and lawless outsiders. Verses 28-29 make the distinction between insiders and outsiders even more rigid and final.¹⁴¹ Here, the final punishment of outsiders is deliberately contrasted with the final reward of insiders.¹⁴²

Some have taken Q 13:25-27 to be directed inwardly at certain members of the Q people.¹⁴³ Yet, the statements that Jesus ate and drank with the addressees, and that he taught in their streets, are not to be taken as evidence of membership in the Q group. During his ministry, Jesus shared his table with many people, not all of whom became part of the Jesus movement, or the Q people in particular.¹⁴⁴ Likewise, residing in close proximity to the streets in which Jesus taught does not a disciple of Jesus make.¹⁴⁵ Rather, exclusion from the eschatological banquet in verse 28, the excessiveness of the punishment in verses 28-29, and the content of

¹³⁹ Vaage, ‘Jewish Scripture, Q and the Historical Jesus’, p. 487.

¹⁴⁰ See Daniel A. Smith, ‘The Construction of a Metaphor: Reading Domestic Space in Q’, in Dieter T. Roth, Ruben Zimmermann and Michael Labahn (eds.), *Metaphor, Narrative, and Parables in Q; Dedicated to Dieter Zeller on the Occasion of his 75th Birthday* (WUNT 315; Tübingen, DE: Mohr Siebeck, 2014), pp. 52-54; cf. Funk and Hoover, *The Five Gospels*, p. 254; Bovon, ‘Tracing the Trajectory of Luke 13,22-30’, p. 286.

¹⁴¹ See Valantasis, *The New Q*, pp. 183-184.

¹⁴² Verheyden, ‘The Conclusion of Q’, p. 713; cf. Jeremias, *The Parables of Jesus*, p. 67.

¹⁴³ E.g. Roth, ‘“Master” as Character in the Q Parables’, p. 395; cf. Davies and Allison, *Matthew I-VII*, p. 696; Kirk, *The Composition of the Sayings Source*, pp. 247-248.

¹⁴⁴ Bock, *Luke 9:51-24:53*, p. 1237; cf. Marshall, *Luke*, p. 566.

¹⁴⁵ Matthew’s version of the saying is indeed directed at fellow Christians (Davies and Allison, *Matthew I-VII*, p. 696; Betz, *The Sermon on the Mount*, p. 540; Luz, *Matthew I-7*, pp. 372-373), but even these Christians are not necessarily part of the in-group that is the Matthean community (see Catchpole, *Quest for Q*, pp. 40-41; *pace* Luz, *Matthew I-7*, pp. 372-373). If Matthew’s version is accepted for Q, the same logic would apply (cf. Fleddermann, *Q*, p. 697).

the accusations in verses 34-35 strongly suggest that the addressees referenced throughout by the second-person plural are outsiders.¹⁴⁶ In fact, the whole purpose of this pericope seems to be to draw a clear boundary between members and non-members of the Q people by disqualifying illegitimate claims of familiarity with Jesus.¹⁴⁷ Thus, in its final form in the main redaction, Q 13:25-27 has much in common with the woes in Q 10:13-15, since the addressees of the latter text also reside in geographical proximity to the locus of Jesus's earthly ministry, but are nonetheless taken to be outsiders due to their rejection of that ministry.¹⁴⁸ Having shared the table of Jesus or having heard him teach during his earthly ministry does not qualify people for eschatological salvation.¹⁴⁹

In Matthew's (7:21-23) reading of Q 13:26-27, future deliverance is only achieved when responding to the ministry of Jesus by putting his teachings into practice.¹⁵⁰ Three features of our text strongly suggest that the same is true for Q: (1) the 'narrow door' metaphor in Q 13:24;

¹⁴⁶ Cf. Etchells, *A Reading of the Parables*, p. 173; Bovon, 'Tracing the Trajectory of Luke 13,22-30', p. 292; Vaage 'Jewish Scripture, Q and the Historical Jesus', p. 481; Valantasis, *The New Q*, p. 183. If Bovon ('Tracing the Trajectory of Luke 13,22-30', p. 289) is correct that ἐνώπιόν σου should be translated as 'in front of you' instead of 'with you', the identification of these individuals as outsiders would be even more apparent. In fact, the descriptions of these people as 'eating and drinking in front of Jesus', and as claiming to own the streets in which Jesus taught (cf. 'our streets' [ἐν ταῖς πλατείαις ἡμῶν]), taken together, portray them as upper-class snobs. This would imply that a distinction between rich and poor was important to the boundary concerns of the Q people. Even though this line of reasoning would support my larger case, there are good reasons to doubt it. Firstly, Bovon's translation removes the rhetorical heart of the appeal for the master to open the door. Why would the master open the door if those begging him to do so ate in front of him at an earlier stage? Why would this be a good argument? Secondly, the phrase 'our streets' (ἐν ταῖς πλατείαις ἡμῶν) is much better understood as a geographical reference than as a reference to ownership. Thirdly, nowhere else does Q draw its polemical boundary along socio-economic lines.

