V&R Academic

© V&R unipress GmbH, Göttingen

Bonner Biblische Beiträge

Band 173

herausgegeben von
Ulrich Berges und Martin Ebner

© V&R unipress GmbH, Göttingen

Markus Tiwald (ed.)

Q in Context II

Social Setting and Archeological Background of the Sayings Source

With 8 figures

V&R unipress

Bonn University Press

© V&R unipress GmbH, Göttingen

universitätbonn

MIX
Papier aus verantwortungsvollen Quellen
FSC® C083411

Bibliografische Information der Deutschen Nationalbibliothek

Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen Nationalbibliografie; detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind im Internet über http://dnb.d-nb.de abrufbar.

ISSN 0520-5670
ISBN 978-3-8471-0323-3
ISBN 978-3-8470-0323-6 (E-Book)
ISBN 978-3-7370-0323-0 (V&R eLibrary)

Veröffentlichungen der Bonn University Press
erscheinen im Verlag V&R unipress GmbH.

Gedruckt mit freundlicher Unterstützung der Fakultät für Geisteswissenschaften der Universität Duisburg-Essen.

© 2015, V&R unipress GmbH, Robert-Bosch-Breite 6, 37079 Göttingen / www.v-r.de
Alle Rechte vorbehalten. Das Werk und seine Teile sind urheberrechtlich geschützt.
Jede Verwertung in anderen als den gesetzlich zugelassenen Fällen bedarf der vorherigen schriftlichen Einwilligung des Verlages.
Printed in Germany.
Druck und Bindung: CPI buchbuecher.de GmbH, Zum Alten Berg 24, 96158 Birkach

Gedruckt auf alterungsbeständigem Papier.

© V&R unipress GmbH, Göttingen

Contents

Markus Tiwald
"To Make This Place a Habitation Was to Transgress the Jewish Ancient Laws" (*Ant*. 18:38). Introduction to the Volume 7

Part I: Archeological Findings in Relevance to the Sayings Source

Lee I. Levine
The Ancient Synagogue in First-Century Palestine 23

Milton Moreland
Provenience Studies and the Question of Q in Galilee 43

John S. Kloppenborg
Q, Bethsaida, Khorazin and Capernaum 61

Part II: Sociological Backdrop of the Sayings Source

Gerd Theißen
The Sayings Source Q and Itinerant Radicalism 93

Markus Tiwald
The Brazen Freedom of God's Children: "Insolent Ravens" (Q 12:24) and "Carefree Lilies" (Q 12:27) as Response to Mass-Poverty and Social Disruption? 111

Giovanni B. Bazzana
Galilean Village Scribes as the Authors of the Sayings Gospel Q 133

Sarah E. Rollens
Persecution in the Social Setting of Q 149

© V&R unipress GmbH, Göttingen

Beate Ego
Different Attitudes to the Temple in Second Temple Judaism – A Fresh Approach to Jesus' Temple Prophecy 165

Jodi Magness
"They Shall See the Glory of the Lord" (Isa 35:2): Eschatological Purity at Qumran and in Jesus' Movement 179

Tal Ilan
The Women of the Q Community within Early Judaism 195

Part III: Opening up the Horizon – Q in the Context of Ancient Diaspora

Paul Trebilco
Early Jewish Communities in Asia Minor and the Early Christian Movement 213

Contributors 233

Index of Ancient Sources 235

© V&R unipress GmbH, Göttingen

Markus Tiwald

"To Make This Place a Habitation Was to Transgress the Jewish Ancient Laws" (*Ant.* 18:38). Introduction to the Volume

1. Q in Context I and II – Project Overview

The two volumes "Q in Context I and II" form a diptych of two theologically aligned conferences that were held in Mülheim (Essen) in February 2014 and in Werden (Essen) in September 2014.

The first conference, *The Separation of Just and Unjust in Early Judaism and the Sayings Source – A New Look at the "Parting of the Ways"* (February 17–19, 2014), focused on the assumption that the Sayings Source Q forms some sort of "missing link" between early Judaism and early Christianity.[1] The origins of Q are most probably still embedded in the matrix of early Judaism. If the Sayings Source antedates the "parting of the ways" between Jews and Christians, Q has to be considered a document of early Judaism even more than a document of early Christianity. Particularly since the title Χριστός is missing in Q, the authorities behind this document should be considered *Jewish followers of Jesus* and not "*Christians*" in the strict sense of the word. In this case, the question of polemics becomes crucial: Polemic imagery is rampant in the Sayings Source – nevertheless, the polemical language in Q does not necessarily have to be interpreted as responding to a past rupture between Q people and Jews. Apocalyptic groups in early Judaism adopted a very polemical language of judgment, exclusion and condemnation of rival Jewish competitors and highlighted the conception of the eschatological damnation of a part of Israel. Thus, polemics in Q can also be interpreted as an inner-Jewish struggle for the true eschatological interpretation of the Torah rather than as a sign of an already completed "parting of the ways." The conference therefore focused on the rhetoric of exclusion in an interdisciplinary exchange between scholars of early Judaism and New Testament exegesis.

1 Cf. the already published volume: *M. Tiwald* (ed.), Q in Context I. The Separation between the Just and the Unjust in Early Judaism and in the Sayings Source (BBB 172), Bonn 2015.

