

# “DIVIDED AGAINST ITSELF”?: INDIVIDUAL MAXIMS AND THE REDACTION OF Q

Dr L Howes  
University of Johannesburg  
llewellynhowes@gmail.com

## ABSTRACT

In his 1987 analysis, Kloppenborg identified a number of logia in the main redaction that were more proverbial than prophetic in nature. The current offering considers the possibility that these sayings originally formed part of Q<sup>1</sup>, but was added to Q<sup>2</sup> by the main redactor during the redactional process. The current article will explore the possibility that the main redactor not only *inserted* and *interpolated* prophetic material into Q<sup>1</sup>, but also *transformed* original wisdom sayings into prophetic Q<sup>2</sup> material.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Ever since the appearance of Kloppenborg’s *Formation of Q* in 1987, with its influential proposal for the stratification of Q, a relatively simplistic procedure has been assumed for the final redactional stage of the Sayings Gospel Q – by most of those who have accepted his proposal<sup>1</sup>, that is:<sup>2</sup> According to this understanding, Q’s final stage<sup>3</sup> of editorial activity constituted the following three aspects: Firstly, a redactor<sup>4</sup> merely added large blocks of existing Q<sup>2</sup> material to the six blocks of existing Q<sup>1</sup> material. Secondly, the same redactor then interpolated a few passages and phrases into Q<sup>1</sup>.<sup>5</sup> Finally, a different redactor<sup>6</sup> added the temptation narrative at the beginning of Q and interpolated two glosses into the document.<sup>7</sup> We are presently concerned only with the activity of the former redactor, whom we will dub the “main redactor”.<sup>8</sup> This redactor was responsible for the first two aspects of Q’s final stage of editorial activity (mentioned just above), which probably occurred simultaneously.

<sup>1</sup> Under whom I count myself.

<sup>2</sup> This is true even though there is relative consensus that the Sayings Gospel Q went through a complex process of redaction before the commencement of this final redactional stage (cf. Horsley 1992:179).

<sup>3</sup> It is possible to view this as the *compositional* stage of Q’s redaction.

<sup>4</sup> Throughout this article, the “redactor” of Q will be referenced in the singular, even though it is assumed that more than one person could have been (and probably were) involved when Q was being edited.

<sup>5</sup> I.e. Q 6:23c; 10:12, 13-15; 12:8-10; 13:[25,] 26-29, 34-35; 14:16-24; cf. Tuckett 1996:70, 72; see Kloppenborg Verbin 2000:120-121, 128, 147-150.

<sup>6</sup> Or perhaps the same redactor, but at a different stage of the Q people’s sociological and theological development.

<sup>7</sup> I.e. Q 4:1-13; 11:42c; 16:17.

<sup>8</sup> Once again (see footnote 4 above), the singular form “redactor” could represent more than one individual. The title “main redactor” seems appropriate for the following reasons: (1) The material added by this redactor was dubbed the “main redaction” by Kloppenborg. (2) This redactor added more material at one stage than any other. (3) The material added by this redactor had more of an impact on the content of the document than any of the material added by others.

Commented [LH1]: Please consult author’s guidelines for correct referencing style.

Commented [LH2]: Changes have been made throughout.

The current article will explore the possibility that the main redactor not only *inserted* and *interpolated* prophetic material into Q<sup>1</sup>, but also *transformed* original wisdom sayings into prophetic Q<sup>2</sup> material. If, as Kloppenborg argues, the main redactor interpolated certain material into the formative stratum, it seems only reasonable to ask whether or not he<sup>9</sup> might have enclosed certain Q<sup>1</sup> sayings into the very fabric of Q<sup>2</sup> passages (cf. Arnal 2001:6). By suggesting that the main redactor had more of a contribution in the redactional process than merely shuffling existing material, I align myself with similar trains of thought emerging recently (cf. Kloppenborg 1995:7; see e.g. Arnal 1995). Kloppenborg (1987:169) further notices that

there are several sayings which, while not originally prophetic in form, have been employed in Q redaction to articulate a threat against those who fail to apprehend the preaching of the kingdom.

The possibility should at least be considered that the main redactor initially found some of these sayings (that were “not originally prophetic in form”) *in the formative stratum*. Accordingly, some of the sayings in question were originally part of the formative stratum, but were reapplied during the compositional process to new and different Q<sup>2</sup> contexts. Kloppenborg (1987:239) further acknowledges that “proverbs and wisdom sayings are also found in the judgment speeches”. In other words, Kloppenborg admits that there are non-prophetic, sapiential small forms in the main redaction. The fact that the “non-prophetic” sayings in Q<sup>2</sup> are mostly *proverbial* logia only adds to the possibility that some of these sayings were originally part of Q<sup>1</sup>. If the latter is accepted, it follows that the main redactor at times built Q<sup>2</sup> material *around* certain wisdom sayings that were originally part of Q<sup>1</sup>.

Kloppenborg differentiates between the sapiential logia in Q<sup>2</sup> and the wisdom sayings of Q<sup>1</sup> by arguing that the former “function not to reinforce ethical imperatives, but to undergird the pronouncements of judgment” (Kloppenborg 1987:239). Yet, the function of these sayings in the final Q document (to “undergird the pronouncements of judgment”) might only have been assigned to them during the process of redaction. If some of these sayings were originally part of Q<sup>1</sup>, they might at that stage have had an entirely different function, and perhaps also an entirely different meaning.

This is perhaps an opportune moment to note that the distinction between Q<sup>1</sup> and Q<sup>2</sup> is not one of “wisdom genre versus prophetic genre”. Rather, the distinction between Q<sup>1</sup> and Q<sup>2</sup> is one of “instruction versus *chreia*” (see Howes 2012:125-130). Both of these are examples of *sapiential* genres (cf. Catchpole 1993:60; Kirk 1998:78; see Kloppenborg Verbin 2000:160-161, 306-307). In terms of genre, the whole Sayings Gospel should be seen as a sapiential document. Kloppenborg’s designations of the first layer as “sapiential” and the second layer as “prophetic” is not an indication of genre, but

---

<sup>9</sup> Given the prevalence of gender-based discrimination in antiquity, the main redactor was in all probability a man (or a group of men). To use gender-inclusive language in this instance would be anachronistic. In this article, the use of the masculine personal pronoun is not a reflection of my own prejudices, but of the unfortunate prejudices of the ancients.

of the overarching *thematic* content of each respective layer. The formative layer makes use of the sapiential genre of Instruction to promote a certain ethic, while the main redaction makes use of the sapiential genre of *Gnomologium* (or “*chreia* collection”) to convey certain typically prophetic themes, like future judgment.

