

Part I: Introduction to this Commentary

This book is the English translation of my German commentary on the Sayings Source (*Kommentar zur Logienquelle*, Kohlhammer 2019)—enlarged with some passages of my introduction to Q (*Die Logienquelle. Text, Kontext und Theologie der Quelle Q*, Kohlhammer 2016). As the general questions concerning the »Two Document Hypothesis« and the existence of the »Sayings Source« are discussed exhaustively in this introduction, this commentary only offers a short résumé to these questions (and only refers in footnotes to a more extensive analysis).

1. Preliminary Questions

1.1 The Existence of the Sayings Source

The »Two Document Hypothesis« (henceforth: 2DH) teaches us that Matthew and Luke, in the process of writing their gospels, not only used the Gospel of Mark but also a second document, the so-called »Sayings Source«—or simply »Q« (from the German *Quelle* »source«). Notwithstanding the fact that this source is not preserved for us as a manuscript but merely reconstructed out of the parallel passages in the Gospels of Matthew and Luke (after subtracting material from the Gospel of Mark), one nevertheless discovers a text with a certain narratological and theological consistency.¹ Recent research has demonstrated convincingly that Q had a consistent narratological flow with a coherent theological plot.² This fits well with the exhaustive review of recent synoptic studies by A. Lindemann, who states that the Q-hypothesis can still be seen as the most convincing response to

1 See Tiwald, *Logienquelle*, 15–32.

2 See the two comprehensive monographs by H. Scherer, *Königsvolk und Gotteskinder: Der Entwurf der sozialen Welt im Material der Traditio duplex* (2016), and M. Labahn *Der Gekommene als Wiederkommender: Die Logienquelle als erzählte Geschichte* (2010). Thus, Scherer, *Königsvolk*, 546, concludes, »dass das Material der Traditio duplex [sc. Q] einen eigenständigen, über mk Jesusrede und mt Sondergut hinausgehenden, in sich sinnvoll vernetzten Entwurf sozialer Identifikationsgrößen bietet—ein Votum zugunsten der These, dass dieses Material aus einem eigenständigen, Mt und Lk gemeinsamen Dokument erwachsen ist.«

this problem.³ In spite of all remaining questions,⁴ the assumption of the existence of a »Sayings Source« as second literary document for the Gospels of Matthew and Luke still seems the most viable way to resolve the Synoptic Problem.

1.2 The Reconstruction of Q

Up for more debate than the general existence of Q is the question as to how it is to be reconstructed.

1.2.1 The Critical Edition of Q

In 2000 the *Critical Edition of Q (CEQ)* was published, edited by J. M. Robinson, P. Hoffmann, J. S. Kloppenborg and M. Moreland. This reconstruction summarises the results of the *International Q-Project (IQP)*, founded in 1989.⁵ The CEQ presents a quite »conservative« reconstruction, free from any far-reaching speculations.⁶ In addition to this, the ongoing project *Documenta Q* in 32 volumes (twelve have been published to date) presents the complete literature on the reconstruction of the respective verses of Q from the last three centuries (C19th to C21st).

The CEQ thus offers a quite reliable reconstruction. Nevertheless, the editors see their work as the ongoing task of reconstruction, as J. Robinson puts it in the introduction to the CEQ (lxxi): »It is not to be assumed that the present critical text is a last word. ... The ... present volume ... is intended to facilitate the study of Q, and thus to stimulate this ongoing process. ... It is thus to be hoped that the refinement of the text of Q will continue unabated ...«⁷

1.2.2 Narratological Access to Q

In recent research, comprehensive narratological studies on the Sayings Source have contradicted the often-repeated view that Q might only have been a loose collection of

3 Lindemann, Problem, 250: »... eine plausible Hypothese, die tatsächlich allen Teilfragen gerecht würde, wird offenbar nicht gefunden. Weder die Griesbach-Hypothese (Mt → Lk → Mk) noch die Farrer-Goulder-Hypothese (Mk → Mt → Lk) noch die Annahme, Mt sei literarisch von Lk abhängig, noch die unterschiedlichen Annahmen eines »Deutero-Markus« gewinnen Zustimmung über das bisherige Umfeld hinaus.«

4 The still remaining questions concerning the existence of Q are discussed in detail by Tiwald, Logienquelle, 15–34.

5 Concerning the IQP und CEQ, see Heil, Rekonstruktion, 133–138, and Tiwald, Logienquelle, 35–38.

6 Cf. Heil, Rekonstruktion, 137: »ein insgesamt eher »konservativer« Q-Text ..., der frei ist von extravaganten Spekulationen.«

