

“...remembering what the Savior had said”

Social Memory and
the Sayings of Jesus Tradition

Kimberly J. Bauser McBrien

A dissertation
submitted to the Faculty of
the Department of Theology
in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

Boston College
Morrissey College of Arts and Sciences
Graduate School

June 2019

“...remembering what the Savior had said”
Social Memory and the Sayings of Jesus Tradition

Kimberly J. Bauser McBrien

Advisor: PHEME PERKINS, Ph.D.

Abstract

Scholarship concerning the sayings attributed to Jesus has often been driven by the goals of historical Jesus studies, so that approaches to the sayings tradition have largely focused on determining the probability of those sayings' having originated with Jesus himself, and sorting the tradition into its presumed more and less genuine parts. This focus has been based in part on an understanding of human memory as capable of conveying accurate kernels of the actual past—here, genuine sayings of Jesus—alongside and within accreted tradition. Social memory theory, which originated in the social sciences but has been applied to Jesus scholarship over the last several decades, controverts this understanding of memory, arguing rather that memory is a dynamic social process, which continually interprets the perceived past through the socially-engaged frameworks of the present, and therefore cannot be separated into accurate and inaccurate parts. This correction to previous thinking about memory demands a corresponding correction to previous approaches to the Jesus and sayings tradition. The present dissertation proposes a variant-conscious approach—a label adopted and adapted from a parallel approach developed within New Testament text criticism—to the sayings tradition as a means of answering this demand and taking into account social memory theory's claims concerning the

entanglement of the past and present in the social construction of the tradition. Its aim is to attend to the sayings tradition and the variants within it each as distinct pieces of evidence for the diverse ways in which Jesus and his sayings were being remembered across Christian communities of the first three centuries CE.

Two case studies (Chapters 2 and 3) apply this approach to two clusters of variants of sayings attributed to Jesus, an “Explaining the Parable(s)” cluster and an “Ask, Seek, and/or Knock” cluster. These studies find that the variations between the variants reflect each one’s origins as a product of social memory, connected at once to its past received tradition and to its own author’s present and socially-informed thinking about, for example, esoteric and exoteric knowledge, community identity, or the ongoing means of authority and revelation. A third case study (Chapter 4) turns its attention onto one sayings tradition text, the Apocryphon of James, in order to observe how its author, who could now be described as participating in the process of social memory, understood and described his own engagement with the processes of memory as a means of authorizing his contribution to the sayings tradition. Together these case studies demonstrate how a variant-conscious approach brings the insights of social memory theory to bear on the sayings tradition in a way that highlights the diversity and even competition within Christianity, as that diversity is given voice through the various memories of the voice of Jesus, which cannot be reduced to a singular *vox Jesu*.

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|-----|
| Table of Contents | iv |
| List of Tables | vi |
| Acknowledgments..... | vii |
| Introduction..... | 1 |
| Sayings Scholarship from Bultmann to Schröter..... | 3 |
| Social Memory and the Sayings Tradition: A Variant-Conscious Approach..... | 10 |
| Chapter 1: Approaches to the Sayings of Jesus | 16 |
| 1.1 Source Criticism, Q, and the Sayings Tradition | 17 |
| 1.1.1 Source Criticism and the Sayings Tradition, from Synoptic Problems to Q | 17 |
| 1.1.2 Q as Source and Document..... | 23 |
| 1.2 Form Criticism, the Criteria Approach, and the Sayings Tradition..... | 34 |
| 1.2.1 Classic Form Criticism and the Pre-Literary Sayings Tradition..... | 35 |
| 1.2.2 The Criteria Approach to the Sayings Tradition..... | 47 |
| 1.3 Studies of Memory and the Sayings Tradition | 55 |
| 1.3.1 Memorization, Memory, and the Sayings Tradition..... | 56 |
| 1.3.2 Social Memory and the Sayings Tradition..... | 70 |
| 1.4 Toward a Variant-Conscious Approach to the Sayings Tradition..... | 76 |
| Chapter 2: The “Explaining the Parable(s)” Sayings Cluster | 85 |
| 2.1 A Variant-Conscious Presentation of the “Explaining the Parable(s)” Cluster... | 91 |
| 2.2 Conclusions Concerning the “Explaining the Parables” Cluster | 113 |
| Chapter 3: The “Asking, Seeking, and/or Knocking” Sayings Cluster | 118 |

| | | |
|--------------|---|-----|
| 3.1 | Defining the “Ask, Seek, and/or Knock” Variant Cluster | 121 |
| 3.2 | A Variant-Conscious Presentation of the “Ask, Seek, and/or Knock” Cluster | 125 |
| 3.2.1 | Asking, Seeking, Knocking | 125 |
| 3.2.3 | Asking: Qualified (Trust)..... | 138 |
| 3.2.4 | Asking: Qualified (Other)..... | 145 |
| 3.2.5 | Seeking (and Knocking): Unqualified | 156 |
| 3.2.6 | Seeking: Unqualified (Seeking, plus) | 162 |
| 3.2.7 | Asking and/or Seeking: Not Attributed to Jesus..... | 168 |
| 3.3 | Conclusions Concerning the “Ask, Seek, and/or Knock” Cluster | 176 |
| Chapter 4: | Remembering the Sayings Tradition in the Apocryphon of James..... | 181 |
| 4.1 | The Apocryphon of James’s Text and Theology..... | 183 |
| 4.2 | Appeals to Apostolic-Era Memory and Authority..... | 188 |
| 4.2.1 | The Letter: An Apostolic Era Epistle of “James” | 189 |
| 4.2.2 | The Narrative: An Apostolic Era Experience of “James” | 194 |
| 4.2.3 | The Dialogue: A Revelation to “James” | 196 |
| 4.3 | Invoking and Inverting Apostolic-Era Memory and Authority | 200 |
| 4.4 | Appeals to the Author’s Memory and Authority | 205 |
| 4.5 | Conclusions Concerning Memory and the Sayings Tradition in the Apocryphon of James | 214 |
| Conclusion | | 216 |
| Bibliography | | 228 |

List of Tables

| | |
|---|-----|
| Table 2.1: Variants of the “Explaining the Parable(s)” Cluster | 89 |
| Table 2.2: “Explaining the Parable(s)” Cluster, Variants’ Contents | 115 |
| Table 2.3: “Explaining the Parable(s)” Cluster, Variants’ Contexts | 116 |
| Table 3.1: Variants of the “Ask, Seek, and/or Knock” Cluster | 122 |
| Table 3.2: “Ask, Seek, and/or Knock” Cluster, Variants’ Contents and Contexts | 179 |

Acknowledgments

At its aspirational best, this dissertation is a celebration of diverse voices. It seems fitting, therefore, at its outset, for me to offer a note of thanks and celebration for the many voices that have been part of its—and my—formation.

Thank you, first, to my advisor, Pheme Perkins, for her tireless efforts to help me improve my thinking and writing about early Christianity, and to my committee members, John Darr and Yonder Gillihan, whose insights and support helped guide this project to successful completion. Thanks, also, to the other Boston College Bible faculty, David Vanderhooft and Jeff Cooley, who generously read chapters when they were just colloquium papers and have provided editorial assistance, encouragement, and espresso-drinks along the way. Thank you to the Boston College Theology Department, which afforded me the opportunity to study with these great scholars and undertake this work.

Thanks to the institutions where I have had the opportunity to work as a Visiting Instructor while still writing, Saint Anselm College, Rivier University, and Trinity University. Each provided me with a job, with wonderful and bright students, and with fantastic colleagues, whose commitment to their teaching and research has been an inspiration and whose friendship has helped to keep me afloat. In particular, I thank Ward Holder, Chris Welch, Sajida Jalalzai, Greg Clines, and Sarah Erickson. In addition, I am especially grateful to Rubén Dupertuis, the Chair of the Religion Department at Trinity. As my once-professor, now- colleague, mentor, and friend, you have been unwavering in your confidence in and encouragement of me and my future in our field—thank you.

Thank you to the many churches communities I have been privileged to be part of, including Good Shepherd Lutheran in Kettering, Ohio, and University Lutheran in Cambridge, Massachusetts. Special thanks to Pastor Terry Morgan, for your ever-

gracious curiosity and solidarity, and to my UniLuers, for teaching me so much about what it means to be the Church and giving me the time and space to try these and other crazy ideas out.

Thank you to the many friends who have patiently endured this process with me, including the many who have gone before me to doctoral glory. Thank you to my BC Bible area squadron, Tom Fraatz, Joel Kemp, John Barker, O.F.M., and Clint Burnett. You know perhaps better than any others what it is to have made it through this process, and I am grateful for all of your help—as scholars and friends—along the way. Thank you to my BC Colleagues in other areas, who have been quick to share theological insights and delicious drinks in equal measure, and whose friendship has made this experience a fuller and better one than I could have hoped, especially Megan McCabe, Nicole Reibe, Dan Horan, Kevin Brown, and Katie Wisley Shelby. Thank you to my YDS Bible nerds, Olivia Stewart Lester and Marshall Cunningham, whose brilliance in is outmatched only by your delight in live animals, and I love that about you.

Thank you to Jess Coblentz and Kat Greiner, whose friendship and FaceTime chats have been my lifeblood these past years. Jess, your keen and generous editorial skills have been a gift, to any reader of this work but especially to me. No number of brambles will ever repay the debt of gratitude I owe you both, but we can try.

Thank you to Alissa Oleson, whose ability to love people well—including me—never ceases to amaze me and give me hope for the Church, and whose Bible questions help me feel like all this studying has been worth it. Thank you for not letting me quit...any of the times.

Thank you to my first and greatest cheerleaders, my family. To my grandparents, Charlotte and Bill Bowman, I thank you for the example of steadfast love and

commitment that you have set for all of us. To my brothers, PJ and David Bauser, thank you for the ways you have never ceased in supporting me while also making sure to keep me humble. I am grateful to you and to your families, Nora, Amanda, Sophia, and William, for the ways you have celebrated when the process has gone well, consoled when it has not, and provided much-needed breaks when it has felt like it just could not go at all. Thank you also to my aunts, Amy Phillips and Judy Mulkey and their families, my parents-in-law, Dana and Phil McBrien, and all the members of our extended clans, all of whom have generously and patiently loved and supported me along the way.

Thank you to my parents, Pam and Roger Bauser, without whom none of this would be possible and to whom this dissertation is dedicated. You are the learners and educators, the generous community members, and the people of faith that I aspire to be, and I can never begin to thank you adequately for the multitude of ways that you have been there for me from the first. I love you both and am so grateful and proud you are my parents

Finally, thank you to my partner through this process and through life, Brendan McBrien. You have seen so much of the ugliness, the crying, the days (weeks, months) of nothing-getting-done, the misplaced anger and fear and self-doubt of dissertation writing, and you have chosen every day to love me well through it all. Thank you for knowing about synagogues in the diaspora before we even met, for learning more about the Apocryphon of James than anyone should have to, for making me a puppy-mama (Thank you, Roland, too!), for embracing new adventures and making everything more fun, and for knowing and telling me this was possible, even when I was convinced it was not. Yours is the voice I want to believe about myself. I love you.

Introduction

If all the fragments of the cross of Jesus from all the reliquaries in the world were brought together in one place, a cargo ship would scarcely be able to carry them all.¹ At least, that was the claim the Dutch humanist Erasmus made in a critique of, what he perceived as, the pilgrimage-obsession rampant among his Catholic contemporaries in the 16th century. The statement, hyperbolic as it may have been, was meant primarily to cast aspersions on a particular brand of piety rather than describe the results of historic or scientific analysis.² Nevertheless, one cannot avoid the underlying implication that many, if not most, of these so-called cross of Jesus fragments must, therefore, be fake. That they were not considered fakes by the members of the churches who maintained them or those who journeyed to see them was, for Erasmus, either beside the point or even the root of the problem. But, that fact, that these pieces of wood existed in the worship and memory of their communities as authentic remnants from the life—and death—of Jesus of Nazareth, was likely all that would have mattered to those parishioners and pilgrims. One might, however, miss that reality if they followed Erasmus in focusing only on the existence of Jesus' cross knockoffs. Interestingly, however, they might also miss it if they were to focus only on somehow determining which, if any, of these bits of wood were

¹ The initial claim comes from Erasmus, the 15th-16th c. Dutch humanist, commenting on pilgrimage practices (Candida Moss, “What Happened to the Cross Jesus Died On?” *The Daily Beast* [23 April 2017]: <https://www.thedailybeast.com/what-happened-to-the-cross-jesus-died-on?>; also cited in Edmund Waterton, *Pietas Mariana Britannica: A History of English Devotion to the Most Blessed Virgin Marye Mother of God* [London: St. Joseph's Catholic Library, 1879], 489-490; see Anne Reeve, ed., *Erasmus' Annotations on the New Testament, Vol. 1: The Gospels* [London: Duckworth, 1986], 178).

² In fact, according to the 19th c. measurements of the independent French scholar Charles Rohault de Fleury, by the time of his research, there were no longer even enough fragments to reconstruct a single cross (Charles Rohault de Fleury, *Mémoire sur les Instruments de la Passion de Notre-Seigneur Jésus-Christ* [Paris: L. Lesort, 1870], <http://books.google.com>).

authentic. To judge them as real or fake and say that they, metaphorically, sink or float depending on their provable connection to a particular moment in the actual past—Jesus of Nazareth’s crucifixion—would result in a failure to see that, for their communities each of these relics was real. Each fragment represented for its community some small piece of the impact of Jesus, a connection to the past as it continued to be felt and made meaningful in their present.

As many pieces of wood as may have been attributed to Jesus’ cross, even more words and phrases have been attributed to his voice. From before the first gospels were written to the present day, people have quoted and misquoted Jesus, adding to the figurative reliquary of his utterances. These verbal relics have long been the focus of attention, whether pious or profane, largely on account of their attribution to Jesus. Observing the many different sayings, as well as the variants of individual sayings among them, however, one would likely conclude that they could not possibly all have originated with Jesus of Nazareth. Taking this as their starting point, many modern scholars of the sayings tradition have worked to determine which, if any, might be the “real,” “authentic,” “original,” or “accurately remembered” sayings of Jesus, the *ipsissima verba Jesu*, as distinct from all the fakes, imitations, or other accreted tradition attributed to him. As with the cross of Jesus pieces, however, so also for the sayings of Jesus tradition: when scholars evaluate them only, or even primarily, as either “real” or not, they stand to miss that each was real, conveying the impact of the past voice of Jesus made meaningful in the present, for the people who wrote and received it. That is to say, each saying or variant of a saying was for someone their actual memory of the voice of Jesus; and, therefore, for modern scholars, each is an artifact of memory. The aim of this dissertation is to attend to the sayings tradition and the variants within it as these artifacts

of memory, pieces of evidence for the diverse ways in which Jesus and his sayings were being remembered across Christian communities of the first three centuries.

Sayings Scholarship from Bultmann to Schröter

This particular way of paying attention to variants within the sayings tradition follows and responds to a long line of sayings scholarship, particularly that over the last century. Within this area, perhaps no one has been so influential as the early twentieth century father of New Testament form criticism, Rudolf Bultmann. Though many of the particulars of his method and scholarship have come under some critique, with his *Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition* Bultmann laid the foundation for sayings studies of the last hundred years.³ Most fundamentally, building on the conclusions of source criticism and the two-source hypothesis, he began his analysis of the history of the synoptic tradition with individual, isolated units of sayings tradition, which were for him the building blocks for Christian preaching and, eventually, Gospel-writing. Sorting these into forms, and holding that the dominical sayings were the core of the tradition, Bultmann's primary focus was on how sayings were used within the Christian community, but he also attempted to explain where they came from. Some, he held, may have originated in Jewish wisdom, prophetic, and apocalyptic tradition only to be adapted into Christian preaching as Jesus sayings. Others may have come from the mouths of Christian prophets, speaking in what was understood to be the continued living voice of the risen Lord. Others, still, may have originated with Jesus himself, only to be developed and expanded over time, according to predictable patterns of transmission, to meet the

³ Rudolf Bultmann, *Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition*, FRLANT 29 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1921); English trans. *The History of the Synoptic Tradition*, trans. J. Marsh (Oxford: Blackwell, 1963); trans. of 2nd ed. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1931).

needs of the narrative or the church community. Concerning all of these, Bultmann asked whether there might be some criterion by which one could evaluate which, if any, of these sayings originated with Jesus himself. Despite having asked, and attempted to answer this criterion question, Bultmann remained quite skeptical about what, if anything, could be determined concerning the genuineness of a given saying or other unit as Jesus material, and focused instead on their life—or history—in the community, leading up to their preservation in the Gospels.

Others had greater confidence in the modern scholarly ability to recover the actual words of Jesus from among those attributed to him, or to confirm the Gospels' general reliability in preserving accurately the sayings tradition. Some scholars latched on to Bultmann's notion of authenticating criteria, and developed from it what has come to be known as a criteria approach. Others critiqued form criticism's inattention to and dubious attitude toward the human mechanics in the process of transmission, and introduced an intentional focus on the role of memory in that process. In either case, scholarship continued to feel the influence of form criticism's assumptions concerning the Gospel sources.

For better or worse, the criteria approach can likely be credited as having brought sayings scholarship to the center of historical Jesus studies over the course of the latter half of the twentieth century. With the development and application of specific criteria of authenticity, practitioners of this approach meant to evaluate any individual saying or variant thereof according to its genuineness to Jesus. In most cases of this approach, as with form criticism, sayings remain at the core of the tradition, to be extracted from their presumed-later narrative contexts. A criteria approach, however, pushed scholarly attention from the pre-Gospel, or pre-literary layers, back to the pre-Easter layer in the

history of the Jesus tradition. Though it has been variously applied by numerous scholars and groups of scholars since its inception, the criteria approach has perhaps been best exemplified in the rigorous and voluminous works of John Meier in his *A Marginal Jew* series published over the last several decades.⁴ Meier's work is primarily a reconstruction of a historical Jesus, and only two of his five volumes focus directly on sayings, but his treatment typifies the approach's goal of weighing variants or other units of tradition against one another and according to various criteria to determine which, if any, originated with Jesus. Though this approach may have roots in form criticism, Meier and others have reoriented it toward the Jesus layer, so that a saying or variant is primarily interesting only in so far as it is thought to be authentic to Jesus, and the rest can be explained and discarded as later tradition.

While both form criticism and the criteria approach have held mostly implicit assumptions concerning human capacity to remember and transmit certain elements of the tradition with greater or lesser accuracy, another scholarly trajectory to stem from and react to form criticism brought the idea of memory to the fore. Members of the so-called Scandinavian school initially introduced memory into the field of Jesus scholarship as a metonym for the trained skill of memorization. These scholars worked with an understanding of memory based primarily on a historical model of late antique rabbinical training for the transmission of oral material, and proposed that the apostles would have received and transmitted the words of Jesus as assiduously as early rabbis did the oral Torah. This model admitted the possibility of some creative interpretation or even expansion within the resulting sayings tradition, but emphasized the overall conservative

⁴ John P. Meier, *A Marginal Jew: Rethinking The Historical Jesus*, 5 vols. ABRL and AYBRL (New York: Doubleday and New Haven: Yale University Press, 1991-2016).

nature of memory and its reliability in reproducing material precisely. Where Bultmann and the more skeptical form critics had seen a chasm between the Church's post-Easter tradition and the initial witnesses' pre-Easter experience of Jesus and his sayings, these scholars saw memory as a reliable link between the two. Not only that, but the link of memory—again, primarily as memorization—assured the general trustworthiness of the extant Gospels, and the sayings contained therein as well.

The thinking about memory within sayings scholarship has changed over time, incorporating and responding to data from, for example, anthropology, orality and performance studies, and neurobiology fields to reconsider both its individual and communal aspects. Yet, even as scholarly understanding of it has shifted, as a category, memory has persisted among sayings scholars, as, for the most part, has the evaluation of memory as either accurate or inaccurate. Even if they are not defining memory strictly as memorization per se, those who hold that memory is essentially reliable, tend to maintain that the sayings or voice of Jesus preserved in the Gospels are generally authentic. On the flip side, those who assess memory as inherently unreliable, whether at the individual or communal level, tend to be skeptical concerning moderns' ability to access genuine Jesus sayings or material from the Gospels. Both groups are, in their own way, still responding to the questions concerning the pre-literary transmission of Jesus material by and for early Christian communities first posed within form criticism, but are divided by their understandings of memory.

Social memory theory has been applied within Jesus scholarship as a corrective to what are perceived as the inaccuracies of all of these previous understandings of memory as fundamentally either accurate or inaccurate on the one hand, and the inefficacies of the criteria approach on the other. Concerning memory, the theory's underlying

understanding of memory originated in the social sciences as a way to take into account the social and dynamic nature of memory. An individual's memory is not, as had previously been thought, primarily a matter of her retrieving fixed files of the past from her internal filing cabinet with greater or lesser efficacy. It might rather be likened to a dynamic reaction between her perception of the past (itself formed by her social situation) and her present, socially-formed internal frameworks of processing and understanding. Any external performance—whether spoken or written—of that internal socially-formed experience of memory contributes in turn to the collective, that is, collectively-held, memory of the past. That collective memory is, in turn, received and internalized and performed anew by others, and, over generations, incorporated (or not) into the cultural memory or meaningful perception of the past by the group or community, what might also be called their tradition. By this understanding, memory is a dynamic social process, which continually conveys the perceived or received past through the socially-engaged frameworks of the ever-new present. It is not best understood as either wholly accurate or inaccurate in its representation of the past; neither should it be taken as a husk from which a kernel of “actual past” can be extracted. For Jesus scholars, to reconsider memory in this way has meant to abandon the dichotomies of authentic versus inauthentic, past versus present, even memory versus tradition, which have characterized previous memory and criteria approaches.

Jens Schröter was among the first to bring the perspective of social memory theory to bear on Jesus and sayings scholarship. In his pioneering work *Erinnerung an Jesu Worte* Schröter considered Mark, Q, and the Gospel of Thomas as recorded instances of memory concerning Jesus, each reflective of its own present as well as the

reported past.⁵ He found evidence of this specifically in the sayings of Jesus common to all three sources, which, despite being recorded memories of words spoken by Jesus, took on different meanings as they were remembered speaking to the theological needs of each source's own author and intended audience. Others, including Chris Keith, Anthony Le Donne, and Rafael Rodríguez, have begun to explore the implications of using social memory theory as a hermeneutical lens through which scholars might view Jesus material.⁶ Recognizing memory's entanglement of the past and present, and, relatedly, the entanglement of "authentic" material and interpretation, not only demands that the working understanding of memory be revised but also challenges several of the prevailing paradigms of Jesus and sayings scholarship. Perhaps most disruptively, it undermines the idea, which has been at the heart of this area of study, of evaluating either whole texts or individual units of material as authentic or inauthentic. Concerning individual units of tradition, they should no longer be extracted and considered apart from their literary contexts, as if authentic memory could be distinguished from its interpretive framework, but must be taken as part of integrated wholes.

Social memory theory's usefulness to the study of Jesus or his sayings is still debated, in part because it is still just starting to be explored. At either pole, scholars continue to defend or deny the ability to recover or reconstruct "authentic" Jesus material in light of social memory theory's reframing of the sources. Schröter, though, has argued

⁵ Jens Schröter, *Erinnerung an Jesu Worte: Studien zur Rezeption der Logienüberlieferung in Markus, Q und Thomas*, WMANT 76 (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1997).

⁶ E.g., Chris Keith, *Jesus' Literacy: Scribal Culture and the Teacher from Galilee*, LNTS 413 (London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2011); Anthony LeDonne, *The Historiographical Jesus: Memory, Typology, and the Son of David* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2009); and Rafael Rodríguez, *Structuring Early Christian Memory: Jesus in Tradition, Performance and Text*, LNTS 407 (London: T&T Clark, 2010).

that while the application of social memory theory should require an abandoning of the criteria approach and its assumptions concerning authenticity, that need not equate to a wholesale rejection of Jesus scholarship or its being reduced to simply reception history. Rather, by taking into account the impact of both the pre-Easter Jesus *and* the post-Easter Christian communities on the diverse recorded Jesus materials, an approach that takes social memory as a lens through which to view the Gospels and other extant sources, might best be understood as offering a *via media* between the extremes of skepticism and optimism toward the historical Jesus project.

In this turning attention from the person or words of Jesus of Nazareth to his and their being remembered by and for early Christian communities, one can see social memory approaches' indebtedness to classic form criticism. This association need not be considered a detriment, as these approaches also follow others in responding to and correcting some of the presumptions of early form criticism. Perhaps most fundamentally, any social memory approach should correct the more radical dissociation of the past from the present, Jesus from interpretation, or memory from tradition, that has come to be considered characteristic of form criticism. Furthermore, in light of its emphasis on the particular influences of an individual and group's present social situation on their experience of memory, a social memory approach should reject the reduction of the diversity of early Christianity to a homogenous notion of Christian community, or the many loci of memory concerning Jesus and his sayings to a single *Sitz im Leben*. While Bultmann himself could not have anticipated the impact, his prioritization of the sayings tradition and his attention to the interplay of memory and tradition in the life of the community set the terms of the conversation concerning Jesus and sayings scholarship for the last century. But while it has been over two decades since Schröter first introduced

social memory theory to the study of Jesus tradition, the potential of these changes, in both understanding and focus, has in many ways just begun to be explored.

