Any study of "the sayings of Jesus" presented in the setting of the University of Manchester, where doubtless the spirit of Professor Manson still broods, runs the risk of leaving an impression of personal and academic hubris on the part of the presenter. The intention is, however, to pay tribute to one whose book of that name remains perennially stimulating within the contemporary discussion of Q, the common source employed by Matthew and Luke. That discussion has flowered profusely during the last twenty years and shows every sign of producing new varieties, in spite of the chill wind of scepticism in some quarters about the very existence of Q.

The purpose of this study is not gladiatorial combat with those who deny the existence of Q because they dispute the priority of Mark, for such a contest would be too complex and protracted for the time and space available. Nor is the present purpose a full frontal attack on those who accept the priority of Mark but still nurse doubts about Q. To such persons it may be pertinent, even if a little terse, to remark that the Q hypothesis appears much the best explanation of phenomena like the extensive overlap in wording within the double Matthew/Luke tradition, the remarkable extent of the agreement in the order of discrete units of tradition which could have been set out in any number of different sequences, the exactly corresponding and scarcely coincidental evidence of tradition-historical strata within many of the individual units shared by Matthew and Luke, and finally the impressive aggregate of instances of Luke's wording appearing to be more primitive than that of Matthew. All these phenomena may repeatedly be observed coming sharply into focus in Matthew 5-7/Luke 6. To be more positive, the purpose of the present study

1 The Manson Memorial Lecture delivered in the University of Manchester on 31 October 1985.
is conversation with those who speak doubtfully and even satirically about any attempt to reconstruct "the hypothetical theology of the hypothetical community which cherished the hypothetical document called Q". Specifically, the intention will be to discover and define, if possible, any sense of community which may pervade the Q material, and to do so by following up the expectation that a carefully delimited and structured inaugural discourse of Jesus within this collection of material may provide vital evidence of the concerns of the collection as a whole.

With just two small clarifications the preliminaries for this investigation will be complete. First, by "Jesus" in all that follows is meant "the Jesus of Q". Doubtless the inaugural discourse enables us from time to time to eavesdrop on the historical Jesus, but the latter is not just now our concern. Secondly, the broad trend in contemporary Q discussion is to accept that Luke has more or less faithfully preserved the Q sequence, and this will be accepted here as, on the whole, a reasonable working hypothesis. At one point, however, within the sequence of Luke 6.20-49 there is a strong suspicion that Luke has intervened, namely by inserting v. 40: "The disciple is not above the teacher ...". The somewhat unnecessary, and probably Lukan, introduction in v. 39a, "He also told them a parable ..." does not by itself mean that the following saying in v. 39b about the blind leading the blind owes its present position to Lukan redaction, and there are strong thought connections between that and the speck/log saying in Mt 7.3-5/Lk 6.41-42. No such connections, however, link v. 40 to the sayings before and after it, and consequently this saying, although present in Q, was probably not present in the inaugural discourse in Q. Otherwise, while the words of Matthew are often

2 Cf. Lk 5.36 diff Mk 2.21; Lk 21.29 diff Mk 13.28.
4 See p. 314.
5 Parallel cases of LkR introduction of single sayings from elsewhere into a controlling Q context are Lk 17.25 (Mk 8.31) and 17.31 (Mk 13.15f).
the words of Q, the scheme of Q may be safely deduced from the scheme of Luke.

I

Let us begin with the evidence of deliberate design in the composition of this discourse. On the one hand, beatitudes are placed at the beginning (Lk 6.20b-23). This conforms to the trend in Jewish tradition to position beatitudes at either the start or the finish of a literary unit, or to use them as “choral endings”, that is, as summarizing acclamations of an impressive whole experience. In conforming to this trend the Q editor signals his conscious intention to place all that follows under the control of Lk 6.20b-23. On the other hand, the “two housebuilders” parable is placed at the end (Lk 6.47-49) and sets before the reader an uncomfortable choice and a terrifying warning. Standing where it does it performs, as is often noted, the same function as the Mosaic warnings at the end of the holiness code in Leviticus 26 and the covenant discourse in Deuteronomy 28. These two signs of deliberate design at top and tail of the Q discourse represent an initial composition-critical investment from which redaction-critical activity may produce dividends.

The Q version of the short beatitudes (Mt 5.3-10/Lk 6.20b-21) has probably been preserved by Luke, except for two modifying features. His first modification was arguably a change from a third-person to a second-person form, since the former is normal and is attested elsewhere in Q (e.g. Mt 11.6/Lk 7.23), while the latter fits a tendency both to address disciples (cf. Lk 6.20a) and also to assimilate to the last and longest beatitude

