

## **“Get Away From Me, You Who Do Lawlessness” (Q 13:27). 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 of 2014 and in Werden (Essen) in September of 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. 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 – as can be seen in the introductory quote: “Get Away From Me, You Who Do Lawlessness (Q 13:27)” is directed against Jews who do not believe in Jesus. 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.

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 Archaeology 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 archaeology and a sociologically oriented exegesis of the New Testament that constituted the *leitmotiv* of the conference. The question arises as to which extent the Jesus-movement was influenced by socio-political and socio-economic factors.

Both volumes thus try 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 prerequisites 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: *Tiwald, Markus (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. The present volume continues to pursue this strategy by focusing on the rhetorical function of inner-Jewish polemics and the rhetoric of exclusion. 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.

## 3. The Contributions in this Volume

This volume has a threefold structure. The first part deals with the topic of a separation between the just and the unjust in early Judaism, the second part focuses on the New Testament, and the last section examines the position of the Rabbis and of the church fathers.

### Part I: The Separation between the Just and the Unjust in Early Judaism

If the Sayings Source has to be considered a Jewish document, early Jewish theologumena and the way of arguing are crucial for the right understanding of

this text. In early Jewish literature, polemics occur frequently, so it is worth examining the rhetorical function behind such statements.

This is especially the aim of the first contribution: *Johann Maier: Die Mittel der Darstellung der Geschichte Israels in Texten aus Qumran und ähnlichen Schriften* focuses his attention on the scribal elites in the Second Temple period. Their importance can be seen in the book of Jesus Sirach, but also in the Enochic literature. The group behind the Qumran manuscripts consisted of descendants from priestly-scribal elites who engaged in a fight for power and influence in the Second Temple period. Hereby the figure of Enoch is functionalized for the mediation of esoteric knowledge revealed only to a small group of “elects” with whom the Qumran group identified itself. All the other groups lacking this knowledge were portrayed as having gone astray. Eschatological expectations in particular led to a metaphorical elevation of reality. Even if the use of metaphors is widespread in such polemical texts, it is not easy to distinguish between the metaphorical use of standard accusations and the reality behind these texts. In consequence, such polemics were not perceived as an exclusion of the rivals for all times, but rather as an exhortation to accept the doctrines of one’s own group.

The trajectory of diverging groups in early Judaism and Jewish in-group polemics is drawn upon by *Loren T. Stuckenbruck: Eschatologie und Zeit im 1 Enoch*. Stuckenbruck starts with a thorough examination of 1 Enoch: The “book” clearly is composite and consists of about 20 originally independent parts that developed in a time span of 400 years. The oldest Aramaic manuscripts from the late third century until the first century BCE indicate that many of these originally independent sections formed a unity already early in time. One can reckon with an *unbroken Enoch-tradition* over a time span of 400 years – the process of rewriting Enoch material lasted until the first centuries of Christianity. However, this does *not* indicate an *unbroken line of social continuity* behind the groups rewriting this material. Even the opposite can be proven: Sometimes opposing groups adapted the Enoch material for their own means. Thus, for example, The Book of the Watchers (1 Enoch 1 – 36) prophesied a “plant of righteousness and truth” (10:16) for the end of times. This plant refers to the ideal part of Israel that keeps God’s commandments. In the Apocalypse of the Weeks (1 Enoch 93:1 – 10; 91:11 – 17) this motive is continued. Here this plant refers to a special community of the elect *inside of Israel* and *in opposition to the rest of Israel*. Only this group will receive sevenfold wisdom concerning God’s creation (1 Enoch 93:5.10). It seems quite possible that the community behind this text identified with the pious groups in Israel that preceded the Maccabean revolt in 167 BCE. Finally, the Epistle of Enoch (1 Enoch 92:1 – 5; 93:11 – 14; 94:1 – 105:2) further adapted such ideas. Here suppression and persecution no longer are connected with “external” powers, but are located within Israel: Enoch’s Epistle reflects inner-Jewish tensions. The reason for this can be seen in social inequity within the Jewish pop-

ulation and in diverging theological concepts. The richer and more powerful classes justified their social opulence by quoting the book Deuteronomy, explaining their wealth by the blessings of God for the righteous. Enoch's Epistle does not invalidate this theology, but opens up a wider horizon. The eight Woe Oracles (94:6–95:2; 95:4–7; 96:4–8; 97:7–10; 98:9–99:2; 99:11–16; 100:7–9; 103:5–8) are directed against politically and theologically influential Jews; here a new interpretation of the blessings and curses of Deuteronomy is developed. In these texts inner-Jewish polemics lead to a separation between righteous and sinners within Israel.