Social Memory and the Sayings Tradition: A Variant-Conscious Approach

This dissertation uses social memory theory as the lens through which to consider anew the existence and meaning of variants in the sayings of Jesus tradition. It takes what I describe as a variant-conscious approach to this tradition. The “variant-conscious” label is adopted and adapted from a parallel approach developed within New Testament text criticism. In that field, a variant-conscious approach has been used to describe a shift in focus, from textual variants as the means through which to recover or reconstruct an original or “earliest attainable” version of the text, onto at least some textual variants as meaningful in and of themselves. A meaningful variant, one that cannot be explained by accidental scribal error, is considered as evidence of both its writer’s and readers’ understanding of the text. A variant-conscious approach to the sayings of Jesus tradition, similarly, shifts the focus, from variants within this tradition as the means through which to recover or reconstruct an original word or voice of Jesus, onto the variants themselves as evidence of both their author’s and audience’s memories of that voice and its words.

Each variant becomes an artifact of the social memory. That is to say that each variant of a saying is the product of its author’s having received, whether heard or read, another variant—or, memory—of that saying. By taking in that received memory of the saying, the author filtered it through and incorporated it into her own internal but socially-formed networks of perception or memory. When she then externally performed the memory of that saying, by writing it down in her own text to be received by others, she contributed anew to the social memory of the saying. Along with other recorded instances of the social memory of sayings, this variant became part of the sayings

tradition. What we have received as a variant of a saying attributed to Jesus is evidence of social memory's reception, internalization, and performance process. It is connected to its own past (via the received memory) and present (via the social forces of internalization and performance), and in it the two are inextricable. Because of this, an understanding of each saying variant as evidence of a unique instance of social memory is incompatible with most previous treatments of the sayings tradition, particularly those of the criteria approach.

The variant-conscious approach presented here, therefore, follows other applications of social memory theory to Jesus tradition in attempting to correct the fundamental misunderstanding of memory at the root of the criteria and previous memory approaches: that memory itself or a record of it can be assessed as accurate or inaccurate, or divided into its accurate and inaccurate pieces. This approach instead considers variants on their own terms, as records of memories, authentic to the individuals who inscribed and read them, but not necessarily to Jesus. That is not to say, then, that every variant has the same historiographical value with regards to Jesus of Nazareth, only that interest in a variant is not dependent on its purported proximity to him.⁷ This opens up the possibility for sayings scholarship to take into account those variants considered to be late, noncanonical, or otherwise irrelevant to previous historical-Jesus-focused approaches. Though it does consider individual variants of a given saying, collected below into clusters, this variant-conscious approach also attempts to correct the atomizing tendency of the criteria approach in particular by taking into account the literary context

⁷ In this dissertation "Jesus of Nazareth" refers to the individual presumed to have lived in approximately the first three decades of the first century CE. "Historical Jesus" refers to modern scholarly constructions of what can be known or proven concerning him—his words, deeds, or person.

around the variant, which is part of the memory of the saying itself and its meaning. While applications of social memory theory to the Jesus tradition have proliferated in recent years, most have been primarily interested in reframing the questions around historical Jesus studies, and few beyond Schröter's have focused directly on the theory's potential impact on an understanding of the sayings tradition or the variants within it. Because the search for authentic sayings has so long dominated this field, this study not only helps to fill a gap in social memory scholarship but participates in a needed corrective within sayings scholarship.

Admittedly, one does not necessarily need social memory theory or an explicitly variant-conscious approach in order to do most of the work of observing variants. Redaction criticism has, for example, turned attention to how individual tradents have reshaped received tradition in light of their own understanding and the perceived needs of their intended audience. It takes variance from the received tradition as evidence of the writing or reading party's social situation and interests. While the analysis of any one variant may resemble a redaction critical treatment, part of the point of a variant-conscious approach is that a variant is not considered in isolation but as part of a cluster of related variants across multiple sources. This comparative element draws attention to the complex and polymorphic nature of the social memory even of a single saying or idea. Each performance of that saying is not only the product of a distinct locus of social memory, but also a contribution to its ongoing process. When viewed collectively these variants expose a diversity of early Christian memory of the voice of Jesus, without trying to reduce that diversity to a single, purportedly authentic voice. While this work may not require social memory theory, social memory theory necessitates this work and the shift of focus that is at its core.

One objective of this dissertation is to demonstrate how an application of social memory theory to the sayings tradition leads to a variant-conscious approach. In order to set up that discussion, the first chapter begins by considering more fully previous treatments of the sayings tradition, particularly as they have intersected with Jesus studies, in order to understand how an approach informed by social memory theory is rooted in and responding to this history of scholarship. It surveys source and form critical as well as criteria and previous memory approaches to the sayings tradition, attending to the assumptions of each approach concerning scholarship's ability and obligation to access various pre-Gospel layers of the sayings tradition, especially the Jesus of Nazareth layer. In reviewing social memory theory's introduction to this field, this chapter notes especially how this theory, as it has been understood and applied by scholars of early Christianity, challenges many of those assumptions and requires a shifting of attention from Jesus himself onto the diverse and dynamic memories concerning him. It is that shift of focus that leads to the variant-conscious approach to the sayings tradition described in more detail at the end of the first chapter and applied in those that follow it.

The second objective, then, is to explore the implications of a variant-conscious approach for an understanding of the sayings tradition. What does it mean to consider a particular variant—or cluster of variants, rather—as evidence for social memory of the words of Jesus? The second and third chapters take on this question through two case studies, each considering a particular sayings cluster. Chapter two examines a cluster of sayings in which Jesus responds to a question concerning his use of parable(s). While this cluster is found only in the relatively early and closely-related memories of the Synoptic evangelists and demonstrates minimal variance in the sayings' wording, a variant-conscious consideration and comparison of the three sayings exposes three dramatically

different memories concerning the pedagogical or missionary strategy behind Jesus' use of parables. Chapter three looks at a cluster, the representation of which extends beyond the Synoptic or first century boundaries that have so long limited sayings scholarship, the cluster of sayings addressing the themes of asking, seeking, and/or knocking. Containing any one or all three of these elements, both the content and context of these variants differ so that they seem to be speaking in some instances, for example, to issues of provision, in others prayer, and in others self-actualization. The wide range of sources and settings in which examples of this cluster have been remembered, combined with the differences in the wording and elements of the variants themselves, indicates that the cluster's ideas were adapted to diverse social and theological settings of early Christian discourse. In both of these case studies, each variant is read as a record of a moment in the social memory of the saying, a piece of the performed memory of the one who recorded it as well as the received memory of his audience.

Chapter four also presents a case study, but of a different sort and with a different objective than the previous two. While social memory theory accounts for the dynamic and social reality of all memory experience, that general description may or may not align with any individual's understanding of her experience as either a receiver of or contributor to social memory. The final objective is to ask and answer the question: how might one author, whom we could now describe as participating in the process of social memory, have understood his role in the preservation and production of sayings tradition? A variant-conscious approach suggests that we cannot assume one single answer for multiple authors or sources. This final case study, therefore, examines a single text, the early third century Apocryphon of James (Ap. Jas.), for evidence of its author's understanding of his participation in this memory process as it relates to the sayings

tradition. While any source that interacts with the sayings tradition might well be the object of this type of treatment, Ap. Jas. is particularly well-suited to a memory-focused study on account of: its extensive engagement with apparently familiar sayings tradition, its seemingly self-conscious descriptions of competing streams of both known and new sayings traditions, and its explicit and implicit appeals to its author's and others' experiences of memory as potentially authorizing new sayings tradition. The text's multivalent use of memory in particular appeals to the literary sensibility of an implied audience that considers itself part of the educated elite seeking to fathom the deeper meanings of an inherited textual tradition. In these ways Ap. Jas. witnesses to the intense competition over textual and theological identities in third century Christian circles as well as to the diversity of memories—and means of memory—concerning the sayings tradition.

Recognizing variants as artifacts of the social memory process, neither real nor fake but records of the genuine memories of the voice of Jesus for those who wrote and read them, requires a new approach. This dissertation's variant-conscious approach to the sayings of Jesus tradition contributes to the developing picture of the variants themselves, the variety of sources in which they are found, and the means by which they came to be part of the social memory of Jesus. In doing so, it brings to the fore the diversity in and even competition over the preservation and production of the voice of Jesus in the first three centuries.

Chapter 1: Approaches to the Sayings of Jesus

In modern history, the sayings of Jesus tradition has been of interest primarily to scholars interested in the Gospels and their histories, or in Jesus himself. This latter focal point—what the sayings tradition does or does not have to contribute to the quest for the historical Jesus—may not have defined the entirety of the history of sayings scholarship, but the points of intersection and overlap between the two fields have shaped much of the scholarly perception of the sayings tradition and its value to the study of early Christianity. Even when the initial goal has been to identify the literary relationship between the gospels and their source(s), or the pre-literary oral traditions of the early churches, the sayings tradition has repeatedly been drawn in as, primarily, a means to historical—or genuine—Jesus material. While variance within the sayings tradition has long been recognized, it has also been viewed as something to be overcome in favor of the earliest, or most proximate to Jesus, version of Jesus’ sayings or voice.

The present chapter traces sayings scholarship around and through these intersections with Jesus scholarship, in source criticism, form criticism and the criteria approach, and various memory-based approaches. This survey of scholarship takes stock of the ways in which each of these methods has shaped understanding of the sayings tradition and the variants within it. It examines in particular how social memory theory corrects prior misunderstandings concerning the tradition and consequently requires a corrected approach to the variants. And it advocates for this dissertation’s proposed variant-conscious approach to the sayings tradition. A variant-conscious approach pays particular attention to the distinctive tradition history of sayings as they were remembered and performed within their many and diverse remembering communities.

1.1 Source Criticism, Q, and the Sayings Tradition

The prioritization of the sayings tradition in modern scholarship stems in part from source critical work with the Gospels, in particular, that which led to and has resulted from the Q hypothesis. While Q was initially conceived as part of a literary solution to the Synoptic Problem, a reconstruction of a pre-Gospel source of sayings attributed to Jesus, this hypothetical collection of sayings has at times been understood as the earliest and most proximate source for understanding Jesus himself. Even as scholarship on the whole has moved away from overstating Q's identity as an unredacted repository of authentic Jesus material, this hypothesis brought the sayings tradition to the center of Gospel and Jesus study, and source critical explanations for the literary relationships between the Gospels and their source material inform this and every treatment of the sayings material.

1.1.1 Source Criticism and the Sayings Tradition, from Synoptic Problems to Q

Source criticism did not begin as a direct consideration of the sayings tradition but grew out of the need to explain a broader spectrum of inconsistencies between the four canonical Gospels. Inconsistency—or variance—in the sayings tradition was just one piece of that problem. Prior to the Enlightenment, the general approach to the problem had been one of harmonization, whether explicit in the form of a Diatesseron or other Gospel harmony, or implicit in the form of spiritual explanations of the Gospels' actual harmony despite the appearance of inconsistency.¹ At the end of the 18th century,

¹ Tatian's Diatessaron is the most famous of these Gospel harmonies, written in the mid-second century and serving as the ecclesial gospel in Syriac through the fifth century. Other examples, however, include the harmonies of Andreas Osiander (1537), John Calvin (1555), Charles Du Moulin (1565), Gerhard Mercator (1592), Martin Chemnitz (1593), and Joannes Clericus (1699). The genre proliferated in the 16th century thanks in part to the invention of the printing press but also the renewed interest in biblical study brought on by the Protestant Reformation. For the role of harmonies in

however, Johann Jakob Griesbach took up the question of inconsistencies between the Gospels, but rejected the idea of a harmonizing solution.² Instead Griesbach highlighted the similarities of the first three gospels while also identifying the problem of their interrelated and sometimes contradictory accounts as part of his work trying to sort out their composition history and literary relationships.³ More impactful than the particulars

this pre-Quest period of life of Jesus research, see, e.g., Dietrich Wünsch, *Evangelienharmonien im Reformationszeitalter: ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Leben-Jesu-Darstellung*, *Arbeiten zur Kirchengeschichte* 52 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1983).

In his 5th century *De consensu evangelistarum*, Augustine provided a formative spiritual explanation of how a proper understanding of the Gospels revealed the actual harmony between their accounts, arguing against those who claimed discrepancies compromised the Gospels' witness. He asserted that each Evangelist wrote his gospel in full knowledge of his predecessors, with Matthew being primary (*De con. evang.* in William Findlay and S. D. F. Salmond, eds. and trans., *The Sermon on the Mount Expounded and the Harmony of the Gospels*, vol. 8 of *The Works of Aurelius Augustine: Bishop of Hippo* [Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1873]; see also, David B. Peabody, "Augustine and the Augustinian Hypothesis: A Reexamination of Augustine's Thought in 'De Consensu Evangelistarum,'" in *New Synoptic Studies: The Cambridge Gospel Conference and beyond*, ed. William R. Farmer [Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1983], 37-64).

² Johann Jakob Griesbach, *Libri historici Novi Testamenti graece. 1. Synopsis evangeliorum Matthaei, Marci et Lucae. Textum graecum ad fidem codicum, versionum et patrum emendavit et lectionis varietatem adiecit J.J. Griesbach* (Halle, 1774); idem, *Synopsis evangeliorum Matthaei, Marci et Lucae. Textum graecum ad fidem codicum, versionum et patrum emendavit et lectionis varietatem adiecit J.J. Griesbach* (Halle, 1776); idem, *Inquiritur in fontes unde Evangelistae suas de resurrectione Domini narrationes hauserint* (Jena, 1783); and idem, *Commentatio qua Marci Evangelium totum e Matthaei et Lucae commentariis decerptum esse monstratur* (Jena, 1789, 1790); repr. in Bernard Orchard and Thomas R.W. Longstaff, eds., *J.J. Griesbach: Synoptic and Text-Critical Studies 1776-1976*, trans. Orchard and Longstaff (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978), esp. 74-135. Griesbach was not the first to create a table for comparison of the Gospels. Among Eusebius's "Canon Tables" his Canon II, for example, was a rudimentary synopsis (with all possible combinations of single, double, triple, and quadruple tradition highlighted in the other nine canons). Griesbach's project, however, was in the service of a composition history of the Synoptic Gospels rather than as a reference for harmonization.

³ By setting the received text of these gospels side-by-side, while keeping each in its own order, Griesbach highlighted the inconsistencies in the narrative chronology between the three, without theological or literary apology. Griesbach introduced the sort

of Griesbach’s solution—that Mark knew Matthew and Luke and extracted most of his material from them both—were his identification of the irreconcilable differences even between the synoptic accounts, his definition of the problem, and his production of a Synopsis.⁴ With these contributions Griesbach inaugurated modern source-critical treatments of the Synoptic Gospels, but only as other scholars took up them up and reconsidered them did they result in particular attention paid to the sayings tradition.

In the decades that followed, source critical Gospel scholars built off of Griesbach’s method and synopsis as they began to speculate further concerning the relationship between the Gospels and potential pre-Gospel sources. They rearranged the order of the sources, considered patristic-era testimony, and introduced hypothetical non-canonical documents, all in a quest for a coherent and most-primitive layer of Jesus tradition as the source behind one or more of the Gospels.⁵ Friedrich Schleiermacher, for

of source critical methods already known in other fields of research, especially classical studies and its treatment of Homer’s *Iliad*, to the study of the Gospels.

⁴ While Griesbach makes clear that his Synopsis is no Harmonization (*Synopsis evangeliorum* [1776], vii-viii) and classic understanding would identify his move from harmonization to synopsis as progress toward the critical consideration of the materials (cf. William R. Farmer, *The Synoptic Problem: A Critical Analysis* [Dillsboro, NC: Western North Carolina Press, 1976], 6), Francis Watson finds a close parallel between the two approaches, in that both harmony and synopsis facilitate the study of one text in the light of others, an essentially Augustinian reading strategy (Francis Watson, *Gospel Writing: A Canonical Perspective* [Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2013], 61).

What came to be known as the *Griesbach Hypothesis*—that Mark followed and used both Matthew and Luke—gradually increased its intellectual market share through the first half of the 19th century (Frans Neiryneck and F. Van Segbroeck (“The Griesbach Hypothesis: A Bibliography,” in *J. J. Griesbach, 176-81*). Adolf J. B. Hilgenfeld declared the Griesbach hypothesis the majority opinion in 1850 (*Das Markus-evangelium, nach seiner Composition, seiner Stellung in der Evangelien-literatur, seinem Ursprung und Charakter* [Leipzig: Breitkopf und Härtel, 1850], 8; cited by John Kloppenborg, *Excavating Q: The History and Setting of the Sayings Gospel* [Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2000], 286).

⁵ Hermann Samuel Reimarus, whose writings were published posthumously by Gotthold Ephraim Lessing, had already proposed an *Ur-gospel* in the latter quarter of

example, appealed to Eusebius's description of Papias's testimony concerning *logia*, to propose that a collection exclusively of sayings of Jesus, which he called the *Logia* source, had preceded the canonical Gospels and served as a source for the Gospel of Matthew.⁶ Schleiermacher further identified the author of the *Logia* as an eyewitnesses to

the 18th century (Reimarus, *Fragmente des Wolfenbützelischen Ungenannten*, ed. Gotthold E. Lessing, 4th ed. [Berlin: Sandersche Buchhandlung (C.M. Eichhoff), 1835], <https://archive.org/details/fragmentedeswol00lessgoog>). This idea as well as accounts by Papias and Eusebius concerning the *Gospel of the Hebrews* or the *Gospel of the Nazarenes*, provided the basis for Lessing's own and others' hypotheses concerning a Hebrew or Aramaic *Urevangelium*, supposed either to have been employed by the evangelists themselves (Lessing, "New Hypothesis Concerning the Evangelists Regarded as Merely Human Historians," in *Lessing's Theological Writings: Selections in Translation*, ed. and trans., Henry Chadwick, Library of Modern Religious Thought [Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1957], 45-72), or to lie behind other pre-Gospel documents (J.G. Eichhorn, "Über die drey ersten Evangelien: Einige Beyträge zu ihrer künftigen kritischen Behandlung," in *Allgemeine Bibliothek der biblischen Literatur*, ed. Eichhorn (Leipzig: Weidmann, 1794), 5:761-996, <http://books.google.com>).

Meanwhile Karl Lachmann, and others, began to question the Griesbach hypothesis and argue for Mark as the earliest gospel and that it was representative of the primitive order of the narrative proto-Gospel (Lachmann, "De ordine narrationum in evageliis synopticis," *TSK* [1835]; Eng. trans. and commentary by N. Humphrey Palmer, "Lachmann's Argument," *NTS* 13 [1967]: 368-78). While Lachmann was not the first to suggest Markan priority, he was among the first whose proposal gained wide acceptance (cf. Gottlob Christiann Storr, *Über den Zweck der evangelischen Geschichte und der Briefe Johannes* [Tübingen: Jacob Friedrich Heerbrandt, 1786], esp. 274-78, <http://books.google.com>).

⁶ I.e., from Eusebius's mention of τοῦ δὲ Παπῖα συγγράματα πέντε τὸν ἀριθμὸν φέρεται, ἃ καὶ ἐπιγέγραπται λογίων κυριακῶν ἐξηγήσεως (Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 3.39. in *The Apostolic Fathers: Greek Texts and English Translations*, ed. Michael W. Holmes, 3rd ed. [Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2007]; Friedrich Schleiermacher, "Über die Zeugnisse des Papias von unsern beiden ersten Evangelien," *TSK* 5 [1832], 735-68; repr. in *Exegetische Schriften*, ed. Hermann Patsch and Dirk Schmid, vol. 1, 8 of *Die Kritische Schleiermacher-Gesamtausgabe* [Berlin: de Gruyter, 2001], 227-54); and Papias's description of some *logia* Ἑβραϊδὶ διαλέκτῳ, collected by Matthew in the composition of his Gospel (*Hist. eccl.* 3.39.)

Schleiermacher's *logia source* included Matthew 5-7; 10; 13:1-52; 18; 23. Some scholars have adopted Schleiermacher's *logia* nomenclature, even as the presumed contents of this pre-Gospel says source have changed. Others, however, have since suggested a more fitting title for this type of pre-Gospel collection of *words* of Jesus would be *logoi*, not *logia* ("oracles"; James M. Robinson, "History of Q Research" in

Jesus of Nazareth, whose recorded accounts remained unchanged, even as they were compiled into larger collections that would become the canonical Gospels.⁷ The idea that a collection of sayings, untouched by the creative liberties of narrative, might provide access to authentic words Jesus, appealed to nineteenth century scholars, many of whom had one foot in source criticism and the other in historical Jesus studies.⁸

In 1838, bringing together the previously-proposed theory of Markan priority and the above idea of a hypothetical sayings source, Christian Weisse introduced a version of what has come to be known as the Two Source or Two Document Hypothesis.⁹

Critical Edition of Q, ed. Robinson, John S. Kloppenborg, and Paul Hoffmann, Hermeneia Supplements 1 [Minneapolis: Fortress Press and Leuven: Peeters, 2000], xx-xxx). Robinson notes the prevalence of Schleiermacher's (mis)interpretation of *Logia*, corrected only by the discovery and dissemination of the incipit of *Gos. Thom.*, λόγοι, as a better attested, first century, genre marker. Dieter Lührmann makes a similar argument ("Q: Sayings of Jesus or Logia?" in *The Gospel behind the Gospels: Current Studies on Q*, ed. Ronald Allen Piper, NovTSup 75 [Leiden: Brill, 1995], 97-116).

⁷ For Schleiermacher, such "a history of the formation of the gospels would not only demonstrate that the church was founded on truth, but would also assure historically the link between Christ and the church for dogmatic purposes" (Christine Helmer, "Schleiermacher's Exegetical Theology and the New Testament," in *The Cambridge Companion to Friedrich Schleiermacher*, ed. Jacqueline Mariña [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005], 229-248). Schleiermacher is just one case among many that demonstrate the often problematic coupling of history and theology in this field.

⁸ E.g., Friedrich Schleiermacher, *The Life of Jesus*, trans. S. Maclean Gilmour, ed. Jack C. Verheyden (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975); trans. of *Das Leben Jesu: Vorlesungen an der Universität zu Berlin im Jahr 1832*, ed. K. A. Rügenik (Berlin: Georg Reimer, 1864).

⁹ Christian Hermann Weisse, *Die evangelische Geschichte: Kritisch und philosophisch bearbeitet*. 2 vols. (Leipzig: Breitkopf und Härtel, 1838), esp. 1:34, 48, 54, <https://archive.org/details/dieevangelische03weisgoog>.

This was introduced, against the mid-19th century thesis of David Friedrich Strauss, that there was a freely circulating *oral* Jesus tradition which had easily been mythologized (David Friedrich Strauss, *The Life of Jesus Critically Examined*, 3 vols., trans. George Eliot [New York: Gloger Family Books, 1993]). Weisse treated his two hypothetical sources as both primitive and written, with the assumption that such early written sources could be considered more historically reliable than either later or oral

According to this hypothesis Matthew and Luke drew independently on both Mark and another separate source, which was primarily a collection of Jesus sayings.¹⁰ By 1890, amid growing acceptance of the Two Source Hypothesis, Johannes Weiss termed this hypothetical collection of sayings of Jesus, thought to be the “other common source” of Matthew and Luke, as *Q*.¹¹ With its new name would come a new life for “Q,” as a document unto itself, and as the root of the idea that the most primitive layer of Jesus material was to be found within the sayings tradition. *Q*, which was a hypothetical source

alternatives. For a treatment of these competing understandings of history and the development of tradition, see Jens Schröter, “New Testament Science beyond Historicism: Recent Developments in the Theory of History and Their Significance for the Exegesis of Early Christian Writings” in Schröter, *From Jesus to the New Testament: Early Christian Theology and the Origin of the New Testament Canon*, trans. Wayne Coppins, Baylor-Mohr Siebeck Studies in Early Christianity (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2013), 9-20.

¹⁰ Between the middle of the 19th and early 20th centuries, several scholars developed and contributed to ideas that might now be described, generally, as within a Two Source Hypothesis. Among these, Heinrich Holtzmann and B.H. Streeter often stand out as two of the primary, but independent, architects of such a hypothesis, with Holtzmann making his impact initially and primarily in German, and Streeter in England. Holtzmann, initially held to an *Ur-Markus* as the second “source” and only later changed that to canonical Mark, with Matthew, as a third source for Luke (Heinrich Holtzmann, *Die synoptischen Evangelien: Ihr Ursprung und geschichtlicher Charakter* [Leipzig: Wilhelm Engelmann, 1863]; idem, *Lehrbuch der historisch-kritischen Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, rev. and enl. ed. [Freiburg im Breisgau: J. C. B. Mohr, 1886]). Streeter revived C.H. Weiss’s idea of canonical Mark as a second “source” (B.H. Streeter, *The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins, Treating of the Manuscript Tradition, Sources, Authorship, and Dates* [London: Macmillan & Co., 1924], 331).

