

# Metaphor, Narrative, and Parables in Q

Edited by  
DIETER T. ROTH,  
RUBEN ZIMMERMANN and  
MICHAEL LABAHN

*Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen  
zum Neuen Testament*

315

---

**Mohr Siebeck**

# Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament

Herausgeber / Editor  
Jörg Frey (Zürich)

Mitherausgeber / Associate Editors  
Markus Bockmuehl (Oxford)  
James A. Kelhoffer (Uppsala)  
Hans-Josef Klauck (Chicago, IL)  
Tobias Nicklas (Regensburg)

315





# Metaphor, Narrative, and Parables in Q

Edited by  
Dieter T. Roth,  
Ruben Zimmermann  
and Michael Labahn

Mohr Siebeck

DIETER T. ROTH, born 1975; 1997 BA; 2004 MDiv; 2009 Doctor of Philosophy from the University of Edinburgh; since 2010 Post-Doctoral Research Fellow at the Johannes Gutenberg-University, Mainz.

RUBEN ZIMMERMANN, born 1968; 1999 Dr. theol. from the Faculty of Theology at the Ruprecht-Karls-University, Heidelberg; 2003 Habilitation at the Protestant Faculty of Theology at the Ludwig-Maximilians-University, Munich; since 2009 Professor of New Testament at the Johannes Gutenberg-University, Mainz.

MICHAEL LABAHN, born 1964; Dr. theol. from the Faculty of Theology at the Georg-August-University, Göttingen; since 2009 Associate Professor (Privatdozent) at the Martin-Luther-University, Halle-Wittenberg; since 2010 minister of the Protestant church of Anhalt; since 2012 External Research Collaborator of the North-West-University South Africa, Potchefstroom Campus.

e-ISBN PDF 978-3-16-152843-9

ISBN 978-3-16-152338-0

ISSN 0512-1604 (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament)

Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliographie; detailed bibliographic data are available on the Internet at <http://dnb.dnb.de>.

© 2014 by Mohr Siebeck Tübingen, Germany. [www.mohr.de](http://www.mohr.de)

This book may not be reproduced, in whole or in part, in any form (beyond that permitted by copyright law) without the publisher's written permission. This applies particularly to reproductions, translations, microfilms and storage and processing in electronic systems.

The book was printed by Gulde-Druck in Tübingen on non-aging paper and bound by Buchbinderei Spinner in Ottersweier.

Printed in Germany.

Dedicated to Dieter Zeller

On the Occasion of his 75<sup>th</sup> Birthday



## Preface

This volume presents the published versions of papers originally delivered at the conference “Metaphorik und Narrativität in der Logienquelle Q/ Metaphor and Narrative in Q” held at the Johannes Gutenberg-Universität Mainz from the 30<sup>th</sup> of August to the 1<sup>st</sup> of September, 2012. One of the primary goals of this conference was to provide an opportunity for the discussion of recent trends in German- and English-speaking scholarship on Q. Consonant with the international nature of the colloquium and the exchange of ideas that took place there, the language of presentation at the conference has been retained as the language of publication in the conference volume. In addition, and as a further reflection of the international context of even the English-language contributions, we have preserved the differing style and spelling conventions of contributors hailing from various English-speaking countries and traditions.

As already revealed in its title, the conference in Mainz was particularly interested in examining and considering the presence and function of narrational and metaphorical elements in Q. At the same time, we also intended for the conference to provide a forum in which the question could be raised of the extent to which a word-level reconstruction of Q may or may not be necessary for studies of Q focusing on the narratological aspects of this document and/or the imagery employed in the text. In other words, can studies of narrative and metaphor provide insight into Q that is not dependent on a word-for-word reconstruction of Q? Though the contributors to this volume reveal a variety of perspectives on the necessity or appropriateness of such Q reconstructions, the conference sought to offer an initial opportunity to consider whether Q studies can, or indeed should, seek to move beyond the now traditional approaches to this “text” based on source- and redaction-criticism inspired reconstructions.

Furthermore, a particular emphasis on parables was encouraged, not only because the parables provide fertile ground for considerations of narrativity and metaphor, but also because a Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG)-funded research project on the parables in Q has been underway at the Johannes Gutenberg-Universität Mainz since 2010. It is the work occurring within the framework of this project that provided the initial stimulus for an international Q conference in Mainz, and we would



like to extend our gratitude to the DFG for their funding of this research on the parables in Q.

We would also like to express our appreciation to the Johannes Gutenberg-Universität Mainz for the provision of university facilities for the conference and, in particular, for a grant funding part of the conference costs. Thanks are also due to Miriam Teutsch and Lydia Vöhl for their assistance in preparing this volume for publication. In addition, we are especially grateful to our colleagues, many of whom traveled great distances in order to come to Mainz, for their participation in the conference and for their contributions to this volume.

Finally, we dedicate this volume to Prof. Dr. Dieter Zeller in anticipation of his 75<sup>th</sup> birthday. With this collection of essays we are pleased to continue the tradition of *Mainzer* scholarship on Q, a tradition that began with Prof. Zeller's "Kommentar zur Logienquelle" (Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1<sup>st</sup> ed. 1984, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. 1993). This dedication expresses our recognition of and deep respect for his work as well as our appreciation for his continuing interest in and contributions to not only the current Q research taking place in Mainz but also the field of NT studies more generally.

Mainz and Halle, August 2013

Dieter T. Roth  
Ruben Zimmermann  
Michael Labahn

## Table of Contents

Preface .....	V
---------------	---

### *Introduction*

*Ruben Zimmermann*

Metaphorology and Narratology in Q Exegesis: Literary Methodology as an Aid to Understanding the Q Text .....	3
--	---

### *Metaphor in Q*

*Daniel A. Smith*

The Construction of a Metaphor: Reading Domestic Space in Q .....	33
---	----

*Christopher Tuckett*

Q and Family Ties .....	57
-------------------------	----

*InHee Park*

Children and Slaves: The Metaphors of Q .....	73
---	----

*Sarah E. Rollens*

Conceptualizing Justice in Q: Narrative and Context .....	93
---	----

*Markus Tiwald*

Die protreptische, konnotative und performative Valeur der Gerichts- und Abgrenzungsmetaphorik in der Logienquelle .....	115
---	-----

### *Narrative in Q*

*Harry T. Fleddermann*

The Narrative of Jesus as the Narrative of God in Q .....	141
---	-----

*Michael Labahn*

Was „Lücken“ berichten:

Exemplarische Beobachtungen zu narrativen „gaps“ in Q .....163

*Detlev Dormeyer*

Q 7,1.3.6b-9.?10? Der Hauptmann von Kafarnaum:

Narrative Strategie mit Chrie, Wundergeschichte und Gleichnis.....189

*Robert A. Derrenbacker, Jr.*

“The Medium is the Message”:

What Q’s Content Tells us about its Medium.....207

*Marco Frenschkowski*

Nicht wie die Schriftgelehrten:

Nichtschriftgelehrte Rezeption alttestamentlich-jüdischer Traditionen  
in der Logienquelle und im Koran.....221*Parables in Q**Paul Foster*

The Q Parables: Their Extent and Function .....255

*John S. Kloppenborg*

The Parable of the Burglar in Q: Insights from Papyrology .....287

*Erin K. Vearncombe*

Searching for a Lost Coin:

Papyrological Backgrounds for Q 15,8-10.....307

*Christoph Heil*

Was erzählt die Parabel vom anvertrauten Geld?

