

*F. Litvinau*

## **Personified Wisdom in the Sayings Gospel Q**

Present paper is dedicated to the reconstruction of the Q-sayings that are traditionally associated with the personified Wisdom. Further every text is supplied by the short commentary that discusses the aspects of the personified Wisdom found in these texts. Analysis of the redactional work of Matthew and Luke with these sayings shows that, since the evangelists are very faithful to the original extent of Q, the ideas associated with personified Wisdom played very important role in the theology of the very first followers of Jesus.

*Keywords:* Sayings Gospel Q, Synoptic Problem, Redaktionsgeschichte, Personified Wisdom, Christology.

### **INTRODUCTION**

The personification of the Wisdom is a characteristic motif, which is found in the Wisdom texts of the Hebrew Bible. In comparison to these texts, the New Testament in general does not demonstrate such a vision. However, there is a limited number of the texts where one can find such ideas. All of these texts are found in the Sayings Gospel Q. The goal of the present paper is to reconstruct (with certain degree of probability)

---

*Fiodar Litvinau* – Diploma in theology and religious studies of the Institute of Theology of the Belarusian State University (Minsk), Licentiate in Sacred Scripture (S.S.L.) of the Pontifical Biblical Institute (Rome), doctoral candidate of the Faculty of Protestant Theology at Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität (LMU) München (fed.lit@gmail.com)

the original text of the Q sayings that had to do with the personified Wisdom and to present a brief analysis of these texts. The study of every passage is threefold: 1) Synoptic comparison of the Matthean and Lucan versions of the Q-saying, 2) Reconstruction of the saying with detailed discussion of the textual variants, 3) Brief analysis of the aspects of the text based on the previous reconstruction.

### Q 7:31-35<sup>1</sup>

<i>Mt 11:16-19</i>	<i>Lk 7:31-35</i>
<sup>16</sup> <b>Τίνι δὲ ὁμοιώσω</b> <u>τὴν γενεὰν ταύτην;</u> <b>ὁμοία ἐστὶν παιδίῳ</b> <b>καθημένῳ ἐν ταῖς</b> <u>ἀγοραῖς</u> <b>ἃ προσφωνοῦντα</b> τοῖς ἑτέροις <sup>17</sup> <u>λέγουσιν·</u> <b>ἠυλόησαμεν ὑμῖν</b> <b>καὶ οὐκ</b> <u>ὠργήσασθε,</u> <u>ἐθρηνήσαμεν καὶ</u> <u>οὐκ ἐκόσμησθε.</u> <sup>18</sup> <u>ἦλθεν</u> γὰρ Ἰωάννης <u>μητε ἐσθίων μήτε</u> <u>πίνων,</u> <u>καὶ λέγουσιν·</u> <u>δαμόνιον ἔχει.</u> <sup>19</sup> <u>ἦλθεν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ</u> <u>ἀνθρώπου</u> <u>ἐσθίων καὶ πίνων,</u> <u>καὶ λέγουσιν·</u>	<sup>31</sup> <b>Τίνι οὖν ὁμοιώσω</b> τοὺς ἀνθρώπους <u>τῆς γενεᾶς ταύτης</u> καὶ τίνι εἰσὶν ὅμοιοι; <sup>32</sup> <u>ὅμοιοί εἰσιν παιδίῳ</u> τοῖς <u>ἐν ἀγορᾷ καθημένοις</u> καὶ <u>προσφωνοῦσιν</u> <u>ἀλλήλοις ἃ λέγει·</u> <u>ἠυλόησαμεν ὑμῖν</u> <u>καὶ οὐκ ὠργήσασθε,</u> <u>ἐθρηνήσαμεν καὶ οὐκ</u> <u>ἐκλαύσατε.</u> <sup>33</sup> <u>ἐλήλυθεν γὰρ Ἰωάννης</u> ὁ βαπτιστῆς <u>μη ἐσθίων ἄρτον μήτε</u> <u>πίνων οἶνον,</u> <u>καὶ λέγετε· δαμόνιον ἔχει.</u> <sup>34</sup> <u>ἐλήλυθεν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ</u> <u>ἀνθρώπου</u> <u>ἐσθίων καὶ πίνων,</u> <u>καὶ λέγετε·</u> <u>ἰδοὺ ἄνθρωπος φάγος καὶ</u>

<sup>1</sup> In the paralleled text I use the following method: 1) in **bold** are the words that are verbatim agreement; 2) underlined are the words that agree in stem but different in the grammatical form; 3) in *italics* are the words that have different stems but are semantically similar; 4) **bold underlined** are the phrases where more than four words stay in the same order.

<u>ἰδοὺ ἄνθρωπος</u> <u>φάγος καὶ οἰνοπότης,</u> <u>τελωνῶν φίλος καὶ</u> <u>ἀμαρτωλῶν.</u> <u>καὶ ἐδικαιώθη ἡ</u> <u>σοφία ἀπὸ τῶν</u> <u>ἔργων αὐτῆς.</u>	<u>οἰνοπότης,</u> <u>φίλος τελωνῶν καὶ</u> <u>ἀμαρτωλῶν.</u> <u><sup>35</sup> καὶ ἐδικαιώθη ἡ σοφία</u> <u>ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν τέκνων αὐτῆς.</u>
---	---

**Q 7:31** Τίτι<sup>1</sup> ὁμοιώσω τὴν γενεὰν ταύτην<sup>2</sup> καὶ τίτι ἐστὶν ὁμοία;<sup>3</sup> **32** ὁμοία ἐστὶν παιδίσις καθημένοις ἐν ἀγορᾷ<sup>4</sup> καὶ προσφωνοῦσιν τοῖς ἐτέροις<sup>5</sup> ἃ λέγει<sup>6</sup>. ἠυλήσαμεν ὑμῖν καὶ οὐκ ὠρχήσασθε, ἐθρηνήσαμεν καὶ οὐκ ἐκλαύσατε<sup>7</sup>. **33** ἦλθεν<sup>8</sup> γὰρ Ἰωάννης<sup>9</sup> μὴ<sup>10</sup> ἐσθίων μῆτε πίνων<sup>11</sup>, καὶ λέγουσιν<sup>12</sup>. δαιμόνιον ἔχει. **34** ἦλθεν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐσθίων καὶ πίνων, καὶ λέγουσιν· ἰδοὺ ἄνθρωπος φάγος καὶ οἰνοπότης, τελωνῶν φίλος<sup>13</sup> καὶ ἀμαρτωλῶν. **35** καὶ ἐδικαιώθη ἡ σοφία ἀπὸ πάντων<sup>14</sup> τῶν τέκνων<sup>15</sup> αὐτῆς.

1. Whether δέ or οὖν, is to be decided. Οὖν might function as a connection with previous section (PLUMMER, *St. Luke*, 206), but the same could be attributed to Matthean δέ. For οὖν: POLAG, *Fragmenta*, 42; SCHENK, *Synopse*, 46; VASSILIADIS, *LOGOI*, 93). CritEd and FLEDDERMANN (Q, 363) omit both as redactional, but if the particle stayed in Q in connection with previous material<sup>1</sup> before redaction of the evangelist, there should be some conjunction. However, the usage of τίτι with δέ is rare, and in the similar expressions (Q 13:18,20) τίτι stays alone, so we do not include it in the reconstruction.

2. Lucan τοὺς ἀνθρώπους and then change to genitive case seems to be secondary (cf. Q 11:31) for the sake of embellishment (HARNACK, *Sayings*, 18; SCHENK, *Synopse*, 46; HOFFMANN, *Studien*, 196; SCHULZ, *Q*, 379; FITZMYER, *Luke*, 679). Against: VASSILIADIS (*LOGOI*, 93), FLEDDERMANN (Q, 365)<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> It must be the questions of John and Jesus' words about him. Mt and Lk agree in placing Q 7:31-35 after Q 7:28 (Mt 11:2).

<sup>2</sup> He considers the word ἄνθρωπος as a catchword for the whole pericope (Q 7:25,34). However, the phrase 'this generation', except one instance does not stay together with "men". Q 11:31 in Lucan version

3. Καὶ τίτι εἰσὶν ὅμοιοι could be possibly Lucan redactional repetition (cf. SCHENK, *Synopse*, 46). Luke has a tendency to insert the questions in the similitude construction (cf. Lk 13:18<sup>1</sup>). But the typical construction of Q similitude is following: subject + ὁμοιὸς/τα ἐστὶν + indirect object. At the same time, the shorter Matthean version could be redactional. Since HARNACK, many scholars thought it probably coming from Q, because the *parallelismus membrorum* is typical for Q, while Matthew usually destroys it (HARNACK, *Sayings*, 18; more recently: POLAG, *Fragmenta*, 42; HOFFMANN, *Studien*, 196; SCHULZ, *Q*, 379; STEINHAUSER, *Doppelbildworte*, 159; VASSILIADIS, *LOGOI*, 93; CritEd; FLEDDERMANN, *Q*, 365). The reconstruction requires also change to the singular.

4. Τοῖς is obviously Lucan addition (STEINHAUSER, *Doppelbildworte*, 159<sup>2</sup>). It is difficult to decide in case of ἀγορά, whether plural (Mt) or singular (Lk). In Mt 20:3, also in the context of a parable, the word is singular. Matthean version could be preferred for the plural fits better to the general parabolic expression rather than Lucan singular. However, in Q 4:3, Luke has singular against Matthean plural<sup>3</sup>. Lucan ἐν ἀγορᾷ is almost unique in the New Testament<sup>4</sup> where it is always used with an article. Hence, POLAG (*Fragmenta*, 42), HOFFMANN (*Studien*, 197<sup>5</sup>), SCHULZ (*Q*, 379) and STEINHAUSER

---

states ἀνδρῶν τῆς γενεᾶς ταύτης, while Matthean version does not have ἀνδρῶν. Lucan insertion in Q 11:31 is probably due to Q 11:32, and thus is not a proof for Q 7:31. Other examples of ‘this generation’ demonstrate it always as a singular (cf. CASEY, *Aramaic*, 129).

<sup>1</sup> This example might be useful but the similar text in Mk 4:30, which overlaps with Q 13:18, could influence Luke to redact 7:31 in the same manner. See FLEDDERMANN (*Q*, 364-365), who considers unlikely the influence of Mk 4:30 on Q 7:31.

<sup>2</sup> He considers it to be a “Hellenistic improvement”.

<sup>3</sup> Lk τῷ λίθῳ against Mt οἱ λίθοι. In this context, the singular is not expected hence is probably original.

<sup>4</sup> Except the awkward ἀπ’ ἀγορᾶς in Mk 7:4.

<sup>5</sup> Matthean “Plural die Beobachtung“ with reference to SCHÜRMANN, *Lukasevangelium*, 423 Anm. 114.

(*Doppelbildworte*, 159), VASSILIADIS (*LOGOI*, 93) prefer this version (against CritEd).

5. Matthean τοῖς ἑτέροις is preferred (POLAG, *Fragmenta*, 42; SCHENK, *Synopse*, 46; SCHULZ, *Q*, 379; CASEY, *Aramaic*, 129; against VASSILIADIS, *LOGOI*, 93). The plural fits better to the context; ἀλλήλοις is typically Lucan (so STEINHAUSER, *Doppelbildworte*, 160).

6. Matthean version is favored by CritEd (there is logical sequence of participles καθημένοις – προσφωνοῦντα), although it could be an improvement of the Lucan *lectio difficilior* as HOFFMANN (*Studien*, 197) proposes<sup>1</sup>. Against HOFFMANN are SCHULZ (*Q*, 379)<sup>2</sup>, STEINHAUSER (*Doppelbildworte*, 160) who do not consider Lucan reading so difficult as it seems. However, Lucan singular λέγει looks really awkward, and this awkwardness could be a hint for originality of this reading. As well, if under the children who invite, we understand ‘this generation’, it becomes quite explainable, why Q-editor left there a singular verb.

