MULTILINGUALISM IN ANCIENT CONTEXTS

Perspectives from
Ancient Near Eastern
and Early Christian
Contexts

EDITORS

Louis C. Jonker
Angelika Berlejung
Izak Cornelius

12

LINGUISTIC ASPECTS OF THE
SAYINGS SOURCE Q
Sociolect and Idiolect

Marco Frenschkowski
Leipzig

12.1 INTRODUCTION

The linguistic situation of early Roman Palestine has been a subject of considerable interest, as is well-known.¹ Clear-cut cultural and linguistic distinctions between Aramaic-speaking rural Jews from Galilee, Greek-speaking diaspora Jews, and Greek-speaking foreigners have already become obsolete as simplifications in the 1960s, and distinctive features of an earliest Aramaic speaking Jesus movement rooted in Galilee and Greek-speaking Jews and Christ people (not yet “Christians”) in Jerusalem have proven much more fluid than had formerly been supposed. Older research on New Testament Greek tried to prove an extensive use of Semitic structures particularly in syntax and linguistic phrases and syntagmatic elements. Marius Reiser and other scholars have however been able to prove much of these so-called Semitisms are simply popular and perhaps lower-class features of spoken Greek,² and the search for such elements can only work effectively in combination with considerations on milieu and sociolect, i.e., on often rather subtle distinctions in group language.

Research has become increasingly aware of the complexities of linguistic situations in countries where dominant and dominated cultures clash, where trade routes and international trade lead to the near proximity of two or even more than two different languages, and where social and ethnic borderlines are not identical with linguistic ones. We do no longer deal with languages as separate entities, but as mixed and often increasingly mixing communicative and often fluid systems. This applies to Aramaic, Hebrew, Greek, and Latin, as it does to other languages. In many Coptic texts, for example, almost every fifth word is Greek; also, in Rabbinic Aramaic and Hebrew, the number of Greek elements is considerable. In modern German, to look at a modern example, we have the phenomenon of young people speaking “Denglisch” (German English), which perhaps allows us to understand the bilingual milieu of societies participating in different language traditions better, as well as how aspects of social status apply to different strata of these languages.

Pidginisation and Creol languages are common in such situations, though we know less about such phenomena in antiquity where only literary and epigraphic sources

1 For a well-balanced statement surveying much evidence see, e.g., John C. Poirier, “The Linguistic Situation in Jewish Palestine in Late Antiquity”, *Journal of Greco-Roman Christianity and Judaism*, 4 (2007) 55-134. He does not discuss Latin, however, though giving some recent literature on the subject (55 no. 1).

2 Marius Reiser, *Syntax und Stil des Markusevangeliums im Lichte der hellenistischen Volksliteratur*. WUNT II/11 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1984); Marius Reiser, “Der Alexanderroman und das Markusevangelium”, in *Markus-Philologie. Historische, literargeschichtliche und stilistische Untersuchungen zum zweiten Evangelium*. Ed. Hubert Cancik (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1984), 131-63.

are available. The difference between these variations is important: A pidgin language is nobody's native language; it emerges when two speakers of different languages try to have a makeshift conversation. They are contact vernaculars where the lexicon may come from one language, but the reduced grammar from the other. The status of such linguistic structures is generally low, though more prestigious vocabulary can substitute older words; this is called relexification. A creole language, in contrast, is an acquired language that can be a first language of speakers in contexts where language worlds clash. These can merge with standard languages and even become written languages, as has happened in the case of Haitian and Jamaican Creole, the first-mentioned having a French substratum, the latter an English substratum.

12.2 1ST-CENTURY PALESTINE AND SYRIA

Similar phenomena must have been common in 1st-century Palestine and Syria, though Greek is clearly the predominant language, and all New Testament authors seem to have spoken it fluently, though not always without faults and idiosyncrasies (not always to be distinguished, as, e.g., in the case of the Apocalypse of John, where un-grammatical language may be a way of sacralising a text). Bilingualism may have been common – indeed even the rule – at least in an urban setting. Therefore, scholars like Jonathan M. Watt have stressed the impact bilingualism research may have on New Testament exegesis, exemplifying this with obvious examples such as the use of ῥακά and μωπέ in Matthew 5:22.³ We have only limited knowledge for late antiquity about sociolects, group languages of professions,⁴ and social milieus, though we do have more knowledge about the special languages of some religious groups, and some informed guesses can be made, as such phenomena tend to repeat themselves in different languages, and some direct evidence is available. We also do have information on dialects: famously, Peter is recognised as a Galilean from his dialect following the arrest of Jesus, when Peter denied knowing Jesus three times (Mk 14:66-72). Some recent discussions have looked for some evidence on a possible Cilician dialect Paul may have spoken (though the Greek Koiné minimised such differences).⁵

3 Cf. Jonathan M. Watt, "Some Implications of Bilingualism for New Testament Exegesis", in *The Language of the New Testament. Context, History, and Development*. Linguistic Biblical Studies 6. eds. Stanley E. Porter & Andrew W. Pitts (Leiden: Brill 2013), 9-27, here 24-27.

4 For some speculations on the artisan background of Jesus, see Marco Frenschkowski, "Itinerant Charismatics and Travelling Artisans – Was Jesus' Travelling Lifestyle Induced by His Artisan Background?" in *The Q Hypothesis Unveiled. Theological, Sociological, and Hermeneutical Issues behind the Sayings Source*. Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament 225. Ed. Markus Tiwald (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2020), 191-222.

5 Cf. Niclas Förster, "Sprach Paulus einen kilikischen Koine-Dialekt? Ein bisher übersehener Aspekt der Biographie des Paulus", *ZNW*, 88 (1997): 316-21.

Also, phenomena of code-switching and non-élite bilingualism in late antiquity have been the subject of much research, particularly in the field of popular Latin.⁶ Loan words have always found attention, not only as borrowings recognised as such, but also as words that have “received citizenship” in the new language, as Seneca, who was aware of such dynamics, famously put it (*quaest. nat.* 5:16,4). Counteractions are part of these developments. The emperor Tiberius, for example, has been a spokesman of a conservative trend in the spoken Latin of the elite defending it against the increasing number of Greek loan words (*Dio Cass.* 57:15,1-7; 17,1-3), and against speaking Greek in Rome (it must not be forgotten that the Christian community in Rome for perhaps 150 years seems to have been almost exclusively Greek speaking). These are just some remarks on the complex linguistic situation of early Christianity and its milieu, the multilingual matrix from which Christianity emerged (Greek, Hebrew, different dialects of western and eastern Aramaic, Latin, Phoenician-Punic, Coptic, Parthian, Nabataean Arabic,⁷ and perhaps others were involved).⁸ Such a multilingual landscape is particularly well suited for a movement breaking down cultural boundaries and “going global”. It must also not be forgotten group languages can share the same essential grammar but develop highly divergent vocabularies even for basic items (as happened between Hindi and Urdu, or between Serbian and Croatian).

12.3 THE SAYINGS SOURCE Q – SOME GENERAL REMARKS

The Greek language of Q, the Sayings Source, an early collection of Jesus sayings not extant as a book, but recoverable from the gospels of Matthew and Luke, will now be discussed.⁹ This early Christian reconstructed gospel text has been known since the

- 6 We may think of the large study by James N. Adams, *Bilingualism and the Latin Language* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), as well as id., *Social Variation and the Latin Language* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013). These are on Latin, however, not on Greek language varieties. In Greek we can distinguish such varieties mainly for Egypt, and to a minor degree for Asia Minor, with the older pre-Hellenistic Greek dialects having almost completely vanished. For a general reference frame of questions on the cultural and psychological aspects of bilingualism we might mention the classic study by Uriel Weinreich, *Languages in Contact. Findings and Problems*, 9th Ed. (The Hague, Paris, New York: Mouton Publ., 1979).
- 7 Two passages in the New Testament are clearly in contact with some form of Northern spoken Arabic (*Acts* 13:8; *Gal* 4:25). I have to abstain from discussing these passages here.
- 8 Strangely, it is said about Cleopatra (the last queen of Egypt, who was a genius in languages, speaking several languages fluently and the first queen from the Ptolemaic dynasty able to converse with all her people in their own languages) that she spoke both Syriac and Hebrew (*Plutarch*, *Marco Antony* 27,3), whatever exactly that might mean.
- 9 The following remarks are a short abridgement of some selected observations on the language of Q as discussed at length in Marco Frenschkowski, “Q-Studien. Historische, religionsgeschichtliche und theologische Untersuchungen zur Logienquelle” (2000, rev. 2007 – unpublished as a book, but some parts have appeared as articles). Only a most rudimentary documentation is possible in this short chapter. A virtually complete bibliography of recent

late 19th century, but has come into the focus of research as a major source on the earliest Jesus movement only since the 1970s, with a particular active period in the 1990s. All passages which can be reconstructed are part of the two canonical gospels of Matthew and Luke (a very few texts only in either Matthew or Luke may also have been part of Q). The Q-texts themselves are therefore not “new”, but as parts of an autonomous reconstructable book, they nevertheless offer a completely new way of gaining access to Christian beginnings.

The so-called International Q Project has since 1985 discussed these reconstructions at great length (often at SBL sessions), and summarised this discussion in 2000 with a publication called the *Critical Edition*, edited by Paul Hoffmann, James M. Robinson and John Kloppenborg.¹⁰ This is not just a reconstruction, but tries to define all questions that have to be taken into account for each single text in detail. Of course, research is ongoing, and slightly different reconstructions have been published in the meantime,¹¹ as had been the explicit intention of the *Critical Edition*. This text was never meant to be a final version of Q, and research will certainly continue. This highly acclaimed, though reconstructed and somewhat fluid text, is meant when we speak about the Source Q (or Sayings Gospel, as some prefer, Q not just being a source for something else, but a Gospel text of its own right). It is a reconstructed book of which every single detail exists in the extant gospels, however. The text I take as a starting point has only very few variant readings compared to the *Critical Edition*, which can always be used as a reference text in the following analysis.¹²

Q studies is available online <http://www.reconstructingq.com/bibliography.php> (Accessed September 2020). This is organised by David B. Sloan, who believes Q and the Jewish-Christian Gospel of Hebrews are the same text. This is highly improbable for reasons not to be discussed in this short chapter.

- 10 James M. Robinson, Paul Hoffmann & John S. Kloppenborg, eds. *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: Peeters, 2000). A shorter version of this without apparatus is Paul Hoffmann & Christoph Heil, eds. *Die Spruchquelle Q. Studienausgabe Griechisch und Deutsch* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2002/4th Ed. 2013). Questions of reconstruction are generally not discussed in this chapter, which takes the Critical Edition as a starting point, but always keeps the different degrees of certitude in this reconstruction in mind (as does the Critical Edition itself). The name ‘Critical Edition’ is a bit misleading insofar as this is not an edition but a reconstruction.
- 11 E.g., Harry T. Fleddermann, *Q: A Reconstruction and Commentary* (Leuven: Peeters, 2005); cf. also Richard Valantasis, *The New Q: A Fresh Translation with Commentary* (New York: T&T Clark, 2005).
- 12 Q-texts are quoted below according to the relevant passages in Luke’s gospel, as Luke seems to have preserved the original order of Q better. So, “Q 6:20”, for example, means the hypothetical text that can be reconstructed (with rather high plausibility) from Luke 6:20 and the parallel in Matthew 5:3, and which may have looked something like the following: καὶ [[ἐπάρ]]ας τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῦς]] αὐτοῦ [[εἰς τοὺς]] μαθητὰς]] αὐτοῦ [[<εἶπεν>]] μακάριοι οἱ πτωχοί, ὅτι [[ὑμετέρας]] ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ (with the different brackets indicating different degrees of plausibility; for all details see the Critical Edition and also the full documentation in the

A number of scholars have tried to solve the literary interdependence between the synoptic gospels without the assumption of a Sayings Source as a separate book, but their arguments are not seen as convincing by the majority of experts and by the present writer and will not be taken into account in this short discussion. For reasons not to be discussed on this occasion (as, e.g., its recognisable overall architectonic structure and composition), I am reasonably sure that Q was a real book and looked approximately like the reconstruction suggests, with many unclear passages, and some major uncertainties of course. There is no way, for example, to reconstruct traditions both Matthew and Luke chose not to include. The number of these traditions was probably not high, as Q clearly was a major authoritative text for both gospels, perhaps even more so than Mark.¹³ Similar books using the instruction genre as a frame of collecting sayings and apophthegms are well known from antiquity,¹⁴ and have also been used as vehicles of the Jesus tradition, as the apocryphal Gospels of Thomas and Philip illustrate, that are perhaps only slightly younger than the canonical gospels. This similarity supports the plausibility of the reconstruction.

Q also had some narrative elements, even a miracle story (as Q 3:21-22; Q 4:1-13; Q 7:1-10; 11:14-26) and an overall structure (e.g., putting eschatological elements towards the end of the composition, as many early Christian books did, and beginning with references on the Baptist, the temptation of Jesus and perhaps also his baptism).

series James M. Robinson, Paul Hoffmann & John S. Kloppenborg eds., *Documenta Q* (Peeters: Leuven, 1996–2014). Twelve volumes have appeared thus far: Q 4,1-13 (1996); Q 6:20-21 (2001); Q 6:37-42 (2011); Q 7:1-10 (2002); Q 11:2b-4 (1996); Q 11:39-44 (2012); Q 11:46-52 (2012); Q 12:8-12 (1997); Q 12:33-34 (2007); Q 12:49-59 (1997); Q 13:34-35 (2014); Q 22:28, 30 (1998).