Sozio-historische und theologische Aspekte von Q 19,12-26.....339

*Dieter T. Roth*

“Master” as Character in the Q Parables.....371

Contributors .....397

Index of Ancient Sources .....399

Index of Modern Authors .....413

Index of Subjects .....421

# Introduction



# Metaphorology and Narratology in Q Exegesis: Literary Methodology as an Aid to Understanding the Q Text

*Ruben Zimmermann*

## 1. Introduction: Metaphor and Narrative in Q – A Paradigm Shift?

Although the vast majority of NT scholars accepts and works with the ‘Q Document’ as a discrete source within early Christian tradition, there are those who have questioned the Q reconstruction of the ‘Critical Edition of Q’ in particular, or even the Q hypothesis in general. In the English-speaking world, the best-known are perhaps Michael Goulder<sup>1</sup> and Marc Goodacre.<sup>2</sup> In Germany, Werner Kahl recently published an article in *ZNW* questioning Q and arguing for a so-called ‘neue Benutzungshypothese’,<sup>3</sup> which takes up the Farrer-Goulder hypothesis that Luke used Mark and Matthew as sources. Kahl concludes his article with the contention and challenge: ‘Die schwere Beweislast liegt auf Seiten derer, die hypothetische Quellentexte zur Klärung des synoptischen Problems einführen.’<sup>4</sup> In other words, he is attempting to force Q scholars to redouble their efforts in arguing for the plausibility of the Q document.

Q scholars are, however, used to taking up such challenges. Many publications on Q are largely concerned with arguing for the existence of Q

---

<sup>1</sup> M. GOULDER, The Derrenbacker-Kloppenborg Defense, *JBL* 121 (2002), pp. 331-336, esp. p. 332; cf. also IDEM, Is Q a Juggernaut?, *JBL* 115 (1996), pp. 667-681 and IDEM, Self-Contradiction in the IQP, *JBL* 118 (1999), pp. 506-517. Cf. the discussion in R. A. DERRENBACHER JR./J. S. KLOPPENBORG VERBIN, Self-Contradiction in the IQP? A Reply to Michael Goulder, *JBL* 120 (2001), pp. 57-76.

<sup>2</sup> M. GOODACRE/N. PERRIN (eds.), *Questioning Q*, London: SPCK 2004.

<sup>3</sup> W. KAHL, Erhebliche matthäisch-lukanische Übereinstimmungen gegen das Markusevangelium in der Triple-Tradition: Ein Beitrag zur Klärung der synoptischen Abhängigkeitsverhältnisse, *ZNW* 103 (2012), pp. 20-46.

<sup>4</sup> KAHL, Erhebliche matthäisch-lukanische Übereinstimmungen (see n. 3), p. 46.

and presenting ‘the facts’ so that they might be convincing.<sup>5</sup> This is, however, essentially a defensive, apologetic task, not unlike a military rear-guard action.

With the following volume we are, at least to a certain extent, extending an invitation to take the discussion in a different direction by reframing the questions and moving out of the defensive trenches. As such, we have invited contributors to focus not so much on the ‘facts’ of Q’s existence or wording, but rather to consider the ‘fiction of Q’. In other words, an invitation was extended to approach Q on a literary level, in particular considering metaphorical and narrational elements found in Q and the Q parables, the genre in which metaphor and narration is explicitly combined. Interestingly, the demonstration that such considerations of Q reveal a carefully composed and stylistically sophisticated text may also serve to strengthen the arguments for the existence of Q: the constructed ‘fictionality’ of Q supports the factuality of Q.

But how exactly can one consider or work with a text, which does not exist, or to put in more precisely, which does not exist as a manuscript? There is, of course, a ‘text’ in the double tradition of Matthew and Luke, but how does one go about approaching or accessing this ‘text’? Before giving attention to metaphors in Q (the first main section of this contribution) or to analyzing narrative aspects of Q (the second main section of this contribution), a few methodological reflections are helpful.

## 2. Methodological Questions: Looking for and Analyzing the Q ‘Text’

This is not the place to consider or discuss various potential methodological and editorial problems of the ‘critical edition’ of Q.<sup>6</sup> I have no doubts that the critical edition was and is an important step for Q scholarship as well as for NT scholarship in general. At the same time, however, significant problems remain in reconstructing the exact wording of Q. A so-called ‘thought experiment’, suggested by Eric Eve and others, of what a ‘Mark’ reconstructed from Matthew and Luke would look like has highlighted some of the significant problems attendant to the content

---

<sup>5</sup> Cf. for example the good summary in C. M. TUCKETT, *The Existence of Q*, in: R. A. Piper (ed.), *The Gospel Behind the Gospels: Current Studies on Q* (NT.S 75), Leiden: E. J. Brill 1995, pp. 19-47.

<sup>6</sup> C. HEIL, *Die Q-Rekonstruktion des internationalen Q-Projekts: Einführung in Methodik und Resultate*, *NT* 43 (2001), pp. 128-143; J. M. ROBINSON, *A Critical Text of the Sayings Gospel Q*, in: Idem (J. Verheyden/C. Heil [eds.]), *The Sayings Gospel Q: Collected Essays* (BETHL 189), Leuven: Leuven University Press 2005, pp. 309-317.

of any reconstruction of *Q*.<sup>7</sup> An additional challenge facing the reconstruction of *Q* at the word level is how one approaches variations in the wording of Matthew and Luke. Although the editors of the 'Critical Edition' recognize the possibility that neither Matthew nor Luke retained the *Q* wording,<sup>8</sup> it appears that the reconstructed text of *Q* is, nevertheless, nearly 100% identical with either Matthew or Luke.<sup>9</sup> Though the overviews and summaries of *Q* research found in the Documenta *Q* series is clearly a valuable service to scholarship, it also reflects how debates and discussions concerning the precise reconstruction of *Q* may well never end and may therefore be an unproductive line to continue to follow.