*Armin Lange: Intra- und extrajüdische Polemiken. Ein Vergleich von Essenern und Urchristen.* Lange examines criteria that enable us to distinguish between inner-Jewish and extra-Jewish polemics. Here he exemplarily compares the anti-pharisaic polemics of the Qumran manuscripts with anti-Jewish passages in the New Testament. In the Qumran manuscripts, he focuses special attention on the Nahum Peshar (4QpNahum). According to this text, the Qumran community considered the Pharisees to be sons of darkness who belonged to the world of Belial. In this text, only the Essene community represents the true and real Israel, the Pharisees are excluded and part of the “*massa damnata*.” However, all this still remains an inner-Jewish conflict. From this point of view, the polemics in the Sayings Source against Jews who do not believe in Jesus can also be interpreted as an inner-Jewish conflict. The picture changes with the Gospels of Mark, Matthew and Luke. According to Lange, especially the use of the word Ἰουδαίος – which is missing in Q – indicates that the perspective meanwhile has become an extra-Jewish one. Lange then examines 1 Thess 2:13–16 and poses the question as to whether this text can be seen as reflecting inner-Jewish conflict or not. He shows that the crucial point resides in the missionary activity of Paul. The Roman government responded very negatively to attempts to convert non-Jews to Judaism. Therefore Paul's activities led to understandable fears among the Thessaloniki Jewry. In return, Paul answered with stereotypes of pagan and Christian anti-Jewish literature: A pagan stereotype might be seen in the accusation of “hostility towards humankind,” a Christian stereotype in the accusation of having “murdered Jesus.” By adapting such anti-Jewish stereotypes – thus the conclusion of Lange –, Paul has already left the inner-Jewish discourse. Even if the Essene polemics against Pharisees are as harsh as Paul's accusation against “the Jews”, Lange nevertheless sees a difference here: Essenes regarded themselves as the only authentic Jews and criticized other Jews. In opposition to this, Paul – so Lange – condemns all the Jews *in toto* and thus already has broken with his Jewish background.

Part II: The Separation between the Just and the Unjust in the New Testament

In this second section, *Markus Tiwald: Verborgene Weisheit – Wahres Israel. Die eschatologische Scheidung zwischen Gerechten und Ungerechten in Logienquelle und frühjüdischer Apokalyptik* tries to bridge the gap between early Jewish and early Christian literature. Here the Sayings Source appears to be a “missing link” of sorts. By drawing parallels between Enoch’s Epistle (1 Enoch 92:1–5; 93:11–105:2), the Apocalypse of Weeks (1 Enoch 93:1–10; 91:11–17), *Musar leMevin* (a text found in Qumran, consisting of: 1Q26, 4Q415–418, 4Q423), the fourth book of Ezra, and the Sayings Source, Tiwald tries to show that the rhetoric of exclusion and the theologoumenon of an eschatological separation between the just and the unjust were widespread in early Judaism. These patterns follow two different schemes: a *direct exclusion* through the condemnation of sinners and an *indirect exclusion* by way of the exclusive possession of revealed wisdom that sets the chosen and elect apart from the rest of Israel. These two patterns are present in a large stream of early Jewish literature; the “*Jubelruf*” in Q 10:21–24, the woe oracles in Q 10:13–15, and the judgment against those who do ἀνομία in Q 13:28 f. fit perfectly in this context. The claims in Q thus functioned like the Enochic (cf. the article by Stuckenbruck in the present volume) and Qumranian claims (cf. the contribution by Maier in this book). Therefore, the rhetoric of exclusion in Q is not a sign of an already consummated “parting of the ways”, but is indicative of a continuing inner-Jewish struggle over the right interpretation of the Law.