As such, the intent of the current work is not to “move” certain sapiential material out of the “prophetic” layer and into the “sapiential” layer.<sup>10</sup> Put differently, the present work is not motivated by the incorrect notion that wisdom, prophecy and apocalypticism are somehow incompatible.<sup>11</sup> Thus, there is no current interest in making the formative stratum “more sapiential” or the main redaction “less sapiential”. Neither is there any interest in creating a “better” distinction between Q<sup>1</sup> and Q<sup>2</sup> by “removing” the “unwanted” wisdom material from the main redaction into the formative stratum. Instead, the current work is motivated by a genuine suspicion that the redactional process was more complex and involved than originally suspected. Hence, when it is argued that certain sayings in Q<sup>2</sup> are more typical of Q<sup>1</sup>, the assumption is that these sayings are “proverbial” in nature, meaning that they attempt to convey general sapiential truths in a way that is more typical of the instructional genre than the *chreia* genre. The assumption is *not* that these sayings are somehow “more sapiential” than the rest of Q<sup>2</sup>.

## 2. A DIACHRONIC INVESTIGATION OF SAPIENTIAL SMALL FORMS IN Q<sup>2</sup>

Kloppenborg (1987:169, 239) provides the following examples of proverbial small forms in Q<sup>2</sup>: Q 7:35; Q 11:17b-18;<sup>12</sup> Q 11:20; Q 11:21-22; Q 11:23; Q 11:24-26; Q 11:33; Q 11:34-35; Q 12:54-55; Q 12:58-59 and Q 17:37. In what follows, we will look at each saying in turn, carefully considering whether or not it could at some stage have formed part of the formative layer.

### 2.1 Sophia’s children (Q 7:35)

<sup>10</sup> The current article is not the first attempt to reposition Q<sup>2</sup> material into the formative layer. As criteria for relocating certain Q<sup>2</sup> passages to Q<sup>1</sup>, Vaage (1994:107-120) pointed not only to certain thematic tensions and seams in the text, but also to the social history of certain sayings. These indicators fail to convince, particularly his use of social history and Cynicism as criteria (cf. Kirk 1998:43). Surely, the social history of a saying or layer should be extrapolated only *after* the editorial history of the document has already been determined, and not before. Instead of improving the structural flow of the formative stratum, Vaage’s proposed emendations seem to disrupt the overall structure of Q<sup>1</sup> (cf. Kirk 1998:43). Similarly, the proposed relocations do not properly fit in with the genre and content of Q<sup>1</sup> (cf. Kirk 1998:43). Vaage’s attempts to move material back into Q<sup>1</sup> do not seem to be motivated by a true concern for the literary history of Q, but seems rather to be motivated by his desire to compare Q<sup>1</sup> with contemporary Cynic texts. Contrarily, the current effort to “move” some Q<sup>2</sup> material to Q<sup>1</sup> is motivated by a concern for Q’s literary development, and is not biased by an overall, pre-determined theory of the document’s social (or other) affinities. Furthermore, the potential additions currently treated are not only identical in genre and form to those of the formative stratum, but also thematically analogous to the latter.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. Allison 1997:41; cf. also Kirk 1998:77; Kloppenborg Verbin 2000:380; see Edwards 1976:71-73; Piper 1989:137-155; Sato 1995:141-142.

<sup>12</sup> “Every kingdom divided against itself is left barren, and every household divided against itself will not stand. And if Satan is divided against himself, how will his kingdom stand?” (πᾶσα βασιλεία μερισθεῖσα [καθ’] ἑαυτῆ[ς] ἐρημοῦται καὶ πᾶσα οἰκία μερισθεῖσα καθ’ ἑαυτῆς οὐ σταθήσεται. καὶ εἰ ὁ σατανᾶς ἐφ’ ἑαυτὸν ἐμερίσθη, πῶς σταθήσεται ἡ βασιλεία αὐτοῦ;)

The first logion to consider is Q 7:35. Although the concepts introduced in Q 7:31-35 are fairly common in instructional wisdom literature (see Prov 1:20-33; 8:1-21), the idea that Sophia's children will "vindicate" (ἐδικαιώθη)<sup>13</sup> Sophia does not sit well with the docile and peaceful content of the rest of the formative stratum, especially the inaugural sermon. In this short saying, the redactional theme of Israel's deuteronomistic history is combined with the traditional sapiential image of "Sophia" in order to promote a negative view of "this generation" (cf. Kloppenborg 1987:112; see Piper 1989:125-126, 166-168, 170). The reference to "Sophia" appears elsewhere in Q<sup>2</sup> (cf. Q 11:49), but not at all in Q<sup>1</sup>. It is hard to see how this saying with its vindictive message could ever have functioned in the literary context of the formative stratum.

Conversely, the saying fits perfectly in its literary context in Q<sup>2</sup> (7:31-35), without seeming in any way forced or synthetic (cf. Kirk 1998:264, 375-376; Catchpole 1993:47-48). This is true despite the apparent composite nature of Q 7:31-35 (see Kloppenborg 1987:110-112). Kloppenborg (1987:112) is probably correct in claiming that verse 35 was added to verses 31-34 at a very early stage, most likely during the prehistory of Q<sup>2</sup>. In verse 31, the out-group, or "this generation", is compared to children at the market place. In verse 35, the in-group, or the "Q people" are described as "Sophia's children". In this Q<sup>2</sup> text, the two groups of children are contrasted with each other in favour of the in-group (cf. Piper 1989:168-169; Kirk 1998:376). The same conclusion is effected if the children of Q 7:35 are linked to the "children of Abraham" in Q 3:8 (see Fleddermann 2005:385-387). Hence, there is absolutely no reason for proposing or assuming that Q 7:35 could at some stage have been part of Q<sup>1</sup>.