---

6 For our present purposes it is not necessary to take sides in the dispute about whether or not the Lukan woes (6.24-26) stood in Q.
7 Psalm 1.1; 32.1f; 41.1; Sirach 26.1; Psalms of Solomon 6.1; 10.1.
8 Deuteronomy 33.29; Psalm 2.11; 144.15; Sirach 48.11; Psalms of Solomon 17.50.
9 1 Kings 10.8f/2 Chronicles 9.7f.
12 P. Hoffmann, “‘Selig sind die Armen ...’ Auslegung der Bergpredigt II (Mt 5,3-16)”, *Bibel und Leben*, x (1969), 113: “Dies entspricht dem Trend der Überlieferung die christliche Gemeinde direkt anzusprechen.”
(Mt 5.11f/Lk 6.22f). Luke's second modification was arguably a change from the language of mourning and being comforted to that of weeping and laughing, since the former pairing is attested in both Mt 5.4 and Lk 6.24,25, while the latter pairing is faintly inappropriate in view of the adverse connotation of derision conveyed by laughter. If this is correct, we can go on to observe that the short beatitudes in Q consisted, not of three discrete declarations about the poor and the hungry and the grief-stricken but of a single controlling declaration, which was amplified or paraphrased by two others. For in Jewish tradition the poor are themselves persons who struggle to obtain necessary food, and experience at all times what others know only in times of bereavement. This being so, the future reversal affirmed in "they shall be comforted" and "they shall be filled" enables us to interpret the verb "is" in Mt 5.3/Lk 6.20b as a Semitic future-type present, and "the kingdom of God" as the totality of God's design for the deprived. All this draws upon the programme of Isaiah 61.1-2, as the answer of Jesus to John (Mt 11.5/Lk 7.22) confirms. Not only so: the choice of the beatitude form to articulate that programme draws its meaning from the frequency with which this very form had been used to reflect upon the covenant and the blessings which stemmed from it. In other words, the self-awareness of the people of God is concerned, and the concentration upon the poor reflects the conviction that the God of the covenant's concern for the marginalized and vulnerable on the fringes of his people (humanly speaking) remains unchanged.

This brings us to the fourth and last beatitude (Mt 5.11f/Lk 6.22f). The secondariness of this blessing of the persecuted is widely recognized and well grounded. By contrast with the first

13 K. H. Rengstorff, γελάω, TDNT, i (1964), 659; P. Humbert, "'Laetari et exultari' dans le vocabulaire religieux de l'Ancien Testament", RHP, xxii (1942), 185-214. See Job 22.19; Psalm 52.6; Jer. 20.8; Testament of Reuben 4.7.

14 Psalm 132.15; Proverbs 22.9; Isaiah 58.7; Sirach 43.21; Psalms of Solomon 5; cf. the intention of the legislation in Exodus 23.1; Leviticus 19.10; 23.22: H.-J. Degenhardt, Lukas Evangelist der Armen (Stuttgart, 1965), p. 22.

15 Psalm 12.5; Sirach 4.1f; 7.32-34; cf. texts bracketing the poor with the widow, e.g. Isaiah 10.1f.


17 Deuteronomy 33.29; Psalm 33.12; 84.12; 144.15; 146.5; Isaiah 30.18; 56.2.

18 S. Schulz, Q. Die Spruchquelle der Evangelisten (Zürich, 1972), p. 454f;
three, it uses the second-person rather than the third-person form; it represents pastoral encouragement of disciples rather than unrestricted public proclamation; it is long and elaborate rather than short and pithy; it is christological while they are not. The corollary of this is that the saying must be interpreted on the Q level, rather than being translated without more ado back into Aramaic and interpreted on some other level. On the Q level insult (δοέωδιζεον) and the receipt of evil (πονηρὸς) in some form were much in mind. What was probably not in mind was the experience of separation (ἄφοροδιζεον), mentioned by Luke but not by Matthew. 19 This is unlikely to have been dropped by Matthew as he breathed an unpleasant atmosphere in which echoed charges and counter-charges of deceit and apostasy. What probably was in the mind of the Q editor was "the Son of man", since (i) there is no precedent for Luke’s introducing this term without any basis in tradition, 20 and (ii) elsewhere in Q a secondary appendix (Mt 11.18f/Lk 7.33-35) to primary tradition (Mt 11.16f/Lk 7.31f) introduces the Son of man and at the same time, by careful choice of language, recalls the succession of prophets who came2' and were rejected by verbal defamation and slander. That is, of course, the horizon of the fourth beatitude.

Here, then, by employing the terminology of persecution which, however, falls short of separation, and by using the Deuteronomic pattern of perpetually persecuted prophets, which had often been employed (as it were) domestically within Israel, 22 the compiler allows us a glimpse of a situation within the community of Israel. That situation has developed "because of the Son of man". What that means is not that other Israelites object to the teaching of Jesus as such, for the Jesus of Q is through-and-through orthodox (cf. Mt 5.18/Lk 16.17) and his teaching again and again anticipated by Jewish precedents. What is meant is the conviction that

Lührmann, Redaktion, p. 55; P. Hoffmann, Studien zur Theologie der Logienquelle (Münster, 1975), p. 73; Dupont, Béatitudes, ii, 281-284.
19 Rightly, Schulz, Q, p. 452; otherwise, Dupont, Béatitudes, i, 231.
21 See Isaiah 50.2.
the Son of man is Jesus, an equation established with some effort and care elsewhere in Q (cf. Mt 11.2-6/Lk 7.18-23).  

From the beginning of the discourse we turn now to its end. The different Mt/Lk versions of the parable of the two housebuilders vary in some details, but the shared intention is clear and the interest of Q not in doubt. Identical testing of identical buildings spells security in the one case and disaster in the other: similarly, when persons are subjected to the storms of divine testing in judgment, the necessary condition of survival is a life grounded in active performance of the sayings of Jesus. To this parable there is attached in Lk 6.46 an introduction, “Why do you call me, ‘Lord, Lord’, and do not do what I say?” This Lukan introduction is probably the Q original, in spite of contrary arguments that Luke himself has intervened to deprive the text of its eschatological bearing, to substitute obedience to the words of Jesus for performance of the will of the heavenly Father, and to lose the primitive-sounding phrase “enter the kingdom of heaven”. In fact, the eschatological bearing may not be quite so lacking in the invocation, “Lord, Lord”, and the two other features are typically Matthaean. Moreover, Lk 6.46 integrates neatly with the Q parable, in that both are concerned with Jesus as speaker, both focus on the need for προσευχή, and both give particular emphasis to a warning against disobedience.

