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This study investigates the most prevalent view of the social circumstances prompting the Synoptic Sayings Gospel Q, namely Gerd Theissen's thesis of radical itinerant preachers. The focus of the investigation is on Q, and specifically its inversionary rhetoric and language of uprootedness, which is, of course, fertile territory for the itinerancy hypothesis. After reviewing the scholarly history of this theory, several substantial conclusions are drawn. First, the actual textual evidence for the itinerancy hypothesis is very tenuous indeed. For the most part, a prior assumption of itinerancy is required for the texts in question actually to evince the peripatetic behavior imputed to their tradents. The entire hypothesis should certainly be called into question at least as regards Q. Second, the immediate material context for the rise of earliest Christianity, Q included, is one of socio-economic crisis. This crisis was caused by a deliberate effort to restructure the northern Galilean local economy along lines more conducive to a monetized and trade- (and booty-) oriented Roman Imperial economy. Galilean isolation, especially from the coast, had allowed the region a measure of autonomy both social and economic, putting a natural brake on the degree to which the region could be exploited by outside political powers. Antipas' foundation of new cities within the Galilee, however, most especially Tiberias, put an end to this autonomy and caused significant social and economic changes. The foundation of cities and the consequent loss of local autonomy marked the period and region with which we are con-
cerned. Third, the reaction of the Q tradents was a reaction of local "village scribes" to these changes, which deleteriously affected their social standing. Their rhetoric of deracination is a symbolic reflection of their loss of independent local standing and power. But more than this, it is also a careful rhetorical strategy to enlist local support for a program intended to reaffirm autonomy, to endeavour to return to the autonomous days of the past, in which, for the Q tradents, local relations were marked by a kind of idealized reciprocity and justice.
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The following study — ostensibly of Q's inversionary rhetoric — was generated by an initial suspicion that the standard and conventional view of the social practice of the earliest Christian movement was fundamentally flawed. That standard and conventional view, of course, at least among more recent and innovative scholarship, is that the "first followers of Jesus" were wandering radicals: itinerant preachers whose proclamation of the "kingdom of God" was essentially coextensive with their own itinerant lifestyle. The embryonic Christianity fostered by these individuals focussed on an ascetic practice of renunciation, and, in consequence, the very peculiar rhetoric of some of the sayings ascribed to Jesus — sayings which appear to exhort poverty and homelessness as positive values, sayings which promise happiness to the poor and hungry, sayings which critique the acquisition of worldly goods as mercilessly as possible — is explained as the by-product and direct ideological reflection of (voluntarily) wandering beggars.

This hypothesis, while attractive in a variety of ways, not least because of its sociological cast, immediately presents the student of Christian origins with a series of problems. The motivation for this purported behaviour remains vague, if it is described at all. The circumstances — the concrete material context — of such radical itinerancy are also left rather cryptic and obscure. The hypothesis is also undermined by textual deficiencies: the reading of the sayings tradition which supports the itinerancy thesis tends to an inconsistent literalism, and a failure to explore the contextual force and rhetorical use of individual sayings. This study thus began as an effort to consider the
deficiencies of the itinerancy hypothesis as they pertained to a single documentary source containing material critical for the theory, namely the Synoptic Sayings Gospel, Q.

Q is not the only (documentary) location for material employed by the itinerancy hypothesis. But it is one of the documents that is most broadly illuminated and explained by this hypothesis. The social description of the forces behind Q has depended to a tremendous extent on the assumption that wandering radicals are at least partly responsible for at least some stages in the development of the material preserved in Q. Not only does Q have, like the Gospel of Mark, apparent direct references to homelessness and travel, it additionally seems to exhort "radical" behaviour as a central focus of its platform. Itinerancy is the practice which such exhortation is generally assumed to exhort — it is thus a major interest and theme of the Synoptic Sayings Source. Oddly, however, while itinerancy is rather frequently used to describe Q, Q is not so often used to describe itinerancy. That is, of a piece with the persistent textual failings of the itinerancy hypothesis. Q as a coherent document is rarely given careful consideration as evidence for Wanderradikalismus; but the itinerancy hypothesis assumed to apply to Q, is used as a basis for a social description of the people responsible for the document. This procedure, at least insofar as I have just described it accurately, is of course methodologically dubious. The itinerancy hypothesis must be verified rather than simply posited; and more than this, even if the existence of wandering radicals be granted, they must be shown to be linked to Q and the traditions behind Q before they can be deemed relevant to the document's social history. Early Christian peripatetic there may (or may not) have been; such behaviour's relationship to the composition of Q is another question altogether.

It is Q's inversionary rhetoric that marks the document as a fertile application for the itinerancy thesis. Q not only refers to homelessness and to travel but also — and for
the most part — encourages what appears to be a radical countercultural stance, in which love of enemy, giving without restraint, turning one's back on material gain, and similar behaviors are enjoined. A variety of other Q sayings similarly appear to imagine a world in which conventional values are inverted and turned on their heads, prompting the suspicion that perhaps Q imagines that the world itself is about to be turned on its head in some (unspecified) way. This study, therefore, focuses on the question of such rhetoric as an entry-point into the question of itinerancy and the larger issue of the social description of the persons responsible for Q and its traditions. I have referred throughout to this peculiar style of discourse, perhaps somewhat tendentiously, as a rhetoric of deracination. On the one hand, this terminology avoids prejudging the social intentions or specific social context out of which Q's strange injunctions arise: the character of the uprootedness is unspecified, and the term thus simply denotes a series of assertions in Q in which conventional values are, apparently, taken up by the roots. On the other hand, the terminology conveys a somewhat sociological prejudice: inversionary language is deemed to be all of a piece, and is associated, vaguely, with an unspecified social condition of detachment. The uprooting of conventional values, as with itinerancy hypotheses, is here assumed to reflect a social condition involving uprooting or dissociation of some sort. Whether, however, this uprooting is enjoined or is suffered is left unspecified, and the detachment of whom and from what is not prejudged.

Such a focus on Q, and on its "rhetoric of deracination," raises several preliminary problems, however. Most of these problems are associated with Q itself, as an hypothesized and certainly no-longer-extant document. I sometimes fantasize about

---

1. The term, as it applies to Q, I have stolen outright from John Kloppenborg, who has used it in print and who suggested it to me as an itinerancy-neutral adjective to characterize the peculiarly "countercultural" or "radical" material in Q. As this theft indicates, I am grateful for the suggestion.
the day when "Q" will actually be found, a prospect that both excites me and frightens me. In the meantime, however, Q as a single, written, ancient document does not exist. Rather, Q is an hypothesized source undergirding much of the sayings material found in the Gospels of Matthew and Luke. As such, the study of Q is, and continues to be, vulnerable to accusations of frivolity. The persistent refrain that "Q is only a hypothesis" is used to indict any of the more productive or interesting work on Q, as if it were somehow legitimate to posit the document, perhaps as a solution to source-critical problems, but were not legitimate to explore the document for its redactional, historical, or social-historical significance. Thus scholarship on Q, which is assuredly at the present time one of the most, if not the most, fecund areas of research into the gospel traditions, is at least viewed with suspicion (at most, dismissed outright and unconsidered) even by those who subscribe to the two document hypothesis as the best solution to the problem of synoptic relationships.

Here is not the place to defend either the two document hypothesis, the postulation of Q, or the specifics of the reconstruction of Q's original wording (on which latter, see below). It is sufficient here to point out that, although there is a contingent within NT scholarship which does cast doubt on the validity of the two source theory, and to which we owe many insightful and unquestionably correct insights about the ideological tendentiousness of the that theory's initial formulation, such scholarship has something of the character of creationism in the context of academic biology: it attempts to use the tools and language of the discipline, but remains a marginalized position, one that represents an effort to turn back the clock on scholarly progress. Books on biological issues do not need to provide initial justifications for their assumption of evolutionary theory.

Nor are such studies required to acknowledge the hypothetical character of the theories they rely on by conscientiously refraining from building upon them. The his-
tory of human intellectual endeavors — in the sciences or in the humanities — is a story of hypothesizing on hypotheses. The biologist assumes evolutionary theory and assumes the particular cladistic classifications within that theory whenever s/he considers any given species. Hypothesis is piled on hypothesis, although few would claim that efforts to classify any given species are irresponsible or frivolous. Likewise, in NT scholarship, an exegesis of any given passage in, say, the Gospel of Mark, is laboring under a whole series of assumptions and hypotheses, most of them, like the evolutionary hypotheses of the biologist, well founded: that Mark is the earliest Gospel, that our understanding of Koine is accurate, that "Mark" represents a single text, and most of all, that the textual reconstruction of Mark in the exegete's Greek Bible is not simply a synthetic backproduct, but corresponds more or less to the autograph. Work on Q is not much different than either of these processes. Q may not "exist," but then again, neither does "Mark" — both are reconstructions, both are hypotheses. Hypothesis piled on hypothesis is really just knowledge growing from knowledge. The process should persist until better alternative hypotheses are formulated or until the hypotheses in use can be falsified. The following pages will therefore take for granted the erstwhile existence of Q, as a single document roughly coextensive with the synoptic double tradition, and (originally) written in the Greek language.²

NT scholars, therefore, should be far more sanguine than they apparently are in making use of the recent advances in research on Q which are coming to prove so productive. Comprehensive efforts to take Q scholarship seriously in historical reconstruc-

². These basic issues are addressed thoroughly by John S. Kloppenborg, The Formation of Q: Trajectories in Ancient Wisdom Collections (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987). 41-88. Many other good treatments exist as well. The literature on each one of these questions is vast.
tions of Christian origins can be counted on one hand. The arguments against utilizing recent Q scholarship, moreover, do not take the form of engaging that scholarship. and indeed. could be formulated without having read any of it. Meier is typical in this regard:

Nevertheless, some educated guesses can be made on the order, extent. and even wording of Q — though they must all remain in the realm of the hypothetical. It is at this point that my ability to believe is exhausted — which just happens to be the point at which most speculation about Q begins to "rev up." Contemporary scholars have attempted to pinpoint the community that produced the Q document. the geographical area from which it originated, the stages of tradition and redaction it went through (some scholars assigning almost every verse of Q to a particular stratum of tradition or redaction), and its different theological stances. It is here that I fear that exegetes are trying to know the unknowable. To adapt a famous dictum of Ludwig Wittgenstein: whereof one does not know thereof one must be silent.4

"To know the unknowable." of course. is simply to pursue knowledge. In any case. the principle is applied selectively: Meier is in the process of writing a multi-volume work, hundreds of pages. on the historical Jesus. a scholarly black hole if there ever was one. Thus is Wittgenstein's "silence" honored only when it pertains to Q. As Kloppenborg has noted,

Such a view is convenient to Meier's purpose: it allows him to ignore compositional features in Q in a way he would not dare to in the case of Mark or Matthew. If he thought that the compositional history of Q was unknowable. the appropriate posture would be to use all Q sayings with extreme caution: instead. he assumes that unknowable means nonexistent so that he can short-circuit scholarship. This is an (unargued) attempt to turn the clock back to

3. Especially notable are the several books of John Dominic Crossan. and those of Burton Mack. Both are productive reconceptualizations of Christian Origins which are partly driven by recent studies of Q. See also the comments of John S. Kloppenborg. "The Sayings Gospel Q and the Quest of the Historical Jesus." Harvard Theological Review (1996): 307-344. 325. A dramatic example of the more common tendency to dismiss such scholarship without much consideration. and thus to fail (or refuse) to benefit from its insights. is to be found in John P. Meier's work on the historical Jesus. especially A Marginal Jew: Rethinking the Historical Jesus. vol.2: Mentor. Message, and Miracles (Anchor Bible Reference Library; New York: Doubleday. 1994). 178-181.

4. Meier. Marginal Jew. v.2. 179. Wittgenstein's actual words were. "Wovon man nicht sprechen kann. darüber muss man schweigen" (quoted by Meier. Marginal Jew. v.2. 233 n.277; emphasis added). The point is obviously quite different.
the time of von Harnack, who regarded Q as an unedited deposit of domini-
cal sayings.5

One might add that the reluctance to approach scholarship on Q — both redactional and
socio-historical — seriously has much less to do with its "hypothetical" character than
with its novel implications. The problem with Q is not that it "does not exist." but that
it does not tend to confirm the historical conclusions of the last four or five decades of
NT scholarship. Scholars having strong prejudicial commitments to those conclusions
can handily avoid have to defend the indefensible in any strenuous or rigorous way by
dismissing as "hypothetical" the document that is causing most of the trouble.

Such an approach will not be taken here. Rather than reinventing the wheel. or.
worse. insisting that it does not revolve, the results of the last decade (or so) of Q
scholarship will be taken seriously and an effort will be made to build upon those
results and. hopefully, to supplement them. Two of those results in particular should be
noted here. as they constitute critical assumptions behind the arguments of the final
chapter. The first of these assumptions is the now-dominant thesis that Q is a literarily
stratified document, i.e., that it evolved into the form in which Matthew and Luke used
it in a series of literary stages. The most thorough and accepted form of this hypothesis
is that of John Kloppenborg, as enunciated in The Formation of Q. Up to the present.
Kloppenborg’s carefully-argued conclusions have been employed fruitfully in a handful
of detailed studies of Q and the sayings tradition, and have not been effectively refuted
by anyone. Efforts at refutation have simply not addressed the detailed arguments in
favour of stratification, but have either dismissed it as "hypothetical" (as a way to avoid
engaging the arguments) or have attacked the presupposition that "wisdom" and
"apocalyptic" forms are not incompatible. a point which the stratification hypothesis

never assumes or invokes. Thus Kloppenborg's stratification will be presumed and used in what follows. This stratification assumes that Q developed in three discrete written stages, as follows:


The rhetoric of deracination in Q is primarily located in the first, formative stratum (Q1). Both of the original (apparent) Q references to travel and/or homelessness derive from this stratum as well. While some of the secondary, redactional material also implies or predicts significant social reversals and inversions, these sayings do not especially support the itinerancy hypothesis, nor are they especially mysterious in terms of their point of reference or their implications for the social location of their tradents. These sayings conceptualize reversal in terms of apocalyptic judgment, fictively (as a literary motif) or otherwise, and presuppose some kind of sectarian formation which is marginalized with regard to its larger context because of its sectarian identity. Thus they fall largely outside the parameters of the present inquiry.

Another major presupposition of the present study involves the conclusions of Ronald Piper, who has demonstrated the existence in Q of a series of compact and for-

---


7. Q texts are cited by Lukan versification, without prejudice to their original wording or location.
mally stereotypical argumentative clusters. These clusters, composed at least in part of originally loose and independent material, share the following form: 1. a general opening saying; 2. sayings producing arguments directly in support of the initial instruction; 3. rhetorical questions and new illustrations; 4. final argument and application. Piper has identified at least six such clusters in Q, all six deriving from Q1, and these clusters will form a major part of the final inquiry of this study.

Another matter usually pertaining to studies of Q is the issue of reconstruction of the text. Since this erstwhile document is in fact no longer extant, it must be reconstructed from the Matthean and Lukan "double tradition." Where Matthew and Luke disagree in their wording or ordering of the double tradition, individual judgments must be made as to which, if either, evangelist preserves the original Q form. This process can, as many have observed, be a highly subjective one. In order to avoid this critique, as well as to avoid producing pages and pages on issues of detailed reconstruction which have already been addressed by perhaps hundreds of different scholars, I have attempted, for the most part, to rely on the text of Q carefully reconstructed by the Society of Biblical Literature's "International Q Project." under the direction of James M. Robinson. Over the course of the last several years, this group has attempted to reconstruct the wording of the entirety of Q, taking into account the various arguments proffered for discussion by group members, and compiling as comprehensive a list as possible of printed arguments on each variation between Matthew and Luke. I have thus tried to follow the finished text of Q produced by the col-


lective efforts of the IQP, even where I have not entirely agreed with them, simply for the sake of consistency and standardization. Where I have departed from the IQP’s rendition of the original text, I have noted the divergence, and in the few instances where the deviation is critical to the argument, have attempted briefly to justify the reconstruction I prefer.

Methodologically, the study presupposes the value and validity of socio-historical approaches to biblical texts, and in particular assumes that historical reconstruction, rather than hermeneutical results, is the goal of the inquiry. The critical study of the NT is here understood not as a technique for determining the "truth" or "meaning" or even "original sense" of the texts in question, but rather as an historical approach to the inaugural period of what eventually became one of the great religious traditions of the world. As such, the study of the NT may shed light both on Western history in general and on the academic study of religion. I have, moreover, taken a fairly materialist stance throughout, attempting to link the development of ideas to the social conditions in which they arose, and assuming that some sort of causality exists along this nexus with the material pole serving as the primary causal force.

The following study of Q’s rhetoric of deracination thus takes a rather convoluted route to its destination. The history of the itinerancy hypothesis is treated in chapters 2 through 4, if not exhaustively, then at least thoroughly. Chapter 2 describes the first scholarly appearance of the modern itinerancy hypothesis in Adolf von Harnack’s work on the Didache, very shortly after the document’s discovery. Some effort is made to relate Harnack’s conclusions to his own Sitz im Leben, not necessarily as a directly causative factor, but as a predispositional undercurrent, as a kind of cultural subtext undergirding and lending resonance to his conclusions. The same process is then fol-
l owed in chapter 3 for the modern reappearance of the itinerancy hypothesis, and its
close relative, the Cynic hypothesis, in scholarship from about 1960 on. These efforts
to describe earliest Christianity as a movement of itinerants, and to relate that descrip-
tion to the Synoptic Sayings Source, reach their culmination, of course, in the work of
Gerd Theissen. Scholarship on Q subsequent to Theissen has tended to presuppose his
insights. Even the most current and innovative approach to the synoptic tradition, i.e.,
the effort to draw connections between the early Jesus movement and Greco-Roman
Cynic philosophers, is ultimately dependent on suggestions made by Theissen at the
behest of the itinerancy hypothesis. A rather different Sitz from that of Harnack.
obviously, has actuated this revivification of his hypothesis and its application to Q.

Chapter 4 addresses what I regard to be the weaknesses and failing of these recent
arguments for early Christian Wanderradikalismus. Sociologically, the hypothesis is
theoretically vacuous, and textually it is unfounded, or at least insufficiently supported
to serve as the basic assumption behind socio-historical reconstructions of Christian
origins. Not only is it difficult to connect Q to purported itinerants, it is extraordinarily
difficult to find evidence that such itinerants once existed anywhere within the Christian
movement. The solution to these shortcomings is simple: earliest Christianity needs to
be situated rather more firmly within its economic and social context. Myriad studies
have focused on the cultural background of the various NT writings, working from the
idealist presumption that ideas form the background to and are generative of ideas. To
whatever degree this may be partially true, its truth is nevertheless partial: people react
to social forces and to economic forces, and use cultural artifacts or techniques to com-
municate those reactions. Insufficient attention has thus been paid to these factors in
their causative or their contextual role. 10

10. By contextual role, I mean simply that quite apart from their causative significance, no reaction is
historically comprehensible in isolation from the factors to which it is in fact reacting.
Thus chapter 5 attempts to reconstruct the context out of which Q (probably) emerged, viz., Galilee in the early first century CE. The focus of this chapter is on the material situation rather than the cultural trappings (especially the red herring of the "Hellenistic" versus "Judaic" context of Q) of that situation: it focuses especially on economic considerations and on the social ramifications of these forces. Moreover, on the assumption that new cultural forces (and Q does appear to represent a fairly novel cultural irruption) are the result of social and material changes and ruptures, the focus of this description is in large measure on the changes that the first-century Galilean system of (economic) production suffered during the early Roman period, and specifically during the tetarchy of Antipas. Chapter 6, finally, analyzes Q's rhetoric of deracination in order to uncover the program it advances. That program revolves around an effort to reaffirm local reciprocity and communal values; if anything, it is sedentary and even a little conservative, rather than radical and itinerant. Such a program, in its turn, can be understood as a reaction to the economic changes brought about by Antipas, and to reflect the social deracination of the Q tradents which those changes caused.

Ultimately, the following conclusions are suggested by these chapters. First, the itinerancy thesis, even where it is innocent of specifically theological motivations, is culturally tendentious, and has gained its enormous scholarly popularity more from its resonance with contemporary socio-cultural trends than from its superior treatment of the evidence. Second, the actual textual evidence for the itinerancy hypothesis is very tenuous indeed, requiring for the most part a prior assumption of itinerancy in order for the texts in question to actually evince itinerancy. The entire thesis probably needs to be re-considered, and should certainly be called into question as regards Q. Third, the immediate material context for the rise of earliest Christianity, Q included, is one of
socio-economic crisis. This crisis was caused by a deliberate effort to restructure the northern Galilean local economy along lines more conducive to a monetized and trade-(and booty-) oriented Roman Imperial economy. Galilean isolation, especially from the coast, had allowed the region as measure of autonomy both social and economic, and thus had, to a degree, allowed geography and the technological limits of ancient transport to put a natural brake on the degree to which the region could be exploited by whatever political power happened to control it. Antipas’ foundation of new cities within the Galilee, however, most especially Tiberias, put an end to this autonomy and caused significant social and economic changes. It was the foundation of cities and the consequent loss of local autonomy, rather than widespread poverty, Roman military oppression, or rampant "Hellenization" that most marked the period and region with which we are concerned. Fourth and finally, the reaction of the Q tradents was a reaction of local "village scribes" to these changes, which deleteriously affected their social standing. Their rhetoric of deracination is a symbolic reflection of their loss of independent local standing and power. But more than this, it is also a careful rhetorical strategy to enlist local support for a program intended to reaffirm autonomy, to endeavour (fruitlessly, as it turns out) to return to the autonomous days of yore, in which, for the Q tradents, local relations were marked by a kind of idealized reciprocity and justice, along the lines of the communal and ancestral values of the "good old days," and thus under the rubric of the "kingdom of God."
In 1873 a Greek manuscript of the Didache, or Teaching of the Twelve Apostles, was discovered in the Patriarchal library of the Holy Sepulcher in Constantinople and was published ten years later, bringing to light for the first time in centuries this ancient, apocryphal "church order". In this document, apparently, provisions are laid out for the treatment of certain "travelers" (παρόδιοις) who "come" (ἔρχομενος) to the more settled Christians to whom the Didache is addressed (12:2). Chapters 11-15, in fact, seem to be preoccupied with issues of the authenticity of such figures and the support they may expect, and so the author offers specific precepts for the reception of particular types of preachers, discussed under the rubric of "apostles," "prophets," and "teachers." Apparently, the two former categories, at the very least, refer to peripatetic figures:

3Περὶ δὲ τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ προφητῶν, κατὰ τὸ δόγμα τοῦ εὐαγγελίου οὕτω ποιῆσατε. 4πᾶς δὲ ἀπόστολος ἔρχομενος πρὸς ὑμᾶς δεξιθήτω ὦς

2. By Archbishop Philotheos Bryennios, its discoverer: Δίδακται τῶν διδάκται ἀποστόλων ἐκ τοῦ ἱεροσολυμικοῦ χειρογράφου τῶν πρῶτων ἐκδικομένη ἵπτο Ἐλληστὶ ἤρισσειν (Constantinople, 1883). See Audet, Didaché, 1. 24-26; Geit, L’énigme, 15-16; Mattioli, Dottrina, 17-18; Niederwimmer, Didaché, 33-36; Rordorf and Tuilier, Doctrine, 11-12; Shepherd, "Didache", v. 1, 841.
3. On the date of the Didache, see further below. The manuscript itself is actually dated: it was written 11 June, 1056. See Audet, Didaché, 25; Geit, L’énigme, 15; Mattioli, Dottrina, 17; Niederwimmer, Didaché, 33.
The gospels make reference to missionary journeys on the part of Jesus’ disciples.
and of course to the wandering of Jesus himself, and Acts and Paul’s letters make it clear that Paul’s missionary work was also characterized by perambulation. But it was the discovery of the Didache, with its comments on itinerant "apostles, prophets, and teachers", that gave modern NT scholarship its first indication of the possible existence of a class of professionally homeless preachers of the Christian message long after the "apostolic" period. The assumption — initially brought to scholarly attention by the Didache — that such figures existed and persisted, in turn, serves as the sine qua non of the itinerancy hypothesis as it has been articulated in modern NT scholarship, and particularly as it has evolved into the dominant interpretive filter for Q’s rhetoric of deracination. It was left to Adolf von Harnack to articulate explicitly the historical


5. Of course, the hypothesis that some elements of the synoptic tradition may have been the product of peripatetic preachers has a long and venerable history in the Christian tradition, pre-dating by centuries any critically-motivated historical study of these texts. Especially among radical reformers and renewal movements within the Christian religion, the gospels’ rhetoric of deracination has been understood as an indication that the earliest — and therefore normative — Christian behaviour consists at least of literal divestment of possessions in a communistic group setting (as is described in Acts 2:44-45; 4:32-37; cf. 6:1), and at times goes so far as to eschew settled living altogether. English Familists in the 16th century, for example, specifically invoked the model of Jesus’ disciples in their advocacy of itinerancy. Likewise Baptist tinkers and Quaker missionaries ensnared by the new English Vagrancy Act of 1656 complained that the same law would "have taken hold of Christ" and his disciples. So Christopher Hill, World Turned Upside Down: Radical Ideas during the English Revolution (London: Penguin Books, 1972), 49-50, quoting N. Penney, ed., Extracts from State Papers relating to Friends (1913), 43. Cf. also Hill, 27. The examples could of course be multiplied: various Anabaptists, on the continent, came immediately to mind. Such a perspective, however, is most often conceptualized in terms of the narrative presentation, in the canonical gospels and Acts, of the behaviour of the disciples of Jesus, and of Jesus
implications of the discovery of the *Didache*, and to spell out in detail just what this writing revealed about early Christian itinerants.6

**HARNACK’S THESIS**

In 1884, barely one year after the publication of the newly recovered manuscript, Harnack published a commentary on the *Didache* in the *Texte und Untersuchungen* series.7 In this commentary he devoted an entire chapter to the *Didache*’s presentation of those “apostles”, “prophets”, and “teachers” whose behaviour is the primary concern of *Didache* 11-15.8 It was Harnack’s detailed study that first articulated explicitly what was implicit in the newly-discovered manuscript: that *Didache* 11-15 appears quite clearly to give evidence of the existence of peripatetic preachers who relied upon the churches they visited for material provision.9 Harnack devoted his discussion of these chapters to detailing the precise characteristics and history of these itinerants.

For Harnack, four essential characteristics define the itinerants of the *Didache*. First and foremost, the entire discussion of the apostles, prophets, and teachers in chap-

---

6. That Harnack is the modern author of the itinerancy hypothesis is observed by Stephen Patterson. *The Gospel of Thomas and Jesus* (Sonoma, California: Polebridge Press, 1993), 172-173.
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ters 11-15 is to be understood, he claims, in terms of their designation, earlier in the document (4:1), under the rubric of ἡ αὐτοτες τῶν λόγου τῶν θεοῦ. That is, the primary activity described for these figures in the *Didache* is, precisely, their teaching or preaching activity. Second, those to whom the *Didache* refers as " prophets" and "apostles" (at least) are imagined by Harnack to be unaffiliated with any particular local church community (see especially *Did* 11:3-6 on apostles: they are described as ἐρχόμενος πρὸς ὑμᾶς, as staying one or two days, and then as ἐξερχόμενος: more explicitly, 12:2 refers to those "who come in the name of the Lord" as παρόδος). For Harnack these texts do not only provide an indication of actual homelessness, but also imply that such itinerants did not derive their authority from election by any local congregation: neither their mission nor their authority was in any way locally-based. Third, such wanderers were impoverished; they were employed exclusively and full-time in their missionary activity, and had no other trade or means of support. Rather, they depended upon the generosity of the local congregations they visited to supply them with food (so *Did* 11:6: ἀρτος; 11:9: τράπεζα; 13:1-2: τροφή; 13:3-7 actually specifies that the first part of any offerings are to be given to prophets), lodging (*Did* 11:5-6; 12:2-3 refer to the lengths of time for which an itinerant may stay with the community), and possibly money and other types of material goods (*Did* 11:6. 12 warn against apostles and prophets who ask for money; 13:7. conversely, exhorts the reader to provide prophets with money, clothing, and "all your possessions"). Fourth, and as a corollary to their homelessness, these figures are charismatic. The substance of their preaching, the character of their behaviour, and the source of their authority are all independent of the scattered local communities among which they wander. For the

itinerants themselves, as well as in the perception of those who receive them. Their mission and authority has been granted to them directly by God, rather than any office conferred on them by local churches, in spite of the authority they exercise over such congregations in their teaching capacity. Harnack sums up the discussion thus:

Who . . . are the λαλούντες τῶν λόγων τοῦ θεοῦ according to the Didache? They are not permanent officials of a single community, nor again are they officials chosen by the community, but above all are independent teachers, who — so we must suppose — attributed their calling to a divine mandate or charisma, and who wandered, with their preaching, from community to community.  

Harnack also regards the Didache’s delineation of the teaching office in the church under the three-fold rubric of "apostles", "prophets", and "teachers" as significant, having implications both for reconstructing the specific roles of these preachers, as well as for drawing inferences about their place within the history of the church. This tripartite classification occurs in other sources, most strikingly in the Pauline and deuto-Pauline letters. In 1 Cor 12:28, particularly, Paul repeats these titles, in precisely the same order as they are given in the Didache, and even indicates that these "offices" are derived from God: ἐθετο ο θεὸς ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ πρῶτον ἀποστόλους, δεύτερον προφήτας, τρίτον διάκονους. Similar occurrences appear in Eph 4:11 and Acts 13 (see also Rom 12:6-7). The fact that exactly the same distinctions, expressed with exactly the same terms, and in exactly the same order occurs relatively frequently and in very early sources leads Harnack to surmise that these words are in fact titles, and designate fairly specific roles or "offices", with their own specific standards of behaviour:

Unter ihnen [the category of λαλούντες τῶν λόγων τοῦ θεοῦ] werden zwei Klassen streng unterschieden, von denen die zweite wiederum in zwei

15. Harnack, Lehre, 97; Expansion, v.1, 419-420.
Thus the apostles are travelling founders of churches, who rely for their livelihood upon the generosity of already-extant communities, while the prophets and teachers offer guidance to communities already established. As for the distinction between prophets and teachers, according to Harnack the designation διδασκαλος did not in fact refer to itinerant teachers (as do the other two classifications) but to a settled and renumerative teaching capacity within the community. All three of these "offices" are held in very high esteem, and those who fill them most frequently exercise a strong position of leadership and authority.

In addition, and perhaps more significantly, the early and common repetition of this three-fold designation leads Harnack to the conclusion that these "offices" significantly predate the Didache and that they were common to the early Christian movement as a whole, rather than being restricted to a particular set of congregations. The great antiquity (the distinction is "uralte", and predates Paul) of this classification, however, does not lead Harnack to retroject this form of ministry into the lifetime of Jesus, although he notes that the gospels do indeed present Jesus as commissioning itinerant preaching prophets (particularly Matt 10:41). Nevertheless, he concludes, the

---

17. See Harnack, *Expansion*, v.1, 444: "The Didachê mentions teachers twice (xiii. 2. xv. 1-2). and what is more, as a special class within the churches. Their ministry was the same as that of the prophets, a ministry of the word; consequently they belonged to the 'honored' class, and, like the prophets, could claim to be supported. On the other hand, they were evidently not obliged to be penniless; nor did they wander about, but resided in a particular community."
18. See note 13. above.
rise of this three-fold grouping, and the esteem in which its membership was held, is to be attributed to the "Spirit" which possessed the earliest Christian community in Jerusalem.\textsuperscript{21}

Finally, Harnack believes that this particular type of church organization was coming to be phased out around the time the Didache was composed. In the early period, presumably when the "Spirit" was more active than during the post-apostolic period, it was appropriate and beneficial to organize the church as a whole on the basis of charismatic itinerants who served a church-wide teaching function, and thus ensured a) dogmatic consistency, and b) the organization and functioning of individual communities on the basis of dogma. However, as time went on, local forms of hierarchical institutional authority developed, and ultimately supplanted the role and authority of the itinerants (as well as of the non-itinerant διδάσκαλοι). The Didache, which Harnack dates to the second century\textsuperscript{22}, stands at the juncture of this transition, and gives evidence for it. Particularly in Didache 15:1-2, there is evidence that the author is seeking to promote bishops and deacons as authorities of the same stature as the itinerants:

\begin{quote}
1 Χειροτονήσατε οὖν ἑαυτοῖς ἐπισκόπους καὶ διακόνους ἁξίους τοῦ κυρίου, ἀνδρὰς πραεῖς καὶ ἀφιλαργύρους καὶ ἀληθεῖς καὶ δεδομενούς· υἱὸν χάρις λειτουργοῦν καὶ αὐτοὶ τὴν λειτουργίαν τῶν προφητῶν καὶ διδασκάλων.
-μὴ οὖν υπερίδητος αὐτοὺς· φυτοί γὰρ εἰσὶν οἱ τετυμημένοι υἱοί μετὰ τῶν προφητῶν καὶ διδασκάλων.
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{21} Harnack, Expansion, v.1, 434.

\textsuperscript{22} Harnack, Lehre, 158-159. There is considerable scholarly agreement on the Syrian provenance of the Didache (although Harnack believed it to derive from Egypt); rather less so on the question of dating, which is variously estimated to range between the mid-first (e.g., Audet: 50-70 C.E., and many French scholars, following him; Streeter: before 100 C.E.) and mid-second centuries (e.g., Harnack: 135-165; Shepherd: mid-second century), or anywhere in between (e.g., Kloppenborg: not before 100 C.E.; Rudolf Knopf: 100-150 C.E.; Lightfoot: Klaus Wengst). See Audet, Didaché, 8-14, 121-210; Harnack, Lehre, 68-87; Jefford, Sayings, 4-6, 9-16; Robert A. Kraft, "Apostolic Fathers", IDB Supp.; Keith Critt, ed. (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1962), 36-37; Niedermann, Didache, 64-80; Patterson, Gospel of Thomas and Jesus, 173; Shepherd, "Didache", v.1, 842; Burnett Hillman Streeter, The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins (London: MacMillan & Co., 1964), 507.

In chapters 11-12 the itinerants are the object of various restrictions (the length of time they are permitted to remain with the local community, and the amount and form of renumeration they may seek), while in chapter 13 they are the recipients of considerable material bounty. At last, in the text quoted above, the reader is asked not to despise or neglect (ὑπερδείν) bishops and deacons (!), and uses the ministry of the itinerant teachers as a positive model for these local offices. Clearly, the ambivalence of the text reflects a power-struggle, or at least a transition from one kind of authority and organization to another. Ergo, Harnack argues, we see in the Didache not only the church's most ancient form of office and organization (itinerant preachers of the word and local "teachers"), but additionally the decisive historical movement of the church away from these charismatics and toward a "monarchical episcopate." 24

Not only is Harnack's sketch of the itinerants themselves paradigmatic for more recent reconstructions, but indeed (and surprisingly) it foreshadows, albeit imperfectly, the fashion in which the more recent itinerancy hypotheses have been applied to early synoptic tradition. For although Harnack does not regard the "apostles, prophets, and teachers" of the Didache to have originated with Jesus, neither does he regard the gospel stories in which Jesus is presented as commissioning his disciples (notably, the "Mission Charge" [Mark 6:6-13 and parallels; also Luke 10:1-16/Matthew 9:37-38: 10:7-16]) as irrelevant to the issue of itinerancy. The connection is to be found in the Didache's "ordinance of the Gospel" (Did 11:3: τὸ δόγμα τῶν εὐαγγελίων), according to which the author of the Didache says one is to treat apostles and prophets. This "ordinance" must refer — says Harnack — to the Mission Charge of the synoptic gospels, a conclusion confirmed to Harnack's satisfaction by the presence in Matt 10 (in which the Mission Charge appears in this Gospel) of further instructions explicitly

24. Harnack, Lehre, 97; Expansion, 431-433; see also Expansion, 105.
concerned with the reception of itinerant prophets (i.e., Matt 10:41). Thus the Mission Charge is drawn into the discussion of itinerancy, although *not necessarily* as itself evincing itinerants, but rather as the foundational prescription of their behaviour and role.

A second surprising facet of Harnack's discussion is that it is implicitly sociological. Again, Harnack does not take the crucial step made by later scholars, and argue that synoptic texts (especially the "Mission Charge"), and the ideology therein, are the products of a specific social setting, best defined in terms of the itinerancy of the material's tradents. He does, however, employ an incipiently structural-functionalist model for explaining and describing the relevance of the itinerant "preachers of the word". In Harnack's understanding of history in general, he reveals a strong concern with the *function* (conceived almost teleologically) of any given phenomenon. In *What is Christianity*, he says as much:

> . . . we must call to mind a piece of advice which no historian ought ever to neglect. Anyone who wants to determine the real value and significance of any great phenomenon or mighty product of history must first and foremost inquire into the work which it accomplished, or, as the case may be, into the problem which it solved . . . the great edifices of history, the States and the Churches, must be estimated first and foremost, we may perhaps say, exclusively, by what they have achieved. It is *the work done* that forms the decisive test.27

Moreover, a strong concern with the social background of Christianity in general is also evident in Harnack's writings. When these two emphases are combined, and applied to the discussion of itinerant preachers, Harnack comes very close to the kind of sociological conclusions typical of Theissen, in which certain historical forms appear to arise (and persist) precisely *because* they serve certain functions. In the case of the

---

26. On structural functionalism, and its role in the itinerancy hypothesis, see further below, and chapter three.
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Itinerants, the function they serve — a function replaced subsequently by the institutionalized episcopate — is the provision of unity and homogeneity within a far-flung, and sociologically and culturally diverse, church.  

Harnack also approximates the sociological tendencies of recent scholarly approaches to itinerancy in his comparison of the description offered of these itinerants in the *Didache* with similar phenomena in non-Christian sources, notably Peregrinus in Lucian.

**HARNACK’S WORLD AND ITS SUBTEXTS**

In retrospect, it is not immediately obvious how, if at all, Harnack’s thesis is influenced by Harnack’s own *Sitz im Leben*. Nonetheless, the itinerancy hypothesis as proposed by Harnack probably owes as much to the *Zeitgeist* of the period in which the *Didache* was first published as it does to the fact of the *Didache*’s publication itself.

The document could not have appeared at a more opportune time. According to Clayton Jefford,

> The discovery of the Greek text of the *Didache* . . . by Archbishop Bryennios in 1873 occurred at a time when biblical scholarship was beginning to assume the reins of its own destiny. As the emergence of twentieth century "criticism" loomed imminently on the horizon, scholars were poised to transcend the restrictions that dogmatics had imposed upon biblical scholarship for centuries and to open themselves to a new arena in which scripture could be evaluated, both with respect to textual integrity and with respect to historical witness.

Jefford’s paean is overstated and not entirely accurate. What is true, however, is that during the latter half of the 19th century, biblical critics were coming into their own as independent interpreters of "canonical" texts. and the *Didache* offered a fresh instance

---

for the application of their skills. The dogmatic encrustations of past efforts at interpretation, "the tradition of the dead generations," could not put in an appearance to circumscribe the activities of the living; no tradition of case law would interfere with the free and contemporary application of this newly-discovered constitution. As can been seen very obviously in the case of the Nag Hammadi discovery, the appearance of new documentary sources allows for fresh approaches to the material, unconstrained by a prior scholarly discourse, and hence likely to reflect quite forthrightly current interests. And so, with the appearance of a fresh and interpretively unsullied text upon which freely to exercise newly-acquired creative hermeneutical authority, it is precisely at this point that we should be able to see interpretive projection most clearly, and it is precisely at this point that we do, in three main ways. It is impossible, in my view, to appreciate the significance of Harnack's ideas about the Didache without contextualizing those ideas within the framework of the dominant concerns and issues of the Age of Progress, emergent German nationalism, and Protestant liberalism.

The itinerancy hypothesis as articulated by Harnack reflects the concerns of the "Age of Progress" insofar as it offers a historical reconstruction of earliest Christianity in which a focus on process, on culture, and on mission as the key variables is

---

31. Thus the point is less that religious dogma had inhibited the development of some kind of itinerancy hypothesis, than that the Didache provided a showcase for a successful new approach to intra-Christian theological deliberation.
32. By "dogmatic," I do not mean to imply that the critique of Christian dogma began with the publication of the Didache — far from it! I mean "dogma" here in the broadest (and in a potentially secular) sense: older views that have the weight of tradition behind them but which may lack cogency for contemporary work or resonance for contemporary issues.
33. In the case of the Nag Hammadi, this phenomenon is most evident in the immediate and uncontested interest these documents were purported to show in the role of women. Such an interest, arising through the 1960s and into the 1970s, was less easily applied to already-known documents, because the exegetical and scholarly parameters of the debates around those documents had already been fixed, and required some time to be shifted away from gender-insensibility. In the case of the Nag Hammadi documents, however, the inquisition of the texts from a gender-sensitive perspective was almost immediate, and was certainly pervasive, continuing right up to the present.
inevitable. Harnack's hypothesis moves the center of historical interest from the event to the structure, from nature (especially the miraculous) to culture (behaviour, belief, conviction, charisma), from stasis to development (especially development forward, in terms of both increasingly global success and increasingly constructive application to the daily life of the late Empire). Earliest Christianity becomes the story of the quest of roving geniuses to spread culture to the ends of the earth. All of these shifts in interest can be linked to the sense of progress that characterized the age. The itinerancy hypothesis, therefore, is not in its details or generation a direct product of this interest in progress, but allows for a view of earliest Christianity in which such an interest may find a place.

The European (and North American) "Age of Progress," i.e., the latter half and especially the close of the nineteenth century, was marked, as its nomenclature implies, by a strong general conviction of the irreversibility of historical improvement.34 At the same time, there was a strong sense that the culmination of that advance — technologically, politically, culturally, perhaps even biologically — was on the brink of achievement by the human race (or at least its European, educated, male avatar), and the

34. See the telling comments of Eric J. Sharpe, *Comparative Religion: A History*, 2nd edition (La Salle, Illinois: Open Court, 1986), 24:

... as the nineteenth century advanced, it became increasingly clear that the real focus of the study of religion was to be located, not in transcendental philosophy, but in the altogether this-worldly categories of history, progress development and evolution. The idea of progress was, of course, far from being a new one. Its roots were to be found in the Renaissance, and early exponents were Descartes and Bacon in the early seventeenth century; in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries it won ground throughout Europe as a philosophical idea, and notable philosophies of history were constructed on developmental lines by Fichte, Schelling and Hegel in Germany, and by Saint-Simon and Comte in France. While Sharpe is focusing here particularly on the development of academic ideas about religion, the same might be said of views of history in general.
prevailing mood was one of optimism. Such an ideology drew on Darwin’s increasingly-popular evolutionary theories for its basic model, but probably had its roots over the course of the prior century more in the consistent expansion and consolidation of European states, the triumphant reduction of the nobility by an emergent bourgeoisie, and the steadily increasing GDP of industrializing nations. The mood of this age was one of universalism and globalism, a tendency reflected and reinforced both by imperialism and its cultural supplement, mission work. The latter served as ideological justification for the former: the taming of barbarians through culture and

35. See the contemporary accolades of Felix L. Oswald, “Pessimism and the Signs of the Times.” International Review 12 (January - June, 1882): 564-575, 564-565:

The gloom of the medieval dogmas is growing more hateful than all their barbarisms. Sweetness and light are becoming synonymous terms. It may be doubted if the present type of civilization has made the progressive nations more charitable, but it has certainly made them less atrabilious: in the old home of Puritanism, as well as in France, a fond gaillard has become the chief condition of popularity. Here and there the owls of the Middle Ages have not yet vanished, but the dawn is getting to bright for them, and their wails, instead of awakening a chorus of sympathetic voices, are now answered only by angry remarks and brickbats, and even nightingales are not safe against such missiles if their strain is becoming too lugubrious.

36. Sharpe, Comparative Religion, 47: “By about 1880, however, the Darwinian hypothesis was becoming virtually impossible to resist.”

37. Note that Hegel, whose main works began to appear some 24 years before Darwin even set out on the Beagle (Phenomenology of Spirit was first published in 1807, while the voyage of the Beagle began in 1831), proposes a philosophically-based evolutionary schema. It is misleading, therefore, to attempt to trace nineteenth-century historical evolutionism to the success of Darwin’s scientific views, when in fact a successful and popular historical evolutionary scheme had already appeared. Darwin’s views simply lent the epistemological prestige of the “hard sciences” to views which were in circulation already.

38. The links between imperialism, mission work, and anthropology are very well documented. See, rather superficially, Sharpe, Comparative Religion, 49. A very interesting example from toward the end of the period in question is the thoughtful but nevertheless exemplary article by Wilson D. Wallis, “Missionary Enterprise from the Point of View of an Anthropologist,” American Journal of Theology 19 (1915): 268-274. He suggests that the negative effects of the dramatic imposition of Western culture, at the expense of indigenous practices, “. . . may be but one phase of the contribution of civilization, yet it suggests that the missionary has before him a task involving more than merely religious problems” (268). i.e., the missionary need undertake his civilizing activity in an atmosphere of knowledge and (feigned?) respect for the traditions which he is in part engaged in an effort to supplant. He concludes (274):

Protestants might observe with profit the good use which Romanists have made of this principle of taking over a people by taking over, if only for the time being, their customs and superstitions — or a part of them — giving a new orientation to native life without depriving the natives of all they hold sacred, fulfilling and not destroying the best that is in native life. To the anthropologist this best seems at least of such importance that no missionary can afford entirely to overlook and neglect it.
civilization (a task of "religion") was the great mission of the white man, and served to sanction — indeed, demand — the imperial expansion of the civilized European powers. Conquest is thus imagined in terms of service, "the white man's burden."

Take up the White Man's burden —
Send forth the best ye breed —
Go bind your sons to exile
To serve your captives' need;
To wait in heavy harness,
On fluttered folk and wild —
Your new-caught, sullen peoples,
Half-devil and half-child.

Take up the White Man's burden —
The savage wars of peace —
Fill full the mouth of Famine
And bid the sickness cease;
And when your goal is nearest
The end for others sought.
Watch sloth and heathen Folly
Bring all your hopes to nought.40

Expansionism is a boon, a movement forward, and it serves this function by being the vehicle for the dissemination of culture. All of this expansionism, increasing nationalism, and intensifying globalism, was rationalized by the notion of the establishment of "modern" culture.41 Culture thus served as the rhetorical center against which to delineate the peripheries, against which, in other words, to divide the world

39. A contemporary observer, and a scholar of the highest caliber of religion in antiquity, Shirley Jackson Case, "Religion and War in the Graeco-Roman World," *American Journal of Theology* 19 (1915): 179-199, offered a similar assessment at the start of the Great War (181): "All wars are usually holy wars, from the belligerent's own point of view. When men deliberately hazard their lives in behalf of a cause they naturally believe they are doing God's service. Whether this loyalty is phrased in the conventional language of religion, or in the more secular terminology of patriotism, does not greatly matter."


41. Case, "Religion and War," again (193, emphasis added): "War, as a concrete factor in human experience, has rarely been popular. Not until it clothes itself in the garments of patriotism, or affects to champion some moral or spiritual ideal, does it acquire a semblance of respectability."
into its civilized and barbaric components. The myth of progress resulted, therefore, in an intimate and intrinsic link being forged in the era’s imagination between culture, on the one hand, and national or political expansion and hegemony, on the other. The strong emphasis on missionary activity in this period of expansionary imperialism — an emphasis matched in Harnack’s own reconstruction of early Christian history — is an obvious reflection of this identification of Western interests with Western culture.

As a result of such a rhetorical valorization, culture thus comes to be understood as the inner essence, force, or complexion of national identity. Interestingly, this sort of rhetorical centrality persisted even up to and during the first World War, and was, rather ironically, used as a central feature of the propaganda both for and against

---

42. Even toward the conclusion of the First World War, we witness in Germany such sentiments as see in the War an ultimate resolution to European disunity, paving the way for a more complete mastery of civilization over the rest of the world. See, e.g., Theodor Wolff (ed.?), Vollendete Tatsachen 1914-1917 (Berlin: Kronen-Verlag, 1918), 186: “Ein schöner Ausgleich ist zwischen vielen edlen Geistern Europas erfolgt. Und man wird nur hoffentlich, in weiser Erkenntnis, die Neger in Afrika nicht noch einmal mit dem Schreckensruf begrüssen: wir bringen euch die europäische Zivilisation.”

43. It is fascinating the degree to which Nietzsche can be seen as a reaction to this entire Zeitgeist. His whole vocabulary — morality, progress, the ancients, beauty, culture, genius, power — is derived from it, and his views are as shocking as they are precisely because they invert the usual assumptions behind, and about the relations between, these conceptions. For a description of the world which stands as a full-blowen converse of that offered above, see Friedrich Nietzsche, Twilight of the Idols (R. J. Hollindale, transl.: London: Penguin Books, 1968 [1889]), esp. 89-104 (## 37-51), in which progress is abandoned for a notion of progressive weakening, in which civilization is equated with loss of freedom, in which morality and culture are dethroned. Some telling examples:

1. (89; #37): Whether we have grown more moral. — As was only to be expected, the whole ferocity of the moral stupidity which, as is well known, is considered morality as such in Germany, has launched itself against my concept “beyond good and evil” . . . . Above all, I was invited to reflect on the “undeniable superiority” of our age in moral judgment, our real advance in this respect . . . . — by way of reply I permit myself to raise the question whether we have really grown more moral. That all the world believes so is already an objection to it.

2. (97; #44): The relationship between a genius and his epoch is the same as that between strong and weak, and as that between old and young: the epoch is always relatively much younger, less substantial, more immature, less sure of itself, more childish.

3. (101; #48): Progress in my sense. — I speak of a “return to nature”, although it is not really a going-back but a going-up — up into a high, free, even frightful nature and naturalness, such as plays with great tasks, is permitted to play with them.
Germany.\textsuperscript{44} Germany was to be opposed, said the allies, because her militarism was a threat to the culture of the civilized world,\textsuperscript{45} while Germans responded with the counter-claim that their military was an essential defense, without which their high culture could hardly endure: strength secures virtue.\textsuperscript{46}

Such an ideology perforce changes the very conception of what history is. Instead of focusing on the antiquarian veneration, through as complete a knowledge as poss-

\textsuperscript{44} See the fascinating commentary, by Charles Leonard Moore, "German Culture," \textit{The Dial} 57 (1914): 441-443. He states that (441), "We confess to a weakness for Germany, because of the cult of genius which has, intermittently, prevailed in that country for nearly two hundred years," but concludes (443), "It does not seem to us, therefore, that their culture is so overwhelmingly superior to any single European State that they should seek to impose it by force of arms upon the whole world. As if culture could be imposed by force!"

\textsuperscript{45} See, \textit{inter alios}, Barbara Tuchmann, \textit{The Proud Tower}. 266-338. on German militarism and the response of other (themselves militaristic!) European powers. Interestingly, this antipathy to German militarism existed some time before World War 1, and was expressed much the same way: as a barbaric incursion on culture, culture represented, in its most sentimental form, via religious imagery. A piece by Archibald Forbes, "Christmas-Tide with the Germans Before Paris," \textit{Harper's Magazine} 72 (December, 1885 - May, 1886): 263-274, describes thus the effects of the Franco-Prussian war, more than a decade earlier (266-267):

\begin{quote}
I was inside [the] church while it yet remained as the desperate combat left it. Its open door creaked dismally in the wind. As one entered, there lay the bloody rags and gouts that were the relics of the wounded. Priestly vestments lay torn and foul: they had been used in the pinch to bind up wounds with, and the blood on them was scarcely dry. . . . The Virgin had a bullet hole through her heart; our Lord had been shot right through the head.
\end{quote}

The writer appears to be aiming for a pathos that rather eludes him.

\textsuperscript{46} See the claims and counterclaims recorded at the beginning of the war in "Art and Germany's Savants," \textit{The Literary Digest} (October 24, 1914), 790-791, esp. 791. See also the remarks of Harnack, \textit{Milita Christi: The Christian Religion and the Military in the First Three Centuries} (translated by David McInnes Gracie: Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1981 [1905]). 27-28, in which military strength is not only seen as a necessity of human life, but is presented as, ultimately, inextricably linked to and with culture, including religion.

Nor was the sentiment an exclusively German one: its refraction into theological discourse pervaded the English-speaking worlds as well. As just one example among many, see the conclusions of J. M. Powis Smith, "Religion and War in Israel," \textit{American Journal of Theology} 19 (1915): 17-31 (30), who retrojects his own wartime reflections onto ancient Israel:

\begin{quote}
War in Hebrew experience was neither an unmixed evil nor an unmixed good. It was one of the elements, and an important one, that went to make up the difficult environment amid which Israel had to develop its religious and ethical ideals. The struggle for existence goes on in the world of ideas and ideals as everywhere else. Only the fittest survive the ordeal.
But they come through it strengthened, enriched, and purified by the testing.
\end{quote}
sible, of ancestral heroes or cultures, and the effort to locate communally-significant origin points,\textsuperscript{47} history increasingly becomes an attempt to map \textit{processes}, and especially evolutionary processes which have contributed to, or which reflect, or which parallel, the central historical drama of the progress of civilization, the culmination of

\textsuperscript{47} It is worth noting that this observation, which makes the quest for pure origins less a feature of irresponsible historiography here and always, and more a contingent manifestation of a very specific sense of social vision which has not \textit{prevailed} in historical work since the nineteenth century, stands somewhat at odds with Jonathan Z. Smith's understanding of the underpinnings of theologically-tendentious historiography, especially as it is articulated in his \textit{Drudgery Divine: On the Comparison of Early Christianities and the Religions of Late Antiquity} (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990). See also my review of this book in \textit{Method and Theory in the Study of Religion} 6/2 (1994): 190-199. It is likewise somewhat at odds with Tomoko Masuzawa, \textit{In Search of Dreamtime: The Quest for the Origin of Religion} (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993), who (if I am reading her correctly) suggests that the great nineteenth- and twentieth-century theories of religion have turned out to be self-deconstructing fables of originary moments, which, when pushed hard enough, prove themselves to be imbued with a certain duality, making their originary significance, if not suspect, then at least un-self-contained, or un-self-identical. See the collection of reviews of this work, alongside the author's own response, in \textit{Method and Theory in the Study of Religion} 8/3 (1996): 291-325. Masuzawa is, in my view, certainly correct to point to the duality of the notion of origin as such, but the examples she uses to make her point — Max Müller, Durkheim, Freud — make of the conception a straw man, since it is unclear (even by her reading) that they view the threat very seriously. As in Freud's case, certainly, there seems to be in modern historiography, a playing with origins as a fable that renders the subsequent processes — which are the real focus of the investigation — somewhat more transparent or conceivable. At any rate, while the study of religion or Christian origins, which seems to lag behind the rest of the world's intellectual currents, does from time to time manifest that stubborn seeking after origins that both Smith and Masuzawa relate, since the Reformation, and increasingly into modernity, much more than putative origins has been at stake.


\textit{... after the Napoleonic era, men turned to the past with immense enthusiasm in order to rediscover there the principles of ordered social life. To reconcile authority and liberty was the primary need; and when both divine and natural right had failed, historic right seemed the only recourse. But in our own day, when we are again, somewhat as men were in the eighteenth century, seeking a "new freedom," when we are less intent upon stability and more insistent upon "social justice," the past seems unable to furnish us what we want. The past seems to be on the side of vested interests. Behind the mask of historic right, many people think they can discern the old familiar features of divine right. And so the authority of tradition grows as burdensome as the authority of kings.}
European world-supremacy. As Hegel had already shown, all history — and this includes Christian origins — was part of the great narrative of the self-epiphany of Geist. This view, of course, tends toward a very much idealist conception of history: it is ideas and culture which move the whole process forward; when human beings are seen to be motive forces, they are geniuses, in themselves reflecting in a unique or exceptional way the Geist of the era, or of eras to come in the grand concourse of progress. Thus the liberal Jesuses so scorned by Schweitzer proclaimed Jesus — a Jesus espousing a message quite identical to their own vision of culture — to be a genius.

---

48. Sharpe, Comparative Religion, 48 (emphasis added), speaking more specifically of the anthropological study of religion, rather than of history in general (although the observations are largely applicable). says, "Viewed in Darwinian perspective, religion became something it had never really been before. From being a body of revealed truth, it became a developing organism." He adds (48-49), "In the new evolutionary perspective, the mind of 'primitive' man was removed from the lower rungs of the hierarchical ladder, and could be seen to be human, if childish, and therefore worth studying. His religion could also be seen to be eminently worthy of attention, if only as a means of demonstrating the earliest stages through which the faiths of mankind had passed on their way to the heights of ethical monotheism, or the heights of agnosticism, whichever was preferred."

49. The classic historical work is Phenomenology of Spirit (1807). Hegel’s early ideas, for instance, about the genesis of Christianity need to be understood within the larger conceptual framework of his entire theory of history — both in terms of the idea of history being the progressive movement of Spirit toward freedom, and in terms of the dialectical process by which this movement is effected. The positive element (the "thesis") is Judaism, with its rigid legal requirements, which were based merely on authority rather than reason and thus were opposed to human dignity; Jesus opposed to these views a notion of human freedom and rational dignity, in which human beings are freed from the Law and exalted to freely create themselves. Thus, in Spirit of Christianity (212), Hegel says, "The Sermon [on the Mount] does not teach reverence for the laws; on the contrary, it exhibits that which fulfills the law but annuls it as law and so is something higher than obedience to the law and makes law superfluous." Again, in the same text (218), he claims that "... Jesus makes a general demand on his hearers to surrender their rights, to lift themselves above the whole sphere of justice or injustice by love, for in love there vanish not only rights but also the feeling of inequality and the hatred of enemies which this feeling's imperative for equality implies." Jesus was forced, however, to temper his teaching with positive and restrictive commands in order for it to be received by his contemporaries; and in fact it was this commanding element, an element that was later reinforced by appeal to miracles, that the disciples emphasized. Thus we have in the development of Christianity from Judaism to Jesus to the church a dialectical movement toward self-consciousness of freedom: with Judaism there is no freedom, with Jesus' teaching no comprehensibility, but with the church, comprehensibility is combined with an emphasis on freedom from at least the Jewish Law, and hence represents a movement forward in the human epic.

The virtuosity of the Christian religious vision, its cultural embodiment in human genius, is to be found in Harnack's roving missionaries. These heralds of a new order serve as historical representatives of pure culture, not of the world but in it, imbuing it, globally, as the mission spreads, with a vision, an idea, a high moral purpose. The genius of these characters is to be found in their extreme embodiment and perfect enactment of the "ordinance of the gospel" while in the very act of spreading that same message. Like the University Professor — in his splendid isolation from and lofty disdain for the grubby politics of the day-to-day — these figures serve simultaneously to proclaim and to manifest the highest features of the culture the world had hitherto developed; indeed, they surpass them, and thereby ensure their appeal and success (high morality and lofty spirituality are attractive in their own right, and guarantee their own success51), and move the wheel of progress forward another rotation.

So the idealism of the world of progress in Harnack's Zeitgeist is manifested in the unworldly figures of the itinerant missionaries, who transmit, as it were, pure culture. The globalism of this Zeitgeist is also manifested in such characters, who traverse the whole world and spread their cultural payload to the ends of the earth. The very conception of mission itself was firmly entrenched in Harnack's world — it was the cultural vanguard of European Imperialism, and comes to be reflected backwards as the cultural vanguard of the temporal spread of Christian power in antiquity; like contemporary missionaries in Africa and other barbarous places, Harnack's itinerant preachers paved the way for the imposition of military and civil control of the Empire by Christianity. The whole circumstance of the "white man's burden" — that of the advance of human progress through the onward march, and universal spread, of cul-

51. See Expansion, v.1, 263: "A whole series of proofs lies before us, indicating that the high level of morality enjoined by Christianity and the moral conduct of Christian societies were intended to promote, and actually did promote, the direct interests of the Christian mission."
ture, is borne in antiquity by itinerant apostles, prophets, and teachers. Fascinatingly, the idealist separation of the pure idea — culture, in this case — from its manifestation in the world is matched by an institutional separation between the missionary and the soldier, the latter providing the background of order and strength in which the former can operate. So also with the itinerants, a strict institutional separation is imagined between them and an emerging episcopate. The routinization of charisma corresponds to the worldly incarnation of a cultural essence or ideal. Note, as discussed above, that the isomorphism — if that it be — of these phenomena is not rendered by Harnack as a numinous originary fixture to which contemporary practices hearken back and imperfectly reflect. There is no moment here, and certainly no especial numen. The point is the process: the progressive — monogenetic and evolutionary — movement of civilization with "pure culture" at its fore and accommodation to human necessity coming later is an historical vision that reflects both the feeling of Harnack’s age and its circumstances. Whether it accurately reflects antiquity, or can serve as a useful vehicle for our own historiographic incursions into the past, is a completely different question.

In the same period, perhaps paradoxically, nationalism had a exceptional and sometimes contrary effect on intellectual life, in Germany as elsewhere. The universalism of the Age of Progress came to be curiously intermingled with a sense of cultural particularity, and Imperialism became less the great mission of European civi-

52. See the comments of Sharpe, Comparative Religion, 172-173. Sharpe suggests that nationalism, a by-product of imperialism, had the effect of heightening Romantic impulses which focused on the national character of culture, over against its universal aspects. On German imperialism and imperial aspirations in the late the nineteenth century, see Hans Fenske, ed., Quellen zum politischen Denken der Deutschen im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert, Band VII: Unter Wilhelm II. (1890-1918) (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1982), 5-7, and for original documents see especially 187-188, 263, 322-323, 370, 389.
lization, than the quest of a superior People to subjugate their environment. an environment that expands according to the capacity of a given People to expand, according. that is, to their hardiness. This peculiar brand of Romanticism can still be reconciled with Darwinian evolution: the notion of continual progress is not so much replaced as it is supplemented by the conception of the survival of the fittest. The people’s desire for mastery is itself an indication of its fitness to survive, and indeed, its fitness to exercise that mastery over weaker and inferior races. The historical paradigm is the Aryan conquest of India, a vision of "Germanic" Imperialism in the ancient past replete with blood, guts, glory, and racism. Nietzsche is uncharacteristically uncritical in his adoption of this perspective; indeed, for once, on this issue he can be seen as somewhat representative. His preference for the "Dionysian" frenzy over against "Apollonian" order is a symbolic repudiation of the civility and collectivism of modern liberalism, and a Romantic assertion of the right and duty of the strong to dominate the weak. At times, this takes the form of a racist assertion of breeding, the central example of which is the Indian Aryan, and the anti-type of which is the Jew (out of whom, in the case of Nietzsche’s thought, Christianity derives):

53. Historians of religion and philologists were thoroughly complicit in this development. Max Müller being a prominent example (although he was working in Britain during much of his career). Ivan Strenski ("Misreading Max Müller," Method and Theory in the Study of Religion 8/3 [1996]: 291-296, 294-295) refers to the . . . German romantic, nationalist, and Aryansist sensibilities that nurtured Max Müller throughout his life, and in the absence of which we cannot possibly understand him and his attitudes to myth, religion and language. . . . [H]e was typical of the idealism, romanticism, and German nationalism of his generation of young intellectuals. Müller’s own religion tended toward pantheism, and he, like others of his class, much admired the Vedanta philosophy which became the rage among religious liberals as well as Aryansist racists of his time. . . . // After describing the nature worship of the Vedas, Müller rhetorically asks: "And are we so different from them?"

Perhaps the most striking literary example of this current in German thought is Herman Hesse, with his well-known love of things Indian, and his pantheistic theological tendencies.

54. For a comprehensible summary of his views of these concepts, see Twilight of the Idols, 73-74 (##10-11). They were introduced in 1872 in his The Birth of Tragedy.
These regulations [the *Laws of Manu*] are instructive enough: in them we find for once *Aryan* humanity, quite pure, quite primordial — we learn that the concept "pure blood" is the opposite of a harmless concept. It becomes clear, on the other hand, in which people the hatred, the Chandala hatred for this "humanity" has been immortalized, where it has become religion, where it has become *genius*. . . . From this point of view, the Gospels are documents of the first rank; the Book of Enoch even more so. — Christianity, growing from Jewish roots and comprehensible only as a product of this soil, represents the reaction against that morality of breeding, of race, of privilege — it is the *anti-Aryan* religion *par excellence*.55

A correspondence or possible isomorphism is most obvious in the analogy the "mission and expansion" of the church might have for the development of German imperialism in Harnack's time. Biblical critics and theologians were hardly immune to the strong sense of rebirth, or a manifest destiny to seize the current epoch, to the dream that Germany was, at the end of the nineteenth century, finally entering upon its historic inheritance. Even Schweitzer, who in the contemporary scholarly imagination is viewed as the great debunker of intellectual bias, displays *this* particular bias rather openly. "When," he says, writing less than a decade before the Great War,

...at some future day our period of civilization shall lie, closed and completed, before the eyes of later generations. German theology will stand out as a great, a unique phenomenon in the mental and spiritual life of our time. For nowhere save in the German temperament can there be found in the same perfection the living complex of conditions and factors — of philosophic thought, critical acumen, historical insight, and religious feeling — without which no deep theology is possible.56

This triumphalism, using religious sensibility and claims to a profundity of religious thought, shows a tendency to imagine German greatness — something at the forefront of the German Zeitgeist prior to the War57 — precisely in terms of religious development. Less theologically inclined German intellectuals of the time may not have used

---

56. *Quest of the Historical Jesus*, 1.
57. See Barbara Tuchmann, *The Proud Tower*, 340-341, 357, etc.
such specifically religious imagery: *Kultur* in general, says Thomas Mann, was to be the product of "the German peace" that would follow "the German War," i.e., WWI. Nor was Harnack personally immune from such sensibilities. After the outbreak of the war, when one of Germany’s first great acts of *Kultur* was the burning of Louvain in retaliation for military casualties, Harnack — among 92 other German intellectuals — was signatory to a manifesto which declared the civilizing influences of German culture and attempted to deflect responsibility for the destruction of Louvain.

What is perhaps most interesting about this *Zeitgeist* is its missionary spirit, born of the fact that the rest of the world had yet to recognize German genius for what it was. Barbara Tuchmann describes it thus:

... music was the only sphere in which foreigners willingly acknowledged the superiority that Germans believed was self-evident. German Kultur in German eyes was the heir of Greece and Rome and they themselves the best educated and the most cultivated of modern peoples, yet foreigners in their appreciation of this fact fell curiously short of perfect understanding. Apart from German professors and philosophers, only Wagner excited their homage, only Bayreuth, seat of the Wagner Festspielhaus, attracted their visits. Paris remained Europe's center of the arts, pleasure and fashion, London of Society, Rome of antiquity and Italy the lure of travelers seeking sun and beauty.

59. "Art and Germany's Savants," *The Literary Digest*, October 24, 1914, 790-791. The article quotes a collective manifesto of German intellectuals that had recently appeared in the *Berliner Tageblatt*, the signatories of which included signatories include: Harnack, Sudermann, Litzl, Hauptmann, Roentgen, Humperdinck, Behring (790). The article quotes the manifesto as asserting that "Germany will fight to the end as a cultured nation, which has the might of Goethe, Beethoven, and Kant, who are to it just as holy as its hearths and homes" (791) and that "Those who associated with Russians and Servians and offer to the world the spectacle of letting loose mongrels and niggers on the white race have the least right to call themselves defenders of European civilization" (791). The quotation concludes (791), "Our hypocritical foes say the fight is against our so-called militarism and not against our culture, but without German militarism, German culture would long ago have been trodden into the earth. Militarism has gone out in defense of culture, in defense of the land which has for decades proved such a home for art as it will never enjoy anywhere else."
The point is not that Harnack's scholarship is somehow invalidated by Harnack's personal involvement in prewar German nationalism, nor that of German biblical scholarship in general. Nor, in fact, is this general sense of mission simply a product of German nationalism; it recurs in different forms among the different industrial nations of this period as a sense of superiority, of being at the vanguard of progress and Enlightenment. But this nationalism provides a plausible context in which a sense of mission and expansion makes for a resonant and sympathetic view of the earliest Christians. The coalescence of early Christianity, from a scattered and charismatic movement with no formal organization, to a world-wide hierarchically-organized political and military power, corresponds, as a process, to the Imperial aspirations of Germany backed up with the nation's alleged cultural mission and superiority to the rest of the world. As a number of scattered little states banded together to realize their greater destiny, so also did the earliest Christians found little outposts of Christian culture which eventually came to claim the Empire as its own.

Likewise, the notion that power defends virtue — invoked as an explanation for German militarism and a justification for German expansionism — requires a routinization, requires some kind of process by which the ideal becomes incarnate in the material world. Nationalism is rationalized in terms of the hard, practical necessity for guns in the defense of whatever material entity forms the vehicle for cultural genius. Such a perspective is reflected in the process by which Christianity "comes to earth." or takes its place in the world of temporal affairs, thus allowing its cultural payload to become manifest. From such an idealist perspective, in other words, "culture" is a lofty and ethereal entity: its purest form is always ideal and exaggeratedly and institutionally detached from worldly powers and structures; yet in its applied form concessions must be made in order that the ideal be manifested and come to earth in the fullest way pos-
sible. Without guns, no Goethe; so also without an episcopate or other concessions to worldly life, no Christianity, however much its essence is best represented by those supplanted by such compromises. Thus, says Harnack, "As the proof of 'the Spirit and power' subsided after the beginning of the third century, the extraordinary moral tension also became relaxed, paving the way gradually for a morality which was adapted to the worldly life." Such adaptation is necessary, albeit perhaps in tension with the impulses behind the movement in the first place. A tenuous dialectic is imagined to persist, in which essence (culture) and incarnation (adaptation) achieve a delicate balance. In another writing, Harnack not only reiterates this tense equilibrium, but, tellingly, applies it to the question of warfare:

... war is one of the basic forms of all life, and there are inalienable virtues which find their highest expression at least symbolically in the warrior's calling: obedience and courage, loyalty unto death, self-abnegation and strength (virtus). No higher religion can do without the images which are taken from war, and on this account it cannot dispense with "warriors." Whether a religion allows itself to be determined by these necessities, by becoming engaged more and more in the military and its forms, is a question the answer to which always reveals an important part of the history of religion.62

The similarities to Hegel's dialectic of an ethereal "negative" lawlessness domesticated to comprehensibility are striking;63 even more striking is the correspondence to the cultural "necessity" of German militarism.

The point, in other words, is that while Harnack's vision does necessarily valorize the "charismatic" pure originary period of the Christian mission — a valorization of charisma eminently congenial to liberal individualism, and also reflected in the more-or-less contemporary work of Troeltsch and Weber — it does not correspondingly

63. See note 49, above.
demonize the development toward the episcopate, but makes this development a necessary part of the process of enculturation of the Christian morality and spirituality.\textsuperscript{64}

»1. Das Ziel der Kulturarbeit wie das der Religion ist die Aufrichtung der Ordnung in der Welt«, wobei der Unterschied nur der sei, »dass die Kulturarbeit das Ziel mehr auf dem Weg der Naturbeherrschung zu erreichen strebt, während es die Religion durch sittlich-religiöse Erneuerung der Menschheit zu gewinnen hofft. 2. Die Religion nennt das der Menschheit gesteckte Ziel das Reich Gottes. Dieses Reich ist gleichbedeutend mit der Herrschaft des Gutten, der Friedens, der Gerechtigkeit.\textsuperscript{65}

The liberal emphasis on ethics and individualism is shockingly easily transformed into virulent nationalism, a transformation noted with reprobation in histories of the epoch. The transformation occurs via the process by which ethics is domesticated, the necessary fitting of an ethical programme, which uplifts and liberates the people, into a specific political reality which allows that ethics to be propagated and defended. In the case of the itinerants, and their Christian morality,

The gospel thus became a social message. The preaching which laid hold of the outer man, detaching him from the world, and uniting him to his God, was also a preaching of solidarity and brotherliness. The gospel, it has been truly said, is at bottom both individualistic and socialistic. Its tendency towards mutual association, so far from being an accidental phenomenon in its history, is inherent in its character. It spiritualizes the irresistible impulse which draws one man to another, and it raises the social connection of human beings from the sphere of a convention to that of a moral obligation. In this way it serves to heighten the worth of man, and essays to recast contemporary society, to transform the socialism which involves a conflict of

\textsuperscript{64} See, e.g., his comments in \textit{Militia Christi}, 40-41:

Paul had once used the ancient image of the different parts of the body in order to correct the pride of the Corinthians with regard to spiritual gifts; Clement wants to reduce the independence and freedom of individual members compared to the ecclesiastical officeholders. It is on this account that he presents the military organization as a model for Christians, because a strict line is drawn there between the officers and the soldiers: the former command, the latter obey. The military analogy benefits the clergy here. All Christians are soldiers, but just for this reason they have to obey their commanders, the presbyters.

\textsuperscript{65} Karl Hammer, \textit{Deutsche Kriegslehre (1870-1918)} (München: Küsel-Verlag, 1971), 126. See also Fritz Fisher, \textit{Der Erste Weltkrieg und das deutsche Geschichtsbild} (Düsseldorf: Droste Verlag, 1977), 49: "Der Prediger selbst ist nur noch als Sittenprediger, als Landrat, als Listenmacher, als geheimer Polizeidiener unter staatlicher Autorität und fürstlicher Vollmacht zu existieren berechtigt."
interests into the socialism which rests upon the consciousness of a spiritual unity and a common goal. 66

The whole Weberian notion of charisma and its routinization, which is essentially the same model as that employed by Harnack in his description of itinerancy and its eventual results, thus matches the demonstrable political drift of liberalism toward nationalism in this period. The liberal distrust of formal institutions and emphasis on the individual and his ethos is maintained by protecting the origination of significant progressive phenomena from their corruption; but it is also mitigated by the process in which such phenomena come to be embodied in particular societies. In fact, by an ironic twist of fate, Liberalism’s distrust of institutional forms of religion lead to a closer identification with the Prussian state, as it fueled anti-papal feeling — and hence anti-French nationalistic sentiment in the wake of 1871. 67 Liberal Protestantism was

67. See the combination of the two sentiments in the following, contemporary, poem quoted, 201, in Julius Duboc, "German Comic Papers," International Review 4 (1877): 191-208 (a translation is given on 202 n.1.):

Ich sah wie auf den Thron gekommen
Ein Parvenu — wie hiess er doch?
Ein ganzes Volk hiess ihn willkommen
Und trug schier zwanzig Jahr sein Joch.
Die Freiheit trat er keck zu Boden,
Das Licht der Wahrheit löscht'waus;
Und doch ward in Begeisterungs-Oden
Gefeiert ER samt SEINEM Haus.

Ich' seh wie jetzt zum Ketzer-Braten
Der Pfaff' den Schetterhaufen schürt,
Ich seh' ein Volk, das Von Prälaten
Zu Wunderquellen wird geführt;
Seh' rings nur schwarze Pilgerheere,
Und höre, wie der Bischof spricht:
Zum Satan mit der freien Lehre!
Von Roma kommt allein das Licht!

Ist das die Leute, die ihr zündet?
Ist das die neue Wunderkraft,
Mit der die Freiheit ihr begründet
Und eine neue Welt erschafft?
Ist das die Zukunft hoch erkoren?
Dann mit der "Volker-Harmonie"
not immune from the effect of German nationalism, nor, as it turns out, was Harnack's vision of Christian origins.

A final observation should be added to dispel any doubt that the loose affinities between Harnack's vision of early Christian history and the Zeitgeist for which this vision turned out to be so resonant are of significance for the itinerancy theory and its reception. I have attempted to argue that the emphasis on culture and process in the Age of Progress is reflected in Harnack's thesis; that contemporary missionary spirit is obviously reflected in the content of thesis; that nationalism's rationale as a defense of culture is structurally paralleled by the hypothesis' processual concessions to successful worldly embodiment; and that liberalism, of course relishing the notion of so individualistic and moralistic a phenomenon as Wanderradikalismus, was sufficiently sanguine about this process of embodiment as to tolerate decidedly un-liberal phenomena such as nationalism in its name, provided that some kind of institutional separation could be made to protect the raw necessities of life from intruding upon the pure and ethereal beauty of reified culture while protecting that beauty at the same time — the itinerancy thesis allows for a pure foundation followed by an historically-distinct period of compromise, thus replicating, along temporal lines, such an institutional separation.

Yet none of these basic notions requires wandering charismatics. One cannot say, apparently, that the specific lineaments of the itinerancy thesis itself — wanderers, their radicalism, even their alleged "charisma" — were conjured out of the Zeitgeist just described. Merely, it would appear, these elements are described by Harnack in such a way as to accommodate the most important preconceptions of his day. The essential

Larst mich, ist bitt'euch, ungeschoren!
Ich hab' genug davon! Merci'!
pith of the hypothesis seems to remain unsullied. In fact, however, the very contents of the hypothesis appear to have resonated with the cultural context of late-19th century imperialism and nationalism to a greater degree of precision than the loose connections described above might suggest. Two examples — more could doubtless be found — illustrate the degree to which wandering was linked in Harnack’s era to a) imperial expansion, b) culture, and c) "authentic" living. The first example is obvious: the thesis of wandering Indo-Europeans who invaded India as well as central Europe, bringing with them a distinctive language family but also a powerful race and virile culture.68

The sharp contrasts drawn by Nietzsche between the "Aryan sensibility" and the "Jewish sensibility" were not unique to this thinker: the linguistic spread of Indo-European was seen as evidence of the vibrant, strong, and expansionary (and hence "evolutionarily" superior) character of the Aryan race. Travel is mission, and mission is its own authorization, a kind of responsibility to subdue the world. Harnack’s travelling charismatics are simply the religious equivalent to this racial schema: travel is the vehicle by which culture is spread, and the spread of culture is the way in which conquest is rationalized. Christianity’s conquest of the Empire forms a structural parallel to German expansionism, rationalizing that expansionism in much the same way that the Indo-Aryan "wanderings" were used.

A second, even more striking, example of this contemporary fascination with wandering is the development of a German youth organization in the period before WWI known as the Wandervölgeln.69 An essentially apolitical group, these "migratory birds," as their name suggests, were primarily interested in revivifying their own

cultural purity by escaping from the cities into the woodland and walking about in the countryside. They were not "migrating" to any particular location, but rather pursued these rural excursions as devices for putting themselves in touch with their own roots: the din of the town drowned out their inner voices. The parallel to itinerancy as conceived by Harnack is plain. Not only does this practice assume the same idealist dichotomy between cultural essence and its institutionalization, but it also, as a corollary, seeks the unconnected life (or a few moments of it) as the best way to access that cultural essence. Thus wandering and travel emerges — as it does with the Indo-European hypothesis — as this era's most succinct symbolization of cultural purity.

While the tendentious character of any hypothesis never can serve, logically, to falsify it. in Harnack's case the socio-cultural context of his historical inquiries are so resonant with the hypothesis itself, that it is impossible to avoid the speculation that the itinerancy hypothesis, among other historical conclusions, serves as a kind of working-out of a contemporary political subtext. This "working-out" need not, in fact, take place in the mind or according to the intentions of the author. My point here is not to seek some weird originary point outside of Harnack for Harnack's own ideas, an originary point that will "explain" them and reveal them in their purity and essence. Harnack, at an unconscious level, may or may not have intended some of the ramifications I have spelled out above (I doubt that, at a conscious level, very many at all are intentional), nor is it likely that Harnack's social context in some way symbolically intruded its own grand currents into Harnack apart from his intention. Rather, my point
is to draw out the meaning of these hypotheses as — to use a metaphor I invoked earlier — contemporary judicial decisions about a text of law, a meaning which can only be mediated socially and therefore which will only transmit current along the webs of conduction already socially provided. To put it another way: I am investigating the conditions of possibility of Harnack’s communicating through the vehicle of the history of earliest Christianity, the networks of shared assumption which allow his work to be interpretable at all to his contemporaries. In the case of the itinerancy hypothesis, its hermeneutical circuit-board — and hence the limits and foundations of its reception and transmission of meaning — revolve primarily around the pressing contemporary questions of imperialism, nationalism, and individualism, and their ideological corollaries of universalism, romanticism, idealism, and so forth. To a certain degree, then, the itinerancy hypothesis is the product of this historical constellation, and derives its meaning, potency, and especially cogency, from this constellation.
Chapter 3
The Sayings Tradition and Intinerancy

The tradition of the dead generations weighs like a nightmare on the brain of the living. — Karl Marx, *18th Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte*

The importance of the *Didache* for socio-historical reconstructions of earliest Christianity is underscored by the extent to which Harnack’s reading of the text has remained the standard one for more than one hundred years. In spite of changing circumstances, it has acquired the force of received tradition. has been incorporated into religio-historical "case law," at least in its original (i.e., the study of the *Didache*) jurisdiction. Beyond this jurisdiction, however, since the 1960s, and up to the present, this conception of radical itinerants has been progressively retrojected further and further back into the dim recesses of the originary impetus of the Christian movement, whether onto Jesus’ disciples themselves, or on to some formative and early development which generated the complexion of the earliest traditions. This trend in scholarship culminated in the work of Gerd Theissen during the 1970s, a corpus which in its turn has served as a bedrock for the development of further hypotheses. This reappearance (and extended application) of the hypothesis is curious, given the anti-liberalism and anti-modernism of intellectual currents since the late 1960s. As it turns

out. the impetus behind the itinerancy thesis has changed considerably, and hence also the ultimate meaning of the hypothesis. It is therefore to a scrutiny of the more recent avatars of Harnack's contentions that we must now turn.

**HEINZ SCHÜRMMANN**

Heinz Schürmann, in a 1960 article, raises an itinerancy hypothesis similar in many respects to the sketch later offered by Theissen, and earlier by Harnack, but ancillary to making a rather different point. Schürmann argues that form-critical method-odology can support an accurate investigation into the Sitz im Leben of "pre-Easter" Christianity. This is so, he says, because even before belief in the resurrection surfaced — indeed, even during Jesus' life — the followers of Jesus had typical patterns of behaviour, typical communal needs, and a shared pattern of living. If we take "Sitz" correctly as the sociological category it is hailed to be, it is thus unquestionable that a stable and recognizable Sitz im Leben served to define Jesus and his followers long before the emergence of anything like a "church"; the term need not be restricted to the period after Jesus' death.

In pursuing this claim, Schürmann offers a description of the typical Sitz of the "pre-Easter circle of disciples." The "outer" or "external" aspect of this Sitz was the
proclamation which Jesus commissioned his disciples to carry out, a proclamation of the nearness of the Kingdom and a call for repentance, a proclamation which takes for granted and has as its basis the assumption that Jesus is God’s eschatological messenger. It is in this commission that the sayings tradition is rooted; it is here that it has its (pre-Easter) setting. Like Harnack before him, and even more like Theissen after him, Schümann posits the synoptic “mission charge,” in its various forms, as descriptive of this commission, rejecting the notion that it is merely a retrojection into the life of Jesus of activities characteristic of the "post-Easter" church:

But — and this Schürmann’s regards to be critical for his thesis — the setting reflected in these narrative traditions is also presupposed by the sayings material itself, which at least in part provides rules for the behaviour of these itinerant disciples and takes for granted their status as Jesus’ "co-workers." The content of their preaching, whose fundamental tenet is the nearness of the Basileia, includes specific dimensions which elaborate the content of this vision:

Gewiss sind die Jünger Jesu aber nun nicht nur mit dem Heroldsruf: ‘Die Basileia der Himmel ist nahe herangekommen’ (Mt 10,7; vgl. Mk 1,15) aus-

9. See "Die vorösterlichen Anfänge," 58: "Erinnerung an solche vorösterlichen Sendungen finden sich nicht nur in der späteren synoptischen Redaktion und im Erzählungsstoff, sondern — was überzeugender sein dürfte — auch fest verankert im Redestoff."
gesandt worden. Es bedurfte der Variation, der Erklärung und weiteren Entfaltung eines solchen Rufes. Manche Basileia-Worte lassen sich aber einer Jüngerspredigt gut einfügen; so vor allem der dreifache Makarismus Lk 6,20b-21, aber auch Rufe, die Augen und Ohren öffnen sollten für die Gegenwart des Heils und die Nähe des Endes (vgl. Lk 10,23f.; 12,54ff.; Mk 13,28f.), ferner auch die Basileia-Gleichnisse wie das über den Glücksfund (Mt 13,44ff.), Hinweise auf das nahe Ende (vgl. Lk 17,34f.); aber auch wohl schon solche Worte, welche die Botschaft von Nahen des Königtums wider Augenschein und Unglauben verteidigen mussten (Lk 13,18-21; Mk 4,2-9,26-29).11

Schürrmann's basic point is that the pre-Easter "Verkündigung" of the disciples provides the basic Sitz im Leben for the sayings tradition.12 While he does not take the crucial step of arguing a genetic relationship between the ethical content of the sayings tradition and the circumstances or Sitz in which it was transmitted, Schürrmann does suggest that this peripatetic Sitz impacted on the form of the sayings tradition, and even that it provided a suitable context for the formation of at least some of its material (particularly parables of growth). His form-critical approach, moreover, is explicitly sociological (albeit in a very general way) and, although he tends — in contrast to most later scholarship — to connect itinerancy in a direct way with the "mission" of Jesus himself and to view it in terms of particular commission rather than habitual behaviour (i.e., as a task, rather than a "lifestyle"), he is nevertheless a pioneer of the hypothesis in his locating the sayings tradition in a Sitz marked, above all by travel and preaching.

Schürrmann himself notes at the end of his article that the methodological and historical scenarios he has sketched out have theological significance. On the one hand, by pushing form-critical analysis back into the "pre-Easter" tradition, the NT critic is able to avoid the Bulmannian (existentialist) tendency to dissociate the Christian faith from any historical grounding, with the result that the faith shades over into "Gnosticism." 13

12. Hence, see also "Die vorösterlichen Anfänge," 56-58.
13. Vorösterlichen Anfänge," 64.
At the same time, the faith is seen to be the result of creative historical processes and human input; the work, that is, of the Holy Spirit animating its human adherents, without which, the tradition would be a mere dead letter, akin, says Schürmann, to the Rabbinic tradition.  

GEORG KRETSCHMAR AND ERNST KÄSEMANN

D. Georg Kretschmar, in a 1964 article on asceticism, also contributes to the revivification of the itinerancy hypothesis. The ideological resistance to such an effort can be clearly seen: Kretschmar is forced to argue that early Christian asceticism is not a development out of anthropological dualism, but rather breathes the spirit of apocalypticism. The discredited and heretical Gnostics are repudiated (implicitly), while the existential moment celebrated by Bultmann in the eschatological (at least, in its mythologized form) encounter with futurity and possibility is retained. In order to accomplish this end he attributes the spread of early Christian asceticism to Syrian wandering prophets, such as are encountered in the Didache, the Acts of Thomas, and the Pseudo-Clementines. Kretschmar's basic thesis is that the roots of Christian asceticism lie in an ancient Syrian-Palestinian effort to imitate the behaviour and command of Jesus. Thus, "Der eigentliche geschichtliche Ursprung der christlichen Askese im syrisch-palästinensischen Raum liegt dann in dem Versuch, den Ruf Jesu zur Nach-
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folge und seine Jünger-belehrung in eine christliche Lebensordnung umzuprägen. “

Kretschmar argues that Christian prophetic charisma, which has its roots in much older regional practices associated with prophecy, not only went back to the traditions about Jesus in Q, but was adapted and perpetuated in the Pauline churches (1 Cor 12:4, 28: 14:31), and is attested, in the form of distinct offices, also in Luke-Acts (Acts 11:27- 28: 13:1; 21:9-10). The Didache, in addition to reflecting wisdom currents in its ethics, also reflects earlier Palestinian prophets, as well as its more contemporary Montanist enthusiasts. Ultimately, the ascetic impulse in Christianity, and its itinerant and charismatic expression, became a minority phenomenon, the prerogative of a spiritual elite, rather than the normative disposition of the movement as a whole, as it modulated into a segregated office.

Kretschmar’s basic thesis puts the cart before the horse, at least as far as later depictions of itinerancy are concerned: there the impulse to cast Jesus and his disciples as wandering missionaries or as ethical radicals is a result of the traditions’ wandering asceticism, not its cause. But the effort also recalls Harnack and the Didache: the impulse toward itinerancy hearkens back to the "mission charge." the Didache’s "ordinance of the Gospel." And it is an effort to locate the Christian ascetic impulse in mission and in wandering, rather than the converse. It identifies the bearers of the radical ethics of the Christian movement with charismatic itinerants, and it describes an eventual decline or marginalization of the significance of this phenomenon. And it implies, without calling attention to itself, the invocation of Max Weber’s "routinization of charisma" in its assertion that what was once a charisma of prophecy becomes.

in time, a relatively circumscribed "office." In regard to these points, Kretschmar's views are exceptionally interesting and creative, if not, in my view, particularly convincing. These views anticipate in many the ways the later contours of the itinerancy hypothesis, but without, it appears, having exercised a significant influence on the course of later scholarship in their own right.

But already in 1960, four years earlier, Ernst Käsemann published an article in Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche which advanced, almost gnomically, ideas very similar to those of Kretschmar, but applied to a much earlier period. Citing the "sentences of holy law" in which missionaries are granted the full authority of Jesus, and thus have an eschatological function of their own (Q 10:16; Q 10:23-24; Q 12:11-12; cf. Q 6:23), Käsemann draws attention to the pairings of "prophets" with "righteous men" in the oldest forms of these sayings. This distinction, he believes, can by no means represent an early form of distinction between clergy and laity (he fails to explain why this is so, or why it matters), but rather is an expression of the dynamic which activates and inspires the whole community: "the Spirit of prophecy himself who governs this community and therefore guides it by means of the instruments he considers appropriate." Thus we have a church organization marked by a sort of eschatological charisma, represented for us in the texts as "prophecy." Lead-

22. On the missionaries as charismatics, see, inter alios, Kretschmar, "christliche Leben," 94-100.
ership is exercised by charismatic and possibly itinerant prophets who depend on their "congregations" for financial support. The groups thus characterized are to be identified with small groupings in Syria-Palestine, independent of the "Jerusalem church."

If we ask where this hypothetical church order might have prevailed, Jerusalem is eliminated, because there the leadership of the community was exercised first by the Twelve and then, very soon, whether before or after James, also by a presbyterate. The only possibility lies in the small congregations on the borders of Palestine and Syria in which any other form of organization other than leadership by a charismatic man was out of the question because of the small number of their members. Perhaps, too, one peripatetic prophet looked after a chain of such congregations. The promise contained in our saying would then make particularly good sense: such prophets were thrown upon the resources of this divinely pledged, but obviously chancy, hospitality.

The possession of the Spirit in such charismatic leadership was itself viewed as a sign of the end; thus prophecy here combines "naturally" with an intensely-expectant apocalyptic eschatology.

Käsemann ascribes a prophetic impulse to the construction of such judgmental lex talionis sayings as Q 11:31-32. Additionally, formerly-conservative aphoristic wisdom is transformed by this orientation into a radical, rash, and imprudent eschatologically-motivated ethos. The beatitudes as well are to be attributed to this prophetic impulse with its apocalyptic outlook. The (specifically Lutheran) theological implications of this position, including the theological implications of apocalypticism, are spelled out quite explicitly by Käsemann:

Prophecy had not only to admonish and warn but also to comfort and hold out promises. It calls the disciples of Jesus to obedience by holding up to

---

them the standards of the Last Judgment. But at the same time, it also puts these disciples in a state of gratitude and joy by recalling to them the accomplished acts of God. Gospel and Law are here bound up together in the closest possible way, because the community has to be directed, on the basis of what has already been done of the divine will to that which remains to be done and before which it must bow. Parenesis in the post-Easter community was founded primarily on apocalyptic. That becomes particularly clear where aphoristic material is incorporated, but at the same time reshaped into an eschatological utterance.33

Apocalyptic, in addition to establishing the form of early Christian praxis in relation to authority and community organization, also, says Käsemann, "was the mother of all Christian theology."34 A kind of spiritual enthusiasm is intrinsically linked to this apocalypticism. so that in such ancient theology we see a delicate dialectic between the Spirit on the one hand and the Gospel and Christology on the other. According as this attempt succeeds or fails, the community remains Christian or lapses into Judaism and heathenism. is competent or incompetent to speak adequately of miracle and the ministerial office.35

The things that matter most to Käsemann in the theologies of Paul and the Fourth Gospel — the identification of apostolic office with the proclamation of the Gospel. the priesthood of all believers, the dependence of the church on the epiphany of Jesus as Lord. the presence of the Kingdom in Christian preaching — are rooted in this post-Easter prophetic and eschatological enthusiasm which he finds reflected in a number of Q-related Matthean texts. Thus Käsemann, contemporary with Schürmann and earlier than Kretschmar, articulates a very modern-sounding, and ultimately quite influential, version of the itinerancy hypothesis, and moreover links this hypothesis to several Q (or Q-like) texts.

PAUL HOFFMANN

It remained for Paul Hoffmann, writing twelve years later, finally to articulate the modern version of the itinerancy thesis in his 1972 monograph on Q.36 Hoffmann’s thesis is simple: the people responsible for Q, both its explicit instructions for mission and its radical ethics, were itinerants, who voluntarily and deliberately, as part of their religious ethos, gave up home and family, possessions, and indeed (and in consequence?), their standing with their peers, kinspeople, comrades:


Once again, the mission charge is taken to be more or less (self-) descriptive, while the sayings reflect an ethic conditioned by this experience. Once again, the disciples are commissioned to proclaim the imminent judgment and the nearness of the Kingdom. But here Hoffmann takes two critical steps beyond Schürmann. He identifies itinerancy with the tradents of the sayings tradition (and Q in particular), rather than with the immediate followers of Jesus themselves (although he notes the similarity of their lifestyle to that of Jesus). And he posits the (more or less) sociological feature behind this behaviour already identified by Harnack, and then again by Kretschmar: charisma.38

For Hoffmann, “charisma” is a prime sociological factor which both conditions the behaviour and ideology of the Q people, and dictates the primary characteristics of

38. See also *Studien*, 329-331: “Die charismatische Eigenart der Gruppe.”
their social existence, internally and vis-à-vis the larger world. Hoffmann uses Max Weber’s characterization of charisma and its routinization to speculate about the size of the Q group (small), its persistence (short-lived), and its development (toward Weber’s "routinization," i.e., toward the development of institutional forms and away from charismatic freedom). At the point at which Q crystallized, the movement of its trauents toward routinization is already apparent:

... In Rejudaisierungstendenzen, in der Entwicklung von Wunderheilungspraktiken, der allmählichen Ausformung eines Bekenntnisses, in der Sammlung der Worte Jesu und damit in der allmäßlichen Stabilisierung der Gruppe. Diese zeigt sich speziell in der Instruktionsrede, die sie sich unter Berufung auf Jesus gibt, und in dem besonderen Reglement, das sie für ihr Auftreten entwickelt.

Charismatic or enthusiastic apocalypticism among a core of devotees committed to a voluntary alienation from nearly all aspects of their society modulates into a stable, if somewhat marginal, "rejudazied" group-formation under the impact of the day-to-day, especially efforts at self-definition. At the same time, thus redefined, they still show their prophetic-charismatic roots in their miracle-working activity and their intense apocalyptic expectation, fostered by their temporal proximity to the original activity of Jesus, and by a situation of intense political crisis and persecution.

The mission speech in Q attests to this missionary situation and intention, eschatological messengers stamped above all by the twin characteristics of charisma and prophecy, who bore a radical ethic of love of enemies and an extreme brand of

40. Studien, 331.
41. Note that "enthusiasm" also serves as the hallmark of the earliest stratum of Q-traditions in Siegfried Schulz’s 1972 tradition-historical stratification of Q. See Siegfried Schulz, Q: Die Spruchquelle der Evangelisten (Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1972), especially 60-65. For Schulz, however, the mission speech postdates the apocalyptic/charismatic primary stratum of Q, being presented as it is in the form of a speech of the earthly Jesus, characteristic of later redaction (Spruchquelle, 409-410).
42. Hoffmann, Studien, 331.
43. Hoffmann, Studien, 331.
pacifism in a foreboding situation. The attributes which Kretschmar had determined had come from Q, Hoffmann now locates in Q. Moreover, allowing Q 10:5-7a. 9a to speak with the slightly-routinized voices of the missionaries themselves as they encounter sedentary folk — their putative audience — in villages and towns, Hoffmann also takes the step of locating in the Didache, and in 2 and 3 John, the response of these settled recipients to the missionaries whom they receive. The application of the itinerancy hypothesis to the synoptic tradition, and its fleshing-out by giving the itinerants themselves an independent voice in Q, is essentially full-blown with the publication of Hoffmann’s Studien.

**IN SUM**

What we have here in sum is the development, up to 1972, of somewhat tentative and partial hypotheses which attribute to radical itinerants the burden of some aspects of the synoptic tradition. Whether these itinerants are imagined as operating at a somewhat later period and consciously imitating a tradition already in place, or as contributing, through their message, to the development of the tradition itself, they are characterized as in some fashion imitating the Jesus of the Mission Charge, as imbued with charismatic enthusiasm and an apocalyptic spirit, as embodying the virtues ostensibly proclaimed by Jesus, and as interacting, in an ambivalent way, with sedentary Christians, as attested by the Didache and several other sources. Several factors distinguish this presentation from that of Harnack. First and more obviously, the scope of these characterizations has been widened to include more sources, a broader range of characteristic activities, and earlier sources. Additionally, with the gradual demise of

---

classical liberalism, the ethical component of the proclamation of these missionaries has been overshadowed by the apocalyptic motivation behind their activity. Third, the radicalism — the separation from society — of these figures has been emphasized, taking the form of extreme asceticism or pacifism, a stance, one cannot help but conclude, that represents a studied and meaningful reversal of the nationalism and militarism of Harnack. In particular, Hoffmann’s pacifistic opponents of Jewish nationalism stand, in the wake of defeat of Germany in WW2 and its moral infamy after the Holocaust, not only in the sharpest contrast to Harnack’s militarism and nationalism, but more especially to the predominance of those trends in Germany’s last two centuries as a whole. It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that prophylaxis and/or amends is at least part of the motivation here. Fourth and finally, a significant point of contrast centres over the theme of universalism. Scholars of the second half of the twentieth century are more than willing (perhaps too willing) to assume that, at least at an early stage — for Hoffmann, at the stage at which Q was composed —, the Christian "mission" was confined to "Israel."46 It is notable that with such a perspective fails to emphasize the pet themes of the earlier, liberal church historians, who emphasized the universalistic character of the mission.