© V&R unipress GmbH, Göttingen

After identifying early Judaism as the theological matrix of the Sayings Source, the second conference, *The Social Setting of the Sayings Source Q – New Evidence from Archeology and Early Judaism* (September 15–17, 2014), highlighted the sociological backdrop against which the Sayings Source Q could develop. It was especially the interplay between biblical archeology and a sociologically oriented exegesis of the New Testament that constituted the *leitmotiv* of this conference. The question arises as to which extent the Jesus-movement was influenced by socio-political and socio-economic factors. The introductory quote "To Make This Place a Habitation Was to Transgress the Jewish Ancient Laws" (*Ant.* 18:38) refers to the city of Tiberias that was built by Herod Antipas on an old burial ground, and highlights the socio-religious implications of the Galilean habitat. According to Num 19:16, Jews coming in touch with graves remained unclean for seven days. Thus, Herod Antipas by force compelled Jews to live in this city and admitted slaves and poor persons (*Ant.* 18:36–38). Perhaps this explains why Tiberias obviously never was visited by Jesus. Similar reasons might hold true in the case of Sepphoris: Though only 5 km from Nazaret, the city is not mentioned in the entire New Testament. An explanation is needed for this selective geographical radius of Jesus, his disciples, and the Sayings Source (cf. the contributions of Moreland and Tiwald in this volume).

Q in Context I and II thus seek to redefine the context of the Sayings Source. The first volume focuses on the religious matrix that gave birth to Q, the second volume highlights sociological preconditions for the development of Q.

Both conferences were made possible through funds from the DFG (*Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft*). I would also like to express my gratitude to Prof. Dr. Martin Ebner for accepting these volumes for publication in the series *Bonner Biblische Beiträge* and to the Faculty of Humanities of the University Duisburg-Essen making their publication possible through a grant.

2. Preliminary Works

The present two volumes continue the trajectory begun at a previous conference that was held in Mülheim (Essen) in February of 2012; its proceedings were published as: *M. Tiwald, (ed.), Kein Jota wird vergehen. Das Gesetzesverständnis der Logienquelle vor dem Hintergrund frühjüdischer Theologie (BWANT 200), Stuttgart 2012.* Here the focus lay on the pluriformity of early Judaism and the place that Q may have occupied in this vast landscape. These three volumes can thus be seen as a triptych dealing with the same topic (Sayings Source and early Judaism), but accessing it from different perspectives.

© V&R unipress GmbH, Göttingen

3. The Contributions in this Volume

This volume has a threefold structure. The first part deals with the topic of archeological findings in relevance to the Sayings Source. The second part sheds light on the sociological backdrop of Q. The third part opens up the horizon and puts the Sayings Source in the context of the ancient diaspora.

Part I: Archeological Findings Relevant to the Sayings Source

Before starting the interpretation of Q, it seems noteworthy to examine the material evidence that we have for the Galilee of the first century CE.

Here *Lee I. Levine* offers the first insight. It is frequently debated whether the Q community had already broken up with the "synagogue community" (cf. Q 12:11), but there are only few studies by New Testament scholars bothering with the question where synagogues existed in these times and which means they served. In his contribution *The Ancient Synagogue in First-Century Palestine* Levine fills in this lacuna: No pre-70 source systematically addresses the nature or functions of the Judaean synagogue. In contrast to the Jerusalem Temple, the synagogue merited relatively little attention; we have only a few sources describing how synagogues functioned (e.g., the Theodotos inscription), where they were located, or how they looked. Archeological evidence for the first-century synagogue is attested at five sites in the southern part of Judaea: Masada, Herodium, Jerusalem (i.e., the Theodotos inscription from the City of David), Qiryat Sefer, and Modi'in (the latter two in Western Judea), and possibly also Ḥorvat 'Etri, south of Bet Shemesh. As for the Galilee and Golan in the north, first-century synagogues were discovered at three sites – Gamla, Magdala, and presumably Khirbet Qana; proposed synagogues at several other sites are less certain – Capernaum, Chorazin, and a second site at Magdala. By the first century CE, when the synagogue appears in archeological and literary sources, it had already become the dominant institution on the local Jewish scene, and this holds true for both the Diaspora and Judea, excepting, of course, pre-70 Jerusalem. Synagogues throughout the empire served the following purposes: political and social events, worship, study, holding court, administering punishment, organizing sacred meals, collecting charitable donations, and housing communal archives and a library. Although clearly secondary in terms of the broader *raison d'être* of the first-century synagogue, the religious dimension was nevertheless an important component in the New Testament's narrative concerning this institution, and the Theodotos inscription notes the religious-educational aspects of the synagogue prior to its social and communal ones. Given the penchant of our literary sources to highlight the religious aspects of the institution, the ar-

© V&R unipress GmbH, Göttingen

cheological remains reviewed above serve as an important corrective. The buildings themselves are neutral structures with no notable religious components: no inscriptions attesting to the sacred status of the building; no religious art or symbols (except a remarkable stone from the Magdala synagogue depicting a *menorah*); no orientation towards Jerusalem; and no permanent Torah ark. The Torah scrolls and ark were presumably mobile, introduced into the main hall only for the Torah-reading ceremony and removed thereafter. In short, the first-century synagogue's architecture did not have the decidedly religious profile that it was to acquire in Late Antiquity. The religious dimension, so central to the accounts in the literary sources, especially the Gospels, is clearly absent from the archeological remains. Thus, we are confronted with the fact that the authors of the New Testament, who were specifically interested in religious-theological matters, invoked synagogue settings to further their agenda while those who built and maintained the synagogue buildings (i. e., the local congregations) focused on the community-center setting.