## 2.2 Divided against itself (Q 11:17b-18, 20)

Within the Beelzebul accusation, Kloppenborg (1987:169, 239) identifies both Q 11:17b-18 and Q 11:20 as traditional wisdom sayings. With the naked eye, Q 11:17b<sup>14</sup> certainly looks like a maxim. Not only does the saying's use of parallelism remind one of traditional Old Testament proverbs (cf. Ceresko 1999:31), but the gnomic nature and general applicability of the saying also conforms to the typical nature of a maxim (cf. Kirk 1998:90). Nonetheless, Kloppenborg (1987:124) is almost certainly correct in concluding that verses 17-18 were added to verses 14-15 at a very early stage in the tradition (cf. Horsley 1992:191). This confidence derives from the fact that Mark (3:22-26) and Q agree in placing the saying in question directly after the initial accusation (cf. Allison 1997:124-125; Kirk 1998:186; Casey 2002:161). Such agreement trumps all other pieces of evidence in this regard. Kloppenborg (1987:124) is probably also correct in claiming that verses 19-20 were added thereafter.<sup>15</sup> Once again, the Gospel of Mark is determinative in this regard. In Mark's version of the Beelzebul accusation, Q 11:19-20 is entirely missing (cf. Piper 1989:121, 123; Kirk 1998:186). There is an additional reason for concluding that verses 19-20 were added later. The content of Q 11:17-20 represents two completely

<sup>13</sup> Unless otherwise specified, the text of the Critical Edition of Q is followed (see Robinson, Hoffmann and Kloppenborg 2000).

<sup>14</sup> "Every kingdom divided against itself is left barren, and every household divided against itself will not stand." (πᾶσα βασιλεία μερισθεῖσα [καθ'] ἐαντῆ[ς] ἐρημοῦται καὶ πᾶσα οἰκία μερισθεῖσα καθ' ἐαυτῆς οὐ σταθήσεται.)

<sup>15</sup> Cf. also Horsley (1992:191).

different and distinct arguments against the initial accusation (cf. Horsley 1992:191; Kirk 1998:187; Casey 2002:164-165; see Fleddermann 2005:505-506).

Despite the probability that verses 19-20 were added at a later stage, it is still highly unlikely that any part of it ever belonged to the formative stratum. Verse 19 clearly presupposes the accusation of verse 15, as is evidenced by the repetition of the phrase “by Beelzebul ... cast out demons” (ἐν Βεελζεβούλ ἐκβάλλει / ἐκβάλλω τὰ δαιμόνια)<sup>16</sup> in both verses (cf. Kloppenborg 1987:122). In fact, the second argument is perhaps a more direct and appropriate response to the initial accusation than the one we find in verses 17-18 (cf. Horsley 1992:191). The argument of verses 19-20 begins by repeating the accusation word for word, but turning it into a conditional clause and redirecting the very same accusation at the initial accusers. This type of deflection is an expected response to an accusation of such gravity and magnitude. Moreover, the rhetorical questions at the end of verse 18 and at the beginning of verse 19, as well as the threefold repetition of the conditional conjunction “if” (εἰ) in verses 18, 19 and 20, unite the two respective arguments in Q 11:17-18 and Q 11:19-20 (cf. Kirk 1998:186-187; Fleddermann 2005:502).

More significant, though, is the likelihood that verses 19 and 20 belong together. The latter is supported by the use in both verses of the conditional clause “if by...I cast out demons” (εἰ ἐν...ἐγὼ ἐκβάλλω τὰ δαιμόνια) (cf. Kirk 1998:189). It is further reinforced by the conjunction “but” (δὲ) at the beginning of verse 20. The possibility should not be overlooked that the latter conjunction was added by the main redactor to effect a smooth transition between two formerly separate sayings. Nevertheless, the association between verses 19 and 20 seems exceptionally firm (cf. Casey 2002:170). If, then, verse 19 only makes sense as part of the initial accusation, and verse 20 should be read with verse 19, it follows that these two verses were added to Q 11:14-18 during the prehistory of Q<sup>2</sup>. As such, it is unlikely that verse 20 could at any stage have been part of the formative stratum. This conclusion is confirmed by the fact that the formative stratum is altogether unconcerned with demonology and exorcism (see below). On the other hand, verses 19 and 20 show a number of thematic links with another Q<sup>2</sup> passage, namely Q 11:31-32 (see Kloppenborg 1987:124-125).

### 2.3 Stealing from a strong person (Q 11:21-22)

There is legitimate doubt as to whether or not the sapiential saying of Q 11:21-22 actually belongs in Q (cf. Kloppenborg 1987:125, esp. n. 105; Piper 1989:243-244 n. 120). Scholars wanting to include this saying point to the agreement between Matthew and Luke regarding the placement of this logion after the saying of Q 11:20 (cf. Neiryneck 1995:271; see Casey 2002:173-174). Against this, the likelihood should not be overlooked that Luke and Matthew both chose this placement without the help of Q. Regardless of its history of redaction, Q 11:14-20 functions as a literary unit, with a proper introduction in verse 14 and a proper conclusion in verse 20 (cf. Fleddermann 2005:502, 506; see Kirk 1998:186-189, esp. 187, 188). In Mark, the saying about looting a strong man’s house appears directly after the Markan version of the Beelzebul accusation (i.e. Mark 3:20-26, without

<sup>16</sup> All alternative readings are taken from the twenty-seventh edition of *Novum Testamentum Graece* (Nestle, Nestle, Aland and Aland 1993).

Q 11:19-20). It follows that if this saying occurred only in Mark 3:27 (and not in Q), the most natural position for it<sup>17</sup> would be after Q's version of the Beelzebul accusation (i.e. after Q 11:20). It is not at all unlikely that both evangelists would have followed the same (somewhat inevitable) logic at this point, and would have placed the Markan saying after Q's more elaborate refutation of the Beelzebul accusation. The large degree of accord between Matthew 12:29 and Mark 3:27 suggests that Matthew used only Mark here as a source. Although Luke (11:21-22) did not copy Mark 3:27 word for word, his rendering is easily understood as an imaginative expansion of Mark at this point (cf. Kloppenborg 1987-;125 n. 105).

If this saying were in Q (which seems doubtful), it agreed with Mark as far as its placement after the Beelzebul accusation is concerned. Consequently, even if this saying were in Q, it could not have been part of the formative layer, for this would mean that it originally appeared after Q 11:13. The latter is extremely unlikely, given the location of the saying in Mark. The *content* of Q 11:21-22 further supports the conclusion that, even if this saying did occur in Q, it could not at any stage have been part of the formative layer. If the saying did follow directly after Q 11:13, the "strong person" (ἰσχυρός) who owns the "house" (οἰκία in Matt) would here have referred to God. In view of the supposed literary context of this saying in Q<sup>1</sup>, where God is repeatedly referred to as the "Father" (πατήρ) of his symbolic family,<sup>18</sup> the previous conclusion is inescapable. In the family metaphor, God is undeniably painted as the *pater familias* (see Moxnes 2003-;115-121, 152; cf. esp. Q 11:11-13).