Given this state of affairs, a question that presents itself is whether such a precise reconstruction of *Q* is even necessary? Is there a way to analyze a text without having the exact wording?<sup>10</sup> There are many types of textual analyses which, given the hypothetical state of a reconstructed *Q* text, should not, and perhaps cannot, be applied to the text of *Q* (e.g. detailed

---

<sup>7</sup> Cf. C. A. EVANS, *Authenticating the Words of Jesus*, in: Idem/B. Chilton (eds.), *Authenticating the Words of Jesus* (NTTS 28), Leiden, E. J. Brill 1999, pp. 3-14; C. S. RODD, *The End of the Theology of Q?*, *ET* 113 (2001), pp. 5-12; IDEM, *The Theology of Q Yet Again: A Reply to the Responses of Christopher Tuckett and Paul Foster*, *ET* 114 (2002), pp. 80-85; E. EVE, *Challenging Q*, *ET* 113 (2002), pp. 408-409; IDEM, *Reconstructing Mark: A Thought Experiment*, in: M. Goodacre/N. Perrin (eds.), *Questioning Q* (see n. 2), pp. 89-114.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. J. S. KLOPPENBORG VERBIN, *Excavating Q: The History and Setting of the Sayings Gospel*, Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress Press/Edinburgh: T & T Clark 2000, p. 101: 'there are instances where both versions [i.e., Matthew and Luke] betray the editorial interests of the evangelists and hence, the original wording of *Q* may be irrecoverable.' J. M. Robinson wrote: 'If the Lucan reading is shown not to be that of *Q*, it does not necessarily follow that the Matthean reading is that of *Q*, since it is quite possible that neither reading is that of *Q*.' (ROBINSON, *A Critical Text* [see n. 6], p. 313). For further discussion of this problem, cf. D. T. ROTH, *Die Parabeln in der Logienquelle: 'Alte' Probleme und 'Neue' Ansätze*, in: C. Heil/G. Harb/M. Hölscher (eds.), *Built on Rock or Sand? Q Studies – Retrospects, Introspects and Prospects* (BETHL), Leuven: Peeters (forthcoming).

<sup>9</sup> This result remains the same regardless of whether the parallels between Matthew and Luke have a 20% (for *Q* 6,47-49), 35% (for *Q* 15,4-5a.7), 60% (for *Q* 7,31-35), 80% (for *Q* 10,2) or 98% (for *Q* 16,13) identical wording. Cf. ROTH, *Die Parabeln in der Logienquelle* (see n. 8). The percentages are based on R. MORGENTHALER, *Statistische Synopse*, Zürich: Gotthelf-Verlag 1971, pp. 258-261.

<sup>10</sup> The question of analysis and reconstruction also lies behind the observation by A. LINDEMANN, *Die Logienquelle Q: Fragen an eine gut begründete Hypothese*, in: Idem (ed.), *The Sayings Source Q and the Historical Jesus* (BETHL 158), Leuven: Leuven University Press/Peeters 2001, pp. 3-26, p. 26: 'Theologische und literarische Tendenzen der *Q*-Texte lassen sich benennen und auch systematisch beschreiben. Aber es bleibt die Frage, ob eine umfassende literarische Analyse und theologische Auslegung der Logienquelle, (die der Analyse und Interpretation der synoptischen Evangelien vergleichbar wäre,) wirklich möglich ist.'



syntactic analysis, certain linguistic analyses, or particular grammatical issues). There are, however, elements of the Q text which are not dependent on exact wording.

Here, the analysis of metaphors and narrative criticism has proven itself useful in many fields. Such analyses can be applied not only to fixed texts, but also to the phenomena of memory and perception, to semi-literary texts or – as in our case – to intertexts. Even if the Q text cannot be reconstructed with absolute certainty from the readings in Matthew and Luke, it is possible to make plausible statements about its composition. This is to an even greater extent the case when considering textual characteristics that go beyond the word level, such as when studying the figurative world of or character constellations in the text, or, in other words, when considering metaphorical and narrative elements of Q. I would contend that it is not only possible to study the Q ‘text’ through literary analysis, but also that literary analysis helps us even more in handling and interpreting the Q ‘text’ than pure source criticism.

### 3. Metaphors in Q

Before being able to analyze metaphors in Q, one must address the foundational question: What is a metaphor? The number of definitions of a metaphor is almost as large as the number of disciplines striving for one: along with philosophy and linguistics, social-scientific and cognitive studies have addressed metaphors.<sup>11</sup> Though it may be heuristically valuable to distinguish between different perspectives and approaches, at times such attempts result in the presentation of simplistic alternatives and/or distorted contrasts, ultimately leading to caricatures of the various positions. It would be rather audacious to think that the variety of issues related to the phenomenon of metaphors could be addressed and resolved within the confines of this brief discussion. At the same time, I would like to list three aspects that are viewed as constitutive in numerous theories and that may be able to further and advance the analysis of metaphors in Q.

---

<sup>11</sup> Cf. for instance A. HAVERKAMP (ed.), *Theorie der Metapher*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft 1996; IDEM (ed.), *Die paradoxe Metapher*, Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp 1998; IDEM, *Metapher: Die Ästhetik der Rhetorik*, München: Fink 2007; cf. the application for biblical exegesis R. ZIMMERMANN, *Metaphertheorie und Biblische Bildersprache: Ein methodologischer Versuch*, *ThZ* 56 (2000), pp. 108-133 and more recently IDEM, *Metapher: neutestamentlich*, in: O. Wischmeyer et al. (eds.), *Lexikon der Bibelhermeneutik*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., Berlin: De Gruyter 2012, pp. 377-378.

### 3.1. The Two Semantic Domains of a Metaphor

From Aristotle to George Lakoff and Mark Johnson a metaphor has been defined as ‘understanding and experiencing one kind of thing in terms of another’.<sup>12</sup> The literal meaning of μετα-φέρειν is ‘to transfer’ or, even more concretely, ‘to transport’. Accordingly, one may define the metaphor as the transport of meaning from one domain of meaning to another.

Along these lines it becomes clear that a metaphor consists of two components, which have been labelled in a variety of different ways in scholarship, e.g., tenor/vehicle (Ivor Richards), focus/frame (Max Black) or ‘bildspendender und bildempfangender Bereich (Harald Weinrich)’.<sup>13</sup> Weinrich (and with him numerous others) has shown that a tension exists between the two involved semantic domains.<sup>14</sup> According to the denotative spectrum of meaning of a semanteme or the spectrum that can be lexicalized, the two associated realms do not fit together. They are, however, associated in the text through a syntactic or structural connection (this distinguishes a metaphor from a symbol, where the association does not arise from the text, but rather from the discourse community). Weinrich therefore speaks of a counter-determination (‘Konterdetermination’) or a contradictory predication: ‘Die kühne Metapher ist ... eine Prädikation, deren Widersprüchlichkeit nicht unbemerkt bleiben kann.’<sup>15</sup>

The terminology of the two aspects of metaphors already reveals that these two realms can be distinguished. It is not simply: focus 1 and focus 2, but focus and frame; instead of image 1 and image 2, a *bildspendender* (image providing) and *bildempfangender* (image receiving) realm. Even though a ‘substitution’ theory of metaphors has rightly been rejected since Max Black and Paul Ricoeur,<sup>16</sup> there also is no reciprocal interaction between the two realms. Instead, the transfer of meaning in one direction is strengthened. With a view towards the Q metaphors and their exegesis we can establish:

---

<sup>12</sup> G. LAKOFF/M. JOHNSON, *Metaphors We Live By*, Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press 1980, p. 5; cf. Aristotle, *Poet.* 1457b: μεταφορά δέ ἐστιν ὀνόματος ἀλλοτρίου ἐπιφορά.

<sup>13</sup> Cf. the references in ZIMMERMANN, *Metapherntheorie* (see n. 11), p. 113.