Milton Moreland: Provenience Studies and the Question of Q in Galilee poses the question as to whether the Sayings Source really originated in the Galilee. He presents seven criteria that are used to help determine the provenience of an anonymous ancient text, with Galilee and the Q sayings serving as an example of how the criteria can be employed: *1. Chronology:* If the latest edition of Q, before it was redacted by Matthew and Luke, does not date later than the time just after the Jewish War (in the early 70s CE), then we do not have a major problem with positioning Q in a Galilean setting. Because of a lack of reference to Galilean Christianity in any ancient source, we cannot assume that the Galilee remained a vital center for Jewish believers in Jesus after the Jewish War. *2. Language and Scribal Competence:* With the very strong likelihood that Q was written in Greek, we must evaluate whether Greek was spoken and written at a particular site during the relevant time frame. Even though the majority of the Galilean population spoke Aramaic, there was significant contact with the commerce and administration of the Roman East, which insures that at least a portion of first century Galileans spoke and wrote Greek at the level needed to posit the text of Q sayings being written in that region. Galilean "village scribes" – see the contributions of Tiwald and Bazzana in this volume – might have been the authors of this document. *3. Demographics:* The key demographic information here is the relation between Jewish and gentile groups in a region. Latest archeological findings – miqwaot, stone vessels, and ossuaries as typical Jewish "fossils" – have pointed out that even Sepphoris and Tiberias were mainly Jewish cities. This fits well with the situation presented in Q. *4. The Presence of Early Jewish and Jesus/Christos Groups:* Since Jesus lived in Galilee, it is often assumed that a group of his followers also lived in that region after his death. It is difficult to imagine that all Galilean people who were part of a Jewish Jesus group immediately left the Galilee

© V&R unipress GmbH, Göttingen

after his death in Jerusalem. Nonetheless, unsubstantiated claims to long-term Jesus groups in Galilee after the Jewish War should also be avoided. Q specifically reports that the message was rejected by the Galilean villages (Q10:13–15). *5. Socio-Economic-Political Factors:* In a setting like Galilee, where 90 % of the population lived in agrarian and fishing villages, the establishment of two new administrative and market centers like Sepphoris and Tiberias must have had a major impact. As we look towards the Q sayings, explicit concerns for changes in the economy are to be expected. Q focuses on the underprivileged groups in Galilee, cutting out prosperous cities like Tiberias and Sepphoris. The well-established focus on economic tensions and instabilities in the sayings of Q is well matched to the archeological evidence of mid-first century Galilee. *6. Independent Literary References:* Beyond the fact that Q was taken up into two literary sources, there are no references to the provenience of Q in our extant literature. *7. References to Sites, Names, Regional Events, Geographical Details and Social Map:* Here Moreland makes reference to the work of Reed, Duling, and Sawicki, drawing the authors' "spatial imagination" or "social map," and making use of Duling's social network analysis to reconstruct a Capernaum-based spatial context for Jesus' social network. He concludes, on the basis of the seven criteria that it is likely that Q was written and edited in Galilee.

John S. Kloppenborg: Q, Bethsaida, Khorazin and Capernaum continues with the examination of the issue as to where the document Q might have originated and takes a special interest in Q 10:13–15: Does the mention of Khorazin, Bethsaida, and Capernaum reflect local colour and historical facts of Q's Galilean genesis? This might be seen as a continuation of point 7 of Moreland's scheme. For Kloppenborg two questions arise: First, since the implication of Q 10:13–14 is that wonders occurred in those towns, have we any evidence for this? And second, should we conclude that these three Galilean towns utterly failed to adhere to the Jesus movement? First, we do not have any reliable hints as to which miracles Jesus might have worked in these towns, even when church fathers tried to amend this lacuna. Regarding the second question: Kloppenborg here thoroughly pieces together archeological evidence, the testimonies of the church fathers, and early pilgrims. He concludes that neither literary nor material evidence provides a strong basis for supposing that there were Jesus groups in Capernaum or Bethsaida, especially prior to the first revolt, and that there is no reason at all to suppose that there were Jesus followers in Khorazin. So, as Q 10:13–15 seems to imply, the Jesus movement represented by Q was largely unsuccessful in these three towns. If we put the Q-message into the context of the sociological matrix in these towns, we get astonishing results: Q's envoys certainly stood for a somewhat utopian program of debt forgiveness (6:30; 11:3; 17:3–4), various strategies of conflict avoidance and reduction (Q 6:27–28; 12:58–59), and resource sharing (6:29; cf. also 12:22–31). Instantly, there is a lot of scholarly discussion concerning

© V&R unipress GmbH, Göttingen

how rich and prosperous these towns might have been. Kloppenborg discusses the different positions and points out that neither Capernaum nor Bethsaida were damaged in the first revolt, in sharp contrast to Yodefat and Gamla, the latter only 10 km distant from Bethsaida. This without doubt is an indication that neither showed any resistance to the Romans; on the contrary, these towns tried to establish a moderate wealth and influence. Kloppenborg attributes the woes against the Galilean Towns to the final stage of Q's composition. Thus, the decision not to welcome the Q workers arose from a complex social, economic and political calculation probably a decade before the revolution. Q's polemic against possessions (Q 6:20b, 29; 12:16–20, 22–31; 16:13) may have been just too unpalatable to these towns.

Part II: Sociological Backdrop of the Sayings Source

In 1972, *Gerd Theißen* developed the thesis that itinerant preachers were the first authorities in early Christianity. He coined the term "itinerant radicalism" for their ethos of homelessness and criticism of possessions, and connected sociological studies with the exegesis of the New Testament. Particularly the mission discourse in Q reflects such ideas. Now, more than fourty years later, the question arises as to what the socio-historical thesis of itinerant radicalism in early Christianity might contribute to the right understanding of the Sayings Source. In his contribution, *The Sayings Source Q and Itinerant Radicalism*, Theißen tries to respond to the questions that have arisen in the wake of his publications: Can we infer, on the basis of prescriptive statements in the mission discourse in Q, real behavior in history? Did the presumed messengers live an itinerant existence? How were these itinerant messengers able to exercise influence on other people despite their marginal existence? Are such itinerant charismatics represented in the Sayings Source as having an ethos that can be characterized as itinerant *radicalism?* Are we able to identify a geographic focus of their activities? What is the contribution of these itinerant charismatics to the literary history of the Sayings Source – at the level of tradition and the final edition and the reception history of Q? How does itinerant radicalism socially fit into Jewish society in antiquity? Is it a product of some crisis in this society? Or is it the product of a society in peace and prosperity? Theißen now thoroughly examines the counter-arguments that his theses had to confront in the past decades. He concludes that there indeed existed such homeless itinerant charismatics, whose lifestyle was constitutive of their existence. They exercised a charismatic influence on their sympathizers in local communities and practiced a radical ethos of homelessness, a criticism of family, labor and possessions. This itinerant radicalism originated in Jewish areas, but spread very early beyond its boundaries with a