¹⁴⁷ Jacobson, *The First Gospel*, p. 208; cf. Hoffmann, 'Mutmassungen über Q', p. 283; Kloppenborg, 'Discursive Practices in the Sayings Gospel Q', p. 169.

¹⁴⁸ Catchpole, *Quest for Q*, p. 42; cf. Verheyden, 'The Conclusion of Q', p. 713; Zeller, 'Jesus, Q und die Zukunft Israels', p. 353. This is not to say that the Sayings Gospel did not foresee the future punishment of individual insiders (cf. Q 12:9).

¹⁴⁹ Jeremias, *The Parables of Jesus*, p. 175; Marshall, *Luke*, pp. 562-563; Bock, *Luke 9:51-24:53*, p. 1237; Etchells, *A Reading of the Parables*, p. 173; Bovon, 'Tracing the Trajectory of Luke 13,22-30', p. 291; Hoffmann, 'Mutmassungen über Q', p. 283; Zeller, 'Jesus, Q und die Zukunft Israels', p. 353; Valantasis, *The New Q*, p. 182.

¹⁵⁰ Nolland, *Matthew*, p. 341; see Davies and Allison, *Matthew I-VII*, pp. 716-717; Donahue, *The Gospel in Parable*, pp. 97-98; Betz, *The Sermon on the Mount*, pp. 540-541, 546-548, 550-551; Luz, *Matthew 1-7*, pp. 372-373, 380-381. Luke's larger literary context similarly deals with the topic of human responsibility as a corollary to divine action (Bovon, 'Tracing the Trajectory of Luke 13,22-30', pp. 285, 293; cf. Jeremias, *The Parables of Jesus*, p. 175; Bock, *Luke 9:51-24:53*, pp. 1234-1235, 1237; Etchells, *A Reading of the Parables*, pp. 172, 174-175, 176).

(2) the imperative mood of ‘enter’ (εἰσέλθατε) in Q 13:24; and (3) the reference to ‘lawlessness’ (ἀνομία) in Q 13:27 (cf. Q 6:43-46; 14:27).¹⁵¹ It seems reasonable to assume that the Q people originated as a group of people who wanted to put the teachings of Jesus into practice in their daily lives, suggesting that the two concepts of Q membership and practicing the message of Jesus were for them closely related. Hence, the people accused of ‘lawlessness’ in the face of chance encounters with the earthly Jesus would naturally have qualified as outsiders.¹⁵² Ultimately, the parable’s literal outsiders are wholly rejected as the community’s metaphorical outsiders.¹⁵³

Findings

This article has argued, firstly, that Q 13:25 was elaborated by the addition of Q 13:26-27, and, secondly, that Q’s main redactor was responsible for this addition. The former case was built on textual features that betray the original independence of verse 25, the artificiality of verses 26-27, and the discontinuity between verse 25 and the material that immediately follows it (Q 13:26-27, 28-29). The latter case was built on the three criteria used by Kloppenborg to delineate between Q¹ and Q². It was found that Q 13:25 initially belonged to the formative stratum as an independent sapiential logion, but that the main redactor added verses 26-27 (together with verses 28-29) to create a parable proclaiming the eschatological judgment of outsiders.

¹⁵¹ Tuckett, *Q and the History of Early Christianity*, pp. 193, 294; Kirk, *The Composition of the Sayings Source*, pp. 248-249; Hoffmann, ‘Mutmassungen über Q’, p. 269; Kloppenborg, ‘Discursive Practices in the Sayings Gospel Q’, p. 169; Zeller, ‘Jesus, Q und die Zukunft Israels’, p. 353; Fleddermann, *Q*, pp. 696-697; Valantasis, *The New Q*, p. 182; cf. Jeremias, *The Parables of Jesus*, pp. 175, 194-195; Betz, *The Sermon on the Mount*, pp. 521, 523, 534, 541; Bock, *Luke 9:51-24:53*, pp. 1234-1235; Luz, *Matthew 1-7*, 380.

¹⁵² Jacobson, *The First Gospel*, p. 208; cf. Hoffmann, ‘Mutmassungen über Q’, p. 283.

¹⁵³ Cf. Valantasis, *The New Q*, p. 183; see Etchells, *A Reading of the Parables*, pp. 175-177.