1

Jesus, Q, and the Gospel

The quest for the historical Jesus continues to be a site of vigorous debate in the contemporary study of Christian origins.[1] The most distinctive feature of this quest,[2] particularly in the last thirty years, has been its emphasis on the *Jewishness* of Jesus,[3] although there is still no consensus on what *kind* of Jew Jesus was. [4] The Gospels portray Jesus as challenging Jewish ethnic

1. For the widely accepted "facts," see E. P. Sanders, *Jesus and Judaism* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985), 11; idem, *The Historical Figure of Jesus* (London: Penguin, 1993), 10–11; Craig A. Evans, "Authenticating the Activities of Jesus," in *Authenticating the Activities of Jesus*, ed. Bruce D. Chilton and Craig A. Evans (NTTS 28/2; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 3–29.

2. N. T. Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God*, vol. 2, *Christian Origins and the Question of God* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1996), xiv–xv, coined the term "The Third Quest." See also Stephen Neill and N. T. Wright, *The Interpretation of the New Testament 1861–1986* (2d ed.; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988). But see Fernando Bermejo Rubio, "The Fiction of the 'Three Quests': An Argument for Dismantling a Dubious Historiographical Paradigm," *JSHJ* 7 (2009): 211–53; Dale C. Allison, Jr., *Resurrecting Jesus: The Earliest Christian Tradition and Its Interpreters* (New York: T&T Clark, 2005), 1–18; Stanley E. Porter, *The Criteria for Authenticity in Historical-Jesus Research: Previous Discussion and New Proposals* (JSNTSup 191; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), 28–59.

3. See Gerd Theissen and Annette Merz, *Der historische Jesus* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996), 29; Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God*, 119–20; Tom Holmén, "The Jewishness of Jesus in the 'Third Quest,'" in *Jesus, Mark and Q: The Teaching of Jesus and its Earliest Records* (JSNT Sup 214; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), 143–62; idem, ed., *Jesus from Judaism to Christianity: Continuum Approaches to the Historical Jesus* (London: T&T Clark, 2007).

4. The rabbinical literature – late, negative, and polemical – is not particularly reliable. See, for example, *b. Sanh.* 43a, where Jesus/*Yeshu* is hanged because "he practiced sorcery and enticed Israel to apostasy." See also *b. Sanh.* 107b; *b. Gittin* 56b; 57a. For Jesus as the son of "Pantera/Pandera," see *Qohelet Rabbah* 1:8(3); *Tosefta Hullin* 2:22f; *Toledot Yeshu*. See also Peter Schäfer, *Jesus in the Talmud* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2007); Hermann Strack, *Jesus, die Häretiker und die Christen nach den ältesten jüdischen Angaben* (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrischs'sche Buchhandlung, 1910); Morris Goldstein, *Jesus in the Jewish Tradition* (New York: Macmillan, 1950); Jacob Z. Lauterbach, "Jesus in the Talmud," in idem, *Rabbinic Essays* (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College, 1951); Johann Maier, *Jesus von Nazareth in der*

boundaries and in conflict with some of his contemporaries, but these conflicts were *Jewish* conflicts *within* Judaism. Moreover, despite the fact that Jesus can be relatively easily understood as a Jewish teacher, healer, and prophet, our models sometimes seem to function in mutually exclusive ways and fail to encompass the full range of Jesus' personality, sayings, and deeds.[5] Our sources do not conform to our desires to extract and secure reliable information from them.[6] The utility and reliability of the traditional criteria of authenticity have also recently come under fire.[7] Different scholars apply the same criteria to the same sources and attain different results. Our criteria are not sufficient in and of themselves to differentiate the authentic from the inauthentic. The criterion of multiple attestation depends on contested judgments regarding which sources are actually independent.[8] The criterion of dissimilarity, in particular, has been rightly criticized for its historical, theological, and methodological inadequacies.[9] Intended to identify what was distinctive about Jesus,[10] the criterion misses much of what was culturally continuous between Jesus and his

talmudischen Überlieferung (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1978); Jacob Neusner, *Judaism in the Matrix of Christianity* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986). But see Joseph Klausner, *Jesus of Nazareth* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1925).

5. Mahlon H. Smith, "Israel's Prodigal Son: Reflections on Reimaging Jesus," in *Profiles of Jesus*, ed. Roy W. Hoover (Santa Rosa: Polebridge, 2002), 87–113, esp. 93; Ben Witherington III, *The Christology of Jesus* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990), 267; Marcus J. Borg, "Con: Jesus was not an Apocalyptic Prophet," in *The Apocalyptic Jesus: A Debate*, ed. Robert J. Miller (Santa Rosa: Polebridge, 2001), 35; Meier, *A Marginal Jew: Rethinking the Historical Jesus*, Vol. 2, *Mentor, Message and Miracles* (New York: Doubleday, 1994), 407.

6. Rafael Rodriguez, "Authenticating Criteria: The Use and Misuse of a Critical Method," *JSHJ* 7 (2009): 152–67, at 167, calls them "*vehicles of subjectivity*."

7. See *Jesus, Criteria, and the Demise of Authenticity: The 2012 Lincoln Christian University Conference*, ed. Chris Keith and Anthony Le Donne (New York: T&T Clark International, 2012). For reservations, see James D. G. Dunn, *Jesus Remembered* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), 92–97, 191–92; Rodriguez, "Authenticating Criteria"; Dale C. Allison, Jr., "How to Marginalize the Traditional Criteria of Authenticity," in *Handbook for the Study of the Historical Jesus*, ed. Tom Holmén and Stanley E. Porter (4 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 2011), 3–30. On the criteria, see also D. G. A. Calvert, "Examination of the Criteria for Distinguishing the Authentic Words of Jesus," *NTS* 18 (1972): 209–19, at 211; M. Eugene Boring, "Criteria of Authenticity: The Beatitudes as a Test Case," in *Foundations and Facets Forum I* (1985): 3–38, at 3.

8. E. P. Sanders and Margaret Davies, *Studying the Synoptic Gospels* (London: SCM, 1989), 323–30, esp. 323; Dennis Polkow, "Method and Criteria for Historical Jesus Research," ed. Kent H. Richards, *Society of Biblical Literature 1987 Seminar Papers* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987), 336–56, at 350–51; John P. Meier, *A Marginal Jew: Rethinking the Historical Jesus*, I, *The Roots of the Problem and the Person* (New York: Doubleday, 1991), 174–75; Allison, *Resurrecting Jesus*, 75. See also Jens Schröter, "The Historical Jesus and the Sayings Tradition: Comments on Current Research," *Neot* 30 (1996): 151–68, at 158.