The contribution by *Christopher Tuckett: Apocalyptic – in Q?* tries to define what can or should count as “apocalyptic”, whether it is sensible to talk about “apocalypticism”, and what the relationship between “apocalyptic” and “eschatology” is. After an attempt to provide such a definition, Tuckett discusses the “apocalyptic” nature of Q. He comes to the conclusion that Q itself is certainly not an “apocalypse” according to almost any definition of what an “apocalypse” might be. Nevertheless, “apocalyptic” patterns of some kind may be present in Q. If an essential feature of an “apocalypse” constitutes the idea of the revelation and mediation of divine secrets, then there is one reference in Q to such an idea: the so-called “*Jubelruf*” of Q 10:21–22, with the claim that “these things” have been hidden from the “wise and understanding” but have now been revealed to “infants”, who presumably include the members of the Q group. “Apocalyptic” conceptions might also be behind Q 22:28.30, where the disciples (and perhaps then derivatively the Q followers of Jesus) are promised that they will sit on thrones to judge the twelve tribes of Israel. In this case, a model by which the saying functions to provide hope and encouragement for the hearers does indeed fit in well with the content of the saying. After examination of some other “apocalyptic” patterns in Q, Tuckett concludes that Q was not written in a situation in which there has been an irreparable division. If there has been some

“parting of the ways”, the aim of the Q Christians is to seek overcome those divisions and to break down any boundary lines. There is therefore an appeal still going to whole of Israel, the rupture is not yet final.

The article by *John S. Kloppenborg: A “Parting of the Ways” in Q?* fits in perfectly at this point. Certainly the threat of judgment is a major editorial theme of Q. This in turn raises a critical question: does Q’s composition and its strong featuring of the judgment of specific Israelite towns and the desolation of Jerusalem and its temple indicate that nothing awaits Israel but final judgment? Kloppenborg examines the texts thoroughly and concludes that Q freely engages in a shaming technique that can already be found at various points in the Tanak, especially Isa 3:9–17 and Ezek 16. Neither of these prophets thought that Israel had been abandoned by God, but both were willing to invoke the worst comparisons possible in order to shame their addressees into a change of heart. Accordingly, we should also read Q’s polemic as a kind of rhetorical exaggeration that one encounters in intramural disputes against competitors, and as language that articulates a claim for Q and its partisans as being the most authentic representatives of Israelite identity. Such rhetorical techniques should not be seen as blanket rejections of the role of Israel in the economy of salvation. They are rhetorical constructions intended to create a space *within* Israelite discourse for Q’s particular brand. The framers of Q were most likely low-level scribes who suffered under a shift in the organization of power from rural to urban centers and who stood in competition to other, more successful groups in early Judaism (such as the Pharisees and other scribes). Although they were prepared to condemn their co-ethnic group, there is no evidence that they had fundamentally turned away to embrace non-Israelites. Here, actual and hypothetical Gentiles are invoked as counterexamples, designed to shame the (imagined) addressees of Q into what is called “repentance,” apparently simply meaning recognition of Q’s practices and message.

The contribution of *Daniel Smith: “But You Will Be Thrown Out” (Q 13:28): The Spatial Dimensions of Q’s Apocalyptic Rhetoric* follows the trajectory of Tuckett and Kloppenborg in demonstrating the socio-political aims that are immanent in apocalyptically oriented polemics. In an overview, he shows that from 1970 scholars began turning their attention to the persuasive purposes and strategies of apocalyptic literature and of apocalyptic *topoi* employed in other genres. More recently, advocates of the socio-rhetorical method of Vernon Robbins have studied the rhetorical dimensions of apocalyptic discourse. Robbins has noted that often there is less attention to the rhetorical effects of apocalyptic discourse on *space* than perceptions of *time*. Here Smith’s efforts come in by demonstrating that space sometimes is constructed socially and imaginatively. Early Jewish documents in particular often reflect a political strategy of resistance that effectively creates an alternatively lived space in re-