7. It is difficult to choose between two verbs. Κλαίω is preferred by Luke<sup>3</sup> and is found only once in Q 6:21. Matthew uses κόπτω in middle voice one more time (Mt 24:30) so it could also be redactional. Luke has κόπτω twice (Lk 8:52<sup>4</sup> and Lk 23:27<sup>5</sup>), in both contexts the verb means traditional mourning<sup>6</sup>. I suppose that Lucan ἐκλάυσατε is the original reading (so VASSILIADIS, *LOGOI*, 94; CritEd), because Luke had no

---

<sup>1</sup> VASSILIADIS (*LOGOI*, 93) prefers the entire Lucan passage.

<sup>2</sup> SCHULZ: “Lk hat auch den Satzbau geändert, der bei Mt mit ᾧ προσφωνοῦντα ... λέγουσιν ursprünglicher bewahrt ist, indem er das die direkte Rede einleitende ᾧ λέγει subordiniert“.

<sup>3</sup> It is found mostly in L or Mk sections.

<sup>4</sup> ἔκλαιον δὲ πάντες καὶ ἐκόπτοντο αὐτήν.

<sup>5</sup> γυναικῶν αἱ ἐκόπτοντο καὶ ἐθρήνουσαν(!) αὐτόν.

<sup>6</sup> In Syriac version, in Mt 11:17 both verbs ‘to dance’ and ‘to mourn’ come from the same root (ܟܘܝܢܐ). Hence, the phrase itself is a word-play: ܟܘܝܢܐ ܕܘܟܘܝܢܐ ܟܘܝܢܐ ܕܘܟܘܝܢܐ. This reading can point to the originality of the text, if we assume that Q-Vorlage was Aramaic. However, it could be a redactional feature of the Syriac translator who wanted to make the text sound more rhythmical for the Aramaic speakers.

reason to replace κόπτω here, where the context has to do with funerary customs, as he uses it in different places (against HARNACK, *Sayings*, 18; POLAG, *Fragmenta*, 42; SCHENK, *Synopse*, 46; HOFFMANN, *Studien*, 197; SCHULZ, *Q*, 379; FLEDDERMANN, *Q*, 366).

8. Luke changes form of the verb from aorist to perfect for the improvement of style, and the same is valid for Q 7:34 (HARNACK, *Sayings*, 19; POLAG, *Fragmenta*, 42; SCHENK, *Synopse*, 46; HOFFMANN, *Studien*, 197; against VASSILIADIS (*LOGOI*, 94).

9. Lucan ὁ βαπτιστῆς is obviously redactional (VASSILIADIS (*LOGOI*, 93; CritEd), though STEINHAUSER (*Doppelbildworte*, 162) claims it originality.

10. CritEd and VASSILIADIS (*LOGOI*, 93) prefer simple Lucan μή instead of Matthean μήτε. Both versions are possible, but in light of Q 10:4 I prefer Lucan version.

11. Addition of bread and wine are obviously secondary (FLEDDERMANN, *Q*, 367).

12. The verb λέγουσιν is probably original since the previous sayings used the third person, and the rest of Q (11:29-32, 50-51) speaks about ‘this generation’ always in third person<sup>1</sup>. As well, Luke probably wanted to “heighten the parenetic appeal of the text” (FLEDDERMANN, *Q*, 367). For preference of the Lucan version: POLAG, *Fragmenta*, 42; HOFFMANN, *Studien*, 197<sup>2</sup>; VASSILIADIS *LOGOI*, 93; CritEd.

13. For the word order, CritEd and POLAG (*Fragmenta*, 42) prefer Matthean version. It is correct because the word

---

<sup>1</sup> There are no examples where ‘this generation’ is explicitly called ‘you’. In the series of the ‘Woes’ addressed to the Pharisees and the Teachers of Law (Q 11:42, 39b, 41, 43-44, 46b, 52, 47-48) the phrase does not appear, although it stays in Q 11:50 that follows immediately the ‘Woes’. Nevertheless, the Wisdom-oracle Q 11:49-51 was added to the ‘Woes’ in order to make a connection to the motif of the persecuted prophets.

<sup>2</sup> „...ihre redaktionelle Einführung in die „Rede“, die sich an die Menge richtet, ist unwahrscheinlich. Dagegen ist das neutrale λέγουσιν (Mt 11:18f.) als Anpassung an die allgemeine Aussage des Gleichnisses verständlich“. However, the pedagogical interest from Luke’s side is more apparent here.

φίλος is not Matthean favorite and the word order is so awkward that it needs the correction (against VASSILIADIS, *LOGOI*, 93).

14. For Harnack πάντων belongs to the Lucan redaction (*Sayings*, 19; also HOFFMANN, *Studien*, 197; SCHULZ, *Q*, 380). However, as it seems from the text of Q, Matthew has tendency to have πᾶς in the place where Luke omits it (Q 6:22, 6:49, 11:17, 33<sup>1</sup>). Hence if Luke preserves it, it must be original (so VASSILIADIS, *LOGOI*, 93).

15. The Lucan version is preferred. The motif of ‘children’ is prominent in Q (3:8, 10:21, 11:11-13, 13:34 etc.), and there are reasons for Matthew to change the original obscure saying and connect it with τὰ ἔργα τοῦ Χριστοῦ (Mt 11:2) (cf. HARNACK, *Sayings*, 19; LÜHRMANN, *Redaktion*, 30; POLAG, *Fragmenta*, 42; SCHENK, *Synopse*, 46; HOFFMANN, *Studien*, 197; SCHULZ, *Q*, 380; VASSILIADIS, *LOGOI*, 93; CritEd; FLEDDERMANN, *Q*, 367). Against – CASEY, *Aramaic*, 143.

Q 7:31-35 is connected to the previous sayings (Q 7:1-9, 18-19, 22-28), which have to do with conversion of the Gentiles and dialog between John and Jesus. However, both versions agree in the positioning of the pericope after the saying about John as the greatest among women’s offspring (Q 7:28/Mt 11:11) but insert new material between two sayings<sup>2</sup>. The word agreement is very high and the redactional interventions do not change much of the original meaning of the saying.

Q 7:31-35 consists of three parts<sup>3</sup>: a) a parable of the children in a market-place with an introduction<sup>4</sup> (Q 7:31-32), b) commentary words about John and the Son of man, c) a con-

---

<sup>1</sup> In these texts, it seems to be original.

<sup>2</sup> Matthew inserts Q 16:16 (Mt 11:12-13) and special material between the sayings, while Luke has Lk 7:29-30 (which could be also ascribed to Q) before Q 7:31fol.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. KLOPPENBORG, *Formation*, 110.

<sup>4</sup> I do not consider the introduction “To what I shall compare ... etc.” as a separate unit since the catchword ὁμοίος connects both parts.

clusive statement about the Wisdom and her children<sup>1</sup>, which reflects also the redactional/compositional history of the passage<sup>2</sup>. The original similitude about ‘this generation’ (vv.31-32) was expanded by the interpretational parallelism between John and Jesus (vv.33-34) in order to specify and explain the parable, and then the last saying about the children of Wisdom (v.35) was added in order to summarize the saying<sup>3</sup>. The originally separate traditions were joined together by the catchword and thematic agreement<sup>4</sup>.

In comparison to the previous sections, Q 7:31-35 changes both theme and form<sup>5</sup>. Now Jesus does not speak about John anymore but turns to ‘this generation’ (Q 7:31) and speaks about it in the form of the parable or, preferable, *similitude* (cf. ὁμοιώσω). The beginning introduces a new “character” which is γενεὰ αὐτῆ – ‘this generation’. Here it appears for the first time in Q, but is connected to the sayings that report John’s words about the “brood of vipers” γεννήματα ἐχιδνῶν (Q 3:7). We have to note that the phrase ‘this generation’ is a catchword in the Wisdom passages of Q (cf. Q 11:31,32,51). The introduction to Q 3:7-9 demonstrates connection with Q 7:29-30, where the Pharisees and the baptism are mentioned. It demonstrates that both sayings are to be understood in the context of imminent judgment. Although in Q 3:7-9 the addressee of John’s speech are the Pharisees, the audience of Q 7:31 is different. From the previous context one may conclude that the implied audience of the saying is the crowd (Q 7:24) that listens Jesus’ speech about John (Q 7:22-28). However, the accent now changes. Jesus speech is resembling the speech of John the Baptist and the parable unites them both in the context of the apocalyptic judgment.

---

<sup>1</sup> LUZ (*Matthew 8-20*, 145) considers v.35 (Mt 11:19) to be a narrator’s commentary.

<sup>2</sup> SCHULZ insists that Q 7:31-35 was no original unity (Q, 381).

<sup>3</sup> Cf. TUCKETT, Q, 176.

<sup>4</sup> KLOPPENBORG, *Excavating Q*, 126.

<sup>5</sup> LÜHRMANN, *Redaktion*, 25.

‘This generation’<sup>1</sup> is compared to the children who play the games related to the traditional circle of life. Motif of “childhood” plays an important role in Q. There are different terms for this in Q. The word παῖς appears once in Q (7:7<sup>2</sup>) while here we have παιδίοι, which served to denote the age category<sup>3</sup>. The association of ‘this generation’ with the children may point to the aspects of immaturity and folly of the accused part. The place of their games (ἀγορά) is found also in Q 11:43 where it is used in the ‘woe’ context<sup>4</sup>.

The children are divided into two groups, those who invite and those who reject the invitation. The presence of ἑτέροις underlines the distinction between two groups: one that invites is strictly separated from another<sup>5</sup>. To the inviting party belong, long, respectively, boys and girls<sup>6</sup>, because the games represent sent a wedding and a funeral<sup>7</sup>, i.e. the male and female characters are in mind. That means that two groups represent the entire society, hence ‘this generation’ must not be limited to exclusively Jews or Pharisees, nor should one overestimate the temporal dimension of the word ‘generation’. The inviting part accuses the second group for unresponsiveness.

The phrase seems to be rooted in Wisdom tradition, if we compare it with Eccl 3:4 (LXX): καιρὸς τοῦ κλαῦσαι καὶ καιρὸς τοῦ γελᾶσαι<sup>8</sup> καιρὸς τοῦ κόψασθαι καὶ καιρὸς τοῦ ὀρχήσασθαι. The parallelism is hardly accidental. It is quite

---

<sup>1</sup> The negative usage of the expression is attested in Num 32:13, Dt 1:35, 32:5, 20.

<sup>2</sup> Q 7:7 contributes little for the present context since it speaks about a boy of the centurion and no and thus has not to neither with Wisdom tradition, nor with judgment context.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. OEPKE, παῖς, TDNT V, 638.

<sup>4</sup> Although we cannot immediately conclude that market-place had some negative connotation for Q editor, we should notice the fact that the ‘agora’ was regarded as opposite to Q people. Did Q-people see the overcrowded cities as opponents of their rural environment?

<sup>5</sup> Cf. TUCKETT, Q, 176.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. JEREMIAS, *Gleichnisse*, 161.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>8</sup> This passage clearly reminds of Q 6:21 (Lk): μακάριοι οἱ κλαίοντες νῦν, ὅτι γελᾶσετε.

possible that the source of phrase was a proverbial saying that resembled or could be borrowed from Ecclesiastes. Read in this view, the accusation from the side of the inviting children is due to the inappropriateness of the reaction of the invited ones. Contrary to the Eccl 3:4, the accusers speak about rejection in the past tense<sup>1</sup>, as the fact has already happened. The text does not provide the reason of such behavior of the invited part, which could be explained by the allegorical character of the parable.