Nevertheless, for all that Lk 6.46 dovetails so precisely with what follows, it is unnecessary. First, Matthew took the saying and merged it with additional material, which appears in Lk 13.26f, to form a distinct unit, Mt 7.21-23. The effect was the isolation of, but no damage to, Mt 7.24-27. The latter stood, as it were, on its own feet without assistance. Secondly, the parable

23 The term ὁ ἐφορμένος in the mouth of the Baptist (Mt 11.3/Lk 7.19) picks up the wording of his earlier proclamation (Mt 3.11/Lk 3.16), but a part of that proclamation which is christological and contrasts with the theocentric concentration in the adjacent material. It is therefore likely to be Q editorial, cf. Hoffmann, Studien, pp. 22-25.

24 See Job 22.16; Ezekiel 13.13f; 38.21f.; Wisdom 5.22f.

25 Schulz, Q, p. 427; E. Schweizer, Matthew, p. 188; Schürmann, Lukas-evangelium I, p. 381.


27 This follows from the tendency within antithetic parallelism to stress the second half.
contains entirely within itself the key to its own meaning. Thirdly, two remarkably close parallels for the parable in rabbinic texts lack any introduction. Since one can scarcely envisage this neat but unnecessary introduction in Lk 6.46 existing in isolation the inference must be that, like the fourth beatitude, it is a secondary editorial growth.

What then did Lk 6.46 communicate on the Q level of meaning? First, we observe the ποιεῖν theme continuing to be given prominence in the next Q unit, the healing of the centurion's servant (Mt 8.5-10,13/Lk 7.1,2,6-10). Here it is christologically grounded in reflection on ἐξουσία. The centurion is a person with understanding, and in respect of authority he detects a similarity between his position and that of Jesus. Yet there is also a dissimilarity: he addresses Jesus as the "Lord" who, by virtue of his word, can bring about the healing for which he, the centurion, is obliged to plead. Jesus as "Lord" is a healer, and his word is effective in healing because it is the word of one under authority, i.e. his word is God's power decisively in action. Now in Q the being through whom the power of God is decisively exercised in miracle is "the coming one" (Mt 11.3/Lk 7.19), that is, the Son of man.

Secondly, elsewhere in Q κόριος (the term employed by Lk 6.46) denotes the person who has servants, gives them instructions, goes away, comes back, calls them to account, and exercises a fierce and final judgment upon those who have heard, but have either in disobedience done wrong (thus, the parable of the faithful and wise servant: Mt 24.45-51/Lk 12.42-46) or in negligence done nothing (thus, the parable of the talents: Mt 25.14-30/Lk 19.11-27). The κόριος figure of these parables has immediately beforehand in Q been defined (thus, the parable of the watchful householder: Mt 24.43f/Lk 12.39f) as the one who comes, the Son of man.

We find therefore that the Q discourse is deliberately designed and christologically controlled. Only twice within it does explicit christology surface, once at the start and once at the finish. This christological inclusio articulates one central conviction, namely that the coming Son of man is the authoritatively speaking Jesus.

28 Aboth 3.18; Aboth d'Rabbi Nathan 24.1f.
Let us now turn to Lk 6.27-35, the section dealing with “love of enemies”. Once again, there is evidence of deliberate design, specifically in the positioning of sayings about insult, giving and the golden rule (vv. 29-31) inside the main tradition. Students of Mark and John are familiar with such theologically motivated “sandwich structures”, but they are not a feature of Luke. Hence, this one is likely to have been present in Q and present for a reason.

This reason becomes more accessible after Lk 6.27-35 is brought alongside another Q tradition which, in respect of form, is remarkably similar. This is the material “on anxiety” (Mt 6.25-33/Lk 12.22-31). Beneath the surface of that tradition there is discernible a coherent and self-contained unit combining four elements: 1. a demand couched in negative terms: “Do not be anxious…” (Lk 12.22); 2. a pair of illustrative examples, the ravens and the lilies, supporting the demand (Lk 12.24,27f); 3. a summary which restates the negative demand and draws together the implications of the examples: “Do not be anxious … for your Father knows” (Lk 12.29,30b); 4. a balancing, positive and eschatologically orientated demand: “Seek the kingdom…” (Lk 12.31). When we move to Lk 6.27-35 the same scheme is evident. Its component parts are: 1. a demand: “Love your enemies…” (Lk 6.27f); 2. some illustrative examples, setting out the love and beneficence of certain person (Lk 6.32f); 3. a summarizing restatement of the demand (Lk 6.35a); 4. an attached eschatological prospect involving the great reward of future sonship (Lk 6.35b).

29 D. Lührmann, “Liebet eure Feinde (Lk 6,27-36 Mt 5.39-48)”, ZTK, lxix (1973), 412-438, esp. 413-416; Schürmann, Lukasevangelium I, p. 345f. The opposite view that Matthew’s order is original is maintained by S. Schulz, Q, p. 120f; H. Merklein, Die Gottesherrschaft als Handlungsprinzip (Würzburg, 1978), p. 222f; D. Zeller, Mahnsprüche, p. 102.