- 13 Probably, our major losses are the *inscriptio* and/or *subscriptio* (title) and perhaps a few introductory and connecting words. Mt and Lk both omitted some parts of Mk, trying not to exceed the length of one book scroll, so this may have been the case with their treatment of Q as well. Cf. however Marco Frenschkowski, "Matthäus als Gewährsmann der Logienquelle: Neues zu einer alten Theorie", in *Built on Rock or Sand? Q Studies: Retrospects, Introspects and Prospects*. Biblical Tools and Studies 34. eds., Christoph Heil & Gertraud Harb (Leuven: Peeters, 2018), 409-39. Fleddermann, *Q. A Reconstruction and Commentary*, 74 is even more confident: Q might be preserved completely or almost completely. He also tries to prove both Mt and Lk preferred Q to Mk, in cases where both go parallel. Cf. already id., *Mark and Q. A Study of the Overlap Texts*. BETL122 (Leuven: Peeters, 1995).
- 14 It has been the lasting merit and significance of John S. Kloppenborg (*The Formation of Q. Trajectories in Ancient Wisdom Collections* [Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987]) to have defined and described the non-prophetic macroforms that may have influenced Q. This may well be the single most influential book in Q research (besides the Critical Edition), though many scholars do not share its redactional model for the emergence of Q. See also John S. Kloppenborg, *Q, the Earliest Gospel: An Introduction to the Original Stories and Sayings of Jesus* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2008); John S. Kloppenborg, *Synoptic Problems: Collected Essays*. WUNT 329 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014). Cf. on some consequences Marco Frenschkowski, "Welche biographischen Kenntnisse von Jesus setzt die Logienquelle voraus? Beobachtungen zur Gattung von Q im Kontext antiker Spruchsammlungen". In: *From Quest to Q. Festschrift James M. Robinson*. BETL 156. eds. Jon Ma. Asgeirsson, Kristin de Troyer & Marvin W. Meyer (Leuven: Peeters 2000), 3-42.

So it was not just a string of sayings, but a work “im Prozeß der Buchwerdung” (in the process of becoming a book, with some degree of an in-between status as to its literary form). Within this frame of reference of basic observations and some open questions about Q, we will look at the Greek language of the Sayings Source.

12.4 THE GREEK OF THE SAYINGS SOURCE Q

Such an examination of the language of Q is naturally difficult and only possible with constant back-reference to an analysis of the language of Matthew and Luke (that we know quite well from comparing it with the language of Mk). However, in the final instance, this complex must be kept completely independent and detached from the further question of what might be traced back in Q to an (oral or even written) Aramaic original.¹⁵ Q has been a Greek book, though part of its tradition goes back to the Aramaic words of Jesus; but our topic of discussion here is exclusively the Greek language of Q as a Greek book. As we will see, this leads to surprising and far from self-evident observations of which only a few examples can be given here. My remarks will have to be restricted to some observations on vocabulary (especially the little-noticed verbs), on Semitic and other loan and foreign words, and on some details of grammar and style. These are only building blocks of a comprehensive analysis of the linguistic form. However, the observations of this contribution will already

15 On this, cf. the summarising (and sceptic) accounts by Kloppenborg, *The Formation of Q*, 54-64; John S. Kloppenborg, *Excavating Q: The History and Setting of the Sayings Gospel* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2000), 72-80. The most important evidence comes from some observations already by Julius Wellhausen, as well as by Matthew Black, *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts*. 3rd Ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1967); Black, Matthew, “The Aramaic Dimension in Q with Notes on Luke 17.22, Matthew 24.26 (Luke 17.23)”, *JSNT*, 40 (1990), 33-41; also in Craig A. Evans & Stanley E. Porter, eds. *The Historical Jesus. A Sheffield Reader*. The Biblical Seminar 33 (Sheffield: Sheffield University Press, 1995), 237-44. Above all, the alleged translation variants for Q 6:22, 23, 46; 10:5; 11:3, 4, 41, 42, 48; 12:10; 14:27 are to be mentioned, which Kloppenborg, *The Formation of Q*, 54-9 has criticised (which means, they do not really give information on an earlier Aramaic form). Cf. also Robinson et al., *The Critical Edition of Q*, XXX-XXXIII. An Aramaic tradition for individual logia can of course be expected in many, perhaps most cases, but we do not have clear evidence for competing or co-existing translations. Many relevant observations are hidden in smaller and older studies; cf. e.g., Otto Böcher, “Aß Johannes der Täufer kein Brot (Luk. 7,33)?” *NTS*, 18 (1971): 90-2. There have been many erratic and over-confident studies in this field on the other side, as, e.g., Günther Schwarz, “Und Jesus sprach”. *Untersuchungen zur aramäischen Urgestalt der Worte Jesu* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2nd Ed. 1987). Others are more in contact with recent Aramaic studies, as Maurice Casey, *An Aramaic Approach to Q: Sources for the Gospels of Matthew and Luke* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 2002), though they also fail to convince with their over-all theories. Also problematic are the considerations about lexematic structures that allegedly are impossible in Semitic texts (as, unfortunately, even considered by Kloppenborg, *Excavating Q*, 78), which, of course, in no way prevented the Syrian translators from finding a Syrian translation. An elegant Greek formulation can well be based on a longer or more awkward Aramaic version.

enable some important conclusions, even a clear shift of emphasis compared to earlier research assumptions in scholarship.

In general, it should be emphasised (and this, of course, is not new) that the Greek of the Sayings Source is rather simple and specific. It has been said (by James M. Robinson and others, at different occasions and in different wordings) that Q is a book about “stones and streets and hunger and hope”, and not so much about a detailed theology. This may be over-simplified, but it remains true as to its language, which is clearly neither a priestly nor a scribal sociolect, as we shall see.¹⁶

12.4.1 Verbs

A glance at the verbs immediately shows that they are perhaps even more significant than the nouns in this respect. The following *verba simplicia* are used (apart from εἶναι), where the numbers roughly indicate the frequency (participial forms are also considered, but many uncertainties remain, and results can only be viewed as approximations):

ἀγιαρίζειν (1), ἀγαλλιᾶσθαι (1), ἀγαπᾶν (4), ἀγγαρεῦν (1), αἶρειν (4), αἰτεῖν (6), ἀκολουθεῖν (5), ἀκούειν (11), ἀλήθειν (1), ἀμαρτάνειν (2), ἀριθμεῖν (1), ἀρνεῖσθαι (2), ἀρπάζειν (1), ἄρχεσθαι (4), ἀσθενεῖν (1), ἀσπάζεσθαι (1), αὐλεῖν (1), αὐξάνειν (2), ἀφανίζειν (2), βάλλειν (8), βαπτίζειν (3), βαστάζειν (2), βιάζεσθαι (1), βλέπειν (5), βούλεσθαι (1), βρέχειν (1), γαμῖν (1), γαμίζειν (2), γέμειν (2), γίνεσθαι (10), γινώσκειν (6), γράφειν (5), δανίζεσθαι (2), δεικνύειν (1), δεῖν (1), δεῖσθαι (1), δέχεσθαι (6), διδάσκειν (2), διδόναι (12), δικαιοῦν (1), διχάζειν (1), διώκειν (2), δοκεῖν (3), δουλεύειν (2), δύνασθαι (10), ἐγγίζειν (1), ἐγείρειν (5), εἰπεῖν (mit φημί etc.: 39), ἐλπίζειν (1), ἐρημοῦν (1), ἔρχεσθαι (31), ἐσθίειν (8), εὐαγγελίζεσθαι (1), εὐλογεῖν (1), εὐρίσκειν (10), ἔχειν (14), ζῆν (1), ζητεῖν (8), ζυμοῦν (1), ἥκειν (3), θάπτειν (2), θαυμάζειν (2), θεᾶσθαι (1), θέλειν (3), θεμελιοῦν (1), θεραπεύειν (2), θεριίζειν (3), θησαυρίζειν (2), θρηνεῖν (1), ἰᾶσθαι (1), ἰδεῖν (5, dazu ἰδοῦ 12 und ἴδε (1)), ἰστάναι (3), καθαρίζειν (2), καθῆσθαι (2), καθιστάναι (4), καίειν (1), καλεῖν (5), καλύπτειν (1), κείσθαι (1), κηρύσσειν (1), κλαίειν (1), κλείσαι (2), κλέπτειν (2), κλίνειν (1), κομίζειν (1), κοπιᾶν (1), κοσμεῖν (1), κρίνειν (6), κρούειν (3), κρύπτειν (3), λαλεῖν (2), λαμβάνειν (6), λάμπειν (1), λατρεῦν (1), λέγειν (41), λυσιτελεῖν (1), μεθύειν (1), μέλλειν (1), μένειν (1), μερίζειν (3), μεριμνᾶν (5), μετρεῖν (2), μισεῖν (3), μοιχεύειν (2), μωραίνειν (1), νήθειν (1), νικᾶν (1), οἶδα (9, counted separately from ὁρᾶσθαι), οἰκοδομεῖν (3), ὁμοιοῦν (3), ὁμολογεῖν (2), ὀνειδίζειν (1), ὁρᾶσθαι (5), ὀργίζειν (1), ὀρχεῖσθαι (1), πείθειν (1), πεινᾶν (2),

16 This was the main point of my study Marco Frenschkowski, “Nicht wie die Schriftgelehrten: Nichtschriftgelehrte Rezeption alttestamentlich-jüdischer Traditionen in der Logienquelle und im Koran”, in Dieter T. Roth, Ruben Zimmermann & Michael Labahn, eds. *Metaphor, Narrative, and Parables in Q*. WUNT 315 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014), 221-52.

πειράζειν (1), πέμπειν (1), πενθεῖν (1), πίνειν (7), πίπτειν (5), πλανᾶν (1), πληροῦν (1), πνεῖν (1), ποιεῖν (19), πορεύεσθαι (5), πραγματεύεσθαι (1), πυρράζειν (2), πωλεῖν (1), ραπίζειν (1), ρίπτειν (1), σαλεύειν (1), σαροῦν (1), σκανδαλίζειν (2), σκορπίζειν (1), σπείρειν (3), στρέφειν (1), στυγνάζειν (1), ταπεινοῦν (2), τιθέναι (2), τρέφειν (1), τρώγειν (1), τύπτειν (1), ὑψοῦν (3), φαίνεσθαι (1), φεύγειν (1), φθάνειν (1), φιλεῖν (1), φοβεῖσθαι (4), φορεῖν (1), φορτίζειν (1), φυτεύειν (1), χαίρειν (2), χορτάζειν (1), χρῆζειν (1), χρονίζειν (1).

This list is far from perfect, and would need detailed discussion.

To this, we may compare the *verba composita*:

ἀμφιεννύναι (2), ἀναβλέπειν (1), ἀνακλίνειν (1), ἀνατέλλειν (1), ἀνιστάναι (1), ἀνοίγειν (3), ἀντέχειν (1), ἀπαγγέλειν (2), ἀπαιτεῖν (1), ἀπαλάσσειν (1), ἀπέρχεσθαι (4), ἀποδεκατοῦν (1), ἀποδημοῦν (2), ἀποδιδόναι (1), ἀποκαλύπτειν (4), ἀποκρίνεσθαι (6), ἀποκτείνειν (5), ἀπολλύναι (6), ἀπολύειν (2), ἀποστέλλειν (6), ἀφανίζειν (1), ἀφιέναι (15), διαβλέπειν (1), διακαθαρίζειν (1), διακρίνειν (1), διασκορπίζειν (1), διαφέρειν (2), διέρχεσθαι (1), διορῶσιν (3), διχοτομεῖν (1), ἐγκρύπτειν (1), εἰσέρχεσθαι (9), εἰσφέρειν (2), ἐκβάλλειν (13), ἐκζητεῖν (2), ἐκκόπτειν (1), ἐκπειράζειν (1), ἐκριζοῦν (1), ἐκτινάσσειν (1), ἐκχύνειν (1), ἐνδύνειν (1), ἐντελεῖν (1), ἐξέρχεσθαι (11), ἐξομολογεῖσθαι (1), ἐπαίρειν (1), ἐπιδιδόναι (2), ἐπιζητεῖν (1), ἐπιθυμεῖν (1), ἐπιστρέφειν (3), ἐπισυνάγειν (2), ἐπιτιμᾶν (1), ἐπιτρέπειν (1), καθίζεσθαι (καθησθαι) (2), καθιστάναι (4), καθοπλίζειν (1), καταβαίνειν (1), κατακαῦειν (1), κατακρίνειν (2), κατανοεῖν (1), καταρτίζειν (1), κατασκευάζειν (1), κατασκηνοῦν (1), καταφρονεῖν (1), κατοικεῖν (1), λιθοβολεῖν (1), μεταβαίνειν (1), μετανοεῖν (2), ὁδηγεῖν (1), παραδιδόναι (2), παρακαλεῖν (2), παραλαμβάνειν (4), παρέρχεσθαι (2), περιβάλλειν (2), περικεῖσθαι (1), περιπατεῖν (2), προσδοκᾶν (2), προσεργάζεσθαι (1), προσέρχεσθαι (1), προσεύχεσθαι (2), προσκόπτειν (2), προσκυνεῖν (2), προσπίπτειν (1), προστιθέναι (2), προσφωνεῖν (1), συλλέγειν (1), συνάγειν (6), συναίρειν (1), ὑπάγειν (2), ὑπακούειν (1), ὑπάρχειν (1), ὑποδεικνύειν (1).

Some obvious points may simply be coincidence, due to the limited length of the Q-material. The large number of verbs denoting ‘speaking’ and ‘preaching’ is not surprising. More remarkable is the preference for ἔρχεσθαι and composites, and generally for verbs of movement. This may well be related to the basic life experience of the tradition bearers behind Q, which perhaps also explains the frequency of verbs for aggressive experiences. Not only does ἀποκτείνειν occur six times, but also rare verbs such as λιθοβολεῖν (Q 13:34) and διχοτομεῖν (Q 12:46), referring to cruel physical punishment, as well as the even more graphic διχάσαι (Q 12:53). Q seems to have had a special, quite peculiar affinity for ἐκβάλλειν (13 times, see also ἔξω βάλλειν in Q 14:35). This is also a word of an emphatic-aggressive tone. In addition to the semantic field “come, arrive, etc.,” the frequency of εὐρίσκειν is conspicuous, to which

the evidence in Luke 15:8-10 (pericope of the lost drachma) might be added, if this text indeed stood in Q (it is not considered in the list above as no reconstructable text is available). Also, quite prominent is ζητεῖν which occurs seven times.

Some verbs are otherwise quite uncommon: διχοτομέω occurs only in Q 12:46 (> Mt 24:51, Lk 12:46) in early Christian literature; also, in non-Christian literature it is extremely rare (in descriptions of executions and similar contexts). Σαρῶ (Q 11:25 > Mt 12:44, Lk 11:25) is a late subsidiary form of σαίρω which is rejected by the atticists,¹⁷ which seems to be documented outside the New Testament only in the 2nd century (Pastor Hermae has it twice, sim. 9:10 = 87:2,3 Whitt). Also, ἀμφιεννύναι (Q 7:25 > Mt 11:8; Lk 7:25; probably also Q 12:28 > Mt 6:30) is a very unusual word, which has been used since Homer, but later became mainly epigraphic language, with which the copyists had their trouble according to the *variae lectiones* (as to Lk 12:28), varying between ἀμφιάζειν (a Dorism), ἀμφιέζειν (Hellenist Greek) and older ἀμφιεννύναι (cf. BDR sections 29,2; 69,1; 73,1). Ἀλήθειν (Q 17:35) is Hellenistic Greek for the preferred and more frequent ἀλεῖν (similar is νήθειν Q 12:27, a Hellenistic secondary form for νῆν, but already Platon, politic. 289C has it).