¹¹ The designation *Q* as an abbreviation for *Quelle* has been attributed either to Johannes Weiss (possibly drawing on his father Bernard Weiss) or Eduard Simons. In a study on a parallel passage between Luke and Matthew, J. Weiss notes: “...weithin folgen beide einer andern gemeinsamen Quelle, nämlich *Q*,” (“Die Verteidigung Jesu gegen den Vorwurf des Bündnisses mit Beelzebul,” *TSK* 63 (1890): 557; cited in Frans Neiryck, “The Symbol *Q* (=Quelle),” *ETL* 54 (1978) 119-125. In his second volume of collected essays, however, Neiryck identified the use of *Q* to refer to the position of B. Weiss in Simon’s 1880 dissertation (Neiryck, “Note on the Siglum *Q*,” in *Evangelica II: 1982-1991*, *BETL* 99 [Leuven: Peeters, 1991], 474; Eduard Simons, *Hat der dritte Evangelist den kanonischen Matthäus benutzt?* [Bonn: Universitäts-Buchdruckerei von Carl Georgi, 1880]).

reconstructed by picking which of the double-tradition variants was more original, became the increasingly sure link between sayings scholarship and historical Jesus studies.

1.1.2 Q as Source and Document

While as a literary hypothesis explaining the double-tradition of Matthew and Luke, the two source theory had already, by the early 20th century, gained wide source-critical scholarly assent, it was as a potential source for the authentic sayings of Jesus that Q captured imaginations. Q brought the saying tradition to the center of broad scholarly attention, but tied that attention primarily, if not exclusively, to Jesus. Perhaps no one had higher expectations for Q's usefulness to Jesus studies than Adolf von Harnack. In the wake of William Wrede's and Albert Schweitzer's destabilizations of Synoptic and historical Jesus studies at the beginning of the century,¹² Harnack found in Q a firm foundation.¹³ By his account Q was a non-apologetic, and entirely unfiltered collection of sayings of Jesus. It was compiled early and in Aramaic, in Palestine, possibly even Galilee. More so than other available sources, namely Mark, it accurately represented the primarily moral nature of Jesus' teaching and personality, without the Christological

¹² William Wrede, *Das Messiasgeheimnis in den Evangelien: zugleich ein Beitrag zum Verständnis des Markusevangeliums* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1901); Albert Schweitzer, *Das Messianitäts- und Leidensgeheimnis: eine Skizze des Lebens Jesu*, vol. 2 of *Das Abendmahl im Zusammenhang mit dem Leben Jesu und der Geschichte des Urchristentums* (Tübingen and Leipzig: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1901); idem, *Von Reimarus zu Wrede: eine Geschichte der Leben-Jesu-Forschung* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1906).

¹³ Adolf von Harnack, *The Sayings of Jesus: The Second Source of St. Matthew and St. Luke*, trans. John Richard Wilkinson, *New Testament Studies* 2 (London: Williams & Norgate, 1908), 250; trans. of *Sprüche und Reden Jesu: Die zweite Quelle des Matthäus und Lukas*, *Beiträge zur Einleitung in das Neue Testament* 2 (Leipzig: J.C. Heinrichs, 1907), <https://archive.org/details/newtestamentstu04harngoog>.

apologetic interests of the Gospels.¹⁴ This collection became for Harnack, a documentary source, that stood in direct geographic, chronological, linguistic, and ideological contact with the historical Jesus. It was thus an ideal, alternative source of authentic Jesus material, from which one could recreate a historical Jesus who was primarily a first century moral teacher, with broad appeal for twentieth century morally-minded audiences.¹⁵ Harnack opened the door for others to prioritize Q—and the sayings

¹⁴ Harnack, *Sayings of Jesus*, esp. 233-52

While lacking historical narrative or context provided by Mark, Q offered what Harnack understood to be essentially unedited sayings of Jesus, recorded with reverence by a faithful but simple-minded compiler, unencumbered by “the inconsistencies, the discrepancies, and the incredibilities of the narrative” (Harnack, *Sayings of Jesus*, 249-50).

Not only Q’s sayings but also the portrait of Jesus derived from them, was to be preferred over the other Gospels’. By removing the eschatological and kerygmatic interests of especially Mark’s Jesus from his portrait of the historical Jesus, Harnack was likely reacting to the work of his contemporaries, including Wrede (*Das Messiasgeheimnis*), Schweitzer (*Das Messianitäts- und Leidensgeheimnis*; and *Von Reimarus zu Wrede*), and Wellhausen (*Einleitung in der drei ersten Evangelien* [Berlin: Georg Reimer, 1905]).

¹⁵ In suggesting that Q provided not only an earlier version of Jesus’ sayings but a different and better portrait of Jesus himself, Harnack broke rank from his contemporaries, notably Julius Wellhausen. Reflecting on this debate, James Robinson titled his overview of this moment in scholarship “The Essence of Christianity as Q or Kerygma” (in *The Sayings Gospel Q in Greek and English with Parallels from the Gospels of Mark and Thomas*, ed. James M. Robinson, Paul Hoffmann, and John S. Kloppenborg, CBET 30, [Leuven: Peeters, 2001, 35-38).

Other scholars, however, did not conform to a the Q versus kerygma dichotomy. An early proponent of form criticism, Martin Dibelius, posited Q as a paraenetic (or halakhic) supplement to the passion-centered kerygma evident in Paul or the Gospels. According to Dibelius, this need for supplemental teaching resulted from an ethical crisis brought about by the delay of the Parousia, and reflected a secondary interest in compiling authentic and authoritative sayings of Jesus (Martin Dibelius, *Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums* [Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1919]; English trans. *From Tradition to Gospel*, trans. B. L. Woolf [London: Nicholson and Watson, 1934]; trans. of 2nd ed. [Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1933].

Similarly, Streeter, one of the early architects of the Two Source Hypothesis, held that Q was most likely a supplement to the passion kerygma of the early Jesus

tradition—in pre-Gospel reconstructions. But a Harnack-like model of (1) accepting Q whole-cloth as containing the very words of Jesus and (2) using those words in isolation to construct a portrait of a historical Jesus, however, has since often served as the strawman to be easily, if unfairly, dismantled by those wishing to refute Q’s usefulness particularly in historical Jesus studies.

Interestingly, it was Harnack’s own idea of Q as a documentary source that contributed most significantly to the undoing of his conception of Q as an unedited repository of sayings tradition. As scholars in the mid-twentieth century began to treat Q as a document—however hypothetical—and to explore its possibilities as a literary entity, Q ceased to be regarded as raw Jesus material and came to be subjected to the same critical methods applied to the Gospels and other extant texts.¹⁶ James M. Robinson and

movement, written down primarily because sayings would have been the most difficult material to remember precisely (Streeter, *Four Gospels*, 215, 291-92).

To the extent that sayings material was at the center of much 20th and early 21st century historical Jesus research, this debate had implications for that field as well. The question was: Is Jesus essentially similar to or different from the portrait(s) presented in the canonical Gospels? By the end of the 20th century, some scholars (e.g., Burton Mack, *The Lost Gospel: The Book of Q and Christian Origins* [San Francisco: Harper One, 1993], e.g., 202-03) would answer “different from” while others (e.g., James Dunn, *Jesus Remembered*, vol 1 of *Christianity in the Making* [Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2003], e.g., 29-32, 150-151, 470-477) would say “similar to.”

¹⁶ Since Harnack’s reconstruction of Q (Harnack, *Sayings of Jesus*, 127-45) other reconstructions and critical editions of Q have included: Athanasius Polag, *Fragmenta Q: Textheft zur Logienquelle* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1979); and Wolfgang Schenk, *Synopse zur Redenquelle der Evangelien: Q-Synopse und Rekonstruktion in deutscher Übersetzung* (Düsseldorf: Parnos Verlag, 1981); John S. Kloppenborg, *Q Parallels: Synopsis, Critical Notes, & Concordance*, FF (Sonoma, CA: Polebridge Press, 1988); Frans Neirynck, *Q-Synopsis: The Double Tradition Passages in Greek*, SNTA 13 (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1988); Marvin W. Meyer, Stephen J. Patterson, and Michael G. Steinhauser, eds., *Q Thomas Reader* (Sonoma, CA: Polebridge Press, 1990); Robinson, Kloppenborg, and Hoffmann, eds., *The Critical Edition of Q* (2000); Harry T. Fleddermann, *Q: A Reconstruction and Commentary*, BTS 1 (Leuven: Peeters, 2005); and Richard Valantasis, *The New Q: A Fresh Translation with Commentary* (London: T&T Clark, 2005). In addition to the *Critical*

Helmut Koester, for example, began by addressing the question of Q's genre.¹⁷ They looked to the Gospel of Thomas, which had only recently been discovered and published, as supporting evidence for a sayings source genre previously unknown within early Christian literature.¹⁸ From this comparison and examples of Jewish wisdom literature,

Edition, the International Q Project published the results of their work (critical Greek text of individual units with English translation) yearly (*JBL* 109 [1990]: 499-501; 110 [1991]: 494-98; 111 [1992]: 500-08; 112 [1993]: 500-06; 113 [1994]: 495-99; 114 [1995]: 475-85; 116 [1997]: 521-25).

¹⁷ Robinson and Koester expanded upon the work of the form critic and their teacher, Rudolf Bultmann (for more on Bultmann, see 1.2.1 "Classic Form Criticism and the Pre-Literary Sayings Tradition" below), particularly his exploration of individual *logia* and their analog in Jewish wisdom sayings or *meshalim*. Bultmann had identified "Wisdom sayings" as one class of dominical sayings, determined according to their content rather than formal analysis. Both Robinson and Koester, however, moved beyond Bultmann's focus on "smaller, oral units of tradition," to the form and genre of the sayings collection as a whole (Rudolf Bultmann, *The History of the Synoptic Tradition*, trans. J. Marsh [Oxford: Blackwell, 1963], 69-108; trans. of *Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition*, 2nd ed. [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1931]; Robinson, "ΛΟΓΟΙ ΣΟΦΩΝ: Zur Gattung der Spruchquelle Q," in *Zeit und Geschichte: Dankesgabe an Rudolf Bultmann zum 80. Geburtstag*, ed. Erich Dinkler [Tübingen: Mohr, 1964], 79-96; English trans. repr. in Robinson and Koester, eds. *Trajectories through Early Christianity* [Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971], 71-113).

¹⁸ Q's genre, previously unknown among Christian texts, had occasionally been considered a mark against the hypothesis that such a source ever existed. See, e.g.: "There is no independent evidence for anything like Q. To postulate Q is to postulate the unevidenced and the unique," (Austin Farrer "On Dispensing with Q," in *Studies in the Gospels: Essays in Memory of R. H. Lightfoot*, ed. D. E. Nineham [Oxford: Blackwell, 1955], 55-88, 58).

The 1959 first publication of a transcription and translation of the Coptic Gos. Thom., however, lent plausibility to Q's genre as a sayings source. Furthermore, comparing the Coptic to Greek fragments of Gos. Thom. suggested that even a sayings source like Q might have experienced various redactions over time (Antoine Guillaumont, et al, *The Gospel According to Thomas* [Leiden: Brill, 1959]; for the Greek fragments, B.P. Grenfell and A.S. Hunt, *Logia Iesou: Sayings of Our Lord* [London: 1897]; idem, *New Sayings of Jesus and Fragment of a Lost Gospel from Oxyrhynchus* [London: 1903]; idem, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri, Part IV* [London, 1904]).

Gos. Thom. was the only extra-canonical source of Jesus sayings that received mainstream attention in Jesus scholarship. This was despite work on other extra-canonical sayings or "agrapha," or work on sayings of Jesus in patristic sources as in

Robinson identified Q as belonging to the genre, “λόγοι σοφῶν,” ‘sayings of the sages,’ or ‘words of the wise.’”¹⁹ Koester used the comparison to Gos. Thom. to develop a hypothesis of Q’s evolution over time. Applying redaction criticism to the hypothetical source, he argued that Q’s “Son of man”-centered apocalypticism, which is lacking from the Gos. Thom., represents a secondary development in the sayings material and a move away from a strict λόγοι σοφῶν genre.²⁰ The broader idea that Q might have belonged to a known literary genre and undergone redaction(s) meant that its sayings could not be

Koester’s own dissertation written under Bultmann suggesting that independent oral tradition preserved otherwise unattested sayings (Helmut Koester, *Synoptische Überlieferung bei den Apostolischen Vätern*, TU 65 [Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1957]; Otfried Hofius, “Isolated Sayings of the Lord,” in *New Testament Apocrypha, Volume One: Gospels and Related Writings*, ed. Wilhelm Schneemelcher, rev. ed., Eng. trans., ed. R. McL. Wilson [Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2003], 88-91). Joachim Jeremias compiled a collection of the “unknown,” i.e., extra-canonical, sayings from the first through the 17th centuries. He found as many as eighteen sayings that he determined could be genuine Jesus material (Jeremias, *Unbekannte Jesusworte*, ATANT 16 [Zurich: Zwingli Verlag, 1948]). Though he cast the net far more widely in the search, his conclusions reflected the general interest in sayings material primarily as a means to the words of Jesus himself. In his slightly narrower collection of sayings, William D. Stoker avoided judgments of authenticity but did attempt to demonstrate early and independent lines of tradition (*Extracanonial Sayings of Jesus*, SBL SBS 18 [Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989]).

¹⁹ Robinson, “ΛΟΓΟΙ ΣΟΦΩΝ,” 71-72.

²⁰ Helmut Koester, “One Jesus and Four Primitive Gospels,” in Robinson and Koester, eds., *Trajectories through Early Christianity*, 158-204, 186.

According to Koester, this genre was Gnosticized in the Gos. Thom., while in Q, that tendency was domesticated by what became an orthodox apocalypticism (Koester, “GNOMAI DIAPHORAI: The Origin and Nature of Diversification in the History of Early Christianity,” in Robinson and Koester, eds., *Trajectories through Early Christianity*, 114-157, 138). In addition Koester detected external evidence for a primitive but once well-known “wisdom theology” within the Gos. Thom. and also the projected opponents of Paul as described, for example, in 1 Corinthians.

taken as a record of Jesus' own words. Instead this collection of sayings of Jesus represented the changing interests of Q's transmitters.²¹

John Kloppenborg continued the trend of analyzing Q as a document through a diachronic redactional analysis.²² He posited two main strata, the formative stratum (Q¹) and the redaction (Q²), distinguished by the unique literary features of each.²³ Q¹ consisted of six sub-collections of hortatory sayings, organized by topic and

²¹ Dieter Lührmann also applied redaction criticism to a reconstructed text of Q and argued that it was possible to isolate several layers that represent changing theological interests (Dieter Lührmann, *Die Redaktion der Logienquelle*, WMANT 33 [Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1969], 16-19). The initial Q redactor revised sayings drawn from an existing collection into a stratum largely concerned with the judgment of "this generation." A later Deuteronomistic edition was the (provisional) culmination of a lengthy process of transmission (Lührmann, *Die Redaktion*, 84).

²² John S. Kloppenborg, *The Formation of Q: Trajectories in Ancient Wisdom Collections* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987); and idem, *Excavating Q*.

²³ See, Kloppenborg, *Excavating Q*, 146-53.

Having compiled examples of the sayings collection genre (instructions, gnomologia, and chriae) from Ancient Near Eastern and Hellenistic sources, Kloppenborg identified parallels between these corpora and his own redactional layers of Q along a literary trajectory from instruction to proto-biography (Kloppenborg, *Formation of Q*, 263-341).

Kloppenborg has defended the strictly literary, and not ideologically-based, nature of his criteria against his critics. Cf. especially, John J. Collins ("Wisdom, Apocalypticism, and Generic Compatibility," in *In Search of Wisdom: Essays in Memory of John G. Gammie*, ed. Leo G. Perdue, Bernard B. Scott, and William J. Wiseman [Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 1993], 165-85), whom Kloppenborg claims has misunderstood his method as thematic or form-critical, or driven by notions of generic purity, (*Excavating Q*, 145, n. 61). Kloppenborg rather finds elements of wisdom and apocalyptic traditions in all strata of Q, and suggests Q should be read as representing a "wisdom of the kingdom" genre containing both wisdom and apocalyptic element. Matthew J. Goff has supported this hypothesis of an apocalyptically-colored wisdom genre in Q, and has said that such a genre fits within Jewish sapiential tradition, through a comparison to the Dead Sea Scrolls' 4QInstruction ("Discerning Trajectories: 4QInstruction and the Sapiential Background of the Sayings Source Q," *JBL* 124 [Winter, 2005]: 657-673).

catchwords.²⁴ Q² added to the collection, framing the material as chriae and inserting motifs of judgment associated with Deuteronomistic conceptions of history.²⁵ Finally, Kloppenborg identified a later layer of “minor glossing,” Q³, which incorporated comments on the collection as a whole and corrected or qualified sayings from the main redaction.²⁶ Kloppenborg posited that those initially responsible for Q were likely “village scribes,” or lower level administrative functionaries located in rural villages and towns in Galilee, an idea which has been picked up by others and occasionally pressed to make claims concerning Jesus of Nazareth’s own interests or socio-historical situation.²⁷

²⁴ *Excavating Q*, 154: 1. Q 6:20b-23b, 27-35, 36-45, 46-49; 2. Q 9:57-60, (61-62); 10:2-11, (23-24?); 3. Q 11:2-4, 9-13; 4. Q 12:2-7, 11-12; 5. Q 12:22b-31, 33-34, (13:18-19, 20-21?); and, probably, 6. Q 13:24; 14:26-27; 17:33; 14:34-35 (*Formation of Q*, 171-245; also, *Excavating Q*, 146). Kloppenborg’s note on this list adds his own recent suggestions “that Q 13:18-21 was perhaps attached to Q 12:22b-31, 33-34...and that Q 15:4-7, 8-10;16:13, 16, 18; 17:1-2, 3-4, 6 belong to the earliest level of Q” (*Excavating Q*, 146, n. 62, citing idem, “Jesus and the Parables of Jesus in Q,” in *The Gospel behind the Gospels: Current Studies on Q*, ed., Ronald A. Piper, NovTSup 75 [Leiden: Brill, 1995]: 275-319).

²⁵ These motifs include polemic against “this generation” and allusions to the Genesis story of Lot. 1. Q 3(2-3), 7-9, 16b-17; 2. Q 7:1-10, 18-28, 31-35; 3. Q 11:14-15, 16, 17-26, (27-28), 29-32, 33-36, 39b-44, 46-52; 4. Q 17:23-24, 37b, 26-30, 34-35; 19:12-27; 22:28-30; and possibly, 5. Q 12:39-40, 42b-46, 49, 50-53, 54-59; Kloppenborg, *Excavating Q*, 143-144.

²⁶ E.g., Q 4:1-13; 11:42c; 16:17 (*Excavating Q*, 152-53).

In his analysis of Q, Kloppenborg determined that, from its foundational form through its redactions, Q remained consistent with a genre of “sapiential” or “instructional” sayings that had been shaped by a “soteriologically intensified” message (Kloppenborg, *Formation of Q*, 327-28; idem, *Excavating Q*, 380).

Though Kloppenborg has tried to resist what he takes as theologically-loaded labels like “sapiential” or “prophetic,” his reading of Q and its stratigraphy is often characterized as generally sapiential.

²⁷ E.g., Kloppenborg, “Jesus and the Parables of Jesus in Q”; idem, *Excavating Q*, 200-201; and idem, *Conflict and Invention: Literary, Rhetorical and Social Studies on the Sayings Gospel Q*, ed. Kloppenborg (Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press, 2004), 5-6; similarly, Willi Braun “The Schooling of a Galilean Jesus Association (The Sayings

According to Kloppenborg, however, the literary nature of Q undermines the idea of isolating any saying from its context for a reconstruction of the historical Jesus.²⁸

Furthermore, he has more recently argued that each variant of a saying, whether found in Q or elsewhere, must be taken within the discursive context of its own distinct written context in order to be properly understood. This last turn, while not yet common among source critics, has served as part of the model for the approach of the present work.

Gospel Q),” in *Redescribing Christian Origins*, ed. Ronald Dean Cameron and Merrill P. Miller, SBLSymS 28 (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 43-65.

Building off of Kloppenborg’s thesis concerning Q’s origins among village scribes William Arnal has described the particular circumstances of an urbanizing Galilee that would have resulted in a discontented class of village scribes, prone to make the sort of social critique found in the earliest stratum of Q (William E. Arnal, *Jesus and the Village Scribes: Galilean Conflicts and the Setting of Q* [Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001]; and idem, “The Trouble with Q,” *Forum* 2,1 [2013]: 7-77).

Others have moved Q’s scribes slightly up the social ladder of first century Galilee, insisting that Q is not a random compilation but neither is it quite sophisticated literature. Alan Kirk suggested that the scribes’ social location should “be estimated a few notches higher than that of village functionaries postulated by Kloppenborg” (*The Composition of the Sayings Source: Genre, Synchrony and Wisdom Redaction in Q* [Leiden: Brill, 1998], 399). Jonathan Reed argued that the authors of Q had contact with urban centers and even betray some urban interests, including a romanticization of rural life (“The Social Map of Q,” in *Conflict and Invention*, 17-36). Simon J. Joseph has recently argued against the Galilean scribe hypothesis as falsely limiting perspective on Q and its interaction with other Palestinian Jewish and Jesus movement traditions (Simon J. Joseph, “The Quest for the ‘Community’ of Q: Mapping Q Within the Social, Scribal, and Textual Landscape(s) of Second Temple Judaism,” *HTR* 111 [2018]: 90-114). Each of these authors, in pressing for the social location of Q, affirms that the social location of Q is not the same as the social location of Jesus of Nazareth, and that the social location of Q has impacted its account of the sayings tradition.

²⁸ Kloppenborg has noted that “none of the more than twenty comprehensive studies of Q since the 1960s attempts, either explicitly or implicitly, to provide a characterization of the historical Jesus” (John S. Kloppenborg Verbin, “Discursive Practices in the Sayings Gospel Q and the Quest of the Historical Jesus,” in *The Sayings Source Q and the Historical Jesus*, BETL 158, ed. A. Lindemann [Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2001], 149-190, 161; also idem, “The Sayings Gospel Q and the Quest of the Historical Jesus,” *HTR* 89 [1996]: 323-324). While that may be true, and a reasonable counter to those who might argue that Q-scholarship has been primarily historical Jesus scholarship by a different name, that does not diminish Q’s centrality in historical Jesus studies of that same time period.

Others have taken interest in reconstructing the purported material and social histories of Q—what it physically looked like, as well as who might have used it and why. In the consideration of these questions, Q studies has intersected with memory studies, as well as those concerning the historical Jesus. Dale Allison, for example, has proposed that Q was primarily a memory aid for itinerant preachers, that was updated according to the needs of a changing audience and went through at least three developmental stages.²⁹ Migaku Sato, similarly suggested a series of unsystematic expansions of Q, likened to pages added to a loose-leaf notebook, compiled and used by prophets carrying on the prophetic work of Jesus.³⁰ While Alan Kirk does not describe Q as such an informal memory aid, he does consider how it may have been used, primarily via memory, by the scribal tradent he argues would have been responsible for producing the Gospel of Matthew. According to Kirk, this scribe was necessarily a participant in the

²⁹ Dale C. Allison, *The Jesus Tradition in Q* (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 1997), 32. Notably, as he has reconstructed these loosely redactional stages, Allison has argued that, even in its initial redaction, Q's Jesus is apocalyptically-minded and, therefore, not incompatible with the apocalyptic Jesus of the Synoptic Gospels. B.H. Streeter, one of the architects of the Two Source Hypothesis, had proposed a similar idea of Q as primarily a memory-aid for early Christian preaching (Streeter, *Four Gospels*, 215).

The idea that written copies of text were used as memory aids for future oral performance has found support outside of Q studies in recent studies concerning the intersections of literacy and orality in the field of Classics. See e.g., Holt Parker's argument that Latin poetry was primarily learned via private reading of a written copy rather than through aural reception and repetition, debunking a longheld claim to the contrary (Holt N. Parker, "Books and Reading Latin Poetry," in *Ancient Literacies: The Culture of Reading in Greece and Rome*, ed. William A. Johnson and Holt N. Parker [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009], 186-229); and Simon Goldhill's analysis of imperial literature, for example, Philostratus' *Lives of the Sophists*, as primarily written handbooks of anecdotes meant to be read and reperformed (Simon Goldhill, "The Anecdote: Exploring the Boundaries between Oral and Literate Performance in the Second Sophistic," in *Ancient Literacies*, 96-113).

³⁰ Migaku Sato, *Q und Prophetie: Studien zur Gattungs- und Traditions-geschichte der Quelle Q*, WUNT 2, 29 (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1988), 51.

process of social memory, and the structured text of Q, as well as that of Mark, would have been part of his received memory, which he both consciously and unconsciously reconstituted in his own performance of the tradition, the Gospel of Matthew.³¹ While Q for Kirk must have been an intentionally organized written text with recognizable micro- and macro-level structure, the physical reality of working with scrolls or other manuscripts meant that in order to be useful in producing a new Gospel it most likely had been committed to memory by the responsible scribe.