This brief survey suggests that at least the building blocks of the itinerancy hypothesis have been around at least since the 1960s, and that an essentially comprehensive application of the hypothesis to Q had been made by 1972. By this time, nearly all of the aspects to appear in Theissen’s work had already been touched on: itinerancy, charisma, prophecy, the formative influence on the sayings tradition, the evidence of the synoptic tradition, the evidence of the Didache, even explicit sociologi-

46. Käsemann does not fit this tendency: he seems to regard the "enthusiasm" of the earliest Christian prophets to have been transmitted easily into Gentile forms of Christianity, and to have existed at the earliest stages of these movement as well.
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Theological methodology. What was missing was not so much content or substance, as form—the hypothesis had still not achieved anything like a global and synthetic characterization: it was articulated piecemeal, in different places, and usually ancillary to making another point. Whether about form-critical methodology, or about asceticism, or about the anti- Zealot roots of the Q people. Additionally, as a related problem, the thesis had not procured a popular forum: since it had been articulated (mostly) in specialized studies of other problems, it had not achieved a form which might widely appeal to a broad range of historians of Christian origins. Theissen, only a year after the appearance of Hoffmann’s book, was to rectify both of these deficiencies.

GERD THEISSEN

In a 1973 essay, which was followed up by a book-length expansion in 1977. Gerd Theissen developed his enormously influential articulation of the itinerancy hypothesis. He approached the question in a consistent and synthetic fashion, bringing together most of the insights (and sources!) of previous work, to bear on a theory relevant to the synoptic tradition as a whole, and indeed, something like a "unified field theory" of early Christian history. In his discussion, he treats the whole of the earlier ("Palestinian" as opposed to "Hellenistic") synoptic tradition as an

47. Käsemann is the exception.
50. See Theissen, First Followers of Jesus, 3.
amorphous unity: issues of literary sources, and form-critical and tradition-historical distinctions tend to be ignored.51

Theissen contended that the ethical radicalism of much of the sayings tradition argued against the traditional form-critical postulation of a "congregational" Sitz im Leben. Instead, he proposed to determine what kinds of people and situations lie behind these traditions by employing a clearly-articulated three-fold methodology.52 He claims that appropriate sociological conclusions about the setting of sayings material can be arrived at by deductions of an analytical (i.e., from the form and content of the sayings), constructive (i.e., from direct statements about the situation presupposed by the sayings), and analogous (i.e., from contemporary parallels) character.53 The critique of wealth embedded in many of the sayings, for instance, would fall into the first category; much of the Mission Charge, which speaks directly of travel, would fall into the second; and the analogy of other peripatetic contemporaries of the Jesus movement into the last. In this fashion documents which were never intended to be read sociologically or to provide information of a sociological character can nevertheless be responsibly mined for such information.

This methodology is interesting in its own right, but it is additionally significant because of the fashion in which it imposes unity, synthesis, totality upon the objects of

51. See Theissen's comments, First Followers of Jesus, 3-4. Theissen has done work directly on such issues as the theology and specific Sitz of the Q source, or the date of various individual traditions in the Synoptics, but these efforts are, in my view, relatively crude. See, e.g., The Gospels in Context: Social and Political History in the Synoptic Tradition (Linda M. Maloney, transl.; Minneapolis: Fortress Press. 1991 [1989]), esp. 203-205, 221-234.

52. For a summary, see Theissen, First Followers of Jesus, 2-3.

its inquiry. Whether or not this was intended by Theissen, it is almost inevitable, using such an overarching method, that he would arrive at the synthetic and all-embracing conclusions he does. The very use, self-consciously, of "analytical" deductions, for instance, ensures that the content of the sayings tradition cannot and will not stand independent of the circumstances in which this content was disseminated. The sayings tradition will necessarily reflect and appear to be shaped by the circumstances which are deduced, "analytically," from its content. It is worth noting explicitly, if in passing, that Theissen tends to imagine the relationship between social Sitz, and the form and content of the sayings tradition — i.e., the "analytic" equation — as isomorphic: 54 the sayings tradition's content (or form) will be a more or less direct reflection of the interests and social realities of its tradents and/or authors.

Working with this basic sociological approach, Theissen concluded in his 1972 article that all three types of evidence support an hypothesis which makes itinerant charismatics formative for the synoptic tradition. Particularly on the basis of his analysis of the "radical ethics" of the tradition, he can conclude that

54. Even when Theissen draws attention to the difficulties in such an approach, most particularly the possibilities of discrepancy between the norms and reality (do norms describe reality in their efforts to prescribe reality?), he ultimately will only concede that the differences between the two are limited to certain. rather fixed, predictable effects: they may be metaphorical, exaggerated, or, in the case of negative prescriptions, contrary to reality. See Theissen, "Sociological Interpretation," 184-189: First Followers of Jesus, 1-2. 5. This is still, in my view, far too literalistic. The assumption remains that norms in the gospels, in a more or less distorted form, are real articulations of actual lived norms among their tradents, rather than viewing them, as I would deem more appropriate, as characterizations of Jesus' norms. Hence, for instance, the example that Theissen uses — Matt 10:5-6 — allows him to draw the conclusion that there is a Gentile mission operating in Matthew's environs; otherwise the prohibition as a negative norm would not refer to anything at all, and so here is an instance of a real norm reflecting a contrary-to-reality prescription. One cannot directly conclude, in fact, that Matthew wishes to prohibit a Gentile mission (cf. 28:19); rather, he wishes to present Jesus as having prohibited such a venture during his lifetime, which is of course a completely different intention, and one that requires more care in interpretation. It may even be (although I would not want to push the point) that no Gentile mission is directly in view at all for Matthew's addressees, and that the prohibition is harnessed to some other point (for instance, the characterization of the Jesus movement as distinctively Jewish or obedient, against the [correct] counter-claims of non-Christian Jewish contemporaries).
The ethical radicalism of the sayings transmitted to us is the radicalism of itinerants. It can be practiced and passed on only under extreme living conditions. It is only the person who has severed his everyday ties with the world... who can consistently preach renunciation of a settled home, a family, possessions, the protection of law, and his own defense. It is only in this context that the ethical precepts which match this way of life can be passed on without being unconvincing. This ethic only has a chance on the fringes of society; this is the only real-life situation it can have.55

His book (1977) takes the same thesis and expounds it in considerably more detail, filling in holes, expanding on suggestions, and generally presenting his views more fully and more convincingly than had been the case in the 1972 article.56

Theissen identifies itinerants as the formative factor behind the earliest Jesus movement. Jesus himself, Theissen claims, did not intend to found communities, but to call into being a movement of wandering charismatics: "travelling apostles, prophets and disciples who moved from place to place and could rely on small groups of sympathizers in these places."57 The charismatic property of these figures is emphasized: "Use of the term ‘charismatic’ keeps in view the fact that their role was not an institutionalized form of life, a position which someone could adopt as a result of his own decision. The role of the charismatic is grounded in a call over which he had no control."58 It is these figures who are responsible for shaping the earliest synoptic tradition, especially the sayings; the peculiarity of much of this radical material becomes much more explicable when one considers the formative role such

57. Theissen, First Followers of Jesus, 8.
58. Theissen, First Followers of Jesus, 8.
homeless radicals had. These peculiar sayings are largely constituted by material which promotes ethical norms endorsing a removal from ordinary settled life, including an endorsement of homelessness, rejection of family, disdain for possessions, and defenselessness. It is only itinerants themselves, those who had in their own lives really rejected these things, who could convincingly advance such an ethos; and such views would only have been adopted in the first place by marginal types, by "outsiders." Their charisma and itinerant lifestyle was supported, says Theissen — in a fashion reminiscent of Käsemann —, by intense eschatological expectation. In addition to the indirect evidence afforded by these ethical precepts, such itinerants are more directly attested in the instructions of the mission speech and Jesus' call to individual disciples. In addition, there are references to Christian itinerants in Lucian's *Peregrinus* (16), and in the Pseudo-Clementine *Epistulae ad virgines*, as well as in the *Didache*. Theissen is also able to cite "comparative" evidence. In a move which is only peripheral — even opportunistic — in regard to his own argument, Theissen makes an offhand suggestion that has proven to be of extravagant importance in subsequent scholarship: that the itinerants he proposes have an analogy in the contemporary Cynic philosophers of the Hellenistic world. It also requires mention that although Theissen

59. Theissen, *First Followers of Jesus*, 10. In his *The Miracle Stories of the Early Christian Tradition* (Francis McDonagh, transl.; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1983 [1974]), esp. 261-263, he considers and ultimately rejects the possibility that such itinerants were also responsible for the miracle traditions.

60. Theissen, *First Followers of Jesus*, 1-14. He cites synoptic tradition as follows:


63. Theissen, *First Followers of Jesus*, 9-10.

64. Theissen, *First Followers of Jesus*, 14-15. He cites Epictetus, *Diss* III.22.46-48; Suetonius, *Vespasian* 10; and of course Peregrinus as examples attesting to such Cynic peripatesis.
does regard Paul's behaviour as also comparable to that of the Cynics, he draws a sharp distinction between Palestinian itinerant charismatics and Hellenistic community organizers, with Paul of course falling into the latter category. The charismatics exist for the sake of their lifestyle, while the community organizers are itinerant only for the sake of founding settled Christian communities.

One of the more significant additions of the book is its greater emphasis on the activity and role of "sedentary sympathizers," figures whom he regards as a necessary complement to the itinerants, providing their condition of possibility and at the same time evolving into a form of Christian practice in their own right. Although the majority of the materials of the synoptic tradition have itinerancy as their original *Sitz*, there is a handful of traditions which either (more or less) directly attests to local groups (and hence constitutes "constructive" evidence), or which reflects, in its distinctive norms, the existence and *Sitz* of such figures (and hence constitutes "analytical" evidence). These norms *are* distinctive precisely by virtue of being watered down; that is, they stand apart from the rest of the synoptic tradition by being less radical, or by pertaining to the ordinary requirements (leadership, community hierarchy, membership standards, etc.) of settled living. Finally, hunting for "comparative" data, Theissen adduces the

---

66. Theissen, *First Followers of Jesus*, 17. He cites Acts 1 ff.; 9:10; 10:1 ff.; 11:20 ff.; 21:3-4, 7; and Gal 1:22. In addition, Matt 8:14; Luke 8:2-3; 10:38 ff.; and Mark 14:3 ff. are cited as evidence that *families* formed the original nuclei of these sedentary "communities" (conceding that the term "community" may be misleading).
67. Theissen, *First Followers of Jesus*, 18-21. He cites texts of three basic types:
   3. Acceptance and rejection of membership: Matt 28:19; 1 Cor 1:17; 18:15 ff.; *Didache* 7:11:1. He also notes (19) that both Matthew (19:21) and the *Didache* (6:2) imply that not everyone need be "perfect" (*τέλειος*, in both cases), perfection being a function, apparently, of radical itinerancy and divestment of possessions.
Essenes as a contemporary example of a religious community with gradational norms; according to Josephus and the DSS, while full members adhere rigidly to an arduous and comprehensive code of conduct, initiates and other peripheral members live out only an attenuated version of these values. Thus there arises, according to this more developed formulation, a symbiotic — but not serene — relationship between these two groups. The itinerants, on the one hand, embody and transmit the charisma of the Spirit and the teachings of Jesus; they provide continuity with the "perfection" of a lived radicalism, as well as speaking with the authority of Jesus' own voice and that of the Spirit. At the same time, on the other hand, the sedentary supporters, while failing to take up the itinerant lifestyle that would give them direct access to the charismatic authority of the Holy Spirit and the lived words of Jesus, did provide the economic support without which these figures would have been unable to practice their extremist and marginal lifestyle. Theissen summarizes the situation thus:

The radical attitude of the wandering charismatics was possibly [sic] only on the basis of the material support offered to them by the local communities. To some degree the local communities relieved them of worries about their day-to-day existence. In turn, the local communities could allow themselves to compromise with the world about them because the wandering charismatics maintained such a clear distinction.

While Theissen argues here that all three types of sociologically-relevant evidence — constructive, analytical, and comparative — support the existence and basic characterization of such sedentary supporters, the argument is more tautological than this

68. Theissen is assuming that the Essenes described by Josephus and the Qumranites reconstructed from the Scrolls represent the same movement.
69. Theissen, First Followers of Jesus, 21-22.
70. Theissen, First Followers of Jesus, 20, cites the Didache as evidence of conflict and power struggles between the two groups. Theissen has indicated elsewhere ("Sociological Interpretation," 181) that he regards situations of conflict to be especially revealing of the social structures that transcend individual experience and behaviour.
71. Theissen, First Followers of Jesus, 7.
might suggest. As his preponderant focus on the itinerants themselves suggests, the real basis for adducing these sedentary supporters is their logical necessity to the itinerancy hypothesis: both as provision for the economic needs of the itinerants, and as a pipeline to the written, organized, and obviously settled brands of Christianity which represents the immediate Sz of all of our surviving records. Once Theissen has adduced the existence of these figures, he can show how, given their existence, the more conservative or worldly elements of the synoptic tradition must be attributed to them. But the presence of these elements in no way, in its own right, demonstrates this initial assumption.

Theissen also attempts to place this entire historical reconstruction within an explicit and comprehensive sociological theory which could, to some degree, account for both the genesis and the subsequent development of the radical experiment which Christianity was in its inception. The model he uses is a structural-functionalist one, in which religious renewal movements (and other social phenomena) serve — or aim to serve — a useful social function with respect to the organic totality of the culture or society of which they are a part.73 Theissen is careful not to make the relationship overly mechanical or consistent. He points out, for instance, that the effects of religious (and other social) phenomena cannot be derived from their origins:

If religious phenomena have at least relative, functional and oppositional autonomy, an analysis of the effects of religious phenomena cannot be identical with an analysis of the factors which condition them, since as a result of these religious phenomena new elements come into play which cannot be derived from the conditioning factors.74

73. See Theissen, *First Followers of Jesus*, 98: "Now an analysis of function does not investigate all effects, but only those which have some reference to the objective, basic aims of society." Cf. *Miracle Stories*, 2, 26, 231-264.
74. Theissen, *First Followers of Jesus*, 98. Theissen qualifies this statement in an interesting way, claiming that even a completely reductionistic understanding of religion as an epiphenomenon still needs to take seriously the religious response itself, its own self-understanding, and the effects of that self-understanding.
Nor does Theissen believe that the precise character of a response to social crisis is dictated by that crisis: renewal movements arise as responses to social crises, and can be explained that way, but the choice of which type of response to adopt is not susceptible of reductionistic explanation, at least not on a sociological level. Oddly, Theissen claims that his basic approach tends toward a conflict model of society rather than an integration model. It focuses on crises, and views these crises, rather than stable circumstances, as the motivating impulse behind the formation of religious groupings and agenda. On this issue, Theissen is simply wrong: the functionalist model necessarily prioritizes integration as the primary and explanatory social goal. Conflict is ubiquitous simply because it serves as that which integrating impulses resolve. Theissen is no exception in the way he actually treats his material (as opposed to the way he claims to treat it), to this overall characterization.

Thus a functional explanation or characterization of a religious renewal movement will explore the factors which lead up to and define the crisis to which the movement is a response. And it will examine the fashion in which, and the extent to which, the movement creates useful rejoinders to this crisis, what compensatory efforts the movements represents in response to these "factors," i.e., what social functions it does end up serving. Theissen's book accomplishes both of these objectives. He discusses at some length the "socio-economic," "-ecological," "-political," and "-cultural" factors which would have generated a sufficient crisis in first-century Palestine to account for the emergence of new religious movements. The book concludes with an "analysis of function." The overall effect of these additions to the discussion is to lend the book

75. Theissen, First Followers of Jesus, 97; cf. 32.
76. Theissen, First Followers of Jesus, 94. Cf. also 2; Miracle Stories, 29-30, 234-235.
77. For both assertions, see Theissen, Earliest Followers of Jesus, 1.
78. See Theissen, First Followers of Jesus, 31; Miracle Stories, 28-29, 231-264.
79. Theissen, First Followers of Jesus, 97-119.
an even more explicitly sociological ambiance than the effort to derive social information from religious texts using a consistent methodology. It also, of course, serves to contextualize the Jesus movement as he describes it within a global theoretical framework, as an effect of certain definite historical processes and phenomena, conceived in a very particular way. As a result of this approach, I do not think it would much of an exaggeration to say that, within the field of Christian origins (an important caveat), Theissen is the eminent sociological theorist of religion of our time.

Socio-economic factors, in this instance, relate to the social rootlessness of the itinerant prophets as Theissen has reconstructed them. Alongside direct evidence of economic crisis in the form of concentration of land holdings, Theissen finds contemporary analogies which confirm that social rootlessness was related to the then-prevalent factor of economic crisis: emigrants, new settlers, robbers, beggars, vagabonds, resistance fighters, prophetic movements, and movements of withdrawal such as the Qumranites. In these cases, a strong link can be drawn between the rootlessness and economic forces by noting that these movements tended fairly consistently to criticize riches or the wealthy. In particular, the problematic phenomenon of double-taxation lacked religious legitimation, and hence was a factor in the generation

80. Theissen, *First Followers of Jesus*, 33-34. Theissen claims that in some instances (e.g., Matt 11:28; Mark 10:52; Luke 5:1 ff.) the primary texts offer direct indications that poverty or marginality in some way preceded an itinerant life following Jesus. Cf. "Legitimation and Subsistence," 30-31.
81. Theissen, *First Followers of Jesus*, 41-42. He cites: Josephus, *Antiquities* 15.4.2, §96; 16.1.1, §2; 17.11.2, §307; 17.11.4, §318 ff.; 17.11.5, §321; 17.13.5, §355; Josephus, *War* 1.18.5, §361; 2.21.2, §591; Josephus, *Life* 24, §119; Diodorus Siculus 2.48.9; Acts 12:20 ff. He also notes (44) the role played by the Pharisees in legitimating the claims of the native aristocracy, as well as pointing to the way that over-population and taxation exacerbated and contributed to this crisis (40-45).
83. Theissen, *First Followers of Jesus*, 39. But note also that Theissen draws back from an economistic reduction of social phenomena to direct economic causes, especially by pointing to (39-40; cf. 46) the much-cited observation that it is usually not the destitute who cause trouble who cause trouble in periods of economic crisis, but rather those more in the economic middle-range who are most affected, adversely or positively, by changes.
of either outright rebelliousness or ethnocentricity and xenophobia in some religious movements of the time (e.g., the Zealots, and more aristocratic religious movements, respectively); thus a part of the economic crisis was the question of the legitimacy of state taxes.\textsuperscript{84} The Jesus movement rejected both of these responses, undermining aristocratic privileges and legitimacy by questioning the necessity of accepted religious duties, and at the same time repudiating the Zealot stance that paying Roman taxes was incompatible with God’s rule.\textsuperscript{85} It can thus be viewed as one response among many to the longing for renewal brought about by the shattering of traditional values in the contemporary economic fluctuations.\textsuperscript{86}

The other three "factors" also exercised considerable force on the development of the Jesus movement. "Socio-ecological" factors concern primarily the tension between city and countryside.\textsuperscript{87} Economic pressure was greater in the countryside, while the cities, and especially Jerusalem which benefited economically from its religious centrality, tended as a result to greater conservatism.\textsuperscript{88} Like analogous movements (Essenes, resistance fighters, John the Baptist’s movement), the Jesus movement operated in the countryside and had an ambivalent — if not downright hostile — attitude toward urban centres. From a socio-ecological perspective, it is probably quite significant — certainly no accident — that Jesus was finally executed not in Galilee, and certainly not in the countryside, but in Jerusalem.\textsuperscript{89} A constant state of political crisis, military action, jurisdictional fragmentation also ensured that "socio-political factors" would heighten apocalyptic enthusiasm and give birth to a variety of "radical theocratic

---

84. Theissen, \textit{First Followers of Jesus}, 44-45.
85. Theissen, \textit{First Followers of Jesus}, 44-45.
86. Theissen, \textit{First Followers of Jesus}, 45.
88. See Theissen, \textit{First Followers of Jesus}, 52.
89. Theissen, \textit{First Followers of Jesus}, 57.
movements," movements which hoped in some way or another for an act of God which would replace a discredited (and hence illegitimate) aristocracy and restore a genuine rule of God over his people.90 Finally, a threat of cultural assimilation was behind a "socio-cultural" crisis:

Our hypothesis is that the tendencies to intensify norms within Jewish renewal movements are a reaction to the drift towards assimilation produced by superior alien cultures. The first evidence for this connection was produced by the observation that tendencies to intensify norms are often caused by concern for inter-cultural segregation.91

This intensification of norms, especially those centering around aggression,92 is also matched by the Jesus movement in the social sphere, but is repudiated in the religious sphere in order to prevent the fragmentation that typically ensued from such efforts.93

In the context of these various "factors," we learn that the teaching of the itinerants served the function of containing the aggression fostered by the various forces of social disruption:

... the best description of the functional outline of the Jesus movement for overcoming social tensions is an interpretation of it as a contribution toward containing and overcoming aggression. In this connection, four forms of containing aggression emerge: aggression was: (1) compensated for by counter-impulses; (2) transferred to other objects and ascribed to other subjects; (3) internalized and reversed so as to fall on the subject of the aggression; (4) depicted in christological symbols and transformed.94

While these various crises created, as their overwhelming threat to social integration, an impulse toward aggression, the Jesus movement aimed to contain that impulse through its radical ethics, through its transfer of violent impulses to an eschatological consummation, through condemnation of proponents of aggressive behaviour, and through its projection of the scapegoat role onto — and simultaneous identification with

91. Theissen, First Followers of Jesus, 87.
92. See Theissen, First Followers of Jesus, 78.
94. Theissen, First Followers of Jesus, 99.
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— the figure of the Son of Man.95 The hope that the movement could permeate society to the extent to which any real transformation would be possible was predicated on the expectation of an eschatological miracle; apocalypticism was intrinsically tied to the social function of the Jesus movement.96

**THE FATE OF THEISSEN'S HYPOTHESIS**

Like Harnack's more limited proposal of itinerancy, Theissen's work has been formative for nearly all subsequent work, and has set the agenda for social inquiry into earliest Christianity even among those who disagree with his conclusions. Since its first appearance in published form, Theissen's itinerancy hypothesis has had an undeniable influence on the shape of synoptic scholarship. The ends to which it has been harnessed, and the texts to which it has been applied, are manifold. In spite of various modifications and criticisms (see below), the itinerancy model continues to be used, expanded upon, and debated. In much mainstream NT scholarship, its applicability is simply assumed. Itinerants are usually assumed to have existed and to have played some significant role in the shaping of the traditions about Jesus and the actual historical development of movements of Jesus' followers. In particular, the role of "prophets" and "prophecy," frequently conceived in terms of these Theissonian itinerants, has been emphasized as important for earliest Christian history over the last two decades. Moreover, several early Christian texts have been interpreted in light of a *Sitz im Leben* much like that which Theissen proposes. This has affected, of course, how these texts are understood, and how their data is marshalled to reconstruct earliest Christian history. It is impossible here to describe the manifold ways in which Theissen

---

96. Theissen, *First Followers of Jesus*, 111.
has influenced the field of NT studies and Christian origins or even Q scholarship specifically — to do so would practically require a survey of everything written about the synoptic tradition since the mid-1970s. It will suffice, instead, to note here a few of the more significant applications of Theissen’s itinerants, which have changed the shape of Q scholarship, and of synoptic scholarship as a whole.

First, the general application of Theissen’s theory to synoptic scholarship has meant that prophecy and apocalypticism have played an increasingly central and persistent role as the assumed ideological framework of the earliest Jesus tradition. Mission, also, is perceived as a fundamental historical and sociological factor in the development of earliest Christianity. It has meant, as well, that sociological description of earliest Jesus people — the pre-gospel tradents of the synoptic tradition — has tended to avoid descriptions which locate the Jesus people within a broader social milieu, focusing instead on the wandering activity of these figures and its social causes and/or ramifications. Descriptions of group dynamics are passed over in the absence of any group, and instead, when internal questions of authority and structure are raised, the focal point is on the inter-relations between the charismatics and their sedentary auxiliaries. The impact of these tendencies is felt very strongly in Q scholarship.97

At the most general level, the association between charismatic prophecy and Christian mission — as well as the view that this mission was somehow historically determinative, or essential to the complexion of what the Jesus movement ultimately

---

At the same time that Lührmann’s book set in action a renewal of the literary description of Q, a parallel revolution in its historical evaluation was announced by Gerd Theissen in his 1973 article on "itinerant radicalism." With this essay, specific attention began to be paid to the social history of Palestinian Christianity and, as before, Q was at the center of things. As with Lührmann, Theissen’s preliminary insights required further explication and elaboration by others.
became — has exercised a strong influence since Käsemann's work, and has been perhaps the primary focus of scholarship on the social history of "Palestinian Christianity" since Theissen's work in the 1970s.98 Eugene's Boring's 1982 study of Christian prophecy, for instance, stands as an influential critique and scion of Theissen's work.

Boring assays to both revise and refine traditional form-critical investigations into the genesis of the Jesus traditions, and simultaneously provides a description of the mechanism whereby Theissen's itinerants might have had such a formative effect on the sayings material.99 Citing Harnack's characterization of charismatic itinerancy in the Didache as his starting point,100 Boring argues for the existence of Theissenian itinerant prophets in the first-century Syro-Palestinian Christian movement, citing the Didache not only as evidence for the existence of these prophets, but also as evidence for what they were like.101 Criticizing Harnack's assumption that the prophets discussed in the Didache are exclusively wandering, however, and indicating his doubts about (later, i.e., Theissen's) "questionable analogies" to Cynicism and other ancient peripatessis,102 Boring conceptualizes his prophets as subsisting in an ecclesiastical setting, and as being distinguished as a class less by itinerancy than by "inspiration" or "enthusiasm" (they are πνευματικοί).103 He associates these prophets with miracle-working, charismatic authority independent of formal institutions, views them as neces-

98. Mack, *Myth of Innocence*, 87 n.7, characterizes the assumption that both Jesus and his immediate followers (especially those represented by Q) were prophets as "the current scholarly view."
100. Boring, *Sayings of the Risen Jesus*, 58. Here Boring incorrectly characterizes Harnack as separating "apostles, prophets and teachers," who are charismatic, universal, and itinerant missionaries, as over against the bishops and deacons, who represent the settled groups. Harnack in fact felt that "teachers" as a distinct class were not itinerant.
sary to the life of the early churches for certain special functions, as delivering prophetic speech in the name of Jesus and by the authority of their charisma or inspiration, as not engaging in normal occupations but requiring the economic support of their congregations, and distinguished from the ordinary members of their congregations by their ascetic poverty and rejection of family life.\textsuperscript{104} They are, moreover, imbued with and motivated by an intense expectation of the apocalyptic End.\textsuperscript{105} His basic thesis is not too far removed from that of Theissen: "There is some significant evidence, then, that early Christian prophets typically were committed to poverty and sexual abstinence, and we may expect to find that sayings originating from, or shaped by, such prophets may sometimes manifest this commitment."\textsuperscript{106} Boring, in a nutshell, is distancing himself from Theissen's (and Harnack's) characterizations without really offering anything much different: he does not deny that such figures travelled, but does relativize the importance of this activity, and argue that it was not omnipresent. In common, both Boring's prophets and Theissen's itinerants are marked by a (relatively mild) ascetic discipline.

This overall acceptance of Theissen's charismatic radicals is in evidence when Boring is discussing Q, where he makes little effort to preclude wandering as a significant factor in the history of Q's tradents. Finding in Q abundant instances of what he considers to be the literary or formal characteristics of early Christian prophetic speech — speaking for the Risen Lord in the first person ("I-sayings"), eschatological correlatives, sentences of holy law, blessings and curses, and initial ἀμὴν. λέγω Ἰησοῦς\textsuperscript{107} — he concludes that a large number of sayings in Q either originated as

\textsuperscript{104} Boring, \textit{Sayings of the Risen Jesus}, 87-92.
\textsuperscript{105} Boring, \textit{Sayings of the Risen Jesus}, 136.
\textsuperscript{106} Boring, \textit{Sayings of the Risen Jesus}, 94.
oracles of Christian prophets108 or at least show the marks of prophetic reformulation.109 Boring uses these conclusions to argue for the non-sapiential character of Q and of the impetus behind it, and believes that the radical position of the document would have been impossible without an appeal to the revelation to which the prophet—not the wise man—has access. For instance, in defining the "prophetic" character of the persecution beatitude in Q 6:22-23, he looks askance at James Robinson’s characterization of Q as a wisdom collection:110

The saying [6:22-23] is typical of Q in general, which is not to be seen as a collection of proverb-like catechetical materials for the moral instruction of the early church but as a setting-forth of a radical understanding of life that can only be understood as revelatory. Such forms of speech are at home in Jesus’ own mouth, and in the mouths of his inspired post-Easter spokesmen, but are not particularly appropriate to teachers and non-charismatic transmitters of tradition.111

The Syro-Palestinian Christians that Q represents drew their collection of Jesus’ sayings (Q) from charismatic prophets who spoke the original words of Jesus, as well as their own charismatic utterances, indistinguishably as "words of the risen Lord." These sayings, and the early Jesus people influenced by them, are infused with a spirit of eschatological imminence.

Boring’s study dovetails with that of Theissen most provocatively in the case of the so-called Mission Instruction (Q 10:2-16). Boring claims that the speech as it now

---

111. Boring, Sayings of the Risen Jesus, 140 (original emphasis); cf. 180-181. Boring notes, in fact, that there are "historicizing" (i.e., sapiential) tendencies in Q alongside the prophetic "contemporizing" forms, but believes that the latter predominate, and that the overall form of Q (beginning with a prophetic "call" — the baptism and temptation — and proceeding on to a collection of oracles) likewise suggests a relationship to Christian prophecy.
stands in Q is evidently composite, and searches its constituent pieces for evidence of prophetic construction, which he finds in abundance.\textsuperscript{112} In particular, he associates the intense eschatological expectation of some of the material — notably Q 10:4, which he believes argues against the adequate provisioning of missionaries because the dawning of the new age is expected so immediately — with charismatic prophecy, a feature in marked contrast, he assumes, to "Cynic-Stoic preachers."\textsuperscript{113} The collection of this material together into an organized and coherent speech infuses the cluster as a whole with the prophetic and eschatological tenor missing in a handful of the original constituent units, and hence the formulation of the speech itself probably does represent the continuing influence of the charismatic prophets within the Q group.\textsuperscript{114} We thus have, as in Theissen, a Q whose composition is strongly marked by the influence of charismatics, whose eschatological expectations lead to an ascetic or otherwise "radical" ethos. But where Boring departs from Theissen is in his image of the relationship between prophet and community. Boring notes that the mission speech, although spoken by a prophet and in prophetic mode, does not necessarily address prophets. He concludes that while some of the missionaries envisioned in this speech may have been prophets, we have no basis for concluding that all of them were, nor any reason to imagine that all prophets were wanderers.\textsuperscript{115} Thus we return to the original thesis, that prophecy is an ecclesiastical function of settled communities. Q's mission speech presupposes such a settled and structured community from which missionaries are sent out and to which they return, and so, in associating prophecy with such a community, we do not necessarily assert, à la Theissen, that such charismatics must have been gen-

\textsuperscript{112} Boring, \textit{Sayings of the Risen Jesus}, 142-149. For an itemization, see note 108, above.

\textsuperscript{113} See Boring, \textit{Sayings of the Risen Jesus}, esp. 144-145. So also Aune, \textit{Prophecy}, 213.

\textsuperscript{114} Boring, \textit{Sayings of the Risen Jesus}, 149.

\textsuperscript{115} This basic characterization, says Aune, \textit{Prophecy}, 215 (cf. 213), applies also to Matthew and the \textit{Didache}.
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uine itinerants.\textsuperscript{116}

Nonetheless, the thesis here clearly owes something to Theissen: it is partly articulated in opposition to or as corrective of his thesis, and is partly a further elaboration of his thesis. David Aune has shown how Boring’s conclusions, or any direct focus on Christian prophecy, will lead to conclusions much like those of Theissen. While he follows many of Boring’s conclusions (although thinking that his case is somewhat "overblown"),\textsuperscript{117} he states that it is impossible to sustain any arguments that at least some of the prophets could not have been itinerants.\textsuperscript{118} What we see here is a reconciliation of Boring’s and Theissen’s views, so that the entire Theissonian thesis — including the postulation of itinerants, and the gradual developments within their roles and their being supplanted by internal and regular and less-charismatic community mechanisms — is allowed to stand side-by-side with Boring’s view that charismatic prophets were responsible for much of the shaping of the Jesus tradition. Such prophecy, among itinerants, served the function of uniting scattered Christian communities and providing leadership roles in the earliest period, which functions were then supplanted by a more stable internally-based leadership structure at a later period. The prophetic behaviour of some of the itinerants not only provided the driving force behind their peripatetic activities, but also drove their reformulation of the Jesus traditions to reflect their radical ethos. We see, in fact, that most of the characterizations of the Jesus movement (or the people behind Q) as prophetic rely on the conception of their behaviour as it is articulated by Theissen: apart from an occasional tinkering with details, as we see, e.g., in Boring, "prophetic" is just a specification of the charismatic impulse behind this itinerancy. We are left with a complex of adjectives characterizing

\textsuperscript{116} Boring, \textit{Sayings of the Risen Jesus}, 149.
\textsuperscript{117} Aune, \textit{Prophecy}, 213.
\textsuperscript{118} Aune, \textit{prophecy}, 211.
all (relevant) aspects of Q's history: prophetic (traditionally and formally), eschatological/apocalyptic (ideologically), and itinerant (sociologically).

Even more interesting have been the attempts to build a "unified field theory" of Christian origins on the foundation of Theissen's early itinerants. According to such schemata, the historical Jesus was itinerant or at least encouraged itinerancy. His immediate followers were itinerant, and the theological and historical development of the subsequent Christian movement can be attributed to and understood in terms of the behaviour and activities of these itinerants, including the eventual usurpation of their roles by other, non-charismatic, figures.

Stephen Patterson, for instance, recently has argued that Theissen's itinerants also underlie the traditions of the Gospel of Thomas, a text which he believes witnesses not only to their existence and "radical" perspective on the world, but additionally to the conflict that developed between these charismatic preachers and their "sedentary sympathizers" in the last third of the first century. Such texts as Thomas #14, 42, 73, 86 attest fairly directly to itinerant activity and homeless wandering among the Thomas traditions. The overall pattern of ethics, congruent with these basic indications of itinerancy, revolves around cutting family ties (#8, 31, 55, 76, 99, 101, 105), willful poverty (#36, 54, 63-65, 69, 95, 100, 107, 109, 110), and a relativization

119. See Patterson, Thomas and Jesus, esp. 126-170. The book is a revision of his Claremont dissertation under the supervision of James Robinson.
120. See Patterson, Thomas and Jesus, 129-134. For a summary and brief critique of the applicability of the basic Theissonian model to Thomas, on the grounds that the direct evidence of homelessness is ambiguous, see William E. Arnal, "The Rhetoric of Marginality: Apocalypticism, Gnosticism, and Sayings Gospels," Harvard Theological Review 88/4 (1995): 471-494, esp. 480-482.
121. Note that it is unclear that all of these sayings do in fact offer a critique of wealth; in some instances (e.g., #109), Patterson is forced to argue that the saying is intended ironically. It is also notable that of all the motifs Patterson adduces in support of itinerancy, the critique of wealth is easily the best attested. Such a motif, however, does not in its own right evince itinerancy.
of purity requirements and political norms (#6, 14, 27, 52, 53, 71, 78, 89). There is also evidence of an only-minimal internal organizational structure (#12, 30, 49), consistent with a charismatically-inspired network of itinerants. 122

Where this reconstruction most notably departs from — but supports! — Theissen's readings of the synoptic tradition, is in its conclusion that Thomas, (almost) uniquely, offers us the unadulterated perspective of the itinerants themselves, rather than those who were forced to deal with these figures. Thomas, says Patterson, shows no indications of the perspective of the settled Christians who, according to Theissen's theory, are responsible for recording and transmitting, albeit in an attenuated, sanitized, or segregated way, the tradition of Jesus' sayings originally transmitted by the itinerants. Patterson, in other words, has found evidence of an earlier stage. has found a "missing link" critical to the itinerancy hypothesis in Thomas. This is not to say that Thomas is actually earlier than the synoptic gospels, or directly reflects a pre-synoptic Sitz. 123 Rather, it attests to the strand of development which ran counter to the synoptic position in the period in which itinerants and an emerging local householder leadership were struggling for power over the nascent Christian communities. The synoptic position, of course, was that of the householders rather than the itinerants. 124 Thomas

---

122. On this matter see esp. Patterson, Thomas and Jesus, 151-153. He also posits the possibility of female itinerants. Thomas and Jesus, 153-155.
123. I cannot, however, resist citing the as-yet-unpublished paper of Stevan Davies which argues that the Gospel of Mark is literally dependent on Thomas. The paper makes a surprisingly good case (largely on the basis of demonstrable Markan dependence on Thomasine redactional features discernible, for instance, in Thomas #13 [cf. Mark 8:27-33] and #65-66 [cf. Mark 12:1-12]), and if its thesis is correct, this would date even developed versions of Thomas to a period prior to that of any other extant writings about Jesus.
124. It is worth speculating (as Patterson in fact does, Thomas and Jesus, 212-214) that the different trajectories of secondary theological reflection undertaken by Thomas and Q (Thomas in a Gnostic direction, Q in an apocalyptic direction) owe their distinction to the initial difference between the documents' traditions. The Thomas itinerants tend toward a radical and somewhat individualistic self-justification in the form of Gnosticism, while the Q people, representing the householder orientation, seek legitimation within the more communicalistic and conservation framework of apocalypticism. For a methodologically similar, but substantively different explanation of the same phenomenon, see Arnal, "Rhetoric of Marginality," 492-494.
may be thus be seen, especially in its final stages, as a testimony to the itinerants' stand in the course of this conflict, in which a gnosticizing theological vision is marshalled to support an embattled itinerant social radicalism in the face of the local communities' increasing marginalization of the itinerants. 125

Not only does Patterson's inclusion of *Thomas* widen the scope of Theissen's socio-historical reconstruction, as well as providing us with the hitherto lacking voice of the itinerants themselves, it additionally extends the historical sketch of itinerancy and its consequences both forward and backward in time. The concluding chapter of his book on *Thomas* offers a preliminary sketch of the way the *Gospel of Thomas* might be used to investigate the historical Jesus. Patterson argues that, given the independence of *Thomas* from the synoptic tradition, those aspects which they have in common will most likely constitute the best places from which to launch suppositions about Jesus himself. 126 The "common ground" that in fact emerges from such a comparison is, unsurprisingly, constituted by a collection of wisdom sayings and parables. The content of this material, however, is interesting for its fairly consistent drift toward an ethos of "social radicalism." 127 Although Patterson does not say outright that the source for the radical character of the preaching of the historical Jesus was an advocacy of itinerancy, he does include itinerancy as an aspect of the "common ground" and as a feature of the radical ethos which, in a general way, he asserts goes back to Jesus:


125. Here see esp. Patterson, *Thomas and Jesus*, 196-214.
best reflects its practical dimensions... Utterly destitute, the wise sage is called upon to dispose of his or her money (Thom 95, par. Matt 5:42//Luke 6:34-35a, Q), and to take no care for such necessities as clothing (Thom 36 [Coptic], par. Matt 6:25-33//Luke 12:22-30, Q) or food (Thom 69:2, par. Matt 6:6//Luke 6:21a, Q). Their poverty is to be a sign of blessing (Thom 54, par. Matt 5:3//Luke 6:20b, Q).128

In the other temporal direction, Patterson pursues evidence of itinerancy in a range of Christian writings which attest to conflict or competition between local authorities and charismatic wanderers. Looking to the Didache (chs. 11-13), the Epistle of James, and the Johannine letters (2 and 3), he finds ample evidence to support both the claim that there were itinerants among the Christian groups during this period, and that there was a power struggle between these figures and local, sedentary community leadership.129 We have already seen that Harnack used the Didache as his point of departure in describing an early Christian charismatic ministry of itinerants. The evidence from the Didache cited by Patterson is not much different from that deduced by Harnack.130 What makes Patterson’s analysis so interesting is that it brings Thomas into the discussion, as a representation at least of the stance of those figures whom the author of the Didache aimed to suppress or control. Patterson says, "Whether one should properly call the wandering teachers, apostles and prophets known to the didachist ‘Thomas Christians’ is probably an unanswerable question."131 But the fact that the question can even be raised is an indication of the potential such an analysis of Thomas has to unify in a comprehensible way a series of disparate strands or sources of early Christian history.

---

128. Patterson, Thomas and Jesus, 234.
129. Patterson, Thomas and Jesus, 171-195.
130. See Patterson, Thomas and Jesus, 172-178. Where Patterson does depart from Harnack (in addition to dating the Didache much earlier — probably the end of the first century — than Harnack did) is in attempting to stratify the text of the Didache. He argues that chapter 11 stems from an earlier period than chs. 12-13, and that the latter attest to the itinerants’ greatly-diminished status. We can thus see even within the Didache evidence of a historical process toward the marginalization of the power and status of the itinerants.
131. Patterson, Thomas and Jesus, 177.
In addition to the predictable citation of the Didache, Patterson also turns to some of the NT epistolary literature as evidence for this same phase of power struggle. In 2 and 3 John, for instance, we see an analogous controversy centering around issues of hospitality: 132 3 John apparently is defending the authority and right to hospitality of itinerants who impose on the generosity of the churches they visit:

You do faithfully whatever you do for the brothers, even though they are strangers to you; they have testified to your love before the church. You will do well to send them on in a manner worthy of God; for they began their journey for the sake of Christ, accepting no support from non-believers. Therefore we ought to support such people, so that we may become co-workers with the truth. (3 John 5-8)

Second John, which Patterson thinks was written by another hand in imitation of the "presbyter" responsible for 3 John, intends to defuse this argument, by marshalling the presbyter's voice. this time, against itinerancy:

Many deceivers have gone out into the world, those who do not confess that Jesus Christ has come in the flesh; any such person is a deceiver and the anti-christ! . . . Do not receive into the house or welcome anyone who comes to you and does not bring this teaching; for to welcome is to participate in the evil deeds of such a person. (2 John 7, 10-11)

Here, as with the Didache, we see a conflict between itinerants and householders, and can trace, at least a little, the development and some main events of this process. Also as in the case of the Didache, we could speculate, without really being sure, that the itinerants in question, including those whose voices we hear in 3 John, are — or are akin to — "Thomas Christians." 133

The letter of James is also adduced in support of the itinerancy hypothesis and drawn into the hypothesis as a result. 134 Patterson argues that James’ tripartite dis-

---

132. See Patterson, Thomas and Jesus, 188-195.
133. Patterson, Thomas and Jesus, 192, notes an affinity between the Thomas version of saying #25 — Love your brother [not "neighbor"] like your soul — and the consistent use of the term "brethren" for the itinerant preachers in 3 John. This is obviously a rather strained and flimsy observation.
134. Patterson, Thomas and Jesus, 178-188.
quisition on rich and poor (2:1-26) actually conceals a struggle between wealthy local patrons, to whom this church appears to be turning, and "the poor" who are not in fact simply the economically-deprived but a (technical) designation for a body of people within the church who feel that they ought to be in control and be honored (the wording of James 2:5, τῶν πεπιστευκέντων τῶν κόσμων, supports the notion that "the poor" is a technical term). This interpretation of "poverty" in James, coupled with the fact that Abraham, cited as an instance of "justification by works" (2:21-24), was a proverbial example of hospitality in Jewish sources of the time, as well as the citation of the prostitute Rahab (2:25), indicates that the author of James, also, is defending the status of the itinerants against the encroachments of local patrons. Patterson concludes by linking James not only to the phenomenon of itinerancy, but — speculatively — to Thomas and its environs as well:

... what we have found in the three central treatises is a defense of three areas // in the life of the wandering radical — poverty and the right of the "poor" to be heard; itinerancy and the right of itinerants to receive hospitality; and teaching and the reservation of this right for those who would fulfill some form of ascetic requirement and become "perfect." In addition, the author describes him or herself as one such teacher. We can only offer an hypothesis, but it seems quite likely that the same sort of transition from wandering radical leadership to local authorities that we have already observed in the Didache is part of the picture also in James. ... Whether there was any historical connection between the author of James and Thomas Christianity would be impossible to know. But the possibility should not be excluded. Both James and the Gospel of Thomas draw upon the authority of James. The epistle of James . . . stands very close to the sayings tradition . . . .

In a nutshell, although this is not his primary aim, Patterson has in fact used the historico-interpretive filter of Theissen's itinerancy to construct a network of connections and developments which link and explain Jesus' activity (at least somewhat); the early sayings tradition; its manifestations in the Synoptics and Q, on one hand, and

135. Patterson, Thomas and Jesus, 186-187.
Thomas, on the other; a collection of epistolary literature; and the Didache. What emerges is an early Christianity initially driven by a kind of radical asceticism which takes the specific form of wandering homeless. The ethos of the sayings tradition is molded by these people, who in their turn transmit it to, and rely for support upon, local sympathizers who do not adopt this ethos of radical homelessness in its entirety, but supportive of the basic message. Eventually, a large-ish body of early Christian literature comes to be built around a developing controversy between these itinerants and their erstwhile supporters on the interrelated questions of support, prestige, and authority, which are being progressively withheld from the itinerants as their sympathizers develop their own, local and stable, forms of administration, ethics, theological rationalization, and so on. The writings which reflect this process can be placed on a continuum, depending upon the historical period they reflect, and the stance they take. One can find traces of successive stages of the conflict from one perspective (e.g., in the Didache, that of the settled householders), or find the opposing voices of the two protagonists (as in the synoptic tradition, or the shift from 3 John to 2 John).

John Dominic Crossan, also, has come up with a broad sketch of the history of the Jesus movement in which itinerants, and the relationships devolving from them, form a central aspect. By his reading, the historical Jesus shows a primary interest in a radical egalitarianism marked by what Crossan calls "open commensality," which extinguishes concepts of ranking from the social process. In particular, the conjunction of this open commensality around eating with his healing activity serves as an

136. For an explicit association of itinerancy with the theme or category of asceticism, see Patterson’s as-yet unpublished paper on "Askesis and the Early Jesus Tradition," paper presented at the symposium on Asceticism in Early Christianity, Toronto: 5 October, 1996.

indication for Crossan that Jesus did in fact inaugurate, intentionally, a social movement. The first traces of this movement are to be found among itinerants, who Crossan sees reflected in the earliest layer of Q posited by John Kloppenborg. Crossan explicitly indicates that the continuity he sees running between the early itinerants reflected in Q1 and the historical Jesus is not necessarily one involving the verbatim transmission of speech materials. Rather,

...the continuity is not in mnemonics but in mimetics, not in remembrance but in imitation, not in word but in deed. They were living, dressing, and preaching as physically similar to Jesus as was possible. More simply: most of them were originally as poor and destitute as he was. . . . it is the continuity of lifestyle between Jesus and itinerants that gives the oral tradition its validity even if one were ready to accept every single aphorism or parable we now have as reconstructed summary or redacted expansion.

Crossan regards as especially revealing the Q1 cluster of instructions found in Q 6:20-23, 27-45, which, he notes, would have immediately preceded the "mission speech" (Q 9:57-62; 10:2-11, 16) in the earliest edition of Q. The radical injunctions of the first segment of this speech (6:20-23, 27-36) are oddly juxtaposed with a concluding set of warning injunctions (6:37-49). While this basic structure — a set of admonitions followed by a description of the consequences of following, or failing to follow, such advice — is rather typical of wisdom writings, the opposition usually articulated is between accepting or rejecting the wisdom, not between acceptance with or acceptance without doing.

139. See Kloppenborg, Formation, esp. 171-245, 317-322.
140. Crossan, "Itinerants and Householders," 117.
Crossan concludes that the first segment of the speech is simply a straightforward advocacy of the itinerants' way of life. The second, however, with its peculiar opposition between acceptance with practice and acceptance without practice — an opposition that would necessarily be secondary to any between simple acceptance and rejection — suggests a group of people who, on the one hand, were willing to accept the message of the itinerants and see themselves in alliance with them; but on the other hand, who were unable to live out such an ethic in its entirety. Reasonably enough, Crossan can thus conclude that "[w]e hear in that specific warning the reproach of itinerant to householder, the reproach of one who has given up everything against the one who has not given up enough." We thus have access, in the Q1 warnings of Q 6:37-49, to the itinerants' regard for the householders.

The Didache, by contrast, serves, according to Crossan, to provide us with the voice of the householders themselves. Crossan is less interested than Patterson in stratifying the Didache, instead arguing that its constituent material stems from different times, but was drawn together into a single constitutive moment. The Didache, especially the material in chapters 11-13 (discussing the hospitality to be accorded to itinerants), and 15:1-2 (discussing the appointment of local leaders), . . . is redolent with transitional social formation. It bespeaks the moment when itinerant authorities are being combined [with] but not yet confronted let alone replaced by resident ones (bishops and deacons). Finally, then, it is those itinerant authorities that I focus on here but as seen not from their own point of view, as in the Q Gospel, but from that of the householders.

Crossan sees the controls and restraints being put on hospitality to itinerants to be phrased and implemented in a very delicate way, reflecting the gradual process by

144. Crossan, "Itinerants and Householders," 115.
146. Crossan, "Itinerants and Householders," 117.
which the local authorities came to supplant itinerant leadership. One controls the itinerants by limiting their stays, by compelling them to work in the instance of permanent settlement, and by requiring their teaching to conform to the community's norms. The Didache reproduces lists of (radical) sayings which in some cases even conform in superfluous details to those found in Q: Crossan speculates that its author has access to summaries of the itinerant lifestyle akin to the sayings complexes found in Q. But this tradition is qualified in a number of ways, such as the addition of warnings against rapacious demands (see Did 1:5-7) and the stipulation that one need not attain perfection (Did 6:2).

Crossan's conclusions are worth quoting in extenso, because of the way they draw together these assertions into an overarching map of the earliest, originary moment of the Jesus movement:

During his life Jesus was the center of a network of companions, itinerants empowered to perform the kingdom's presence by the social and ethical . . . radicalism of their lives and by the reciprocity and mutuality of their interaction with householders to whom they brought healing and with whom they shared an open commensality. I emphasize strongly that Jesus held no monopoly on the kingdom and that those companions . . . were not sent to tell others about Jesus or to bring others back to Jesus. But there is, as far back as I can see, a paradoxical tension built into the kingdom program in that necessary interaction of itinerants who move on and householders who stay put. Is the kingdom with the itinerants or is it in that dialectic between itinerants and householders? If the itinerants believe the former option, is that why they start to quote Jesus rather than perform the kingdom, they start to beat the householders over the head with Jesus, that is, they begin to change the kingdom movement into the Jesus movement?  

---

149. Crossan, "Itinerants and Householders," 119-120.
150. See Crossan, "Itinerants and Householders," 118. His case in point is Didache 1:3b-4, which parallels Q 6:27-29 in consisting of a set of in (similar) injunctions, the first set phrased in the second person plural, and the second in the second person singular. See his "Itinerants and Householders," 122.
151. Crossan, "Itinerants and Householders," 122-123.
152. Crossan, "Itinerants and Householders," 124, emphasis original.
A related point that deserves to be raised in its own right is the way in which the activity of women has been worked into the hypothesis. Patterson has suggested that there are some indications in the Gospel of Thomas that women may be full members of the Thomas-group. Citing Thomas #114, paradoxically but convincingly, as evidence that there are women within the group, Patterson hints that "becoming male" as it is here exhorted may be an allusion to the dangers faced by itinerant "Thomas virgins" (cf. #79), who are forced to adopt male guises as protection.\footnote{153} Crossan likewise posits female itinerants, but suggests a different subterfuge: "The only way the earliest kingdom movement could have had women as itinerant prophets in that cultural situation was they travelled with a male as his ‘wife’."\footnote{154} Crossan finds evidence for this in a variety of places: the Didache’s reference to the enactment of a "worldly mystery of the church" (Did 11:11), Paul’s reference to a "sister wife" in 1 Cor 9:5, the companions implied by various synoptic texts (Mark 6:7; Luke 10:1: 24:13, 18), and the apparent Pseudo-Clementine references to female itinerants in the epistles to virgins.\footnote{155}

Luise Schottroff, however, is to be credited for drawing out the fullest description of the itinerant mission’s implications for women. In a paper discussing the role of women in the itinerant mission of the Q people, she notes that the basic message of these Q itinerants was one that created conflict within and problems for the patriarchal household, breaking up families as a result of homeless wandering and intra-familial

\footnote{153. Patterson, Thomas and Jesus. 154-155, citing Especially Elizabeth Castelli, “Virginity and its Meaning for Women’s Sexuality in Early Christianity,” Journal of Feminist Studies in Religion 2 (1986): 61-88; and the figure of Xanthippe in Xenophon’s Ephesica.}

\footnote{154. Crossan, “Itinerants and Householders,” 120.}

\footnote{155. This latter reference does not occur in the published form of Crossan’s paper, but was part of the original speech. Otherwise, see Crossan, “Itinerants and Householders,” 120-121.}
conflict (cf. Q 9:58; 12:51-53; 14:26). These indications of an anti-patriarchal stance behind Q make her question the applicability of Theissen’s model of a symbiosis between radical itinerants and patriarchal households, in which, she believes, the itinerants come to be regarded as "moral freaks," and the household model as normative. A Q which leads to the breakdown of families and which effectively proclaims the end of the patriarchal order — albeit from an androcentric perspective — is not very likely, says Schottroff, to exist in any easy harmony with patriarchally-structured sedentary household-based groups. In addition, Schottroff believes, the signs of intra-family conflict among women (Q 12:53) and the prohibition against divorce (Q 16:18) should be taken as an indication that women were also to be numbered among the itinerants. Backing away from this assertion ever so slightly, she concludes:

Even though the sayings source’s androcentric language conceals the presence of women among the messengers of Jesus (especially in the mission speech Q 10:2-12), they are nevertheless to be counted among those who considered their labor to be for the kingdom of God, and not for the patriarchal household: these were women laborers for God’s harvest (Q 10:2). Whether sedentary or itinerant, they lived as messengers of God in a new community. Traces of this community are present in the portrayal of solidarity among the male and female disciples, who together lived as sheep among wolves (Q 10:3).

The observation that Q is critical or corrosive of family structures is not unique to Schottroff, nor is the assumption that the alternative to these patriarchal structures tends to be itinerancy. Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, for instance, in her ground-breaking feminist analysis of Christian Origins, argues that Theissen’s description of the

159. Schottroff, "Itinerant Prophetesses," 355 (cf. 360).
160. For a survey of these views and a critique of and alternative to the suggestion that Q is self-consciously critical of the subordination of women, see William Arnal, "Gendered Doublets in Q: From Rhetoric to Social History," Journal of Biblical Literature 117/1 (1997): 71-90, esp. 78-83.
itinerants reveals an androcentric bias — in this instance, a tacit assumption that the itinerants are men and that any women in view for the early traditions are to be located amongst the not-very-radical sedentary householders.¹⁶¹ Instead, says Fiorenza, the Galilean "house churches" responsible for the earliest transmission of the sayings of Jesus espoused a radical break from the patriarchal household at every level, not a restricted religious virtuosity among a select group that allowed most Jesus-people to continue living as though nothing had changed.¹⁶² Arland Jacobson is, like Fiorenza, critical of Theissen’s approach to itinerancy, but still views Q as destructive of ordinary family relationships. He imagines a very limited itinerancy (noting that Q 10:4 seems to prohibit provisions for travel), with the majority of the Q people, by contrast, persisting in small common "households" based on fictive family identity.¹⁶³ These households, much more than any itinerant wandering, are responsible for the plethora of indications in Q of family-related conflict and rejection of home (Q 9:58; 12:22-31; 12:51-52; 16:13).¹⁶⁴ Q does, probably, reflect a limited practice of itinerancy. but its rhetoric of deracination is more a reflection of the separation from family generated by the Q people’s programme of creating fictive-kinship household units, in competition with the household units from which its members originally came.

¹⁶⁴. Jacobson, "Divided Families," 364, 369. Jacobson views Q 16:13, the statement that it is impossible to serve both God and "mammon," as anti-familial because the locus of economic activity in Q's environment would have been the subsistence household. He regards viewing this text as a warning against amassing wealth to be anachronistic.
The application of these various theories of itinerancy to Q has been straightforward and widespread. Very few scholars have explicitly denied the applicability of the itinerancy thesis to Q.165 Very few, in fact, have managed to resist using the itinerancy hypothesis as a basis for articulating some kind of social description of the Q people.166 A few examples of the latter are in order, if only to demonstrate a tendency to assume itinerancy as a starting point in the social description of the Q people, and then to move on to fill in the details of their behaviour. It is notable that normally this social description is inhibited by the itinerancy hypothesis, not facilitated by it: the "social description of the Q people" tends in fact to be simply an historical elaboration of the specific behaviour of itinerants as reflected in Q. An actual social description of the shared circumstances which generated, fostered, or even allowed such peculiar behaviour is thus avoided. In this respect, at any rate, Theissen's work remains superior to and more useful than that of most of his protégés.

Anthony J. Blasi is a good example both of the ordinary application of the itinerancy thesis to social description of the Q people, and of the limitations of this application. Blasi actually begins his study by acknowledging and justifying these limitations:

The analysis which will be presented below will be a micro sociology. No attempt will be made to postulate the gross stratification and power relationships, the cultural commonalities and the deviance patterns of the eastern end of the Roman Empire, in the absence of a sufficient database. Indeed, it would be a dubious procedure even to use such concepts as "class" and "social movement" in a study of the ancient world; "class" presupposes a dominant economic market system (such as that of capitalism and state capi-

---

165. Richard Horsley and Burton Mack are the most notable exceptions. See discussion below.
166. Again, there are exceptions, most productively, perhaps, John Kloppenborg and Ronald Piper, in addition to Mack and Horsley.
tialism), and "social movement" presupposes a mass media market of quite some intensity.167

Like Theissen, Blasi argues that Q references to social roles (Theissen's "constructive evidence") provide useful social information, but departs from Theissen's approach by marginalizing "analytic" evidence, arguing that "non-theological inessentials" were more likely to be modified in sociologically telling ways than the theological core of the material.168 The "laborer" itinerants described in the Q mission speech are, for Blasi, full-time articulators of a subcultural ethos, who operate within a larger pool of the population which is likewise somewhat resistant to the dominant culture, albeit in a less egregious way. It is this intended audience — disgruntled, but still sedentary and caught up in ordinary social intercourse — which the Q prophets address their words for "babes." The social composition of this audience was mixed: it included the destitute, but also embraced secure householders, as the material's optimism (e.g., the "God will provide" sense of Q 11:9-13) and its more specific addresses to those who have financial resources (e.g., 6:30, 34) indicate.169 Conflict was generated between these itinerants and the households on which they were dependent for support, not only because of differing values, but also as a result of recruiting new itinerants from within these sedentary households, a practice which would have created serious economic dif-

167. Anthony J. Blasi, "Role Structures in the Early Hellenistic Church," Sociological Analysis 47/3 (Fall, 1986): 226-248, 228. I cannot help but note at this point that a) Blasi's characterization of "class" is ignorant, and b) he has published a substantially identical version of this paper in a book entitled Early Christianity as a Social Movement (Toronto Studies in Religion #5; New York: Peter Lang, 1988), evidently coming to think that positing a "mass media market of quite some intensity" is a less anachronistic postulate for antiquity than social differentiation based on the production of surplus and the division of labour (i.e., class). "Class" was indeed a hugely important and acknowledged feature of Roman social life: we are speaking here about a culture which put financial requirements on its aristocracy, which divided its population into five distinct "classes" on the basis of economic function, which was perfectly sanguine about the value of governmental and military offices providing those who held them with opportunities for looting (literally or metaphorically), and which provided us with the modern word, "proletariat". Blasi's assertion — although typical of sociologists of antiquity — is appallingly obtuse.


ficulties for its "victims." As a result, it is no mystery that, when settled Christian groups became large and financially independent enough to support a local resident clergy, they availed themselves of the opportunity.

Another, rather more sophisticated, example is the work of Werner Kelber on orality and textuality. In his introductory chapter, which explores the models biblical scholarship has used in its analysis of oral traditions, Kelber approvingly cites Theissen's work as an example of the principle of social identification — i.e., that oral tradition will persist when and to the extent that there is fit or match between its content and the circumstances of the people who pass it on. According to such an insight, Theissen is able to deduce from anti-social sayings an anti-social lifestyle, i.e., one in which wandering charismatic prophets pass on the words of Jesus while emulating the lifestyle those very words endorse. It is thus on the basis of its making sense of the oral tradition that Kelber endorses Theissen's work: "Theissen's study is impressive because it combines characteristic sayings of the synoptic tradition, a model of oral transmission, and a plausible social milieu into a grand thesis which accounts for oral transmission according to the rule of social identification." Kelber qualifies his praise for Theissen's accomplishment, however, by noting that the relationship between forms of speech and settings in life is certainly not isomorphic. More settled

individuals could — and do! — assent to such sayings in principle, without actually living out their implications literally. A saying, or type of saying, can function in more than one social setting.176

In the book's concluding chapter, Kelber asserts that Q is an example of an "oral hermeneutic."177 As a sayings collection, Q in fact stands generically at a tremendous remove from the narrative gospels, as much so as the gospels stand from the NT epistles. The sayings collection was not the first step on the road to narrative gospels as we find them in the canon, but represented a tendency all its own, a tendency, as Robinson has correctly identified, toward a contemporizing view of Jesus' words as a living authority in the present.178 While the gnostic revelation discourses may continue the generic trajectory of the sayings gospel, narratives of Jesus' earthly life, by contrast, serve to locate the sayings firmly in the unalterable past.179 The content of Q conforms with its "prophetic" oral hermeneutic, casting those who communicate Q's message as speaking for Jesus himself.

The hermeneutical principle of prophetic speech is unequivocally stated in Matt. 10:40/Luke 10:16: "He who hears you hears me, and he who rejects you me, and he who rejects me rejects him who sent me." This formula of legitimation authorizes the prophetic representatives of Q to speak in accordance with the hermeneutical purpose of the genre. Endowed with prophetic authority, they speak the sayings not as mere human words, but as words of Jesus, and not the Jesus of the past, but in his present authority.180

It is obvious that this conclusion is supported by Theissen's hypothesis. Charismatic prophets stand behind — and take the weight of — Kelber's use of Q as example to illustrate his hypotheses about the contrast between orality and textuality. At the same

time, the apparent success of Kelber's approach to orality has doubtless contributed to
the popularity of the itinerancy/prophesy hypothesis, especially as it pertains to Q.

Others — including most specialists on Q itself — continue to maintain similar
sketches of Q's social circumstances. Jacobson, while backing away from a literal
Theissenian interpretation of the mission speech, nevertheless argues its fundamental
importance for any efforts to reconstruct the "self-understanding and actual behaviour"
of the people responsible for Q.181 Hoffmann continues to accept the validity of his
general characterization from decades earlier.182 While arguing against Theissen's
colorization of the Q prophets' destitution as voluntary, Luise Schottroff accepts
Theissen's basic description of Q's background. So also, with attendant variations:

Wendy Cotter,183 Helmut Koester,184 Migaku Sato,185 Risto Uro,186 Dieter Zel-

181. Arland Dean Jacobson, The First Gospel: An Introduction to Q (Sonoma, California: Polebridge
Press, 1992), 144.
182. See, e.g., his "Redaction of Q and the Son of Man," 190, 196.
183. Wendy J. Cotter, "The Parables of the Mustard Seed and the Leaven: Their Function in the Earliest
Stratum of Q," John S. Kloppenborg and Leif E. Vaage (eds.), Scriptures and Cultural Conversations:
Cotter argues that the motif of hiding as it appears in the Q parables of the mustard seed and leaven cor-
responds to hints within the mission charge that one's missionary activity is best conducted in an
unuobtrusive and secretive a fashion as possible. Here is perhaps the most blatant and striking effort to
cast the Q missionaries as deliberate agents provocateurs, as skulking social saboteurs. The image has a
surprising attractiveness, in spite of its apparent anachronism.

185. Whose views are similar to those of Zeller and Blasi: the Q group represents a sedentary body from
whom the itinerants draw recruits. Hence the Q material does bear witness to the erstwhile presence of
such itinerants, but not as constitutive of the Q group itself. See, inter alios, Migaku Sato, Q und
Prophezie: Studien zurGattungs- und Traditionsgeschichte der Quelle Q (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr/Paul
Siebeck, 1988), esp. 8-9 (this text, pp. 16-47, 62-65, is excerpted as "The Shape of the Q Source,"
pp.156-179 in John S. Kloppenborg [ed.], The Shape of Q [Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1994]); "Wis-
dom Statements in the Sphere of Prophecy," pp.139-158 in Ronald A. Piper (ed.), The Gospel Behind
the Gospels: Current Studies on Q (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1995), esp.156. The main burden of Sato's argu-
ment is show the continuity — in terms of genre and self-understanding — between Q's tradents and the
OT prophets. He believes that while Theissen's description of the itinerants is essentially correct, it
obscures the diachronic elements which link these figures to the tradition of Israelite prophecy. In con-
sequence, his study is explicitly held up as a supplement to Theissen's work (see esp. Q und Prophetie,
9).

186. Risto Uro, Sheep Among Wolves: A Study of the Mission Instructions of Q (Helsinki: Suomalainen
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Among these scholars — variations notwithstanding — there seems to be a developing consensus that Q, while offering additional confirmation to Theissen’s hypothesis in the form of a radical substratum of which itinerants were probably the original tradents, is itself the product of a more settled group, rather than such itinerants themselves. This conclusion is, of course, perfectly consistent with Theissen’s general thesis, but there is something of a tendency to reject a literal interpretation of Q’s ethics, while maintaining, like Theissen, a relatively literal reading of the mission instructions.

One of the advantages of the "global" approaches surveyed above is that they allow the voices of the itinerants themselves to be found in various early Christian documents, rather than hearing their voices behind writings which were written by local supporters, often with the intention of limiting the itinerants’ significance, as Theissen, and these more specialized studies of Q, would have it. On the other hand, a difficulty with adducing documents representative of the itinerants’ perspective is that it raises the question why on earth itinerant radicals are running around composing documents. An advantage of Theissen’s original hypothesis and its hypostasis in most Q scholarship is that the forms or media we encounter in the transmission of the synoptic (and especially sayings) tradition show a perfect and predictable fit with their tradents at the various

---

187. Dieter Zeller, "Redactional Processes and Changing Settings in the Q Material," pp.116-130 in John S. Kloppenborg (ed.), The Shape of Q: Signal Essays on the Sayings Gospel (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1994), 128-129. Zeller is responsible for the observation that Q 10:2’s exhortation for more mission workers is directed not to missionaries themselves, but to a sedentary group which "commissioned" such workers (Zeller, "Redactional Processes," 125; cf. also Q 10:21-24; 11:2-13). Thus the mission speech, while evincing itinerancy at some stage prior to the composition of Q, is in its final form a product of a settled group which viewed such activity somewhat retrospectively.

stages through which the tradition has passed. That is, the itinerants are associated with the oral traditions, while the incorporation of these traditions into larger — and mitigating — written works is undertaken as part of the domestication of the tradition by supportive, but less radical, householders. Texts such as the *Gospel of Thomas* (and *Q* to a much lesser degree) show sufficient primitivity of form and lack of organization that one might at least deny that such texts represent conscious efforts to domesticate the tradition. But this qualification still leaves unanswered the conundrum of why and how such texts might have been composed by itinerants in the first place. Are itinerants literate? If so, what does this tell us about the background of their original social location? Do itinerants, who claim to have given up all wealth and social connections, carry around just enough money in their non-existent purses (see *Q* 10:4) to buy paper and hire a scribe? The proliferation of written sources from the perspective of the itinerants suggests that the "global" itinerancy theory, at least in its more recent and comprehensive avatars, is not as well thought-through as it might be. In addition, it is worth speculating that this peculiar tendency might actually be an indication that the itinerancy thesis is in fact wrong: that documents like the *Gospel of Thomas*, which as written works it is hard to attribute to itinerants, express almost perfectly the purported perspective of these itinerants, may in fact suggest that the radical ethics of the synoptic tradition (and elsewhere) require a different explanation. Hence the broader work of scholars such as Patterson (re. *Thomas*) and Crossan (re. *Q1*) may stand as oblique testimony to failures even within the more usual and more conservative application of theories of itinerancy to *Q*.

SIGNIFICANT CRITICISMS, TANGENTS, AND ALTERATIONS

The broad acceptance of Theissen's work as a standard or starting-point in the study of the social history of Q and of the synoptic tradition as a whole should not be taken to imply that his views have entirely escaped the scrutiny of scholarly critique. Even in the more positive treatments listed above, certain nuances of Theissen's work have fared poorly, certain deficiencies have been rectified. And, predictably, a number of important outright rejections and global critiques of Theissen's ideas have appeared. Three tangents are notable in this respect. First, several scholars have addressed deficiencies in Theissen's actual reading of the texts in question, with respect to a variety of different issues. Second, Theissen's sociological framework has been questioned from a theoretical perspective. And finally, a number of scholars have pursued in considerable detail and with considerable vigor the analogy Theissen has suggested between the roving preachers of the Jesus traditions and Hellenistic Cynic philosophers.

The desultory critiques of the substance of Theissen's readings of the texts in question all allege, to various degrees, that something is amiss in the particularities of what he deduces from the relevant synoptic texts. The earliest critique of this sort focuses on the issue of the willfulness with which the itinerants embraced their radical lifestyle. Theissen locates a number of "factors" which might have called forth the itinerant response, or encouraged it, but regards this behaviour as essentially voluntary; as a chosen response, and as one limited to a minority stratum within the broader society. Thus one major critique of his view lies in the claim that vagabond radicalism was in fact not voluntary, but was thrust on the wandering prophets. Luise Schottroff, for instance, largely adopts Theissen's reconstruction, and pursues it in productive and novel directions, as has already been noted. But both she and Wolfgang Stegemann
fault Theissen at some length with seriously misrepresenting the earliest itinerant Jesus movement insofar as he made its radical behaviour the product of an ethical or ideal choice to embrace poverty and homelessness.\footnote{Schottroff, "Sheep Among Wolves," 40-42. See also her cutting remarks, 40-42, both about these philosophers of renunciation themselves (who are characterized as privileged armchair ascetics) and about those scholars who propose them as a model for understanding early Christian itinerancy (who are characterized as interpreting the Q material from their own position of affluence).} In fact, says Schottroff, the sayings tradition and Q in particular reflects the very real anxieties and deprivations of the genuinely and literally impoverished, in sharpest contrast to the rather self-indulgent and romanticized detachment of the philosophically-inclined leisure class. Such texts as Q 7:24-26 reflect this Sitz of poverty and concomitant contempt for the affluent.\footnote{Schottroff, "Sheep Among Wolves," 124 n.58, citing a considerable secondary literature.} Sayings such as the first beatitude (Q 6:20b) understand poverty as an actual, given, condition, and not as a voluntarily-chosen lifestyle or an ethical outlook.\footnote{Schottroff, "Sheep Among Wolves," 39-43.} Likewise, Q’s exhortations to avoid anxiety (Q 12:22-31; cf. 11:9-13; 12:4-7) are to be taken as seriously and concretely as other hortatory synoptic texts: rather than being reinterpreted in line with philosophical exhortations to stoic indifference, they are to be understood as genuine expressions of the economic anxieties — which include anxieties about the very persistence of life itself — of the ordinary people.\footnote{Schottroff, "Sheep Among Wolves," 44-45; cf. 38. See 29-31 for her argument about this conception’s lack of literary, intellectual, or religious antecedents.} Ultimately Q’s response to these anxieties is not a practical one, but rather, trusting an absolutely unique vision of economically-grounded eschatological reversal, involves renouncing the anxiety itself and placing one’s trust in God’s care.\footnote{Schottroff, "Sheep Among Wolves," 40-42. See also her cutting remarks, 40-42, both about these philosophers of renunciation themselves (who are characterized as privileged armchair ascetics) and about those scholars who propose them as a model for understanding early Christian itinerancy (who are characterized as interpreting the Q material from their own position of affluence).} 


191. Schottroff, “Sheep Among Wolves,” 40-42. See also her cutting remarks, 40-42, both about these philosophers of renunciation themselves (who are characterized as privileged armchair ascetics) and about those scholars who propose them as a model for understanding early Christian itinerancy (who are characterized as interpreting the Q material from their own position of affluence).
operates within this framework of the renunciation of anxiety in the face of involuntary deprivations. The only additional provision is the exhortation to renounce anxiety about homelessness as well, a special predicament of the itinerants. The itinerant lifestyle, therefore, is by no means a spectacular voluntary adoption of a renunciatory lifestyle, but is rather an extreme application of the remedy Q proposes for involuntary poverty: trust in the beneficence and providence of God. She thus deconstructs Theissen’s distinction between the social Sitz of the itinerants and that of their "sedentary supporters":

Matthew 6:25-33, Q [Q 12:22-31] is not describing the special existence of the wandering messengers of Jesus as contrasted with that of sedentary Christians; nor was anxiety about the minimum for survival a special problem of Christians. The renunciation of preparedness [in the "Mission Charge," Q 10:2-12] is an implementation of Mt. 6:25-33, Q: it was no less possible for (still) sedentary Christians to obey the exhortation in that passage and to set aside their anxiety.

Schottroff’s overall presentation is marred by several weaknesses. She is clearly motivated by a theological concern with the material, for instance, and thinks in terms of its present relevance. This orientation has serious consequences for the substance of her exegesis: at times her analysis is simply over-theologized, apologetic, confessional — it seeks to explain why the Q vision is valid, important, profound. An additional problem lies in the incompatibility of her critique with a continued acceptance of the outline of Theissen’s thesis. How, if the characterization of the lifestyle of the Q people is to be understood as involuntary, we are ever to deduce actual itinerancy

199. See for instance her assertions that Q is basically a utopian vision based on "what human beings really are," that is, what they are "in the presence of God"; Schottroff, "Sheep Among Wolves," 51: cf. 52-57.
200. See esp. Schottroff, "Sheep Among Wolves," 31-32, 57, etc.
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from the text? Presumably, the "radical ethics" which form a considerable rationale for Theissen's deduction of the itinerants' existence would now attest only to the attitude of all Jesus-people to a poverty already held in common. If no social distinctions are to be drawn between the itinerants and their sedentary supporters, almost all of the evidence that the itinerants were there in the first place simply evaporates. True, Schottroff makes the specific injunctions of the Mission Charge the exclusive province of itinerants, but if the kind of renunciation envisioned here is common to all early Jesus people, why should we take homelessness as a pre-eminent index of their social behaviour. Or, to put the matter differently, why assume that the itinerancy supposedly attested in Q 10:2-12 is any more voluntary than any of the other renunciations mentioned in Q? But despite these problems, Schottroff's analysis of Q's deracinating rhetoric has identified a significant problem with Theissen's reconstruction. This problem is, of course, the ethical or "principled" understanding of poverty and deprivation. The first three Q beatitudes, as Schottroff rightly notes, are indeed focused on economic poverty and genuine deprivation: this cluster of sayings is not exhortation to adopt the characteristics of those who are blessed (in which direction Matthew redacts the material), but is rather a pronouncement about the status of those who already may be described in this way.201 The tendency to make the poverty of the synoptic sayings tradition a voluntary and principled act does indeed, as Schottroff argues, reflect the affluence of the exegetes who find it in the text. It is a danger of our modern position of privilege, as well as our reification of matters "moral" and "religious," to identify

201. And this is so regardless of the reason for their deprivation. Even if the fourth and final Q beatitude, the "persecution beatitude" shifts the focus of the cluster specifically to Jesus people who are persecuted for that very reason (and hence, presumably, also poor, hungry, weeping), the cluster still assumes that these people are already in this state, and not by their own choice. This is clearest perhaps because of the juxtaposition of weeping with poverty, hunger, and persecution. No reconstruction of itinerancy suggests that the charismatics were voluntarily sad on top of everything else!
any deprivation we encounter behind our "canonical" texts as having a significance with which we can identify — say, a principled asceticism, of the very sort that was so attractive for the contemplation of wealthy ancients — rather than to see in them situations for which we have little point of reference, i.e., concrete poverty. Or, as Stegemann puts it, Theissen's hypothesis

. . . becomes a promise of mercy when we come to be judged. And perhaps it is our very prosperity that makes it impossible for us to conceive of the poverty of the first followers of Jesus as other than a form of social renunciation. It is not that we are unwilling but rather are unable to imagine the followers of Jesus, and Jesus himself, as belonging to the poorest of the poor, to the lowly of Palestine. On the other hand, the simple, carefree life that even we sometimes dream of manifests to a dangerous degree the traits peculiar to the daydreams of the rich.

This is not to say that Schottroff is correct in understanding as involuntary the deprivation supposed to reside behind the synoptic tradition. She has, however, in making this claim, identified a major (liberal and affluent) assumption, unsupported by the evidence, behind Theissen's work, and in the process has thereby disclosed one of the hypothesis' chief, but misleading, attractions.

In addition, Stegemann has criticized both Theissen and by implication many of those who follow his work with failing sufficiently to differentiate discrete sources and their various histories and settings, from the use of sayings in particular literary contexts; i.e., he accuses Theissen, correctly enough, of failing to practice ordinary critical awareness of the complexity and tendentiousness of the texts. In spite of the impres-

202. Such asceticism on the part of the wealthy, it should be noted, probably serves to universalize their own experience (which thus includes both economic extremes) while marginalizing the experiences or perspectives of those who have no such choice; it serves as a way for the wealthy and powerful to lay claim to, and hence defuse the rhetorical potential of, an entire sector of human experience to which they might otherwise be closed. In addition, by adopting the supposed garb, experience, and attitude of the poor, the ascetic reinterprets cultural conceptions of poverty, and serves to naturalize it as a phenomenon.

203. Stegemann, "Vagabond Radicalism," 166.

204. Stegemann, "Vagabond Radicalism," passim, esp. 151-161. See also Kloppenborg and Vaage, "Early Christianity, Q and Jesus," 9; Kloppenborg, "Recent Opinion," 16.
tion of solidity behind Theissen's reconstruction of itinerants — a solidity especially fostered by Theissen's invocation of various other, comparable types of social uprooting in this period — there are very few texts on which to hang such a rich description: we actually have but meager information about what "following Jesus" entailed. Moreover, this information, when it appears for instance in Mark 1:18-20; 10:28-30, seems to have been mediated through secondary stages of the history of the Christian movement. Theissen wishes to reconstruct the behaviour of the Jesus movement in Palestine prior to 70 CE, and thus seeks to isolate the "earliest traditions" from synoptic redaction, but in fact fails to do so. For instance, Mark 10:28-30's apparent reference to itinerancy derives not from Jesus' saying itself but from its redactional context, i.e., Peter's assertion in v.28 that they have given up everything and followed Jesus. The saying itself, when denuded of this secondary and redactional interpretation, does not refer to itinerancy but to the social rewards — oikias kai adelphous kai meteiras kai tekna, etc. — that devolve upon those who have had to cut other social ties as a result of associating themselves with a Christian community. Similarly, in failing to examine the literary and redactional interests of a discrete "Q," from which many of the itinerancy "proof-texts" derive, and instead identifying Q sayings with an unmediated access to the Sitz of Jesus' earliest followers, Theissen avoids the question whether Q has altered or reinterpreted earlier material, perhaps material reflecting a very different situation. This methodological failure creates problems:

206. Stegemann, "Vagabond Radicalism," 156-157. All other materials evincing itinerancy, he argues, are either from Q, which Stegemann thinks is a special case, or from Matthean or Lukian redaction of Mark, a problem with Theissen ignores because of his indiscriminate use of sources.
The Q texts that Theissen uses are the ones most likely still to reflect the social situation that he has analyzed as being the historical and sociological context for the Jesus movement. But the representatives of this Jesus tradition in Q are not identical with the earliest Jesus movement, nor does a "Cynical" interpretation square with their way of life. For, although the texts . . . reflect (also) the homeless existence of wandering prophets in Syria and Palestine before A.D. 70, they do not advocate a pattern or ethos of homelessness. These individuals do indeed live the desperately poor life of the starving, but not as a result of an ethical principle that calls for a lack of possessions.209

Stegemann further notes that the one certain example we have of an early Christian traveling preacher, i.e. Paul, shows no interest whatsoever in the "radical ethics" of the synoptic tradition.210 Theissen’s proof texts do not reflect a Sitz of wandering itinerants, but are in fact literary fictions on the part of the synoptic evangelists, especially Luke, and are the products, ironically enough, of a settled community Sitz, one in which the wealthy members of an established group (that of Luke) are to be shamed into more generous behaviour.211 There were travelling missionaries and preachers, says Stegemann, but these figures neither served as decisive community authorities, nor did they consciously emulate and promote a lifestyle established by Jesus and his immediate disciples.212

More focused studies of itinerancy lying behind Q largely avoid this uncritical appropriation of texts noted by Stegemann, but in turn raise new problems. For instance, students of Q have noted that many of the categories Theissen seems to take for granted depend on older form-critical descriptions of early Christian Sitze — "mission," "church," a sharp distinction between "Palestinian" and "Hellenistic" environments, and the like — that must be abandoned as anachronistic, or at the very least

211. Stegemann, "Vagabond Radicalism," 155, 164-165.
largely inapplicable to Q’s specific Sitz. 213 John Kloppenborg has noted as well that
the geography and demography of Galilee, the most probable locale of the tradents of
Q, 214 does not lend itself to long journeys or extended campaigns. 215 Kloppenborg
also suggests that the language of the "Mission Charge" (Q 10:2-12) is not suggestive
of local leaders: the socially-demeaning image of laborers (Q 10:7: ἀξιως γὰρ ὁ
ἐργάτης τῆς τροφῆς/τοῦ μισθοῦ αὐτοῦ), the exhortations not to deprive such people of
their subsistence, and the absence of any titles of leadership surely indicate that these
individuals were at best marginal to the groups they visited. 216 Thus if the Mission
Charge is evidence for itinerant radicals, it is equally evidence that such radicals were
not founders or leaders of the settled sympathizers they addressed. Burton Mack.
likewise, addresses pointed questions to Theissen’s characterization of the itinerants,
especially the use of a "prophetic" paradigm to understand them. 217 Much like Klop-
penborg, Mack appears to accept the notion that there were wandering preachers, but

---

214. On this matter see especially Jonathan Reed, "The Sign of Jonah (Q 11:29-32) and Other Epic
Mack. Elisabeth A. Castelli and Hal Taussig, eds. (Valley Forge, Pennsylvania: Trinity Press Interna-
tional, 1996); "The Social Map of Q," pp.17-36 in John S. Kloppenborg, ed., Conflict and Invention:
Literary, Rhetorical, and Social Studies on the Sayings Gospel Q (Valley Forge, Pennsylvania: Trinity
215. The problem is that Galilee is much smaller than such activity might suggest (15 by 25 miles), and
in addition is very densely populated. "Missionary journeys" would therefore have been less than an hour
from village to village, and at most a day between major centers! See Kloppenborg, "Literary Conven-
tion. Self-Evidence and the Social History of the Q People," pp.77-102 in John S. Kloppenborg with
Leif E. Vaage, eds. Early Christianity, Q and Jesus = Semena 55 (1991). 89. This point seems to have
been conceded by Patterson, "Askesis and the Early Jesus Tradition," 13-14, but he regards this observa-
tion as a detail fleshing out Theissen’s views, not as a refutation of them. What Patterson does not
address however is how radically Theissen’s views would need to be modified by such a suggestion: the
possibility of only very short journeys imply that these figures at least have a home base and that mis-
missionary travels are not their characteristic, or at least most time-consuming, activity.
217. See Burton L. Mack, The Lost Gospel: The Book of Q and Christian Origins (San Francisco: Har-
perSanFrancisco, 1993), 42-43; A Myth of Innocence, 84-87 and n.7. Cf. also his "The Kingdom that
imagines these figures to have been few and far between, and to have devoted more of their time and effort simply to survival than to actual preaching. Eventually, "mission work" seems to have been entirely eschewed. The weakness of the indications of itinerancy in Q, alongside all of these necessary qualifications, has caused some to question whether any practice of itinerancy lies behind Q at all.219

HORSLEY AND STRUCTURAL-FUNCTIONALISM

In addition to these textually-based critiques of Theissen's hypothesis, his work has also been questioned on theoretical grounds, particularly by Richard Horsley. Horsley has written an entire book apparently devoted to the overthrow of Theissen's version of the itinerancy hypothesis. In addition to offering his own, very different, analysis of the circumstances behind Q, Horsley subjects Theissen's work to a caustic assessment on the basis of its failings from a sociological perspective, regardless of its sufficiency to the actual evidence of Q itself. His comments chiefly center around the adoption of a "structural functionalist" perspective, which Horsley believes stands, in Theissen's work, as an unreflective sociological abstraction which merely replaces — rather than improving on — older theological abstractions, and which similarly generates its own results regardless of the actual evidence.221

As a sociological orientation, structural functionalism views society as a more or less unified and coherent single entity; as a social organism. It thus focuses on the utility or "function," that is, the objectively positive (i.e., socially self-perpetuating) social results of the relationships between the whole ("society") and its parts (particular

institutions, types of behaviour, and so forth). Following in the sociological tradition of Comte and then Durkheim, and in punctilious antithesis to Marx, structural functionalism focuses on the *unity* and self-persistence of the given social entity, in which the key social players are *morality*, which fosters social cohesiveness, and *anomie*, which stands for the social entropy which particular social "functions" *find* their function in addressing and diffusing. The effect of such an orientation is both conservative and abstract. *Abstract*, because the approach focuses on the teleological, systematic, and schematic apprehension of an ill-defined social totality (i.e., "society") rather than the subjective aims of the people behind various institutions; rather than on particular historical societies and the data about those societies; rather than economic problems, exploitation, technological changes, and irreducible conflicts within a given "society." *Conservative*, because the approach assumes that equilibrium, rather than change and conflict, is the relevant sociological datum; because it inquires into the "needs" of societies as they are given rather than into the needs of the people who make up those societies. Both of these methodological weaknesses are explicable as results of the circumstances under which structural functionalism was developed by Talcott Parsons:

Parsons began constructing the theoretical system of structural functional sociology during the 1930s, when the modern capitalist economic system had apparently broken down. But, far from calling any aspects of this system into serious question, he looked to religious convictions, moral values, and social norms as the necessary sources for social order.

It is this reactive and intrinsically conservative and idealistic sociological framework that Theissen has uncritically — and seemingly unconsciously — adopted. Horsley

notes that this out-of-date perspective works well for North American biblical scholars because it is the approach they were taught in university, and even more to the point, it has an "elective affinity" with the liberal, middle class position and orientation of most of these scholars (a point similar to that raised by Schottroff).227 Thus Theissen's structural functionalist analysis assumes that "religion" has a sociologically-discernible "function" insofar as it fosters balance, equilibrium, integration.228 Yet this approach, in addition to all of its intrinsic weaknesses, is also anachronistic: it fails, for instance, to provide a social definition of what, exactly, "religion" might be; it treats attitudes toward wealth exclusively at an individual level; it separates institutions and behaviors that were not regarded as discrete in antiquity; it psychologizes social phenomena.229 The theoretical framework does, in a nutshell, precisely what such an ahistorical approach is most likely to do: it modernizes antique data, and uses such data as mere illustration for its already-determined overarching theoretical premises.230 Theissen has thus offered a sociological approach to early Christianity, but one which is, sociologically speaking, naive, outdated, unhistorical, and biased. It needs to be replaced by a theory which emphasizes concrete conflict between different social interests.

This rather devastating critique of the sociological basis for Theissen's work, even if accepted in its entirety,231 does not necessarily demonstrate that the basic historical description of wandering charismatics behind the earliest Jesus movement must

228. So Horsley, Sociology, 28.
230. Horsley, Sociology, 10, says that "Theissen has not so much uncovered patterns of social structure, behaviour, and tensions implicit in the sources as super-imposed an abstract system of analysis and modern social patterns and concepts onto ancient Jewish Palestine, using Gospel and other texts as illustrations."
231. On which, see further below.
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be incorrect, but would simply indicate that the sociological framework in which this description is elaborated is bankrupt. In order, therefore, the more completely to undercut Theissen’s vision of peripatetic prophets, Horsley both demolishes the evidence Theissen adduces for itinerancy, and simultaneously erects his own hypothesis about the social situation particularly behind Q, in which hypothesis itinerants do not figure at all. Horsley asserts that the gospel traditions — in line with a long Jewish history of radical theocratic criticism of the social status quo — deliberately challenge the ruling classes, and deliberately criticize and threaten the institutions by which they maintain their power.232 The irony of understanding such a critique in terms of its integrative social function is not lost on Horsley, nor consequently is the strategic value of pretending, contrary to any indications or evidence, that the "radical ethic" of this tradition is intended to apply exclusively to a marginal and specialized class of religious virtuosi.233 As Stegemann (and others) had already observed, so too Horsley adds that the evidence cited by Theissen is a) very meager; b) interpreted in a literalistic or distorted way; and c) fails to distinguish between fictional redactive impositions on the material and the material’s original Sitz.234 The travel instructions in Q 10:2-12 (and Mark 6:8-12) may, uniquely, attest to the behavior of certain Christians who, as part of an incipient Christian division of labour, required support for their preaching and healing activities, but this is a far cry from the overarching lifestyle, the leadership role, and the preeminently constitutive role of these itinerants as conceived by Theissen.235

In lieu of the itinerancy hypothesis, Horsley proposes that the radical injunctions of the sayings tradition and Q in particular reflect a project of "renewal" on the part of

settled individuals in "local communities" who wish to address disturbing and exploitative social changes, especially pertaining to increasing levels of debt among the peasantry. Q, he believes, launches a critique at the exploitative behaviors of the ruling classes and purveyors of the normative "Great Tradition" of Jewish religiosity (see especially Q 11:39-52; 13:34-35), especially those in Jerusalem and the cities. It does so from the perspective of a "Little Tradition" appropriation of the Hebrew Bible tradition (or the historical events and oral traditions behind this tradition), innocent of the exegetical and learned "official interpretation" of the significance of this cultural reservoir. What Q is about, in brief, is the redefinition and restoration of Israel over and against the ruling elites. Horsley insists that the conceptual model drawn from the tradition which actuates this behaviour is that of prophecy; the material is to be understood as "prophetic" and its tradents as self-conscious "prophets." This activity or project, which Q reflects and encourages, takes place at the level of local peasant villages, not in cities and not among wandering charismatics; this can be seen by the predominance of agricultural imagery, the use of the names of towns but not cities, and the document's predominant concern with continuing local, sedentary relations. The "religious" project of the "Kingdom of God" imagined and articulated in

---

236. On Horsley's underscoring of the social importance of debt in this period see especially Sociology, 88-90.
237. See Horsley, Sociology, 91, 110.
239. Horsley, Sociology, 111, 120-121; "Q and Jesus," 197, 203-204. It has been noted elsewhere (Arnal, "Rhetoric of Marginality," 481, 484, 490) that not only Q, but the Gospel of Thomas as well, contain sayings that, far from evincing itinerancy, seem to assume continued "mundane" social interactions (such sayings would include Q 11:11-13; 12:57-59; Thomas 3, 14, 16, 22). Most of the ethical exhortations of the sayings tradition can in fact be understood as directed to all Jesus-people, and not simply to itinerants: they are statements of social values, not proposed individual achievements. Horsley also notes, Sociology, 106, that the most striking sociological feature of the Jesus movement is that it generally seemed to take the form of settled communities. This feature is clearest among the groups established by Paul.
Q is in fact a social project, motivated by egalitarian principles, committed to reciprocity and communal care at the local level, and standing as a palpable threat to ruling institutions. He summarizes:

... in response to illness, self-blame, and possession by alien spiritual forces, for example, the Jesus movement continued the healing, forgiveness of sin, and exorcism initiated by Jesus. In attempting to deal with the heavy indebtedness, poverty, and despair that plagued many of the people, the Jesus movement advocated mutual forgiveness of debts, social-economic cooperation, and other forms of reciprocity in local communities. In reaction to the disintegration of local village communities and the decline of patriarchal authority, the Jesus movement apparently revitalized local life in terms of egalitarian nonpatriarchal familial communities. ...

The reception of Horsley’s views on the sayings tradition has been quite limited; the most important scholarship affected by these arguments seems to be that of Horsley himself. Theissen’s proposal remains too attractive to most scholars in pursuit of social description of the synoptic traditions for Horsley’s quite cogent criticisms to be taken as seriously as they should be. But part of the problem must also be the weakness of the counter-hypothesis Horsley proposes, which is even more vague and unconvincing than Theissen’s reconstruction. The appeal to "prophecy" as an interpretive category really adds nothing to the reconstruction, while Horsley’s steadfast misunderstanding of the grounds for Q’s stratification and his concomitant rejection of that stratification weakens his understanding of the literary characteristics and social developments of the Q tradition. Indeed, one gets very little actual textual analysis of Q (or any other specific early Christian writing) from his work; instead, some general views on the social history of the early Jesus movement are projected wholesale onto the text. A basic insight governs textual readings, or, more accurately, disguises their omission.

240. Horsley, Sociology, 122-125, 130-137. Such sayings as Q 22:28-30 are thus to be understood as prophetic calls to renewal, rather than as oracles of catastrophic judgment. See Horsley, "Q and Jesus," 188, 196.
Although Horsley is quite correct to criticize the sociological vagueness of Theissen's views, his own reconstruction is just as vague, and almost as insensitive to the textual details. This lack of convincing alternatives must ineluctably suggest to many readers that, for all of Theissen's failures, his study still represents the (only) viable "sociological" scenario. Horsley represents, more or less by default, the only strong voice raised against the itinerancy hypothesis; few others have taken this position or offered such a sharp critique of Theissen's views. His alternative hypothesis, however, is articulated in a very undisciplined way, and apparently with little or no reference to the text of Q. Thus while offering some cogent suggestion that Theissen's views may be misleading, Horsley fails to provide a satisfying direction for any other approach to a social reading of Q.

THE CYNIC TANGENT

Finally, the most popular, controversial, and resonant application of Theissen's views involves a considerable shift of focus, while remaining true to and inspired by the initial Theissenian peripeties. Theissen's "analytic" and "constructive" conclusions are the ones most focused on both by Theissen's adherents and his critics surveyed so far. A wholly distinct tangent, however, has evolved from Theissen's "comparative" conclusion that Greco-Roman Cynic philosophers provide a contemporary analogy to the itinerants' behaviour. The Cynic hypothesis, itself a source of "renewal" and rather savage controversy in recent scholarship, might thus be seen as a variant of the

243. It should probably also be noted that nearly all of Theissen's direct critics — especially Schottroff, Stegemann, and Horsley — are fairly explicit about their position on the political left. There is something, some indefinable je ne sais quoi, about Theissen's reconstruction that appears objectionable to leftists. Unfortunately, instead of this peculiarity suggesting a conservative bias on the part of itinerancy proponents, it suggests instead that criticisms of the hypothesis are tendentious, that there something "non-scholarly" at stake in even questioning itinerancy.
itinerancy hypothesis, as well as representing a stab in its own right at a viable, alternative, social description of earliest Christianity.

Proponents of the Cynic hypothesis think that Greco-Roman wandering Cynic philosophers provide the best analogy not only to the peripatetic \textit{behaviour} of the Jesus people but additionally to their socially-critical \textit{ideology}. Cynicism is the one instance in the world of earliest Christianity in which one might find a wandering lifestyle conjoined with a radical and self-consciously contentious ethos. The comparison, according to the proponents of the hypothesis, allows fundamental insights into the impetus and intentions behind the Jesus movement. Interestingly, these observations about Q have occasionally been extended to the historical Jesus, so that according to some scholars, Jesus himself is best understood by analogy to Cynicism; he was something of a Jewish Diogenes.\footnote{See, for instance, Mack, \textit{Myth of Innocence}, 65-69; Crossan, \textit{Historical Jesus}, 340, 421-422.}

The Cynic hypothesis proceeds from the marked similarity between the style, content, and in some cases specific form or details of the material in the sayings tradition (and/or Q) and the literary remains of Cynicism. F. Gerald Downing, for instance, argues that, in terms of genre, Q was modeled after or finds its closest analogy to the "Lives" of Cynic philosophers such as Diogenes Laertius' life of Diogenes of Sinope.\footnote{F. Gerald Downing, "Quite like Q; A Genre for ‘Q’: The ‘Lives’ of Cynic Philosophers," \textit{Biblica} 69/2 (1988): 196-225. Kloppenborg had already noted generic connections between Q and the Cynic chreia. See \textit{Formation of Q}, 306-316, 322-325.} Downing finds the Cynic "Lives" to possess a distinctive form among Diogenes Laertius' sketches of philosophical lives. These sketches usually consist of summaries of philosophical systems, whereas those pertaining to Cynics mostly consist of what the hero "said" (\textit{ēφη}) or "used to say" (\textit{ἔλεγεν}), sometimes framed within the
context of a chreia or apophthegm. Regardless of minute differences in form between Diogenes Laertius and Q (e.g., the relative rarity of "true" chreiai in Q). Downing believes that, simply as collections of items (pericopae), lacking in narrative or other unifying structures. Q and the "Lives" form each other's closest formal analogies. Downing in fact argues that the generic analogy between Q and the Cynic "Lives" is closer than that between Q and the Gospel of Thomas! In order to firm up this generic connection. Downing goes on to note the extensive thematic parallels between Q and the message of Cynic philosophers such as Diogenes and Antisthenes. He assembles numerous thematic parallels to Q from the Cynic lives. of greater or lesser cogency, noting in particular a common concern with such themes as reliance on nature. sonship with God. openness to social outsiders. denunciations. and so forth. Likewise. the synoptic mission charge appears to reflect the same traits that for Epictetus embody the ideal Cynic. On the basis, then, of these generic and thematic similarities. Downing concludes that Theissen's analogy is more than merely an analogy. The people responsible for Q were aware of and directly influenced by Cynicism - they deliberately adopted its favorite literary genre to communicate the teachings of Jesus. and those teachings themselves were infused with Cynic ideas. This is not to

246. Downing, "Quite Like Q," 197-198. Downing notes that Socrates. alone among the non-Cynic philosophers, is an exception: he is presented with the same collocation of chreiai and (other!) attributed sayings. But. says Downing. this phenomenon is an exception that proves the rule: the image we have of Socrates in Diogenes Laertius is precisely that of the Cynic Socrates!
say that Christians themselves, including those responsible for Q, might not have insisted on subtle differences, might not have aimed to distinguish themselves as not really Cynics: the point is influence and perception, not absolute identity.252

Others have argued for a Cynic (or Cynic-like) sub-stratum behind Q; it is among such proposals that one can see something like a revival of Theissen’s description of the social characteristics of the Q people. Typically, these scholars take Kloppenborg’s literary stratification of Q, mutatis mutandis,253 as a starting point, and argue for a Cynic or Cynic-like derivation of the first and earliest literary stratum of the erstwhile document. Later strata, it is assumed or argued, depart from this Cynic(-like) orientation. David Seeley for instance has made an important case for the influence of Cynic ideas and ideology on Q1’s perception of Jesus’ death. Arguing that the absence of the rhetoric of boundary-formation in the Q cross sayings (Q 14:27), which Kloppenborg had left assigns to Q1, supports this identification as a Q1 logion (the later strata of Q, i.e., Q2 and Q3, show marked evidence of developing interest in social boundary formation, a drift toward sectarianism of which the cross saying is innocent).254 In this Q1 saying, which Seeley thinks does in fact have Jesus’ death in mind, the hearer is told that s/he must be willing to bear the cross in order to be worthy of Jesus. The point here is not so much the fate of crucifixion itself as the worthy individual’s willingness to accept whatever unpalatable fate might proceed from the pursuit of truth. a

252. See Downing, “Quite Like Q,” 222; Jesus and the Threat of Freedom, 126-149.
253. It is interesting that some of the Cynic-advocates in question do not accept Kloppenborg’s stratification as given (in The Formation of Q), in spite of claiming it as a starting point. Rather, they tend to adapt the stratification to their own claims that Q1 (as opposed to Q2) is Cynic-like. Thus material that appears to cohere with Cynic interests tends to be assigned to the earliest stratum regardless of where it might appear in Kloppenborg’s original schema. Mack is rather limited in his alterations, while Vaage is quite extensive.
sentiment which precisely echoes contemporary Cynic and Stoic promptings to be prepared to follow truth and wisdom even to death itself. For Seeley this interest matches the general orientation of the earliest stratum of Q; a "... strange sort of anti-ethos ethos typical of Cynicism ... " Q 14:27 would thus stand as a distinctively Cynic-like interpretation of Jesus’ death; viewing that death as a consequence of his single-minded pursuit of Truth, an attribute to be emulated by his followers. It is only later, as the Q people become more interested in sectarian boundary-formation and invoke the deuteronomistic tradition in service of that interest, that Jesus’ death — and his teaching — comes to be seen in a prophetic mold. Texts such as Q 7:31-35; 11:47-51; and 13:34-35 all reinterpret the earlier Cynic/Stoic-inspired interpretation of Jesus’ death by invoking the deuteronomistic framework of Israel’s past rejection of the prophets sent by God. The stakes of the initial assay have been raised as the community behind Q strengthens and secures its boundaries.