It follows that if Q 11:21-22 did at first appear after Q 11:13, the logical and inevitable conclusion would have been that there is an external threat, described in Luke's metaphor as a "stronger person" (ἰσχυρότερος), with the ability to overpower God. This deduction is so apparent that any first-century Jew would have noticed it almost immediately. Given their unshakable belief that the Jewish God is more powerful than other ancient gods, not to even mention earthly beings or worldly threats, it should be accepted as a near impossibility that Q 11:21-22 was ever part of the formative stratum. That any first-century Jew would have spoken or put a saying in a context that leads to the implication that God could in any conceivable manner be overpowered is a near impossibility. In sum, it seems highly unlikely that this logion was ever part of the Sayings Gospel Q, not to even mention the formative layer.

## 2.4 In or out? (Q 11:23)

In the Sayings Gospel, Q 11:23 probably followed directly after the Beelzebul accusation (Q 11:14-15, 17-20). Matthew and Luke agree against Mark in placing Q 11:23 after the saying about looting a strong man's house. The logion in Q 11:23 is well-suited as a follow-up comment after the Beelzebul accusation (cf. Piper 1989-;122; Casey 2002-;176). It implies that the accusers of verse 15 are against Jesus, which means that they are the ones who are in cahoots with Beelzebul, not Jesus (see esp. Allison 1997-;126-127;

<sup>17</sup> From the evangelists' vantage point.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. e.g. Q 6:35-36, 41-42; 11:2-3, 13; 12:22-31; 17:3-4; cf. Horsley 1995:44; Cotter 1995:127; Kirk 1998:340, 343, 357; Arnal 2001:175; Fleddermann 2005:450; see Mack 1993:136, 139-141; Schottruff 1995; Jacobson 1995; Moxnes 2003:54-55, 91, 115-121, 152.

Casey 2002:176-177; cf. also Kloppenborg 1987:125-126; Kirk 1998:190; 2006:188, 189). Mark's version of this logion also occurs in a literary context that deals with the casting out of demons. More specifically, both Mark 9:38-39 and Q 11:19 deal with the existence and work of other exorcists (besides Jesus) (cf. Allison 1997:126). The fact that Mark also has this saying after a paragraph about exorcism strongly suggests that it followed the Beelzebul accusation in Q. On the other hand, this agreement between Mark and Q stoutly argues against the possibility that this saying ever belonged to Q<sup>1</sup>. It is hard to see how Q 11:23, which is utterly polemic and accusatory in nature,<sup>19</sup> could ever have followed Q 11:13, which is about the loving support of God.

## 2.5 The return of the unclean spirit (Q 11:24-26)

That Q 11:24-26 originally circulated independently is evidenced by the artificiality of its association with its literary context in Q (cf. Kloppenborg 1987:126; Piper 1989:123). The Beelzebul accusation speaks about a "demon" (δαμόνιον), while Q 11:24-26 talks of "unclean spirits" (τὸ ἀκάθαρτον πνεῦμα). Also, if the Beelzebul accusation is read in conjunction with Q 11:24-26, the possibility arises that Jesus introduced, not the reign of God, but the reign of Satan, when he cast out the mute's demon, since more demons will inevitably return to their host. As such, Q 11:24-26 might actually support the initial accusation *against* Jesus.

As Allison (1997:126-127) has indicated, however, Q 11:24-26 was meant to be read primarily in conjunction with Q 11:23 and Q 11:19a. These logia connect the story of Q 11:24-26 and the Beelzebul accusation in a way that impedes confusion. The point is that, whereas other exorcists typically leave the body of the possessed "empty" after casting out a demon, Jesus fills it with the kingdom of God. In the former case, the person is left exposed to the same and other demons after the exorcism (cf. Fleddermann 2005:508). In the latter case, however, the kingdom of God fills up all the leftover "space", thereby not only hindering unclean spirits, but also keeping them out altogether. On the constructive side, Q 11:24-26 explains that only the exorcisms of Jesus are truly effective (cf. Allison 1997:127). On the polemical side, Q 11:24-26 teaches that the exorcisms of outsiders are ineffective, especially when it comes to aftercare (cf. Allison 1997:131).<sup>20</sup> Hence, Q 11:24-26 intends to illustrate that rejection of Jesus' message about the kingdom of God is tantamount to opening oneself up to the infestation of evil spirits and the kingdom of Beelzebul (cf. Fleddermann 2005:508; see Piper 1989:122-124; Kirk 1998:190-191, 330-331). As such, Q 11:24-26 clearly belongs with its current literary context in the main redaction.

The subject of demonology and exorcism unites this whole section (Q 11:14-26), including Q 11:24-26 (cf. Allison 1997:124). Like the previous logion (Q 11:23), it is hard to see how this passage, about the defiling capabilities of evil spirits, could ever have operated in the formative stratum, or have followed after Q 11:13. In this regard, we have

---

<sup>19</sup> Cf. Kloppenborg 1987:125.

<sup>20</sup> In Q, polemic and didactic meanings often appear side by side in the same text as flip sides to the same coin (cf. Fleddermann 2005:501).

to conclude with Kloppenborg that not one of the sayings in Q 11:14-26 were ever part of the formative stratum.

## 2.6 Obscuring light and illuminating darkness (Q 11:33, 34-35)

Kloppenborg (1987:121, 147-148) rightfully attributed the block of Q material that deals exclusively with the proclamation of judgment against “this generation”, including the Pharisees and scribes, to the main redaction.<sup>21</sup> On the face of it, though, this block of material is rudely interrupted by Q 11:33-35 (cf. Sato 1994:171; Vaage 1994:119; see Lührmann 1994:59-60). The prophetic small forms, polemical content and sombre atmosphere of this block of Q<sup>2</sup> material are visibly at odds with the sapiential small forms, practical content and neutral tone of the two sayings in Q 11:33-34 (cf. Piper 1989:127; Allison 1997:165). This block of material would certainly have been more cohesive, both formally and thematically, if the woes against the Pharisees followed directly after Q 11:31-32 in the tradition (cf. Sato 1994:171). In my view, the best explanation for why the main redactor would have inserted the sayings of Q 11:33-35 into this block of prophetic judgment material is because he found at least one of them in the formative layer.