31 For our present purposes it is not necessary to decide whether Luke’s third illustrative argument concerning δαιμόνια (6.34) stood in Q as a sequel to the δαιμόνια demand of Mt 5.42/Lk 6.30 or alternatively derived from LkR.
Not below, but on the surface of, Lk 12.22-31 can now be found three superimpositions, two of which also have positional or substantial counterparts in 6.27-35. First, the bland declaration that “soul and body are more than food and clothing” (Lk 12.23) could be unreservedly endorsed by the anxious, and is therefore no deterrent to anxiety. It also interrupts the sequence from initial demand to supporting illustrations, and is therefore secondary. Identically and secondarily positioned in Lk 6.27-35 is the trio of sayings about insult, giving and the golden rule (vv. 29-31). Secondly, the saying about adding a cubit to one’s lifespan interrupts the two genuinely parallel illustrations of the ravens and the lilies. It argues anthropocentrically rather than theocentrically, and it fastens on the ineffectiveness rather than the inappropriateness of worry. It therefore appears to be secondary, but this time there is no counterpart in 6.27-35. Thirdly, “for all the nations seek these things” (Lk 12.30a) is an intrinsically different argument, in that it calls for behaviour better than that of certain others. It is also badly positioned, in that it occurs within the concluding summary when the time for argument has passed. Therefore it too is secondary. But this time there are two counterparts in 6.27-35. The substantial counterpart is Lk 6.32f where exactly the same argument, “behave better than certain others”, is employed. Not only so, but the specified persons are the same, i.e. Gentiles. Matthew’s positive attitude to the Gentiles (cf. 28.19f) and to taxcollectors (cf. 10.3 diff Mk 3.18) makes their presence in Mt 5.46f unlikely to derive from MtR, while their absence from the version of the pro-Gentile Luke is readily attributable to LkR. We note also that an anti-taxcollector saying fits Q, in which there is not a single favourable reference to taxcollectors: when Jesus is accused in Mt 11.19/Lk 7.34 of being “a friend of tax-collectors and sinners” this insulting jibe by opponents has to be presumed to be as untrue as the initial smear that he is “a glutton and a drunkard”. Thus the overall inference, taking into account the substance of Lk 12.30a, is that Lk 6.32f is secondary. This leaves us with the positional counterpart of Lk


33 This must be affirmed over against the proposal of P. Hoffmann, “Die bessere Gerechtigkeit. Die Auslegung der Bergpredigt IV (Mt 5.38-48)”, *Bibel und Leben*, x (1969), 264-275, esp. 269f., that these sayings derive from the historical Jesus. Arguing that the function of the εθνικός + τελώνης pairing matches the function of the Samaritan in Lk 10.30-37, Hoffmann concludes:
12.30a, namely Lk 6.35c, the reference to God's kindness in creation. I take it here that Q referred to sun and rain, a much more vivid allusion than Luke's punning \( \chi\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\varsigma-\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\varsigma-\acute{\alpha}\chi\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\varsigma\omicron\tau\omicron\varsigma \) combination, and one much more in tune with Q's regular approach to the created order (cf. Mt 10.29-31/Lk 12.6f). I take it also that Q referred, by use of synonym, only to evil persons rather than to evil and good. The latter pairing is typical of Matthew (cf. 22.10) and is also the less starkly radical of the two, while Luke's version happens to agree with Q's sweepingly negative view of humanity at large: "If you being evil ..." (Mt 7.11/Lk 11.13). Now this Q saying about the divine gifts of sunshine and rain to the wicked is an argument for the imitation of God, but positionally it is all wrong, since at the stage of a concluding summary the time for argument has passed. Moreover, its contribution is superfluous, because without it we have a saying which calls for love on earth in the present and promises sonship in heaven in the future, that is, a saying which is well-balanced and complete.

We thus arrive at the conclusion that compositional and redactional activity in Lk 6.27-35 is responsible for the insertion of vv. 29, 30, 31 and the creation of vv. 32, 33, 35c. Furthermore, since the repetition of the demand for love is made necessary only by the creation of the illustrative arguments, that must also be editorial. From this overall conclusion we can now resume our search for the reason for the presence of vv. 29, 30, 31 in their Q setting.

First, v. 29 picks up the fourth beatitude. The two halves of this saying about the blow on the cheek and the removal of clothing must combine as two variations on a single theme, and there is Mk/Lk agreement in the first half that the theme is hostile against this, the Samaritan makes his contribution precisely because the prejudice he provoked is attacked and overcome, whereas in this context the prejudices provoked by the tax collectors and Gentiles are reinforced and exploited.

"Jesus fordert die Überwindung des Fremd-Feind-Denkens, eine universale Offenheit, die jedem Menschen Anerkennung und Güte entgegenbringt ..." Against this, the Samaritan makes his contribution precisely because the prejudice he provoked is attacked and overcome, whereas in this context the prejudices provoked by the tax collectors and Gentiles are reinforced and exploited.