By simple counting, Q has 157 *verba simplicia* and 91 *verba composita*. This is a ratio of 100:58. For comparison: the Gospel of John has a ratio of 100:48; the first Epistle of Peter 100:63; and Ephesians 100:79 (these are all approximate numbers, as these verbs are often text-critically uncertain). The *verba composita* in Q are also of the most common kind. A bicomposite is found only once (ἐπισυνάγειν, Q 13:34, perhaps from a quotation, cf. Lk 17:37, where the parallel Mt 24:28 only reads συνάγειν, which may be more original).

Such bicomposites in Greek texts of the Roman period are always a certain indication of the “modernity” and sophistication, or as we may say of the literary grace of a writer in an elitist sense (Mt has 8 bicomposites in 12 places; Mk has 10 in 14 places; Lk has 20 in 31 places; the Corpus Paulinum has 47 in 74 places; while the Corpus Iohanneum on the other side of the spectrum mostly avoids bicomposites, following a completely different ideal of concise language comparable to the style of the Corpus Hermeticum; Apc with its deliberately archaising language has only one bicomposite in a single instance). This all indicates a straightforward, rather simple Greek language for Q without any traces of Greek upper class education. We are far from the world of Paul and his love, e.g., of *verba composita*, particularly those with ὑπέρ, of which he has 19 in a total of 28 in the New Testament.

17 Κόρημα χρῆ λέγειν, οὐχὶ σάρων, καὶ κορεῖν καὶ παρακορεῖν, ἀλλὰ μὴ σαροῦν. Phrynichus, ecl. 62 (*The New Phrynichus: Being a Revised Text of the Ecloga of the Grammarian Phrynichus*, ed. W. Gunion Rutherford, London 1881, 156).

12.4.2 Nouns

I will not list the vocabulary of nouns in this short overview. It comprises mainly general and religious terms which have neither any affinities to popular philosophical concepts (this has to be considered for the “cynic thesis”),¹⁸ nor to any recognisably priestly vocabulary. Note that in the anthropological vocabulary, for example, the popular καρδιά (Q 6:45; 12:34; 12:45) seems to have about the same weight for the volutative centre of the person as the more abstract ψυχή (Q 12:22-23; 17:33), the use of which is completely free of any specifically Hellenistic-philosophical connotations. In a certain area (monetary and financial terms) the vocabulary in Q achieves technical precision, which is one of the most striking features of the Sayings Source. This will be discussed in more detail later and needs much more attention in research. “Son of man” is certainly the strangest lexeme in the gospels, when read by a Greek audience without particular Jewish background. Paul did not use it: his readers simply would not have understood it (whereas “Christ”-words increasingly became an identity marker for the Jesus movement), and already the Epistle of Barnabas (early 2nd century CE) completely misunderstands it (Barn 12:10), as does much of the later church writing.

Q is compiled for an audience that does not need any explanations about this enigmatic metonym of Jesus, as it does not need any clarifications on what the βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ might be, though Jesus of course defamiliarises the tradition with surprising aspects, and the lexeme is far from being used in all Jewish literature. This does not just mean Q is a Jewish book, but also it presupposes a special milieu within Judaism: popular, non-priestly, more often vividly alluding to figures from the canonical past and perhaps to oral narrative than actually quoting texts, connected to apocalyptic traditions though only rarely using apocalyptic genre conventions, interested in and perhaps competing with the Baptist’s movement. Its Jesus is more than Jonah, more than Solomon: more than a prophet, more than a sage (Q 11: 31-32).

12.4.3 Proper Names

Proper names are sparse and are mostly found in Old Testament allusions: Ἀβελ (11:51), Νῶε (17:26-27), Ἀβραάμ (3:8 bis; 13:28), Ἰσαάκ (13:28), Ἰακώβ (13:28), Δαβὶδ (only Mt 12:23 and there probably Matthean redaction), Ἰωνᾶς (11:29-30, 32 bis), Σολομών (11:31 bis; 12:27), Ἡσαΐας (3:4); perhaps Λῶτ (special tradition Lk 17:28 and 29, which some want to derive from Q). All these are figures from stories, probably folk stories, which only for us are primarily figures in texts. None of the disciples or other followers of Jesus are ever mentioned by name, not even Peter, a very conspicuous

18 Cf. Marie-Odile Goulet-Cazé, *Kynismus und Christentum in der Antike*, ed. Marco Frenschkowski. Transl. by Lena Seehausen. *Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus/Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments* 113 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 2016).

point (also in contrast to the Gospel of Thomas, for instance), but John the Baptist is mentioned several times.

The contemporary martyr Ζαχαρίας υἱὸς Βαραχίου in Q 11:51 is of course not the Old Testament prophet, which would make the parallelism ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου ἀπὸ τῆς γενεᾶς ταύτης as compared to ἀπὸ [[]] αἵματος Ἀβελ ἕως [[]] αἵματος Ζαχαρίου [[υἱοῦ Βαρ ...]] τοῦ ἀπολομένου μεταξύ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου καὶ τοῦ οἴκου meaningless: “from the formation of the world” corresponds to Abel, “from this generation” to the martyred figure Zacharias. The argument only works if Zacharias is strictly a figure of the “present generation”, though he was quickly confused with the Αζαρίας τοῦ Ιωδαε of 2 Chronicles 24:20-21 (this confusion was recognised already by Wellhausen, who identified the Q figure with Ζαχαρίας υἱὸς Βάρεϊς, v.l. Βαρискаίου or Βαρούχου Josephus, bell. 4:335-344; this identification being far from certain, however).¹⁹

In Q, John never has an epithet as “the Baptist” (as opposed, e.g., to the way Mk and Josephus allude to him), a point to which little attention has been given. As John is one of the most common Jewish male names,²⁰ it means the Sayings Source presupposes hearers in active competition with the baptist’s movement (a competition known also from the Gospel of John, denying that the baptist was the “light”, John 1:8),²¹ so for them there can be no doubt which John is in view. He comes to mind so quickly for the Q community that no misunderstanding is possible. Particularly instructive is Q 16:16, where the context does not give any hint as to the Baptist, but hearers are expected to immediately understand who is meant, i.e., which John.

12.4.4 Place Names

All place names derive from the Palestinian and southern Syrian or Phoenician area or from the Old Testament: Bethsaida, Chorazin, Sodom (Gomorrhah only in Mt), Nineveh, Jerusalem, Capernaum (Καφαρναούμ), and the fairy-like country of the “South” connected to the queen of Sheba (which is not mentioned: Q moves in a

19 This is discussed at length in Frenschkowski, *Q-Studien*, and I hope to publish a separate revised study on the problem at some later time.

20 Cf. Scott T. Carroll, Art. “John (Person)”, *ABD*, 3 (1992), 886: “John was a common Jewish name during the Hellenistic age and was especially popular among the priesthood.” Cf. also the accumulation of the name in the Jewish ossuaries (for some references see Levi Y. Rahmani, *A Catalogue of Jewish Ossuaries in the Collections of the State of Israel* [Jerusalem: Israel Antiquities Authority, 1994]): יהוחנן no. 57, 198, 218, 435, 871; יהוחנה no. 27a, 871; יוחנה no. 270; חנה no. 31; IOHANA no. 202; Ἰωάννης no. 50, 89. It is one of the three or four most common male names. Cf. also Margaret H. Williams, “Palestine Jewish Personal Names in Acts”, in *The Book of Acts in Its First Century Setting 4. The Book of Acts in Its Palestinian Setting*, ed. Richard Bauckham (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 79-113.

21 On messianic interpretations of John the Baptist himself cf. Marco Frenschkowski, *Prophetie. Innovation, Tradition und Subversion in spätantiken Religionen*. Standorte in Antike und Christentum 10 (Stuttgart: Hierseemann, 2018), 134-136.

world more of oral folktales than of Old Testament allusions). Sidon and Tyros are the epitome of pagan cities, not Sepphoris or distant Antioch. Tiberias is not mentioned. Perhaps also the Jordan may have been mentioned (Q 3:3, when introducing John the Baptist, but this is unclear). The place names give a rather random impression; too much should not be deduced from them (particularly they tell us precisely nothing on where Q might have been compiled).

12.4.5 References to Evil Spirits

The manifold and varied way in which the evil spirits are spoken of is also quite revealing from a linguistic point of view. Demonology is an essential and central theological concern of the tradition documented in Q, as annoying as this may be for modern readers. In fact, demons are spoken of far more frequently and in a far more varied way than, for example, the problem of the law, where Q clearly represents a non-Pauline position (see 16:16, 17).²² Here I limit myself to the linguistic aspect. The devil is called Βεελζεβούλ (Q 11:15, 19), which is (factually, not linguistically) explained immediately as ἄρχων τῶν δαιμονίων “prince of demons” (Q 11:15; cf. Mk 3:22 and Σατανᾶς Q 11:18). The word itself seems to be Galilean demonological vernacular.²³ The well-known but clearly younger *varia lectio* Βεελζεβοῦβ in codex B (a number of times also in codex κ and in later manuscripts) is a correction with the Old Testament in mind (2 Kgs 1). It is most interesting that the popular language preserved in Q and Mark still uses the correct form.²⁴ The exact linguistic developments, “lassen sich nicht mehr mit hinreichender Sicherheit aufhellen”.²⁵ In a Greek text, it is an extremely strange demonological name (in texts not dependent on the gospels, it occurs only in Symmachus 4Kgs 1:2, 6 and in several references in the Testament of Solomon;²⁶

22 I have tried to show that Q is directly connected to the Jesus movement in Jerusalem as it seems to have developed in the 50s CE, becoming increasingly hostile to Paul. Cf. Marco Frenschkowski, “Galiläa oder Jerusalem? Die topographischen und politischen Hintergründe der Logienquelle”, in Andreas Lindemann, ed. *The Sayings Source Q and the Historical Jesus*. BETL 158 (Leuven: Peeters, 2001), 535-59. There is no evidence for an ongoing Galilean Jesus movement in the pre-War days, neither in Paul nor in Acts.

23 Cf. Wolfgang Herrmann, Art. “Baal Zebub”, *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible*. 2nd Ed. (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 154-6.

24 Douglas L. Perry & Michael O. Wise, “By the Power of Beelzebub: An Aramaic Incantation Formula from Qumran (4Q560)”, *JBL* 113 (1994): 627-50, want to find the name also in the late second century BCE incantation formula 4Q560. But see Klaus Beyer, *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer, samt den Inschriften aus Palästina, dem Testament Levis aus der Kairoer Genisa, der Fastenrolle und den alten talmudischen Zitaten: aramaische Einleitung, Text, Übersetzung, Deutung, Grammatik/Wörterbuch, deutsch-aramäische Wortliste, Register* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984 – Ergänzungsband 1994 – Vol. 2, 2004), here Erg.: 129-130 and many others who argue against this reconstruction.

25 Hans Peter Rüger, “Aramäisch II”, *TRE* 3 (1978): 602-10, here 604.

26 Cf. the Testament of Solomon (ed. Chester C. McCown, Leipzig 1922), which gives the following passages: 3:1, 3, 4, 5C, 6; 4:2; 7:1, 2, 4P, 9, 10; 9:8; 16:3A, 5P, C9, 9T. In most instances the

sometimes in the pseudo-erudite form Βεελζεβούλ). This name may also have been used in magic. The word comes from the Hebrew tradition of course, or more precisely from a Canaanite (Ekronite) theonym, which the Old Testament tradition mentions only in denigrating and contemptuously distorted form. We may note a subtle semantic difference compared to Mark. While this gospel writes: καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς οἱ ἀπὸ Ἱεροσολύμων καταβάντες ἔλεγον ὅτι Βεελζεβούλ ἔχει καὶ ὅτι ἐν τῷ ἄρχοντι τῶν δαιμονίων ἐκβάλλει τὰ δαιμόνια (Mk 3:22), Q says (according to the most probable reconstruction) ἐν Βεελζεβούλ τῷ ἄρχοντι τῶν δαιμονίων ἐκβάλλει τὰ δαιμόνια. In one case, Jesus “has” a “Beelzebul”; this is older demonological lore, with the possessed one “having” an evil spirit. In the other case Jesus uses the demon. In other words: the accusation of the opponents in Mark means that Jesus is possessed, but in Q he is a magician. However, the boundaries between the two ideas are blurred. Both Luke (who prefers Q over the Marcan version) and Matthew (9:32-34 and 12:22-30) follow Q exclusively (instrumental ἐν) and avoid the more explicitly demonistic mode of expression in Mark. Mark 3:23 (“πῶς δύναται σατανᾶς σατανᾶν ἐκβάλλειν”) identifies the exorcist (polemically) with the Demon Lord; this is only possible if he dwells in him, not if Jesus is simply magically working with the help of a demon. So, the Marcan Jesus argues: “How can a demon dwell in me and speak through me, in which case one demon would stand against the other?” Mark is thoroughly consistent and independent of Q.

In Q, Jesus must argue in a more complex way, because the demonological idea is more complex, and the relationship between Jesus and Beelzebul is imagined in a more subtle way by the opponents. Q 7:33 δαιμόνων ἔχει shows, by the way, that Q also knows the older demonological language for possession (as an outsider’s perspective); it is all the more important that this interpretation is avoided in Q 11:15-22. Only the temptation pericope has διάβολος (Q 4:2, 3, 9, 5, 13). This is a significant argument for the special place this narrative piece has in the tradition history and probably also in the composition history of Q; mostly it is seen as a late addition, perhaps even the latest addition to the book as it has reached Matthew and Luke. However, the word as such is quite common in Jewish-Greek writings of the Hellenistic period.