It should be accepted without much doubt that Q 11:33 and Q 11:34-35 did not belong together originally (cf. Kloppenborg 1987:135; Piper 1989:127; Jacobson 1992:156; Robinson 2005b:592). The thematic disjunction between these two autonomous maxims has been observed by other interpreters as well (cf. Kloppenborg 1987:135; Kirk 1998:193). It is certainly telling that both Matthew (5:15; 6:22-23) and Thomas (24, 33) separated the two sayings in their respective gospels (cf. Piper 1989:128). More significant is the fact that Mark (4:21) copied only the saying behind Q 11:33, without Q 11:34-35 (cf. Piper 1989:127, 246 n. 146). On the other hand, there is evidence to suggest that these sayings were already joined in the pre-Lukan tradition (cf. Marshall 1978:488; Piper 1989:128; Zeller 1994:119; Allison 1997:167). It therefore seems likely that these two sayings were for the first time joined in Q (cf. Lührmann 1994:59; *contra* Robinson 2005b:591-592).

It is certainly possible that the main redactor found the maxim of verse 33 in the formative stratum after the pericope that ends in Q 11:13, and before the pericope that starts in Q 12:2 (cf. Zeller 1994:119; Sato 1994:171). Independent evidence of this original position is provided by Mark, whose parallel to Q 12:2 (Mark 4:22) appears directly after his parallel to Q 11:33 (Mark 4:21) (cf. Kloppenborg 1987:215). These two logia also appear together in the Gospel of Thomas 33 (cf. Jacobson 1992:173; Robinson 2005b:438 n. 50). Both of these texts are highly significant as independent evidence of the earlier presence of Q 11:33 directly before Q 12:2 (cf. Robinson 2005a:591; 2005b:438 n. 50; 2005b:591). Q 11:33 follows neatly after Q 11:9-13. Both passages could be viewed as dealing with the ancient social value of reciprocal sharing. Q 12:2-3 also follows neatly after Q 11:33. Besides the obvious catchword connections (cf. Zeller 1994:119; Sato 1994:171),<sup>22</sup> both deal with the subject matter of hiding and exposing wisdom (cf. Valantasis 2005:140).

<sup>21</sup> I.e. Q 11:16, 29-32, 39, 41-44, 46-52.

<sup>22</sup> I.e. οὐδεὶς κρύπτει & κρυπτός.

**Commented [LH3]:** The first quote from the same author in the same year is designated 2005a.

**Commented [LH4]:** I have made changes throughout to accommodate this switch.



If Q 11:34-35 was also taken from Q<sup>1</sup>, its original placement would not be certain. There are a number of possibilities. A position in the inaugural sermon seems most likely. Matthew situates this maxim in the heart of his Sermon on the Mount. Q 11:34-35 would have worked well as a transitional saying between Q 6:41-42 and Q 6:43-45. Like Q 6:41-42, Q 11:34-35 speaks about people's eyes. Like Q 11:34-35, Q 6:43-45 explains how good and bad people may be separated on account of their inner character, which is easily, albeit accidentally, revealed through external means. If the placement of Q 11:34-35 in Matthew's gospel is considered, an attachment to Q 12:33-34 or Q 16:13 is also a possibility. It is finally also possible that Q 11:34-35 was already combined with Q 11:33 when the main redactor took these logia over. If so, it would imply that Q 11:33-35 as a whole appeared between Q 11:13 and Q 12:2 in the formative stratum. In the end, these options are all conjectural. Nonetheless, the extensive thematic overlap between Q 11:34-35 and certain Q<sup>1</sup> texts opens up the genuine possibility that this logion appeared in the formative stratum before being incorporated into the main redaction (cf. Lührmann 1994:59; Vaage 1994:119).

These observations are admittedly not determinative, but they do point to the serious possibility that the two sayings of Q 11:33-35 were discovered in the formative stratum by the main redactor, who then proceeded to incorporate them into the block of material that lashes out against the Pharisees, the scribes and "this generation". If these sayings were indeed taken from Q<sup>1</sup> and added to Q<sup>2</sup>, their original meanings were completely altered by their new literary surroundings (cf. Marshall 1978:487; Jacobson 1992:173, 174; Kloppenborg 1994:145; Vaage 1994:119; Allison 1997:167). In the end, substantiation of these suggestions requires a much more comprehensive and focused study of these logia than what is presently possible.

## 2.7 Good and bad weather (Q 12:54-55)

The existence of Q 12:54-55 in the Sayings Gospel is disputed (cf. Kloppenborg 1987:152, esp. n. 219; Kirk 1998:237). Yet, even if Q 12:54-55 did belong in Q, it is still to be doubted that it ever subsisted in the formative layer. This logion is both formally and thematically dissimilar to the formative stratum. In fact, Q 12:54-55 is not even remotely comparable to any of the themes or forms in Q<sup>1</sup>. The application in verse 56 appears independently in the Gospel of Thomas and was undoubtedly added later to the maxim of verses 54-55 (cf. Kloppenborg 1987:152). Be that as it may, the application does not seem forced or out of place in its Q<sup>2</sup> context. Although meteorology was a common sapiential (and proverbial) theme,<sup>23</sup> the imagery of this logion, especially the references to the sky being "flame red" (πυρράζω), fits well in a Q<sup>2</sup> thematic context, where apocalyptic signs are an issue of much debate (see Kirk 1998:237-238).<sup>24</sup> Finally, the references to "flame red skies" should be viewed as a further development of the apocalyptic image in Q 12:49 of "fire" (πῦρ) being "hurled upon the earth" (βαλεῖν ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν). Given all this, it is doubtful that this saying ever belonged to Q<sup>1</sup>, even if it can be shown to have belonged to the Q document.

<sup>23</sup> Cf. Kloppenborg 1987:152.

<sup>24</sup> Cf. e.g. Q 11:16, 29-32.

## 2.8 Avoid the courts! (Q 12:58-59)

Kloppenborg (1987:152-153) acknowledges that Q 12:58 used to be a sapiential admonition,<sup>25</sup> but argues that Q 12:59 “is more typical of a prophetic judgment statement.” His first argument in favour of the latter is that the formula λέγω ὑμῖν (σοι)· οὐ μὴ ... ἕως / μέχρις occurs predominantly in apocalyptic and prophetic announcements (cf. also Fleddermann 2005:657). The “formula” in Q 12:59, however, is λέγω σοι, οὐ μὴ ... ἕως, not the mixed phrase put forward by Kloppenborg. None of the texts<sup>26</sup> held up by Kloppenborg as examples of this prophetic and/or apocalyptic formula match the “formula” in Q 12:59 word for word. Surely there should be complete verbatim agreement for something to be dubbed a “formula.” Kloppenborg’s second argument in this regard is that λέγω ὑμῖν/σοι commonly introduces a statement about punishment, reward and judgment. Once again, the formalised prophetic introduction is λέγω ὑμῖν, not λέγω σοι, as it appears in Q 12:59. Out of the 24 texts Kloppenborg holds up as examples of this prophetic-type introduction, only Luke 23:43 has the Q form λέγω σοι.