Jewish environment and risks misrepresenting Jesus by making him different from Judaism.[11] We simply do not have enough information about Second Temple Judaism(s) or early Christianity to determine precisely how Jesus was dissimilar from either. Moreover, the criterion may only tell us what was distinctive, not necessarily what was characteristic of Jesus.[12] The criterion of embarrassment, while useful in certain cases,[13] founders on conflicting interpretations of what Jesus' early followers might have found embarrassing. The criterion of coherence only confirms the authenticity of sayings or deeds by comparing them to material already determined to be authentic.[14] Recent interest in social memory theory may provide alternative approaches to our sources, assuming that the Synoptic Gospels contain oral retellings of the same events,[15] but memory is fallible, reproductive, and ideologically invested.[16]

9. See Morna D. Hooker, "On Using the Wrong Tool," *Th* 75 (1972): 570–81; David L. Mealand, "The Dissimilarity Test," *SJT* 31 (1978): 41–50; Sanders, *Jesus and Judaism*, 16–17, 252–55; R. T. Osborn, "The Christian Blasphemy: A Non-Jewish Jesus," in *Jews and Christians: Exploring the Past, Present, and Future*, ed. James H. Charlesworth (New York: Crossroad, 1990), 211–38; Tom Holmén, "Doubts about Double Dissimilarity: Restructuring the Main Criterion of Jesus-of-History Research," in *Authenticating the Words of Jesus*, 47–80; Richard B. Hays, "The Corrected Jesus," *First Things* 43 (1994): 43–48, at 45. For responses to Hooker, see Reginald H. Fuller, "The Criterion of Dissimilarity: The Wrong Tool?" in *Christological Perspectives*, ed. Robert F. Berkey and Sarah A. Edwards (New York: Pilgrim, 1982), 42–48; Craig A. Evans, "Jesus' Dissimilarity from Second Temple Judaism and the Early Church," in *Memories of Jesus: A Critical Appraisal of James D. G. Dunn's Jesus Remembered*, ed. Robert B. Stewart and Gary R. Habermas (Nashville: B & H Academic, 2010), 145–58. N. T. Wright suggests the corrective "double dissimilarity": Jesus must both fit *within* Judaism *and* stand out from within it.

10. See Norman Perrin, *Rediscovering the Teaching of Jesus* (New York: Harper & Row, 1967), 39; idem, *The New Testament: An Introduction: Proclamation and Parenesis, Myth and History* (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1974), 281; Ernst Käsemann, "The Problem of the Historical Jesus," in idem, *Essays on New Testament Themes* (SBT 41; London: SCM, 1964), 15–47, at 37; Sanders and Davies, *Studying the Synoptic Gospels*, 316; Gerd Theissen and Dagmar Winter, *The Quest for the Plausible Jesus: The Question of Criteria*, trans. M. Eugene Boring (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2002).

11. Susannah Heschel, *The Aryan Jesus* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2008).

12. Dale C. Allison, Jr., *Jesus of Nazareth: Millenarian Prophet* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1999), 4.

13. Meier, *A Marginal Jew* 1:168.

14. Jack T. Sanders, "The Criterion of Coherence and the Randomness of Charisma: Poring Through Some Aporias in the Jesus Tradition," *NTS* (1998): 1–25; Charles E. Carlston, "A Positive Criterion of Authenticity," *BR* 7 (1962): 33–44; Polkow, 'Method and Criteria for Historical Jesus," 350; Meier, *A Marginal Jew* 1:174–75; Robert W. Funk, *Honest to Jesus: Jesus for a New Millennium* (New York: Harper San Francisco, 1996), 138. See also Gerd Theissen and Annette Merz, "The Delay of the Parousia as a Test Case for the Criterion of Coherence," *LS* 32 (2007): 49–66; Theissen and Winter, *The Quest for the Plausible Jesus*, 17.

15. Dunn, *Jesus Remembered*, 212.

The historical Jesus will always be a *constructed* Jesus.[17] Historical Jesus traditions may be accessible in and through the impact Jesus made on his followers, but social memory theory does not work primarily on the level of reconstructing "what happened" *in the actual past*; rather, it attempts to reconstruct how Jesus-memories were transmitted and communicated. Social memory theory is therefore less useful in providing access to Jesus than it is in providing access to Jesus' followers and biographers. Critics of this new methodology have accused its advocates of covertly trying to reinscribe (the social memories found in) the Gospels as historically reliable,[18] but social memory theory – *as theory* – fails to establish either the reliability or unreliability of the Gospels; it is simply a theoretical tool useful in understanding how groups *process* their memories. We still have to determine *whose* memories we are reconstructing. The challenge, in other words, still remains one of applying the best methods *and criteria* in identifying what is reliably authentic Jesus tradition.

Like the criteria of authenticity, the historical-critical method has also been subject to critical scrutiny,[19] particularly its tendency to produce hierarchical, patriarchal, and Eurocentric readings.[20] It has been charged with a lack of

16. For the application of social memory to the Jesus tradition, see Jens Schröter, *Erinnerung an Jesu Worte. Studien zur Rezeption der Logienüberlieferung in Markus, Q und Thomas* (WMANT 76; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1997); Alan Kirk, "Memory Theory and Jesus Research," in *Handbook for the Study of the Historical Jesus*, 1:809–42; Dale C. Allison Jr., *Constructing Jesus: Memory, Imagination, and History* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2010), esp. 1–30; Richard Bauckham, *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses: The Gospels as Eyewitness Testimony* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006); Dunn, *Jesus Remembered*; Anthony Le Donne, *The Historiographical Jesus: Memory, Typology, and the Son of David* (Waco: Baylor University Press, 2009); Rafael Rodriguez, *Structuring Early Christian Memory: Jesus in Tradition, Performance, and Text* (LNTS; London: T&T Clark, 2010). For criticism, see Gerd Häfner, "Das Ende der Kriterien? Jesusforschung angesichts der geschichtstheoretischen Diskussion," in *Historiographie und fiktionales Erzählen: Zur Konstruktivität in Geschichtstheorie und Exegese* (BThSt 86; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2007) 102–14; Alexander J. M. Wedderburn, *Jesus and the Historians* (WUNT 269; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 222–23; Paul Foster, "Memory, Orality, and the Fourth Gospel: Three Dead-Ends in Historical Jesus Research," *JSHJ* 10, no. 3 (2012): 191–227.

17. William E. Arnal, *The Symbolic Jesus: Historical Scholarship, Judaism, and the Construction of Contemporary Identity* (RC; London: Equinox, 2005). On the near-impossibility of questing for a pre-interpreted Jesus, see Jens Schröter, "Die Frage nach dem historischen Jesus und der Charakter historischer Erkenntnis," in *The Sayings Source Q and the Historical Jesus*, ed. A. Lindemann (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2001), 207–254

18. Zeba A. Crook, "Collective Memory Distortion and the Quest for the Historical Jesus," *JSHJ* 11 (2013): 53–76; Foster, "Memory," 193.

19. See, e.g., Dale B. Martin, *Pedagogy of the Bible: An Analysis and Proposal* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2008); David R. Law, *The Historical-Critical Method: A Guide for the Perplexed* (London/New York: Bloomsbury T & T Clark, 2012).

critical self-reflexivity, an interest solely in the past, the exclusion of other traditions of interpretation, and a naively idealistic Romantic quest for mythic origins. Destabilizing grand narratives, however, is not the same thing as constructing plausible accounts of the past. Postmodern approaches may engage in discourses no less mythic than those they deconstruct.[21] What is needed, in other words, is a critical postmodern historiography that can still self-reflexively (re)construct plausible accounts of the past or, in this case, an historical person.

Jesus and Q

Since the mid-1980s historical Jesus scholars have increasingly been basing their research on Q, the so-called Synoptic "Sayings Source" or "Gospel." Q is the single most important source for reconstructing the teachings of the historical Jesus.[22] This does not mean that the historical Jesus can be *conflated* with the Jesus of Q.[23] The Jesus of Q is "a literary character, constructed from a network of sayings, stories, and editorial comments,"[24] and the dominant focus in Q studies has long been on its redactional profile, compositional history,

20. Fernando F. Segovia, *Decolonizing Biblical Studies: A View from the Margins* (Maryknoll: Orbis Books, 200), 3-33, esp. 15. See also Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, "The Ethics of Biblical Interpretation: Decentering Biblical Scholarship," *JBL* 107 (1988): 3-17.

