

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Expositor* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php

prone to fall are on the whole of a much slighter kind than those which were a danger to men: the standard of life was higher, apparently, among the women than among the men.

W. M. RAMSAY.

THE DATE OF Q.

Now that the use of Mark by Matthew and Luke (or of a document so nearly identical with it as to be practically indistinguishable) is accepted as an almost certain result of criticism, attention is gradually being fixed more and more intently on the non-Marcian sections of the First and Third Gospels. No excuse, therefore, is needed for an attempt to suggest reasons for fixing the date of the document underlying these sections.

It is generally agreed that the use of a common source written in Greek ¹ is the necessary explanation of the great agreement between these Gospels in sections containing matter not found in Mark. To this document the name of Q is usually given, and among recent attempts to discuss it those of Wellhausen (*Einleitung in die drei ersten Evangelien*) and Harnack (*Rede und Sprüche Jesu*) are the best known and the most generally useful. Harnack, indeed, has gone so far as to reconstruct the probable text of Q, on the basis of a comparison of Matthew and Luke, and the elimination of features likely to be due to their idiosyncrasies.

Although these attempts are certainly on the right lines, and are likely to yield profitable results to those who follow them up, it is perhaps not out of place to utter a preliminary word of caution to those who seem inclined to speak of Harnack's

¹ Many think that this Greek document was a translation of an Aramaic or Hebrew original, and some that the latter was known to Matthew and Luke and occasionally consulted by them. But this, though perhaps probable, does not alter the fact that Q, as directly used by them, was a Greek document.

reconstruction of Q as if it were an extant document. The unwisdom of such a course can be seen if we consider what we should know of Mark if our Second Gospel did not exist. The methods of literary comparison between Matthew and Luke would, in the absence of Mark, only result in the identification of a common source containing all that is now put into Q, together with the greater part, but not all, of Mark. It is exceedingly doubtful if literary criticism could get any further than this. That is to say, instead of at least two sources we should only think of one. The lesson to be learnt from this fact is the desirability of remembering that Q may just as well stand for several sources, all known both to Matthew and Luke, as for one single document; that it is practically certain that Q contained passages which are now found only in one Gospel, and that the probability is almost equally great that it contained some, though probably not many, passages which were not used by the redactors of either of the present Gospels. It is, of course, by no means difficult to make a tolerably good guess at some of the passages found in only one Gospel, yet nevertheless probably taken from Q, but it is obviously impossible to reconstruct sections which are not found in either Matthew or Luke, though that such existed is exceedingly probable.

At the same time, although a consideration of the history of the discovery of the Marcan source suggests caution in speaking of Q as a single document, it also inspires us with some degree of confidence in the general results of research. If we look at their treatment of Mark, we can see that Matthew and Luke both used it with a considerable degree of fidelity, except in small points of diction, such as altering the characteristic historic present of Mark to the more literary past tense. It is unusual for them both to alter Mark at the same place in the same way, and the number of places where they seem to do so ought probably

to be considerably reduced by textual criticism.¹ Therefore we have good reason for believing that as a rule the original Q is preserved either in Matthew or Luke, and an intelligent criticism ought to enable us generally to be right in our discrimination between the two.

Moreover we know that neither Matthew nor Luke omitted very much from Mark. We have therefore an *à priori* reason for thinking that we have probably got the greater part of Q in the two Gospels, even though there is a margin of doubt as to the number of passages belonging to Q which are only preserved in one Gospel.

We have some additional reason for thinking that Q was treated by Matthew and Luke in much the same way as they treated Mark in the fact that they have both followed, in the main, the same order (presumably that of their source in the Q passages, just as they have done in the Marcan ones. That is to say, if we divide up into sections the matter which probably came from Q, these sections as a rule follow each other in the same order in both Matthew and Luke. It is perhaps worth while to show this by a short table. We find the same order in the following passages :

(1)	Matt.	iii.	1-12	=	Luke,	iii.	1-17.
(2)	„	iv.	1-11	=	„	iv.	1-15.
(3)	„	v.	1-12	=	„	vi.	20-23.
(4)	„	v.	38-48	=	„	vi.	27-36.
(5)	„	vii.	1-6	=	„	vi.	37-42.
(6)	„	vii.	15-27	=	„	vi.	43-49.
(7)	„	viii.	5-13	=	„	vii.	1-10.
(8)	„	xi.	1-19	=	„	vii.	18-35.
(9)	„	xi.	20-24	=	„	x.	13-15.
(10)	„	xi.	25-30	=	„	x.	21-24.
(11)	„	xii.	22-37	=	„	xi.	14-23.
(12)	„	xii.	38-42	=	„	xi.	29-32.