© V&R unipress GmbH, Göttingen

focus in Syria. The traditions of these itinerant charismatics are preserved in Q. Q tries to motivate people to take on the role of itinerant charismatics. Perhaps one of them had written down their oral traditions – perhaps to equip the messengers of Jesus with such a collection of traditions.

At this point, the contribution of *Markus Tiwald: The Brazen Freedom of God's Children: "Insolent Ravens" (Q 12:24) and "Carefree Lilies" (Q 12:27) as Response to Mass-Poverty and Social Disruption?* fits in perfectly. In 2002, Tiwald had published his doctoral dissertation on the question of itinerant charismatics as authorities behind the Sayings Source. Now, thirteen years later, he returns to the same topic and tries to confront the old assumptions with the new state of the discussion. Especially three presuppositions have been in for heavy criticism: *1st*, the thesis of *massive social conflicts* leading to a disruption of social structures in Galilee. *2nd*, the Jesus-movement – as preserved in the mission account in Q – would have *adapted this social deviance in a creative way:* In marked contrast to the violent uprisings (as practiced by the Zealots) or the expectation of an eschatological war against God's enemies (as proclaimed in the manuscripts of Qumran), they announced a peaceful new order of the world under God's reign. *3rd:* Itinerant *charismatic prophets must have been common in early Christian communities of Syria-Palestine*, as we see in Didache, Lucian of Samosata and the Pseudo-Clementine Literature. Is it legitimate to complete the picture of Q by putting the itinerant charismatics of the Sayings Source in line with these itinerant prophets, or is this circularity? Here Tiwald recasts some of his previous arguments: Especially the economic situation in the Galilee at the time of Jesus was more complex than earlier publications had assumed. We have to conclude that *the Galilee of Jesus* as depicted in the New Testament is not representative for the *whole of Galilee in these times.* Quite the contrary, it's the world of the marginalized losers (small farmers, fishers and craftsmen) that the Bible zooms in on, disregarding the wider focus of Hellenistic-Jewish city life and the socially upwardly mobile milieus of those who succeeded in harmonizing Jewish and Hellenistic life. Jesus' primary aim is not a revolution against social injustice but the prophetic announcement of the forthcoming *basileia*. Nevertheless, this *basileia* can only be inherited by the poor, the hungry, and the nonviolent (cf. the Beatitudes, Q 6:20–23.27–28). So Jesus' message cannot be separated from the socio-economic situation in Galilee in these times. The Q-messengers only followed Jesus' emblematic lifestyle. The thesis that village scribes framed the document Q (cf. Kloppenborg, Arnal, Bazzana; especially Bazzana's contribution in this volume) does not stand in opposition to the assumption that itinerant charismatic prophets were the authorities behind the Sayings Source. There certainly was a strong interplay between poor itinerant prophets as *authorities* behind Q and a supporting-group of local residents among which village

© V&R unipress GmbH, Göttingen

scribes might have been the *authors* of Q. The interwoven relationship between these two groups might not only have included providing food and a sleeping-place, but we may assume that it extended to cooperation in the composition of the Sayings Source. Concerning the picture of itinerant charismatics in the Syro-Palestine region, Tiwald opts for opening up the picture by taking into consideration the wandering emissaries of the Johannine Corpus and the itinerant author of Revelation (it is agreed that both have their theological and geographical roots in Syria-Palestine). The ancient Palestinian ethos of poor and itinerant prophets persisted quite tenaciously in the early Church, because it was the "lifestyle of the Lord", the τρόποι κυρίου as *Did.* 11:8 coins it as the dominant criterion for a true prophet.

Giovanni Bazzana's contribution continues along the lines of Tiwald by focussing on *Galilean Village Scribes as the Authors of the Sayings Gospel Q.* Particularly the work of J. Kloppenborg and W. Arnal[2] has helped identify Galilean "village scribes" as the social group responsible for the composition and early circulation of the Greek text of Q. Bazzana's contribution attempts to build on these proposals in order to strengthen and refine the original hypothesis by moving forward in two main directions. Firstly, by referring to a few significant examples, he shows that some features of the linguistic and terminological makeup of Q are in all likelihood dependent on the authors' familiarity with the specific quasi-technical idiom of Greek Hellenistic bureaucracies (cf. point 2 of Moreland's scheme). Secondly, he sketches what the acquaintance with such a variety of Greek may indicate concerning the educational and socio-cultural position of the Q scribes. Bazzana succeeds in demonstrating that Greek was actually employed in Galilee before the Roman conquest and that writing indeed was used for administrative purposes in the Herodian period – contradicting the wrong assumptions of R. Horsley.[3] While Aramaic was certainly the means of communication employed by the majority of the population, it is difficult to build a credible historical scenario in which Greek was not present in the villages, at the very least as merely an administrative language. Surely the Ptolemies introduced Greek in their bureaucracy in the Land of Israel in the third century BCE, as they did in Egypt at the same time, and the Seleucids did not bring about significant changes in this respect. Despite the lack of direct evidence, in all likelihood neither the Hasmonean nor the Herodians changed this state of affairs, in particular if one considers the philo-Hellenic and philo-Roman stance that characterized Herod the Great's reign. Thus, the authors of Q might have oc-

2 *W. E. Arnal*, Jesus and the Village Scribes. Galilean Conflicts and the Setting of Q, Minneapolis (MN) 2001, and *J. S. Kloppenborg*, Literary Convention, Self-Evidence, and the Social History of the Q People, in: Semeia 55 (1991) 77–102.