The part Q 7:33-34 functions as the interpretative commentary to the parable, and not otherwise<sup>2</sup>. This is confirmed by the evidence of the parable itself. It is difficult to associate John and Jesus with the inviting children because: a) ‘this generation’ is compared to the children rather than part that refuses, b) as was said before, the groups are both male and female, c) chronological order does not correspond to the order of John’s and Jesus’ ministry, d) it seems logical that those who speak in the parable, now pronounce their judgment about John and Jesus<sup>3</sup>, e) rejection of John and Jesus is bound to their life style and not their preaching<sup>4</sup>.

We have to notice, that while John is called by his name, Jesus speaks of himself as a ‘Son of man’. There is no reason to interpret this title in the context as a messianic one<sup>5</sup>. At the same time, ‘son of man’ has been often associated with Wisdom.

The conclusive statement (Q 7:35) brings Wisdom into play. Here the Wisdom must be understood as personified<sup>6</sup>. This is clearly a later addition because the parable is understandable by itself<sup>7</sup> and the saying could be originally inde-

---

<sup>1</sup> Notice the aorist forms of the verbs.

<sup>2</sup> However, two parts are difficult to reconcile (cf. LUZ, *Matthew* 8-20, 146).

<sup>3</sup> Cf. DAVIES, ALLISON, *Matthew* II, 262.

<sup>4</sup> KLOPPENBORG, *Formation*, 111.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. SUGGS, *Wisdom*, 50. FITZMYER considers the “son of man” to be a surrogate for I (*Luke* I, 681)

<sup>6</sup> CHRIST, *Jesus*, 65.

<sup>7</sup> SUGGS, *Wisdom*, 34.

pendent saying<sup>1</sup>. CHRIST describes her as ‘Mysterium’ that is revealing in Jesus<sup>2</sup> but the context does not support this reading. She is an adversary of ‘this generation’ for they both are female figures and hence have the children. The ‘children of Wisdom’ are those who do not collaborate with the children of ‘this generation’. The activity and fate of Wisdom’s children gave her right to pronounce judgment on the unrepentant generation.

Wisdom is important in so far as she is acting in their children. But here she plays a passive role, when the children are those who justify her. The verb ἐδικαιώθη does not necessarily refers to the past but must be understood in present<sup>3</sup>. “All the children”, as we have chosen the Lucan reading, underlines universalistic connotation of the passage. As in Q 11:50, *all* the blood will be required from this generation, thus all the prophets, from Abel and Zachariah, are the children of Wisdom, and John and Jesus belong to this line<sup>4</sup>.

This generation appears in Q as the main antagonist and this metaphorical language could represent the battle between Wisdom and Folly and thus struggle between children of Wisdom and earthly generation.

### Q 11:49-51

Mt 23:34-36	Lk 11:49-51
<sup>34</sup> <b>διὰ τοῦτο</b> ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ <u>ἀποστέλλω</u> πρὸς ὑμᾶς <b>προφήτας καὶ</b> σοφοὺς καὶ γραμματεῖς· <b>ἐξ αὐτῶν ἀποκτενεῖτε</b> καὶ σταυρώσετε καὶ ἐξ αὐτῶν μαστιγώσετε ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς ὑμῶν <b>καὶ</b> <u>διώξετε</u>	<sup>49</sup> <b>διὰ τοῦτο</b> καὶ ἡ σοφία τοῦ θεοῦ εἶπεν· <u>ἀποστελῶ</u> εἰς αὐτοὺς <b>προφήτας καὶ</b> ἀποστόλους, καὶ ἐξ <b>αὐτῶν</b> <u>ἀποκτενοῦσιν</u> <b>καὶ διώξουσιν</b> , <sup>50</sup> ἵνα ἐκζητηθῇ τὸ

<sup>1</sup> SUGGS, *Wisdom*, 33.

<sup>2</sup> CHRIST, *Jesus*, 66.

<sup>3</sup> It must correspond to Hebrew קִדְשָׁה (QH ST, *Jesus*, 64).

<sup>4</sup> Cf. SUGGS, *Wisdom*, 35.

<p>ἀπὸ πόλεως εἰς πόλιν·  <sup>35</sup> ὅπως ἔλθῃ ἐφ' ὑμᾶς  <u>πάν</u> <u>αἷμα</u> δίκαιον  <u>ἐκχυνόμενον</u> ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς  <u>ἀπὸ</u> τοῦ <u>αἵματος</u> Ἄβελ τοῦ  δικαίου  ἕως τοῦ <u>αἵματος</u>  <b>Ζαχαρίου</b> υἱοῦ Βαραχίου,  ὃν <u>ἐφονεύσατε</u> <u>μεταξὺ</u> τοῦ  ναοῦ <u>καὶ</u> τοῦ <u>θυσιαστηρίου</u>.  <sup>36</sup> <u>ἀμὴν</u> λέγω ὑμῖν, ἥξει  ταῦτα πάντα ἐπὶ  <u>τὴν</u> <u>γενεὰν</u> <u>ταύτην</u>.</p>	<p><u>αἷμα</u> <u>πάντων</u> τῶν  προφητῶν  τὸ <u>ἐκκεχυμένον</u> ἀπὸ  καταβολῆς κόσμου ἀπὸ τῆς  γενεᾶς ταύτης,  <sup>51</sup> <u>ἀπὸ</u> <u>αἵματος</u> Ἄβελ  ἕως <u>αἵματος</u>  <b>Ζαχαρίου</b>  τοῦ <u>ἀπολομένου</u>  <u>μεταξὺ</u> τοῦ <u>θυσιαστηρίου</u>  <u>καὶ</u> τοῦ <u>οἴκου</u>.  <u>ναὶ</u> <u>λέγω</u> ὑμῖν,  ἐκζητηθήσεται ἀπὸ  <u>τῆς</u> <u>γενεᾶς</u> <u>ταύτης</u>.</p>
--	--

**Q 11:49** Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ἡ σοφία τοῦ θεοῦ εἶπεν<sup>1</sup>. ἐγὼ<sup>2</sup> ἀποστελῶ<sup>3</sup> εἰς αὐτοὺς<sup>4</sup> προφήτας καὶ σοφοὺς<sup>5</sup> καὶ<sup>6</sup> ἐξ αὐτῶν ἀποκτενοῦσιν<sup>7</sup> καὶ διώξουσιν, **50** ἵνα<sup>8</sup> ἐκζητηθῇ<sup>9</sup> τὸ αἷμα πάντων τῶν προφητῶν<sup>10</sup> τὸ ἐκκεχυμένον<sup>11</sup> ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου<sup>12</sup> ἀπὸ τῆς γενεᾶς ταύτης<sup>13</sup>, **51** ἀπὸ<sup>14</sup> αἵματος Ἄβελ ἕως<sup>15</sup> αἵματος Ζαχαρίου<sup>16</sup> τοῦ ἀπολομένου<sup>17</sup> μεταξὺ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου καὶ τοῦ οἴκου<sup>18</sup>. ναὶ<sup>19</sup> λέγω ὑμῖν, ἥξει ταῦτα πάντα ἐπὶ τὴν γενεὰν ταύτην<sup>20</sup>.

1. Matthean version is shorter but hardly original. The verse resembles an introduction to the quotation of an (lost?) oracle<sup>1</sup>, so there are better reasons to choose Lucan version as an independent from theological tendency of identification of Jesus with Wisdom (cf. STECK, *Israel*, 29; SCHULZ, *Q*, 336; POLAG, *Fragmenta*, 56; CritEd; CASEY, *Aramaic*, 99). This explains the addition of ἰδοῦ (HARNACK, *Sayings*, 103; FLEDDERMANN, *Q*, 545) and the change of the tense of λέγω from aorist to present (Mt). Lucan καί could be redactional<sup>2</sup> as well as the phrase τοῦ θεοῦ (Lk) in the text (cf. CritEd;

<sup>1</sup> BULTMANN, *Tradition*, 114.

<sup>2</sup> In Q 12:40, Matthean version reads διὰ τοῦτο καὶ (Mt 24:44).

FLEDDERMANN, *Q*, 545), but it is not necessary because this type of phrases is typical for Q<sup>1</sup>.

2. It is quite probable that the original oracle had ἐγώ as in Mt, and Luke has eliminated (cf. HARNACK, *Sayings*, 103), which is confirmed by Q 7:27 and Q 19:23<sup>2</sup> (against SCHULZ, *Q*, 336; POLAG, *Fragmenta*, 56; VASSILIADIS, *LOGOI*, 102; CritEd; FLEDDERMANN, *Q*, 545).

3. The versions have different tense of the verb ἀποστέλλω: Mt – present, Lk – future. It is difficult to decide which is original, because both variants speak not about the past, which could be understandable in the context, but of what is happening or is going to happen. We prefer the Lucan reading (with subjunctive sense) as a more general one which fits better to the style of the oracle speech<sup>3</sup> (cf. SCHULZ, *Q*, 336; also POLAG, *Fragmenta*, 56; VASSILIADIS, *LOGOI*, 102; CritEd; FLEDDERMANN, *Q*, 545). HARNACK (*Sayings*, 103) relies on Mt since Lucan correction was done for the sake of conclusion, which is not correct since διὰ τοῦτο should be added on the later phase of redaction of Q.

4. Lucan εἰς αὐτούς is preferable (also in the following verbs) because it follows the oracle-speech context, while the Matthean version is obviously adapted to the ‘Woe’ context and because of this he changed the third person to the second (cf. SCHULZ, *Q*, 336; also POLAG, *Fragmenta*, 56; VASSILIADIS, *LOGOI*, 102; CritEd; FLEDDERMANN, *Q*, 545).

5. Lucan ἀποστόλους is redactional<sup>4</sup>, while Matthean σοφοῦς is original (CATCHPOLE, *Quest*, 270; CritEd; FLEDDERMANN, *Q*, 545) because of the fact that we are dealing with Wisdom-oracle. However, STECK (*Israel*, 30), SCHULZ (*Q*, 336), POLAG (*Fragmenta*, 56) and VASSILIADIS (*LOGOI*, 102), claim the originality of Lucan version, because the ‘apostles’ in the context should not be understood as the Christian ones. This explanation is not satisfactory since Matthew has no

---

<sup>1</sup> Q 11:20, 12:8.

<sup>2</sup> Q-editor often uses emphatic ἐγώ: Q 3:16, 7:8, 11:19-20.

<sup>3</sup> However, there could be just a scribal mistake during transmission of the text.

<sup>4</sup> It appears 6 time in the Gospel, while in Mt only once.

reason to eliminate the word when he makes Jesus the proclaimer of these words and thus addressing the present Matthean community. Luke used ἀπόστολοι probably under the influence of Q 13:34<sup>1</sup>. The choice of γραμματεῖς is more complicated. HARNACK (*Sayings*, 103) and CASEY (*Aramaic*, 99) stand for its originality, since Matthew would hardly insert it in the text because of the negative connotation (cf. Mt 23). Nevertheless, in Mt 13:52 the term does not have negative character. Luke never has γραμματεῦς in his Q sections, while Matthew inserts it in the passages, where Lucan subjects are not identified (Mt 8:19/Q 9:57, Mt 12:38/Q 11:16) or where only one subject was present (Mt 23:23/Q 11:42 and fol.). This speaks for the secondary character of the Matthean version (cf. CritEd; FLEDDERMANN, *Q*, 545).

6. Καί could be a Lucan addition (see n.2; HARNACK, *Sayings*, 103) but I suppose that it is rather Matthean omission because of the following list of καί in Mt 23:34b (cf. FLEDDERMANN, *Q*, 545; also SCHULZ, *Q*, 337<sup>2</sup>; POLAG, *Fragmenta*, 56; VASSILIADIS, *LOGOI*, 102; CritEd).

7. Matthew changes the verb to the second person (see n.4) and makes additions which describe the kinds of persecution, which were probably influenced by the later persecution of the Christian communities<sup>3</sup> (HARNACK, *Sayings*, 104; STECK, *Israel*, 31<sup>4</sup>; SCHULZ, *Q*, 337; POLAG, *Fragmenta*, 56; CritEd; FLEDDERMANN, *Q*, 545).