¹ The main point in favour of this contention is that in early times the text of Matthew was on the whole the norm to which the others were adapted, and that on the whole Luke has suffered more from this cause than Mark, which often escaped, because it was the least widely used. The result is that when Luke was corrected so as to agree with Matthew it often produced a false appearance of an agreement between Matthew and Luke against Mark.

Moreover the passages in which the same order is not preserved are mostly susceptible of easy explanation: for instance, in Matthew xxiv. 26-28, 37-41 and 29 correspond to Luke xvii. 20-35 and Matthew xxiv. 43-51 correspond to Luke xii. 39-46; it is fairly plain that Matthew has combined these eschatological sections with the similar narrative of Mark xiii. and thus disarranged the order.

Thus if we remember that the symbol Q may possibly represent more than one document and that this document is not extant, there is no reason to be unduly sceptical as to the correctness of Harnack and Wellhausen's views as to the contents of Q.

To establish the date of the document two methods suggest themselves. The first is to compare Mark with Q, assuming—what is indeed not improbable—that the former may be roughly dated as about 70 A.D.¹—earlier rather than later. By this means it would be possible to say whether it was earlier or later than Mark, i.e. than 70. This method has been more or less followed both by Wellhausen and Harnack; but whereas the former thinks that in every case where comparison is possible Mark is seen to be earlier than Q, the latter holds a precisely opposite opinion. Those who have read both these treatises will probably agree that the impression made upon the mind of an impartial critic is that neither has decidedly the better of the argument. The passages in question are susceptible of either interpretation, and there is nothing in any of them to prove definitely the relative date of Mark and Q.

¹ This is certainly a popular hypothesis. Personally, I have never been able to see anything in Mark which points to one date much more than another except that before the fall of Jerusalem seems more likely than after it; and if we could trust the tradition that St. Mark wrote after the death of St. Peter in Rome, that would leave the six years from 64 to 70 open. But this is very dangerous reasoning on which to build any heavy superstructure of conclusions.

It is perhaps, therefore, desirable to try the other possible method, that is, to consider the probable dates of the conditions of Christian thought which could have produced such a document as Q.

The outstanding features of Q are: (1) it began by an account of John the Baptist, and represented Jesus as first realizing his divine commission to be Messiah at his baptism. (2) It shows no sign of polemical motives, but has a purely Christian character; it seems to have been written by a Christian for Christians. (3) It is strongly eschatological, and expects the immediate coming of the Messiah. (4) It has no narrative of the death or resurrection of Jesus.

Of these four characteristics the first is unimportant for the present purpose, because it is equally true of Mark, and we have no means of saying at what time the point of view it implies was changed in favour of that found in the Gospels, while the second is in itself obviously useless for chronological purposes. The other two remain, and are not essentially changed if we admit the possibility (I do not believe that it is a probability) that Q had once a short account of the Passion and Resurrection of such a kind that it was useless for Matthew and Luke, in the light of the fuller treatment given in Mark and in the Jerusalem tradition peculiar to Luke. It might perhaps be argued that this Jerusalem tradition is identical with Q, but so far as I know this view has never been taken and seems exceedingly improbable; for myself the balance of probability is certainly that Q ended with the eschatological discourse and never had any Passion or Resurrection narratives at all.

The main chronological problem, therefore, is to define the date and circumstances under which a gospel, intended not for missionary purposes but for the use of Christians, can conceivably have ended, not with an account of the Passion and Resurrection, but with an eschatological discourse. In

other words, we need to ask, at what time is it possible that the Passion and Resurrection had no personal importance for Christians? It is necessary to emphasize that the question is not concerned with the importance of the Resurrection for missionary work, or for polemical purposes, but merely with the position which it took in the personal religion of convinced Christians. No one would suggest that there ever was a time when the fact that Christ was risen from the dead¹ was not used by Christians as a proof in controversy that Jesus, in spite of his death, was nevertheless the Messiah; but the question is whether there ever was a time when the Resurrection had no personal importance for converts after they had become Christians, because their whole interest was centred in the speedy coming of the Messiah? Or, to put the question in still another form, can we find a chronological importance in the fact that the characteristic Christian greeting was at one time not—as it is to-day in the East—“Christ is risen,” but “Maranatha, the Lord is at hand”? The suggestion is that the writer of Q belongs to the “Maranatha” period, while the canonical Gospels belong to that of “Christ is risen.”