This also applies to δαιμόνιον (Q 11:14, 15, 18, 19, 20), a term which, however, has a much broader, often positively connotated range of meanings in Josephus and in non-

manuscripts read Βεελζεβούλ; H has Βεελζεβουηλ, as has the Coptic (cf. McCown, 44). Unfortunately, the Christian redaction of the text is difficult to distinguish from a possible older Jewish version. In recension C 11:1 the demon’s name is Ἐντζιανφιέλ v. I. Ἐλτζιάνφηλ (cf. Τζιανφιέλ 10:1), which is difficult to explain. Cf. also Peter Busch, *Das Testament Salomos. Die älteste christliche Dämonologie, kommentiert und in deutscher Erstübersetzung*. TU 153 (Berlin, New York: de Gruyter 2006), 103-107. 108, who unfortunately does not discuss the linguistic questions.

Christian and non-Jewish Greek writers (“fate, chance, divine sending,” etc.). The early Christian use for “evil spirits” presupposes a restrictive semantic shift, as it applies to διάβολος as well. Authors like Paul and Luke (in Acts) know the “demonological” use (which Paul only uses four times in 1Cor 10), but obviously tend to avoid it, probably because δαιμόνιον has widely divergent meanings in the general language. Luke follows his given tradition in his Gospel book, but in Acts he prefers πνεύματα and πνεύματα ἀκάθαρτα or πονηρά for denoting evil spirits. These terms might have been less in need of an explanation for his audience.

Q also knows ἀκάθαρτον πνεῦμα (11:24) and plain πνεύματα (11:26). Δαιμόνιον as used for an evil spirit is not completely unheard of with pagan writers, however (cf. e.g., δαιμόνια φαῦλα Chrysipp, SVF 2 [1903] no. 1178 from Plutarch, de Stoic. repugn. 37, 1051B), but these are exceptions. A δαιμόνιον κωφόν is called mute because it makes you mute (*Enallage adiectivi*). The use of Σατανᾶς Q 11:18 also draws our interest, which as a well-known transcription of Hebrew שטן is often used in Jewish-Greek literature such as in Testament of the 12 Patriarchs, Testament of Job, and Vita Adae et Evae, and of course widely in the New Testament; but for Christians with a pagan background the name certainly would need an explanation.²⁷

What is linguistically conspicuous is the co-existence of Semitic and Greek synonymous terms,²⁸ and generally also the rich differentiation of demonological terminology. Jesus’ fight against demons is a central Christological concern in Q (Q 4:1-13; 11:14, 17-20, 23, 24-26; 12:5; 17:1-2). This all may indicate a bilingual background in which terminology may move rather quickly from one language to another. Literary-critical or compositional-historical resolutions to these problems are not adequate; the linguistic phenomena described are part of the sociolect or even idiolect of the compiler. In a similar way, the underworld is called both with the Septuagint word of Hebrew origin γέννα (Q 12:5, which Mt has seven times, Mk three times; Lk only once; and which in the rest of the New Testament is only to be found James 3:6), but it is also evoked with a term from classical Greek tradition, ᾍδης “Hades” (Q 10:15). Perhaps, a semantic difference was felt between these terms, which may no longer

27 For more details on the dynamics governing the various designations and metonyms of the devil see my forthcoming article “Teufel” in Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum (RAC).

28 The LXX majuscule codex A in Job 2:3 has Σατανᾶς as v. l. for more common διάβολος in other manuscripts (cf. Sir 21:27). Such changes are not unheard of. Lk 8:12 changes Σατανᾶς of Mk 4:14 to διάβολος, which he has seven times all in all, with the other passages being derived from Q. But he also has Σατανᾶς seven times (once from Mk, four times in Special Lk, and twice in Acts). Stringency is not to be expected in demonological terminology. “Haec nomina confundunt poetae”, as Servius says on demonological terminology (in Verg. Aen. 4:609), and chthonic numina in Greek tend to be πολυώνυμος (as the Homeric Hymns 5:18 have it on Ἄιδης). Mt prefers διάβολος, which he has six times (Mt 13:39 being clearly Matthean redaction, as may be the case also in 25:41). When Jesus himself speaks, Mt leaves Σατανᾶς unchanged, however.

be fully visible for us. Most likely, ἄδης covers more a cosmological aspect (as an antithesis to οὐρανός in 10:15), γέννα rather a more “theological” one. Hades might mean what in classical Greek mythology has been called Tartaros: the “lowest space” of the tangible and material universe.²⁹ The Sayings Source confirms the highly bilingual and/or trilingual character of large parts of Palestine in the 1st century, and the particular choices of words from the different traditions will need further elucidation.

12.4.6 Semitic and Latin Loan Words

12.4.6.1 Introduction

Of particular interest are the Semitic and Latin loan words in Q, which strangely have received less attention than the question of whether semantic and syntactic traces of translational Aramaic might be discerned. They are however a most distinctive and remarkable feature of the Greek text itself: Q apparently contained a whole set of peculiar, sometimes even unique foreign words, a few of which we already have mentioned. Our long-standing familiarity with the biblical text does, to some degree, prevent us from seeing more clearly the sheer strangeness of some of this vocabulary in a 1st-century Greek book. Luke, on the other hand, tends to translate Hebrew and Aramaic words (also Latin ones), which is well known from his redaction of Mark, a tendency which is continuously, though not consistently applied. This is a common tendency with Greek writers of the Roman Empire: even the Latin administrative terminology is often translated in the most bizarre, changing, and imprecise ways.³⁰ Q in its language and vocabulary is very much an erratic and strange book, when read from the point of view of a Hellenistic educational elite.

12.4.6.2 Less Conspicuous Loan Words

We will start our short survey with some less conspicuous loan words. Ἄνηθον *Anethum graveolens* L. (Q 11:42) is of unknown origin but being a common Greek word does not call for particular attention. This also applies to κύμινον *Cuminum cyminum* L. (Q 11:42), which is of course of Semitic (or common Mediterranean?) origin (Akkadian *kamūnu*, Hebrew כַּמֶּן), but had become naturalised in Greek since ancient times (already Mycenaean Greek has *ku-mi-no*) and therefore also does not say

29 Here only examples of an analysis of the “lexicon” of Q can be given, i.e., its vocabulary in a comparative perspective. Cf. for many further details the very important book by Michael Labahn, *Der Gekommene als Wiederkommender: die Logienquelle als erzählte Geschichte* (Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 2010).

30 David Magie, *De Romanorum iuris publici sacrique vocabulis sollemnibus in Graecum sermonem conversis* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1905 = Aalen: Scientia, 1973); Hugh J. Mason, *Greek Terms for Roman Institutions. A Lexicon and Analysis*. American Studies in Papyrology 13 (Toronto: Hakkert, 1974).

much about Q. The situation is similar for σάκκος (Q 10:13), which, although of Semitic origin, had become part of a regular Greek vocabulary for centuries. Συκάμινος (fem.) (Q 17:6) may be a bit more complicated, though it is without question also Semitic (Hebrew סמך), but it is used in early Hellenistic Greek writing (already Theophrast, de plant. 1: 6,1; 9,7; 10,10; 12,1; 13,1, 5; 4,2 a.o.) for *Morus nigra* L., the Mulberry tree, but also for *Ficus sycomorus* L. “sycomore” (l.c. 1:1,7; 13,2; 4:1,5; 2,1-2 a.o.; cf. the 2nd generation peripatetic writer Phainias quoted in Athenaeus, deipnosophistae 2:51E). The difficult botanical identifications of these terms do not concern the linguistic problem much. Perhaps the Semitic character of such vocabulary, which would have been taken over from Phoenician, could still be felt.

Luke seems to have changed Q 11:42 in a characteristic way. While Q probably read “ἀλλὰ οὐαὶ ὑμῖν τοῖς φαρισαίοις, ὅτι ἀποδεκατοῦτε τὸ ἥδύοσμον καὶ τὸ [[ἄνηθ]]ον καὶ [[τὸ κύμι]]νον καὶ παρέρχεσθε τὴν κρίσιν καὶ τὴν ἀγάπην τοῦ θεοῦ· ταῦτα δὲ ἔδει ποιῆσαι κάκεῖνα μὴ παρεῖναι”, Luke modifies the wording extant in Matthew 23:23 (“τὸ ἥδύοσμον καὶ τὸ ἄνηθον καὶ τὸ κύμινον”) to “τὸ ἥδύοσμον καὶ τὸ πήγανον καὶ πᾶν λάχανον”. This is obviously intended to accommodate an audience less interested in halakhic issues: καὶ πᾶν λάχανον is a generalisation for such an audience.

A reverse editorial procedure is hardly conceivable. Luke, who was certainly not a trained scribe in halakhic matters, by means of this change gets into conflict with the Halakha, as we know it from the Mishna: *Ruta chalepensis* L., the “garden rue” (πήγανον, in Mishnaic Hebrew a Greek loan word) is explicitly not subject to tithing according to mSheb 9:1, but dill and cumin are (mMaʿas. 4:5; mDemai 2:1). *Mentha longifera* L., “mint” (ἥδύοσμον) is subject to the fallow year law (mSheb 7:1), but an explicit early testimony about its tithing seems not to be known. The Septuagint from the three items for tithing given in Q 11:42 mentions only κύμινον (Is 28:25, 27), but the details of tithing only are discussed in a rather vague way in the relevant Old Testament passages anyway which made them difficult to use for halakhic distinctions (Lev 27:30-33; Num 18:21-32; Dtn 14:22-29; 26:12-15). Of course, we also do not know exactly how old the Mishnaic rules are.

A very strange word is σίναπι *Brassica nigra* (L.) Koch (Q 13:19; 17:6), which in Hellenistic times appears next to the older synonymous νᾶπυ and must also linguistically be related to it. The origin is unclear; the word formation reminds of Graeco-Egyptian form duplicates, but an Egyptian model is not known for the correlated terms (the Demotic *hltm* is not connected, but a Demotic *snw-p.t* does exist, and the Greek word is also taken over into Coptic). The form σίναπι is well documented on Egyptian Greek papyri of the Ptolemaic epoch and is also used by botanists, the many variants proving it was still heard as a loan word. Greek σίναπι also corresponds to a word well-known

in both Iranian and Austro-Asiatic languages (Sanskrit *sarṣapa*, Khotan Saka *śśaśvānā*, Parthian *šyṣ-d'n*, Middle Persian *sipan-dān*, also Malay *senawi*, *sawi* etc.; Greek and Iranian forms are in a relation of metathesis, not rare in loanwords). Such cultural vocabulary of course easily becomes disseminated over long distances, this being especially true for names of plants, spices, exotic animals, jewellery, precious stones, coins, etc. For better understanding the cultural background of Q these words do not help us much.

12.4.6.3 Semitic Loan Words

Fortunately, this does not apply to some other loan words and foreign vocabulary of the Sayings Source, to which we will come immediately. Σάτον Q 13:21 is the name of a Semitic grain measure (Hebrew סֵאָה or Aramaic סֵאָה), a word Josephus also uses in transcription (ant. 9:71, 85, five times). It must be emphasised the transcription presupposes the Aramaic form סֵאָה (cf. TgIsaiah 27:7, which immediately reminds of Q 6:38 and Mk 4:24). These are still inconspicuous loan words, but now we come to very different cases.

The most telling and relevant Semitic word of the Sayings Source (next to Βεελζεβούλ) is μαμωνᾶς (Q 16:13), which of course is well-known in modern European languages, being derived from the New Testament in all such cases (already Gothic takes it over as *mammona*, glossing it as *faihuþraihna*).³¹ This familiarity prevents realising the sheer strangeness of the word: in Greek it is completely unique; no pagan or Jewish author uses it, as it is also almost unique in early Christian literature apart from Q 16:13 (> Mt 6:24/Lk 16:13) and its quotations. Only Luke has a second instance in the immediate vicinity of the Q passage (Lk 16:9, 11) and is probably depending on it. Luke 16:1-9 (Special Lk) with the commentary word 16:8b, 9 might even have been in Q, while the intermediate piece Luke 16:10-12 (Special Lk) seems to be a Lukan redaction. Also, a protolukan Q-extension has been suggested, which in turn might have been caused by the keyword μαμωνᾶς.

Of vital importance is the existence of the word in Minimal Q, that is, those parts of Q that can be reconstructed with little room for doubt and where Matthew and Luke completely and verbatim agree (2Clem 6:1 is also hardly independent of the gospels). The word is assumed by Q to be understood by anyone without explanations and is introduced in a theologically central place of ethics (though, as we said, it is completely unknown in literary or inscriptional Greek). This is more than just strange: it is a hint of a highly constrained and perhaps somewhat isolated Greek sociolect or even idiolect. If the Letter to James might have been familiar with Q, James 4:4 could be read

31 Cf. Wilhelm Streitberg, *Die gotische Bibel 2. Gotisch-Griechisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch* (6th Ed. Heidelberg: C. Winter, 2000), 31.

as a paraphrasing development and generalisation of our logion: “οὐκ οἶδατε ὅτι ἡ φιλία τοῦ κόσμου ἔχθρα τοῦ θεοῦ ἐστίν; [...]”. That however remains speculative. The word is known both in Hebrew and in Aramaic, however, where it does not have any negative implications.³² It is well-known in Qumran: מִמּוֹן (1QS 6:2; 1Q27 (Myst) 1: II,5 [DJD I, 1955, 105]; CD 14:20). The meaning is probably “wealth” or simply “money”. The usual word of the Qumran group for “wealth” with a critical undertone is הוֹן (used approximately 110 times in Qumran literature, and 102 times in “sectarian” texts, whereas Tannaitic Rabbinic texts use it only in a very few cases).³³ The oldest Hebrew text documenting מִמּוֹן seems to be Sir 31 (34):8 (however, only preserved in manuscript B from the 12th century, according to the edition of Pancratius C. Beentjes). Some older Aramaic instances are uncertain, as in the older Job Targum (11QtgJob = 11Q10 col. 11:8 to Job 27:17)³⁴ and as a possible background of Ethiopian Enoch 63:10 (cf. Lk 16:9 μαμωνᾶ τῆς ἀδουλίας). As an Aramaic term it is often used in later rabbinical texts, especially in the targums (Neofiti 1 to Gen 14:16, 21 for Heb. רכש; to Ex 18:21 for Heb. בצע; Ps-Jonathan to Ex 21:30 for Heb. כפר; TgTehill 44:13 for Heb. הון 62:11 für Heb. חיל etc.), and Mishnaic Hebrew has it as well (mAb 2:12 [cf. ARN 17]; mSanh 4:1; mBer 9:5) as do other rabbinic sources (tShebu 3:8; bSanh 2b a. 3a; bQid 70a., etc.).³⁵

A particular striking passage for the strict neutrality of the term is ExRabbah 32:15: הקב"ה נתן לו ממון של אמת ועושה אותו שקור "The Holy One, to whom praise be given, has offered mammon of righteousness, and he makes it unrighteous." The late passage PRE (Pirkei de-Rabbi Eliezer) 26 even offers a kind of definition of Mammon: "R. Jehoshua ben Qarcha (about 150) said: For love of her (sc. Sara) Pharaoh in the marriage contract signed over some of his property (מכל ממונו) to her, be it silver or gold, be it servants or land, and he even gave her the land of Gosen as property. Therefore, Israel lived in the land of Gosen, which belonged to our mother Sara."