8. Ἰνα is more typical for Q than ὅπως (Q 4:3, 6:31, 7:6); the latter is clearly Matthean<sup>5</sup> (cf. SCHULZ, *Q*, 337; also POLAG, *Fragmenta*, 56; VASSILIADIS, *LOGOI*, 102; CritEd; FLEDDERMANN, *Q*, 545; against HARNACK, *Sayings*, 103).

9. It is difficult to decide which version is original. Both Matthean and Lucan verbs have the same meaning. Lucan

---

<sup>1</sup> The stoning of the envoys recalls the episode of Stephen's martyrdom (Act 7).

<sup>2</sup> "...semitisierenden καί-Anschluß".

<sup>3</sup> Cf. BULTMANN, *Tradition*, 114; the "midrashic expansion", according to CASEY, *Aramaic*, 99.

<sup>4</sup> The addition was influenced by Mt 10:17 of

<sup>5</sup> 17 times in Mt against 7 in Lk.

ἐκζητέω is rare (*lectio difficilior*, LÜHRMANN, *Redaktion*, 46; SCHULZ, *Q*, 337; POLAG, *Fragmenta*, 56; VASSILIADIS, *LOGOI*, 102) and hence is original (although it is found also in Act 15:17). Act 5:28 reads “ἐπαγαγεῖν ἐφ’ ἡμᾶς τὸ αἷμα” and it can lead us to think that Luke would not replace the expression that he uses elsewhere by such a rare word. HARNACK considers Matthean ἔλθη ἐπὶ to be original because of its Semitic character (*Sayings*, 103), but the similar phrase is found in Mt 27:25 (τὸ αἷμα αὐτοῦ ἐφ’ ἡμᾶς καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ τέκνα ἡμῶν) which is clearly Matthean. FLEDDERMANN (*Q*, 546) also considers Matthean ἔλθη ἐπὶ to be original, however, without enough justification<sup>1</sup>.

10. Matthew put πᾶν before αἷμα and substituted τῶν προφητῶν with δικαίον (HARNACK, *Sayings*, 104) in order to solve the awkwardness of mentioning of the persons who were not counted as the prophets (cf. STECK, *Israel*, 31; SCHULZ, *Q*, 337; POLAG, *Fragmenta*, 56; VASSILIADIS, *LOGOI*, 102; CritEd).

11. STECK supposes that Lucan perfect participle ἐκκεχυμένον is original because it has in mind the fate of the Old Testament prophets but Matthew rather thinks about present persecutions (*Israel*, 31; also SCHULZ, *Q*, 338; cf. VASSILIADIS, *LOGOI*, 97; CritEd).

12. The phrase ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου is unlikely to be Lucan (cf. STECK, *Israel*, 31; POLAG, *Fragmenta*, 56; VASSILIADIS, *LOGOI*, 103; CritEd), for it is found nowhere else in his writings. Matthew used it twice (Mt 13:35, 25:34) and it is quite strange that he would eliminate it, if it was in his Q-Vorlage. HARNACK claims that ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου was inserted by Luke on the place of superfluous ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς (*Sayings*, 104; also CATCHPOLE, *Quest*, 270<sup>2</sup>). However, this super-

---

<sup>1</sup> He considers the sequence of triple ἀπό + ἕως to be the Lucan redaction and finds it sufficient to suppose the heavy redaction of Luke in this Q section (11:50-51).

<sup>2</sup> “‘from the foundation of the world’ [is] less Semitic than Matthew’s ‘upon the ground’ (2 Sam 14:14) and brought in to smooth the transition to the Abel reference”. This actually speaks against the

fluity could be due to Matthean redaction that inserts ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς for the sake of explicitness (cf. STECK, *Israel*, 31; SCHULZ, *Q*, 338).

13. The notion of ‘this generation’ should not be seen as Lucan addition (against HARNACK, *Sayings*, 104; FLEDDERMANN, *Q*, 547), since Q sometimes uses the repetitions especially when it has strong affirmation like in Q 7:26<sup>1</sup>. POLAG (*Fragmenta*, 56), however, puts it into brackets. Matthew has obviously eliminated the phrase about the generation because his ἐφ’ ὑμᾶς has changed the addressee of the speech (cf. SCHULZ, *Q*, 338; VASSILIADIS, *LOGOI*, 103; CritEd).

14. The articles in Mt were used for the sake of embellishment.

15. See n.14.

16. Matthean additions seem to give more reverence to the mentioned figures (cf. HARNACK, *Sayings*, 104; POLAG, *Fragmenta*, 56; CritEd).

17. Since Matthew had changed the whole discourse into address to the second person, here the guilt for murdering lies upon the accused side (i.e. Pharisees and the teachers of Law). Lucan version does not have such claims and hence is probably original (cf. STECK, *Israel*, 31; POLAG, *Fragmenta*, 56; VASSILIADIS, *LOGOI*, 103; CritEd). HARNACK (*Sayings*, 104), incorrectly, claims that Luke has avoided verb φονεύειν on the base of Q 11:48 (Mt 23:31) but in Q 11:49 we see ἀποκτείνειν which Matthew preserves, and in Lk 18:20 (par. Mk 10:19) Luke leaves μὴ φονεύσης without any change (cf. SCHULZ, *Q*, 338). It means that Luke did not want to avoid the verbs which are semantically close to “murder”. FLEDDERMANN (*Q*, 547) claims that both versions are redactional and proposes the ἀπεκτείναν on that place, but this claim is insufficient.

18. Lucan οἶκος is original (cf. Q 13:35) (HARNACK, *Sayings*, 105; STECK, *Israel*, 32; POLAG, *Fragmenta*, 56;

---

Matthean version; the reference to the “earth” is an allusion to the story of Abel (Gen 4:10).

<sup>1</sup> Both Matthew and Luke agree in repetition of προφήτης which is followed by ναί.

VASSILIADIS, *LOGOI*, 103; CritEd; FLEDDERMANN, *Q*, 547). Matthew has νόος 8 times against Lucan 4 (against CATCHPOLE, *Quest*, 270).

19. Ναί is clearly from Q (cf. Q 7:26, 10:21, 12:5) (POLAG, *Fragmenta*, 56; VASSILIADIS, *LOGOI*, 103; CritEd; against HARNACK, *Sayings*, 105; FLEDDERMANN, *Q*, 547).

20. Luke has ἐκζητηθήσεται while Matthew has ἤξει. Verb ἦκω appears in Mt three times in Q sections<sup>1</sup> and once in M<sup>2</sup>. In Lk, the proportion is similar: three times in Q<sup>3</sup> and twice in L<sup>4</sup>. The frequency of the verb in Q makes think that it stayed in Q and that Matthean version is original (also HARNACK, *Sayings*, 105). Against are STECK, *Israel*, 33-34; POLAG, *Fragmenta*, 56; VASSILIADIS, *LOGOI*, 103; CritEd. SCHULZ (*Q*, 338) supposes that ἦκω was inserted by Matthew in conformity with v.35, but this is unlikely since the verbs of movement come from different stems. It is more likely that Luke added ἐκζητηθήσεται in conformity with v. 50.

According to the structure of the passage, we are dealing with a Wisdom-oracle, although not with one that provides the common practical wisdom, but rather with a speech that pronounces the condemnation of the people for their crimes. In this way, it is more comparable with a doom oracle<sup>5</sup>. Both Evangelists agree in placing the oracle in the sequence of the Woes against the teachers of the Law (Q 11:39-52) and after the saying about the fathers who persecuted the prophets (Q 11:47-48). Both Matthew and Luke preserve the original extent of Q.

The origin of the passage is a matter of debate. The introductory phrase may indicate the quotation from an earlier source<sup>6</sup>. Against that speaks the structure of the Woes in Q 11:39-52. The entire sequence could be composed by the pattern of the prophetic oracle like Isa 5:8-14 and thus there is no

---

<sup>1</sup> Mt 8:11 (Q 13:29), 24:50 (Q 12:46).

<sup>2</sup> Mt 24:14.

<sup>3</sup> Lk/Q 12:46, 13:29, 13:35.

<sup>4</sup> Lk 15:27, 19:43.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Isa 5:24, 5:8. Cf. SUGGS, *Wisdom*, 17.

<sup>6</sup> SUGGS, *Wisdom*, 16; CHRIST, *Jesus*, 124.

reason to assume that Q 11:49-51 is a quotation<sup>1</sup>. This vision fails to see that the change of the addressee is an important point: the oracle is directed not against the Pharisees and the teachers of Law but against ‘this generation’<sup>2</sup>. We cannot easily equate the former with the later. As well, the rest of the Woes reproaches the Pharisees and Lawyers not for the killing of the prophets but rather for building their tombs, while the Wisdom oracle accuses ‘this generation’ for the killing and persecution of them. Thus, the oracle was not originally unity with Q 11:39-52 but was connected by the catchwords during the redaction<sup>3</sup>.

The structure of the episode is four-fold: a) short introduction if the speaker (‘therefore the Wisdom of God says’, Q 11:49a), b) a saying about the sending and persecution of the prophets (Q 11:49b), c) a saying about the consequence of the persecution (Q 11:50-51a), d) an affirmation of the previous saying (Q 11:51b).

The introductive *διὰ τοῦτο* is found in Q 11:19, 12:22. While the first example appears in the context of “Beelzebul accusation”, the second is found in the wisdom context, rather than in forensic one. In all the instances, the phrase functions as a connection with the previous material. The phrase corresponds to the typical introduction of the speech of God in prophetic books<sup>4</sup>. However, the introductory saying in Q 11:49 is unique because Wisdom<sup>5</sup> speaks in the first person. The passage was constructed by the pattern of Prov 1:20ff.: introduction of Wisdom’s words (1:20-21) and the speech (1:22-33). The phrase “Wisdom of God” makes clear that she is connected to God and has Him as her source. Then it is she who sends the prophets and sages to the humanity and not God. The oracle does not state that this authority was delegated to her by God,

---

<sup>1</sup> Cf. SCHULZ, *Q*, 341; TUCKETT, *Q*, 167.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. KLOPPENBORG, *Formation*, 144.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>4</sup> Isa 1:24: *διὰ τοῦτο τάδε λέγει ὁ ... κύριος* that corresponds to Hebrew *לכן נאם ... יהוה*.

<sup>5</sup> Exact phrase *σοφία τοῦ θεοῦ* is rather rare (cf. 1 Esd 8:23, Ezz 7:25).

she is an active agent now. This recalls Wis 7:27 where Wisdom is able alone to dwell in the holy souls. These people are called “the friends of God and prophets”<sup>1</sup>. Distinction between the friends of God and prophets reminds of two groups mentioned in the oracle of Q. The prophets correspond to the prophets in Q but the second group could be associated with the ‘friends of God’, i.e. the ‘friends of Wisdom’, hence the sages. However, positioning of both prophets and sages together is unique in the Hebrew Bible and the New Testament.

It is noteworthy that the prophets are mentioned in Q in special contexts. They appear in Q appear in the context which speaks about the persecutions (Q 6:23, 11:47,49, 13:34<sup>2</sup>) of them, and associated with John (twice Q 7:26, Q 16:16) and in the context of revelation (Q 10:24). The chronological aspect is one that unites all the instances. Q speaks about the prophets always in the past as they belonged to the previous age and now they are replaced by others (cf. Q 10:21-24). John is the last among them but he plays a role of a link between two epochs. The wise or sages (οἱ σοφοί) are mentioned only here and in Q 10:21.