Burton Mack similarly understands Cynicism as a more suitable analogy than "prophecy" to the wanderers behind the Q traditions. He argues at some length that Jesus was a Cynic or Cynic-like teacher — a character who had no desire whatsoever to found a movement, nor even to propose a systematic social reform. Jesus was, instead, a rather more individualistic iconoclast, challenging the stable social values of those he encountered, very much in the mold of Cynic popular philosophers.

Cynics were well-known figures who made a profession of social critique and espoused a life lived naturally. All aspects of social existence were constantly under scrutiny. All forms of conventional authority were disavowed. Appeal was made directly to individuals on the basis of common sense and a vague notion about natural law. The ideal was to live simply, learn to endure

256. Seeley, "Blessings and Boundaries," 140.
257. Seeley, "Blessings and Boundaries," 139.
259. See Mack, Lost Gospel, 45-46, 111; Myth of Innocence, 68.
hardship, and not get caught doing anything merely to satisfy the expectations of others who treated traditions as laws. The famous Cynics were extremely sophisticated and well-read. The not-so-famous lived on the edges of society, made an art of begging, and looked for opportunities to display the virtues of an unencumbered existence at the expense of stuffy convention.260

As with Downing so for Mack, both the style and the substance of Jesus’ message suggests affinities with Cynic popular philosophers: a vague critique of the social order lacking any systematic proposal of alternatives; and a cutting wit expressed in parables, aphorisms, and chreiai.261 The mission instructions, likewise, seem to reflect Cynic practice very closely.262 Mack conjectures that the actual practice of a Cynic-like Jesus involved intimate encounters rather than demagogic pronouncements; probably meal settings were the initial location of Jesus’ “teaching” activity, and it is probably these meal settings that formed the locus for later, developing, perceptions of social identity among those who sought to emulate Jesus.263

The subsequent history of the early Jesus movement is, in effect, a history of increasingly tight social formation (and concomitant mythologizing) from this relatively anti-social starting point. The earliest period behind Q, which more or less corresponds to the earliest period of the Jesus movement in general, continued the basic stance of Jesus: "... the social history of the people of Q began with an early period of élan, general social critique, and experimentation with countercultural behaviour."264 We can see this early stage reflected not so much directly in Q1 as an erstwhile document, but in the "core aphorisms" around which the argumentative clusters of the document

261. Mack, Myth of Innocence, 68.
264. Mack, Lost Gospel, 44; cf. 111.
were elaborated.265 These include such observations as "lend without expectation of return," "leave the dead to bury their dead," "do not worry about what to wear." and similar observations.266 This earliest stage behind Q would have appeared almost as Cynic-like as Jesus himself, but for the note of urgency or seriousness that came to characterize their ethos, expressed now in terms of the metaphor "the kingdom of God."267 These individuals were coming to develop a self-conscious programme and ideology, but continued, Cynic-like, to eke out an itinerant survival on the fringes of society, perhaps preaching and begging in local markets, and otherwise withdrawing.268 Thus a whole programme — a set of rules for those who wish to "belong" — arises from and comes to be linked with this meager set of aphoristic observations: "insight" is supplemented by explicit exhortation. Increasing social self-definition led to the edifice of Jesus as a founder-figure for a "movement," rather than simply a sage to be emulated; hence Jesus predictably comes to be embellished with the trappings of authority: attribution to him of gnomological material, the invention and elaboration of chreiai, the construction of speech material which is itself oriented toward establishing or reinforcing Jesus' authoritative character.269 biographical inventions, typological

265. Mack, Lost Gospel, 109-110. For a summary of this argument, and for Mack's overall reconstruction of the history of the people responsible for Q through their various vicissitudes, see especially Mack, "Kingdom that Didn't Come"; and his "Q and a Cynic-like Jesus." forthcoming in Whose Historical Jesus?, eds. William E. Arnal and Michel Desjardins (Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1997). Both papers are briefer statements of the arguments discussed in The Lost Gospel.
266. See Mack, Lost Gospel, 44-45; "Q and the Cynic-Like Jesus," MS 52-53.
268. Mack, Myth of Innocence, 84. See also his "Q and the Gospel of Mark," 32, where he argues that the excitement of the work of social formation itself would be sufficient to account for the attraction of such a "movement."
characterizations, and so forth. Eventually, however, the appeal of these Cynic-like itinerants faded, and the fiction of public proclamation had to be foregone. The roving "messengers" learned first not to go from door to door but to seek out hospitality where they could be sure to find it, among houses of "peace" (Q 10:5-7; i.e., Jesus congregations); eventually, they could no longer even count on that meager hospitality (see Didache 11:4-6). As the public and experimental character of the group faded to a resignation about the failure of Jesus' message to appeal to its intended audience.

[c]ertain changes took place in the language of the kingdom that mark the stages of this history. Heady promises about divine providence for those who turned their backs on social constraints and labors (such as family ties) turned into calls for repentance, then, finally, pronouncements of judgment and doom upon "this evil generation." In sum: the Q itinerants, while perhaps correctly identified by Theissen as itinerant, had a style of behaviour that matched Cynic popular philosophers much more closely than it did the prophetic charismatics in the mold of Theissen or Boring. The apparent appeal to prophecy and Israel's epic history in fact represents a fictive — not actual — call to or mission of repentance, a rationalization and mythologization after the Q people's public activity had already come to an end.

271. Mack, Myth of Innocence, 84-85; Lost Gospel, 128-130.
273. Mack, Lost Gospel, 46; Myth of Innocence, 85, 87-88 n.7.
274. Mack, Lost Gospel, 43.
The scholar most responsible for the Cynic hypothesis as it now stands is almost certainly Leif Vaage, who, prior to the above-noted work of either Mack or Seeley, wrote a dissertation (Claremont 1987) which identified the itinerancy of the Q people as a Cynic or Cynic-like itinerancy. A much-modified version of this dissertation has since appeared in print. Vaage is probably to be credited with the most systematic argument for a Cynic-like Q, an argument which, in his book, is modified specifically by locating the Cynics at the Q1 — i.e., the earlier or "formative" — stage of the tradition.

Recognizing that the specific diction of Q cannot simply be equated with the speech of other Cynic documents, Q nonetheless shares with Cynicism the same basic socio-rhetorical strategy. Both the formative stratum of Q and the Cynics pursued in word and deed a posture of committed marginality, programmatically suspicious of local society's promises to provide through conformity to its norms and codes a measure of happiness. Vaage makes his case both by finding close and convincing parallels between Q and Cynic written artifacts, and by proposing new readings of sayings tradition materials which echo Cynic ideology. The most fruitful locations for establishing such connections are to be found in the first stratum of the Q Mission Charge (Q 10:3-6, 9-11, 16), and in an extended segment of Q's inaugural sermon (Q 6:27-35).

Regarding the former, Vaage proposes a rather novel reading: these instructions, he says, represent an exhortation to a Cynic pattern of behaviour in general, rather than

---

277. Here excluding from the primary stratum vv. 10:2, 7b, against Kloppenborg. See his rationale, Galilean Upstarts, 111-114.
as injunctions specifically related to mission.278 He finds, as others have also found, significant detailed parallelism between both the actual content of these instructions and their ideological force, and Cynic writings. Most strikingly, Q 10:4 seems to refer, in its prohibitions against carrying βαλλάντιον, πήρα, and υποδήμα (purse, knapsack, sandals: Matthew’s version also prohibits a staff and two tunics279), to what had come to be, from the time of Diogenes, standard Cynic equipment for self-sufficient living.280 The fact that these items are here prohibited rather than endorsed, is, quite rightly, untroubling for Vaage.281 For the whole point of the beggar’s bag, the purse, the whole Cynic ensemble, was to embody and convey contempt for cultural artifice and a kind of total rugged and "masculine" (Cynic contempt for the self-indulgent, effete, and "effeminate" objects of culture is expressed by the term μαλακός [cf. Q 7:25!])282 self-sufficiency. In an environment in which such items had come to denote leech-like greed, it is of the essence of Cynic ideology to repudiate such purses rather than adopt them: the point is self-sufficiency, not the item itself. At any rate, Cynics

278. Vaage, Galilean Upsstarts, 17-39. See esp. 25:
Paul Hoffmann writes that all the prohibitions in 10:4 (except for the final injunction not to greet anyone) dispense with the typical equipment and provisions for a journey in antiquity. Hoffmann then proceeds predictably to suggest that 10:4 advocates a wholly different way of moving from one place to another. But the fact that money, a bag, footwear, and a staff were regularly taken on ancient trips does not mean that, therefore, not taking them reveals a completely new mode of travel. For not only travelers used these things. Hoffmann is still influenced by the unnecessary assumption that the persons whom Q represents were on a preaching mission.


281. Vaage, Galilean Upsstarts, 27-28, is able to adduce numerous Cynic parallels to the prohibition against sandals (ps-Anacharsis, ep.5; ps-Socrates, ep.6; ps-Aristippus, ep.13; Dio Chrysostom, or.6.15: or.10.7-8; Lucian, cat.15; 20; Icar.31; ps-Lucian, cyn.1: 13-14; 17: Alciphron, ep.2.38.2; Diogenes Laertius, 6.31). The πηρα especially, however, seems to have been one of the more distinctive emblems of a Cynic "outfit."

were often enough trying to outdo themselves in self-abnegation. Diogenes is said to have thrown away the cup he kept in his purse upon seeing child drinking from his hands.\footnote{Diogenes Laertius 6.37, quoted in Vaage, \textit{Galilean Upstarts}, 26.} The repudiation, therefore, of the distinctive Cynic equipment, is perhaps the Mission Speech's most Cynic-like feature of all. Vaage also sees in the command to silence in 10:4 ("Greet no one on the road") an evocation of Cynic-like anti-sociality.\footnote{Vaage, \textit{Galilean Upstarts}, 29.} The opening charge which "sends out" \((i\delta\omicron\upsilon \alpha\rho\omicron\sigma\sigma\tau\epsilon\lambda\lambda\omega)\) the Q people as "sheep among wolves" is seen not so much as a solemn mission, as a reflection of the normal philosophical attitude of obligation to communicate the truth of their own lifestyle, a responsibility, like that of the Q people, understood to be laid on by the gods.\footnote{Vaage, \textit{Galilean Upstarts}, 19-24.} Q 10:5-6's instructions for approaching households not only reflect the Cynic practice of begging for a living, but additionally — again, much like the Cynics — provide advice on dealing with the rejection of one's mendicant entreaties.\footnote{Vaage, \textit{Galilean Upstarts}, 30-33. He cites (see esp. 31) as Cynic analogies not only accounts of their tendency to go from house to house begging, but also texts which provide or reflect strategies for responding to rejection: particularly Diogenes Laertius 6.49; ps-Diogenes \textit{ep.} 11.} Rather less convincingly, Vaage interprets the injunction of the messengers to "heal the sick" in Q 10:9 as in fact a recognition that they impart a kind of mental/spiritual blessedness to those who are somehow alienated or "weak";\footnote{Vaage, \textit{Galilean Upstarts}, 33-36. He mistranslates the injunction as "treat the weak," but makes a rather more convincing case that the wording of this line does not require any eschatological or apocalyptic background.} and he views the precept to wipe the dust from one's feet when departing villages who reject them (10:10-11) as a comic gesture, designed, like many Cynic rejoinders, to humiliate those who mock them.\footnote{Vaage, \textit{Galilean Upstarts}, 36-37. He cites as thematic parallels Diogenes Laertius 6.33. 6.35. 6.41. 6.89.}

The "Mission Charge" is summed up thus:

\begin{quote}
Outlined in 10:3-6, 9-11, 16 is the daily "life-cycle" of the persons whom Q represents. A brief depiction of the social situation in which they found
\end{quote}
themselves is first given in 10:3, followed then by a minimal code of dress and manners in 10:4, a somewhat longer discussion of how the persons whom Q represents were to seek sustenance and to handle possible rejection in 10:5-6, 10-11, and a brief statement of their actual "work" in 10:9a along with a particular interpretation of its specific value in 10:9b. In 10:16, a transcendental warrant is lastly provided for what otherwise might easily have appeared to be a thoroughly mundane round of activities.289

So also with the "sermonic" material exhorting love of enemies in Q 6:27-35: here, instead of some sort of apocalyptic "interim ethics" we have evidence from which, Theissen-like, can be distilled something like a social description — as it turns out, a social description decidedly Cynic-like. Ethics, for Vaage (again, quite rightly), represent a kind of second-order reflection which generalizes and justifies actual current practice.290 This working assumption allows him to put aside the injunction to "love your enemies" (Q 6:27) as a synthetic formalization or generalization which rationalizes a set of actual practices rather than serving as an actual apodictic itself motivating specific requirements.291 In other words, "love your enemies" is a secondary, after the fact, way of conceptualizing under a single rubric a number of specific different behaviors which constitute ways of coping with opposition and hostility:

... it is important to remember that "love your enemies" in 6:27 does not mean (as, perhaps, it does in P.Oxy. 1224) that "your enemies" will thereby cease to be your enemies. The statement, "love your enemies," would lose all of its rhetorical force, if the activity of "love" in the imagined confrontation were somehow to eliminate or ignore the inimical character of the stated "enemy." In fact, the statement, "love your enemies," must signify in 6:27 precisely what Diogenes suggests above [Gnom. Vat. 187]: a strategy for handling unfriendly opposition. "Love your enemies," in other words, and in this way take care of the "jerks."292

Included under this rubric therefore are an assortment of Cynic strategies of public "passive resistance," such as "offering the other cheek" which in fact preserve the

character of the assaulted Cynic, allow him to escape immediate danger, and humiliate the aggressor.293 The other specific injunctions represent similar techniques emanating from similar Sitze.294

Vaage’s reconstruction of the Q people’s social behaviour does not stop here: he examines the Q use of the phrase "kingdom of God,"295 Q’s use of invidious characterizations of the Pharisees,296 and Q’s conceptualization of John and Jesus,297 in each instance finding evidence that the orientation, self-understanding, and behaviour of the people responsible for Q was thoroughly compatible with and comprehensible in terms of analogous Cynic demeanor.298 This provides a way of understanding the apparent "rhetoric of deracination" in Q as reflecting an itinerant and deliberately ascetic behaviour of a group of Galilean Cynics, who sought, as a consequence of their peculiarly anti-social dramatizations, to repudiate the taken-for-granteds of their day and age. The Cynic comparison thus provides not only an analogy but also a rationale for Q’s many eccentric locutions.

Like the Cynics, the "Galilean upstarts" whom Q’s formative stratum represents conducted in word and deed a form of "popular" resistance to the official truths and virtues of their day. Registered in their unorthodox ethos, ideology, and ad hoc social critique as well as the sparse but vivid memory they maintained of certain "anti-heroes" of the recent past (John and Jesus) was both a decisive "no" to the typical habits and aspirations of their immediate cultural context, as well as a curious confidence in their own

293. Vaage, Galilean Upstarts, 48-49.
294. See Vaage, Galilean Upstarts, 49-54.
296. Q 11:39-48, 52. See Vaage, Galilean Upstarts, 66-86; "The Woes in Q (and Matthew and Luke): Deciphering the Rhetoric of Criticism," SBLASP 27 (1988): 582-607. Vaage’s main point here is that the rhetoric of the Q woes really hinges on a mocking observation of the difference between the appearance and the reality of those who best represent social norms, in this case, the Pharisees. The observation is decidedly Cynic-like in its exposure of the pretense behind social conventions, and is decidedly not motivated by the harsh religiously-motivated polemical stance of later Christianity toward "the Jews."
297. As found in Q 7:24b-26, 28a, 33-34; 9:57-60; 14:26-27. See Vaage, Galilean Upstarts, 87-102. For a similar take on the John and Jesus material in Q 7:19-35, see Cameron, "What Have You Come Out to See?", 35-69.
298. For a summary of all of these facets of the study see Vaage, Galilean Upstarts, 103-106.
peculiar ability to achieve here and now, in the body and despite considerable adversity, a higher form of happiness.299

Such an interpretation of the aims or results of Cynic-like behaviour among the early Jesus people is common to most "Cynical" readings of Q, regardless of the minor differences between them.

These differences, as the above survey suggests (without making explicit), tend to revolve around what aspects of Q or the early sayings tradition as best described as Cynic-like, and what kind of continuity or discontinuity there is between this material and that which appears to be less Cynic-like. Most proponents of the Cynic hypothesis view the Cynic component of the tradition as earlier (or earliest), and non-Cynic ideologies as later.300 In practice this rigid insistence on the equation of "Cynic" with "early" leads to a stratigraphical free-for-all, as any elements of the sayings tradition felt to be amenable to a Cynic comparison are, after the fact, determined to be early, and those elements felt to be incompatible with Cynic ideology are assigned to later

---

300. Some critics of the Cynic hypothesis however have suggested precisely the reverse. As noted above, Stegmann believes the "Cynicizing" of the sayings tradition is the work of Luke. Sean Freyne, "Galilean Questions to Crossan's Mediterranean Jesus," forthcoming in William E. Arnal and Michel Desjardins, *Whose Historical Jesus?* (Waterloo, Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1997), MS 142-144, has suggested that, in Q, Cynic-like elements date from a later period (or stratum), in which the people responsible for the document had moved to an urban setting where such influences would be commonplace and would make more sense. So also Horsley, *Sociology*, 118. A hint of this is also offered by Hans Dieter Betz, "Jesus and the Cynics: Survey and Analysis of a Hypothesis," *Journal of Religion* 74/4 (October, 1994): 453-475, 474 and n.127. Perhaps the most interesting and detailed study is that of John Marshall, "The Gospel of Thomas and the Cynic Jesus," forthcoming in William E. Arnal and Michel Desjardins, *Whose Historical Jesus?* (Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1997). Marshall offers a close tradition-historical analysis of the sayings material in *Thomas* that is paralleled in the synoptic tradition: by using *Thomas* as an independent control on the redaction or oral alteration of the synoptic material, he is able to show, with considerable probative force, that the most significant parallels between the sayings tradition and ancient Cynicism are secondary to the tradition.
strata.301 Such a procedure of course begs the essential question, as well as generating a host of only marginally-different but competing reconstructions. Since the question of a Cynic Q and the issue of Q's stratification are different and not-necessarily-related matters, there is little justification for such a conflation of issues: it represents a methodological step backwards (confusing literary history with tradition history) and makes its own hypothesis (that Cynic-like material forms the basis of the Jesus tradition) the basis for arriving at specific textual conclusions. This critique is not to imply that Kloppenborg's stratification, and the specific substantial details of it, are immune from all criticism or modification. But the minutiae of Q's stratification will not be settled this way, and in fact the procedure not only makes the Cynic hypothesis appear that much more shaky, it also must generate doubt about the stratification of Q itself. There is really no good reason at all, especially prior to considering the evidence, that one or another stratum must exclusively be comparable to Cynicism. If the issue is really com-

301. The most striking instance is that of Vaage's book, which nominally proceeds on the basis of Kloppenborg's reconstruction (see Vaage's claim in Galilean Upstarts, 7, 107), yet which includes a long appendix (Galilean Upstarts, "Appendix One," 107-120) expressing considerable disagreement with the specifics of Kloppenborg's reconstruction in Formation of Q, usually on grounds (such as thematic generalizations) which undercut the methodology by which the stratification was arrived at in the first place. The sources of disagreement are — no surprise! — those texts susceptible to a Cynic reading which Kloppenborg has, on consistent methodological grounds, assigned to later redactional strata of Q, such as especially Q 7:24b-26, 28a, 33-34; and Q 11:39-48, 52. In both of these cases, there is clearly an antecedent oral (or even possibly written) development in which the material aggregated — this is never denied by Kloppenborg (see Formation of Q, 115-117, 139-147). But a complex pre-history neither requires nor even hints at a likelihood that the sayings originated from an earlier stratum of Q. Burton Mack wishes to attribute the whole persecution beatitude (Q 6:22-23) rather than just 6:23c (οὕτως γὰρ ἐποίουν τοῖς προφητεῖσιν τοῖς πρὸ ὑμῶν) to the secondary stratum of Q, presumably since such a view would mesh perfectly with Mack's (simplistic?) reconstruction of the progressively increasing mythologizing and social self-identification which he detects behind nearly all developments in earliest Christian "myth-making." See his Lost Gospel, 83 (see also his attribution to the tertiary layer of Q, for similar reasons, of Q 10:21-22; 12:5; 13:34-35; 16:16-18 [89, 94, 98, 100]). Unfortunately for this rather too-neat scenario, the "association of the beatitudes with the admonition to love one's enemies [this latter an uncontested Q1 argument] presupposed that 6:22-23b was already part of the beatitudes" (Kloppenborg, Formation of Q, 187); for such an association relies on 1) the shared theme of hatred and mistreatment, and possibly 2) a catchword connection between 6:22 (ὅταν μισήσοσαν ὑμᾶς) and 6:27 (τοῖς μισοῦσιν ὑμᾶς) (Kloppenborg, Formation of Q, 178), both of which are only present in the persecution beatitude, rather than the earlier ones.
parison, rather than identity (see further below), Q is comparable to Cynicism at every level of its development, and in fact its comparability will be that much more illuminating if plotted over the course of developmental changes and shifts. The comparison would, easily, still be worthwhile, even if Q1 were less Cynic-like than Q2, or Cynic-like in different ways than Q2. If there is indeed some kind of social continuity between Q's layers, we need to imagine, at least *prima facie*, that later developments will illuminate the directions in which Cynic-like ideology could modulate under various social pressures; thus "secondary" developments are not irrelevant, and should not simply be dismissed as later, and less interesting, "corruptions" of the "original" impulse. These difficulties imply that, disclaimers to the contrary, proponents of the Cynic comparison are no more historiographically sophisticated than the theologically-minded commentators they seek to discredit: there is at issue here a conception of origins as normative, pristine, enviable — and of later developments as rigidifying an initially supple "experiment."302

Common to all advocates of the Cynic hypothesis is an insistence — with greater or lesser clarity and force — that what is being proposed is by no means identity so much as comparability. The Q people, it is insisted, were absolutely not card-carrying Cynics, for, *inter alia*, the simple reason that Cynics did not carry membership cards. On theoretical grounds deriving from the arguments of Jonathan Z. Smith,303 Vaage maintains that there is little point in conceiving comparison as the establishment of *genetic* links; rather it is a "disciplined exaggeration" of some compatible aspect(s) of two phenomena which may shed light on some hitherto unrecognized aspect of one or

302. Vaage, *Galilean Upstarts*, 3-7, 10-14, critiques such an orientation and cites Smith extensively in his introduction as a methodological model. Is this peculiar irony a Freudian-like "return of the repressed"?
303. Smith, *Drudgery Divine*. See also n.302, above.
both items. Mack is usually careful to describe the early Jesus movement as "Cynic-like," as operating with an ideology and set of intentions "analogous" to those of the Cynics. Both Downing and Seeley go slightly farther than the modest claim of mere "comparability," arguing for some kind of influence emanating from Cynic philosophical circles, being disseminated at a popular level, and appropriated by the early Jesus movement in its self-understanding.

It might be said that the Greco-Roman texts referred to above represent upper-class, elite philosophizing which has nothing to do with the more popular style of a group like the Jesus movement. But Downing has demonstrated that boundaries separating the culture of the "elite" from that of the "popular" must be considered rather porous. The impression he gains is of "a very pervasive oral culture sharing much common content with the refined literature of the aristocracy." Dio Chrysostom, for example, presupposes a situation "where very similar material can be used for audiences from the whole range of places and social contexts; and one in which what is said to a fairly select group is almost certain to be disseminated much more widely." It appears, then, that class distinctions could be and were crossed by popular philosophical traditions.

Criticism of the Cynic hypothesis, NT scholarship's greatest — if most vacuous — new growth industry, seems to have badly misunderstood this point about comparison. The point is constantly made by such critics that Jesus, or the earliest Christians, or Q, or whatever, cannot have been Cynics, for a variety of reasons. For instance, "... to claim that Jesus' use of aphoristic wisdom and biting wit is best understood within the context of Hellenistic Cynicism is to miss the most plausible context: Jewish wisdom." Leaving aside the question of why such a putative context is "more plausible," the criticism utterly misses the point: the sayings tradition is "Jewish

---

305. See Mack, "Q and the Cynic-like Jesus," MS 41-44, 57-61, et passim.
wisdom" (Hellenistic, for that matter) and as such can be understood by *comparison* to Cynicism. Likewise, critiques that point to the greater variety within Cynicism than is conceded by advocates of the Cynic hypothesis\(^\text{308}\) may quite possibly be correct, but irrelevantly so: the real issue is not so much a label than it is the comparability of the sayings tradition with a broad spectrum of behaviour which we think we understand, thus shedding light on what is at issue behind the sayings tradition. That the synoptic material may correspond identically to no particular discrete strand within Cynicism, but rather to an artificial amalgam of loosely-related and temporally-distant Cynic-like figures, is only a difficulty if one seeks to identify the synoptic tradition with some particular brand of Cynicism, which in fact no one is trying to do. Substantive historically-based critiques, such as, for instance, the claim that there is no evidence for a Cynic presence in "Jewish" or Galilean society,\(^\text{309}\) that Cynicism is an urban and/or upper class phenomenon,\(^\text{310}\) and that the injunctions of the mission charge to eschew Cynic-like equipment are intended to demarcate the Q people from Cynics\(^\text{311}\) are all likewise open to the charge of missing the point, if less egregiously so. Each one of these critiques refutes the position that Jesus and/or his early followers were self-conscious...

---

\(^{308}\) See, for instance, Betz, "Jesus and the Cynics," 472-473; Eddy, "Jesus as Diogenes?" 459; Christopher M. Tuckett, "A Cynic Q?" *Biblica* 70/3 (1989): 349-376, 351-356, 365; *Q and the History of Early Christianity: Studies on Q* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1996), 375-378. See also Vaage's rejoinders, "Q and Cynicism," 202-205; *Galilean Upstarts*, 11-12. Tuckett believes that the breadth of Cynic parallels simply demonstrates that Cynics were as broadly influenced by their contemporary society as everyone else. Vaage maintains that this issue remains under discussion: it is probably true that not all of the biting wit of antiquity is to be regarded as "Cynic," but it is equally problematic to imagine that we are in a position definitively to separate different Cynic strands into "schools."


identifiable Cynics, a thesis which is not on the table at all, at least explicitly. As Jonathan Smith has argued at length in *Drudgery Divine*, and as advocates of the Cynic thesis have tirelessly asserted, comparison is simply not about showing that one thing is identical to some other thing, it is about setting two things side by side in order to highlight the ways certain definable things aspects of them are similar, in contrast to other potentially comparable things, and the ways in which they differ, in spite of such similarity.\[12\] I may wish to compare a cat with a dog: my comparison might then proceed on the basis of rough similarities in size, the fact that they are popular domestic pets, and the fact that both are mammals; or it might focus on the ways they differ in terms of stamina, agility, superficial appearance, sociality, trainability. Who would think of objecting to my comparison by assuring me that cats and dogs are distinct species? So, by the same token, are the early followers of Jesus comparable to Cynics? Of course they are, in spite of so much spilled ink asserting otherwise, for the simple reason that they are comparable to anything: striking textile workers, wallpaper, automobiles, umbrellas, pine trees, or anything one might think of. Critics would do better, and would be addressing the argument as it is framed, to focus instead on showing why — legitimate! — comparison with Cynicism yields intellectually uninteresting results. For it is only on such grounds that the procedure will be legitimately discredited.

Yet this methodological strength is also the nub of the debilitating problem with the Cynic hypothesis. If, for instance, we accept Seeley’s argument (above, p.127) that social class distinctions do not relate in any fixed way to the philosophical tradition, what gains are made for social description by the comparison? Or, to frame the issue as broadly as possible: if comparison is indeed a disciplined

---

312. The relevant chapter in *Drudgery Divine* is ch.2, "On Comparison."
exaggeration for our own *stated* theoretical and practical purposes, what *are* these purposes? What are the set grounds, the fixed questions, which the comparison is imagined to address? The fact that such questions are rarely, if ever, addressed, suggests the reason for critics' failure to understand the case: the case is being made inconsistently. Proponents of a Cynic-like Jesus movement, Vaage in particular, seem to use Smith rather opportunistically, sliding over into a sloppy *equation* of the Jesus movement with Cynicism from time to time, and really failing to understand or appreciate the nuances of Smith's understanding of comparison. Smith makes it very clear that any comparison for non-genetic purposes implies two usually-unstated qualifications or terms to the comparative pair: "x is like y" really means "x resembles y more than z with respect to . . ." or "x resembles y more than w resembles z with respect to . . .". Yet the details of the repressed terms of this equation are sketchy at the best of times: Vaage, for instance, can conclude that " . . . it would have been extremely difficult to distinguish the persons whom Q represents from other Cynics elsewhere in the ancient world." and elsewhere refer to a "strong degree of similarity," framed absolutely, but without ever telling us what theoretical factors are elucidated by the comparison, or on what specific bases it is offered. Since Vaage never tells us what questions he aims to answer, we are in no position to assess the success of his venture.

316. I should give credit where it is due: Vaage is usually more consistent than this, assiduously avoiding language of identity, and specifying, as part of the overall framework of *Galilean Upstarts*, that the comparison is proceeding on the broad grounds of *ethos*, ethics, ideology, critique, and appeal to founder figures ("memory"). What he has apparently not realized, however, is that according Smith, the point of these specifications is *not* to pile up evidence for either identity or some kind of absolute "comparability," but is rather to restrict the scope of the comparison. That is, if we are comparing Q and Cynicism on the grounds of, say, ideology, the conclusions or fixed questions residing behind and motivating the comparison will themselves have to do with Q's ideology and our understanding of it, not with the broader topic of "Q and Cynicism."
This sloppiness in framing the comparison is by no means restricted to Vaage's work. In addition, the various efforts that have been made to reply to critics of the Cynic hypothesis by showing a Cynic presence in the environs of Galilee or among the social classes to which the Jesus movement is imagined to have belonged likewise (mis)direct attention away from this constructive aspect of comparison and reveal the inconsistency with which Smith's methodological rigour is applied. We are thus left either with an identity equation — the Q people were Cynics —, with all its attendant problems, as well as its methodological naiveté; or we are left with the assertion that the people behind Q were merely, in some unspecified way, "comparable" to the Cynics, which raises the question, "so what, what have we learned?"

On the other hand, if the point of the comparison, in spite of Mack's and Vaage's methodological sleights of hand, are positing cultural influence, the analysis is downright retrograde. Not because it is necessarily incorrect, but because it aims to stand in for detailed social description or sociological explanations for the peculiar behaviour and/or literary expressions of the Q people. To respond to this issue by saying "they adopted Cynic modes of expression," is simply a refusal to acknowledge the question. This is especially so if we accept Seeley's and Downing's claims that such rhetoric was not restricted to upper-class circles, since such a conclusion utterly detaches the behaviour from sociologically-recognizable Sire. In other words, the Cynic hypothesis is simply not a social description at all; it is rather an indication of the cultural model or precedent that would have been drawn upon, or suggested, or implied by the behaviour and ideology of either Jesus or the earliest Jesus movement. Insofar as

317. See, e.g., Cameron, "What Have You Come Out to See?" 60: "John and Jesus are both characterized as Cynics: the one 'ascetic,' the other 'hedonistic' . . . act together to bless the community of Q." 318. See especially Mack, Lost Gospel, 51-68; cf. also Downing, "Social Context," 445-446, 448-449; Seeley, "Jesus' Death in Q," 234; Vaage, Galilean Upstarts, 145 n.58.
such a conclusion is imagined to be a social description or an alternative to Theissen's views, it represents a methodological step backwards: to the extent that we adopt the Cynic hypothesis as it now stands, we know less about the earliest Jesus movement than we were taught by Theissen.

As a result, I think, the Cynic comparison, if "comparison" it be, is not a useful extension of or alternative to the social description of the earliest followers of Jesus as it is provided by Theissen. But this is not to say that these views have not in any way potentially advanced our knowledge. There are a number of things to be learned, or at least (re-)considered as a result of the work of people like Mack, Vaage, Downing, and Seeley. One advantage of the Cynic hypothesis is that it provides a much more plausible context for voluntary homelessness and self-reliance than other advocates of itinerancy are able to provide: it establishes a prior model through which people behaving in such a way could conceptualize their own activities. Specifically, the comparison highlights the extent to which Q1 at any rate is very interested in the theme of avoiding cultural artifice, and can see such a critique as itself constituting an ideological programme in its own right. And this in turn suggests that whatever is at issue for Q or Q1 may be somewhat less serious, momentous, and original than we are used to thinking of it. The burden of Vaage's analysis of the Q woes against the Pharisees (Q 11:39-52), for instance, is simply to demonstrate that the standard "Christian" view of Pharisees as hidebound hypocritical traditionalists committed to conflict with Jesus (or the early Christians) is not what is at issue in Q.319 Likewise his analysis of Q's "love your enemies" speech (Q 6:27-35), instead of viewing the speech as the pinnacle of an ethical revolution, rather normalizes it, and sees it as a set of practical guidelines for

---

319. See Vaage, Galilean Upstarts, 66-86; and "Deciphering the Rhetoric of Criticism."
coping with hostility.\textsuperscript{320} The "mission charge" (Q 10:2-16) can likewise be seen as a set of practical guidelines (guidelines for what, exactly, remains unclear), in contrast to the more established assumption that it represents the initiation of some kind of unique sacred commitment to evangelize.\textsuperscript{321} In sum, the Cynic hypothesis allows Christian origins to be thought out without invoking an anachronistic modernist notion of "religion," which assumes, for instance, the primacy of the "Sacred," the effective priority of myth over ritual, a focus on religious experience as awe at the Sacred's epiphany, an individualistic anthropology, and a concomitant emphasis on charismatic and/or founder figures.\textsuperscript{322} The Cynic hypothesis — whether right or wrong — is intellectually progressive simply because it forces us to reimagine, creatively, what these people were really thinking and doing; because it makes us question very deeply-ingrained presuppositions. This also is presumably why it has generated such a negative response, all out of proportion to its actual claims or influence.

\textit{Context and Cultural Significance:}

As the lengthy review above must imply, the impact of the itinerancy hypothesis, and of Theissen's work as a whole, has been nothing short of astonishing. Thiessen's single article, and his slim booklet, have had an impact on synoptic scholarship far out of proportion to what one might expect. From the sixties onwards, almost no serious sociological work has been done on the early sayings tradition from a perspective radically at odds with that of Theissen (Horsley is the main exception). Although some very recent work holds out the promise of fresh sociological approaches to the specifi-

\textsuperscript{320} Vaage, \textit{Galilean Upstarts}, 40-54.


\textsuperscript{322} So Mack, "Q and the Gospel of Mark," 36.
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cally local (Galilean, village, etc.) derivation and orientation of Q,323 the majority of studies still take the itinerancy hypothesis as a sine qua non, something for further research to work out in detail. And the Cynic hypothesis, likewise, although not nearly as unquestioningly acceptable (in part because it rigorously eschews mystification), continues to generate a massive amount of interest and controversy. This popularity and broad exposure — especially in the face of the various theoretical and evidentiary failings of the itinerancy hypothesis in any form — is interesting in its own right. Why should the itinerancy thesis experience a resurgence in recent times, after its fall to obscurity along with the nineteenth-century liberal theology out of which it was constructed? That itinerancy, and its liberal corollary, "charisma," should be touted by Harnack in the 1890's as an originary impetus behind the development of ecclesiastical institutions is unsurprising. That the hypothesis, or some variant thereof, should be picked up from the mid-60's of our own rather anti-liberal century is of far more interest. I would suggest, in fact, that the main intellectual impulse behind the resurgence of the itinerancy hypothesis is its contemporary resonance (and, indeed, relevance). This contention is worth exploring because of the light it casts on the hypothesis itself and

The Sayings Tradition and Itinerancy

The discipline as a whole.324

The itinerancy hypothesis is attractive to our own era for very different reasons than those which might have made it attractive to nineteenth-century liberals. The world has moved on, but some of its relics, apparently, have found new and interesting applications.325 In classic ideological fashion, the itinerancy and Cynic hypotheses reflect contemporary conditions, respond to them, and, albeit inadvertently, retreat from them. The continued desire to see "religion" as a sui generis entity marked by its own distinctive differentia — which will necessarily be different from ordinary life, exceptional, and serious — is doubtless the most obvious impulse behind the postulation of itinerancy, at least in the form offered by Theissen.326 Itinerancy is a vibrant and explicit living out of charisma, and as such preserves the distinctive novum behind the rise of Christianity.

A concern with travel and a fixation with culture also mark the current era, albeit in different way than they did in the late 19th century. The increased requirement of mobility over the last several decades, and the consequent erosion of "locative" professional sensibilities or self-imaginations has meant that the image of itinerant tinker is resonant and sympathetic for many professionals. It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that the image of wandering teachers (!) as a creative stimulus behind the Jesus movement is (at least in part) the product of a desire to find in the past — especially for formative moments in the past — analogues for our own deeply-ingrained and taken-

324. It should be made perfectly clear, however, that a discussion of the tendentious impetus behind such scholarship is, per se, by no means intended to constitute an argument against it. It is a too-popular (and destructive) fallacy in this field that congenial views are necessarily false.

325. Another classic instance of precisely the same phenomenon is the appropriation of Herman Hesse, the German late Romantic and avid Easternist, by the generation that grew up in the 1960s.

326. Note, most obviously, Tuckett. Q and the History, 390, who explains the itinerancy he deems to lie behind Q in terms of a sense of eschatological urgency: "What is at stake in Q is the preaching of the imminent arrival of the eschatological kingdom of God."
for-granted experiences. This reflective tendency is probably not to be understood as a conscious need to make the Q people, specifically, "like us," so much as it is a largely-imperceptible tendency to frame the past in terminology and concepts which resonate with our own experiential knowledge. Likewise, both standard itinerancy views and the Cynic hypothesis focus on the cultural aspects of the phenomenon: this focus represents in part the same idealism that influenced Harnack, but also reflects a more modern focus on defiance of convention as the truly "revolutionary" stance, an attitude inherited from the 1960s and with us still. Striking retrojections of contemporary cultural concerns also appear frequently in Mack's work. From The Lost Gospel:

"This stance of social critique was a call for individuals to live against the stream, not a program offered for the reform of society's ills." (46)

"Either way, the Cynic's purpose was to point out disparities sustained by the social system and refuse to let the system put him in his place." (116)

"In our time there is no single social role with which to compare the ancient Cynics. But... there is precedent for taking up an alternative lifestyle as social protest, from the utopian movement of the nineteenth century, to the counterculture movement of the 1960s, to the environmentalist protest of the 1980s and 1990s." (117)

"What counted most, they said, was a sense of personal worth and integrity. One should not allow others to determine one's worth on the scale of social position." (119)

Vaage's comments in Galilean Upstarts are similarly focussed:

In modern terms, the Cynics might called "contracultural" dissidents. They were "popular" philosophers, unremittingly opposed to the dominant social values of the ancient Mediterranean world, explicitly rejecting the usual aristocratic "educated" means of achieving and enhancing human well-being (eudaimonia). The Cynics made clear their basic disagreement with contemporary "commonsense" ideals of the "good" life

---

327. Nowhere is this more evident than in Downing's popularizing treatment of his version of the Cynic hypothesis: Jesus and the Threat of Freedom, esp. 1-3, 6, 33-50. Here the economic problems of contemporary US, UK, and France are treated as "threats to freedom" (i.e., as cultural, psychologicistc, and individual problems; obstacles to self-actualization) to which, apparently, the Cynic-like early Jesus movement offers useful rejoinders in its exhortations to openness, generosity, and love, which exhortations originally addressed analogous threats to freedom in antiquity. See also Crossan, Historical Jesus. 421; Downing, Jesus and the Threat of Freedom, 163-164.
by living, speaking, and acting in such a way that, however diverse in
detail, their general comportment consistently cut against the grain of
prevailing cultural assumptions regarding both prosperity and propri-
ety. (13)

[The Cynics are characterized by] . . . an indefatigably ineffable "knee-jerk"
resistance to conformity with the customary categories of ancient social
placement . . . . (14)

It is probably this culturally-focussed (and hence superficial) aspect of the Cynic
hypothesis that irritates James Robinson so much that he has felt compelled in recent
years to write a multitude of different articles devoted principally to a fervent criticism
of these views, or rather, the Cynic hypothesis specifically.328 His comments are often
revealing, pointing to the superficiality of the critique Jesus is imagined to have
engaged in.329 A superficiality resulting directly, it would appear, from the understand-
ing of the early Christian movement as being anti-conventional for the sake of being
anti-conventional.330 Ultimately this reduces to mere rudeness, rudeness as an "alter-
native lifestyle," which addresses nothing, understands nothing, and is simply an
expression of nebulous dissatisfaction faced with the "cynical" assumption that no solu-
tions really exist.

Another factor contributing to the culture-fixation of our scholarship — reflected
in the limitation of most versions of the itinerancy hypothesis to issues of "lifestyle" —

in Claremont Occasional Papers 35 (Claremont: Institute for Antiquity and Christianity, March/April,
1996); "Building Blocks"; "Galilean Upstarts: A Sot's Cynical Disciples?" paper read at the Annual
Meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature: Chicago, November, 1994; "The History of Religions
Taxonomy of Q: the Cynic Hypothesis," pp.247-265 in Gnosisforschung und Religionsgeschichte:
Festschrift für Kurt Rudolph zum 65, eds. Holger Preissler and Hubert Setwert (Marburg: Diagonal-
Verlag, 1994).
329. The following comment ("Afterward," 46), directed to the Jesus Seminar but directly pertinent to
the Cynic hypothesis, strikes me as especially revealing:

What concerns me most about the Jesus Seminar is that it tends to make Jesus into a queer
duck rather than a serious person worthy of a hearing . . . . In a similar way the Jesus Semi-
nar has not communicated to intelligent people a Jesus worthy of consideration, but often
only conveyed the offensiveness of uncritically negative biblical scholarship.
330. This is expressed clearly not only the texts quoted above, but also in such terminology as Seeley's
"anti-ethos ethos," or Vaage's characterization of Jesus as a "party animal," or Mack's repeated
insistence that Cynics, as well as the earliest Jesus movement, had no fixed social agenda.
is the gradual death of the political as an important factor in social life. Whatever the causes — they are doubtless multiple and complex — of very poor voter turnout, lack of distinct agenda among different candidates for office, "image"-driven politics, and most significantly, popular cynicism seem to characterize mainstream political practice. The most effective grassroots movements, on the other hand, are defined by identity-blocks which tend to refer less to socio-political interests and more to prior visible belonging in some (real or fictive) category based on gender, ethnicity, or physical characteristics. Thus while labour union membership, for instance, as well as voter participation, is going through the floor, extraordinarily resonant and successful "political" activity is being undertaken by feminism (based on the identity, "woman"). by the Nation of Islam (based on the identity, "Afro-American"). or even by White Supremist movements (based on the identity, "Aryan," or some such thing). Or again, consider the sub-national separatist movements currently in vogue everywhere: from Quebec, to Ireland, to Rwanda, to the Czech Republic and Slovakia, to Yugoslavia, to the (formerly-) Russian Central Asian republics, to Tibet. strong — if synthetic — national states are being replaced by fragmented collocations of historic, ethnic, religious, and/or cultural jurisdictions. The point is that all of these movements, gathering momentum and on the rise, tend to be culture-driven, while political (in the modernist sense) associations and purposes, are clearly on the wane.

In a sense such cultural movements are autochthonous. They make themselves, and hence their "interests," in the very act of fabricating themselves as an identity. This procedure also parallels what is posited for the Christians, in the general reluctance to

331. The turnout of eligible voters in the 1996 American federal election was the lowest it has been since 1924: and that was the first year women were allowed to vote, so we are to understand the low turnout of that year to be a result of the doubling of the effective pool of voters, with all of the new electorate unused to the process, and perhaps even discouraged from participating in it.
conceive of the early Christian *Sitze* as anything but Christian (or religious, at any rate) *Sitze!* Rather than entertaining the very sensible possibility that Christians became Christians because of common interests and agenda they shared prior to their adopting of the movement, the very contemporary position is assumed that Christians created their agenda by becoming Christians. There is little about potential Cynics — at least as far as one can determine from the work of Mack, Vaage, Downing, and most others — that would distinguish them from their contemporaries. It is only once they are Cynics that one can locate them, describe them, even explain them. Likewise, with non-Cynic or "prophetic" itinerants, although Theissen isolates various "factors" that account for social malaise (i.e., the anomie which was the "function" of the Jesus movement, and any other social movement, to address) in the period in question, these factors only serve as a backdrop against which the activities of the Jesus people take place.

One might further note that the itinerancy hypothesis thrives in a "postmodern" environment because it both manifests and posits the characteristics of postmodernity: as such it is a resonant and comprehensible (and self-referential) historical proposition. The itinerancy hypothesis and its variants thus manage to reflect the condition of postmodernity, albeit, avant la lettre (or at least au lieu de la lettre). It does so in a number of different ways. First, like the general worldview of postmodernity, the itinerancy hypothesis is not historical in the strong sense; that is, it avoids concrete attribution of events to the past, and the past workings-out of those events, tending, instead, toward broad characterization of types of behaviour.\(^{332}\) Second, as already noted, it

---

\(^{332}\) To make this assertion somewhat clearer, one could say that the itinerants or Cynics proposed to lie behind Q and the early sayings tradition could just as easily exist in a "far-away land" as in the past: temporal distance here is interchangeable with spatial distance. The point is not that historical study has eschewed the "great man" approach to the past in favour of broader social description — for such a result, we could only be grateful. Rather, in line with developments in the popular imagination, history is increasingly offering "snapshots" rather than "moving pictures"; disjointed, if richly described, vignettes, rather than linear progressions or sequences which have clearly definable results, or which can be seen as necessary preconditions for subsequent events. *Instances* have replaced *sequences* in the historical imagination. On the atemporality of postmodern sensibilities (or, rather, its spatialization of time), see
understands and emphasizes particularity, typically in terms of group-identity. Third, it shows a strong interest in the activity of "opting out": such an interest is reflective and reinforcing of postmodernism's critique and suspicion of "totalizing discourses."

Fourth, it offers a "reading" of "canonical" texts which is itself disjunctive, deconstructive, corrosive of the emplacement of the texts in our cultural canon; and which reveals the texts in question to be equally disjunctive in their original conception. Finally, at least as far as the Cynic hypothesis is concerned (and, more arguably, the standard form of the itinerancy hypothesis as well), the very same denaturalizing critique of fixed and shared social structures that characterizes postmodern theory (and experience) is retrojected into the very originary moment of the Christian religion.

This postmodern emphasis on disjunction, atemporality, denaturalizing criticisms, and so forth, are at least in part almost inevitable anomic responses to socio-cultural changes which are rendering both the human and the "natural" world increasingly opaque. Hence, for instance, the emphasis on — even obsession with — disjunction presents itself as an effort to make meaningful the very absence of coherence. The absence of coherence in our own social practice thus is subjected, rather ironically, to ideological naturalization at the very hands of the intellectual and cultural movement which claims entirely to eschew the naturalization of the social in all its forms. This inability to conceptualize our own world finds its most important conceptual analogue — apart from such interesting architectural manifestations as, e.g., the Eaton Center or the Bata


333. The reconstruction is itself denaturalizing as well: it presents self-evidently "religious" ideology through the filter of less spectacular and apparently "secular" models, often deliberately so. The movement away from a focus on apocalypticism as a contributing originary factor, which we see very clearly in the Cynic hypothesis, reflects a distinctively postmodern tendency to undercut categories, in this case the category of religion as Other.
Shoe Museum in Toronto, or the Westin Bonaventure Hotel in Los Angeles — in a refusal to totalize, or indeed even posit, social causality. Hence discrete "behaviors" are subjected to minute narration, while the historical narrative in which such behaviors might be embedded remains as invisible as the mysterious mechanisms, processes, and intelligibility of the too-large world in which we currently find ourselves aimlessly whirling. In the roving of Theissen's itinerant preachers we thus not only have an instance of a fantasy of alternative or escape, a utopian rebuilding of the social world from scratch, a desperate effort to retroject onto a specific historical locale our fondest fantasies of a real state of nature from which to rebuild a simpler world more susceptible to the willful choices of coherent human agents. Nor merely do we have, in the itinerants' liminal and ambivalent relationship to their own social "context," a fictive recapitulation of the disjunctive world as it stands, an historical painting lacking, like the Bata Shoe Museum, any obvious frame, any clear angles, any obvious demarcation between "inside" and "out"; lacking, as in our own "natural" world, any clear difference between wilderness and park. In addition, we also have a steadfast and almost willful refusal to conceptualize the local, which in itself is but part and parcel of the global village, the media explosion, the commodification of culture, and the consequent inability to make sense of social totality.

Theissen's approach to the earliest Christian texts, and to a degree the Cynic hypothesis, are also self-referential in their reflection — in a variety of ways — of the

---

334. The same fictive construct, of course, used by early modern and Enlightenment political theorists who wished to distance their political theory from the concrete realities of the societies in which they lived.

335. See Todd Gitlin, "Daily papers' credibility crisis," *Now* (Toronto: January 2-8, 1997), 21: "Roberts cites a study of the fate of the Louisville Courier-Journal since it was bought by Gannett, the longest chain. The overall news space did go up, but much of the increase consisted of features, soft news and wire copy. The average local news story shrunk. Wire service copy — almost always the most rudimentary and least probing — went up by an astounding 76 per cent."
loss of prestige suffered by most academics in recent times, especially in the humanities. The very fact that such a reading is "against the grain" of the ordinary "canonical" treatment of these texts would itself probably be impossible were academics still the predominant ideological mainstays and favored retainers of the (genuinely) powerful classes. "Criticism" in the past has tended to replicate more perfectly what people ought to think about the issues in question. In addition the conceptualization of the originary impulse behind the formation of the Christian movement as one devolving from the transmission of ideas, or as a consequence of the practice of teachers, is much more obviously self-referential. The presentation of these wandering "teachers" as marginal, as anti-social, as running "against the grain," both reflects the increasing marginality of today's academic institutions, and reaffirms their significance in the face of that marginality.336

This increasingly-negative (and appropriately so, I might add) apprehension of our own work and of the world we live in is projected, like that of the ancient apocalyptists, working in similar circumstances, onto a fictive or "ideal" field. In this case, it is not the heavens but rather Roman antiquity that serves as the receptacle for our own impressions of what the world is like, brought about, with various distortions, by what the world really is like for us. Hence in first-century Galilee we encounter the following as among the circumstances to which the itinerants or Cynics are reacting. First, there is imperialism and a concomitant threat of erasure of indigenous cultures,
alongside increasing concentration of wealth in the face of a population explosion.337 There is militarism, lack of care for other people, and the concentration of wealth in the hands of the few, to their own exclusive benefit.338 There is a rigidification and limitation of cultural options.339 There is a society characterized by hierarchy and patronage; by, in other words, mediation of the very marrow of social life and social good.340 There is an economic crisis generated by the lack of general circulation of finance capital.341 There is a world scarred by the tensions created in a pluralistic and multicultural society.342 And, best of all, there is an empire held together by "... a soulless superimposition of law and order, a network of military surveillance and economic exploitation that was incapable of commanding the loyalty of the peoples they governed."343

Identity- and "minority-" based criticisms and readings of the biblical texts are normally assigned to the Sheol of tendentious hypotheses, in part because we can read

337. Theissen's "ecological factors" and "socio-cultural factors," as explained in First Followers of Jesus, 31, 33-46, 77-95; cf.32-41; "Legitimation and Subsistence." 33.
338. Downing, Jesus and the Threat of Freedom, 26-27. He adds (27), "We are just rather better equipped with doles and lotteries and displays of mindless affluence on television to make the excluded believe they belong, this must all be preserved for one day it could be theirs."
339. See Vaage, Galilean Upstarts, 85:
At least there is [as a result of Cynic-like criticism] a sense in which the dominant social order was thereby rendered not inevitably supreme, though this is never expressed in any more positive or constructive terms. The social critique championed by the woes in Q was thus not tied to particular utopian desires for a specific cultural "restoration" or "renewal." It may be that the sheer press of established ways was such that, practically speaking, all the Q people could hope for was to unsettle things a bit.
340. Crossan, Historical Jesus, 421-422 et passim.
342. See Mack, Lost Gospel, 68:
What if we acknowledged that the compact and convoluted history of foreign conquests in Galilee had created disaffection for many Galileans, and a predisposition for social and cultural critique? What if the mix of indigenous, Hellenistic, Jewish, and Roman cultures had disturbed the social equilibrium enough to challenge the traditional diffidence of the people in Galilee?
their ideological subtext with all too much ease. A Jesus who cares, anachronistically, about "nature" is most obviously the product of environmentalist concerns; Jesus as an emancipatory teacher about the roles of women in his society is clearly motivated by feminist concerns; Jesus as dark-skinned is motivated by Afro-American/black concerns; and so forth. But the ideological subtext of the dominant culture or of the broader social totality which encompasses even marginal groups, is normally much harder to read, simply by virtue of its proximity, of one's own embeddedness in it. We have memorized the texture and foliage of the individual trees without even an inkling that we could also map out the parameters of the forest encompassing them. In the case of the itinerancy and Cynic hypotheses, the ideological subtext is as present as in more obviously tendentious efforts, but remains rather more obscured (and hence respectable): "It is spread out upon the earth, and people do not see it." The ideological force of the hypothesis in this case is very similar to that of feminist or environmentalist or black rewritings of history: it signifies both an effort to escape a certain bondage, and, as such offers a legible signature of the present times; and it simultaneously occludes its own insights, encoding in its very solutions the structural characteristics it aims to erase. In this case, the projection of "postmodern" or, differently, "hippie" assumptions on the world of the present or the past will alike promote insularity, nostalgia, passivity; will exacerbate, in the end, the very socio-political helplessness which these approaches aspire to address.

Lest the characterization of what I take to be the subtext of this strain of research appear unremittingly negative, I should note that I think the process both inevitable and

344. The first-person plural here is intended to be inclusive: the ideology of totality of our social relations directly affects, and is rendered equally opaque to, even those groups that are marginalized by it. It should be noted too that "the white male" is also an identity, participating in identity politics. At any rate, the impulse toward self-definitions based on such "identity" is itself a product of our dominant ideological vision of the world, a vision which itself pretends to be universal, and to some degree is successful in making itself universal.
in many ways positive. On the one hand, the task of the historian is probably less to present the past "as it was" and more to present the past to the present in terms that will be meaningful for the present: thus it is an act of, say, ideological translation. The very popularity of the itinerancy hypothesis attests to its success in investing the past with meaningful or comprehensible terms of reference. The identification of this subtext does not in any way refute the hypothesis. However, one can hope, on the other hand, that such a reading will render the hypothesis a little more transparent, a little more understandable, and, ultimately, will help divest it of its "magic" and allow it to be considered more temperately, on its own merits.
A straightforward critique of the *substance* of the itinerancy hypothesis remains to be done. Its development, basic characteristics, and chief proponents have been described, not always sympathetically. Some critics of Theissen’s view, especially in regard either to details or to its theoretical backbone, have already been discussed and have proffered more or less compelling criticisms of some features of his work. Its ideological subtexts have been discussed, both in its original manifestation in the work of Harnack and in its more contemporary Theissonian and Cynic forms. Yet, so far, no concerted effort has been made here to demonstrate the actual inadequacy of the hypothesis. Tendentious though it may be, substantial direct consideration needs to be given to the way in which these approaches treat their (ostensible) data. This attention need include both the treatment of general historical data by the sociological methods employed in such scholarship, as well as their treatment of the direct evidence for itinerancy, i.e., the ancient Christian texts themselves and the sayings tradition on which these texts appear to be based. It could very well be that, tendentious or ill-theorized as the hypothesis is, it is nevertheless securely attested in the evidentiary record. In fact, however, this is by no means the case.

**METHODOLOGICAL SHORTCOMINGS**

As already discussed, in the last ten years Theissen’s hypothesis has received substantial criticism and/or modification. It has been noted that Theissen’s work pays scant
attention to source-critical distinctions and the relative age of the traditions he examines. The itinerancy hypothesis has also been criticized on the grounds that the poverty and homelessness enjoined by Q and the synoptic tradition as a whole probably reflects a rationalization of involuntary destitution rather than a genuine exhortation to adopt it deliberately. Many (too many!) scholars have criticized Theissen's Cynic analogy and the thesis of peripatetic Cynic preachers responsible for the "radical" ethos of the tradents of Q which has developed from that analogy. In some respects the Cynic thesis represents a regressive move away from the properly sociological aspects of the earlier investigations of itinerancy, as it shows a tendency to regard ideological influences or parallels per se as a sufficient illumination of developments in ethos; concrete and material context is not stressed enough. Nevertheless, the comparison with the Cynic movement at least offers a strongly analogous model from the contemporary culture, free of the numinous associations which scholars are often liable to attribute to Judaism (and of course free from the scholarly tendency to protect Christianity's pedigree by emphasizing Jewish roots at the expense of other influences), from which one may make inferences about the functions and motives behind ancient countercultural movements. Finally, critics such as Richard Horsley have argued that Theissen's structural functionalism is an inappropriate sociological vehicle with which to

1. So especially, as above (chapter 3), Stegemann, "Vagabond Radicalism."
2. As above (chapter 3), Schottroff, "Sheep Among Wolves"; Stegemann, "Vagabond Radicalism?"
3. These critics are likewise cited above. See especially (as cited above, chapter 3) Betz, "Jesus and the Cynics"; Eddy, "Jesus as Diogenes?"; Robinson, "Building Blocks"; "A Sot's Cynical Disciples?"; "History of Religions Taxonomy"; Tuckett, "A Cynic Q?"
4. The Cynic analogy, properly applied, is not at all an explanation for the rise of earliest Christianity, and so is immune, to a certain degree, of a materialist criticism that as an explanation it is idealist. Nevertheless, the focus of this hypothesis, at least in the forms currently extant in NT scholarship, is far too much on ideology detached from concrete social setting. The cultural is emphasized at the expense of the social.
examine a society characterized to its core by conflict, and advocates in its place a "conflict model." 6

The inability of these critiques to provide plausible alternatives should not blind us to their ultimate accuracy. Theissen's initial postulation of itinerants uses the evidentiary texts in a fashion largely innocent of sophisticated distinctions between early, and secondary or redactional, materials. Although this criticism does not apply to later Theissenian analyses of Q, the fact that it was formulated devoid of such considerations in the first place is highly problematic: an uncritical reading of the texts serves as the basis for a postulate which is then applied, as a given, to more critical readings of the texts in question. As it happens, Q's literary history has been pushed back considerably by recent studies, and its tradents have at least in some scholarship been associated with a sector of the population assumed to be reasonably literate. 7 We are no longer able to assume that Q specifically, or the sayings tradition in general, represents a deposit of mixed oral lore, communicated by largely illiterate yokels or a bucolic, if disaffected, peasantry. Nor can we assume, in the face of such evidence of

6. As above, especially Horsley, Sociology.
7. I am thinking primarily of John's Kloppenborg's contention in Formation of Q, 243-244, that even the formative stratum of Q was very probably a written document, given the character of the interpolations into it made by the second redactor. Ronald Piper's work, Wisdom in the Q-Tradition: The Aphoristic Teaching of Jesus (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), argues that much of the aphoristic material in Q — most of which happens to derive from Kloppenborg's posited formative stratum — takes the form of carefully composed argumentative clusters in Q. And recent rhetorical studies on the NT writings in general have claimed to find throughout the NT sayings and narrative traditions "chreia elaborations" representative of the preliminary sort of rhetoric taught in the progymnasmata (see especially the various papers in Burton L. Mack and Vernon K. Robbins, Patterns of Persuasion in the Gospels [Sonoma, California: Polebridge Press, 1989]). Cameron, "What Have You Come Out to See?," esp. 50-62, argues that such a rhetorically-fixed structure is to be found at least in the second layer of Q, specifically in Jesus' words about John in Q 7:18-35. According to Kloppenborg, "Nomos and Ethos in Q," the secondary and tertiary layers of Q betray an increasing interest in exegesis, which of course would mark their tradents not only as literate, but as self-consciously literary. All of these studies, in one way or another, underscore the likelihood that Q, at whatever compositional stage, was a deliberately literary and even moderately learned document, composed with the written medium in mind, rather than casually or arbitrarily committed to writing after being formulated in a more ad hoc fashion.
rhetorical deliberateness, that the material preserved in Q is an unselfconscious and transparent reflection of the behaviour of the people who did the preserving. This incertitude might in fact suggest, at least *prima facie*, that Q's rhetoric of deracination is precisely that: *rhetoric*. At the least, the question implies that more sophisticated literary studies of Q will stand at odds with the assumptions of Theissen, rather than as a supplement to them; that the recognition of the literary and even intellectual character of the document, possibly even from its inception, will militate against the assumption that rural beggars formed the original nucleus of the "Q community." The argument which occupies this chapter, therefore, is that the itinerancy hypothesis is fundamentally flawed and inadequate in a number of critical respects, both sociological and evidentiary.

Horsley's claim that Theissen's version of the itinerancy hypothesis suffers from serious methodological and theoretical defects is largely accurate. Little or no methodological framework is established for working with any kind of precision from the itinerancy hypothesis to the texts in which it is manifested; that is, Theissen never bothers to articulate a firm theory of the relationship between literary texts and their social contexts, between the production of the written word and the concrete social realities in which it is produced.8 Theissen's distinction between, and discussion of, "analytic," "constructive," and "comparative" types of evidence might suggest otherwise, but in fact these categories in no way depend upon any particular broad understanding of text-context relationships, designating instead particular categories of

---
8. White, "Sociological Analysis," 261, associates much current sociology of early Christianity with a Weberian model, and says:

Too much of Weber's model, virtually a theology of its own it would seem, was built on his Ritschlian neo-orthodox presuppositions. Even if basic concepts such as *charisma*, *prophetic religion*, or *routinization* are to be retained, one cannot from the historical perspective simply assume that either early Judaism or early Christianity was a patented form.
Evidentiary Weaknesses

Evidence which tend to be read by Theissen in much the same way, i.e., as more or less literal and transparent descriptions of what people are actually doing. Moreover, the argument from the texts is somewhat circular. An initial insight, itinerancy, determines the fashion in which radical-sounding synoptic material of various types will be read. Such a reading, of course, then provides the "evidence" for the postulated itinerants in the first place. The texts, in other words, whether those drawn upon for analytic or for constructive or for comparative conclusions, do not evince itinerancy until one has assumed itinerancy. Where does the assumption stem from? In some measure, obviously, the material associated with the Mission Charge in Q (esp. Q 9:57-10:16) suggests some practice of travel, associated with some ethos of mission. But the precise character of this travel and its association with a particular lifestyle is not clearly or obviously elaborated in these texts; I would suggest that the details of this lifestyle stem in fact from Theissen’s imagination. This kind of tautology is in many cases inevitable when our primary sources for reconstructing the social world are

9. He characterizes them as "[t]hree different procedures" from which social data may be derived as part of a "process of inference" (First Followers of Jesus, 3, emphasis added).
10. This critique is also made by White, “Sociological Analysis,” 253 and n.12.
11. Theissen’s cites the bare existence of "prophets" on the basis of Acts, the letters of Paul, the Didache, Peregrinus, and Epistolae ad virgines. i.e., texts which in themselves are not attributed by Theissen to Palestinian itinerants or which do not stem from an early period (the Didache may be an exception). This section of his argument, i.e., direct testimony to itinerant behaviour, is less than two pages long. The texts directly under examination — the synoptic gospels — are not adduced for his "constructive conclusions" at all! Theissen derives far more documentation from his "analytic conclusions" (inferences) made on the basis of the content of the sayings tradition. This is where the manifest circularity of the argument is most apparent. See, for instance, his concluding claim that:

The ethical radicalism of the synoptic tradition is connected with this pattern of wandering, which could be carried out only under extreme and marginal conditions. Such an ethos could only be practiced and handed down with any degree of credibility by those who had been released from the everyday ties of the world, who had left hearth and home, wife and children, who had let the dead bury their dead, and who took the lilies and the birds as their model. (Theissen, First Followers of Jesus, 15)

Note that a wandering lifestyle, which Theissen has not effectively established by his prior citation of later, geographically distant, irrelevant, and/or inconclusive data as part of his "constructive conclusions," is taken to be the interpretive key to the ethics of the synoptic tradition. These ethics are then made to constitute the main evidence for the existence of wandering radicals!
literary; still, by starting with some kind of conceptual clarity about the relation of ideology to social location, and indicating from evidence extraneous to the texts at issue what the salient details of that social location might have been, this circularity can be considerably reduced.

In this connection, Horsley is entirely correct to note that nearly all of the discussion of itinerancy, although sociological in essence, seems to eschew developed sociological theorizing. The appropriateness of Theissen’s structural-functionalism is assumed by him, not demonstrated, as Horsley indicates at some length. Those who have adopted and adapted his thesis have failed even more profoundly, barely even recognizing the theoretical groundwork on which his sociology of the Jesus movement is based.\textsuperscript{12} Part of this theoretical innocence stems from the quite admirable desire to "let the facts speak for themselves." Admirable indeed, but quite naive: the "facts" are not properly sociological in nature, but literary, and require interpretation if they are to generate sociological, or even historical, conclusions. Such an interpretation can be neither coherent nor convincing without a sufficient theoretical basis by way of justification. That structural-functionalism cannot serve as such a basis is by no means evident, although Horsley goes some way toward showing its broad weaknesses;\textsuperscript{13} what is evident is that structural functionalism cannot be assumed to constitute such a basis.

\textsuperscript{12} Many of the people I would describe as pioneers of sociological examinations of antiquity and of the Biblical texts in particular have been more rigorous than Theissen in their discussion of theoretical issues. Norman Gottwald, in his work on the origins of the Israelite epic tradition (\textit{Tr}ibes \textit{of Yahweh}), has offered considerable justification for his use of a structural-functionalist model. So also has G. E. M. de Ste. Croix for a Marxist model in his \textit{Class Struggle in the Ancient Greek World}.

\textsuperscript{13} See the summary of Horsley’s critiques, above. Two of the striking theoretical weaknesses noted by Horsley are particularly damaging to the structural-functionalist approach and especially relevant for our purposes. First, structural-functionalism fails to account for conflict and dissonance in way that takes seriously and accounts for its dissonant and conflictual nature. Instead, social dissent of any variety is translated into broad social strategies — "functions" — for the perpetuation of the very entity being combated (on the inappropriateness of this orientation, see also Horsley, \textit{Spiral of Violence}, 156-166). It is difficult to imagine a more hegemonic appropriation of resistance than to claim that it is actually an instrument of the very dominant group it opposes! Second, in the absence of any clear indications of the material or concrete basis on which a "society" as a single entity is founded (and by which, therefore, it can be defined), structural-functionalism’s "organismic" take on "society" reifies what is essentially an
Horsley's work, nonetheless, cannot stand as an adequate alternative to Theissen's hypothesis. Horsley does offer considerable justification for the model he adopts. But although his work at least gives sociological theorizing its proper place, and stresses the conflict involved in the production of Q rather than its function in terms of the orderly working of an oppressive society, Horsley fails to apply this basic theoretical framework to any concrete social context. As a result, his social reconstruction of the people behind Q and of the aspirations reflected in their countercultural language is unconvincing. Horsley places too much stock in the continued applicability and explanatory value of a "prophetic" conception of the Q people. He argues that they represent a Jewish "renewal movement." The prophets of the Hebrew Bible, however, are a type which had passed into oblivion many centuries before Q was composed, and can have little relevance (I would go so far as to say no relevance) for understanding either the conditions that generated Q's radical ethos or even for understanding the content of that ethos. This objection is valid even if the Q people actually did think of themselves in terms of the Hebrew prophets, for this imagination can only have been of the character of an analogy. But because Horsley invokes a theological category with unquestioned pedigree — "prophet" — he is able to slough off the hard work involved in finding a specific and concrete context for Q and its project. Like Theissen's

abstraction — society itself. The effect of both such weaknesses is to confound a (more or less) unified sectoral self-consciousness (of representing the "objective" interests of "society" as a whole) or intentionality (the desire to preserve the social status quo) with the inner dynamics of a fuzzy and shifting social totality based on real human behaviour. This outcome would tend to make sociology not so much an academic field of inquiry as a propagandistic technique of obfuscation or the intellectual analogue of social engineering on the part of specifically conservative interests, as Horsley rightly (and indignantly) notes.

14. Horsley is obviously capable of providing just such a detailed social history: he does so in Bandits, Prophets, and Messiahs: Popular Movements in the Time of Jesus (Minneapolis: Winston Press, 1985). In his work on Q, however, he fails to relate the aspects of this social history to concrete and specific features of the text of Q.
invocation of "charisma," a vague and theologically resonant category is offered in lieu of a genuinely convincing social history. The issue is what the Q people were doing and saying in first-century Galilee, not several-centuries-old behaviour which they happened to heroize.\(^\text{15}\) Horsley's more atemporal conceptualization of the behaviour of the Jesus movement as an effort at "renewal" explains nothing. Nevertheless, his concern to preface his work with a theoretical and methodological justification is obviously a step in the right direction, as is his preference for an emphasis on conflict rather than on adaptation.

**REALISTIC CONTEXT?**

The absence of an appropriate theoretical basis for the itinerancy hypothesis (and most other social reconstructions of the Q people) manifests itself most clearly and dammingly in the numerous defects of the itinerancy hypothesis as it now stands, inadequacies in its concrete conceptualization. The overall picture is romantic without being realistic. We are told of wandering charismatic radicals, cast in the OT prophetic mold perhaps, or, as Leif Vaage sarcastically characterizes such a presentation, somewhat resembling Methodist circuit riders.\(^\text{16}\) Little is said, however, by way of plausible accountings for their behaviour. Other than the rather vaguely-applied Cynic analogy, we are not really told how such itinerancy could be possible in the context of first century Palestine (or particularly first-century Galilee, where Q is usually imagined to have been composed). Again, what are the concrete features of the behaviour of these specific itinerants and how do these features relate to the specific characteristics of the

---

15. One might as well try to understand the contemporary blacks Muslims — the "Nation of Islam" — in terms of *African* social circumstances in the 1500s, to which they rhetorically refer, and which obviously are greatly constitutive of their self-understanding, but what actually have almost no sociological relevance whatsoever for the current complexion of this movement.

text(s) they are alleged to have authored? The Cynic analogy does not tell us; it only informs us that (vaguely) analogous behaviour was taking place in different social contexts.

This involves two problems. First, what kinds of circumstances would have made itinerancy possible or impossible, plausible or implausible, for the itinerants in the concrete context of first-century Galilee? Does the geography and demography of the area imply the possibility or likelihood of extended travels? Would these travels have involved longer or shorter distances? What kind of technology would have been necessary for such travels? Would the itinerants have required and used sandals, and walked by foot, or would they have travelled with pack animals? Did such travelers attach themselves to other parties on the road? Or would the distances involved have been so negligible as to make all of these considerations superfluous? If the itinerants carried no provisions with them, what did they eat "on the road"? Were they dependent for hospitality in transit as well as when they arrived at a given destination? Would the authorities, local, Herodian, or Roman, have permitted the behaviour that Theissen describes? Would Cynic-like figures have been tolerated in such an environment? Where and how did these characters propagate their message: houses, village squares, agorae, perhaps legion-halls?

And what about the alleged "sympathizers," who would possibly have had to support these missionaries financially, and at the very least would have had to be willing to hear their message? Anthropologically or sociologically, what evidence can we marshal to suggest how, precisely, first-century Palestinian villagers would have received destitute strangers? Would the pervasive patron/client and honor/shame value-system make villagers unlikely to give a hearing to people who clearly had nothing to offer by way of recompense? What could possibly motivate people to listen, never mind actually
fall in with, these fanatics? Finally, if, as so many claim, Galilean villagers lived at near-subsistence levels, even frequently falling below, from where did they get the money, food, or whatever, to support these preachers?

This brings me to another, quite related, critique: while some effort is made by the advocates of early Christian itinerancy to link the radical sayings of Q to a *Sitz im Leben*, this *Sitz* is really a *Sitz in der Kirche*: life beyond the Christian "community" is often neglected. Yes, Theissen talks of various "environmental" and "ecological" factors contributing to the role of the itinerants, but in fact the setting to which all of their literary activity is related is a setting exclusive to the tradents’ lives as members of "the church." Only infrequently are the sayings of Q, or, indeed, the peripatetic behaviour of the early Christian preachers, related to the conditions of the larger, "secular," world, of which even the church was a part, so that they become truly explanatory.

This rather tedious list of questions and objections is offered solely to make the point that the itinerancy hypothesis is not normally grounded in a careful investigation of the social realia of the period and place in which the itinerants were alleged to have existed. The hypothesis has not been sketched in enough detail to demonstrate even the possibility of such wandering preachers in the *real* social world of their day. Whether there is or is not a genuine textual warrant for positing radical itinerants in the earliest Jesus movement, the thesis remains inadequate at the conceptual level.

**TEXTUAL AND EVIDENTIARY WEAKNESSES**

As it turns out, the conceptual failings of the itinerancy hypothesis are only reinforced, rather than being mitigated, by a consideration of the thesis’ evidentiary basis. Even such late first-century texts as the *Didache*, the text which raised the likelihood of itinerants in the first place, fail to provide any strong evidence of itinerant radicals in
the Theissenian sense. Much earlier writings, for which such a postulate is even more unlikely given the lack of time for the Jesus movement to have established an "international" or trans-local basis, show even fewer indices of actual itinerancy. An analysis of the texts on which the itinerancy hypothesis has been founded — the direct literary evidence of earliest Christianity — reveals that in addition to its ruinous methodological shortcomings, the itinerancy hypothesis is postulating something that the texts do not attest, and which we therefore have no reason to assume ever existed.

**THE PROBLEM OF PAUL**

The first thing that needs to be noted in connection with a critique of the evidentiary basis of the itinerancy thesis is that it rarely invokes Paul as exemplary of and evidence for this phenomenon in earliest Christianity. There are good reasons for this omission. In spite of Paul's extended and apparently perpetual travels, and apart from his supposed adoption of an earlier categorization of missionaries (?) as "apostles, prophets, and teachers" (1 Cor 12:28), which Harnack and others believe is echoed by the Didache's description of itinerants (see Did 11:3; 15:2). Paul provides no good evidence for the specific context in which itinerancy has been postulated by Theissen, and in fact manifests a type of behaviour structurally distinct from that imagined by Theissen. The main reason for this striking difference, recognized implicitly and explicitly by proponents of itinerancy, is the fact that Paul is operating in an almost exclusively urban context, and, in consequence, is interacting with what appears to be a thoroughly different sector of the populace than we would expect to encounter in rural or semi-rural Palestine. Doubtless to some degree the recognition of this problem is a function of the tendency to exaggerate the differences between "Palestinian" and "Hellenistic"
brands of Christianity. Even so, itinerancy proponents are generally correct to exclude Paul, at least for the most part, from instances of— or "constructive evidence" for— *Wanderradikalismus*.

Paul's dealings appear to be restricted, for the most part, to large urban centres. Indeed, they are typically restricted specifically to the large urban centres of Asia Minor and Greece. Those to which the undisputed letters testify to Paul's physical presence with some certainty are: Ephesus (1 Cor 15:32; 16:8), Thessalonica (1 Thess 1:1, cf. 1:9; Phil 4:16), Athens (1 Thess 3:1), Corinth (1 Cor 1:2, cf. 2:1; 2 Cor 1:1, 23, cf. 2:1), Philippi (Phil 1:1, cf. 1:5; 4:15; 1 Thess 2:2), and Troas (2 Cor 2:12). Paul also shows personal knowledge of Cenchrea (Rom 16:18) Paul's autobiographical sketch in Gal 1:11-2:10 suggests that he may also have traversed Arabia, Syria, and Cilicia (Gal 1:17, 21), but this recollection belongs to an earlier period of his life, possibly before his sense of "mission" evolved (but see Gal 1:23, where he is described as "proclaiming the faith" [NRSV; εὐαγγελίζεται τὴν πίστιν], and Rom 15:19 in which he describes his mission as stretching from Jerusalem to Illyricum; this latter reference may however be hyperbolic). At any rate, here the exception proves the rule: we have

---

17. Theissen describes his effort as one to recount the social characteristics of *Palestinian* Christianity, and he aims to separate early material in the synoptic tradition from "Hellenistic" accretions, which he presumes are later: "In the case of the synoptic gospels we have to remove material which is of Hellenistic origin. We can make use of all the rest" (*First Followers of Jesus*, 3). Theissen has done serious work on the social complexion of Pauline Christianity, and arrives at a characterization quite distinct from that which describes the itinerant tracts of the (Palestinian) sayings tradition. Paul, in sharpest contrast to the itinerant radicals, was a "community organizer": "Thus Paul represents a type of missionary who can be described as the goal-oriented community organizer, breaking new ground and establishing independent groups apart from Judaism rather than 'grazing' among existing groups of sympathizers" (Theissen, "Legitimation and Subsistence," 40). In fact, it a direct result of taking this tack that Paul encounters opposition from itinerant charismatics: "The conflict between Paul and other competing missionaries in Corinth does not arise from personal animosities. It is a conflict between different types of missionaries which displays traits independent of the individuals involved" (Theissen, "Legitimation and Subsistence," 40).

18. On the prominence of Troas, see F. V. Filson, "Troas," in *IDB* v.4, 712-713. On Cenchrea as a port suburb of Corinth, see J. Finegan, "Cenchreae," in *IDB* v.1, 546.
direct evidence of Paul's activity in these regions being focused on Damascus (2 Cor 11:32; Gal 1:17) and Antioch (Gal 2:11). In addition, of course, Paul mentions going to Jerusalem (Gal 1:18-19; 2:1-2; Rom 15:19; cf. also Rom 15:25-26, 31; 1 Cor 16:3-4), and proposing, at any rate, to go to Rome (Rom 1:10-15; 15:22-24, 29, 32). The only apparent deviation from this general pattern occurs in the case of the "churches in Galatia," which appear to be multiple, and which are not identified by city names, leading to the impression that they may be constituted by a series of smaller towns. Here again the anomaly simply illuminates the basic pattern: Paul explicitly says that he worked among the Galatians only by accident, as a result of falling ill in the course of his travels: "You know that it was because of a physical infirmity [δι' ἀσθένειαν τῆς σαρκὸς] that I first announced the gospel to you" (Gal 4:13). This pattern demonstrates not only that Paul restricted his activities, de facto, to the cities, but that additionally his own conceptualization of his mission was an urban one. When he claims to have "fully proclaimed the good news of Christ" (Rom 15:19) in the area of the eastern empire to the extent that there is no possible further work for him in this region (Rom 15:23: νυνὶ δὲ μηκέτι τὸποὺν ἐξω ἐν τοῖς κλίμασι τοῦτοῖς), Paul is revealing his own prejudices: he simply means that he has established small groups of Christians in the major cities, not that he has traversed the countryside. In fact, Paul


20. This question is complicated by a measure of uncertainty regarding precisely where the "Galatia" referred to by Paul really was. According to the "north Galatian hypothesis," Paul's designation of "Galatia" refers to the northern segment of the Roman province of Galatia in which Galatians, properly speaking, resided. According to the "south Galatian hypothesis," however, Paul, who usually designates regions by their official provincial names (Asia, Macedonia, Achaia, could have been referring to churches anywhere in the province, and given the testimony in Acts (16:1-2, 6) that specifies Pauline visits to Lystra, Derbe, and Iconium, to the south of the region of Galatia proper. According to the latter hypothesis, the apparent anomaly in Paul's behaviour is considerably mitigated. For a brief survey of this issue see J. Knox, "Galatia," in IDB v.2, 338-343. 341-342.

seems content to allow his converts in major urban centres to evangelize the surrounding region. Additionally, "[w]hen Paul rhetorically catalogs the places where he has suffered danger, he divides the world into city, wilderness, and sea (2 Cor. 11:26). His world does not include the χώρα, the productive countryside; outside the city there is nothing — erēmia."  

Theissen’s enumeration of "factors" is specific to Roman Palestine, tending often to focus on individual historical events or circumstances exclusive to that locale. It cannot be considered applicable to Paul’s non-Palestinian world at all, never mind to its urban sectors. At the very least, Paul’s exclusive focus on urban evangelization would have brought him into contact with a very different social sector of the populace than that which can be assumed for rural or semi-rural Palestine. Paul’s converts represent a group of people with different occupations, different typical values, different experiences, and different daily behaviors than the tradents of the early synoptic tradition. In Paul’s case, we can be fairly certain of the social character and class of his converts: they were artisans and commercial traders. Paul, in passing, appears to identify himself as a craftsman (as someone who works with his hands: ἐργάζεσθαι ταῖς ἱδίαις χερσίν [1 Cor 4:12]), and Acts 18:3 echoes this hint in its characterization of Paul as a tentmaker (σκηνοτοποῦς).  

In 1 Thess 4:11, he uses precisely the same phrase to character-

22. See 1 Thess 1:8, where Paul describes "the word of the Lord" “sounding forth” throughout Macedonia and Achaia from the Thessalonians themselves.  
24. For instance, Theissen, when seeking analogies to the behaviour of the itinerants, focuses on Palestinian evidence of beggary, on "prophetic movements," on resistant Zealots, on the Qumran community (see, e.g., Theissen, First Followers of Jesus, 35).  
25. See also 1 Thess 2:9, where Paul speaks of his (and Timothy’s and Silvanus’) "labour" (τὰν κότον ἡμῶν). It is difficult to imagine what tendentious motives might have inspired the author of Acts to concoct his characterization of Paul as a tentmaker (or better, leather worker). The assertion seems redactionally unmotivated and may constitute an isolated tradition. As result, and in tandem with Paul’s own compatible references to his work, we may, for once, trust the information provided in Acts. On Paul as a craftsman, see Ronald F. Hock, The Social Context of Paul’s Ministry: Tentmaking and Apostleship (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1980), 20, 31; Carolyn Osiek, What are They Saying About the Social Setting of the New Testament? (New York: Paulist Press, 1984), 53.
ize the activity of his converts, when he exhorts them to (continue to) "work with your hands" (ἐργάζεσθαι ταῖς [ἰδίαις] χερσίν ὑμῶν), and the leaders of this church seem to be artisanal laborers as well (see 1 Thess 5:12). 26 Typically, these figures seem to have represented a relatively underprivileged and impoverished segment of the urban population. 27 The Corinthian church may show more social variegation than the one in Thessalonica. Some scholars have detected in the assertion that "not many" (οὐ πολλοί) of the Corinthians are wise, powerful, or well-born (1 Cor 1:26-29) the assumption that some members of the group do possess these characteristics. 28 Prosopographical evidence likewise seems to indicate that at least those individuals mentioned by name in the Corinthian correspondence are of relatively high social and/or economic standing. 29 Some individuals in Corinth are involved in litigation over βιωτικά (1 Cor 6:1-

26. In fact, 1 Thessalonians is curiously replete with the use of labour imagery. See 1 Thess 1:3; 2:9, 13: 3:2; 5; 4:11; 5:12-14.
27. Note that when the "work" that such craftspeople engage in, and by analogy, mission work, is described by Paul, words with pejorative or negative connotations (as opposed to neutral terms such as ἐργαζόμενος) are employed with considerable frequency, particularly the terms ὑπάτος and ὑπατίω (Rom 16:6; 12; 1 Cor 3:8; 4:2; 15:10, 58; 16:16; 2 Cor 6:5; 10:15; 11:23, 27; Gal 4:11; Phil 2:16; 1 Thess 1:3; 2:9; 3:5; 5:12). Paul's own self-description seems to confirm this sense of his occupational self-consciousness: he is slavish (1 Cor 9:19), humiliated (2 Cor 11:7), held in disrepute (1 Cor 4:10), work- weary (1 Cor 4:12; cf. 1 Thess 2:9), and impoverished (1 Cor 4:11-12; 2 Cor 6:5, 10; Phil 4:12; so are the Thessalonian Christians: 2 Cor 8:1-3). See also Hock, Tentmaking and Apostleship, 31, 65-68. It appears that artisans, if not in their own self-regard, at least in the eyes of others, represented a despised occupation in antiquity. See, for instance, Cicero, De Officiis, 1.150, quoted in Moses I. Finley, The Ancient Economy (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1973), 42; Plutarch, Marcus Cato, quoted in Vernon K. Robbins, Ancient Quotes and Anecdotes: From Crib to Crypt (Sonoma, California: Polebridge Press, 1989), 182, §620; Plutarch, Pericles, 2.1-2 quoted in Finley, Ancient Economy, 43, 54: Dio Chrysostom 34.22-23 (LCL, 357-359); see also Hock, Tentmaking and Apostleship, 30, 34, 36, 40; Finley, Ancient Economy, 82.
29. See Malherbe, Social Aspects, 71-78; Meeks, First Urban Christians, 55-63; Theissen, "Social Stratification," 73-96. Some of the prosopographical data derived from Rom 16 probably pertains to Corinth as well: there is some evidence that this chapter represents a letter fragment written in Corinth and originally destined for Ephesus.
Evidentiary Weaknesses

11); others were able to support individual missionaries (see 1 Cor 9:12; 2 Cor 11:5-7). Moreover, Theissen proposes that the difficulties encountered by Paul with his Corinthian congregation may be in large measure results of the fact that the congregation was socially stratified. These better-off individuals, however, appear to have been involved in trade, manufacture, and commerce as well, albeit more lucratively. The fact that it would be in Corinth, a major trading center by virtue of its position straddling an isthmus, that we see the greatest prominence of better-off converts to Pauline Christianity, is probably no coincidence. "The 'typical' Christian, however, the one who most often signals his presence in the letters by one or another small clue, is a free artisan or a small trader. Some even in those occupational categories had houses, slaves, the ability to travel, and other signs of wealth."33

Not surprisingly, the urban locale and the typical occupations of the Pauline converts appear to have impacted on the basic behaviour and the self-conceptualization of these people to a significant degree. Poor though they may (often) be, they are capable, to some limited degree, of raising surplus income. Despite strenuous claims to the contrary, Paul at least sometimes depends on his converts for support (see esp. Phil 4:15-16; 2 Cor 11:8-9), and he also undertakes a collection of money from his churches for the community in Jerusalem (1 Cor 16:1-4; 2 Cor 8-9; Gal 2:10; Rom 15:25-

32. The language of common occupation is used as much for those whom Paul mentions by name — normally the more privileged members of his churches — as it is for his converts in general and himself. See, most strikingly, the list of names in Rom 16. Note also that the fairly extensive travel in which Paul’s "fellow workers" engage in is suggestive of commercial occupations. Meeks, First Urban Christians, 66, takes the reference to lawsuits, which probably applies to better-off Corinthians, as an indication of their involvement in commerce.
33. Meeks, First Urban Christians, 73. He also notes, First Urban Christians, 44, that all of the cities in which Paul founded churches were centres of trade and commerce.
34. Theissen, "Legitimation and Subsistence," 36, claims that the urban Mediterranean world was experiencing an economic boom at the time of Paul, even while Palestine "was caught in a tightening economic squeeze."
Paul in fact describes his experiences in terms of occasional prosperity (Phil 4:12-13): "I know what it is to have little, and I know what it is to have plenty. In any and all circumstances I have learned the secret of being well-fed and of going hungry. of having plenty and of being in need." Urbanites, even apparently those from lower classes, are not living on the margins of subsistence.

Even more relevant for our purposes, the apparently extensive travel of the Pauline Christians appears to have attained much of its complexion from their occupations. Travel is not something that either Paul or his συνεργοί are inspired to do as a result of a sense of mission; their mission, rather, takes its itinerant makeup from the fact that they are accustomed to travel. Travel was not undertaken lightly in the first century Empire, nor was it undertaken for pleasure. The difficulties involved were extensive, and the traveler was exposed to hunger, thirst, cold, attacks from brigands, and shipwrecks. Wealthier individuals would probably have sent servants in their place when long-distant contact of some sort was necessary (cf. "Chloe’s people" in 1 Cor 1:11). So, why are people with whom Paul is in contact so accustomed to travel? Because, apparently, it was an occupational characteristic associated with, inter alia, craftsmen. Paul indicates that he plies his trade in the cities he visits in order to support himself (1 Thess 2:9); his Macedonian converts appear to be involved in an evangelization of the hinterland, or at least to have contact with it (see 1 Thess 1:7-9). Given this pattern, and the exceptional mobility of a number of Paul’s closest associates, it seems most economical and in accord with the evidence to conclude that the trades in which Paul and most of his converts earned their livings were such that they

35. On this, see Meeks, First Urban Christians, 65-66.
36. On this, see Hock, Tentmaking and Apostleship, 28.
37. Hock, Tentmaking and Apostleship, 27-28, notes that there were travelling artisans and tradespeople in the first-century Roman Empire.
required their practitioners, like itinerant tinkers, to circulate constantly in order to capture a sufficient market to support themselves with any consistency. Such movement may have been fixed and periodic, may have been seasonal, may have been dictated by the more or less arbitrary demands of the market, may have been itinerant alongside more fixed practitioners of the same trades; but here is not the place to explore these problems. Individuals involved in commerce — presumably better-off than the artisans who comprised the bulk of the Pauline churches — may also have had to engage in periodic travel, or at least have their servants do so, in order to examine goods, negotiate contracts, and so forth. The point, at any rate, is that for such a class, travel would not have been regarded as out of the ordinary or itself constitutive of a deliberately deracinating change of lifestyle. "Mission" work would instead have been a supplement to their occupational activities — not a departure from them. It would have been a financially necessary type of activity — not a precondition of beggary. For Paul, "apostles, prophets, and teachers" may indeed travel, but they are not the only ones who do so, and hence these "offices," if offices they be, are not defined by itinerancy. Nor would such "missionary" travel have been restricted to local; it is often long-distance and inter-urban, even (sometimes) international.

Finally, the Pauline Christians conceptualize their new institution (the churches) in terms that reflect their urban context. Evincing a fictively political self-understanding, for instance in describing Jesus as "Lord" (κύριος, 197x total), which corresponds to the more or less public character of the church, the very terminology used to describe these fictive political groups is ἐκκλησία (44x), a term which, in pre-Christian usage, appears to refer most frequently to the legislative assembly of the

---

Greek πόλις. Meeks hesitantly adds that a handful of the offices of the new groups are described in terms evoking some kind of (urban) political appointment:

The only candidates for titles common to the Pauline groups and associations are episkopos (Phil 1:1) and diakonos (Phil 1:1; Rom 16:1), which in these passages may have a technical sense designating a local "office," and prostatēs (Rom 16:2), which almost certainly does not. Prostatēs is often used in inscriptions of associations, either as a functional designation (presiding officer; cf. 1 Thess. 5:12) or as a title, but where Roman influence is strong, as it certainly was in Corinth and Cenchreae, it often translates patronus.

In addition, Paul normally addresses himself, in his letters, not to families or to individuals (the exception, among the undisputed letters, is of course Philemon), but to cities: τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ τῇ οὐσίᾳ ἐν Κορίνθῳ, etc. Likewise, Jesus seems to be employed by Paul according to a martyrdom motif in which the one who suffers for the sake of his city brings it salvation (of some kind). And some of the most interesting work currently being done on the sociology of Pauline Christianity is involved in comparing his churches to urban "voluntary associations," a type of organization which seems much more characteristic of the cities than in rural contexts. Given the sharp dif-

39. BAGD, 240. See also Meeks, First Urban Christians, 79: "The choice of εκκλησία might appear to have structural parallel in the language of the associations, for they commonly imitated the technical terms for the structure of the republican city, and the best-known use of the term εκκλησία was for the voting assembly of free citizens in Athens and other free cities of Greek constitution."

40. Meeks, First Urban Christians, 79.

41. On this see Mack, Myth of Innocence, 104-107, citing Sam K. Williams, Jesus’ Death as Saving Event: The Background and Origin of a Concept (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1975); and David Seeley’s 1987 Claremont dissertation, "The Concept of the Noble Death in Paul" (published as The Noble Death: Graeco-Roman Martyrology and Paul’s Concept of Salvation [Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990]).

ferences and even mutual hostility of city and country,\textsuperscript{43} that the Pauline converts would behave in distinctively urban ways should come as no surprise.

Moreover, Paul describes and conceptualizes his own behaviour in ways quite different from those supposed to characterize the charismatic itinerants, as Theissen himself points out. Paul’s behaviour in his travels is oriented toward founding communities, and he works to support himself.\textsuperscript{44} The behaviour of these groups, in turn, either matches that of Paul, or develops its own distinctive patterns:

A familial love-patriarchalism, which places a high value on the obedience of women, children, and slaves and has little room for the nonfamilial ethical radicalism of the synoptic tradition, is characteristic of these communities with their marked social. In this setting charismatic begging was inappropriate.\textsuperscript{45}

In fact, were it not for such significant differences of context, as noted above, Paul would serve rather as an embarrassment to the itinerancy hypothesis, for in spite of his "wandering" lifestyle, he by no means espouses its imitation, concedes it any real significance, or imbues it with a system of radical ethics. Theissen notes that even the proclamation of the "Kingdom of God," critical for the self-legitimation of the synoptic sayings tradition, is all but absent in Paul’s letters.\textsuperscript{46} We might wonder, then, how it is that Theissen and so many others have deduced a wandering \textit{Sitz} from this "ethical rad-

\textsuperscript{43}See especially Ramsay MacMullen, \textit{Roman Social Relations: 50 B.C. to A.D. 284} (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1974), ch.2, "Rural-Urban," 28-56; cf also Meeks, \textit{First Urban Christians}, 14-15. Note that Theissen, \textit{First Followers of Jesus}, 47-58, also recognizes endemic urban-rural conflicts in the Empire, and makes them the centerpiece of his "socio-ecological factors," but, surprisingly, claims that "the socio-ecological structure of the land cannot be expressed in terms of the opposition between city and country" (47). Presumably, Theissen’s statement is inspired by his perception of the presence of — and \textit{cultural} (n.b.!) opposition between — Hellenistic cities, on the one hand, and main Jewish cities, on the other.

\textsuperscript{44}Theissen, "Legitimation and Subsistence," 35-40. See esp. 40: "Thus Paul represents a type of missionary who can be described as the goal-oriented community organizer, breaking new ground and establishing independent groups apart from Judaism rather than 'grazing' among existing groups of sympathizers."

\textsuperscript{45}Theissen, "Legitimation and Subsistence," 37.

\textsuperscript{46}Theissen, "Legitimation and Subsistence," 36. The phrase "Kingdom of God" or its equivalent ("his Kingdom") occurs at Rom 14:17; 1 Cor 4:20; 6:9-10; 15:50; Gal 5:21; and 1 Thess 2:12.
icalism" when the one sure instance of repeated travel which we have in the early
Christian record does not evince such "radicalism" at all. Paul’s travels and
community-founding activity cannot serve as evidence of Theissen’s radical itinerants at
all, and his designations of office does not transpose easily into any conclusions about
the import of those offices.