3 *R. A. Horsley*, Introduction, in: Id. (ed.), Oral Performance, Popular Tradition, and Hidden Transcripts in Q, Atlanta 2006, 1–22.

© V&R unipress GmbH, Göttingen

cupied a socio-cultural location similar to that of Egyptian village scribes. They employed Greek for their trade, but most of their lives took place in an environment in which the overwhelming majority of the population spoke only Aramaic. The production of a hybrid text such as the Sayings Gospel (which creatively combines Hellenistic bureaucratic terminology and Jewish traditions) becomes understandable. In particular, it appears that among village scribes the attention to basic rhetorical tropes (such as the *chreia*) and to gnomological literature was very much alive – an observation that has important implications for an understanding of the formation of a text like the Sayings Gospel.

Sarah E. Rollens: Persecution in the Social Setting of Q observes that a pervasive assumption exists that persecution was an integral part of the pre-Constantinian Christian experience – but what "persecution" precisely means is not always clear. When one looks closely, "persecution" is often applied to a range of situations in such a way that the category conflates interactions between early Jesus followers and their contemporary Jews with those between later Christians and imperial authorities. Such classifications, perhaps inadvertently, have the effect of assuming that the treatment of Jesus followers by their Jewish contemporaries was the same sort of social phenomenon as the later legal punishment of Christians by Roman authorities. Nevertheless, in recent publications this perspective is now almost universally rejected: Until the end of the first century, Jesus' followers were widely regarded as another small sect within the complex web of practices and traditions that made up Judaism. Since it is difficult to identify "Jews" and "Christians" as two discrete groups of this period, most now avoid perpetuating the idea that there was any systematic persecution of the early Jesus movements by their Jewish contemporaries. Besides, persecution is not a *thing* or an *object* of inquiry; it is an *interpretation* of conflict and serves rhetorical and social-psychological purposes. For instance, the language of persecution is often closely bound up with attempts to create an identity, specifically a *persecuted* identity. Painting oneself and one's wider group as a victim, especially if that victimhood is part of an on-going narrative of persecution, invests one's identity with authority and grounds it in history. In such cases identity transforms a victim, who experiences violence, into a martyr, who has the power to endure it. Thus, in addition to being a rhetorically valuable tool for constructing identity, there is also a way in which mobilizing a persecuted identity becomes a form of power to many who have been denied access to other, more traditional forms of power such as wealth, status, or political prestige. Especially in the Sayings Source it may well be impossible to separate fact from fiction. Based on the theoretical caveats above, which describe persecution as an *interpretive lens* instead of an *objective phenomenon*, the question should not be: were the Q people persecuted? Instead, we should reframe the issue in terms of what the language of persecution *does* in Q. It is likely that persecution in Q carries out

© V&R unipress GmbH, Göttingen

precisely the functions outlined above: it contributes to Q's sense of identity and provides the authors with a source of authority. This holds especially true for Q 6:22–23. Here the experience of persecution results in a new identity: the audience, like Jesus and those who suffered before him, *are prophets.* If the Q people suffer like the prophets of past and for all intents and purposes *are new incarnations* of those prophets, then their message and interpretation of Jesus must be taken seriously. Suffering is transformed into proof of the validity of Q's teachings. The same is valid for Q 6:27–28, 35. Here the stakes are even higher: if one endures persecution and prays for the persecutors, the reward consists of becoming "sons of the father". Whereas Q 6:22–23 implied that those who suffer would become prophets, Q 6:35 now envisions them as children of God. Similarly in Q 10:5–9, 10–16 the rejected missionaries are interpreted as envoys of Jesus. Thus, whether or not we can conclude anything about the historical circumstances of persecution in first-century Galilee and Judaea, motifs of persecution helped the Q people to present themselves as prophets, as children of God, and as envoys of Jesus, who were authorized and empowered to disseminate Jesus' teachings.

The contribution of *Beate Ego* continues the discussion over tensions between the Q community and other Jewish groups. While S. Rollens had demonstrated that persecution narratives might not have depicted reality one-to-one, Ego focuses on *Different Attitudes to the Temple in Second Temple Judaism – A Fresh Approach to Jesus' Temple Prophecy.* Jesus' temple prophecy does not occur in Q as we have it in Mk 14:58. Instead we have Q 13:34–35: the woe against the temple and the prophecy that God will forsake his house. This note often was taken at face value as an example of the supposed fact that Q already had broken with its Jewish roots and the temple. But as Rollens was able to show with regard to the persecution narratives, Ego now demonstrates with the focus on temple criticism that such polemics eventually followed rhetorical patterns. It is quite probable that Q 13:34–35 adapted the temple-prophecy of Jesus in its own theological way. It is hard to imagine that Q did not know about these Jesuanic *ipsissima facta* (Jesus' temple-prophecy and his temple-action). So it is worth putting Q 13:34–35 in the wider frame of Jesus' own ministry but also into the large picture of early Jewish attitudes towards the temple. During the times of the Maccabees and the Hasmoneans, critique of the temple was widespread and based on the idea that the Second Temple was defiled during the reign of Antiochus IV, by the events during Jonathan's "coup" attaining the position of High Priest (cf. *Jub*. 23:9–32, Apocalypse of Weeks [*1 Enoch* 93:1–9 and 91:11–17], and texts from Qumran), and, according to the author of the Animal Apocalypse, even during a time before the aforementioned events (*1 Enoch* 85–90). It is this line of critique that led to hopes for a new sanctuary in the eschatological era, an idea that of course necessitated the destruction of the actual temple. Besides, in early Judasim the