The persons to whom the messengers are sent are not specified in Q 11:49 but later it becomes clear that they are ‘this generation’ (Q 11:50-51). The function of the messengers plays no role, but they are mentioned exclusively in the context of rejection. The ways of rejection – killing and persecution<sup>3</sup> – can be understood in two dimensions. The first, which is most obvious, is that the killing refers both to John and Jesus, who were murdered, and then to the adherents of Q who are persecuted during their lifetime. However, this interpretation could be read in Matthean version of the saying where the crucifixion is inserted (Mt 23:34b). The second, which is more probable, would have its Sitz im Leben in Jesus’ lifetime, who had already witnessed the arrest and execution of John, and the per-

---

<sup>1</sup> Prophecy and wisdom appear on the same level in Sir 39:1.

<sup>2</sup> We have to notice that twice it appears in Wisdom context.

<sup>3</sup> The motif is already found in Hebrew Bible (Neh 9:26, 1 King 18:4, Jer 2:30).

secution of himself. This leads to the conclusion that two groups of messengers are represented by John (the prophet) and Jesus (the sage).

Then Wisdom pronounces the condemnation of this generation. The blood of all the prophets will be required from this generation. The phrase ἐκζητηθῆ τὸ αἷμα recalls the aspect of the divine justice<sup>1</sup> for shedding the blood of the messengers<sup>2</sup>. Here we can see parallels to Q 7:35. Wisdom's appeal is aiming to establish the just order, which this generation neglects. First, the children justify Wisdom by firm adherence (Q 7:32) to her, then Wisdom avenges their blood by condemning this generation (Q 11:50).

The notion of the creation of the world and two Biblical figures introduces the historical frames as well as the cosmological dimension of Wisdom's judgment. According to Suggs, Q oracle shares the deterministic understanding of history such as seen in 1 Enoch 93, 91:12-17<sup>3</sup>. Moreover, the reference to 'this generation' who is now responsible for the death of the messengers, places the forensic activity of Wisdom in an eschatological perspective. 'This generation' is guilty for the deaths of *all* adherents of Wisdom.

The last saying Q 11:51b could be considered as an addition of Q-editor<sup>4</sup>. The presence of ναὶ λέγω ὑμῖν connects the oracle with Q 13:35b and Q 10:21c which point if not to the same redactor, but to the same circle of tradition. The repetition of the condemnation functions as a strong affirmation of the imminent judgment.

---

<sup>1</sup> It is a typical expression in the LXX that corresponds to Hebrew עַל שַׂרָד or עַל שַׂרָב (Gen 9:5, esp. Gen 42:22); it is God who requires blood (Ps 9:13, Ezek 3:18, 20).

<sup>2</sup> Cf. 2 King 9:7: ἐκδικήσεις τὰ αἵματα τῶν δούλων μου τῶν προφητῶν καὶ τὰ αἵματα πάντων τῶν δούλων κυρίου ἐκ χειρὸς Ιεζαβελ (2 Ki. 9:7), also Rev 16:6, Rev 18:24.

<sup>3</sup> SUGGS, *Wisdom*, 21.

<sup>4</sup> KLOPPENBORG, *Formation*, 146-147; TUCKETT, *Q*, 171-172.

Q 13:34-35

Mt 23:37-39	Lk 13:34-35
<p>37 <u>Ἰερουσαλὴμ</u>  <u>Ἰερουσαλήμ,</u>  <u>ἢ ἀποκτείνουσα τοὺς</u>  <u>προφήτας</u>  <u>καὶ λιθοβολοῦσα τοὺς</u>  <u>ἀπεσταλμένους</u>  <u>πρὸς αὐτήν,</u>  <u>ποσάκις ἠθέλησα</u>  <u>ἐπισυναγαγεῖν τὰ τέκνα σου,</u>  <u>ὄν τρόπον ὄρνις</u>  <u>ἐπισυνάγει τὰ νοσσία αὐτῆς</u>  <u>ὑπὸ τὰς πτέρυγας, καὶ</u>  <u>οὐκ ἠθέλησατε.</u>  <sup>38</sup> <u>ἰδοὺ ἀφίεται ὑμῖν ὁ</u>  <u>οἶκος ὑμῶν</u> ἔρημος.  <sup>39</sup> <u>λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν, οὐ μὴ</u>  <u>με ἴδητε ἀπ' ἄρτι ἕως</u>  <u>ὅταν εἴπητε·</u>  <u>εὐλογημένος ὁ</u>  <u>ἐρχόμενος ἐν ὀνόματι</u>  <u>κυρίου.</u></p>	<p>34 <u>Ἰερουσαλὴμ</u>  <u>Ἰερουσαλήμ,</u>  <u>ἢ ἀποκτείνουσα τοὺς</u>  <u>προφήτας</u>  <u>καὶ λιθοβολοῦσα τοὺς</u>  <u>ἀπεσταλμένους</u>  <u>πρὸς αὐτήν,</u>  <u>ποσάκις ἠθέλησα</u>  <u>ἐπισυνάξαι τὰ τέκνα σου,</u>  <u>ὄν τρόπον ὄρνις</u> τὴν  <u>ἐαυτῆς νοσσιᾶν</u>  <u>ὑπὸ τὰς πτέρυγας, καὶ</u>  <u>οὐκ ἠθέλησατε.</u>  <sup>35</sup> <u>ἰδοὺ ἀφίεται ὑμῖν ὁ</u>  <u>οἶκος ὑμῶν.</u>  <u>λέγω [δὲ] ὑμῖν, οὐ μὴ</u>  <u>ἴδητέ με ἕως</u>  <u>[ἤξει ὅτε] εἴπητε·</u>  <u>εὐλογημένος ὁ</u>  <u>ἐρχόμενος ἐν ὀνόματι</u>  <u>κυρίου.</u></p>

Q 13:34<sup>1</sup> Ἰερουσαλὴμ Ἰερουσαλήμ, ἢ ἀποκτείνουσα τοὺς προφήτας καὶ λιθοβολοῦσα τοὺς ἀπεσταλμένους πρὸς αὐτήν, ποσάκις ἠθέλησα ἐπισυναγαγεῖν<sup>2</sup> τὰ τέκνα σου ὄν τρόπον ὄρνις ἐπισυνάγει τὰ νοσσία αὐτῆς<sup>3</sup> ὑπὸ τὰς πτέρυγας, καὶ οὐκ ἠθέλησατε. 35 Ἴδοὺ ἀφίεται ὑμῖν ὁ οἶκος ὑμῶν<sup>4</sup>. λέγω<sup>5</sup> ὑμῖν, οὐ μὴ με<sup>6</sup> ἴδητέ<sup>7</sup> ἕως<sup>8</sup> εἴπητε· εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου.

1. Original position is questionable. Matthew could easily join it with previous saying, while Luke could also replace it.

2. The difference in the form is due to Lucan correction (POLAG, *Fragmenta*, 66; CritEd.).

3. The reconstruction follows Matthean version which is similar to the previous statement (verb – def. article + dir. object – pers. pronoun<sup>1</sup>) (POLAG, *Fragmenta*, 66; CritEd.).

4. Matthean addition of ἔρημος is secondary that probably reflects the situation after the Jewish War<sup>2</sup> (POLAG, *Fragmenta*, 66; CritEd.).

5. Both Matthean γάρ and Lucan δέ are secondary. In many instances, Q wording is simply λέγω ὑμῖν, without conjunctions<sup>3</sup> (POLAG, *Fragmenta*, 66; CritEd.).

6. The original position of με is reflected in Matthean version (cf. Q 6:46, 10:16) (against POLAG, *Fragmenta*, 66; CritEd.).

7. ἀπ' ἄρτι is clearly Matthean (Mt 23:39, 26:29, 26:64) (cf. POLAG, *Fragmenta*, 66; CritEd.).

8. METZGER finds Lucan *lectio difficilior* (ἥξει ὅτε) as an original reading on the basis of rarity of construing ὅτε with subjunctive<sup>4</sup>. It was already said before that ἥκω is found very frequent in Q and this is important reason to confirm its originality (cf. CritEd.).

The original position of Q 13:34-35 in Q is doubtful<sup>5</sup>. Matthew places it immediately after Q 11:49-51 which seems logical for there is a unity of the subject and content. However, one should doubt why would Luke replace such saying that is clearly understandable in its immediate context. On the other hand, Luke has his reasons to place it in the context that speaks about Jerusalem and especially about the fate of the prophets (Lk 13:22,33). Both positions seem to be secondary but since the text is attached to Q material in both versions (cf. Lk 13:24-30), there is no doubt that it was part of Q. The similarity in

---

<sup>1</sup> ἐπισυναγαγεῖν – τὰ τέκνα – σου, ἐπισυνάγει – τὰ νοσσία – αὐτῆς.

<sup>2</sup> It is noteworthy that some important textual witnesses, such as B, L, ff<sup>2</sup>, sy<sup>s</sup>, sa, bo<sup>pt</sup>, do not have ἔρημος either.

<sup>3</sup> Q 6:27, 7:9, 7:26-28, 10:12, 11:9, 11:51, 12:22,37,44,51, 13:24, 15:7,10, 17:34.

<sup>4</sup> METZGER, *Commentary*, 163.

<sup>5</sup> SCHULZ, *Q*, 347.

tone and images with Q 11:49-51 could point to the common tradition of the passages<sup>1</sup>.

The passage can be divided in two parts: a) a lament for Jerusalem (v.34), b) a prophecy (v.35). The personality of the speaker is not indicated, and both Evangelists put the phrase on Jesus' lips. Matthean context suggests that the words come from Wisdom as in the previous oracle. Moreover, the imagery in Q 13:34b supposes that the speaker is a female figure. Thus, I attribute these words to the personified Wisdom just as Q 11:49-51<sup>2</sup>.

While in Q 11:49-51 Wisdom speaks to 'this generation', here the addressee is specified and it is Jerusalem. The repetition of the name is found in Hebrew Bible (1 King 13:2, Isa 29:1) both in prophetic context (cf. Q 6:46). In Q 10:13 we find the 'woes' against the Galilean cities, so we see that the reproaches toward the places is typical for Q. It is noteworthy that both 'generation' and Jerusalem are imagined as the female counterparts of Wisdom, hence the antagonism between two women continues. Now Jerusalem is accused for her crimes, which are similar to those in the oracle. The 'killing of the prophets' is identical with Q 11:49b (ἀποκτείνω) while the stoning of the envoys is new. There are reasons to consider that 2 Chr 24:20-22 is in mind thus again connecting present passage with the oracle<sup>3</sup>. It means that Q describes the progression in the crimes and consequently the punishment.

Then Wisdom tells about her intention to gather the children of Jerusalem in a metaphorical manner. The image of a bird<sup>4</sup> that protects her brood under her wings<sup>5</sup> is a positive epithet that promises consolation and protection. Thus, the Wisdom is represented as a mother<sup>6</sup>. The refusal to accept Wisdom as a mother was described in the refusal to listen to the proph-

---

<sup>1</sup> Q 13:34-35 clearly belongs to the same line of polemical (or even judgment) saying of Q 3:7-9, 7:18-35 11:14-52 (ALLISON, *Jesus*, 202).

<sup>2</sup> Cf. SCHULZ, *Q*, 349.

<sup>3</sup> DAVIES – ALLISON, *Matthew II*, 320.

<sup>4</sup> Or probably hen. Cf. Sir 1:15; 2 Esdr 1:30.

<sup>5</sup> Ch. Deut 32:11, Ps 17:8.

<sup>6</sup> SUGGS, *Wisdom*, 67.

ets and the sages (Q 11:49) and, hence, John and Jesus (Q 7:33-34). The children of Jerusalem are opposed now to the children of Wisdom (Q 7:35).

The judgment is now revealing itself in the abandoning of the house of Jerusalem. The easiest interpretation is that here is the Second Temple in mind. Wisdom leaves the Temple until the judgment finally comes (cf. 1 Enoch 42)<sup>1</sup>. There could be seen the allusion to Ps 118:26<sup>2</sup>, especially in the light of what comes next.