7 Cf. also Heil, Rekonstruktion, 137–138: »Damit ist jedoch ähnlich wie beim »Nestle-Aland« nur eine Momentaufnahme gegeben, und es ist damit zu rechnen, daß es wie beim »Standardtext« des griechischen Neuen Testaments auch beim neuen Standardtext von Q zu weiteren revidierten Auflagen kommt.«

sayings and not a consistent literary document—merely some sort of loose-leaf notebook without narrative or theological coherence.⁸ M. Labahn's exhaustive monography *Der Gekommene als Wiederkommender: Die Logienquelle als erzählte Geschichte* (2010) has clearly demonstrated that Q is not an accidental collection of randomly acquired sayings⁹—comparable for example to the Gospel of Thomas—but that Q has a continuous narrative structure and a literary plot.¹⁰ In this sense J. Kloppenborg had already claimed: »... we can speak of Q as a ›literary unity‹ ...«¹¹ Certainly, Q mainly consist of »sayings and speeches«, yet this material nevertheless constitutes a »narratology of sayings«.¹² One has to reckon with an argumentative unity of Q.¹³ Exactly here the *Mainz Approach of Metaphorology and Narratology in the Sayings Source* (2014) by R. Zimmermann and his team has consequences for further work with Q:¹⁴

... how exactly can one consider or work with a text, which does not exist, or to put it more precisely, which does not exist as a manuscript? ... Is there a way to analyse a text without having the exact wording? ... Here, the analysis of metaphors and narrative criticism has proven itself useful in many fields. ... 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 method is further described by A. Bork *Die Raumsemantik und Figurensemantik der Logienquelle* (2015) as an intertextual approach to the text that no longer seeks a literal reconstruction of Q but tries to understand the big narratological patterns of Matthew and Luke's second source.¹⁵ Thus, D. Roth describes the approach as follows:¹⁶

8 Cf. Luz, Matthäus I, 48, who calls Q a »Materialsammlung« and »nicht ein literarisches Dokument«; »ein größeres Notizbuch«, offering the possibility of inserting new leaves (»jederzeit einen Einschub von neuen Blättern«).

9 Labahn, Gekommene, 574: »mehr als eine zufällige Aneinanderreihung von Sprüchen«.

10 Labahn, Gekommene, 575: »dass Q eine innere Struktur—einen plot—hat.«

11 Kloppenborg Verbin, *Excavating*, 135. See also the relevant conclusions of Schnelle, *Einleitung* 251: »Die Endfassung der Logienquelle ... lässt eine bewusste literarische Gestaltung erkennen« with a »bewusste theologische Komposition« *ibid.* 246). See also the even more recent studies of Labahn, *Sinn*, 131–173; Witetschek, *Logien*, 175–192; Dormeyer, *Narrativität*, 213–230.

12 Labahn, Gekommene, 577: »Erzählung des Redens« consisting in »narrativer Sinnbildung«.

13 Cf. Labahn, Gekommene, 119.

14 Zimmermann, *Metaphorology*, 4–6.

15 Bork, *Raumsemantik*, 26: »... ein intertextueller Zugang zum Q-Text ..., der nicht mehr danach strebt, eine Wortlautrekonstruktion des Q-Textes ... zu erarbeiten, sondern durch intertextuelle Rückschlüsse auf die von Matthäus und Lukas verwendete Quelle zulässt. Q wird also als Intertext zwischen Matthäus- und Lukasevangelium aufgefasst, ohne dass die Notwendigkeit einer wortgetreuen (Re-)Konstruktion besteht.«—This approach was already used in the following publications by R. Zimmermann: *Metaphor, Narrative, and Parables in Q* (2014), *Puzzling the Parables of Jesus. Methods and Interpretation* (2015); *Kompendium der Gleichnisse Jesu* (2007). The following monographies using this approach were published by Zimmermann's team: A. Bork *Die Raumsemantik und Figurensemantik der Logienquelle* (2015); D. Roth *The Parables in Q* (2018).

16 Roth, *Parables*, 41–42.

... when Matthew and Luke incorporated Q into their Gospels, they did not simply pick up on the words of their source, but drew out a whole realm of metaphors and images as well as narratival und sociocultural elements. ... Thus, Q as a source cannot be reduced simply to the words of Q and at the same time, a specific, word-for-word reconstructed Q text is not necessarily a prerequisite for analyzing Q as a source.