The problem is compounded if one suspects — and there is good reason for so
doing — that in many ways Paul has in fact provided the template for itinerancy,
simply because he is the only instance of actual habitual travel that really have from
earliest Christianity.47 Paul at least appears to provide the model, the impulse, the
vision, which is then transposed backwards onto a rural Sitz and onto a literary tradition
which does happen to exhibit an explicit rhetoric of deracination. At any rate, not only
does Paul correspond to a different type than the itinerants proposed by Theissen — and
hence is not a usable example of same; in fact Paul’s witness highlights some problems
with the itinerancy hypothesis. Cynic itinerancy developed in as urban a context as the
Pauline churches; Theissen even claims that the Cynic paradigm was explicitly evoked,
both negatively and positively, by Paul.48 And Cynicism does — as proponents of the
Cynic hypothesis have elucidated in some detail — display at least some of the
deracinating characteristics attributed to the synoptic tradents. But if it is Paul’s urban
setting — a completely different socio-economic context than that of the sayings tradi-

---

47. Ignatius travelled once and under exceptional circumstances. Peter and other Jerusalem missionaries
as they appear in Acts are products of the author’s redactional interest in presenting the Jerusalem
church, as a unified body, as engaged in mission, linking the Christian churches throughout the world
into one unified and organized body. Paul attests to Peter’s presence in Antioch, as well as to “men from
James” (Gal 2:11-12). We have no reason to think, however, that such travels were habitual or in any
way like that of the “radical itinerants”: they appear instead to be exceptional “ambassadorial” assign-
ments. As has been pointed out to me by Darlene Juschka, the “itinerancy” of Jesus himself, as well as
that of the “apostles” and Paul in Acts, corresponds to a well-known motif in antiquity in which founder
figures (who are often conflated with the gods) are cast as itinerant. Thus we have the itinerancy of, say,
Apollonius of Tyana; but especially revealing is that imputed to Hippocrates.
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... — that accounts for the departure of his behaviors and ethos from that proposed for the itinerants, how is it possible that the Cynics do not likewise depart from this radical ethos? Something is amiss here. Either the Cynics, by virtue of being an urban phenomenon, do not represent an instance of itinerancy comparable to that behind the sayings tradition; or Paul demonstrates that primitive Christians engaged in travel simply did not look the way Theissen thinks they looked. One must either give up the notion that there is any evidence for such a phenomenon as radical itinerancy in the context in which the early Jesus movement arose, or must understand Paul as a diametrically opposite example, and thus be forced to explain why such an instance should have arisen.

THE EVIDENCE OF THE DIDACHE

It was in Harnack's work on the Didache that the basic lineaments of the itinerancy hypothesis were first drawn out, and it is here in particular that one finds the most important clear evidence that there were such things as Christian itinerants. Harnack's sketch is paradigmatic for the character of the itinerancy hypothesis as it developed over the course of the twentieth century: nearly all of its fundamental features recur in subsequent reconstructions. And in fact the Didache is returned to again and again by more recent advocates of itinerancy as the text which best expresses the basic characteristics of ancient Christian itinerancy, and which best establishes the sine

Evidentiary Weaknesses

It is the (apparently) obvious and explicit appearance of itinerants in the *Didache* that allows us to be so confident that they may also lurk behind Q. As it turns out, however, the text of the *Didache* as it stands provides little more support for Harnack's — or Theissen's — overly-tidy and romantic reconstruction of the situation than does the example of Paul's travels.51

Harnack's typology of "apostles, prophets, and teachers," which he regards to be an ancient classification of charismatic "office," and on the basis of which he sketches out greater and lesser degrees of peregrination and authority, is inconsistent with what the text actually says. Audet notes, for instance, that the three-fold classification is nowhere connected in the *Didache* with any concept of hierarchy;52 Paul's delineation of a hierarchy of "office" in 1 Cor 12:28 is situational and *ad hoc*, specifically designed to counter the Corinthians' claims to spiritual superiority in view of their proficiency in glossolalia.53 Audet adds that the alleged "charisma" of the offices in the *Didache* is only attested for "prophets": it is only in connection with them — not

50. This is especially true of recent "comprehensive" applications of the itinerancy thesis, such as those of Crossan and Patterson. See especially Crossan, "Itinerants and Householders," 117-123, in which he uses the *Didache* as an expression of the voice and sentiments of "householders" over against the voice and sentiments of itinerants behind Q; and Patterson, *Gospel of Thomas and Jesus*, 172-178, in which the *Didache* is used as the primary text illustrating the character of conflicts between itinerants and their sedentary supporters. Theissen also, of course, *First Followers of Jesus*, 9-10, 19-21, along with many others who follow him, does cite the *Didache* as a way of establishing that such itinerant radicals did indeed exist.

51. The major commentary on the *Didache* in the twentieth century is that of Audet, *Didachè*, who, in his discussion of Didache 11:3-6 (435-447), devotes considerable effort to the refutation of several of Harnack's points, arguing that he has done violence to what the text actually says. See also further below.

52. Audet, *Didachè*, 439.

53. Note also that Paul does not here restrict himself by any means to this trinity of roles, but extends the discussion to "deeds of power" and the "gift" of healing. 1 Cor 14:19 makes clear Paul's motivation in assigning preeminence to apostles, prophets, and teachers, and in playing down more obvious charismatic and ecstatic manifestations of the spirit: "In church I would rather speak five words with my mind, in order to instruct others also, than ten thousand words in a tongue" (NRSV). See also the discussion of Paul above. Against the applicability to Paul of Harnack's typology, see also Heinrich Greeven, "Propheten, Lehrer, Vorsteher bei Paulus," *Zeitschrift für die neuestamentliche Wissenschaft* 44 (1952): 1-43.
with apostles and teachers — that we hear of speech ἐν πνεύματι (11:7-9, 12).\textsuperscript{54} In fact, one might go farther than Audet; nowhere in the Didache is any threefold typology, as such, attested at all: in one place (11:1-2) we hear only of teachers; elsewhere (11:3) apostles and prophets; elsewhere (12:1) "those who come in the name of the Lord"; elsewhere (13:1-2) prophets and teachers; elsewhere still (15:1-2) prophets, teachers, bishops, and deacons.\textsuperscript{55} Nor are these "offices" rigorously distinguished from one another; the three terms in question appear to be interchangeable, at least in part.

In the crucial chapter 11, for instance, we find that an ἀπόστολος can be accused of being a ψευδοπροφήτης (11:5-6), while a προφήτης is characterized by his activity διδάσκων (11:10).

The same kinds of objections might be made with respect to the supposed travelling activity of such figures. The text speaks repeatedly of "coming" (ἐρχόμενος πρὸς ὑμᾶς) as a central activity under consideration in chapters 11-13. Yet this "coming" is connected explicitly with teachers in 11:1-2, whom Harnack regards to be sedentary, and nowhere with prophets (but cf. 13:1), whom Harnack thinks are itinerant.\textsuperscript{56} It is clear, moreover, that the author of the Didache did not view ἐρχόμενος as synonymous with or denotative of actual travel, for in 12:2 he feels the need to specify: εἰ μὲν παρόδιος ἐστιν ὁ ἐρχόμενος . . . . Certainly, travel is sometimes at issue here: the text's considerable discussion of how long "apostles" might stay and how they are to be sent on their way (11:4-6), as well as comments about the absorption and reception of other travelers (12:2-4) precludes any contrary suppositions. But the "coming" associated with these figures is not itself intrinsically linked to itinerancy, and it is debatable

\textsuperscript{54} Audet, Didachè, 439.
\textsuperscript{55} So also Draper, "Social Ambiguity," 299 (and see n.40), who calls the threefold ministry "a synthetic construction."
\textsuperscript{56} Likewise, Niederwimmer, "Entwicklungsgeschichte," 156-157, regards "prophets" in the Didache as being quite as indisputably itinerant as "apostles."
whether travel is the defining feature of their activity. Given these discrepancies, it is far more likely that the author of the *Didache* used the verb "to come" to denote appearance or manifestation, rather than actual geographical travel. The verb itself cannot, in any consistent way, evince or depict itinerancy.

Much of the more sophisticated scholarship on the *Didache* since Harnack has come up against the text's failure to speak explicitly of an order of itinerants and local leaders, and has dealt with it, appropriately, by punishing the refractory text itself. Discrepancies between what the text actually says and the image of a tripartite order of charismatics are attributed to redactional layering of the text, which then is held to reflect either changing estimations of the itinerants, or differing descriptions of them, or shifts in the overall situation of the author. For instance, in 11:3 a discussion of "apostles and prophets" is opened, but in chapter 13 (and cf. 15:1-2), the discussion has moved, without comment, to "prophets and teachers." Working from the assumption that these designations represent stable and relatively fixed offices, it becomes

---

57. For examples and discussion of ἐρχομαι used with this sense, see *BAGD*, 310-311, especially meanings 1.1.a.η, 1.1.b.α.β, and 1.1.c.α.β.

58. For a review of scholarship on the redactional history of chapters 11-13, up to 1977 see the extended note in Niederwimmer, "Entwicklungsgeschichte," 148-149 n.8. See also the summary given in Clayton N. Jefford and Stephen J. Patterson, "A Note on Didache 12.2a (Coptic)," *Second Century* 7/2 (1989-90): 65-75, 69-71; and for their own view that the Coptic MS which ends at Didache 12:2a represents not an excerpt but a version of the text prior to a redactional addition of the material from 12:2b to the end of chapter 16. Patterson, *Gospel of Thomas and Jesus*, 172-178, takes the standard view that chapters 12 and 13 represent a later stage in the document's development but, against Niederwimmer and Schille, that this later material reflects a time when "... the power and authority of the wanderers had declined even further" (177, emphasis mine). Patterson argues this rather peculiar view on the grounds that chapter 15, which he also regards as part of the later Didachist's redaction, locates authority in a sedentary leadership of bishops and deacons. Niederwimmer and Schille, in slightly different ways, take the more straightforward view that chapters 12-13, with their milder tone and broader generosity, reflect a higher placement within the community for "apostles and prophets." In favour of the latter view is the fact that the chapter 11 material implies that prophets and apostles are outsiders, extraordinary, an epiphenomenon to be handled carefully by the community; while in the later material in chapters 12 and 13, these roles are integrated completely into the life of the community, and indeed are intrinsically related to such local and hierarchical offices as bishops and deacons (15:1-2; see also the conclusions of Niederwimmer, "Entwicklungsgeschichte," 166-167).
necessary to posit a redactional shift between chapters 11 and 13, alongside concomitant changes in *Sitze*. The latter, supposedly more sedentary, figures represent the focal interest of the *later* material. The situation is similar for the distinction between the passing hospitality to be accorded to "apostles" (11:3-6; cf. 12:2) and the acceptance to be accorded those who seek a permanent home (12:3-5; 13:1-2). Patterson regards this change in topic as due to a shift in situation: while earlier material dealt with itinerants, this material deals with refugees, perhaps from the (first) Jewish War or from the later Bar Kochba rebellion. That such a shift has taken place is also indicated, according to Patterson, by the differences of tone between chapters eleven and thirteen. The latter seems to accord a great deal of status to the "itinerants," and enunciates their worthiness to benefit from this status; while the former aims to restrict the legitimacy of their claims, whether these be claims to authority or claims to material benefit.

John Kloppenborg refers to the Didache as a "manifestly stratified composition." Jonathan Draper, similarly, accuses even advocates of itinerancy, such as Kretschmar and Theissen, of "confusion" generated by a failure to take redactional stages into account in their reading of the text. Yet Draper describes the redactional history of the Didache in a fashion almost entirely opposite that of Patterson. He argues that the instructions on apostles (11:3-6) represent the *earliest* segment of the text.

---

60. Patterson, *Gospel of Thomas and Jesus*, 176-177.
while those regarding prophets are the *latest* redaction.63 His argument rests on the observation that the instructions concerning apostles have a marked formal similarity to the remainder of the document, introduced with the stock phrase, ἄριστα δὲ τῶν . . . οὕτω ποιήσατε (cf. 7:1; 9:1), and exhibiting "brevity" and "casuistic development"; while the instructions regarding prophets are detailed, vivid, and self-contradictory.64 The injunctions about correct teaching in 11:1-2 he regards as a later gloss on 11:3-6. made, however, before the instructions on prophets were added.65

It is worth questioning, however, how necessary such an hypothesis of the *literarily-stratified* character of this *section* of the text really is: the material on travelers in chapters 11-13 (and 15:1-2) is fairly coherent thematically and formally, and its jumpiness probably stems more from the amassing and incorporation of anterior tradition to buttress and/or nuance the author's views, rather than from a multiplicity of textual redactions or some sort of internal self-contradiction in the views expressed as a result of the presence of distinct redactional strata.66 Such a literary procedure can also

---

63. Draper, "Torah and Troublesome Apostles," 350 and n.14. Draper cites for extended argumentation a 1989 paper read for the Social History of Early Christianity sub-group of the Society of Biblical Literature, entitled "Weber and the Wandering Charismatic: A Critique of Theissen's handling of Prophecy in the Didache," which I have not been able to find in print. It is in fact unclear to me just which *section* "on prophecy" he is referring to. I assume that he is focusing on chapter 11, and hence the material to which he refers as a later addition is 11:7-12. It remains to be wondered what relationship is to be assumed between this material and the instructions on prophecy in ch.13. *Probably* Draper assumes that they were added to the text at the same point (along with ch.12?), since he describes the advice given about prophets as "self-contradictory."

64. Draper, "Torah and Troublesome Apostles," 351. Draper is forced by his argument to conclude that the reference to prophets in 11:3, and the phrase κατὰ τὸ δόγμα τοῦ εὐαγγελίου in the same verse are later glosses, added when the material on prophets was introduced into the text.


66. As I argue below in connection to the relative dating of the subsections of chs.11-13's argument, it makes little sense to argue for literary stratification reflecting shifting *Slize* on the basis of apparent *contradictions* in the text. As we can see in the cases of Matthew's and Luke's redaction of Mark, if material runs counter to the redirectors viewpoint, it is either omitted or modified in such a way that it no longer does so. Matthew and Luke's co-incidentally joint omission of Mark 8:22-26 illustrates the point: Jesus here looks rather incompetent, so they simply eliminate the offending material. An even clearer example is Luke's treatment of the disciples. Instead of juxtaposing his own rather lofty vision of the "twelve apostles" with Mark's peculiar emphasis on their inadequacy (which would have resulted in a text with a two-stage redaction holding contrary views side by side), Luke omits or significantly changes the material that communicates this Marcan emphasis (see, for instance, Luke's omission, after 9:22, of
be seen in the text's various allusions to the Tanakh and to older sayings tradition (regardless of whether this material is drawn from independent tradition or from the texts of the synoptic gospels: in either case, it still represents the usage of materials predating the composition of the text or the issues addressed by it). 67 This pastiche-style is relatively predictable in a document of this sort. Jonathan Draper asserts:

... a community rule evolves by trial and error, by erasing words and phrases, by inserting new words or phrases above the line or in the margin, which are later incorporated into the text. This process is graphically displayed in the manuscript of the Community Rule from Qumran. Certainly whole new sections may have been added from time to time, but one should not hypothesize a wholesale, consistent composition for every change.68

This is not to say that the Didache is not an obviously composite document: its incorporation of an earlier integral writing — the "Two Ways" document — is practi-

Mark's rebuke in 8:32-33). Other early Christian documents for which stratification has been proposed exhibit, so far as one can tell, the same phenomenon. The later stages of redaction do not give the appearance of contradicting the earlier stages, but of building on them. Hence, in the case of Q, the second redaction builds on the compositional layer of the document by adding apocalyptic imagery and the theme of judgment — as well as a tendency to mythologize wisdom — to a primarily sapiential layer, which did not include these elements, but did not preclude them either. (Critics of the hypothesis that Q is stratified who point out that "wisdom" is not incompatible with "apocalypticism" are missing the point, and, unwittingly, actually strengthening the case for stratification.) The same is true of the stratification I have proposed for the Gospel of Thomas: the (proto-)Gnostic secondary redaction is able to build on a sapiential core precisely because this core is not inimical to its interests. In this case, the use of an explicitly esoteric hermeneutic means that the reader is challenged to read a Gnostic-like orientation into material that does not explicitly have promote such a viewpoint. Draper comments, analogously that "[t]here would be no need to write instructions regulating a dead institution..." (Draper, "Torah and Troublesome Apostles," 350-351).

67. See, more elegantly, John Dominic Crossan, "Itinerants and Householders," 117: "Stratification is certainly evident in the present text but I am, in general, reading those layers as preceding developments prelaminated into its constitutive formulation rather than succeeding redactions postlaminated upon its basic literary composition." This assertion seems a departure from his earlier apparent acceptance of Patterson's stratification of the document (Historical Jesus, 342-343), although one might argue that what we see here is in fact simply a shift in emphasis or perspective.

68. Draper, "Torah and Troublesome Apostles," 349. Note that Draper here is constructing an argument quite at odds with what I am claiming: he believes that the text of the Didache has become composite as a result of extensive glossing to an already-unified written work. But his description of the evolution of "community rules" quoted here is at least as helpful for my case as for his.
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But at issue is not whether earlier materials of various sorts (including both complete written documents and fragmentary oral traditions) have been incorporated into the Didache, but whether there has been overarching and tendentious redactional modification of the materials in chapters 11-13 (and 15:1-2) from divergent perspectives at some point after these instructions had been committed, in writing, to the text of the Didache. This issue really boils down to two important questions: are these instructions self-contradictory? And, if so: does that contradiction reveal stages of development in the significance of figures they describe? The evidence of the text, in my view, suggests a negative answer to both of these questions. Indeed, the instance where we can be most sure of the Didache’s use of earlier traditions — the "Two Ways" section — actually supports a view of the document as composed of a pastiche-like collocation of desultorily useful earlier materials. It is certain that this "Two Ways" schema significantly predates the composition of the Didache: something like a prototype of it exists in the Qumran Manual of Discipline (1QS), which may have been composed as early as 100 B.C.E., and under completely different circumstances as the Didache. We therefore cannot regard the incorporation of the "Two Ways" material in the Didache as anything like a "Didaché." In general, we need not regard aporiae

69. The "two ways" material appears also in Barnabas 18-20; Doctrina apostolorum; Canons of the Holy Apostles (or Apostolic Church Order); Apostolic Constitutions 7.2.2-6; and cf. the Qumran Manual of Discipline (1QS 3.13-4.26). For a clear and recent summary exposition of the differences among these versions and the literary relationships among them, see Kloppenborg, "Transformation of Moral Exhortation," 88-92. Note also the literature cited there, and see, inter alios, Audet, La Didachè, 122-163, and esp. his synoptic chart, 138-153; Crossan, "Itinerants and Householders," 121-123, and esp. his synoptic chart, 125; Richard A. Horsley, "Logoi Prophêtôn?: Reflections on the Genre of Q," pp.195-209 in Birger Pearson, ed., The Future of Early Christianity: Essays in Honor of Helmut Koester (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991), 207; Jefford, Sayings of Jesus, 22-29; Niederwimmer, Die Didache, 48-64.

70. To illustrate the difference I am invoking here between "stratification" and use of anterior traditions, note that Q is a probably a genuinely stratified document, but each of the literary layers of the document themselves make use of anterior traditions.


72. In spite of the fact that something like the Didache's version of it may formed a textual basis for its incorporation into several other early Christian writings.
in the text (which may indicate the use of traditional materials), therefore, as necessarily due to redactional levels — that is, stratification — within the Didache itself. Rather, synoptic-like, a whole shifting and variegated mass of perpetually-modified traditions have been worked together into a single document: aporiae in the Didache need not be treated in and of themselves any differently than analogous aporiae are treated when they appear in, say, the Gospel of Mark.73

Nor do Draper's claims about the way community rules develop entirely support his reconstruction of the temporal sequence behind this material. Although we can assume that he is correct to regard community rules as especially susceptible to revisions, it is not necessary that these revisions take the form of later glosses to and/or corrections of a basic completed text. On the contrary, we can also regard such rules as developing in the "prelaminated" fashion suggested by Crossan: that is, by incorporating materials already formulated in the life of the community into a larger fixed document which exhibits a certain amount of internal coherence. Hence, material that formally matched the compositional characteristics of the document as a whole might be regarded as later than slightly idiosyncratic sections (especially if these idiosyncratic sections do not exhibit any consistent coherence amongst themselves, which would of course be the necessary and sufficient basis for a stratification hypothesis). Such a process matches the Didache's pastiche style. And it avoids the postulation of glosses or redactions which serve only to contradict material already in place and subsequently left intact, which would be an unusual and counterintuitive redactional process. As a general rule, we should prefer reconstructions of stages in a document's compositional history that postulate a lesser, rather than a greater, degree of self-contradiction in the

73. Niederwimmer, Die Didache, 64-78, treats the redaction of the Didache similarly, i.e., as a bringing together of various older materials by a single "author," rather than a composition in discrete redactional stages. See also his "Entwicklungsgeschichte," 147-153.
resultant text. This is something of a truism: additions *add* to the meaning of themes already contained in the document, normally, rather than deliberately contradicting them. If contradiction of traditional concepts were required — and it does seem to have been required in ancient Christian writing often enough — the most expeditious thing to do would be to omit the offending material and replace it with something else. 74

These considerations do not *entirely* address Draper’s specific claim that 11:7-12 (apparently) was added after 11:3-6 was already in place in the text. Two further considerations militate against this particular conclusion. First, the very fact that 11:3 begins with the stock phrase used to introduce advice elsewhere in the *Didache* (*περὶ δὲ τῶν . . . οὖτω ποιήσατε*) is an indication that the material in 11:3-6 is a function of the redaction which embraces the whole document. Unless all of 11:7-12, and likely chapters 12 and 13 as well, represent extensive glosses, 11:3-6 would appear to be a redactional composition opening this general topic, which is then fleshed out by older, traditional materials. It is notable that 11:3 does in fact refer to prophets, thus anticipating the material in 11:7-12 (and chs. 12 and 13); Draper’s effort to explain this reference away as a gloss begs the question. Second, the argument that 11:3-6 is something of a redactional clasp is supported by the fact that 11:7 is linked to a foregoing assertion about baptism (10:7), both verbally and thematically. In 10:7 the *prophets* are to be allowed to hold the Eucharist however they see fit, even if their procedure is at odds with the formal instructions laid down in 9:1-10:6. 11:7 then reiterates the caution and latitude to be extended to these "prophets" in a slightly broader context: do not examine any prophet who is speaking in the Spirit. Indeed, 11:9, which specifies that a prophet who orders a *meal* in the spirit is a false prophet, may reflect an original connection

74. See n.66, above.
with the material on the Lord's Supper, although in the form in which we now have this proposition, its significance has been generalized. In any case, 11:7-12 seems to be linked to and flow out of the specific Eucharistic injunction at 10:7. This may serve as an indication that the Didache's redaction has here modified and reorganized — has intruded itself upon — already-extent material, which included specific guidelines on the Eucharist and related injunctions about testing prophets generally. Hence it is unlikely that 11:3-6 predates, as Draper suggests, the instructions in 11:7-12 (and chapters 12 and 13). Moreover, the redactional opening formulation of this intrusion serves as an indication that neither did this intrusion occur as a later reinterpretation of an earlier draft of the Didache, but rather arose at the point at which the document was compiled. 75

Finally, it does not appear plausible to claim, as Patterson does, that the temporal or redactional rift in this material occurs between 11:3-12:2a, on the one hand, and 12:2b-13:7, on the other, with the former section being the earlier. 76 Such a view, in Patterson's formulation, assumes that older instructions dealing with itinerants charisms have been retained after such charisms ceased to be an issue at all — hence the possibility of such positive exhortations to generosity in ch.13. These instructions have been modified by the inclusion of rules governing the acceptance of refugees from the Jewish Revolt of either 66-70 CE or 132-135 CE. Not only does this claim presume the peculiar process of textual stratification criticized above, in which later materials are postlaminated onto an original composition, it also assumes a tendency in the

75. Obviously, this particular observation is not directed against Draper's hypothesis, which asserts no such thing, but against the possibility of claiming that the discussion of prophets in 11:7-12 reflects an earlier written redaction of the Didache, modified later by inclusion of (at least) 11:3-6.
76. Patterson, Gospel of Thomas and Jesus, 174-177; "Legacy of Radical Itinerancy," 317-318; Jefford and Patterson, "A Note on Didache 12.2a." Niederwimmer's views in "Entwicklungsgeschichte" are similar, but not identical.
Didache to include material which no longer has any point of reference, and indeed, claims that a reversal of the sense of that older material by a redactional addition (i.e., ch.13’s apparent high estimation of the no-longer-extant itinerants) was made precisely because it longer had any real referent! If in fact a consideration of wanderers had become outdated, or was not imagined to refer to any meaningful current process, we would imagine that such matters would simply be eliminated from the text. And indeed, the MS tradition Patterson cites to support the view of an "original" text ending at 12:2 — the Coptic MS — actually suggests that at a later stage of the document's transmission history, this is precisely what happened: specific injunctions dealing with support of travelers had lost their relevance, and so were not copied out. But what is especially notable in regard to Patterson's thesis is that the complexes in 11:3-6 and that in chapter 12 are thematically, formally, and stylistically almost identical, for instance, in their use of participles, use of ἐστιν as a copula, frequent use of present and future tenses, profuse use of second-position conjunctions, profuse use of negatives (οὐκ or μὴ), profuse use of ei, and the frequent use of ἐάν plus subjunctive. Note the following strong parallels (parallel stylistic or vocabularic features are bolded):

3Περὶ δὲ τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ προφητῶν κατὰ τὸ δόγμα τοῦ εὐαγγελίου οὕτω ποιήσατε.

4πᾶς δὲ ἀπόστολος ἔρχομενος πρὸς υμᾶς δεχθῆτω ὡς κύριος.

7Καὶ πάντα προφήτην λαλοῦσα ἐν πνεύματι οὐ πειράσατε οὐδὲ διακρίνετε.

5οὐ μενεῖ δὲ <ei μὴ> ἡμέραν μίαν ἡν δὲ ἡ χρεία σου μενεῖ δὲ πρὸς υμᾶς ei μὴ δῶ ἡ τρεῖς ἡμέρας, ἡν ἡ ἀνάγκη {cf. ἀνάγκη}, καὶ τὴν ἄλλην.

πρεῖς δὲ ἐάν μείνη {cf. καθήσοι},

1αΠᾶς δὲ ὁ ἔρχομενος ἐν ἀνόματι κυρίου δεχθῆτω.

1ββειτα δὲ δικαίωσατε αὐτῶν γινώσκοντες σώματι γὰρ ἔξετε δεξιὰν καὶ ἀριστεράν.

2ει μὲν παροδίως ἐστιν ὁ ἔρχομενος, βοηθεῖτε αὐτῷ, ὅσον δύνασθε.

3ει δὲ θάλει πρὸς υμᾶς καθῆσαι {cf. μείνη}, τεχνίτης ὁν, ἐργαζόμεθα καὶ φαγέων.
This parallelism suggests at least *prima facie* that the two texts derive from the same hand. Of course, it is quite possible that one of the segments was modelled on the other by a later hand. It seems, however, extraordinarily unlikely that a secondary author would be able to replicate the style of his "source" so well, and even more unlikely that he would want to, especially if he is addressing, as Patterson claims, an entirely different issue (refugees rather than itinerants). This problem is compounded by the fact that in Patterson's hypothesis, when the secondary author wishes, unaccountably, to return to the outdated matter of itinerancy, he opts to do so in a fashion which does not parallel the foregoing material and which is not juxtaposed with it. Instead, he would erect a strong parallelism and a juxtaposition with the very different matter of refugees (12:2b-5) and then returns to the issue of itinerants at a later point (13:1-7) without invoking that parallelism or imitation. Patterson's reconstruction of the textual history of this section of the *Didache* as well, then, is probably inaccurate.

If on the basis of these considerations, we assume, with Niederwimmer, that a single hand has amassed the material in chs.11-13, but has in this process used already-extant traditions, a plausible compilation-history (for lack of a better term) of the *Didache* can be attempted. If the material in chapters 13, which advocates strong generosity to be extended to "prophets" (or the poor), had been later than the material which restricts such generosity (esp. ch.11), its very generality would contradict the earlier material. The addition of these chapters would be a statement that, in essence,
the original strictures in 11:3-6 (and 11:7-12) were wrong: one should, instead of being cautious with such figures, shower them with goods. If so, one wonders why such pre-redactional "older" advice was not simply omitted altogether: there would be no reason to include such traditions in the document if one wanted to argue precisely the opposite. On the other hand, if ch.13 either predates or is contemporary with the strictures in ch.11, these latter instructions can be viewed as a supplement to, a detailed and more restrictive elaboration of, the advice already given, rather than an outright contradiction. "Yes," this newer material is saying, "do show generosity to those to whom it is due, but make sure you're not being duped: test their authenticity on the basis of their behaviour, and limit the extent of your generosity to reasonable bounds." Note also that at least some of the contents of chapter 11 include, in spite of reservations about being swindled, a major assumption shared by the other material (i.e., esp. 10:7; 13:1-7): the sanctity of expressions of the Spirit. Hence 11:7, in spite of what appears to be a pressing concern with establishing the "credentials" of prophets, forbids people to test them while they are "speaking in a spirit" (λαλοῦντα ἐν πνεύματι). This segment of the document (chapters 11-13; and 15:1-2) probably evolved as follows.

(1) Earlier and traditional, i.e., pre-redactional community standards, are reflected in 11:7-12; 13:1-7; and 15:1-2. All of this material concerns the respect to be accorded to particular distinguished roles within the community: prophets (11:7; 13:1; 15:1-2), teachers (13:2; 15:1-2), the poor (13:4; 13:5?), bishops and deacons (15:1-2). As Draper points out, charismatic gifts in the kind of "strong group-weak grid" community implied by the Didache are treated with respectful reservation: "Societies with strongly defined group boundaries tend to view spirit-possession as dangerous, if potentially beneficial, and to limit it to a specialist class."77 Respect is also urged for

teachers, who are, in the language of this material, at times indistinguishable from prophets (see, for instance, 11:10; also 15:1-2). All of this material tends to conflate teaching with prophecy; these two roles are also specifically singled out as compatible with bishops and deacons: apostles are not mentioned. 15:1-2 is also linked to the discussion of prophets in chapters 11 and 13 in terms of wording, as well as explicit cross-references. The motive clause used to urge respect for both sets of offices is identical: αὐτοὶ γὰρ εἰσὶν οἱ . . . (ἀρχιερεῖς ἱμῶν — 13:3/τετιμημένοι ἱμῶν — 15:2). And as the bishops and deacons are like the prophets and teachers, so the prophets and teachers are like high priests. In all of these texts, a positive estimation, translatable into both respect and generosity, is urged for figures who, we must assume, while exercising a special role in the community, have not consolidated their authority. An effort at concretizing and formalizing intra-community structures is in progress. 78

(2) The redactional pre-history of these segments is not important for our purposes. Nevertheless, it should be noted that even here, prior to the compositional redaction of the Didache, some tendentious intervention has already taken place, which serves to unify even older fragments into a relatively coherent argument. Candidates for "redactional" creation at the hand of an earlier collector include 13:2, 3c ("for they are your high priests"), 4;79 15:1-2. An original association of 10:7 and 11:7, even if only at an oral level, may antedate these interventions, as may an association of the material in chapters 9:5-10:6 with that in chapter 14.

78. Draper, "Social Ambiguity," 298, 302-307, although for different reasons, sees the same agenda at work here. He associates the effort to specify community roles as part of what Werner Kelber would identify as a process of textualization. See esp. 307: "The emergence first of oral and then of written text provided the organizational change by which the community of the Didache overcame the severe problems that were left behind by the quarrel over Torah. The ambiguity of roles that is so clear in the instructions of the Didache is transformed by the emergence of an authoritative text . . . ."

The redactional level, that of the collector who put together the various traditions into what is now the *Didache*, is comprised, in our section, not only by the actual incorporation of the material, but also by the addition of the two parallels sets of instructions charted above, 11:3-6 and 12:1-5. These additions serve to bracket, in chiastic fashion, the older set of traditional rules at 12:7-12 which actually pertain to how to recognize charisma, and how to respect and reward those who possess it. This new, redactional, material, however, shifts the emphasis to the issue of hospitality and the disbursement of "church funds." The new material is linked to the earlier traditions by its formal concern with "apostles," i.e., identifiable functionaries, and also by the issue of giving. In the earlier material dealing with giving, however (ch.13), the question is what to do with surplus resources, not how to conserve them. All of this material, at any rate, has been brought together under the rubric of a broad concern with internal organization, and specifically, links the matter of hospitality and support both to the treatment of an emergent class of official functionaries and to the reception of "foreign" Christians in general (ch.12). The differentia of specific offices, and the even the "prophets" themselves, are not in fact at issue here. Instead they come under discussion as a part or factor within in a larger discussion of "giving."

---

80. Niederwimmer, "Entwicklungsgeschichte," 149. thinks such a solution impossible: "Man kann nicht 13,1 an 11,12 anschliessen, denn cap.13 ist zu deutlich durch das Stichwort θῆλων καθήσασθαι πρὸς ἵματι mit 12,3 ff. verbunden," although they address different situations and in fact stem from different hands. This observation, in which 13:1 follows logically on 12:1-5, combined with his characterization of the material in chapter 13 as needlessly repeating that in 11:7-12 (again, "Entwicklungsgeschichte," 149), leads him to the conclusion that most of ch.13 is a redactional formulation modelled on, in part, ch.12. These considerations do not require such a conclusion, however: the process could easily be the reverse of what Niederwimmer suggests, and the connections between chs.12 and 13 would be just as explicable. In fact, the claim that ch.13 repeats generally what has already been dealt with specifically in ch.11 militates against ch.13 as a late, redactional element. One might, additionally, suggest the possibility that the redactor could have modified the phrasing of the first line of the tradition material in 13:1 to read θῆλων καθήσασθαι πρὸς ἵματι in order to smooth the transition from ch.12, although one cannot assume that this has in fact happened. Niederwimmer also makes much of the fact that the substance of ch.11 seems to be aware only of "apostles and prophets," and fails to mention "teachers," as does the material in ch.13. This claim, however, is based on the undemonstrated assumption that "teachers" represent an office or role clearly distinct from that of "prophets."
(4) It is unclear where in this sequence 11:1-2 belongs. It may have been added by the same hand that combined the instructions on prophecy to the Eucharistic material, i.e., the immediately pre-redactional compilation of church instructions. It shares with that stage a focus on teachers and on testing gifts. And since it precedes the typical περὶ δέ redactional introduction in 11:3, verses 1-2 would be an uncharacteristic — but hardly impossible! — departure for the redactor. Its reference back to "whoever comes and teaches you all these things" need not refer to the "Two Ways" (which would certainly make the material redactional): it could equally refer to the foregoing instructions on liturgical matters. But, at the same time, this short section also displays the terminology of "reception" (δέξαι θητείαν αὐτῶν), which is echoed in the redactional 11:4 and 12:1.81

To reiterate, this reconstruction is not intended to be a stratification proposal, so much as an articulation of the sources behind this section of the Didache, which is to be regarded as a unity composition making use of disparate sources. It yields, then, the following chronological sequence:82

1. 9:5-10:6; 14:1-3 (and 7:1b-8:3). These rules for the Eucharist, in tandem with 7:1b-8:3's instructions on baptism and fasting, exist independently, but alongside such material as the Two Ways source and perhaps the apocalyptic speech in chapter 16.

2. 11:7-12; 13:1, 3ab, 5-7. Loose instructions on the treatment of prophets are also in use in this group.83

82. This proposed sequence — at least insofar as it is restricted to the material in chs.11-13 — is similar, but not identical, to that of Niederwimmer, "Entwicklungsgeschichte," 151-152; Die Didache, 67 and n.19.
83. This stage, as well as its pre-redactional accumulation (listed here as step #3), are treated together by Niederwimmer simply as pre-Didache "community rules"; moreover, although he most of ch.11 as traditional, in agreement with this proposal, he regards ch.13 as traditional, and moreover breaks up ch.11 rather differently than I do, i.e., regarding 11:4-6 as part of the longer (traditional) block extending to the end of the chapter. Breaking up the material this way causes him to overlook the strong degree of structural and stylistic similarity between 11:3-6 and 12:1-5, and so he fails to conclude, as I would think appropriate, that these two sections stem from the same hand. See Niederwimmer, "Entwicklungsgeschichte," 151 and n.16.
3. 13:2, 3c, 4; 15:1-2 (11:1-2?). The community rules for the Eucharist, and baptism, and fasting (#1) are combined with the instructions about prophets (#2), perhaps on the basis of catchword association ("prophets") or perhaps because both represent community-sanctioned sets of rules. This combination breaks up the unity of the instructions on baptism, into which the instructions on prophets are interpolated in two large chunks. This traditional material on prophecy is further embellished by this hand by the addition of 13:2, 3c, 4 and 15:1-2, as a conclusion.\(^{84}\) Possibly 11:1-2 belongs to this hand as well.

4. 11:3-6; 12:1-5 (and 7:1a; 9:1-4). Using a similar technique, the Didachist himself, in addition to combining the set of community rules (#3) with a traditional moral exhortation (the Two Ways) and perhaps concluding the whole package — appropriately enough — with a short apocalyptic speech (ch.16), adds his own two cents worth to this set of rules by interjecting comments on the provision of hospitality into the discussion: 11:3-6 and 12:1-5. He also adds a more detailed — and slightly redundant — description of the proper way to carry out the Eucharist at 9:1-4, introduced here by the characteristic \(\pi\epsilon\pi\delta\) formula, and uses the same formula in 7:1a to form a redactional clasp between the Two Ways material and the more specific community rules.\(^{85}\)

The literary stratification of the Didache — its composition, as a document, in layers — is to be rejected in favour of a model involving the incorporation into one literary redaction of various, and various types of, pre-existing traditions. Propositions that it is stratified may in fact depend on the itinerancy hypothesis, in that they see contradictions between segments of the chs.11-13 only because of the assumption that "apostles," "prophets," and "teachers" are in fact distinct offices, an assumption not actually borne out by the text. At the very least, such stratifications support the assumptions of the itinerancy hypothesis by obscuring the degree to which these roles are interchangeable in this text, and by focusing attention on the roles allegedly being

---

84. Note that the discussion of bishops and deacons is associated with "prophets and teachers" here: "apostles" are not yet part of the equation. Yet when apostles are raised, "prophets" are mentioned in conjunction with them. This supports the claim that 15:1-2 belongs with 11:7-12 and 13:1-7; that this hand is unaware of the material in 11:3-6; and that the hand responsible for 11:3-6 is already aware of 11:7-12; 13:1-7; and 15:1-2.

85. Niederwimmer, "Entwicklungsgeschichte," 151-152, agrees that ch.12 is redactional, as well as 11:3, but thinks that the advice in 11:4-6 is traditional. He also believes that ch.13 stems from the hand of the redactor. As noted above, this reconstruction ignores the tremendous similarity between 11:3-6 and 12:1-5; it also has the redactor rather implausibly repeating in ch.13, information that has already been given in a more specific form.
Evidentiary Weaknesses

described here. If we assume, conversely, that this text is unified by a coherent redactional intention, however, it may turn out that the material does not actually provide any evidence for the practice of itinerancy in earliest Christianity.

So what is this coherent redactional intention that supposedly unifies this material? And how are the apparent aporiae and topical shifts in the text, caused by the incorporation of earlier materials, to be understood as contributing to a common viewpoint? In fact, there is considerable continuity in the description of the figures — and the main issues associated with them — in chapters 11-13 (and 15:1-2). Both the traditional material and the redactional additions to it deal with — and are thus linked by — the same broad issue: formal organization of church groupings, i.e., rules not so much simply for the conduct of Christians (already provided by various moral exhortations, and even liturgical rules), but for the management of institutions (or incipient institutions) which themselves are in the process of growing out of organizations of Christians, and which have been made problematic precisely by their relative novelty.

The main issue in the traditional material (everything prior to the intervention of the Didachist), is that of the treatment and definition of an emergent clergy, or, more precisely, of a developing distinction between clergy and laity. The issue is not either the strict definition of official roles from one another, nor a conflict between one set of offices and another (i.e., itinerant offices such as prophets and perhaps teachers, and sedentary offices such as bishops and deacons). This is apparent in the text’s failure to distinguish sharply between "prophets" and "teachers," its imputation to prophets of a teaching role, and especially its chain of association between priesthood, prophets and teachers, and bishops and deacons. The same focus is also evident in the text’s consideration (15:1-2) of bishops and deacons as well as prophets and teachers ("apostles," the best candidate for an actual "office" implying travel, are not dealt with at all in this
pre-redactional material): it is not merely charismatics, or figures allegedly external to the group, who are under consideration here.86

If we turn to the Pauline letters and the (pseudo-Pauline) Pastorals, a trajectory in which this material can be located immediately presents itself. Paul's letters make use of all of the descriptors of behaviour referred to in this material: teachers (Rom 2:20-21; 1 Cor 12:28-29), prophets (Rom 12:6; 1 Cor 12:10, 28-29; 13:2, 8; 14:6. 22, 29, 32, 37-39; 1 Thess 5:20), bishops (Phil 1:1), deacons (Rom 16:1; 2 Cor 11:23; Phil 1:1). All of these functions, and even the titles applied to them, must therefore have existed from a very early date. But it is clear that such figures, in the authentic Pauline letters, do not in any way represent fixed offices or anything like a distinct clergy.87

The impression we derive from 1 Cor 14:29-32, for instance, is that, while special claims may be being made on the basis of such "gifts," prophecy in particular is an open prerogative of all of the members of the group, and pertains not at all to the overall structure or organization of the group, by rather to its liturgical behaviour: "If there is no one to interpret [prophetic utterance], let them be silent in the church and speak to themselves and to God. Let two or three prophets speak, and let the others weigh what is said. . . . For you can all prophesy one by one, so that all may learn and all be encouraged" (1 Cor 14:28-29, 31).88 The same is certainly true of "deacons," and

86. Note that in this material bishops and deacons do not receive a significant amount of attention — the reader is simply encouraged to respect them, and because of their links to prophets and teachers, at that —, nor is their authority contrasted in any way with that of prophets and teachers. It should also be noted that the perspective from which bishops and deacons are discussed is the same as that of prophets: as third parties under discussion, not as embattled advocates of the rules being articulated.
88. Note in the text quoted above the conflation, like that in the Didache, of prophecy with teaching: the activity is supposed to take place in such fashion "so that all may learn."

See also Rom 12:6-8, in which leaders (ὁ προϊστάμενος) are distinguished from prophets. Meeks, First Urban Christians, 134, believes this title is more indicative of a patronage function than it is of actual leadership. But he acknowledges that since such patrons are charged to "admonish," some kind of leadership function is built into or implied by their role. Malherbe, Social Aspects, 98, also argues that the term cannot denote an office.
more arguably, of "bishops" as well. 89 Meeks notes that, against Harnack, a rigid classification of the roles here is not supported by the text: in particular, no sharp lines are drawn by Paul between local and trans-local authority, or between charismatic and non-charismatic authority. 90

But a very different situation emerges by the time we get to the Pastorals. By this time, church the offices are sufficiently fixed and formal that the author feels the need to list, at some length, the qualifications for those who desire the jobs of bishop (1 Tim 3:1-7; Titus 1:7-9) and deacon (1 Tim 3:8-13). The letter to Titus goes so far as to subsume the bishopric under the more general category of "elders," whom Titus (fictively) is told to "appoint" (καθίστημι; Titus 1:5). "The church order which the [Pastoral] letters advance is designed to strengthen the church in its battle with heresy. The church is described as 'the household of God' (1 Tim. 3:15; cf. 2 Tim. 2:20) in which the bishop serves 'as God's household manager' (Tit. 1:7)." 91 Thus the church order being described here is not being generated or implemented, ad hoc, from the imagination of the author. The Pastoral letters in no way fix ecclesiastical roles, nor do they feel any need to encourage respect for, or recognition of, such roles. Rather, the offices in question are taken for granted in the author's effort to fix who should fill such established roles. He discusses, in other words, what qualifications are most suitable for offices whose functions are already taken for granted: "if someone does not know how to manage his own household, how can he take care of God's church?" (1 Tim 3:5). The author is probably involved in some kind of power struggle (see esp. 1 Tim 6:3-5, 20-21; 2 Tim 3:1-9; Titus 1:9; 3:9-10), but that power struggle is being fought on the

89. Meeks, First Urban Christians, 79, argues that the terms episkopos and diakonos may have a technical sense denoting church office, or may not.
90. Meeks, First Urban Christians, 60, 136, following E. A. Judge.
91. Malherbe, Social Aspects, 98, discussing the degree to which this church order is based on the household.
battlefield of ecclesiastical offices already in place: the victorious group will be the one that manages successfully to establish its control over the established "government" of the church.

The pre-redactional material in Didache 11:7-12; 13:1-7; 15:1-2 provides us a fascinating glimpse of a stage almost perfectly equidistant between the largely charismatic and relatively unorganized structuration of the Pauline churches during the apostle's own lifetime, and the fixity of the institutional apparatus that had evolved by the time of the "Pastor." In the (pre-redactional) Didache, the broadest and most central type of the behaviors described appears to be prophecy: this term serves as the overall rubric guiding the discussion. The term, as Audet's observations suggest, is intrinsically linked to being "in the spirit," i.e., being possessed by the word of God. 92 "Prophet" is a general designation, and what it designates is not either an office or even a lifestyle, but a charismatic authority and ability to speak in the spirit, to state the will of God. This understanding has already surfaced in Paul's use of term, and while there is no prima facie reason to suppose that Paul's designation is synonymous with that of the Didache, the text itself bears out such an identification, especially Did 11:9, 12, which assume ecstatic utterance, but indicate that the contents of such utterances are not themselves predetermined. What prophets do, then, is teach the word of God; as such they are teachers, although in their (self-)designation, they are making special claims to charisma. What this suggests is that church offices are growing out of the specialization of charisma: as Draper suggests, this type of activity is viewed with suspicion and associated — in apparent contrast to Paul's practice — with a specialist class. That a group might not have a prophet (13:4) would be inconceivable for Paul, simply because for

---

92. Also, Niederwimmer, "Entwicklungsgeschichte," 156.
Paul "prophecy" is a type of behaviour (albeit associated with a "gift") rather than a type of person.

The thrust of the advice given in this pre-redactional material is to normalize the role of such a distinct class. Hence, since they do represent an identifiable group, and additionally since they are defined by charisma — rather than decisions made by the church in the church's own interests — some care must be taken to distinguish "true" prophets from "false" ones (Didache 11:8b).93 There is still, however, sufficient respect for the charismatic gift in its own right that "testing" a prophets is forbidden (Didache 11:7). If we assume that originally 13:1 followed immediately upon 11:12,94 13:1 provides a fitting conclusion for this segment and a transition into 13:2-7: "having established who a true prophet is," it implies, "this is how we should treat such a figure." Even if the phrasing θέλων καθηθοῦσαν πρὸς ἡμᾶς, echoed in 12:3, does not represent a redactional gloss to this segment (see n.80 above) it is very unlikely, given its immediate argumentative context, that the phrase suggests itinerancy on the part of these prophets. Since the issue is their truth or falsity, the assumption at issue in 13:1 is almost certainly the establishment of someone as a prophet in the group, rather than their settling down with the group after a period of travel.95 Having offered rules to

---

93. Note that although there is an apparent parallel between the injunctions against false teachers in the Pastorals and the concern in the Didache about false prophets, the Didache's concerns with false prophets are decidedly not dogmatic ones.
94. As suggested by the fact that 12:1-5 is a later redactional creation. Note that 13:1 picks up once again the theme and language of "true prophets," which the main concern of 11:7-12.
95. The idea, in other words, could be more clearly phrased as what to do if a true prophet arises among you. See BAGD, 389, on the range of meaning of the verb καθηθοῦσαν. The term literally means "sit," although BAGD cites Did 13:1 as an instance of the figurative meaning "reside" or "settle." Obviously "reside" is the meaning implied by 12:3, but since the material in 13:1 (if original to the pre-redactional stage) stems from a different hand, the two similar phrases need not have meant the same thing when each was written. If the Didachist modelled 12:3 on 13:1, however, he probably did take the καθηθοῦσαν in 13:1 to mean "settle." It would appear, however, that "prophecy" was an institution in desuetude by the time this redaction took place (cf. also the Pastorals), and so the author misconstrues the references to prophets as an exceptional or external phenomenon. Note also that if the καθηθοῦσαν in 13:1 simply means "sit," its point of reference could very well be liturgical, given the apparent liturgical functions of prophets. Hence, the text is referring, very specifically, to prophets who wish to sit in worship as prophets; it could even be the case that the "firstfruits" to be accorded them are specified only for this
establish the parameters of the specialist group (11:7-12), ch.13 offers marks of distinction which accord the group special respect. They are to be given the "firstfruits" (\(\alpha\pi\alpha\rho\chi\nu\)). In spite of the reference to money in 13:7, we should probably take these injunctions as intended to be signs of respect rather than an institutionalization of actual support: the point is that the best of the group's produce should be reserved for the prophets, not that prophets must be paid any fixed amount.\(^\text{96}\) Even more significant is the explanation or rationalization offered here for the respect and distinction to be accorded charismatics. A traditional (cf. Q 10:7; 1 Cor 9:13-14; 1 Tim 5:17-18) justification for feeding teachers — that the worker deserves his food (Didache 13:1-2) — is overshadowed by a new consideration: "for they [the prophets] are your high priests." This specialized and liturgical role for prophets might also lurk behind the enigmatic reference in Didache 11:11 enacting a "worldly mystery of the church." as well as behind the link between prophets and the Eucharist assumed in Didache 10:7.

The other church roles in the process of "hardening" at this point are those of bishops and deacons, roles that existed as early as the time of Paul, but with little fixity or broad authority. In 15:1-2 the compiler of the pre-redactional material exhorts the reader: "do not despise" bishops and deacons. As is the case with prophets, some concern is expressed here about the quality of those who fill such roles, but the advice given is general and stereotypical: it has none of the specificity of that given in the Pastorals. Instead, the issue here is the need to appoint such figures, i.e., to maintain these functions in a consistent way, to ensure against their falling into desuetude, and to respect the individuals who fill. It is surely notable that the rationale given for ensuring

special context. This speculation has the additional advantage of accounting for the interpolation of this material into liturgical instructions (i.e., those on the Eucharist in 10:1-6 and 14:1-3).

96. Even the references to the provision of "money, clothes, and all of your possessions" (13:7) focus on "firstfruits" and qualifies the injunction with "as it seems best to you."
such respect and stability to the bishopric and deaconate is that "they also minister to you the ministry of the prophets and teachers" (ὑμῖν γὰρ λειτουργοῦσι καὶ αὐτοὶ τὴν λειτουργίαν τῶν προφητῶν καὶ διδασκάλων). It is by association with prophecy that an institutional role can be justified for bishops and deacons. Thus as charisma comes to be seen to pertain to a special class, this class then becomes the basis for the erection of a fixed institutional apparatus. As this process developed, the material which laid out rules or practices for each particular role were drawn together by a pre-redactional compiler under the main theme of regularizing a developing "clergy" and administrative machinery.

The interests of the Didachist, both in his collection and incorporation of this material, and in his additions to it, is related but distinct. The main issue at this stage of the document's development is the use and disbursement of communally-held church resources (as opposed to the resources of individual members of the group). The question, that is, revolves around money. It is the matter of finances, not of office, that unifies this final version of the text of chs.11-13. 11:3-6 concerns itself with hospitality; 11:7-12 with "false" charismatic demands for food or money; 12:1-5 returns to hospitality, with no office or distinct function in sight; 13:1-7 specifies how prophets and teachers are to be rewarded. Thus it is under this rubric that the Didachist incorporates the traditional material of 11:7-12; 13:1-7; and even 15:1-2. The discussion of how to distinguish true from false prophets in 11:7-12 is understood now in terms of prohibitions against demanding church resources, even if those demands are made charismatically (or under the authority of an official position). That the redactor sees the restrictions of 11:3-6 and those of 11:7-12 as representing similar problems emerges from his introduction to the cluster: "Now concerning the apostles and
Chapter 13, even if real prophets are no longer in view for the Didachist, establishes the principle that clergy deserve church support. The clergy in question — bishops and deacons — are then linked to this principle by the association of bishops and deacons with prophets and teachers in 15:1-2.

This material also serves to reinforce the church’s defenses against being defrauded by specifying that bishops and deacons cannot be "lovers of money." At issue in the redactor’s incorporation of the pre-redactional material, then, is the financial question of support of or recompense for the arising class of professional religious, this embryonic priesthood.

The redactor fails to distinguish between the offices in question largely because most of them are defunct. If the Pastorals are any indication, only bishops and deacons remain.

New problems, however, have also arisen for the redactor in connection with the theme of church finances, and it is these problems that he addresses in the material he adds to the text (i.e., 11:3-6; 12:1-5; possibly 13:1). In both cases, some kind of travel is absolutely required by the texts: both speak explicitly of people who *come* (11:4; 12:1-2) and the acceptable duration of their stays (11:5; 12:2). If this late stage of redaction, however, is approximately contemporary with the Pastoral letters (very late first century or early second century), there would be serious ramifications for the itinerancy hypothesis. Even if this stage presupposes genuine itinerants, the phenomenon could easily be a function of the increasingly developed character of the trans-local links between individual Christian groups — "churches" — in the late first

97. Similar concerns are expressed in 1 Peter 5:1-2.
or early second century. We see hints of this phenomenon already in the letters of Ignatius. Under such circumstances, there is at least the social and practical possibility of wandering Christians — including non-charismatic travelers (Didache 12:2-5) — moving from city to city in search of passing hospitality from the Christian groups based there. This possibility is attractive to Jonathan Draper, who then uses it to recast the Harnackian understanding of the historical processes at work behind the Didache:

It is usually assumed that the instructions with respect to bishops and deacons in Did 15.1-2 represent a response to the gradual decline and disappearance of the charismatic ministry and a step in the Katholisierungsprozess (process of community institutionalization). The instructions may more properly be seen as a response to the new situation which is caused by the intrusion of wandering charismatic prophets into an existing structure of resident bishops and deacons.

If this is so, the details of Draper’s reconstruction and argumentation notwithstanding, the fact that the Didache may thus evince itinerancy has no probative value whatsoever for earlier periods, simply because the conditions which actuate and enable the phenomenon were not in place at that earlier time. Itinerants would not have constructed and fostered an organized, community-based and trans-local set of churches, but rather the converse: such a set of organized and settled churches was what made itinerancy possible, and brought it into being, this occurring, of course, at a much later date than Theissen suggests.

I would argue, however, that itinerancy is not even indicated under the redactor’s, later, conditions. Theisssonian itinerancy is not required by the references to

98. As well, disagreements persist regarding the dating and provenance of the Didache, with Harnack’s preference for an Egyptian provenance and a rather late date being somewhat atypical of subsequent and current trends (see chapter 2, above). One wonders whether Harnack’s later dating of the Didache might not have something to do with a desire to map out the “fall” into institutionalization, placing Didache on the border between the pristine territory of the apostolic church, and the corrupt realm of emergent catholicism.


100. A major weakness with his claim is that the institution of bishops and deacons is justified with reference to that of the very prophets (and teachers) which Draper thinks are more recent intrusions!
travel in this redactional material. Draper, for instance, regards the references to "apostles" as references to Paul and Pauline missionaries: what is at work behind the Didache's advice is the necessity to quell the impact of an outsider who is advocating abolition of Torah to a moderately Torah-obedient community. The strong parallelism, however, between the advice given on "apostles" (11:3-6) and that concerning ordinary travelers (12:1-5) militates against Draper's suggestion. If the regulations against "apostles" really concern dogmatic issues, rather than questions of hospitality, we would expect both that the advice on apostles would be more clearly distinguished from that of ordinary Christian travelers, and that it would tend to be conflated with 11:7-12, in which dogmatic considerations are at least somewhat at issue for defining prophets.

What the stylistic and substantial parallelism between 11:3-6 and 12:1-5 indicates, rather, is that in "apostles" (11:3) and "those who come in the name of the Lord" (12:1) we are dealing with very similar figures, at least insofar as the redactor's purposes are concerned. There is little either in the actual descriptions offered of "apostles" and "those who come in the name of the Lord" to distinguish them from each other, and so it can probably be affirmed that the most important feature separating the two figures are implied by the terms used to describe them: "apostles" are sent to the community, while those dealt with in chapter 12 come; some of those who "come" apparently wish to settle (12:3-4), while no such provision is offered for apostles. Both figures are travelers, and both raise the prickly issue of hospitality.


The community had experience of those claiming to be apostles who had been part of the community, yet who had changed and taught a different teaching so as to destroy what the community considered fundamental, namely, the observation of the Torah (δὲν δὲ αὐτὸς ὁ διδάσκως στραφεὶς διδάσκῃ ἄλλην διδαχήν εἰς τὸ καταλύσαι, μὴ αὐτοῦ ἀκούσθη). This situation reflects the struggle between the Jewish-Christian community and the Pauline mission.
"Apostles," which Did 11:3 (cf. vv.5-6) treats as largely undifferentiated from (its redactional understanding of) prophets, appear to be travelling visitors from other Christian communities and locales\(^1\) — the hospitable treatment of whom, as Harnack correctly implies, serves symbolically to unify the Christian movement. It is unclear to what extent these figures can claim special status in the groups from which they come: we simply do not know whether they are "official" delegates, charismatic authority figures, "prophets" (i.e., part of the special class of charismatics) from other groups, or something else altogether. In any case, no provision whatsoever is offered for long-term contact: they are not imagined to settle among those whom they visit (11:4: τρεῖς δὲ ἑαυτὸς μείνης, προφητείας ἐστίν), and the advice given about them precludes any legitimate request for funds or provisions (11:6: ἐξερχόμενος δὲ ὁ ἀπόστολος μηδὲν λαμβανέτω εἰ μὴ ἄρτον, ἡς οὖν αὐλισθή). The assumption is made that such travelers are legitimately there in order to visit the church,\(^2\) and are to be shown hospitality during such a visit. Thus the text suggests the reverse of what is assumed by most commentators, i.e., that among the purpose of an "apostolic" visit to a church is the necessity for support.\(^3\)

The persons dealt with in 11:3-6 and 12:1-5 are distinguished from each other not by shifts in Sitze but by a slight shift in the circumstances of the recipients of the hospitality. "Those who come in the name of the Lord" in 12:1 appear to be ordinary

---

102. Crossan, "Itinerants and Householders," 119, describes them, without argumentation, as "... by definition, prophets on their way to found new Christian households or communities elsewhere and are supported by already established ones on their way."

103. This point is partly acceded by Niederwimmer, "Entwicklungsgeschichte," 155-156: "Soviel ist sofort deutlich: der Apostel der Did. erscheint als Gesandter, als Repräsentant des Kyrios (weshalb er auch wie dieser aufgenommen werden will: 11,4.)."

104. Niederwimmer, "Entwicklungsgeschichte," 156, says of the activity of such figures: "Als Funktion des Apostels der Did.-Tradition dürfen wir wermuten: eschatologische Verkündigung, Bussruf, Exorzismen." "Wermuten" is the right word: there absolutely nothing in the text that suggests such activity; indeed, nothing, apart from the act of visiting itself, which describes the activity of these "apostles" at all.
Christians who, in their travels, request the hospitality of Christians they encounter in the towns through which they pass. Such people are distinguished, depending on whether they are travelers who are just passing through, or whether they are coming to settle down. In the first case, a limit is placed on the time during which the traveler may be shown hospitality, after which he (or she?) has worn out his welcome (12:2). In the second case, the extent of hospitality is restricted by demanding that the new arrival work for his food (12:3). If the newcomer is unable to support himself, the issue shifts from the question of hospitality to the question — exhibited in the redactor’s use of earlier material — of the internal distribution of church monies: along the pattern established by 13:4, the newcomer may be a recipient of church charity (12:4a). What marks these figures — apostles and "those who come" — apart is nothing more than the claims they might make for support.\(^{105}\) And it is for this reason that the author of the Didache feels they have to be regulated. Impostors and opportunists must not be allowed to turn the natural hospitality of the church for those who speak in the Lord’s name on behalf of other such congregations, or anyone claiming to be a Christian and seeking "welcome" on those grounds.

This practice of Christians making use of their identity as Christians to claim hospitality is reflected in other NT documents dating from approximately the same time.\(^{106}\) This synchronicity cannot be a coincidence: for a such a practice to arise, a sense of translocal institutional solidarity is required, as well as a sufficiently large, far-flung, and populous church to encourage reliance on such a practice. Thus the question of hospitality becomes a pressing issue right around the time that the Pastoral letters and the General Epistles were composed. The Epistle of James implies that hospitality

---

105. To arrive at such a mundane and even venial interpretation of the material strikes me as infinitely more plausible than an exceptional and interesting reading would be.

106. And, later, in the behaviour of Peregrinus.
is also something of an issue in liturgical contexts: "if a person with gold rings and in fine clothes comes into your assembly, and if a poor person in dirty clothes also comes in, and if you take notice of the one wearing the fine clothes and say, 'Have a seat here please,' while to the one who is poor you say, 'Stand there,' or 'Sit under my footstool,' have you not made distinctions among yourselves?" (James 2:2-4).\(^\text{107}\) The Johannine letters, as well, focus on the matter of denying hospitality to those deemed to be doctrinally unsound.\(^\text{108}\) And 3 John appears to be a letter of recommendation in support of travelers' claims to hospitality: "The Christian practice of hospitality was open to abuses, as not only they but also pagans were aware. As one way to regulate the practice to some degree, at least, letters of were written to introduce travelling missionaries to the churches along the way."\(^\text{109}\)

Such an overall reading of *Didache* 11-13, 15 would allow us to dispense with any assumption of general conflict behind this text; an assumption not borne out either by the overall tenor or the substance of the *Didache*. What we witness here at the level of redaction, predictably enough in light of the evidence of Paul's letters, is an attempt

\(^{107}\) Patterson, *Gospel of Thomas and Jesus*, 178-188, also adduces James as evidence of itinerancy, however. What may be at issue in James, however, is cross-fertilization among different assemblies in the same locale. See Malherbe, *Social Aspects*, 101.

\(^{108}\) 2 John prohibits the extension of hospitality to such persons (2 John 10-11), while 3 John complains that hospitality has been unfairly denied (3 John 10) and exhorts hospitality for "the brothers." See Malherbe, *Social Aspects*, 103-110. That ordinary travel is at issue here, rather than true itinerancy as Patterson, *Gospel of Thomas and Jesus*, 188-195, would claim, is indicated by the author's feeling the need to point out that these travelers do not accept hospitality from non-Christians (3 John 7). In other words, they only stay with fellow Christians along their way. Itinerant missionaries, one imagines, would not be in any position to presume on the hospitality of non-believers!

to regulate the *internal* disbursement of resources,110 and particularly the flow of money as it is influenced by the church *qua* church: "no man shall live among you in idleness because he is a Christian." This framing of the issue reflects a situation roughly comparable with that of the slightly later (?) Pastoral epistles; the provision for charity and hospitality to fellow Christians, and the establishment of a fixed chain of authority, go side by side with the efforts at doctrinal self-definition we see in the later NT writings. Such a reading of the *Didache* also dispenses with the rather artificial layering of the text (so Patterson, Niederwimmer, Draper, etc.), or the tendency to read it as a very *delicate* treatment of such figures (so Crossan). The supposed inconsistencies and equivocations of the text — which generate such speculations — are imposed on the text from without. The real inconsistency is the fact that the text itself does not support the depiction of a three-fold office of charismatics.

**ITINERANCY IN Q?**

Here is not the place to determine in any positive way either what is at issue in Q’s rhetoric of deracination, or what is specifically in mind in Q’s apparent references to mission. Part of the critique of the itinerancy hypothesis already offered is that it is insufficiently concrete about the context in which itinerancy is supposed to have taken place. Since a social description of Q’s context has not yet been attempted in this discussion, to try to solve the problem of Q’s rhetoric at this point would be to repeat — and compound — the weaknesses of Theissen’s schema. It is necessary, however, to

---

110. The view of the issue as nearly entirely internal is in sharp contrast to most treatments. Niederwimmer, "Entwicklungsgeschichte," 153, nicely gives voice to the usual reading of the text, especially 11:4-12: "Der erste Eindruck lehrt: Wandercharismatiker und ortsansässige Christen stellen zwei selbständig und deutlich voneinander unterschiedene Formen christlicher Existenz dar. Das Problem ist die Relation der beiden Gruppen zueinander."
linger over Q briefly at this point, if only to establish that it offers no unanswerable indications of Theissonian itinerancy.\footnote{Apart from the evidence of the Didache, and the mission speech in Q (and its Marcan parallel), the textual evidence adduced for itinerancy by Theissen is usually not very direct. To some degree the texts adduced as indirect evidence for itinerancy have already been treated above: Theissen takes them out of their context, and interprets them in light of his already-established assumption that itinerancy is an important phenomenon in the earliest period. Replaced into their original contexts, most — perhaps all — of these texts urge a subordination of the follower of Jesus to the demands of the Gospel, even if such behaviour results in earthly losses. Their original import, apart from these contexts, is open to question, as a wider aspect of the question of deracinating rhetoric.}

Apart from Q's rhetoric of deracination itself — the basis of Theissen's "analytic" conclusions — the direct and prominent indication of itinerancy in Q is held to be the large chunk of material on "discipleship" (Q 9:57-10:24),\footnote{This classification is offered for the Q material extending from 9:57 through 11:13 by T. W. Manson. The Sayings of Jesus (London: SCM Press, 1971); Crossan, In Fragments: The Aphorisms of Jesus (San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1983), 156, 342-345. Kloppenborg, Formation, 199-203, 343; and Athanasius Polag, Fragmenta Q: Texheft zur Logienquelle (Neukirchener-Vluyen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1979), 23-26, include under this heading only 9:57-10:24, treating 11:2-4, 9-13 under the separate rubric of "prayer." Regardless of whether 11:2-4, 9-13 was or was not conceived as part of a larger composition on discipleship extending from 9:57, since this cluster of sayings focuses on prayer, it is not itself directly relevant to the self-characterization of Q's "mission."} especially the so-called "Mission Charge (Q 10:2-12). This speech has routinely been taken in Q scholarship to refer to — and, more importantly, to provide evidence for — itinerancy as a social factor underlying and informing Q.\footnote{See, for instance, Willi Braun, "The Historical Jesus and the Mission Speech in Q 10:2-12," Forum 7/3-4 (September-December, 1991): 279-316, 295-302; Hoffmann, Studien, 237-263; Mack, Myth of Innocence, 84-85 and n.6; Patterson, Gospel of Thomas and Jesus, 159 and n.5; Tuckett, Q and the History of Early Christianity, 355-367, 390-391; Uro, Sheep Among Wolves, 129; Vaage, Galilean Upstarts, 17-39, esp. 38. See also the general comments of Uro, Sheep Among Wolves, 21-23, and the literature he cites (nn.98-109).} Risto Uro describes the Q mission speech as providing the best general evidence for early Christian "wandering charismatics":

Charismatic authority and itinerancy are, indeed, significant clues to the social situation presupposed in the early mission instructions. The extreme poverty of the equipment rule becomes conceivable, if one views it against the background that Theissen has pictured to us: the ascetic wandering was practicable to those who had forsaken the normal life and felt themselves to be appointed by God to a special task (hence the word "charismatic"). The ethos of the early mission instructions is not that of a normal society, and the behaviour demanded in them is not that of an ordinary man.\footnote{Uro, Sheep Among Wolves, 129.}
That the mission instructions do communicate a broad ethos, a set of instructions for how to live, is reinforced by their juxtaposition, in Q, with 9:57-62, particularly 9:58. Here Jesus warns a prospective follower that allegiance to him will mean adopting a mode of living — one presumes permanently — even less sedentary than that accorded to animals: "Foxes have holes and the birds of the sky have nests, but the Son of man has nowhere to lay his head." The Marcan version of the Mission Charge (Mark 6:8-13) does not quite foster the same impression, for in the context of Mark, the instructions are offered as rules governing travel only over the course of a specific trip (see the description of their return in Mark 6:30): they are not broadly applicable, and do not reflect a lifestyle or ethos. Obviously, Mark’s narrative framing of the speech is redactional, and does not tell us much about its original import. Nonetheless, the contrast between the way the material is framed by Mark, and the way it is framed by Q, indicates the extent to which the speech’s specific referent is unclear. On internal grounds alone, there is no necessity to take the speech as a broad characterization of its tradents’ ethos. The juxtaposition of the mission speech with the saying in 9:58, however, may serve as an indication that at least to some degree, an ethos and lifestyle is genuinely at stake for Q’s version of the speech. This saying, which originally circulated independently (see G. Thom. 86), may by itself refer only to Jesus and his purported itinerant lifestyle, but more likely is a proverb commenting on the vulnerability of humankind ("the Son of Man" in the generic sense). However the

115. See my comment in "Rhetoric of Marginality," 481: "The so-called mission instructions in Q 10:2-12 seem to imagine some kind of travel, but its precise purpose and character is not spelled out, and the radical itinerancy postulated by Theissen may not be in view at all."

116. See my comments above on the mythologizing import of such a characterization. Note also the argument of Frederick H. Borsch, "Jesus, the Wandering Preacher?" pp.45-63 in What About the New Testament? Essays in Honour of Christopher Evans, Morna Hooker and Colin Hickling, eds. (London: SCM Press, 1975), that Jesus himself was not actually itinerant.

saying has been secondarily associated in Q with two other chriae, Q 9:59-60, and Q 9:61-62.118 This cluster employs hyperbole to suggest the strong degree of commitment required of followers of Jesus.119 The point behind Q 9:59-60 is that one not ought to let a sense of filial responsibility (and, by extension, other social obligations) divert one’s focus on the duties entailed by following Jesus; it is not an exhortation literally to leave one’s parents unburied. Likewise, 9:61-62 encourages the reader not to allow a longing for one’s past attachments and/or lifestyle to impede commitment to the "kingdom": it does not intend to prohibit actual backwards glances. Thus also 9:58 is simply an indication to prospective followers that the duties and consequences of following Jesus involve loss and discomfort; it is hardly a literal indication that Jesus has nowhere to spend the night. Thus although 9:57-62 does seem to be endorsing a type of general ethos, the point being advanced does not seem to have to do with itinerancy at all, but with the issue of commitment to discipleship, even when it involves arduous duties and/or disagreeable consequences.120 As a thematic introduction to the mission speech, which charges the followers of Jesus with specific duties, which gives rules for


120. It is ironic that Patterson, Gospel of Thomas and Jesus, 134, n.61, would claim that the juxtaposition of these sayings reinforces the impression that they refer to itinerancy, when in fact such a juxtaposition has the opposite effect.
dealing with rejection, which sends them out "as sheep among wolves" (10:3)\textsuperscript{121}, such a cluster of chriae cannot serve as evidence of itinerancy, but only as an indication that the people behind Q wished to underscore the importance of commitment before laying out the injunctions of 10:2-12.\textsuperscript{122}

The injunctions of the Mission Speech proper (10:2-12) certainly do concern themselves with travel (10:4), the proper reception of hospitality (10:7), and the possibility of rejection (10:10-11), so it is understandable that they would be read as offering evidence of itinerancy. Regardless of the compositional history of the core Q\textsubscript{1} cluster,\textsuperscript{123} if the individual injunctions do clearly and unequivocally evince itinerancy, one will be forced to conclude that itinerancy was either practiced by the Q people, or was an aspect of the lifestyle of the pre-Q tradents of these sayings. However, any such unequivocal indications of itinerancy are lacking:

\textsuperscript{121} Kloppenborg, Formation, 199-200, 243, 343, locates 10:3 with the first stratum of Q, to which 9:57-62 also belong. He appears to think, in fact, that 10:3, \textit{inter alios}, represents an addition on the part of the Q\textsubscript{1} compositor, who is also responsible for the juxtaposition of 9:57-62 with 10:2-12. This suggestion supports the argument offered here that 9:57-62 was conceived as a thematic introduction to the mission speech.

\textsuperscript{122} See Kloppenborg, Formation, 202:

The three chriae, 9:57-62, fit well with this broader outlook. Rather than treating the specifics of instructions for mission, they deal with discipleship in general, interpreting it as an emulation of the homeless and detached life style of Jesus, the Son of Man. Thus the speech shifts from a mission discourse to a discipleship instruction.

Kloppenborg here correctly points to the generalizing tendency of these chriae as exhortation to submit to the commands that follow (the mission speech). But he is mistaken, in my view, to assume that the emulation enjoined is of \textit{homelessness}. As I have indicated above, homelessness is a feature of only one of the three chriae (9:57-58), and then only if understood literally. What links all three sayings is a concern with commitment in general, regardless of the circumstances or consequences.

\textsuperscript{123} I am excluding from consideration, thus, according to Kloppenborg's stratification hypothesis, Q 10:12-15, 21-24. (Note however that David R. Catchpole, "The Mission Charge in Q," Semeia 49 (1990): 147-174, believes that this text, essentially, constitutes a unity.) These secondary, redactional sayings, particularly vv.12-15, promote an almost formal sense of \textit{mission} (a city-to-city, miracle-working, call to repentance), but this mission is almost certainly fictitious, a literary conceit evoking the deuteronomistic understanding of their plight that characterizes this second, redactional, layer of Q. (On the "failure" and fictitious of the Q2 "mission," see, \textit{inter alios}, Kloppenborg, Formation, 167-168, 196, 325; "Literary Convention," 92-96.) Thus these additional sayings confuse the intentions of the original speech by conflating it with an idealized scenario that does not actually accord with the tradents' behaviour.
There is little in Q 10 to suggest that the "workers" were expected to stay for a long duration in any village, or that they intended to "found" a community there. There is indeed no indication that the "workers" were leaders at, either in the communities from which they were sent forth or in the villages that accepted them. . . . It is important in this regard to note that these workers are not invested with the titles "apostle" (1 Cor 9:1; Did. 11.3-6), prophet (Did. 11.3-11; 13.1), or teacher (Did. 13:2), any of which would have made their role as (potential) leaders clear. 124

These remarkable absences are reinforced somewhat by a consideration of Q's environment. The area in which the Q people operated — Galilee — was very small, and very compact, with the result that travel between two points would normally have involved a "journey" of no more than several hours. Itinerancy "would have looked more like morning walks." 125 The probable social dynamics — conservative and tightly-knit — of the rural villages and small towns in question in Galilee also militate against any assumption that travelling strangers could have expected acceptance of a publicly-proclaimed "radical" or "countercultural" message. 126 Basic hospitality may have been extended to travellers, 127 but the formal reception of someone with a "program" is an altogether different proposition. Moreover, Q offers several indications that it takes for granted the continuation of a sedentary, village-based life, with family connections and ordinary life proceeding largely as usual. 128 Realities of settled village, such as lending and borrowing (6:34-35; 12:57-59), lawsuits (12:57-59), and continuing family relations (11:11-13; see also 9:59-62; 14:26, which function rhetorically on the supposition that family relations continue to be meaningful), persist. One is left to wonder.

125. Kloppenborg, "Recent Opinion," 22. For other arguments that the itinerancy hypothesis has been overblown, or overblown in its application to Q, see Aune, Prophecy, 214; Uro, Sheep Among Wolves, 128-131.
126. See Kloppenborg, "Recent Opinion," 22.
127. See also chapter 5, below.
who is itinerant in the face of all these persisting relationships, typical of sedentary life?

It remains to be seen what one is to make either of this speech, or of Q’s rhetoric of deracination, if itinerancy is not at issue (or at least in the absence of any solid evidence that such figures were at work behind Q). It would be unsatisfying, however, to simply leave matters at this unhappy impasse without suggesting some way that the mission speech, or more specifically, its Q1 core, might be understood in the absence of actual itinerants. Recent social studies of Q have suggested the possibility — a possibility that needs to be explored in light of the extant evidence of Galilean social life broadly — that the people responsible for Q, especially its first layer, were village- or town-based scribes.129 Kloppenborg has pointed out that, given the restricted density of such figures, any network comprised of them would have to span several villages.130 If so, it is very easily possible that the instructions given in 10:2-12 (and 10:16) do indeed pertain to "mission," but not as it is ordinarily conceived. They may refer, specifically, to a class of scribal figures with a distinct ideological agenda (embodied, largely, in Q1), attempting to disseminate that agenda as fully as possible among their fellow administrators in neighboring villages. This is not itinerancy, but rather a constructive local agenda involving short trips. The prohibitions against carrying purse, knapsack, sandals, and staff not only reflect the very short distances involved, but may also be intended to eliminate the appearance of travel, and normal-

129. See especially Kloppenborg, "Literary Convention," 81-86; also Piper, "Language of Violence," 53-66; Arnal, "Rhetoric of Marginality," 484; and "Gendered Couplets" (forthcoming).
ize the activity being undertaken. Such figures, then, as they enter a village to approach their fellow κωμογραμματεύς or κωμαρχής, do not take on the appearance of a travelling stranger, but rather an acceptable, local, functionary. That is, the decision not to don Cynic equipment is made to avoid the appearance of beggary that might attach to a stranger, not to radicalize that appearance (and practice) even further. The conflation of acceptance at the level of house (10:5-7) with acceptance at the level of village (10:8-11) may simply reflect the techniques used by these figures, and the implications of the social environment in which they operated: to be rejected in the house of the village scribe or the κωμαρχής is equivalent to being rejected by the entire town. Rejection precludes any further chances at acceptance by that town, and eliminates from use the instrument by which the "kingdom" agenda was to be promoted there. The sheep saying (10:3) reflects these scribes' trepidation at the prospect of rejection; the harvest saying (10:2), on the other hand, their hopes in undertaking the "mission" in the first place: the desire to draw in "workers" (fellow scribes) for the "master's" (God's) "harvest" (the kingdom as it is conceived at the Q1 stage, as a condition of resolution and bounty). Such views are offered here only to demonstrate the possibility of an alternative reading of Q's rhetoric; they will be taken up more fully in chapter six, after an effort has been made to describe social situation such figures may have encountered in the Galilee of Herod Antipas.

CONCLUSION

131. This suggestion is in sharp contrast to the more usual understanding that these prohibitions promote among the missionaries, either literally or symbolically, the condition of radical dependence on God. See, e.g., Braun, 296-298; Catchpole, "Mission Instructions," 168-170; Hoffmann, Theologie, 312; Rudolf Laufen, Die Doppelüberlieferungen der Logienquelle und des Markusevangeliums (Bonn: Peter Hanstein Verlag, 1980), 252-253; Schultz, Spruchquelle, 415; Tuckett, Q and the History, 386-390; Uro, Sheep Among Wolves, 125.
This review of the primary texts pertinent to the question of the erstwhile existence of ancient Christian itinerants has indicated, I hope, that both the reconstruction of the history of the earliest synoptic sayings tradition, and the interpretation of Q's inversionary rhetoric, requires a better explanation than itinerancy is able to offer. The problem is current and debated, but, so far, the majority of the solutions offered are lamentably insufficient, particularly in their lack of social-scientific or textual controls. This minor, and correctable, weakness is vastly compounded, however, by the proposition that the texts at issue — not only Q itself, but such mainstays of itinerancy as the Didache — provide no firm evidence of Theissenian itinerancy at all. If such figures did not exist in the first place, they do not offer much of an explanation for why Q is so fond of inversionary rhetoric! Any study of this rhetoric in Q, therefore, that does not assume itinerancy as its starting point, that invokes significant social description of the context in which Q was composed, and that is based on an explicit sociological theory, should by itself constitute an important contribution to Q scholarship. Such a study has the potential to generate a sophisticated social description of the people responsible for Q, since it is precisely the language of deracination that is Q’s most sociologically significant feature.
Chapter 5
First Century Galilee: A Socio-Economic Description

INTRODUCTION

The specific social circumstances in which Q was composed involve primarily a set of economic, and concomitantly social, shifts brought about directly or indirectly by Roman domination and imperial policy exercised by the Romans. A description of these changes provides the concrete context in which Q arose, and to which it was addressed. Q can thus be described, and rendered more transparent and intelligible, in terms of the set of circumstances that its compilers would have taken for granted, and that would have formed the "universe" which Q addresses, directly or not. Documents grow in worlds, and are part of those worlds; they do not materialize out of the ether. The significance and function of the document — at least as conceived by those initially responsible for it — is as a piece of, a functional contribution to, the world of which it is a part. And that world, while partially constituted by the document itself, cannot simply be extracted from Q by inference: Q, like most argumentative tracts and works of fiction, does not bother to describe the "facts" against which it is constituted and ranged, precisely because those facts, that world, is taken for granted as a starting point for whatever "work" the document is designed to do. Instead, Q offers extravagant ideals which, while not conforming to the "facts" of its context, nevertheless require those facts for its own counterfactuality to be appreciated.1 Possibly the greatest weakness of Theissen's analysis and that of other itinerancy advocates is the assumption that

1. I am working here with the set of theoretical assumptions articulated by Fredric Jameson, *The Political Unconscious: Narrative as a Socially Symbolic Act*. Documents contribute to the social world of which they are a part, and do not do so passively. As a result, they do not transparently reflect that world, but symbolize it in particular ways and attempt to modify it through their symbolic contribution. Jameson, as a Marxist, prioritizes economic factors, but not in a mechanistic or reductionistic way. See also Gottwald's "Social Class."
Q's context is described or implied, accurately, in Q itself, an assumption which implicitly involves an understanding of textual codification as a passive vehicle for the recording of facts and interpretations of facts, rather than as an act in its own right or as a contribution to the social dynamics it reflects.

Q tends to be described, especially by advocates of the itinerancy and/or Cynic hypotheses, as "socially radical," but "radical" is too frequently assumed to be an essential and self-evident category; radical vis-à-vis what is not specified. When context for Q is offered, it is normally described in terms broadly socio-cultural, with minimal emphasis on economic factors. Part of this lop-sided emphasis is an understandable reaction to the paucity of economic data for Q's presumptive context.

first-century Galilee; part, however, is due to a reified understanding of Q as a "religious" document, and of religion as a purely (or at least predominantly) cultural phenomenon, to the exclusion of such mundane and distasteful matters as day to day subsistence. Such a pre-understanding is no doubt a major factor in Theissen's (inadvertent?) restriction of Q's Sitz to a wholly self-referential Sitz in der Kirche. What appears to be needed, by contrast, to circumvent the prejudgment and the artificiality that characterize the approaches to Q's rhetoric of deracination already surveyed, especially the itinerancy hypothesis, is a broad description not so much of the ideas circulating behind and before Q's composition or those which Q itself purveys (as if ideas give birth to themselves), but of the fabric of everyday life which impacted on ideas already in currency, and suggested that those ideas required a new formulation, a revision, such as might necessitate, ultimately, the composition of a novel document to express those ideas.

For this reason, the intuition many scholars seem to have had that Q's production as a document is related to some kind of crisis is probably correct: the appropriate con-
text for Q will not be found in static descriptions of its apparent setting, but rather in
the shifts and ruptures that characterized everyday life — and significant disturbances to
ordinary expectations of how everyday life is best lived — in the time and place in
which Q was composed. In consequence, when Q’s Sitz is imagined to embrace a wider
world than the intra-"Christian" movement itself, there is a tendency to identify Q’s
context with moments, events, or characterizations of epochs, that have come to be
appreciated as of major historical significance. For instance, "Roman domination" is
often blamed for nearly every novelty of first-century Palestinian religion, including the
impulses which led to the movement or group behind Q. This "domination," which in
the case of the Jesus movement must be applied to Galilee somehow, is imagined in
terms similar to those applicable to Judea, and which are held to have led up to the
Jewish War of 66-70. The situation in Galilee is collapsed with that of Judea, as both
are "Jewish" responses to Roman domination. This vague designation of "oppression"
is then interpreted with reference to whatever aspect of social life the researcher intuits
to be most significant. For Theissen, Q is a response to Caligula’s effort to enforce his
own deification in Judea.² For Paul Hoffmann, it is the effort of a "peace party" to
counteract the forces of violent nationalism, the Zealots and their ilk, who sought mili-
tary liberation from Roman rule.³ And for many others still, the character of Roman
"oppression" is economic: the imposition of Roman rule, it is claimed, laid upon an
already overtaxed people the burden of additional tribute, which meant that the Jewish
people of Palestine suffered under double taxation: Temple and other local dues were

². Theissen, Gospels in Context, 206-221.
³. See Hoffmann, Studien, 74-78, 306-311, 326, 331-333. Tuckett, Q and the History of Early
Christianity, 361, considers this equation to be “probably too restricted and narrow.” See also Uro,
Sheep, 139-140 and Kloppenborg, Formation, 183 ("... Hoffmann’s interpretation of μὴ κρίνετε as a
rejection of revolutionary violence seems forced").
compounded by Roman taxes.\footnote{Horsley, *Jesus and the Spiral of Violence*, 29, is typical in this regard:}

What such approaches do, then, is conjecture a crisis behind Q (probably correctly), then look for a crisis, and when they have found a more or less obvious one — "Roman oppression" still serving as the best catch-all category — they use that crisis to interpret Q. The most conspicuous single crisis event against which to locate Q from our 20th-century perspective, in the broad period under consideration, is of course the Jewish War itself and the events leading up to it. The inherent attraction of this event as a background for Q has in some cases led to the conclusion that Q is itself to be dated \textit{after} the Jewish War, and was in some measure composed as a response to it.\footnote{Most strikingly Matti Myllykoski, "The Social History of Q and the Jewish War," 144-199 in Risto Uro, ed., *Symbols and Strata: Essays on the Sayings Gospel Q* (Helsinki: Finnish Exegetical Society, 1996), esp. 175-199, with some approving reference to Hoffmann’s views. Crossan, *Historical Jesus*, 218, is more cautious, noting that Jesus and the first followers of Jesus lived decades before the War, but equivocates, probably quite correctly, "... neither do I think that all was peaceful until the decades immediately preceding the revolt so that, for example, nothing that happened then can tell us anything about the much earlier period when Jesus was alive."} But whether the Jewish War or some rather less dramatic and obvious milestone is selected against which to measure Q, the events scholarship tends to focus on — because they
are interesting and because ancient literary sources focus on them — are usually singular, dramatic, and pertain to upper-level political events.\(^6\)

Unfortunately, the *assumption* of crisis is not a very good methodological foundation on which to launch an investigation into the proximate context of the Q document. This caution is fairly straightforward: such a procedure relies to far too great an extent on a retrospective appreciation — whether on the part of the historian or in the available ancient literary sources — of what might constitute so subjective an entity as a "crisis." We cannot be certain that events we perceive as critical, from a distance of two thousand years, would necessarily be coextensive with what people at the time would have regarded as significant. Events we may have no inkling of, because of the incomplete nature of the historical record, could have had a huge impact on daily life. Conversely, many of the events that historical interpretation valorizes, in part because they are viewed in retrospect and hence in terms of their ultimate significance, may have had minimal impact on most people. The Caligula episode, for instance, is viewed in retrospect as a focal instance of the collision course of Rome with Judea, foreshadowing of the ultimate conflict that would take place several decades later; to some extent, our main source for the event, Josephus, also writing after the destruction of Jerusalem, presents it to us similarly.\(^7\) Does this mean, however, that the entire

---

6. Note that Freyne, "Galilean Questions," 67, criticizes Crossan’s reconstruction of the milieu of Jesus for its "atopicality," precisely on the grounds that singular characteristics of the contemporary and specific Galilean political order are absent from it: "... Antipas was a fact of life in the Galilee of Jesus, and I find his almost complete absence from Crossan’s book strange but predictable in the light of Crossan’s tendency to atopicality."


> but that if he wished to set up these statues, he must first sacrifice the entire Jewish nation; and that they presented themselves, their wives and their children, ready for the slaughter.

These words filled Petronius with astonishment and pity at the spectacle of the incomparable devotion of this people to their religion and their unflinching resignation to death.

And see *Ant.* 18.270 (Loeb 9.158-159): "The Jews, though they regarded the risk involved in war with the Romans as great, yet adjudged the risk of transgressing the Law to be far greater."
episode would not have been viewed by those who people who lived before the events of the 60s as just another political event in a turbulent time? Would it call forth a movement, or inspire such a movement to codify its overall views in a document? Indeed, the very sorts of events which the historical-literary record preserves for us, and to which we tend to be most attracted — that is, singular, dramatic, and political events — are precisely the kinds of events we would least expect to impact on everyday life in the countryside, especially in the kind of persistent way that would generate a movement. The Jewish War is something of an exception: a war can affect the whole populace in ways that other "political" events may not. Most upper-level political events, however, especially given the very sharp divide between urban and rural in antiquity,8 may have gone unnoticed in the countryside: one must establish how and why an event now deemed to have historical significance would have impressed itself as of vital and world-changing importance to its contemporaries before positing that event as a "cause" behind changes of thought or the formation of (relatively) novel movements. Similar doubts may be raised for similar reasons about such cultural "contexts" as the phenomenon of encroaching Hellenism: there is no particularly good reason to imagine that the people immersed in the phenomenon would have had the foresight (or precognition) to have recognized its long-term implications and hence its importance for their own time. Likewise, those who posit a Cynic-like Jesus movement or one which embraced "open commensality" in table fellowship do not imagine such a movement as a response to discrete historical or political events, but instead focus their descriptions of context on broad cultural phenomena such as intellectual effervescence,9 the sterility of certain cultural options,10 or excessively rigid and "oppressive" social

---

8. See MacMullen, *Roman Social Relations*, 1-56; and below.
Such efforts at contextualization, as with the notion of encroaching Hellenism, fail to explain why, *at this time and among these people*, such incremental cultural changes were a) noticed, and b) resisted.

How, then, is one to locate the putative "crisis" to which Q responds, the disturbed or shifting context out of which it arises? If one accepts the near-consensus position of scholarship that Q is a product of Galilee and is to be dated before the Jewish War, some broad and relatively concrete description of the organization of social life in Galilee before the War is needed to serve as a context in which either a) significant historical events, or b) incremental cultural or other changes, would have had a discernible and definite effect. Such a description may then function not only as a sketch of the backdrop against which Q was intended to be read — and in fact read — in the first place, hopefully allowing its rhetoric to function with greater transparency, but may additionally offer some clues about what kinds of immediately-consequential changes were actually taking place in this time and locale, the sorts of changes that may not immediately strike the historical eye, but which necessarily have a formidable impact on daily life.

What is thus at issue in the following pages is an attempt at a description of everyday life in Galilee, and particularly of changes to everyday life and expectations about it that might have occurred around the early to middle first century. The focus in this description will be first and foremost economic, working on the assumption that the organization of social life will preeminentely revolve around production or acquisi-

---

12. On the provenance and dating of Q, see, briefly, below, chapter 6. One of the primary reasons Tuckett rejects Hoffmann's association of Q with the events leading up to the War is the evidence Q presents for a pre-War date. See Tuckett, *Q and the History of Early Christianity*, 361-362.
tion of the necessities of life, especially in the case of those for whom the availability of such necessities is relatively tenuous, i.e., the rural poor. As a result, actual economic behavior will constitute the first sphere of inquiry, with the deliberate and creative organization of social life around these economic factors being considered only subsequently. Such an approach will, hopefully, avoid ethereal questions about the cultural "essence" of Galilee, which continue to be a major source of controversy in much scholarship on the early Christian movement. The paramount issue is not, then, cultural continuity between first-century Galilee and Israelite biblical traditions, cultural and/or political discontinuity with Jerusalem and Judea, the extent to which Galileans identified themselves as "Jews" and what this identification meant for them, whether "Jewish theocratic ideals" were in conflict with contemporary economic trends (as though such ideals were invested with immutable content), or whether Pharisaic and/or apocalyptic ideologies were in wide circulation. The conflation — even identification — of such cultural effects with more concrete economic and social matters is one of the major weaknesses of the itinerancy hypothesis, and remains a widespread characteristic of scholarly reconstructions of the context of the early Jesus movement.  

The argument to be offered below is fairly simple, although it ranges across a variety of data and phenomena: the imperial Roman "development" of the non-coastal hinterland, expressed politically in Galilee first in the form of Antipas' client tetrarchy, later through the kingship of Agrippa and then direct Roman control, attempted to

bring this agriculturally productive area into the orbit of Empire in order more effectively to siphon off its surplus product in the form of tribute, taxes, rents, interests and loans, and a variety of other measures. Because of the limitations of transportation technology, and the absence of a highly monetized, market-oriented economy, the primary way in which this "development" was made possible was through the foundation of cities proximate to the hinterland to be exploited and accessible to potential trade outlets. The (re)foundation and expansion of Sephoris in 4 BCE and the foundation of Tiberias sometime in the neighborhood of 17-23 CE are the known notable instances of this conduct in Galilee during the reign of Antipas. These foundations had a decisive effect on Galilean economic production and organization (as we might expect was precisely their intention). This effect in turn was socially disruptive
at a quotidian level, and, *inter alia*, changed the character of rural social organization and hierarchy. It is against such a context that Q reacts.

**THE QUESTION OF SOURCES:**

Having no direct access to Galilean economics of the first century, we are forced to rely on a variety of problematic sources for inferences about economic behavior. None of these sources, obviously, was ever intended to provide such information: moreover all of these sources are hermeneutically problematic in some fashion or another. Some comment needs to be made, albeit very briefly, on the character of these sources and the way in which they can be used. An appropriate use of such sources may allow us a better hint of the political economy of Herodian and Roman Galilee than would appear possible at first glance.

helpfully drawn attention to the effects of the establishment of these two cities. Freyne regards their establishment as "administrative centers" to have been a symbolization and a step in the direction of an "agrarian market economy," consequently "disrupting old relationships and the values associated with them" ("Galilean Questions," 82). Reed, by contrast, examines the evidence (comprised mainly by archaeological/architectural evidence of the density of occupation) for the populations of Sepphoris and Tiberias, concluding that each probably had a population in the neighborhood of about 24,000 persons (214). Reed then simply notes the huge effect such centers of consumption would have had on the surrounding countryside (215, 218-219). Both authors remain *relatively* general in their observations, and, in my opinion, do not sufficiently focus on the deliberate siphoning off of agricultural surplus that would actually have occurred as a result of these foundations. Edwards is more specific about a deliberate policy of urbanization, but in my view distorts the evidence by insisting on the a) reciprocal advantages, and b) the psychological effects, of the resultant system. Nevertheless, my observations in what follows are entirely dependent on and indebted to the original insights of these three authors. Richard Horsley's most recent book on Galilee, *Archaeology, History, and Society in Galilee: The Social Context of Jesus and the Rabbis* (Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press International, 1996), develops theses even more similar to those that will be presented here, but these similar trains of thought were developed independently; I had arrived at these general conclusions about early-first-century Galilee, its political economy, the tributary mode of surplus extraction (on which see Gottwald, "Social Class"), Roman policy, and the implications of the ancient urban-rural divide, before having looked at Horsley's excellent book.
First, archaeological evidence provides probably the best and most specific type of information about Galilee particularly in the time period in question. In the case of literary evidence, we are dependent for our information on what the ancients considered to be important and hence committed to the written record, as well as on how they interpreted this information. The character, availability, and utility of archaeological data, by contrast, will be more nearly random or accidental, affected by factors such as casual preservation, ancient loss, climate, and so on; in addition, of course, modern factors such as availability of sites (the Temple mount in Jerusalem, for instance, will not be excavated so long as it sits under the Dome of the Rock), funding, decisions about the relative importance of sites, the use and availability of particular technologies, and of course current interpretation of the evidence will play a part in the constitution of this data as well — archaeological evidence is not free from the constraints of interpretation and subjectivity. But at least with the physical remains of antiquity, preserved and made available both more or less by accident and by modern decisions, we are not dependent on deliberately selective accounts of what the ancients themselves considered to be important or on their, necessarily tendentious, interpretations of such events and personages. As a result, archaeological evidence can provide a window into localities largely ignored in the literary-historical record, and into the unremarkable and generally unremarked features of everyday life, the very types of things that are most useful for generating conclusions about political economy.

19. So much so that Richard Horsley published a second book on Galilee a bare year after his first on the sole grounds that his first took insufficient account of the archaeological record! See Horsley, Archaeology, viii.
20. For a discussion of the interpretive problems associated with archaeological evidence, and even the different potential modalities of interpretation, see Sawicki, "Archaeology as Space Technology," 319-348.
particular, the archaeological record can provide us with information about patterns of commodity distribution, as attested by the distribution of local pottery, the frequency and distribution of particular coins, and so on. Archaeology may also provide useful information about goods and commodity distribution by furnishing us with direct information about the presence and character of roads, and about the particular devices (wagons, ships, etc.) available for transport. Archaeological evidence may also sometimes suggest conclusions about the types of "industry" actually being operated, the implements required for them, and even the size and distribution of particular operations, as well as local population sizes, matters which literary evidence will often treat most vaguely and unreliably, if at all.22 On the other hand, archaeological evidence alone cannot provide all of the data we need, not can it answer some of the most important questions in a socio-economic description of early-Roman Galilee. In particular, data concerning the organization of social life, and the cultural expressions by which that social life is symbolized and rationalized, are not always immediately accessible through archaeology.23 *Realia* only tells us so much, and cannot usually provide information about interesting cultural intangibles, only about the basics of material life and corollary inferences. We are further hampered by the dearth of good evidence: archaeological evidence for Galilee becomes plentiful toward the *end* of the Roman period, and is often lacking (relatively or absolutely) for the earlier period which concerns us here.24

22. For instance, Fiensy, *The Land is Mine*, uses archaeological evidence in conjunction with literary sources to establish his thesis that land holdings were being consolidated into larger and larger units in the Herodian period, while Reed, "Population Numbers," uses archaeological evidence to establish the demographic density of particular sites, as a step toward accurate estimates of total population.
23. By contrast, however, see Richardson, "Desiderata," 303-305, who argues that archaeological data can shed some light on cultural questions.
24. So also Horsley, *Archaeology*, 4-5; see also Richardson, "Desiderata," 303, who notes that the oft-cited excavations of Capernaum concern a predominantly Byzantine site, as is also the case, to a lesser extent, for Sepphoris and Chorazin.
Thus, second, the archaeological record requires, especially for our period, supplementation from literary sources. Those most nearly proximate to the period and locale are early Christian writings themselves, including primarily the NT and its sources, but also extending to some extra-canonical material, such as the *Gospel of Thomas*. These writings represent literary sources that have the potential to shed further light on, and fill out an archaeologically-derived picture of, Galilean daily life in Roman times, as well as on other locations in the Empire; although these texts focus on economic and material matters no more than other available literature, they appear to describe a social world not so restricted to the lofty circumstances of the very highest classes, as is the case with most other ancient literary remains. These texts tend, in my opinion, to be under-utilized as sources for first-century Roman economic and social life, for a couple of reasons. One of these is the tendency already noted to distance "religious" interests from those of the concrete and mundane questions that characterize everyday life, such that early Christian writings, insofar as they are indeed *Christian writings*, fall into the former category and provide no information on the latter.