Despite the expanding influence of various literary or socio-historical approaches to Q, John Meier has consistently been among those who have criticized such treatments.³² He has agreed with the predominant scholarly opinion that “Q” refers to the source of the Matthew-Luke double tradition and may have circulated in different forms. But, according to Meier, there are no rigorous historical grounds for going beyond the analyses of individual sayings complexes. There is no reason, for example, to presume that there was a single Q community, with a peculiar Q theology represented in the

³¹ Alan Kirk, *Q in Matthew: Ancient Media, Memory, and Early Scribal Transmission of the Jesus Tradition*, LNTS 564 (London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2017); also, idem, *The Composition of the Sayings Source*; and, idem, “Manuscript Tradition as a *Tertium Quid*: Orality and Memory in Scribal Practices,” in *Jesus, the Voice and the Text: Beyond the Oral and the Written Gospel*, ed. Tom Thatcher (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2008), 215-34.

Kirk, with his understanding of the interface of textuality and memory in scribal literacy, then, distinguishes himself from those scholars who would dispense with a textual Q all together treating the double-tradition as oral tradition, arguing that the performative or didactic function of oral clusters of wisdom sayings and exhortation explains the relative stability and development of this material (e.g., Richard Horsley and Jonathan A. Draper, eds., *Whoever Hears You Hears Me: Prophets, Performance, and Tradition in Q* [Harrisburg, Pa.: Trinity, 1999], esp. 123-310; James D.G. Dunn, “Q¹ as Oral Tradition,” in *The Oral Gospel Tradition* [ed., Dunn; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2013], 80–108).

³² John P. Meier, *A Marginal Jew: Rethinking The Historical Jesus*, 5 vols. ABRL and AYBRL (New York: Doubleday and New Haven: Yale University Press, 1991-2016), 1:43-44; 2:177-181; 4:522-527, 531; 5:335 n. 74.

collected sayings.³³ Claims to detect distinctive literary theological orientations for different layers of Q are even more problematic. Meier defaults to treating Q as a “Topsy-like grab bag” of sayings and occasionally deeds attributed to Jesus—and occasionally John the Baptist—that grew over time, without a clear intention, let alone trajectory of development.³⁴ The most one can say about Q’s literary shape involves smaller units, clustered by theme and catchwords.

While some would still deny Q all together,³⁵ for many scholars Q has come to define source criticism of the sayings tradition. With it, source criticism introduced the prioritization of sayings tradition. Attention to Q has intersected with various interests and methodologies, but perhaps in no arena has it been so impactful as in Jesus studies. As a hypothetical source, the contents of which are determined by sorting variants into earlier and later—that is, more and less authentic—piles, Q has fit well within most

³³ Others have made similar cases. James Dunn, e.g., argues against what he describes as the “one document per community fallacy,” (Dunn, *Jesus Remembered*, 150). Cf., e.g., Burton Mack, who based his hypothesis in part on Kloppenborg’s redactional proposal for Q and proposed a Capernaum-based Q community that understood Jesus as first and foremost, a Cynic-like sage, devoid of what Mack understood to be the later apocalyptic characteristics attributed to him (Burton Mack, *The Lost Gospel*).

³⁴ Meier, *Marginal Jew*, 2:180; “Topsy-like,” referring to the character from Harriet Beecher Stowe’s *Uncle Tom’s Cabin*, who, when asked if she knows who made her, responds: “Nobody, as I knows on...I spect I grow’d. Don’t think nobody never made me,” (*The Annotated Uncle Tom’s Cabin* [eds. Henry Louis Gates, Jr. and Hollis Robbins; New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 2007]).

Meier draws attention, to the perennially troubling Temptation Narrative, which Kloppenborg handles by affixing it to Q in a late redaction (Q³). This text, is only troubling if one seeks a clear and coherent Q, and rather lends further support to his idea of a theological agglomerate (Meier, *Marginal Jew*, 2:271).

³⁵ E.g., Mark Goodacre, *The Case against Q: Studies in Markan Priority and the Synoptic Problem* (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 2002); idem, *Goulder and the Gospels: An Examination of a New Paradigm*, JSNTSup 133 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996); and, Watson, *Gospel Writing*.

twentieth century Jesus scholarship's approach to the sources of Jesus tradition. And, given that Q's contents are generally thought to be those of that earlier—that is, more authentic—pile, Q has become invaluable to these approaches as a source for Jesus tradition. With Q's fittingness for historical Jesus studies, however, has often come an assumption that Q, and the sayings tradition more broadly, should be considered primarily or even exclusively for Jesus studies. Melanie Johnson-DeBaufre has observed and critiqued the Jesus-centeredness of much of Q studies.³⁶ While she applied feminist-critical principals of de-centering to propose a shift in attention from Jesus to the Kingdom of God tradition in Q, the present study might be understood as proposing a de-centering from Jesus to the social memory concerning him. Given the present study's interest in considering extant variants in their received context, it will occasionally assume Q as part of the received tradition to which Matthew and Luke had access, but it will not treat Q as a separate source of sayings variants.

1.2 Form Criticism, the Criteria Approach, and the Sayings Tradition

The first New Testament form critics, working in the early twentieth century, turned attention from pre-Gospel to pre-literary traditions. Concerning the sayings attributed to Jesus, form critics initially sought to recover or reconstruct their pre-Gospel forms, those developed and used in the oral traditions of the early “church.” Most of these scholars assumed the source-critical Two Source Hypothesis and its “Q.”³⁷ They

³⁶ Melanie Johnson-DeBaufre, *Jesus among Her Children: Q, Eschatology, and the Construction of Christian Origins*, HTS 55 (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2005), esp. 27-42.

³⁷ They also responded to source criticism's limitations, particularly its exclusively literary interests in the Gospels and their pre-history. Rudolf Bultmann and other early form critics acknowledged both form criticism's indebtedness to and critique of the methods we now know as source criticism but which were also described as synoptic criticism or literary analysis (e.g., Bultmann, *Die Geschichte*, 3,

wanted to push beyond the literary level, and they continued to prioritize the sayings tradition as a more reliable locus of pre-literary tradition than its surrounding narratives. Naturally, as attention shifted further back in time, from recovering this pre-literary oral layer to recovering the pre-Easter Jesus layer from within the Gospels and Q, the sayings tradition not only persisted but rose to prominence as the primary access point to reliable Jesus material.

1.2.1 Classic Form Criticism and the Pre-Literary Sayings Tradition

In the early twentieth century, in fact within two years of one another, two German scholars independently published monographs introducing form criticism to gospel studies: Martin Dibelius's *Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums*, and Rudolf

http://www.archive.org/details/MN41445ucmf_1; Martin Dibelius, *Die Formgeschichte*, 8-9, http://www.archive.org/details/MN41397ucmf_0; and Karl Ludwig Schmidt, *Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu: Literarkritische Untersuchungen zur ältesten Jesusüberlieferung* [Berlin: Trowitzsch & Sohn, 1919], 317, <http://hdl.handle.net/2027/njp.32101055431157>). Dibelius in particular showed a preference for the sayings preserved in "Q," though he warned against the danger of overlooking the hypothetical nature of Q, and suggested thinking of it as a stratum rather than a document like Mark or one of the other Gospels (Dibelius, *Die Formgeschichte*, 234-237).

In addition to these influences of source criticism, New Testament form critics were also influenced by the History of Religions School, as well as Old Testament form criticism. Dibelius established explicitly his own dependence on the work of Hermann Gunkel, for example, and his predecessors (*Die Formgeschichte*, 5). Bultmann likewise identified the particular contributions of, among others, William Wrede, Julius Wellhausen, and Hermann Gunkel to the then-contemporary *status quaestionis* of Gospel studies (*Die Geschichte*, 1-3; e.g., Wrede, *Das Messiasgeheimnis*; Wellhausen, *Einleitung in die drei ersten Evangelien*; and Gunkel, *Genesis* [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1901]). Wrede demonstrated that the portrait of Jesus in Mark was dogmatically-influenced, which cast doubt on the gospel as a historical account. Along with Schweitzer and other contemporaries, Wrede thus contributed to the destabilization of the Gospels as historical records. Form criticism, in some ways, brought the Gospels back into the historical conversation, though under a more skeptical eye.

Bultmann's *Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition*.³⁸ Both were interested in the pre-literary existence of the sayings and Jesus traditions, and looked to the Gospels as evidence of it. This was possible because, to their minds, the Evangelists were editor-authors of low literary skill who, to borrow a description from Dibelius and Bultmann's contemporary Karl Schmidt, strung units of received tradition together like pearls on a narrative thread.³⁹ By un-stringing these units of tradition, then, one could recover from the individual pearls their pre-literary oral forms, as they had been used in the life of the early church. The extant sayings tradition was, for these early form critics, primarily a means to the pre-Gospel early Christian community.

In order to move from the received "pearls" to their pre-literary form, Dibelius attempted to identify both the motive for preserving and transmitting Jesus material and

³⁸ Dibelius, *Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums*, 1st ed. (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1919); English trans. *From Tradition to Gospel* (trans. B. L. Woolf; London: Nicholson and Watson, 1934); trans. of 2nd ed. (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1933).

Bultmann, *Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition*, 1st ed., FRLANT 29 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1921); English trans. *The History of the Synoptic Tradition* (trans. J. Marsh; Oxford: Blackwell, 1963); trans. of 2nd ed. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1931).

In addition, one might also include Karl Ludwig Schmidt's *Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu: Literarkritische Untersuchungen zur ältesten Jesusüberlieferung* (Berlin: Trowitzsch & Sohn, 1919) from the same time, though Schmidt might better be understood as a transitional figure than a form critic outright. Building off the work of Wrede and others, Schmidt viewed his work as contributing to the questions of *Leben-Jesu-Forschung* through literary analysis. His consideration of the literary history of Mark and its usefulness as a source for the historical Jesus affirmed several assumptions concerning the nature of the Gospel material that would be formative in form criticism: every gospel is an assemblage of individual narrative and saying units that circulated orally before Mark strung them together; and this thread or framework, is the secondary creation of the evangelist and neither a chronological nor geographical recording of Jesus' activities.

³⁹ Schmidt, *Der Rahmen*, 52-53, 67-68, 76-77, 152.

the rules governing its transmission.⁴⁰ Both the motive and the process of transmission, he determined, were rooted in a particular *Sitz im Leben*: the missional preaching of the early Christian church.⁴¹ One could detect early Christian preaching within the Gospels because the evangelist-editors were primarily tradents of pre-existing units of material—saying or narrative—that were already formed by and for the purposes of Christian preaching.⁴² As such these units conformed to certain useful forms. In the case of the sayings tradition, these forms included maxims (proverbs and gnome), metaphors, parabolic narratives, prophetic calls (beatitudes, woes, eschatological preaching), and commands (short and extended, with a motive, promise, or threat), which were used primarily as paraenesis or exhortations, employed in service of catechetical teaching.⁴³

⁴⁰ Dibelius, *Die Formgeschichte*, 10-11; cf. idem, 12-15, 20-31.

⁴¹ Dibelius further specified that missionary purpose was the cause and preaching was the means of spreading the tradition, which initially grew out of what “eyewitnesses and servants of the word” said (Luke 1:2; Dibelius, *Die Formgeschichte*, 11-12). Preaching included all forms of Christian proclamation and could be missional, cultic/liturgical, or didactic/catechetical (Dibelius, *Die Formgeschichte*, 13).

⁴² Dibelius, *Die Formgeschichte*, 14-21.

According to Dibelius the evangelists did not reshape received units of tradition in any significant way (*Die Formgeschichte*, 56-58). Compared to later Christian writings, which were comparable to other works of literature in their form, the Gospels bore little if any resemblance to literature proper, and Dibelius described them as “nichtliterarisch” or “Klein-Literatur” (*Die Formgeschichte*, 2).

⁴³ Dibelius, *Die Formgeschichte*, 247-248.

Dibelius treated narratives about and sayings of Jesus as two separate streams of tradition, with independent laws of transmission (Dibelius, *Die Formgeschichte*, 26-28, 236-237). His primary interest was in the narrative categories, which included: paradigms, tales, legends, and the Passion story. Early Christian preachers used stories about Jesus to bolster the claims of the kerygma. Consequently, this material exhibits fluid variations comparable to the narratives of Jewish Haggadah.

Among the narrative forms, Dibelius held that “paradigms” (brief narratives with a saying of Jesus as their climax; *apophthegmata* in Bultmann) were the earliest and most likely from Jesus himself, in part because they originally circulated among the

Given this motive, the rules governing the process of their transmission had to be relatively strict, on account of the sayings' requiring obedience.⁴⁴ In some cases, Dibelius determined, the use of a saying as paraenesis may have gone back to Jesus himself, since even Paul seems already to have known collections of Jesus' hortatory sayings. In other cases, that emphasis was generated during the teaching-oriented transmission process. Christian teachers were familiar with collections of Jesus' words and used them readily in their teaching, often side by side with their own exhortations. All of this exhortation was, according to Dibelius, regarded as having been inspired by the Lord, whether or not it had been spoken by Jesus of Nazareth.⁴⁵

eyewitnesses who could control and correct the tradition. They were useful in Christian preaching providing support to the kerygma, and the context of the sermon would have contributed modifications to the paradigms suited to the purpose of the speaker. Particular paradigms, therefore, can be analyzed as exhibiting more and less primitive traditions (e.g., Mark 2:23-28; 3:31-34; 10:35-40). According to Dibelius, neither the ingenuity nor the unreliability of the evangelists was to blame for obscuring our access to the words of Jesus, but the very form of the paradigm and the requirements of its *Sitz im Leben* (*Die Formgeschichte*, 56-60).

⁴⁴ Dibelius compared the transmission of this portion of the sayings tradition to that of Jewish Halakhah, which would also require strict obedience (Dibelius, *Die Formgeschichte*, 26-29).

⁴⁵ Dibelius, *Die Formgeschichte*, 242. Dibelius observed that the tendency of the communities to base exhortation on the sayings of Jesus may have led them to over-interpret or even misinterpret some sayings in transmission (Dibelius, *Die Formgeschichte*, 257-259).

Though the needs of proclamation and exhortation preserved words of Jesus within the community, that did not equate to preserving a historical record of Jesus' words or deeds. For Dibelius form criticism only addresses questions about the pre-Gospel, oral tradition. It was not intended to determine what the words of Jesus himself had been (Dibelius, *Die Formgeschichte*, 295-300). Though others would eventually build off of form criticism in attempts to recover the actual sayings of Jesus, Dibelius resisted pushing that expansion of the historical project. A similar division exists today between scholars who treat "memory" as reliable access to Jesus' own words and those who support Dibelius's reluctance to make any such claims.

While Bultmann would come to a relatively similar conclusion, he got there by taking as his point of departure the individual units of the tradition rather than a presumption of their use in the early church. He asked how these examples show tradition passing from what was initially quite fluid to a fixed form. Only after describing the “data” provided by individual units and clusters of Jesus material could one determine its *Sitz im Leben*.⁴⁶ Bultmann’s primary focus was on sayings, which he categorized into apophthegms and dominical sayings. Apophthegms (or apophthegmata, Dibelius’ “paradigms”) consisted of dominical sayings in a concise narrative context, usually involving interaction with an interlocutor.⁴⁷ This narrative context was derived from the dominical sayings themselves, not from any record of Jesus’ own speech or actions. One could, then, reduce an apophthegm to a bare dominical saying by stripping away this secondary setting.⁴⁸

Dominical sayings were for Bultmann those that were, or could have been, independently circulating units of tradition like proverbs or Robinson’s “words of the

⁴⁶ Bultmann described Dibelius’s as a constructive method (beginning with a study of the community and, from that, constructing a history of the synoptic tradition) and his own as an analytic method (beginning with the analysis of the tradition, and, from that, constructing a picture of the community). However he also acknowledged the circularity of the enterprise and the interdependence of the two approaches. Despite the role played by communal context in shaping and transmitting Jesus tradition, Bultmann remained convinced that the judgments reached using form criticism were historical, even if expressed as probabilities as to the authenticity of a saying or the historicity of a report (Bultmann, *Die Geschichte*, 6; cf. e.g., idem, 157-158).

⁴⁷ From comparison to Rabbinic and Hellenistic sources, Bultmann identified three distinct types of apophthegm: disputes (*Streitgespräche*), scholastic dialogues (*Schulgespräche*), and biographical apophthegms (*biographische Apophthegmata*) (Bultmann, *Die Geschichte*, 39-72). What Bultmann identified as apophthegms, others have called pronouncement stories; see, e.g., Robert C. Tannehill, ed. *Pronouncement Stories*, Semeia 20 (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1981).

⁴⁸ Details concerning the geographic setting, interlocutors, and collective responses from the narrative audience, for example, were all evidence of accreted narrative context (Bultmann, *Die Geschichte*, 67-73).

wise.”⁴⁹ Bultmann observed that many of these sayings, both in form and content, bore striking resemblances to their predecessors or counterparts in Jewish wisdom, prophetic, and apocalyptic traditions. He concluded that traditional Jewish materials might easily have been incorporated into the Jesus tradition during the oral period. Additionally, later Christian prophets might have spoken “in the spirit,” only to have their pronouncements later accreted to the sayings tradition as part of the continually-present voice of the Lord.⁵⁰ Like Dibelius, Bultmann held that, dominical sayings concerning the law and regulation of the community were the earliest, but even they had likely been retro-fitted as explicitly “Christian” instruction.⁵¹ According to Bultmann:

The tradition collected sayings of the Lord, shaped them in form, multiplied and re-formed them; it also collected other—Jewish—sayings, and adapted them for inclusion in the treasury of Christian instruction, and it produced new sayings...which it put unselfconsciously into the mouth of Jesus.⁵²

⁴⁹ He subdivided this form further into logia, featuring Jesus as a Wisdom teacher, prophetic and apocalyptic sayings, and legal sayings and community rules (Bultmann, *Die Geschichte*, 73).

⁵⁰ Bultmann, *Die Geschichte*, 134-135. Bultmann cites both Hermann Gunkel and Hermann von Soden as having proposed a similar idea before him (Hermann Gunkel, *Reden und Aufsätze* [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1913], 173; and Hermann von Soden, *Das Interesse des apostolischen Zeitalters an der evangelischen Geschichte* [Tübingen: Mohr, 1892], 153).

⁵¹ Bultmann, *Die Geschichte*, 156.

⁵² Bultmann, *Die Geschichte*, 156; English from the translation by John Marsh, *History of the Synoptic Tradition*, 145.

Both traditional Jewish material, and sayings of Christian prophets inspired by the Spirit and speaking with the voice of the risen Lord, were ascribed to Jesus in the tradition. On the former, see e.g., Bultmann, *Die Geschichte*, 105-110, 132-135; for the latter, see e.g., idem 134-135, 174-175.

This accretion of material continued as the tradition spread from Palestinian to Hellenistic Christianity, at which point Jesus was transformed into διδάσκαλος and κύριος, the protagonist of stories and legends concerning the Christ and the cult, rather than the Jesus of history (e.g., Bultmann, *Die Geschichte*, 394-397).

In this way Bultmann explained how he understood the initial stock of dominical sayings to have “unselfconsciously” expanded, both in oral and written transmission, according to the needs of the church.⁵³ As a result, the gospels contain both more and less genuine units of material side by side without any distinction between them.

Excursus: Christian Prophecy and the Sayings Tradition

Bultmann’s proposal that many of the so-called dominical sayings, attributed to Jesus, might have originated with Christian prophets speaking in the Spirit or even in the name of Jesus has been a persistent hypotheses, often implied by sayings scholarship even when not put forward directly.⁵⁴ According to him this accretion was possible because:

In ihnen sprach gewiss manchmal...der erhöhte Christus, und erst allmählich wird man in solchen Worten Weissagungen des historischen Jesus gesehen haben. Ein Unterschied zwischen solchen Worten chistlicher Propheten und den überlieferten Jesusworte nicht Aussagen einer Autorität der Vergangenheit waren, sondern Worte des Auferstandenen, der für die Gemeinde ein Gegenwärtiger ist.⁵⁵

⁵³ Helmut Koester argued that the oral circulation of sayings continued even into the second century and did not end with the written gospels (e.g., Koester, *Synoptische Überlieferung bei den Apostolischen Vätern*; idem, *Ancient Christian Gospels: Their History and Development* [Philadelphia: Trinity Press International, 2007]; idem, “Written Gospels or Oral Tradition?” *JBL* 113 (1994): 293-297.

⁵⁴ Among those who largely just repeated Bultmann’s hypothesis on this point, see, e.g., Ernst Käsemann “Is the Gospel Objective?” in *Essays on New Testament Themes*, ed. Ernst Käsemann, SBT 41 (London: SCM, 1964), 48-62, 60; and H. M. Teeple, “The Oral Tradition that Never Existed,” *JBL* 89 (1970): 56-68. The most robust analysis in support of this hypothesis, considering in particular which sayings might best be understood as products of “prophecy” has been performed by Eugene Boring, *Sayings of the Risen Jesus: Christian Prophecy in the Synoptic Tradition*, SNTSMS 46 (London: Cambridge University Press, 1982); idem, *The Continuing Voice of Jesus: Christian Prophecy and the Gospel Tradition* (Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1991).

⁵⁵ Bultmann, *Die Geschichte*, 135.

For Bultmann, a prophet speaking in the name of the Lord, or offering speech in the Spirit that is only later attributed to the Lord, was just one of the ways in which material might have come to be added into the Jesus sayings tradition despite not having originated with him. But this idea of prophets speaking in the continuing voice of Jesus caught on in scholarly imagination in part because of its plausibility and malleability. The hypothesis was plausible in that a wide variety of early Christian literatures attest to the existence of prophets and the phenomenon of prophecy within early Christian communities (e.g., Acts 11:27; 13:1; 15:32; 21:9-10; Rom 12:6; 1 Cor 11:4-5; 12:28-29; 14:29-32; and 1 Thess 5:20; Did. 11-13; Exeg. Soul 135; Ap. Jas. 6:27-32); and it was malleable in that few of the references to prophets or prophecy give any great detail or parameters for what this position or activity entailed, so scholars can imagine them to suit their needs.

Others, however, have taken issue with what they understand to be the logic of Bultmann's hypothesis. James Dunn, for example, has argued that, if Bultmann were right, then one should expect to find a Christian sayings tradition that is wholly unfixed and fluid, left completely open to the indiscriminating whims of Christian prophets and their recorders.⁵⁶ He has pointed to evidence in Jewish and Christian tradition for restraint concerning prophets and prophetic

⁵⁶ James D.G. Dunn, "Prophetic 'I'-Sayings and the Jesus Tradition: The Importance of Testing Prophetic Utterances within Early Christianity," *NTS* 24 (1978): 175-198; idem, *The Oral Gospel Tradition* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2013), 322-324. Similarly, David Hill, "On the Evidence for the Creative Role of Christian Prophets," *NTS* 20 (1974): 262-274; idem, *New Testament Prophecy*, New Foundations Theological Library (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1979).

action imposed by the receiving community and its sense of God's true word (e.g., Deut 13:1-3; 1 Cor 12:3; 1 John 4:1-3). He has also noted that the sayings tradition (by which he means the canonical sayings tradition) does not reflect such unrestrained creativity. From these observations, Dunn has concluded, contrary to Bultmann, that there is not evidence for the indiscriminate inclusion of prophet-produced logia in the tradition as Jesus material.

In this way the idea of "prophecy" has been brought brought into broader questions concerning the reliability of the Gospels as access points to Jesus material. Bultmann has been placed on the side of the skeptics acknowledging the post-Easter perspective and inherent creativity of early Christian communities. Dunn places himself on the side of those arguing for continuity between the pre-Easter Jesus and the post-Easter sayings tradition. He sees early Christian creativity curtailed by something like a criterion of coherence operative even in the first centuries, whereby the communities would assess the veracity of a purported Jesus saying according to a kerygmatic standard and dismiss as "false prophecy" any that did not cohere. As with other elements relevant to the debate concerning scholarly ability to retrieve or reconstruct historical Jesus material, prophecy has been forced into a dichotomy, either supporting or contradicting the reliability of the sayings tradition as authentic Jesus material.

A middle way, however, is supported by the references to prophecy in the third century text, the Apocryphon of James, considered at greater length in Chapter 4 below. There, in dialogue with the resurrected Jesus, James inquired on behalf of himself and others: "how shall we be able to prophesy to those who request us to prophesy to them? For there are many who ask us, and look to us to

hear an oracle (ἀγλoρoς) from us.” To this the Lord replied “Do you not know that the head of prophecy was cut off with John?” (Ap. Jas. 6:22-31; cf. Luke 16:16 and par. Matt. 11:13). While James, speaking on behalf of the implied author, acknowledges the existence of Christian prophecy as a means of continuing oracles or sayings, which could have been attributed to the voice of Jesus, the implied author, speaking through the Lord, indicates that he does not consider such prophecy to be a legitimate means of sayings tradition. That some “prophets” or others might have spoken in the Spirit or in the continuing voice of the Lord, and that some of their sayings might have been incorporated into Christian tradition as sayings of Jesus over the course of the first three centuries, seems probable; that does not, however, necessarily result in a completely free or independently creative sayings tradition. Prophets, like others, would have received and contributed to social memory concerning the sayings tradition, but might have understood their experience of that memory as particularly inspired (cf. John 14:26).