Nevertheless, it was again J. Kloppenborg (2000) who had already paved the way for such an approach:¹⁷

... it must be kept in mind that there is already in the double tradition approximately 50 percent verbal agreement even if it is still sometimes necessary to decide the syntax of the sentence. For example, in Q 15:4 ... This text is typical. It illustrates the fact that disagreement in vocabulary notwithstanding, the general sense of the Q text is clear.

The most recent narratological and sociological studies on Q prove the accuracy of this approach. H. Scherer *Königsvolk und Gotteskinder* (2016) underscores that the material of Q offers an independent and theologically consistent strain of Jesus tradition.¹⁸

1.2.3 Consequences for this Commentary

In accordance with the aforementioned *Narratological Approach to the Sayings Source*, one can conclude that Q's narratological plot can be understood even without a complete and correct reconstruction of Q. Nevertheless, the approach taken here by no means seeks to abandon the project of the reconstruction of Q. This commentary builds on the meticulous work accomplished by the *Critical Edition of Q*. Even if this reconstruction can never reach a reliability of 100%, it nonetheless offers an accurate basis for this commentary. Hence this study offers a balanced mix of both elements. On the one hand a *text-based exegesis* without an indulgence in the exuberant details of reconstruction, and on the other hand a *narratological approach* without ignoring the issue of the base text. Thus, the quest for a correct reconstruction of Q is not dismissed but—thanks to the reliable results of the CEQ—does not represent the primary concern of this commentary.

Here the two points of H. Scherer's critique of the Mainz Approach are certainly helpful. Firstly, she emphasizes that an exclusive reliance on the narrative approach in ignoring all forms of text reconstruction might lead to a projection of our own narratological ideas onto the text (»Zu groß ist dabei die Gefahr, die tatsächlich vorhandenen Daten mit unbewussten narrative Eintragungen anzureichern und so den gesuchten ›Sinn‹ der Texte schnell zu justieren«¹⁹). Secondly, she rightly criticises the approach of A. Bork for ignoring the cultural and sociological context to focus solely on narratological patterns. Both criticisms hit the nail on the head and

17 Kloppenborg Verbin, *Excavating*, 102–103.

18 Scherer, *Königsvolk*, 546: »dass das Material der *Traditio duplex* einen eigenständigen ... in sich sinnvoll vernetzten Entwurf sozialer Identifikationsgrößen bietet ...«—Scherer's critical remarks to the *Mainz Approach* (ibid. 129) will be dealt with later.

19 Scherer, *Königsvolk*, 129–130.

shall be reflected in this commentary. 1) The CEQ offers a reliable text basis permitting this commentary to focus mainly on the theological patterns of Q (but without ignoring questions of text reconstruction). 2) The sociocultural and sociotheological wort background of the Sayings Source are main points of particular interest in this commentary: Q shall be read against the backdrop of early Judaism and placed within the picture of Second Temple Palestine (cf. the *Excursi in Part IV*).²⁰

1.2.4 Textual Fluidity as an Essential Feature of Q

In reconstructing »the« Sayings Source, one must not forget that the text underwent a period of thirty years growth with development in different stages.²¹ Perhaps one can even assume with G. Theißen that a primary core of logia-collections dates back to the time of Jesus himself, when he sent out his disciples as missionaries (cf. Mark 6:7 // Luke 10:1). Here the master obviously teaches his emissaries the basic thrust of his message which they can proclaim. Such texts might have formed the core of later sayings-traditions.²² After Jesus' resurrection, the disciples continued their missionary work by adopting and adapting Jesus' sayings.

About 60 CE the oral traditions of the Sayings Source were framed within a literary document, written down by village scribes. Nevertheless, this by no means ended the phase of oral fluidity—modern approaches reckon with a longer time span of *secondary orality*: parallel to the written transmission, oral performance of the text was still current.²³ At that time most people were illiterate, and scrolls with a written text of the length of Q were quite expensive and far too bulky to be carried over long distances. Hence missionaries, even after the text had been written down, could still rely on their memorized versions of the sayings. Accordingly, even the genre of a missionary sermon must not be imagined as the reading aloud of a fixed text, but as a dramatical *mise en scene*. It is not the verbatim repetition of a »canonical« text which was important, but the inspired presentation of the missionaries' convictions.²⁴ »[I]n a situation where literacy was very low, texts were »performed« rather than read in the way that modern literate readers approach texts.«²⁵ Some variant readings thus might not be deliberate

20 Additionally, see the proceedings of two conferences dealing with the sociological background of Q: Tiwald (ed.), *Q in Context 1 & 2*; but also Tiwald, *Logienquelle*, 79–135.