© V&R unipress GmbH, Göttingen

assumption was common that the earthly temple had a heavenly counterpart. This can be seen in the Book of the Watchers of *1 Enoch*, where Enoch reaches the heavenly sanctuary and views the heavenly throne and God sitting there pronouncing judgment. The so-called "Songs of Sabbath Sacrifice" provide further proof for the existence of the motif of the heavenly sanctuary in early Judaism. This Qumran collection of 13 hymns is dedicated to the praise and worship in the heavenly sanctuary. Within the text of the "Songs of Sabbath Sacrifice", the term "sacrifice" (*t*^{e}*ruma*) is usually only used in connection with the term "tongue" (*lashon)*, which leads to the conclusion that this constitutes a metaphorical use of sacrifice terminology. The heavenly praise is here understood as a kind of sacrifice. The idea of a heavenly temple, which originally was a cosmic concept, could be linked to eschatological hopes. Thus, some traditions from the time of the Second Temple and later, such as *4 Ezra* 13:36, establish a connection between the heavenly sanctuary and the new temple. In the New Testament, the Revelation of John also appears to use such a model for its image of the New Jerusalem, albeit changing it somewhat when stating that the New Jerusalem comes down from heaven and does not contain a temple (Rev 21:22). Thus, Jesus' critique of the temple – and also Q 13:34–35 – might be seen on the backdrop of early Jewish theology. With regard to Q one might conclude: As the temple *logion* appears in close connection to the lament over Jerusalem, this observation supports the thesis that this lament also has to be understood in light of the cultural and religious context of Judaism in the first century CE.

Jodi Magness: "They Shall See the Glory of the Lord" (Isa 35:2): Eschatological Purity at Qumran and in Jesus' Movement tries to show that Jesus and his first followers in Q observed biblical law perfectly – not only with regard to moral laws, but also purity matters. Actually, Jesus' exorcisms and healings as well as his emphasis on moral or ethical behavior should be understood within the context of biblical purity laws. According to early Jewish thought, absolute human purity and perfection were prerequisites for the kingdom of God. This is the reason for the exclusionary bans in the Qumran manuscripts (e. g., in the Rule of the Congregation and the War Scroll), and it explains why the sect was so concerned with the scrupulous observance of these laws. Like Jesus, the Qumran sect anticipated the imminent arrival of the eschaton. But in contrast to Jesus, the Qumran sect effected this by excluding the blemished and impure from the sectarian assembly. Jesus' exorcising of demons, healing of the sick, and raising of the dead are presented as signs that the kingdom of God has arrived, as we can see in Q (e. g., Lk 7:20–22 = Mt 11:2–5: "the blind receive their sight, the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, the deaf hear, the dead are raised, the poor have good news brought to them"). This suggests that rather than rejecting ritual purification, Jesus took it for granted. Like the Qumran sect, Jesus and his Q followers assumed that all creatures entering God's presence must be absolutely

© V&R unipress GmbH, Göttingen

pure and perfect. Therefore, Jesus' exorcisms and healings were intended to enable those suffering from diseases, physical deformities and disabilities, and "unclean spirits" or demonic possession to enter the kingdom of God. Whereas Jesus' attitude towards the diseased and disabled can be characterized as inclusive and proactive, the Qumran sect was exclusive and reactive. Jesus' healings and exorcisms were intended to enable the diseased and disabled to enter the coming kingdom of God, not to exclude them. The eschatological dimension of Jesus' exorcisms is expressed clearly in another Q passage: "But if it is by the finger of God that I cast out demons, then the kingdom of God has come to you." (Lk 11:20 = Mt 12:28). However, 4Q521 (the "Messianic Apocalypse"), which might not be a sectarian work, displays striking parallels to the Gospel accounts, and in particular to Q: Both 4Q521 and Q contain references to healing the blind, raising the dead, and preaching to the poor that are drawn from Isa 35:5; 29:18; 26:19; 61:1 and Ps 146:1–8. These commonalities might indicate that there was a common Jewish tradition that describes the time of salvation. – In the discussion following Magness' paper, G. Theißen noted, that he himself already had formulated a similar thesis regarding Jesus' proactive purity and inclusive holiness:[4] Not impurity is contagious, but the purity of the upcoming basileia permeates everything, like – according to Q 13:21 – a piece of yeast leavens the whole flour. This position has been followed by Loader, Avemarie, and Tiwald.[5] J. Magness has now demonstrated the validity of such assumptions by crosschecking these concepts with ideas in the Qumran manuscripts.

The contribution by *Tal Ilan: The Women of the Q Community within Early Judaism* concludes this chapter and focuses our attention on the question as to how we are to imagine the position of women in the Sayings Source. Actually, this question already has been discussed extensively, e. g., by L. Schottroff or by E. Schüssler-Fiorenza.[6] But for T. Ilan these old theses have to be revisited within the

4 *G. Theißen/A. Merz*, Der historische Jesus, Göttingen [2]1997, 380: "'offensive Reinheit' und 'inklusive Heiligkeit', die den Kontakt mit dem Unheiligen nicht scheut". Cf. also *G. Theißen*, Das Reinheitslogion Mk 7,15 und die Trennung von Juden und Christen, in: K. Wengst/G. Saß (ed.), Ja und nein: Christliche Theologie im Angesicht Israels (FS W. Schrage), Neukirchen-Vluyn 1998, 235–51, 242. With this thesis Theißen adapted an older position of *K. Berger*, Jesus als Pharisäer und frühe Christen als Pharisäer, in: NT 30 (1988) 231–262, 238–248.