Bultmann’s hypotheses concerning the accretion of non-Jesus material onto the Jesus and sayings tradition left open the possibility that one might separate those genuine Jesus units from the rest. Bultmann asked whether there might be any criterion—or criteria—by which one could determine the genuineness of a particular logion.⁵⁷ Though he offered no single criterion, by observing tendencies in how sayings were altered and tradition expanded, he derived patterns of transmission, modification, and expansion,

⁵⁷ Bultmann’s question and the criterion he proposed in response anticipated form criticism’s turn toward other criteria of authenticity (Bultmann, *Die Geschichte*, 105; see also *idem*, 157-158).

which he traced into the pre-literary phase of the tradition.⁵⁸ Those sayings that could neither be derived from Jewish proverbial wisdom or prophetic tradition, nor reflected explicit concerns of the later Christian church, were more probably genuine.⁵⁹ Bultmann himself resisted making definitive claims about genuineness, since he was generally skeptical about the possibility of deriving reliable historical information about Jesus of Nazareth from Gospel sources shaped by the post-Easter kerygma, but he raised the question for others to answer.⁶⁰ These earliest applications of form criticism have since

⁵⁸ Bultmann, *Die Geschichte*, 347.

⁵⁹ These distinctive sayings, tended to depict Jesus as a preacher of truthfulness or repentance and the imminent coming kingdom (Bultmann, *Die Geschichte*, 106, 221-222; idem, “The Study of the Synoptic Gospels,” in *Form Criticism: Two Essays on New Testament Research*, rev. ed., trans. Frederick C. Grant [New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1962], 7-76, 60-63)

Bultmann anticipated what would become a key item in later “quests” for the historical Jesus, a criterion of dissimilarity from possible Jewish sources and subsequent Christian communal or theological concerns. On the initial contributions to what would become the criterion of dissimilarity, see, Gerd Theissen and Dagmar Winter, *The Quest for the Plausible Jesus: The Question of Criteria*, trans. M. Eugene Boring (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2002), 1-167, 261-316. For continued use of a criterion of dissimilarity, modified by contemporary emphasis on retaining the historical Jewishness of Jesus, see Meier, *Marginal Jew*, 1:171-174.

⁶⁰ Bultmann’s historical judgments correlate with his theology. His theological writings reflect an existential understanding of the word-event between God and the believer, embodied in Christian preaching and response, but epitomized in the kerygma and words of Jesus, the incarnate Word of God (e.g., Rudolf Bultmann, *Jesus and the Word*, trans. Louise P. Smith and Erminie H. Lantero [New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1934], 8; trans. from *Jesus* [Berlin: Deutsche Bibliothek, 1926]; and idem, *Kerygma and Myth: A Theological Debate*, ed. Hans Werner Bartsch, trans. Reginald H. Fuller [New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1961]).

Bultmann rejected attempts to ground the theological truth of Christianity in historical data typical of the “liberal lives” of Jesus. He famously conceded: “we can now know almost nothing concerning the life and personality of Jesus, since the early Christian sources show no interest in either, are moreover fragmentary and often legendary; and other sources about Jesus do not exist” (Bultmann, *Jesus and the Word*, 8). Rather, according to Bultmann, Christians should focus on Jesus’ work, that is, his distinctive words; but, even these, are seen only through the post-Easter lens of

come under broad critique,⁶¹ but their impact on the subsequent fields of Gospels, Jesus, and sayings scholarship continues to be felt.

Christian kerygma (Bultmann, *Jesus and the Word*, 12-13; idem, “Study of the Synoptic Gospels,” 60-76).

⁶¹ Form criticism was attacked from different angles. Redaction critics and their successors, for example, argued that the early form critics gave the evangelists too little credit as independent authors able to exercise literary and theological intent (e.g., Willi Marxsen, *Der Evangelist Markus: Studien zur Redaktionsgeschichte des Evangeliums*, FRLANT [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1959]; Gunther Bornkamm, *Überlieferung und Auslegung im Matthäusevangelium*, WMANT 1 [Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1961]; and Hans Conzelmann, *Die Mitte der Zeit: Studien zur Theologie des Lukas*, BHT 17 [Tübingen: Mohr, 1964]). Martin Hengel rejected its sharp distinction between Palestinian and Hellenistic Christianity, which growing evidence for Second Temple Judaism has proven to be a prudent judgment (Martin Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in Their Encounter in Palestine during the Early Hellenistic Period*, trans. John Bowden [Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2003]; trans. of *Judentum und Hellenismus, Studien zu ihrer Begegnung unter besonderer Berücksichtigung Palästinas*, 2nd ed., WUNT 10 [Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1973]; also, Larry W. Hurtado, *Lord Jesus Christ: Devotion to Jesus in Earliest Christianity* [Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2003], 23-24; and Christopher Tuckett, “Form Criticism” in *Jesus in Memory: Traditions in Oral and Scribal Perspectives*, ed. Werner Kelber and Samuel S. Byrskog [Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2009], 21-38, 30). Ernst Käsemann had made the same point already in 1953 (“Das Problem des historischen Jesus,” [paper presented at reunion of Marburg alumni, Jugenheim, Germany, 20 October 1953]; repr. *ZTK* 51 [1954]:125-153; repr. in *Jesusforschung in Vier Jahrhunderten: Texte von den Anfängen historischer Kritik bis zur ‘dritten Frage’ nach dem historischen Jesus*, Werner Zager, ed. [Berlin: DeGruyter, 2014], 313-325, 317; Citations are from the Werner Zager edition). Others have taken up orality/aurality studies and raised questions concerning the performance of Jesus traditions that have challenged the idea of a single “original form” (e.g., Werner H. Kelber, *The Oral and Written Gospel: The Hermeneutics of Speaking and Writing in the Synoptic Tradition, Mark, Paul, and Q* [Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1983]; and James D. G. Dunn, *The New Perspective on Jesus: What the Quest for the Historical Jesus Missed* [London: SPCK, 2005], 30). Others, who focused on the role of memory and memorization in the primarily oral culture of Jesus and the evangelists, were critical of form criticism’ as both circular and weak on the mechanics of transmission, as shall be seen below (e.g., Birger Gerhardsson, *Memory and Manuscript: Oral Tradition and Written Transmission in Rabbinic Judaism and Early Christianity*, ASNU 22, trans. Eric J Sharpe [Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1961]; rev. ed. with *Tradition and Transmission in Early Christianity* [Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998], 9-11).

1.2.2 The Criteria Approach to the Sayings Tradition

Many have answered Bultmann's question, reversing his underlying skepticism in order to propose various criteria for determining the pre-Easter authenticity of an individual unit of tradition and to develop a criteria approach to the Jesus tradition in general.⁶² Ernst Käsemann, for example, posited a criterion of dissimilarity, which suggested that those units in which Jesus was differentiated from his compatriots were most likely to be authentic.⁶³ With Käsemann, the idea of applying authenticating criteria

⁶² While the connection between Bultmann's question concerning a criterion and the subsequent criteria approach has long been recognized, Chris Keith has made a point of noting the criteria approach's broader—and, Keith would argue, largely uncritical—indebtedness to form criticism, in particular in the method of separating the texts into discrete units of tradition to be considered apart from their narrative context in order to recover from it some presumably more-authentic element of pre-Gospel tradition (Chris Keith, "The Indebtedness of the Criteria Approach to Form Criticism and Recent Attempts to Rehabilitate the Search for an Authentic Jesus," in *Jesus, Criteria, and the Demise of Authenticity*, ed. Chris Keith and Anthony Le Donne [London: T & T Clark, 2012], 25–70; idem, *Jesus' Literacy: Scribal Culture and the Teacher from Galilee*, LNTS 413 [London: T&T Clark, 2011], 29-40).

⁶³ Ernst Käsemann, "Das Problem," 317.

Käsemann identified the distinctive aspects of Jesus' mission and message as having a dialectical relationship to the law—asking about the will of God while defying the letter of the law (Käsemann, "Das Problem," 318, 317-324). On these grounds Käsemann affirmed the authenticity of the first, second, and fourth antitheses of Matthew's Sermon on the Mount (Matt 5:21-22, 27-28, and 33-35) along with Jesus' treatment of rules concerning Sabbath (Mark 2:23-38) and ritual purity. Contrary to Bultmann, Käsemann insisted that there must be some continuity between Jesus and early Christianity.

Nils Ahlstrup Dahl, in a lecture one year prior (1952) to Käsemann's, made a similar point. He insisted that Jesus must be understood within, not in contrast to, his Second Temple Jewish context ("The Problem of the Historical Jesus," reprinted in *Jesus the Christ: The Historical Origins of Christological Doctrine*, ed. D.J. Jeul [Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991], 81-111).

Emphasis on Jesus' Jewishness contributed to the development of the criterion of coherence, in addition to arguments from dissimilarity (see, Geza Vermes, *Jesus the Jew: A Historian's Reading of the Gospels* [Philadelphia: Fortress, 1973]; E.P. Sanders, *Jesus and Judaism* [London: SCM, 1985]). More recent efforts have attempted to balance Jesus' social distinctiveness and social coherence. Gerd Theissen and Dagmar

to any unit of tradition said to derive from Jesus became the *modus operandi* and spurred renewed scholarly interest in constructing a historical picture of Jesus and the pre-Easter traditions from or about him.

The sayings tradition remained a, if not the, primary object of this approach, and the criteria approach became the primary way in which the sayings tradition was considered. Joachim Jeremias appealed to linguistic features of Aramaic in reconstructing Jesus' own words, pointing to traces of Aramaic vocabulary and syntax in the Greek versions of sayings as indications of probable authenticity.⁶⁴ Norman Perrin employed criteria of dissimilarity, coherence, and multiple attestation.⁶⁵ Only two decades later, the

Winter define this balance as the necessary matter of "historical plausibility" in reconstructing a historical picture of Jesus (Theissen and Winter, *The Quest for the Plausible Jesus*, 172-191; see also Dagmar Winter, "Saving the Quest for Authenticity from the Criterion of Dissimilarity: History and Plausibility," in *Jesus, Criteria, and the Demise of Authenticity*, 25-48).

⁶⁴ E.g., Jeremias, *Die Bergpredigt* (Calwer Hefte 27; Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1959); or idem, *Das Problem des historischen Jesus* (Calwer Hefte 32; Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1960).

For critique of this criterion, see e.g., Stanley E. Porter's work. Based on evidence that some first century Galileans used Greek, Porters argues that Jesus would have spoken Greek in some situations and looks for traces of oral Greek as evidence of authentic Jesus material (Stanley E. Porter, *The Criteria for Authenticity in Historical-Jesus Research: Previous Discussion and New Proposals*, JSNTSup 191 [Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000], 141-164).

⁶⁵ Perrin treated the criterion of dissimilarity as "the fundamental criterion for authenticity upon which all reconstructions of the teaching of Jesus must be built" (Norman Perrin, *Rediscovering the Teaching of Jesus* [New York: Harper & Row, 1967], 39). Perrin agreed that any portrait must fit a first century Jewish setting, which requires an additional criterion of coherence. He also employed a criterion of multiple attestation, but held that it applied more to a larger context than to particular sayings: "It will not often help with specific sayings, but rather with general motifs, and consequently will tend to be more useful in arriving at general characteristics of the ministry and teaching of Jesus than at specific elements in the teaching itself" (idem, 46-47). Perrin's restrained description of its application aligns rather closely with Dale Allison's recently proposed, criterion of recurrent attestation (Dale C. Allison, Jr., *Constructing Jesus: Memory, Imagination, and History* [Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2010]). Allison's proposal, however, came in part from a revised

criteria approach in general had already gained a strong foothold within Jesus scholarship, but with little consensus as to how or which criteria should be applied.⁶⁶ Whichever criteria might be used to test for authenticity, however, by the second half of the 20th century most scholars assumed that one could reasonably recover the “authentic voice” —if not the exact words—of Jesus from our written remains.⁶⁷ The recovery or

understanding of human memory and transmission of tradition but also as a corrective to abuses or over-extensions of Perrin’s criterion of multiple attestation (e.g., John Dominic Crossan, *In Fragments: The Aphorisms of Jesus* [San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1983]; idem, *The Historical Jesus: The Life of a Mediterranean Jewish Peasant* [San Francisco: Harper San Francisco, 1991]; Meier, *Marginal Jew*, 5 vols.).

⁶⁶ In 1987 Dennis Polkow identified as many as twenty-five criteria of authenticity that had been proposed over the previous twenty years or so, many of which were similar in premise but differed in name, all of which were competing for primacy of place among Jesus scholars (Dennis Polkow, “Method and Criteria for Historical Jesus Research,” in *Society of Biblical Literature 1987 Seminar Papers*, ed. Kent H. Richards, SBLSP 26 [Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987], 336-356; citing William O. Walker, “The Quest for the Historical Jesus: A Discussion of Methodology,” *ATR* 51 [1969]: 38-56; N.J. McEleney, “Authenticating Criteria and Mark 7:1-23,” *CBQ* 34 [1972]: 431-460; Robert H. Stein, “The ‘Criteria’ for Authenticity,” in *Gospel Perspectives: Studies of History and Tradition in the Four Gospels*, vol. 1, ed., R. T. France and David Wenham [Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1980], 225-263; James Breech, *The Silence of Jesus: The Authentic Voice of the Authentic Man* [Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1980]; and M. Eugene Boring, “The Historical-Critical Method’s ‘Criteria of Authenticity’: The Beatitudes in Q and Thomas as a Test Case,” *Semeia* 44 [1988]: 9-44). Polkow’s list of criteria has been accused of hair-splitting (Craig A. Evans, *Jesus and His Contemporaries: Comparative Studies*, AGJU 25 [Leiden: Brill, 1995]). It is worth noting, the survey of multiple formulations of dissimilarity reflects expanding scholarly interest in distinguishing “authentic Jesus” from the post-Easter representations of him.

For a bibliography and detailed introduction to the criteria approach, see, e.g., Tom Holmén, “Authenticity Criteria,” in *Encyclopedia of the Historical Jesus*, ed. Craig A. Evans (New York: Routledge, 2010) 43-54; or John P. Meier, “Basic Methodology in the Quest for the Historical Jesus,” in *Handbook for the Study of the Historical Jesus*, ed. Tom Holmén and Stanley E. Porter, 4 vols. (Leiden: Brill, 2010) 1:291-330, 1:310-330.

⁶⁷ This was despite early criticism from some pockets of scholarship. See, e.g., Morna D. Hooker, “Christology and Methodology,” *NTS* 17 (1970): 480-487; and idem, “On Using the Wrong Tool,” *Theology* 75 (1972): 570-581. In her “Foreword” to the *Jesus, Criteria, and the Demise of Authenticity*, Hooker noted that Robin Barbour had offered similar criticisms of the criteria approach (idem, “Foreword: Forty Years on” in

reconstruction of authentic Jesus sayings became the focus of scholarly attention,⁶⁸ and those sayings and sources preserving alternative versions, judged inauthentic, were for the most part discarded.⁶⁹

This approach gained wide public attention in the mid-1980s when Robert Funk organized the Jesus Seminar with a stated goal of achieving a scholarly consensus on the authenticity of the sayings attributed to Jesus in Gospel materials. The Seminar continued the form-critical practice of focusing on individual saying units, to be evaluated apart from their narrative context. Members of the Seminar applied what they referred to as “rules of evidence,” for both written and oral tradition, “in order to determine what [Jesus] really said—not his literal words, perhaps, but the substance and style of his utterances.”⁷⁰ These rules drew on familiar criteria as well as other proposed patterns of

Jesus, Criteria, xiii-xvi; citing Barbour, *Traditio-Historical Criticism of the Gospels* (Studies in Creative Criticism 4; London: SPCK, 1972).

⁶⁸ E.P. Sanders questioned prioritizing of Jesus’ sayings, and began instead with a consideration of Jesus’ deeds. Sanders held that the teacher-Jesus portraits painted by treatments of his words alone did not satisfactorily account for his death by execution, and argued that his deeds better account for his fate (*Jesus and Judaism*, 4, passim). The first three volumes of Meier’s series began with traditions about Jesus and his deeds; volumes 4 and 5 treated Jesus’ teachings and parables, respectively (Meier, *Marginal Jew*).

⁶⁹ Though the criteria approach was rooted in form criticism, in this singular focus on the genuine sayings tradition, it split off from the latter’s broad focus on the role played by life in the community. The transmission of a sayings cluster became interesting to the extent that it could be rewound or traced to its origins in the life of Jesus.

⁷⁰ Robert W. Funk, opening address of the Jesus Seminar (presented to the Jesus Seminar, Berkeley, CA, 21-24 March 1985); repr. as “The Issue of Jesus,” *Foundations & Facets Forum* 1 (March 1985): 7-12. The Seminar did not always maintain this qualification—that they were not determining the *literal words* of Jesus. The same address suggested a more ambitious agenda: “We are going to inquire simply, rigorously after the voice of Jesus, after what he really said,” which returns in the subtitle of an initial report on the seminar’s conclusions, *The Search for the Authentic Words of Jesus*, and other work by members of the group (Robert W. Funk, Roy W.

transmission to determine the most primitive version from a set of variants of a saying.⁷¹

Surveying the whole of the sayings tradition, members of the seminar reduced that material to only the “authentic” words of Jesus.⁷²

Though lacking the spectacle of the Jesus Seminar, John Meier’s treatment of the historical Jesus in *A Marginal Jew*, has been among the most rigorous examples of the

Hoover, and The Jesus Seminar, *The Five Gospels: The Search for the Authentic Words of Jesus* [Sonoma, CA: Polebridge Press, 1993]).

Many of the seminar’s “rules of evidence” are, repurposed rules for transmission, comparable to Dibelius’s laws of transmission. E.g.: “The evangelists frequently group saying and parables in clusters and complexes that did not originate with Jesus”; “The evangelists frequently expand sayings or parables, or provide them with an interpretive overlay or comment”; or “Hard sayings are frequently softened in the process of transmission to adapt them to the conditions of daily living” (Funk, et al, *Five Gospels*, 16-33).

⁷¹ For the saying preserved in Matt 7:7-8 and Luke 11:9-10 (considered in Chp. 3 of this project), for example, the Seminar determined with up to 75% confidence that this was not only the earliest attainable version of the saying but could be attributed as original to Jesus himself. This decision was based on the saying’s attestation in similar forms across multiple sources and its “gross exaggeration and surprising” nature of this aphorism’s radical promise, which the Seminar interpreted using a criterion of dissimilarity or embarrassment and evidence of an as-yet un-softened saying (Funk, et al, *Five Gospels*, 36-37; see also, 155, 328). Those other variants were discarded as less-probably original, in favor of this form, in part because of what had become their common, non-distinctive concern for prayer and trust (Funk, et al, *Five Gospels*, 98-99, 229-230). Possible parallels in the farewell address of John were ruled out with barely a comment, given the view that the fourth Gospel is almost entirely theological (idem, 16, 450-57). The only exceptions were the set of *seek* and *find* aphorisms preserved on three occasions in the Gos. Thom. (2, 92, 94). In each case, the editors explained that, some version of “seek and find” is most likely attributable to Jesus, because “absolute assurances of this type betray the kind of serene confidence Jesus had in the goodness and providence of God,” while the rest of logia 2 and 92 is likely the result of “gnostic” expansion (Funk, et al, *Five Gospels*, 471-472, 521-522).

⁷² Individual members then reassembled words into various “historical” Jesuses, each presented to readers as the singular result of objective questing. The general consensus of seminar members was to “regard Jesus as a secular sage” (Funk, et al, *Five Gospels*, 287). Because they started with the sayings alone, among other criticisms aimed at the Seminar, was that they rendered Jesus a talking head, disembodied from both his historical and narrative contexts (Ben Witherington III, *The Jesus Quest: The Third Search for the Jew of Nazareth* [Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1997], 42-57).

criteria approach.⁷³ Meier outlined the stages through which Jesus tradition originated, was passed along, and took its present shape, and he adopted five “Primary” and five “Secondary (or Dubious)” Criteria from previous scholarship in order to identify the material most likely to have come from the earliest stage(s).⁷⁴ Because the traditions concerning Jesus’ words and deeds “are inextricably bound together in the Gospel traditions,” Meier did not separate these elements but organized his work primarily according to themes within the Jesus tradition.⁷⁵ In keeping with his larger goal of presenting a thoroughly Jewish Jesus of Nazareth, he provided an extensive treatment of the socio-historical context in first century Judaism in addition to the literary context for each unit of tradition that he treats. Therefore unlike much of the previous scholarship of

⁷³ Meier, *A Marginal Jew*, 1:4-6.

Chris Keith has pointed to the disparity between Meier and the Jesus Seminar as evidence that even the near-unanimity in methodological approach characteristic of the so-called “Third Quest” fails to produce consensus concerning the historical Jesus (Keith, “Indebtedness,” 26-27).

⁷⁴ The primary criteria were: embarrassment; discontinuity; multiple attestation; coherence; and, a somewhat more amorphous evaluative standard, something that might plausibly provoke eventual rejection and execution. As more problematic criteria, Meier points to: Aramaic, Palestinian environment, vividness of narration, tendencies of the developing synoptic tradition, and historical presumption. All together, these criteria can serve to discern what can plausibly be attributed to Jesus of Nazareth as well as to sort out possible derivation from later stages in the tradition (Meier, *Marginal Jew*, 1:167-195; or idem, “Basic Methodology,” 310-330). Neither Meier’s criteria nor his application of them is particularly innovative, rather he presents what he considers the best arguments for a particular approach that is already in the literature. On Meier’s continued commitment to this basic methodology over the past quarter century, see Meier, *Marginal Jew*, 5:12-21.

⁷⁵ Meier, *Marginal Jew*, 3:451.

Meier’s most recent volumes deal almost exclusively with sayings traditions, Torah interpretation and love commands in *Marginal Jew* volume 4 and the parables in volume 5. A rigorous application of methodological skepticism leaves him unwilling to accept most parables as “authentic Jesus” tradition, though he classifies a larger number as possible, but lacking good evidence.

sayings material, Meier does provide considerable discussion of the existing variants of sayings that he does not think derive from Jesus himself, and offers a useful model of how to apply the criteria approach without wholly neglecting the variants of the tradition.

Nearly from their introduction the criteria have faced some criticism over their idiosyncracies and inefficacy as historiographical tools.⁷⁶ Even at its best, there are, according to some critics, flaws in the logic of the criteria approach, both at the level of its individual criteria and the underlying premises of the approach as a whole. To the former, the subjectivity, modern critical bias, and exceptionalism of individual criteria have made them the target of numerous attacks.⁷⁷ To the latter, some scholars have made the case that, even if an agreed upon set of criteria were universally accepted as viable according to disinterested, historical parameters—which they are not—they still could not guarantee objective results so long as scholars then reconstruct, from the minimal,

⁷⁶ See, e.g., Morna D. Hooker's 1970 and 1972 articles, "Christology and Methodology" and "On Using the Wrong Tool."

⁷⁷ A number of problems continue to be raised about these criteria. In a recent volume aimed in part at identifying the weaknesses of the criteria approach, for example, Mark Goodacre has criticized the arbitrary nature of the criterion of multiple attestation, Rafael Rodriguez has pointed out the culturally-specific nature of "embarrassment" (a common sub-category of dissimilarity), and Anthony Le Donne has associated "coherence" with a broader criticism of the binary assumptions behind the criteria approach in Chris Keith and LeDonne's volume, *Jesus, Criteria, and the Demise of Authenticity* (Mark Goodacre, "Criticizing the Criterion of Multiple Attestation: The Historical Jesus and the Question of Sources," 152-169; Rafael Rodriguez, "The Embarrassing Truth about Jesus: The Criterion of Embarrassment and the Failure of Historical Authenticity," 132-151; Anthony Le Donne, "The Criterion of Coherence: Its Development, Inevitability, and Historiographical Limitations," 95-114). Other critiques of the criteria approach can be found in: Dale C. Allison, *Constructing Jesus*; James G. Crossley, "Writing about the Historical Jesus: Historical Explanation and 'the Big Why Questions', or Antiquarian Empiricism and Victorian Tomes?" *JSHJ* 7 (2009): 63-90; and W.J. Lyons, "A Prophet Is Rejected in His Home Town (Mark 6.4 and Parallels): A Study in the Methodological (In)Consistency of the Jesus Seminar," *JSHJ* 6 (2008): 59-84.

authentic kernel, their own positivist portraits of Jesus.⁷⁸ Others, however, have argued that to try to sort the Gospels and Q, or any sources of the sayings tradition, into “authentic” and “inauthentic” piles, is to fundamentally misunderstand what these sources are and how they reflect and preserve the past. The sum of these arguments against the criteria approach means that it is not, as Dale Allison has put it, “that this or that criterion is problematic or needs to be fine-tuned, but rather that the whole idea of applying criteria to individual items to recover the Jesus of history is a problematic endeavor.”⁷⁹

Nevertheless, the criteria approach has persisted as the dominant strain of scholarship to have grown out of form criticism of the Gospels. And, as the criteria approach has continued to dominate Jesus and sayings scholarship, the sayings tradition has continued to be evaluated primarily according to the criteria approach. This work operates under the assumption, inherited from form criticism, that the Gospels contain, side by side, earlier and later, authentic and inauthentic, material, and that, with the right methodological tools, one could and should separate out those parts. For early form criticism this meant primarily identifying those pre-literary oral traditions to be situated in the life of the early Church. For practitioners of the criteria approach this has meant

⁷⁸ The critique of the situation, that each scholar looking for the historical Jesus ends up finding a figure who looks rather like him/herself and rather unlike Jesus, has long been described by the metaphor of the scholar, peering down the deep well of history only to see himself, which remains as apt today as it was roughly a century ago. Though often attributed to Albert Schweitzer, it was in fact coined by George Tyrrell (*Christianity at the Crossroads* [London: George Allen & Unwin, 1909], 44). Elizabeth Schüssler Fiorenza applied this critique to her contemporaries, with historical positivists on one side and theological fideist positivists on the other (“Jesus and the Politics of Interpretation,” *Harvard Theological Review* 90 [1997]: 343-58).