21. See George Aichele, Peter Miscall, and Richard Walsh, "An Elephant in the Room: Historical-Critical and Postmodern Interpretation of the Bible," *JBL* 128.2 (2009): 383-404; John Van Seters, "A Response to G. Aichele, P. Miscall and R. Walsh, An Elephant in the Room: Historical-Criticism and the Postmodern Interpretation of the Bible," *JHS* 9.26 (2009): 2-13.

22. Gerd Theissen and Annette Merz, *The Historical Jesus: A Comprehensive Guide*, trans. John Bowden (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1998), 29. On Q and the historical Jesus, see James M. Robinson, "The Jesus of the Sayings Gospel Q" (OPIAC 28; Claremont: Claremont Graduate School, 1993); idem, "The Critical Edition of Q and the Study of Jesus," in *The Sayings Source Q and the Historical Jesus*, ed. Andreas Lindemann (BETL 158; Leuven: Peeters, 2001), 27–52; Daniel Kosch, "Q und Jesus," *BZ NF* 36 (1992): 30–58; Dieter Lührmann, "Die Logienquelle und die Frage nach dem historischen Jesu," paper presented at the fall meeting at Westar Institute, Edmonton, Alberta, Oct 24–27, 1991; Jens Schröter, "Markus, Q und der historische Jesus: Methodologische und exegetische Erwägungen zu den Anfängen der Rezeption der Verkündigung Jesu," *ZNW* 89 (1998): 173–200; John S. Kloppenborg, "The Sayings Gospel Q and the Quest of the Historical Jesus," *HTR* 89, no. 4 (1996): 307–44; idem, "Discursive Practices in the Sayings Gospel Q and the Quest of the Historical Jesus," in *The Sayings Source Q and the Historical Jesus*, 149–90; Richard A. Horsley, "Q and Jesus: Assumptions, Approaches, and Analyses," *Semeia* 55 (1991): 175–209; Dale C. Allison Jr., *The Jesus Tradition in Q* (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 1997), 60–61.

23. Dennis Ingolfsland, "Kloppenborg's Stratification of Q and its Significance for Historical Jesus Studies," *JETS* 46, no. 2 (2003): 217–32.

24. Kloppenborg, "Discursive Practices," 161–62.

provenance, and social setting. Nonetheless, the study of Q has significant implications for Jesus research[25] and is inevitably linked to the quest.[26] Q is our earliest source of authentic Jesus tradition,[27] and while the move from Q to Jesus may be "fraught with enormous methodological difficulties,"[28] Q also takes us "nearer to Jesus than anywhere else on the pages of history."[29] This so-called "first Gospel" is "older than the traditional Gospels, older than the Christian church itself . . . More than any other document, this text holds the answer to the mysteries surrounding Jesus."[30]

The existence of Q continues to be doubted in some circles,[31] but the Two-Document Hypothesis (2DH) of Markan Priority and Q (*Quelle*) remains the dominant consensus solution to the Synoptic Problem in contemporary New Testament scholarship. Nonetheless, Q's existence should not be taken for granted, and something should be said at the outset in its defense, especially as the Farrer-Goulder-Goodacre hypothesis (FGGH) also affirms Markan priority, but posits that Luke reworked Matthean material to suit his own literary and theological purposes.[32] The FGGH attempts to resolve the minor agreements,[33]

25. Kloppenborg, "The Sayings Gospel Q and the Quest for the Historical Jesus," 315–19; Ron Cameron, "The Sayings Gospel Q and the Quest for the Historical Jesus: A Response to John S. Kloppenborg," *HTR* 89, no. 4 (1996): 351–54; Helmut Koester, "The Sayings Gospel Q and the Quest for the Historical Jesus: A Response to John S. Kloppenborg," *HTR* 89, no. 4 (1996): 345–49.

26. James M. Robinson, "Theological Autobiography," in *The Sayings Gospel Q*, 3–34, at 24–25.

27. See Kloppenborg, "The Sayings Gospel Q and the Quest for the Historical Jesus," 334–43, for the methodological principles to be applied in utilizing Q in Jesus studies.

28. Christopher M. Tuckett, "The Son of Man and Daniel 7: Q and Jesus," in *The Sayings Source Q*, 371–94, at 389.

29. Robinson, *The Sayings Gospel Q*, 180, 183.

30. Marcus J. Borg, *The Lost Gospel Q: The Original Sayings of Jesus*, consulting ed. Marcus Borg; ed. Mark Powelson and Ray Riegert (Berkeley: Ulysses, 1999), 25.

31. See especially Austin Farrer, "On Dispensing with Q," in *Studies in the Gospels: Essays in Memory of R. H. Lightfoot*, ed. Dennis E. Nineham (Oxford: Blackwell, 1955), 55–88; Michael Goulder, "On Putting Q to the Test," *NTS* 24 (1978): 218–34; "Is Q a Juggernaut?" *JBL* 115 (1996): 667–81; Mark S. Goodacre, *The Case Against Q: Studies in Markan Priority and the Synoptic Problem* (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 2002). For the existence of Q see Joseph A. Fitzmyer, "The Priority of Mark and the 'Q' Source in Luke," in *Jesus and Man's Hope* (Pittsburgh: Pittsburgh Theological Seminary, 1970), 131–70; Charles E. Carlston and Dennis A. Norlan, "Once More—Statistics and Q," *HTR* 64 (1971): 59–78; Petros Vassiliadis, ΛΟΓΟΙ ΙΗΣΟΥ*: Studies in Q* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1999), 1–38; Christopher M. Tuckett, "The Existence of Q," in *Q and the History of Early Christianity: Studies on Q* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1996), 1–39; David R. Catchpole, "Did Q Exist?" in *The Quest for Q* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1993), 1–59; Harry Fledderman, *Q: A Reconstruction and Commentary* (BTS 1; Leuven: Peeters, 2005), 41–68. John S. Kloppenborg Verbin, *Excavating Q: The History and Setting of the Sayings Gospel* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 2000).

Mark–Q overlaps, and double tradition without positing Q, and so its primary appeal is its apparent methodological economy. The FGGH also affirms, with the 2DH, that Luke used a number of sources.[34] The main problem with the FGGH is that it does not easily explain why Luke changed virtually every detail in Matthew's infancy narrative, resurrection narrative,[35] and Sermon on the Mount.[36] The amount of textual surgery that Luke would have had to perform on these Matthean sections is formidable.[37] The claim that Luke contains Matthean vocabulary is undermined by Matthew's use of *Lukan* vocabulary.[38] There are instances in which Luke seems to retain a more primitive form of a saying in Matthew. Luke also seems to follow the original order of the double tradition more faithfully than Matthew. The minor agreements *are* a problem for the 2DH, but there are also a number of ways to explain them.[39] The FGGH does not easily, let alone compellingly, explain

32. See J. H. Ropes, *The Synoptic Gospels* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1934), 66–73; Morton S. Enslin, *Christian Beginnings* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1938), 426–36; Goulder, "On Putting Q to the Test," 218–34; "Is Q a Juggernaut?," 667–81; Mark S. Goodacre, *Goulder and the Gospels: An Examination of a New Paradigm* (JSNTSup 133; Sheffield: Sheffield University Press, 1996); Goodacre, *The Case Against Q*; idem, "A Monopoly on Marcan Priority? Fallacies at the Heart of Q," *Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers 2000* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2000), 538–622. On the Griesbach hypothesis, see Allan J. McNicol, et al., *Beyond the Q Impasse—Luke's Use of Matthew: A Demonstration by the Research Team of the Internacional Institute for Gospel Studies* (Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press International, 1996); Mark A. Matson, "Luke's Rewriting of the Sermon on the Mount," *Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers 2000* (SBL Seminar Paper Series 39; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2000), 623–50; Edward C. Hobbs, "A Quarter Century Without Q," *PSTJ* 33, no. 4 (1980): 10–19; E. P. Sanders and Margaret Davies, *Studying the Synoptic Gospels* (London: SCM, 1989), 117.