5 *W. Loader*, Jesus' Attitude towards the Law (WUNT 2/97), Tübingen 1997, 523, mentions Jesus' "inclusiveness". *F. Avemarie*, Jesus and Purity, in: R. Bieringer et al. (ed.), The New Testament and Rabbinic Literature, Leiden 2010, 255–279, 276 and 279, talks about "dynamic purity" exactly in this sense. *M. Tiwald*, Art. Gesetz, in: L. Bormann (ed.), Neues Testament. Zentrale Themen, Neukirchen-Vluyn 2014, 295–314, 299–300, points out that, according to an early Jewish theologumenon, in eschatological times the protological holiness and the prelapsarian integrity of Israel will be restored. Thus, Jesus only followed such conceptions by declaring that the upcoming *basileia* would reestablish holiness and integrity for all Israelites.

6 *L. Schottroff*, Itinerary Prophetesses: A Feminist Analysis of the Sayings Source Q, in: The Gospel behind the Gospel. Current Studies on Q (Sup. NT 75), Leiden 1995; *E. Schüssler-*

© V&R unipress GmbH, Göttingen

wider frame of early Judaism. Here some older points of view might no longer be congruent within a Jewish-Palestinian context of the Roman period. Ilan now thoroughly examines the Jewish contexts of literature, sociology, and finally theology. 1) The literary genre of parallel parables, positing a male and a female protagonist, is probably not an innovation of Jesus or of the Q source, for it has parallels in near-contemporary Jewish sources and thus comes from the Jewish background of Q. The use of such imagery was used neutrally (as in the Mishnah), but already in Jewish circles it was also used to draw moralistic conclusions about social justice. In this Q is not foreign to its Jewish roots. 2) The Q community was not especially anti-patriarchal. Q was a sect. Anti-familial sayings in Q are about loyalty to the sect, not about dissolving the patriarchal household. In this it is not different from the Dead Sea Sect, which also demanded from its members loyalty over and against family ties. 3) It is doubtful that Q had a Sophia theology, because the references to her in Q do not yet signify a theology, and certainly not to a goddess-like figure in a monotheistic religion. Perhaps the Q community had no qualms representing God with feminine similes in their parables, but in this too it was deeply rooted in its Jewish context – as can be seen in Jewish Midrashim. Thus, Ilan concludes: "All this together may make Q less feminist than some feminists would have liked us to think, but it certainly makes it more Jewish."

Part III: Opening up the Horizon – Q in the Context of Ancient Diaspora

As we have seen previously (cf. the contributions of Theißen and Tiwald), the Q-movement and itinerancy have to be seen in the wider horizon of Syria and perhaps even Asia Minor. *Paul Trebilco: Early Jewish Communities in Asia Minor and the Early Christian Movement* comes in here and focuses on the similarities and differences between Jewish and Christian communities in Asia Minor and considers the various ways in which these two groups of communities interacted. In this way he widens the horizons of our discussion from Palestine to Asia Minor, and helps us to put the Palestinian picture into a wider frame. For Jewish but also for Christian communities we can detect various links between the communities in Asia Minor and Jerusalem. Jews paid the Temple tax and went on pilgrimage to Jerusalem. Similary early Christians had connections to Jerusalem or Palestine. It is very likely that there was significant movement to and fro for both Jews and Christians. It is also obvious that someone travelled with Q from Palestine to wherever Luke and Matthew wrote their Gospels. And, given this

Fiorenza, In Memory of Her: A Feminist Theological Reconstruction of Christian Origins, New York 1983.

© V&R unipress GmbH, Göttingen

evidence for interconnectedness, the suggestion that both the author of the Fourth Gospel (and for some, the community to which he belonged) and John the author of Revelation had earlier in their lives been resident in Palestine or Syria and had then travelled to Asia Minor (notably Ephesus) is entirely credible (cf. the contribution of Tiwald in this volume, focussing on itinerancy and mobility). Thus early Judaism as well as early Christianity in Asia Minor (and elsewhere) understood themselves to be interconnected and to "belong together" as a network of groups. Points of difference between Jewish and Christian social structures might be seen in the perception of ethnicity. Jewish ethnicity was a very significant factor of Jewish identity in Asia Minor. By contrast, within Christian groups in Asia Minor ethnicity was not a salient feature and it is clear from a range of documents that early Christian groups were made up of both Jew and Gentile. As far as interactions between Jewish and Christian communities are concerned, we have to consider that Christian groups at the very beginning of the movement were regularly formed from within the Jewish community. In the earliest period, Gentiles would have understood themselves to be joining a Jewish group. Outsiders would also have seen Christians as a Jewish group. But as the Christian groups became increasingly Gentile and as the Jewish and Christian groups became increasingly separate, the Christian groups grew away from Jewish communities and their context increasingly became the city. In return, there is very little evidence that the Christian groups formed the context for the Jewish communities, at least not in the first and second centuries CE. As far as we can tell, the general impact of the growing Christian movement on the Jewish communities was small. On the other hand, we have some evidence for the influence of Jewish communities on Christian groups. A key example of this comes from the Synod of Laodicea (c. 363 CE), which related to Christians in Asia. Its Canons prohibited Christians from practising their religion with Jews, in particular, "celebrating festivals with them", "keeping the Sabbath", and "eating unleavened bread" during the Passover. This is highly revealing and indicates significant Jewish influence on the life of Christian communities in the mid-fourth century, influence that the Council was seeking to combat. It also shows the appeal of Judaism to many Christians, and suggests that, even in the fourth century, there was at times a blurring of the boundary lines between Jewish and Christian communities.