Obviously such an objection, where stated outright, will not stand up to scrutiny. A different problem, and a rather more legitimate objection — or at least caution — to using early Christian literature to reconstruct the quotidian socio-economic setting of the early Roman Empire, is the circularity (potentially) involved in the attempt. Since the primary impulse behind such descriptions of "context" for students of Christian origins is precisely the contextualization of extant documentary remains, to use those very

---

25. So, again, Horsley, *Archaeology*, 5. Note that most of the writings of the NT, and early non-canonical material as well, are not usually regarded as of Galilean provenance. The exceptions, rightly or wrongly, are Q (on which see further below, ch.8) and the Gospel of Mark. A case might also be made for a Galilean provenance for early stages of the *Gospel of Thomas*. On Thomas's provenance, see, *inter alios*, Patterson, *Gospel of Thomas and Jesus*, 113-120, who argues for the possibility of an early stage of *Thomas* emanating from Jerusalem.
remains to sketch out that context involves, at least in theory, the very peculiar practice of using a set of set of documents to illuminate and contextualize *themselves*. Assuredly such a practice is part of the reason that descriptions of early Christian *Sitze* tend frequently to entirely self-referential, and hence not *Sitze* at all. Such an objection does not apply equally to all possible uses of this material, however. Where ancient Christian writings are most helpful for providing information about the social contexts out of which they arose is not so much in what they self-consciously argue — which is neither overtly socio-economic (at least not in all instances) nor necessarily a realistic reflection of life as it is actually lived — as in what they take for granted, view to be self-evident, or mention in passing.26

Third, in addition to early Christian material, a contemporary record of insuperable magnitude is provided by Josephus, who is probably our best source for the *history* of Palestine in the first century. Although it is recognized that Josephus was hardly unbiased, his accounts of Jewish history in this area (Palestine, and especially Galilee) and in this period (i.e., the first century, and earlier) are the only contemporary accounts we have with an overtly and scrupulously historical (albeit propagandistic) purpose. Particularly when it comes to his description of the period of the War, we have in Josephus an actual eyewitness to many of the events described. For our purposes what is even more significant about Josephus’ eye-witness involvement in the War is the fact that Josephus engaged briefly in political and military action

---

26. So Kloppenborg, "Literary Convention," 78 ("... it would be naïve to suppose that every document of primitive Christianity associated with a community in fact mirrored the viewpoints of that community"). 79 ("I begin with the premise that a homological relationship exists between the symbolic world of the social group and the formal and material characteristics of its documents, such that the 'truth' of the canonical documents is rendered self-evident by its correspondence to the structure of the social world ... "). 80 ("... literary features ... reflect the various unspoken assumptions made by the Q people about the world they inhabited"). One might add, at a rather more simple level, the statements the documents make in passing about the world its intended hearers inhabit.
in Galilee itself, which he region discusses at some length in *The Jewish War* and *The Jewish Antiquities*, and at greater length in his *Life*. His descriptions of his own behavior are inconsistent and self-serving, as are even his descriptions of actual events. Long speeches tend to be free Josephan rhetorical compositions. In addition, and more important for the light Josephus might cast on the socio-economics of early-Roman Galilee, there are clear *Tendenz* in Josephus: a tendency to present phenomena in terms his elite, Hellenized, audience will understand (hence, most obviously, the Pharisees and Sadducees are described as philosophical schools); and an apologetic interest in "explaining away" any Jewish anti-Roman sentiment, leading especially to Josephus' seriously underplaying Jewish Messianism. All of this would be a greater problem for a biographer of Josephus (or of any of the characters who appear in his works) than for an economic historian: there is little reason to think that in the course of his self-aggrandizement Josephus would have altered day-to-day matters, the uninteresting background "give-aways," the social features deemed to be self-evident, from which socio-economic history is to be culled. On the other hand, where he is providing direct information about life-styles, population figures, and the like, his information needs to be weighed against other available evidence, given his marked tendency to exaggerate

27. See the comment of Horsley, *Galilee*, 72:
Both the value of and the problem with Josephus's accounts of events in Galilee from the summer of 66 to the summer of 67 stem from the fact that Josephus himself was one of the principal actors in those events. Thus, while he often provides "eyewitness" reports, his accounts are not only apologetic but self-glorifying and self-serving in the extreme. See also Horsley, *Galilee*, 14, 257; Judah Goldin, "Josephus, Flavius," vol.2, pp.987-988 in George Arthur Buttrick, ed., *Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1962), 987.
28. See Schürer, *History of the Jewish People*, v.1, 57: "He invested the history of the remote past with a halo, and the same interest moved him to treat more recent history similarly." Schürer further argues that *War* is more accurate and carefully composed than is *Antiquities*.
29. Schürer, *History of the Jewish People*, v.1, 57: "Messianic expectation, which on account of the political claims attached to it constituted the most powerful incentive to rebellion, was passed over in silence in order to conceal Jewish hostility to Rome. It was not the people who wished for war against the empire; they were led astray by a few fanatics."
and to put matters in a better — or at least more dramatic — light than a dispassionate
telling might offer.

As a result of the gold-mine of information Josephus provides, most of the better
social descriptions of first-century Galilee rely heavily on Josephus' works. There
are limitations, however. Precisely because the matters about which we inquire are so
mundane, because they are usually so taken-for-granted, we will only occasionally and
serendipitously find decipherable allusion to them in Josephus' histories, which, in the
fashion of historians, tend toward describing "great" people and "great" occasions.
Especially in cases where matters socio-economic are not perceived by Josephus to be
relevant to the events he is describing — either as background, or as results or
precipitating cause — he simply ignores them. In some instances, too, we can expect
that where such matters would have been identical in first-century Galilee to the cir-
cumstances of Josephus' later readers, he will have even omitted important "back-
ground" material, assuming that his readers could take it for granted. Thus the informa-
tion we receive will be accidental, will tend toward the unusual and particular (speaking
in terms of the whole Mediterranean basin), and will mostly be directly related to
specific events or characters rather than processes. The information will be
punctilinear, a veritable aorist of data, when what we really want is a linear imperfect.

There is another difficulty with Josephus: his biases do in fact have an impact on
the socio-economic data that he records. This is a different issue than his quite specific
and personal biases regarding individuals and political issues, which tend to be rela-

30. Indeed, up until very recently, most accounts of "Jesus' environment" or of Galilee in the first
century have the feel of synopses of Josephus' writings, with a handful of details added from the NT or
Rabbinic sources. So, for instance, Freyne, Galilee, esp.101-246 (social and economic description of
Galilee); Horsley, Galilee, esp.62-88 (on Galilee from 4 BCE-67 CE); Jesus and the Spiral of Violence,
esp. 61-145 (socio-cultural description of Galilee); Schürer, History of the Jewish People, esp. v.1, 340-
353 (on Antipas), 491-496 (on the Jewish War as conducted in Galilee).
tively overt (everyone, for instance, knows to take what Josephus says about John of Gischala with a grain of salt). Josephus shows a definable but quite general class bias, which not only seems to impel him to political conservatism (maintain the status quo until the Romans come in and "restore order"), but probably affects his descriptions of daily life, his selections of relevant information, even his description (and understanding!) of religious behavior, and most especially his articulation of the motives behind other people's behavior. A case in point is his description of the burning of the Jerusalem public archives during the war (see War, 2.427). He explicitly gives as explanation for this action "in order to win over a host of grateful debtors and to cause a rising of the poor against the rich." It has been argued that this description reveals the class bias for at least some of the actions of the War. In fact, however, it is at least possible that this description owes more to Josephus' class biases, and the assumption that by attributing such a motive to the action, he will exculpate the Jews who "matter" from responsibility in such unforgivable actions: blame the rabble, or at least the fanatical manipulators of the rabble. Thus while Josephus can indeed serve as a first-rate source, in spite of his overt redactional interests, for the social history of the period he describes, it must be recognized that the information he provides will a) be haphazard and incomplete, and b) be permeated with Josephus' own class bias which will shape the timbre of everything he describes.

A fourth and rather more problematic source, also literary, is constituted by Rabbinic writings, in particular the Mishnah, the Tosefta, and the Talmuds, which contain

31. This bias cannot be better illustrated than by noting that, apparently, Vespasian, Titus, Agrippa II, and other highly-placed Romans who participated in the events of the war vehemently approved of the account offered by Josephus in the Jewish War. See Josephus, C. Ap., 1.9 (Loeb 1.182-183); and esp. Vita 65 (Loeb 1.363-364): "Indeed, so anxious was the Emperor Titus that my volumes should be the sole authority from which the world should learn the facts, that he affixed his own signature to them and gave orders for their publication; while King Agrippa wrote sixty-two letters testifying to the truth of the record." See also Schürer, History of the Jewish People, v.1, 47.

32. See, e.g., my own comments: Arnal, "Rhetoric of Marginality," 486.
traditions emanating from Galilee, and which provide general information about day-to-day rural living in Roman antiquity, especially from the perspective of village-based landowners.33 There are two main difficulties involved in using Rabbinic literature and the traditions contained therein as a source for Palestinian "context" in the first century. The first difficulty is date; the second is social location and perspective. The earliest of these writings, the Mishnah, was composed only by 200 CE, that is, 150 years or more after the period with which we are concerned.34 While the traditions contained in such late texts may be much earlier than the compilation of the texts themselves,35 it is no simple matter to distinguish among the age of these various internal traditions; the various authorities cited can be roughly dated,36 but there is no guarantee that the material

33. See Gildas Hamel, Poverty and Charity in Roman Palestine, First Three Centuries C.E. (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1990), 5: "The Rabbinic literature reflects the perspective of large and small landowners, with strong beliefs in the meaning of an invisible history once and for all mapped out by the scriptures, and paramount interest in all the things of daily life that maintained or activated that history." See also Horsley, Galilee, 103. The entire Mishnaic tractate Zera' im is concerned with agricultural matters, and assumes their application to Palestine.

34. On the grounds for dating the composition of the Mishnah to about 200 CE, see Jacob Neusner, Judaism: The Evidence of the Mishnah (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1981), esp.2-3, 122, and Schürer, History of the Jewish People, v.1, 76-77, both of whom note however, that written antecedents for it and other sources are likely to have been used. Cf. Isidore Epstein, "Talmud," v.4, pp.511-515 in George Arthur Buttrick, ed., Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible (Nashville: Abingdon, 1962), 512; Horsley, Archaeology, 188; Jacob Neusner, The Economics of the Mishnah (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1990), ix. The dating of the Rabbinic material does not, of course, negatively affect its utility as a source for the later social history of Palestine. Safrai, Economy of Roman Palestine, uses especially Talmudic writings as copiously as those interested in the first century use Josephus.

35. Thus, rather optimistically, Schürer, History of the Jewish People, v.1, 69: "Although most of rabbinic literature reaches back no further than the end of the second century A.D., it is, nevertheless, an invaluable source of knowledge of the period preceding it, for the origins of the traditions it codifies may be traced back to the first century A.D., and sometimes even pre-Christian era." For a survey of pre-War Mishnaic traditions, see Neusner, Judaism, ch.2 (45-75). The Tosefta, which is to be dated even later than the Mishnah (i.e., to around 400 CE) nonetheless contains a portion of legal traditions unparalleled in the Mishnah and therefore not demonstrably secondary to the Mishnah; it may thus preserve some pre-Amoraic formulations. See Jacob Neusner and Richard S. Sarason, eds., The Tosefta: Translated from the Hebrew (First Division: Zera' im) (Hoboken, New Jersey: KTAV Publishing House, 1986), ix-xi.

ascribed to them is ascribed accurately or has not been altered to reflect a latter or different setting. However, as with Josephus, this difficulty is more pressing for the biographer or the chronicler of events than for one primarily interested in social and economic history, for the information provided to the latter by Rabbinic writings concerns the ordinary practices and conditions of everyday living, matters which are unlikely to have changed very much in the course of the hundred years or so in which at least the Mishnaic traditions developed. Thus, although some of the material in the Talmuds and Midrashim is far too late to be of much use, the Mishnaic traditions, insofar as they reflect the persistent and material conditions of life (e.g., the technology of crop production, the potential uses of money, the arrangement of domestic space, etc.), rather than historically-specific or mutable circumstances (e.g., political conditions, cultural and/or symbolic expressions, legal norms, the impact of urbanization and trade, etc.), remain a usable source of information, even when the traditions in question demonstrably postdate the first century.

A much greater difficulty than dating, therefore, will be that of perspective, which even at the level of socio-economic history may distort the record. The rabbinic literature reflects, it may be argued, the perspective of a relatively atypical layer of the populace, and therefore can be expected routinely to distort its presentation of economic life to mesh with the ideology and perspective of that sector. Moreover, Rab-

37. See, e.g., Neusner, Judaism, 14: "I refer to the matter of uncritically assigning sayings attributed to various authorities to the period in which the said authorities lived, and, among the less critical, the prevalent assumption that if the rabbinic sources claim Mr. X said something, he really did say it, and if they tell a story about what Mr. Y did, he really did do it." See also his comments in chs. 4 (esp. 122-126) and 5 (esp. 167-172) regarding the distinctively post-Bar-Kochba setting of a great deal of Mishnaic material. Cf. Neuser and Sarason, Tosefia, ix.

38. Or, conversely, the Rabbinic literature only reflects the variegated views of an assortment of desultory and separate batei midrash, and "consequently, each book or part of a book has a different social background, which must be discussed separately" (Safari, 5, disapprovingly, citing Goodenough, Neusner, and, to a lesser degree, Lee I. Levine). See Lee I. Levine, The Rabbinic Class of Roman Palestine in Late Antiquity (New York: Jewish Theological Seminary, 1989), 28-33, 39-41, on the early rift between the sages and the Galilean people (and environment) in general.
binic rulings and stipulations may not reflect the *reality* of everyday life even in the period in which they were finally codified, but rather an idealized or backward-looking vision of how things *ought* to be.\(^{39}\) Be this as it may, these writings nevertheless, like Josephus and like early Christian literature, tell us something about the persistent realities of daily life in what they assume, what they take for granted, what they let slip ancillary to making other points. Take, for example, the Mishnaic definition of what constitutes a herd for purposes of tithing (any body of cattle within 16 miles of one another\(^{40}\)): such a definition may not, because of its prescriptive and idealistic character, tell us anything about regularity of cattle tithes, nor again about typical sizes of herds or pasturage land (since the definition of a herd here may be intended to be meticulous, rather than ordinary or realistic), but it does tell us something about the ordinary orbit of pasturage, and thus, concomitantly, about what actual distances might be involved in relatively *local* traffic. For this kind of information, then, the Mishnah especially, but a considerable amount of other Rabbinic material as well, serves as a potentially useful source.

Fifth and finally, in addition to the main direct sources as just described, indirect information by and/or about persons not in Galilee in the first century or shortly thereafter can nevertheless have the highest utility. There are, of course, a number of Greek and Roman authors whose literary works comment directly on historical and other matters pertaining to early Roman Palestine: stray remarks about Palestine may appear in

---

39. So Horsley, *Archaeology*, 188; *Galilee*, 98-103, esp. 98 ("The early rabbis had very little interaction with or influence upon social-economic-religious life in Galilee. Their own testimony in the case law of tannaic literature [Mishnah and Tosefta] indicates this clearly. . . . the rabbis' own witness is strikingly clear: their rulings were by and large disregarded"), and 103 ("Economically, the center of interest is the village, made up of households as the units of agricultural production. But village life and produce are aligned to the Temple as the center of holiness"). Cf. Safrai, *Economy of Roman Palestine*, 5-6, disapprovingly, citing Goodenough, Neusner, and Lee I. Levine.

40. See Danby, *Mishnah*, 542 (*Bekhoroth* 9.2), and further below.
the work of contemporary historians (such as Tacitus) and geographers (such as Strabo), and information may be provided by inscriptive and papyri evidence, both from within Palestine and without. Even more significantly, however, Graeco-Roman writings comment broadly, often in passing, on socio-economic matters that help flesh out the picture of everyday life in the empire as a whole. As part of the Roman Empire, Galilee will have at least some similarities to other segments of the Empire to which this data directly pertains.41 Again, such matters as the uses to which money was put, agricultural techniques, travel technology, features of manufacture and trade, relations between city and countryside, and so forth, may be gleaned usefully and easily from the wealth of extant literary (and archaeological!) data on the Roman world broadly, at least so long as historical shifts are not ignored or distinct conditions conflated which may have changed over time. By extension, moreover, this kind of information dovetails with and may be supplemented by comparative data from far outside of the geographical or temporal boundaries of Roman antiquity, particularly that which focuses on typical social and material properties of agrarian-based empires, peasant societies, and pre-modern technological problems.

In sum, then, there is actually a surprising amount of potential information directly on first-century Galilee, or from which inferences about first-century Galilee may be drawn. Although this data is more sparse for the early Roman period than for

41. This is true especially as regards the basics of agricultural production. See, for instance, M. M. Postman, ed., The Cambridge Economic History of Europe, 2nd edition (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1966), v.2, 92:

This [homogeneous] zone of summer drought comprises the area of the whole Roman Empire, if its northern prolongation into Gaul and Britain is excepted; indeed, to a geographer, there is no more remarkable aspect of Julius Caesar's career than his extension of the Roman Empire into a climatic area distinct from it. For elsewhere the climate has homogeneity, and while the mass of ancient agricultural doctrine is concerned with Greece and Italy, modern observation reinforced by the hints of ancient authors allows us to establish general principles valid throughout the Mediterranean region.
subsequent centuries, some additional sense of everyday life in this time-frame may be gained by comparative and indirect evidence, while our historical record for the period is actually quite good, even accounting for both the class biases and the specific Tendenz of our literary sources. The relative rarity of broad social-economic descriptions undergirding research on the rise of Christianity (and the historical Jesus), at least until relatively recently, is not so much a function of a dearth of data as of a lack of interest and of the idealist assumptions that have tended to mark at least the literary investigation of formative Judaism and Christianity.

VILLAGE OCCUPATIONS AND PRODUCTION

The primary occupation of the populace of the Roman Empire was agriculture. Only a tiny percentage of the people, disproportionately represented in evidentiary data and in historical reconstruction, earned their livings or performed what work was required of them in any other fashion; an equally tiny percentage were absolved by wealth from work entirely, but of these, most held their wealth in agriculturally exploited land. Those vast numbers who were unfortunate enough to dwell in the countryside, in villages on the land, or as slaves in larger villae, were engaged exclusively in agriculture or the support of agriculture. Production from the land was central to all wealth in antiquity, including that of the state.42 The situation was the same for


The Roman economy was underdeveloped. This means essentially that the mass of the population lived at or near subsistence level. In a typical underdeveloped, pre-industrial economy, a large proportion of the labor force is employed in agriculture, which is the main avenue for investment and source of wealth. The level of investment in manufacturing industries is low.
Galilee as for the rest of the Empire, if not even more intensely. Josephus presents Galilee as a land under intense cultivation to an extraordinary degree:

For the land is everywhere so rich in soil and pasturage and produces such variety of trees, that even the most indolent are tempted by these facilities to devote themselves to agriculture. In fact, every inch of the soil has been cultivated by the inhabitants; there is not a parcel of waste land. The towns, too, are thickly distributed, and even the villages, thanks to the fertility of the soil, are all so densely populated that the smallest of them contains above fifteen thousand inhabitants.43

The statement is an exaggeration in several respects: not only are the population figures ridiculous, but a significant portion of the land in Galilee is not cultivable.44 The basic point made by Josephus, however — that the entirety of the territory of Galilee is a generally productive and fertile region, and that it was (relatively) densely populated and was intensely under cultivation —, is accurate enough.45 Elsewhere, Josephus suggests that there are a total of 204 cities and villages in Galilee.46 an estimate that Horsley, at least, is prepared to accept, arguing that since sites for fifty villages in the wider region of Sepphoris alone can be identified from literary and archaeological evidence, a figure of approximately 200 for the whole of Galilee is not unreasonable.47 If

Resources that might in theory be devoted to growth-inducing investment are diverted into consumption or into unproductive speculation and usury. Demand for manufactured goods is relatively low, and most needs are met locally with goods made by small craftsmen or at home.

44. The population figures are obviously exaggerated; for a discussion of more likely figures, see Horsley, Galilee, 166-167, 193; Archaeology, 44-45, 114. Horsley, Archaeology, 15, notes, moreover, that Josephus’ idyllic picture here ignores the fact that "... much of the [Galilean] countryside was so mountainous or rocky that it resisted cultivation." So also Freyne, Galilee, 5; Horsley, Archaeology, 89; Peter Richardson, Herod: King of the Jews and Friend of the Romans (University of South Carolina Press, 1996), 132.
45. So also, e.g., Freyne, Galilee, 5, 15; Hoehner, Antipas, 65; Douglas E. Oakman, Jesus and the Economic Questions of his Day (Lewiston: Edwin Mellen Press, 1986), 19; Richardson, Herod, 133; Schürer, History of the Jewish People, v.1, 341.
46. Josephus, Vita 235 (Loeb 1.89).
47. Horsley, Archaeology, 89, citing knowledge of surface surveys personally communicated by Mordechai Aviam; and Galilee, 190-191.
so, the land was densely populated indeed, with, on average, very little distance between settlements.

While in terms of topography, and hence also of agricultural variations as well as of administration, the region is divided into two or possibly three sectors — Lower Galilee, Upper Galilee, and "the Valley," i.e., the basin of the lake\(^{48}\) — the whole region is nevertheless intensely productive, although in varying ways. Both soil and rainfall are felicitous for crop production.\(^{49}\) Lower Galilee stretches, according to Josephus, from the Plain of Esdraelon village of Xaloth in the south to Bersabe in the north\(^{50}\) — that is, from the northern boundaries of Samaria and the region of Scythopolis northward to the Beth HaKerem Valley, approximately level with the northern tip of the lake.\(^{51}\) East to west, the area extends from the lake to the immediate hinterland of the coastal cities (unless one excludes the lake basin as another

\[\text{48. For this division, see Josephus, } B.J. \text{ 3.35-40 (Loeb 2.585-587), and for description of the parameters of these regions and their main characteristics see also David Adan-Bayewitz, Common Pottery in Roman Galilee: A Study of Local Trade (Jerusalem: Bar-Ilan University Press, 1993), 27-31, incidental to locating the site of Kefar Hananya, which marks the division between Upper and Lower Galilees; Freyne, Galilee, 9-15; also, inter alios, Fiensy, Land is Mine, 55; Richardson, Herod, 132. Danby, Mishnah, Shebiith 9.2 (49), describes the distinction in terms of agricultural differences: "Galilee is divided into upper Galilee, lower Galilee, and the valley: from Kefar Hanania downwards, wheresoever sycamores do not grow, is upper Galilee; from Kefar Hanania downwards, wheresoever sycamores grow, is lower Galilee; the region of Tiberias is the valley."
}

\]
\[\text{As the highest and northernmost of the mountain regions, Galilee is the coolest and most lush of them all, reminding one of the densely vegetated Lebanon. Spotted with small villages, blanketed by olives and various fruit trees, it was relatively isolated from the main arteries of commerce and centers of government. Its role as a kind of hinterland was much more important than would appear from the historical sources.}
\]

\]

\[\text{51. Adan-Bayewitz, Common Pottery, 27; Freyne, Galilee, 9. Xaloth was in the Great Plain (modern Iksal, according to Loeb 2.587 a.b), about level with Mount Tabor. Freyne associates Bersabe with a site proximate to Kefar Hananya in the Beth HaKerem Valley, and believes that this valley, and its continuation in the deep gorge of the Ammud stream, is the geologic marker of the boundary between Lower and Upper Galilee. Kenneth W. Clark, "Galilee," v.2, 344-347 in George Arthur Buttrick, ed., Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible (Nashville: Abingdon, 1962), 346, describes the distinction as marked by the plain of Ramah, roughly on a line from Capernaum to Ptolemais.} \]
This area is marked geographically in the east by a series of rugged plateaus covered by volcanic basalt, while the western area is gentler, a series of limestone ridges with deep basins running from west to east in a slightly northward direction, and sloping upward from the sea. The area is essentially foothill country between the Great Plain to the south and the Lebanon mountain ranges to the north. The climate in this whole area is conducive to vegetation in large measure because of the generous supply of water. Rainfall here, in contrast to the more arid south of Palestine, is plentiful, and increases as one moves north. The average annual rainfall for Lower Galilee is in the neighborhood of 500-700 mm, and there is frequently snowfall in the winter as well. This precipitation was absolutely necessary to ensuring fertility in antiquity; the absence of rain, or of the right kind of rainfall, could affect crop yield, tree yield, or the filling of cisterns for water storage. This rainfall, concentrated in the winter and early spring, was insufficiently consistent: the water needed to be stored for purposes of irrigation, as the references to cisterns illustrate. Moreover, this lopsidedness of precipitation meant that violent

52. Josephus, B.J. 3.38 (Loeb 2.587) describes the east-west range of Lower Galilee as extending from Tiberias to Chabulon, "which is not far from Ptolemais on the coast" (ἡς ἐν τοῖς παραλίοις Πτολεμαίους γεώτερος).
54. Freyne, Galilee, 5.
56. Freyne, Galilee, 5.
57. See Danby, Mishnah, Taanith 3.1-2 (197): "So, too, if rain had failed for forty days between rainfall and rainfall, they forthwith sound the shofar, since it means the onset of dearth. 2If rain fell [in fashion good] for the crops but not for the trees, or [good] for the trees but not for the crops, or [good] for them both but not for the cisterns, pits, or caverns, they forthwith sound the shofar."
58. Freyne, Galilee, 5; Hamel, Poverty and Charity, 102-103.
rainfalls could cause significantly deleterious soil erosion, especially in the upper areas of the hill country where the inclines were steep. Nevertheless, the gross fall of water was generally sufficient for irrigating the basins of the Lower Galilee, which are thus a source of rich vegetation, enhanced in a large area to the south and south-west of Tiberias by volcanic alluvia.

In particular, this region is marked by the production of two main kinds of crops, namely, grains and fruit-bearing trees. Of the former, wheat (σῖκος; triticum durum, triticum sativum) was the most common and the most central; barley (κρωθί; hordeum sativum) can be grown in the more arid conditions to the south, such as Idumea, but makes an inferior bread, deemed appropriate only for the very poor. Galilee, because of its sufficient availability of water, did not require barley as a staple; its main grain

---

60. Freyne, Galilee, 5; Hamel, Poverty and Charity, 103, 106-107. The story of Honi the circle-drawer (Danby, Mishnah, Taanith 3.8 [198]) illustrates these conditions, and the delicate balance required between drought and flood: when Honi stood inside the circle he had drawn, 'Rain began falling drop by drop. He said, 'Not for such rain have I prayed, but for rain that will fill the cisterns, pits, and caverns.' It began to rain with violence. He said, 'Not for such rain have I prayed, but for rain of goodwill, blessing, and graciousness.' Then it rained in moderation.'

61. Clark, "Galilee," 346; and see map in Pritchard, Atlas, 59. This volcanic basalt also characterizes the Golan region, to the north-east of the lake.

62. Which comes to mean grain in general. See Bauer, Lexicon, 752.

63. See Danby, Mishnah, Ketuboth 5.8 (252): "Only R. Ishmael provided her with barley because he lived near Edom."

64. In fact other grains were cultivated in ancient Palestine as well — fox-tail, spelt, emmer, durra, millet, rice (Hamel, Poverty and Charity, 11; Safrai, Economy, 117-118) — but "... wheat and barley not only bore the biggest grains and yielded the most flour but also were the most suitable for bread" (Hamel, Poverty and Charity, 13). The problem with barley is that it could not be easily husked without prior roasting, which operation destroyed much of the gluten content of the grains and thus made its dough inelastic (Hamel, Poverty and Charity, 13). On barley as a source of inferior bread, see Bauer, Lexicon, 450, who refers to Appianus, Illyr. 26.76, where inferior soldiers receive κρωθί ἄριστον; and see Josephus, Ant. 5.219 (Loeb 5.101), who refers to a κριβίμῳ ἰπτεῖλειας ἄνθρωπος ἀβρωτόν. The Talmud (TB Beza 1.23, quoted by Safrai, Economy, 109) states that barley is animal fodder; Danby, Mishnah, Sanhedrin 9.5 (396) states that a three-time criminal offender is to be put into prison and fed only barley "until his belly bursts"; and the amount of barley required to be left on the threshing floor for the poor is double that of wheat (Danby, Mishnah, Peah 8.5 [19]).
product was wheat. The aniconic coins of the Agrippas, those designed for their Jewish subjects, show heads of wheat on one side, illustrating the perceived centrality of the product; the Mishnah mentions wheat 88 times, over against only 47 times for barley. In the Murabba'at documents, values for various other agricultural products were expressed in terms of wheat. Wheat was also therefore the main source of food. taken (obviously) in the form of bread; aside from festive occasions, ordinary dining practices involved two main meals per day, both of which revolved around bread:

The ancients ate two daily meals during the week and three on the Sabbath. Breakfast, eaten in the third or fourth hour of the day, consisted of bread dipped in olive oil or bread with some type of vegetable. The poor made due with bread and garlic while the wretchedly poverty-stricken ate "dry bread" which they dipped in salt. Supper, eaten during twilight, was the main meal of the day. This evening meal included bread and some cooked food such as an egg, or some type of cooked legume flour or paste.

The Mishnah seems to regard standard daily human consumption (in the absence of other comestibles) to be approximately the bread made from one-half of a kab of wheat (= approx. 0.525 kg; or a whole kab of barley): this makes up the two meals of an

---

65. See Pritchard, Atlas, 59, and, indirectly, Safrai, Economy of Roman Palestine, 108-109. One can only guess, but it is possible that Josephus so highly esteemed the productivity of Galilee because, in contrast to less irrigated regions to the south or north-east, proportionately little of the land was used for grazing or for the production of animal feed (barley and other inferior grains). It must thus have seemed that "every inch of the soil" was under direct cultivation.
66. See Meshorer, Ancient Jewish Coinage, 52-59, 79; plates #9-16.
68. See Mur 90 (DJD 2:218), which lists produce in one column, followed by a parallel column which gives equivalences in wheat, using the formula ια(ου) (πυροδ) ιυγ., etc., literally given as ια(ου) (and see editors' commentary on this practice, 219); cf. #96 (228-229); and see Hamel, Poverty and Charity, 126 n.178. For the relative value of wheat to barley in different regions and at different times, see chart #6 in Ben-David, Talmudische Ökonomie, 102.
69. Safrai, Economy, 105. The bread was in fact very hard and dry and was used for scooping up a vegetable and/or oil pulp, which in its turn helped soften the bread and make it more palatable. See Hamel, Poverty and Charity, 12, 14-15.
ordinary diet, not including other products going into the meals. 70 If one factors in other products, the weekly consumption of grain per person would be at least about 2 kabs (= 2.1 kg). 71 Safrai, assuming an average annual yield of 600 kg per acre, calculates that wheat cultivation of 0.32 acres is necessary to sustain the average person, which means, because of alternate crop rotation, 72 that the average family would need to consume at least the wheat of 0.625 acres of cultivable land per person. 73 Adding to this figure on the basis of seed requirements (generously assuming a 1:5 yield, for which see below) translates into a requirement of 0.69 acres per person, and thus subsistence for a family of four, of six, or of eight, would require the unencumbered (i.e., with no taxes or other dues) availability of at least 2.76, or 4.14, or 5.52 acres, of cultivable land.

---

70. See, for instance, Danby, Mishnah, Peah 8.7 (20): "A poor man that is journeying from place to place should be given not less than one loaf worth a pondion [from wheat costing] one sel[a for four seahs]." Safrai, Economy, 105, works this out to a loaf of 0.525 kg: "The price for a seah of wheat is one-quarter of a sel[a = dinar. The pondion is one-twelfth of a seah. Thus, a loaf is one-twelfth of a seah or one-half of a kab. A seah of wheat, therefore, is 6.3 kilograms. Thus, the Mishnah is describing a loaf that weighed 0.525 kilograms." See also Danby, Mishnah, Peah 8.5 (19); Ketuboth 5.8 (252); Neusner, Tosefta, Peah 4.8 (69). Safari, Economy, 107, suggests that this figure of (the equivalent of) about one-half of a kilogram of wheat per day applies to nearly everyone: "The rich consumed more, but the addition would mostly [sic] likely not have been in terms of grain, but rather additional fruits, wine, meat and other luxury items."

71. So Safrai, Economy, 110 (cf.106), based on Mishnah Ketuboth 5.8 (quoted below). This estimate is probably rather low, since it assumes the availability of these other products, an assumption that may not pertain accurately to the condition of the rural poor or to all times of the year. Two kabs would make eight ordinary meals, i.e., enough for four days, not seven. Safrai is assuming six additional meals comprised of oil and vegetable products, or of figs. One should therefore take the figures offered here as a minimum. Evans, "Wheat in the Roman World," 432, suggests that minimum intake to sustain life is between 190 and 235 kg per year; if Safrai's figures are augmented to include seven days of intake rather than four, weekly consumption is 3.675 kg per week, or 191.1 kg per year, on the low end of Evans' range.

72. See Hamel, Poverty and Charity, 126 n.181; Oakman, Jesus and the Economic Questions of his Day, 28.

73. Thus Safrai, Economy, 110. This figure is based on the figure of 0.525 kg required per day, not on the weekly figure which incorporates other types of food products. Nevertheless, the figure is probably a minimum, given that Safrai admits that his yield figures are rather optimistic. Safrai gives his figures for the dunam, not the acre, which have been translated here on the basis of the equation 4 dunams = 1 acre. The figures he gives are: an annual yield of 150 kg per dunam; basic dietary needs require the annual yield of 1.28 dunams; with alternate fallow, this translates into about 2.5 dunams.
Safrai’s yield figures, however, are unrealistic, apparently in the neighborhood of 1:10.74 Excluding obviously exaggerated figures, literary sources and comparative evidence suggest a usual expectation of about 1:5 seed to product yield.75 Talmudic traditions cited by Hamel suggest a standard yield of 1:5,76 and perhaps a yield of 1:6 in better locations of the Galilee.77 Figures for grain from Italy suggest yields of about 1:4;78 for exceptional districts of Sicily, about 1:8.79 Hamel further cites P. Ness. 82

74. Safrai does not give yield ratios directly, but his figures work out to a cereal product of 1482.6 kg per hectare; Hamel, Poverty and Charity, 135, working on the assumption of a 1:5 yield, puts cereal product at 750 kg per hectare. Or again, Safrai suggests a product of 150 kg per dunam, while Ben-David, Talmudische Ökonomie, 78, 106 implies a yield of 77 kg per dunam (a Beth-Se’atjim = 1568 m², a five-fold yield on 20 Beth-Se’atjim would be 2057 kg). Therefore Safrai appears to be assuming an average yield about double that of Hamel or Be-David. Safrai depends on Y. Feliks, Agriculture in Palestine in the Period of the Mishnah and Talmud (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1963), for his figures. Note that Garmsey and Saller, Roman Empire, 77-82, however, agree with this higher yield figure, arguing that Columella’s low figure is idiosyncratic.

75. Mark 4:8 (1:30, 1:60, and 1:100) and Gospel of Thomas #9 (1:60 and 1:120) are examples of such inflated and essentially meaningless figures. Varro and the Talmuds also give similarly unrealistic figures from time to time, ranging from 1:45 to 1:100. Danby, Mishnah, Peah 5.1 (15), which suggests that the same amount of grain should be left for the poor as is set aside for seed, implies a ratio of 1:45 (and see Danby, Mishnah, 363 n.1). Modern farming yields ratios of 1:30 to 1:40 under the very best of conditions. See Hamel, Poverty and Charity, 126-128.

76. Hamel, Poverty and Charity, 127 and n.189, citing bBM 105b which implies yield ratios 1:3.75 and 1:7.5 (4-8 se’ahs per kor). Cf. Oakman, Jesus and the Economic Questions of His Day, 28; Reed, "Population Numbers," 212 n.40.

77. Hamel, Poverty and Charity, 129 and nn.201, 203, 204: pPe’ah 7.4.20a: a se’ah of Arbel (i.e., from the Arbel plain, 6 km northwest of Tiberias) generates 6 se’ahs of various grades of flour and bran; pSot. 1.8.17b; 9.14.24b: a se’ah of Arbel produces 6 se’ahs of various grades of flour and bran; bKeth. 112a: a se’ah of Judah produces 5 se’ahs of various grades of flour and bran. Note, however, that these texts describe flour yield, not grain yield. Volume increment takes place at milling, depending on the quality of the grain: hence actual grain yield figures would probably be lower.

78. Columella, De re rustica 3.3.4; see Hamel, Poverty and Charity, 131 n.216.

79. Cicero, Actionis secundae in C. Verrem, 3.18.47; 3.47.112; see Hamel, Poverty and Charity, 131 n.218. Actually, there seem to be two main sets of credible figures, not quite compatible with each other. Cicero suggests around an eightfold yield, while Columella suggests about fourfold. Likewise the P. Ness. papyri suggest a similar discrepancy. See Evans, "Wheat in the Roman World," 429-431. Evans argues (431) that this discrepancy, which, suggestively, involves a doubling or halving of the figures in question, may only be an apparent contradiction: the result of yield figures being calculated on the basis of ground actually sown (which would then yield the 1:8 figure), or on the basis of ground actually possessed, half of which would normally be fallow (thus giving the 1:4 figure); or perhaps the lower figure refers to intercultivation. This ingenious suggestion is probably incorrect: statements about yield in the ancient literature are based directly on land sown, as they sometimes explicitly refer to seed to yield ratios. The discrepancy is thus probably to be explained some other way: differing soil productivity, yield being measured by flour rather than grain, or discrepant sowing practices.
and *P. Ness.* as giving yield figures for wheat which translate into a ratio of 1:6.75-7.2 in the first instance and 1:4.28, 1:3.7 in the second.¹⁰ The latter is deemed to be standard, the former exceptional if believable at all.¹¹ Yields in Medieval Europe tended to be between 1:3 and 1:4.¹² Arab yields in modern Palestine before the 20th century tended to be about 1:5 in the best years.¹³ Interesting confirmation of these lower yield ratio figures may come from another source: Julius Caesar in 59 BCE provided land grants to veterans (and the poor) in the amount of ten *iugera* for a family of three or more children,¹⁴ which amounts to about six and a quarter acres, and this amount is deemed by Finley to be at the razor's edge of subsistence even with a tax exemption, such that eventual failure was a certainty.¹⁵ A calculation of 4.5 acres for subsistence for a family of six, therefore, assumes too high a yield of produce, even if one makes the obviously counterfactual assumption that most land is wholly unencumbered by rents, tithes, local dues of various kinds, debt payments, and taxes.

Working from yield figures of half that assumed by Safrai, i.e., 1:5,¹⁶ necessary mini-

---

¹⁴ Finley, *Ancient Economy*, 81.
¹⁵ Finley, *Ancient Economy*, 81, and 226 n.56.
¹⁶ This figure is an average, not a norm: in the Galilean valleys yields probably fluctuated between as low as 1:3 and as high as 1:8. So Hamel, *Poverty and Charity*, 133. In fact, there are indications that sometimes yield was 1:1 or less, i.e., barely enough for next year’s seed; hence some tenancy contracts introduce penalties for non-cultivation (Hamel, *Poverty and Charity*, 130 and n.210). See Murabba‘at papyrus #24b, lines 11-13 (Benoit, Milik, and de Vaux, 125):

\[\text{The Mishnah also includes such penalties: Danby, Mishnah, Baba Metzia 9.3 (362): "If a man leased a field from his fellow and he let it lie fallow. they assess how much it was likely to have yielded and he must pay the owner accordingly, for thus such a lease prescribes: 'If I suffer the land to lie fallow and do not till it I will pay thee at the rate of its highest yield'";}\]

Danby, Mishnah, Baba Metzia 9.5 (362-363): "If a man leased a field from his fellow and it was not fruitful, and there was only enough produce to make a heap, he must still cultivate it. R. Judah said: What manner of measure is 'a heap'? — but, rather,
mum land allotments double, making them comparable to Caesar’s land grants: subsistence for a family of four, of six, or of eight, would require the unencumbered availability of at least 5.52, or 8.28, or 11.04 acres, of cultivable land. This is a minimum figure, failing to take bad years and crop failures into account (except as an average), and assuming — falsely — the absence of various dues, debts, tithes, and taxes. Thus Ben-David, assuming actual consumption of only one-third (!) of gross yield (the remainder devoted to seed and various dues), and noting that a fellah’s farm in 1909-23 comprised six to nine people for 8 to 10 hectares of land (= 19.768 to 24.71 acres), supposes for the Roman period that a family of six to nine people will work a farm of about 7 hectares (= 17.297 acres). This is about double the figures just given. Such a plot would, assuming the general accuracy of the figures given, gross about 2625 kg of grain product. This range of figures for subsistence — and their variability — should be kept in mind in what follows.

Thus the most important crop — in terms of cultivation and consumption —, the sine qua non of human occupation, was this wheat, which the Galilee produced in abundance. Of the three main soil types in the Roman Mediterranean world — bare mountain, limestone hill, and alluvia — Lower Galilee possessed significant amounts of the latter two: its hillside land could be used for trees and mixed crops (including

he must cultivate it even if it yields only as much grain as was sown there."
88. Assuming, with Hamel, Poverty and Charity, 136, 150 kg of seed sown per hectare, with a 1:5 yield. Seven hectares would thus yield 5250 kg of grain, if under continuous cultivation. Alternating fallow would yield half that figure, viz., 2625 kg. Note also the various yield figures given by Safrai, Talmudische Ökonomie, 106.
89. As evinced most strikingly by the reduction of produce values to those of wheat as a standard. See note 68, above.
grains), and its alluvial valleys primarily for grain.90 The valleys or basins between elevations, receiving run-off from higher land, would thus have been devoted primarily to wheat,91 while cultivation of the higher ground was accomplished normally through the use of strip lynchets,92 although to a lesser extent also through terracing, which was common on graded limestone in antiquity, but which was not used extensively or well in the Galilee because small holdings made the effort prohibitive.93

The wheat was sown on ploughed land94 in the early winter, around December,95 to take advantage of the rainy winter growing season, and hoed in the spring for

---

90. Hamel, Poverty and Charity, 102:

   The soil structure [of the Mediterranean generally] falls into three main categories: rather naked and rough mountaintops; slopes that have been smoothed and covered with deposits of limestone, sandstone, or marly clay; and small alluvial plains. In the summer, the mountaintops and hills are used mostly by shepherds. The slopes carry planted (olives, vineyards) and sown crops. The alluvial plains are suitable for more crops and garden vegetables, especially when properly irrigated.

Of course, irrigation would not have been too much of a problem in Galilee.


92. That is, "... the slope is cultivated in strips that do not follow the contours of the mountains but rise and descend gently along the slopes" (Golomb and Kedar, "Ancient Agriculture," 137). Cf. Hamel, Poverty and Charity, 116.

93. See Golomb and Kedar, "Ancient Agriculture," 138:

   The system of terraces in the Galilee is, however, generally inferior to other types of cultivation and to the kind found in the Judean Hills. The reason for this inferior quality of terracing in the Galilee may be explained by the fact that the inhabitants were small tenant farmers, who lacked the resources for the construction of elaborate terrace work. Moreover, most of the mountains in Lower Galilee consist of tilted blocks, the geological strata of which dip steeply and are unfavorable for the construction of terraces.

This article discusses the archaeological evidence for these types of cultivation in ancient Galilee. See also Ben-David, Talmudische Ökonomie, 81-82, 91-93 and photographs of terracing, 81 and 92; and Hamel, Poverty and Charity, 115. Hamel, 116, suggests that the poorer quality of Galilean terraces has more to do with the difficulty of the terrain than it does with the dearth of smallholder resources.

94. Sometimes ploughed twice or more, partly in order to minimize weeds: once in the late summer/early fall after threshing and winnowing, and again in December, just before sowing. See Hamel, Poverty and Charity, 110, 113-115, who notes that the post-harvest ploughing was sometimes neglected. Cf. also Duncan-Jones, Economy of the Roman Empire, 329.

95. See Hamel, Poverty and Charity, 109 and table #1, p.110.
thinning and weeding. It was harvested in late spring/early summer, just before the onset of the hot days. Safrai described the processes which followed harvesting:

After harvesting the wheat, the farmer would bring it to the threshing-floor (goren). There he would smooth out the heap of wheat, thresh it, scatter it to complete the separation of chaff from seeds, and sift it. The final result of all this was a pile of seeds. The farmer did not grind these himself, but sold them in this form or stored them. . . . The final stage is the merihah or smoothing out of the pile of seeds. This was necessary to measure the seeds. . . .

Although in terms of transport it would have been more economical to wholesale flour rather than wheat, normally the unground seeds were wholesaled, because of the difficulty of storing flour. The grinding of the wheat was normally done by women or servants, and is described by Hamel as "long, painful, and dreary," taking at least two to three hours per day, usually in the morning before sunrise, using either a hand-mill, or, more elaborately, a two-way mill operated by two women (as may be referred to in Q 17:34 and Apoc. Zeph. 2:2-4), or a rotary mill which was operated by one woman and capable of grinding about 4 pounds (= 1.82 kg) of grain into flour in one hour.

96. Hamel, Poverty and Charity, 113.
98. Safrai, Economy of Roman Palestine, 116. Cf. Danby, Mishnah, Shabbath 7.2, 106, which lists among classes of work: sowing, ploughing, reaping, binding sheaves, threshing, winnowing, cleansing crops, grinding, sifting, kneading, baking, etc.
99. Safrai, Economy of Roman Palestine, 117. See also Danby, Mishnah, Maaser Sheni 4.1 (78, emphasis added): "If a man brought produce from the threshing-floor to the town . . . the increase in value falls to the Second Tithe . . . ."
100. See, inter alia, Q 17:35: "Two women will be grinding at the mill"; Apocalypse of Zephaniah 2:2-4, O. S. Winternute, transl., 497-515 in James H. Charlesworth, ed., Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, vol.1 (Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, Ltd., 1983), 509-510: "I also two women grinding together at a mill." Most clearly and explicitly, however, see Danby, Mishnah, Ketuboth 5.5: "These are the works which the wife must perform for her husband: grinding flour and baking bread and washing clothes and cooking food and giving suck to her child and making ready his bed and working in wool. If she brought him in one bindwoman she need not grind or bake or wash . . . ." Cf. also Danby, Mishnah, Toboroth 7.4 (726); and Hamel, Poverty and Charity, 112.
101. Hamel, Poverty and Charity, 112 and n.102. Grinding at a handmill on a saddlestone allows for the grinding of about one pound (= 0.454 kg) of grain into flour per hour.
In addition to the wheat staple, Galilean agriculture, because of the suitability of its soil and climate for trees, was marked by fruit production. The most important of these products was the olive, which Hamel describes as the "bread and butter" of the Palestinian fellah. As well as being eaten fresh with bread, or as preserves (sliced and salted), olives were fundamentally important for their oil, which served dietary needs in the absence of animal fat and to which nearly all of the olive harvest was devoted. The olive grows well in rocky soil, and can endure dry conditions if necessary but grows best in temperate climates, and, while new trees grow very slowly, once mature they produce heavily for hundreds of years. Olives were

102. Josephus, B.J. 3.516-517 (Loeb 2.721), with his standard panegyric, describes tree-growth in Galilee (in the region around north-western end of the lake) thus:

Skirting the lake of Gennesar, and also bearing that name, lies a region whose natural properties and beauty are very remarkable. There is not a plant which its fertile soil refuses to produce, and its cultivators in fact grow every species; the air is so well-tempered that it suits the most opposite varieties. The walnut, a tree which delights in the most wintry climate, her grows luxuriantly, beside palm-trees, which thrive on heat, and figs and olives, which require a milder atmosphere.


104. Hamel, Poverty and Charity, 10. For the an expression of some of the ways olives were consumed, see Danby, Mishnah, Tebul Yom 3.6 (777): "If he was eating crushed olives or moist dates and intended to suck the stone, and it fell on his garments and on a loaf that was Heave-offering, the loaf is rendered susceptible. If he was eating dried olives or dried dates and did not intend to suck the stone, and it fell on his clothes and on a loaf that was Heave-offering, the loaf is not rendered susceptible." On the primacy of oil production over other uses, see also Safrai, Economy of Roman Palestine, 118-120, who points to the ubiquity of presses (118-119: "Olive presses ... are found in almost every region of Palestine having undergone even a superficial survey") as evidence of the economic centrality of the olive as well as its primary use for oil.


106. The Mishnah (Danby, Mishnah, Shebiith 1.8 [40]) considers them "saplings" for the first four to seven years, but full and consistent production of good olives took decades.

planted at a density of 44-48 trees per acre or greater. Hamel states that a grown olive in full production could generate 8 to 10 liters of oil per year. Safrai, conversely, citing the Mishnah, Tosephita, Palestinian Talmud, and Cato’s De re rustica, argues for a much smaller yield: between 1.8 and 5.5 liters per tree per harvesting. Hamel’s figures may be the result of mistaking yield figures of fruit for yield figures of oil, since the lower ranges of Safrai’s figures are about 20% of Hamel’s, which corresponds to the (approximately) 20% oil content of the olive. In any case, Safrai’s figures are based on ancient literary data from a variety of sources, and there is little reason to doubt them in this case, although his upper range is probably too exuberant. The lower range of Safrai’s figures would suggest the necessity of about a quarter acre of olives per individual if the olives were to supplement one’s grain intake in the fashion described by Safrai, i.e., a half-log of oil per week, enough for two whole meals (but presumably spread over several), or 18.5 liters every two years. This means that a family of four, of six, and of eight, would require one, or one-and-a-half, or two, acres of trees under cultivation in order to maintain dietary norms as they are

108. See Danby, Mishnah, Shebuet 1.6-7 (40): “If ten saplings are spread over a seah’s space, the whole seah’s space may be ploughed for their sake, until the New Year, but if they are set out in a row or surrounded by a fence, only such space may be ploughed as is needful for them. Saplings and gourds may be included together to make the total of ten within a seah’s space.” Thus 10 saplings to a beth seah (= 782 m²) translates into about 44 to 48 trees per acre. Cf. Safrai, Economy of Roman Palestine, 122. One can only surmise from the wording of these Mishnaic texts that 10 saplings could be planted in an area smaller than a beth seah, so the figures here are probably low.

109. Hamel, Poverty and Charity, 10, without argument.

110. Safrai, Economy of Roman Palestine, 122: 20-60 liters per dunam, which roughly equals 80-240 liters per acre, which, at a (low?) density of 44 trees per acre translates into 1.8-5.5 liters per tree annually (recognizing, however, that a reasonable yield can be expected only every other year).

111. Safrai, Economy of Roman Palestine, 122: “The amount of oil in an Italian olive is a little less than 20 per cent of the olive.”

112. Safrai, Economy of Roman Palestine, 106, citing Danby, Mishnah, Ketuboth 5.8 (252).

113. I.e., a half-log is 0.178 liters, which in 2 years or 104 weeks adds up to 18.512 liters, which requires about ten trees. Cf. Safrai, Economy of Roman Palestine, who estimates that a family of seven would require 64.8 liters of oil per year (this is almost exactly the same amount I have calculated: 18.5 liters every two years = 9.25 liters per year per person, multiplied by seven = 64.75 liters). Ben-David, Talmudische Ökonomie, 112, by contrast, estimates a half-log to be about 0.14 liters.
perceived by the Mishnah. A village of, say, 400 people, would thus require 100 acres of trees and the equipment to press this amount of olives, i.e., between 37000 and 52800 kg of fruit every two years, for between 7400 and 10560 liters of oil.\textsuperscript{114} Archaeological evidence demonstrates the availability of such equipment, often multiple press, in many villages, as well as larger cities.\textsuperscript{115} The presses normally consisted of an angled beam with the lower end set in a stone socket and the upper end weighted with removable stone weights; a pit with a grooved basin was set in the ground underneath the bar, toward its lower end (for greater leverage), a stone wheel placed above on the bar itself, and baskets of olives piled between the two stones, with boards

\textsuperscript{114} Safrai, \textit{Economy of Roman Palestine}, 123-125, discusses various estimates of oil press capacity, concluding that estimates based on traditional Arab presses are methodologically questionable. Basing his own figures on the capacity of the storage pits of actual ancient presses (an average of 40-50 liters), and recognizing that the contents of these pits was 75% water, he arrives at an average pressing capacity of 10-12.5 liters of oil per turn. Thus 900 of a standard press (or 450 turns of two such presses, or 300 turns of three, and so on) would be required to supply our hypothetical village. Safrai further notes that Arab presses, which are more sophisticated than those of antiquity, take about an hour for one complete turn, and argues that ancient presses would therefore have taken between one and two hours for a complete turn. Of course, different types of presses will produce at different rates; a screw press is faster than a beam press relying on weights (see Safrai, \textit{Economy of Roman Palestine}, 124). With such rates, 900-1800 hours of press-time is required to supply a village of four hundred persons. If, with Safrai, we assume a ten-week season and a press-week of between 80 and 98 hours (the first figure is Safrai's, assuming a 14-hour day with observance of sabbath; the second figure is an extrapolation deliberately failing to account for observance of the sabbath), reasonable press-time for a single press in season would have been 800-980 hours. A little less than double this output is required unless the press was operating at the fastest rate indicated, i.e., one turn per hour. Otherwise, to be adequate for the supply of a 400-person village, the press would have to be worked during the night (unlikely but conceivable?), or two presses would have to be operating (more likely), or olive yield would have to be planned so that only half of the press under cultivation yielded each year (so that the two-year total yield was in fact spread over two seasons, rather than occurring all at once).

against their sides to keep them vertical; the force of gravity was then used to press the oil out of the olives and into the cavity of the pit below. In the lower Galilee, the trees were planted mostly on the hillsides, not in the valley basins where wheat is most effectively grown. Although olive cultivation, or that of other fruits, would have been more strictly profitable than that of grain, and although Galilee was renowned for its oil production, especially Upper Galilee, dietary requirements for grain were greater in volume than for oil. Thus, in surveyed sites in Samaria the area apparently cultivated for olive groves is normally about half the size of that devoted to grain. Olives were also grown over or alongside grain (intercultivation) or used as trellises for grapevines. During the Hellenistic period, it appears that, in spite of the Galilee’s oil-producing potential, Judea imported grain from Galilee, not oil. Later,

116. See the diagram in Trever, “Olive Tree,” v.3, 596; cf. Safrai, Economy of Roman Palestine, 119. For a description of the items of an olive press, see Danby, Mishnah, Baba Bathra 5.5 (371). For a description of the process of pressing see Danby Mishnah, Tohoroth chs.9 and 10 (729-731).
117. So Safrai, Economy of Roman Palestine, 356, who calculates that a vineyard would be 4 times as profitable as an identical area dedicated to wheat, and an olive grove 2.5 times more profitable.
118. See above, on standard diet. Ben-David, Talmudische Ökonomie, 113, estimates that oil comprised 14% of daily caloric intake. Additional oil would be used for lamps.
119. I.e., if grain = 50% of cultivated area, then olives = about 25%; if grain = 25%, then olives = about 12%; etc.). Differences in terrain and climate, however, will undoubtedly have an effect on these proportions. See Safrai, Economy of Roman Palestine, 108.
120. Intercultivating trees with grain would presumably be a useful check on soil erosion. Under the law of diverse kinds, it is forbidden to sow wheat under hanging grapevines, but it is not forbidden to sow wheat under trees, nor to grow grapevines over or around trees. Thus see Danby, Mishnah, Kilaim 6.4 (35): “If he trained the vine over part of a fruit tree he may sow seed beneath the rest, and if new tendrils spread along the rest of the tree they must be turned back.”
121. On which both Ben-David, Talmudische Ökonomie, 112-113, and Safrai, Economy of Roman Palestine, 366, 368, cite Rabbinic sources referring to the tribe of Asher — associated with Upper Galilee — having exceptional oil resources.
122. So Freyne, Galilee, 338 n.34, citing Eupolemus (ca. 150 BCE), as recounted in Eusebius, Praep. Ev. IX 33.1. This text mentions agricultural supplies coming to Jerusalem from various sources: wheat comes from Galilee, while oil comes from Judea. Freyne believes that the importation of wheat rather than grain is more a product of halakhic considerations (a question of being uncertain about the ritual purity of Galilean oil at this time, before the region had been officially integrated into Judea) than an indication of low oil production. This is possible, but it is equally possible that Judea was self-sufficient in oil at this time, and that where grain-growing was possible, Galileans did so, having no real market.
however, during the Roman period, it is obvious that Galilee did export oil, at least to Jews living outside of Palestine, where Galilee and Judea had something of a monopoly on oil that diaspora Jews required to be ritually clean; thus olive oil would have been an excellent export cash-crop, and at a premium. Bearing in mind both the evidence adduced by Safrai and Ben-David for the export of oil during the Roman period, on the one hand, and Horsley’s cautions against the anachronistic presumption of a market economy, on the other, we should probably conclude that Galilean production of oil was not in a static condition in the period under consideration: production and use shifted over time, moving from local subsistence production to production for export over several centuries, in consequence of the changing religious status of Galilee (which thus provided it with a market for export) as well as under the pressure of financial burdens brought about by Roman domination or some other political phenomenon (which created demands above and beyond the requirements for local self-sufficiency).

In addition, other food products were part of regular dietary intake, and were in fact available in Galilee, including beans or other vegetables, figs, wine and grapes.

---

123. See Safrai, *Economy of Roman Palestine*, 122-127, arguing for olive oil as an export crop; and cf. similarly Ben-David, *Talmudische Ökonomie*, 111-112. Josephus’ account of John of Gischala taking advantage of war conditions to inflate artificially the price of olive oil (*Vita* 74-76 [Loeb 1.31]) is revealing in this regard, demonstrating both the abundance of oil in Upper Galilee (the price of oil in Gischala was one-tenth its price in Caesarea Philippi) as well as the demand for pure oil (which evidently now included that from Galilee) elsewhere. It is notable also that the Mishnah includes provisions for retaining the purity of Galilean oil from contamination by the *Amme-haarez*, including locking them in the pressing area (Danby, *Mishnah*, Tohoroth 10.1 [730])! Horsley, *Archaeology*, 68-69, 102-103, concedes that some export of surplus oil occurred, but never as a “business” or in exchange for grain, on the model of a market economy; rather, what oil was exported was used as payment of taxes, rents, or whatever other demands were forced on the populace over and above subsistence. He is probably correct to note that the activities of John of Gischala reported by Josephus are described as *ad hoc*, but fails to explain the strong Mishnaic concern with workers contaminating the oil supply.

124. Freyne, *Galilee*, 170-176, argues that from the Hellenistic period onward there was increasing
and fish. Meat was only rarely consumed. Vegetables were a major part of the standard diet, but receive little attention because they were ill-regarded as an agricultural product. Normally, sufficient vegetables for the consumption of one’s family could be grown on a plot a few hundred square meters; they were not grown for export or sale. Figs, likewise, were grown mostly for consumption, and fig-products are regarded as a standard part of diet; so also various other products, including dates, the carob, various other kinds of fruit, and industrial crops such as flax, silk, hemp, and cotton. Especially important were grapes, grown primarily for wine. Diversification of produce helped ensure survival: if and when one crop failed, another’s yield might prevent ruin or starvation; diversification also distributed the work load (as well as ensuring a recurrent yield of different products), since different products matured at different times, and required different kinds of labour at dif-

---

125. See Danby, Mishnah, Ketuboth 5.8 (252):
If a husband maintained his wife at the hands of a third person, he may not grant her less than two kabs of wheat or four kabs of barley [every week]. . . . He must also give her half a kab of pulse and half a log of oil and a kab of dried figs or a mina of fig-cake; and if he has none of these he must provide her with other produce in their stead.

See also Neusner, Tosefta, Peah 4.8 (69), which stipulates that during the week hospitality for a poor traveler should include oil and beans; on the Sabbath it should include oil, beans, fish, and a vegetable. On various Palestinian food-products (in addition to grain and olives), see also Strabo, Geography, Horace Leonard Jones, transl. (LCL, 8 volumes; New York: G. P. Putnam’s Sons, 1923) 16.2.41 (LCL v.7, 291-293), 17.1.51 (LCL v.8, 133), on the palm, balsam, and other Judean products. Strabo, Geography, 16.2.45 (LCL v.7, 297) also refers to the fish in the Sea of Galilee and to surrounding trees: "At the place called Taricheae the lake supplies excellent fish for pickling; and on its banks grow fruit-bearing trees resembling apples trees."

126. See Hamel, Poverty and Charity, 25-29.

127. See Hamel, Poverty and Charity, 9.

128. Safrai, Economy of Roman Palestine, 144-146, 355, 366.

129. See Hamel, Poverty and Charity, 10; Safrai, Economy of Roman Palestine, 136-138; as well as the Mishnaic inclusion of fig products in the list of supplies an absent husband must provide his wife.

130. See Hamel, Poverty and Charity, 9-10, 21; Safrai, Economy of Roman Palestine, 138-145, 146-163.
different times. In addition, land requirements for fruit products, especially oil and grapes, were not as extensive as for grain, and could in fact be intercultivated with grain.

The physical plant required for all of this work is fairly extensive. In addition to requiring the availability of fields to the extent discussed above, treatment of the fields, involving ploughing, weeding, and burning off stubble, would at least have required possession of ploughing instruments, and, where fields were on hillsides, other kinds of treatment to ensure relative level (by terracing or some other method) and perhaps irrigation, depending on the character of the land and climatic conditions. On moderately sloping land, stone enclosures were also used, not only for the partition of fields, but also to prevent erosion and to retain the level. In addition,

132. See the agricultural calendar offered by Safrai, *Economy of Roman Palestine*, 366: the different products are shown clearly to require different degrees of labour spread throughout the whole of the year. Obviously, the time of harvest and preparation of grain would have occupied the bulk of the time and effort of most farmers, but the presence of other crops would have ensured that labour could be more easily spread throughout the seasons. See also, although less helpfully, the calendar provided by Hamel, *Poverty and Charity*, 110.

133. See Postan, *Cambridge Economic History*, 97.

134. Hoeing was frequently used in addition to ploughing, because of the primitive character of available ploughs, which were not capable of creating furrows, but more or less simply scratched the ground. See Hamel, *Poverty and Charity*, 113. The Mishnah regards ploughing instruments as essential: like a pillow, they must be returned for use (Danby, *Mishnah*, Baba Metzia 9.13 [364]: "he must give back a pillow during the night-time and a plough during the day-time").

135. Cisterns may have been needed, or channels to collect run-off, or dams to divert water flow for collection and to create new strips of cultivable land by collecting eroded soil from run-off from higher fields (Golomb and Kedar, "Ancient Agriculture," 139). On the technology and use of irrigation in Roman Palestine see Ben-David, *Talmudische Ökonomie*, 83-91, including photographs; and Hamel, *Poverty and Charity*, 117-118. See also Danby, *Mishnah*, Baba Bathra 2.1 (366). Because of irrigation considerations, land higher up on hills was less desirable than land lower on their sides or in the valleys between them: water would wash down from top to bottom, bringing with it eroded soil. The majority of the land, at any rate, was not artificially irrigated (Hamel, *Poverty and Charity*, 118). Cf. also Danby, *Mishnah*, Baba Bathra 4.8 (371):

> If a man sold a field he has sold also the stones that are necessary to it, and the canes in a vineyard that are necessary to it, and its unreeaped crop, and any reed-thicket that covers less than a quarter-kab's space of ground, and the watchman's hut if it was not fastened down with clay, and ungrafted carob trees and young sycamores.

one needed harvesting equipment (hand sickles), threshing floors, storage units for the seed, and milling instruments for processing the grain. References to mills in the gospels seem to assume the general use of the more elaborate larger mills, but the Mishnah seems to assume the frequent use of transportable and privately-owned hand-mills — saddle stone bases, anchored to the ground with plaster, with a rough hand-held basaltic rock used to crush grain against the surface — as primary milling instruments. Larger estates, one can only assume, would have used larger rotary mills, perhaps driven by animal power rather than people; more elaborate mills may also have been held in common by villages, but with all of the references to women grinding, and to hand-mills, it seems safest to assume (against Hamel) that more primitive hand-mills were in frequent use among smallholders. As long as technologically primitive milling techniques remained the norm, its practice did not require com-

137. And whatever equipment was used for the threshing: flails, or oxen, or tribulum (a flint-studded board driven over the floor by animals). See Postan, Cambridge Economic History, 99; and Alison Burford, Land and Labor in the Greek World (Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993), 140-141. The grain was normally winnowed from the threshing floor.


139. Either, as above, the two-person mill, or a larger type with circular stones driven by a donkey. The Q text which refers to hanging a millstone around someone's neck (Q 17:2) is described by Matthew as a μύλος ὄνικος, a donkey millstone. See Bauer, Lexicon, 529, "μύλος"; and "ὄνικος," 570. On the other hand, the fact that the author feels it necessary to stipulate the kind of millstone in order to convey its largeness may in fact suggest the more common use of hand-mills. The author, that is, cannot take it for granted that his will assume that a millstone is very large.

140. See Danby, Mishnah, Moed Katan 1.9 (208-209): "They may set up an oven or stone or hand-mill during mid-festival. R. Judah says: They may not roughen the millstones for the first time"; Baba Metzia 9.13 (364): "If a man takes away the mill-stones, he transgresses a negative commandment, and he is culpable by virtue of taking two utensils together, for it is written, No man shall take the mill and the upper millstone to pledge. They spoke not only of the mill and the upper millstone, but of aught wherewith is prepared necessary food, as it is written, For he taketh a man's life to pledge"; Baba Bathra 2.1 (367): "The hand-mill may not be kept at such a distance that the wall is less than three handbreadths from the lower mill-stone or four from the upper mill-stone." For a description of these implements, see H. Neil Richardson, "Mill, Millstone," vol.3, 380-381 in George Arthur Buttrick, ed., Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible (Nashville: Abingdon, 1962), 380.

141. Postan, Cambridge Economic History, 99: "In towns with a large and reasonably certain demand, and perhaps in small villas, it was ground in mills turned by horses or donkeys, but in most parts of the Empire the women still ground at the hand-mill as in Biblical days."
municipal equipment. Oil presses, conversely, were demonstrably held communally much of the time. Literary sources indicate that olive presses were held to be proper to the village as a whole, and were deemed sold when the village as a whole was sold. Archaeological evidence supports such a conclusion: presses that have been discovered in towns and villages have tended to be located for communal use, rather than being spread around private locations. Likewise, threshing floors were used, communally, by the whole agricultural village. This public use and public location is probably

142. In contrast to Medieval Europe, for instance, in which the use of the water wheel for milling was a feature of most manors. Rome and Constantinople had water mills, and horse- or donkey-driven mill-houses have been found in larger centres, such as Pompeii or London. See Postan, Cambridge Economic History, 99. The references in Q and Apoc. Zeph. to women milling together, however, do suggest a communal practice of milling, regardless of the actual equipment used.
143. Danby, Mishnah. Baba Bathra 4.7 (371): "If a man sold a town, he has sold also the houses, cisterns, trenches, vaults, bath-houses, dovecots, olive-presses, and irrigated fields, but not the movable property." This list serves as a helpful précis of the standard features that were often an intrinsic part of a town or village. Prior to this text (Danby, Mishnah, Baba Bathra 4.5 [371]), however, there is discussion of the sale of presses, which indicates that they could be privately owned. Since, however, they are included as part of the sale of a town, and since they are specifically exempted from the sale of a courtyard (Baba Bathra 4.4), is clear that privately owned though they may be, nevertheless they are located for communal use (and these communities and community locations can evidently also be privately owned). Cf. also Safrai, Economy of Roman Palestine, 124.
144. See, e.g., Avi-Yonah, Encyclopedia, v.1, 231: an oil press was discovered beside the city gate on the northern side of the hill at Beth She'arim. Apparently the same layout was used at Tiberias in the Byzantine period: Yizhar Hirschfeld, A Guide to Antiquity Sites in Tiberias (Jerusalem: Israel Antiquities Authority, 1992), 41-42 shows the location of an oil press just inside the Byzantine walls on Mount Berenice, and proximate to a gate in the wall and to the church built during the reign of Justinian. Or again, two oil presses discovered at Chorozain were located in a public, i.e., non-residential, area (the town center was on terrace at the highest elevation, and included most important public buildings; a second area was on the lowest terrace to the south, and this is where the presses were, along with a cistern; a third sector, to the west, was residential and densely populated). On Chorozain, see Avi-Yonah, Encyclopedia, v.1, 299.

This is not to say that no oil presses were privately owned. Peter Richardson (personal communication) has pointed to a press discovered on the western portion of the site at Gamla that was likely privately-owned. The point here is that in most small villages, the oil press was not a household feature (like milling equipment) but was a sufficiently elaborate and central installation as to be used by the community as a whole.
145. On the threshing-floor, see Danby, Mishnah, Peah 5.8 (16); Kilaim 2.5 (30); Sanhedrin 4.3 (387: on threshing floors as round); Middoth 2.5 (593: on threshing-floors as round); Kelim 15.4-5 (626). See especially Baba Bathra 2.8 (368): "A permanent threshing-floor may not be made within fifty cubits from the city. None may make a permanent threshing-floor within his own domain unless his ground extends fifty cubits in every direction; and it must be far enough from the plantations and ploughed land of his fellow for it to cause no damage." Safrai, Economy of Roman Palestine, 75, notes that archaeological evidence for threshing-floors is rare because little actual construction was involved: a flat rock or pounded-earth surface, evidently rounded (on which see also H. Neil Richardson, "Threshing," vol.4,
what made the threshing floors ideal locations for the collection of tithes (or any other dues, for that matter).  

All of these features affect the layout and physical characteristics of any agricultural (grain-based) settlement. The set-up among freeholders normally involved living in small villages immediately proximate to the land held and worked. Contrary to Josephus, archaeological evidence suggests village populations were fairly small, ranging from only a few dozens in the smallest settlements, to perhaps in the neighbourhood of 1000 or more persons for larger towns, leaving aside the two Galilean cities of note, Sepphoris and Tiberias. If the size of the village populations was

636 in George Arthur Buttrick, ed., *Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible* [Nashville: Abingdon, 1962]). However, he does point to a threshing-floor found about ten meters from the cluster of buildings of Khirbet Levad, which was apparently used by the small settlement's residents (Safrai, *Economy of Roman Palestine*, 75, and see fig.19 on p.68).

146. See Josephus, *Ant.* 20.181, 206 (Loeb 10.99, 111; cf. *Vita* 80 [Loeb 1.33]); and see Freyne, *Galilee*, 284; Hamel, *Poverty and Charity*, 148-149: the system of tithing "required the close supervision of village threshing floors by priests" (149); Jeremias, *Jerusalem*, 106-108 (citing b. Ket. 105b, which describes the priest who patrols the threshing floor); Schürer, *History of the Jewish People*, v.2, 262-263. It is irrelevant to my point whether these dues were scrupulously observed or not, or how the laws regulating their collection changed over time; the point is simply that the (theoretical? occasional? institutional?) collection of dues from the threshing floors makes perfect sense in light of the communal nature and use of these floors.

147. Smaller, indeed, than village populations would have been in the same region early in this century, in spite of, or rather because of, the greater prosperity of the Galilee in the Roman period. Magen Broshi, "The Population of Western Palestine in the Roman-Byzantine Period," *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 236 (Fall, 1979): 1-10, 6, explains that in times of relative peace and prosperity the *number* of settlements increases, while their *size* decreases. In other words, hard times tend to lead to a concentration of settlements: fewer in number, but greater in size.

148. Horsley, *Archaeology*, 44-45, offers overall population estimates (150,000 for all Galilee, with 15,000 of that in Sepphoris and Tiberias combined) suggestive of an average town/village population of less than 700. He arrives at his figures by working from the physical size of Tiberias (40 hectares) and Sepphoris (60 hectares) and assumes a density comparable to that known of Pompeii (about 125-156 people per hectare) rather than a more congested city like Ostia (about 435 people per hectare). On the physical space occupied by Sepphoris and Tiberias see also Broshi's table, "Population of Western Palestine," 5. Horsley thus arrives at an overall figure for Galilee by assuming that, as is usual in agrarian societies, there must be at least ten people on the land to support any one non-productive person in the cities. Thus the overall population of Galilee will be about ten-fold that of Sepphoris and Tiberias combined, i.e., 150,000 people or thereabouts. If we divide this figure, less the supposed population of the two cities, by the number of other settlements in Galilee, i.e., 202, the average population of a settlement is somewhat less than 700 persons. This does not mean, however, that the average settlement will possess this many persons, since a number of atypical larger sites would distort the overall picture. Thus while larger villages like Capernaum may have had 1000-1,700 or so people in early Roman times (downgraded from the 15,000 of some earlier estimates!; see Horsley, *Archaeology*, 114; Reed, *Popula-
fairly moderate, Josephus' figure of 204 cities and villages in Galilee could be accurate, reflecting a tendency to proliferate smaller settlements (with fairly stable holdings) rather than expand existing settlements.\textsuperscript{149} In the cases of larger villages and those built on steep ground, terracing was sometimes used to create level areas. Thus Capernaum was based on three main and distinct elevations, with the town's main buildings at the highest elevation, further public areas at a lower elevation, and a mainly residential sector to the west.\textsuperscript{150} Likewise, Tiberias appears to have been organized along the natural contours of the terrain.\textsuperscript{151} Some towns and villages were

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{149} As is typical of peaceful and stable circumstances. See note 147, above. And see Safrai, \textit{Economy of Roman Palestine}, 69-74.


\textsuperscript{151} Avi-Yonah, \textit{Encyclopedia}, vol.4, 1180.
\end{footnotesize}
walled, and size does not seem to have been much of a factor: the decision to fortify seems to be based on other considerations. Minor fortifications seem often to accompany agricultural installations outside of the village as well.\textsuperscript{152}

The village, therefore, would consist of a population cluster surrounded by fields and other agricultural land, sufficient to meet the needs of the actual population of the village itself.\textsuperscript{153} What was not a feature of the fields themselves (i.e., irrigation, terraces, enclosures of various sorts) was held in the village, sometimes in common (oil presses, cisterns), sometimes in individual houses (probably milling instruments), and sometimes shared by groups of individual houses. Other devices, such as threshing floors, were held in common outside of the city limits.\textsuperscript{154} Houses were clustered together around common courtyards, and the courtyards and their appurtenances were deemed to be the common property and common responsibility of the households around it.\textsuperscript{155} The fields, then, extended outward from the perimeter of the village; people did not normally live on the land they worked, but travelled the short distance to it from their homes in the village. A corollary of this practice was that land closer to the village was worth more than land farther from it;\textsuperscript{156} obviously this is a result not only of the further distance one would have to travel to work such fields but also (and primarily?) because of the distance would subsequently have to transport finished produce. This difficulty of course would have placed limitations on the amount of actual

\textsuperscript{152} See Danby, \textit{Mishnah}, Arakhin 9.5 (553).
\textsuperscript{153} On the self sufficiency of villages, see Horsley, \textit{Archaeology}, 120.
\textsuperscript{154} See Danby, \textit{Mishnah}, Baba Bathra 2.8 (368).
\textsuperscript{155} There is a significant amount of Mishnaic regulation of matters pertaining to courtyards. See Danby, \textit{Mishnah}, Baba Bathra 1.1, 1.4-6 (365-366), 3.7 (370), 4.4 (371). For a sense of the overall size, design, and situation of such houses, see the various diagrams, photographs, and descriptions in, e.g., Meyers, Strange, and Meyers, \textit{Meiron}; Corbo, \textit{Cafarnao}, v.1; Safrai, \textit{Economy of Roman Palestine}, 64-67.
\textsuperscript{156} See Danby, \textit{Mishnah}, Arakhin 9.2 (552): "A man may not sell a distant field in order to redeem one that is nearby", the reason behind the stipulation being that the practice would be usurious, as nearer land
physical space a village could comfortably cultivate, and would have generated a disposition to a merely local-orientation to production, since the cultivation of surplus, at least in the case of wheat, would have increased the size of land under cultivation and generated diminishing returns. Hence, once again, the large number of small villages, rather than smaller number of larger villages. Archaeological remains indicate that offshoot settlements would develop around villages; such settlements represent a way of more effectively exploiting more distant land.\textsuperscript{157} We might expect, because of natural differences in the quality of the land, as well as the variations in value caused by proximity (or its lack) to the village, that within any given village, even a small one, there would have been a) variations in prosperity, and b) variations in sizes of holdings.

We cannot conclude from the communal nature of some aspects of village life that rural Galilee was marked by some kind of ideal primitive communism; Mishnaic regulation of sales, ownership, debt, and so forth makes this very clear.

On the other hand, specialization in products other than grain may have generated surplus sufficient to motivate at least local specializations and trading patterns. It is often difficult to tell, at least from archaeological evidence alone, the ultimate intentions and dispositions of farming activity:

Archaeological evidence shares this deficiency. Field-survey can show the survival of small-unit farming, as in Tuscany and the Molise, but it cannot distinguish an owner-occupier from a tenant. To make matters worse, peasants do not leave monuments. Their farmsteads, built of perishable materials, have not survived. The normal ‘small site’ of the archaeological field-survey turns out to have a relatively elaborate construction inappropriate to a basic peasant cottage. Its owner might have controlled perhaps 50 to 80 iugera or $12\frac{1}{2}$ to 20 hectares and produced cash crops for the local market.\textsuperscript{158}

\textsuperscript{157} Safran, \textit{Economy of Roman Palestine}, 67-73. See the map of a town and its satellites reproduced on p., above.
If Lower Galilee, where agriculture focused on grain, was to develop trading patterns, they would have to devolve from production in addition to the grain yield for the local population, and would require close markets (on which see further below). The matter is further complicated in regions other than Lower Galilee. Upper Galilee clearly specialized in olive and fruit production, probably in addition to grain production for local needs. The area along the western side of the lake is also sometimes considered a distinct region called "the Valley," for reasons primarily geographical, which had an impact on production. According to Josephus, this area was rich in figs, olives, and grapes, and of course fish from the lake itself. Fishing, of course, requires the ownership of fairly extensive equipment: nets, boats, and so on. Such features place the region bordering the lake in a different category from the inland basins around Sephoris. Where cash-cropping was employed, and when it was employed, we can also expect that a major source of subsidiary income for poorer farmers was working on other peoples' larger estates, especially during peak periods like the harvest.

---

159. Upper Galilee included the southern ranges of the Lebanon mountains and had rainfall in the neighbourhood of 1110 mm per annum. See Clark, "Galilee," *IDB* v.2, 346; Freyne, *Galilee*, 5; Pritchard, *Atlas*, 58-59. The rainfall obviated the need for irrigation, which latter tends to reduce the oil content of olives. Thus the Upper Galilee made a good setting for fruit and olive production. Gush Halav (= Gischala) means "fat soil" (*אִשָּׁר* = crust of earth, *inter alia*; הַהֲאָב = fat).

160. For Josephus' description of the Valley as a distinct geographical area, see *B.J.* 3.516-521 (Loeb 2.721-723). Freyne, *Galilee*, 10, states: The valleys on the eastern side [of Lower Galilee] are narrow and devious and communication on an east/west axis is not at all as easy as might appear at first sight. In turn this means that the region of the lake is to some degree cut off from the rest of Lower Galilee, a factor that will have to be kept in mind when discussing the likely sphere of influence of Tiberias on the hinterland.

Notably, under Agrippa II the region was also administratively distinct from the rest of Galilee.


The point of all of this discussion is to present an overall picture of the material circumstances of early-Roman Galilee that are more stable than the specific and historically-malleable features of the social organization of those circumstances, to which we now turn. What emerges is a Galilee which is dominated first by wheat production, depending on the region in question, and secondarily by olives and grapes, i.e., in all cases, direct crop production from the land.164 Life in the countryside was normally of a standard peasant sort, rather than dominated by estates: people lived together in small villages from which they worked nearby moderately-sized tracts of land,165 primarily in a self-sufficient and maintenance-oriented (as opposed to profit-oriented) manner (although these circumstances are subject to change). The manner of life implied by all of this involves a high concentration of work: the amount of land required to feed a family comfortably is extensive enough to employ all of its members during peak periods, and the absence of economies of scale meant that concentration of holdings did not significantly diminish the labour-to-product ratio. The domestic duties of women would also have occupied a significant amount of time. On the other hand, although agricultural labors would have been spread across the year as evenly as possible.

164. Witness, of course, as already noted, the frequency of agricultural motifs on amoniconic coinage; witness also the Mishnah’s classification of kinds of work (Danby, Mishnah, Shabbath 7.2 [106]), the majority of which are related to agriculture.

165. See Finley, Ancient Economy, 80-81, on soldiers accepting land allotments which he thinks, even with tax exemption, were not of sufficient size. See also Finley, Ancient Economy, 105-106:
The optimum size of a peasant farm is an obviously meaningless notion: there are too many variables. But let us take as a basis of discussion the Caesarian settlement, ten jugera (six-plus acres) for a veteran with three children. The Roman unit, the jugum, was the area of land one man could (hypothetically) plough in a day. Ten jugera of good arable would produce enough food to sustain a small family (but not an ox in addition) even with the alternate fallow system, especially when free from rents and taxes. The size of the family itself then became a major crux, first because there were few crops to spare; second, because ten jugera cannot keep a family employed full time; third, because, under the Greek and Roman rules of inheritance, an estate was in principle divided equally among legitimate sons (and sometimes daughters), with no trace of primogeniture; fourth, because a peasant cannot dismiss his excess labour.
sible, the off-peak periods for major crops (wheat, olives) would probably have allowed for considerable leisure.\(^{166}\) Such a life, in work or in leisure, would have been lived in close association with one's neighbors. People chose to live together, in villages and towns, rather than alone on their own (private) plots. The houses in villages were small and crowded together (minimizing wasteful occupation of arable land), with shared courtyards and often with shared equipment.\(^{167}\) Even where equipment was privately owned, the work may have been done with one's fellows, whether family or neighbor, as seems to be the case with grinding (see above). The villages were apparently self-regulating, even where they lacked formal administrative apparatus,\(^{168}\) and were as self-sufficient as possible, possessing and working their own land, and on it producing, if possible, the entirety of the different products needed to sustain life. There would thus have been very little division of labour among villages, and probably very little within them as well.\(^{169}\) The tremendous risk involved in peasant agriculture — production for subsistence, especially when one's produce is in part devoted to next's year's seeding, is highly susceptible to climatic factors, and year-to-year variations in yield might have a significantly deleterious effect — would to some degree have been offset by village communalism, where those with better fortune or greater resources could assist — with loans, or hospitality, or some other kind of charity — those whom weather, soil, or economic deprivation conspired against. Once again, however, this is not to say that there were not discernible economic strata within

---

166. Finley, *Ancient Economy*, 31, notes that the olive, although it requires time and attention, is not labour-intensive.


168. For Safrai, *Economy of Roman Palestine*, 64, this absence of administrative structure is what defines a settlement as a village, as opposed to a town. Towns, such as Capernaum, *would* have had a formal administration, as well as public buildings.

169. For the absence of a division of labour in small towns (as opposed to larger cities), see Xenophon, *Cyropaedeia* 8.2.5.
any village or network of villages, nor that these strata would not have easily translated into a rigid social hierarchy.\textsuperscript{170} This overall picture thus offers a description of a rural Galilee (i.e., excluding Sepphoris and Tiberias) intensely under cultivation, densely populated, and dotted with settlements, but does so \textit{without} invoking either mind-boggling population estimates, or anachronistic and inappropriate concepts of cosmopolitanism or urbanity.\textsuperscript{171} Outside of the main cities — recent cities at that! — Galilee was, like all ancient hinterland, devoted to agricultural production. One can quite properly argue that Galilee was not culturally isolated from the currents of Hellenism in the Roman period, but, if so, some notion other than "urbanization" (in the strictest sense) is required to express this cultural influx.

\textit{TRADE, TRAVEL, AND TRANSPORT:}

Trade or any other form of the movement of goods in antiquity was determined and curtailed by the contemporary technological limitations on transport. Too frequently, discussions of trade, of import and export of goods, even of taxation and payment of debts, assume a monetized economy (allowing the transportation of value without requiring the transportation of actual goods) or ease of travel (allowing the transportation of actual goods), neither of which can be taken for granted in rural districts of the early Roman period.\textsuperscript{172} In the case of rural Galilee, transport of goods was further complicated by geography. A consideration of these physical limitations on

\textsuperscript{170} Indeed, local socio-economic inequities would have translated into hierarchy just as easily as any other class distinction: whether by charity or debt, rescue in misfortune creates long-term obligations, the returns of which keep accruing to the benefactor.

\textsuperscript{171} This is a major contention of Horsley, \textit{Archaeology, passim}, esp. 118-130, who objects to the description of Galilee as either "cosmopolitan" or as "urbanized." One of the main culprits is Burton Mack. See especially \textit{Lost Gospel}, 55-58.

\textsuperscript{172} On monetization, see further below.
the possibilities of transport will allow a more realistic reconstruction of actual trading patterns and their social importance.

Whether or not, as Horsley would have it, self-sufficiency was a major interest among villagers,\(^{173}\) trade in bulky items was severely curtailed by the technological limitations on transport, which was physically difficult, slow, and expensive. In Finley’s graphic description,

The ox was the chief traction animal of antiquity, the mule and donkey his near rivals, the horse hardly at all. All three are slow and hungry. The transport figures in Diocletian’s edict of maximum prices imply that a 1200-pound wagon-load of wheat would double in price in 300 miles, that a shipment of grain by sea from one end of the Mediterranean to the other would cost less (ignoring the risks) than carting it seventy-five miles.\(^{174}\)

Draft animals hauling produce are expensive to keep on hand, potentially expensive to rent, move slowly, and, with each passing day, consume more of the produce they are supposed to be carting.

Contemporary writers not only confirm these limitations, but show a general awareness of their consequences. Thus Columella, for instance, describes location as a major variable in the desirability of land:

After these two primary considerations he [Porcius Cato] added, as deserving no less attention [than climate and fertility], the following: the road, the water, and the neighbourhood. A handy road contributes much to the worth of the land: first and most important, the actual presence of the owner, who will come and go more cheerfully if he does not have to dread discomfort on the journey; and secondly its convenience for bringing in and carrying out the necessaries — a factor which increases the value of stored crops and lessens the expense of bringing things in, as they are transported at lower cost to a place which may be reached without great effort; and it means a great deal, too, to get transportation at low cost if you make the trip with hired draught-

\(^{173}\) E.g., Horsley, *Archaeology*, 83-84, on the grounds of the agrarian and non-specializing character of the villages.

animals, which is more expedient than looking after your own . . . .175

The shocking absence of any kind of rational economic calculations among Greco-Roman writers176 makes the explicit appearance — even among such obtuse commentators as Cato — of consideration of the cost of transport that much more arresting. Interestingly, even cash crops and industrial produce, such as flax or hemp, is affected by the high cost of transport. Pliny, describing rushes along the coast of Cartagena suitable for rope-making, adds that "the cost of carriage prohibits its being transported any considerable distance [longius vehi impendia prohibent]."177 Columella argues that "it is not profitable to establish vineyards for food unless the plot is so close to a city that conditions warrant the selling of the raw grapes to marketers, as we do other fruit."178

Very important for our purposes is the fashion in which these strictures were overcome. Most easily and naturally, they were dealt with by marine transport of one kind or another, wind and water currents being less hungry and more potent than oxen: shipping a load of grain down a river, or even across the Mediterranean, was faster and


Quand on a dans le voisinage des débouchés satisfaisants, où l’on puisse vendre ce que l’on fait pousser, et que l’on y trouve un approvisionnement favorable pour tout ce qui est nécessaire au domaine, elles rapportent. Car souvent, dans des propriétés où le blé, le vin ou autre chose fait défaut, il faut importer; en revanche il n’est pas rare qu’il faille exporter quelque chose.

And see Varro, *De re rustica*, 1.16.6 (in Heurgon, *Varron*, p.42):

Ce qui augmente encore le revenu d’un domaine, ce sont les transports, s’il existe des routes où les chariots [plaustra = wagons] puissent circuler facilement, ou des cours d’eau à proximité, où l’on puisse naviguer: c’est par ces deux moyens, nous le savons, que beaucoup de choses sont portées au dehors ou au dedans des propriétés.

less expensive (whether in terms of money or of the actual produce being shipped) than moving it over land. Thus the best way effectively to exploit the land was to concentrate on land with easy access to good waterways, as most of the ancient agronomists attest. Thus, at least at first, the "civilized" Roman world, at least its eastern end, tended to inhabit the fringes of the Mediterranean, drawing on only a thin belt of hinterland for produce, while the interior was ruled by "barbarians," with nearly all the great urban centres within a few miles of the coast. This pattern, however, changed over time, especially in Western Europe: the Empire slowly inland. In addition, of course, rivers allowed for cheap and effective water transportation. The result was the much greater desirability of land close to rivers, and a tendency for cities to spring up along these waterways, supplied by them and providing markets for land adjacent to them. Strabo thus describes the cities of Italy in terms of their access to the Tiber:

The cities this side the Apennine Mountains that are worth of mention are: first, on the Flaminian Way itself: Ocricli, near the Tiber and Larolon, and Narna, through which the Nar River flows (it meets the Tiber a little above Ocricli, and is navigable, though only for small boats); then, Carsuli, and Mevania, past which flows the Teneas (this too brings the products of the plain down to the Tiber on rather small boats); . . .

The problem with water transport, of course, is that it normally requires the cooperation of nature: one cannot control the availability of rivers for access to the hinterland, nor the seasonal vicissitudes of water and wind currents. And only a tiny proportion of potentially arable (or otherwise productive and populated) land was accessible to boats. The result was of course that transport, where undertaken under

179. Finley, Ancient Economy, 126, as quoted above.
180. Including the texts quoted above. See also, e.g., Cato’s manual, 1.3, cited in Finley Ancient Economy, 111, n.*.
181. Finley, Ancient Economy, 30.
182. Finley, Ancient Economy, 31-32.
183. Strabo, Geography, 16.2.46 (LCL v.2, 371-373).
these circumstances, was only via the slow, difficult means of land transport and effective only over short distances and with relatively restricted loads, and thus tended to be simply local, regionally restricted and autonomous, its substance underexploited by the Empire. This is not to say that land transport was not used. All cities required transport of food produce from their immediate hinterland, as well as other products from even farther abroad:

No city was self-sufficient. All supplies, of food or materials for shipbuilding, house-building, and industry — such as wood, stone, wool, metal, and potter’s clay — had to be brought in either from the surrounding countryside, or from overseas. Land transport was always necessary in the first case, and often in the second, since many cities lay miles inland from their ports. For example, Argos and Corinth are about 5 miles from the coast, and Athens is 7 miles from the Piraeus.184

The older view was that heavy transport was severely limited by the character of the throat-and-girth harnesses available to the ancients, which tended to ride up the horse’s throat and choke it if it applied its full strength. This problem, and the failure to apply multiple yoking in any effective way, meant that animal power was never utilised to its fullest possible extent, was capable of an absolute maximum load of 1100 pounds, and did not replace the use of human beings as the primary manner of bearing loads.185

Even if this view were correct — and it is not, most importantly because the primary draught-animal of antiquity was the ox, not the horse186 — such limitations have more of an effect on very heavy items, such as stone, metal, or even timber, rather than produce (of any sort).187 Indeed, in the case of produce, bulk — the transport of large amounts of grain seed or oil, whether carried by pack animals or placed in a wagon —

---

185. Burford, "Heavy Transport," 1-2, reviews this position.
186. For a broad critique of this view, see Burford, "Heavy Transport," 2-3 *et passim*.
187. Even with such limitations, significant amounts of building stone were transported relatively routinely up to 25 miles; Diodorus Siculus (16.9.5) refers to the transportation of 5000 suits of armor from Acragas to Syracuse. See Burford, "Heavy Transport," 3.
would always have been a more significant factor than weight in retarding transport. 188

The difficulty for moving produce, then, is not lack of power so much as lack of speed; not so much the expenditure of energy on weight as on distance. It was ineffective and uneconomical, except in the instance of rare, extremely small, or specialized items, to transport for any significant distance over land. Indeed, for peasant villagers, access to pack animals and carts cannot be assumed, nor can the leisure to take several days of travel in order to market one's produce. We have already seen evidence that even in so restricted an area as a village and its environs, the effect of distance was such that fields were valued differently according to their distance from the village. 189 If any further proof is needed of the way in which ancient life revolved around the restrictive character of distance, a study of Romano-British walled towns has shown that their relative spacing was based on the optimum distance of a settlement from a) its "tributary area" (i.e., its dependent countryside = χώρα, and/or smaller settlements), and b) larger settlements on which it in turn is dependent for markets or specialized products. 190 The study concludes:

As suggested by the fixed lattice [a model used in this study], the approximate distance along the main roads from the major unwalled settlements to the edge of their tributary areas is 8 miles. . . . The average maximum distance to the hypothetical locations of the minor unwalled settlements on the other hand, is about 4 miles from the edge of their tributary areas — again probably rather more on the ground. Approximately this distance has often been noticed as being the maximum distance to market preferred in societies with primitive means of transport. . . . These minor settlements may have acted as the local markets, while function of the major unwalled and the walled centres would have been to provide specialist services to lower-order central places, although also providing the same range of services as the

188. See, e.g., Danby, Mishnah, Baba Metzia 6.5 (358), which allows damages against someone who abuses a rented ass by forcing it to carry additional bulk rather than additional weight.
189. See note 156, above.
lower levels in the hierarchy. In any case, as a testable hypothesis, the whole
observed locational pattern might be seen to be based on the maximum dis-
tance easily travelled to and from the local market in one day.\textsuperscript{191}

In other words, settlement patterns reflect and partially compensate for the difficulties
involved in ground transportation. At least under Roman rule, and after some centuries
of it,\textsuperscript{192} regular settlement patterns evolved in the way most conducive to maximal
contact between the largest settlements and the interior they "served" (or which served
them). The same pattern is true of Roman Palestine as well.\textsuperscript{193}

This pattern of evolution suggests two important conclusions. First, in the
absence of access to waterways for transportation, villages and other small settlements
were, because of the difficulties involved in land transport, restricted to exploiting
agriculturally an area whose perimeter is no more than five miles from the village in
any direction. This figure is a maximum: working a field five miles from one's village
would involve considerable hardship. Moreover, even a tiny fraction of such a huge
area would easily be sufficient to meet the dietary needs of even a larger town or vil-
lage. In a densely-settled Galilee, villages were far closer together: only larger towns
(such as Capernaum) would have been this far apart, thus facilitating traffic between
their own "tributary areas," i.e., the villages which used them as markets. The second
point, however, is more important. As long as the inland settlement pattern was
restricted to large-ish towns about 5 miles (8 km) apart, the economy will remain
purely local. Again, we can expect inequities to arise due to varying natural
advantages, due to exploitative economic practices (insofar as they may have been

\textsuperscript{191} Hodder and Hassall, "Non-Random Spacing," 404, emphasis added. Cf. Finley, Ancient Economy, 127.
\textsuperscript{192} Hodder and Hassall's study focuses on walled towns from the third century.
\textsuperscript{193} See Yehuda Karmon, "Geographical Influences on the Historical Routes in the Sharon Plain," Palestine Exploration Quarterly 93 (1961): 53-57, 57: of 58 Roman settlements in the Sharon Plain, not
one is more than 5 km from a paved road.
applied in trading, loans, etc.), and local class variations. Nevertheless, the local centres comprised by larger towns, at least according to the model offered by Britain (and as far as can be told from the size of the towns), would have been capable of producing their own basic dietary needs from their own fields. Where they would have differed from smaller settlements is in providing additional services and local markets, which would in turn have generated sufficient surplus to support these middle-range specialists.\textsuperscript{194} Thus produce would not have escaped from the local economy: towns and village would have existed in a sometimes-symbiotic, sometime-parasitic relationship, in which the larger settlements did exploit their hinterlands, but provided services in return, and at any rate were in little position to export surplus out of the region.\textsuperscript{195} The existence of larger cities within a reasonable distance from a cluster of such towns would be necessary to expand the economy in an outward, extra-local direction.

Moving from the abstract or hypothetical to the specific and concrete, several features of the Galilean countryside invite modification of these conclusions. First, in Galilee, there is access to waterways for the region described above as “the Valley.” Second, however, the terrain generates even more restrictions on transport than is usual, steep hills and massifs between towns forcing roads to be circuitous and extending the actual distance to be travelled, and normally precluding the use of carts or

\textsuperscript{194} Finley, Ancient Economy, 107: “The typical ‘peasant market’ was a place where peasants (and no doubt village craftsmen) met from a radius of five or six miles in order to fill gaps in necessities by exchange with each other; there were only a few things a peasant could not produce himself — a metal ploughshare, for example — when everything went well.”

\textsuperscript{195} Finley, Ancient Economy, 107, states that any town outside of the area of about 10-12 miles would not have been a suitable market for any goods as would be produced in a village.
oxen. Thus the transportation of produce in this area must be carried by mules or human beings, and can be transported economically only short distances. In addition, certain patterns of movement are reinforced by the specific shape of the terrain: a) "the Valley" is geographically isolated from most of the rest of Lower Galilee; b) the use of the lake for transportation makes the towns along its shores very easily accessible to each other; c) for the remainder of Lower Galilee, the topography runs east-west, rather than north-south, cutting it off from Upper Galilee but facilitating access to the coast. Third, there were few Roman roads in Lower Galilee, and none (known) in Upper Galilee. Fourth and finally,, we cannot assume the ordinary availability to peasants and small villages of draft animals, even mules; nor, for that matter, of boats to take advantage of the lake.

196. Safrai, Economy of Roman Palestine, 267, believes that these difficulties were obviated by donkey transport to the roads at which point produce could be loaded onto wagons. The Mishnah, in fact, routinely refers to asses as animals used for transport, while referring to cattle as herd animals (as in the cattle tithe or the parts of cattle included in various sales [Baba Bathra 5.5]) or as used for ploughing (Baba Metzia 6.5). On the other hand, when reference is made to wagons (infrequently: Kelim 14.4-5, 21.2, 24.2), the wording makes it clear that the yokes are intended to be attached to cattle. What this suggests to me (as does the relative frequency of reference to asses against reference to wagons), is that, naturally enough, cattle were used to haul wagons, but that wagons were used only infrequently, while donkeys were used to carry produce much more frequently, at least among the relatively prosperous farmers represented by the Mishnah. On the other hand, Danby, Mishnah, Baba Bathra 5.1 (372), associates mules with wagons and oxen with yoke (for ploughing?). Thus not all wagons were pulled by oxen.

197. Adan-Bayewitz, Common Pottery, 234. On Roman roads from the period after the Jewish War, whose general contours confirm the observations made above about the overall shape of the terrain and its impact on travel, see Isreal Roll, “Roman Roads,” pp.21-22 with one map, in Yoram Tsafir, Leah Di Segni, and Judith Green, eds., Tabula Imperii Romani Iudaeae Palaestinae: Eretz Israel in the Hellenistic, Roman and Byzantine Periods: Maps and Gazetteer (Jerusalem: Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 1994).