36 If Lk 6.34 stood in Q it would also have to be assigned to the editor responsible for the insertion of v. 30.
personal attack, the very antithesis of love (cf. Hosea 11.4). Matthew’s second half is set in legal process, the person addressed being not the offended one but the offender, i.e. the debtor whose refusal of the pledge envisaged in Exodus 22.26f and Deuteronomy 24.10-13 causes the creditor to go to court to obtain it. But this makes the two halves of the saying jarringly discordant, and moreover conforms to the MtR tendency elsewhere in 5.21-48 to introduce formal legal procedure. Luke, by contrast, lacks any allusion to legal procedure, and uses the verb αἰρέων, which is both suggestive of violence and also normally used by Luke only under the influence of a source. The sense of violence is well caught by the notable parallel in Cant 5.7: “They beat me, they wounded me, they took away (LXX: ἕραν) my mantle”. In this light the double act of violence against the person has a single meaning, and all the more so when one draws in the rabbinic list of examples of the most serious form of insult carrying maximum financial penalty (Baba Kamma 8.6). Along with tearing a person’s ear, pulling out his hair, spitting so that the spittle touches him, and loosening a woman’s hair in public, there is included slapping with the back of the hand and pulling a person’s cloak off him. Of course, we require Matthew’s δέξιός to stand in Q, but that is no problem, since (a) it gives the bipartite saying a technical meaning which Matthew himself was obscuring rather than exploiting, and (b) it allows the saying to conform to the recurrent pattern of Jesus’ teaching, which often takes as its starting-point the most trivial offence by the Christian disciple or the most extreme offence against him. If the Q original approximated to

τῷ ἰαπίζοντι σε εἰς τὴν δεξιὰν σιαγόνα,  
στρέψον καὶ τὴν ἄλλην·  
kαὶ τῷ αἴροντι σοῦ τὸ ἴματιον,  
ἀφες καὶ τὸν χιτώνα

then it dealt with response to insult which is itself the very antithesis of love. Insult is central to Lk 6.22, and the response of love is the essence of Lk 6.27. Therefore, v. 29 integrates perfectly with its context and the Q editor’s design continues to emerge.

Secondly, v. 30 picks up Isaiah 61.1f and therefore the first three beatitudes. Once again Matthew and Luke agree the first half of the saying, though not the second. But in the second half

37 This is agreed by Schulz, Q, p. 122; H. Merklein, Gottesherrschaft, p. 269.
Matthew's δανίζειν is presupposed shortly afterwards in Lk 6.34, and Luke's ἀπαίτεῖν (= to ask for the return of something) might be thought an unduly weak sequel to the violent Lukan counterpart of δανίζειν, namely αἰρεῖν. Consequently the Q version of the saying probably approximated to

τῷ αἰτούντι σε δόσ,
καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ δανισαμένου μὴ ἀπαίτεῖ.

Generous giving, so often in the wisdom literature an expression of righteousness and of mercy (cf. Psalm 37.26; Sirach 29.1f), is now to be supplemented by declining to request the return of a loan, so often an expression of reproach and a cause of hatred (cf. Sirach 20.15). But the wisdom material which points so directly towards our saying has to be supplemented by the two legal texts which in the LXX, the sacred text employed by Q, use δανίζειν. The second of these is Deuteronomy 24.11, which describes the problem with which MtR wrestled in the transformed insult saying, i.e. the obtaining by voluntary means of a pledge that a loan will be repaid. But the first is Deuteronomy 15.1-11, which describes the sabbath year legislation, laying down the cancellation of debts within, but not outside, the brotherhood of Israel (v. 3) and recommending the intention to eradicate the evil of poverty from the community (v. 4). That year is defined as one of ἀφεσις (vv. 1, 2, 3, 9) and the abandonment of ἀπαίτησις (vv. 2, 3), except in the case of the foreigner. Lest the existence of this legislation discourage giving, even in the face of obvious poverty and proven need, an incentive is added, namely a return not of the loan itself but of a blessing from God (v. 10). Now Deuteronomy 15.1-11 is one of the texts upon which the programme and the proclamation of Isaiah 61.1f is built. And thus we find the clue to the presence of Luke 6.30 within the Q discourse. It not only details conduct which is the very opposite of what disrupts human relationships, expresses reproach, generates hate, establishes enmity (compare Lk 6.27f); it not only puts flesh on the bones of “doing good” (see Lk 6.27) and implicitly points to the divine recompense (see Lk 6.35b); but it also spells out the didactic implications of the kerygma, proclaimed so simply but so majestically in the beatitudes.

Thirdly, vv. 31, 32-33, 35c, the golden rule, the illustrations and the allusion to divine kindness, belong together and pick up Leviticus 19.18: “You shall love your neighbour as yourself”. En route to this conclusion let us observe that ἀγαθοποιεῖν is much more likely than ἀσπαζομαι to have stood in Q. First, it makes no realistic sense to imply that the Gentiles greet only their brothers, because the term “brother” has meaning only within the confines of a well-defined community, whether Jewish or Christian. Secondly, these supporting arguments are intended to engage with a setting of persecution, but the withholding of greetings is scarcely persecution. Thirdly, the term ἀγαθοποιεῖν meshes with the recurrent use of ποιεῖν and the ἀγαθος/πονηρος contrast in the discourse as a whole. This being so, we can go on to observe the key role of the golden rule. On the one hand, it shares with the illustrative arguments the correlation of actions of oneself towards others and actions of others towards oneself. On the other hand, the association of the golden rule and the imitatio Dei idea (v. 35c) is already anticipated in the Letter of Aristeas 207:

As you wish that no evil should befall you, but to be a partaker of all good things, so you should act on the same principle ... For God draws all men to himself by his benevolence.