According to a plausible thesis, mammon(a) is not originally Hebrew or Aramaic, but a Phoenician loan word in Aramaic. There are indications for this from the expected word formation, but also direct proof which is even more important for us, and which also clarifies the semantics. Main witness is Augustine, who knows the term as part of the still existing Punic colloquial language in North Africa: "Mammona apud

32 Statements to the contrary in older theological literature are plainly wrong, as has already been shown by Gustav Dalman, but more recently by Hans-Peter Rüger, "μαμωνᾶς", *ZNW*, 64 (1973): 127-31 to whom we owe the best study of the word.

33 Cf. Francesco Zanella, Art. הון *hôn*, in Heinz-Josef Fabry, Ulrich Dahmen, eds. *Theologisches Wörterbuch zu den Qumrantexten 1* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2011), 758-762.

34 This reading is rejected by Beyer, *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer* 1, 287, however.

35 Full references and some uncertain older instances are given in Frenschkowski, *Q-Studien*, and in Rüger, "Aramäisch II".

Hebraeos divitiae appellari dicuntur. Congruit et punicum nomen: nam lucrum punice mammon dicitur” (de serm Dom. 2:14, 47 [CCL 35, 138]); “Hebraeum verbum est, cognatum linguae Punicae. Ista enim linguae sibi significationis quadam vicinitate sociantur. Quod Punici dicunt mammon, latine lucrum vocatur. Quod Hebraei dicunt mammona, latine divitiae vocantur” (sermone 113:2, 2 [MPL 38,648]). This testimony cannot be lightly brushed away. It is quite unlikely that the economically successful Phoenicians would have adopted this technical financial term from the Arameans in their “hinterland” and that it then migrated into Punic (as a Phoenician dialect). According to all plausibility of language contact and its social laws, the borrowing can only have taken place the other way around: from Phoenician into Aramaic and Hebrew. The meaning was preserved.

For the pagan Syrians, Jerome says: “Non potestis Deo servire et mammonae, id es divitiis. Nam gentili Syrorum lingua mammona divitiae nuncupantur” (ep. 22:31). Also, for him it is primarily not a Jewish word. Adamantius (4th century) defines the word as τὰ χρήματα τὰ ἀργυρᾶ,³⁶ the Latin version of Rufinus has here “mammonam [...] pecuniam dicit gentili lingua”.³⁷ The word cannot possibly be a Canaanite loan word³⁸ and it certainly is no loan word from the Hebrew root מָנָה (which would make its reception into pagan Aramaic and Punic highly unlikely). All older witnesses in Greek and in Syriac write it with single μ/Mim; only the younger and many Latin ones duplicate this. The pejoration of meaning apparently occurs only in a Christian context: neither Aramaic nor Hebrew evidence has demonological or negative connotations. Considering the conspicuous significance of Tyros and Sidon in Q, the reception of such a word in a quite central place will not be a coincidence but can be read as a further indication of the socio-cultural place of the Q community. So, we have a Phoenician loan word in the Greek of the Sayings Source, which also occurs in Aramaic and Hebrew, but with a different meaning.

The central question – oddly enough hardly considered in exegetical studies – seems why the tradition felt obliged to use a term here that is unknown in any standard Greek? Klaus Beyer, the leading scholar of Palestinian Aramaic of the last generation, saw the problem, but provided an unlikely explanation: “transkribiert, da den Aramäern etymologisch dunkel”.³⁹ Syrians and Jews certainly did not think in such linguistic categories. The coercion for a Greek transcription must have been related to

36 Adamantius, dial. c. Marc. (GCS 4 (1901), ed. W.H. van de Sande Bakhuyzen), 58, 1.

37 Cod. Seletstadt. 96 ed. Caspari, Kirchenhistorische Anekdoten 1, 1883, 37.

38 As shown by Beyer, *Die aramäischen Texte*. Erg., 374.

39 Beyer, *Die aramäischen Texte*. Erg., 374, also states: “unaram., da es sonst im Neuen Testament übersetzt und nicht transkribiert worden wäre” (625). This indeed would mean that the word was still heard as a technical term from Phoenician and was somehow made to participate in a critical attitude towards wealth and finances in the Jesus movement.

a peculiarity of semantics (as with γέννα, which is not entirely identical with Hades), and most likely to a technical – that is, financial – use, the subtleties of which we might perhaps miss. It would have been written down in a cultural surrounding by an author for whom this technical use was so self-evident and so important that he adopted it into Greek, without seeing any need for an explanation; or even more likely: for whom the technical vocabulary was such a natural part of his personal language that its unusualness in a Greek context did not occur to him. This does not pertain to an Aramaic version of this logion, but only to the Greek version in Q. (We will have to pay attention to this observation once again in the context of coin names and other technical financial vocabulary).⁴⁰

In the Sayings Source the word perhaps already has demonological connotations, but it is hardly already a full-fledged demon name as it became later in Byzantine usage. The first Christian writer who deals with the word in more detail is Clemens Alexandrinus, defining “τὴν φιλαργυρίαν οὕτως ὀνομάσαντος τοῦ κυρίου” (strom. 4:6. 30, 4), as do later catenae (“μαμωνᾶς ἐστὶν ἡ φιλαργυρία”: Coislianus 195 fol. 34r and other catenae to Mt 6:24). For our context, the word is a clear indicator that Q is witness of a highly specialised and uncommon sociolect, or perhaps idiolect.

At one point in Q, we might expect an Aramaic word, but it seems not to have been used. The Lord’s Prayer begins in Q 11:2 with πάτερ, not with ἄββᾶ. Since, according to evidence from Mark 14:36; Romans 8:15; and Galatians 4:6, the Aramaic term in

40 In Christian literature the word became personalised as a regular demon’s name, as, e.g., in the early Byzantine Hygromantia Salomonis (ed. from five codices in: *Catalogus codicum astrologorum Graecorum* 8, 2 [Brussels 1911] and more recently by ed. Pablo A. Torijano, *Salomon the Esoteric King* (Leiden: Brill, 2002); for a comparison of the versions, cf. also Ioannis Marathakis, *The Magical Treatise of Solomon Hygromanteia* (Singapore: Golden Hoard Press, 2011). In this astrological and ritual text Μαμωνᾶς opposes Gabriel in an astrological context. In Byzantine grimoires Μαμωνᾶς is not rare, as in an example printed by Armand Delatte, *Anecdota Atheniensia* 1 (Liège: Imp. H. Vaillant-Carmanne, 1927), 435, 438. Richard Reitzenstein, *Poimandres. Studien zur griechisch-ägyptischen und frühchristlichen Literatur* (Leipzig, 1904), 301 has edited a Mediaeval prayer from Codex Paris 2316 fol. 426v, which very strangely has Μαμωνᾶ as an angel name, denoting one of the astral Elders Apc 4:4. However, usually the name in different orthographies denotes a demon, as in Ps.-Abdias, *virtutes apostolorum* 5:15 „Mamona autem daemonis nomen est, qui lucris camalibus praeest, et dominator eorum qui diligunt mundum” (Iohann Albert Fabricius, *Codex apocryphus Novi Testamenti* t. 2 [Hamburg 1703], 564). This may date to the late 5th century CE. Even gnostic writers share this tradition, as does Pistis Sophia 130 (ed. Carl Schmidt, *NHS IX* [Leiden, 1978], 331); cf. perhaps (doubtful reading) *NHC IX*, 3,68,4. Marcion may have used Μαμωνᾶς as a synonym of the Jewish God (Irenaeus, *adv. haer.* 3:8,1; Tertullian, *adv. Marc.* 4:33; Adamantius, *de recta in deum fide* [GCS 4, 1901, ed. Van de Sande Bakhuyzen, 56]), though this was doubted by Adolf von Harnack, *Marcion. Das Evangelium vom fremden Gott*, TU 45 (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 2. ed. 1924 = Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft 1985), 101 with n.1. The Testament of Solomon, the main demonological text of the Ancient Church (ed. Chester Ch. McCown [Leipzig, 1922]) does not have the name. A much more complete documentation is given in Frenschkowski, *Q-Studien*.

this case was well known amongst the Greek-speaking Christian communities, its absence at this point is somewhat surprising. There is every reason to believe that the Lord's Prayer contained ܐܡܢ in its Aramaic version, and it is most likely that gentile Christians would know the word from this context (which was apparently also used as a charismatic acclamation in worship, as we know from Paul).⁴¹ Or, should we assume that both Matthew and Luke had it deleted or translated? After all, they also (both) delete the ἁββᾶ of the Markan Gethsemane scene (cf. Mt 26:39 and Lk 22:42 with Mk 14:36), avoiding the loan word. The different versions of the Lord's Prayer must go back to a single translation; otherwise, it would be difficult to explain all variants have the extremely rare word ἐπιούσιος, an adjective of unclear meaning, which certainly would not have been used by two different translators.⁴² Of course, the redaction of the gospels and the Didache later may have introduced some differences into the prayer text, as is the rule with liturgical texts which keep their basic wording, but are easily extended or enlarged.

Another term of extraordinary interest is ἀγγαρεύειν, which only Q/Matt 5:41 has (i.e., which seems to come from a Q verse only extant in Mt, according to most Q scholars; a detailed discussion substantiating this claim cannot be given here). The verse may have been situated next to Q 6:29 and perhaps read as follows: [[ὅστις σε ἀγγαρεύσει μίλιον δύο ἔν, ὕπαγε μετ' αὐτοῦ δύο.]] This refers to the violent recruitment of civilians for services in support of the military or other state institutions, such as the State Post (which had been well-organised since Persian times and was taken up amongst the Romans, but up to the time of Constantine transported exclusively administrative letters). The word itself is of Iranian, perhaps ultimately Akkadian origin and was first received into Greek in substantive form (Herodotus 8:98), but already in early Hellenism a verb was also created, describing one of the most unpleasant aspects of military and state arbitrariness.⁴³

From Egypt we hear of numerous complaints against the procedure documented on papyrus, with the rural population trying to defend itself against such demands of the travelling army. Attacks and impertinent demands on the edge of legality were

41 This also makes plausible Jesus used to pray in Aramaic, not in Hebrew, which is not self-evident.

42 The Aramaic here had *mahar*, as we know from the Jewish-Christian Gospel of the Nazoreans quoted by Jerome, comm. in Mt. 6, 11 (Erich Klostermann, *Apocrypha II. Kleine Texte* 83 (Berlin 1929), 7). Though this gospel probably was a translation in targum-style of the Greek canonical Matthew, the Lord's Prayer certainly was given from the tradition and not re-translated. Cf. what seems to me still the best discussion: Joachim Jeremias, *Neutestamentliche Theologie I. Die Verkündigung Jesu* (Gütersloh: Mohn 1987), 193.

43 Aramaic etymologies of the Iranian word, time and again suggested by some writers, are improbable, as forms from a root 'GR would rather lead to ἄγαρος, not to ἄγγαρος with nasal occlusive.

the order of the day, although there had been various official attempts to organise the *angareia* so it could be better accepted by the population. For example, from December 48 CE we have an edict of Cn. Vergilius Capito from the oasis town of Girgeh, which forbade passing soldiers μηδέν λαμβάνειν μηδέ ἀνγαρεύειν εἰ μὴ τινες ἐμὰ διπλώματα ἔχουσιν (OGIS 665 III from the entrance hall of a temple, not far from the famous edict of Tiberius Julius Alexander from the same temple, OGIS 669). Similarly, we have an edict from the time of Prefect Sempronius Mamertinus (133–137 CE), which in turn requires the application of authorisation (διπλώματα) if citizens should be forced to provide animals or boats.⁴⁴ Obviously this was not the norm, and abuse by soldiers had to be resisted time and again. When Germanicus, the adopted son of Tiberius, visited Egypt in 19 CE, his troops made extensive use of such services from the population (Pap. SB 1 no. 3924 giving detailed information). Evidence is contradictory about when and how much the army and its soldiers had to pay for such services (which, as a matter of principle, they had to do, but which they tried to avoid).

Most of the documents come from Ptolemaic and Roman Egypt, but conditions in Palestine would not have been much different. *Angareia* was a major source of discontent even in peace times. From Ḥama, Syria we have an inscription, the statements of which are in complete agreement with the Egyptian evidence, namely a letter from the Emperor Domitian to the Procurator. He explicitly refers to the continuity of the legal situation since the time of Vespasian, which only needed to be implemented and controlled more rigidly (Inscriptions grecques et latines de la Syrie V (Paris 1959), No. 1998).⁴⁵ Ulpian, leading Roman lawyer of the early 3rd century CE, writes *de officio proconsulis* IV: “Viae sternendae immunitatem veteranos non habere Iulio Sossiano veterano rescriptum est. Nam nec ab intriptionibus, quae possessionibus fiunt, veteranos esse excusatos palam est. Sed et naves eorum angariari posse Aelio Firmo et Antonino Claro veteranis rescriptum est” (CIC, dig. 49: 18, 4).

The Pythagorean scholar Nigidius Figulus (1st BCE) already uses *angarus* for a public messenger (comment. gramm. 17), etc. The unwelcome practice could haunt a man even in his dreams: Ἐδοξέ τις ναύκληρος ἐν Μακάρων νήσοις εἶναι καὶ ὑπὸ τῶν ἡρώων κατέχεσθαι, ἔπειτα ἐλθόντα τὸν Ἀγαμέμνονα ἀπολύσαι αὐτόν. ἀγγαρεία περιπεσὼν ὑπὸ τῶν ἐπιτρόπων τοῦ αὐτοκράτορος κατεσχέθη, ἔπειτα ἐντυχὼν τῷ βασιλεῖ ἀφείθη τῆς ἀγγαρείας” (Artemidorus, oneir. 5: 16). Only an appeal to the emperor brings help in this situation. The lawyer and legal writer Iulius Paulus (also early 3rd century CE) uses the term already with the *Cursus publicus* in mind (the Roman state postal

44 Cf. Raphael Taubenschlag, *The Law of Greco-Roman Egypt in the Light of the Papyri 332 B.C. – 640 A.D.* 2nd Revised Ed. (Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1955), 58–111.