Differentiating between the plural and singular forms of the second person personal pronoun might seem like nitpicking, but surely an author would rather stick to the more recognised form of a prophetic formula when attempting to turn a sapiential saying into a prophetic saying. Doing so would put the *prophetic* application and intent of the saying beyond serious doubt. As it stands, Q 12:59 does not need to be read as a prophetic saying at all (cf. Piper 1989:106; Kirk 1998:238). The Sayings Gospel Q uses the phrase λέγω ὑμῖν in both the sapiential sayings of the formative stratum<sup>27</sup> and the prophetic-apocalyptic sayings of the main redaction.<sup>28</sup> Lastly, in Kloppenborg’s statement that the formula in Q 12:59 “is more typical of a prophetic judgment statement,” the word “judgment” is perhaps more pertinent than the word “prophetic.” One should not be surprised to find the phrase λέγω ὑμῖν/σοι in Q 12:58-59, seeing as it clearly deals with *judicial judgment*. If λέγω σοι, οὐ μὴ ... ἕως does function as a formula in Q 12:59, it is rather the context of judicial judgment than the supposed implication of prophetic and/or apocalyptic judgment that determines its usage in this instance (cf. Piper 1989:106). It would seem that there are no definitive reasons for the conclusion that Q 12:59 is a prophetic text.

Kloppenborg’s valuation of verse 59 determines his rendering of the whole saying in Q 12:58-59. In view of verse 59’s use of the word “from there” (ἐκεῖθεν), Kloppenborg concludes (correctly) that verses 58 and 59 appeared together as a unified saying when added to the Sayings Gospel. As a result, Kloppenborg believes that, even though verse 58 used to be a sapiential admonition, Q 12:58-59 functions in the Sayings Gospel as a prophetic logion. However, if the inherently prophetic nature of verse 59 is denied, the only remaining argument in favour of the prophetic nature of the complete logion is its appearance in the literary *context* of the main redaction<sup>29</sup> (cf. Kloppenborg 1987:153; see Kirk 1998:238-239; cf. Fleddermann 2005:657). Yet, it is not at all certain that the logion

<sup>25</sup> Cf. also Piper 1989:106; Kirk 1998:238.

<sup>26</sup> I.e. Mark 9:1; 13:30; 14:25; Matt 5:18; Luke 13:35.

<sup>27</sup> Cf. e.g. Q 11:9; 12:22, 27; 15:10.

<sup>28</sup> Cf. e.g. Q 3:8; 7:26, 28; 10:12, 24; 12:44; 13:35; 17:34.

<sup>29</sup> I.e. Q 12:39-59.

occurred in this literary context to begin with (cf. Piper 1989:105, 237 n. 22, 23). Matthew (5:25-26) places the logion in the midst of his sermon on the mount (cf. Piper 1989:105). If this placement is due to Matthew and not Q, it still illustrates that a purely sapiential reading of Q 12:58-59 was possible at the time. However, if Matthew's literary context does go back to Q, it would mean that an unadulterated sapiential reading of Q 12:58-59 is *preferable*.

The most compelling arguments against Matthew's placement of this logion are, firstly, that Luke generally preserves the order of his sources more devotedly, and, secondly, that the thematic content of this saying, if interpreted prophetically, is compatible with its literary context in the main redaction. The former is more suggestive than determinative. Against the latter, it could be reasoned that the literal thematic content of Q 12:58-59 fits better with the intentions of not only the inaugural sermon specifically,<sup>30</sup> but also the formative stratum in general.<sup>31</sup> Piper (1989:106-107) adds additional arguments against the Lukan placement. Firstly, the singular form of the second person personal pronoun (σοι) does not properly fit with the literary context in Q 12:39-59, but fits the Matthean literary context like a glove. Secondly, unlike Q 12:39-59, the language of this logion is not utterly polemic, but it certainly is sapiential.<sup>32</sup>

The latter is supported by the respective redactional activities of Matthew and Luke. Three Q sayings appear in Matthew 5:17-26: (1) Q 16:17 in Matthew 5:18; (2) Q 12:58-59 in Matthew 5:25-26; (3) Q 16:18 in Matthew 5:32. Each of these Q sayings have been elaborated by the Matthean author<sup>33</sup> to bring about longer argumentative pericopes on the specific Q theme in question: (1) Matthew 5:17-20 on the continued validity of the Torah; (2) Matthew 5:21-26 on the theme of "brotherly reconciliation;" (3) Matthew 5:27-32 on the subject of marriage and divorce. Two observations should immediately be declared. Firstly, the three pericopes are thematically unrelated, and held together only by the fact that they represented the words of Jesus. A keen exegete could perhaps point to some degree of thematic relatedness between these three pericopes, but the truth of the matter is that three distinct ideas are basically mentioned side by side. Secondly, if one disregards the Matthean elaborations, Q 12:58-59 appears in Matthew between Q 16:17 and Q 16:18.

The first observation could act as yet another argument in favour of the Matthean placement of Q 12:58-59. The fact that these three unrelated themes appear together in Matthew's gospel fiercely suggests that the evangelist was following the sequential order of his source at this point. The latter is in stark contrast to Luke's handling of the saying in Q 12:58-59. Luke places Q 12:58-59 at the end of an elaborate section<sup>34</sup> that also comes from Q, and that deals specifically with the theme of Jesus' second coming.<sup>35</sup> Two indications strongly suggest that Luke purposely took Q 12:58-59 from a different context and placed it here. Firstly, as one would expect if the latter were the case, the saying

<sup>30</sup> Cf. e.g. Q 6:22, 27-28, 35, 29-30, 36-38, 39, 40, 41-42; cf. Piper 1989:107; Fleddermann 2005:658.

<sup>31</sup> Cf. e.g. Q 10:3; 11:4; 12:4, 11, 33-34, 22-31; 16:13; 17:3-4)

<sup>32</sup> Cf. e.g. Prov 6:1-5; 25:7-10; Sirach 18:20.

<sup>33</sup> Whether this was done by adding inherited traditions or by creating new material *ex nihilo* is irrelevant for our current purposes.

<sup>34</sup> I.e. Luke 12:35-59.