33. See *Minor Agreements: Symposium Göttingen 1991*, ed. Georg Strecker (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993); Frans Neirynck, *The Minor Agreements of Matthew and Luke against Mark with a Cumulative List* (BETL 37; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1974).

34. Luke 1:1–3.

35. See B. H. Streeter, *The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins* (London: Macmillan, 1924), 183.

36. Matson, "Luke's Rewriting of the Sermon on the Mount," 623–50.

37. See Christopher M. Tuckett, review of *The Case Against Q*, *NovT* 46, no. 4 (2004): 401–3. Raymond E. Brown, *The Death of the Messiah: From Gethsemane to the Grave: A Commentary on the Passion Narratives in the Four Gospels* (2 vols.; New York: Doubleday, 1994), 1: 42: "it takes immense imagination stretched to the point of utter implausibility to contend that Luke wrote knowing Matt's infancy narrative."

38. John S. Kloppenborg, "Goulder and the New Paradigm: A Critical Appreciation of Michael Goulder on the Synoptic Problem," in *The Gospels according to Michael Goulder: A North American Response*, ed. Chris A. Rollston (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 2002), 58.

39. Simon J. Joseph, *Jesus, Q, and the Dead Sea Scrolls: A Judaic Approach to Q* (WUNT 2d ser. 333; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012), 34–38.

Luke's redactional activity, or the distinctive and coherent themes found in Q,[40] including its identification of Jesus as "the One Who Is To Come," its Deuteronomistic theology, prominent interest in Wisdom, repeated use of the rejected prophets motif, and its notable non-use of the term *Christos*.

It is, of course, theoretically possible that Luke knew *of* or *about* Matthew's structural modifications to Mark (that is, Matthew's Davidic genealogy, infancy narrative, post-resurrection appearances) without having a physical copy of Matthew at hand, which could explain some of the similarities between the two Gospels, maintain the *relative* independence of the two authors (and thus Q) without appealing to the close re-working required of the FGGH, but Luke's alleged use of Matthew can only "dispense" with Q in so far as it adequately explains how and why Luke used Matthew. The FGGH does not address, let alone explain, where *Matthew* got these traditions from. The FGGH simply increases – to a significant degree – the amount of special "M" material available to Matthew, essentially *renaming* "Q" "M." But whether we call this material "Q," "M," a pre-Matthean "sayings collection,"[41] or "double tradition," much of Q, especially its instructional material, is arguably coherent, authoritative, dominical, canonical, and authentic Jesus tradition. There is, in other words, and for our present purposes, no "dispensing" with "Q." A rose by any other name would smell as sweet.

Q and Christian Origins

Following the founding of the Jesus Seminar in 1985, John Kloppenborg's *Formation of Q* proposed that Q developed as a collection of six sapiential speech-clusters conforming to the instructional genre. Kloppenborg's proposal

40. On Q's distinctiveness, see Catchpole, *The Quest for Q*, 7; Kloppenborg, "Introduction," in *The Shape of Q: Signal Essays on The Sayings Gospel*, ed. John S. Kloppenborg (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1994), 2; Kloppenborg Verbin, *Excavating Q*, 163–64. Goodacre, *The Case Against Q*, 66–75, explains Q's apparent distinctiveness as Matthean passages "displeasing" to Luke.

41. Francis Watson, *Gospel Writing: A Canonical Perspective* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2013), 118, affirms Markan priority and posits Matthean use of a "sayings source" or "collection," arguing that Luke *interpreted* Matthew, thus "dispensing" with Q, an hypothesis that "entails a radical reconstruction of Christian origins" (118). For Watson, Q – as *Urevangelium* – represents a model within which the "fourfold canonical" Gospels "decline into untruth and illusion" (113) and where Q and the historical Jesus are "set *in opposition to* the canonical gospels, Paul, and the mainstream church" (118). See now also John C. Poirer and Jeffrey Peterson, eds., *Marcan Priority without Q: Explorations in the Farrer Hypothesis* (LNTS; London/New York: T & T Clark International, 2014).

became a working hypothesis for many North American scholars and directly influenced Burton Mack and John Dominic Crossan, both of whom appropriated Kloppenborg's stratification theory in their work on Jesus. Mack found a Galilean Cynic-like Jesus in Q,[42] whereas Crossan found a radical Galilean "Jewish peasant Cynic."[43] Responding in part to the methodological confusion elicited by (mis)applications and (mis)representations of his proposal, Kloppenborg published a study on the methodological challenges involved in using Q as a source for the historical Jesus.[44] He argued that interpreters must (1) acknowledge Q as literary "invention" and "arrangement,"[45] (2) carefully interpret Q's "silence" (that is, its notable lack of a passion and resurrection narrative),[46] and (3) recognize Q's essential "conservatism and continuity" with its inherited traditions. For Kloppenborg the redaction of Q is neither the result of an editor introducing "previously unknown materials" nor a "massive change from a 'noneschatological' to an 'apocalyptic' document."[47] Rather, the redaction of Q signifies a "fundamental change" in "rhetorical posture," so that "one must presume a basic continuity in eschatological outlook between Q1 and Q2."[48]

In July 2000, the forty-ninth Colloquium Biblicum Lovaniense was held in Leuven, Belgium, and focused on the study of Q and the historical Jesus. William Arnal acknowledges this impressive "wealth of scholarship," but holds that the Colloquium's collected papers also testify "to the impasse Q scholarship appears to have reached,"[49] "a field in serious danger of stagnation." For Arnal, "Q scholarship remains too invested in, and charged by, its (putative) implications for reconstructing the historical Jesus."[50] For Arnal the golden age

42. Burton L. Mack, *A Myth of Innocence: Mark and Christian Origins* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988), 53–77; *The Lost Gospel: The Book of Q & Christian Origins* (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1993).

43. John Dominic Crossan, *The Historical Jesus: The Life of a Mediterranean Jewish Peasant* (San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1991). See also Jeffrey Carlson and Robert A. Ludwig, eds., *Jesus and Faith: A Conversation on the work of John Dominic Crossan* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1994).

44. Kloppenborg, "The Sayings Gospel Q and the Quest of the Historical Jesus."

45. Ibid., 326.

46. Ibid., 329.

47. Ibid., 336.

48. Ibid., 337.

49. William E. Arnal, review of *The Sayings Source Q and the Historical Jesus*, *CBQ* 69, no. 3 (2007): 627–29, at 629.

50. Ibid., 629.

of Q studies began with Kloppenborg's work,[51] but this breakthrough has not yet been developed or extended to "other areas of Christian origins."