The last saying Q 13:35b should not be immediately understood as a Christian interpolation. It was already established that we are dealing with Wisdom's speech. Moreover, the phrase "you will not see me" does not have much sense in the Gospel context. The phrase "blessed is one who comes in the name of the LORD" has already appeared in Mt 21:9 and will appear in Lk 19:38, hence the sentence "you will not see me..." is Wisdom's words and not of Jesus. If we consider the situation, that Q had Ps 118 in mind, then ἥξει ὅτε could be interpreted as referring to the "day of the LORD" (v.24). The last saying "...when it comes, you will say: blessed is one who comes in name of LORD" must be understood in a way that Wisdom departs from Jerusalem and will return only at the time of the judgment which will be anticipated by the advent of Messiah<sup>3</sup>.

### Q 11:31-32

Mt 12:41-42	Lk 11:31-32
<sup>42</sup> <u>βασιλίσα νότου</u> <u>ἐγερθήσεται ἐν τῇ κρίσει</u> <u>μετὰ τῆς γενεᾶς</u> <u>ταύτης</u> <u>καὶ κατακρινεῖ αὐτήν,</u> <u>ὅτι ἦλθεν ἐκ τῶν</u> <u>περάτων τῆς γῆς ἀκοῦσαι</u>	<sup>31</sup> <u>βασιλίσα νότου</u> <u>ἐγερθήσεται ἐν τῇ κρίσει</u> <u>μετὰ τῶν ἀνδρῶν τῆς</u> <u>γενεᾶς ταύτης</u> <u>καὶ κατακρινεῖ αὐτούς,</u> <u>ὅτι ἦλθεν ἐκ τῶν</u> <u>περάτων τῆς γῆς ἀκοῦσαι</u>

<sup>1</sup> Sir 24:9-12 depicts Jerusalem as a place of Wisdom's dwelling.

<sup>2</sup> ALLISON, *Jesus*, 194.

<sup>3</sup> Ὁ ἐρχόμενος is a title for Messiah in Q (cf. Q 3:16, 7:19-20).

<u>τὴν σοφίαν</u> <u>Σολομῶνος, καὶ ἰδοὺ</u> <u>πλεῖον</u> <u>Σολομῶνος ὧδε.</u> <sup>41</sup> <u>ἄνδρες Νινευῖται</u> <u>ἀναστήσονται ἐν τῇ κρίσει</u> <u>μετὰ τῆς γενεᾶς</u> <u>ταύτης καὶ κατακρινοῦσιν</u> <u>αὐτήν, ὅτι μετενόησαν</u> <u>εἰς τὸ κήρυγμα Ἰωνᾶ,</u> <u>καὶ ἰδοὺ πλεῖον Ἰωνᾶ</u> <u>ὧδε.</u>	<u>τὴν σοφίαν Σολομῶνος,</u> <u>καὶ ἰδοὺ πλεῖον</u> <u>Σολομῶνος ὧδε.</u> <sup>32</sup> <u>ἄνδρες Νινευῖται</u> <u>ἀναστήσονται ἐν τῇ κρίσει</u> <u>μετὰ τῆς γενεᾶς ταύτης</u> <u>καὶ κατακρινοῦσιν αὐτήν·</u> <u>ὅτι μετενόησαν εἰς τὸ</u> <u>κήρυγμα Ἰωνᾶ,</u> <u>καὶ ἰδοὺ πλεῖον Ἰωνᾶ</u> <u>ὧδε.</u>
--	--

**Q 11:31**<sup>1</sup> Βασίλισσα νότου ἐγερθήσεται ἐν τῇ κρίσει μετὰ<sup>2</sup> τῆς γενεᾶς ταύτης καὶ κατακρινεῖ αὐτήν<sup>3</sup>, ὅτι ἦλθεν ἐκ τῶν περάτων τῆς γῆς ἀκοῦσαι τὴν σοφίαν Σολομῶνος, καὶ ἰδοὺ πλεῖον Σολομῶνος ὧδε. **32** Ἄνδρες Νινευῖται ἀναστήσονται ἐν τῇ κρίσει μετὰ τῆς γενεᾶς ταύτης καὶ κατακρινοῦσιν αὐτήν, ὅτι μετενόησαν εἰς τὸ κήρυγμα Ἰωνᾶ, καὶ ἰδοὺ πλεῖον Ἰωνᾶ ὧδε.

1. In Lucan sequence, the saying about the Ninevites follows the saying about the Queen of South. Matthew changes their order for the sake of connection of the Ninevites with the previous saying of the sign of Jonah (Mt 12:39-40) (cf. POLAG, *Fragmenta*; SCHENK, *Synopse*, 71; KLOPPENBORG, *Parallels*, 100; VASSILIADIS, *LOGOI*, 97; CritEd; FLEDERMANN, *Q*, 493; against HARNACK, *Sayings*, 23; LÜHRMANN, *Redaktion*, 37).

2. Luke adds τῶν ἀνδρῶν under the influence of Q 11:32 (cf. SCHULZ, *Q*, 252; SCHENK, *Synopse*, 71; CritEd; FLEDERMANN, *Q*, 493; against LÜHRMANN, *Redaktion*, 37; VASSILIADIS, *LOGOI*, 97). The same addition was made in Q 7:31.

3. Luke changed original αὐτήν into plural in order to conform it with τῶν ἀνδρῶν (CritEd; FLEDERMANN, *Q*, 493; against LÜHRMANN, *Redaktion*, 37; VASSILIADIS, *LOGOI*, 97).

Q 11:31-32 is positioned following the sequence concerning the Beelzebul controversy (Q 11:14-26) and immediately follows the request of the sign (Q 11:29-30), in which Mt and

Lk agree. Q 11:31-32 is closely connected with Q 11:29-30 because of the common themes: accusation of ‘this generation’ and the story of Jonah<sup>1</sup>.

The literary unit is divided into two parts: a) Queen of South and Solomon, b) the Ninevites and Jonah. The appeal to the Hebrew Bible characters makes the passage parallel to Q 11:49-51 where Abel and Zacharias are mentioned. This is a hint for sharing the common tradition. Here these characters play a different role. They demonstrate an example of positive response to the Wisdom call to repentance.

Two sayings are closely paralleled: ἐγερθήσεται/ἀναστήσονται<sup>2</sup> μετὰ τῆς γενεᾶς ταύτης καὶ κατακρίνει/οὔσιν αὐτὴν ὅτι ... καὶ ἰδοὺ πλεῖον ... ὧδε. This saying probably presupposes the knowledge of resurrection that occurs in the day of judgment<sup>3</sup>. But this motif does not play much role in the passage<sup>4</sup>, the focus is on the condemnation. The accent changes: it is not the Wisdom who judges ‘this generation’ but the ‘Gentiles’ are condemning the unrepentant. This connects the passage with Q 11:19 (“your sons ... will be your judges”) and Q 22:30 (“you will sit on the thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel”). It means that the authority of judgment is not limited to Wisdom but she delegates this right to her children, who now embrace not only Jews but also Gentiles. The positive view of Gentiles is characteristic for Q. In some instances, the faith of a Gentile is demonstrated in order to oppose it to unre-

---

<sup>1</sup> Cf. KLOPPENBORG, *Formation*, 129-30.

<sup>2</sup> Both verbs, as it seems from the saying, were synonyms for Q. Cf. Isa 26:19a (LXX): ἀναστήσονται οἱ νεκροὶ, καὶ ἐγερθήσονται οἱ ἐν τοῖς μνημείοις.

<sup>3</sup> Q prefers the verb ἐγείρω but its meaning changes depending on the context. In Q 13:25 (CritEd.), the verb has literal meaning of “raising up” (the master of the house rises in order to close the doors of the house). In other two instances, ἐγείρω has to do with semantics of “to give birth, to be born” (in Q 3:8 the verb is used to describe the ability of God to create the children from the rocks; Q 7:28 (CritEd.) nobody arose (ἐγήγερται) so great as John). As for resurrection of the dead, there is only one example: Q 7:22, which relies on Isa 26:19a.

<sup>4</sup> The resurrection was more important for evangelists, it explains Matthean interpretative addition to Q 11:30.

penitance of Israel (Q 7:1-9, cf. 10:13-15), but in Q 13:28-29 (also Q 13:30) we find a motif of the salvation of the Gentiles<sup>1</sup>.

There are some elements that connect this saying with two previously discussed. Two figures – Solomon and Jonah – represent two roles of sage and prophet, and thus fit well into the pattern of two groups discussed in Q 11:49-51 – sages and prophets to whom John and Jesus are joined now (Q 7:31-35). The Queen of South is representing those Gentiles (and probably not only them), who heed the true wisdom by following the sages and hence coming under ‘Wisdom wings’ (Q 13:34b). The Ninevites are those who repented for their crimes and sins (cf. Q 11:50-51) by following the words of the prophets, who speak in Wisdom’s name.

However, it is not easy to see a clear reference to Wisdom as a personified figure in this passage. The presence of *πλεῖον* (neuter) makes a hint that the saying is not about the Son of man (in this case, it must be *πλείος*) who was mentioned in Q 11:30, but about something else<sup>2</sup>. The agreement in both terms and ideas of Q 11:31-32 with previously discussed makes us think that even if personified Wisdom is not mentioned explicitly in the pericope, it presupposes her presence here. *Πλεῖον* is not a Son of man but the personified Wisdom which proclaims

---

<sup>1</sup> Cf. TUCKETT, *Q*, 193. However, this passage could be understood as return of the Diaspora Jews.

<sup>2</sup> FLEDDERMANN (*Q*, 515) claims that the neutral form could be used for masculine or feminine, as in Q 12:23. However, in Q 12:23 the subject is clearly indicated unlike in Q 11:31-32. His thesis points to the contrary: here the neutral form could be understood as feminine exactly as in Q 12:23. Hence the saying is about personified Wisdom and not about Son of man. TUCKETT (*Q*, 188) considers “something” to be the “the presence of Jesus’ teaching”, but Q does not focus on a teaching exactly as a teaching of *Jesus*. In Q 6:46 where Jesus say “my words” they should not be attribute immediately to Jesus. The introductive “κύριε, κύριε” (the LXX equivalent of Hebrew יהוה יהוה) refers traditionally to YHWH (Deut 3:24, Judg 6:22, 1 King 8:53, Ps 68:7, Amos 7:2, Ezek 21:5), hence, when Q puts these words on Jesus’ lips, it is the prophetic utterance in the name of God and not a reference to Jesus’ personal teaching.

the eschatological salvation before the imminent end that this generation must suffer<sup>1</sup>.