To answer this question we do best to try to reconstruct the general point of view of the first Christians, and to notice the way in which it came to change.

The first stage in the history of Christian thought comes immediately after the death and resurrection of Jesus. The dominant feature of this period was the expectation of the

¹ It should, however, be noted that the speeches in the early chapters of Acts show that the *gravamen* of the Christian argument was not that Jesus had been resuscitated, but that he had been *raised and glorified*. Mere resuscitation was no argument that any one was Messiah: glorification was. This is why the emphasis is at the beginning all on the glorification of the risen Lord—on the change in him. Only later, for other purposes, was the emphasis shifted on to the identity of the risen body, and the idea of glorification united to the Ascension, regarded as a different event from the Resurrection.

coming of the Messiah, his establishment of the kingdom of God, and the eschatological drama of judgment of the heathen. We are accustomed to speak of the return of the Messiah, but the first generation of Christians spoke of his Parousia, or coming, because, although it seems certain that they identified Jesus as the Messiah even during his life, and that he accepted their identification, this view meant rather, if accurately expressed, that Jesus was he who was destined to be the Messiah. From the point of view of personality he was Messiah, and could properly be spoken of as such, but from the point of view of function he was *going to be* Messiah, and his Parousia had not yet taken place. He was "Son of God," but not yet Messiah in more than a proleptic sense of the word.

At this stage of development what was the importance of the Resurrection of Jesus to Christian thought? It was primarily the means whereby Jesus had become a heavenly being, so that he would soon be seen descending in the clouds to take up the functions of the Messiah.

This point of view seems to be that of the Petrine speeches¹ in Acts (chap. ii. 14-36; iii. 12-26; v. 29-32; x. 34-43). In all these passages the main argument is that through the Resurrection Jesus has been glorified and proved to be the expected Messiah. From the point of view of polemic against the Jews the Resurrection was evidence of the true character of Jesus; but for the Christian, who required no instruction on that point, it was merely the method by which he was glorified: the attention of the Christian was fixed not on what Jesus had done, but on what he was going to

¹ It is of course obvious that many of the words of those speeches, and some of the sentiments are Lucan and not Petrine. Still, when all possible allowance has been made for these facts, there remains over a very considerable and important amount which is *not* Lucan, and belongs to the source, whether written or oral, used by St. Luke, and this source seems to have so good a knowledge of the doings of St. Peter that the speeches have a real claim to be regarded as Petrine.

do. There is in these speeches no clear distinction made between the Resurrection, Ascension and Glorification, which are rather different ways of describing the same fact from various points of view. For instance, chap. ii. 33, St. Peter says, "This Jesus did God raise up, whereof we all are witnesses. Being therefore exalted by the right hand of God, having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Spirit, he hath poured forth this which ye see and hear." Here it is clear that the Ascension and Resurrection are regarded as two ways of looking at the same fact—the glorification of Jesus to a heavenly being—on which all the emphasis is laid. Moreover this glorification is, when looked at from the point of view of function, described in chap. ii. 36 as "God hath made him both Lord and Christ, this Jesus whom ye crucified"; or in chap. v. 31, "Him did God exalt with his right hand to be a prince and a saviour"; or still more plainly in chap. x. 42, "He charged us to preach unto the people and to testify that this is he which is ordained of God to be the judge of quick and dead."

All this implies that for Christians of that period the very centre of their belief was that Jesus, who had been exalted to the position of a heavenly being, was about to come in order to establish the kingdom of his followers and to judge the world outside according to its deeds. The method of the exaltation was in itself less important, and had no personal bearing on Christians, in so far as they had no expectation of going through any experience at all parallel. They had themselves no thought of Resurrection,¹

¹ Nor did they look for judgment in the same sense as they expected it for the Heathen. The Parable of the Sheep and Goats is the most striking instance of the primitive point of view. It describes a judgment, not on Christians but on Heathen, *τὰ ἔθνη*, who do not know the Messiah for good or evil, and they are judged in accordance with their behaviour to the *ἀδελφοί*—the Christians, who are clearly pictured as standing round the throne of the King, as his followers, not among those who are being arraigned.

because they had no thought of death. If, therefore, they had written out during this period a gospel for their own benefit, not for polemical, and not for missionary purposes, they would have put the emphasis on the expectation of the coming of the Messiah and on his teaching concerning it and concerning their behaviour until he came.