<sup>14</sup> Cf. H. WEINRICH, *Sprache in Texten*, Stuttgart: Klett 1976, pp. 311, 320.

<sup>15</sup> WEINRICH, *Sprache in Texten* (see n. 14), p. 309; cf. also D. DAVIDSON, *Was Metaphern bedeuten*, in: Haverkamp (ed.), *Paradoxe Metapher* (see n. 11), pp. 49-75.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. M. Black, *Die Metapher*, in: Haverkamp (ed.), *Theorie* (see n. 11), pp. 55-79 who speaks about a ‘substitution view of metaphor’ (p. 61) versus an ‘interaction view of metaphor’ (p. 68); cf. also P. RICOEUR, *Die lebendige Metapher*, trans. R. Rochlitz, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed., München: Fink 2004 (orig. *La métaphore vive* [Ordre philosophique], Paris: Éditions du Seuil 1975).

1. A metaphor consists of two semantic fields which are consciously brought into contact with each other, even though they actually do not belong together. When analyzing the Q metaphors it is necessary to describe the two semantic fields.
2. Although there is a reciprocal determination in the sense of 'interaction theory', the association is 'directed' and the transfer moves more from one side (*bildspendender Bereich*) to the other (*bildempfangender Bereich*). In general the 'image giving field' in Q is daily life, whereas the 'image receiving field' is the religious sphere.
3. Because of the uncertain wording of Q, it is often necessary to restrain from offering a precise syntactical description of the association. At the same time, there are so many possible points of contact (genitive metaphors, sentence metaphors, context metaphors) that they remain predicable.

In essence, the analysis of Q metaphors means perceiving the figurative domains employed, on the one hand, and their associations, on the other. So, which metaphors in particular can be recognized?

If one begins at the outset of Q, a series of metaphors can be found in the preaching of John the Baptist. John begins his announcement of judgement with a metaphor: 'snakes' litter!' (γεννήματα ἐχιδνῶν, see Q/Luke/Matt 3,7). Saying this to an actual brood of vipers would not have been a metaphor at all; however, it is spoken to individuals coming to John the Baptist. In calling human beings 'a brood of snakes' the saying becomes a metaphor, transforming a certain meaning of 'snakes' (*bildspendender Bereich*) to 'humans', or, more specifically, of 'offspring of snakes' to 'human behaviour' (*bildempfangender Bereich*). There is some uncertainty with regard to the addressees (πολλοὺς τῶν Φαρισαίων καὶ Σαδδουκαίων; in Matt 3,7 and ὄχλοις in Luke 3,7) and concerning the assumed reference (people who have come to be baptized or just to observe John's baptism);<sup>17</sup> however, there is no doubt that the speech is addressed to humans (see also the ὑμῖν and the imperative ποιήσατε).

In the next verse John shifts from animal to agricultural imagery with the issue of bringing forth fruit. It is not only the addressees, but also the combination of the word 'fruit' with the ethical or religious idea of repentance which makes the expression a metaphor: ποιήσατε οὖν καρποὺς

---

<sup>17</sup> Cf. the discussion on the passage in C. M. TUCKETT, Q and the History of Early Christianity: Studies on Q, Edinburgh: T & T Clark 1996, pp. 109-116. 'Matthew's version is often dismissed as an historically impossible grouping and probably redaction' (p. 110); however, in using such a harsh and unusual image it is 'unlikely that in Q the people addressed are actually being baptized or even intending to be.... Matthew himself presumably took the words as implying that the Jewish groups mentioned came only to look at John, without being baptized themselves' (p. 113).

ἀξίους τῆς μετανοίας (Luke 3,8). Some may have noticed that I did not quote the wording of the ‘Critical edition of *Q*’ here, which takes the singular καρπὸν ἀξιον from Matt 3,8, instead of the plural from Luke. Once again, regardless of the exact wording, the metaphor remains quite the same in combining the semantic field of ‘fruit’ with the semantic field of ‘(human) repentance’.

The text follows that line with the next verse, which takes up the fruit metaphor and expands upon it with the idea of a tree bearing fruits and with the adjective ‘good’ (καρπὸς καλός, Matt 3,10/Luke 3,9). The latter is well known as an evaluative attribute within ethical discourse.<sup>18</sup> Regardless of the precise wording in *Q*, a reading highlighting the metaphor clearly brings the ethical aspect to the fore.

The fruit-deeds metaphor is used once again in *Q* 6,43-45, which may serve as an example for a context metaphor. In *Q* 6,43-45 we are told about a tree and its fruits by means of an assumed contradiction: ‘There is no good tree bearing bad fruits, nor a bad tree bearing good fruits’ (Οὐ ἐστὶν δένδρον καλὸν ποιοῦν καρπὸν σαπρὸν, οὐδὲ πάλιν δένδρον σαπρὸν ποιοῦν καρπὸν καλόν, Luke 6,43). This time Matthew uses the plural (καρπούς, Matt 7,18) and Luke the singular (καρπὸν). Matthew also employs ἀγαθός whereas Luke writes καλός, not to mention other uncertainties with regard to wording and syntax.<sup>19</sup> None of these differences, however, have any significant influence on the meaning of the metaphor. If one does not connect the saying to John’s proclamation, at this point the statement reflects nothing more than a rural sapiential experience like a wisdom proverb. In the following verses, however, this semantic field of bearing fruit is linked to human beings. Once again, despite some uncertainty concerning the wording of this verse (regarding figs and thorns) the metaphor is still understandable in its basic structure: a good tree bears good fruit and, correspondingly, a good person (ὁ ἀγαθὸς ἄνθρωπος) produces good (προφέρει τὸ ἀγαθόν).

To sum up: Metaphors are built through the combination of semantic fields. These different fields are bound together by means of structural or syntactical links. Even though the exact wording and syntax are different

<sup>18</sup> Cf., e.g., R. ZIMMERMANN, ‘Das “Gute” als ethische Norm in Antike und Christentum. Gut, Güter, Güterabwägung,’ in: F. W. Horn/U. Volp/R. Zimmermann (eds.) unter Mitarbeit von E. Verwold, *Ethische Normen des frühen Christentums: Gut – Leben – Leib – Tugend* (WUNT [forthcoming]), Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 2013, pp. 53-60.

<sup>19</sup> Cf. the many brackets and footnotes in the reconstruction in J. M. ROBINSON/P. HOFFMANN/J. S. KLOPPENBORG (eds.), *The Critical Edition of *Q*: A Synopsis, Including the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, Mark and Thomas: With English, German and French Translations of *Q* and Thomas* (Hermeneia Supplements), Leuven: Peeters/Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress Press 2000, pp. 86-87.

in Matthew and Luke, the combination and transfer of meaning can clearly be recognized. Thus, metaphors can be identified and analyzed without the reconstruction of a Q 'text' by considering just the intertextual level between Matthew and Luke.