45 Cf. Stephen R. Llewelyn, *New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity*, 7 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994), 75 (text and translation).

system, as said to be used only by the state administration): “Angariorum praestatio et recipiendi hospitis necessitas et militi et liberalium artium professoribus inter cetera remissa sunt” (CIC, dig. 50: 5, 10, 2). Still later ἀγγαρεῖος came to mean almost exclusively the *cursus publicus*, but this limitation of the meaning had not yet evolved in the 1st century CE.

Surely there is a huge difference whether ἀγγαρεύειν has to be done for a Jewish tetrarch or a Roman governor. Unfortunately, Q does not reveal what exactly it has in mind: the Galilean situation at the time of Jesus, the conditions in Judea and Jerusalem a few years later, or the time of the Jewish War. In later rabbinical literature, at any rate, the word had lost none of its emotional connotation; the matter was familiar to all, and so it was for the Q community. Matthew has the verb again in 27:32, but here Mark 15:21 is in the background: the soldiers force Simon of Cyrene to carry the cross of Jesus. The only other early Christian evidence is Did 1:4, where the same Logion as Matthew 5:41 is quoted (the complicated question of the sources of the Didache cannot to be dealt with here). Josephus has the verb only in ant. 13:52, and once ἀγγαρος for a “mounted courier” in ant. 11:203. The Septuagint and the rest of the Greek-Jewish literature have no instances of the word.

I think that, during the tense situation before the Jewish War (and certainly during the war itself), the matter gained oppressive topicality, and that from here the Q-text received its burning relevance (cf. also Lk 3:14, which is Special Luke, “Sondergut”). This combines well with other evidence: Q was compiled shortly before the outbreak of major military operations (a major argument is the “peace eschatology” in Q 17:23-30, differing so markedly from the “war eschatology” of Mk 13).

In texts originating from Q, Matthew has as a loan word also ἀμῆν, which probably represents his redaction, though it may have been used in Q 12:44. It is unlikely that ῥαββί stood in Q (which only Mt has in relevant passages). Only Luke on the other hand has μνᾶ as a coin name (taken over from Semitic already in pre-Hellenistic times). Ἰῶτα Q 16:17 is uncertain (only Mt 5:18, not Lk 16:17) and also had been used in Greek for centuries, anyway. In addition, and more significantly, we encounter the group designations ‘Pharisees’ and ‘Sadducees’ (the last ones only in Mt), and as a last Semitic loan word we may mention τοῖς σάββασιν in the very uncertain text Q 14:5. This, however, has been well-known as a “Jewish term”, and does not allow for any special conclusions.⁴⁶

46 Cf. e.g., Meleagros of Gadara, Anthol. Pal. 5: 160; Plutarch, de superstitione 8, 169C; quaestiones conv. 4, 6, 671E-672A, passages that prove general familiarity of the word, or cf. the even more telling passages Tibull 1:3, 15-18 and Frontinus, strategem. 2:1, 17, qualifying the Shabbat as day of Saturn. For complete passages and discussion cf. Menahem Stern, *Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism*, 3 vols. (Jerusalem: Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 1976–1984), in particular 3, 146 – Index s. v. Sabbath.

To summarise, the Semitic loan words in Q are frequent, but not overwhelmingly so; in some unique cases, however, they have a technical background which is rather striking, and is proving a very clear-cut sociolect or even idiolect.

12.4.6.4 *Latin Loan Words and a Roman Centurio in Q*

Even more noticeable is the Latin vocabulary in Q, to which we now turn. Together with Mark (e.g., Mk 12:42 which clearly proves Mark's audience is using Roman coin names), and later also Pastor Hermas (the last one certainly written in Rome, the first one plausibly so), Q has the most striking, indeed unique, indebtedness to Latin loan words and Latinisms of all early Christian writings. Q/Matt 5:41, which we already have considered [[ὅστις σε ἀγαρεύσει μίλιον ἔν, ὕπαγε μετ' αὐτοῦ δύο.]], has the word μίλιον < Latin *mille* "a thousand (paces)", which is common mostly in geographical writers, and is also used as a loan word in later rabbinic language. It touches on the same military world as does ἀγαρεύσει. More interesting is μόδιος < *modius* "a grain measure" in Q 11:33. These are both rather uncommon words for which Greek functional equivalents would have been easily available.

We may suspect a certain degree of direct contact with the Latin language, probably arising from frequent communication with people speaking Latin or Greek with many Latin expressions. In Palestine this meant the Roman army: the international trade language was Greek; only the army spoke Latin, and everyone who dealt with the army in trade would have to know a bit of Latin (and even Roman "civil administration" and taxation is connected to some degree to the army). This is raised to the level of evidence by two other technical financial terms, which are Latin coin names.

Q 12:6 reads:

οὐχὶ [[πέντε]] στρουθία πωλοῦνται ἀσσαρίων δύο; καὶ ἐν ἐξ αὐτῶν οὐ πεσεῖται ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν ἄνευ τοῦ θεοῦ." The other text, Q 12:59, we quote in its fuller context: 12:57,⁴⁷ 12:58 [[ἕως ὅτου]] εἰ μετὰ τοῦ ἀντιδίκου σου [[]], ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ δὸς ἐργασίαν ἀπηλλάχθαι ἀπ' αὐτοῦ [[]], μήποτε σε παραδῶ [[ὁ ἀντίδικος]] τῷ κριτῇ καὶ ὁ κριτὴς τῷ ὑπερέτῃ καὶ ... β...λ... εἰς φυλακὴν. 12:59 [[]] λέγω σοι, οὐ μὴ ἐξέλθῃς ἐκεῖθεν, ἕως ... τὸν ἔσχατον κοδράντην ἀποδῶς.

Familiarity with the biblical texts unfortunately obscures the extreme unusualness of using Latin coin names in a Greek text. Greeks use Greek names and strictly avoid Latin names in literary style, as we shall see. Q 12:59 in the Lukan version has λεπτόν instead, the parallel Mt 5:26 on the other hand has the Roman κοδράντης < quadrans

47 The crossing out means this verse probably was not in Q; for some words, no complete reconstruction is possible.

(certainly as an adaptation to the Matthean text, Lk 12:59 D it vgmss having the ν . I $\kappa\omicron\delta\rho\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\eta\nu$).⁴⁸ There is a rather general agreement that Q had $\kappa\omicron\delta\rho\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\eta\varsigma$. Whoever wanted to write cultivated Greek, as Luke did, avoided Latin loan words, as Luke does otherwise (though not quite consistently). A more decisive argument is added in this case. The image used by Q's Jesus wants to name the smallest circulating coin (cf. the older German saying "auf Heller und Pfennig"). In the Roman numismatic system this is the Quadrans, which until the time of Antoninus Pius was issued as a copper coin (under Nero also as a brass coin), and as such, the name may be used metaphorically (Petron., sat. 43: 1; Gaius, inst. 1: 122 cf. Plinius, n. h. 34: 165) and as a symbol for a very small amount of money (as in Q) also in many Latin poets (Horace, sat. 2: 3, 93; Juvenal, sat. 7: 8; Martial 2: 44, 9; 5: 32, 1; 7: 10, 12 cf. Jerome, epist. 40: 2).

This (of course) would however be highly unusual in Greek writings, which strictly avoided Latin coin names. In the early imperial period, Quadrans had been, for example, the admission fee into a public bath (Horace, sat. 1: 3, 137; Juven., sat 6: 447 cf. 2: 152; Seneca, epist. 86: 9). The imperial Quadrans was not the smallest coin circulating in Palestine, however. Instead, smaller copper coins had been minted, which stand outside the official Roman system and only had local significance. In the year 6 CE a coin was introduced by the local administration, which held this function for many years and was later called פרוטה in the Mishna. This λεπτόν was therefore not identical with the Quadrans. In addition, the imperial Quadrans was issued only rarely and in small quantities, so that it was replaced in the east by local copper coins and even in the city of Rome by *tesserae*. This corresponds to the data in Mark 12:42, which are probably intended for readers outside Palestine: two Lepta of the widow correspond to one $\kappa\omicron\delta\rho\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\eta\varsigma$. In the Mishnah (Qidd. 1:1; 'Ed. 4:7) one Peruta is $1/8$ as (while the Quadrans of course is $1/4$ as). However, in 21:2, Luke also avoids the Latin word $\kappa\omicron\delta\rho\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\eta\varsigma$ from Mark 12:42. In any case, the Q 12:59 variant of Luke is more logical and stringent – the variant of Matthew, on the other hand, more conspicuous, more in need of explanation. This alone speaks in favour of Matthew as Q-text. If one adds the known redactional peculiarities of Luke, the conclusion is mandatory that $\kappa\omicron\delta\rho\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\eta\varsigma$ was written in Q, especially since a reverse change would be completely incomprehensible (the image becomes less logical).

If the above reconstruction is correct, it has to be emphasised again that Q names the smallest Roman coin as a symbol for the smallest amount of money, not the smallest coin actually circulating in Palestine, the λεπτόν, which is otherwise quite present in

48 On the history of the quadrans cf. the two articles by Heinrich Chantraine, Art. "Quadrans", *KP*, 4 (1972): 1283; id., Art. "Quadrans", *RE* XXIV (1963), 649-67; also Dietrich Klose, "Quadrans", *Der Neue Pauly* 10 (2001): 679. On coins in the NT the best survey is Marius Reiser, "Numismatik und Neues Testament", *Filologia Neotestamentaria*, 81 (2000), 457-88.

the New Testament (Mk 12:42; Lk 12:59; 21:2). The author or compiler of Q thinks in the precise terms of the Roman coinage system. This orientation towards the Roman system and its Latin names is extremely conspicuous. In this context we must emphasise that this Roman coin designation is almost unique in a Greek text of the early Empire.

Not to be misunderstood: these observations are not about the Latin coins themselves but about their Latin names in a Greek text.⁴⁹ The Sentences of Sextus 39⁵⁰ from the middle of the 2nd century CE have the word both in the Greek version and in Rufin's Latin translation (the textual criticism is difficult here), but this verse is probably dependent on Matthew: “κακῶς ζῶντα μετὰ τὴν ἀπαλλαγὴν τοῦ σώματος εὐθύνει κακὸς καὶ δαίμων μέχρις οὗ καὶ τὸν ἔσχατον κοδράντην ἀπολάβῃ”; “male viventes cum e corpore excesserint cruciabit malus daemon, usque quo exigit ab eis etiam ultimum quadrantem”. Plutarch is the only relevant author of our epoch who mentions the quadrant (Cicero 29:5), and he considers the coin name in need of an explanation to Greek readers.⁵¹ With reference to a personal name Κουαδραντία (obviously perceived as rather bizarre) he writes: τὸ δὲ λεπτότατον τοῦ χαλκοῦ νομίσματος κουαδράντην ἐκάλουν (that is, the Romans). Here it cannot be doubted that Plutarch would not have used the term in Greek colloquial language, although Roman coins came into the hands daily. We repeat: even if Roman money was widespread, Roman names took the place of Greek ones only very irregularly (Lk 15:8 can even say δραχμή for δηνάριον, which at this time had already become part of the spoken language, even in Palestine). On the Egyptian, Palestinian, and Nabataean papyri the word κοδράντης is extremely rare. Only from the 2nd century CE on, Roman coin names gradually replaced the ancient Greek and Semitic ones to a greater extent, as in rabbinic tradition and in the Greek cities.⁵²

49 This applies to literary texts. In Greek documentary texts, business texts, contracts, etc. of the early Empire, Latin technical vocabulary is more frequent, though coin names are still rare. Cf. Irene-Maria Cervenka-Ehrenstrasser, *Lexikon der lateinischen Lehnwörter in den griechischsprachigen dokumentarischen Texten Ägyptens mit Berücksichtigung koptischer Quellen*. Faszikel I and II (Wien: Brüder Hollinek, 1996–2000), of which unfortunately only two parts have appeared so far (235–236 on δηνάριον; 110–111 on ἀσσάριον; the article on the κοδράντης < quadrans has not yet appeared).

50 Σέξτου γνῶμαι, Wilfried Eisele, ed. *Die Sextussprüche und ihre Verwandten*. SAPERE XXVI (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015), 62; also Henry Chadwick, ed. *The Sentences of Sextus* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1959), 16–17.

51 On coin names in Plutarch cf. Ludwig Hahn, *Rom und Romanismus im griechisch-römischen Osten, mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Sprache bis auf die Zeit Hadrians* (Leipzig: Dieterich, 1906), 240–252; this older book is perhaps still the best survey on Latin words in Greek literary texts of the NT era.

52 Once again, a much fuller numismatic documentation has been given in Frenschkowski, *Q-Studien*.

The case is slightly different with ἄργυρος or ἀργύριον (Q 19:23), “silver coinage”, which I can only mention *en passant*, and the money mentioned in the missionary instruction Q 10:2-4 (cf. Mt 10:9), but there the vocabulary is not conspicuous. The long, but strongly diverging parable of the talents Q 19:12-27 provides evidence for a larger monetary unit, the talent or the mine. Unfortunately, the name of the amount of money in question has been passed down inconsistently by Matthew and Luke, and I have to abstain from discussing this here.

Next, we have the case of the ἀσσάριον in Q 12:6, once again a Roman coin name in a Greek Sayings collection. The saying stands in a context which comprises Q 12:2-7, but also shows clear references to texts earlier and later in Q, without becoming a full speech as in the case of Q 6:20-49. It once again shows that Q was a book in the making, and not yet completely organised according to a strict literary standard. A plausible reconstruction is:

12:2 οὐδὲν κεκαλυμμένον ἐστὶν ὃ οὐκ ἀποκαλυφθήσεται καὶ κρυπτὸν ὃ οὐ γνωσθήσεται. 12:3 ὃ λέγω ὑμῖν ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ εἶπατε ἐν τῷ φωτί, καὶ ὃ εἰς τὸ οὐς ἀκούετε κηρύξατε ἐπὶ τῶν δωματίων. 12:4 καὶ μὴ φοβεῖσθε ἀπὸ τῶν ἀποκτε[[ν]] νόντων τὸ σῶμα, [[τὴν δὲ ψυχὴν]] μὴ δυναμένων [[ἀποκτεῖναι]] 12:5 φοβεῖσθε ... τὸν ... γεενν ... 12:6 οὐχὶ [[πέντε]] στρουθία πωλοῦνται ἀσσαρίων δύο; καὶ ἐν ἑξ αὐτῶν οὐ πεσεῖται ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν ἄνευ τοῦ θεοῦ. 12:7 ... καὶ αἱ τρίχες τῆς κεφαλῆς ὑμῶν πᾶσαι ἡρίθμηνται. μὴ φοβεῖσθε· πολλῶν στρουθίων διαφέρετε ὑμεῖς.