In 2004, the Society of Biblical Literature's Seminar on Ancient Myths and Modern Theories of Christian Origins published *Redescribing Christian Origins*, a collection of papers that attempt to identify a number of viable alternative methodological approaches to the canonical narrative of early Christianity.[52] The volume focuses on three projects: (1) the social formation of the Q community; (2) the early Jerusalem community; and (3) the messianic and titular interpretation of Paul's use of *Christos*. Taking Q and the *Gospel of Thomas* as "alternative points of departure to the typical assumption of the apocalyptic and kerygmatic orientation of the first followers of Jesus,"[53] and presupposing Kloppenborg's stratification of Q, Willi Braun and William Arnal see the Q community as a kind of philosophical school, a "Galilean Jesus Association" or collective of deracinated "village scribes."[54] At the same time, Dennis Smith, Burton Mack, and Luther Martin question the historical existence of a Jerusalem community as a product of early Christian "mythmaking,"[55] challenging Paul's references to a "Jerusalem community" (Paul's "churches of Judea")[56] comprised of the "pillars" Peter, James, and the "brothers of the Lord," not to mention the Twelve and the five hundred.[57] Merrill P. Miller further argues that Jesus research fails to explain the relationships between Jesus' teaching, his "messianic" death, and a "messianic" Jerusalem community that "survived relatively unmolested for more than a generation."[58] He concludes that "it is unlikely that either the death of Jesus or the identity of the group of followers in Jerusalem revolved around messianic

51. Ibid., 628–29.

52. Ron Cameron and Merrill P. Miller, eds., *Redescribing Christian Origins* (SBL SS 28; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2004). See also now *Redescribing Paul and the Corinthians*, ed. Ron Cameron and Merrill P. Miller (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011).

53. Merrill P. Miller, "Introduction to the Papers from the Third Year of the Consultation," in *Redescribing Christian Origins*, 33–41, at 33.

54. Willi Braun, "The Schooling of a Galilean Jesus Association (The Sayings Gospel Q)," in *Redescribing Christian Origins*, 43–66; William E. Arnal, "Why Q Failed: From Ideological Project to Group Formation," ibid., 67–88.

55. Dennis E. Smith, "What Do We Really Know about the Jerusalem Church? Christian Origins in Jerusalem according to Acts and Paul," in *Redescribing Christian Origins*, 237–52; Burton L. Mack, "A Jewish Jesus School in Jerusalem," ibid., 253–62; Luther H. Martin, "History, Historiography, and Christian Origins: The Jerusalem Community," ibid., 263–75.

56. Gal. 1:22.

57. 1 Cor. 15:6. Merrill P. Miller, "'Beginning from Jerusalem . . .': Re-examining Canon and Consensus," *JHC* 2, no. 1 (1995): 3–30.

confrontations, claims, or titles."[59] The appeal to Jerusalem thus has more to do with early Christian "mythmaking and social history" than with historical fact.[60] Merrill Miller and Barry Crawford also pursue Burton Mack's thesis that the Christ-*kerygma*-cult was created by pre-Pauline Hellenistic groups, and that Paul's use of *Christos* is non-messianic and may even have originated as a kind of "nickname."[61]

Since Q does not use the term *Christos*, several members of the Seminar argue "against the common assumption of the emergence of Christianity as a messianic sect."[62] They suggest that the use of *christos* as a messianic title first appears not in Paul's letters, but "only later in the narrative tradition of the canonical Gospels."[63] The Seminar concedes that Paul did not *introduce* the term and that its near-ubiquitous presence in his letters demonstrates that both he and his readers were intimately familiar with it,[64] but holds that its original referent and significance "cannot be derived from what is to be found in the Gospels and Acts."[65] Miller's proposal, for example—that "pre-Pauline usages of *christos* did not presuppose the usages of the term in the Gospels"—attempts to reverse "the usual assumptions about the provenance and significance of the term in its earliest usage."[66] The open agenda of the Seminar, in other words, is to deny any historical "appeal to a messianic conception of Jesus" and to any pre-Pauline messianic Jewish Palestinian Jesus movement.[67] The earliest use of the term *christos* was "not titular, not royal, not eschatological, and not martyrological": the identification of Jesus as *Christos* reflects (Hellenistic) "mythmaking," not Palestinian Jewish messianism.[68]

58. Ron Cameron, "Proposal for the First Year of the Seminar," in *Redescribing Christian Origins*, 141–50, at 141.

59. Miller, "Beginning from Jerusalem," 30.

60. Ibid., 27–28.

61. Merrill P. Miller, "The Problem of the Origins of a Messianic Conception of Jesus," in *Redescribing Christian Origins*, 301–36; Barry S. Crawford, "*Christos* as Nickname," ibid., 337–48; Merrill P. Miller, "The Anointed Jesus," ibid., 375–416.

62. Cameron, "Proposal for the Second Year of the Seminar," in *Redescribing Christian Origins*, 285–92, at 288.

63. Ibid.

64. Cameron, "Introduction to the Papers from the Second Year of the Seminar," in *Redescribing Christian Origins*, 293–300, at 296 (emphases added).

65. Cameron, "Proposal for the Second Year of the Seminar," 288.

66. Ibid., 287.

67. However, see Ron Cameron and Merrill P. Miller, "Issues and Commentary," in *Redescribing Christian Origins*, 443–57, at 454.

The Seminar's attempt to "reinvent" the term *Christos* does have the virtue of recognizing that the messianic identification of Jesus has long been a puzzle in modern critical scholarship,[69] but it is problematic to limit the range of scholarly responses to this problem to two models: *either* Jesus was "a political revolutionary who failed" *or* the messianic identification of Jesus is "a stunning reinterpretation" of "Jewish messianic hopes,"[70] with the latter model basically recapitulating "the canonical paradigm of Christian origins." In seeking to find "a more plausible reading of beginnings," the Seminar's greatest concern is exposed: "if messianic beginnings are a point of departure, then the Jesus movements as we have understood and redescribed them [Q and *Thomas*] will be lost, absorbed by the dominant (canonical) paradigm of Christian origins."[71] In conclusion, the Seminar claims that they have "successfully problematized . . . the picture of messianic beginnings" and "achieved . . . a more reasonable explanation for the emergence of the designation *christos*."

This confidence is not echoed widely outside the Seminar's relatively small circle of contributors.[72] Cameron and Miller may reject the "Gospel story" because "Jesus did not fit the expectation of a Messiah,"[73] but even if we were to bracket the diversity of first-century messianism for a moment, what are we to make of the Seminar's claim that *they* have sought to "resolve" this "anomaly" while *most* other scholars simply seek to "retain" it?

The Seminar provides us with a welcome set of experiments attempting to determine *whether* a non-messianic paradigm of Christian origins can be sustained. The question is whether their proposals have sufficient explanatory power to compel a non-messianic reading of the early Jesus tradition. They do not. Despite the theoretical validity of a sociological redescription of the data, the Seminar is unable to explain away Paul's 270 references to Jesus as *Christos*, unable to divorce the term from its titular associations, and unable to explain why the title originated, if not from an early messianic identification of Jesus, a man crucified as "*king* of the Jews." The Redescribing Christian Origins project is an extreme example of the Quest for an alternative ideological narrative—a tradition that can be traced back to the dawn of the Enlightenment—but

68. Burton L. Mack, "Why *Christos*? The Social Reasons," in *Redescribing Christian Origins*, 365–74, at 365.

69. Ron Cameron, "Introduction to the Papers from the Second Year of the Seminar," 293.

70. Ibid.

71. Ibid., 296.

72. See especially James D. G. Dunn, review of *Redescribing Christian Origins*, *JBL* 124, no. 4 (2005): 760–64, and John Parrish, review, *MTSR* 20, no. 3 (2008): 291–95.