So long, therefore, as this period lasted it is intelligible that Christians should have written just such a document as Q. In it we have no definite statement of the death of Jesus, but the fact as implied. For instance, in Luke xvii. 25, which almost certainly belongs to Q, though it is omitted by Matthew, we read, "but he (the Son of Man) must first suffer many things, and be rejected of this generation." Or, again, the wording of the saying, that he who does not "take up his cross" is unworthy of discipleship (Matt. x. 38, corresponding to Luke xiv. 27) must imply a knowledge of the Crucifixion, while the fact that the Son of Man is expected to come from heaven implies a knowledge of his Glorification, or, in other words, of the Resurrection.¹ No emphasis is laid on the fact, which is only mentioned in passing, but great stress is laid on the coming of the Son of Man in power, and this is clearly expected before the passing away of that generation. The exact time of the coming of the Messiah is unknown, and the disciples are warned not to listen to those who say, "Lo here, or lo there," because the coming of the Son of Man will be as a flash of lightning which leaves no room for doubt or question; but with this margin of uncertainty the idea that the Parousia would not

¹ These passages, added to the general improbability that a Gospel was written before the Passion, are, I believe, the adequate proof that Sir William Ramsay's hypothesis that Q was written during the life of Jesus is unsatisfactory. The following arguments are similarly the proof that he is wrong in thinking that it was only before the Passion and Resurrection that a Gospel could have been written without describing these events.

take place at all in that generation is as foreign to Q as it is to Mark.

Thus the general background of thought implied by Q is an expectance of the coming of the Messiah within a very short time, so short that it made the question of a resurrection of no importance for Christians, and an identification of Jesus with the Messiah. It is equally certain that this background of thought is that of the earliest Christianity, and so far as the contents of Q are concerned no date after the Passion seems impossibly early. It might theoretically have been written on the day of the Resurrection. So far, therefore, as fixing the *terminus a quo* of Q is concerned we have to rely upon other arguments of a rather vague nature, such as the general probability as to the time when Christians began to write books and as to the probability or otherwise that Q is a translation from an Aramaic original. But at present it is probably more important to try to fix the *terminus ad quem* of Q. To do this we need to ask, how long did the background described thus continue to exist unchanged? Obviously it is not likely to have endured beyond the limits of the first generation, and the Gospels, with their great interest in the death and resurrection, as distinct from the glorification of Christ, are a proof that the attitude of mind implied by Q did not last long. But the date of the Gospels is not easy to determine, and fortunately we have better indications in the Acts, and in the Pauline Epistles in passages the chronology of which is fairly certain, to show us the date at which the background of thought implied by Q was gradually giving place to one more familiar to us.

In the Acts the most instructive incident for the present purpose is that of Apollos. It has often been misunderstood because commentators have had too little feeling for the atmosphere of the first century and have tried to force into it ideas foreign to the time to which it refers.

Apollos was an Alexandrian Jew who had been attracted by the teaching of the Forerunner, whose baptism he knew. That is to say, he was acquainted with the baptism of cleansing and repentance as preliminary to membership of the Messianic kingdom, but he did not know who the Messiah was to be. On this basis he expounded the Messianic teaching of the Old Testament which St. Luke, speaking from the standpoint of Christian knowledge, describes as "the passages concerning Jesus." He then came into contact with Aquila, who explained to him the Christian standpoint, and the result was that he added to his teaching "that the Messiah," whom he had already preached "was Jesus," (τὸν Χριστὸν εἶναι Ἰησοῦν,¹ It should be noted that the meaning usually read into this passage, "that Jesus was the Christ," is a bad piece of translation, into which even the revisers fell, untrue to the Greek, and obscuring the sense. The whole point is that there was Messianic teaching before there was Christianity, and that what Aquila did was to persuade Apollos to recognize Jesus as that Messiah whose existence² he had long known (that is what is meant by saying that he was "instructed in the way of the Lord") without being aware of his identity.

Such teaching as Apollos must have given after his intercourse with Aquila would have been probably very like that of Q, so long as he was not engaged in directly polemical

¹ After I had formulated this view, I happened to mention it in conversation to Mr. J. H. Hart, who told me that it was also his own, and had been published in 1904 in the *Journal of Theological Studies*: I ought to have known this, but Mr. Hart's very interesting article, which gives detailed arguments for each step of the reasoning, was published at a time when I was mostly occupied in learning Dutch, and I never read it. I venture to mention this, as Mr. Hart and I are thus independent witnesses, and, as he would express it, "It is written again, out of the mouth of two witnesses, etc."