### *3.2. The Social Background of a Metaphor (The Domain from Which the Image Is Drawn)*

As noted above, generally speaking, one of the two domains of the metaphor refers to the religious or ethical sphere (this is the 'image receiving' domain), the other is taken from different fields of daily experience, often from the realm of daily life (this is the 'image providing' domain). Within an initial, roughly systematic ordering, I would like to differentiate between five fields of metaphors in Q with regard to the 'image providing' domain (*bildspendender Bereich*):

#### 1. Metaphors of Animals and Plants

Animals:

Snakes (brood of vipers in Q 3,7; Q 11,12)

Foxes and birds (Q 9,58)

Sheep (sending in the midst of wolves in Q 10,3; lost sheep in Q 15,4-7)

Sparrow (Q 12,6);

Ravens (Q 12,24)

Hen gathering her chicks (Q 13,34)

Ox (Q 14,5)

Vultures (Q 17,37)

Fruits/plants:

(Tree) bearing fruits (Q 3,7-9; Q 6,43-45)

Figs and grapes (Q 6,44)

Lilies and grass (Q 12,27f.)

Seed (mustard seed Q 13,18f.; Q 17,6)

#### 2. Social Metaphors (of the Household): Human Relationships

Disciple/Teacher (Q 6,40)

Brother/Brother (Q 6,41)

Playing children (Q 7,31-35)

Child/Parent (Q 10,22; Q 11,9-13; cf. Q 14,26)

Divided household (Q 11,14-20)

Kingdom (Q 11,17; Q 11,52)

Slave/Master (Q 12,42-46; Q 16,13; Q 19,15)

Thief/Owner (Q 12,39f.)

3. Metaphors of Rural Life

Threshing floor (Q 3,16f.); Woman at the mill (Q 17,35)  
 Weather phenomenon (sun and rain in Q 6,35; predicting the weather in Q 12,54-56; the flash of lightning in Q 17,24)  
 Speck and log (in the eye) (Q 6,41f.)  
 Harvest workers (Q 10,2)  
 Making bread (the leaven in Q 13,20f.)  
 Useless Salt (Q 14,34f.)  
 Men in the field (Q 17,34)

4. Metaphors of Urban Life

Constructing houses (Q 6,47-49; cf. the housetop in Q 12,3)  
 Treasure in Heaven (Q 12,33f.)  
 Juridical realm (going to court in Q 12,57-59; judging in Q 22,30)  
 Open/closed door (with a doorkeeper) (Q 13,24-27)  
 Invitation of the feast (Q 14,16-23)  
 Woman at the mill (Q 17,35)  
 Slave/Master motifs (Q 12,42-46; Q 16,13; 19,15)

5. Visual Metaphors: Ability to See/Ethics

The blind leading the blind (Q 6,39)  
 The speck and the beam in the eye (Q 6,41f.)  
 Light on the lampstand (Q 11,33)  
 Light and darkness (Q 11,34; Q 12,2f.)

Metaphors reflect the discourse in which they are used in order to explain something new or less understandable. In other words, in order to explain the new message of Jesus and his disciples, well-known experiences and daily routines are taken and transferred to the religious domain. In analyzing these metaphor fields we can gain insights into the context in which the communication takes place and trace the contours of the sociological setting (*milieu*) of Q.<sup>20</sup> When using a metaphor it does not make sense to draw images from a particular context which is unknown to the addressee. So we learn from the Q metaphors that, for instance, the nautical sphere and cultic motifs are missing, realms which play an important role in other early Christian texts (e.g., the fish motif in Luke).

There are many metaphors built on rural life and the family life of a household. This is more or less the situation where Q tradents are normally

---

<sup>20</sup> Similarly, J. L. REED, *The Social Map of Q*, in: J. S. Kloppenborg (ed.), *Conflict and Invention: Literary, Rhetorical and Social Studies on the Sayings Gospel Q*, Valley Forge, Pa.: Trinity Press International 1995, pp. 17-36, p. 20 points out that 'spatial images ... should be seen as a reflection of the Q community's social map'.

located, i.e., in the rural environment of Galilee.<sup>21</sup> However, when one takes a closer look at the metaphors some objections to our normal assessment may arise. On the one hand, perhaps the mention of the desert (ἔρημος in Q 4,1; 7,24; 17,23) or the metaphorical saying concerning a vulture (Q 17,37), which obviously is a desert animal, can still be understood as part of the cultural memory of Galilean peasants (as a contrast foil to the fruitful hills).

On the other hand, however, there are obviously metaphors which are constructed against the background of the *urban life of an upper class*. Within the structure of Galilean peasant-life the different master/slave scenarios do not have a realistic setting. In the parable of Q 12,42-46, for instance, a hierarchy of slaves is explored, which cannot be located in a village structure. Correspondingly the parable of the 'entrusted money' (Q 19,12-26\*) takes up the complex structure of a wealthy urban merchant. In this article these different domains from which the metaphors are drawn cannot be pursued further. On a methodological level, however, these observations may be sufficient for the general statement that metaphors, especially the semantic domain providing the images (*bildspender Bereich*) may reveal new aspects of the sociological setting of Q and the Q tradents.

### 3.3. *Traditio and Innovatio (The So-Called 'Bildfeldtradition')*

The third aspect to consider is that metaphors are daring speech, they thrive on surprise and inventiveness and are themselves 'living', as formulated by Ricoeur.<sup>22</sup> This reality, however, depicts only one side of the coin. It is not only recent work on metaphor theory that has shown that metaphors only 'function' within traditional systems of metaphors. Aristotle, in *De memoria*, had already named images as the singular medium to bring memories to mind.<sup>23</sup>

Weinrich especially is to be credited with having demonstrated how metaphors are embedded in *Bildfeld* traditions. Just as words are paradigmatically bound to a word field, a metaphor remains embedded in a

---

<sup>21</sup> Cf. J. S. KLOPPENBORG, *City and Wasteland: Narrative World and the Beginning of the Sayings Gospel (Q)*, in: D. E. Smith (ed.), *How Gospels Begin* (Semeia 52), Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press 1990, pp. 145-160, p. 155: 'the perspective of villagers in agrarian societies'; cf. also J. L. REED, *Galileans, 'Israelite Village Communities,' and the Sayings Gospel Q*, in: E. M. Meyers (ed.), *Galilee through the Centuries: Confluence of Cultures* (Duke Judaic Studies Series 1), Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns 1999, pp. 87-108.

<sup>22</sup> Cf. RICOEUR, *Lebendige Metapher* (see n. 16).

<sup>23</sup> Cf. Aristotle, *Mem. rem.* 451a where he stated that memory and remembering is 'having a depiction (φάντασμα), taken as an image (εἰκονος) of that of which it is depicting'.