21 Cf. Kloppenborg Verbin, *Excavating*, 143–153, who posits three stages of growth in the Sayings Source.

22 Theißen, *Entstehung*, 46: »Jesus schickte seine Jünger auf Wandermission. Seine Jünger mussten seine Botschaft an mehreren Orten wiederholen! Ein paar mündlich vorgegebene Texte müssen sie dazu mitgebracht haben, die sich ihnen durch Wiederholung einprägen!«

23 Cf. Heil, *Textverarbeitung*, 103, who refers to W. J. Ong, *Orality*, 135–137. See also Theißen, *Entstehung*, 41–46. Recent publications on this topic include Kloppenborg, *Contexts*, 49–72, and Smith, *Parable*, 73–97.

24 Cf. Heil, *Textverarbeitung*, 101: »nicht ... die wortwörtliche Wiederholung eines kanonischen Textes ..., sondern ... die inspirierte, emphatische Aufführung«.

25 Kloppenborg, *Contexts*, 70.

redactions or copy errors, but simply diverging »performances«.²⁶ The aforementioned *Narratological Approach to the Sayings Source* thus is not only a makeshift solution for not having the original text, but the only »genre«-appropriate approach to Q.

1.2.5 Textual Basis for this Commentary

Generally, the CEQ offers the textual basis for this commentary. Nevertheless, in some cases (which will be explained in detail) the commentary proposes an alternative reconstruction. This is in accordance with the wishes of the editors of the CEQ, who did not provide a complete text, but offered different grades of plausibility for a reconstruction.

I have provided an English translation on the basis of such a reconstructed Q-text.²⁷ The translation avoids text-critical sigla. Firstly, they would disturb the flow of the text. Secondly, the commentary puts the main focus not on detailed reconstruction but on highlighting the theological and narratological plot of Q. For a detailed justification of this reconstruction, the reader easily can consult the CEQ. Only if the text diverges from the CEQ is a detailed explanation given. Thirdly, subtle details of the reconstruction can be seen only in the Greek text. As this commentary operates on the basis of the English text (but with due recourse to the Greek form), unfortunately not all intricate details of reconstruction can be taken into account.

Although I do not provide text critical sigla, I want to emphasize that this should not lead to the illusion that we have the original form of the Q-text. Nevertheless, without the comprehensive details concerning reconstruction, the reader should see the big picture of Q's narratological plot and consistent theology. I am deeply convinced that this is feasible—even if we never will be able to reconstruct Q verbatim in all its details.

2. Positioning this Commentary among other Q-Commentaries

2.1 Status Quaestionis

A commentary should always address the questions of *Cui Bono?* and *Aliquid Novi?*: does this publication really contribute something new? In the German speaking

26 Heil, *Textverarbeitung*, 103: »Manche Varianten in der Textüberlieferung gehen dann nicht auf unabsichtliche Abschreibfehler oder absichtliche Redaktionen zurück, sondern auf Varianten in der mündlichen Überlieferung.«

27 Providing one's own translation should be a self-evident prerequisite for a commentary. Nevertheless, the English translation offered by the CEQ could not be used due to licence regulations.

world the necessity of an update surely is evident, as the last Q Commentary was published by D. Zeller (1984 in the series *Stuttgarter Kleiner Kommentar*, SKK).²⁸

In the English-speaking world there appears to be no need for such an update: H. Fleddermann published *Q: A Reconstruction and Commentary* in 2005 and in the same year R. Valantasis brought out *The New Q: A Fresh Translation with Commentary*. Fleddermann's meticulous and comprehensive thousand-page commentary really is a milestone in Q-research. Nevertheless, two major deficits reduce the value of this *opus magnum*. Firstly, Fleddermann maintains the minority view »that Mark knew and used Q«. ²⁹ And secondly, he also has the unusual proposal »that the background of Q lies in gentile Christianity«, ³⁰ for »From start to finish Q reads like a gentile Christian gospel.« ³¹