198. The Mishnah associates ships and their packing bags with mules and their wagons as means of transport. See the regulations for their respective sale in Danby, Mishnah, Baba Bathra 5.1 (372). Slaves are associated with shipping vessels in this text, so we have to assume that the owner of such a ship was relatively and distinctively wealthy. The presence of such ships should be assumed for the coast, not for the Sea of Galilee. On boats in Galilee, see Josephus, B.J. 2.608, 635; Hoehner, Antipas, 68. Mules were regularly rented: see Safrai, Economy of Roman Palestine, 263-267; and, on Talmudic texts referring to donkey-lending practices, see Safrai, 266. See also Danby, Mishnah, Baba Mezia 6.3, 5 (358), etc.
Actual patterns of Galilean trade, as far as they can be discerned, help flesh out this picture. First, as might be expected, trade in basic products tended to be local and subsistence-oriented. It is also perforce relatively specialized, mainly limited to those items whose character makes them difficult to produce everywhere. Pottery is the most obvious instance of such a product: it is relatively cheap and broadly necessary, but cannot be made everywhere (at least not well), because good potting clay is not ubiquitous. As it turns out, the most sophisticated, clear-cut, and precise study of Galilean local trade currently available focuses on pottery. Adan-Bayewitz has painstakingly analyzed the distribution of pottery throughout Galilee deriving from two known centres of pottery production. Kefar Hananya, marking the "border" between Lower and Upper Galilee, and (to a much lesser degree) Shikhin, possibly about 1.5 km to the north of Sepphoris. These two centres were identified from literary sources as producers of pottery, and this identification, as well as the locations of the erstwhile settlements, confirmed archaeologically. The clay in the neighbourhood of these sites, and the pottery known to have been manufactured on site, was analyzed using neutron activation analysis, which measures a wide array (30-40) of elements found in pottery specimens; the composition of pottery from one location normally has a distinctive and fairly consistent chemical signature which can be contrasted with that derived from pottery known to have been manufactured elsewhere. Pottery from a variety of sites

---

199. On the significance of clay quality, and the concentrations of "black" (i.e. lacking a high lime content) clay around specific locations, see Adan-Bayewitz, Common Pottery, 25-26 and n.5.
200. Adan-Bayewitz, Common Pottery. See also David Adan-Bayewitz and Isadore Perlman, "The Local Trade of Sepphoris in the Roman Period," Israel Exploration Journal 40/1 (1990): 153-172. This latter study, as the title suggests, analyzes the frequency of wares of different provenance (primarily, as it turns out, from Kefar Hananya and Shikhin) in Sepphoris only.
201. At least in the case of Kefar Hananya. See Adan-Bayewitz, Common Pottery, 27-31. J. F. Strange has identified a site 1.5 km north of Sepphoris with ancient Shikhin; so Adan-Bayewitz and Perlman, "Local Trade," 168; cf. Adan-Bayewitz, Common Pottery, 32.
scattered throughout Palestine was sampled,\textsuperscript{203} with a view to identifying the proportion of Kefar Hananya ware in any given location.\textsuperscript{204}

The results were striking.\textsuperscript{205} While it is clear that pottery was a major "industry" of Kefar Hananya, the vast majority of its wares were discovered very close to home; with a few significant exceptions (see below), the farther one gets from the manufacturing center, the lower the proportion of Kefar Hananya ware one finds, and the greater the proportion of other types.\textsuperscript{206} As the map shows, the vast majority (anywhere from about 80-100%) of quantified assemblages closely proximate to Kefar Hananya, such as Meiron (9.7 km away), Rama (5.1 km), Hazon (4.5 km), and Kefar Hananya itself, derive from Kefar Hananya.\textsuperscript{207} This set of towns very nearly falls within the 8 km radius suggested above as a comfortable distance to travel and exchange goods. The heavy concentration of Kefar Hananya ware within this radius (or slightly beyond) should come as no surprise. Nor is it especially surprising — although it is certainly remarkable, given the specialized character of pottery manufacture and the quality of the clay available to Kefar Hananya — that these figures do indeed drop off significantly as the distance from Kefar Hananya increases. In towns about 25 km away, such as Yodefat (23 km) and Sepphoris (26.5 km), the proportion of domestic ware from Kefar Hananya drops to 76% and 74%, respectively, while those even farther away have a still smaller proportion (Khirbet Zabdi, 36.5 km — 59%; Jalame, 45.5 km

\textsuperscript{203} See Adan-Bayewitz, \textit{Common Pottery}, 51-59, for a survey of the sites sampled.
\textsuperscript{204} Or, in the case of Adan-Bayewitz and Perlman, "Local Trade," with a view to determining the provenance of the main specimens of ware found in Sepphoris.
\textsuperscript{206} This is strikingly illustrated in figure 10, Adan-Bayewitz, \textit{Common Pottery}, 212: frequency is an inverse function of distance.
\textsuperscript{207} The figures are as follows: Kefar Hananya, 100%; Hazon, 100%; Rama, 97%. Three locations in Meiron were sampled separately, yielding figures of 99%, 84%, and 69%. The first site dates through the Roman period (50 BCE-365 CE), while the second and third date from the fourth and fifth centuries CE, respectively. See Adan Bayewitz, \textit{Common Pottery}, 205, 221-222.
— 56%). By about 50 km away, the proportion drops off to nothing. There are noteworthy exceptions to this very regular pattern. First, the towns of the Golan show smaller proportions of Kefar Hananya ware than their distance alone would warrant: Kanaf, 30.3 km away, has 12%; 'Ein Nashut, 41.3 km away, has 21%; and Gamla, 44.5 km away has 11%. Second, and conversely, Hammath Tiberias, 23.2 km away, shows a much higher proportion of domestic pottery from Kefar Hananya than one might expect: 97%.

These results do not entirely speak for themselves; they are susceptible to some varying interpretation. Clearly, the data do contradict Safrai’s image of marketing, which suggests that the common picture of producers coming to town to market their goods should be supplemented by inclusion of caravans that left the city (polis) and traveled from town to town during the week, selling items and buying surplus produce.208 Were such means used for the marketing of any bulk items, including pottery, we would expect a much more even distribution of Kefar Hananya ware over a greater radius: the longer route of such caravans, including their cities of origin — rather than areas within easy walking distance of each other — should have about the same proportions. Horsley is thus doubtless correct to interpret Adan-Bayewitz’ results as suggestive of very limited marketing of basic items:

One reference in the Jerusalem Talmud (Ma’as. 2.3, 49d) seems to portray Kefar Hananya potters as peddlers (rokholim) of their own products, going around to four or five villages before returning home for the night. But Adan-Bayewitz’s own study of all the rabbinic references to the term rokhel reveals a specific type of itinerant peddler who carried products of light weight and relatively high value such as cosmetics or spinning goods in their baskets. Significantly, the term is never used in connection with pottery. So pottery would not have been marketed by middlemen such as peddlers. The distribution pattern of Kefar Hananya pottery taken together with rabbinic references to the transport and sale of pottery and other goods thus suggests limited social interaction among Galilean villages or between villages and the

two major cities of Sepphoris and Tiberias. The distribution of the pottery itself apparently would have entailed interaction primarily between the potters of Kefar Hananya and their customers.209

Adan-Bayewitz offers slightly different conclusions, which fit the data more completely:

There is good reason to suspect that the marketing of Kefar Hananya ware by itinerant potters was probably not an important means of distribution. The predominance of Kefar Hananya ware in cities and villages 25 km. from the manufacturing center cannot easily be explained except in terms of central-place marketing. The relevant rabbinic texts, few as they are, include no hint of marketing by itinerant potters. Moreover, potters are not included in the list of occupations which involved frequent dealings with women, although rokham are mentioned.210

Itinerant peddlars, as far as can be told from the literary evidence, transported, as Horsley suggests, cosmetics and spinning goods, all relatively light and high-value items which could be carried easily by one person.211 Pottery, conversely, is bulky, relatively inexpensive, and not frequently replaced.212 It was evidently marketed in part by the producers themselves, carried bundled together or on a carrying pole, to market; or perhaps on a pack animal.213 According to the Talmud, when potters travelled to other villages to market their goods, they did so only to four or five settlements nearby, and then returned home the same night.214 This certainly matches the distribution patterns of local pottery discovered in the Golan, which attest to overlap-

213. Danby, Mishnah, Tohoroth 7.1 (726) describes a pot seller setting down a group of pots bundled or tied together. Danby, Mishnah, Ohaloth 16.2 (672) describes a pot seller walking about with his pots on a carrying yoke resting behind his shoulders. See Adan-Bayewitz, Common Pottery, 232. Literary sources do not attest to the use of pack animals, but it is reasonable enough to assume they may have been used, especially for longer distances. Adan-Bayewitz, Common Pottery, 232 n.5, notes that transport in a wheeled vehicle would not have been very practical, given the terrain.
ping spheres of small-scale production serving quite restricted areas. Such practices would explain the way the distribution pattern drops off with distance, and hence confirm, at least in part, Horsley's assertion that the pottery trade was quite limited and local.

But the preponderance of Kefar Hananya ware in towns along a 25 km radius also indicates that the cookware was marketed some significant distance beyond the 5 km radius of easy daily travel. Given the distances involved, this marketing was probably performed by middlemen. Thus Adan-Bayewitz suggests that in addition to a considerable degree of local marketing by its producers, Kefar Hananya ware was also distributed through central marketing, i.e., transported to a central location (or set of locations) by producers or middlemen, and sold to consumers there. Such a practice would explain the fairly surprising extent of large proportions of this ware. Thus Kefar Hananya, at least at a regional level, was indeed involved in specialized trade of manufactures, and this trade went somewhat beyond merely local relationships. Indeed, it is equally clear that Kefar Hananya marketed to Galilee's two cities, as well as its scattered towns, and this in spite of the fact that Sepphoris had a pottery-producing town in the immediate neighbourhood (Shikhin).

On the basis of these data, Adan-Bayewitz, in sharpest contrast to Horsley, concludes that:

215. Adan-Bayewitz, Common Pottery, 234 and n.10. Incidentally, this small-scale production in the Golan and the eastern side of the lake probably explains why Kefar Hananya pottery is not widely distributed there, in spite of easy access by water: the main market for this ware was among Jews, because of the ritually pure character of the vessels. Thus the main maritime market of these goods would have been on the west side of the lake.


217. One can draw this conclusion in part because the proportion of Kefar Hananya ware found in given sites does not seem to be dependent on the size of settlement or its rural versus urban character. So Adan-Bayewitz, Common Pottery, 219.


219. Adan-Bayewitz is assuming, correctly I suspect, that the surprisingly high proportion of Kefar Hananya ware found in Hammath Tiberias reflects the situation in Tiberias itself as well.
It should be noted that the predominance of Kefar Hananya cooking ware at Sepphoris and, presumably, Tiberias represents the first archaeological evidence of the dependence of these Galilean cities on the manufactured products of a rural settlement. It also represents the first well-defined archaeological evidence for continual urban-rural commercial interaction within Roman Galilee. It may also be noted that the distribution pattern of Kefar Hananya ware does not seem consistent with the picture, common among scholars, of the exploitation in the early Roman period of the Galilean peasant by the urban wealthy. The present evidence, of an important local manufacturing center in rural Galilee, is also inconsistent with the conception that rural Galilee in the early Roman period was exclusively agricultural.  

These peculiar conclusions, however, are no more founded on the data than those of Horsley. While Adan-Bayewitz is quite correct to point, against Horsley, to the distances involved and to the contacts with Sepphoris and (probably) Tiberias, he is incorrect to presuppose the applicability of a modern market model for squeezing more general conclusions out of this data. In particular, Adan-Bayewitz’ conclusions assume a) that cities should be manufacturing centres, as they are today; b) that trade is an instrument for the generation of capital, as it is (apparently) today, rather than value accruing directly from labour and the (more or less legalized) seizure of goods; c) that the distribution of Kefar Hananya pottery is a direct function of trade, and moreover of free trade;221 d) concomitantly, that the benefit of such trade will accrue to the producer, along the model of, say, Medieval artisanal production; and finally e) that Kefar Hananya’s production of pottery was the town’s major means of support, to the exclusion of agriculture.222

221. Horsley, Archaeology, 66-87, has argued at length that the movement of goods in early Roman Galilee, especially from village to city, was a result of tribute rather than trade, i.e., the (more or less) forced removal of goods from the countryside rather than their free and advantageous sale. This would mean that the presence of Kefar Hananya ware in the cities is by no means an indication that the cities did not exploit the countryside; on the contrary, it is evidence of that exploitation.
222. A point he himself denies later on: climatic conditions make the production of pottery difficult precisely during the olive processing season. Potters would thus have been available for agricultural work when extra hands were most needed. Ethnographic studies tend to confirm that potters normally assist in the agricultural work of their communities. So Adan-Bayewitz, Common Pottery, 236 and n.14. It is also worth noting that if pottery was the prime focus of Kefar Hananya, food would have to be imported, raising all kinds of difficulties not easily solved by the central marketing of the pottery.
In fact, not one of these assumptions is especially cogent. Setting such anachronisms aside, rather different conclusions suggest themselves. First, what these distribution patterns show, rather, is that trade even in speciality items was regional. Confirming this conclusion is one of the exceptions to the distance rule noted above, that is the significantly diminished proportion of Kefar Hananya ware discovered in the Golan: the ware manufactured in Galilee was marketed for Galilee. Second, even as specialized producers, the potters were governed by distance and the difficulty of over-land trade. Thus one of the reasons Kefar Hananya was able to market its pottery throughout Galilee was its advantageous central location. It is also likely that the disproportionate amount of Kefar Hananya ware found at Hammath Tiberias is partially a function of the availability of marine transport, or perhaps also a function of the political centrality of Tiberias for the region. Third, the presence of Kefar Hananya ware in the cities is simply further evidence of the cities’ overall dependence on the countryside for their goods, including manufactured basics. This does not mean that the cities were not centres of specialization; their markets were indeed the place one might find the specialty products of a variety of local centres all in the same place. But we should not assume that as settings for larger markets, the goods in question were produced on site. The very large percentage of Kefar Hananya ware in Hammath Tiberias, out of proportion to its distance from the town (one would expect about 75% rather than 97%) not only reflects the accessibility of marine transport along the lake, but additionally points to Tiberias as a marketing center for specialized products: Adan-

223. Hence they are ritually pure. Non-Jews in the Golan would have obtained their own pottery from local sources.
224. So also Adan-Bayewitz, Common Pottery, 237: "Kefar Hananya was well situated with respect to the Galilean markets; the settlement lies on the border between the Upper and the Lower Galilee, and along the route from 'Akko to the eastern Galilee."
Bayewitz' data suggest that the city served as a point of concentration of the goods of the hinterland to an extent that made it an exception to the consistent rule of proportion diminishing with distance. Access to the lake for transportation could only have facilitated this tendency. What is especially informative in regard to the role of the cities in the distribution of goods is the pattern of pottery finds at Sepphoris. Here, while the common cookware was to a large degree from Kefar Hananya, a significant proportion of the pottery (45%) found was from Shikhin, in the immediate neighbourhood. One must note the importance of the fact that the majority of Sepphoran cooking ware (74%) was from Kefar Hananya in spite of there being a pottery producer in the immediate neighbourhood. This datum serves as a further indication that the cities functioned as concentration points for specialized rural products, manufactured and otherwise. But what is really striking is the marked differences of function of the pottery from the two different locations. Sepphoran cookware is, as noted, predominantly from Kefar Hananya, while the 45% of pottery deriving from Shikhin was comprised predominantly of storage vessels. This not only indicates that Shikhin's pottery production specialized in storage vessels rather than cookware, but much more importantly indicates that Sepphoris was a large consumer of such vessels, which of course invites speculation as what the vessels contained! As Adan-Bayewitz and Perlman conclude:

Regarding Sepphoris as supplier, the literary sources provide useful background for our evidence. These texts indicate that Sepphoris was the most important market center in central Galilee during the Roman period. The city is said to have had an upper and lower market and its own standards for weights and measures; on a lead weight recently discovered by the Joint Sepphoris Expedition, a market inspector is mentioned and a colonnade depicted, providing archaeological evidence for the Sepphoris markets. It is reasonable

225. Adan-Bayewitz and Perlman, "Local Trade," 162.
226. This accounts for 25% of the total pottery found in Sepphoris. Thus, in terms of total accumulations (rather than just cooking ware), a town in the immediate neighbourhood, Shikhin, provided Sepphoris with less than double the amount of pieces of pottery as Kefar Hananya, 26.5 km away.
to assume, therefore, that Sepphoris was an important market center for the pottery of both Kefar Hananya and Shikhin, and that many of the Shikhin storage-jars, manufactured so close to Sepphoris, were filled with products and sold in the markets of that city.228

In particular, if the large storage jars, obtained, as we know, locally, were filled with grain, we have further evidence of Sepphoris' draining produce from the countryside.

These observations suggest a number of general conclusions about trade in Galilee. First, manufacturing, even of extraordinarily basic (i.e., relatively cheap and in general demand) items was a very limited enterprise. Kefar Hananya did not have a monopoly on Galilean cookware, but was the major supplier of this necessity in its region. Specialized production was necessary, not only because of the restrictions of skill and equipment, but also because of nature. Nevertheless, this production for the whole region was undertaken by a mere village, and evidently was not allowed to interfere with its continued agricultural activities. Second, we have no grounds for concluding that this trade was especially profitable for its producers, and in fact a continued focus on agriculture in Kefar Hananya, along with the failure to develop this industry in urban locations,229 would suggest that it was not. Rather, pottery manufacture, as a result of the presence of appropriate clays, developed opportunistically (i.e., because it could), and, as more of the village's resources (in terms of time and the development of appropriate equipment and skills) were devoted to it, came to be a necessary compensation for agricultural shortcomings.230 Any pressure on the village’s agricultural

228. Adan-Bayewitz and Perlman, “Local Trade,” 170, emphasis added.
229. On Sepphoris and Tiberias failing to produce pottery, see Adan-Bayewitz and Perlman, “Local Trade,” 169; Adan-Bayewitz, Common Pottery, 227. Finley, Ancient Economy, 22. 137 notes that no cities were established because of, or rested their prosperity on, manufacture.
230. Similarly, Adan-Bayewitz, Common Pottery, 235, who cites the natural presence of good ceramic resources, and the absence of an adequate agricultural base as preliminary factors stimulating the specialization of Kefar Hananya.
resources would necessitate a corresponding increase in the devotion of resources to pottery manufacture; in a tribute system, such pressure could come in the form of simple increasing demands for "surplus" produce, while even in a market system (which is too much to expect from antiquity), could come from high and increasing demand for the pottery itself. 231 In either case, village was as much a subject of this task as a beneficiary of it. We cannot, in the absence of a strong market economy, assume a monetary profit beyond the needs for decent subsistence, as might have been provided by exclusively agricultural work. Third, the pottery was apparently marketed locally by the producers themselves — if our literary sources are to be trusted, probably by short-distance travelling salesmen (not rokhlim) —, and does have a monopoly (or nearly so) in the limited 5 km radius of casual local interaction. It was probably marketed regionally, however, by middlemen who were responsible for its transport, and who, although they worked outside of the 5 km local radius, were also influenced by the contemporary limitations on land travel, remaining within a 50 km radius and evidently working less prolifically as distance increased. It is difficult to say how, precisely, the ware was marketed at these distances. Central place marketing is convincingly argued by Adan-Bayewitz, but since the proportions of ware are normally a function of distance rather than the size of the settlement, it is difficult to argue for any singular "central place"; instead we should assume that middlemen transported the pottery to a variety of different locations from which they were locally marketed, and that these middlemen may have dealt with products other than pottery as well. 232 On the other hand, disproportionate quantities of Kefar Hananya cookware at Hammath Tiberias quite possibly attest to concentration of this ware in Tiberias, as the high quantities of Shikhin

231. Adan-Bayewitz, Common Pottery, 235, acknowledges the availability of a market, i.e., demand, as another preliminary factor stimulating increased specialization.
232. See Adan-Bayewitz, Common Pottery, 229, where this pattern is identified as options "D" or "F."
vessels in Sepphoris attest to the concentration there of the contents of those vessels. What emerges, the cities as market centres notwithstanding, is that Tiberias and Sepphoris were large consumers of rural products, without having been significant suppliers of much of anything. Thus, fourth, we have some concrete evidence of urban siphoning of rural products, whether manufactured goods or produce, with "trade" attested only insofar as it signifies the physical transportation of these products. Indeed, the presence of a village which specialized in manufacturing storage-jars so accessible to Sepphoris (rather than in a central location, like Kefar Hananya) suggests that its industry evolved to meet Sepphorean needs, and hence that the presence of Sepphoris had a decisive effect on the surrounding neighbourhood. Furthermore, its presence attests to Sepphoris' demand for vessels to store produce, which in its turn suggests a chronic practice of collecting and accumulating produce necessarily grown elsewhere.

Thus, at the very least, and in contrast to Horsley, there appears to have been a fairly elaborate network in place to channel, in spite of technological and geographical difficulties, produce and other goods to the main cities, as well as throughout the region. By extension, other sorts of ordinary intercourse evidently could have taken place on a routine basis between close-by settlements, and so for the inhabitants of one village to have dealings on a frequent and even casual basis with those of another is unlikely to have unusual or worth remarking. Indeed, the presence of some limited regional trade (i.e., within a 25-40 km radius, diminishing with distance) in such speciality items as cookware indicates that travel in the Galilean hinterland beyond one's
Immediate neighbourhood was also acceptable.\textsuperscript{233} Indeed, the pottery trade was an inverse function of distance much more because of the limitations of cartage than the sheer distance itself. A person travelling lightly could easily traverse much or most of Galilee in a very brief time.\textsuperscript{234}

The situation is similar, and rather more straightforward, in the case of olive oil. Like pottery, this product requires a measure of specialization: although a staple, it cannot serve the majority of dietary needs, and it necessitates an appropriate climate (ideally, one not requiring irrigation), a prior commitment (because of the length of time it takes the trees to mature), and a not-inconsiderable physical plant (since it was the oil that was marketed, not the olives, hence making presses a necessity).\textsuperscript{235} Thus, as was the case with pottery, oil was one of those isolated ancient items that was both a basic need and yet required a more-than-basic set of circumstances to produce. As Josephus describes it, the marketing of oil may have been a feature of at least the Upper Galilean economy. Describing, as is his wont, the treachery of John of Gischala (from Upper Galilee), Josephus complains that:

He next contrived to play a very crafty trick: with the avowed object of protecting all the Jews of Syria from the use of oil not supplied by their own countrymen, he sought and obtained permission to deliver it up to them at the frontier. He then bought up that commodity, paying Tyrian coin of the value of four Attic drachms for four \textit{amphorae} and proceeded to sell half an

\textsuperscript{233} Note that this regional radius \textit{very roughly} to the distances envisioned by the Mishnah (Danby, \textit{Mishnah}, Bekhoroth 9.2 [542]) for the limits of a single herd of cattle. Cattle are imagined to range about 16 "miles" (the measure appears to be somewhat between a kilometer and a mile) while pasturing, and the text allows for (at least hypothetically) the single ownership of herds stretching along 32 of these "miles." Thus property could be spread out, regionally, over fairly significant distances.

\textsuperscript{234} Hence there are literary references to the reception of the travelling poor, and the hospitality to be accorded them. See, e.g., Danby, \textit{Mishnah}, Peah 8.7 (20); and an amplification of such stipulations in Neusner, \textit{Tosefa}, Peah 4.8 (69). The latter text provides a \textit{very close} parallel to the Q "Mission Charge."

\textsuperscript{235} On olive production generally, in addition to the description offered earlier in this chapter, see Shim'on Dar, \textit{Landscape and Pattern: An Archaeological Survey of Samaria 800 B.C.E. - 636 C.E.}, 2 vols. (Oxford: B.A.R., 1986). Dar's yeild figures are rather higher than my own.
amphora at the same price. As Galilee is a special home of the olive and the
crop had been plentiful, John, enjoying a monopoly, by sending large
quantities to districts in want of it, amassed an immense sum of money,
which he forthwith employed against the man who had brought him his
gains.236

This text actually does not indicate — in spite of its frequent citation as evidence
of a thriving oil trade and thus perhaps a significantly commercialized economy — that
there was a large-scale and regular trade in olive oil from Galilee to Syria (and/or else-
where).237 The text from War only describes the delivery of all of the local oil (i.e.,
apparently, only what oil was on hand in Gischala) to the frontier; the slightly different
account in Life describes the oil as destined only for the town of Caesarea Philippi.238
In neither case is the oil shipped any significant distance. Moreover, Josephus presents
this act as a consequence of the war: he specifies that the extraordinary circumstances
have driven the price of oil to remarkable heights, because they have somehow
prevented the inhabitants of a nearby portion of Syria from "obtaining oil from their
countrymen" (i.e., fellow Jews). While such a result could attest to the war’s interrup-
tion of commerce, by preventing the movement of producers (marketing their produce
to consumers), consumers (travelling to the producers), or middlemen. between
mutually hostile territories, Josephus actually describes the high oil prices as the con-

236. Josephus, B.J. 2.591-592 (Loeb 2.549-551). Cf. the parallel passage in Vita 74-75 (Loeb 1.31). This text reads:

He [John] stated that the Jewish inhabitants of Caesarea Philippi, having, by the king’s
order, been shut up by Modius, his viceroy, and having no pure oil for their personal use,
had sent a request to him to see that they were supplied with this commodity, lest they
should be driven to violate their legal ordinances by resort to Grecian oil. John’s motive in
making this assertion was not piety, but profiteering of the most barefaced description; for
he knew that at Caesarea two pints were sold for one drachm, whereas at Gischala eighty
pints could be had for four drachms. So he sent off all the oil in the place, having ostensibly
obtained my authority to do so. My permission I gave reluctantly, from fear of being stoned
by the mob if I withheld it. Thus, having gained my consent, John by this sharp practice
made an enormous profit.

237. See also Horsley, Archaeology, 68, and the texts he cites (206-207, nn.1-4).

238. A point also noted by Horsley, Archaeology, 68. Horsley believes that the account in War is vague
and general, while that in Life specifies the details of the event more accurately.
sequence of much more specific (and directly political) factors. Either the border was closed (B.J. 2.591 [he "obtained permission to deliver it up to them at the frontier"]), or, more specifically, the Jews in Caesarea Philippi were deliberately confined within the city (Vita 74). Such a restriction would entail the inability of Caesarean Jews to travel even locally, and hence having to make due with whatever oil was already in this predominantly Gentile town. Hence the issue of the (religious) purity of oil, combined with the extraordinary and unique circumstances that confined local Jews to the town itself, caused the tremendous increase in price. Horsley goes so far as to argue that such a price increase, moreover, would have been a function of the cost of overland transport anyway, or at least that this cost would eat into John's profits.239 Josephus does, however, regard John's actions to have been netted him "an immense sum of money." Nevertheless, Horsley is correct to point to the high cost of land transport, insofar as Josephus' story implies that shipping such a distance would only be undertaken as a profitable enterprise under such extraordinary circumstances of scarcity.

This is not to say that olive oil was not ever traded or transported under ordinary circumstances. What Josephus' account does suggest, for instance, is that there was a sufficient oil surplus to sell, that there were means of transporting it, and that there was demand for it, although special and probably unique factors pushed this demand to unreasonable heights. The very extraordinary characteristics of this episode simply indicate the ordinary limits on this trade. Particularly, they indicate that while trade in oil probably was a feature of the Upper Galilean economy, trade over such distances as that between Gischala (Gush Halav) and Caesarea Philippi (about 32 km in a straight line, more on the ground) would have been profitable chiefly (or only) under conditions

239. Horsley, Archaeology, 68.
that make possible extravagant increases in price. Thus we have a picture here of a specialized industry much like that of pottery: regional distribution limited by the constraints of distance and the shortcomings of land transport.

Oil production, however, was less specialized than that of pottery. Not only was the whole region of Upper Galilee apparently involved in some degree of oil production, much of Lower Galilee was as well, as were the neighboring regions, and in fact oil as a staple was produced even in less advantageous locales. So, unlike pottery, it makes little sense to imagine that the Upper Galilee's apparent surplus was used to supply the dietary subsistence needs of Palestine or Syria: the cost would have been prohibitive, and the demand would simply not have been there. The image of a thriving commercial economy makes little sense. The very locales to which Galilean would most easily ship oil are precisely those which were quite capable of producing that oil themselves. However, Horsley's insistence on the entirely local character of the Galilean economy, and its complete self-sufficiency, may be exaggerated. Subsistence grain production evidently did accompany the cultivation of olives, and it is possible that the oil presses that have been discovered were initially used for purely local demand. But Josephus' story attests to a surplus, and the oil generated in the Upper Galilee would have been superior in quality and, as the story indicates, in religious virtues as well. Moreover, larger towns would have had to obtained their oil for all purposes from somewhere: thus a plausible urban demand and evidence that surpluses

---

240. As attested by the wide range of towns in both Galilees found to have possessed oil presses (see Adan-Bayewitz, Common Pottery in Roman Galilee, 52-59; Hamel, Poverty and Charity, 10 n.14; Strange, "Six Campaigns at Sepphoris," 343; Avi-Yonah, Encyclopaedia, v.1, 299; v.3, 922; ). See also Josephus' testimonial to the fertility of the area around the lake (Josephus, B.J. 3.516-517 [Loeb 2.721]).

241. As noted above. On the cultivation of olives in Samaria, see Safrai, Economy of Roman Palestine, 108. On their cultivation in Judea, see Freyne, Galilee, 338 n.34, citing Eupolemus (ca. 150 BCE), as recounted in Eusebius, Praep. Ev. IX 33.1.
were generated (at least when, as Josephus says, "the crop had been plentiful"), suggests, minimally, that the basis or potential for trade in this product existed for the villages of the Upper Galilee.

What confirms this observation and adds interesting detail is the fact that Josephus describes John of Gischala’s transactions as monetary transactions involving, specifically, Tyrian coin ("paying Tyrian coin." War 2.591). This detail is especially interesting in light of the fact that a significant proportion of the coinage discovered in Galilee was from Tyre or other Phoenician cities.242 Indeed, this preponderance of Phoenician coin is sometimes cited as an indication of strong trade ties between Galilee and the coastal cities.243 Such trade ties would make a measure of sense: geographically, Upper Galilee is more accessible to the coastal cities than it is to cities further to the south in Galilee or in the rest of Palestine. In terms of distance, the coast is no farther from, say, Gischala, than are the cities of Lower Galilee. And in terms of geography, the coast is more accessible to Upper Galilee than anywhere else: the east to west flow of the terrain makes the transportation of goods from Upper Galilee to the coast a matter of greater ease (one simply follows the contour of the land downward) than would be the case for transport to the Golan (which would involve transport across the mountains) or to anywhere in Lower Galilee (which would involve continual negotiation up and down a series of east-to-west ridges blocking one’s route). Moreover, the Phoenician coastal cities were centres of maritime shipping — the only economical way to transport produce in antiquity — and thus the relatively short distance from, say, Gischala, to Acco or Tyre was, in economic terms, the greater portion of

242. See, e.g., Meshorer, "Hoard of Coins," 57 (and see chart, p.56), noting that about half of the coins found in a hoard from Migdal were from Tyre, Acco-Ptolemais, and Byblos; Meshorer, Ancient Jewish Coinage, 41, noting that the basic currency of Palestinian antiquity was the Tyrian shekel, rather than the Roman denarius.
the distance from Gischala to Egypt, or to Italy, or to Greece. 244 John's shipping of oil overland from Gischala to Caesarea was only profitable because of the extraordinary circumstances of war; but shipping it about the same distance from Gischala to Tyre would have been useful under even the most ordinary conditions, because of the city itself would have generated a high demand for produce (and had either the money or the power necessary to acquire it), and because its accessibility to the Mediterranean would have allowed an extension of trade otherwise impossible. Literary evidence also attests to the links between the produce of Upper Galilee and the consumption and/or trade of Tyre. Acts 12:20 states that the people of Tyre and Sidon sued Agrippa for peaceful relations, "because their country depended on the king's country for food" (διὰ τὸ τρέφεσθαι αὐτῶν τὴν χώραν ἀπὸ τῆς βασιλικῆς), while the Talmuds describe oil caravans coming from the Galilee to the Phoenician coast. 245 The now-standard picture of fairly close relations between Upper Galilee and Phoenicia is almost certainly correct. 246 This also suggests, as does the overall picture painted by the gospels, that political borders were not much of a barrier to travel except (cf. Acts 12:20; War 2.591) in times of war.

The evident export of oil to the coast, however, does not in itself answer the question whether the Galilean economy was "open" or "closed" in the early Roman period. 247 While it is clear that oil and perhaps other produce went from Upper

244. On Tyre as a major center of trade, see, inter alios, A. S. Kapelrud, "Tyre," vol. 4, 721-723, in George Arthur Buttrick, ed., Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible (Nashville: Abingdon, 1962); Horsley, Archaeology, 85-86; etc.
246. A point that even Horsley, Archaeology, 85-86, concedes, with some qualification of the usual portrayal. See further below.
247. The terms are borrowed from Safrai, Economy of Roman Palestine, 415. "Closed" means that normally farmers produced for their own or local needs, with luxury or trade items being picked up from the occasional surplus. "Open" means that farmers were extremely dependent on trade and commerce, and cultivated different crops specifically for sale.
Galilee to the Syrian coastal cities, it is by no means likely that the Lower Galilee was implicated in this trade. Although its geographical position made it accessible to Phoenicia (Ptolemais/Acco), its production seems to have been oriented more or to mixed subsistence, at least at the beginning of our period. Trade in even such a specialized item as pottery appears to have been regionally limited. Kefar Hananya is situated directly on the border of the two Galilees, and it is for this reason that it could supply them both. The preponderance of Tyrian coinage in Lower Galilee as well as Upper Galilee, moreover, does not indicate direct trade with Tyre. As Horsley points out, Tyrian currency served as a kind of standard in the area: it was minted in abundance, had an excellent and stable metal content, and silver and gold coins could not, of course, be minted locally, or even regionally.248 Thus the presence of particularly Tyrian coinage does not necessarily indicate trade with Tyre, even though it does indicate some monetization of the economy. Moreover, even in Upper Galilee, it is by no means clear that the movement of these goods was necessarily profitable for its producers. As was noted above regarding pottery, the advantages of the movement of goods could, and probably did, accrue to the cities, where they were consumed or traded, rather than the countryside, where they were produced. Horsley draws attention to the overtly political background to such exchange, repudiating the anachronistic presumption that the movement of goods in antiquity is the same thing as modern trade, i.e., open, laissez-faire, and motivated by the self-interest of the free parties who engage in them. He contends:

The principle "surplus product" of the Galilean or Judean peasantry, however, was under the control of the Herodian or high-priestly rulers and/or

---

248. Horsley, *Archaeology*, 69. It is also worth noting that the coins of Acco are far less frequent in Galilean (Upper or Lower) than those of Tyre (Migdal: 74 Tyrian coins, but only 15 from Acco; Meiron: 25 Tyrian coins, but only 2 from Acco), in spite of being about the same distance as Tyre from Upper Galilee, and even closer to Lower Galilee.
the Roman government in the form of taxes, tithes and offerings, and tribute. Trade between Judea or Galilee and Tyre was thus under the control of the very rulers who expropriated the agricultural products of the peasantry and who desired the luxury goods Tyre had to offer — as mediated perhaps by traders working for the Judean or Roman rulers. Tyre, of course, with its shortage of land from which to draw agricultural produce, was dependent particularly on imports from nearby agricultural areas with a "surplus," such as Galilee. 249

These are extraordinarily important points. The fact that some exchange took place between, say, Upper Galilee and Tyre should not imply that the Galileans initiated this contact on their own behalf, that it was in their own interest, or that any impressive benefit accrued to them as a result. It is difficult to imagine where in Upper Galilee one would find sufficient demand for Tyrian products to overcome the peasant tendency to minimal effort which normally limits cash cropping and trade to whatever is required for subsistence, or who in Upper Galilee would have had the power and resources to initiate the infrastructure and organization that allowed this contact to persist. Tyre may very well have required the produce of Upper Galilee, but it is difficult to see why the exchange need have been reciprocal: when other powers had control of this region, Tyre was forced to negotiate with them in order that they allow, and organize, and if necessary force, the shipping of goods down to the coast. And these powers, unlike independent villagers scattered through the hill country, would have had more than sufficient demand for Tyrian products, including, inter alia, money.

These observations suggest that, at least insofar as the two Galilees were a collection of more or less self-governing villages, trade, especially open trade, need not have

249. Horsley, Archaeology, 86. He also associates the rise of pottery-producing centers with the establishment of Sepphoris and Tiberias (Archaeology, 85, emphasis added): "It is surely of significance that the sudden increase in the incidence of pottery from Kefar Hanania coincides with the rise to prominence of Sepphoris and the founding of Tiberias. Not only would increased demand for cooking ware have stimulated an increasing specialization of production of pottery at Kefar Hanania, but the Herodian administration of these cities would have been concerned to assure an adequate supply of such an essential item." In my view the case for this kind of influence is even stronger for Shikhin.
been a major factor in their economies. Some trade in basic but specialized necessities undoubtedly took place, and surplus product may have been used to acquire the odd luxury or imported good, especially from the Phoenician coast. In other words, the Galilees were marked, in spite of what movement of goods took place, by a closed economy. Political force, however, would have oriented production, especially in Upper Galilee, toward cash crops. Military force is not quite as constrained by the same limitations as trade: whoever happened to rule (or dominate) Upper Galilee at any given time had the means to ensure its inhabitants' compliance. The causal development of free and open trade as a result of market forces is an unrealistic and anachronistic depiction of village life. Where the transport of goods became a major factor of the region’s economy, we can only conclude that it was as a result of political decisions and political force; how such changes could have been organized and enforced is addressed below.

At the same time, however, there is also some evidence that by the later Roman period the entirety of the Galilee, including Lower Galilee and "the Valley," was immersed in a variety of forms of trade. The Mishnah itself is filled with considerations pertaining to the treatment and sale of large herds of livestock, produce, cash crops, and so on, while it dismisses those who live on the land as the intractable 'am ha'aretz. Obviously, as the Mishnaic traditions developed and by the time they were codified, some significant portion of Galilean economic life was controlled by rather well-off farmers and townspeople who worked for profits and who owned considerable property. Likewise, apparent specialization of crops and shortages of staples in some regions seems to indicate a more "open" economy, at least among some sectors of the population. 250 Archaeological evidence seems to confirm this picture. Unusually large

and elaborate buildings at Capernaum, especially the synagogue. "... indicate a large, prosperous Jewish community supported by trade, fishing, and agriculture."251 It is notable that these remains date from significantly after our period, and that one of the buildings is a synagogue: the Mishnaic image of profit-oriented townspeople taking advantage of Galilee's fertility immediately suggests itself. Thus there appears to have been a significant change in trading patterns over time, a movement from a closed economy to a (more or less) "open" one, a movement from a village-based economy incapable of sustaining the major cities to a regionally interdependent and profitable network of exchange, a movement from direct military imposition of exchange from outside to one undertaken by larger landowners and wealthy figures within the region. Safrai sums up the situation thus:

As we have already seen, the trade system was rather limited during the Second Temple period, with the most important commercial institution of the time in the rural sphere apparently being the traveling salesman. The local market served, in addition to its commercial functions, as a convenient meeting place on Mondays and Thursdays. Such seasonal or temporary markets are usually good indicators of a small amount of commercial activity and the unimportant role of such activity in everyday life. The situation changed, however, somewhere at the end of the Second Temple period or immediately afterwards. The sources from that time provide a picture of a developed trade system functioning at various levels.252 These conclusions — at least if we reject Safrai's (and others') assumptions that such developments occur, in a laissez-faire society, simply because opportunities present themselves — raise the question why and how these changes occurred, what kind of tributary apparatus was initially applied by the cities to the countryside and what its effects might have been, how trade was organized and encouraged, how the flow of wealth moved from one set of rulers to another, and where the producer figured in all

of this. This set of questions immediately raises the (closely related) issues of monetization and of taxation.

**COINAGE, MONETIZATION, DEBT, AND TAXES:**

The circumstances pertaining to monetization are less ambiguous than those associated with trade. During our period, the use of regular coinage — money rather than barter — demonstrably increases from almost nothing in the Hellenistic and early Roman period to a regular device for exchange by middle to late Roman times. First, throughout the Roman period, economic systems in which money was a major factor in exchange, especially in rural areas.²⁵³ Crawford specifies:

If, therefore, the use of coined money as a means of exchange was largely limited to the cities of the Empire, its use there was probably an accidental consequence of its existence and not a result of government policy. Certainly a city did not need coined money, as the history of Babylon and other Eastern cities shows. The view that the cities of the Roman Empire came only by accident to adopt coined money as their means of exchange is corroborated by the absence of government reaction to the forms and structures individually created.²⁵⁴

These conclusions are probably only partially correct. Although the creation of coinage may have been accidental at first, there were good reasons for the increased production of coinage or a monetized system, especially intensifying as the size of the empire increased without a corresponding rise in technology of transport: coinage is the best form for the long-distance transport of extracted value.²⁵⁵

---


²⁵⁵. This is not say, however, against all evidence, that the Roman government had sufficient fiscal foresight to regulate the flow of money except in those instances where it was to their obvious and direct benefit to do so, such as for the payment of troops, or to inhibit forgeries which might later be paid in taxes. See Crawford, "Money and Exchange," 48. See also Finley, *Ancient Economy*, 56, 166, 196, on the Roman state's inability to maintain sufficient supplies of coin for the population's needs, and the consequently chronic liquidity problems, even among the upper classes.
The main administrative uses for hard money were the payment of taxes to the government, and the payment of troops by the government. In addition, urban life in antiquity required the use of money at all social levels. Both literary and archaeological evidence supports this claim. Various decrees, inscriptions, letters, and historical accounts reveal the significance of money in urban locations. All of the cities that have been excavated have yielded large numbers of coins, including various denominations of the low-value copper coinage required for everyday transactions. Ordinarily, however, coins were not a regular feature of rural life. In the country, when coinage is found, it tends to be silver, and thus in higher denominations than are required for use in everyday, commonplace transactions. At an excavated villa near Capua, for instance, only 30 coins were found, all but one of which were struck 50-100 years before occupation began, and this in spite of the fact that during the period of the villa's occupation Augustus had struck enormous issues of orichalcum and copper in (relatively) nearby Rome.

This does not suggest that coinage played in the life of the occupants of the villa the sort of rôle that a rapid turnover of coins would suggest, the sort of rôle that is suggested by the occurrence at Pompeii of coins of every

256. See Crawford, "Money and Exchange," 46. During the late Republican period, fluctuation in volume of coinage shows a direct correspondence to the number of legions in the field. E.g., the only major issue of the 70s BCE corresponds to the assistance sent to Pompey in Spain in 74 BCE.
258. Crawford, "Money and Exchange," 42 and n.16, citing Plutarch, Pericles 16: the economic activities of Cicero and his correspondents; the general plaudits received by the praetor Gratidianus in 85 BCE for stabilizing the exchange rate between bronze and silver; OGIS 484, an inscription of Hadrian at Pergamum, recording a petition from merchants and traders complaining about bankers charging illegal rates of exchange.
denomination struck within a few years before the destruction of the town. It can of course be argued that a countryman would go into town to purchase his wants and that he could partake of a market economy as much as a town dweller. But the emphasis of Cato’s *de agri cultura* is on producing what is needed and buying only what was absolutely necessary; it is summed up in the phrase . . . the head of a household should be a seller, not a buyer. Small, recurrent purchases do not form part of the picture. If this was true of a farm run for profit it was probably even more true of peasant farms. Cicero’s claim that ordinary farmers had no spare cash undoubtedly rang true.262

Papyri remain confirm this picture of rural life: rent is often paid in livestock or produce.263 Only extraordinary expenditures, or efforts to hoard large values (see Matt 13:44; Luke 15:8; Matt 25:25), would require coin: hence the rural preference for high denominations. Actual money, as opposed to produce or other goods, was used to buy such objects as houses or fields, or to repay loans and other types of dues.264 It may also have been used while travelling, to avoid having to carry bulky goods to pay one’s way,265 as well as in times of crisis, when liquidity was necessary to preserve or transport one’s wealth.266 When used for these desultory purposes, the money may have been acquired in the first place by *making* loans, by selling produce to the government (in Egypt) or to whomever else could pay cash for it, by selling property, or by renting out one’s slaves.267 Presumably hiring out one’s *self* for labour, as attested in parables attributed to Jesus, was a comparable source of hard money for the

263. See, e.g., A. S. Hunt and C. C. Edgar, *Select Papyri* (3 vols., Loeb Classical Library: Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1932/1988), #72 (v.1, 211) and #73 (v.1, 211-213): rental receipts in which payment is made in pigs and in produce, respectively.  
264. See Finley, *Ancient Economy*, 56. Cf. the various “agreements” and “receipts” from Hunt and Edgar, *Select Papyri*, vol. 1, in which large purchases of property or the repayment of loans are best attested for transactions involving money.  
265. See the Matthean wording of Q 10:4 (Matt 10:9): “Take no gold, nor silver, nor copper in your belts . . . .”  
266. Josephus makes it clear that conversion of assets to money was a safe means of liquidating wealth threatened by war circumstances. See in particular the gruesome stories recounted in B.J. 5.420-421 (Loeb 3.333) and 5.550-551 (Loeb 3.371).  
267. On the hiring out of one’s slaves for cash, see, e.g., Theophrastus, *Characters*, Jeffrey Rusten, I. C. Cunningham, and A. D. Knox, transl. (Loeb Classical Library; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1993), 30.15 [*Chiseling*, 163]: “When he collects tenant-rent (ἀποφορά) from his slave, he demands also the fee to exchange the copper, as also when he settles accounts with a steward”; and
less affluent. Obviously, any developing need for money or the sorts of activities or products for which money was used — the payment of money dues, the payment of loans, the purchase of fields, travel — would require one to engage in that limited range of activities which generated money.

The point is worth reflecting on when one comes to consider the situation in Palestine, and in Galilee particularly. Here, the use of money demonstrably increased from the first century onwards, and alongside of this trend, the kinds of transactions for which money was a requirement. Safrai argues that the use of (copper) city coins was widespread throughout Palestine, even in rural areas, and refers to finds of foreign city coins in such towns as Capernaum, Migdal, Gush Halav, Meiron, and elsewhere. Among such Galilean finds, Phoenician city coinage is normally most common, followed by various Palestinian issues, with a stable but usually quite small portion coming from Transjordanian cities (including the Golan and Arabia); oddly, Galilean coins are present, but are not especially abundant. But Safrai does not pay sufficient attention to the dating of these coins. In the case of Migdal, for instance, which Safrai

Theophrastus, Characters (LCL, 163), 30.17: "When he is travelling with acquaintances he uses their servants, and hires out his own (τῶν δὲ ἐκ τούτων ἔξω μοιῶσαι) without sharing the proceeds."

268. See, e.g., the parable of the laborers in the vineyard, Matt 20:1-16. The workers are explicitly paid in cash. See also Hunt and Edgar, Select Papyri #17 (LCL v.1, 51-53), for an example of cash payment for labour, in this case labour at an oil press.

269. Safrai, Economy of Roman Palestine, 399.

270. See Safrai, Economy of Roman Palestine, 399, who breaks down the composition of the large quantity of coins found at Migdal, thus: of 168 city coins, 89 (47%) were from Syrian cities, 44 were from Israel (23%), and 19 (10%) were from Transjordanian cities. On the city coins found at Capernaum, Safrai, Economy of Roman Palestine, 400, notes that 55% are from Israel (including Galilee), 38% from Phoenicia, and 7% from Arabian cities. Tyre is especially well represented in this collection, its coins comprising 22-27% of the total. A breakdown of the coin collection at the Eretz Museum of Tel-Aviv (Safrai, Economy of Roman Palestine, 400-401), which Safrai concedes is both eclectic and uncatalogued, nevertheless is comprised of coins from Israel (42%), from Phoenicia (28%), from Transjordan (8%), from cities in Syria (10%), and from Egypt/Alexandria (16%). Individual cities prominent in the collection include Tyre (15%), Sidon (4%), Antioch (7%), Acco (3%), Alexandria (16%), Neapolis (9%), Caesarea (8%), Aelia Capitolina (6%), and Tiberias (3.3%).
cites, there are no coins in the hoard earlier than 74 CE.271 Another hoard, found at Huara, has a similar range.272 Since both of these collections represent deliberate hoarding rather than natural accumulation, and contain coins dating well into the third century, we must assume that the distribution of dates does not reflect directly the relative abundance of coinage throughout the time period covered by the hoards. But the stark paucity of first-century copper city coins, not only in hoards but in general, does reflect a relatively unmonetized Galilee in the first century, at least as regards the daily transactions for which copper coinage would be required.

This is hardly surprising: silver and gold coinage, which could only be minted in select locations, travelled widely and quickly, even into the countryside, as already noted. But copper coinage, which in the Roman period was normally minted locally, by individual cities, did not tend to travel very far, probably because of its limited value.273 Tyre was sufficiently proximate to Palestine for its high-denomination coinage to circulate throughout Palestine; and was close enough to Upper Galilee for one to assume that a certain portion of copper coinage leaked into the region, an

271. Ya'akov Meshorer, "A Hoard of Coins from Migdal," 'Atiqot 11 (1976): 54-71, 54, 57 (and #75, see p.62). The range of dates in the hoard extends from 74 CE to 222 CE (#91, see p.64).

272. Meshorer, "Hoard of Coins," 57. The earliest of these coins dates from the time of Claudius (50 CE) and the latest to that of Volusianus (253 CE).

273. See Meshorer, "Hoard of Coins," 57: The distribution of city [= bronze] coins in this, as well as in other similar hoards, is limited. We find that city coins in the Roman period were current principally in their own vicinity. Naturally, the larger and more important the city, the greater was the possibility that its coins would reach distant places. As a rule, it can be said that the geographical distribution of city coins was very limited.

See also the chart on p.56. Meshorer does not offer an explanation for this phenomenon, but one can only assume that the kinds of transactions that would take place over significant distances would involve greater sums of money than would be convenient to pay in copper city coins.
assumption confirmed by the archaeological evidence. But throughout the Mac-
cabean and Herodian periods, Galilee had no local mints. Copper coins minted in
Jerusalem would have had to travel an unusually long way before circulating in Galilee;
even Tyrian copper coins would have to travel some considerable distance before arriv-
ing in Lower Galilee or the region around the lake. It should be clear, then, that the
establishment of a mint in Tiberias (apparently coincident with the establishment of the
city itself) was intended to provide the Lower Galilee, and especially the perimeter of
the lake, with the kind of low-denomination copper coinage that could be used for
ordinary transactions. The fact that such local Galilean coins are relatively sparse
even in Galilee itself indicates that the economy was not already monetized, and that it
was not easily or quickly monetized by Antipas. The effect of the foundation of

274. See Safrai, Economy of Roman Palestine, 402-403, pointing to increasing numbers of Palestinian
coins from the first century onwards. Of city coinage in the Museum of Beirut, 5% is Hasmonean, 1% Herodian, and 11% from 1st century Judea. Only 1% of its total of Palestinian coins date to the period before the Common Era. Safrai believes this indicates that trade relations between Israel (including Galilee) and Phoenicia became extensive only from this period onward; more likely, it indicates the extensive monetization of the Palestinian economy from this period onward.

275. On the very restricted circulation of local Galilean coins, see Safrai, Economy of Roman Palestine,
403, noting that the coin collection of the Museum of Beirut has a grand total of 26 coins from Sepphoris
and Tiberias, or only 4% of the total collection. See also Meshorer, Ancient Jewish Coinage, 41:
The coins minted by Antipas were not circulated beyond the borders of his tetrarchy. Indeed,
only one of the tens of thousands of ancient coins found in various excavations in Jerusalem
was struck by Antipas. The pieces minted by this tetrarch have been generally discovered in
the excavations in and around Tiberias.

On the denominations of Galilean coins, see Meshorer, Ancient Jewish Coinage, 37-38, who argues that
Antipas issued four denominations: a large denomination (see plates #9-10, #1, 5, 9, 13, 17) cor-
responding to a Roman dupondius; a half-denomination corresponding to a Roman as (see plates #9-10,
#2, 6, 10, 14, 18); a quarter denomination corresponding to a Roman semis (see plates #9-10, #3, 7,
11, 15, 19); and an eighth denomination corresponding to a Roman quadrans (see plates #9-10, #4, 8,
12, 16). The weights of these coins are slightly different than those of their Roman (rough) equivalents
because the alloy used by Antipas (a consistently poor bronze alloy) differs from those used for Roman
coins (Roman sestertia and dupondia were made from a zinc and copper alloy, while smaller coins were
copper only).

276. Meshorer, Ancient Jewish Coinage, 38, notes a hiatus in Antipas' production of coins from 21 to 29
CE, for no apparent political reason. He speculates that "the new currency would have been superfluous.
The market may have been saturated with the bronze coins struck for Judea and Samaria by the Roman
procurators." Much more likely, there was insufficient demand for lower-denomination coin in the
Tiberias itself, however, eventually served as a stimulus to the use of copper currency, and so the coins of Antipas have been found in Hammath Tiberias, Meiron, Gush-Halav, Nabratein, Arbel, and Capernaum.\textsuperscript{277} This was the intention: the fact that the issues were aniconic is a further indication that they were not intended either for foreign trade, or for strictly governmental/Tiberian use, but were for the Galilean (Jewish) population at large.\textsuperscript{278}

Thus the establishment of a local Galilean mint at Tiberias and the increasing evidence for the use of money from the first century onward are of a piece: the Galilean economy was not especially monetized by the time Antipas came to power, but became increasingly so from that point onward, and did so as a result of, or at least with the encouragement of, \textit{deliberate political policy}. The simultaneous foundation of Tiberias and of a Galilean mint is no coincidence: an effort to "urbanize" corresponded to an effort to monetize. Monetization was unquestionably in the interests of the wealthy and ruling classes, and well as the Romans: it allowed value to be removed from Galilee without the burdensome requirement of transporting bulky items overland;\textsuperscript{279} as a result, the wealth of this very productive region could be tapped effectively and rela-

\textsuperscript{277} Meshorer, \textit{Ancient Jewish Coinage}, 205 n.28.

\textsuperscript{278} See Freyne, "Herodian Economics," 40, who helpfully notes that while the royal palace in Tiberias sported animal likenesses, the coinage did not. For a good sense of how consistently Antipas' coins avoid the portrayal of anything offensive to Jewish sensibilities, see the description in Meshorer, \textit{Jewish Coins of the Second Temple Period}, pp.72-75, which focuses on the reed/palm-branch design. Meshorer thinks that the design, invoking the plant life to be found nearby, is intended to evoke the founding of the city (74-75). For the actual coins, see plates ##9-10, consistently with reed/palm and olive wreath (see also Meshorer, \textit{Ancient Jewish Coinage}, pp.35-41 and plate #6). Likewise, the coins of Agrippa I intended for his Jewish subjects were inscribed with a canopy and wheat/barley design (79; and see Meshorer, \textit{Ancient Jewish Coinage}, esp.52-59; plates ##9-16, and plate #10 for Agrippa I canopy design).

Meshorer, \textit{Ancient Jewish Coinage}, 40-41 (cf. 39-41; plates #6, ##1-15) also comments that "all coins struck by Antipas prior to 38 C.E. are inscribed with his title and name in the genitival form: ΗΡΩΔΟΤ ΤΕΤΠΑΡΧΟΤ. This grammatical construction adds emphasis to the ruler's possession of both country and currency." One might, if Meshorer's reasoning here is cogent, suggest that this feature, too, is indicative of his intention that the coins circulate \textit{locally} (or regionally, i.e., within his tetarchy).

\textsuperscript{279} See Freyne, "Herodian Economics," 38, on the utility of money for expanding the possibilities of exchange.
tively cheaply. It allowed land to be purchased and hence concentrated into fewer hands. It allowed Galilee — a hinterland region (i.e., not immediately on the coast) — to be brought into the economic orbit of the Empire. By facilitating the easier exchange of one type of product for another, it encouraged economic specialization such as cash cropping, which was of no discernible benefit to the local peasantry, but which benefited both the local upper classes, by generating greater profits, and the well-off of the rest of the Empire, by orienting production toward trade and luxury consumption, rather than subsistence. At the political level, a ruler like Antipas or his successors could conveniently allow the Phoenician cities to retain their virtual monopoly on, say, oil exports from Upper Galilee, because the revenue from such sales *in the form of money* could be easily directed to other locations and converted into whatever goods the rulers required, or used to pay tribute to Rome.

In order for all of this to happen, however, more than a mere convenient *supply* of money is required: *demand* must also be generated. In England, as the Middle Ages drew to a close, and in the imperial situations of the 19th century, alienation of land was used, often in combination with legally-required cash dues, to *create* a free labour force: the mere availability of employment for cash wages was normally insufficient to motivate wage labour, and so large numbers of people had to be placed in a position where they needed the money such employment could provide in order to survive. For quite different economic reasons — i.e., to monetize and internationalize sub-

---

280. Both Fiensy, *Land is Mine*, *passim*, and Horsley, *Galilee*, *passim*, point to a shift in the Hellenistic and Roman periods from patrimonial, family-based ownership of relatively small plots of land, to the purchase of land, tenancy, and large estates. Obviously, an unmonetized economy discourages the (speculative) purchase of land; indeed, it makes land virtually inalienable, except by brute force.

281. Alienation of land, as a result of enclosure or outright seizure, ensured that non-agricultural means were necessary for survival, while the imposition of cash dues made the possession of actual money necessary, regardless of how one eked out a living.
sistence economies, rather than to generate a free labour force — and somewhat less effectively, the Romans employed similar techniques. The generation of (extra-local) debt and the effective collection of dues worked in tandem and in mutually-reinforcing ways to create a demand for currency, which in its turn necessitated sales — of produce, property, or labour — that would generate that currency (see p.289, above), which in their turn fostered further monetization, in a slowly-accelerating cycle.

In an influential article, Martin Goodman has suggested that the availability of liquid capital to the Judean upper classes fostered the usury which was a principal cause of the unrest leading up to the War of 66-70 CE. In the absence of other outlets for investment, "the exceptional influx of wealth into the economically parasitic city of Jerusalem" could only be invested profitably in the form of interest-bearing loans. Thus unconsumed wealth (in money) from temple dues, pilgrimage income, and Herodian spending generated debt simply by being available to peasants for loans in difficult times, against the security of their land or their person. Goodman draws our attention to some provocative phenomena, but his thesis is at odds with what is known generally about capital in antiquity. Finley states outright that the ancient economy did not have "excess capital seeking the more profitable investment outlets we associate with colonialism," and further notes that in the absence of mechanisms for the creation of credit, moneylending was limited by the amount of cash actually on

hand. This latter point may be irrelevant for wealthy moneylenders based in Jerusalem: as Goodman quite correctly points out, the city, as the final destination of a variety of money dues (both civil and religious) and of pilgrim travelers, would have had immoderate amounts of available coin. But the notion of profitable investment of this coined wealth — the use of abstract money to generate more abstract money, and the assumption that wealth is money — is uncomfortably modern. Indeed, it assumes a stability and fixed (abstract) value to money that was simply not the case in antiquity. Rates of exchange between copper and higher-value coins fluctuated widely, and, as Josephus attests, the "value" of money could be depreciated (and, presumably, appreciated) by circumstances. Wealth, as always in antiquity, is land, and land, in turn, generates further wealth. Goodman is certainly correct insofar as the copious amounts of money flowing to Jerusalem would have allowed for loans in money, especially loans to the less affluent of Jerusalem itself. But the main reason to lend money, whether in Jerusalem or Galilee, would have been the longing to acquire land, rather than an interest in abstract return on one's money. Indeed, loans would have been a singularly inept means for generating stable profits: it is only when the borrower fails to repay that any significant gain is made, whether in the form of exorbitant late-payment penalties, or, more realistically, in the seizure of the lands or persons pledged against the loan. But for the very same reasons, moneylending would have been an extraordinarily effective means for acquiring land. This observa-


288. See Crawford, "Money and Exchange," 43. He lists various fluctuating values of the *denarius* vis-à-vis the *as*: 16 *asses* in Cibyra and Syros (the official rate); 18 in Ephesus and Pergamum; 20 and 24 in Transylvania.


290. See p.297, below.
tion should direct our attention to the effects of moneylending and indebtedness, rather than simply their preconditions. Goodman emphasizes only one side of the overall process: not only did liquid wealth fuel debt, but debt fueled liquid wealth, i.e., the overall monetization of the economy.

It is something of a commonplace that debt levels were increasing among free rural smallholders throughout the first century, and that this increase resulted in the concentration of land among the wealthy creditors. The largest body of evidence for this trend comes from the gospels themselves, which are replete with descriptions of tenant farmers, absentee landlords, and the supplications of insolvent debtors. Josephus, similarly, records the burning of the public archives during the revolt against Rome, commenting explicitly on its class basis:

> They next carried their combustibles to the public archives, eager to destroy the money-lenders' binds and to prevent the recovery of debts (μὲθ' ἀ τὸ πῦρ ἐπὶ τὰ ἄρχεια ἐφέρον ἀφανίσας σπεύδοντες τὰ συμβόλαια τῶν δεδανεικτῶν καὶ τὰς εἰσπράξεις ἀποκόψαι τῶν χρεῶν), in order to win over a host of grateful debtors and to cause a rising of the poor against the rich, sure of impunity. The keepers of the Record Office having fled, they set light to the building.

This event offers reasonable grounds for concluding that the situation in the decades preceding the war was difficult, and probably worsening, for those obligated to take out loans. Papyri and inscriptive remains tend to confirm this inference. The wording

---


293. Josephus, B.J. 2.427 (Loeb 2.491). On the historical and interpretive difficulties raised by this text, see Goodman, "First Jewish Revolt," 418.

of loan documents from the period offers some indication that foreclosure was a major motivation behind lending. Exorbitant and punitive interest rates (the usual penalty for late repayment was a fine of half of the principal or more), clauses explicitly anticipating execution of the loan on the debtor's property or person, and records of complaints about overzealous lenders exacting repayment unfairly or above and beyond the terms stipulated, all indicate that usurious lending and subsequent foreclosure were preponderant social phenomena. This evidence also shows that these phenomena were problematic: that they were, and were regarded to be, causes of hardship and conflict. The introduction of the *prozbul*, attested both in Rabbinic literature, and in an earlier (mid-first-century) papyrus, demonstrates that loans were prevalent enough and economically important enough to warrant overriding the injunctions of Torah. Significantly, the Mishnaic *prozbul* laws apply only to loans in which land is offered as collateral. In other words, it is only agricultural loans which are of sufficient economic importance to merit such provisions; other lending and borrowing is left to the wiles of those involved.

The abrogation of the sabbatical provisions of Torah guarantees that debtors are unprotected from the seizure of their securities, at least in the case of land. One can


296. See Danby, *Mishnah*, Shebiith 10.1-9 (50-51); Gittin 3.3 (311).

297. Benoit, *Discoveries in the Judean Desert*, 101-103, describes an Aramaic loan contract from about 55-56 CE; this text specifies that the debt will be repaid "even if it is the sabbatical year."

298. Danby, *Mishnah*, Shebiith 10.6 (51):

A *prozbul* may be written for a loan secured by immovable property. If the debtor has none, the creditor gives him title to part, however small, of his own land. If the debtor has land held in pledge in the city, a *prozbul* may be written on its security. R. Huspith says: They may write a *prozbul* for a man on the security of his wife's property, or for an orphan on the security of his guardians' property.
only agree with Goodman that the bounty of coin in Jerusalem accelerated this process. Insofar as it made coin easily available for loans. But it should also be noted that much of the time agricultural loans were not made in cash, but in produce. The farmer who suffered a bad harvest did not so much need money, but rather extra produce from those who possessed larger tracts of land, to feed himself and to provide seed for the following year. Several of the literary and documentary remains attest to such practices of loans in kind; many more, however, do attest to loans in money. Whether the loans were made in produce — by those with sufficiently large holdings to weather bad harvests — or in coin — by those who had sufficient coin on hand or saleable produce — they would slowly have stimulated a monetization of the economy, with all of its attendant effects. A smallholder who went into debt because of a bad harvest, if he received coin, would then use that coin to buy produce from his more successful neighbors (i.e., those with better and larger plots), putting those neighbors in the position of selling surplus produce for cash. Moreover, if the loan was made in cash, there is every indication that it was expected to be repaid in cash. Thus the hapless borrower, even if his subsequent harvests were sufficient, would have to sell his extra produce to generate the money required to repay the loan. Or, conversely, would have to hire himself out to wealthier neighbors, who in their turn would have to use his labour for the surplus cash-cropping which would generate the cash to pay him. Conversely, if the

299. What would he do with it? Buy lottery tickets? Go to the grocery store? One can only assume that under normal circumstances crop failure was not restricted to a single plot: one’s neighbors thus would not be in position to sell their own produce.

300. Hunt and Edgar, Select Papyri. #68 (LCL v.1, 203) refers to a loan of wheat; Danby, Mishnah, Baba Metzia, 5.1 (355) speaks of lending two seahs of wheat for three in repayment; and Danby, Mishnah, Baba Metzia, 5.8-9 (357) also speaks of lending wheat and bread.

301. See, e.g., the various stipulations in Danby, Mishnah, Baba Bathra 10 (380-382); see also Hunt and Edgar, Select Papyri #62-67, 69-70 (LCL v.1, 185-207).

302. All of the loans and stipulations already cited presuppose repayment in the same form as the loan was originally made.
original payment was made in produce, and subsequent harvests fall short, the debtor, if he is to make payment, must sell (for money) some of his own assets — property, equipment, labour — in order to buy (for money) the produce to repay his creditor. In either case, the local economy is quite effectively monetized in a variety of locations.

Moreover, if we assume that the primary debtors in this cycle are those who possess small, subsistence-oriented tracts of family land, it is easy to see how indebtedness led to concentration of land. If, as Fiensy claims, the average family plot was in fact 6-9 acres,⁴ and if the figures offered earlier in this chapter for subsistence levels are correct, most families lived on the razor’s edge of starvation and failure most of the time. Village communalism and local charity probably made up for ordinary shortcomings by distributing produce. However, extraordinarily bad harvests, which left little to be distributed, or external demands for cash or extra produce (see below), would have forced smaller landholders to take out the kind of loans on which interest was calculated and penalties for late payment imposed.⁵ Repayment of such loans would then have cut into the tiny margins on which such individuals survived. When such loans were made, foreclosure was bound to follow eventually. This cycle, then, in addition to outright (military or political) seizure, led to the progressive concentration of landholdings attested for our period,⁶ and these in turn further monetized the economy, in their generation of surplus produce, in the necessity to pay hired laborers, and so forth.

---

303. Fiensy, Land is Mine, 92-95.
305. As early as Ptolemaic times, extreme concentration of agricultural holdings appears in an inscription which refers to whole villages as the property of a single person (see Y. H. Landau, “A Greek Inscription Found Near Hefzibah,” Israel Exploration Journal 16 [1966]: 54-70, esp. 59-61 [lines 21-23]). Such huge holdings are presupposed much later in the gospels, most egregiously in Gospel of Thomas #64: “I have bought a village.”
This whole cycle, I would contend, itself conducive to monetization, was set in motion by the creation of a greater demand for surplus, or, more specifically, for cash. This increased demand was of course fostered by political processes, i.e., the increased demand for dues of various types, particularly taxes, from the small peasantry. Here, the evidence suggests two apparently contradictory conclusions, which, however, may be reconciled. The first conclusion, on the one hand, is that taxation was undoubtedly felt to be burdensome in the time of Herod the Great, in the tetrarchies under his sons, and under direct Roman rule. Most of our evidence on this matter comes from Judea, but general conclusions about the character of taxation in Galilee might be carefully extrapolated.

According to Josephus, Herod's death was taken as an opportunity to complain about his capricious and excessive taxation. Archelaus, attempting to curry favour with his new subjects, therefore entertained requests that he reduce yearly payments and eliminate certain sales taxes. It should be noted, however, that the real focus of these outbursts was not so much the rate of taxation, as the manner in which it was exacted. The degree or burdensomeness of the regular tribute (πράσσεσθαι φόρους ἐπιβαλλομένους ἐκάστοις τὸ ἐπ᾽ ἐτος) is not addressed; instead the focus is on the use of servants to collect it, the capriciousness with which it was assessed, its ultimate disposition in foreign cities, and even, in the case of sales taxes, the consistency or effectiveness with which it was collected ("ruthlessly exacted"). After Archelaus left for

306. Josephus, Ant. 17.306-308 (Loeb 8.513-515), describes the complaints that Herod imposed contributions in excess of the regular tribute and that the income from his taxes went to the enhancement of foreign cities rather than his own realm. Similar charges are recounted in Josephus, B.J. 2.85 (Loeb 2.355).

307. Josephus, Ant. 17.204-5 (Loeb 8.467): "Some cried out that he should lighten the yearly payments that they were making. Others demanded the release of the prisoners who had been put in chains by Herod . . . Still others demanded the removal of the taxes that had been levied upon public purchases and sales and had been ruthlessly exacted." Cf. War 2.4 (LCL v.2, 325).
Rome, the entire country appears to have broken out into open, if scattered, revolt and brigandage:

And so Judea was filled with brigandage (ληστηρίων). Anyone might make himself king as the head of a band of rebels whom he fell in with, and then would press on to the destruction of the community, causing trouble to few Romans and then only to a small degree but bringing the greatest slaughter upon their own people.308

Whether this outburst was motivated by burdensome taxation or not is unclear. The Roman response was particularly ferocious in Galilee, and resulted in the complete destruction of Sepphoris.309

More obviously related to taxation were the revolts that accompanied the deposition of Archelaus and the imposition of direct Roman rule, accompanied as it was by a census and direct Roman tribute:

The territory of Archelaus was now reduced to a province, and Coponius, a Roman of the equestrian order, was sent out as procurator, entrusted by Augustus with full powers, including the infliction of capital punishment. Under his administration, a Galilean, named Judas, incited his countrymen to revolt, upbraiding them as cowards for consenting to pay tribute to the Romans and tolerating mortal masters, after having God for their lord. This man was a sophist who founded a sect of his own, having nothing in common with the others.310

At about the same time, Tacitus records general dissatisfaction in Syria and Judea with the levels of tribute.311 And the Great Revolt, as well, appears to have been at least partially motivated by Roman extraction of tribute: Florus forcibly extracted 17 talents

308. *Antiquities* 17.285 (LCL v.8, 505). Cf. *Antiquities* 17.250ff. (LCL v.8, 489ff.); 17.269 (LCL v.8, 497); 17.271-272 (LCL v.8, 499); 17.273-284 (LCL v.8, 499-505); War 2.39ff. (LCL v.2, 337ff.); War 2.56-65 (LCL v.2, 345-347).


from the Temple treasury for the Imperial service, and, in fact, tribute was in arrears.312 Agrippa’s speech at the commencement of hostilities makes payment of back tribute a central issue:

But your actions are already acts of war against Rome: you have not paid your tribute (τῶν φόρων) to Caesar, and you have cut down the porticoes communicating with Antonia. If you wish to clear yourselves of the charge of insurrection, re-establish the porticoes and pay the tax (τελέσετε τὴν εἰσφοράν).313

And, finally, as is well-known, literary portrayals of tax collectors cast these figures in an unequivocally and invariably bad light, as voracious, unclean, and immoral.314

The second conclusion, on the other hand, apparently contradicting the first, is that Roman levels of taxation were not appreciably higher than those prior to Roman domination. According to 1 Maccabbees 10:29-32 and reiterated by Josephus (Ant. 13.48-51 [Loeb 7.249-251]), Seleucid tribute on the land was one-third of grain produce and one-half of orchard produce, in addition to the regular tithes paid to Jerusalem and the Temple. Roman tribute, if anything, was less stringent:

Gaius Caesar, Imperator for the second time, has ruled that they shall pay a tax for the city of Jerusalem. Joppa excluded, every year except in the seventh year, which they call the sabbatical year, because in this time they neither take fruit from the tress nor do they sow. And that in the second year they shall pay the tribute at Sidon, consisting of one fourth of the produce sown. and in addition, they shall also pay tithes to Hyrcanus and his sons, just as they paid to their forefathers. . . . As for the villages in the Great Plain, which Hyrcanus and his forefathers before him possessed, it is the pleasure of the Senate that Hyrcanus and the Jews shall retain them with the same rights as they formerly had, and that the ancient rights which the Jews and their high priests had in relation to each other should continue, and also the privileges which they received by vote of the people and the Senate.315

313. Josephus, B.J. 2.403-404 (Loeb 2.481).
Rome did add a poll tax to Judea after 6 CE, but this imposition would not have affected the client kingdom of Antipas in Galilee. Nor were Herod the Great’s massive building projects funded entirely on the backs of his subjects: Emilio Gabba has argued convincingly that the great additional revenues required for such products were acquired from Herod’s personal wealth, in landholdings, and, more interestingly, in mining and tax-farming outside of his own domain. In spite of all of his building activity, he was thus able, it appears, to maintain the tax rates established by Rome at the death of Caesar, yielding approximately 1000 talents annually for the entire realm. Thus,

[i]t certainly appears that the amount collected was the result of a re-ordering of the previous variegated fiscal system and that the collection was carried out with the usual brutal methods: this in itself is enough to explain the obvious complaints which were raised in Jerusalem and Rome after the death of the King. The accusations of excessive exploitation of the kingdom and of consequent general misery, which are often accepted by modern historiography, seem, however, to be without foundation. Taxes were levied directly — on products of the soil, through payment of a proportional or fixed quota (there does not appear to have been a poll tax: this was introduced later by the Romans), and indirectly — on sales and certain trade, particularly transit trade activities, by means of excise duty and tolls. It is possible that the collection methods later imposed by the Romans replicated at least part of the system in force under Herod.

Gabba’s summary indicates precisely how our discrepancy is be explained. It is not that the tax burden had increased in terms of total demand, at least until the time of Vespasian, but rather that it was being exacted more efficiently and effectively than

317. So Gabba, "Finances of King Herod," 161 and n.1. This figure is arrived at in part by attention to the "incomes" stipulated for the various parts of Herod’s kingdom when it was divided in 4 BCE. See Josephus, Ant. 17.318-320 (Loeb 8.519-521); B.J. 2.95-97 (Loeb 2.357-359).
319. Finley, Ancient Economy, 90, citing Seutonius, Vespasian 16.2, notes that as a result of spiraling expenses, Vespasian doubled the land taxes in some provinces.
it had been in the past. Finley points out that taxation, the bulk of which fell on the land, was bearable, in spite of accelerating rates of gross intake. Instead of raising tax rates, as Gabba notes, ever-increasing amounts of tribute and government income was generated by administrative means, that is, either "by various schemes designed to bring marginal and deserted land into production, by confiscations and by requisitioning devices, for example, for road construction and the imperial post, or by large-scale money-lending by the same individuals who were responsible for collecting the taxes that made the loans necessary in the first place. Since the Roman tax burden lay disproportionately on those who worked the land, i.e., the peasantry, the effect of this extension of taxation into areas not-yet within the orbit of the imperial economy was to place further pressure on an already-encumbered peasantry. Thus Finley summarizes:

> It is in the nature of things that the peasant, independent or tenant, has a fragile hold on his land: he has little margin when times are hard. The combined effect of the various developments I have been examining — increasing taxation, depredations and devastations, depression in status as symbolized by the establishment in law of the category of humiliores — were to drive him either into outlawry or into the hands of the nearest powerful landlord (or landlord’s agent). And the latter, as we saw in the case of the tenants on the imperial domain at Carthage, meant protection and oppression at the same time.

---

320. In addition, Goodman, "Origins of the Great Revolt," 41-46, draws attention to the apparent deficit of legitimacy suffered by those native elites whom Rome entrusted to rule the country. This must have had an exacerbating effect on the resentment felt over paying taxes.
321. Finley, Ancient Economy, 55, 89-90.
322. Finley, Ancient Economy, 90. For an example of the imposition of such requisitioning devices onto rural communities, see the inscription in SEG XIX 476, which records a petition from villagers complaining about being "overcome" by public duties and compulsory courier service.
323. See Finley, Ancient Economy, 49-50: "There was, it is true, a small but important section among them [i.e., the equites, the overwhelming majority of whom were involved in landowning], the publicans, who engaged in public contracts, tax-farming and large-scale moneylending, chiefly to communities in the provinces who were in difficulties over the taxes these same publicans were collecting for the Roman state."
324. Finley, Ancient Economy, 91.
325. Finley, Ancient Economy, 91.
While the circumstances here encapsulated by Finley do not necessarily pertain directly to first-century Galilee, the general implication is correct that additional tax burdens on the peasantry would have had the effect of shaking them loose from control of the land.

The complaint that Herod's sales taxes were exacted "ruthlessly" reveals less concern about the official existence of the taxes than about the fact that they were enforced. When Josephus and other sources describes the actual collection of taxes, in Judea or elsewhere, what emerges is that, as with all other kinds of economic contact, proximity is a prerequisite. Physical contact is necessary to determine the amount of taxes to be collected, and in order to actually, physically, collect them. Josephus, speaking of Judea in the period immediately before the War, describes the manner in which the Roman tribute was obtained:

... the magistrates and the members of the council (οἱ τε ἄρχοντες καὶ βουλεύοντες) dispersed to the various villages (εἰς δὲ τὰς κώμας) and levied the tribute. The arrears, amounting to forty talents, were rapidly collected. Thus for the moment Agrippa dispelled the menace of war. ... The king ... sent the magistrates and principal citizens (τοὺς μὲν ἄρχοντας αὐτῶν ἀμα τοὺς δυνατοὶς) to Florus at Caesarea, in order that he might appoint some of their number to collect the tribute in the country (τοὺς τὴν χώραν). 328

What is especially notable here is that the city — Jerusalem — collects its tribute from the villages immediately adjacent to it. As with transport, easy economic contact is restricted to the immediate neighbourhood. The collection of dues "from the country," on the other hand, must take place at a later time, and under direct Roman supervision.

326. The increase in taxation is measured by Finley over centuries, not decades. Indeed, Galilee is not under direct Roman rule until after the death of Agrippa I. Apart from the Jewish War, which is after our period, the only Galilean "depredations and devastations" of note revolve around Varus' destruction of Sepphoris in 4 BCE. The distinction between humiliores and honestiores in law is not demonstrably relevant, as it was only certainly formalized by the early second century (Finley, Ancient Economy, 87). 327. See MacMullen, Roman Social Relations, 36-37, for a description of the physical removal of goods from the countryside, and the resistance with which it was met. 328. Josephus, B.J. 2.405, 2.407 (Loeb 2.481-483).
While this example derives from Judea, not from Galilee, the general point should be clear: the taxation system at the time worked best in situations of close physical proximity.

What emerges, then, is that political power must be based physically fairly close to its sources of revenue, in order to, in fact, obtain that revenue. Even the use of military forces, armed servants, contracted tax collectors, and other travelling emissaries decreases in efficiency the farther it reaches beyond its power base. Under normal circumstances, a hinterland community, especially one with an unmonetized economy, while theoretically subject to the taxes levied by its rulers, was often in an easy position to slight those demands simply because of the physical difficulty of and the cost involved in the physical removal of its produce. This is not to say that taxes were not collected: simply that they were collected much more regularly and efficiently from areas close to cities than they were from areas far from cities. Other types of dues would be even more affected by the same considerations: tithes paid to a local priesthood could be easily maintained, but those dues, especially money dues, destined for Jerusalem are less likely to have been honored.329 Such a hinterland community, in its ability to avoid a variety of dues and to be largely unmolested by the demands of tax collectors (who would gravitate to centers more likely to yield higher profits, i.e., those within easy transportation distance from larger cities), and its relative segregation from Mediterranean trading patterns, would, as long as these circumstances continued,

329. On the fashion in which tithing to priests took place, see Josephus, Ant. 20.180-181 (Loeb 10.99): "No, it was as if there was no one in charge of the city, so that they acted as they did with full license. Such was the shamelessness and effrontery which possessed the high priests that they were actually so brazen as to send slaves to the threshing floors to receive the tithes that were due to the priests, with the result that the poorer priests starved to death. Thus did the violence of the contending factions suppress all justice." The text indicates the local priesthood's dependence on tithes, as well as the actual physical removal necessary to redirect those tithes to Jerusalem. There is no evidence for such events taking place in Galilee, it should be noted. There is a great deal of discussion in the Mishnah, esp. Shekalim (Danby, Mishnah, 152 ff.), about various tithes and dues owed in money.
have been able to maintain a certain autonomy and the basic patterns of smallholder village life. On the other hand, the moment these circumstances change, and the community is subjected to intensified tax demands, whether in money or in kind, the peasants' tenuous hold on the land is threatened, and they begin a cycle of debt, monetization, loss of land, tenancy and further monetization, all of which serves to benefit the local elites and the Imperial administration. By the political imposition of taxes, the region in question is drawn into an empire-wide orbit of money and trade, and must redirect its own local resources accordingly.330

THE CITIES AND "URBANIZATION"

Of course it is obvious that the sole events in first-century Galilee that would have achieved these effects are the foundation of cities within the Galilean "hinterland." As we know, two such cities were founded by Antipas, i.e., Sepphoris and Tiberias. Moreover, these cities were founded at the very beginning of the period we have been considering, and, indeed, shortly before the rise of the earliest Jesus movement and the composition of Q. It has become the standard view in scholarship on antiquity that the cities were sites of consumption, not of production.331 As a result, the normal attitude

330. In a very detailed and meticulously supported article, Keith Hopkins ("Taxes and Trade in the Roman Empire," Journal of Roman Studies 70 [1980]: 101-125) argues that "the Romans' imposition of taxes paid in money greatly increased the volume of trade in the Roman empire (200 B.C.-A.D. 400). Secondly, in so far as money taxes were levied on conquered provinces and then spent in other provinces or in Italy, then the tax-exporting provinces had to earn money with which to pay their taxes by exporting goods of equal value" (101). He adds that rents functioned in approximately the same way (104), and that the entire process was accompanied by a corresponding growth in money supply (106, 109). Cf. also Finley, Ancient Economy, 175-176.
331. See, succinctly, Finley, Ancient Economy, 123:

Greeks and Romans never tired in their praise of the moral excellence of agriculture, and simultaneously in their insistence that civilization required the city. They were not being self-contradictory; Strabo, it will be noticed, saw agriculture, not trade or manufacture, as the prelude to stability and urbanism. The true city in classical antiquity encompassed both the chora, the rural hinterland, and an urban center, where the best people resided, where the community had its administration and its public cults.

Finley discusses several examples of ancient cities which might appear to have "carried their own weight," but which, in the final analysis, did not: Athens, Marseilles, Tarentum (see 130-134, 193-194).
of the countryside to urbanites was fear and hatred; tensions and conflict mark the contacts between city and countryside.\textsuperscript{332} We have already seen how Sepphoris and Tiberias relied even for such basic \textit{manufactured} goods as pottery on small towns and villages such as Shikhin and Kefar Hananya. The cities' complete dependence on the countryside for agricultural goods, which they of course were \textit{incapable} of producing, is even more obvious. These goods could be obtained through outright seizure, through forced services, through taxes, through rents, through interest on loans, or through fees for various services offered by the cities, including market and exchange services.\textsuperscript{333} If we take this notion of the consumer city seriously, the impact of the foundations of Sepphoris and Tiberias should become clearer. Jonathan Reed has already described at some length the effect such large new cities would have on the countryside surrounding them:

\textbf{The impact of so many people in Sepphoris and Tiberias on the entire Galilee, especially when they are viewed as consumer cities, must be taken seriously. After their founding as major centers by Herod Antipas, the agricultural practices of the Galilee were not only completely realigned, but were also stretched. Lower Galilee could no longer be considered as a series of villages, hamlets, and farms. The entire agricultural focus turned to feeding Sepphoris and Tiberias . . . now entrepreneurial farmers and landowners, who grew a single cash crop on a larger scale for the granaries at Sepphoris, became necessary.} \textsuperscript{334}

But mere urban consumption of the produce from nearby villages is just the beginning. The effect of the new cities should not be measured only terms of what they took because they \textit{had to}, but also in terms of what they took because they \textit{could}. In addition

\textit{See also MacMullen, Roman Social Relations, 28-56, generally.}
332. See, e.g., Horsley, \textit{Archaeology}, 118-130; MacMullen, \textit{Roman Social Relations}, 28-41. Much of the "social banditry" described by Hobsbawm, \textit{Primitive Rebels}, takes the form of organized terror against the representatives of urban authorities.
to requiring a complete reorientation of the Galilean economy toward surplus production and cash-cropping — with attendant stimulation of trade and monetization — simply to feed their inhabitants, Sepphoris and Tiberias would have also formed a practical and proximate home base for those — including Rome and the Herodian government — who wished to plunder the agricultural wealth of this underexploited region. The new settlements could serve as concentration points, collection centres, for tax demands on the countryside, for loans to Galilean freeholders, and eventually for the income of absentee landlords from their rural estates.335

It is difficult to conclude that this policy was anything but deliberate. Towns had to have access to fertile hinterlands to survive,336 but, conversely, fertile hinterlands could not be adequately exploited without the presence of towns. The entire history of the incorporation of the Middle east into the vast Hellenistic and then Roman empires is the story of the establishment of new cities by conquerors.337 In Palestine, the Roman proconsul Gabinius is reported to have established or rebuilt Samaria, Azotus, Scythopolis, Anthedon, Raphia, Adora, Marisa, Gaza, Apollonia, Jamneia, Gamala, and perhaps others.338 Roman client kings likewise established cities, as did the Flavian Emperors.339 Even where the client kings exercised a measure of autonomy, their own interests in founding administrative centers for themselves would have

335. See Gottwald, “Social Class,” 6, 18-20, on the techniques for removing surplus from the countryside. Many of the parables of Jesus, as Gottwald points out, serve as graphic illustrations of the political exercise of power in first-century Palestine. It is interesting, by the way, that the words often used for “tribute” and for “rent” are the same: φόρος.
336. Finley, Ancient Economy, 126, 139.
337. The most startling example being, of course, Alexandria in Egypt. In Palestine, the some of the coastal cities and the cities of the Decapolis represent Hellenistic foundations or refoundations. See Schürer, History of the Jewish People, v.2, 85-93.
339. Again, for a summary, see Issac, “Roman Administration,” 154-158, arguing, however, that the Roman government did not actively pursue such a policy, nor bear its costs.
likewise served the demonstrable tendency of the whole empire toward urbanization. Gottwald refers to the political-economic organization behind the Hellenistic and Roman empires as the "foreign tributary mode of production." Its establishment of a network of metropolis-periphery relationships is to be distinguished from that of modern imperialism insofar as the main source of surplus in the ancient tributary mode of production derives from force — the application of military and political power to directly remove others’ assets —, rather than from uneven market transactions. But in order for local rulers and profiteers to exercise this power economically and effectively — and thus to enrich themselves and to enable Rome to expect consistently high levels of tribute as well as simply to circulate the goods of the countryside among the Empire’s wealthy consumers — physical proximity was required, and hence a policy and consistent practice of "urbanization" (i.e., the founding of cities of significant size, spaced throughout the hinterland in order effectively to tap its

341. In drawing this contrast, I am relying on the work of André Gunder Frank (Capitalism and Underdevelopment in Latin America: Historical Studies of Chile and Brazil [New York: Monthly Review Press, 1967]) on metropolis-periphery relations in modern colonialism, leaving aside the intra-Marxist question of whence the accrued and drawn off value described by Gunder Frank actually and ultimately derives. Andrew Pearse, "Metropolis and Peasant: The Expansion of the Urban-Industrial Complex," pp.69-78 in Teodor Shanin, ed., Peasants and Peasant Societies, 2nd edition (New York: Basil Blackwell, 1989), describes the penetration of more or less traditional and autonomous peasant societies in modern times through the mechanism of urbanization, but the proximity of cities in modernity tends to stimulate "free" trade and market exchange through the mere availability of markets, rather than extracting rural goods by sheer force. For a helpful summary of theoretical perspectives on the metropolis-periphery relationship, see Michael Rowlands, Mogens Larsen, and Kristian Kristiansen, eds., Centre and Periphery in the Ancient World (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 4-11. And for a series of discussions on the actual Roman Imperial penetration of various hinterland regions, see Rowlands, Larsen, and Kristiansen, Centre and Periphery, 87-140.
342. Again, it should be noted that even a client king acting in his own interests would have been motivated by imperial demands for tribute, and so his behaviour would have been at least somewhat constricted by this requirement.
resources). A glance at a map of Palestine's official "cities" in the Middle- to Late-Roman period shows how effectively this policy was eventually pursued.

So, as a piece with this general Imperial practice, all of Herod the Great's successors engaged in city-building in their new, smaller, realms. Philip built Caesarea Philippi; Antipas did not restrict himself to Galilee, but also built/rebuilt Betharamphtha (Livas, Julias) in Perea. Strictly speaking, Antipas did not found Sepphoris: the city had been the major urban center of Galilee for decades or longer. Antipas merely reestablished the city in about 3 BCE, only a year after it had been destroyed by Varus. Horsley even suggests uninterrupted continuity of occupation during this period. Clearly, Antipas rebuilt Sepphoris on a grander scale than it had hitherto existed; nevertheless, in so doing, he only altered the magnitude of its impact on Lower Galilee. Only a year had gone by since it had last been standing, and, at any rate, the rebuilding of Sepphoris took place a good deal before the public activity of Jesus or the composition of Q, and, apparently, some distance from the setting of these events. The (re)foundation and expansion of Sepphoris, while of a piece with Herodian and Roman policy, and necessary for the exploitation of Lower Galilee proper, probably did not have much impact around the rim of the lake, which was not only rather distant, but was geographically isolated. Nor is it likely that Upper Galilee

343. See Tenney Frank, ed., An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome, vol. 4 (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1938), 704: In Asia Minor, in the period "... of Augustus and the Julio-Claudians, although it records a substantial beginning upon the urbanization of the areas still organized as villages and tribes, achieved much more evident results ... in the restoration of cities previously existent. There are indications, however, that the emperors from Augustus on were as willing to further the rise of new cities as they were to restore and maintain the old."

344. Josephus, Ant. 18.27 (Loeb 9.25); B.J. 2.168 (Loeb 2.389); cf. Schürer, History of the Jewish People, v.1, 342; v.2, 93; Hoehner, Antipas, 84-91.


347. Hence Josephus' reference to the rebuilding making Sepphoris "the ornament of all Galilee" (Ant. 18.27 [Loeb 9.25]).
was much affected by this "new" foundation, for the same reasons.

Thus it is very interesting, both in terms of Antipas' political-economic policy and its impact on the region of primary interest to Q, that several years later, Antipas established a completely new foundation, in a region not easily accessible to Sepphoris: in a region that was accessible to "the Valley," i.e., because of the availability of water transport, the whole area bordering the western edge of the lake, as well as being in easier contact with Upper Galilee; and moreover even made this new city his capital. Tiberias was founded by Antipas around 19 CE, after more than 20 years with Sepphoris as his royal "ornament," on the southern edge of the lake. From here, because of the character of the local geography (i.e., the availability of the lake and thus the accessibility of all the towns within easy reach of its shores,348 and the mountain ranges dividing "the Valley" from Lower Galilee proper), Antipas had access to large sections of Galilee formerly untapped by Sepphoris. Reed sums up the situation:

The major urban centers along the Levant — Caesarea Maritima, Scythopolis, and Tyre — form a rough triangle. Galilee lies beyond the immediate reach of each of these major urban centers. Only Scythopolis lies within twenty five km of Galilee. But with the founding of Sepphoris and Tiberias, no area of Galilee lies outside a twenty-five km radius of these two minor urban centers. Therefore Tiberias and Sepphoris must be seen as minor urban centers, dominating the agricultural landscape of the Galilee, but not large enough to attract substantial international trade.349

348. See Finley, Ancient Economy, 128:
Water transport, in short, and especially sea transport, created radical new possibilities for the ancient town. In the first place, imports of food and other bulk commodities permitted a substantial increase in the size of the population, no longer held down by the limiting factor of local agricultural production, and an improvement in the quality of life, through a greater variety of goods, a greater abundance of slave labour for domestic as well as productive work. Both population and amenities would then be further stimulated by the inevitable attraction of a secondary population, craftsmen, entertainers, artists, teachers and tourists. There might also be a feedback effect on the countryside in that imported necessities allowed more efficient exploitation of larger landholdings (though not of peasant holdings) through specialization, not really possible in more or less isolated, self-sufficient communities.

This suggests that the Roman partition of Palestine was a very wise strategic move: by parcelling off political jurisdictions, in an economy based on tributary extraction of surplus, Augustus thereby ensured, with such fragmentation at a political level, a far more concentrated and penetrating economic exploitation. The foundation of Tiberias, then, should be seen as a deliberate part of Roman-Herodian policy, and one which had a decisive and dramatic effect on the surrounding countryside, which had, prior to this foundation, lived in relative smallholder autonomy, protected by geography and the constraints on ancient transport from severe exploitation by Roman or Hellenistic powers based even as close by as Sepphoris. The moment the brand-new city of Tiberias went up, however, there would have been a sudden and dramatic effect on the countryside around the lake, and, to a lesser degree, in Upper Galilee. In particular, we would expect this region to experience a drift of goods toward the city (with attendant social effects at the village level), a (forcible) reorientation of agriculture toward urban consumption, progressive monetization of the economy, more frequent use of hired labour, greater efficacy in the extraction of taxes and other dues, incremental concentration of land with resultant tenancy and loss of smallholdings,350 cash-cropping and specialization,351 greater trade, and a noticeable polarizing of the divide between the relatively wealthy and the very poor; in short, an incremental reduction, at a variety of levels, in the rural peasantry's standard of living.352

350. See Fiensy, Land is Mine, 23.
351. See Finley, Ancient Economy, 106-107, on the way in which subsistence farming encouraged variety rather than specialization.
352. See the crisp summary of the economic effects of commercialization in John H. Kautsky, The Politics of Aristocratic Empires (Chapel Hill, N.C.: University of North Carolina Press, 1982), 34-35: Nor does agriculture, the economic basis of the old traditional; aristocratic empire, remain unaffected. If the landed aristocracy wants to buy the products newly made available by trade, whether by exchanging money or agricultural products for them, peasants, who may now pay their dues in cash rather than in kind, must contribute a bigger surplus out of their labor than was needed to support the aristocracy before. This can lead to more extensive and intensive agriculture, to peasant indebtedness, the alienability of land and its sale as a commodity, and the division of the peasantry into landed and landless segments. All these are symptoms that tend to accompany commercialization.
SOCIAL EFFECTS ON GALILEAN VILLAGE LIFE (CONCLUSION)

The effects on these (relatively sudden) changes unquestionably had a significant impact on the social organization of the villages, forcing as much of a concomitant reconfiguration and reconsideration of social roles as of economic behaviour. It is obvious that the villages were not communistically oriented prior to Roman/Herodian rule and the establishment of Tiberias. Whatever else he did, Antipas did not dismantle paradise. Class differences (and distinctions) had long existed in the villages, in spite of their relative autonomy and their subsistence-orientation.353 Houses were of different sizes and quality.354 Some land was better than other land, because of its agricultural character or, as discussed above, merely because of its relative proximity to the settlement. Plots were different sizes. Some specialization of produce had already begun centuries before: orchards and oil presses were not the prerogative of everyone, nor did they benefit everyone. And some export trade to the Phoenician coast — including grain — is attested from Ptolemaic times.355

One should thus not be misled by the rhetoric of Q itself, nor by the panegyrics on smallholder life offered by Horsley, Fiensy, and others:356 the old-fashioned ideals

355. See Westermann and Hasenoehr, Zenon Papyri, vol.1, #2 (6-7; transl., 9), which records camel caravans travelling from Sidon to Galilee and vice-versa, and carrying grain between these locations.
356. Horsley, Galilee, 196-201 (cf. Archaeology, 74-75), for instance, implies that the fundamental social distinction in village life was simply that between men and women, and that even this distinction did not really amount to much.
and practices of the pre-Herodian period did indeed both conceal and foster class distinctions, and did indeed benefit a relatively elite sector of the local populace. At the risk of being circular, it is nevertheless worth pointing out that Q takes for granted the *legitimate* existence of rich and poor, of creditors and debtors, as well as the more obvious distinctions between men and women, children and parents. Those with greater resources could increase their wealth and their access to luxury items by exporting their surplus to the coast, a practice we *know* took place. They could afford to devote less of their time and personal labour to the maintenance of their lands, and perhaps even hire some of their fellow villagers as laborers during peak periods. They could serve as patrons or benefactors at a local level, and thus bolster their social status and local prestige. Finally, in consequence of all of these factors, their political position within the village would be one of leadership.357 This kind of phenomenon must necessarily have been somewhat variegated: more or less absent and/or unofficial in tiny settlements, exaggerated and/or formalized in larger ones, and shared by a greater or smaller number of prominent families.358 In the case of larger villages and towns, with several prominent families, with diverse economic circumstances and plot sizes, with some specialization, with some occasional hiring of labor or perhaps tenancy, and with at least nominal attachment to an outside power (Egypt, Syria, Judea, depending on circumstances), a local administrative apparatus was required. The (necessarily limited) political affairs of such communities were conducted by a collection of elders — some of whom, perhaps, from time to time bore the title of *κωμαρχής* or something similar.