*Bildfeld* and only becomes understandable within the context of the conventional joining of semantic fields. The audacious metaphor is always whittled down and eventually unconsciously lexicalized into the treasure trove of everyday speech metaphors. Every expression is located between the poles of a bold or a conventionalized metaphor. Markus Buntfuß has described this interplay as follows: 'Metaphern erinnern, um Neues zu sagen und sie erneuern, um Altes zu bewahren.'<sup>24</sup>

With these perspectives in mind, the *Kompendium der Gleichnisse Jesu* reflects a methodological decision to focus not only on issues of narrative criticism and the analysis of the socio-historical background, but also on the traditional background (*Bildfeldtradition*) of the metaphors upon which the parables are constructed.<sup>25</sup> In order to illustrate this approach for *Q*, I would like to consider the metaphor of the shepherd, a metaphor which is found, e.g., in the parable of the lost sheep (*Q* 15,4-7). The shepherd metaphor is common currency in the entire linguistic world of antiquity: Sumerian and Akkadian royal inscriptions already describe the king as a shepherd installed by the deity.<sup>26</sup> Similar evidence can be listed for the Syro-Palestinian world<sup>27</sup> or in Egypt.<sup>28</sup> Greek texts are no exception in their use of shepherd metaphors: Homer, e.g., identifies Agamemnon as a ποιμῆν

---

<sup>24</sup> M. BUNTFÜß, *Tradition und Innovation: Die Funktion der Metapher in der theologischen Theoriesprache* (TBT 84), Berlin: Walter de Gruyter 1997, p. 227.

<sup>25</sup> Cf. the third methodological step 'Analyse des Bedeutungshintergrunds (Bildfeldtradition)' and the introduction in R. ZIMMERMANN, *Die Gleichnisse Jesu: Eine Leseanleitung zum Kompendium*, in: Idem et al. (eds.), *Kompendium der Gleichnisse Jesu*, Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus 2007, pp. 3-46, esp. pp. 36-38; a similar argument can be found in D. ZELLER, 'Die Bildlogik des Gleichnisses Mt 11,16f./Lk 7,31f.', in: Idem, *Jesus – Logienquelle – Evangelien* (SBAB 53), Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk 2012, pp. 145-150.

<sup>26</sup> I. SEIBERT, *Hirt – Herde – König: Zur Herausbildung des Königtums in Mesopotamien* (SSA 53), Berlin: Akademie Verlag 1969. Cf. the collection of Babylonian and Assyrian references in A. SCHOTT, *Die Vergleiche in den akkadischen Königsinschriften* (MVAG 30), Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs 1926, pp. 70-72.

<sup>27</sup> Cf. especially the texts from Ugarit, e.g., *KTU* 1.108 (recto), Z.1-5 and *KTU* 1.21 (heavily damaged). On these, cf. R. HUNZIKER-RODEWALD, *Hirt und Herde: Ein Beitrag zum alttestamentlichen Gottesverständnis* (BWANT 155), Stuttgart: Kohlhammer 2001, p. 32.

<sup>28</sup> As already found in the Old Kingdom, cf., e.g., K. SETHE, *Die altägyptischen Pyramidentexte*, 4 vols., Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs 1908-1922, Text 2:1533b: 'Du hast sie in deine Arme gelegt, als Hirt deiner Kälber.'; cf. Text 2:771b: 'deinem Hirten, der hinter deinen Kälbern ist'. In addition, as seen in HUNZIKER-RODEWALD, *Hirt und Herde* (see n. 27), pp. 22f., Amenhotep III, Seti I, and Ramesses I. are each identified as a 'good shepherd' (*mnjw nfr*) who leads his soldiers to victory. Cf. also D. MÜLLER, *Der gute Hirte: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte ägyptischer Bildrede*, ZÄS 86 (1961), pp. 126-144.



λαῶν in the Iliad (Il. 2,243) and Plato refers to rulers as ‘shepherds of the polis’ (ποιμένες πόλεως, Resp. 4,440d).<sup>29</sup>

As highlighted in the *religionsgeschichtlichen* anchoring of the OT in its ancient context, the common near Eastern metaphorical use of the shepherd is also found in Hebrew thought and the Hebrew scriptures, even though the plethora of examples found throughout the OT also reveal significant differences.<sup>30</sup> I have elsewhere considered the development of the shepherd metaphor traditions and will therefore offer only a few summary statements here.<sup>31</sup> There are three OT *Bildfelder* for the shepherd metaphor in which, along the lines of the above-offered definition, the intertwining of two fields of meaning have resulted in one firm pattern of speech:

1. The King-Shepherd image
2. The YHWH-Shepherd image
3. The Messiah-Shepherd image

Whereas ruling aspects dominate in the King-Shepherd image, in the YHWH-Shepherd image the care for the sheep is foregrounded (see, e.g., Ps 23). Alongside the motif of the gathering of the scattered, it is especially the closeness of the shepherd to his sheep that is emphasized. The ‘uniqueness’ of the Messiah-Shepherd can be named as one of his characteristics, along with his ‘unifying function’ in regards to the different animals in the herd and his ushering in a time of peace. The King-Shepherd and the Messiah-Shepherd receive their commissioning as a shepherd from God. Even though they are able to be ‘good shepherds’ fulfilling their mission, the flock still remains the property of God. The people are consistently depicted as the sheep of God’s flock. In this way all three *Bildfelder* are encapsulated within a higher-level image: God is the

---

<sup>29</sup> Cf. also Plato, Resp. 1.343b-345e; 3.416ab; 4.440d; Leg. 5.735b-e. A human is a σῆμα τὸ τοῦ θεοῦ νομέως (Pol. 275c), because in primordial times humanity was shepherded by God (Pol. 271e); cf. I. VON LOEWENCLAU, Der göttliche Hirte im Griechentum und im Alten Testament, *ThV* 1 (1966), pp. 30-45, esp. pp. 33-36, 37-42.

<sup>30</sup> The metaphorical use of the shepherd or shepherd motif is found in each section of the OT. That is to say, it is found in the Torah (Num 27,17), in the historical books (2 Sam 24,17; 2 Chr 18,16), in the prophets (Mic 2,12; Isa 53,6), and in poetic or wisdom literature (Ps 23,1; Sir 18,13). Particular emphasis on this image can be seen in several prophets (Jeremiah, Micah, Zechariah) as well as in the Psalms (Pss 23; 80; 95,7).

<sup>31</sup> Cf. R. ZIMMERMANN, Jesus im Bild Gottes: Anspielungen auf das Alte Testament im Johannesevangelium am Beispiel der Hirtenbildfelder in Joh 10, in: J. Frey/U. Schnelle (Hgg.), Kontexte des Johannesevangeliums: Das vierte Evangelium in religions- und traditionsgehistorischer Perspektive (WUNT 175), Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 2004, pp. 81-116.

owner of the flock who either commissions a shepherd or acts as a shepherd himself.<sup>32</sup>

These traditions assist us in the interpretation of the Q parable found in Q 15,4-7. According to the definition used in the *Kompendium der Gleichnisse Jesu*,<sup>33</sup> a parable is a metaphoric text. In the following, it is the figure of the Shepherd within the narrative who is of particular interest. The motifs of caring for the sheep, as well as collecting lost or dispersed sheep, clearly evoke the tradition of the YHWH-Shepherd *Bildfeld*. For this reason, the shepherd seeking the lost sheep in Q 15 can certainly be seen as part of the traditional YHWH-Shepherd *Bildfeld*. At the same time, however, the shepherd is identified as a 'man' (ἄνθρωπος, Q 15,4), and, according to Luke, 'as one of you' (ἐξ ὑμῶν), that is, as 'one like you and me'. How then is this shepherd to be understood? Is it God as presented in the traditional *Bildfeld* and here depicted anthropomorphically<sup>34</sup> like an ordinary shepherd?