⁷⁹ Dale C. Allison, “The Historians’ Jesus and the Church,” in *Seeking the Identity of Jesus: A Pilgrimage* (ed. Beverly Roberts Gaventa and Richard B. Hays; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2008), 80.

isolating those pre-Easter sayings that could be placed on the lips of Jesus. These methods have kept the sayings tradition at the forefront of Jesus and Gospel scholarship, but have offered a relatively limited perspective on its value.

1.3 Studies of Memory and the Sayings Tradition

In the mid-twentieth century many scholars were insisting that form critics had not paid enough attention to possible continuity between the post-Easter sayings tradition and its pre-Easter origins.⁸⁰ While those considered above responded by developing criteria meant to see through that gap, others argued that more attention needed to be paid to the actual processes and mechanics of transmission. Among the latter, many saw *memory* as the key to those processes. Memory had previously been implicitly involved in scholarly debates over laws of transmission, oral sources, or the general reliability of the Gospels, but these scholars brought the consideration of memory and its role in the transmission of the sayings to the fore. Initially they looked to evidence from other predominantly oral cultures in order to understand the working of intentional memorization and natural memory in the transmission of material. More recently, however, some scholars have sought to integrate findings from cognitive psychology and the social sciences into historical studies, in order to understand better the capacity and

⁸⁰ Already in the early 1930s Vincent Taylor had critiqued this oversight in the works of Dibelius and Bultmann and other historically skeptical form critics. Their hypotheses concerning the anonymous transmission of tradition according to certain laws and the needs of the kerygmatic Church, Taylor argued, ignored the ongoing presence of the disciples and other eyewitnesses to Jesus in that early Church. Eyewitnesses, according to Taylor, safeguarded the accuracy of the pre-Easter tradition for the post-Easter church, and made Bultmann and Dibelius's models impossible (Vincent Taylor, *The Formation of the Gospel Tradition: Eight Lectures* [London: Macmillan & Co. Ltd., 1933], esp. 38-43, 168-189, https://archive.org/details/MN41444ucmf_3). In both his criticisms and his attention to the role of eyewitness, Taylor anticipated moves that would be made again by others after him, also attempting to account for continuity between Jesus and the movement founded after him.

limitations of individual as well as collective and cultural memory. By thinking about the Gospels and sayings tradition as products of “social memory,” as it has come to be known, these scholars have challenged both previous thinking concerning memory and the criteria approach to recovering “authentic” Jesus sayings.

1.3.1 Memorization, Memory, and the Sayings Tradition

In the second half of the twentieth century, the so-called Scandinavian School turned to the role of memory in the transmission of the sayings tradition, challenging form criticism’s historical skepticism with an alternate account of how oral forms of Jesus tradition originated and were transmitted. They argued that oral teaching was proclaimed and received in settings that fostered accurate memorization, and, therefore, that the sayings tradition is a generally reliable representation of Jesus’ authentic words. Harald Riesenfeld, for example, compared the transmission of the sayings tradition to both prophetic discourses in the Hebrew Bible and rabbinic material, and posited that the transmission of such words was carefully controlled, limited both in how and to whom they were shared. The same, he held, would have been true of the words of Jesus.⁸¹ Jesus’ teachings were “memorized and recited as holy word.”⁸² The sayings tradition was so

⁸¹ Harald Riesenfeld first presented these ideas in a paper at the Congress on the Four Gospels, held in Oxford on September 16, 1957, and they were published as: Riesenfeld, *The Gospel Tradition and Its Beginnings: A Study in the Limits of Formgeschichte*, 2nd ed (London: A. R. Mowbray, 1961); and *idem*, “The Gospel Tradition and Its Beginnings,” in *The Gospel Tradition: Essays*, ed. Harald Riesenfeld, trans. E. Margaret Rowley and Robert A. Kraft (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1970), 1-29.

⁸² Riesenfeld, “Gospel Tradition,” 26.

carefully transmitted from the start that when Jesus' words were written down, they represented the actual teaching of Jesus himself.⁸³

Birger Gerhardsson expanded Riesenfeld's initial thesis.⁸⁴ The early Church, he argued, was "both ordered and organized, and...recognized some men—and not others—as doctrinal authorities."⁸⁵ He developed Riesenfeld's suggestion that the methods and organizational structure of the early Church were similar to those of rabbinic Judaism, with a multi-tiered educational system based on a foundation of strict memorization.⁸⁶ From his reading of the rabbinic evidence Gerhardsson determined that at all levels the "text"—even that which was only ever oral—was transmitted with utmost faithfulness, because its words themselves were sacred. In the same vein, Gerhardsson argued, the disciples would have received and transmitted the words of Jesus with the trained

⁸³ Riesenfeld, "Gospel Tradition," 26-29. See also, *idem*, "Observations on the Question of the Self-Consciousness of Jesus," *SEA* 25 (1960): 23-36.

⁸⁴ Birger Gerhardsson, *Memory and Manuscript: Oral Tradition and Written Transmission in Rabbinic Judaism and Early Christianity*, ASNU 22, trans. Eric J Sharpe, (Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1961), 324; *idem*, rev. ed. with *Tradition and Transmission in Early Christianity* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998). Citations are from the first edition unless otherwise noted.

⁸⁵ Gerhardsson was particularly critical of Dibelius's and Bultmann's descriptions of a primarily charismatic and uneducated early Church leadership structure and followed what he described as an "extremely important reorientation," concerning the organization and intentionality of the earliest Church, effected by Schmidt (Gerhardsson, *Memory and Manuscript*, 12; with reference to Karl Ludwig Schmidt, *Die Kirche des Urchristentums: Eine lexicographische und biblisch-theologische Studie* [Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1927], 259-262).

⁸⁶ Gerhardsson, *Memory and Manuscript*, 122-170; *idem.*, *Tradition and Transmission in Early Christianity*, ConBNT 20, trans. Eric J. Sharpe (Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1964), 16-21.

Gerhardsson's reliance on rabbinic evidence was a major vulnerability of this work. Morton Smith was among the first to point out this anachronism (Morton Smith, review of *Memory and Manuscript*, by Birger Gerhardsson, *JBL* 82 [1963]: 169-176; and *idem*, "A Comparison of Early Christian and Early Rabbinic Tradition," *JBL* 82 [1963], 169-176).

attention and reverence befitting the sacred words of their teacher-Messiah.⁸⁷ Jesus had formed the Twelve as an authoritative circle of leadership that assured the accurate transmission of the tradition. In the decades following his death, resurrection and ascension, they became a collegium of apostles in residence in Jerusalem.⁸⁸ The model allowed some room for adaptation on the part of official tradents, but it assumed the generally accurate transmission of the authentic pre-Easter teaching of Jesus.⁸⁹

Excursus: Memory and the *Ars Memoriae*

Memory was initially introduced to Jesus and sayings scholarship as the memorization and precise recall of a set corpus of material. This understanding of

⁸⁷ Gerhardsson, *Memory and Manuscript*, 326-328. “Since Jesus was considered to be the Messiah, the ‘only’ teacher (Matt. 23.10), his sayings must have been accorded even greater authority and sanctity than that accorded by the Rabbis’ disciples to the words of their teachers...the Jesus-tradition in the early Christian documents is *isolated* from the sayings of other authorities; this shows it had a distinctive position among early Christian doctrinal authorities, a particular dignity,” (*idem*, 332-333, emphasis original).

⁸⁸ Gerhardsson, *Memory and Manuscript*, 329-331.

⁸⁹ Gerhardsson’s hypothesis faced a great deal of criticism. Critics maintained that rabbinic model of later centuries should not be applied uncritically to the early 1st century, the preserved traditions do not support the suggestion that Jesus and/or his disciples had such elite training as was available in 2nd temple Judaism, and the variance in clusters of tradition between gospels attests to greater fluidity than Gerhardsson’s controlled process would allow (e.g., Smith, review of *Memory and Manuscript*; *idem*, “A Comparison of Early Christian and Early Rabbinic Tradition”; Ernst Käsemann, review of *Memory and Manuscript*, *VuF* 8 [1963]: 85-87); and Joseph Fitzmyer, review of *Memory and Manuscript*, *TS* 23 [1962]: 442-457; Werner Kelber, *The Oral and Written Gospel*, 14; Martin Hengel, *The Charismatic Leader and His Followers*, trans. James Grieb [Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1968; repr. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2005], 53-57; and Jens Schröter, *Erinnerung an Jesu Worte: Studien zur Rezeption der Logienüberlieferung in Markus, Q und Thomas*, WMANT 76 [Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1997], 29-30).

However, some scholars welcome Gerhardsson’s challenges to what they consider excessive skepticism on the part of form criticism (e.g. W.D. Davies, *The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1966], 480).

memory was based on a historical model drawn from the early rabbis. Gerhardsson's analysis of rabbinical writings on the matter attest to a model of memory-based, progressive stages of literacy education. The *bet sefer* was a primary school of sorts, devoted to the elementary tasks of teaching pupils how to read and memorize the written Torah, so that even when reading aloud from a written text the pupil would know it as if by heart.⁹⁰ Students and teachers would use various strategies including rote memorization, mnemonic devices and written notes, abridgement of the text into short segments marked by "pregnant" titles or keywords, and the use of rhythm and cantillation, to aid in the precise memorization and repetition of large bodies of "text" Only by demonstrating proficiency in the tasks of reading and memorizing written Torah precisely at the *bet sefer* could the qualified student then graduate on through the various levels of the *bet midrash*, which would again begin with memorization and then incorporate higher levels of training, including interpretation and, for the most capable students, expansion of oral Torah.⁹¹ Few would advance to the stage of

⁹⁰ The origin, popularity, and public nature of these schools are a matter of some debate. According to some rabbinic tradition, such schools existed in large numbers even before the fall of the Second Temple (see, e.g., b. B. Bat. 21a; y. Meg. 3.1, 73d; b. Ket. 105b; b. Git. 58a; Gerhardsson, *Memory and Manuscript*, 58-61). Even if, as Catherine Hezser has suggested, such statements are likely both hyperbolic and anachronistic concerning the Tannaitic period, it is possible they do more accurately reflect the experience of later rabbis (Catherine Hezser, *Jewish Literacy in Roman Palestine*, TSAJ 81 [Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001], 37-67). Even if they exaggerated aspects of the prevalence of elementary education, the rabbis likely reflect accurately the general procedure by which they and others learned.

Gerhardsson cites evidence for teachers at this level and others testing children's memorization of certain passages: e.g., b. Git. 56a, 68a; b. Hag. 15ab (Gerhardsson, *Memory and Manuscript*, 64).

⁹¹ Gerhardsson, *Memory and Manuscript*, 85-112. Gerhardsson offers mostly rabbinic evidence for a Jewish model of education that parallels the Roman or Greco-

offering their own, creative contributions to *Talmud*, and yet, the rabbis were critical of those who might be satisfied remaining at the lower, merely mechanical memory-as-memorization alone, levels of education.⁹² Competency at each stage authorized the pupil's participation in the next, and served as a sort of membership card into an increasingly elite group of proven scholars.

The early rabbis, however, were not unique, either in their tiered approach to literacy education, or in their strategies for aiding memorization. Among the oldest and most widely circulated stories on the topic of memory and human capacity to harness it is that of the Simonides of Ceos's fortunate discovery of the

Roman rhetorical model of memorization as the foundation for interpretation and expansion described above. Others have found evidence for a similarly progressive educational system among the Covenanter community, represented by the Dead Sea Scrolls. Steven Fraade, for example, has noted how, according to the Rule of the Congregation, the Covenanter community "defined its elect identity, at least in part, in terms of its ongoing activity of study," whereby individuals would participate in a process of learning from childhood onwards, receiving instruction and progressing in order to join the congregation of holiness (1 QSa 1:6-8; Steven Fraade, "Interpretive Authority in the Studying Community at Qumran," *JJS* 44 [1993]: 46-69, 53). Hezser offers the further comment that "members seem to have been admitted, upgraded and downgraded on the basis of their knowledge" (Hezser, *Jewish Literacy*, 47, n. 57).

David McLain Carr (*Writing on the Tablet of the Heart: Origins of Scripture and Literature* [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005]) and Martin S. Jaffee (*Torah in the Mouth: Writing and Oral Tradition in Palestinian Judaism, 200-400 CE* [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001]) have further discussed the role of memorization in the transmission of oral Torah, and the relationship between oral and written Torah. Carr emphasizes the role of written materials as primarily supportive to memorization and enculturation into elite educated segments of various ancient societies (Mesopotamian, Egyptian, Greek, and Israelite). Jaffee describes a later transition to prioritizing oral tradition, "Torah in the Mouth," within early Rabbinism.

⁹² Gerhardsson, *Memory and Manuscript*, 101-108; and Chris Keith, *The Pericope Adulterae, the Gospel of John, and the Literacy of Jesus*, NTTS 38 (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 104. Both refer to b. Sot. 22a, several sayings of which discuss the *tana'im* or *shana'im* who, though considered to possess knowledge equal to baskets full of books, are nonetheless criticized for their merely mechanical repeating of the Scriptures and the Mishnah without understanding them. The *tana*, then, need not understand what he says; he may have an excellent memory but lack the capacity for higher scholarship. See also b. Meg. 26b.

ars memoriae at an otherwise unfortunate dinner party.⁹³ As related by Cicero in *de Oratore*, after the tragic collapse of a full banquet hall, Simonides, a Greek lyric poet of the early classical era, “was enabled by his recollection of the place in which each of [the guests] had been reclining at table to identify them for separate interment.”⁹⁴ He later developed this association of remembered content with specific locations (*loci*) as a tool by which one might cultivate the memory to be able to recall and reproduce certain sets of information.⁹⁵ Cicero and other rhetoricians applied this *method of loci* to be able to retain and recall the texts of memorized speeches, as precisely as if they were reading them a wax tablet.⁹⁶ While examples like the rhapsodes, who competed at reciting lines, books, and works of Homer, are frequently cited as evidence of the ability for memorization and precise recall within predominantly oral cultures, such performer-poets were the equivalent of Olympic athletes of memorization, possessing extraordinary skill but using it for a narrow purpose.⁹⁷ For most individuals who engaged in the

⁹³ Cicero described Simonides’s discovery of the “science of mnemonics” (*ars memoriae*), alternatively translated as the art of memory, in his *De oratore* in 55 BCE (*De or.* II, 350-354 [E. W. Sutton and H. Rackham, LCL]). Several decades earlier, an anonymous author described the resulting technique, the method of loci, in *Rhetorica ad Herennium* and categorized it again as part of the art of memory, as distinguished from the natural memory (*Rhet. Her.* III, 16-24 [Harry Caplan, LCL]).

⁹⁴ *De or.* II, 86, 352-353 (Sutton and Rackham, LCL).

⁹⁵ *De or.* II, 86, 354.

⁹⁶ *De or.* II, 86, 354; *Rhet. Her.* III, 16-18. Both use the analogy of writing on a wax tablet, which had been a common one for memory in general, since at least the time of Plato (*De or.* II, 8, 354; see, e.g.: Plato, *Theaet.* 191c-d; idem 194 c-195 a; Aristotle, *Mem. rem.* 449 b-450 b).

⁹⁷ See, e.g., Craig S. Keener’s familiar claim that “Like some other societies, the ancient Mediterranean world highly prized oral memory,” which he defends by pointing to bards and other professionals, as well as even a group of people who no longer were able to speak Greek, being able to recite Homer by heart. Likewise, Keener notes, Seneca

method of loci and other mnemotechniques, strict memorization was just the first step toward broader literacy training and education.

Quintilian, first century CE Roman rhetor and teacher of rhetoric, spoke to this in his *Institutio Oratoria*, a manual for the education of forensic rhetoricians but also literate pupils in general. He described memory as the essential foundation of all intellectual labor, for which memorization is the most elementary step.⁹⁸ But memorization and the resulting “imitation alone is not sufficient, if only for the reason that a sluggish nature is only too ready to rest

the Elder lauded his own capacity for memorization and those of others with whom he had come in contact (Craig S. Keener, *The Historical Jesus of the Gospels* [Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2009], 140-141, 145-146). Keener cites as evidence: Xenophon, *Symp.* 3.5-6; Dio Chrysostom, *Or.* 36.9; Seneca (the Elder), *Controv.* passim, e.g., 1. pref. 2 and 19; and Philostratus, *Vit. soph.* 1.11.495. Though Keener acknowledges that those cited are examples of exceptional memories, they are yet provided as evidence of general capacity for memorization in oral culture.

Concerning the rhapsodes in particular, however, Keener notes that “intellectuals generally regarded these bards as low-class, engaging in an elementary exercise,” (Keener, *Historical Jesus*, 141; who cites Martin Litchfield West, “Rhapsodes,” *Oxford Classical Dictionary*, 3rd ed. [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996], 1311-1312). See, e.g., the conversation in Xenophon’s *Symposium* in which, a man who takes pride in his having memorized all of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* is humbled by the fact that even rhapsodes, the silliest of all tribes, can do that but do not understand the poems’ meaning (Xenophon, *Symp.* 3.5-6).

⁹⁸ *Inst.* XI, 2, 1 (Donald A. Russell, LCL).

According to Quintilian, as soon as a boy is able to speak, his teacher should assess his natural capacity for memorization and begin with him the task of memorizing short narratives precisely, both backward and forward, without extemporizing, lest he develop the bad habits of a premature confidence (*Inst.* I, 3, 1; II, 4, 15). He should then begin memorizing and delivering speeches exactly as if he were declaiming, still only ever imitating the noble examples whose work and ideas are worth emulating, since education was understood as a moral as well as an intellectual pursuit (*Inst.* I, 10, 12-14; X, 1, 20; X, 2, 1). As Russell notes in his introduction to Book XI, Quintilian promoted an “ideal of the orator as *vir bonus* and not simply a technician” (Donald A. Russell, “Introduction,” in *The Orator’s Education, Volume V: Books 11-12*, ed. Russell, LCL 494 [Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2002], 3-4).

content with the inventions of others.”⁹⁹ Rather, by memorizing and imitating others, a student proves himself worthy of being allowed to *interpret* these same works, starting small with fables or aphorisms or short chriae, as he learns to analyze the verses and vocabulary, possibly even to translate them into another language or paraphrase them into his own.¹⁰⁰ If the first step is memorization, then, the second might be identified as interpretation, or memorization *ad res* rather than *ad verba*.¹⁰¹ Finally, mastery of the first two allows for—or authorizes—one’s own expansion or composition.¹⁰² Even for the youngest students and at the smallest scale, according to the *Institutio*, this memorization-interpretation-expansion model is the process by which one is authorized to compose, while lesser students should and do inevitably stop short of producing their own works. This was true not only for the forensic rhetorical world of Rome and its oratorical elite, but also for the compositionally-literate population of the Roman era.¹⁰³ This understanding of memory as memorization, interpretation, and

⁹⁹ *Inst.* X, 2, 4.

The qualified pupil is, in fact, obligated to move beyond mere memorization and imitation, as this is the only way for him to improve. A pupil’s imitation will always be inferior to the rhetorician’s original, and the pupil’s development will be arrested if he does not use imitation as a springboard for his own interpretation and composition (e.g., *Inst.* X, 2, 9-10)

¹⁰⁰ *Inst.* I, 9; see also, Theon, *Progymnasmata* 1.93-171.

¹⁰¹ E.g., *Inst.* I, 8, 18-19; XI, 2, 44-45.

¹⁰² *Inst.* I, 9

¹⁰³ “Compositionally literate population” refers to those whose capacity for both reading and writing would allow them to draw upon and manipulate known units of written and oral information, to rearrange and incorporate them into new text, and to author original text for a specific audience and purpose. This definition draws from Rafaella Cribiore’s helpful taxonomy of writing competencies (Rafaella Cribiore, *Writing, Teachers, and Students in Graeco-Roman Egypt*, ASP 36 [Atlanta: Scholars

expansion, informed, for example, the thinking and work of the author of the Apocryphon of James, to be considered in Chapter 4.

Press, 1996]; see also idem, *Gymnastics of the Mind: Greek Education in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt* [Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001]). Though Criboire and others have noted that reading and writing were separate skills, which were acquired at different stages in literacy training, development of the latter was always subsequent to and dependent on development of the former. Criboire emphasizes that only a proficient and privileged few would progress through all education levels and, ultimately, be able to compose original text.

For further discussion of the levels of literacy and the presumed authority granted to those who possessed them, in particular the highest level of authority associated with compositional writing, see, e.g., the treatment and bibliography of Chris Keith, *The Pericope Adulterae*, 53-94, who, in trying to establish the likely literacy level of Jesus, presents a useful introduction to relevant literacy scholarship in general, particularly the spectrum of literate skills and the relationship between literacy and textuality; William V. Harris, *Ancient Literacy* (Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press, 1989), 3-41, who established the oft-repeated ten percent literacy rate of the ancient world, but also suggested that literacy ought to be understood as a multi-dimensional spectrum involving combinations of reading and writing skills rather than a dichotomy between “literate” and “illiterate”; and Robin Lane Fox, “Literacy and Power in Early Christianity,” in *Literacy and Power in the Ancient World*, ed. Alan K. Bowman and Greg Woolfe (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 126-148, who suggests, against claims to exceptional book production and widespread literacy among early Christians, that, though literacy rates may not have been greater in Christian circles than in the population as a whole, “Literacy joins virginity, martyrdom and poverty on that new and important scale, the double standard between good and less-than-ordinary practice” (idem, 146).

Mary Carruthers affirms the general pattern of *memorize, interpret, compose* and has traced similar phenomena all the way through the medieval period but also to these ancient roots. She identifies among the *ars memorativa* the way in which this memorized authoritative material would be incorporated into composition. The *auctor* of an authoritative text, she claims, is the one who is conversant in such authorities, having them at his ready disposal and indicating his truly adroit fluency through his ability to paraphrase and rewrite even more so than his ability to cite. She considers, for example, Julius Victor, a fourth century writer on rhetoric who drew on both Cicero and Quintilian and wrote: “Memory is the secure perception [literally ‘gathering together’] in the soul of words and themes *for composition*” (*Ars rhetorica*, cap. 23; as cited and glossed by Mary Carruthers, *The Book of Memory: A Study of Memory in Medieval Culture*, Cambridge Studies in Medieval Literature 10 [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990], 85, 309 n. 19, emphasis added]). According to Carruthers, Julius Victor quotes *De oratore* I, 18 “to the effect that memory is a treasure-house (‘thesaurus’) of everything an orator needs, safe custodian of the *verba* and *res* required in thought and invention” (Carruthers, *Book of Memory*, 85).

While memory was first introduced to Jesus studies as, strictly memorization, a means of ensuring accurate transmission of Jesus' sayings, Gerhardsson's description of a rabbinic model was not only anachronistic and demographically inappropriate for Jesus and the first apostles, it also underestimated the creativity that would have been implied as part of the *ars memoriae*.

Rainer Riesner in his *Jesus als Lehrer* and Samuel Byrskog in his *Jesus the Only Teacher* continued to affirm the essential reliability of memory in the transmission of Jesus traditions. Both followed Gerhardsson in focusing on Jesus's role as a teacher, whose didactic and personal authority demanded faithful preservation of his teachings by his followers.¹⁰⁴ In a later work, *Story as History—History as Story*, Byrskog emphasized

¹⁰⁴ Riesner concluded that the Gospels' records of Jesus' teaching are generally reliable because Jesus would have presented his teaching in an intentionally memorizable way, and his audience would have recognized his prophetic and messianic authority (Rainer Riesner, *Jesus als Lehrer: Eine Untersuchung zum Ursprung der Evangelien-Überlieferung*, WUNT 2.7 [Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1981; 4th ed., 1994]; idem, "Jüdische Elementarbildung und Evangelienüberlieferung," in *Gospel Perspectives*, 209-23; and idem, "Jesus as Preacher and Teacher," in *Jesus and the Oral Gospel Tradition*, ed. Henry Wansbrough, JSNTSup 64 [Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991], 185-210).