357. At a slightly later period, perhaps John of Gischala was just such a local "strong man." See Josephus' description of him in *B.J.* 4.84-85 (Loeb 3.27).
358. See Schürer, *History of the Jewish People*, v.2, 184-190, for a general description of city and village administrative structures, and the sources from which such a description can be derived.
—,359 their legal affairs by magistrates,360 while their total polity and community life was expressed in gatherings of village assemblies.361

Under such circumstances, even the most (de facto) autonomous of towns required various ("official" and witnessed) bills of sale, petitions, contracts, marriage agreements, wills, and so forth, as well as an apparatus for the administration of justice. Thus, in addition to local strong men and affluent families, a small class of literate administrators were essential to the smooth functioning of the region even prior to Roman-Herodian city-building. Such a role was normally filled by the so-called "village clerk," the κωμογραμματεύς. We have fairly extensive evidence from Egypt for the presence and function of these figures,362 and some indications that they were a feature of Palestinian village life as well.363 As the title indicates, their primary task

359. As was certainly the case in Egypt. See SEG 33 #1359; Hunt and Edgar, Select Papyri #2 204 (v.2, 35).
360. For the apparent presence of magistrates in villages, see SEG XIX #476 (164-165), side C lines 20-21; Josephus, Ant 18.37 (Loeb 9.31): some of those forcibly drafted from the countryside to populate Tiberias were magistrates (τινες δὲ καὶ τῶν ἐν τῇδε).
361. Thus the argument that the "synagogue," in its inception, was simply such an assembly, rather than a distinctively religious institution. See, e.g., Horsley, "Historical Jesus and Archaeology of the Galilee," 113:

It is increasingly evident that the buildings identified as "synagogues" in the villages and towns of Galilee date from the mid-third century CE and after. I explored the implications of the lack of archaeological evidence for synagogue buildings for earlier periods in a 1989 SBL Annual Meeting paper (publication forthcoming). The most important point is that the synagogue in Mark and Q (and in Matthew and Luke, except 7:4) are clearly not religious buildings but local village assemblies (as in the meaning of the Greek word!). Other important points are that there is no indication in Mark and Q and Luke, and I would argue also not in Matthew as well, that the Pharisees were leaders of the synagogue or that there was any conflict between the synagogue and the Jesus movement(s) (vs. Kee 1990).

362. See SEG 33 #1359; Hunt and Edgar, Select Papyri #2 204, 275-277, 339 (v.2, 34-39, 250-259, 392-393); Westerman and Hasenhoerl, Zenon Papyri, #54.28 (vol.1, 135; transl., 143); #55.2 (vol.1, 147; transl. 149); William Linn Westermann, Clinton Walker Keyes, and Herbert Liebesny, Zenon Papyri: Business Papers of the Third Century B.C. Dealing with Palestine and Egypt, vol.2 (New York: Columbia University Press, 1940), #90.4 (105; transl. 106). See also Hunt and Edgar, Select Papyri #56 (v.1, 171), for an illiteracy formula suggesting the use of a scribe in the composition of a document.
was writing: composing various official documents for those unable to write;\textsuperscript{364} forwarding petitions to the appropriate officials;\textsuperscript{365} but also ensuring the execution of legal responsibilities,\textsuperscript{366} and serving as witnesses,\textsuperscript{367} middlemen,\textsuperscript{368} or accountants\textsuperscript{369} for persons with extensive business dealings. These administrators would not be found in every settlement, and could not have been very numerous even in larger settlements.\textsuperscript{370} Thus a single scribe might very well have serviced a cluster of villages, and inhabitants of smaller settlements, when seeking justice, preparing documents, or pursuing other official business, had to travel to the nearest settlement that had a scribe. These duties did not occupy the scribes full-time. They were as engaged by agricultural production as their fellow villagers, and were drawn from the local peasantry itself.\textsuperscript{371} with whom they probably, to some degree, identified. At the same time, however, their roles involved a measure of prestige and power, at least within the village and its immediate area.\textsuperscript{372} These administrators thus occupied a middle position between the

\textsuperscript{364} See Select Papyri #56 (v. 1, 171), a bill of sale attesting to the legitimate handing over of all rights to crushing and grinding instruments from an inherited farm: "I, Aurelias Sarapion son of Julianus, of Alexandria, dwelling in the same village, have written for her, as she is illiterate."

\textsuperscript{365} See Hunt and Edgar, Select Papyri, #204 (v.2, 35); #275-77 (v.2, 251-259).

\textsuperscript{366} See Hunt and Edgar, Select Papyri, #276 (v.2, 255); Westermann, Keyes, and Liebesny, Zenon Papyri, vol.2, #90.4 (105; transl. 106). In the latter text, the village scribe, together with the royal scribe, have found items missing from a property inventory, and are compelling the person deemed responsible to replace them or pay for them.

\textsuperscript{367} See Westermann and Hasenhoerl, Zenon Papyri, vol. 1 #54.28 (135; transl. 143).

\textsuperscript{368} See Westermann and Hasenhoerl, Zenon Papyri, vol.1, #55.2 (147; transl. 149): "Etearchos, son of Kleon, Elenian, acknowledges receipt from Anosis, village secretary, of 40 metretes of sweet wine from the grant estate of Appolonius near Philadelphia . . . ."

\textsuperscript{369} Westermann, Keyes, and Liebesny, Zenon Papyri, vol.2, #90.4 (105; transl. 106).

\textsuperscript{370} Philadelphia in Egypt apparently had only have one village scribe. Anosis, whose duties appear also to have embraced Zenon's extensive business dealings.

\textsuperscript{371} The duties of Menches, of Kerkeosiris in Egypt in 119 BCE, involve the cultivation of a set parcel of land in addition to his administrative obligations (Hunt and Edgar, Select Papyri, #339 [v.2, 393]). Local origin of such figures would explain the scorn implied by the Josephan references to village scribes, on which see below, p. 319.

\textsuperscript{372} As attested by apparent "bidding" for the position in Egypt. See Menches' willingness to pay high rent on unproductive land in exchange for the appointment, Hunt and Edgar, Select Papyri, #339 (v.2, 393).
average smallholder and the larger landowners who dominated village life and whose interests the scribes tended to represent. They therefore form something of a rudimentary retainer class, who mediated between the people and the upper classes, and who, in so doing, sought to maximize their own power and privileges.\footnote{373}

The relative loss of local autonomy brought about by Antipas’ administration would probably have affected the social roles and the perceptions of these village scribes more than anyone else. As Kautsky notes about peasant responses to change, [they]\footnote{374} peasants] must become aware of changes affecting their conditions for better or for worse if they occur quickly enough to provide an opportunity for comparison with preceding conditions. Thus, crop failure, particularly when not accompanied by a reduction of taxes, or an increase in taxes imposed upon them are obviously felt by peasants and are likely to be resented. As Barrington Moore puts it: “Economic deterioration by slow degrees can become accepted by its victims as part of the normal situation. Especially where no alternative is clearly visible, more and more privation can gradually find acceptance in the peasants’ standards of what is right and proper. What infuriates peasants (and not just peasants) is a new and sudden imposition or demand that strikes many people at once and that is a break with accepted rules and customs.”

The foundation of Tiberias probably did in fact have a fairly dramatic and immediate effect on the settlements within its orbit.\footnote{375} But the incremental deterioration of smallholders’ circumstances, as it has been described in this chapter, took place \textit{primarily} through a serious of processes that were relatively slow, cumulative, and methodic: debt, monetization, trade, gradual loss of title to the land (without necessarily loss of its occupancy). If Kautsky and Moore are correct, not much of a reaction is to be expected from the peasantry under these circumstances.


\footnote{375. Josephus’ account (\textit{Ant.} 18.37 [Loeb 9.31]) of its forcible settlement is a case in point.}
Those who, however, were the victims of (relatively) sudden change, of new impositions and demands that did indeed "break with accepted rules and customs," were the few and scattered individuals charged with administration of a defunct system. With the transfer and centralization of wealth and power to the new cities, their mediating status is lost. Their patrons and masters have transferred their allegiances (and residences!) to these cities, leaving the scribes behind to make do, alongside the small peasantry, in the countryside, away from the centers of power. They have been transformed into local clerks charged with little more than supervising the intensified exploitation of their compatriots. This new situation, in addition to involving a considerable curtailment of function and a loss of prestige, also places these figures in a tenuous position among their neighbors. Still charged with a mediating position, they must now serve the villagers as functionaries for and representatives, not of the local strong men or leading families, who may both serve as respected community patrons and as nearby sources of power and authority in cases of conflict, but of the distant and hated city. Like the tax collectors who figure so prominently in the narrative story of Jesus, they are forced to play the role of the enemy within. Abandoned by their patrons, perhaps resented by their charges, with considerable loss of power and diminution of roles, these individuals both increasingly identify with the

376. Josephus (Ant. 18.37-38 [Loeb 9.31]) complains of Antipas populating the new city of Tiberias with rabble, but the text clearly indicates that these poorer individuals were brought in to supplement the population, not to comprise it entirely. What so scandalizes Josephus is not that the population of Tiberias is uniformly poor, but that any of its citizenry is poor.

377. For a sense of their diminution in status as a result of falling within the orbit of the cities, note the scorn of the references in Josephus, B.J. 1.479 (Loeb 2.227); Ant 16.203 (Loeb 8.291).

378. It is sheer speculation, but given the training and position of the figure of the κυριογραμματεύς, especially the evidence that they were responsible for the execution of some legal orders, is it not possible that they would have made ideal local due collectors (rents or taxes) on behalf of the cities? If so, could not the references embedded in the narrative tradition to tax collectors among the companions and followers of Jesus be testimony to the involvement of village scribes in the formative stages of the Jesus traditions?

379. Including supplantation by urban bureaucrats, such as the agronomos attested on the weight found at Sepphoris. For a description and photograph, see Meyers, Netzer, and Meyers, "Sepphoris," 16-17.
progressively-exploited peasantry, yet are alienated from them and, indeed, participate in their exploitation.

Of course the relative autonomy of the village as a whole (not only that of its administrators) was affected, and this is nowhere more evident than in the gradual transformation of the role of synagogues. As Horsley argues, the "synagogue" as an institution predates identifiable remains of synagogue buildings. The tendency over the centuries was toward a more explicitly Jewish and explicitly religious function. This is reflected architecturally from the third to fourth centuries CE, as what appear to be simply public buildings are increasingly marked by distinctively religious designs. But literary evidence (the NT and Rabbinic literature) indicates that these changes may have come earlier, as rabbis and other religious leaders came to dominate these assemblies. In first-century Galilee, before the war, it is probable that the term "synagogue" retained its primarily political connotation of local assembly, at least in the cities. The gradual transformation of these institutions into self-consciously and explicitly religious bodies, however, attests to their relentless removal from practical functionality. The local assemblies atrophied, and came to serve little purpose beyond the affirmation of communal identity made in religious worship. Relative prosperity was also affected, and this was undoubtedly felt. Economic changes of this sort, even incremental ones, did indeed breed resentments, as is evident from persistence of the rural/urban divide, the continuation of widespread banditry, and the willingness of Galileans to participate in the war against the Romans.

381. See Josephus, Vita, 277 ff. (Loeb 1.103 ff.).
382. As evinced at length in the behaviour of "the Galileans" (as opposed to the residents of Tiberias) recounted throughout Josephus' Vita; and as evinced in the Rabbinic segregation of and scorn for the amme haaretz.
Other major changes were cultural. Several scholars have appealed to the routine anthropological distinction between the "Great Tradition" and the "Little Tradition" in attempting to chart these changes. The terms, however, are routinely misapplied, either to refer to the distinction between the actual behaviour of the ruling classes (great tradition) and the ideal values that characterize the society (little tradition), or to distinguish between the elite documentary compositions (great tradition) and the oral traditions that preceded them (little tradition). The little tradition in fact is simply the popular reflection, appropriation, and distortion or subversion of "high culture"; it is not a pre-existing "authentic" culture over which the upper classes ride roughshod to accomplish their nefarious aims. The "Little Tradition" is always, by definition, inferior. On the other hand, an intensified ideology of patronage would have been accelerated by the more sharply hierarchical character of the relationship between city qua city and country qua country. Such an ideology would have served the interests of the urban elites by reorienting and fragmenting class (or, if one prefers, regional) loyalties:

Patronage works by distributing resources and services preferentially to some of the poor but not others, and the ideal rural client (from the patron's perspective) is concerned with his own interests to the exclusion of those of his fellows. It may be that we should see the ideology of patronage as subverting village solidarity in some areas of the ancient world. Patronage provides an

383. See, e.g., Fiensy, Land is Mine, 23: "According to the Great Tradition, all land in principle and the best land in fact belonged to the elites."
384. Horsley, Archaeology, 172-175.
385. A case in point is Q's reference to Solomon's glory (Q 12:27), which is used as a proverbial and commonly-known instance of sartorial distinction. The reference is not clearly derived from, or in explicit reference to, a written source, and yet it is unrealistic to imagine that interest in the figure of Solomon ultimately stems from any location other than the Hebrew Bible. In this instance, some features of this text have simply been disseminated in oral form, and have thus come to assume an oral or proverbial character. Compare the phrase "to be, or not to be" in current usage.
alternative or a supplement to reciprocity within kinship groups and between status equals."  

The process is actually reciprocal: as village solidarity is eroded, opportunities for elite patronage increase, which, in their turn, further erode village solidarity.

It is first and foremost, as I have argued, the village scribe — the κωμογραμματεύς — from the previously (de facto) autonomous towns newly within the sphere of Tiberias ("the Valley") who will have been aware of these changes, most affected by them, most resentful of them, and thus most inclined to react in some fashion. While perhaps alienated from the populace by virtue of their involuntary complicity in the "new order," what sources exist, suggest that there was enough general resentment of the social, economic, and cultural changes enforced by the new regime for these scribes to imagine that their indignation was generally shared by their fellow villagers, and thus that their response to the situation would be shared as well. As numerous studies have shown, dependent peasantries only rarely rise in open revolt, even when conditions are deteriorating. More typically, the response to deterioration in conditions — and it should be stressed that most innovations initiated by the elites bring deterioration (for the peasant, that is) with them — is a variety of forms of relatively


Well, I may be asked on behalf of peasants, aren't they allowed to get help for themselves? Certainly, would be my reply, provided that it is not illegal but never any that is evil. First there is that from the gods, which may be gained by prayers and acts of worship. Then there is that from water: if it does harm it is shut off, but if it is likely to be of assistance it is let in. They can even make their masters (kyrious) more kindly disposed towards them, so as either to allow a remission of debts, or even to offer a grant and again, if they ever have need to have recourse to law between each other, they should approach the owner . . . "Well," it may be said, "what happens if the landlord is incapable of doing the job, and some more powerful personage is needed?" Then let the peasant tell the master, and he tell this other. You, my man, make your request to him, and let him pass it on. You could get help in this way, and he would suffer no harm since the proper order of precedence in such matters remains firmly fixed.
passive resistance: "foot-dragging, dissimulation, desertion, false compliance, pilfering, feigned ignorance, slander, arson, and so on." 387 We should thus expect a response of roughly this sort — a kind of bullheaded passive resistance — from the general population of "the Valley" in response to what appears to have been an event of major political and economic import, the founding of Tiberias. We should further expect that among those in a position to be most vocal and creative in their resistance will be the village scribes, a class of persons dramatically uprooted in their social and professional standing by the extended process set in motion by Antipas, and moreover, a literate class, trained in the administration of village life.

Chapter 6
The Rhetoric of Deracination in Q:
A Reassessment of An Ideological Trope

At some, perhaps excruciating, length, the various twists and permutations of the
itinerancy hypothesis and its history have been recounted in the foregoing pages. This
basic theory has been, and remains, the main scholarly approach to Q’s social history
and to its rhetoric of inversion and upheaval. The development of this hypothesis, and
its intimate association with the cultural politics of its desultory advocates, betrays a
certain timeliness, which one might suspect has had as much or more to do with the
hypothesis’ enormous popularity as does the cogency of its treatment of the evidence.
In fact, its treatment of the evidence is not especially cogent: none of the texts normally
adduced for traces of early Christian Wanderradikalismus — especially the Didache, Q,
and the Gospel of Thomas — provide unequivocal evidence of the phenomenon. Several
of these texts — not all — do appear to refer to travel, but what animates these discus-
sions is the problem of hospitality, as well as the question of the status and renumera-
tion of an emergent clergy. These are exactly the kinds of matters we would expect to
crop up in the ordinary course of the church’s evolution: a phenomenon as unique or
dramatic as itinerancy is superfluous. At the very least, the texts in question do not
compel itinerancy to explain their contents — other readings are possible. Moreover,
the hypothesis is broadly unrealistic and unaccountable, a fatal flaw in a viewpoint
which aims to be at least proto-sociological. There is no especially good reason offered
why people in first-century Palestine suddenly decided to take on the role of roving
beggar, nor why they rationalized that role in the terms offered by the Jesus-movement,
Theissen’s various excessively broad and vague "factors" notwithstanding. No explana-
tion is offered how such travelling might be funded, where the surplus for their support would come from, or how people might react to them or their impositions. In spite of possible Cynic parallels, the thesis appears to draw its real force from a credulous appropriation of the image of the ancient Hebrew prophets. Too little attention, on the other hand, is paid to the Hellenistic literary precedents for presenting a god or hero as itinerant (Herakles, Asklepius/Hippocrates, Apollonius, etc.), so that Jesus' peripatetic behaviour in the gospels is normally granted unquestioned assent.

The foregoing discussion has also addressed the concrete context in which the earliest Jesus movement appeared, viz., Galilee before the War. Here again, nothing very extraordinary need be posited. A Roman policy of "urbanization," pursued in other locations as well, was adopted in Galilee by Herod Antipas, the Roman client "king." The intention of this policy was to allow the resources of otherwise-inaccessible hinterland to be tapped more effectively, to the benefit of the Imperial administration and of the local upper classes. The foundation of Tiberias, in particular, formed the basis for a more effective incorporation of the region to the immediate west of the lake into the economic orbit of the Empire. The result, for the smallholders in that hitherto rather autonomous area, was a more effective collection of taxes, a progressive monetization of the economy, increased trade, increased cash-cropping, and increased consolidation of holdings and consequent tenancy. The economy of "the Valley" was thus rather suddenly and forcefully pushed from a local and subsistence-oriented organization to an "open," outward-oriented market economy (or proto-market economy, to avoid overstating the case). These changes were to the obvious detriment of the small peasantry, instituting the beginning of a cycle of incremental deprivation. Even more affected than the ordinary peasantry, at least in terms of immediate, visible, and dramatic consequences, was the small class of local administrators, a retainer class for
an older order which was suddenly defunct. These figures had the most to lose, at least at first glance, from the changes taking place, and had a certain amount of education and administrative experience.

In such a context, itinerancy is by no means absolutely precluded. Indeed, the trading patterns of the Galilee as discussed in the last chapter, both before and after Antipas' administration, suggest that travel within the region was not especially remarkable. And economic dislocation of a sort certainly was taking place, although, arguably, not in a way commensurate with Theissen's catastrophic generalities. But the mere physical possibility of itinerancy does not make the evidence for its actual occurrence any better, nor does it make the overall hypothesis any more realistic. The economic and concomitant social dislocations described in the last chapter do not form much of a platform on which to erect a thesis of wandering radicals: as the primary discernible social disturbance of the general time and place of Q's composition (and that, presumably, of the first stages of the sayings tradition), which might plausibly constitute its primary Sitz im Leben, it is simply not reflected in the rhetoric and ideology of Wanderradikalismus as reconstructed by Theissen. What this suggests is that a more fruitful, and less circular, direction for research would, as I have already argued, begin with this situation, the evidence for which is independent of Q itself, interrogate its relationship to the composition of Q, and assess Q's arguments, rhetoric, and ideology in terms of that relationship.

**THE IMMEDIATE SETTING OF Q**

Thus the first question of import linking the composition of Q to the situation described in the last chapter is that of the immediate circumstances of Q's composition, viz., where and when it was collected and written down, and by what kinds of people.
The (internal) evidence provided by Q itself suggests an immediate setting in Galilee before the war, probably among the towns and villages of the upper rim of the lake, and further suggests that the cultivation and composition of the Q traditions was undertaken by persons with the characteristics of the κωμογραμματεύς, that is, by rural scribal figures who were moderately, but not spectacularly, educated. Such conclusions would place Q squarely in the midst of the socio-economic changes and dislocations surrounding the foundation of Tiberias, and would suggest that these events did indeed constitute the formative social matrix out of which Q arose.

The geographical location of the people responsible for Q, and thus probably also the location of Q's composition, is normally fixed in Galilee, and with fairly good reason. Of the places named by Q, a significant preponderance are Galilean or Phoenician: Bethsaida (Q 10:13), Capernaum (7:1; 10:15), Chorazin (10:13), Sidon (10:13-14), and Tyre (10:13-14). Jerusalem (4:9; 13:34), Nineveh (11:32), and Sodom (10:12) are also mentioned, but their significance is intertextual — symbolic or thematic — rather than immediate; they occur in the context of references to epic or mythic events: Jesus’ temptation by Satan, hypostasized Wisdom’s transtemporal

lament, the biblical-epic Jonah story, and the biblical legend of the destruction of Sodom. As Reed elucidates it,

The mention of Jerusalem in the lament in Q 13:34-35 provides an example: here Jerusalem is not merely the capital of Judaea, nor the city perched along the Kidron Valley, nor even that point in Palestine where thirty-one degrees north latitude and thirty-five degrees east longitude intersect. Rather Jerusalem is personified as a character in the Q community’s reading of Israel’s epic.

The only places mentioned in Q as real places known, and of immediate significance, to the (fictive) speakers and (real) "hearers" of Q are Galilean towns and villages on the northern rim of the lake, as well as perhaps the two Phoenician cities of Tyre and Sidon.

The significance of the mention of these Galilean towns is compounded by their relative obscurity, especially that of Chorazin. Chorazin, in fact, plays no role elsewhere in the gospel tradition. Thus the appearance of these towns in Q is unlikely to

2. On Q’s "narrative world" (as opposed to its real world), derived from sacred story and employing cities of biblical repute as negative exemplars, as sites of corruption, see Kloppenborg "City and Wasteland," 144, 150-154; Reed, "Sign of Jonah," 130-131; "Social Map," 18. Of course, as Kloppenborg stresses, there is a "real" dimension to this distrust of urban centers lurking behind this symbolic usage.


4. Unlike Jerusalem, Nineveh, and Sodom, the two Phoenician cities are not associated in the text of Q with particular mythic tropes or biblical legends, so their significance is not necessarily textually (as opposed to experientially) based. Of course, Tyre and Sidon are among the main cities of any significant size proximate to, and linked with, the northern end of Galilee. Reference to them would tend to confirm a northern Galilean origin for Q. However, the two cities may — like Jerusalem, Nineveh, and Sodom — have some symbolic or epic force: in the context of Q, the mention they receive is associated (at least by implication) with a kind of proverbial wickedness. Reed, "Social Map," 21-22, includes Tyre and Sidon alongside the more obviously literary/imaginative references to specific locations: "Israel, Sodom, Tyre and Sidon, Nineveh, and Jerusalem can each claim an important role in the Israelite epic imagination, and they can each boast a long literary pedigree in the Hebrew Bible as well as in other Graeco-Roman and ancient Near Eastern texts."

5. So Havener, Sayings of Jesus, 43; Reed, "Social Map," 22; Schenk, "Verwünschung der Küstenorte": Tuckett, Q and the History of Early Christianity, 102.

6. Havener, Sayings of Jesus, 43: “The naming of the towns of Chorazin and Bethsaida is particularly significant, because these towns play no role elsewhere in the Synoptic tradition and their mention in passing suggests familiarity with the area and, perhaps, the places from which these materials came.” See also Tuckett, Q and the History of Early Christianity, 102. The claim that Bethsaida plays no role elsewhere in the Synoptic tradition is erroneous. Chorazin appears in the entire NT only in Q, but Bethsaida, a larger city/town, aside from its appearance in Q, occurs in Mark 6:45; 8:22; Luke 9:10; John 1:44; 12:21.
be a consequence of any general repute or firm place within the traditions about Jesus they might have possessed. In any case, as a sayings collection, Q is not under the same obligation as the narrative gospels to lend its contents verisimilitude by specifying the (Galilean) locales in which Jesus must have appeared. Contrast, for instance, Q's various references to actual places with the flawless atopicality of the *Gospel of Thomas.* Moreover, the extreme localization of these references (the three Galilean towns mentioned are within about 5 km of one another) contrasts sharply with what is found in the narrative gospels, which tend to scatter topical references (comparatively) widely throughout Galilee, Gaulanitis, Samaria, and Judea.

On the other hand, these local Galilean references, including the references to Tyre and Sidon, are, for the most part, restricted to a single pericope: the woes on the unrepentant cities (Q 10:13-15) that conclude the so-called "Mission Charge." Tuckett therefore cautions:

> The evidence is, of course, not conclusive, above all since it is virtually confined to one unit, the woes in Q 10:13-15. Hence the place names there may indicate that only that individual tradition, rather then [*sic*] the whole of Q, stems from such a locale.

The situation is complicated further by the literary stratification of Q. If indeed Q is to be divided into (more or less) discrete instructional and polemical compositional layers along the lines suggested by Kloppenborg, this unit *certainly* belongs to the secondary

---

7. Saying #60 comes closest to specifying locations: "A Samaritan [was] carrying a lamb and going to Judea." The saying does not locate the event it describes, however, and is surprisingly vague. If the underlying point involves the sacrifice of the lamb, we would at least expect that Samaritan’s destination to specified as "Jerusalem," rather than simply as "Judea."

stratum. Since the peculiar types of inversionary "ethical" injunctions and encomia on detachment from cultural norms — the supposed "social radicalism" — that characterize Q's rhetoric of deracination are largely restricted to the first stratum of Q, it is disconcerting that practically the only material which allows a localization of the Q traditions is from its second stratum. Although most recent studies of the relationship between Q's strata and the history of their development have assumed a social continuity between them, this assumption — although probably correct — has yet to

9. See Kloppenborg, *Formation*, esp.195-196, 199-200, 243. The stratification of Q proposed by Kloppenborg and independently confirmed, at least in some respects, by Piper, *Wisdom in the Q-Tradition* (on which see Kloppenborg, "Sayings Gospel Q: Literary and Stratigraphical Problems," 50-51; James M. Robinson, "The Q Trajectory: Between John and Matthew Via Jesus," pp.173-194 in *The Future of Early Christianity* [Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991], 186), is adopted in the argument of the present chapter. The assumption of such a stratification, it may be noted, is not absolutely necessary to much of the argument, however, since the material that falls under the rubric of the "rhetoric of deracination" derives almost exclusively from Q's putative first stratum. The material in Q's second stratum certainly attests to conflict, dissension, and rejection, but is quite straightforward in its expressions and rationalization of this phenomenon. Simple failure and consequent polemical rejoinder are sufficient explanations for this language: itinerancy is not at issue. This restriction of a particular type of language to one, and only one, stratum of Q should, of course, only serve to underscore the thematic unity and distinction of each of the layers of Q as they have been reconstructed by Kloppenborg.

10. Most strikingly, Mack, "Kingdom that Didn't Come": *Lost Gospel*. In both pieces, he traces the social history of the people responsible for Q through these strata, taking the orientational shifts from one layer to another as indicative of the experiences of the group. See also Kloppenborg, "Literary Convention," who traces Q's history in a similar way.

11. For instance, Kloppenborg, "Literary Convention," 100, notes that Q is dominated at each of its stages by a scribal ethos. Likewise, although the orientation of the Q material changes sufficiently from one stratum to the next to allow their differences to be recognized, there remains a striking degree of continuity: the redaction of Q, for instance, was apparently quite sanguine with retaining the material of the compositional layer rather than drafting an entirely new document, and usually with retaining, moreover, its essential literary/argumentative integrity; the presentation of Jesus as primarily a teacher does not change from one layer to the next; the broad generic parameters remain the essentially the same in spite of changing preferences in the form of its constituent materials; a rural (or at least anti-urban) ethos persists among the strata; a strong interest in wisdom, first proverbial, then mythological, is maintained. Moreover, the changes from one stratum to the next are easily accounted for in terms of a rather predictable set of experiences on the part of a single community responsible, at different stages, for their respective composition.
Rhetoric of Deracination

be demonstrated. And to the best of my knowledge no one has shown or even argued that such a social continuity would also necessarily imply geographical continuity in the group’s location. In consequence, one could conceivably argue that Q 10:13-15 only tells us where one of the traditions of Q came from, and a secondary tradition at that, potentially unrelated to the layer from which the radical ethos of Q is derived.

Several factors, however, militate against such a conclusion. Q’s links to other writings likely to have derived from Syria, such as Matthew and the Gospel of Thomas, might reinforce the suggestion of a Galilean provenance. In addition, Jonathan Reed has ingeniously noted the geographical significance of the “Sign of Jonah” pericope (Q 11:29-32), arguing that:

One of the most neglected aspects of the study of the Sign of Jonah pericope is that Jonah was not only a northern prophet, but a Galilean prophet, and that there were local traditions which attest to his significance in the Galilee. The importance of the Galilean connection is not only obvious for the saying if it is authentic, since Jesus’ activity is surely to be placed in the Galilee, but also because his first followers who compiled and created Q should be placed there.

12. See Kloppenborg, “Sayings Gospel Q: Literary and Stratigraphic Problems,” 57-58:

There are still many open questions. 1. If one presumes that the formative layer of Q was fundamentally hortatory and deliberative in character and the polemical layer secondary (from a literary, though not necessarily tradition-historical standpoint), it is still necessary to specify the conditions under which components of the polemical stratum formed — did this occur within a single “Q group” or not? — and to explain the circumstances under which the secondary redaction occurred. 2. If a stratigraphy along the lines suggested by Kloppenborg and Piper commends itself, it remains to be seen whether and how literary-critical observations might be coordinated with social-historical inferences. Do the two stratum [sic] in Q reflect two stages of development? Or are they simply two distinct but contemporaneous “moments” in the life of a group or network?

13. So Tuckett, Q and the History of Early Christianity, 102. If Matthew can indeed be located in Syria, especially in southern or south-western Syria, this may be a fairly strong argument: Matthew is likely in considerable social continuity with Q (on which see M. Eugene Boring, “The Convergence of Source Analysis, Social History, and Literary Structure in the Gospel of Matthew,” pp.587-611 in Eugene H. Lovering, Jr., ed., Society of Biblical Literature 1994 Seminar Papers [Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994], esp.587-589; Robinson, “Q Trajectory,” 193). The provenance of the Gospel of Thomas, however, may be less relevant, as Q and Thomas are unlikely to have any literary links. One may still make a case, however, that the extent to which they share parallel traditions militates for geographical proximity.

The (supposed) site of Jonah’s tomb was in Galilee, at Gath-Hepher, only two miles outside of Sepphoris along the road to Tiberias.15 The subsequent reference in the Q woes against the Pharisees (11:47-48) to building tombs for the prophets is possibly an allusion to this site in particular.16 Reed believes that the reference to Jonah in Q 11:29c (ei μη το σημειον Ἰωνα) is original to the tradition about Jesus’ response to requests for a sign, and has been deleted in the parallel Markan version (Mark 8:11-12; see v.12: ei δοθησεται τη γενεα ταυτη σημειον).17 Regardless of which of the two ver-

---

15. Reed, “Sign of Jonah,” 135-136. One should not, in my view, conclude from this proximity that the tradients of this pericope, or those of Q as a whole, were especially associated with the environs of Sepphoris. The import of Reed’s observation is that Jonah was deemed to be a hero with Galilean pedigree and was an object of local interest in this region; it is not that a Sepphorean origin is to be imputed to either Jonah or the Jonah-traditions.

16. Reed, “Sign of Jonah,” 136. Reed even suggests (“Sign of Jonah,” 138) that Jonah was associated in Galilean traditions with rebukes to Jerusalem, such as are offered in Q 13:34-35. He cites Vitae Prophetarum 10:10-11 and the proem to Lamentations Rabbah.


The main argument in support of this claim is that the linkage in Q between 11:29 and 11:31-32 depends on the catchword connections of Ἰωνας, Νινευταυς, and γενεας αυτης, which appear, however, in 11:30; thus the two units were combined because of the presence of 11:30, rather than 11:30 composed to join the units. If the association of 11:30 with 11:29 predates the compilation of this speech as a whole, Q’s version of 11:29c is required to suggest this expansion or elaboration in the first place. In addition, since the “son of man” title is normally used in secondary elaborations of sayings but never at the level of Q’s redaction (Schürmann, “Son of Man Title,” esp. 83-84; I have also suggested [William Arnal, “Redactional Fabrication and Group Legitimation: The Baptist’s Preaching in Q 3:7-9, 16-17.” pp.165-180 in John S. Kloppenborg, ed., Conflict and Invention: Literary, Rhetorical, and Social Studies on the Sayings Gospel Q (Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press International, 1995), 173, 178-179 n.17] that redactionally Q uses the title δ ἐρχόμενος as a replacement of and corrective to the earlier υιος του ἀνθρωπος, but this view does not appear to have attracted any support), the fact that 11:30 makes reference to the “son of man” may serve as an indication that it evolved, prior to the compilation of Q2, as commentary explicating 11:29, again supporting the originality of Q’s wording, as opposed to that of Mark. Mark abbreviated this original wording because “[t]his represents a lectio difficilior which, on the one hand, was omitted by Mark because it entailed a concession to Jesus’ opponents, and on the other, was elaborated in pre-Q tradition by the addition of an explicative phrase. Only then was 11:31-32 appended to the pronouncement story” (Kloppenborg, Formation, 130).

On the other hand, this entire line of development is accountable even if the Marcan wording was original. It is clear that the reference to the son of man makes 11:30 look like a pre-redactional explication of 11:29, and that the addition and formulation of 11:31-32, which exhibits the distinctive gender-pairing style of Q (Arnal, “Gendered Couplets”; Alicia Batten, “More Queries for Q: Women and
sions of the core of this pronouncement is original, it is clear that the various additions to it made prior to, and during, its incorporation into Q (i.e., 11:30, and 11:31-32) either create, or intensify, the focus of the pronouncement on Jonah. This suggests, then, a Galilean origin not only for the original core saying itself, but for its subsequent elaboration into the cluster now comprising Q 11:29-32.

These observations suggest another point. Q 7:1, one of the few doubly-attested narrative overtures in Q, records Jesus entering Capernaum; thus the Q references to the northern rim of the lake are not entirely restricted to 10:13-15. But what is especially interesting about this reference is that as a narrative clasp between the initial Q sermon (Q 6:20-49) and the story of the centurion's παῖς (Q 7:1-10), the description is likely to be a redactional creation: indeed, if one follows Kloppenborg's stratification of Q, the phrase is virtually certain to derive from the hand responsible for the second redaction of Q.18 The redactionally-formulated 11:31-32,19 likewise, may betray a

Christian Origins,* Biblical Theology Bulletin 24 [1994]: 44-51), is probably to be imputed to the hand responsible for Q's redaction. But this development might easily enough have also involved the addition of the exception clause to an originally categorical refusal of a sign. The greatest argument in favour of such a view is that several of the traditions incorporated into Q, most notably the woes on the unrepentant towns, but also Jesus' response to John (Q 7:19-23), and even the story of the Centurion in 7:1-10, impute considerable significance to signs and to "this generation's" steadfast refusal to take them properly into account. From such a perspective, which rates Jesus' "signs" as the indisputable proof of his identity, the Markan reading is in fact the lecture difficilior. It is easy to see how such a perspective would compel an emendation in the direction of the wording Q preserves. Also notable is Mark's peculiar phrasing, which eliminates the expected apodosis which should accompany a conditional εἰ-clause, apparently as a way of expressing strong negation ("would that this generation receive a sign!" or something along those lines; see BAGD, 219; F. Blass and A. Debrunner, A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature [revised and translated by Robert W. Funk; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961], 255, § 482, "Aposiopesis"). It is easy to see how such wording would suggest the exception clause (εἰ μὴ) of the Q version, or even perhaps generate a misreading of the text as positive or at least incomplete.

18. It not only forms a bridge between two larger sections, suggesting relatively late incorporation into the document, but also forms a bridge between a section from the first stratum (Q 6:20-49) and a section from the second stratum (Q 7:2-10, 19-35). Hence, as a clasp, it cannot be attributed to anything but the written composition of the second stage of Q.

19. Although not necessarily redactionally created. See n.17, above.
Galilean provenance in its emphasis on the Galilean prophet Jonah. Moreover, the woes of Q 10:13-15, so replete with references to the northern shore of the Sea of Galilee, are almost certainly representative of the latest stage in the composition of the Mission Charge, and are linked to the Mission Charge with a redactionally-formulated connector (i.e., Q 10:12). Again, if one follows the conventional stratification of Q, these additions must have been made at the stage of the Q2 redaction, because the earliest portions of the Mission Charge (Q 10:2-11, 16) were already incorporated, in written form, into Q1. Thus any later additions to the Mission Speech could not have occurred in oral transmission, but are products of the redactor of Q2, who, apparently, at this stage incorporated 10:13-15 and composed 10:12.

Thus all of the texts that actually mention northern Galilean place-names are late redactional creations and/or additions of the second stage compositor; and the emphasis on Jonah may belong, in part, to this stage as well. While this observation does not help us directly to locate the first stage of Q, it at least indicates that at one stage in its development, the people responsible for Q were probably located at the northern rim of the lake, especially around Capernaum, which is singled out for attention twice. The place-names are a product of this group's interests, not merely a reflection of the original provenance of some of the traditions incorporated into Q. In other words, because of the redactional character of the indications of locale that appear in Q, we

21. So Kloppenborg, Formation, 192-197, 243. By contrast, see Uro, Sheep Among Wolves, 98-116, who suggests that vv.2, 3, and 16 were added at later stages.
22. Note also that Kloppenborg, "City and Wasteland," esp.151, provides additional support for the view that the Q2 redactor composed 10:12, insofar as its concern with Sodom is matched by an over-arching Q2 interest in the symbol afforded by this proverbially evil town.
cannot attribute their appearance merely to the fact that some desultory Jesus traditions must (of course) have had their origin in Galilee.

Two further considerations suggest that the two main strata of Q derive from roughly the same geographical area, although on this question any conclusive verification is almost certain to remain elusive. First, Matthew's and Luke's appropriation of Q in virtually identical forms,23 and the document's subsequent disappearance, indicate that if Q did indeed have a three-stage compositional history, it probably only circulated beyond its immediate composers after that composition had reached its "final," i.e., tertiary, form. This evidence of very limited circulation of Q's first and second stages matches what we know of the production and publication of texts in antiquity: normally that circulation is quite restricted, and usually it moves along social links already established, at least at first. Thus if Q was so narrowly disseminated as to fail to survive apart from its incorporation into Matthew and Luke, and was known to those writings only in its final form, it seems relatively safe to assume that the first stage of Q's composition was not widely known at all. It is therefore also safe to assume that the accessibility of this text to the secondary redactors of Q — and their treatment of it as a foundational document in some need of supplementation — is indicative of the proximity, indeed identity (socially speaking), of the persons responsible for the first

23. This is the standard view, and is reflected in the near-verbatim agreement of some double-tradition material, as well as the similar sequences of material evinced by Matthew and Luke (on which see Vincent Taylor, "The Original Order of Q," pp.246-269 in New Testament Essays: Studies in Memory of T. W. Manson (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1959); Kloppenborg, Formation of Q, 64-80). Although some Q scholars have proposed divergent recensions as the cause for some of the differences between Matthew and Luke (e.g., esp. Sato, Q und Prophefte, 47-62; Lührmann, Redaktion, 105-121, has also proposed a significant expansion of the Q tradition received by Matthew), these proposals are speculative and, for the most part, gratuitous: the differences between Matthew and Luke are more economically explained by recourse to different redactional interests and independent omissions of Q material or additions of non-Q material. Too frequently Q\textsuperscript{Mt} looks very much like Matthew itself, and Q\textsuperscript{Lk} like Luke. See Tuckett, Q and the History of Early Christianity, 96-100.
layer with the persons responsible for the second. A second, admittedly peculiar, argument may be offered for the identification of the site of Q1 with that of Q2. The literary evidence is unanimous in suggesting that Jesus lived in Galilee, and that a major portion of his public activity took place along the northern shores of the lake. Without adopting the (mythic) Lukan model of the gradual and systematic spread of the Christian movement outward from its origins, it must be said that it appears unlikely that a group based in the north-western side of the lake which viewed Jesus as a founding-figure would have drawn traditions about him from outside of this geographical area. Obviously, this consideration is not probative, but it does serve to underscore the likelihood that the people responsible for Q2 were, more or less, the same people who were responsible for Q1. Thus a northern Galilean location — probably in the neighborhood of Capernaum — is indicated for both major stages of the document's literary history.

This conclusion already solves the problem whether Q is the product of a "rural" or an "urban" environment. In a sense, the question is anachronistic: to the extent that every city was dependent on its χώρα, to the extent that even the most urban of centres of necessity dealt largely with agricultural produce, and to the extent that neither Sepphoris nor Tiberias were exceptionally large, even by the standards of the day, everyone in Galilee, including the residents of Sepphoris and Tiberias, lived in a "rural" environment. Thus Jonathan Reed's attempt to associate Q's use of natural imagery with the bucolic romanticism of urbanites such as Virgil, expressing a desire to flee the confines of the city rather than a real intimacy with the natural world, is, in spite of

24. See also the arguments for the social continuity of Q1 and Q2 offered in n. 11, above.
25. And in fact may have lived in Capernaum. So Robinson, "Q Trajectory," 191, citing Q 7:1; 10:15; Mark 1:21; 2:1; John 2:12; 4:46.
some attractive features, is not convincing. Indeed, the character of the references to urban life is sufficiently limited that larger cities are probably not in view at all:

The particular amalgamation of urban imagery in Q provides considerable information about the Q community's perception of the city. None of the amenities that urban life offered, such as the baths or the theater, appears in Q. Although Q betrays an awareness of the city, the Q community does not seem to have scaled the social hierarchy of the city very high. Rather, the blend of images portrays a familiarity with those features of and places in the city open to the lower classes and those coming from outside the city: gates, plazas, streets, the agora, banks, and, in the worst case, courts and prisons.

Of course, this same description of Q's "urban" imagery could suggest two alternative conclusions, namely that the people responsible for Q did not live in one of the two larger Galilean cities, but rather encountered them as strangers, visitors, travelers; and that the setting in which the Q people did live lacked at least some "of the amenities that urban life offered," i.e., was a smaller town than either Sepphoris or Tiberias. The fact that Q fails to show any interest in the ultimate disposition of Tiberias or Sepphoris, even to the point of failing to single them out for criticism or to mention them at all, is hardly indicative of an origin in these cities, despite some creative suggestions

---

26. Reed, "Social Map," esp. 28-30, 36 n.57. One attractive feature of Reed's argument is the observation that peasants are unlikely either to romanticize their own work or to extol the virtues of "nature." While probably true, the observation misrepresents the use to which agricultural imagery is put in Q. In fact, the countryside is less romanticized than it is taken for granted. Like the references to urban transactions also noted by Reed (see esp.26-28), "rural" transactions are primarily used in exemplary ways: they are cited as familiar features of life from which argumentative conclusions may be drawn (see, e.g., Q/Luke 12:18; Q 12:24, 28; 12:54-56: there is nothing especially romantic about building granaries, about ravens, about grass being burned in the oven, about rainstorms). And, as Reed himself cannot help observing, many of the "romanticized" (i.e., paradigmatic or exemplary) transactions invoked by Q are not "natural," and could take place as much in "urban" settings as in "rural" ones (see, e.g., Q 11:9-13). But the real problem with Reed's argument remains that, unlike Virgil's Rome, Sepphoris and Tiberias are simply not large enough to be distanced from the rural exchanges which Reed imagines are presented as alternatives to their city life.

that have been made. We are thus compelled to surmise that the people responsible for Q — while they certainly lived in a settlement of sufficient size that relatively complex transactions were a commonplace, and while they may have had some experience of Sepphoris or Tiberias as *visitors* — lived in a town or village settlement of more moderate size. Even Reed, in spite of an inclination to stress the "urban" features of Q, draws similar conclusions, which are worth quoting in full:

To summarize: an analysis of the place-names in Q strongly suggests the importance of Capernaum to the Q community; and the remaining place-names, especially Chorazin and Bethsaida, the negative comparison with Tyre, and a suspicious view of Jerusalem confirm more broadly a Galilean perspective. The particular amalgamation of agricultural and urban imagery, especially the positive example of nature, makes good sense in the recently urbanized Galilee. Although I would not go so far as to locate the entire Q community in the cities of Sepphoris and Tiberias themselves based on spatial imagery, contact with these cities — illustrated primarily in the market and judicial imagery — on the part of the Q community is certain. Although perhaps more likely at home in such larger Galilean villages as Capernaum, or other sites on the north shore of the lake, the Q community perceived the major cities of Galilee with some apprehension — because they were visited by the members of the Q community.

Capernaum thus presents itself as the most attractive single possibility for the location of the people responsible for Q (at both major stages), but any of the towns, of vary-

---

28. Most especially by Schenk, "Verwünschung der Küstenorte." A failure to mention these cities because of their unresponsiveness to Q's message makes no sense, given the vehement denunciations of Capernaum, Bethsaida, and Chorazin. Cf. also Kloppenborg, "Literary Convention," 86, who appears to want to associate Q with toparchic centers (Tiberias, Sepphoris, Tarichaeae, Gabara) because of the probable density of administrative figures there. One might also note that the cultural/ethnic homogeneity presupposed in Q's bland and unelaborated references to Gentiles as negative examples (Q 6:33; 12:30) may point to a less "urban" environment. Kloppenborg, "Literary Convention," 87, has also suggested that the dislocations which prompted Q's radical ethos may have been a result of transfers of political jurisdiction, most notably that in which Sepphoris replaced Tiberias as the capital of Galilee in 54 CE (on which see Josephus, *Vita*, 38 [Loeb 1.17]).


31. Cf. also Kloppenborg, "Literary Convention," 86, who, like Reed, opts for Capernaum as a secondary possibility alongside larger centers.
ing size, in this general region at the north of the lake would also suffice. Such a location would of course place Q’s composers at the center of the socio-economic impact generated by the relatively novel foundation of Tiberias. Capernaum, that is, is situated in an area formerly not easily accessible to large-scale trade or other contacts; thus we can expect it to have maintained a considerable autonomy, and, most likely, status as a major local center, until the founding of Tiberias suddenly brought it and its immediate neighbors (as well as other areas, of course) into the orbit of the broader Roman-Herodian political economy.

The date at which Q was composed is not as easily unraveled as its place of composition. Two main suggestions have been made recently on Q’s date, neither of which is especially convincing. Gerd Theissen wishes to locate Q’s final composition to the period of about 40-55 CE. Two considerations are offered to support this conclusion. First, Theissen sees in Q 7:1-10’s positive presentation of a Gentile military officer a reflection of Petronius’ role in preventing Caligula from erecting a statue of himself in the Temple, an episode also possibly reflected in Satan’s desire to be worshipped as a god in Q 4:5-8.32 Theissen does not think that the story actually refers to Petronius, but it does suggest a date shortly subsequent to this event, since “its incorporation in a collection of sayings dating from the time after 40 C.E. is understandable if we know that gentile officers could also have a positive image.”33 In addition, Theissen believes that the woes against the Pharisees (Q 11:39-52) assist in dating. On the basis of the treatment of the Pharisees in gospel texts, as well as evidence from Paul and Josephus on their stances toward the Christian movement, Theissen concludes that while Pharisaic opposition to Christianity was mostly a feature of the thirties and forties.

---

33. Theissen, Gospels in Context, 227.
had evaporated by the time Paul was tried in Jerusalem (late 50s, see Acts 23:9) and certainly by the time Ananus executed James (62 CE, see Josephus, Ant. 20.200-201).34 "Therefore, the negative image of the Pharisees as persecutors must have been formed earlier, that is, ca. 30-55 C.E."35

Space does not permit an enumeration of all that is wrong with these arguments. Both of the texts that Theissen associates with the Caligula episode actually rely on conventional motifs — idolatry and the supposed ("moral") inferiority of Gentiles — to make their points, rather than allusion to any specificities.36 In the case of the Centurion in Capernaum, the rhetoric of the account actually requires the opposite of what Theissen suggests in order to achieve its point of shaming "Israel": the Centurion have a self-evidently negative image. As for the temptation account, resistance to idolatry hardly requires the Caligula episode to serve as a vivid demonstration of the perspicacity of the sage. Theissen’s efforts to associate Q with a particular stage of Christian-Pharisaic relations is equally forced. It is certainly true that Q devotes considerable space to specifically anti-Pharisaic polemic. What is not true is that such conflict can be so specifically localized as Theissen thinks. His reasoning depends on three assumptions, none of which is cogent. The first is that the Christian movement was sufficiently unified or monolithic that the Pharisaic attitude to one segment (i.e., Paul or James) reflects the attitude towards other segments of the movement (i.e., the people responsible for Q, who have no known links to either Paul or James).37 The second is that the Pharisees were equally monolithic. And the third is that the singular episodes

34. Theissen, Gospels in Context, 227-234.
35. Theissen, Gospels in Context, 231.
36. This is also part of the problem with Hoffmann’s association of the Temptation narrative with an anti-Zealot "peace party."
37. Myllykoski, "Social History of Q," 173-174, notes that there need be no connection at all between the relationship of the Pharisees to the Jesus people in Jerusalem and their relationship in Galilee.
recounted in Acts and Josephus are not only accurate but also representative of a general dogmatic acceptance of Christianity as a movement (rather than ad hoc rejoinders based on local and particular circumstances), and that these attitudes persisted indefinitely. Thus for Theissen’s reasoning to be correct we must reconstruct both "Christianity" and Pharisaic Judaism in the most idealist terms conceivable.

Others have argued for a very late date, and with similar shortcomings. The locus classicus for the argument that Q is not especially early is Dieter Lührmann’s discussion of the evidence for a fairly long transmission-history behind several of Q’s redactional motifs, and the presence in Q of material attesting to a Gentile mission or to a "Greek-speaking Hellenistic community." Others have pushed these observations further, and locate Q’s (final) composition to the period of, or even after, the Jewish War (i.e., 66-70 CE or later). Paul Hoffman’s thesis that Q as a whole, and especially the temptation narrative, betrays pacifistic anti-Zealot interests. Obviously, such a thesis would place Q’s composition in the period immediately prior to the War at the earliest. Hoffmann has buttressed this late dating with some observations on the Son of Man title and its apocalyptic imagery in the redaction of Q. He regards Q 13:34-35 as a vaticinium ex eventu of the destruction of the temple, and, moreover, regards v.35b as a christological addition to the saying reflecting an imminent expectation of the parousia. This imminent expectation, reflected also in Q’s redactional (!) integration

38. Tuckett, *Q and the History of Early Christianity*, 101-102. questions the accuracy of the Lukan depiction of Paul’s trial, pointing out that the account quite clearly manifests Lukan redactional interests. 39. Again, Tuckett, *Q and the History of Early Christianity*, 102, suggests that it is “precarious” to generalize about Pharisaic attitudes from this single event. No doubt the matter had more to do with Pharisaic rivalries with high priestly families than with any particular sympathy for James. 40. Lührmann, "Q in the History of Early Christianity," 60-62. Lührmann cites in particular Q 10:21-22 as evidence that Q has moved beyond the confines of the "Aramaic-speaking church." 41. Hoffman, *Studies*, 74-78, 308-311, 326. The temptation of Q 4:5-8 thus allegedly repudiates (as Satanic) earthly political power, while the first temptation rejects expectations of a messianic repetition of God’s bestowal of manna from heaven. 42. Hoffmann, "Redaction of Q," 191-192.
of the son of man title, is of a piece with Marcan apocalyptic motifs, and thus could very likely reflect composition around the same time as Mark, viz., toward the end of the War or immediately afterward. 43 Most recently, Matti Myllykoski has argued at some length for an overall dating of Q to the period after the War, indeed, after the composition of the Gospel of Mark. 44 Focusing primarily on the Q apocalypse, Myllykoski argues that the criticism leveled against the relaxation of apocalyptic tension in Q 17:26-30 indicates a period of calm after intense expectation of the parousia. 45 Mark, of course, witnesses to no such normalization of life. Thus, Myllykoski concludes.

Since the verses following Q 17:23 presuppose a time of peace which has no traces of messianic expectation, it is hardly possible to imagine the change of situation between Q 17:23 and the following verses to the late 50’s or early 60’s. The situation that is described in the main bulk of the apocalypse is much more plausibly located after the Jewish War, after the destruction of the temple. It is exactly the situation of eschatological resignation and general disappointment over signs that evokes in the Q community the emphasis on the sudden, unexpected coming of the Son of Man. If this reasoning is on a right track, the redaction of the apocalyptic discourse in Q must be dated even later than that of Mark 13 in which the situation of the war is still actual. 46

Not one of these arguments is convincing. Each of the characteristics cited as evidence of Q’s lateness can in fact be found the writings of Paul, which we know to be very early. 47 Paul displays moments of apocalyptic enthusiasm long before the Jewish

46. Myllykoski, “Social History of Q,” 196. The occasional infelicities of the English are original to the text, but are my fault anyway (!), since I corrected Myllykoski’s English in the original MS.
47. Traditionally, Paul’s letters are dated to the early- to mid-50s. John Hurd has quite convincingly proposed much earlier dates for some of the letters, arguing against the (slavish) use of Acts, and with it the Gallio inscription, to establish dates for the letters. For a very early of dating of 1 Thessalonians, Paul’s earliest letter, see Gerd Luedemann, Paul, Apostle to the Gentiles: Studies in Chronology (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984), 262; Blasi, Early Christianity as a Social Movement, 52, 77 n.2. See also John C. Hurd, “Thessalonians, First Letter to the,” IDB Supp., Keith Crim, ed. (Nashville: Abingdon, 1962), 900.
War, as well as writing in Greek and engaging in a Gentile mission. These features are deemed necessarily to be late more because of Acts-based schematic notions of Christianity's development than because of the evidence we actually possess. Paul of course does not employ the son of man title, but as Myllykoski concedes, to attribute the entire development of these traditions to the all-too-brief period around the War is too rapid to be realistic.48

There are in fact several features of the text which suggest — Hoffmann, Myllykoski, and others to the contrary — that Q was completed before the War, and indeed that its compositional history begins at a very early date. Most obviously, and unlike Matthew and Luke, for example, Q betrays no overt awareness of the destruction of the temple by Titus in 70 CE. Indeed, there are no references to war whatsoever in minimal Q, at any stage of the document's composition. Compare the eirenic backdrop to Q's apocalypse with that of Mark:

And as it was in the days of Noah, so it will be in the days of the son of man. They ate, they drank, they married, they were being married, up to the day when Noah entered the ark, and the flood came and destroyed them all... So will it be on the day when the son of man is revealed. (Q 17:26, 30)

When you hear of wars and rumors of wars, do not be alarmed; this must take place, but the end is still to come. For nation will rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom; there will be earthquakes in various places; there will be famines. This is but the beginning of the birth-pangs. (Mark 13:7-8)

There is no good reason at all to image that these texts reflect the same or similar circumstances: Q urges awareness in the face of normality; Mark urges circumspection in the face of cataclysm. The temptation narrative is equally lacking in military overtones or any other indication of knowledge of the Jewish War — indeed, it seems to reflect no specific political situation whatsoever.49 As far as Q 4:9-12 is concerned, the exist-

49. See Kloppenborg, Formation, 254-256. The points of contact between the Temptation account and Zealot ideology are very weak, as Kloppenborg shows.
ence of the temple requires no comment. Likewise, other possible tertiary glosses to Q, such as 11:42c and 16:17, promote a nomistic orientation without reflecting on the significance of the temple’s absence for such an orientation. Q 13:34-35 is unlikely to be a *vaticinium ex eventu* because it envisions not a rebuilding of Jerusalem or its sanctuary, but a repentance on the part of the city (*οὖ μὴ ἴδητε με ἐώς . . . εἴπητε εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος . . .*): the sanctuary is not destroyed, but *given over* by God back to his impenitent people (*ἰδοὺ ἀφίεσαι ὑμῖν ὁ οἶκος ὑμῶν*). Admittedly, these observations represent an argument from silence, but such a silence is significant enough when one reflects on the Galilee’s direct involvement in the War, as well as the Q people’s bitter denunciations of Jerusalem. Indeed, the whole general force of Q’s rhetoric — layer by layer and from beginning to end — requires the normality of life to make its examples convincing: its arguments tend to be buttressed by appeal to *ordinary* experience, rather than by pointing out extraordinary events.

These observations may be pushed a little further: there are reasonable grounds for suggesting a date for Q quite early in the pre-War period, rather than toward its end. The redactional complexity of Q and of its traditions, once one has settled on a model of Q’s development which involves the stratification of *written* layers rather than *oral* aggregation of units, suggests a relatively long history, and hence one whose initial steps must have been quite early. The distance, at least in tone, from Q1 to Q2, and again from Q2 to Q3, is sufficiently ample to indicate the lapse of several years. If the latest stage of Q was composed *prior* to 66 CE, we are probably safe in guessing that its earliest written phases could be *no later* than the 50s. Even the second, redactional, layer of Q is also likely to have been composed no later than the 50s. This conclusion

---

is suggested, albeit tenuously, by Q2’s thematic links to the earliest of Paul’s letters, 1 Thessalonians. Regardless of the actual causes for this language, 1 Thess and Q2 share a strong authorial (i.e., not traditional or ancillary) in a) current persecution, b) past, epic persecution of the prophets, and c) apocalyptic judgment in consequence of these actions. This set of motifs is representative, of course, of the deuteronomistic view of Israel’s history, which is widely acknowledged to be a major factor in the redaction of Q(2). The main elements of this perspective, however, are far less prevalent in Paul’s letters, even where apocalyptic expectation is emphasized. The text of 1 Thess, however, not only contains a handful of references to apocalyptic judgment scenarios (1:9-10; 4:13-18; 5:1-7) but also shares with Q — and in sharp contrast to Mark — the concern that the progress of ordinary life not dampen expectation of the imminent end. Moreover, in 1 Thess 2:14-16, Paul provides a thumbnail sketch of the deuteronomistic condemnation of Israel which thoroughly matches Q2’s redactional interests:

For you, brothers, became imitators of the churches of God in Christ Jesus in Judea, for you suffered the same things from your own compatriots as they did from the Jews, who killed both the Lord Jesus and the prophets, and drove us out; they displease God and oppose everyone by hindering us from speaking to the Gentiles so that they may be saved. Thus they have constantly been filling up the measure of their sins; but God’s wrath has overtaken them at last (or “completely,” ψίξ τῆς λοιπῆς).52

51. Especially as a result of Lührmann, Redaktion; cf. also Odil Hennes Steck, Israel und das gewaltsame Geschick der Propheten (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1967), esp. 62-64, 122-124, and elsewhere. More recently, Kloppenborg, Formation, 102-170, and most other current treatments of Q.
52. Some argumentation has been put forward to the effect that this text is an interpolation into 1 Thessalonians dating from the period around the Jewish War. The same considerations which lead to a dating of Q’s apocalyptic features to this period are likewise partly responsible for this interpolation hypothesis. In addition, this text appears to constitute a deviation from the ordinary formal features of Pauline letters, i.e., it constitutes the beginning of an unprecedented second “thanksgiving” section. See Birger A. Pearson, “1 Thessalonians 2:13-16: A Deutero-Pauline Interpolation?,” Harvard Theological Review 64 (1971): 79-94. Thus Myllykoski, “Social History of Q,” 175, notes that the comparability of 1 Thess 2:13-16 is not a very effective argument for an early dating of Q. However, John C. Hurd, “Paul Ahead of his Time: 1 Thess 2:13-16,” pp. 31-36 in Peter Richardson and David Granskou, eds., Anti-Judaism in Early Christianity (Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1986), and “Thessalonians, First Letter,” 900, has shown convincingly that these verses are actually an integral part of the letter’s overall structure, and are surely original.
Regardless of the actual situation — in Thessalonica or Judea — prompting the hope for such harsh reprisal, the motifs used to describe and rationalize this situation are nearly identical to that found in Q(2). Note especially how closely the already-accomplished consummation of judgment in Paul ("God's wrath has overtaken them at last," ἐφθάσεν δὲ ἐπ’ αὐτοὺς ἡ ὀργὴ εἰς τέλος) matches that of Q 13:34-35 ("your house is forsaken." ἴδον ἀφίέται ὑμῖν ὁ ὦκος ὑμῶν). If there is any single NT text that most closely matches the style (not genre, obviously) and thematic content of the redaction of Q (Q2), it is 1 Thessalonians! Interestingly, this use of emphatic deuteronomistic language largely drops out of Paul's writings after 1 Thessalonians, and is not especially marked in other NT epistolary literature.

Without suggesting a monolithic "Christianity" in which 1 Thess and Q2 must devolve from essentially similar circles, Paul's rather uncomfortable and uncharacteristic use of deuteronomistic theology in this letter indicates, at the very least, the currency of this literary-theological framework within some (non-Pauline) Christian circles at the time 1 Thessalonians was written, and its use to describe and rationalize varieties of negative or critical reception of Christians.53 The evidently temporary (judging by its subsequent desuetude) application of deuteronomistic theology within at least some branches of the Christian movement to desultory situations of disapproval might thus — if we are to date it at all — be situated roughly in the period in which 1 Thessalonians was composed, i.e., sometime between 41 and 51 CE.54

53. I say non-Pauline because Paul appears to use the motif only in connection with a comparison between his Thessalonian converts and the churches of Judea. It appears that he has borrowed and re-applied a stereotypical presentation of the experiences of those churches from some, obviously Christian, source.
54. And in my view, the earlier date is preferable. See n.47, above.
which in its turn might have implications for dating Q2. 55 Further support for such an early dating of Q2 may be found in the use to which John the Baptist is put by the redaction of this stage. 56 John is not, at this stage, a figure drawn from the epic of Jesus’ own story, but rather appears in Q as an independent folk hero whose commensurability with the Q group’s program, behaviour, and hero/founder (i.e., Jesus) is used to inflate the sense of the group’s legitimacy. What is important here is that this use reflects an oral, folk, esteem for John, not his preservation in the literary record of later Christians or even of disciples of John himself. While we need not suppose folk memories to be short (witness Robin Hood), the only folk appeal to the memory of John of which we may be certain — Q excepted of course — is that recorded by Josephus surrounding the defeat of Antipas’ army by Aretas sometime before 37 CE. 57 Thus, as with 1 Thessalonians and the deuteronomistic theme, the only datable manifestation of this motif derives from the period around the early 40s CE.

A final indication of how the various layers of Q are to be dated, i.e., that the compositional layer of Q is to be dated very early, is the complete absence of christological reflection in the first stratum of Q. Although Q1 does show interest in the status and significance of Jesus, especially evinced in Q 6:46’s appeal to him as “Lord. Lord,” the first stratum of the document is entirely lacking in any reflection on Jesus’ supernatural significance or his relationship to God: he is simply and only a wise man.

55. Note also that Peter Richardson, “The Thunderbolt in Q and the Wise Man in Corinth, pp.91-111 in Peter Richardson and John C. Hurd, eds., From Jesus to Paul: Studies in Honour of Francis Wright Beare (Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1984), esp.95-96, 100, argues for a link between the "Johannine thunderbolt" of Q 10:21-24 and the Pauline material in 1 Cor 1-2, believing Paul here to be commenting on and providing a “correct” (in Paul’s view) interpretation of this text. Such a conclusion would tend to support my observations on the use of 1 Thessalonians tentatively to date Q2: 1 Corinthians is the second earliest of Paul’s letters (Hurd: ca. 46 CE), and the "thunderbolt" is a Q2 text. 56. On which see Armal, “Redactional Fabrication,” esp.176.
57. Josephus, Ant. 18.116-119 (Loeb 9.81-85). Indeed, for Josephus it is only in terms of the popular regard for John and its relevance to the reaction to Antipas’ military defeat that the Baptist merits mention at all.
whose words, like those of all wise men, must be obeyed if one is to live wisely and well.\(^58\) Given, not only that all subsequent forms of "Christianity" of which we are aware from the NT attribute to Jesus in their different ways a "religious" — i.e., supernatural and extraordinary — role, but that Q2 pursues this trajectory as well and so reveals that the Q group had no animus against this mode of inflating Jesus' authority, the complete absence of such reflection must indicate an extremely early and rather isolated phase of the Jesus movement as a whole. Jesus is nothing more than a sage: we are not even informed that his sayings belong to the past. In light of this, Ivan Havener's observation, in connection with Q, that "the rationale for preserving and transmitting Jesus' sayings existed before his death,"\(^59\) while outrageous in its implications, is surely pertinent. There is simply no thematic indication in Q1 that Jesus is perceived to be a figure from the past, even the recent past. This is not to argue that Q1 dates from the period before Jesus' death;\(^60\) but it is surely a very, very old composition.

The final question pertaining to Q's immediate context is that of the identity of its purveyors. While much has been made of the "prophetic" identity of these figures, or their Cynic-like character (see chapter 3, above), these designations do not help us identify the social sectors from which these figures might have been drawn in the first

---

58. On the presentation, in the Q inaugural sermon (6:20-49), of Jesus as an authority on the basis of his role as a speaker of wisdom who has a personal relationship with his hearers. see Carruth, "Strategies of Authority."
59. Havener, Sayings of Jesus, 42, emphasis original.
60. Simply because, literally, there are indications in the overall design of Q1 that some effort has been made to organize, indeed in several stages, a body of extant material. In particular, the formalized argumentative clusters noticed by Piper were not only compiled, but then were collected together and framed by other material, such as the (also secondarily-associated, cf. Thomas #54, 68-69) beatitudes, the parable of the builders, the Mission Charge, and so on. Mack, "Kingdom that Didn't Come," 618, and Lost Gospel (esp. 105-130) constructs elaborate developmental stages behind the compilation of Q1, all on the basis of literary characteristics.
place; the labels are simply not descriptive. The only evidence we possess for who these individuals might have been comes from the document itself: its presupposed world of experience and its own essential complexion. The latter consideration especially suggests purveyors who at the very least were literate: Q was indeed a written document.61 More than this, its written form is not the result of simple transcription of orally-circulating material, but involved the organization and arrangement of material in the form of carefully-constructed arguments.62 Ronald Piper's work on the argumentative clusters which comprise much of the hortatory, sapiential material of Q1 (including Q 6:27-36; 6:37-42; 6:43-45; 11:9-13; 12:4-7; and 12:22-31), has revealed a consistent compositional pattern, which is complex, painstakingly-structured, and repetitive:

Characteristic of these collections too is the pattern of progressing from general to specific application, the location of the interpretive key at the conclusion of the argument, the use of (usually multiple) rhetorical questions at the center of the collection, the change in imagery as the argument progresses, and the dominance of the appeal to experience and reason.63

The argumentative techniques of Q1 involve primarily the constituent arguments of wisdom literature: clusters of imperatives followed by supporting motive-clauses and/or

---

61. For a summary of the arguments for a written, as opposed to oral, Q, see Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 42-51; Tuckett, *Q and the History of Early Christianity*, 34-39. The high degree of verbal agreement between Matthew and Luke in the double tradition — surpassing even their degree of agreement with each other in the triple tradition, which we know to have been drawn from a written source (viz., Mark; see Charles E. Carlson and Dennis Norlin, "Once More — Statistics and Q," *Harvard Theological Review* 64 [1971]: 59-78, esp.71-72); their common sequence of individual pericopes; and the presence of peculiar phrases unlikely to survive oral transmission all serve to indicate that Q was a fixed and necessarily written document, rather than a deposit of oral traditions coincidentally used by Matthew and Luke.


aphorisms, and the use of persuasion by analogy (e.g., Q 6:43-45), *doubled* rhetorical questions (e.g., 6:32-33; 6:39; 6:41-42; 11:11-12), appeal to common experience (e.g., 6:47-49), observation of general human behaviour (e.g., 6:32-33; 11:33), arguments from lesser to greater (e.g., 11:11-13; 12:6-7; 12:24-28), *imitatio Dei* arguments (e.g., 6:35), and possibly even such intentional rhetorical forms as enthymemes (6:20-22) and elaborations (6:27-36). In many of the argumentative clusters, as Piper has shown, some behavioral application is spelled out explicitly toward the end of the argument. This sort of intellectually-sophisticated, suavely-oriented construction, and the careful composition of Q1 within the parameters of a known ancient *literary* genre underscore the conclusion that Q is not merely *literate* but is also *literary*. Nor does the picture change for the other strata of Q, which retain the overall generic characteristics of Near Eastern and Hellenistic wisdom literature, and which show numerous signs of careful composition and deliberate rhetorical technique, including chreiai and elaborated chreiai. Moreover, each layer actually shows *increasing* comfort with the use of literary traditions, an increasing tendency to textual exegesis. At the first stage of the document's composition, ordinary experience is normally invoked to support

---


argumentative points; no OT texts are quoted, nor even, apparently, alluded to, outside of a very general reference to Solomon's splendor in Q 12:17. By the secondary redaction, the group is appealing primarily to a deuteronomistic understanding of the epic tradition, and the revised document includes a number of textual allusions (e.g., Q 7:22) and prooftexts (e.g., 7:27), as well as frequent references to biblical events (e.g., 10:12) and characters (11:30-32; 13:28). By the time of the tertiary emendation of Q, written texts are a basis for authoritative revelation (Q 16:17), and (textual) exegetical proficiency is the mark of wisdom (4:1-13); note that two of the three Q3 texts contain actual references to the written word (Q 4:4, 8, 10, 12: γραπτά; 16:17: μίαν κεραιαν68). One might finally observe in connection with the literary status of Q that the document produced at the level of Q1 evidently came to serve as a kind of foundational or authoritative document for the group that produced it, as attested not only by its preservation (within that group) but by its continual emendation to suit the group's changing situations.

Thus any description of Q's tradents which fails to take this feature into account — including any itinerancy hypothesis that forces us to imagine wandering beggars carrying scrolls and writing implements from town to town69 — is guilty of ignoring one of the most telling pieces of evidence: these people communicated and preserved their ideas in writing. Moreover, writing was not simply a passive vehicle for the recording of the oral life of these traditions (against Kelber): it was a main — and evidently comfortable — vehicle or medium for promoting the ethos and agenda of these people.

What they wrote down was composed, not recorded, and composed according to the

68. "Horn" or "hook": the reference is to a serif, i.e., a part of a letter, or possibly accents or breathings. See BAGD, 428.
69. Douglas, "Love Your Enemies," 120: "... the sayings-complexes are not entirely due to wanderers. The elaborations require settled, literate reflection. Would staff and cloak have been left behind but writing instrument and parchment or ostraka brought along?"
dictates of the style, rhetoric, and to some degree the content of the broader category of writings we may call wisdom literature. The immediate conclusion to be drawn from these observations is not only that Q’s tradents were literate in a world where literacy was relatively rare,70 but that their literacy was more than merely functional: these individuals were not simply capable of writing down words — thus, e.g., taking dictation, copying decrees, keeping accounts, etc. — but were relatively proficient at the production (composition, authorship) of texts, and literary texts at that. On the other hand, the genre of text evidently preferred by these individuals, and the rhetorical techniques they employed within it were, although literary and cultivated, more or less rudimentary, especially when compared to some the “high literature” of antiquity.71 Alongside extended historical writings, developed biographies, or, in Jewish literature, apocalypses, Q can appear rather disorganized, simplistic, or primitive. We are thus dealing, in the case of the Q tradents, with persons who are educated, and who think of themselves as — and are — learned beyond the ancient norm; but who, at the same time, do not occupy the pinnacle of the learning antiquity had to offer.

John Kloppenborg’s suggestion, therefore, that the persons responsible for Q were scribal figures, and more particularly, were village scribes (κωμογραμματεύς),

70. William V. Harris, Ancient Literacy (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1989), judges only about 10% of the general populace in antiquity to have been even functionally literate.
71. See Kloppenborg, “Literary Convention,” 84-85:
Finally, the instructional speeches are far from being “random collections of sayings.” They display, on the contrary, signs of deliberate stylization and reflect some of the techniques fostered in rhetorical schools. Yet Q does not show the same self-conscious and studied composition expected in the products of the elite scribal establishments. The mode of organization is topical rather than by more complicated devices such as alphabetic acrostics or numeric schemata. There are few word plays apart from a possible pun on μοραίνω (Q 14:34) and rhetorical ornamentation does not go much beyond alliteration and assonance. Interestingly, this dichotomy — between prestigious and not-so-prestigious forms of scribal — is used by Kloppenborg in lieu of the Great versus Little tradition dichotomy to account for Q’s hostility toward the Pharisees. See Kloppenborg, “Sayings Gospel Q: Recent Opinion,” 25.
i.e., middle- or lower-level administrators who dealt with local "administrative infrastructures which saw to the collection and disbursement of various revenues and to the administration of justice," 72 makes a good deal of sense. Indeed, it is difficult to see who else in first-century Galilee would have been likely or able to produce a document such as Q1, or Q as a whole other than the villages scribes sketched in the last chapter. 73 Not merely the form, but the values and contents of Q(1) support such a conclusion:

In accord with scribal values, the Sayings Gospel places a premium upon both clarity of perception, especially when it comes to matters of guidance (Q 6:40, 41-42), and good speech, the characteristic mark of good thinking (Q 6:45). Guidance and moral example are also the subjects of the sayings on judging (Q 6:37-38), scandal (Q 17:1-2), and forgiveness (Q 17:3b-4). This reflects the self-consciously "public" character of the scribal pursuit: although the scribe necessarily requires leisure not at the disposal of the peasant or hand-worker, the scribe's responsibility is ultimately to the public and public approbation in the form of honour and fame crowns the sage's achievement. 74

Also buttressing such a conclusion are the indications in Q, at both major levels of redaction, of familiarity with teaching situations (esp. Q 6:39-49), 75 and especially with the processes and mechanisms of law courts (esp. Q 6:29; 6:37-38; 11:31a, 32a; 12:11-12; 12:57-59; 22:30). 76 In addition, Q shows a predilection for coupling male examples with female examples, a stylistic tendency that I have argued is characteristic of legal and other types of regulatory language. 77 This apparent familiarity with the

---

72. Kloppenborg, "Literary Convention," 85; cf. 82-86. See also the arguments for scribal composition adduced by Douglas, "Love Your Enemies," 122.
76. On the familiarity of the people responsible for Q1 with law courts, see especially Piper, "Language of Violence." Note that many of the examples I have listed are from the second stratum of Q.
administration of justice and apparent comfort in appropriating its language, style, and imagery support the characterization of the Q tr declents as village scribes. One final observation on the language and imagery of Q — this time more typical of the second stratum than the first — helps corroborates this identification, and that is the strong interest in the language and imagery of delegation. Perhaps the most prominent single motif in Q2 (with the possible exception of that of judgment), representation or delegation forms the most common basis of the appeals to experience one finds in the constituent material of Q2. The notion of one person speaking for or acting for another serves as the primary theological metaphor for the relationships between God, Jesus, and the Q people themselves (see Q 7:8; 10:16; 10:22; 12:8-9; 12:42-46; 14:16-24; 19:12-26; 22:29-30). There is a clear homology between this kind of (theological) language and the (social) roles of the retainer class, to whom, of course, the village scribes belong.\(^78\) At the very least, the ubiquity of this theme for Q2’s theological constructs demonstrates habitual exposure to and experience of the phenomenon of delegation, and suggests that this experience leads those who have generated these images to identify naturally with the delegate, rather than the one who does the delegating. This emphasis, then, accords well with the experience and perhaps worldview of the village scribe — a retainer who habitually acts on behalf of the law, the state, and powerful patrons.

In sum, the immediate circumstances of Q’s composition place its development squarely in the midst of the events devolving from the foundation of Tiberias shortly before, or during, the early 20s CE. Internal evidence suggests that the document was

\(^{78}\) Moreover, the character of these metaphors, insofar as the subordinates are normally (but not always — see Q 7:8) δοῦλου, does not suggest a high social placement among those who use such imagery.
composed, at least in its first two major stages, in Galilee, probably at the northern edge of the lake, and quite conceivably in Capernaum itself, which, as Kloppenborg notes, would probably have had a sufficiently density of bureaucrats to allow for such developments:

... it seems doubtful that a single village could have sustained the Q group. The Q people, however, may have flourished in a network of villages, perhaps even in association with the lower administrative sectors of a larger center. ... One might also consider the larger towns like Capernaum in Galilee or Bethsaida Julias in Gaulanitis, whose commercial interests would have supported a relatively substantial bureaucracy. 79

The date at which its formative layer was composed is (of course) no longer determinable, but an earlier date, such as the 30s or 40s CE seems preferable to a later one. Even the second layer Q, to the extent that any evidence whatsoever can be adduced, may be ascribed to the 40s or 50s. Thus the time over which the document was composed was probably the period in which the long-term and structural effects of Galilee's gradual incorporation into the Roman-Herodian orbit — increased trade and monetization, more effective demands for taxes and other dues, increasing debt, incrementally increasing tenancy and land consolidation, and the restructuring (and revaluing) of village and town administrations and social organization — were beginning to be felt with a vengeance. And, finally, the persons apparently responsible for the document, village scribes involved in the administration of formerly-autonomous village life, are the persons identified in the last chapter as those with the most (or apparently the most) to lose from the "new world order" heralded by Antipas' foundation of Tiberias. All of this of course implies that the immediate context of Q's composition was precisely the set of circumstances outlined in the last chapter. It remains to be seen what Q's composers made of those circumstances, and to what extent Q's "program" represents a response to them.

Because of the general dominance of the itinerancy hypothesis, and the centrality of Q’s Mission Charge for most social description of the Q people, the first issue that presents itself in an attempt to decipher Q’s inversionary or deracinating rhetoric is the question of travel. Q(1) does indeed include references to travel, as well as possible indications of homelessness. It is of course this combination of references — viewed synthetically80 — that makes Q a fertile source for theories of early Christian radical itinerancy, against the background of which Q’s other injunctions are assessed.

The first thing to observe in this connection is that Q, again at all of its stages, presupposes a complex social life and a complex set of interpersonal interactions, in which, inter alia, even the most conventional and structured relationships persist. The sapiential instructions in Q are most obvious in this regard. Different socio-economic classes are assumed to be present among the document’s addressees, with the result that exhortation is made about both giving (Q 6:30) and receiving (10:7), both borrowing (12:57-59; do beggars make out loans?) and lending (6:34-35); the wealthy are directly addressed (12:33-34; 16:13), as are the poor (6:20-21; 12:22-31).81 An ongoing involvement in structured and sedentary village life is presupposed.82 In Q1, we are

80. That is to say, the two themes do not appear together in Q; one is not used to interpret the other. The advocate of itinerancy underlying Q must therefore read each of these themes separately, view each as a literal, if partial, description of the actual circumstances of the authors, and then combine the characterizations to produce homeless travelers.
81. See Arnal, "Rhetoric of Marginality," 481, 484.
82. So also Horsley, "Social Conflict," 43 (Q attests to "tensions with local communities"); Spiral of Violence, 211-212 ("... evidence available will suggest that we look for those to whom Jesus ministered and who may have responded to his teachings and actions in the village communities of Galilee, not in some separated community or particular groups"); cf.209-284, generally. See also Tuckett, Q and the History of Early Christianity, 306 (referring to Q 6:30): "The behaviour demanded is thus the much more positive one of building community relationships rather than allowing them to be severed by hostility and bitterness."
dealing with a document which can offer the following types of injunctions at the same time:

Do not lay up for yourselves treasures on earth, where moth and rust consume and where robbers break in and steal, but lay up for yourselves treasure in heavens, where neither moth nor rust ruins and where no robber digs through and steals. Where your treasure is, there will your heart be also. (Q 12:33-34)

Therefore I tell you, do not be anxious about [your] life, what you shall eat, nor about [your] body, what you shall put on. Is not life more than food, and the body more than clothing? Look at the ravens; they neither sow nor reap nor gather into barns, and yet God feeds them. Are you not of more value than birds? (Q 12:22-24)

It is thus clearly a document which — at least fictively — addresses itself to the range of social classes in its general purview; it does not restrict itself to the poor or outcast (in spite of the impression given by such programmatic texts as Q 6:20-22). As Tuckett states,

A number of other passages in Q imply that the people addressed are, if not well-to-do, at least not destitute. Warnings about storing up treasure on earth (Q 12:33f.) or against serving mammon (Q 16:13), only make sense if directed against those who have a certain amount of money or possessions. Similarly, the exhortation to lend to those who ask without expecting any return presupposes an audience who have the wherewithal to give money away. One must not therefore make the situation presupposed too uniform.

Proponents of itinerancy tend to treat the ordinances apparently offered to the wealthy by Q(1) as though they were general statements of principle, while those addressed to the poor are treated as specific injunctions with direct application.

83. I am here following the IQP reconstruction of the text, which in this instance prefers the Matthean wording. The Lukan wording does indeed suggest voluntary (if partial) impoverishment, although, apparently, to further charity rather than itinerancy: "sell your possessions, and give alms" (cf., similarly, e.g., Luke 16:9, for the Lukan notion that wealth may be used to "buy" righteousness).
84. Tuckett, Q and the History of Early Christianity, 360.
85. See, e.g., Theissen, First Followers of Jesus, 12-13:

A third characteristic of the earliest Christian wandering charismatics was their criticism of riches and possessions. Someone who was manifestly poor, without money, shoes, staff, or provisions, and with only one garment, who travelled the roads of Syria and Palestine (Matt. 10.10), could criticize riches and the possession of property without losing credibility... Anyone who acted in this way could put forward the view that it was easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter the kingdom of God (Mark 10.25), and he could advise men to lay up treasure in heaven and not on earth
Given the undeniably specific character of the other advice directed by Q(1) to those in comfortable economic positions (the material on giving and lending offered above), such a reading is not only arbitrary, but demonstrably false. Q addresses itself, at least in part, to the (relatively) wealthy. Indeed, one might turn the tables on itinerancy advocates and tentatively advance the hypothesis that Q(1) is primarily addressed to the affluent; that it is the statements apparently addressed to the poor that articulate general principles, using the imagery of poverty as a rhetorical device, rather than because destitution is a reality for the Q tradents or their intended audience. For instance, the text on anxiety quoted above (12:22-24; cf. vv.25-31) appears as though it is addressed to people who are in a position to worry about such basic necessities as food and clothing: a situation of the utmost poverty is thus implied. But the advice given is idealistic in the extreme, even offensive, and, if meant to be taken seriously, actually suggests a situation in which "care-less" living is possible, i.e., one of general prosperity: "It does not seem very likely that idealizations of poverty and detachment would have had much appeal to beggars, day workers or small holders; instead, these are the views of intellectuals who utilize such idealizations as a counterbalance to what is perceived as a bankrupt or failing culture." One wonders, therefore, whether the two texts quoted above are not of a thematic piece, that is, whether they both advocate.

(Matt. 6.19ff.). He could warn men that they could not serve both God and mammon (Luke 16.8)...

Cf. also Patterson, Gospel of Thomas and Jesus, 159 and n.7; and perhaps Crossan, "Itinerants and Householders," 123.


87. So, for example, Horsley, Spiral of Violence, 258; Theissen, First Followers of Jesus, 13.

to the affluent, a general emotional detachment from their wealth. Q 12:22-31 is actually an effective argument only in such a context. It is not especially credible or useful to tell people who are naked and starving to "consider the ravens," but for those to whom the necessities of life have never (or only infrequently and temporarily) been denied, this argument matches, somewhat, their own experience (that is, of finding the world relatively bountiful), and may, therefore, serve as a quite resonant suggestion to tone down concerns about the accumulation of wealth.89

Relations with family probably persist at both major strata of Q as well: Q 11:11-13. from Q(1)'s sapiential material, fictively or not, to those who have children, and apparently whose children live with them: "what man among you (τίς ἐστιν ἐξ ὑμῶν) if his son asks for a loaf of bread, will give him a stone . . . ?" (Q 11:11). Richard Horsley has noted that two Q(1) texts often adduced for an anti-familial ethos in Q — 9:59-62 and 14:26 — actually suggest the opposite:90 the texts work properly rhetorically only on the supposition that family relations continue within the group to whom Q is addressed.91 Both of these texts are hyperbolic examples — focal instances — of the kind of radical commitment required of those who follow Jesus. Q 14:26-27, exhorting the hearer to hate parents, is, like the (independent) version in Gospel of Thomas #55, juxtaposed with a statement about taking up one's cross in order to be a worthy disciple. David Seeley has shown that the cultural and argumentative context for the cross saying is best found in Cynic-Stoic notions of discipleship, stressing that the true student will be sufficiently committed to the truth taught by his master (Jesus), that in the pursuit of this truth he will despise any consequences, including the loss of his own life, consequences which are, in fact, predictable in a world in which the truth is

89. See further the section on "Q's Rhetoric of Deracination," below.
despised. Unless we imagine that itinerants are deliberately to seek crucifixion (!), it is clear that this injunction is simply intended to serve as a rather extreme example of the potential cost — and thus the commitment required — in seeking true wisdom. The point of the cluster of examples in Q 9:57-60 (or 9:57-62) is the same: following Jesus requires unconditional commitment, even at the cost of responsibilities otherwise deemed unquestionably inescapable. Obviously the rhetorical force of these "focal instances" is completely lost unless those to whom they addressed — that is, members of the group itself, since the interest in "following Jesus" is taken for granted in these sayings — have close family relationships and persist in maintaining them. They are not being told, literally, that they must give these things up any more than they are being told to commit suicide (14:27). Rather, they are being told that these family connections, which are at an apogee of value comparable to their very lives, are of less importance than their "mission" to advance the wisdom of their teacher, the importance of which latter is thus dramatically (and hyperbolically) underscored. At the level of Q2 and Q3, incidentally, the situation does not much change. Q(2) 17:34-35 implies that those who have heeded the Q2 call to repentance are indistinguishable — in their activities and locations — from those who have not. Even Q3, which adds so little to the Q document, and the bulk of which is set in the wilderness, advocates the diligent tithing of spices (Q 11:42c), a practice unlikely to be of any relevance or concern to a wandering beggar.

93. The IQP, unaccountably in my view, exclude Luke 9:61-62 from the original text of Q. See Moreland and Robinson, "International Q Project," 503. For a contrary view, see Kloppenborg, Formation, 190-191 n.80. For a summary of the scholarly positions on this question and an indication of the character of the arguments, see Kloppenborg, Q Parallels, 64. Especially notable among the arguments for inclusion in Q is the suggestion that Matthew (8:21) may be showing knowledge of — "reminiscences" of — the material from Luke 9:61 in his wording, εὐεργετός δὲ ... ἐὰν ἤπειρον.
The apparent stability of this set of complex, socially-involved, and apparently sedentary contexts militates against a traveling lifestyle among the people Q envisions for its audience, and it equally precludes any kind of isolation of the people responsible for Q from the ordinary life of larger villages and small towns. Since much of the exhortation in Q1 is very clearly directed to "insiders" (concerning, as it does Jesus' "disciples" or those who are "worthy" of him), it seems reasonable enough to conclude that the sedentary and rather ordinary lifestyle envisioned in general by the text applies as much to its traditions as to its (fictive?) audience.

The only direct and unequivocal reference to homelessness in Q, at any stage of its development, is limited to the single saying in Q 9:57-58: "Someone said to him. I will follow you wherever you go. And Jesus said to him. Foxes have holes, and birds of the air have nests, but the son of man has nowhere to lay his head." As already noted, in its immediate Q1 context, the saying has more to do with absolute commitment than with literal homelessness. The following saying (9:59-60), exhorts a would-be follower not so much to leave home as to (shockingly) value his commitment to Jesus over basic filial responsibility. The final saying in this triptych (Q?/Luke 9:61-62), if indeed it derives from Q, is clearest of all: a statement of general principle that one must not be distracted from the crucial task at hand. The fact that this set of sayings is immediately followed by the Mission speech already in Q1 makes the cluster appear to be a programmatic introduction to a longer discussion of the practices involved in (wandering) discipleship. But such an interpretation relies entirely on a

95. See Q 6:40 (μαθητής, doubly-attested); 14:26 (Matt: ἀξιωμάτης; Luke: μαθητής); 14:27 (Matt: ἀξιωμάτης; Luke: μαθητής). So also Kloppenborg, Formation, 238-239; Piper, "Design and Argument," 416-418; Selliew, "Argument and Design."
96. So, e.g., Kloppenborg, Formation, 200-201; Patterson, Gospel of Thomas and Jesus, 133-134, and 134 n.61; Schürmann, "Son of Man Title," 83; and most others. See also Theissen’s interpretation of this text and of the Mission speech, First Followers of Jesus, 10-11, although since he does not reconstruct Q, he does not make a point of their juxtaposition.
particular reading of 10:2-16 in light of itinerancy (on which see below), which, of course, begs the question. The situating of the Mission speech — which itself makes no reference at all to homelessness! — after this set of chreiai only denotes that the Mission charge itself pertains, like 9:57-60 (61-62), to the issue of discipleship and how one is to understand and undertake the commitment of being "worthy" of Jesus.97

The individual saying (9:57-58) is actually quite opaque, and does not have a clear referent. If the version in Gospel of Thomas #86 reflects a more original form of the saying,98 the statement was not originally made in rejoinder to an interlocutor's interest in discipleship, but as a general observation. This text is one of the few synoptic instances in which "son of man" may be a generic designation, rather than a titular reference to Jesus.99 Thus if the text does not bespeak itinerancy in Q, neither does it at an earlier stage of the tradition, circulating as a loose saying: what it denotes, rather, is the conviction that human beings are helpless to an extent shared by no other creature on earth.100 If, however, as Kloppenborg argues, Q 6:22 was originally part of

97. See Kloppenborg, Formation, 202: "Rather than treating the specifics of instructions for mission, they [9:57-62] deal with discipleship in general, interpreting it as an emulation of the homeless and detached life style of Jesus, the Son of Man. Thus the speech shifts from a mission discourse to a discipleship instruction."

98. And it probably does: Thomas shows no aversion to response-chreiai (cf. Thomas ##6, 12, 18, 20, 21, 24, 37, 43, 51, 52, 53, 61, 72, 79, 91, 99, 100, 104, 113, 114), and so there is no good reason to imagine that the author has pared away the original introduction to the chreia. Rather, Q1 or pre-Q tradition has added the narrative setting to explicate its significance, as well as, possibly, to create the double or triple set of interchanges that now appears in Q. See Kloppenborg, Formation, 192; Schürmann, "Son of Man Title," 82. On the other hand, Thomas' addition of "and rest" (N ΜΤΟΝ Μ[MO] ) to the end of the saying is of a piece with his redactional motif of ανέπιπτον, and so should be regarded as secondary. See Patterson, Gospel of Thomas and Jesus, 33 and n.60.

99. So Rudolf Bultmann, History of the Synoptic Tradition (John Marsh, transl.; New York: Harper & Row, 1963), 28: "And 'man' must have been in fact the original meaning; man, homeless in this world, is contrasted with the wild beasts. This is presumably an old proverb which tradition has turned into a saying of Jesus." Against this view, see Hoffmann, Studien, 90-91; Schürmann, "Son of Man Title," 82-83.

100. If this was indeed the original thrust of the saying, it is no wonder that Q substantially revised its direction. The sentiment (rather more realistically) in this saying, taken alone, runs precisely counter to the ideas expressed in Q 12:22-31!
Q1, \(^{101}\) "son of man is used in this text to designate Jesus, and so, at the time the "foxes have holes" saying was incorporated into Q1, the reference was already understood to refer to Jesus, specifically.\(^{102}\) Its association, secondarily, with the pair of chreiai which follow it would have already suggested such an interpretation.\(^{103}\)

What is so interesting about this history of transmission is what it implies for almost any version of the itinerancy hypothesis. Several analysts have already drawn the conclusion that Q itself and Q’s mission speech in particular cannot reflect the perspective of itinerants, but of a settled "community" which made use of older material, originally transmitted by itinerants, in new rhetorical contexts, and with new implications.\(^{104}\) The history of 9:57-58 suggests that this conclusion is only partly accurate. Not only is the Q(1) mission speech apparently not addressed to missionaries themselves, but the collection of chreiai which precedes this speech, especially if one counts 9:60-61 as originally part of Q, clearly is concerned with the theme of commitment, and perhaps, more specifically, the theme of commitment in the face of familial dis-

\(^{101}\) Kloppenborg, Formation, 178 (cf. 173, 187), noting that the association between the beatitudes and the next Q1 material, 6:27 ff., is based on the common theme of persecution and adversity, as well as a possible original catchword connection between 6:22 and 6:27 (ὃταὶ μισήσουσιν ἀνήλικος καὶ τοῖς μισήσουσιν ἀνήλικος). By contrast, see Mack, Lost Gospel, 73, 83; Vaage, Galilean Upstarts, 183-186 n.2.

\(^{102}\) Again, see Kloppenborg, Formation, 192.

\(^{103}\) So Kloppenborg, Formation, 192, 200-201; Schürmann, "Son of Man Title," 82. Against these views, and running against the composition-historical arguments of most commentators, the IQP, by denying a Q provenance for vv.61-62, suggests a formation of this cluster beginning with the pair of apophthegmatic units in vv.57-58 and vv.59-60, to which was subsequently added the mission charge, and only at the stage of Lukan redaction was a third example slipped in between the two chreiai and the mission speech.

\(^{104}\) Kloppenborg, Formation, 193; "Sayings Gospel Q: Recent Opinion," 17; Uro, Sheep Among Wolves, 113-115, 204; White, "Sociological Analysis," 256; Zeller, "Redactional Processes," 125-126. The grounds for this conclusion are especially the shift between Q 10:2, which exhorts prayer that more "missionaries" (actually, "workers," ἐφαγαται) materialize (implying that those addressed are not themselves missionaries), and Q 10:3, which appears directly addressed to those missionaries (behold, I send you . . .).
approbation. The follower is not enjoined to be itinerant; only Jesus himself is presented as "having no place to lay his head." And what this phrase is deemed to mean in its Q1 context — actual homelessness, or the absence of family for Jesus as in the two following sayings, or simply a general lack of welcome, i.e., rejection — remains less than clear. But the saying, in fact, once it is detached from its immediate literary context, implies itinerancy even less than it does within the confines of Q. Without the immediate context of Q 9:59-60 (61-62), the voluntary aspect of the homelessness describes in vv.57-58 is nowhere in sight. And without the larger context of Q1 as a whole, "son of man" does not obviously refer to Jesus or to any other single person, but, quite naturally, would be taken simply to mean "human beings." Thus the point of this wisdom saying, circulating in isolation, is that not some but all human beings, and not willingly but perforce, have no natural sanctuary. There is no especially good reason to regard such a sentiment as the invention of itinerants, particularly when the itinerant's asceticism is voluntary and hence a display of religious virtuosity, something absolutely not to be imputed to human beings in general.

Of course the main impetus for associating Q with any form of itinerancy, at any stage of its development or of the development of its traditions, is the "Mission charge" of Q 10:2-16. The text in its current form is a product of both major redactional layers of Q. Q 10:13-15 clearly interrupts the flow of the thought and the form of the preced-

105. Note, in fact, that the redactor of Q2 may have understood this cluster in the same way, i.e., as part of a general injunction to replace familial affections with commitment to "the kingdom," of a piece with 14:26 (and, more generally, 14:27 and 17:33), with family serving as a focal instance of some level of social ostracism. The last line of the foregoing Q material, a block which was added at the level of Q2's overarching redaction, is "but Wisdom is justified by her children, ἀπὸ τῶν τέκνων αὐτῆς (7:35), and this phrase is used at the conclusion of a description of the general disparagement suffered by both Jesus and John. It may not be a coincidence that an image of fictive family is thus associated by this redactor with earlier (Q1) injunctions to be willing to turn one's back on actual family.
106. See Crossan, "Itinerants and Householders," 121, refers to the itinerants' "spiritual pyrotechnics."
ing material: it is directed to outsiders, not to those sent; and like other Q2 texts (7:1-10; 11:31-32; 13:28-29) emphasizes not only the theme of judgment and rejection, but also of invidious comparison of Israel with Gentiles. One might also note the distinctive retrospective, rather than prospective, sense of these verses: given the miracles performed, Tyre and Sidon would have repented long ago (πάλαι). These sayings then, were added secondarily to a collection that already existed in Q1, by the hand responsible for Q2.

Beyond this conclusion, however, the virtual consensus ends, and a multiplicity of different suggestions assert themselves. Kloppenborg, intelligibly enough, associates the thematically similar 10:12 with the Q2 interpolation of vv.13-15, and regards v.16 — which, following Jacobson, forms an inclusio with v.3 (ιδοὺ ἄπωστελλων; τὸν ἄπωστελλαντά με) that brackets almost the entirety of the speech — as the original (i.e., Q1) conclusion to the speech. Thus at the Q1 level, the Mission Charge, regardless of its compositional prehistory, consisted of 10:2-11, 16, to which the Q2 redactor added only one interpolation, namely the judgment sayings comprised by vv.13-15, along with a transitional bridge constituted by v.12. The basis of the associa-


108. So Kloppenborg, Formation, 199-203, cf.192-197, 243. Note that some thematic association already exists between the cluster of apophthegms in 9:57-60 (61-62), which derive from the first stratum of Q, and the (bulk of the) “Mission Charge.”


tion was thematic: Q2 placed its shaming, judgmental, and (retrospectively) pessimistic exclamations precisely at the location in the Q1 speech which considers the possibility of, and potential responses to, rejection.112 Uro, by contrast, also noting the links between v.16 and v.3 argues to the opposite effect, i.e., that this connection illustrates that both sayings represent secondary additions made at the same time, additions which, however, he associates with vv.12-15: "[t]he common tone of the sayings points strongly to the conclusion that Lk 10.3, 10.12, 10.13-15, and 10.16 were added at the same stage of composition."113 While Uro here is concerned with the history of the (oral) aggregation of this unit rather than with its literary development within Q, his argument has implications for the latter insofar as it contradicts the outlines of Kloppenburg's proposal. If Uro is correct, then vv.3, 16 are also to be attributed to Q2.

Uro is probably not correct, however: his reasoning that vv.3 and 16 are linked to one another is certainly valid, but there is very little reason to associate these two verses with the pessimistic tone of vv.12, 13-15. Verse 3 emphasizes the dangers of the projected "sending out," and v.16 discusses the possibilities of both acceptance and rejection; but these (relatively) mild concerns are of a piece with vv.8-11, where rejection is a possibility but only one possibility: by the time we get to vv.13-15, rejection appears to be the only possibility.114 In a word, v.16, especially, is simply too optimistic to be associated with vv.13-15, and so, carrying v.3 with it, it belongs in

112. See Kloppenburg, Formation, 195-196, 199, 243.
113. Uro, Sheep Among Wolves, 112.
114. Or, as Uro, Sheep Among Wolves, 87, puts it, "The gravity of negative response is greatly emphasized by the judgments of Lk 10.12 and 10.13-15 . . . ."
this speech prior to Q2 redaction.\textsuperscript{115} Kloppenborg additionally notes that v.3, with its sheep imagery, coheres with the defenseless posture advocated in vv.4-7.\textsuperscript{116}

Still another suggestion has been made, to the effect that v.12, λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι Σωδόμαις ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἀνεκτότερον ἔσται ἥ τῇ πόλει ἐκείνη, actually served as the original (oral? Q1?) conclusion to this speech, rather than having been added at the same time as vv.13-15.\textsuperscript{117} Thus Braun argues that

the Sodom saying, though form-critically a minatory saying and thus most closely related to 10:13-15, expilicates and bolsters the judgment motif inherent in the \textit{Fluchgestus} (v.10-11) so that v.12, not v.16, could have been the (more?) original conclusion of the mission speech to which the woe sayings were then added ad vocem ἀνεκτότερον ἔσται. On this account one may then reasonably speculate that 10:12 was originally an independent saying which has been modified in order better to serve as a compositional bridge between 10:11 and 10:13-15.\textsuperscript{118}

Catchpole agrees, removing v.11b as a subsequent addition, and thus seeing a smooth argumentative flow between v.11a and v.12.\textsuperscript{119} Further buttressing this contention is his view that v.16 is not an early part of the unit, and thus without v.12, the entire speech ends not with a bang, but a whimper.\textsuperscript{120} These kinds of conclusions, again.