© V&R unipress GmbH, Göttingen

Part I: Archeological Findings in Relevance to the Sayings Source

© V&R unipress GmbH, Göttingen

© V&R unipress GmbH, Göttingen

Lee I. Levine

The Ancient Synagogue in First-Century Palestine

The synagogue, one of the unique and innovative Jewish institutions of antiquity, was central to Judaism and left indelible marks on both Christianity and Islam as well. As the Jewish public space par excellence, the synagogue was invariably the largest and most monumental building in any given Jewish community, often located in the center of a town or village. In the Hellenistic and early Roman periods, the term *synagōgē* (συναγωγή, "place of assembly") was used to refer to the community at large, its central building, or both. Luke uses the term in the same chapter (Acts 13:14, 43) to denote both meanings, as do the Jews of Berenice in one of their inscriptions. In Asia Minor, Rome, and Judaea,[1] the term "synagogue" referred to a building, although several inscriptions from Bosphorus clearly intended the community.[2] In some Diaspora communities, as well as one in Tiberias, the synagogue was referred to as *proseuche* (προσευχή, "place of prayer").[3]

1 We use the name Judaea for the pre-70 period, as this was the official title of the Roman province at the time. Only in the wake of the Bar-Kokhba revolt in 135 CE did Hadrian rename it Syria-Palaestina, a change that is reflected in the use of the name Palestine. However, the name Judaea had a dual meaning in the pre-70 era – a limited reference to the southern part of the country (as against Samaria, Galilee, and Peraea) and a broader one relating to the entire province. See *M. Stern*, Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism, 3 vols., Jerusalem 1974–1984, vol. 1, 233–234, 290; vol. 2, 11–15, 168–170, 217–220; *L. H. Feldman*, Some Observations on the Name of Palestine, in: HUCA 61 (1990) 6–14; and *E. Schürer*, The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C.-A.D. 135), rev. ed., 3 vols., Edinburgh 1973–1987), vol. 1, 514. We shall distinguish between the two meanings by using the spelling "Judea" for the more limited geographical area and "Judaea" for the province as a whole.

2 *L. I. Levine*, The Ancient Synagogue. The First Thousand Years, rev. 2nd ed., New Haven 2005, 81–134.

3 In Bosphorus, Egypt, and Delos, this word was used in reference to the building. For other terms referring to the synagogue, particularly in the Diaspora, see *L. I. Levine*, The Second Temple Synagogue. The Formative Years, in: Id. (ed.), The Synagogue in Late Antiquity, Philadelphia 1987, 13–14. For the suggestion that the term "synagogue" might on occasion refer to a semi-public voluntary association such as the Essenes, see *A. Runesson*, The Origins of the Synagogue. A Socio-Historical Study, Stockholm 2001, Chap. 3 and especially pp. 129–134.

© V&R unipress GmbH, Göttingen

The term "synagogue" will be used here to refer to the Second Temple-period communal building whose various functions were primarily of a religious nature on the Sabbath but focused on general communal activities during the week. It is entirely possible that early on some communities met somewhere other than in a separate building (e.g., in the town square or in a private home). Whatever the case, from the second century CE on the term "synagogue" regularly designated a public building in which both communal and religious activities were held.

No pre-70 source systematically addresses the nature or functions of the Judaean synagogue. In contrast to the Jerusalem Temple, the synagogue merited relatively little attention; we have only a few sources describing how synagogues functioned,[4] where they were located, or how they looked – aspects for which Josephus and the Mishnah supply a plethora of information (albeit contradictory at times) regarding the Temple.[5] To the best of our knowledge, the synagogue in the pre-70 era had no halakhic or religious standing; it was first and foremost a communal institution and, as such, merited no special status and consequently little attention in our sources.

Almost a score of synagogues is attested for first-century Judaea.[6] In the literary sources they are mentioned only *en passant* within the agenda of each particular narrative. Josephus notes synagogues in Tiberias, Dor, and Caesarea with regard to political incidents; the New Testament, in Nazareth, Capernaum, and Jerusalem with respect to Jesus and his activities on Sabbath mornings; as well as in assorted rabbinic traditions and the Damascus Document. Archaeological evidence for the first-century synagogue is attested at five sites in the southern part of Judaea: Masada, Herodium, Jerusalem (the Theodotos inscription from the City of David), Qiryat Sefer, and Modi'in (the latter two in western Judea), and possibly also Ḥorvat 'Etri, south of Bet Shemesh (Fig. 1).[7]

As for the Galilee and Golan in the north, first-century synagogues were discovered at three sites – Gamla, Magdala, and presumably Khirbet Qana; proposed synagogues at several other sites are less certain – Capernaum, Chorazin, and a second site at Magdala.[8]

4 See especially the Theodotos inscription from first-century Jerusalem: *J. S. Kloppenborg Verbin*, Dating Theodotos (CIJ II 1404), in: JJS 51 (2000) 243–280.

5 *L. I. Levine*, Josephus' Description of the Jerusalem Temple. War, Antiquities, and Other Sources, in: F. Parente/J. Sievers (ed.), Josephus and the History of the Greco-Roman Period, Leiden 1994, 233–246.

6 *Levine*, Ancient Synagogue (n. 2) 45–80.

7 On the problematic suggestion of a Second Temple-period synagogue in Jericho, see *Levine*, Ancient Synagogue (n. 2) 72–74.

8 *L. I. Levine*, The Synagogues of the Galilee, in: D. Fiensy/J. R. Strange (ed.), Galilee in the Late Second Temple and Mishnaic Periods, vol. 1: Life, Culture and Society, Minneapolis (MN) 2014, 129–150.

© V&R unipress GmbH, Göttingen