73. Cameron and Miller, "Issues and Commentary," 446.

its claims fail to convince, with the end result being a further polarizing of the field. We see this most clearly in ongoing debates about wisdom and apocalypticism,[74] where our terms have become "so freighted with misconceptions, ambivalences, and ideological concerns that they have ceased to function as good descriptive categories."[75] In Q and Jesus studies these terms have been deployed to construct oppositional paradigms to the question of whether or not Jesus "proclaimed an empirical cosmic transformation in the imminent future."[76] The real "impasse" in Q studies, in other words, may not be the conservative leanings of a guild unwilling to accept any particular leap forward in research, but rather the exaggerated claims attending the appropriation of Q in ideological redescriptions of Christian origins, claims that have turned out to be easily countered, easily refuted, and easily dismissed, taking with them many of the more reliable results in recent Q studies.

For example, many historical Jesus scholars have appealed to the stratigraphy of Q in order to reconstruct Jesus as a non-messianic Galilean peasant. It is debatable, however, whether Q is really non-messianic or represents a low Christology.[77] It is also debatable whether the provenance of Q should be located in a rural Galilean setting. Simplistic descriptions of Q's sapiential/instructional material have led to ideological and polemical caricatures of Jesus as a "teacher of wisdom" when this proposal is clearly undermined by the pervasive eschatology contained throughout Q. We clearly need to revisit the social, cultural, and theological matrices of Q in Second Temple Judaism if we are going to use Q more responsibly in Jesus research.

Q is an ethnically and geographically Palestinian Judean text.[78] Compositionally, Q is a composite text, a collection of Jesus' sayings arranged into discursive structures containing disparate voices from different forms of social experience. The Inaugural Sermon (Q 6:20–49), for example, is framed by the Temptation and Centurion narratives. This Sermon is not worldly wisdom by any common standard, nor is its guarantor a mere teacher of wisdom. The Jesus of Q is the "Son of God" who defeats Satan and can work signs and wonders at will. The Inaugural Sermon begs the question: what was the original "good news" or message of Jesus? And should that original message or "good news" also be designated as a "Gospel?"

74. Kloppenborg, "The Sayings Gospel Q," 339–43.

75. Ibid., 339.

76. Ibid., 340.

77. Simon J. Joseph, "'Blessed is Whoever is Not Offended by Me': The Subversive Appropriation of (Royal) Messianic Ideology in Q 3–7," *NTS* 57, no. 3 (2011): 307–24.

78. Joseph, *Jesus, Q, and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 45-93.

Q and the Gospels

Q does not so much provide us with new *information* about Jesus as it allows for a different perspective on the origins and development of the earliest Jesus traditions.[79] There has been some discussion about whether Q qualifies as a "Gospel" as opposed to a theoretical literary "source," but that discussion is more than academic. If Q is a Gospel, perhaps even the *earliest* Gospel, then its theological authority must also be reckoned with. Q "makes a difference."[80] If the term Gospel is limited to the Pauline interpretation of Jesus' life and death, then maybe Q is not a Gospel.[81] But if what we mean by "Gospel" is a literary-theological narrative representation of Jesus, then Q certainly seems to qualify. Finally, if Q represents our best access to the "good news" proclaimed by Jesus, then what *was* that "good news" all about?

The word "Gospel" is an English translation of the Greek word εὐαγγέλιον, which means "good news." The term εὐαγγέλιον was used in imperial Roman inscriptions to celebrate the blessings of peace and prosperity brought about by Caesar Augustus,[82] but our earliest evidence for the use of the term in the New Testament is found in Paul's first letter to the Corinthians, where Paul refers to "*the* good news" (τὸ εὐαγγέλιον) through which "you are

79. Philip Jenkins, *Hidden Gospels: How the Search for Jesus Lost Its Way* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2002).

80. John S. Kloppenborg, *Q, The Earliest Gospel: An Introduction to the Original Stories and Sayings of Jesus* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2008), 61. See also James M. Robinson, *The Gospel of Jesus: In Search of the Original Good News* (New York: HarperSanFrancisco, 2005); Arland Jacobson, *The First Gospel: An Introduction to Q* (FF; Sonoma, CA: Polebridge, 1992).

81. See Frans Neirynck, "Q: From Source to Gospel," *ETL* 71, no. 4 (1995): 421–30; Jean-Paul Michaud, "Quelle(s) communauté(s) derrière la Source Q," in *The Sayings Source Q and the Historical Jesus*, 577–606; idem, "Effervescence in Q Studies," in *Studien zum Neuen Testament und seiner Umwelt* 30 (2005): 61–103; "De quelques présents débats dans la troisième quête," in *De Jésus à Jésus-Christ. I. Le Jésus de l'histoire* (Paris: Mame-Desclée, 2010), 189–214.

82. Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels*, 3–4.

saved" (σῳζεσθε).[83] Paul's "Gospel," which he claims to have "received" from the Lord,[84] focuses on the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ.

Today the semantic range of the word "Gospel" seems to include a wide variety of possible meanings. According to Darrell Bock, for example, the "gospel" is "the good news of God's love and initiative . . . to bring us into a healthy relationship with Himself" and "save us from hell."[85] Jesus delivered the "good news" that "God's promised rule" had arrived, although the gospel should not be understood simply as "a transaction—the removal of a debt," as this does not sound like very "good news."[86] For Bock, the cross is "the hub of the gospel, but Jesus' dying for sin is *not* the entire gospel."[87] Here the term "gospel" has essentially become a cipher for the entirety of the Christian faith. Similarly, Scot McKnight notes the dissociation between Jesus and the cross-centered "Gospel" of contemporary Evangelical Christianity and argues that the Jesus story can only be understood in relation to the larger "story of Israel" and God's "plan of salvation."[88] First Corinthians 15 is the "true gospel of the church's tradition."[89] For McKnight "the 'gospel' is the Story of Jesus that fulfills, completes, and resolves Israel's Story."[90] Paul's gospel "was the same as Jesus' and—in fact—the same as everyone's in the first century,"[91] and since Jesus claimed "*Israel's story was fulfilled in himself*," this means that Jesus also "*preached the gospel*!"

The word "Gospel" did not initially signify a particular literary *genre*, but rather a story, preaching, or proclamation (κήρυγμα) *about* Jesus.[92] The Gospels appear to be theological "biographies" (βίοι) of Jesus,[93] but there is no denying a certain degree of ambiguity in the use of the term, both in contemporary

83. 1 Cor. 15:1–2. For alternative views see Martin Hengel, "The Titles of the Gospels and the Gospel of Mark," in *Studies in the Gospel of Mark*, ed. idem (London: SCM, 1985), 64–84; idem, *The Four Gospels and the One Gospel of Jesus Christ: An Investigation of the Collection and Origin of the Canonical Gospels* (London: SCM, 2000); Graham Stanton, "The Fourfold Gospel," *NTS* 43 (1997): 317–46. Lawrence M. Wills, *The Quest for the Historical Gospel: Mark, John and the Origins of the Gospel Genre* (London: Routledge, 1997), argues that the "gospel" genre originated in the narratives of the (dead) hero cult.

84. See Klaus Wegenast, *Das Verständnis der Tradition bei Paulus und in den Deuteropaulinen* (WMANT 8; Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1962), 57–70.

85. Darrell L. Bock, *Recovering the Real Lost Gospel: Reclaiming the Gospel as Good News* (Nashville: B & H Academic, 2010), 9.

86. Bock, *Recovering the Real Lost Gospel*, 10–11.

87. Ibid., 12–13.

88. Scot McKnight, *The King Jesus Gospel: The Original Good News Revisited* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2011).