Thus, a single mind seems to be at work in vv. 31, 32-33, and 35c. But what was the thought in the mind? Three elements combine to answer that question. The first is the controlling theme of love, mentioned first in v. 32 because it was dominant in the pre-Q saying about love of enemies. The second is the sense of Israelite, and exclusively Israelite, community in v. 32f, where the persons addressed clearly distinguished themselves from Gentiles and those who live like Gentiles. The third is the use of the self and the self’s wishes as a criterion in v. 31, the golden rule. These three elements add up to Lev. 19.18b: “You shall love your neighbour as yourself”. The persecuted ones are addressed along the lines of the ancient text, interpreted strictly in its own terms. Of any pre-

39 It is curious that ἀσπαζομαι should be so widely accepted as the original Q wording: thus, A. Harnack, The Sayings of Jesus (London, 1908), p. 62; Schmid, Matthäus und Lukas, p. 230; W. C. Van Unnik, “Die Motivierung der Feindesliebe in Lukas 6,32-35”, NovT, viii (1966), 284-300, esp. 288f.; Schulz, Q, p. 129.

40 E. Schweizer, Matthew, p. 114, observes pertinently that Matthew’s version is “strangely weak”.

occupation with defining, still less with redefining, the neighbour, there is not the slightest trace. The community to which the editor and his audience belong is therefore not so much a Christian church as Israel. The confession which he and they maintain, the confession of the Son of man, is one which he strives not to allow to bring separation, even though it has provoked vehement opposition inside Israel. It is a confession which must be maintained within the ancient community. Every effort is made therefore to be faithful simultaneously to the confession of Jesus and the command of Moses to love the neighbour as oneself.

III

A serious discrepancy of scheme confronts us at the start of the next section.

The *imitatio Dei* saying (Mt 5.48/Lk 6.36), couched in terms of “perfection”, had been used by Matthew to round off the antitheses in 5.21-48. The presentation of different themes in Mt 6 had separated it from the saying in 7.1, “Judge not, that you be not judged”, with which perforce a new unit began. After a further judgment saying in 7.2a, “With the judgment you judge you will be judged”, had been formed in exact imitation of the measure saying in 7.2b, “With the measure you measure it will be measured to you”, the latter, which by itself might have been interpreted judgmentally or salvifically, could bear only the former judgmental sense. With γάρ bringing 7.2ab into a supporting role for 7.1 the Matthaean unit was complete and its message clear: “Do not judge, or God will judge you”.

The *imitatio Dei* saying, couched in terms of “mercy”, functions in Luke as a heading. Under its control stands an antithesis, consisting of two negative demands in synonymous parallelism prohibiting κρίνειν and καταδικάζειν (6.37ab), and two positive demands in synonymous parallelism featuring ἀπολαμβάνειν and διδόναι (6.37c, 38a). Since within an antithesis the emphasis normally falls on the second part it comes as no surprise that the promise attached to the positive demands is amplified in the “good measure, pressed down, …” material (6.38b). And when 6.38c sets out the measure principle which, it will be recalled, is by

itself neutral and applicable either judgmentally or salvifically, then it is clear that it explains the κρίνειν + καταδικάζειν prohibitions, but explains and emphasizes the ἀπολύειν + διδόναι demands. Its primarily positive emphasis therefore brings it alongside the mercy saying. The result is an inclusio in 6.36, 38c surrounding the two synonymous parallelisms in antithetic relationship.

For Luke in all this we can, however, substitute Q. First, the fact that in Q the section 6.27-35 had ended and had been complete in itself, compelled 6.36 to begin a new section. Secondly, the crucial word οἰκτίρμων is widely accepted as pre-Lukan. On the one hand, τέλειος stems from MtR elsewhere in the “rich young ruler” episode. On the other hand the blessing of the merciful in Mt 5.7 uses a synonym for οἰκτίρμων and is formulated more exactly according to the measure principle than any other beatitude, which suggests a Matthaean reminiscence of the Q version. Thirdly, other small hints of the originality of Luke’s wording are in evidence. The verb καταδικάζειν occurs in the MtR saying 12.37, “By your words you will be condemned (καταδικασθήσῃ)”, which is attached to Mt 12.33-35/Lk 6.43-45. Since the latter stood in Q very near the tradition we are discussing, another Matthaean reminiscence is suggested. Finally, the Palestinian custom of using the fold of a garment as a container for grain (6.38b) is unlikely to have been injected into the tradition by Luke.

If, then, Lk 6.36-38 preserves a Q unit of tradition its meaning can now be explored. The term “mercy” inevitably evokes the covenant relationship, with its partial symmetry of obligation on either side (cf. Exodus 34.6). Lk 6.36 therefore calls not simply for a general imitatio Dei but for a very specific fulfilment of the obligations which make the people of Israel the people of God. Further to that, the standard antithesis between mercy and wrath or judgment defines Lk 6.36 as an address to those who have received God’s mercy and forgiveness as repentant members of his

42 Schmid, Matthäus und Lukas, p. 230; Dupont, Béatitudes, i, 151-3; H. Schürmann, Lukasevangelium I, p. 360; Schulz, Q, p. 130.
43 R. Bultmann, οἰκτίρμα, TDNT, v (1967), 159-161, esp. 160: “There is no palpable distinction between οἰκτίρμεν and ἔλεεῖν, or οἰκτίρμόν and ἔλεος”. See also Schürmann, Lukasevangelium I, p. 360.
44 Schürmann, Lukasevangelium I, p. 362.
people. For their part they are to forswear judgment and, through ἀπολύειν and διδόναι, to exercise compassion towards persons who have offended them. This is dramatically portrayed in the only other tradition in the synoptics (not necessarily from Q) using ἀπολύειν in this sense, namely the parable of the unmerciful servant (Mt 18.23-35). That parable very obviously reflects on the measure principle (see vv. 30, 33, 34) and has as its major theme mercy (v. 33), mercy which takes effect through ἄφέσις and ἀπόλυσις (vv. 27, 32) in a context where compassion and wrath are contrasted (vv. 27, 34).