With a view towards another animal metaphor, 'gathering' also appears within the saying concerning Jerusalem. Like a hen gathers her brood, it is Jesus who wanted to gather the children of Jerusalem (Q 13,34). Jesus, who here is the subject of the gathering, may shed some light on the shepherd metaphor in Q 15. Is it therefore Jesus, as the Messiah-Shepherd, who seeks the lost sheep? Could we here be confronted with a narrative Christology where the 'Son of Man' is sketched according to the YHWH-Shepherd *Bildfeld* in order to present and interpret a 'pastoral purpose of Q's Son of Man Christology'?<sup>35</sup> Along these lines, Harry Fleddermann interprets the shepherd metaphor of Q 15 christologically by stating that it

---

<sup>32</sup> One outcome of Hunziker-Rodewald's work is the foundational distinction between YHWH as 'Lord of his flock' (i.e., the owner of the flock) and as "Shepherd of his flock" (i.e., exercising the role of the shepherd). Cf. HUNZIKER-RODEWALD, *Hirt und Herde* (see n. 27), p. 15 et passim.

<sup>33</sup> Cf. Zimmermann, *Leseanleitung* (see n. 25), p. 25. Cf. also R. ZIMMERMANN, *How to Understand the Parables of Jesus: A Paradigm Shift in Parable Exegesis*, *Acta Theologica* 29 (2009), pp. 157-182, p. 170: 'A parable is a short narrative (1) fictional (2) text that is related in the narrated world to known reality (3) but, by way of implicit or explicit transfer signals, makes it understood that the meaning of the narration must be differentiated from the literal words of the text (4). In its appeal structure (5) it challenges the reader to carry out a metaphoric transfer of meaning that is steered by co-text and context information (6).'

<sup>34</sup> Cf. R. ZIMMERMANN, *Anthropomorphism, III. NT*, in: H.-J. Klauck et al. (eds.), *Encyclopedia of the Bible and its Reception*, 5 vols. published thus far, Berlin: Walter de Gruyter 2009-, pp. 1:163-165.

<sup>35</sup> Cf. P. FOSTER, *The Pastoral Purpose of Q's Two-Stage Son of Man Christology*, *Bib.* 89 (2008), pp. 81-91, who points out the 'pastorally comforting message' of Q's Son of Man Christology, but does not deal with Q 15,4-7 in any detail.

is 'the Lord's care for his disciples'.<sup>36</sup> With reference to John the Baptist's question in Q 7,22, Fleddermann compares the action of the shepherd with Jesus' care for the lost and ill.<sup>37</sup>

To sum up: Metaphors remain 'open', at least to a certain extent, in their interpretation. They open up horizons of meaning and do not narrow or restrict them. They disclose theological insights, and, at the same time, tell us something about the world and the discourse in which they are used. By more closely considering the metaphors of Q we can learn not only about the metaphorical theology of Q, but also about the sociological setting as well as the known and presupposed traditions of Q. Within this volume various authors consider and explore Q metaphors in order to advance these ideas in their own ways.<sup>38</sup>

## 4. Narrative in Q

### 4.1. Narrative Criticism in Q – Methodological Problems

Within literary criticism and scholarship, narratological analysis has long been an established method for interpreting stories. Biblical scholarship now also contains numerous monographs, and even textbooks, on 'narrative criticism'.<sup>39</sup> Recently Sönke Finnern has offered an integrative summary of narratological analysis along with a methodological application for biblical exegesis.<sup>40</sup> The question remains, however, whether narrative criticism can be applied to Q in the form to which it has been transmitted to us.

---

<sup>36</sup> H. T. FLEDDERMANN, *Q: A Reconstruction and Commentary* (Biblical Tools and Studies 1), Leuven: Peters 2005, p. 775.

<sup>37</sup> FLEDDERMANN, *Q: A Reconstruction and Commentary* (see n. 36), pp. 776f.

<sup>38</sup> Cf. domestic space and the household (D. A. SMITH); family ties (C. TUCKETT); slaves and children (I. PARK); justice and juridical metaphors (S. E. ROLLENS and M. TIWALD); burglars (J. KLOPPENBORG); coins, women, and neighbors (E. K. VEARNCOMBE); Masters and slaves (C. HEIL and D. T. ROTH), etc.

<sup>39</sup> To name just a few: R. ALTER, *The Art of Biblical Narrative*, New York, N.Y.: Basic Books 1981; M. A. POWELL, *What is Narrative Criticism?*, Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress 1990; J. P. FOKKELMAN, *Reading Biblical Narrative: An Introductory Guide*, Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox 1999; D. MARGUERAT/Y. BOURQUIN, *How to Read Bible Stories: An Introduction to Narrative Criticism*, London: SCM Press 1999; D. F. TOLMIE, *Narratology and Biblical Narratives: A Practical Guide*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., Eugene, Oreg.: Wipf & Stock 2012; and L. JAMES, *Narrative Criticism of the New Testament: An Introduction*, Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Academic 2005.

<sup>40</sup> S. FINNERN, *Narratologie und biblische Exegese: Eine Integrative Methode der Erzählanalyse und ihr Ertrag am Beispiel von Matthäus 28* (WUNT II, 285), Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 2010.

It was John Kloppenborg in his essay 'City and Wasteland' who first distinguished between a 'narrative world in Q' and the 'real world' of the narrating Q community.<sup>41</sup> Fleddermann, in his important commentary, strongly argued for Q as a narrative which contains all the elements of the gospel genre. He states: 'Q contains all the elements of narrative-plot, character, setting, narrative voice, theme, and tone ... Q is a narrative portrayal of the ministry of Jesus.'<sup>42</sup> Michael Labahn, in his 2010 *Habilitationsschrift* entitled 'Die Logienquelle als *erzählte* Geschichte' confirmed this view and explicitly used narratological methods for analyzing the Q 'text'.<sup>43</sup> His book represents a milestone for the narrative dimension of Q.

It is not my intention here to present the contents of these works, nor do I wish to recount the history of research of when and in which way narrative criticism of Q has already been undertaken. Rather, what I would like to do in the following is to raise a few fundamental questions regarding the narrative analysis of Q and offer two brief examples of how narrative criticism could work when applied to Q.

First, a few methodological questions and preliminary issues. Here a fundamental question is: Does a narrative analysis necessarily require certain assumptions about the form and manner of transmission of Q? Three often-discussed issues are particularly relevant here.

#### 4.1.1. Oral or Written Form?

The majority of Q scholars considers Q to be a written source.<sup>44</sup> In recent years, however, the number of voices seeing Q as a partially (cf. James D. G. Dunn, Terence Mournet)<sup>45</sup> or entirely oral source (cf. Armin Baum,

---

<sup>41</sup> Cf. KLOPPENBORG, *City and Wasteland* (see n. 21) with its special focus on Q 3,3 (the region of the Jordan).

<sup>42</sup> Cf. FLEDDERMANN, *Q: A Reconstruction and Commentary* (see n. 36), pp. 107, 109 (cf. the discussion on the genre of Q, *ibid.*, pp. 100-110). Cf. also his contribution in this volume.