² It is scarcely necessary to say that the Book of Enoch is the absolute proof that a "Messianically-minded" Jew would certainly have thought of the Messiah as already existing.

work. The Resurrection would be for him merely another name for the Glorification of Jesus. The details of its accomplishment would be immaterial in comparison with the expected Parousia, and the death of the Messiah had probably obtained no special significance: just as there is nothing in Q to suggest that redemption—entry into the Messianic kingdom—depended on the death of the Messiah, so in the opening chapters of Acts it is “the name” of Messiah, not his death, which brings salvation.

In the earliest Pauline epistles we also catch a glimpse of the same state of things, but it is beginning to change, and the Resurrection of Jesus is obtaining a personal importance for Christians, in the light of the fact that the first generation was beginning to see that their ranks were not immune from the attacks of death. In I Thessalonians the new converts are expecting the Parousia so momentarily that it is necessary to urge them to attend to their ordinary work; but some of them were distressed at the death of friends, apparently doubting whether they would not be prevented by death from entering into the Messianic kingdom which the Parousia would inaugurate. They are then comforted by St. Paul, who teaches that there will be a Resurrection at the Parousia, so that those who remain will not have any advantage over those who sleep. It is especially noteworthy that he clearly regards those who remain as representing the normal event—he speaks of them as “we”—and that whereas in speaking of the Parousia he assumes that it is well known—“It is not necessary that I should write to you,”—in dealing with the resurrection of those who sleep he treats it as a new subject,—“I would not have you ignorant.”

Here we certainly see the beginnings of that change in Christian thought which ultimately made the Parousia be regarded as the resurrection and judgment of all,—including

Christians—rather than the joyful coming of the Messiah to join and comfort his own followers and to judge not Christians, who stand by the side of the judge rather than by those to be judged, but the heathen world, and to destroy the powers of evil. But the change has not yet come. The resurrection of those who sleep is in 1 Thessalonians not a judgment, but merely the means of restoring Christians who had died before the Parousia to fellowship with their surviving friends.

It is obvious that as soon as this—in a certain sense—new doctrine of a resurrection for Christians became well known, it gave rise to discussion, and the Resurrection of Christ must have been used as an analogy for the resurrection of Christians. That is exactly what we find in 1 Cor. xv. ; for the first time this analogy is put forward, and put forward so elaborately as to have a tendency to deceive us as to its position in the development of Christian teaching. St. Paul's Epistles are for us scripture, and it is difficult for us to make the effort to recollect that they were originally letters written on special occasions to discuss special points, as to which there was either some difference of opinion, or a danger of forgetfulness on the part of Christians. Yet it is most important to make this effort, for without it we are apt to try to construct systems of Paulinism out of the Epistles by treating as most important the things on which he says most. It would only be a somewhat paradoxical way of expressing the truth to say that the reverse method is the better. In letters no one discusses the things at the centre, on which he is perfectly agreed with his correspondent, but rather the things at the periphery of thought, where agreement and difference meet. There is no reason to think that St. Paul was an exception to this rule ; his Epistles may be taken to deal most fully with points on which there was a difference of opinion among Christians, or which had

not previously been emphasized in teaching. Among these points was the personal importance of the resurrection of Christ as an analogy for the resurrection of Christians.

To many people this is a central—or even the central—feature of their Christianity, but there was a time when it was unknown, when, as 1 Thessalonians shows, Christians had no hope of resurrection because they had no expectation of death. 1 Corinthians xv. marks the appearance of the doctrine of a resurrection for Christians and its connexion with the resurrection of Christ at the periphery of Christian thought.

The importance of this argument for the dating of Q is obvious, for Q clearly belongs to the world of thought earlier than 1 Corinthians xv., to which probably Apollos at Ephesus and certainly the Church at Thessalonica belonged, at least until they received 1 Thessalonians.

To translate this result into a definite date is of course impossible, but it is probably not too much to say that every year after 50 A.D. is increasingly improbable for the production of Q.

At the same time we have no right to dogmatize too much on this point or to say that a date later than 50 is impossible: there may have been circles of Christian thought in which it would not have been impossible. It would be impossible in the directly Pauline circle after the date mentioned, but we do not know what was the rate of the progress of thought in non-Pauline communities, nor do we know whether Q belongs to a Pauline or non-Pauline circle.

KIRSOPP LAKE.