Thus in Lk 6.36-38 we have a very full presentation of what mercy means and why it should be exercised. There shines through the commands the light of a vivid sense of God's grace and forgiveness, a sense that he matches adverse human action with precisely corresponding adverse action, but also matches acceptable human action with far-and-away exceeding grace and goodness. In this we are reminded of the rabbinic presentation of the measure principle (Sotah 1.7-9): "With what measure a man metes it shall be measured to him again". This is variously illustrated, e.g. by the case of Samson, whose eyes led him astray, and who was punished by having his eyes put out; or by the case of Absalom, who gloried in his hair, took ten of his father's concubines, and stole three hearts, and who was punished by being hanged by his hair, and pierced by spears ten times and by darts three times. On the other hand, Miriam waited for Moses for one hour and was waited for by Israel for seven days; Joseph, the greatest of the brothers, buried Jacob, and Moses, the greatest in Israel buried him, while even God himself looked after Moses.

Let us recall, however, the necessity of defining any nuances of meaning that there may be on the Q level. This can be done in two stages:

At the outset, it is plain that vv. 36-38 repeatedly pick up the concerns of vv. 27-35. The refusal to reciprocate evil (v. 29) and the call for a thoroughly beneficent reaction to it (v. 27f)—both represent an abandonment of the measure principle as a guide to personal conduct. The generosity of the giving in v. 30 prepares for the same approach in vv. 37c, 38a. Observance of the golden rule in a setting of opposition is itself a very direct expression of attitude to the measure principle, just as the rejection of the example of tax collectors and Gentiles, who restrict love and good deeds, is a subordination of that principle to the higher demand of
neighbourly love. Looking to God for his gracious reward in v. 35b is a preparation for the promises of vv. 36, 37c, 38. And above all, the whole range of recommended actions in vv. 27-35 can be distilled in the single idea of mercy, v. 36. But if there are these common ideas binding vv. 27-35 to vv. 36-38, it follows that the latter is designed by its compositional closeness to the former to speak about the conduct of those who are treated with hostility and hate for confessing the Son of man. What do vv. 36-38 ask these particular persons to do? This begins to emerge as we uncover a scheme:

a) In Leviticus 19.17,18 the love command is coupled with the injunction: “You shall reason with your neighbour . . .” These two aspects of upright behaviour are set over against a hostile action, namely taking vengeance, and hostile attitudes, namely hatred and bearing a grudge. The concern to tackle the problem through the heart is striking; so is the correlation of love with a restoration of ruptured relationships by means of ἔλεγχεν, i.e. reasoned reproof; and so is the synonymous usage of the terms “brother” and “neighbour”.

b) In Mt 18.15-17,21f there occurs material which sets out in some detail a conciliation procedure, material which arguably derives from Q and which has survived in approximately its original form in Mt and in a much truncated and damaged form in Lk.46 The problem is again an offence by a brother which is met by the offended person’s implementing the ἔλεγχεν procedure. Failure of the three-stage conciliation process leads to the offender’s being regarded in the same way as Gentiles and tax collectors are regarded (note the same combination of persons as in Mt 5.46f), but at the same time to his being shown unlimited forgiveness. What is additionally fascinating is Matthew’s placing next in his sequence the parable of the unmerciful servant (18.23-35) which, as we have already observed, shows a remarkable resemblance to Lk 6.36-38. The evangelist seems to think the two themes highly consonant.

c) In the Testament of Gad the subject of reflection is hatred. Hatred had been aroused by the conduct of Joseph, and its effects

---

are spelt out in a sickly catalogue. It brings a longing for the death of the hated person (2.1f; 4.3-7); it surfaces in distortion and disapproval of all he does (3.2); evil speaking, envy and arrogance become the order of the day (3.3); the whole person is taken over by evil (2.1); mercy disappears, along with righteousness and obedience to the law of God (3.1,3; 4.1; 5.3). What is very significant is the definition of the law which is being infringed:

Hatred does not want to hear repeated the Lord’s commands concerning love of neighbour, and thus it sins against God.

The law in question is clearly Leviticus 19.18. Significantly, the writer puts into the mouth of Gad an extended explanation of the measure principle (5.10f):

By whatever human capacity anyone transgresses, by that he is also chastised. Since my anger was merciless in opposition to Joseph, through this anger of mine I suffered mercilessly, and was brought under judgment for eleven months, as long as I had it in for Joseph, until he was sold.

Love, already mentioned as synonymous with mercy, is the opposite of all these grim attitudes and actions. It brings life into a context of death (4.6); it forms an alliance with the divine law to effect the salvation of men (4.7); as love of the brother (sic) it is a matter of ἔργον + λόγος + διάνοια ψυχής or καρδία (6.1,3). But in immediate and practical terms it issues in a process of trying by direct reproof to achieve a state of peace with the offending neighbour. Thus there emerges an equation in 6.3,6:

\[
\text{δὲλὲγχειν} = \text{εἴπειν ἐν εἰρήνῃ.}
\]

The writer goes on to stress the importance of all this if the offender’s repentance and confession are not forthcoming. Abandonment of hatred means no anger, no evil speaking and no talking to others. A damaging disruption of relationships is at all costs to be prevented. Peace is the prize of success, but the sequel of failure must be forgiveness from the heart and the recognition of God as sole judge. From this whole panoramic view of the problem of hatred and the process of conciliation it is clear that the controlling principles are found in Leviticus 19, in v. 17 as well as in v. 18.