action to the ideological constructions of space of both other Jewish groups and the Roman occupation. Now Smith tries to adapt these theories to the Sayings Source. Like Tuckett, he correctly points out that Q in general is not an apocalyptic text, but that it undeniably includes some argumentative *topoi* found elsewhere in apocalyptic literature. When we consider imagery in Q, which evokes enclosed, built space (domestic or agricultural) in the service of apocalyptic rhetoric, three patterns emerge: first, houses under threat of destruction or invasion; second, separations within elite households; and third, separations within enclosed agricultural space. Jesus conquers this space and also bests his opponents – but do the polemics reflect “real-world” debates and rivalries, or are they directed more to the formation of the identity and ethos of an in-group operating under the radar of dominant out-groups? Smith concludes that the spatial constructions of Q’s apocalyptic rhetoric, whether pertaining to domestic space, village, city, cultivated agricultural space, or mythic space, serve the larger purpose of group identity formation with reference to a coming separation mirrored by a present separation.

*Giovanni Bazzana: Q 22:28–30. Judgment or Governance in the Sayings Gospel Q?* Most probably Q 22:28.30 (“You who have followed me will sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel”) constituted the ending of Q. According to some scholars, this would imply that the entire Sayings Gospel ended with an outright rejection of Israel. Nevertheless, it is not easy to establish the appropriate meaning of κρίνειν in Q 22:28.30. The semantic range of κρίνω is in itself much broader than “judging” understood as a synonym of “condemning.” Hellenistic documentary papyri show that the occurrences of κρίνω are so ossified within bureaucratic terminology that they *do not carry any forensic nuance*, but indicate the *exercise of sovereign authority* not only by kings and emperors, but also by prefects and other lower-ranking officials. As such, while the saying certainly conveys the idea of Israel’s ultimate restoration (judging the twelve tribes obviously means a restoration of the lost tribes), its main theme is the participation of Jesus’ disciples (and of the Q people) in the exercise of divine sovereignty in the end-time. Hence, the “judging” of Q 22:30, while entailing “condemnation”, cannot be reduced to its negative aspect only. As the other constitutive elements of ancient government and of ideal sovereignty, the activity of “judging” is both beneficial and threatening at the same time. Thus Q 22:28.30 provides us no hint that the “parting of the ways” between the Q-group and other Jews had already taken place.

*Christoph Heil: Die Zukunft Israels in der lukanischen Redaktion von Q* refers to the once existing consensus among scholars that the final redaction of Q looked back on an already failed mission to Israel. This failure – so the position of Lührmann and Hoffmann – would have led to a rejection of “whole Israel” (seen as “this generation”). In recent publications, this consensus has been challenged

more and more frequently. Theißen, for example, sees Q as a document of Christian Jews; the woes against Jewish cities are interpreted here as a last chance to repent, but not as a definite statement of a “parting of the ways” that has already occurred. Heil, for his part, takes a closer look at these woe oracles (Q 10:13–15), then examines Q 11:31 f. and Q 11:49–51 (the condemnation of “this generation”). Hereby he not only reads the text of Q thoroughly, but also compares it with the Lukan Redaction. He also focuses his attention on the “κρίσις of Israel” in Q 13:24–27; 13:29.28; 13:34 f.; the judgment of Jerusalem (Q 13:34 f.) and the judgment of the twelve tribes of Israel (Q 22:28.30). He comes to the conclusion that Q still has an inner-Jewish point of view. The polemics against other Jews follow the same pattern that we find in the similitudes of 1 Enoch. Nevertheless, for Q Jews who do not believe in Jesus will be condemned – as also in 1 Enoch the unbelieving majority of Israel becomes subject to condemnation. This scheme is adopted, but also adapted by Luke, who already writes his gospel after the “parting of the ways.” The third evangelist proposes a “separation in Israel” between believers and non-believers in Jesus. The person of Jesus himself leads to this κρίσις of Israel.