### Q 10:21-24

Mt 11:25-27, 13:16-17	Lk 10:21-24
<p><sup>25</sup> Ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ καιρῷ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν·  <u>ἔξομολογοῦμαί σοι, πάτερ, κύριε τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ τῆς γῆς, ὅτι</u>  <i>ἔκρυσας ταῦτα ἀπὸ σοφῶν καὶ συνετῶν καὶ ἀπεκάλυψας αὐτὰ νηπίοις·</i>  <sup>26</sup> <u>ναὶ ὁ πατήρ, ὅτι οὕτως εὐδοκία ἐγένετο ἔμπροσθέν σου.</u>  <sup>27</sup> <u>πάντα μοι παρεδόθη ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς μου,</u>  <u>καὶ οὐδεὶς ἐπιγινώσκει τὸν υἱὸν</u>  <u>εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ,</u> οὐδὲ τὸν πατέρα τις ἐπιγινώσκει <u>εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱὸς καὶ ὃ ἔαν βούληται ὁ υἱὸς ἀποκαλύψαι.</u>  <sup>16</sup> ὑμῶν δὲ <u>μακάριοι οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ</u> ὅτι <u>βλέπουσιν</u> καὶ τὰ ἄτα ὑμῶν ὅτι ἀκούουσιν.  <sup>17</sup> ἀμὴν γὰρ λέγω ὑμῖν <u>ὅτι πολλοὶ προφητῶν καὶ δίκαιοι ἐπεθύμησαν</u> <u>ἰδεῖν ἃ βλέπετε καὶ οὐκ εἶδαν,</u> καὶ <u>ἀκοῦσαι ἃ ἀκούετε καὶ οὐκ ἤκουσαν.</u></p>	<p><sup>21</sup> Ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ ἠγαλλιάσατο [ἐν] τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἁγίῳ καὶ εἶπεν·  <u>ἔξομολογοῦμαί σοι, πάτερ, κύριε τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ τῆς γῆς, ὅτι ἀπέκρυσας ταῦτα ἀπὸ σοφῶν καὶ συνετῶν καὶ ἀπεκάλυψας αὐτὰ νηπίοις·</u>  <u>ναὶ ὁ πατήρ, ὅτι οὕτως εὐδοκία ἐγένετο ἔμπροσθέν σου.</u>  <sup>22</sup> <u>πάντα μοι παρεδόθη ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς μου,</u>  <u>καὶ οὐδεὶς γινώσκει τίς ἐστὶν ὁ υἱὸς εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ,</u> καὶ τίς ἐστὶν ὁ πατήρ <u>εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱὸς καὶ ὃ ἔαν βούληται ὁ υἱὸς ἀποκαλύψαι.</u>  <sup>23</sup> Καὶ στραφεὶς πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς κατ' ἰδίαν εἶπεν· <u>μακάριοι οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ οἱ βλέποντες</u> ἃ βλέπετε.  <sup>24</sup> λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν <u>ὅτι πολλοὶ προφητῶν καὶ βασιλεῖς ἠθέλησαν</u> <u>ἰδεῖν ἃ ὑμεῖς βλέπετε καὶ οὐκ εἶδαν,</u> καὶ <u>ἀκοῦσαι ἃ ἀκούετε καὶ οὐκ ἤκουσαν.</u></p>

<sup>1</sup> SCHULZ, Q, 256-257.

**Q 10:21-24** Ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ὥρᾳ εἶπεν<sup>1</sup>· ἔξομολογοῦμαι σοι, πάτερ, κύριε τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ τῆς γῆς, ὅτι ἀπέκρυψας<sup>2</sup> ταῦτα ἀπὸ σοφῶν καὶ συνετῶν καὶ ἀπεκάλυψας αὐτὰ νηπιῖς· ναὶ ὁ πατήρ, ὅτι οὕτως εὐδοκία ἐγένετο ἔμπροσθέν σου. **22** πάντα μοι παρεδόθη ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς μου, καὶ οὐδεὶς γινώσκει<sup>3</sup> τὸν υἱὸν<sup>4</sup> εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ, καὶ<sup>5</sup> τὸν πατέρα<sup>6</sup> εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱὸς καὶ ᾧ ἔαν βούληται ὁ υἱὸς ἀποκαλύψαι. **23**<sup>7</sup> μακάριοι οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ οἱ βλέποντες ἃ βλέπετε<sup>8</sup>. **24**<sup>9</sup> λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν<sup>10</sup> ὅτι πολλοὶ προφηταὶ καὶ βασιλεῖς<sup>11</sup> ἠθέλησαν<sup>12</sup> ἰδεῖν ἃ<sup>13</sup> βλέπετε καὶ οὐκ εἶδαν, καὶ ἀκοῦσαι ἃ ἀκούετε καὶ οὐκ ἤκουσαν.

1. In both versions, the initial passage was redacted by both Evangelists<sup>1</sup> (cf. CritEd<sup>2</sup>; FLEDDERMANN, *Q*, 438), although some retain the opinion that there should be an introduction in Q-text with the reference to the time (SCHULZ, *Q*, 213; HOFFMANN, *Studien*, 105; VASSILIADIS, *LOGOI*, 97)<sup>3</sup>. HARNACK (*Sayings*, 20) notes that ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ is typically Lucan phrase<sup>4</sup>, while ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ καιρῷ is probably Matthean<sup>5</sup>. Καιρός is found only twice in the passages Q 12:42, 56, and in Lk 4:13, that might be ascribed to Q. At the same time, καιρός seems to be more Lucan<sup>6</sup> while ὥρα seems to be more Matthean<sup>7</sup>. The more frequent occurrence of ὥρα in Q (12:12,40,46; 14:17(?)) points to its originality. POLAG (*Fragmenta*, 46) reconstructs the phrase as ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ὥρᾳ which seems to be original (cf. Q 12:12) (so FLEDDERMANN, *Q*, 438; against SCHENK, *Synopse*, 58; VASSILIADIS, *LOGOI*, 97). Matthean ὁ Ἰησοῦς looks logical in the context (cf. SCHULZ, *Q*, 213) but the surprising absence of it in the Q section in the Lu-

<sup>1</sup> Ἠγαλλιάσατο [ἐν] τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἀγίῳ is clearly Lucan (cf. Lk 1:47, Act 2:26, 16:34), although VASSILIADIS (*LOGOI*, 97) places ἡγαλλιάσατο in the reconstruction.

<sup>2</sup> The editors did not include either version in the critical text. The English translation (also the German and French) reads “at that time”.

<sup>3</sup> POLAG (*Fragmenta*, 46) considers Lucan ἡγαλλιάσατο [ἐν] τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἀγίῳ καὶ as possible introduction.

<sup>4</sup> Lk 12:12, 13:31, 20:19, cf. Act 16:18.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Mt 12:1, 14:1.

<sup>6</sup> 12 against 10 instances in Mt.

<sup>7</sup> 20 against 16 instances in Lk.

can context<sup>1</sup> points to preference of Luke's version (against FLEDDERMANN, *Q*, 438). It is difficult to decide about Matthean ἀποκριθείς, for it looks awkward in both contexts. I prefer to omit it because it does not change anything for the understanding of the text (cf. FLEDDERMANN, *Q*, 438).

2. Ἀέκρυσας is unique in Lk and the Gospels<sup>2</sup>. The simple form κρύπτω is more frequent<sup>3</sup> and is typically Matthean<sup>4</sup>. Thus, the Lucan verb is original (so VASSILIADIS, *LOGOI*, 97; against HARNACK, *Sayings*, 20), even if according to another view, Luke used for the sake of parallelism with ἀποκαλύψαι (SCHULZ, *Q*, 214; POLAG, *Fragmenta*, 46; HOFFMANN, *Studien*, 105; cf. CritEd; FLEDDERMANN, *Q*, 438).

3. The preference is given to Lucan simple form γινώσκει (cf. Mt 7:16/12:33 and Lk 6:44)<sup>5</sup> (SCHULZ, *Q*, 214; POLAG, *Fragmenta*, 48; VASSILIADIS, *LOGOI*, 97; against SCHENK, *Synopse*, 58; CritEd; FLEDDERMANN, *Q*, 438).

4. Matthean version is original. Luke has stressed not the aspect of merely knowing Jesus as a person but of knowing his identity<sup>6</sup>, that colours the saying with the Messianic connotations (cf. HARNACK, *Sayings*, 20; SCHULZ, *Q*, 214; HOFFMANN, *Studien*, 105; CritEd; FLEDDERMANN, *Q*, 439; against VASSILIADIS, *LOGOI*, 97).

5. Matthean reading οὐδὲ is redactional since Lucan καί is against his tendency to improve the text<sup>7</sup> (cf. VASSILIADIS, *LOGOI*, 97; against POLAG, *Fragmenta*, 48; CritEd;

---

<sup>1</sup> It is absent in every introductory phrase from the beginning of ch.10 until v.29.

<sup>2</sup> The word in the part. perf. pass. form is found in 1 Cor 2:7, Eph 3:9, Col 1:26.

<sup>3</sup> 17 times in the entire New Testament.

<sup>4</sup> 6 times, once in Q (19:21, Mt 25:25).

<sup>5</sup> HARNACK, basing on the patristic witness, claims that the original form was ἔγνω (*Sayings*, 19). This claim, however, is not supported by textual witness, because this form is never found in Mt and Lk at all.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Lucan redaction of Mk 6:16 in Lk 9:9.

<sup>7</sup> In Q 11:22, we find the sequence of three καί: καὶ οὐδεὶς ... καὶ τὸν πατέρα ... καὶ ὃ ἐάν...

FLEDDERMANN, *Q*, 439<sup>1</sup>). 6. Τὸν πατέρα (Mt) is probably original and agrees with previous statement. The next τις ἐπιγινώσκει is, nevertheless, redactional because it conforms with previous ἐπιγινώσκει and betrays Matthean tendency to make the text more “semitic” (cf. SCHULZ, *Q*, 214; HOFFMANN, *Studien*, 105; VASSILIADIS, *LOGOI*, 97; against FLEDDERMANN, *Q*, 438)<sup>2</sup>.

6. Lk 10:23a<sup>3</sup> is redactional as well as Matthean ὑμῶν δε, Luke had no reason to eliminate it since he had already inserted the notion of the disciples (cf. SCHULZ, *Q*, 419; POLAG, *Fragmenta*, 48; VASSILIADIS, *LOGOI*, 97; CritEd; FLEDDERMANN, *Q*, 443).

7. BULTMANN points out that Lucan formulation ἃ βλέπετε is original because it refers not to the ability to see, as does Matthean causal clause which is introduced by ὅτι, but to *what* they see (BULTMANN, *Tradition*, 109; cf. SCHULZ, *Q*, 419-420; POLAG, *Fragmenta*, 48; SCHENK, *Synopse*, 59; VASSILIADIS, *LOGOI*, 97; CritEd). Matthean καὶ τὰ ὅσα ὑμῶν ὅτι ἀκούουσιν is redactional, it was inserted under the influence of Q 10:24 (cf. Isa 6:9).

8. Matthean ἀμήν is redactional (SCHULZ, *Q*, 420; POLAG, *Fragmenta*, 48; CritEd; against SCHENK, *Synopse*, 59; FLEDDERMANN, *Q*, 443).

9. Placing of γάρ on the first position is typically Matthean (Mt 5:18, 10:23, 17:20) (Cf. POLAG, *Fragmenta*, 48; VASSILIADIS, *LOGOI*, 97; CritEd; FLEDDERMANN, *Q*, 443).

10. Lucan βασιλεῖς is probably original for Matthean reference to the just is clearly redactional (cf. SCHULZ, *Q*, 420;

---

<sup>1</sup> FLEDDERMANN considers that original text contained the second καὶ οὐδεὶς γινώσκει (Q 439-40) but I see no reason why would Luke abolish such parallelism.

<sup>2</sup> The CritEd puts it under the question.

<sup>3</sup> FLEDDERMANN (*Q*, 442) thinks that Luke inserted στραφεῖς πρὸς τοὺς μαθητάς κατ' ἰδίαν between καὶ and εἶπεν which stayed originally in Q. The expression καὶ εἶπεν is so common that one should not claim its necessity in this context. Two pericopae were probably originally independent, thus the connection between them is to be considered secondary.

POLAG, *Fragmenta*, 48; SCHENK, *Synopse*, 59; VASSILIADIS, *LOGOI*, 97; CritEd; FLEDDERMANN, *Q*, 443).

11. Lucan ἠθέλησαν stems from Q (cf. Q 6:31, 13:34; cf. FLEDDERMANN, *Q*, 443). Otherwise think SCHULZ, (*Q*, 420), POLAG (*Fragmenta*, 48) and SCHENK (*Synopse*, 59), CritEd is undecided. Ἐπιθυμέω is found in Lk more often than in other NT books (4 times), hence there is no reason to replace it by the more frequent verb.