89. Ibid., 47, or "the *apostolic gospel tradition*" (p. 46).

90. Ibid., 51.

91. Ibid., 78.

usage and in the Gospels. The Gospel of Mark, for example, opens with the "good news *of* Jesus Christ,"[94] but Jesus has not taught anything yet, so it seems that what Mark had in mind was something like Paul's gospel of Jesus' death and resurrection.[95] Mark's Jesus also preaches the "good news of [the *kingdom* of] God" (τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ θεοῦ).[96] The Gospel of Matthew portrays Jesus as preaching "the good news of the *kingdom*" (τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς βασιλείας). It would seem, therefore, that Jesus' proclamation of the kingdom, his "good news to the poor,"[97] can also be called a "Gospel."[98] It is no accident that Luke portrays Jesus as announcing his mission by citing Isaiah 61:1:

> The spirit of the Lord God is upon me . . .
> the Lord has anointed me (מָשַׁח/ἔχρισέ)
> to proclaim good news to the poor (לבשר ענוים/εὐαγγελίσασθαι πτωχοῖς).[99]

Isa. 52:7 also envisions a coming age of peace and salvation as "good news" to be inaugurated by a divinely authorized "messenger":[100]

92. Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders, "Gospels and Midrash: An Introduction to Luke and Scripture," in *Luke and Scripture: The Function of Sacred Tradition in Luke-Acts* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993), 2.

93. On the Gospels as ancient biographies (βίοι), see Richard A. Burridge, *What Are the Gospels?: A Comparison with Graeco-Roman Biography* (SNTSMS 70; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992). Garry Wills, *What the Gospels Meant* (New York: Penguin, 2008), 7, defines a Gospel as "a meditation on the meaning of Jesus in the light of Sacred History as recorded in the Sacred Writings.

94. Mark 1:1.

95. Stuhlmacher, *Das paulinische Evangelium*, 234–38.

96. Mark 1:14. Some manuscript witnesses read "of the kingdom."

97. Q 7:22; Luke 4:18.

98. Matt. 4:23; 9:25; 24:14.

99. Isa. 61:1; cf. Luke 4. See also Isa. 40:9; 52:7. Isaiah 61 is generally dated to ca. 530 bce.

100. Peter Stuhlmacher, "The Theme: The Gospel and the Gospels," in *The Gospel and the Gospels*, ed. idem; trans. John Vriend (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991), 1–25; William Horbury, "'Gospel' in Herodian Judaea," in *The Written Gospel*, ed. Markus Bockmuehl and Donald Hagner (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 7–30; Hubert Frankemölle, "Jesus als deuterojesajanische Freudenbote? Zur Rezeption von Jes 52,7 und 61,1 im Neuen Testament, durch Jesus und in den Targumim," in *Vom Christentum zu Jesus. Festschrift für Joachim Gnilka*, ed. Hubert Frankemölle (Freiberg: Herder, 1989), 34–67.

> How beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of the messenger (מבשר)
> who announces peace (שלום/εἰρήνης), who brings good news (εὐαγγελιζομένου),
> who announces salvation (ישועה/σωτηρίαν),
> who says to Zion, 'Your God reigns' (מלך אלהיך/βασιλεύσει σου ὁ Θεός).

In his response to John the Baptist's inquiry, the Jesus of Q 7:22 cites a number of Isaianic passages in order to confirm his identity as "the One Who Is To Come," explicitly referring to the eschatological "good news" being proclaimed to the poor:

> "the blind see, and the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed,
> and the deaf hear, and the dead are raised,
> and the poor have *good news* preached to them (καὶ πτωχοὶ εὐαγγελίζονται)."

The literary and theological relationships between Jesus, Q, Luke, and Isaiah 61 are significant, not least because Isaiah 61 served as an exegetical key for Early Jewish groups and provided a Judaic semantic root and anchor for the Greek gospel genre (LXX: εὐαγγελίσασθαι). Q 7:22 contains a series of clauses reflecting passages from Isa. 29:18, 35:5-6, and 61:1.[101] Isaiah 61 "is used to inform and delineate the teaching of Jesus . . . and his own interpretation of his work."[102] Q 7:22 provides an organizing principle for the first major section of Q 3–7.[103]

The publication of 4Q521 in 1992 provided a remarkably similar description of what God would perform when "his messiah" (משיחו) arrived:[104]

101. Christopher Tuckett, "Scripture and Q," in *The Scriptures in the Gospels*, ed. idem (BETL 131; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1997), 21.

102. Tuckett, "Scripture and Q," 21.

103. Robinson, "Building Blocks in the Social History of Q," in *Reimagining Christian Origins: A Colloquium Honoring Burton Mack*, ed. Elizabeth A. Castelli and Hal Taussig (Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press International, 1996), 87–112, in Robinson, *The Sayings Gospel Q*, 500, notes the "pervasive dependence of the Q trajectory on Isaiah 61:1."

> . . . liberating the captives, giving sight to the blind,
> straightening the bent . . .
> For he will heal the wounded, revive the dead,
> and proclaim *good news* to the poor.

4Q521 refers to a messianic figure and a series of eschatological blessings described in Isaiah, including an explicit reference to the resurrection of the dead. Jesus' "good news" was part of an exegetical tradition in which Isaiah 61 was understood as heralding an eschatological new age of peace, salvation, healing, and debt-forgiveness: the Jubilee year.[105]

According to Leviticus 25 and Deuteronomy 15, God commanded that a Jubilee year be held every forty-nine years for the release of slaves, the remission of debts, and the restoration of property.[106] The Jubilee year was a "day" of physical and spiritual release and restoration.[107] The socio-economic difficulties associated with the Jubilee motivated the Pharisees to invent a legal compromise (the *Prosbul*) in order to avoid implementing the Jubilee. The authority to proclaim the Jubilee was ultimately shifted from the king to the priests to God and the eschatological age. The Dead Sea Scrolls illustrate that the Qumran

104. 4Q521 2 ii 8, 12. Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Christian Origins* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 37. For the original publication, see Émile Puech, "Une Apocalypse Messianique (4Q521)," *RevQ* 15 (1992): 475–519; *Discoveries of the Judaean Desert XXV: Qumran Grotte 4 XVIII: Textes Hebreux (4Q521–4Q528, 4Q576–4Q579)* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998), 1–38; Robert Eisenman, "A Messianic Vision," *BAR* 17, no. 6 (1991): 65; Robert Eisenman and Michael O. Wise, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Uncovered* (Shaftesbury: Element, 1992), 19–23; James D. Tabor and Michael O. Wise, "4Q521 'On Resurrection' and the Synoptic Gospel Tradition: A Preliminary Study," in *Qumran Questions*, ed. James H. Charlesworth (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995); Geza Vermes, "Qumran Forum Miscellanea I," *JJS* 43 (1992): 299–305; Lawrence H. Schiffman, *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls: The History of Judaism, the Background of Christianity, the Lost Library of Qumran* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1994), 347–50; John J. Collins, "The Works of the Messiah," *DSD* 1 (1994): 98–112.

105. James A. Sanders, "From Isaiah 61 to Luke 4," in *Christianity, Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults: Studies for Morton Smith at Sixty*, ed. Jacob Neusner (Leiden: Brill, 1975), 1:75–106; idem, "Isaiah in Luke," in *Interpreting the Prophets*, ed. James L. Mays and Paul J. Achtemeier (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987), 75–85; idem, "Sins, Debts, and Jubilee Release," in *Luke and Scripture*, 84–92.