Especially Fleddermann's thesis, »that the author of Q was a gentile Christian writing for other gentile Christians« ³² leads to certain imbalances in his commentary, given that a growing number of Q-scholars see the matrix of the Sayings Source as still deeply rooted in early Judaism (see below, *II.2.1: Q and Early Judaism*). In accordance with this, Fleddermann also categorically denies that Q might still preserve Jesus traditions. For him »the characters of Q, including Jesus, [are] literary figures« and thus only »literary constructs« ³³ without any connection to the historical Jesus or to his Galilean followers. Certainly, the Sayings Source must not be (mis)taken uncritically as the *ipsissima vox Jesu*, but nevertheless the overwhelming majority of scholars see in Q an important bridge to the historical Jesus ³⁴ (see below, *II. 2.3: The Heritage Contained in Q*). In addition to this, Fleddermann's commentary mainly focusses on the reconstruction of the text of Q and not so much on exegetical questions. In spite of the major contribution of Fleddermann's commentary, the theological and narratological plot of Q is treated somewhat briefly.

Valantasis' commentary offers a completely different picture. Incomprehensibly, this monograph contains no references to secondary literature, and indeed no notes at all. There also is not a word about such common questions in Q research as by whom, when, where, and why Q might have been written. Thus, Valantasis' exegesis somewhat hangs in thin air. Or as J. Verheyden has put it in his review: »... at times it may appear Valantasis had to stretch the text to have it say what he thinks it means.« ³⁵

28 S. Schulz, *Q: Die Spruchquelle der Evangelisten* (1972) is not commentary but an analysis of theological patterns in Q.

29 Fleddermann, Q, 183; but »Mark uses Q creatively« (ibid.).

30 Fleddermann, Q, 164.

31 Fleddermann, Q, 166.

32 Fleddermann, Q, 791.

33 Fleddermann, Q, 204 und 206.

34 Cf. Heil, *Rekonstruktion*, 141, who defines Q and the Gospel of Mark »als wichtigste Zeugnisse für die Rekonstruktion des historischen Jesus«.

35 Cf. the online recension by J. Verheyden in RBL 1 (2007), accessed: 8.3.2019: https://www.bookreviews.org/pdf/5177_5452.pdf.

In addition to these aforementioned commentaries, there nevertheless exists a plethora of excellent publications on Q, albeit not »commentaries« in the strict sense of the word. In the English speaking world one has to point out the ground-breaking analyses by J. Kloppenborg and C. Tuckett. Both scholars have worked over more than forty years on the Sayings Source. Both scholars have emphasized that the Sayings Source was a document of early Judaism, whose authors had not yet broken from their Jewish matrix. The same applies to the publications on Q and on the Synoptic Problem by J. Verheyden and P. Foster. Even if not all of their publications are referred to in this commentary, they are nevertheless quoted in the preliminary volume to this monograph, *Die Logienquelle: Text, Kontext, Theologie*. Their discussions of the synoptic problem form the backdrop to this commentary.

Also essential for this commentary have been the many publications of P. Hoffmann and C. Heil. Both have introduced Q-research to the German speaking world. P. Hoffmann was one of the editors of the Critical Edition of Q. His *Studien zur Theologie der Logienquelle* (³1983, [1972]) was ground-breaking in the German-speaking world. C. Heil now edits the series *Documenta Q* but has himself contributed various valuable studies on Q, especially concerning how Luke dealt with his Q-material, as discussed in his monograph *Lukas und Q* (2003). Similarly, M. Hölscher, *Matthäus liest Q* (2017) has published a dissertation on Matthew's use of the Sayings Source.

In the German-speaking world one has to point to a huge number of narratological studies on Q, e.g., M. Labahn *Der Gekommene als Wiederkommender: Die Logienquelle als erzählte Geschichte* (2010), or the publications by R. Zimmermann and his team: *Kompendium der Gleichnisse Jesu* (2007; especially here the parables of Q), *Metaphor, Narrative, and Parables in Q* (2014), *Puzzling the Parables of Jesus: Methods and Interpretation* (2015); A. Bork *Die Raumsemantik und Figurensemantik der Logienquelle* (2015); D. Roth *The Parables in Q* (2018). Particular mention should also be made to the monographs of H. Scherer *Königsvolk und Gotteskinder: Der Entwurf der sozialen Welt im Material der Traditio duplex* (2016) and M. Ebner *Jesus—ein Weisheitslehrer?* (1998).