12. Lucan ὑμεῖς is an insertion for explicitness and was influenced by redactional addition in Lk 10:23 (so SCHULZ, *Q*, 420; against POLAG, *Fragmenta*, 48; VASSILIADIS, *LOGOI*, 98; FLEDDERMANN, *Q*, 443).

KLOPPENBORG divides the text into two parts (Q 10:21-22 and 10:23-24)<sup>1</sup> but acknowledges that vv.21-22 present the composite structure<sup>2</sup>. We think that it is more reasonable to consider a tripartite structure of the passage. Matthew places the third part (Q 10:23-24) in different context (Mt 13:13-15) in order to join it to the material concerning the purpose of the parables. The introductions to Jesus' speech in v.21 and v.23a show that the passages belonged to different sayings and were put together by Q editor. Hence, v.22 was inserted in order to connect the sayings.

The first part is introduced by the praise of the Father<sup>3</sup>. The verb ἐξομολογέω is a typical translation of the Hebrew verb הָדַי by which text shows affinities with the form of Hodayot<sup>4</sup>. It distinguishes Q 10:21-24 from the previously discussed texts, which were a parable plus interpretation (Q 7:31-35), an oracle (Q 11:49-51), a lament (Q 13:34-35) and a prophetic oracle (Q 11:31-32), by the genre. It signalizes the change of the addressees as well. While the previous texts were

---

<sup>1</sup> KLOPPENBORG, *Formation*, 197.

<sup>2</sup> V.22 is not a thankgiving (KLOPPENBORG, *Formation*, 198); cf. SCHULZ, *Q*, 215.

<sup>3</sup> "Lord of the heavens and earth" is found in Exod 20:11, 31:17, Tob 7:17 (LXX).

<sup>4</sup> ROBINSON, *Hodayot*, 79.

directly or indirectly addressed to ‘this generation’, in Q 10:21-24 Jesus speaks to Father and to the disciples.

This text speaks about the revelation that was concealed from “the wise and intelligent” but was revealed to the “infants”<sup>1</sup>. The critique of the ‘wise’ is not typical for Wisdom sayings but is present in Q and New Testament<sup>2</sup>. The ‘sages’, that were previously mentioned, are not those who are in mind here. The former were the messengers of Wisdom, while the later could be counted as those who belong to ‘this generation’<sup>3</sup>. This places Q 10:21 on a different level than the rest of Q passages concerning Wisdom. The opposition of the infants and the wise resembles the opposition of the ‘children of Wisdom’ and ‘this generation’ in Q 7:31-35, thus confirming, however in indirect way, several affinities with Wisdom texts. The first part is concluded by strong affirmation *vai* which, as we have seen, typical for Q (p.9).

The passage does not clearly say what exactly is disclosed by God to the children<sup>4</sup>. FLEDDERMANN<sup>5</sup> supposes that the content of ταῦτα is what is found in Q 10:22 – everything is given to Jesus by the Father<sup>6</sup>. By accepting this interpretation, one must assume that Wisdom is not present in this passage. However, this interpretation seems artificial because, as we have observed above, v.22 was added later by the editor and might function as a commentary to v.21<sup>7</sup>. High Christological tone of Q 10:22 and its affinities with Johannine theology<sup>8</sup> demonstrate that this passage was inserted in Q on the latest stage of redaction<sup>9</sup>. The text speaks about exceptional relationships

---

<sup>1</sup> Motif of hidden and revealed Wisdom is typical for Wisdom literature (CHRIST, *Jesus*, 83).

<sup>2</sup> Cf. 1 Cor 2:6-8.

<sup>3</sup> Although the phrase does not appear in present context.

<sup>4</sup> This “what” in BULTMANN’s view is the “Messianic age” (*Tradition*, 109). Matthew put the saying in “artificial” context of Mk 4:13 (Parable of Sower), and in this context, it “has no correlative object anymore”.

<sup>5</sup> FLEDDERMANN, *Q*, 451.

<sup>6</sup> It means that Q 10:21-24 is an organic unit.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. KLOPPENBORG, *Formation*, 198.

<sup>8</sup> Jn 3:35, 7:29, 10:15, 13:3

<sup>9</sup> Cf. SCHULZ, *Q*, 215-216.

between the Father and the Son: the Father delegates the authority to the Son because of their mutual knowledge, and Son has authority to reveal this knowledge to everyone whom he would like. However, the indication that this “all” refers to the authority of the Son on the earth (cf. Jn 3:35, Mt 28:18) could be objected. Since we are dealing with the revelation it could refer to the Wisdom. CHRIST observes, that the description of the relation between the Son and the Father in Q 10:22 follows exactly the pattern of the relations between God and Wisdom: nobody knows Wisdom (Job 18:1-22, Sir 1:6) except God (Job 28:23-27, Sir 1:8, cf. Prov 8:22-30) and only Wisdom has true knowledge of God (Prov 8:12, Wis 7:25)<sup>1</sup>. It means that Q now moves in the direction of Wisdom Christology, rather than representing Jesus just as one of her messengers.

Q 10:23-24 stay in the same line as Q 10:21 but, while in the later Jesus was praising the Father, now he addresses to the ‘infants’<sup>2</sup>. While the first part follows the literary form of Hodayot, Q 10:23-24 is a macarism, which is one of the favorite Q literary form (Q 6:20-22, 7:23, 12:43; probably Lk 11:27-28), which is always directed to the adherents of Jesus. By metaphorical usage of the part of body<sup>3</sup> (cf. Lk 11:27), Jesus blesses those who receive the revelation. The recipients of the revelation are compared with the prophets and kings of the past, who wanted but could not see what they see. Q 10:23-24 differs in this point from v.21, because here the prophets and kings are understood as positive figures. In this two groups, we find again the pattern of two messengers of Wisdom: prophets and sages, who now are called the kings<sup>4</sup>. The text speaks about about them as already the figures of the past, while in the pre-

---

<sup>1</sup> CHRIST, *Jesus*, 89.

<sup>2</sup> As we have seen in the reconstruction, the “disciples” are the addition of the Evangelist.

<sup>3</sup> Job 29:11 (LXX) reads: ὅτι οὗς ἤκουσεν καὶ ἐμακάρισεν με ὀφθαλμὸς δὲ ἰδὼν με ἐξέκλινεν. In this text, the situation is reverted: the part of body blesses the man.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. PHILO, *De Migratione Abrahami*: ...βασιλείαν δὲ σοφίαν εἶναι λέγομεν, ἐπεὶ καὶ τὸν σοφὸν βασιλέα. It is possible that such usage is reflected in Q 10:24.

vious texts the prophets seemed to be understood in the present time. Hence the text demonstrates the progression in the chronological and historical understanding of reality.

### CONCLUSION

Gospels of Matthew and Luke preserves Wisdom sayings of Q in the form very close to original. It means that these texts played special role as in the Q-group, and also in their communities. In almost all of the texts that we have discussed, Wisdom is represented as a personified figure. Wisdom is represented as continuously sending her messengers to 'this generation'. Then she acts as a judge that condemns 'this generation' for unrepentance and persecution of her messengers. Her messengers are divided into two groups 'prophets and sages', to whom Jesus and John are counted. Her adherents are 'children of Wisdom' to whom her messengers could be counted too, as well as the followers of John and Jesus. The 'children of Wisdom' are not limited to the Jewish followers, but her message could be accepted by the Gentiles. Wisdom has exclusive relationship with her children to whom she delivers special revelation as well as authority to judge 'this generation'. In the passages that might be composed later than the rest of the texts, one can see the tendency to identify Jesus with Wisdom.

### BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ALLISON D., *Jesus Tradition in Q* (Harrisburg, PA, 1997).
- BULTMANN R., *The history of the synoptic tradition* (Oxford, 1972).
- CATCHPOLE D. R., *The Quest for Q* (Edinburgh, 1993).
- CASEY M., *Aramaic Approach to Q: Sources for the Gospels of Matthew and Luke* (New York, 2002).
- CHRIST F., *Jesus Sophia: die Sophia-Christologie bei den Synoptikern* (Zürich, 1970).
- DAVIES W. – ALLISON D., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to Saint Matthew in 3 volumes* (ICC; Edinburgh, 1991-1997).

FITZMYER J., *The gospel according to Luke: introduction, translation and notes*. I (AB; Garden City, NY, 1981).

FLEDDERMANN H.T., *Q: A Reconstruction and Commentary* (Biblical Tools and Studies; Leuven, 2005).

VON HARNACK A., *The Sayings of Jesus: The Second Source of St. Matthew and St. Luke* (New Testament Studies II; New York, 1908).

HOFFMANN P., *Studien zur Theologie der Logienquelle* (Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen; Münster, 1982)

JEREMIAS, *Die Gleichnisse Jesu* (Göttingen, 1984).

KLOPPENBORG J., *The formation of Q: Trajectories in Ancient Wisdom Collections* (Philadelphia, 1987).

KLOPPENBORG J., *Q parallels: Synopsis, Critical Notes & Concordance* (Sonoma, CA, 1988).

LUZ U., *Matthew: a Commentary / 2:8-20* (Minneapolis, MN, 2001).

LÜHRMANN D., *Die Redaktion der Logienquelle: Anhang: Zur weiteren Überlieferung der Logienquelle* (WUNT; Neukirchen, 1969).

METZGER B.M., *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* (Stuttgart, 2000).

PLUMMER A., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to Saint Luke* (ICC; Edinburgh, 1928).

POLAG A., *Fragmenta Q: Textheft zur Logienquelle* (Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1979).

ROBINSON J.M., The *Hodayot* Formula in Prayers and Hymns of Early Christianity, in *The Sayings Gospel Q: Collected Essays* (Leuven, 2005).

ROBINSON, J.M. – HOFFMANN P. – KLOPPENBORG J., *The Critical Edition of Q: Synopsis Including the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, Mark and Thomas with English, German, and French Translations of Q and Thomas* (Leuven, 2000).

SCHENK W., *Synopse zur Redenquelle der Evangelien: Q-Synopse und Rekonstruktion in deutscher Übersetzung mit kurzen Erläuterungen* (Düsseldorf, 1981).

SCHULZ S., *Q – die Spruchquelle der Evangelisten* (Zürich, 1972).

STECK O.H., *Israel und das gewaltsame Geschick der Propheten: Untersuchungen zur Überlieferung des deuteronomistischen Geschichtsbildes im Alten Testament, Spätjudentum und Urchristentum* (Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1967).

STEINHAUSER M.G., *Doppelbildworte in den synoptischen Evangelien: eine form- und traditionskritische Studie* (Würzburg, 1981).

SUGGS M.J., *Wisdom, Christology, and Law in Matthew's Gospel* (Cambridge, 1970).

TUCKETT, *Q and the History of Early Christianity: Studies on Q* (Edinburgh, 1996).

VASSILIADIS P., *ΛΟΓΟΙ ΙΗΣΟΥ: Studies in Q* (Atlanta, GA, 1999).

*Ф. Литвинов*

## **Персонифицированная Премудрость в речениях Евангелия Q**

В данной статье предлагается реконструкция речений из Q, которые традиционно считаются связанными с персонифицированной Премудростью. Каждый текст снабжен комментарием, в котором рассматриваются аспекты персонифицированной Премудрости, содержащиеся в этом отрывке. Анализ редакционной работы Матфея и Луки показывает, что, так как евангелисты очень точно воспроизводят оригинальный текст Q, идеи, связанные с персонифицированной Премудростью, играли важную роль в богословии первых последователей Иисуса.

*Ключевые слова:* Документ Q, синоптическая проблема, критика редакций, персонифицированная Премудрость, христология.

*Федор Литвинов* – выпускник Института теологии Белорусского государственного университета (Минск), лицензиат в Священном Писании Папского Библейского института (Рим), докторант факультета протестантской теологии Мюнхенского университета Людвиг Максимилиана ([fed.lit@gmail.com](mailto:fed.lit@gmail.com)).