*Konrad Huber: Die Zukunft Israels in der Logienquelle und in der Offenbarung des Johannes. Skizze eines Vergleichs* tries to compare the Sayings Source and the Revelation of John. Juxtaposing these two texts makes sense, for the author of Revelation most seemingly comes from Palestine, has Jewish roots, and is influenced by prophetic traditions – all these are parallels to the authors of the Sayings Source. One could even go a step further in drawing parallels between the itinerancy of John (who shuttled between Ephesus, Smyrna, Pergamum, Thyatira, Sardis, Philadelphia, and Laodicea) and the itinerant lifestyle of Q prophets (cf. Q 10:4–11.16). Some scholars would even go so far as to interpret John as one of the itinerant charismatics, as were the authorities behind the Sayings Source. K. Huber acknowledges all of these parallels, but he also points out the differences. First, there is the time span of nearly 40 years that lie between the composition of Q and Rev (which he dates under Domitian’s reign). In the same way, there is also closeness and distance in some striking theological parallels between Q and Rev. For example, there is widespread use of the eschatological judgment metaphors in Q and in Rev, but in Q this imagery is directed against Israel and “this generation,” whereas in Rev it is aimed at Roman imperial structures. Regarding the question of Israel’s fate, it is remarkable that John identifies Jews as the “synagogue of Satan” (Rev 2,9; 3,9). Does this already indicate a “parting of the ways” between Jews and Christians or is this *intra-muros*-polemic? We do not know, but in any case the theology of John remains “Israel-bound” (cf. the “Israelbestimmtheit” that Klaus Wengst mentions): The author of Rev sees the Christian community in continuity to “Israel” and claims to be the “true Israel.”



Part III: The Separation between the Just and the Unjust in the Theology  
of Rabbis and Church Fathers

In this third section, *Günter Stemberger: Rabbinische Konzepte einer Scheidung in Israel?* offers a profound overview of Rabbinic conceptions concerning the question as to who in Israel will have part in the coming world. In this regard, the most prominent saying in rabbinic literature is: “All Israel has a share in the world to come.” This saying is normally attributed to Mishna Sanh. 10:1 and precludes the concept of a separation between the just and the unjust in Israel. Nevertheless, Stemberger meticulously demonstrates that this sentence was *not* present in the best versions of the Mishna (e.g., Codex Kaufmann); it only occurs in Codex Parma 138 and in the Leiden manuscript. Furthermore, this saying is not mentioned in the Tosefta, but there we encounter an extensive discussion concerning which groups will *not* have part in the world to come. The same goes for Talmud Yerushalmi. Only in Talmud Bavli can the sentence “All Israel has a share in the world to come” be found in all manuscripts. Even though this saying is restricted by some exceptions, the threat of exclusion no longer serves as a criterion regarding who belongs to Israel and who does not, but is only operative as a means of exhortation. B. Sanh. 44a even goes a step further: When Israel has sinned, it still remains Israel! Nobody in Israel – not even the apostate – can, in principle, lose his status as part of the elect people. Thus at least at the level of Bavli the concept of a general separation between the just and the unjust in Israel is precluded by the Rabbis.

*Joseph Verheyden*, for his part, sheds light on *Israel’s Fate in the Apostolic Fathers. The Case of 1 Clement and the Epistle of Barnabas*. First of all, it must be emphasized that there is no such thing as “the Apostolic Fathers.” Therefore, we can only examine the positions of certain scriptures from the so-called “time of Apostolic Fathers.” Verheyden thus exemplarily focuses on *1 Clem.* and *Barn.* since the two writings mention the term “Israel” by name and as a concept. While the differences between these two texts cannot be ignored, when it comes to dealing with “Israel” they are in some respects relatively close to one another. For both, Israel’s fate is assumed to be known by the intended readership and is presented as such. Both treat and make use of it as if the case were settled, resolved, and closed. The verdict has already been spoken. There is no discussion, only a monologue. As a consequence, Israel’s fate is formulated from the perspective of the authors and the group to which they belong, stating that “we” are the elect and the chosen ones who assume the place once occupied by the “old Israel.” Between *1 Clem.* and *Barn.* there may be some differences in the form by which this is expressed, but the result is the same: a transfer has taken place, the “old Israel” is abandoned and the connotation of exclusiveness that is attached to the whole concept of a chosen people or nation prevents arguing that two or more parties could make this same claim. There is only one. Some may feel inclined to call it a case of identity theft.