d) In Q, for reasons already mentioned, Lk 6.36-38 was followed by v. 39 (minus its introductory εἴπεν δὲ καὶ παραβόλην
αὐτοῖς) but not by v. 40. The elimination of v. 40 from the reconstructed Q sequence enables the closeness of association between v. 39 and v. 41f to become evident. This association is not just a matter of shared imagery but rather of shared ideas. First, v. 39 speaks of one person acting as guide to another, and so do v. 41f. Secondly, v. 39 depends for its cogency on the guide’s sharing the same disability as the guided person, and so do v. 41f. Thirdly, the specific disability in v. 39 is a sight problem, and the same is true in v. 41f. Fourthly, by contrast with other sayings about leading the blind (cf. Testament of Reuben 2.9) v. 39 is preoccupied with the guide, and the same is true in v. 41f. Thus v. 39 interlocks tightly with v. 41f, and the latter tradition about the speck and the log discloses the particular concern.

Verbal discrepancies between the Mt/Lk versions are minor and insignificant, and they need not detain us. Two features, however, certainly should detain us. First, the term “brother” appears for the first time in this discourse, the term which is used uniquely in Leviticus 19 at v. 17, and the term whose only other occurrence in Q is in the ἐλέγχειν passage, Mt 18.15/Lk 17.3. Secondly, Lk 6.41f is exactly matched in the rabbinic text, b. Arak 16b, which reads:

R Tarfon said, I wonder whether there is anyone in this generation who accepts reproof, for if one says to him, “Remove the mote from between your eyes”, he would answer, “Remove the beam from between your eyes”.

From this it is clear that terminology which is at home in the context of the reproof process is being employed by Lk 6.41f and, moreover, that the juxtaposition of vv. 36-38, 39, 41f points to a well-attested scheme. Consequently, the question as to what vv. 36-38 ask the wronged and persecuted ones to do can be answered. They are to address the problem and take positive steps by means of the ἐλέγχειν process to bring about a change of the persecutor’s mind and a restoration of personal and communal peace.

The sole remaining issue for us is the role of the “tree + treasure” complex in Mt 7.16-20; 12.33-35/Lk 6.43-45. The double Matthaean use of these sayings brings complications in the

47 So Dupont, Béatitudes, i, p. 55.
reconstruction of the Q Vorlage, but since almost all features of the Lukan version are present in at least one of the Matthaean versions it seems likely that Q is once again respected, and more exactly preserved, by Luke. On this basis we can make the following observations: (i) The term θησαυρός in v. 45 indicates that this saying is still in the area of metaphor (cf. Mt 13.52). Consequently v. 45 is not the interpretation of the metaphorical saying in vv. 43, 44a, but it is a second metaphorical saying. This is confirmed by a certain asymmetry between the two: the first works negatively by affirming that the good does not produce the rotten and vice versa, while the second works positively by affirning that the good produces the good while the bad produces the bad. Moreover, v. 44a, “From the fruit the tree will be known”, summarizes v. 43ab, while the similarly formulated v. 45c, “Out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaks”, applies v. 45ab. Hence in vv. 43-45 there is a pair of matching illustrations separated by a dependent but interrupting question about grapes and thorns (v. 44b). Formally, this recalls very firmly the structure of the “ravens and lilies” tradition.49 (ii) The first illustration focuses on fruit which, within Biblical tradition, can be variously understood as actions50 or as speech.51 An ambiguous metaphor, always needing definition by context, is being employed, and thus the first illustration needs the second to provide definition. The combined message of the two is clearly an insistence that good speech is necessary and that it will be produced (v. 45ab), but will only be produced (v. 43), from a good inner being. The demand, the call, is therefore for through-and-through personal integrity and goodness. (iii) Normally in Q a pair of illustrations would, as we have observed, be preceded by a heading, and it is here that the binding thematic connections between vv. 39, 41f and vv. 43-45 come into their own. Both complexes deal with speech, both are calls for self-examination and integrity and consistency at the deepest personal level, and both place such an emphasis upon the negative side of things as to sound a severe note of warning. Therefore, vv. 43-45 depend upon and amplify vv. 39, 41f, and are designed to protect the ἔλεγχος process from failing because of blemishes in the person who activates it.

49 See above, p. 304.  
50 Proverbs 1.31; 31.16,31; Jeremiah 17.10; Hosea 10.12; Micah 7.13.  
51 Proverbs 13.2; 18.20f; Sirach 27.6; 37.23f.
Our study is at an end, and it remains only to summarize its outcome. The inaugural discourse of Jesus in Q is an integrated whole in respect of both formal construction and theological texture. The introductory beatitudes ensure that the whole is determined by the majestic kerygma of Isaiah 61.1f, and the concluding parable warns of the serious consequences of inattention to the related didache. Both traditions remind the audience of the supreme authority of the Son of man whom they confess. The centre of the discourse is a spelling out of Leviticus 19.17f, and the persons addressed by Q form no community other than that addressed by that ancient law. The pivotal position of vv. 36-38 within vv. 27-45, gathering together the themes of vv. 27-35 (where Leviticus 19.18 dominates) and yet controlling vv. 36-45 (where Leviticus 19.17 dominates), gives the discourse its keynote: mercy. Members of the audience of this discourse live in the permanent light and reality of divine mercy. They are enabled, indeed obliged, to act mercifully because they have experienced in the past, and they know they will experience in the future, that mercy by which, as adherents of Jesus and members of the community of Israel, they bring to effect what it means to be the community of God.