<sup>35</sup> In Luke, that is, not necessarily in Q (cf. Horsley 1992:182)!

appears at the *end* of the passage. Secondly, Luke felt it necessary to add verse 57 as a redactional joint between Q 12:58-59 and the material that precedes it. If Q 12:54-56 does stem from Q (which is all but certain), then Luke's need to add verse 57 is all the more telling. It seems highly likely, then, that Luke placed Q 12:58-59 at the end of a section that is prophetic and apocalyptic in nature in order to invite a novel interpretation of this Q logion. Against this, Matthew betrays no need to thematically tie Q 12:58-59 (and its elaboration in Matthew 5:21-26) to its literary environment. Rather, Matthew sticks to the disparity of his source, which, at this point, places unrelated sayings of Jesus side by side, almost as if merely listing them.

The second observation mentioned above, namely that Matthew places Q 12:58-59 between Q 16:17 and Q 16:18, relates directly to and affirms the first observation. Kloppenborg's sixth block of sapiential material<sup>36</sup> is thematically the most disparate block of sapiential sayings. Although this block's logia (*in toto*) are not *wholly* unrelated, the sayings of Q 16 certainly are: (1) Q 16:13 deals with God and mammon; (2) Q 16:16-17 deals with the Torah, although Kloppenborg argues that verse 17 was added by the redactor of Q<sup>37</sup>; (3) Q 16:18 deals with divorce. In light of the preceding arguments, it certainly does not seem like a far cry to suggest that Matthew's three unrelated pericopes derive from three equally unrelated, but successive, Q logia.<sup>38</sup> It seems that Q 12:58-59 was never part of Q<sup>2</sup>. Luke should be indicted as the culprit who removed this saying from its proper placement in the Q document and attached it to Luke (Q) 12:54-56.

## 2.9 Vultures (Q 17:37)

The last consideration is Q 17:37. Thematically, the morbid and gruesome scene of vultures flying around a corpse fits very well in the main redaction, and not at all in the formative layer. Although "death" is mentioned on occasion in Q<sup>1</sup>,<sup>39</sup> it is never in any of these texts a thoroughgoing theme or focal point. Instead, "survival" and "life" are much more fully developed as themes in the formative stratum.<sup>40</sup> Conversely, the main redaction persistently and continuously develops themes like "death", "destruction" and "final judgment".<sup>41</sup> The latter context fits Q 17:37 like a glove (see Fleddermann 2005:833-834).

The latter is not only true of the main redaction as a whole, but also of the saying's most immediate literary context within the main redaction<sup>42</sup> (see Catchpole 1993:252-253; Fleddermann 2005:829-837). Like its immediate literary context, this logion is concerned with both the heavenly Son-of-Man figure and the swiftness and certainty of the eschatological event (cf. Kloppenborg 1987:161, 162; see Piper 1989:138-142). Besides, if Q 17:37 were part of Q<sup>1</sup>, it would not only have followed after the saying about

<sup>36</sup> I.e. Q 13:18-19, 20-21, 24; 14:26, 27, 34-35; 15:4-5, 7, 8-10; 16:13, 16, 18; 17:1-2, 3-4, 6, 33.

<sup>37</sup> See Kloppenborg Verbin 2000:152-153; cf. Mack 1993:173; Cromhout 2007:264.

<sup>38</sup> I.e. Q 16:17, 12:58-59, 16:18.

<sup>39</sup> Cf. e.g. Q 9:59-60; 10:3; 12:4-5; 17:2.

<sup>40</sup> Cf. e.g. Q 6:21, 35; 10:2, 7-9; 11:3, 4, 11-13; 12:6-7, 22-31.

<sup>41</sup> Cf. e.g. Q 3:7, 9, 17; 10:12, 14-15; 11:19, 29-32, 44, 47, 49-51; 12:8-9, 10, 40, 46, 49, 51, 53; 13:28, 34-35; 17:24, 26-27, 34-35; 22:28, 30.

<sup>42</sup> Cf. Q 17:24, 26-27, 34-35.

having “faith like a mustard seed” (Q 17:6), but it would also have been the stratum’s concluding logion. Both of these factors argue against the presence of Q 17:37 in the formative layer.

### 3. CONCLUSION

By and large, Kloppenborg’s stratigraphy has been reaffirmed by this article. Out of the nine proverbial-type clusters considered, seven were merely confirmed to have originated, not in the formative stratum, but in the traditional material of the main redaction.<sup>43</sup> It was found that one saying (Q 12:58-59) never formed part of the main redaction to begin with. In fact, out of the nine passages examined, the two logia behind Q 11:33-35 were the only cases where the main redactor could be shown (with some measure of persuasiveness) to have inserted a proverbial saying from Q<sup>1</sup> into prophetic Q<sup>2</sup> material. This type of redactional activity is well attested in *chreia* collections, which tended to absorb all kinds of genres into its own structure (cf. Kloppenborg 1987:323). The result of this redactional process was not only the assimilation of the Q<sup>1</sup> maxim to its new literary context in the main redaction, but also the (quite significant) transformation of its initial meaning. Hence, out of all the sayings considered, only three<sup>44</sup> should probably be moved from Kloppenborg’s main redaction to his formative stratum.

### BIBLIOGRAPHY

ALLISON, D.C.

1997. *The Jesus tradition in Q*. Valley Forge: Trinity.

ARNAL, W.E.

1995. Redactional fabrication and group legitimation: The Baptist’s preaching in Q 3:7-9, 16-17. In: J.S. Kloppenborg (ed.), *Conflict and invention: Literary, rhetorical and social studies on the Sayings Gospel Q* (Valley Forge: Trinity), pp. 165-180.

ARNAL, W.E.

2001. *Jesus and the village scribe: Galilean conflicts and the setting of Q*. Augsburg: Fortress.

CASEY, M.

2002. *An Aramaic approach to Q: Sources for the gospels of Matthew and Luke*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. SNTSMS 122.

CATCHPOLE, D.R.

1993. *The quest for Q*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.

CERESKO, A.R.

---

<sup>43</sup> I.e. Q 7:35; 11:17b-18, 20; 11:21-22; 11:23; 11:24-26; 12:54-55; 17:37.

<sup>44</sup> I.e. Q 11:33, 34-35; 12:57-58.

1999. *Introduction to Old Testament wisdom: A spirituality for liberation*. New York: Orbis Books.

COTTER, W.

1995. Prestige, protection and promise: A proposal for the apologetics of Q<sup>2</sup>. In: R.A. Piper (ed.), *The gospel behind the gospels: Current studies on Q* (Leiden: Brill), pp. 117-138.