Here ἀσσάριον is the usual Greek equivalent of *as* (Plural *asses*), often also *assarius*, but is also used for local Greek copper and bronze coins (cf. Varro, ling. Lat. 8:71).⁵³ The form is a diminutive, emphasising the insignificance of the amount (in legal language the term remained in use metaphorically even when the coin already was no longer circulating, as the German still say “Pfennig”, which as a coin went out of use 2002).⁵⁴ Two *asses* would be a *dupondius*, as indeed the Vulgate translates Luke 12:6 (dipondio); the rabbinic writers called this coin פִּוּנְדִין. Once again, the use of this Latin word in Q points to an environment of Roman administration and trade, being perhaps the sociolect not of a religious group, but of a profession. Josephus, Philon, other Graeco-

53 Cf. Wilhelm Kubitschek, Art. “As”, *RE* 2,2 (1896=1970): 1499-513; Wilhelm Kubitschek, Art. “Assarion”, *RE* 2,2 (1896=1970): 1742-4; Alexander Mlasowsky, Art. “As”, *Der Neue Pauly*, 2 (1997): 72-4; Alexander Mlasowsky, Art. “Assarion”, *Der Neue Pauly*, 2 (1997): 109-10; Dietrich Klose, “As und Assarion”, *Jahrbuch für Numismatik und Geldgeschichte* 36 (1986): 101-5; Ruprecht Ziegler, “Methodische Überlegungen zur Rekonstruktion von Nominalsystemen der städtischen Aes-Prägung im Osten des Römischen Reiches”, *Litterae Numismaticae Vindobonensis*, 4 (1992): 189-213; and of course Michel Amandry, Andrew Burnett & Pèr P. Ripollès, *Roman Provincial Coinage* I,1 (London: British Museum Press, 1992), 30-6. On the numismatic discussion related to these terms see l.c. 31 with note 34. Local special rulings are to be taken into account, cf. e.g., Pergamon OGIS 484 = IGRR IV, 352.

54 Cf. Cervenka-Ehrenstrasser, *Lexikon der lateinischen Lehnwörter*, 111.

Jewish writers, the pseudepigrapha (when preserved in Greek) etc. do not use the word but have little reason to do so.

In Egypt – which only later became fully integrated into the Roman monetary system – the word is, according to the papyri, rarely part of the colloquial language, although there are isolated documents from the early imperial period where it is an accounting term, not an actual coin (our presentation of the numismatic facts has to be a bit simplified here for the purpose of our discussion). Nevertheless, the coin was of course known in the Greek East. It is important, however, to note that using Latin names was unusual in a Greek context (apart from the technical use on customs documents etc.). From Plutarch, *Pupl.* 11:4, we explicitly hear that Greeks routinely also called the Roman *assarius* an ὀβολός, and still the *Suda* – documenting the older usage – explains ἀσσάρια οἱ ὀβολοί (ed. Ada Adler 1, 378). Some older Greek evidence for the Latin word is Heron Alex. (1st century CE?), who uses the word at least four times in his *περὶ μέτρων* 60:1 [ter]; 60:23 (a compilation of geometric rules), but also Dionys. Halic., *ant. Rom* 9:27,3; 10:49,5 and perhaps 13:5,1 (cj.); Pedanius Dioskurides, *περὶ ἀπλῶν φαρμάκων* 235:1 (ed. Max Wellmann 3, 240, 23-24) and above all Plutarch, our most precious witness of what a cultured Greek of late New Testament times may have known about the world. He explains the word in *Camillus* 13:1, and therefore does not take it for granted (he also has it in *Marc. Anton.* 8, but in *Cato mai.* 18 he substitutes it by χαλκοῦς). The imperial *asses* of Gaius (which, of course, were mostly minted in the west) circulated in large quantities; numerous imitations illustrate the significance of these overwhelmingly common coins. Under Caligula, for unknown reasons, all local minting sites in the west were closed, resulting in a massive shortage of small change, which was first remedied by Nero around 64 CE, who now (albeit only for a short time) had *asses* minted in brass (and without the abbreviation SC).

An edict of Germanicus from the years 18–19 CE (when he had the supreme command in the east), which we know both in a Greek and in a Palmyrene-Aramaic version (from a Bilingue of 137 CE), orders that taxes could only be paid with coins of the Italian coin standard; even small amounts had to be paid in *assarii*.⁵⁵ For the daily small exchange this would obviously not apply. Anyway, coins and coin names are a subject which for early Christian literature will need further research, though some studies exist which rather give more attention to the cultural and political impact of the currency as such, and too little to the linguistic side.

What we have observed so far leads to a suspicion that the compiler of Q was a person with a background affiliated to the Roman administration and perhaps even the army,

55 OGIS 629; *Textbook of Syrian Semitic Inscriptions* IV, ed. John F. Healey, no. 37: the famous Palmyrene tariff.

though he became critical of wealth and money as a part of his adherence to the Jesus movement. This combines well with the observation that the Galilean administrative officer (βασιλικός, *Vg regulus*) known from John 4:46-53 in Q 7:1-10 became a Roman soldier (ἐκατοντάρχος/ἐκατοντάρχης).⁵⁶ This Q variant, of course, could not have been the original version of the story as no Roman officers (centurions) were stationed in the Galilee of Herod Antipas, this, strictly speaking, not even being Roman territory (though the tetrarch had to pay tribute). John uses an older oral tradition here, as in a few other cases (Herod Antipas was always called by the population a “king”, though by Roman standards he was only a tetrarch; so his clerks are βασιλικοί). Q applies the story to its own time and its problems, where the Roman army is increasingly felt as a hostile power, indeed as the “enemy”, changing the administrative officer into a Roman soldier, producing a willful anachronism. Particularly telling is Josephus, bell. 4:442: Vespasian in CE 67/68 garrisons centurions and their troops in the larger cities, decurions in the smaller towns. This is exactly the situation Q presupposes in 7:1-10, confronting this reality with the words of Jesus. (In the Clementine Homilies 9:21, the Syrus Sinaiticus of the Matthean version and by a few church fathers he is again changed into a χιλιάρχος, commanding a group of a thousand, perhaps to make him look more important).

This interpretation of the redactional process is supported by Q's change of the clerk's son (as in the older tradition) to a servant (παῖς, no longer a υἱός). Roman soldiers have not been allowed to marry and have legal children whom they could present in public.⁵⁷ So, Q had no other choice than change the son into a servant to make

56 The variant might have been part of oldest tradition; it is frequent in the *variae lectiones* of the gospels and it exists also in the manuscripts of Josephus (see, e.g., ant. 14:69 and the edition of B. Niese vol. 3:252 apparatus). In Josephus, speaking about the Roman period, a ἐκατονταρχία is exclusively an office of the Roman army (bell. 1:149. 351; 2:61. 298. 319; 3:87. 124. 333; 4:37. 442. 636; 5:503; 6:81. 175. 262. 238; 7:238; ant. 14:69 (bis). 476; 17:282; 18:203. 230. 232; 19:307. 308. A ἐκατονταρχία bell. 3:117 is part of a Roman auxiliary troop, as may be the case bell. 6:131. Also, in Philon the word simply means a Roman centurio (in Flacc. 86. 109; leg. in Gai. 30), as it does with non-Jewish historians of the time (e.g., Plut., Pomp 78:1; Lucull. 35:1; Brut. 36:4; Dion. Halicarn. 2:11,14; 11:42; Cass. Dio 42:51; 45:13. 35; 62:23; 67:12; Herodian 4:13, 1; 5:4, 7; 6:9, 6, as on inscriptions and papyri (P. London 276 from CE 15) etc. (this of course does not apply to passages speaking about OT times). Only once in Josephus an officer of the insurgent Jewish troops is called by that name, and in this special case a willful imitation of the Roman army is discussed (bell. 2:578). Generally, the insurgent troops avoided Roman titles. Also, the Herodian armies did not use the title; in fact, bell. 1:351; ant. 14:476 Roman hecatontarchs are distinguished from the officers of the Herodian army. For NT authors the word generally means a Roman officer of high rank (Mt 27:54; Lk 23:47; Acts 10:1.22; 21:32; 22:25.26; 23:17.23; 24:23; 27:1.6.11.31.43; 28,16 v.1.). Outside of the Roman territory, Periplus Maris Erythrae 19 mentions an ἐκατοντάρχης at the maritime port Leuke Kome (east of Myos Hormos at the incense road) as military staff of a tax station, but this is a Nabataean officer, not yet a Roman one. A much fuller discussion has been given in my *Q-Studien*.

57 Once again things have to be a bit simplified and are discussed in full only in Frenschkowski, *Q-Studien*. Cf. Sara Elise Phang, *The Marriage of Roman Soldiers (13 B.C – 235 A.D.)*, Columbia

the public healing scene plausible. Q clearly “Romanizes” the text, for reasons easily recognised, and fully in accordance with the literary context. The preceding “Love your enemy” commandment Q 6:27, 35c-d becomes illustrated and interpreted by a story: even the Roman officer is to be loved and treated kindly, as it was practised by Jesus. Realistically, the enemy does not cease to be an “enemy”, by the way, and remains someone meaning ill to the hearers of the story.

In a rare instance of compositionally relating succeeding texts Q here directly connects the story of the Centurio with the preceding sermon preaching love of one’s enemy: Q 7:1 ... ἐ[[πλήρω]]σεν [[τοὺς λόγους τούτους]] εἰσῆλθεν εἰς Καφαρναύμ (also the address κύριε Q 7:6 is connected to Q 6:46). This is one of the most extreme statements in Q in which the radical Jesus tradition is adapted to the political situation of the 60s CE. The Romanising of a narrative figure, in fact making him an officer of the Roman army, demonstrates what “Love your enemies” is about. This fits in completely with the idiosyncratic linguistic character of Q.

12.4.7 Particles, Prepositions, and Articles

Particles, preposition and articles in Q cannot be analysed here at length, though the proportionate frequency of these is an important indicator of the literary level of a text, and a few preliminary remarks might be useful.

Paratactic καί is common (as it is in Mk), as is δέ (at least 40 instances, even more in the Critical Edition); οὐδέ is used at least five times and μηδέ about two times, but not at any place where they might be expected. In the Mission Discourse with its 17 sentences paratactic καί, for example, is used five times, and asyndeton is found eight times.⁵⁸ This would look extremely strange for an educated Greek reader. Μὲν ... δέ, which is uncharacteristic of translational Greek, is found at the most three times (3:16; 10:2; 11:48 [not in the Critical Edition]; Minimal Q has it only in 10:2; cf. also the apparatus to 14:18 in the Critical Edition). Matthew uses the phrase twice as often as Mark, who still includes it more often than Q.⁵⁹

Studies in the Classical Tradition 24 (Leiden: Brill, 2001), for the most complete survey available. She also shows even centurions in active service did come under the ban of legal marriage (130-131). Only Septimius Severus at last permitted soldiers to marry (Herodian 3:8,5). These military facts behind the story are not seen, e.g., by David Catchpole, *The Quest for Q* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1993), 281-308, who at least realised a Roman soldier cannot possibly have been the original figure of the story. It is of course true that Q 7 is not about mission amongst pagans, but about the reception of individual foreigners into the sphere of salvation created by Jesus.

58 This has been observed by Fleddermann, *Q. A Reconstruction and Commentary*, 122, who is to be consulted for all questions of style and language in Q, though he does not cover the ground of this chapter.

59 Cf. Nigel Turner, *Style = Moulton*, James Hope Moulton et al., *A Grammar of New Testament*

This means an improvement of literary style according to elitist standards as compared to Q language. Also, γάρ is not used quite as frequently as would be expected in elegant Greek style. The particle τέ is never found, neither is τέ ... καί; although Matthew and Luke otherwise have τέ, while this is also absent in Mark (John has it only three times, and each instance is text-critically uncertain). Such small details show the distance compared to the preferred style of the educational elite. Also frequent are εἰ (17 times) and, according to the expectation in a text with Semitic background, ἐν (57 times), ἐκ (16 times) and εἰς (31 times). An exact comparative investigation would be worthwhile. We read ἐνί in 28 instances, with μετά 11 times (but only 19:15 with the meaning “after”), and ἀπό 18 times.⁶⁰ Rarer are περί (7 times), ἔμπροσθεν (6 times), κατά (2 times), διά (6 times), ὑπέρ (3 times), πρὸς (4 times), ὑπό (8 times), ὀπίσω (2 times), ἄνευ (once), ἐνώπιον (once), ἄχρι (once), and μέχρι (once). Rather striking is the rarity of παρά (the *Critical Edition* wants to include it 6:34; 10:7 and 11:16 in the text, but all cases are uncertain). Both Matthew (6 times with genitive, 6 times with dative, 7 times with accusative) and Luke (9 times with genitive, 7 times with dative, 13 with accusative) have no dislike of the preposition παρά, neither has Mark (6 times with genitive, two times with dative and 7 times with accusative). These frequencies are rather remarkable, and are certainly a feature of a personal idiolect, and not of a sociolect. There is a similar case with the rarity of σύν (only perhaps 19:23; Mk 6 times, Mt 4 times, Lk 23 times).

Such unconscious avoidances are features of an idiolect, and not of a sociolect; of individual language preferences, and not of group language; though the extant text of Q is too short for too confident statements. An exact comparison with the linguistic usages of Matthew and Luke allows for more conclusions on the peculiarities of Q and thus, vice versa, also influences the reconstructed text.⁶¹ Temporal subordinate clauses with ὥς are rare or even missing (the evidence not being completely clear); ὥς is usually a comparative particle. A genitive absolute occurs only once or twice: once in the mouth of Jesus (7:24 and perhaps 12:54, but in this case only according to Mt 16:2).

Greek 4 (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1976 / reprint 1986), 38, 59; Christopher M. Tuckett, *Q and the History of Early Christianity. Studies on Q* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1996), 91 (who is skeptical about the possibility to find clear criteria for non-translational Greek in Q, but also skeptical whether statements about the style of Q are possible anyway. Certainly, only clusters of such criteria will allow for confident statements).