<sup>43</sup> Cf. M. LABAHN, *Der Gekommene als Wiederkommender: Die Logienquelle als erzählte Geschichte* (Arbeiten zur Bibel und ihrer Geschichte 32), Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt 2010.

<sup>44</sup> Cf., e.g., TUCKETT, *Q and the History of Early Christianity* (see n. 17), p. 92: 'It still seems most likely that the Q material was available to Matthew and Luke in a written, Greek form.'

<sup>45</sup> Cf. J. D. G. DUNN, *Q as Oral Tradition*, in: M. Bockmuehl/D. A. Hagner (eds.), *The Written Gospel*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 2005, pp. 45-69; cf. *IDEM*, *Jesus Remembered* (Christianity in the Making 1), Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans 2003, pp. 231-254; T. C. MOURNET, *Oral Tradition and Literary Dependency: Variability and Stability in the Synoptic Tradition and Q* (WUNT II, 195), Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 2005.

Richard A. Horsley/Jonathan A. Draper)<sup>46</sup> has increased. Is an initial decision concerning the oral or written nature of Q necessary in order to conduct a narratological analysis? By no means. As Jörn Rüsen and numerous others have described,<sup>47</sup> narrative is the fundamental form of processing history and of interpretive memory. Both the oral and written transmission of tradition utilize a narrative form in order to make the past communicable.

#### 4.1.2. Genre: Semi-Gospel or Sayings Collection?

Secondly, the question must be raised of whether or not a narratological approach requires a preliminary decision concerning the question of genre. Must one abandon the thesis of a 'sayings collection' or 'sayings source' since it is a 'gospel' that is characterized by narrativity? Certainly, the presentation of narrative connection on the macro-level provides a strong argument for Q as a 'gospel' as presented, for example, by Fleddermann. At the same time, we know, as demonstrated in the *Kompendium der Gleichnisse Jesu*, that even shorter sayings reveal a narrative structure. If one follows the views of Christoph Heil ('Spruchevangelium')<sup>48</sup> or Kloppenborg ('Sayings Gospel')<sup>49</sup> narrative aspects are, from the outset, also included. Even Marco Frenschkowski's 'Gattungsgeschichtliches Patch-Work',<sup>50</sup> leaves room for narrative forms. In other words, a narrative analysis is possible and useful, even apart from a definitive decision concerning the macro-genre of the text.

---

<sup>46</sup> A. D. BAUM, *Der mündliche Faktor und seine Bedeutung für die synoptische Frage: Analogien aus der antiken Literatur, der Experimentalpsychologie, der Oral Poetry-Forschung und dem rabbinischen Traditionswesen* (TANZ 49), Tübingen: Francke 2008, p. 386; R. A. HORSLEY/J. A. DRAPER, *Whoever Hears You Hears Me. Prophets, Performance, and Tradition in Q*, Harrisburg, Pa.: Trinity Press 1999, pp. 294-295; see further R. A. HORSLEY (ed.), *Oral Performance, Popular Tradition, and Hidden Transcript in Q* (Semeia Studies 60), Atlanta, Ga.: Society of Biblical Literature 2006.

<sup>47</sup> See chapter 2 'Historisches Erzählen' in J. RÜSEN, *Zerbrechende Zeit: Über den Sinn der Geschichte*, Köln: Böhlau 2001, pp. 43-105; A. MUNSLOW, *Narrative and History* (Theory and History), Basingtoke: Palgrave Macmillan 2007; and R. ZIMMERMANN, *Geschichtstheorie und Neues Testament: Gedächtnis, Diskurs, Kultur und Narration in der historiographischen Diskussion*, *Early Christianity* 2 (2011), pp. 417-444, esp. pp. 427-443: 'Die narratologische Geschichtswissenschaft'.

<sup>48</sup> C. HEIL, *Einleitung*, in: P. Hoffmann/C. Heil (eds.), *Die Spruchquelle Q: Studienausgabe: Griechisch und Deutsch*, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed., Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft/Leuven: Peeters 2009, pp. 11-28, esp. p. 20.

<sup>49</sup> See KLOPPENBORG VERBIN, *Excavating Q* (see n. 8), pp. 398-408, esp. p. 403.

<sup>50</sup> See M. FRENCHKOWSKI, *Q-Studien: Historische, religionsgeschichtliche und theologische Untersuchungen zur Logienquelle*, *Habilitationsschrift* (masch.), Johannes Gutenberg-Universität Mainz 2000, Kap. III, 3.

#### 4.1.3. Synchronic or Diachronic Approach?

Finally, the question concerning synchronic or diachronic approaches must be considered. Does a narrative analysis apply only to the extant intertext (to the extent that it can be reconstructed from Matthew and Luke) or should diachronic perspectives and various redactional layers also be considered?<sup>51</sup>

Fleddermann opposes the view that *Q* gradually grew through successive additions and seeks to establish the literary unity of the text with seven arguments. According to Fleddermann, '*Q* represents rather an original work written by a single author following a unified artistic and theological conception.'<sup>52</sup> Labahn also prefers the synchronic approach, referring to Richard Horsely, Jens Schröter and Alan Kirk.<sup>53</sup> However, as I have already mentioned above, narratives are the most basic forms of memory. Thus, even if we consider *Q* to be tradition-literature – and not the artefact of one single author – the basic stories as well as the macro-story which is told can be analyzed through narrative criticism. Nevertheless, it would be wise not to focus on a 'reconstruction behind the reconstruction,' but rather to deal with the intertext of the double tradition as we have it.

At this point, I would now like to consider some more general aspects of how one can approach the *Q* document through narrative criticism:

#### 4.1.4. A Fundamental Differentiation: Story and Discourse

Following the works of Seymour Chatman and Gérard Genette,<sup>54</sup> narrative theory has distinguished between 'story' and 'discourse', where the 'story' relates to the plot (the 'what' of the account) and 'discourse' relates to the manner in which the story is told (the 'how' of the account). Thus, in a narrative analysis of *Q* one could focus more on the content of the story (i.e., the Jesus story and its plot line) or the manner in which the story is told. Though it is possible to highlight one or the other of these two distinct foci, it is also important to recognize that they are closely interrelated, as Labahn has shown in his consideration of 'time' in the relationship between narrative time and narrated time.<sup>55</sup>

---

<sup>51</sup> See LABAHN, *Der Gekommene als Wiederkommender* (see n. 43), pp. 104-119.

<sup>52</sup> FLEDDERMANN, *Q: A Reconstruction and Commentary* (see n. 36), pp. 124-128.

<sup>53</sup> LABAHN, *Der Gekommene als Wiederkommender* (see n. 43), pp. 116-119.

<sup>54</sup> Cf. S. B. CHATMAN, *Story and Discourse: Narrative Structure in Fiction and Film*, Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press 1978 and G. GENETTE, *Discours du récit*, Paris: Édition du Seuil 2007.

<sup>55</sup> LABAHN, *Der Gekommene als Wiederkommender* (see n. 43), pp. 191-242.