Byrskog pointed to the formulation in Matt 23:8 (...Εἷς γὰρ ἐστὶν ὑμῶν ὁ διδάσκαλος...) and its use in the church fathers (e.g., Ign. *Eph.* 15:1 and *Magn.* 9:1) and sought to explain Jesus' unique authority as teacher within the early Christian, specifically Matthean, community. Byrskog considered examples within Jewish literature and tradition where certain figures' or their teachings' were regarded as having particular didactic authority (e.g., Hebrew prophets, ben Sirach, the Teacher of Righteousness, and prominent rabbis). From these, he drew three primary motivations for the preservation of tradition about a teacher or a teaching: the teaching's inherent value, the teacher's inherent value and authority, or the value and authority associated with labels applied to the teaching or teacher over time. Byrskog observed evidence for all three of these motivating characteristics in the traditions about Jesus' teaching, Jesus himself, and the labels that came to be applied to both in the Gospel of Matthew (e.g., καθηγητής and ἐξουσία). These motivating factors guarantee the reliability of the transmission process and the Matthean record of Jesus' sayings. According to Byrskog,

autopsy, that is, eyewitness testimony, as the safeguard for the accurate transmission of oral history.¹⁰⁵ Even if they were not operating in a formal school-like setting, certain designated individuals among Jesus' earliest followers acted as eyewitness informants and safeguards who remembered his words and assured the reliability of the developing sayings tradition.¹⁰⁶ According to Byrskog, not only the trained memories of experts but even the untrained memories of everyday witnesses and the communities they formed were generally trustworthy in their accurate recall and reproduction of the sayings tradition.

James Dunn similarly emphasized the reliability of memory in the transmission of sayings tradition, without positing a formal academic setting for that transmission.¹⁰⁷

though early Christian prophets may have introduced new sayings into the oral tradition, the aim was to preserve and “Matthew did apparently not allow [these new sayings] to enter into the Jesus tradition as pre-Easter Jesus-sayings” (Samuel Byrskog, *Jesus the Only Teacher: Didactic Authority and Transmission in Ancient Israel, Ancient Judaism and the Matthean Community*, ConBNT 24 [Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1994], 360, *passim*).

¹⁰⁵ Samuel Byrskog, *Story as History—History as Story: The Gospel Tradition in the Context of Ancient Oral History*, WUNT 123 (Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 2000).

Taylor had posited “eyewitnesses” as the guarantors of tradition nearly seventy years before (Taylor, *Formation of the Gospel Tradition*, 38-43), but Byrskog developed this idea and supported it with a consideration of the role of eyewitness testimony both in the Gospels and elsewhere in Greco-Roman historiography.

¹⁰⁶ Samuel Byrskog, *Story as History*, 69. Byrskog recognized that eyewitness testimony was not simply factual recall, but, like oral history, involved a subjective filtering or interpretation of the past. Nevertheless, for the evangelists, whom Byrskog views as primarily historians, this was eyewitness testimony was the ideal source for information concerning the past. Not only did the evangelists write the eyewitnesses' stories but they included these eyewitnesses as characters in the narratives, further assuring the stories' reliability.

¹⁰⁷ E.g., James D.G. Dunn, *Jesus Remembered*; *idem*, *The Oral Gospel Tradition*; *idem*, “On History, Memory and Eyewitnesses: In Response to Bengt Holmberg and Samuel Byrskog,” *JSNT* 26 [2004]: 473-487).

Whereas the Scandinavian School relied primarily on ancient models as evidence for their proposals concerning the role of memory in the transmission of tradition, Dunn employed Kenneth Bailey's observations concerning oral transmission of tradition in the modern Middle East as a model for understanding the role of memory in predominantly oral communities.¹⁰⁸ Drawing on Bailey's work, Dunn described an informal setting but relatively controlled content for the sayings tradition. Bailey had claimed that, even in informal settings, certain forms, like proverbs and poems, tended to be reliably preserved, with no flexibility in transmission; others, like parables, were transmitted with some flexibility; while still others, like jokes or casual news, were transmitted with a great deal of flexibility.¹⁰⁹ In this way, Bailey had attempted to explain both the stability and the

In reviewing Dunn's *Jesus Remembered*, Byrskog pointed out its indebtedness to the Scandinavian School (Samuel Byrskog, "A New Perspective on the Jesus Tradition: Reflections on James D.G. Dunn's *Jesus Remembered*," *JSNT* 26.4 [2004]: 459-471), a fact that Dunn acknowledges in his response (Dunn, "On History," esp. 479-483)

¹⁰⁸ Kenneth Bailey ("Informal Controlled Oral Tradition and the Synoptic Gospels," *AJT* 5 [1991]: 34-54; repr. *Themelios* 20.2 [1995]: 4-11). Bailey, it has been noted, was not a trained anthropologist or ethnographer but a minister and professor of New Testament who lived in several countries in the Middle East for approximately forty years (Theodore Weeden, "Kenneth Bailey's Theory of Oral Tradition: A Theory Contested by its Evidence," *JSHJ* 7 [2009]: 3-43; cited by John S. Kloppenborg, "Memory, Performance, and the Sayings of Jesus," *JSHJ* 10 [2012]: 97-132, 112-117). During this time, Bailey made observations concerning the predominantly oral culture of those around him. From these he described settings of oral transmission as either formal or informal, and the content of oral transmission as either uncontrolled or controlled. Bailey proposed that, for most of Jesus' sayings, the primary setting of transmission was informal yet, to some degree, controlled; Dunn followed this proposal (e.g., *Jesus Remembered*, 205-210; *Oral Gospel Tradition*, 248-264).

¹⁰⁹ Bailey, "Informal Controlled," *AJT*, 33, 42-45. The "control" or "flexibility" depended primarily on the form of the saying but also the centrality of its content to the community's identity-forming narrative, and was determined from the originating instance of the saying.

Subsequently, Theodore Weeden has reexamined Bailey's argument and evidence and found far greater variation in the oral traditions than Bailey reported or than his model suggests. Even in cases where Weeden could observe the effect of

flexibility of the sayings tradition. Dunn focused on control, in the core elements of the Gospel and sayings traditions, while also accounting for the flexibility in what he considered to be its non-essential elements.¹¹⁰

Dunn, like Byrskog, moved scholarship away from an understanding of memory as primarily the product of rigorous training and formal attention, and toward an appreciation of everyday memory as a natural part of all—but especially predominantly oral—cultures. In doing so, they continued to emphasize the general reliability of memory even as they also, to various limited extents, admitted its fallibility.¹¹¹ Others, however, have drawn on research from the cognitive sciences to revise that notion. Dale Allison, for example, employed primarily psychological observations about memory to investigate the types of variation or “error” one might expect to find in the Jesus tradition. Human memory generally fails at recalling details, like the exact wording of a saying or

“control” providing fixity to the transmission of an oral tradition, the tradition was not controlled by the originating saying or experience but by the community’s need in its transmission (Weeden, “Kenneth Bailey’s Theory,” 3-43). Despite this, Dunn has defended Bailey’s work and his reliance upon it in part by pointing out the existence of multiple “originals” in oral tradition (James D. G. Dunn, “Kenneth Bailey’s Theory of Oral Tradition: Critiquing Theodore Weeden’s Critique,” *JSHJ* 7 [2009]: 44-62, 52). Both Bailey and Weeden’s readings of oral tradition have been reevaluated by T.M. Derico in light of his own ethnographic fieldwork concerning oral tradition in present-day Jordan (*Oral Tradition and Synoptic Verbal Agreement: Evaluating the Empirical Evidence for Literary Dependence* [Eugene, OR: Pickwick Publications, 2016], 63-114).

¹¹⁰ Dunn, “Jesus in Oral Memory: The Initial Stages of the Jesus Tradition,” in *Jesus: A Colloquium in the Holy Land*, ed. D. Donnelly (New York: Continuum, 2001), 84-145; idem, *Jesus Remembered*, 204-209, 238-254.

¹¹¹ Others who drew upon an understanding of memory as generally reliable, despite its inherent limitations include, e.g., Markus Bockmuehl, *Seeing the Word: Refocusing New Testament Studies* (STI; Grand Rapids, MI, 2006), 166-178; Paul Rhodes Eddy and Greg A. Boyd, *The Jesus Legend: A Case for the Historical Reliability of the Synoptic Tradition* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2007), 275-285; Craig S. Keener, *The Historical Jesus of the Gospels*; and Robert K. McIver, *Memory, Jesus, and the Synoptic Gospels*, RBS 59 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011).

phrase, but excels at capturing the “gist” of an aural experience.¹¹² So, Allison proposed a criterion of “recurrent attestation,” referring to the identification of those topics or motifs that could be observed recurring throughout the tradition.¹¹³ According to this criterion, a particular saying unit was primarily valuable as it contributed to a broader motif observed across multiple units in multiple sources, and as such could contribute to a construction of the generally remembered interests of Jesus.¹¹⁴ Even by this standard, however, the

¹¹² Dale C. Allison, Jr., *Constructing Jesus*. See also, Allison’s lament over memory distortion in “It Don’t Come Easy: A History of Disillusionment,” in *Jesus, Criteria, and the Demise of Authenticity*, 186-199.

Allison considered several varying scholarly opinions on why we “gistify” memory—e.g., efficiency and flexibility—but more so than why it happens, Allison emphasized that this process seemed to be inevitable (Allison, *Constructing Jesus*, 11-13). He distinguished gistification from the other characteristic distortions typical of memory—e.g., sequential displacement, accretion of post-event information, revision under now-known outcomes, and susceptibility to external and communal influence, including systematic forgetting (Allison, *Constructing Jesus*, 2-8).

For previous affirmations of his point concerning the general reliability of motifs in the sayings tradition, Allison pointed to the works of Jürgen Becker, James D. G. Dunn, and E.P. Sanders, each of whom pointed to the ubiquity of Jesus’ sayings on the kingdom of God, and, thus, put the burden of proof on anyone who would argue against the historicity of the general claim that Jesus spoke about such a kingdom (Allison, *Constructing Jesus*, 19-20, n. 81, 82; Jürgen Becker, *Jesus of Nazareth*, trans. James E. Crouch [New York: de Gruyter, 1998], 100-101; Dunn, *Jesus Remembered*, 384; Sanders, *Jesus and Judaism*, 139. See also, e.g., David E. Aune, “Oral Tradition and the Aphorisms of Jesus,” in *Jesus and the Oral Gospel Tradition*, 240-241; Meier, *Marginal Jew*, 2:618-619; Gerd Theissen and Annette Merz: *The Historical Jesus: A Comprehensive Guide*, trans. John Bowden [Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1998], 269).

¹¹³ E.g., Allison, *Constructing Jesus*, 20.

In this work Allison responded, on the one hand, to what he took to be serious flaws in the criteria approach, and on the other, to the misunderstandings of memory by those who have introduced it as a primary category for consideration in studies of Jesus and the transmission of tradition about him. In this way, though his interdisciplinary interlocutors and his conclusions are different, his purpose is not unlike some who would apply social memory theory to the Jesus traditions, as discussed below.

¹¹⁴ While it was not the only correction he has made to others’ portraits of Jesus, Allison did turn on its head the picture of Jesus fostered by much of the Q discussion, that Jesus was an aphorism-spouting sage, whose words were only strung together into

sayings tradition has continued to be of interest primarily as the central access point to pre-Easter Jesus tradition, to be evaluated as fundamentally reliable or not.

1.3.2 Social Memory and the Sayings Tradition

This idea, that memory and its transmission could be evaluated as either reliable or unreliable in its representation of the actual past, and that the Gospels or other sources of sayings tradition could and should consequently be evaluated as either accurate or inaccurate, informed both the criteria approach and the above considerations of memory in relation to the Jesus and sayings traditions. According to social memory theory, however, this fundamental understanding is in fact a fundamental misunderstanding of memory and its processes.

Social memory theory, which originated in the social sciences and has since been introduced to Gospels and Jesus studies, explains memory as a social or socially-influenced, simultaneously past- and present-oriented, phenomenon, one that is neither inherently reliable nor unreliable, but always interpretive.¹¹⁵ Concerning memory's social

full speeches by later tradents and editors. He insisted, rather, that “the canonical Gospels remember Jesus as uttering connected discourses” and not isolated sayings (Allison, *Constructing Jesus*, 305-306).

¹¹⁵ Sociologist Maurice Halbwachs is widely credited as being one of the first to develop an understanding of memory as fundamentally social and present-oriented, an understanding that has been the basis for what has come to be known as social memory theory (Halbwachs, *The Collective Memory*, trans. F.J. Ditter, Jr. and V.Y. Ditter [New York: Harper & Row, 1980]; trans. from *La Mémoire Collective* [Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1950]; idem, *On Collective Memory*, ed. and trans. Lewis Coser [Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992]; trans. from Halbwachs, *Les cadres sociaux de la mémoire* [Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1952]). Halbwachs was not particularly concerned with the actual past, but its representation in present memory; this has since been described as presentist perspective. Though some of his work reflected on the Gospels explicitly, namely the relationship between holy sites and the collective memory of their significance, it is his more theoretical works that have made the greater impact on Gospel studies (Halbwachs, *La topographie légendaire des Évangiles en Terre sainte: Étude de mémoire collective* [Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1941]). Egyptologist Jan Assmann built upon Halbwachs's understanding of

nature, social memory theory observes that an individual's memory is fed in part by the collectively-held memories of the group or groups of which she is a part—their cultural past or tradition. When she receives these collective memories, she processes or

collective memory, what he described as communicative memory, and in particular explored its transmission across generations over time, which he described as cultural memory. Assmann also paid attention to media in the process of transmission, especially writing as the means by which book-based religions shared their memories over time (Jan Assmann, *Moses the Egyptian: The Memory of Egypt in Western Monotheism* [Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1998]; idem, *Religion and Cultural Memory: Ten Studies*, trans. Rodney Livingstone, Cultural Memory in the Present [Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2006]; idem, *Cultural Memory and Early Civilization: Writing, Remembrance, and Political Imagination*, trans. Jan Assmann [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011]).

In response to the above presentist, or what have even been described as more radical constructionist, theories concerning memory's wholesale invention or construction in the present, Barry Schwartz has offered what has been described as an essentialist or continuity perspective, which emphasizes an essential continuity between the past and its representation in present memory. The influence of the past, according to Schwartz, has a stabilizing or constraining effect on its representation in collective memory. For Schwartz a continuity perspective allows him to be more optimistic concerning collective memory's representation of the past, but this does not equate to claiming that the past necessarily happened as it has been remembered. Rather a continuity perspective views both the past and the present as exerting pressure on collective memory (Barry Schwartz, "Where There's Smoke, There's Fire: Memory and History" and "Harvest," in *Memory and Identity in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity: A Conversation with Barry Schwartz*, Tom Thatcher, ed. [Atlanta: SBL, 2014], 7-37, 313-337; idem, "Jesus in First-Century Memory—A Response," in *Memory, Tradition, and Text: Uses of the Past in Early Christianity*, ed. Alan Kirk and Tom Thatcher, SemeiaSt 52 [Atlanta: SBL, 2005], 249-262; and idem, "Rethinking the Concept of Collective Memory," in *Routledge International Handbook of Memory Studies*, ed. Anna Lisa Tota and Trever Hagen [New York: Routledge, 2016], 9-21).

While each of these theorists has at least tangentially, and at times directly, engaged the idea of the Gospels as products of social memory, their greater contribution has been in the ways Gospel scholars have applied their theories to the Jesus traditions. Within Gospel studies, the continuity perspective has come to dominate, on account of its explanatory power concerning the Gospels' apparent relationship to both the "past," and their present social realities. Chris Keith has helpfully outlined this history and the status quaestionis of social memory theory's application in Gospel studies in two articles, printed in successive issues of *Early Christianity* (Chris Keith, "Social Memory Theory and Gospels Research: The First Decade (Part One)," *Early Christianity* 6.3 [2015]: 354-376; idem, "Social Memory Theory and Gospels Research: The First Decade (Part Two)," *Early Christianity* 6.4 [2015]: 517-542).

internalizes them through her own socially-formed frameworks of memory and understanding. To the extent that she shares or performs her internalized memory externally, she contributes anew to the collectively-held memory, or tradition, of the group. Her receiving or perceiving, her processing, and her performance, are thus all socially-engaged acts of memory.¹¹⁶ This process holds and transmits the remembered past in light of and in service of the present. Memory is neither wholly independent of nor wholly beholden to the actual past, what happened or was spoken at some prior moment in time. Rather, the impact of the past persists as it is remembered into and for the ever-changing present, but the past does not exist within memory as a discernible or isolatable kernel that could be separated from its present.¹¹⁷ On account of these observations, social memory theory holds that all memory is interpretive. To evaluate individual memories or their performance as either reliable or unreliable is to misunderstand the process.

Social memory theory, therefore, has been used to correct earlier discussions of memory, particularly those considered above, that focused on the memory of individual eyewitnesses or other earliest tradents of the sayings tradition as both fundamentally reliable and stable in its representation of the actual past. Scholars have also used social memory theory to critique the assumption that sayings tradition can be sorted into discrete, authentic and inauthentic, pieces, at the root of the criteria approach. Social memory theory has provided a hermeneutic through which Gospel scholars have come to understand: there is no pristine unit of memory—even sayings memory—that can be

¹¹⁶ E.g., Halbwachs, *Collective Memory*, 42-55; idem, *Social Frameworks*, 38-49; Keith, “Social Memory Theory...(Part One),” 359-362.

¹¹⁷ E.g., Assmann, *Moses*, 8-14; Keith, “Social Memory Theory...(Part One),” 362-367.

isolated and extracted from its interpretive context, because every unit of memory exists only as interpreted in its present context.¹¹⁸

Jens Schröter was one of the first to engage social memory theory in extended interaction with the sayings tradition in particular.¹¹⁹ In so doing, he developed a

¹¹⁸ Depending on their presumed interlocutors, scholars of Jesus and the Gospels have been careful to make it clear that their applications of social memory theory imply neither that historians can say nothing about the actual past, nor that they can or mean to affirm the authenticity of representations of the actual past. Though cast in different terms, social memory theory to some extent affirms Bultmann's and other early form critics' skepticism concerning the historian's ability to know anything outside of a kerygmatically-imbued tradition. Chris Keith, for example, has argued against what he describes as Paul Foster's misunderstanding of social memory theory that it establishes historical reliability (Keith, "Social Memory Theory... [Part Two]," esp. 533, cf. Foster, "Memory, Orality, and the Fourth Gospel: Three Dead-Ends in Historical Jesus Research," *JSHJ* 10 (2012): 191–227). While Anthony LeDonne has argued against Zeba Crook's representation of social memory theory as suggesting that it undermines any historical reliability (Anthony Le Donne, "The Problem of Selectivity in Memory Research: A Response to Zeba Crook," *JSHJ* 11 [2013]: 77-97; cf. Zeba Crook, "Collective Memory Distortion and the Quest for the Historical Jesus," *JSHJ* 11 [2013]: 53-76; and idem, "Gratitude and Comments to Le Donne," *JSHJ* 11 [2013]: 98-105).

¹¹⁹ Schröter, *Erinnerung*; idem, *From Jesus to the New Testament*, 9-132, 436-486; idem, "The Criteria of Authenticity in Jesus Research and Historiographical Method," in *Jesus, Criteria, and the Demise of Authenticity*, 49-70; Keith, "Social Memory Theory... (Part Two)," 527-529.

In 2005, Kirk and Thatcher observed with some surprise, that social memory theory had, at that time, "made no significant impact on biblical studies" ("Jesus Tradition as Social Memory," in *Memory, Tradition and Text*, ed. Kirk and Thatcher, 25-42, 25). The entries in their volume and their contributions elsewhere have no doubt helped to raise the theory's profile within biblical, and especially Jesus, studies, so that is no longer the case (e.g., Thatcher, *Why John Wrote a Gospel: Jesus, Memory, History* [Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2006]; Thatcher, ed. *Memory and Identity*, passim; Kirk, *Q in Matthew*; Kirk, *Memory and the Jesus Tradition*, vol. 2 of *The Reception of Jesus in the First Three Centuries*, ed. Chris Keith, Helen K. Bond, Jens Schröter [London: Bloomsbury, 2018]). Other significant applications of social memory theory to Gospels and Jesus research have included: Anthony LeDonne, *The Historiographical Jesus: Memory, Typology, and the Son of David* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2009); Rafael Rodríguez, *Structuring Early Christian Memory: Jesus in Tradition, Performance and Text*, LNTS 407 (London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2010); Keith, *Jesus' Literacy*; idem, *Jesus against the Scribal Elite: The Origins of the Conflict* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2014); and Robert K. McIver, *Memory, Jesus, and the Synoptic Gospels*.

historiographical method that aimed to break from the atomism and positivism of previous approaches. Schröter began his discussion of memory in the reception and transmission of Jesus' sayings as evidenced in the common sayings material of the Gospel of Mark, Q, and the Gospel of Thomas.¹²⁰ Schröter emphasized that in each of its variations, a saying took on a different shade of meaning as it spoke to the needs and concerns of a present community. Even as each source preserved a memory of Jesus and his words, variation in meaning existed primarily because the early Christians were not interested in the proclamation or even the fate of Jesus, except as these aspects of the

As Sandra Hübenal has observed, Jesus research has been the primary area to which social memory theory has been applied (Sandra Hübenal, "Social and Cultural Memory in Biblical Exegesis: The Quest for an Adequate Application," in *Cultural Memory in Biblical Exegesis*, ed. Pernille Carstens, Trine Bjørnung Hasselbalch, and Niels Peter Lemche, PHSC 17 [Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press, 2012], 191-216, 192), but examples of applications of social memory theory to other topics within New Testament studies include: Stephen C. Barton, "Memory and Remembrance in Paul," in *Memory in the Bible and Antiquity*, ed. Loren Stuckenbruck, Stephen C. Barton, and Benjamin G. Wold, WUNT 212 (Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 2007), 321-339; Philip F. Esler, *Conflict and Identity in Romans: The Social Setting of Paul's Letter* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2003), 174-178; Markus Bockmuehl, *The Remembered Peter: Peter in Ancient Reception and Modern Debate*, WUNT 262 (Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 2010), 17-30; Loren T. Stuckenbruck, "The Teacher of Righteousness Remembered: From Fragmentary Sources to Collective Memory in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *Memory in the Bible and Antiquity*, 75-94; April D. DeConick, "Reading the Gospel of Thomas as a Repository of Early Christian Communal Memory," in *Memory, Tradition, and Text*, 207-220. Chris Keith provides an even more extensive list (and bibliography) of New Testament and related topics to which social memory theory has been applied (Keith, "Social Memory Theory... [Part Two]," 517-518).

¹²⁰ His list included the composition and reception histories of: the mission instructions to the disciples (Q 9:57-10:22; Mark 6:7-13; Gos. Thom. 14, 73, 86); a saying on Beelzebul the binding of the strong man (Q 11:14-32; Mark 3:20-35; Gos. Thom. 35); a saying on the lamp under the basket and the manifestation of hidden things (Mark 4:1-34; Q 11:33-36; Gos. Thom 5, 6, 33); a saying on bearing one's cross and losing versus saving one's life (Mark 8:34-9:1; Q 14:26f; 17:33; Gos. Thom 55, 101); a saying on prayer and the power to move mountains (Mark 11:22-25; Q 17:6, 11:9-13; Gos. Thom. 48, 106) (Schröter, *Erinnerung*, 144-435).

actual past were relevant to their understanding of their own present.¹²¹ Drawing on both philosophy of history and social memory theory, Schröter argued that, in any memory, the recollection of the actual past is inseparable from its interpretation in the present of the one remembering it.¹²² Schröter thus reframed historical Jesus studies, eschewing the practice of isolating individual units of sayings tradition to assess them as reliable or unreliable, and suggesting instead that these units can be understood only through, and never apart from, their interpretive context.¹²³

The individual and communal processes of remembering have remained an issue as scholars continue to use understandings of memory as a methodological hermeneutic through which to view the sayings tradition. Whereas previous treatments generally sought to affirm or deny the reliability of memory, the turn toward social memory theory has undermined the validity of that goal. Social memory theory has allowed scholars of the sayings tradition to argue that memory always operates with one foot in the past and one in the present, so that, in any given instance or performance of memory, the two are indistinguishable. Each performance of a saying whether oral or written, becomes an

¹²¹ Schröter, *Erinnerung*, 463-464.

¹²² In addition to Halbwachs, Assmann, and Schwartz on the memory theory side, Schröter drew heavily on the work of Gustav Droysen, who argued that history always requires “interpretation,” as well as Robert G. Collingwood, who referred instead to a “historical imagination,” and Arthur Danto, who described the “narratological element of historiography” (Droysen, *Historik* [lecture, presented at Jena, Germany, 1857], Eng. trans. *Outline of the Principles of History*, trans. E. Benjamin Andrews [New York: Howard Fertig, 1893]; Collingwood, *The Idea of History*, rev. ed. [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994 (1946)]; and Danto, *Analytical Philosophy of History* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965]); see e.g., Schröter, *From Jesus*, 9-32; idem, “The Criteria of Authenticity,” 60-61.

¹²³ Schröter has objected to misinterpretations of his position as strictly presentist Schröter, “The Criteria of Authenticity,” 60 n. 35; responding, in particular, to Alexander J.M. Wedderburn (*Jesus and the Historians*, WUNT 269 [Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010], 13-32).

artifact of memory, the past interpreted to and through the present, and so must be viewed within the particular context in which it was remembered.