60 All figures are from my reconstruction, which only in a very few places differs from the *Critical Edition*. Many details would need further discussion.

61 This mainly happens in the Documenta Q-series (1996 and following), which unfortunately has been rather faltering in the last years. But the available volumes are the most informative source on Q reconstruction we have so far.

This again would be an indication of a more sophisticated (scribal?) language; even Mark has it 34 times, Matthew 51 times, Luke 57 times, and Acts 100 times and in much more unrestricted use.

Its absence is telling. It is also absent in the Epistle of James, by the way, perhaps coincidentally, as the Greek of James is rather on a high level.⁶² The construction εἶναι + participle, which is extraordinarily frequent in Luke, is still rare in Q (one or two cases). Also, many constructions with γίνομαι (which Luke has frequently and Matthew from time to time) are absent. Q very much is a book of questions; this is indeed one of its most obvious features, distinguishing it from most other Sayings collections which have a much more apodictic style. “Q uses rhetorical questions extensively.”⁶³ Together with the frequent parataxis and the occasional parallelismus membrorum, as well as its limited yet strange vocabulary, it achieves quite some stylistic uniformity, exhibiting clear traces of an idiolect. Imperfect is rare, and the optative is absent. Q 16:16a is a semitising nominal sentence. Nominalised adjectives are common. The historical present (praesens historicum) is found frequently, also in alternation with tenses of the past (4:1-13 passim; 7:2; 7:22; 11:24; 19:15), but not everywhere where it would have been possible and might have had a dramatic effect (not, e.g., 11:14 or 14:16-23). There is also the frequent pleonasm of the personal pronoun and an abundant use of αὐτός in the oblique casus.

12.4.8 Lexemes and Syntactic Structures

Some lexemes and syntactic structures are strange and otherwise hardly known; a number of these I have already mentioned as loan words.⁶⁴ Ἐν γεννητοῖς γυναικῶν (Q 7:28) reminds of βροτὸς δὲ γεννητὸς γυναικός and similar phrases in the Graeca of the Book of Job (11:2, 12; 14:1; 15:14; 25:4), but otherwise seems hardly possible in idiomatic Greek (but cf. 4Esra 4:6 “quis natorum poterit hoc facere ...” and similar phrases in Jewish texts like Sir 10:18; 1QH 13:14; 18:12, 16, 23; 4Q 482,1,4 [DJD VII, 1982, 1; uncertain reading]; also many Rabbinic phrases might be compared (Aboth deRabbi Nathan 2:2a; bShabb. 88b; Num. Rabba 4:141b; Lev. Rabba 35:132b; also, in Aramaic (TgJob 15:14; TgFragm Ex 14:29)).⁶⁵ The only older non-biblical instance

62 Cf. BDR section 423, 2.

63 Fleddermann, *Q. A Reconstruction and Commentary*, 97.

64 The survey of Q's vocabulary in the otherwise excellent commentary by Fleddermann, *Q. A Reconstruction and Commentary*, 119-22 does not give attention to these aspects, lacking a comparative approach. The most recent German commentary on Q by Markus Tiwald, *Kommentar zur Logienquelle* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2019) is interested in narratology, the Q community and other aspects, but not so much in the linguistic character of Q. He probably is right underlining a certain fluidity of the Q-text (14). Other literature might be mentioned, but a full study on the linguistic peculiarities of Q remains a *desideratum*.

65 Cf. Marcus Jastrow, *Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the*

1 Clemens 30:5 is a quotation from Job 11:3. This of course is an example of Jewish and perhaps more generally Semitic usage. Quite unusual in Q is also ἱκανὸς ἵνα (Q 7:6),⁶⁶ as are εἰπὲ λόγῳ (Q 7:7), the semantics of ὁμολογεῖν (Q 12:8) and the omnipresent λέγω ὑμῖν, which presents a claim to revelation and would not have been used in such a sense by non-Jewish speakers of Greek.⁶⁷ Q may have introduced Jesus' sayings consistently with the aorist εἶπεν,⁶⁸ but this is perhaps more than can be deduced from our reconstructed text (cf. the standard ΠΕΞΕ ΙC "thus says Jesus" of the Gospel of Thomas). We might discuss in much detail the repeated *passivum divinum* (6:37-38; 7:22, 35; 11:9, 51 etc.), whose fundamental character, however, has become highly controversial in recent research, and so this would need much further analysis which is not possible in this short chapter.

12.5 SYNTHESIS: SOCIOLECT OR IDIOLECT?

The intriguing question is whether these features and idiosyncrasies are to be regarded as sociolect or idiolect? Of course (being a Greek text) we do not simply have a document for the *ipsisima vox* of Jesus here (though most of the Sayings may go back to Jesus). This is not our point, anyway, but Q as a book must have had a compiler, a main person who wrote it down as an act of remembering and interpreting Jesus and making available his words for a certain community (even if copies will have varied slightly). This compiler may very well have shown idiosyncrasies of a special language, perhaps due to his religious, cultural, and professional background. Most recent Q research, which focuses on theories about the slow growth of Q and its place in the Jesus movement, would clearly assume a sociolect, a group language.

Terms that later became part of Christian theology are evident, as ὁ ἐρχόμενος, πτωχοί (later a self-referring terminus technicus of Jewish-Christians⁶⁹), μακάριος, εὐαγγελίζονται, Ναζαρά (which also is connected to self-referring terms in Jewish-Christian tradition), υἱὸς (...) τοῦ θεοῦ, ὁ υἱὸς, τὸ πνεῦμα (brachylogical for Holy

Midrashic Literature 1 (New York: Pardes 1950), 577f.

66 This is extremely rare (John 1:27 has it as v. l). The dictionaries compare the alchemical Papyrus Holmiensis Lagercrantz 4:23 "πρὸ ἱκανῶν ἡμερῶν, ἵνα" (ed. Robert Halleux, *Les Alchimistes Grecs I. Papyrus de Leyde. Papyrus de Stockholm. Fragments de Recettes*, Paris 1981, 17 l. 149-150; cf. 116). However, this is not the same.

67 Cf. Joachim Jeremias, *Neutestamentliche Theologie 1. Die Verkündigung Jesu*, 44-45; id., *Abba. Studien zur neutestamentlichen Theologie und Zeitgeschichte* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 1966), 148-151; Martin Hengel, Anna Maria Schwemer, *Jesus und Judentum* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 2007), 504-505.

68 This is suggested by Fleddermann, *Q. A Reconstruction and Commentary*, 153.

69 On the many possible meanings of this term cf. Marco Frenschkowski, *Prophetie. Innovation, Tradition und Subversion in spätantiken Religionen*. Standorte in Antike und Christentum 10 (Stuttgart: Hiersemann, 2018), 197.

Spirit, or Spirit of God).⁷⁰ The peculiarities of the non-theological language must not be over-looked and reveal perhaps even more on the persons (person?) behind Q as a book. The suggestion in recent scholarship that these persons behind the compilation of Q may have been village scribes has met with much approval. These scribes would have been people who were able to read and write documents and letters professionally and for money, acting, e.g., perhaps also as notaries, but not theologians in any traditional sense.⁷¹ This theory is sometimes combined with the older idea of itinerant charismatics who might have been the social matrix of Q, sometimes distinguished from it.

However, I do think that the evidence also shows traces of more individual and specific preferences, that is, rather of an idiolect, as we know it well for Matthew and Luke (and of course for Paul; but for the Gospel of John the search for both aspects of language on the other side is much more difficult). It is not easy to get methodically safe ground under our feet in this quest. Sociolects are the result of group-specific language formation, which goes hand in hand with demarcation processes against an “outside world”. In addition, there is the vocabulary of group-specific experiences of the Jesus movement.⁷² Thus, many features of the language of the Sayings Source may be explained sufficiently.

Aspects like the preference for Latin coin names, the significant accumulation of verbs for aggressive persecution, and even such as ἐκβάλλειν or ἔρχεσθαι, the singular and even unique Semitic loan words, can be better understood as individual language, that is, as an idiolect of an author personality. The simplicity and uniformity, but also the oddity of the language of Q is striking. I therefore disagree with Christopher Tuckett (otherwise a major voice in Q studies) when he says: “In fact it is very dubious how far

70 These are the examples discussed by James M. Robinson, *The Sayings Gospel Q*, in id., *The Sayings Gospel Q. Collected Essays*, eds. Christoph Heil and Joseph Verheyden (Leuven: Peeters, Leuven University Press, 2005), 319-348.

71 Cf. William E. Arnal, *Jesus and the Village Scribes. Galilean Conflicts and the Setting of Q* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001); also, Giovanni B. Bazzana, *Kingdom of Bureaucracy: The Political Theology of Village Scribes in the Sayings Gospel Q*. BETL 274 (Leuven: Peeters, 2015), 29-117. Both are important books arguing from the ability to write in a small village milieu, but completely failing to consider the extreme idiosyncrasies of Q Greek as discussed in this chapter and pointing to a much more specific authorship or compilership. He (the male form here is probably adequate) could not just write and read: we know from his language much more about his intellectual world. Cf. also Tiwald, *Kommentar zur Logienquelle*, 23-24; Kloppenborg, *Excavating Q*, 194-6, 200-201, etc.

72 The creative side of early Christian language (vocabulary and style) has mostly been discussed from the perspective of looking for its differences compared to a Jewish or pagan background, i.e., its innovations (e.g., Nigel Turner, *Christian Words* [Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1980]). A larger study from a comparative view also looking at other small and emerging religious groups in antiquity is much needed and should not share the pathos of Christian uniqueness marring so many older studies.

we will ever be able to say very much about the detailed style of Q [...].”⁷³ But we do have several conspicuous features that are quite meaningful. Of course, the “standard view” of the extent of Q is presupposed, but with this taken for granted, the style of Q can clearly be distinguished from that of Matthew and Luke, even if particularly Matthew has been read as an augmented and enriched edition of Q in some ways.⁷⁴

The main result of these observations on the language of Q is that this lost book is not just a reconstructable relic of an early stratum of the Jewish Jesus movement on its eventual way to become a religion of its own. It is also a book showing clear features of an idiolect, and traces of the personality of its compiler. The language of Q is a personal language, and it transmits the remembered (but translated) language of Jesus in a highly individual and idiosyncratic way. This is done by selecting certain traditions which are put into writing, but also by the choice of words and phrases, loan words and metaphors. Latinisms and financial technical terms abound, as do subjects and metaphors taken from lending and giving back, buying and selling, tithing, possessions and poverty, the foolish trust in material goods and the paradoxical carefree lifestyle of the poor messengers of Jesus, debts to people and debts to God, robbers and treasures, local authorities, out-of-court settlements (about money, of course), small sums of money, large sums of money, real sums of money and imaginary sums of money, interest and the burying of money, faithful and disloyal servants, the administration of property, making debts and cancelling debts.

All this is the social world from which Q originates and takes its metaphors. As other sources (Mk, Special Mt, Special Lk, older tradition in John) show, this is only a part of the early Jesus tradition, and though taken from remembering Jesus, it is also a focused and therefore selective work of a person deeply devoted to Jesus, but who is also deeply shaped by a special social world of his own. This author (if we may call him so) in his own biography perhaps had come to realise, and indeed had discovered, the freedom of the invitation to a new life as given in Q 12:22-31.

Does this fit together with speculative suggestions relating to the famous Papias passage on Matthew the tax collector “sitting at the receipt of custom”: “περὶ δὲ τοῦ Ματθαίου ταῦτ' εἴρηται: ‘Ματθαῖος μὲν οὖν Ἑβραϊδὶ διαλέκτῳ τὰ λόγια συνετάξατο, ἡρμήνευσεν δ' αὐτὰ ὡς ἦν δυνατὸς ἑκαστος” (Euseb, h.e. 3:39,16)? Does this mean having become a disciple after having been a tax collector he was also known as collecting sayings of Jesus? This tradition originally could not have meant the gospel of Matthew which is a

73 Tuckett, *Q and the History of Early Christianity*, 92.

74 But cf. the observations by Ulrich Luz, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus (Mt 1-7)*. EKK I/1 (completely rev. Düsseldorf/Zürich, Neukirchen-Vluyn: 2002), 78-80, 89-90. Luz (with all due respect) unfortunately misses the linguistic character of Q, even rejecting to give any attention to the uniqueness of the Latinisms (78-79 n. 162).

second generation book written in Greek, and is certainly not written by an eyewitness, though Papias clearly confuses this. Papias mistakenly speaks about canonical Mt as a translation, and thereby probably tries to explain the different variant versions of Mt circulating (i.e., the Jewish-Christian gospels) which he knew about. He saw them (intelligently, but wrongly) as slightly different translations from a Semitic book. The most plausible explanation of this confused state of affairs still might be that Papias knows a tradition about Matthew and a Sayings collection (which he may never have seen) and mixes this up with the one gospel where Matthew is a figure of its own (Mt 9:9; 10:3). Many other aspects have to be considered as well (for example, Lk 1:2 refers to eyewitness accounts as sources, which cannot refer to Mk who never was regarded as an eyewitness but may mean another book he saw as written by an αὐτόπτης, combined with oral tradition).⁷⁵

Can these arguments and observations on Q be taken together to form a possible idea about the alleged or namegiving authority (“Gewährsmann”, not “author”) behind Q (as Thomas is for the Gospel of Thomas)? I rather think they do, though with many questions remaining open. However, this quest may enrich the fascination of Q even more, if it is indeed the only New Testament source compiled by a person who knew Jesus first-hand, though with much on-going history in-between.⁷⁶

75 Cf. the further suggestions in Frenschkowski, “Matthäus als Gewährsmann der Logienquelle”, where the Papias passage is also discussed at length. Logia, by the way, means oracles, divine words, not “sayings” or “speeches” (*logoi*).

76 This of course does not mean Q simply gives the ipsissima vox of Jesus, as little as the Platonic dialogues are the ipsissima vox of Socrates, though Platon had indeed known Socrates well in his youth. Cf. also the skeptical remarks of Fleddermann, *Q. A Reconstruction and Commentary*, 169-72 for using Q as a main source for looking for the historical Jesus; or, in a similar guarded vein, Bazzana, *Kingdom of Bureaucracy*, 5-6. As we have seen, Q by its redactional processes brings its message to its own time, re-interpreting its tradition probably as freely as did Mk, Mt and Lk.