\textsuperscript{115} I have some hesitation, however, about entirely rejecting Udo's proposal. The reason for this is that 10:16 coheres remarkably well with the Q2 tendency observed above (among the examples of which I listed 10:16!) to focus on the theme of delegation or representation. Q 10:16 is one of the clearest articulations of this interest in the entire document, and, as such, it also flows naturally into the following, Q2, material (10:21-22) dealing with the relationship between the "Father" and the "Son." On the other hand, if one accepts the social continuity of Q's traditions from one stratum to the next, it would not be entirely surprising to find some of the major interests of the second layer presented in limited ways in the first layer. Still, the thematic focus of 10:16 is cause for some apprehension, although its inclusion in Q2 redaction would not much alter the complexion of the Q1 version of the speech nor necessitate a revision of the conclusions about any of the other verses. On the various Rabbinic comments about the principle of agency, see Kloppenborg, \textit{Formation}, 197 n.113.


120. Catchpole, "Mission Charge," 163, citing the "harmony" that exists between v.16 and v.2, which latter he argues is a late editorial insertion (152-157).
have implications for the literary stages of the unit: they imply that v.16, *rather than* v.12, should (probably) be associated with the secondary redaction of the speech. Some sundry glosses to the speech made at a late stage have also been suggested.121

With some hesitation (see above, n.115), one should concede that the variations on Kloppenborg’s views remain unconvincing, at least insofar as the *literary* history of this unit is concerned. The association posited by Catchpole between v.2 and v.16 is overshadowed by v.16’s connections with v.3.122 The sanguinity of these latter two verses, on the other hand, contrasts sharply with unmitigated pessimism of vv.13-15, making them unlikely candidates for Q2 additions. Interestingly, in spite of the obvious aporia (see below) between vv.2 and 3, the verse is far too optimistic to represent a Q2 redactional addition.123 Secondary though this verse may be, it was already present in Q1’s version of this speech. Verse 12, on the other hand, unless one wishes to speculate a series of completely hypothetical modifications, belongs with vv.13-15 both thematically and formally, as indeed it does with the remainder of Q2.124 Its wording is almost identical to that of 10:14, it maintains the Q2 redactional interest in Sodom specifically as well as in shaming impenitent Israel generally, and it invokes the specter of apocalyptic judgment ("on the day"); moreover it could not have circulated independently since under those circumstances τῇ πόλει ἐκείνη would have no referent.125 Most likely, v.12 was formulated on the basis of v.14 as a (Q2) redactional means of linking the new material to the already-extant (Q1) Mission Speech.126

121. E.g., 10:2, so Catchpole, "Mission Charge," 152-157.
122. The verb of sending out is the same in vv.3, 16, i.e., ἀποστέλλω, while in v.2 it is ἐκβάλλω.
123. Kloppenborg also notes the connection between vv.2 and 7, in their use of the word ἔργον. In general, see Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 200. It is of course instances such as this one that demonstrate the importance of drawing as sharp a distinction as possible between literary history and tradition history.
126. On v.12 as a redactional bridge, so also Lührmann, *Redaktion*, 60, 62.
So much for the literary history of this unit. As for its prehistory, which is of lesser concern for our purposes here, the suggestions that a) the unit's core was comprised by Q 10:4-11,\textsuperscript{127} to which b) subsequent additions of vv.2, 3, 7, 16 were made, all prior to or at the time of the text's incorporation into the first stratum of Q,\textsuperscript{128} should suffice.\textsuperscript{129} What does need to be considered a little further, however, is the disjunction between Q 10:2 and 10:3. It has already been noted that at least at some stage, at or prior to its incorporation into Q, a change in perspective marks the traditions of this cluster of sayings, such that they are no longer "sent out" (10:3: \(ιδοὺ \ αποστέλλω \ υμᾶς\)) but now rather are encouraged to "beg" (\(δεύθησε\)) for "workers" (\(ἔργάτας\)) who will go out.\textsuperscript{130} Such, at any rate, is the view of those who do not see Q as document of itinerants but who do see itinerancy as lurking behind some its traditions. It is obvious that, form-critically or tradition-historically, the two lines do not belong together: they presuppose different (fictive) audiences, and so were not composed by the same hand or at the same time.\textsuperscript{131} But the shift in perspective associated with this pair of sayings — i.e., that from itinerant in the earlier v.3 to sedentary (perhaps those who fund or


\textsuperscript{128}That is, the discussion above suggests that only vv.12-15 were added at the Q2 stage, so the identification of these other verses as secondary to the original speech can only indicate that they were added by Q1 redaction or were part of Q1's received tradition, and thus added during the oral circulation of the speech.

\textsuperscript{129}The "core" of the speech constituted by vv.4-11 is almost certainly not original, either. Comparison with Mark 6:8-11; \textit{Gospel of Thomas} #14; 1 Timothy 5:8; and \textit{Didache} 13:1-2, as well as attention to the various minor aporiae within the unit, all suggest a series of compilations, amplifications, emendations, and perhaps even excisions over the course of the unit's transmission. Most suspicious are vv. 4c, 7b,c, 10-11. See Braun, "Mission Speech," 288-290; Kloppenborg, \textit{Formation}, 195; Uro, \textit{Sheep Among Wolves}, 98-111, 116.

\textsuperscript{130}See above, n.104.

\textsuperscript{131}See Kloppenborg, \textit{Formation}, 193; Uro, \textit{Sheep Among Wolves}, 99; Zeller, "Redactional Processes," 125 and n.38. Note that \textit{Gospel of Thomas} #73 presents a version of this opening saying (the harvest saying, Q 10:2), which suggests independent circulation prior to its inclusion in this speech. Also dividing these two lines is the singularity of the harvest image in v.2, which does not recur, and the fact that while God is the sender of missionaries in v.2, Jesus sends them in v.3.
otherwise "send out" (ἐκβάλλειν) itinerants — is the product of a too-literal and rather forced reading of v.2. Thus Zeller argues:

The metaphor of the harvest and the command to pray for missionaries are not directed to those who in v.3 are sent out but to Christians who, as it were, gathered for prayer before a commissioning (Acts 13:1-3). In this verse an ecclesial Sitz im Leben is visible, while the rules in vv.3-12 were probably the concern of the messengers of Jesus alone. 132

Without wishing to argue that this text is a unitary composition — it clearly is not —, its logic and sense is not quite as bifurcated as a such a reading would suggest. The failure of the harvest imagery to recur is no more notable than the failure of the animal imagery of the following verse to recur; indeed, the image of the ἑργάτης does recur in v.7. 134 The apparent shift from being sent by God in v.2 to being sent by Jesus in v.3 is actually addressed, and minimized, explicitly at the end of this little speech: "whoever receives you receives me, and whoever receives me receives the one who sent me" (10:16). We do not at all require an ecclesial, never mind liturgical (!). setting to contextualize v.2: prayer is involved in the usual translation of this text, but the word actually used in Q 10:2, δέομαι (doubly-attested), means to beg or ask for something: it is not strictly synonymous with προσεύχομαι. Zeller's scenario is derived from Acts and from a stylized view of the "commissioning" of "missionaries," something which we have no evidence at all is operative here. It makes far more sense — especially when one considers that the various aporiae which certainly exist between v.2 and v.3 did not especially bother the Q redactor — to envision v.2 as indeed a secondary introductory clause to the entirety of the following speech, but one that was intended to be as much addressed to those who were "sent out" as the remainder of the material. In other words, the observation that the harvest is large and that more

133. So, apparently, Schultz, Spruchquelle, 409.
workers would be helpful if only the master would send them out is precisely the kind of observation one would expect from the workers themselves, and not from those who retrospectively contemplate the role of (erstwhile) missionaries. The request for more "workers" by no means precludes a setting among those "workers" themselves, Zeller (and others) to the contrary.

If the "insider" perspective on these instructions has not in fact changed by the time they were incorporated into Q1, and yet the erstwhile document as a whole appears to attest to a continuation of sedentary village existence, what is one to make of the obvious connotations of "mission" and especially travel in this unit? If the people responsible for Q1 were sedentary, why include these traditions? Several observations on the character of the Q1 speech, however, suggest that the journeys it envisions are strictly local and short-term. First, the lower Galilee itself was sufficiently small and sufficiently densely populated that travel from one village to another was usually a matter of less than an hour, not several days. Advocates of a perpetual itinerancy among the Q traditions must explain how any sense of "mission" could be sustained over the length of time in which the document developed.

Second, it has also been observed that the equipment rule, which restricts the "traveler" from even the most basic of provisions, may itself suggest a desire to avoid

---

135. As White, "Sociological Analysis," 256, would have it.
136. So also Kloppenborg, "Sayings Gospel Q: Recent Opinion," 22; and "Literary Convention," 89: "Hence itinerancy is more likely to have looked like brief excursions than like the extended journeys of Paul."
138. Mack, Myth of Innocence, 84 (emphasis added), makes a tentative effort to offer such an explanation when he suggests that "[a]s time went by, the Q itinerants learned that some cities were hopeless and not to be bothered. They also learned not to go door-to-door. Instead, they looked for the house that would return the sign of ‘peace’ and ‘receive’ them for dinner. But even that got old."
long journeys, or at least the appearance of extensive travelling. Advocates of the Cynic hypothesis make much of these restrictions, quite correctly noting that the prohibition, rather than endorsement, of these typically Cynic items in no way distances the material from the Cynic ethos. But what Cynic advocates will not concede is that the items in question, while typically Cynic, are not uniquely Cynic: they simply represent attire for the road, and thus the connection between the Cynic paraphernalia and that prohibited the Q people probably has more to do with ordinary travelling equipment (one wonders at the absence of a harmonica) than with any genetic links between the two traditions. And this observation in turn highlights the main distinction between the Q instructions and the standard Cynic garb: for the Cynic, the possession of equipment for the road is intended to characterize their self-sufficient lifestyle: this motley collection of goods is the sum of their possessions all the time; but for Q the instructions (prohibitions, in this instance) pertain only to sending out "on the road," i.e., to actual travel, not to literal and perpetual lifestyle. We may thus conclude from the equipment rule in v.4, then, that not only is a Cynic-like itinerant existence not necessarily evinced, but that, if anything, very short journeys are envisioned, jour-

139. Kloppenborg, "Literary Convention," 89. In n.15 (p.102), Kloppenborg credits Wendy Cotter with this observation. Cotter, in fact, argues elsewhere that the Q people attempt to minimize the appearance of travel or "mission" because of a deliberate effort at concealment of their subversive behaviour and agenda. See Cotter, "Parables of the Mustard Seed and Leaven," esp.44-47.

140. See, e.g., Vaage, Galilean Upstarts, 26-30; and see ch.3, above.

141. Hoffmann, Studien, 313-314, a point noted but not pursued by Vaage, Galilean Upstarts, 25. A decidedly non-Cynic reference to these items can be found, for instance, in Danby, Mishnah, Berakhoth 9.5 (10): "He [a man] may not enter into the Temple Mount with his staff or his sandal or his wallet, or with the dust upon his feet." Here the items appear simply as standard travelling implements, with dust on one's feet (cf. Q 10:11) thrown in for good measure. Incidentally, if, as this text suggests, dust on the feet is simply a standard sign of travel, the interpretive crux of Q 10:11 (opinions on which have ranged from a solemn curse or gesture of contempt to a "slightly wacky" and deliberately ridiculous mockery [so Vaage, Galilean Upstarts, 37]) may be slightly illuminated: the injunction to shake the dust from your feet may be directed solely at the traveler, rather than as a prophetic demonstration to the people of the town (diff. Luke 10:11, cf. IQP's reconstruction, which follows Matthew here). The point would then be, "your dealings with this town, i.e., your trips to it, are over. This particular journey is over."
neys which do not require even sandals or staff despite the rugged terrain of the Galilee. In support of this conclusion, it is notable that Mark's version of the text, situated in the midst of a broader narrative in which relatively extensive journeying is imagined, does not prohibit but actually endorses the use of these items (i.e., staff and sandals: see Mark 6:8-9).

Third, Kloppenborg has noted that

... the very fact that Q describes these persons with a metaphor of an agricultural day-laborer — whose relative social position requires no elaboration — and the fact that it needs to remind those addressed by Q that such "workers" were deserving of subsistence support implies that these workers were not invested with the titles "apostle" (1 Cor. 9.1; Did. 11.3-6), "prophet" (Did. 11.3-11; 13.1) or "teacher" (Did. 13.2), any of which would have made their role as (potential) leaders clear.\footnote{142. Kloppenborg, "Sayings Gospel Q: Recent Opinion," 22. Cf. "Literary Convention," 89-90.}

The individuals addressed by Q 10.2-11, 16 are thus not leading communities nor, apparently, are they staying very long or "founding" "communities."\footnote{143. Kloppenborg, "Literary Convention," 89.} One may, in fact, go further. The image of the master sending out (wage-) laborers to the field (see esp. vv.2, 7) actually implies an extraordinarily localized "mission" sphere. Typically, the wage-laborer is found in the local marketplace at the beginning of the day, sent into the employer's fields for an agreed-upon rate, and is paid and returns home that night, waiting, perhaps, for further employment the following day.\footnote{144. See the detailed and fascinating description of this process offered in Matthew 20:1-16.} If the metaphor is a significant one for those who compiled Q1 — and it appears to be\footnote{145. Q1 redaction cannot be responsible for actually composing this saying, because an independent version exists in Gospel of Thomas #73. Its secondary character vis-à-vis the original "kernel" of the speech, however, has been dealt with above, and suggests at least the possibility ("probability" would be going too far) that the saying was added to the rest of the speech at the time Q1 was compiled.} — the mental image suggested by the work they feel "called" to perform is one involving considerable labor, effort, hardship, and yet only the most minimal travel: to the "fields" and, after receiving one's "wages," back home the same day. The image therefore
matches the limitations suggested by the equipment nile, and matches the impression we receive of an unexpressed "home base" implied in sending these figures out on journeys.

Fourth and finally, that the "mission" implied by the Q1 version of this speech involved only very short travels is unquestionably assumed by the persons responsible for the subsequent redaction of Q, i.e., Q2. The addition by this redaction of the woes in 10:12-15 (or even just vv.13-15) indicates that the travels described in vv.2-11 are imagined by these people to have extended to Bethsaida, Chorazin, and Capernaum (if indeed Capernaum was not the "home base"), all of which were within a radius of no more than 10 km. If we assume Capernaum as a starting-point, both of the other towns mentioned are the distance of an easy day’s travel, there and back, a journey, in fact, that many of the residents of these towns probably made with relative frequency and for a variety of reasons. Tyre, 55 km away, is not even conceived to be within the purview of this "mission," in spite of an apparent (if only rhetorical?) openness to Gentiles in Q2. Thus at least in the minds of the Q2 redactors, retrospectively to the "mission" announced (and practiced?) by their Q1 forebears, "itinerancy" was a practice.

---

146. v.13: εἰ ἐν Τύρῳ καὶ Σιδώνι οὐκ οὐκ ὄρθις οὐκ οὐκ ὄρθις . . . ἐν . . . , that is, grammatically expressed with εἰ + aorist indicative (with εἰ in apodosis), and thus as a condition contrary to fact. See Blass and Debrunner, Greek Grammar, 182 (§ 360).

that only extended within about a 10 km orbit.  

Q's "mission," therefore, both as it is being undertaken at the level of Q1, and as it is being remembered at the level of Q2, appears to have involved travel, but nothing more arduous or "radical" than day-trips to the immediately neighboring towns and villages — from Capernaum, for example, such towns as Chorazin or Bethsaida. These nearby settlements, of course, would already have commercial and social contacts with the travelers’ "home base." If indeed the Q1 "mission" (and Q2's memory of it) was so limited, the traditional conceptions of "missionary proclamation" and "spreading the gospel" apply no better than the scholarly standby of Wanderradikalismus. How was such a limited "mission" conceived, how was it undertaken, and what could it be expected to achieve?

In answer to these questions, the Q1 version of the mission charge allows for at least a few inferences. The explicit analogy of those "sent" to day-laborers in v.3 is complemented by what appears to be an implicit analogy to other types of travelers and to the parameters of "official" local hospitality that they might reasonably expect. Both the Mishnah and the Tosefta have closely parallel texts, which are, surprisingly, routinely ignored by itinerancy advocates. The Mishnah, describing how one is to practice charity, states that

A poor man that is journeying from place to place should be given not less than one loaf worth a pondion [from wheat costing] one sela for four seahs. If he spends the night [in such a place] he should be given what is needful to support him for the night. If he stays over the Sabbath he should be given food enough for three meals.  

148. This text also dispels any possibility that "city" (πόλις, vv.8, 10) in the original (Q1) mission charge should be read in its more precise apparent connotations (i.e., not a κώμη) and thus indicates the kind of large settlement that one would not likely encounter with a 10 km or so radius. For Q 10:12-13, however, πόλις is evidently a term that can be applied to even so small a settlement as Chorazin. It is instructive to note that while BAGD, 461 ("κώμη") describes the use of "village" as frequently in opposition to πόλις, BAGD, 685-686 ("πόλις"), in describing the range of meanings of this term, does not make the size of the settlement a factor.

149. Danby, Mishnah, Peah 8.7 (20). Emphasis added.
The Tosefta, somewhat later, offers clarifying amplification of these injunctions (while simultaneously abbreviating the language):

Do not open yourself (i.e., give charity) to a poor person who wanders from place to place [beyond] a dupondius’ worth [of bread] from [wheat costing one sela] for four seahs. If he sleeps there, give him what is due to a sleeper: oil, and beans. If he stays over the Sabbath (i.e., if he stays a week), give him food for three meals: oil, beans, fish, and vegetables. These things are said for instances in which you do not know him. But for instances in which you do know him, you are even to go ahead and clothe him. Now, if he goes around from door to door, you are not obligated to him for anything.\(^{150}\)

In comparing Q’s mission speech to these texts, what is missing from Q is as remarkable as what is present. Utterly lacking in Q is the concern expressed by the Mishnah and Tosefta about the provisions required for those who stay various lengths of time: overnight ("if he spends the night," "if he sleeps there"), or a week ("if he stays over the Sabbath"). Unlike the travelers described in the Didache, and unlike those wandering paupers (beggars?) at issue in the Mishnah and Tosefta, the Q travelers do not stay overnight. Thus the reference in the Mission Speech to entering houses (Q 10:5) is almost certainly not an indication that lodging is sought, but instead that these individuals seek a general welcome and table hospitality (a supposition supported by 10:7b, which imagines food offerings as an indication of "acceptance").

The two main features that Q shares with these injunctions are also notable. First, these texts all evince a practice of wandering and the expectation of hospitality in the

\(^{150}\) The (Hebrew) version of the Tosefta cited here (Peah 4.8) is that of Saul Lieberman. Emphasis added. The translation into English was made for me by Rachel Urowitz (personal communication). See also Neusner, Tosefta, Peah 4.8 (69):

They give to a poor person travelling from place to place no less than a loaf [of bread] worth a dupondius [made from wheat which costs at least] one sela for four seahs. [If such a poor person] stayed overnight, they must give him enough [food] for a night’s lodging [namely, they give him] oil, beans, fish, and a vegetable. Under what circumstances does this apply? [It applies] so long as [the townspeople] do not recognize the poor person. But if they recognize him, they even provide clothing for him. [If a poor person] went from door to door [begging for food from each family] they are not obligated to him in any way [because he should receive money from the communal fund].
form of rations. Moreover, that hospitality appears to have an "official" character: that is, it represents what the travelers may be expected to receive from the village/locality in which he is found, not from individual persons. The rations to be provided (a small loaf of bread for the day; oil, fish, vegetables, if the wanderer stays longer) are not especially prodigal, but they are — and are meant to be — sufficient for subsistence, indicating that such charity is not expected from each and every person in the village, but from the village as a whole. Thus the image suggested by vv.8-10 that acceptance or rejection of the Q "messengers" occurs at the level of the "city" as a whole makes sense not only in terms of the social homogeneity of small settlements, but apparently also in terms of the concrete strategies actually used (at least according to the Mishnah and Tosefta) among villagers and townspeople for dealing with strangers, and invoked (deliberately?) in this speech. Thus the direct juxtaposition of instructions for behaviour toward a household (οίκία, vv.5-7) with instructions for behaviour toward a village (vv.8-11), while almost certainly a form-critical aporia, was probably viewed as completely continuous advice within the context of Q. What all of this tells us is simply that the Q(1) "messengers" viewed themselves as addressing themselves to

---

151. On which see Kloppenborg, "Literary Convention," 90:
Q 10:10 seems to envisage acceptance and rejection at the level of the village itself: being welcomed by one household (10:5) is tantamount to being welcomed by the village, and rejection is rejection by the village. In other words, when discussing the specific role of the workers, Q 10 presupposes village structures in which the social solidarity produced by kinship, patron-client relationships and economic ties would have made it difficult for any village household to adopt a posture that varied from the rest of the village. Clearly there is some relationship: the parallels are simply too close to be coincidental. But the temporal distance between the composition of Q and of the Mishnah, and then again of the Tosefta — which is to be reckoned in the centuries rather than the decades —, complicates the situation tremendously. It seems most likely to me that all three writings are simply recording, at different times, a long-standing conventional practice toward travelers. But it remains quite possible that stipulations originally conceived by the Q tradents were absorbed into general local lore and subsequently incorporated into Mishnah and Tosefta. If so, the cogency of my arguments here is somewhat diminished.

152. I am forced to question the deliberateness of the allusion simply because I do not think it possible to determine the lineage of these injunctions or their relation to one another. Clearly there is some relationship: the parallels are simply too close to be coincidental. But the temporal distance between the composition of Q and of the Mishnah, and then again of the Tosefta — which is to be reckoned in the centuries rather than the decades —, complicates the situation tremendously. It seems most likely to me that all three writings are simply recording, at different times, a long-standing conventional practice toward travelers. But it remains quite possible that stipulations originally conceived by the Q tradents were absorbed into general local lore and subsequently incorporated into Mishnah and Tosefta. If so, the cogency of my arguments here is somewhat diminished.
— and in return being addressed by — the settlement as a corporate entity, and in its relatively "official" manifestation. Visits to houses are hence deemed to be commensurate with "official" and public visits to, appeals to, and acceptance or rejection by, the whole settlement in which the house was located.

On the other hand, the relative paucity of the rations corporately provided by villages (according to the Mishnah and Tosefta, that is) may in part account for Q's stipulation to "eat what is set before you" (v.8). That is, while v.7 encourages the workers to accept hospitality as their due (their "wages"), v.8 warns them not to spurn hospitality that is not all that it could be, i.e., to accept whatever it is that any given town has to offer. The important thing is not what is given, but that anything is given at all, sage advice when one considers that the people who live in these villages are probably not especially well-off, and that, if anything, given the circumstances recounted in the last chapter, their livelihood is probably shrinking. The concern here thus seems to have little to do with Jew/Gentile or purity issues (cf. Gospel of Thomas #14, where purity does seem to be an issue) and more to do with how to receive hospitality when it is offered.154

Second, the text from the Tosefta includes, as does Q 10:7c, a stipulation about going from door to door.155 The Tosefta’s stipulation that one is not required to extend

154. Against Braun, "Mission Speech," 289; Catchpole, "Mission Charge," 164-165, and most others. Given what we know about early Christianity and the categories through which we ordinarily view it, this inference is a natural one, but is not supported in the text itself, where hospitality, not ethnicity, is the matter under discussion.
155. Oddly, the IQP has seen fit to exclude this stipulation from its reconstruction of the original Q speech. See Milton C. Moreland and James M. Robinson, "The International Q Project: Work Sessions 23-27 May, 22-26 August, 17-18 November, 1994," Journal of Biblical Literature 114/3 (Fall, 1995): 475-485, 480. The prohibition, however, appears to be Q’s version of what appears in Mark (6:10) as "remain there until you leave the place," which Matthew has conflated with the Q version, as is his wont (Matt 10:11: "determine who is worthy, and stay with that person until you depart"), but which Luke has retained essentially verbatim in his Markan-derived doublet of this speech (Luke 9:4: "And whatever house you enter, remain there, and from there depart"). Thus in his Q-derived version of the speech, Luke probably retains an original Q injunction against going door-to-door. Matthew’s interpolation of the proverb about the worker deserving his food (Matt 10b, from Q, diff. Mark) between the equipment
charity to a poor person if that person has been going from door to door probably does not represent any kind of specific disapprobation of begging so much as an assumption that such a person's needs will thus have already been addressed, and so no (further) charity is required. This stipulation, therefore, confirms the impression that the charity or hospitality in question in the Mishnah and Tosefta is "official": it is offered in the stead of, or as an alternative to, the charity of individual households. Again, the parallel may suggest useful lines of interpretation for the injunction in Q 10:7c. The point of this prohibition is not to avoid greed or to prevent the "messengers" from pestering individual householders. Rather, the point is — at least insofar as the Tosefta's parallel sheds light on the assumptions and implications the Q Mission Charge — that the messengers are addressing themselves to the village/town as a corporate entity rather than to the individual households that comprise it. In other words, a mission of individuals to individuals is not in view. By way of confirming the relevance of this parallel for such an interpretation, it is notable that this prohibition (10:7c) is associated both thematically and by juxtaposition with the twin injunctions to accept (10:7a,b), and to receive graciously (10:8b), whatever hospitality may be offered. Thus the argumentative progression of the multiple sayings concatenated in these two verses is: a) accept what you can get on such journeys, because you deserve it (10:7a,b), but b) the point of the journeys is "official business," i.e., involves dealings with the

rule and the prohibition against travelling from house to house, an arrangement which Luke shares, is further indication that a Q version of the prohibition underlies Matthean and Lukan texts: the saying is not derived solely from Mark.

156. An insight I owe to Rachel Urowitz (personal communication).
157. For such an interpretation, see, e.g., Mack, Lost Gospel, 129-130: "Begging [generally speaking] had been modulated into requesting hospitality [from specific houses] as a representative of the movement. One gets the impression of a network of house groups interested in staying touch."
158. This reading, i.e., as directed to and prescribing the behaviour of, the missionaries themselves, runs counter to that of Kloppenborg, Formation, 200, and many other, on which see above, pp.370, 378.
village or town as a unit, and is not orientated toward establishing individual connections (10:7c, cf. 10:8a), and so, therefore, c) even if the "official" pickings could be better, accept what you are given, because the real point is whether or not you will be welcomed at all, not how much you can accumulate or how comfortable your hosts will make you (10:8b).

Several scholars imagine that the shift within the Q mission discourse between instructions pertinent to approaching houses (vv.5-7) and those applicable to approaching cities (vv.8-12) represent is an *aporia* indicative of different historical stages in the activity of the people responsible for this unit.159 This is almost certainly correct, as the absence of the additional city-oriented material in the Markan parallel attests.160 But any claim that the *city* stage came prior to the *house* stage is certainly incorrect.161 As most commentators argue, it is clear that the instructions for entering households represent a core element of the speech, probably combined with the equipment rule to


160. Against Bultmann, *History of the Synoptic Tradition*, 145, who maintains that the Marcan version is an abridgement of an originally-longer text, which is thus better preserved in Q. Cf. also Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 195 and n.103; Uro, *Sheep Among Wolves*, 103. The tendency to regard Q/Mark parallels in which Mark's material is shorter as indicative of *Marcan abbreviations* rather than *Q expansions* has more to do, I think, with the attractiveness and mysteriousness of the Q versions of these speeches (Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 195, referring to the wording of Q against Mark, rather than the original extent of the speech, nevertheless states "the radical comportment of Q is usually taken as a sign of antiquity"; the sentiment could apply to much of Q's material), as well as of Q itself, than with any of the observed redactional predilections of Mark or ordinary and discernible form-critical tendencies in the transmission of the material. It should be recognized — although most frequently it is not — that Q or the pre-Q traditions tend to expand on certain units, especially in terms of their dialogue rather than narrative content, that Mark retains essentially intact. The temptation of Jesus in the wilderness (Q 4:1-13; Mark 1:12-13) is probably the most obvious example of this phenomenon: a rather more contentious example is Q's *expansion* (Q 3:7-9, 16-17) of Mark's very brief "speech" by John the Baptist (Mark 1:7-8), on which see Arnal, "Redactional Fabrication," 170-171. That Q is likely an earlier document than Mark is entirely irrelevant to the issue of its originality in these cases.

161. A claim made by Mack, *Lost Gospel*, 129-130. Mack believes that a publicly-oriented mission, having failed to achieve any significant results, was replaced by a focus on individual households. Hoffmann, *Studien*, 267-283, likewise — although for rather different reasons — argues that the Q mission was a mission to *households*. 


form the earliest nucleus of the charge as a whole.\textsuperscript{162} And what is equally clear is that at or by the time the instruction was incorporated into Q, the focus was now entirely on "cities" as such,\textsuperscript{163} on the public character of the "mission."\textsuperscript{164} Thus the Mission Speech as it now appears in Q (at both main strata of the document), focusing on "official" and collective reception and subsuming the household instructions within that program,\textsuperscript{165} is the logic of the people responsible for Q, or at the very least is logic they accept and endorse.

\textsuperscript{162} So Uro, \textit{Sheep Among Wolves}, 107-109, 115-116. Supporting this view is the fact that such a "core" is attested by the Marcan parallel. Note also that the parallel saying in \textit{Thomas} #14 specifies welcome by \textit{cities no more than does Mark: for Thomas, the mission grounds are E\&K and NX P.}

\textsuperscript{163} Against Hoffmann, \textit{Studien}, 267-283. See Braun, "Mission Speech." 289: "Further indirect evidence for the city mission in Q is found in the source's own expansion of the mission speech with the addition of the woes on cities. . . . The transition from the house- to a city- mission thus appears to be an inner-Q compositional development . . . ."

\textsuperscript{164} See the observation of Uro, \textit{Sheep Among Wolves}, 103, that ". . . while Mark has no positive command about the disciples' public behaviour, Q orders them to heal the sick and to proclaim the kingdom of God in such a town in which the disciples are welcomed. " The observation is ancillary to a very different point, but it does serve to underscore the extent to which \textit{publicity} distinguishes the Q version of this tradition from the Marcan version.

\textsuperscript{165} See Kloppenborg, "Literary Convention," 90: "being welcomed by one household (10:5) is convertible with being welcomed by the village . . . ." The point here is not that there is no discontinuity between these instructions, but that the assumptions of those who cobbled together this speech obscure that continuity. As far as the final compositor of the Q version of the Mission Charge is concerned, and hence in terms of the logic of the speech as whole, rather than of its constituent units, household acceptance and village acceptance are the same thing. Hence "do not go from house to house." Historically, this is a fairly important point. Without wishing to concede \textit{anything} to the itinerancy tradition in scholarship, one is forced to note that the original (?) juncture of the equipment rule (whether in its Marcan or Q formulation) with the household instructions is indeed suggestive of an early tradition oriented toward begging, and one in which lodging is indeed at issue: this rather different \textit{SitZ} would explain why the focus on the etiquette of entry into a house is so strong. However, by the time we get to Q or even pre-Q formulations of the speech, whatever may have been at issue in these instructions originally has been re-oriented in a public direction, and toward a situation in which begging is not practiced, and lodging is not an issue. It is notable, in passing, that if this reconstruction is correct, the Marcan version of the equipment rule — almost universally held to be secondary — could in fact better represent the original wording, the point being, take nothing \textit{except} basic travelling equipment on your begging trips; Q, more interested in local public proclamation, denied its "sheep" even this, not in order to be more "radical," but simply because overnight trips are no longer in view.
What are the (pre-?)Q1 villages scribes doing, then? Apparently, at least immediately prior to the incorporation of the Mission Charge into Q(1), they are making short trips to adjacent towns in some kind of official or quasi-official capacity. In other words they are acting, as we might expect, like administrators, even if what they are doing is not part of their authorized "job responsibilities." In the performance of administrative duties, it appears that normally subordinates travelled to superiors, and not the other way around. Thus the village scribe may indeed have been expected to venture to, say, Tiberias from time to time, but would not normally venture out to the nearby villages, at least not in the course of his official duties. If a villager needed "paperwork" done, that was a reason to come into town, not for the scribe to venture out to the village. So in this sense, i.e., in terms of the performance of their official duties, the activity described in Q 10:2-11, 16 is decidedly unauthorized. But the approaches made, from (newly-peripheralized!) "center" to "periphery" (such as from, e.g., Capernaum to Chorazin) were made in an official mood or were intended to have an official tone. They were thus local, public, and corporate in intention. Persons were actually travelling, but not as beggars, and not for long distances. The "official" aura of the injunctions, and the apparent satisfaction of these emissaries with bare acceptance rather than some sort of acquisition, may allow us hints of what the Q1 (or pre-Q1) people were trying to accomplish. Obviously they were not taking these trips to procure a good supper. If bare welcome, signalled and symbolized by any degree of hospitality (cf.10:8), was sufficient, the main point of these trips was surely ideological persuasion, the effort to convince one's neighboring towns to join the βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ (10:11). This effort was probably not made by ragged bums preaching in the town square, but by "official" emissaries addressing themselves to the local leadership, whether in the form of another village administrator or the κωμάρχης, or the local "big
man. " The intention, then, was not to behave like wild-eyed roving prophets (a literary type if there ever was one), but to use a combination of bureaucratic position and reasoned persuasion to generate a network of villages and towns which adopted — officially, as it were — the ethos of the Q people. The overtures were not made to individual persons as such, but to the political-administrative apparatus already in place, in the form of presenting themselves in the town square and there making approaches to whatever officials or leaders could be found. 166 Q is able to gloss over the juxtaposition between house instructions and village instructions so easily not only because social solidarity makes the two essentially equivalent, but also because for Q, they were literally equivalent: as far as they were concerned, welcome was not intended to procure a good supper. If bare welcome, signalled and symbolized by any degree of hospitality (cf. 10:8), was sufficient, the main point of these trips was surely ideological persuasion, the effort to convince one's neighboring towns to join the βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ (10:11). This effort was probably not made by ragged bums preaching in the town square, but by "official" emissaries addressing themselves to the local leadership, whether in the form of another village administrator or the κωμάρχης, or the local "big man." The intention, then, was not to behave like wild-eyed roving prophets (a literary type if there ever was one), but to use a combination of bureaucratic position and reasoned persuasion to generate a network of villages and towns which adopted — official-

166. Interestingly, the pairing of the core of the mission material with the image of day-laborers (by the addition of 10:2) may constitute the town speech under the auspices of a single unified image: poor folks wandering into town, seeking a living both through local hospitality (which, according to the Tosefta, makes up about 1/2 of the meals they need for a week), and seeking to complement this by offering themselves as day-laborers (which is why they stay in the town square). If so, Q has chosen an especially resonant image for its mission, identifying that mission, metaphorically of course, with the situation of such newly-landless poor wanderers, put off their turf by the same forces which actuate the Q people's agenda. If the reversal represented by administrators travelling to those they service, their (supposed) subordinates, actually represents a novelty in the experience of the persons responsible for Q(1), such an image as that of day-laborer might be invoked simply to make sense of the practice. Of course, serving as day-laborers for God somewhat mitigates the social stigma and status reduction implied by the image.
cially, as it were — the ethos of the Q people. The overtures were not made to individual persons as such, but to the political-administrative apparatus already in place, in the form of presenting themselves in the town square and there making approaches to whatever officials or leaders could be found. Q1 is able to gloss over the juxtaposition between house instructions and village instructions so easily not only because social solidarity makes the two essentially equivalent, but also because for Q, they were literally equivalent: as far as they were concerned, welcome by the village or town ("city") was being welcomed by its chief man. This also implies that the agenda promoted by Q1 was intended to be enacted politically or administratively as well as disseminated in this fashion. And that in its turn suggests that the ethos, agenda, or program of the "kingdom of God" was itself a political and administrative policy, rather than the sort of thing we moderns would regard as self-evidently and obviously "religious."

One should finally note that even at the stage at which Q1 was finally pieced together, these individuals were not especially optimistic that their plans would come to fruition. That the network they proposed to establish came to naught is evident enough in the Q2 woes against Capernaum, Chorazin, and Bethsaida. But already in Q1 there are indications that things are not proceeding according to plan. Although the majority of the Q1 Mission Speech focuses on how to approach towns and what to make of a

167. Interestingly, the pairing of the core of the mission material with the image of day-laborers (by the addition of 10:2) may constitute the town speech under the auspices of a single unified image: poor folks wandering into town, seeking a living both through local hospitality (which, according to the Tosefta, makes up about 1/2 of the meals they need for a week), and seeking to complement this by offering themselves as day-laborers (which is why they stay in the town square). If so, Q has chosen an especially resonant image for its mission, identifying that mission, metaphorically of course, with the situation of such newly-landless poor wanderers, put off their turf by the same forces which actuate the Q people's agenda. If the reversal represented by administrators travelling to those they service, their (supposed) subordinates, actually represents a novelty in the experience of the persons responsible for Q(1), such an image as that of day-laborer might be invoked simply to make sense of the practice. Of course, serving as day-laborers for God somewhat mitigates the social stigma and status reduction implied by the image.
positive reception (so vv. 2, 4-9), it is in later additions that discuss how to respond to rejection (vv. 10-11) and that express trepidation about the enterprise as a whole (v. 3). Moreover, the juxtaposition of the Mission Charge (10:2-11, 16) with the sayings on discipleship (9:57-62) — which must come from a very late stage in the composition of this material, probably Q1 redaction itself — reinforces the sense of hardship associated with this work, and actually may represent a first step in the direction of converting these injunctions from literal instructions into metaphorical exhortations to perseverance in discipleship.168

**THE RHETORIC OF DERACIONATION IN Q**

Of what, exactly, this scheme, ethos, agenda, or program might have consisted is another question, and the question that brings us face to face with Q’s imagery of inversion and deracination, imagery which scholarship has normally explained in terms of the legacy of radical itinerants. If the Q people were not wandering beggars, however, were not itinerant radicals, were not the settled "converts" of such individuals, whence the inversionary and "radical" tone of their language, and hence presumably of their "program"? To what ends is this rhetoric applied in their efforts to persuade their fellow administrators of the cogency and attractiveness of the "kingdom of God"?

If one examines Q’s rhetoric as rhetoric, i.e., in its rhetorical (literary) context and as an effort at persuasion,169 the document’s apparent concern with poverty as

---

168. Which is how Rudolf Laufen, *Die Doppelüberlieferungen der Logenquelle und des Markusevangeliums* (Bonn: Peter Hanstein Verlag, 1980), 252-253, e.g., reads the equipment rule in Q 10:4: as a hyperbole intended to exhort general reliance on God, not actual travel without provisions. It is easy to see how such an interpretation would evolve, either among modern scholars or the individuals for whom Q served as a foundational document.

169. I do not mean, necessarily, in terms of the formal rhetorical techniques of antiquity.
such, and especially with outright destitution, is somewhat attenuated.\textsuperscript{170} While a great deal of its rhetoric is inversionary, that rhetoric does not necessarily either reflect or exhort poverty: rather, it uses poverty alongside other images of social inversion as a metaphor to communicate the repudiation of social hierarchy as they experienced it. In other words, the terms and especially the dichotomies of the contemporary social structure (and its ideological rationalization) were taken up and either dissolved or inverted in Q's rhetoric. The image of poverty is used in Q(1) to this end, as is a variety of vignettes involving loss or depreciation of social standing (loss of wealth, of honour, of status, of prestige). These images are of a piece. While they do indeed reflect the diminished status of the QI tradents as a result of the socio-economic phenomena outlined in chapter 5, their primary and intended purpose is to provide loci for arguments the cumulative effect of which latter is the subversion of local and trans-local hierarchy as it being manifested, in novel (and evidently disagreeable) form, for these individuals and for their occupational caste generally. The point, then, was not to promote the specific inversions which appear in Q(1) so much as to advocate a persuasive way of viewing the social body in which the bases for a unfamiliar social hierarchy were corroded. In general, all of this rhetoric focuses on a single basic idea, viz., the eschewal of any and all forms of social mediation:\textsuperscript{171} poverty, loss of status, denigration of strict reciprocity, and so forth, are within the context of Q1 and of the program it advances, simply suasive forays into this theme, in the form of (logically or rhetorically) convenient examples or focal instances.\textsuperscript{172}

\textsuperscript{170} The comments at the beginning of this chapter, on the relatively broad range of social classes addressed by Q, should already have made this clear.

\textsuperscript{171} On which see further below.

\textsuperscript{172} The idea of "focal instances" as applied to some of the rhetoric of Q is drawn from John S. Kloppenberg, "Jesus and the Parables of Jesus in Q," pp.275-319 in Ronald A. Piper, ed., The Gospel Behind the Gospels: Current Studies on Q (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1995), esp.316-317.
This pattern is perhaps most clear in the stereotypical argumentative clusters noted by Piper, which probably formed the backbone around which Q1 was constructed. As Piper has noted, each one of these speeches uses a very conventionalized argumentative structure to convey its point:

1. A saying used as a general opening;
2. arguments directly in support of this opening assertion;
3. rhetorical questions, or new illustrations;
4. final argument and application.

Thus, speaking from the rhetorical perspective of the pre-Q1 compilers of these speeches, the point of each argument will be found in its concluding exhortations. Collecting together the exhortations Piper identifies as concluding each of these speeches, we arrive at the following:

Be merciful, as your Father in heaven is merciful (Q 6:36);
Remove first from your eye the log, and then you will see clearly to cast out the speck . . . the eye of your brother (6:42b);
The good person brings forth good things from a good treasure. But the evil one brings forth evil things from the evil treasure. For from an abundance of the heart the mouth speaks (6:45);
If you then, though you are evil, know how to give good gifts to your children, how much more will your father from heaven give good things to those who ask him (11:13);
Do not fear, you are worth more than many sparrows (12:7b);
Therefore do not be anxious, saying What shall we eat? or What shall we drink? or What shall we wear? For the Gentiles seek all these things; for your Father knows that you need them. But seek his

173. The model of Q1's development I am assuming here, attempting to work together the insights of Kloppenborg's *Formation* and Piper's *Wisdom in the Q-Tradition*, is one in which a set of argumentative "templates," examples of stereotypical strategies of persuasion on a variety of thematically-related points, were collected together and supplemented by some clarifying glosses and other commentary material, a few loose aphorisms, the Lord's Prayer, the Mission Speech, the Beatitudes as an opening address, and a handful of parables. These argumentative speeches, all deriving from the same *Stt* and quite possibly in written form already, thus constitute the earliest stage of Q's literary development.

kingdom, and these things shall be yours as well (12:29-31). Not a one of these concluding points is at all inversionary: they exhort mercy, fair judgment, good deeds, trust in prayer, and — perhaps the most "radical" conclusion of the lot — avoiding obsession with material goods. These conclusions are sufficiently banal that one can easily imagine them circulating as part of the stock and utterly conventional sagacity of local scribalism long before the specific and peculiar agenda of Q1 had developed, indeed, plausibly enough, before Jesus came on the scene at all.

However, when we turn to the opening lines of each cluster, the resultant picture is very different:

Love your enemies and pray for those who abuse you: thus you will be sons of [God]... (Q 6:27, 6:35b)
Judge not, and you will not be judged; for with the judgment you judge you will be judged (6:37);
There is no sound tree which bears bad fruit, nor again an unsound tree which bear good fruit (6:43);
I tell you, ask and it will be given to you, seek and you will find, knock and it will be opened to you (11:9);
Nothing is covered which will not be revealed and hidden which will not be made known (12:4);

Therefore, do not be anxious about your life, what you shall eat, nor about your body, what you shall put on (12:22).

175. Piper, "Evidence of Design," 416. Note that the approach being used here is — appropriately, as different ends are in view — almost exactly the opposite of that used by Mack, Lost Gospel, 108-11 (and elsewhere). That is, Mack attempts to determine the agenda of the earliest stage behind Q1 by stripping away everything but the sayings that are most primary from a tradition-historical or form-critical perspective. I am attempting, on the other hand, to focus on the agenda represented by the compositiof these speeches (and hence probably the penultimate stage of Q1 redaction), and so am focusing on the latest, or at least most compositionally-bound, sectors of these speeches.

176. The characterization of "the wisdom tradition" as necessarily conservative is something of a caricature. Nevertheless, ordinarly wisdom literature and wisdom sayings represent the expression of a conventional Weltanschauung (see the comments in Kloppenburg, Formation, 318-321). Thus it is a distinctive (I do not say unique!) and characteristic mark of the Synoptic (and Thomasine) sayings tradition, and thus probably of the Jesus tradition in general, that proverbial forms are used to convey inversionary or counter-cultural content. My point about the sayings which conclude (and, according to Piper, apply) the Q1 argumentative clusters is that they lack this distinctive trait.

177. As noted by Kloppenburg, Shape of Q, 135 n.14, Piper is here following Matthean, rather than Lukan order in this cluster. The IQP reconstruction follows Lukan order.

These assertions and imperatives are rather more peculiar. Here the familiar "radicalism" and inversion of Q(1) is most apparent. One is encouraged to love enemies (6:27), to eschew judgment entirely (6:37), to seek anything in the conviction of receiving it (11:9), to trust in God even for bare subsistence (12:22). Q 12:4 invokes an inversionary scheme, which seems to imagine divine intervention or at least a "world turned upside down." Not every single one of these introductory sayings are self-evidently "radical" — the inversionary saying in 12:4 could be applied in a variety of ways, and as for the proverb about sound and unsound trees in 6:43, as Bultmann says (in his usual tendentious manner), "[n]o one wants to maintain that the saying rises above the standards and outlook of secular wisdom." But all of these statements are categorical, and all envision radically revised or novel circumstances in which their validity will be apparent. In this sense, like the first three beatitudes, their rationale works along the lies of an enthymeme, directing the hearer's attention to the unstated premise lurking behind the ostensible conclusion. This premise cannot be, as Carruth thinks is the case regarding the beatitudes, that "you" (i.e., those being addressed)

179. Q 12:22 appears almost identical to 12:29-31, but in fact, when carefully compared, conveys rather different ideas. The opening maxim (v.22) addresses subsistence — life itself —, encouraging those addressed not to worry about their lives or their bodies. The idea, then, is to display no concern whatsoever for the perpetuation of life. Vv.29-31, on the other hand, subtly shift the focus to bounty and especially to acquisition. The point, as the examples of ravens failing to gather into barns or the quality of lilies' adornment (vv.24-27) make clear, is not to devote oneself to the pursuit of material goods, rather than to eschew the necessities of life altogether. Within the cluster, such a thematic shift is signalled already, immediately after the opening line, by the rhetorical question "Is not life more than food, and the body more than clothing?" (v.23), which entirely subverts the point — and "radicalism" — of v.22.

180. Bultmann, History of the Synoptic Tradition, 104. Here, as with Q 12:22, the opening saying is still somewhat more "radical" than the conclusion of the speech: as Bultmann notes (History of the Synoptic Tradition, 84, 104), vv.43-44, unlike v.45, are not restricted in their focus to either individual words or individual deeds but to the entire character of sentiment of people. Summary judgment is conveyed: not exhortation to do good deeds or think good thoughts. Note also that this saying has been appropriated by the secondary redaction of Q (Q2) with explicitly apocalyptic consequences, in Q 3:9.

181. On which see Carruth, "Strategies of Authority," 107-108. Of course, the beatitudes are formally enthymemes, while the injunctions currently under discussion are not.
fall into the categories under discussion, 182 because most of these sayings make the
direct address (i.e., to "you") quite explicit; it is thus in no way "unstated." Rather, it
seems that the unstated premise to which all of these peculiar sayings direct the hearer's
attention — and direct it in large measure precisely because of their apparent unconven-
tional character or even counterfactuality (e.g., 6:37a; 11:9; 12:4) — is that there will
be circumstances in which each assertion is valid; 183 it is notable that several of the
sayings (6:27, 35b; 6:37; 11:9) take the form of imperatives (implying future action)
followed by motive clauses specifying results which are described in the future tense.
The failure, enthymeme-like, to state those circumstances explicitly is an interesting
rhetorical strategy, inviting — or at least leaving open the possibility for — the hearer
to imagine or consider what those circumstances will be.184 Unfortunately, the modern
exegete is left in the same position, unsure whether the implicit transformations
required by the logic of these sayings are to be characterized in terms of an attitude
(and are thus Cynic-like), a social program (and are thus reformist or revolutionary), or
some kind of direct divine intervention (and are thus "eschatological".) 185

182. Carruth, Strategies of Authority," 108. I.e., she claims that in the case of the beatitudes the unstated
premises are: you are poor, you are hungry, you weep now. This claim is as unconvincing in the case of
the beatitudes as it is in the case of the sayings currently at issue, because in the beatitudes such a premise
is in fact already explicitly stated: blessed are you poor, etc.
183. Thus, if one of these opening sayings (e.g., 6:37), taken in isolation, were to be formulated,
beatitude-like, as an enthymeme, in terms of the categories offered by Carruth, "Strategies of Authority,"
108, it would look like this:

    Unstated: There will be circumstances under which someone will apply your own standards of
    judgment to you.
    Stated: Judge not.
    Conclusion: Thus you will be not be judged harshly.

184. Cf., otherwise, Carruth, "Strategies of Authority," 108: "their claim to truth rests solely on the
authority of the one who pronounces them."
185. "Eschatological" is of course the favorite explanatory category for these inversions, for the obvious
reason that the term is strongly connotative of distinctively (and sui generis) religious ideology and inter-
ests, under the rubric of which biblical (!) texts are typically approached. In addition, as Ron Cameron
has pointed out ("Response to Helmut Koester, Ancient Christian Gospels," Paper Presented at the
Annual Meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature [Kansas City: November, 1991]), "eschatology" is
an extraordinarily labile term, and so can mean almost anything (and hence nothing): thus the failure to
understand the referent of these sayings is most frequently expressed by a proliferation of references to
"eschatology," "eschatological consummation," and the like. The virtue of both the Cynic hypothesis and
It is notable that the sayings which conclude these clusters are no less attested, as isolated sayings, than are the "radical" sayings which open the clusters. Thus, clearly, the rhetorical organization of the material does not reflect — at least not directly — their tradition-historical provenance. We can only conclude that the argumentative relationship between the opening and closing sayings of these clusters represents a deliberate and motivated decision on the part of the people responsible for them. The compositions, then, were organized with a view toward subsuming these "radical" or inversionary sayings into coherent and persuasive arguments which asserted fairly commonplace conclusions. The inflammatory, mysterious, or inversionary aspects of the rhetoric of the constituent material were thus effectively domesticated: they became general principles supporting (relatively) conventional observations. Two conclusions are thus indicated. First, the people responsible for these compositions were not interested in the same inversionary agenda that stimulated the original imperatives. The people behind the Q document, as one might have already determined from of Horsley's thesis of "local renewal" is that they avoid both of these features, i.e., eschatology's "religious" overtones and its lack of a stable referent.

186. Thus Q 6:27, an opening exhortation, is paralleled in Romans 12:14, while this cluster's concluding imperative (6:36) is not paralleled in the tradition; but 6:37, an introductory saying to another cluster, is not paralleled, while that cluster's conclusion (6:42) is paralleled in Gospel of Thomas #26. The same is true of the illustrations which appear in the midst of these arguments (e.g., Q 12:27 par. POxy 655.1.1-17): there simply does not appear to be a consistent pattern of attestation matching the rhetorical function of each component of each speech.

187. And which, moreover, draw many of their examples from "rather mundane exchanges in a village or town" (Kloppenborg, "Literary Convention," 82).
that document's apparent *Sitz*, are not withdrawn from the social world of their contemporaries and are not promoting the complete dissolution of that world. Second, however, the use of these originally-isolated exhortations as persuasive statements of general principle from which to launch rather more focused and innocuous compositions betrays an implicit openness to the inversionary rhetoric they represent. That is, provided it is expressed metaphorically or in terms of general wisdom, the lexicon of social dissolution remains powerful enough for these persons to serve as a persuasive basis. Just as the overall argumentation of these clusters mitigates the radical character of some of their constituent elements, so the radical character of the constituent elements mitigates somewhat the banality of the arguments they serve. The presence of these inversionary sayings within the clusters makes it clear that the conventional arguments offered at this stage are *not* intended to procure entirely conventional results; the use of eccentric premises to attain rather subdued conclusions is indicative of a certain subversive ethos, a countercultural spirit, behind those conclusions, however subdued they may be. While there may be an intelligible and even constructive social agenda behind Q(1), the easy application of a rhetoric of deracination *to* this agenda should serve to warn us that the program is *reactive*, that it is offered at least in part as a response and rejoinder to some kind of social alienation on the part of its advocates.188

---

188. See the comments of Kloppenborg, "Literary Convention," 88:
It is not possible to know whether the deracination of the Q group is literal or metaphorical, that is, whether economic hardship and social upheaval had already deprived the members of their place in the system, or whether they were still active in the scribal and administrative sector but had begun to question the integrity and stability of the system.
The solution offered here is that the deracination is metaphorical, at least for the most part.
The Q(1) beatitudes (Q 6:20b-23b\(^{189}\)) offer another salient example of essentially the same process. As the opening teaching of the first recension of Q, they serve a programmatic function for what follows: they are more an assertion of Q1's overall viewpoint than an argument for it, but they influence the tone of all that follows.\(^{190}\) This programmatic function, as well as the bare content, of the Q version of the beatitudes encourage the view that Q is addressed to, if not actually written by, the destitute and miserable, and dominated overall by an interest in them.\(^{191}\) This view is further bolstered by the wording of the first beatitude, which blesses not simply "the poor," but the πτωχοί. The distinction between πένης and πτωχὸς is made much of by some commentators, as denoting a distinction between the merely poor (i.e., those who have to work for a living) and the utterly destitute.\(^{192}\) Thus, in blessing the πτωχοί, Q

---


190. On the introductory function of the beatitudes, at least for the initial Q sermon, see, inter alios, Carruth, *Strategies of Authority,* 108-109; David R. Catchpole, *The Quest for Q* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1993), 80; Douglas, *Love your Enemies,* 125; Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 188-189. 188 n.77: "Literary Convention," 81; Tuckett, *Q in the History of Early Christianity*, 226: "They form the start of the Great Sermon which inaugurates Q's account of Jesus' teaching. They can therefore justifiably be seen as outlining the terms in which the whole of what follows is to be seen."


'Tis the beggar [πίθχος] alone who has nought of his own, nor even an obol possesses.

My poor [πενήτος] man, 'tis true, has to scrape and to screw and his work he must never be slack in;

There'll be no superfluity found in his cot; but then there will be nothing lacking.

Bloomquist, "Rhetoric," has rightly observed that the distinction offered here cannot be taken at face-value: it serves the (rhetorical) interests of the figure of Poverty, defending herself against the accusations of Chremylus.
Rhetoric of Deracination

6:20b is doing more than simply blessing those who are not wealthy: it is blessing the destitute, the beggars, the "Unclean, Degraded, and Expendable classes."193

This reasoning does not entirely stand up to scrutiny, in part because the structural role of the beatitudes for the entirety of Q1 is not given sufficient consideration, nor is the process by which they came to fill this role. The first point that must be stressed in that this cluster of beatitudes, even in its Q1 form, is composite and went through several stages of development. Classically, Bultmann pointed to the distinction in both form and content of the fourth of the Q beatitudes from the first three:

it is essential to see that Lk.6:22 or Matt. 5:11f. is a new element of the tradition which is clearly distinguished from the older element Lk.6:20f. or Matt. 5:3-9 in form (second person and detailed grounds of blessedness) and content, arising ex eventu and for that reason created by the Church. It is in this second set that we first have a direct reference to the person of Jesus.194

It is clear that the first three Q beatitudes form a set marked by similarity in form (μετάφρασις or + plural substantive, followed by a single-part ὁτι-clause195) and in focus (i.e., apparently on socio-economic categories). Even these three beatitudes were not originally a series,196 but were collected together on the basis of their similar form and because they all make the same basic point.197 The fourth beatitude does not fit this original set, not only in its focus on reputation, its connection of this concern to "in-

---

193. Crossan, Historical Jesus, 273, citing Lenski.
194. Bultmann, History of the Synoptic Tradition, 110. On which cf. also Crossan, Historical Jesus, 273-274; Funk and Hoover, Five Gospels, 138-139, 290-291; Kloppenborg, Formation, 172-173; Schürmann, "Son of Man Title," 80-81; Tuckett, Q and the History of Early Christianity, 226; and most others. I am here excluding from consideration v.23c as an even later (i.e. Q2) gloss; see n.189, above.
197. They are not collected together in Gospel of Thomas, or, in some instances, are collected in a slightly different way (e.g., the association of the persecution beatitude with the hunger beatitude in Thomas #69).
group" membership (ἐνεκὲν . . . ), its address to "you," and its use of "Son of Man" as an title apparently in reference to Jesus, but also in its extended form and multiple rationalizations. This fourth beatitude is composite in its own right, not only by virtue of the Q2 gloss at v.23c, but also, as the independent parallel in Gospel of Thomas #69a (cf. #68) demonstrates, in the addition of the ἐνεκα/ἐνεκὲν clause (v.22c) and the imperative clause (23a: χαίρετε καὶ ἀγαλλιᾶσθε). Verse 23b, ὅτι ὁ μισθὸς Ὸμῶν τολῶς ἐν τῷ οἴρανῷ, or some version of it, on the other hand, is probably original to the makarism, as it is attested in both Thomas versions of the saying. We do not need to trace the process by which these elaborations were added; it is sufficient to note that all of the additions (excluding v.23c) were probably made subsequent to this saying's association with the other three beatitudes, but prior to their attachment to the following instructions on love of enemies and forgiveness.

198. Thus the fourth beatitude stands apart even if one rejects Bultmann's schematization (as do Crossan, Historical Jesus, 273-274; Funk and Hoover, Five Gospels, 290; but cf. Kloppenborg, Formation, 173: Schürmann, "Son of Man Title," 81), which characterize it as ex eventu and "Church"-related.

199. Neither of which appears in either of the two Thomas parallels, indicating that the saying circulated as a bipartite unit: a blessing on the persecuted followed by a motive clause describing the rewards or results of the persecution. The amplification of the description of persecution in 6:22a,b is probably also secondary.

200. That is, some kind of result or reward is described as the second half of the saying. Thomas #68 the result is that "no place will be found, wherever you have been persecuted," while for #69a, the reward is that they "have truly come to know the Father." Both formulations in Thomas are almost certainly secondary: they evince the redactional characteristics of the document as a whole, including the terminology of "place" (πατα or παπα) and "Father" (πατή). But the indicate, as noted, that the saying circulated independently in a bipartite form with some type of result clause, the original form of which is unknown. Even in this bipartite form, however, the saying was structurally distinct from the first three beatitudes.

201. The basis for the association of the fourth beatitude with the first three is its rough formal similarity to them, as well as its thematic similarity ("blessed are those who weep, for . . . blessed are you when they revile you, and . . . "); both of these features are clearly apparent only in the persecution beatitude's original, bipartite, form. Once it has been added to the end of this list, however, it serves as an interpretive key for the foregoing three beatitudes, so that by clarifying its referent (those persecuted on behalf of the son of man), the referent of the entire list is clarified. Thus, in final position, this beatitude has suffered considerable modification, while the others have been left relatively intact. Note also that the expansion in v.23a, χαίρετε καὶ ἀγαλλιᾶσθε, may have been inspired by the prior association with v.21, ὅτι γέλαστε.

On the other hand, once an association has been made between the beatitudes and the speech on love of enemies, there is little reason to add such amplifications as we find in vv.22-23, because a) they redirect the beatitudes toward a rather different thematic focus as the association with vv.27 ff. would suggest, and b) vv.22-23 no longer occupy as rhetorically significant a position once the set of beatitudes
What this indicates, among other things, is that already prior to their incorporation into Q(1), the beatitudes, as a single unit, had come to refer to something other than literal poverty or destitution: they were used, rather, to enunciate a set of paradigmatic inversions of basic social positions in support of a final conclusion to the effect that adherence to \( x \) program (that is, \( \text{eueker} \ x \)) would be beneficial in spite of apparent disadvantages. As a result, the "kingdom of God" in the first beatitude also comes to have this self-referential sense: it too becomes denotative of the specific program (\( x \)) marked by \( \text{eueker/\text{euka}} \).\(^{202}\) Even the juncture of the first three beatitudes indicates that something other than voluntary itinerancy is at issue. Regardless of the \( \text{Sitz} \) of the blessing on the poor or on the hungry, their association with the blessing on those who weep is certainly indicative of a general and principled inversion (the world turned upside-down) than of a specific and practicable one accomplished by choice, such as voluntary itinerancy. Itinerants may choose to be poor and even perhaps hungry, but they do not choose weeping as a feature of their \textit{lifestyle}! Indeed, strictly speaking, "weeping" (\( \text{klai	ext{o}ntez} \)) is not a socio-economic index at all; thus even the very early is associated with the following material.

This reasoning, however, is potentially paradoxical: it \textit{could also} suggest quite the opposite conclusion, namely that the association between the fourth beatitude and the speech on love of enemies \textit{predates} the various amplifications and redirections added secondarily, since the original form of this beatitude is thematically closer to vv.27 ff. than is the secondary form in which we now have it. This similarity could be a coincidence, or a product of both units drawing from the same traditional font, which one would expect to have at least some measure of thematic consistency. On the secondary character of the association, however, see Schürmann, "Son of Man Title." 80-81.

\(^{202}\) On the "kingdom (of God)" as a self-referential cipher, see, somewhat obscurely, see Burton Mack in Mack and Robbins, \textit{Patterns of Persuasion}, esp.159-160, on "kingdom of God" as a cipher for the content of early Christian \textit{paideia}; and, much more clearly, Mack, \textit{Myth of Innocence}, 69-74; and, most clearly of all and with explicit reference to \( Q \), \textit{Lost Gospel}, 123-127: "the link between the notion of the rule of God and the pattern of \( Q \)'s countercultural practices is very, very strong," (124) but "the thought had not yet occurred at the \( Q1 \) level, as it did later at the \( Q2 \) stage, that the location of God's kingdom was to be found precisely in the social formation of the movement" (127). See also Vaage, \textit{Galilean Upstarts}, 55-65. Mack in particular is one of the only commentators to make sense of the phrase in any clear and convincing way; most accounts of its referent are (unsurprisingly) obscurantist.
clustering of the *first three* beatitudes represents a shift away from the strictly socio-economic force of the first and second beatitudes taken in isolation.\textsuperscript{203} The point has become general and (relatively) abstract. The addition of a fourth (persecution) beatitude, attracted by the influence of the third (weeping) beatitude, further shifts attention away from the strictly economic character of the first two blessings, and sharpens and elaborates the apparent reference to weeping: "those who weep" are weeping *because* they are reviled, cast out, or reproached. On the influence of this motif, then, the last beatitude is elaborated and amplified to express this theme more clearly, and to specify the motivations behind the reproaches, influencing, as a result, the tenor of the entire list of blessings.

Thus the thematic progress of the beatitudes in the course of their development was: 1. economic inversion --> 2. general or abstract inversion --> 3. a specific social inversion (involving esteem or repute) --> 4. social inversion as a result or consequence of adherence to a specific program.\textsuperscript{204} Such a progression of course already matches to some degree what has already been noted in the development of other Q1 blocks. The composition of Piper's pre-Q1 argumentative clusters follows the same course rhetorically (synchronously) as the beatitudes follow tradition-historically (diachronically): that is, they are (1) based on radical sayings, which are (2) used to express inversion in the abstract, in the service of (3) some specific type of social

\textsuperscript{203} See, in this vein, Vaage. *Galilean Upstarts*, 57: "It is clear in 6:20b that a share in God's kingdom means not going along with the customary understanding of misery and bliss, if only because one is convinced that present tears and hunger will soon give way . . . ." Note the logical connection in Vaage's reading of the first beatitude between its meaning and the presence of the two following beatitudes. Even the juxtaposition of the first with the *second* beatitude mitigates the force of the former somewhat: poverty is a status and is restricted to only some people, while hunger is a state and is experienced in greater or lesser degrees by everyone; poverty is imagined to be a permanent feature of the people blessed, while hunger will be mitigated.

\textsuperscript{204} If there is any general pattern to be seen here at all, it is the movement from a specific (indeterminable?) setting to a generalized one, from which subsequent and increasingly specific applications may be made. The stage of generalization is what allows the new applications to be made.
exhortation (often involving esteem or repute — see below). The fourth step, on the other hand, not present at the stage in which the pre-Q1 clusters developed, is however paralleled in the Q1 redactional juxtaposition of the Mission Charge (3: a specific set of social behaviors, concerned with welcome, i.e., esteem or repute) with the discipleship sayings of Q 9:57-62 (4: the social destabilization occurs as a result of adherence to the program).

And within the overall context of Q1, as its programmatic introduction, the beatitudes serve a similar literary and rhetorical (synchronic) function to that served by the opening lines of Piper's argumentative clusters: they establish a general or abstract inversionary tone (stage #2, above) which is used as a basis upon which to develop further arguments. Thematically, however, this incorporation into the totality of Q(1) means that they function in terms of diachronic stage #4, i.e., as denotative of social inversion which stems from advocacy of a certain program. This is natural enough: it corresponds to the final stage in the development of these beatitudes in their Q1 form. This is all to say, in other words, that although the beatitudes as a unit already show in their aggregational development an orientation toward the theme of deracination as a consequence of certain choices, they function rhetorically within Q1 as generalizations promoting the principle of inversion and as identifications of that comprehensive inversion-in-principle with the "kingdom of God" or "the son of man." Thus all of what follows has the character of specific applications of Q(1) 6:21-23, just as many of the constituent clusters attempt specific applications of the general principles with which they open. Carruth is at least partly correct when she argues that the authority of Jesus as the speaker is presumed here, not developed:

---

205. Of course the fifth step, visible at the level of Q2 redaction, but not undertaken (much) in Q1 is to use authoritative and conventional topoi (such as apocalyptic judgment, or biblical proof-texts, or the deuteronomistic schema of Israel’s history) to rationalize that destabilization: "for so their fathers did to the prophers."
Enunciating a number of beatitudes does not prove a case, but it does intensify the sense of the speaker's authority by showing that he or she can illuminate the situation of the hearers in a comprehensive way. Here in the exordium of the sermon, where rhetorical principle emphasizes the establishment of the speaker's character, Jesus is shown to be one who overturns common wisdom and lays down a different way of perceiving one's situation. The acceptance of this new wisdom will depend in large measure on the authority attributed to Jesus by the audience.206

Apparently Jesus was a sufficiently authoritative character for the people responsible for Q1 (or their fictive/putative audience) that an effort was made to assimilate or subsume material already circulating under his name. Carruth may, however, be reversing cause and effect. The association of Jesus with such inversionary sayings may have been part of the reason he was selected as a speaker in the first place. These inversionary sayings have a powerful suasive force of their own, and to the extent that Q1’s agenda was in fact subversive, and to the extent that its tradents identified themselves as uprooted and/or their audience as responsive to such rhetoric, such material — if it could be successfully integrated into the program at hand, must have been extraordinarily attractive in its own right, Jesus himself notwithstanding.

This logic is the logic of the categorical opening statements of Piper's clusters, and is partly attractive simply because of its categorical, black-and-white, and arresting view of reality.207 The sayings are memorable and powerful precisely because they are not subtle, not casuistic. But even more so, they are powerful because of the way they force the hearer to imagine for themselves the circumstances under which they might be true. It is for that reason that I described these opening sayings above as enthymemelike in their rhetorical effect.208 What the beatitudes do, as the opening for Q1 as an entire document, is invoke that speculation in the most general, explicitly inversionary,

207. In this sense they are not, formally speaking, much unlike conventional wisdom. A view of the world in which categories are sharply drawn is not eschewed: it is simply inverted.
208. See p.390, above.
and comprehensive way possible. Appropriately enough, the beatitudes are enthymemes, in their formal characteristics, and not simply in terms of the logic they depend upon.\textsuperscript{209} As such, the reader/hearer is left to supply the premises that will make the main assertions of these sayings come true. S/he is warned (or promised) that the arguments to follow will be inversionary, but not how they will be inversionary; s/he is warned that the arguments which follow will depend on and articulate a condition known as "the kingdom of God," but is not told the terms and preconditions of this condition: transformation is promised, but not described. Not only is the serialization of the blessings attendant upon hearkening to wisdom a known introductory strategy within the genre of wisdom instructions,\textsuperscript{210} but their formulation as enthymemes\textsuperscript{211} is perfectly appropriate to Q\textquotesingle s subsequent rhetoric and tone. Moreover, it serves to "hook" the reader or hearer, inviting not simply a) speculation and consideration about the character of this future inversion, but also b) curiosity about the remainder of the document ("how will these promises be fulfilled?"), c) the assumption that the arguments which follow do indeed fulfill the agenda of general inversion ("these ideas are what it is that will make the poor, hungry, etc. happy"), and possibly also d) assent in advance (by forcing the audience to imagine the topsy-turvy world in which such sayings would be true, the audience \textit{creates} that world, \textit{in mente}, making what follows

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{209} Carruth, "Strategies of Authority," 107-108. \\
\textsuperscript{210} Kloppenborg, \textit{Formation}, 188. \\
\textsuperscript{211} In contrast to most of the examples cited by Kloppenborg, \textit{Formation}, 188 n.77, which a) tend to be prescriptive, and b) have fully articulated premises. See for instance, Tobit 13:14b: "Blessed are those who grieved over all of your afflictions; for they will rejoice for you upon seeing your glory." The framing of beatitudes with dropped premises — presumably in order to foster consideration and reflection about wisdom and the good life, to invite assent — is not unique to Q, however. See, for instance, Sirach 26:1: "Happy is the husband of a good wife; the number of his days will be doubled." Here, the premise "an unhappy home life will kill you" (or the like) is left unstated. It is, however, very easily inferred.
\end{flushright}
all the more plausible.212

In sum, then, within the context of Q 1 as a document, the beatitudes are not indicative of beggary among the audience or speakers. The use of \( \pi \nu \omega \chi \alpha \iota \) in the first of these blessings is not as significant as it has been made out to be: in Hellenistic literature, \( \pi \nu \eta \zeta \) and \( \pi \nu \omega \chi \alpha \zeta \) are used interchangeably, and for the NT, \( \pi \nu \omega \chi \alpha \zeta \) is the usual term for poverty.213 The kind of conditions these sayings outline is decidedly not prescriptive,214 and hence their inversionary rhetoric is only imperfectly accounted for by itinerancy hypotheses. In the form in which they appear in Q, the beatitudes have already been considerably "domesticated," and now serve rhetorically to promote an abstract sense of inversion which both thematically situates or reinforces the material that follows, and actively attempts to engage the audience prior to the commencement of what promises to be an unconventional project. By the time we arrive at the redaction of Q 1, this project, invoking the Jesus traditions and (apparently) Jesus himself, is already being viewed retrospectively. The composition of Q 1, in time with and (thematically) of a piece with, the evolution of the individual traditions harbored by the group, may have been (in part) a response to the failure of an earlier agenda215 represented by a) the initial formulation of Piper’s argumentative clusters; b) the mission speech (as a unit and in its Q 1 form); and c) the initial serialization of the first

212. Any audience might be resistant to simple description of such an outlandish world; it is difficult to imagine how such a description could be or even sound realistic. But by forcing the audience to create the image for themselves, not only is assent to its (mental) reality compelled, but its characteristics will match the desires and resonances of each person’s imagination. This basic technique — the compulsion of assent — is the way Sirach 26:1 works: the imagination constructs a happy man living well at home, or a haggard man unhappy at home, and one’s own mind has already — in the course of merely trying to follow the argument — supplied an image which confirms the author’s conclusions, and thus convinces one that those conclusions are agreeable and, indeed, self-evident.

213. Ernst Bamme, "\( \Pi \nu \omega \chi \alpha \zeta \)," vol.6, pp.885-915 in Gerhard Kittel, ed., Theological Dictionary of the New Testament (Geoffrey W. Bromiley, transl.; Grand Rapids, Michigan: W. B. Eerdmans, 1968), 894 & n.79; 902 & n.155. Cf. BAGD, 728.

214. So also Kloppenborg, Formation, 188.

215. And hence a desire to collect such traditions in lieu of the mission to disseminate them.
three beatitudes and the especially their juncture with (the original form of) the fourth beatitude. For the persons represented by Q(1)'s development, then, the deracination expressed in the beatitudes is not economic and is not voluntary; it is metaphoric, rhetorical, and deliberately vague. It is invoked only in the service of more specific points which are considerably less "radical" (and less mysterious), and which focus on *social esteem* to a considerable degree. Thus the economic deracination evoked by some of the Q1 material appears, rhetorically, to be yoked to the service of a redactional and pre-redactional Q(1) interest in social deracination. That interest, in turns, seems to center on — or to have once centered on — a specific social vision in which esteem, honour, and local standing are of paramount importance. It is to the specific points served by these arguments, to the specific social vision and agenda they were intended to promote, that we now must turn.

**THE SOCIAL PROJECT OF THE Q TRADENTS**

The agenda to which Q1 hearkens as the basis for its own group identity can be identified with some plausibility if we return to the specific applications which concluded each of the argumentative clusters noted by Piper.\(^{216}\) These applications include exhortations to be merciful regarding the failings of others (Q 6:36), to exercise clear and objective judgment (6:42b), to act and speak good things (â€œγαθάδα) corresponding to one's reputation (â€œγαθάδα) corresponding to one's reputation (ὁ ἀγαθὸς ἄνθρωπος, 6:45), to trust in God's care (11:13), to avoid fear (12:7b), and to forbear from concern for material goods (12:29-31). Obviously the last three items form a coherent set with a single coherent theme. They are slightly different ways of saying the same thing: you can avoid the pursuits of material goods, even necessities, by placing your trust in God (or the kingdom of God, Q 12:31), who

---

216. See above, p.387.
will then provide them for you. There does seem to be a relationship here between the commitment or attitude enjoined and the promised results. People are not actually told that under all circumstances God will simply provide them what they need. Rather, they are told that if one relies entirely on God (what precisely this means, as usual, is unspecified), these providential results will follow (see esp. 11:13b: "to those who ask him"; 12:31: "but seek his kingdom, and these things shall be yours as well").

What is enjoined, then, is a redirection of the commitments, values, or interests of those addressed (addressed fictively, at least in the context of the document), from material goods (economic greed) to God (commitment to the collective values of the social body, at least as they are understood by the Q people). Of course the economic inversions of the first two beatitudes effectively underscore such an appeal. Material benefit is to be subordinated to the value of community, to ancestral values (as they are understood by the people responsible for Q).

There remains the question, however, what is intended by the first three exhortations on judgment and whether they fit the agenda expressed by those on trust in God.

217. Against Douglas, "Love your Enemies," 124, who argues that this type of material in Q(1) is intended to critique a limited-good orientation. But the texts in question, at least in their Q contexts, do not suggest absolute bounty (in general) so much as the conviction that, under the right circumstances, God will provide whatever is lacking.

218. This represents a kind of Durkheimian "take" on the significance of religious language, but should not be especially controversial. The persons represented by this document as its intended audience are self-evidently Jewish; the composers take it for granted that the behaviour of "Gentiles" (παρά ξάρη) is not to be emulated (Q 12:30, possibly Matt/Q 6:33; see also Bultmann, "What the Sayings Source Reveals," 32; Theissen, *Gospels in Context*, 225). Thus language invoking "your Father," "God," "God's rule," and so forth is almost certainly an effort to invoke a set of collective values. Whether these values as they are understood by the Q people represent the articulation of those values in the culture at large is another question; the people responsible for Q would of course (at least at first) wish to maintain that they do.

219. This description is an effort to summarize both the actual injunctions and the consequences they would have conveyed or were intended to produce. The basic characterization offered here — that the injunctions against anxiety are ultimately more designed to affirm community values over against acquisitiveness than to be taken literally ("don't worry") by people who are actually destitute — is remarkably similar to Horsley's general observations about the early Jesus traditions, insofar as he describes the Jesus movement as an effort at "local renewal" (Horsley, *Jesus and the Spiral of Violence*, 167-284; "Social Conflict," 43-51, esp.45; etc.). The observations on Q proffered here, however, are rather more specific than Horsley's, and are more strongly textually founded.
These former arguments, with their focus on judgment and their language of brotherhood, are normally understood to be addressed to an in-group.220 That is, the group responsible for Q is exhorting its own membership to be fair and peaceable with one another. As we have already seen, however, the range of social roles addressed by Q1 indicates that the persons responsible for the document were not limiting themselves to a sectarian enclave, at least not in theory.221 The insider form of address in Q1 (e.g., "brother," Q 6:41-42) is perfectly appropriate to a general address to everyone at a local level, at least so long as sectarian lines have not yet been drawn. Moreover, if, as has been argued, the people responsible for Q(1) were involved in the general administration of justice, an address intended to circulate amongst themselves would nevertheless be an appeal with broad implications for the entire local population. If these exhortations are addressed to the local community at large, in which mechanisms for judgment and the acquisition of esteem are already in place, their significance will obviously be rather different than were they intended to regulate sectarian or in-group behaviour.

It is also notable that — in spite of the grand idealism of their opening injunctions (Q 6:27, "love your enemies": Q 6:37, "judge not") — the applications of these first three argumentative clusters do not forbid judgment, but actually assume its continuation and offer guidelines for how it is to take place. Judgment is to be merciful, clear, objective, and based on deeds and words rather than prior reputation. All of the injunctions are thus thematically of a piece, insofar as they all advocate a certain type of justice in which mercy and overt (good) deeds are of central import and are accorded the

221. See also Arnal, "Gendered Couplets," 92-93 and 93 n.75.
role of central and basic juridical ideals.\textsuperscript{222} The examples used in the course of making these arguments are significant. At least in part, actual judicial practices are in mind: one is to sustain injury generously, rewarding one's "enemy" with additional benefit (prayer, the other cheek, your shirt, and the principal to one's debtors) in lieu of seeking formal redress (Q 6:28-30; cf.12:58-59). Piper believes that such advice is indicative of a complete loss of confidence in the legal system, and represents a warning that it is \textit{better} (for oneself) to give up a great deal, informally, than trust in a rapacious legal system.\textsuperscript{223} But these exhortations are not actually showing a broad disdain for the legal system as such (with its various stipulations that have nothing to do with the actions described in Q), but rather focus only on its adversarial aspects. Moreover, several of the examples these clusters use are drawn from without the legal sphere but share with the forensic examples the focus on conflict or, more specifically, on situations in which unequal social roles might impart some form of competitive advantage: begging (6:30), leadership (6:39), teaching (6:40), and so forth. This phenomenon suggests that what motivates these arguments is less an impulse and exhortation to flee specifically \textit{legal} institutions of all and any kind than an interest in avoiding conflictual or competitive relationships entirely. The whole paradox of "love your enemies" is that such a practice (in the abstract, at any rate) leaves no "enemies" left to love. Giving to all who ask leaves no one left in need. Within all of the formal contexts with which a scribe, particularly, will have contact — legal claims, loans, but also master-pupil relationships, leadership, and the assessment of deeds in general — a kind of pragmatic (and latently conservative) ethos of dependability and ethical transparency, combined with a spirit of communal generosity is enjoined. One is to return to a simpler assess-

\textsuperscript{222} Or are offered in lieu of established juridical ideals. See Piper, "Language of Violence," 58-60.  
\textsuperscript{223} Piper, "Language of Violence," 59-66.
ment of social behaviour in which the good are good, the bad are bad, and in which being "good" means acting for the benefit of all rather than attempting to accrue benefit to one's self. The claim that Q(1) militates against a limited-good view of the world is probably quite mistaken: rather, these arguments presuppose a universe in which value is limited (exactly what one would expect of an ancient document such as Q) and thus one in which gain, whether in honour or in material goods, is made at the expense of others, or, more accurately, made at the expense of the group. The injunctions to avoid the pursuit of material gain or the (active) retention of honour at the individual level thus aim to inhibit the loss of these items at a communal level. The perception of limited good in this instance is probably correct: the new links of the villages at the northern end of the lake to the Imperial order represented by Tiberias may have allowed individual gain among the local upper classes but would simultaneously have meant loss for the villages themselves, corporately speaking. A reassertion of "old fashioned" values and the transparency of moral judgment is applied to the effort to shore up, or return to, the social autonomy of the past, in which social relationships were conceptualized and acted upon at the level of the villages and towns, and not in relations to the Roman Imperial order, the Herodian dynasts, or the city of Tiberias. The wealthy are thus encouraged in these speeches to cease their predatory behaviour, to abandon the (in some measure newly-acquired) techniques of personal gain, in favour of an ethos of communalism which would have fostered local independence and self-sufficiency, and would have employed values conceived as ancestral and self-evidently authentic.

As noted in the last chapter, the value of honour and shame, of course, when applied to the new situation of the northern Galilean villages, simply reinforces the

moral economy of the Roman-Herodian system: an extended social hierarchy based on status, reputation, and thus powerful (i.e., Herodian or Imperial) patronage rather than "genuine" good deeds or (local) community benefaction is supported by these values. The effort to align these values away from social status and toward communal service appears radical; in fact, it is only a rhetorical effort to return to earlier (local) standards for the assignment of status. Thus the "radical" opening injunctions of Piper's clusters are illuminated somewhat. While these injunctions are subordinated to the argumentative focus of each of the clusters, each serves additionally, on its own, to reinforce the tenor of the specific conclusions drawn, insofar as they all show a tendency to undercut honor-shame considerations in their own right. "Love your enemies," for instance, is not simply the first step toward the conclusion "be merciful," but is also, on its own and in its own right, an attack of the honour-shame edifice that "be merciful" was also intended to attack. Thus its "radical" character nevertheless serves the "banal" purposes of the cluster as a whole, or, rather, the cluster's argument is ultimately directed against the same institutions and circumstances that its more radical opening line attacks directly.

Both three-fold sets of arguments militate against acquisitiveness in the interests of something like social solidarity: in the last three arguments, material interests — with the acquisition of property and other excessive economic benefits being in mind — are subordinated to a realm of plenty signaled by God's providence, i.e., by whatever self-evident collective interests are signaled by "God" or for whatever corporate body "God" stands as a cipher. In the first three sets of arguments, similarly, the acquisition of honour, prestige, reputation, or power — evidently at the expense of others — is set over against an understanding of justice in which the community's interests prevail, in which the trees that bear good fruit are the trees that are deemed "good," in which
everyone is marked by judgment in the same way, and in which mercy rather than
hostile competition marks relations between individuals. 6:37-38 sums up both poles of
the argument:

And judge not . . . you will not be judged. For with the judgment you judge
you will be judged, and with the measure you measure will it be measured to
you.

To the extent that basic and informal reciprocity is at odds with the values of honour,
extended hierarchy, and the acquisition is superfluous value, Q(1)'s arguments promote
a retreat from the social effects of economic "urbanization."

These propositions are confirmed by contents of the remainder of Q1. The
original document as a whole is devoted to a rhetoric which denigrates any and all for-
mal hierarchy, and which appeals to naturalistic imagery to reinforce that denigra-
tion.225 It is in this respect that the Q people and the Q programme most resembles
Cynicism. But, as with Cynicism, the appeal to nature and to logical transparency and
unaffected behaviour does not actually constitute a rejection of all human processes or
of all artificiality; rather, it is a potent rhetorical strategy for attacking novel structures
felt to be artificial, in favour of a falling back onto older patterns of behaviour which
assume the appearance, by contrast, of nature, of transparency, of lack of affecta-
tion.226 The entirety — or nearly the entirety — of Q1 proposes an ethic of local com-
munalism, in large measure by the elimination of competitive behaviour based on social
hierarchy, a hierarchy which Q criticizes by appeal to nature and "natural" behaviour,
and by appeal to an incipient leveling of that hierarchy expressed by inversionary lan-
guage. Q1's "kingdom of God" is both the paradisical state of affairs that will arise out

225. See the comments of Kloppenborg, "Literary Convention," 82; "Sayings Gospel Q: Recent
Opinion," 27.
226. See again the comments of Kloppenborg, "Literary Convention," 84, on Q's rhetorical appeal to
"nature."
this programme, and the symbolic expression of the social force (the force of custom, collective values, "God") that will ensure its completion. Q's suasive program, in combination with the inherent and obvious rightness of its goals, will put an end to the extended social and economic hierarchies by which some locals gain tremendously at the apparent expense of everyone else; as a result, the establishment of God's reign will ensure that the poor are blessed, that the hungry will be fed, that those who weep will laugh. Inversion, for Q, denotes leveling, which in its turn is actually denotative of the resumption of a former social hierarchy deemed to be natural.

Thus, for instance, as John Kloppenborg has argued, the parables in Q1 support a similar programme of local leveling:

The entire section from Q 15:4 to 17:6 deals with reconciliation and peace-making in a social situation where the categories of honour and status threaten stability by valuing the large, the numerous, the male, the elder, the "just" and the powerful over their opposites. . . . no shepherd will let one sheep go astray, even if there are still 99 left; . . . no woman will ignore the loss of one drachma, even if she still has nine left. Why then in community relationships should there be differential valuations according to the standards of gender or standing or honour and why should those standards be permitted to destroy and dishonor the one or the weak? Like the ethics proposed by Q 6:27-35, this section of Q imagines the reduction of local conflict by a re-evaluation of the values (protection of honour) operative in Palestine (and indeed Mediterranean) village culture.227

This characterization requires supplementation or correction in only one respect. The situation to which this ethos stands opposed is not a static one; Q1 is not simply an enlightened but unaccountable attack on the conventional values of the day. Rather, the conventional values of the day are attacked to the extent that they promote and support the economic and social changes wrought by the Herodian foundation of Tiberias. As discussed in the last chapter, these changes generated a dislocation — or relocation — of the previously-operative local village hierarchy and set of values, in which the per-

sons responsible for Q had been heavily invested. The mere oppression and exploitation of the poor, a practice millennia-old, comes to the attention of these figures only to the extent that its recent intensification was caused by the extension of the social world of northern Galilee which ensured the region's subsumption, in a dependent and peripheral role, within the larger world of the Roman Imperial order. This increase in the capacity and hence extent of exploitation — the siphoning off of local surplus product — was matched, moreover, by a notable and significant reduction in the status of the village scribes who comprised the original Q tradents. Thus they have thrown in their lot, as persons dispossessed by the new order, with those have been dispossessed by every other regime in the past (οἱ πτωχοί, οἱ πεινῶντες, οἱ κλαίοντες), and who were now even more intensely exploited. Such persons had little to gain from a return to "the good old days," but in the imagination of the Q tradents, such a return would mark a renewal of prosperity, of peaceable and just local relationships, with no city, no artificiality, no false allegiance to alien values, to abet competition and strife.228

The *ideology*229 behind this program and set of interests is expressed most obviously in the notion of the "kingdom of God,"230 but more broadly in a general set of suppositions about God and the relationship of God to the circumstances which Q addresses. It has already been noted that in Q "God" and the values associated with

---

228. As noted at the beginning of chapter 5, Seán Freyne, Richard Horsley, and Jonathan Reed have all, in different ways, suggested something similar: Q, and the early Jesus movement in general, are responses or reactions to the socio-economic restructuring of Galilee as a result of Roman domination, and more particularly as a result of the foundation of Tiberias by Antipas.
229. I mean "ideology" here in the most narrow sense: a transcendent and universalizing *projection* of social relationships onto a metaphysical realm, such that those relationships, real or ideal, are rationalized and justified in their concrete and/or quotidian manifestations by virtue of their correspondence with essential reality.
230. Vaage, *Galilean Upstarts*, 55-65, has helpfully suggested the designation "ideology" for Q's language of the "kingdom."
God are tied very, very closely to communal values. We are unquestionably dealing here with a self-consciously Jewish group which views their audience's Jewish identity as self-evident, and which sees in ancestral religious allegiance a cipher for the social unity and solidarity of the local audience it addresses. What makes this so interesting is that Q's programme, when viewed in terms of its theology (an approach that has been avoided here so far), displays an arresting structural homology with the social situation of its tradents and with the social and political ideals they endorse. The main ideological rationale offered in Q(1) for its ethos, its inversionary rhetoric, and for the specific behaviors it exhorts, is the immediacy of God's providential care. Q(1) both argues and assumes that access to God is direct, and is unmediated by any formal structures, such as Temple, holy text, or even purity considerations. This theological position of course makes excellent social sense. To the extent that the formal structures for the mediation of God's providence are themselves the ideological apparatus of the ruling classes, and involve differential gradations according to wealth, status, or proximity to the redemptive media of the city, a theological focus on such structures would have had the effect of tying the northern Galilean villages that much more closely to the city and the values of the city. Thus Q's focus on unmediated access to God directly (and intentionally?) bypasses the very ideological apparatuses which serve

Father, let your name be sanctified; let your kingdom come. Our day's bread give us today; and pardon us our debts as we too have pardoned those in debt to us; and do not bring us to a test.

God is here addressed as though directly present.
233. See, e.g., Kloppenborg, "Literary Convention," 83-84. On the social interests and consequences of, e.g., Pharisaic piety, or of devotion to the Temple, see, inter alios, Oakman, Jesus and the Economic Questions of his Day; Anthony J. Saldarini, Pharisees, Scribes and Sadducees in Palestinian Society (Wilmington, Delaware: Michael Glazier, 1988).
to universalize and justify the interests of the cities and of the Imperial order (in its Jewish manifestations).

But more than this, the promotion of an ideology of divine immediacy parallels, at a metaphysical level, the conception of status and social hierarchy promoted by Q, and opposes that promoted by the new Herodian order. It has been noted by several studies that, commencing in the Hellenistic period, there was an ideological tendency to distance God from the mundane world, probably as a result of the alienation of the centres of political power.234 Such a trend was manifested, for instance, in apocalypticism, which posited a series of mediating figures between earth and heaven, such was the incredible spiritual and moral distance between the two realms; the causes of earthly events are neither transparent nor localized.235 Thus the metaphysical world, in which the center of power was far distant and approached indirectly through a series of angelic patrons, matches a political situation in which, as a result of the great Empires of the Hellenistic and Roman periods, the center of power was no longer local but distant, and in which it could only be approached, indirectly, by the patronage of a series of intermediaries. The increasing extension of hierarchy (as a result of the incorporation of local political entities into great empires) is matched by the structurally homologous alienation of the deity from immediacy and earthly affairs. What is so striking about this is that Q's theology in such a context serves as a structural homology in an almost identical — although opposite — way: its theological emphasis on the immediacy and nearness of God, his accessibility through nature and direct contact, for instance, is a structural homologue to and a symbolic articulation of the social consequences of the Q programme, a programme which eliminates all extra-village or

234. On which see especially Smith, "Wisdom and Apocalyptic."
extra-local political structures. Hence, just as the whole set of external social structures and contacts is eliminated, so the distance of God is eliminated. The emphasis on the immediacy of God is but a symbolic ideological articulation of a hearkening back to a vision of local autonomy.

The initial promotion of the Q1 agenda appears to have been undertaken along the lines suggested by the "Mission Charge" in its original form, i.e., not itinerancy, but short day trips to the villages and towns of the region (all of which would have been affected similarly by the foundation of Tiberias) in order to appeal to *their* administrative infrastructure to support their program. The appeals, the seeking of a "welcome," are "public" and "official" because they are made to the local leadership and made on behalf of the village as a whole. The effort is a clearly political one, in which village leadership is encouraged to ignore the administrative apparatus of the new city and the values disseminated by it. Q1's emphasis on leadership and judgment, as well as on the voluntary *relinquishment* of financial gain and other types of power, confirms this focus. The program was intended to be enacted administratively and officially, if it was to be enacted at all.

Such a program, a kind of nativistic renewal movement with a strong "Luddite" dimension — an imagined return to the gloried (if fanciful) past as a response to the economic pressures and social injustices of the present — was doomed to failure on two obvious grounds. The first, that it understandably failed to capture the imagination of the common people, is aggravated by the second, that it equally-understandably failed to capture the imagination of the local powerful and wealthy it aimed to "convert."

---

These scribal figures were unquestionably caught in the difficulties of social realignment: they had appropriated a local folk hero, Jesus, as a spokesperson for their fictive address to a segment of the population that had no real investment in the "good old days" and from whom, presumably, the Q tradents had been somewhat distanced or alienated even before the onset of the new Herodian economic order. Their actual address to the upper classes and local leadership, although it attempted to play on symbols of common identity, did not sufficiently take into account the degree to which these changes may have worked to the benefit of these classes and the extent to which the religious ideology of Judaism could be harnessed to those interests as well. The initial Q project, in short, was a failure.

The consequences of this failure can not only be seen in the later literary stages of Q's development — especially the bitter polemic of Q2 — but even in the process leading up to the formation of Q1 itself. Even at the level of Q1, the focus is no longer directly on the agenda just described or on its promulgation. Rather, compositions which reflect that agenda and the interest in its promulgation (such as the Mission Speech or Piper's argumentative clusters) have been incorporated into a larger document whose overarching theme has shifted to reflection not so much on the programme itself as on the consequences of allegiance to that programme. If one inspects the discrete speeches that comprise Q1, it quickly becomes obvious that a strong interest in commitment has been redactionally attached to nearly all articulations of ethos. Thus the opening beatitudes have been supplemented by — and hence reinterpreted in terms of — persecution "for the sake of the son of man"; the "Sermon" has been concluded by a series of sayings on the effects of commitment; the Mission Charge has been prefaced with a series of illustrations of the high cost of discipleship; promises of

237. Here drawing from the chart in Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 342-345 (*Appendix 2*).
God’s providential care have been prefaced with a prayer, suggesting the provision of such care is a consequence of group identity, not a general principle; exhortations to avoid anxiety have been prefaced with sayings encouraging fearless preaching; and the collection as a whole has been concluded with a series of sayings emphasizing the need to follow the advice given and the high personal cost that may result (13:24; 14:26, 27; 17:33; 14:34-35). Thus interest in a social programme has modulated into an incipient group-formation which understands its identity in terms of its commitment to the programme, to the "kingdom of God." The point is no longer the advancement of the programme but commitment to the group that endorses the programme.

CONCLUSIONS

In sum, the agenda of Q1 (or indeed of any later stage in the document’s development) does not seem to evince itinerancy at all. The document’s rhetoric of deracination is a device used in the service of a much more specific social agenda which can be characterized, in brief, as essentially "Luddite." A new social order, perceived to be unjust and unappealing, was criticized in terms of the values and conditions of the past. The critique is simultaneously progressive and reactionary: it hearkens to a past which was no more genuinely beatific than the authors’ present, but simultaneously it uses that past as a lever to offer serious class-based criticisms of the present order. Traditionalism is used against itself. The deracination evinced by Q also reflects a realignment of the social interests of the scribal figures responsible for Q and the change their own status had recently suffered. The extension of hierarchy resulting from the progressive incorporation of local political entities into the structures of the whole empire finds its ideological reflection in cultural effects that mirror its extended pyramidal structure, such as patronage ideology, or any religious paradigms — Temple,
Torah, purity — for which mediation is a central aspect. In reaction to this process and its ideological corollary, Q(1) radically flattens and simplifies the ideological pyramid, reducing it to only two levels: "us villagers" and God. Q(1) furthermore suggests in its programme that all other structures of mediation or structural hierarchies in human life are false; the effect of this, culturally, is to pretend (or intend) that the social pyramid of Galilee is (naturally or essentially) free-standing, and hence out of the orbit of the newly-felt extended Imperial structures placing pressure on local relations. What is at issue here is not a rejection of native traditions, but an effort to revive those traditions, to apply a brand of nativistic revival against the encroachments of imperialism.

The validity of these conclusions could probably be tested by comparing Q, and the social situation presupposed by it, to other imperial situations, especially within Roman antiquity (but also cross-culturally). Such a study is beyond the purview of the present work, but does suggest several specific directions for further study. First, the question of the historical Jesus has not been addressed here at all, and one need not suppose any direct continuity between Jesus himself and the "Jesus movement" as represented by Q, especially if the figure of Jesus has been used by Q simply because he was a current folk hero. However, if some of the materials used in Q1 do indeed go back to Jesus, even if used in an idiosyncratic way by Q, they may serve as evidence that Jesus himself was engaged in some form of reaction to circumstances similar to those which actuated the Q people. The best way to pursue this suggestion, in all probability, would be to analyze the independently-circulating narrative traditions about

239. John the Baptist, apocalyptic movements, Messianic movements, and even perhaps Gnosticism, all represent similar phenomena in the broadest sense. See Horsley, Spiral of Violence.
240. A fairly prevalent view: see especially Funk and Hoover, Five Gospels, 549, in which 11 of the 15 "red" sayings (i.e., sayings deemed certain to have derived from Jesus himself) appear in Q.
Jesus, many of which appear in Mark and several of which were incorporated into Q2 and Q3 as well. These apparent folk traditions about Jesus, when juxtaposed with the more focused utilization of Jesus by scribal interests in Q and probably also the *Gospel of Thomas*, may reveal a common core. The non-scribal use of the figure of Jesus, and hence perhaps Jesus himself, may thus also be an example of nativistic reactions to the consequences of Herodian-Roman policy. Second, the Pharisaic/Rabbinic movement in Galilee might be queried as a similar, if rather more successful, nativistic response to new imperial circumstances. With Q, this movement shares a primitivizing or nativizing tendency, but unlike Q cast that appeal to ancestral traditions in terms of extended structures of mediation, and hence was more appropriate to the changed circumstances. Third and finally, one would expect, if the conclusions suggested here are at all correct, that other areas of the Empire would manifest, *mutatis mutandis*, similar movements as they too were incorporated into the Imperial order. One should expect to find, in other words, at various times throughout the Roman period, the rise of radical primitivistic movements in such places as North Africa, Gaul, Britain, and so forth. Such movements would then provide perhaps the best comparative context for the rise of the earliest Christian movement.

---
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