106. Deuteronomy 15; Lev. 25:10.

107. John Sietze Bergsma, *The Jubilee from Leviticus to Qumran: A History of Interpretation* (VTSup 115; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 20. See also James C. VanderKam, "Sabbatical Chronologies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls in Their Historical Context*, ed. Timothy H. Lim (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 2000), 159–78. See also Robert G. North, *Sociology of the Biblical Jubilee* (AnBib 4; Rome: Pontificio Instituto Biblico, 1954); Jean-François Lefebvre, *Le jubilé biblique: Lv 25—exégèse et théologie* (OBO 194; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2003).

community was well aware of the Jubilee tradition of liberty to the captives and release from debt, slavery, and sin.[108]

11QMelchizedek, a *pesher* (scriptural interpretation) drawing from Leviticus, Deuteronomy, Isaiah, and the Psalms, announces the arrival of an *eschatological* Jubilee. Melchizedek appears as a heavenly figure inaugurating the liberation of the "captives"[109] and ushering in the "day of [peace]" (יום ה[שלום). This text, drawing directly from Isa. 61:1-2,[110] may have been "the first *messianic* re-interpretation of the jubilee,"[111] conflating Isa. 52:7 and Isa. 61:1-2 in its depiction of the coming "messenger . . . anointed of the spirit" (משיח הרוח המבשר הואה), who will announce "salvation" (4Q521 ישועה).[112] and 11QMelchizedek illustrate that the Jubilee tradition was developed by the Qumran community, for whom eschatological redemption and salvation—the time when the poor, oppressed, and imprisoned would hear the "good news" of God's favor and release—was an imminent reality. The Jesus of Q 6:20, Q 7:22, and Luke 4 takes a special interest in Isaiah 61: Jesus announces his ministry as the arrival of the Jubilee year.[113] The Lord's Prayer in Q explicitly refers to the cancelling of debts:

108. For bibliography, see Adam S. van der Woude, "Melchisedek als himmlische Erlösergestalt in den neugefundenen eschatologischen Midraschim aus Qumran Höhle XI," *Oudtestamentische Studien* 14 (1965): 354–73; idem, "11QMelchizedek and the New Testament," *NTS* 12 (1966): 301–26; Joseph A. Fitzmyer, "Further Light on Melchizedek from Qumran Cave 11," *JBL* 86 (1967): 25–41; David Flusser, "Melchizedek and the Son of Man," *Christian News from Israel* 17 (1966): 23–29; Yigael Yadin, "A Note on Melchizedek and Qumran," *IEJ* 15 (1965): 152–54; Merrill P. Miller, "The Function of Isa 61:1-2 in 11QMelchizedek," *JBL* 88, no. 4 (1969): 467–69; Daniel F. Miner, "A Suggested Reading for 11QMelchizedek 17," *JSJ* 2 (1971): 144–48; J. T. Milik, "Milkî-Sedeq et Milkî-Reš' dans les anciens écrits juifs et chrétiens," *JJS* 23 (1972): 95–112, 124–26; James A. Sanders, "The Old Testament in 11QMelchizedek," *Janes* 5 (1973): 373–82; Émile Puech, "Notes sur le manuscrit de XIMelkîsédeq," *RevQ* 12 (1987): 483–513.

109. See Isa. 61:1.

110. 11QMelch 2.4, 6, 9, 13.

111. Bergsma, *The Jubilee from Leviticus to Qumran*, 202.

112. 11QMelch 2.18-19. Bruce D. Chilton and Craig A. Evans, "Jesus and Israel's Scriptures," in Chilton and Evans, eds., *Studying the Historical Jesus: Evaluations of the State of Current Research* (NTTS 19; Leiden: Brill, 1994), 283–335, at 325. Bergsma, *The Jubilee from Leviticus to Qumran*, 294, concludes that the figure of Melchizedek takes on the roles of the "anointed of the spirit" (Isa. 61:1-2), "anointed prince" (Dan. 9:25-26), and "messenger" (Isa. 52:7).

113. Robert B. Sloan Jr., *The Favorable Year of the Lord: A Study of Jubilary Theology in the Gospel of Luke* (Austin: Schola Press, 1977); Sharon H. Ringe, "The Jubilee Proclamation in the Ministry and Teachings of Jesus: A Tradition-Critical Study in the Synoptic Gospels and Acts," (unpublished) Ph. D. diss., Union Theological Seminary, 1981; Donald W. Blosser, "Jesus and the Jubilee (Luke 4:16-30): The Year of Jubilee and Its Significance in the Gospel of Luke," Ph. D. diss., St. Andrew's University, 1979.

> *Forgive our debts* (ἄφες ἡμῖν τὰ ὀφειλήματα ἡμῶν) for us,
> as we too have cancelled for those in debt to us.[114]

Jesus' instruction to repeatedly forgive interpersonal sin is also found in Q 17:3-4:

> "If your brother *sins* (ἁμαρτήσῃ) . . . *forgive* him (ἄφες αὐτῷ).
> And if seven times a day he sins against you,
> also seven times shall you *forgive* him."

Such an announcement—the eschatological release of debts and the forgiveness of sins—would have transformed the social, economic, and political landscape of first-century Judea.[115] Whether or not Jesus believed that the Jubilee year's provisions should have been implemented literally and immediately – and is not simply Luke's symbolic representation of Jesus' eschatological significance – it seems safe to conclude that Jesus' central message was not an accouncement of his own imminent death, but rather the proclamation of God's restorative work occurring in and through his own life and ministry, that is, the kingdom of God.

Jesus proclaimed the "good news" of the kingdom of God, but after Jesus' death the Gospel of Jesus became the Gospel of Christ crucified:[116] "*The proclaimer became the proclaimed*."[117] It is not likely, however, that Jesus intended

114. Q 11:4.

115. Sanders, "Isaiah in Luke," 81; idem, "Sins, Debts, and Jubilee Release," 87–88. John Howard Yoder proposed that Jesus embraced a politics of nonviolence based on the Jubilee tradition (*The Politics of Jesus: Vicit Agnus Noster* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1972], 39). See also his *Nonviolence: A Brief History: The Warsaw Lectures*, ed. Paul H. Martens, Matthew Porter, and Myles Werntz (Waco: Baylor University Press, 2010); *Nevertheless: The Varieties and Shortcomings of Religious Pacifism* (Scottdale, PA: Herald Press, 1992); *The Original Revolution: Essays on Christian Pacifism* (Scottdale, PA: Herald Press, 1972); *The War of the Lamb: The Ethics of Nonviolence and Peacemaking* (Grand Rapids: Brazos, 2009). See also Stanley Hauerwas, *The Peaceable Kingdom: A Primer in Christian Ethics* (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1983).

116. Acts 5:42; 8:4-5, 35; 11:20; 17:18; Rom. 1:1-4; 10:8-17; 15:19-20; 2 Cor. 4:4-6; 11:4; Gal. 1:16; Eph. 3:8; Phil. 1:15-18; 2 Tim. 2:8. On the *one* Gospel, see Rom. 1:11-17; 2 Thess. 2:13-14; Gal. 1:7; 2:7-9. On the problem between Paul's "Gospel" and Jesus' Gospel of the kingdom, see Robert A. Guelich, "What Is the Gospel?" *Theology, News, and Notes* 51 (2004): 4–7.

his teachings to be ignored, compromised, or superseded. Jesus' teachings may be idealistic and inconvenient, but they are not irrelevant. If the ultimate goal of Jesus Research is to accurately reconstruct the social, economic, political, and theological contexts of Jesus' life and teachings, and if the requirements of Christian discipleship – that is, "following Jesus" – have anything to do with the historical figure of Jesus' life and teachings, then careful historical and theological reexaminations of the historical Jesus are clearly still in order.

117. Rudolf Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament*, trans. Kendrick Grobel (2 vols.; New York: Scribners, 1955), 33. Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels*, 13.