Older but still important literature includes E. Sevenich-Bax *Israels Konfrontation mit dem letzten Boten der Weisheit: Form, Funktion und Interdependenz der Weisheitselemente in der Logienquelle* (1993) and D. Kosch *Die eschatologische Tora des Menschensohnes: Untersuchungen zur Rezeption der Stellung Jesu zur Tora in Q* (1989).

2.2 Aliquid Novi?

This commentary owes much to all the aforementioned publications—my thanks to all the »Fellow Q-bies«! Yet the value of this publication lies in bringing together the *parting of the ways between Jews and Christians* and the *sociological and theological positioning of the Sayings Source*.³⁶ The question of the *parting of the ways* has gained a lot of momentum in recent years. Recent publications underscore that the parting

36 Cf. my earlier monographs: M. Tiwald, *Das Frühjudentum und die Anfänge des Christentums* and *Die Logienquelle: Text, Kontext, Theologie*.

of Jews and Christians did not occur with one single moment in history. »[A]ny reference to a parting of the ways between Judaism and Christianity must further specify who parted, when they parted, and where this separation occurred.«³⁷ Thus, Harlow specifies: »There can be no denying that the borderlines between Judaism and Christianity were not clearcut everywhere in the early centuries of the Common Era, or that the separation between them was uneven and complex.«³⁸ Particularly: if one wants to place the Gospel of Matthew *before* the parting of the ways (as does much recent research³⁹)—this has to be assumed *a fortiori* for the Sayings Source.⁴⁰ The community behind the Sayings Source had not yet broken from their Jewish matrix—polemics against other Jews have to be seen as *intra muros* Jewish struggles.⁴¹ Thus, the Sayings Source is not only an interesting document of emerging Christianity, but even more a valuable document of Second Temple Judaism. Hence, Q can be seen as the *missing link* between Jesus the Jew and early Christianity.

37 Broadhead, Ways, 389.

38 Harlow, Judaism, 275. Cf. also: Dunn, Partings, 230–259; Boyarin, Christen, 112–129; Broadhead, Ways, 354–391 (with the catchphrase »Parting with ›The Parting of the Ways‹; ibid. 389); Becker/Reed with the programmatic title of their book »The Ways that Never Parted«; Frankemölle, Frühjudentum, 437; Nicklas, Jews, passim. For an overview of the research, see Tiwald, Frühjudentum, 33–48.

39 See the position of Konradt, Matthäus, 19, who sees the Gospel of Matthew »ohne weiteres noch im Rahmen eines innerjüdischen Differenzierungsprozesses«. For a detailed discussion see Strotmann/Tiwald, Matthäusevangelium, 64–106.

40 See the detailed discussion at Tiwald, Logienquelle, 94–116.

41 Cf. Ebner, Q, 98, who maintains that Q has to be read »von einer intakten jüdischen Matrix aus«; see also ibid. 100.

Part II: Introductory Questions to Q

This commentary provides verse-by-verse exegesis of the Sayings Source. Given the limited space, an exhaustive discussion of *introductory questions* such as the date, location, and theological situation of the Sayings Source cannot be achieved here. I have however done this in an earlier publication: *M. Tiwald, Die Logienquelle: Text, Kontext, Theologie* (2016). This commentary offers in *Part II* an overview of the relevant issues that summarizes the results of more extensive discussion.

1. The Time and Place of Q's Composition

1.1 The Time of Q's Literal Composition

The *terminus post quem* for the composition of Q is the date of Jesus' death, presumably the year 30 CE.¹ As a *terminus ante quem* one can note the composition of Matthew's and Luke's Gospels (i.e., the eighties of the first century CE), as both evangelists used a written copy of the Sayings Source. The most plausible date of Q's written composition might be the early 60s of the first century CE—shortly before the outbreak of the Jewish War in 66 CE. Theories of an earlier dating in the forties² have not found widespread approval, nor has the proposal of a later dating in the 70s.³

1 See the discussion in Tiwald, *Frühjudentum*, 89–90.

2 Cf. Theißen, *Lokalkolorit*, 235, assuming a composition of Q before the so-called Apostolic Council (49 CE), or Schnelle, *Einleitung*, 250, who tries to parallel the persecution in in Q 6:22 with 1 Thess 2:14–16.

3 Cf. Hoffmann, *Studien*, 175 and 179, also Myllykoski, *History*, 199. Both see in Q 13:34–35 a hint at the destruction of the temple in 70 CE.