CROMHOUT, M.

2007. *Jesus and identity: Reconstructing Judean ethnicity in Q*. Eugene, OR: Cascade.

EDWARDS, R.A.

1976. *A theology of Q: Eschatology, prophecy, and wisdom*. Philadelphia: Fortress.

FLEDDERMANN, H.T.

2005. *Q: A reconstruction and commentary*. Leuven - Paris - Dudley, MA: Peeters. Biblical Tools and Studies 1.

HORSLEY, R.A.

1992. Q and Jesus: Assumptions, approaches, and analyses. In: J.S. Kloppenborg & L.E. Vaage (eds.), *Early Christianity, Q and Jesus* (Atlanta: Scholars), pp. 175-209. Semeia 55.

HORSLEY, R.A.

1995. Social conflict in the Synoptic Sayings Source Q. In: J.S. Kloppenborg (ed.), *Conflict and invention: Literary, rhetorical and social studies on the Sayings Gospel Q* (Valley Forge: Trinity), pp. 37-52.

HOWES, L.

2012. *The Sayings Gospel Q within the contexts of the third and renewed quests for the historical Jesus: Wisdom and apocalypticism in the first century*. Pretoria, South Africa: Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Pretoria.

JACOBSON, A.D.

1992. *The first gospel: An introduction to Q*. Sonoma, CA: Polebridge.

JACOBSON, A.D.

1995. Divided families and Christian origins. In: R.A. Piper (ed.), *The gospel behind the gospels: Current studies on Q* (Leiden: Brill), pp. 361-380.

KIRK, A.

1998. *The composition of the Sayings Source: Genre, synchrony, and wisdom redaction in Q*. Leiden: Brill. NovTSup XCI.

KIRK, A.

2006. Going public with the hidden transcript in Q 11: Beelzebul accusation and the woes. In: R.A. Horsley (ed.), *Oral performance, popular tradition, and hidden transcript in Q* (Atlanta: SBL), pp. 181-191. SBL Semeia Studies 60.

Commented [LH5]: Why is this entry being deleted. It was referenced on page 7, lines 3-4.

KLOPPENBORG, J.S.

1987. *The formation of Q: Trajectories in ancient wisdom collections*. Philadelphia: Fortress. SAC.

KLOPPENBORG, J.S.

1994 [1986]. The formation of Q and antique instructional genres. In: J.S. Kloppenborg (ed.), *The shape of Q: Signal essays on the Sayings Gospel* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress), pp. 138-155.

KLOPPENBORG, J.S.

1995. Conflict and invention: Recent studies on Q. In: J.S. Kloppenborg (ed.), *Conflict and invention: Literary, rhetorical and social studies on the Sayings Gospel Q* (Valley Forge: Trinity), pp. 1-14.

KLOPPENBORG VERBIN, J.S.

2000. *Excavating Q: The history and setting of the Sayings Gospel*. Minneapolis: Fortress.

LÜHRMANN, D.

1994 [1969]. Q in the history of early Christianity. In: J.S. Kloppenborg (ed.), *The shape of Q: Signal essays on the Sayings Gospel* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress), pp. 59-73.

MACK, B.L.

1993. *The lost gospel: The book of Q and Christian origins*. San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco.

MARSHALL, I.H.

1978. *The Gospel of Luke: A commentary on the Greek text*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans.

MOXNES, H.

2003. *Putting Jesus in his place: A radical vision of household and kingdom*. Louisville - London: Westminster & John Knox.

NEIRYNCK, F.

1995. Assessment. In: H.T. Fleddermann (ed.), *Mark and Q: A study of the overlap texts* (Leuven: Peeters), pp. 261-307. BETL 122.

NESTLE, E., NESTLE, E., ALAND, K. & ALAND, B.

1993. *Novum Testamentum Graece 27*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelstiftung.

PIPER, R.A.

1989. *Wisdom in the Q-tradition: The aphoristic teachings of Jesus*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

ROBINSON, J.M.

2005a [1994]. The history-of-religions taxonomy of Q: The Cynic hypothesis. In: C. Heil & J. Verheyden (eds.), *The Sayings Gospel Q: Collected essays by James M. Robinson* (Leuven: Leuven University Press & Peeters), pp. 427-448. BETL CLXXXIX.

ROBINSON, J.M.

2005ba [1998]. The sequence of Q: Lament over Jerusalem. In: C. Heil & J. Verheyden (eds.), *The Sayings Gospel Q: Collected essays by James M. Robinson* (Leuven: Leuven University Press & Peeters), pp. 559-598. BETL CLXXXIX.

ROBINSON, J.M.

2005b [1994]. The history-of-religions taxonomy of Q: The Cynic hypothesis. In: C. Heil & J. Verheyden (eds.), *The Sayings Gospel Q: Collected essays by James M. Robinson* (Leuven: Leuven University Press & Peeters), pp. 427-448. BETL CLXXXIX.

ROBINSON, J.M., HOFFMANN, P. & KLOPPENBORG, J.S. (EDS.)

2000. *The critical edition of Q*. Minneapolis: Fortress. Hermeneia Series.

SATO, M.

1994 [1988]. The shape of the Q-Source. In: J.S. Kloppenborg (ed.), *The shape of Q: Signal essays on the Sayings Gospel* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress), pp. 156-179.

SATO, M.

1995. Wisdom statements in the sphere of prophecy. In: R.A. Piper (ed.), *The gospel behind the gospels: Current studies on Q* (Leiden: Brill), pp. 139-158.

SCHOTTROFF, L.

1995. Itinerant prophetesses. In: R.A. Piper (ed.), *The gospel behind the gospels: Current studies on Q* (Leiden: Brill), pp. 347-360.

TUCKETT, C.M.

1996. *Q and the history of early Christianity: Studies on Q*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.

VAAGE, L.E.

1994. *Galilean upstarts: Jesus' first followers according to Q*. Valley Forge: Trinity.



VALANTASIS, R.

2005. *The new Q: A fresh translation with commentary*. New York - London: T&T Clark.

ZELLER, D.

1994 [1982]. Redactional processes and changing settings in the Q-material. In: J.S. Kloppenborg (ed.), *The shape of Q: Signal essays on the Sayings Gospel* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress), pp. 116-130.

*Key words*

*Sleutelwoorde*

Sayings Gospel Q

Spreuke-Evangelie Q

Redaction

Redaksie

Kloppenborg

Kloppenborg

Stratification

Stratifikasie

Maxims / Proverbs

Spreuke