1.4 Toward a Variant-Conscious Approach to the Sayings Tradition

This reframing of memory, introduced by Schröter and others, requires a corresponding reframing of attention concerning the sayings tradition. If, as an application of social memory theory would suggest, each variant of each saying attributed to Jesus is best understood as a written performance of social memory, a socially-engaged interpretation of the remembered past reinscribed in and for the performer's present, then no one variant can be weighed as more valuable than another simply on account of a presumed proximity to Jesus.¹²⁴ Each variant is meaningful or valuable as a record of one moment and location in the social memory of the sayings tradition. Social memory theory thus accounts for variants within the sayings tradition, and requires that those variants be considered, each on their own terms, as a distinctive artifact of social memory.¹²⁵

This dissertation offers this consideration of variants within the sayings tradition through what I describe as a variant-conscious approach. This approach is informed by social memory theory and its prior applications to the Jesus tradition, as well as similar prior treatments of the sayings tradition made without social memory theory.

On the sayings side, Kloppenborg, as was mentioned above, has argued that the sayings of Q, much like the rest of the Jesus tradition, reflect the interests of those who

¹²⁴ That is not to say that each has the same historiographical value in relation to Jesus of Nazareth, rather that their relation to Jesus of Nazareth ought not be the primary concern.

¹²⁵ For the language of “artifact(s)” of memory, see, e.g., Kirk and Thatcher, “Jesus Tradition as Social Memory,” in *Memory, Tradition, and Text*, 41; also Kirk, “Memory Theory and Jesus Research,” in *Handbook for the Study of the Historical Jesus*, 1:809-842, 820; cited by Keith, “Social Memory Theory... [Part One],” 364, n. 47.

recorded and edited them, and, therefore, one must attend to each instantiation of a saying within its own discursive context.¹²⁶ In a consideration of Q 6:36-38 for instance, he surveys the “measure-for measure” aphorism preserved there as well as its parallels in Matthew, Luke, 1 Clement, and Mark. Despite the relative stability of the content of the aphorism in each of these witnesses, Kloppenborg observes, the “varying social registers in which the tradition is performed” have lead to its having quite different senses in each of these “performance contexts.”¹²⁷ This observation aligns with the evidence of cognitive and social sciences concerning individuals’ capacity for precise recall of oral tradition and groups’ tendency to control transmission in order to bring received tradition in line with community needs.¹²⁸ Whether one version of this saying originated with Jesus or multiple versions were known as traditional sayings, once it became part of the Jesus sayings tradition, the saying quickly conformed to a stable, short and alliterative,

¹²⁶ See, Kloppenborg (Verbin), “Discursive Practices”; also, idem, “Memory, Performance.” Schröter’s *Erinnerung* is based on a similar premise concerning the common sayings in Mark, Q, and Gos. Thom., and he has elsewhere made the case for this approach (e.g., Schröter, “The Historical Jesus and the Sayings Tradition: Comments on Current Research,” *Neotestamentica* 30 [1996]: 151-168).

¹²⁷ Kloppenborg, “Memory, Performance,” 132. Kloppenborg draws on the work of Alan Kirk and others concerning the interface of orality, memory, and writing, in order to come to this use of “performative contexts” to describe the aphorism’s various textual settings (Kloppenborg, “Memory, Performance,” 120; citing Alan Kirk, “Manuscript Tradition as a *Tertium Quid*: Orality and Memory in Scribal Practices,” in *Jesus, the Voice and the Text: Beyond the Oral and the Written Gospel*, ed. Tom Thatcher [Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2008], 215-34, 271-72).

Kloppenborg begins the article with a survey and evaluation of recent work concerning memory, primarily at the individual or neurobiological levels. Though neither his survey nor his approach to the “measure-for-measure” aphorism engage social memory theory directly as such, his analysis, that revisions in research have demonstrated that no saying moves from its original utterance to its recorded instantiation in an unmodified version, aligns at the individual level with what social memory theory observes at the communal level (Kloppenborg, “Memory, Performance,” 98-117)

¹²⁸ Kloppenborg, “Memory, Performance,” 98-117, 132.

and therefore easily remembered, aphoristic form. Though its wording remained relatively fixed in its various performative contexts, however, those contexts transformed its meaning. While, for example, Q preserves the aphorism as a saying dealing with appropriate agrarian economic practices, Mark preserves it as part of a comment on the possession and acquisition of knowledge.¹²⁹ By observing the individual instances of this aphorism, each in its own performative context, rather than as evidence of an “original” aphorism or even the “same” aphorism in multiple sources,¹³⁰ Kloppenborg is able to highlight each as a distinct socially engaged performance.

Since the 1990s, a group of New Testament textual critics have argued for and explored an analogous shift of focus in their discipline. Since as early as the mid-19th century the standard practice of New Testament textual criticism had been to sift through the available data of variant textual readings, weighing both the magnitude and import of manuscript witnesses in order to determine or reconstruct an original—or, at least, an “earliest attainable”—text.¹³¹ Those proposing an alternative focus have suggested, rather, that variant textual readings should be treated as significant repositories of

¹²⁹ Kloppenborg, “Memory, Performance,” 124-125, 130-131.

¹³⁰ Kloppenborg, “Memory, Performance,” 132.

¹³¹ See Constantin von Tischendorf, *Novum Testamentum Graece* (4th ed. [Leipzig, 1849]; cited in the 7th ed. [1859: xxvii-xviii] and Gregory’s *Prolegomena* to Tischendorf [1869], whose goals have been reiterated more recently e.g., in Kurt Aland and Barbara Aland, *The Text of the New Testament: an Introduction to the Critical Editions and to the Theory and Practice of Modern Textual Criticism*, trans. Erroll F. Rhodes, 2nd ed. (Leiden: Brill, 1989); and, Bruce Metzger, *The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration*, 3rd. ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992).

Eldon Epp has critiqued the language of an “original” or “authentic” text, insisting that the more modest “earliest attainable” text nomenclature is the most that can ever be recovered (“It’s All About Variants: A Variant-conscious Approach to New Testament Textual Criticism,” *HTR* 100 [2007]: 275-308).

information about the history and thought of early Christian communities. Eldon Epp and others have come to view each of the extant “meaningful variants,” as, in a sense, its own original. “Meaningful variants” refers to those textual alterations that cannot readily be explained by scribal error or correction, and that reflect something of the theological, liturgical, or ethical contexts of a scribe or community. These readings, previously discarded, provide a localized snapshot of how texts were being interpreted as they were transmitted. Narrative text criticism, as this method has at times been labeled, presents an approach to textual variants in which any meaningful textual variant is an artifact in itself, preserving the interpretive thought and practice of a particular scribe or community.¹³² David Parker applied this approach to the textual variants of the sayings tradition within the Gospels, and argued that the recovery of a single “original” saying of Jesus is impossible, but that each manuscript variant preserved the Gospel—and with it the voice of Jesus—for those who received it.¹³³ The task of the text critic, then, is to

¹³² E.g., Eldon Epp, “Textual Criticism and New Testament Interpretation,” in *Method and Meaning: Essays on New Testament Interpretation in Honor of Harold W. Attridge*, ed. Andrew B. McGowan and Kent Harold Richards, SBL Resources for Biblical Study 67 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011), 79-105; Epp, “The Jews and the Jewish Community in Oxyrhynchus: Socio-Religious Context for the New Testament Papyri,” *New Testament Manuscripts: Their Texts and Their World*, ed. Thomas J. Kraus and Tobias Nicklas (Leiden: Brill, 2006), 13-52; David C. Parker, *The Living Text of the Gospels* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997); Bart D. Ehrman, *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture: The Effect of Early Christological Controversies on the Text of the New Testament* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993); and Ehrman, “The Text as Window: New Testament Manuscripts and the Social History of Early Christianity,” in *The New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the Status Quaestionis*, ed. Bart D. Ehrman and Michael W. Holmes, SD 46 (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1995), 361-79.

¹³³ Parker, *Living Text*, 92-93, 212-213.

Concerning variance in the manuscript tradition Parker observed that, while pious intuition might lead one to expect greater reverence for and resulting stability in the copying of sayings attributed to Jesus, the textual evidence points in the opposite direction. Not that Jesus’ words were not revered, but this reverence and the complexity

clearly present the full range of variants and to read each as evidence for how their responsible scribe or receiving community could have understood its theological significance. This is, as Epp has described it, a variant-conscious approach to New Testament textual criticism.

As this variant-conscious approach has shifted textual critics' attention from a largely aspirational, reconstructed original to the meaningful variants of the textual tradition, Kloppenborg has shifted his focus onto the socially engaged performances of the sayings tradition. Both are evidence that one does not necessarily need social memory theory in order to pay attention to variants within the tradition. The hermeneutical perspective offered by social memory theory concerning the sayings tradition, however, does require a variant-conscious approach. The present project draws from each of these models in order to construct such a variant-conscious approach to the sayings tradition, employed in three case studies concerning variants within the sayings tradition.

Each of the first two case studies considers a cluster of variants of one saying, described as the "Explaining the Parable(s)," and the "Ask, Seek, and/or Knock" clusters.¹³⁴ With the first focusing on a cluster found only in the Synoptics and the second

of interpretation it raised for communities and copyists led to an increase rather than a decrease in variant readings. Some scribes may have felt obliged to insert their own hand to bring the text of their copy into line with their and their community's understanding of its theological significance, and this pressure was only so much greater in the case of sayings of Jesus, precisely because of the importance attributed to them (Parker, *Living Text*, 75, 198, passim).

¹³⁴ A cluster here describes a set of variants, grouped together according to the idea of a common saying, which is reflected in their use of or engagement with common vocabulary, topics, or themes; what is often described as "X [saying] and its parallels." Describing the groups as clusters, however, means to avoid assuming an "original" saying or ordering of the examples as linear developments from an originating version. The language of clusters also allows for the possibility that, if a cluster includes any number of possible attributes, any individual example within the cluster need not include

on a cluster that was remembered and performed anew through the first three centuries, these two case studies work together to demonstrate the significant variance in the remembered voices of Jesus both in and outside the canon-within-the-canon of sayings scholarship. The individual variants of each cluster are presented both synoptically and individually.¹³⁵ That is, each study includes the whole cluster presented in a table and offers comments concerning both the content and context of each individual variant.¹³⁶ The collective and individual presentation of variants corresponds to analysis that is at once comparative/contrastive (identifying similarities or differences between variants)

all the possible attributes of the cluster. Consequently inclusion in the cluster is comparable to a family-resemblance model, but without the genetic implications.

The language of “meaningful variant” is adopted from narrative text criticism, and adapted here to describe each instantiation or inscription of a saying within a cluster, what Kloppenborg describes as a “socially engaged performance” or a “performance variant” (Kloppenborg, “Memory, Performance,” 117, 129). For text criticism variants are found in manuscript witnesses to a single text. This study of variants within the cluster that represents a saying (or sayings group) draws on their preservation in different texts, each representing a community memory of Jesus’ words. Variants in the sayings tradition may have come about as the result of repetition by Jesus himself; divergences in individuals’ and communities’ memories of the sayings of Jesus; the theological, rhetorical, and narrative interests of individual authors; mistakes in hearing, transcribing, or copying; or other causes all together. As is the case with text criticism’s meaningful variants, however, I have tried only to consider as “meaningful” those variants that cannot be more readily explained by scribal error or correction.

¹³⁵ “Synoptically” is used here to describe the way in which variants are laid out so as to be *viewed together*, regardless of whether they come from any of the Synoptic Gospels.

¹³⁶ The presentation of variants is based on the model proposed by Eldon Epp in his sample section of a text critical “Variant-Conscious Edition” (Epp, “All About Variants,” esp. 301-308).

This project is not overtly text critical. Manuscript witnesses are considered only on an *ad hoc* basis. And yet, in part as an homage to the precedent work of Epp, and in part for the sake of presenting a depth of variant-consciousness, where available manuscript variants are presented I follow Epp’s model. In this model, textual variants are listed directly under the corresponding base text (highlighted in grey). Though the manuscript source information is still included only in footnotes, this variant-conscious presentation highlights the variants themselves without relegating them to an apparatus.

and explanatory (understanding the distinct meaning of individual variants). To avoid the atomistic effect of isolating individual units of tradition, each variant is considered on the basis of its literary context as well as its content.¹³⁷ As Kloppenborg has demonstrated, even in cases where different forms of a tradition exhibit little variation in their content, their discursive or performance contexts can change their meaning, sometimes so much so that it would be misleading still to consider them the same saying.¹³⁸ While this project's cases demonstrate greater variation in content than Kloppenborg's example, they support his observations concerning the impact of the performance context on the meaning of a saying.

The third case study turns the approach toward an entire repository of sayings, itself a variant of the voice of Jesus, in order to ask how that author may have understood his participation in the memory process concerning the sayings tradition. As a deposit of meaningful variants of the sayings tradition, the Apocryphon of James (Ap. Jas.) is a socially-engaged performance of the voice of Jesus as it was remembered by and for an elitist early Christian reading community. It incorporates sayings variants with parallels known elsewhere in the sayings tradition into its collection of mostly unique sayings that makes up the content of its revelation. As the products of cultural memory, even these received traditions, however, are given new meaning or significance in their present performance context, a purported first century revelation between the resurrected Lord

¹³⁷ Keith critiqued the criteria approach for its atomistic treatment of units of tradition, a hold-over from form criticism (Keith, "The Fall of the Quest for an Authentic Jesus: Concluding Remarks," in *Jesus, Criteria, and the Demise of Authenticity*, 200-205).

¹³⁸ Kloppenborg, "Memory, Performance," 117-132. Kloppenborg closes his article with this note of apparent critique concerning previous treatments of sayings variants, as if they could be reduced to a single "same" saying that merely appears in different texts.

and the early church's leaders, James and Peter's. Though the author of this text was obviously not aware of social memory theory as such, he like all tradents did participate in its processes. He also, however, participated in the processes of a memory-based educational system, demonstrating his ability to memorize for accuracy, his compositional literacy, and his theological prowess. The final case study considers the author's various appeals to memory, the pseudepigraphical eyewitness memory of his narrator "James," as well as his own memory, as authorizing his own superior theology and delegitimizing its competitors. This study complements the first two by asking of just one text, how and why its author may have come to remember the voice of Jesus as he did, and how he understood his own contribution to the social memory of Jesus and the sayings tradition. It demonstrates that, though social memory may be universal, its actualization looked and was understood differently in every context.

As an application of social memory theory, a variant-conscious approach offers sayings scholarship a way forward between a focus either on only the historical Jesus or on purely reception history, by acknowledging the entanglement within each variant of its received past and its socially-engaged present. This approach responds to the limitations, in particular, of prior methods that have depended on a misleading dichotomy between memory and tradition, or genuine historical material and its interpretation. It is not, however, merely a matter of methodological concession in light of the historiographical limitations of the quest. Rather, it offers a more accurate perspective on the sources to which we have access, which allows for a richer appreciation of the diverse ways in which the voice of Jesus was both preserved and produced across early Christian communities. This recapturing of diversity contributes to the ongoing effort to cut away

at the assumption of early Christian homogeneity or a single model for the transmission of tradition across all early Christianity.

Chapter 2: The “Explaining the Parable(s)” Sayings Cluster

Jesus’ use of parables is one of the most enduring, iconic, and, by many modern accounts, historically reliable, aspects of the social memory—or, tradition—concerning his sayings and patterns of speech.¹ Joachim Jeremias, for instance, once described the parables of the Synoptic Gospels as “a fragment of the original rock of tradition,” and believed he could find in them not only their “original meaning,” but the “actual living voice of Jesus.”² His surety and others’ comes in part from the fact that historical Jesus studies has traditionally prioritized the Synoptic Gospels as sources for sayings material, and the Synoptic Gospels have often been read as presenting an ostensibly unanimous portrait of Jesus’ use of parables. The result has been that, even as scholars argue over which of the parables may have originated with Jesus himself, and how one or all of the parables should then be understood, they tend to agree that the parabolic form is authentic to him.³ Klyne Snodgrass, for example, has recently reaffirmed Jeremias’s claim that the

¹ The idea, in particular, of the historical reliability of Jesus’ use of parables came into modern scholarly thinking via the work of Adolf Jülicher at the end of the 19th century. Jülicher posited that the long-standing allegorical mode of parable interpretation fundamentally misunderstood Jesus’ own intention for the parables, which was to explain an idea via a single concrete point of comparison (Adolf Jülicher, *Die Gleichnisreden Jesu* [Freiburg: J.C.B. Mohr (Siebeck), 1888]). The understanding of Jesus’ use of parables as 1) distinct from the Evangelists’ representation of the parables and 2) a key to understanding Jesus himself, paved the way for much of parable scholarship of the 20th and early 21st centuries.

² Joachim Jeremias, *The Parables of Jesus*, 2nd ed., trans. S.H. Hooke [Upper Saddle River, NJ: SCM Press, Ltd., 1972], 11, 18, 114).

John Dominic Crossan presented a similar case for the reliability of many of the parables including some in the Gospel of Thomas (John Dominic Crossan, *In Parables: The Challenge of the Historical Jesus* [New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1973]).

³ Modern parables research could be described as falling into one of three primary categories: historical, literary, and audience-oriented. While predominantly historical approaches began with and occasionally continue to perpetuate questions of authenticity to Jesus, they have often turned to socio-historical questions concerning the probable

parables persist as the bedrock of historical Jesus tradition.⁴ Even John Meier, despite having rejected the fundamental *vox Jesu* premise behind some other parable studies and

setting of the parables in Jesus' life and in early church transmission (e.g., Crossan, *In Parables*; C.H. Dodd, *The Parables of the Kingdom* [London: Nisbet, 1935]; Charles W. Hedrick, *Many Things in Parables: Jesus and His Modern Critics* [Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2004]; William R. Herzog II, *Parables as Subversive Speech: Jesus as Pedagogue of the Oppressed* [Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 1994]; Jeremias, *Parables*; A.J. Levine, *Short Stories by Jesus: The Enigmatic Parables of a Controversial Rabbi* [New York: HarperOne, 2014]; Meier, *A Marginal Jew*, vol. 5; and Luise Schottroff, *The Parables of Jesus*, trans. L.M. Maloney [Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2006]). Predominantly literary approaches to the parables include those that consider the form and intent of various types of metaphorical speech or writing as well as narrative or literary analysis of the parables' function within their macro contexts (e.g., Mary Ann Beavis, "Parable and Fable," *CBQ* 52 [1990]: 473-498; Craig L. Blomberg, *Interpreting the Parables*, 2nd ed. [Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2012]; David Flusser, *Die rabbinischen Gleichnisse und der Gleichniserzähler Jesus*, *JudChr* [Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1981]; Jack Dean Kingsbury, *The Parables of Jesus in Matthew 13*, 3rd ed. [London: SPCK, 1976]; Norman Perrin, *Jesus and the Language of the Kingdom: Symbol and Metaphor in New Testament Interpretation* [Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1976]; Klyne Snodgrass, *Stories with Intent: A Comprehensive Guide to the Parables of Jesus* [Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2007]; David Stern, *Parables in Midrash: Narrative and Exegesis in Rabbinic Literature* [Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1991]; Frank Stern, *A Rabbi Looks at Jesus' Parables* [Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2006]; Jeffrey T. Tucker, *Example Stories: Perspectives on Four Parables in the Gospel of Luke*, *JSNTSup* 162 [Sheffield: Academic Press, 1998]; and Dan O. Via, *The Parables: Their Literary and Existential Dimension* [Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1967]. Finally, predominantly audience-oriented approaches to the parables have included those oriented to audiences both ancient and modern (e.g., Mary Ann Beavis, *The Lost Coin: Parables of Women, Work and Wisdom*, *BibSem* 86 [London: Continuum International, 2002]; Matthew Carter and John Paul Heil, *Matthew's Parables: Audience-Oriented Perspectives*, *CBQMS* 30 [Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association, 1998]; John Donahue, *The Gospel in Parable: Metaphor, Narrative and Theology in the Synoptic Gospels* [Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988]; David B. Gowler, *The Parables after Jesus: Their Imaginative Receptions across Two Millennia* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2017); Arland Hultgren, *The Parables of Jesus* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2000); and Mary Ann Tolbert, *Perspectives on Parables: An Approach to Multiple Interpretations* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979). Ruben Zimmermann proposed these three categories, but describes his own integrative approach as drawing on work done in each of these categories as well as that of media and memory theory in order to understand parables primarily as "tradition-creating media of memory" (Ruben Zimmermann, *Puzzling the Parables of Jesus: Methods and Interpretation* [Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2015], 88).

⁴ Klyne Snodgrass has reiterated the point (Klyne Snodgrass, "Are the Parables Still the Bedrock of the Jesus Tradition?" *JSHJ* 15 [2017]: 131-146).

determined that only a small handful of the parables attributed to Jesus can reliably be traced to him, still does not question the premise that Jesus did employ the parable form in his teaching.⁵ Whether or not Jesus of Nazareth ever spoke in parables in the first century, the predominant social memory in the twenty-first century, is that he did.

This near consensus exists despite the fact that, outside of the Synoptic Gospels, few sources that record memories of Jesus and his teaching attest to his having used parables at all.⁶ Furthermore, even among those that do, specifically among the Synoptic Gospels, there is stark disagreement as to how and why he would have employed this form of speech. This disagreement is evidenced in part by the variants of a saying, Jesus' explanation concerning the parable(s) (Mark 4:11-12; Matt 13:11-13; and Luke 8:10),

⁵ John P. Meier, *A Marginal Jew: Rethinking the Historical Jesus, Vol. 5, Probing the Authenticity of the Parables*, AYBRL (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2016), 48-57, *passim*. On an opposite end of the spectrum, Snodgrass takes issue with Meier's criteria approach, the criterion of multiple attestation in particular, and the conclusion Meier draws from them, and argues that Meier's confidence in only four parables is overly skeptical and based on obsolete methodology (Snodgrass, "Are the Parables," 142-146, *passim*). Despite these conflicting findings concerning the reliability of particular parables, both Meier and Snodgrass affirm the probability of Jesus of Nazareth's use of parables in his teaching.

⁶ According to the predominant reading, for example, no parables appear in the Gospel of John (see, e.g., Hultgren, *Parables*, 2). Neither does John use language of *παραβολή* to characterize Jesus' speech. It does, however, include Jesus' use of figurative language and images, sometimes described as a *παροιμία*, and Ruben Zimmermann has argued that some of Jesus' short narratives in John (e.g., John 10:7-10, 11-18) ought to be read as parables, despite not being identified as such within the Gospel (Zimmermann, "Are there Parables in John? It is Time to Revisit the Question," *JSHJ* 9 [2011]: 243-276; Zimmermann, *Puzzling the Parables*, 333-360).

The Gospel of Thomas and Apocryphon of James may be the only noncanonical texts to attribute clearly parabolic speech to Jesus (e.g., Gos. Thom. 8:1-3; 9:1-5; 20:1-4; 21:1-5; 57:1-4; 63:1-3; 64:1-11; 65:1-7; 76:1-2; 96:1-2; 97:1-4; 98:1-3; 107:1-3; 109:1-3; Ap. Jas. 7:24-28; 8:16-23; 12:22-27). The Apocryphon of James is the only extant text outside of the Synoptic Gospels to use the term "parable(s)"—in this case, the Greco-Coptic *παραβολή* (Ap. Jas. 7:2, 8-9; 8:4)—to describe speech of Jesus.

which make up the cluster to be considered in the present case study.⁷ For modern interpreters, the questions of *how* and *why* Jesus spoke in parables have raised issues of Jesus of Nazareth's potential familiarity with traditional Jewish *meshalim* and other forms of ambiguous or metaphorical speech, his or the evangelists' understanding of the fundamental message and pedagogical method of his mission, and the parables' interpretation within their initial and contemporary hearing and reading communities. For the Synoptic Evangelists who preserved the earliest extant memories of Jesus' parabolic speech, however, the disagreement, or variance, in their memories of Jesus' explanation concerning the parables reflects an underlying variance in their memory of Jesus' teaching and mission in general. While each of their Gospels contains a similarly worded saying of Jesus in response to a question concerning one or all the parables, each of those sayings, when considered as a variant of the cluster, presents a very different explanation. Were the parables, for instance, the cornerstone of a public pedagogy meant, in the

⁷ These are not the only texts that remember Jesus reflecting on the use of figurative speech. The Gospel of John remembers Jesus as having explained to his disciples in the Farewell Address that, though he had been speaking in figures of speech (ἐν παροιμίαις), he would soon speak with openness (παρρησία) (John 16:25). Likely reacting to that type of claim, the Apocryphon of James remembers a post-resurrection Jesus explaining to James and Peter that though he had initially spoken to them in parables (παρβολῆ) and now was speaking openly (οὔτῳ ἄβᾳ), in neither case did they understand or perceive (Ap. Jas. 7:1-6). In both John and Ap. Jas., the audience for Jesus' speech remains the same whether he is speaking figuratively or openly, so the distinction becomes a matter of pre- and post-resurrection time. These sayings have not been included in the present cluster, however, because neither makes explicit the question of why Jesus used these forms of speech when he did.

The variants included in this cluster, therefore, all come from the Synoptic Gospels, the "traditional" sayings scholarship sources (that is, those that have generally been included as of-interest to sayings scholarship). On account of their strong editorializing quality, however, they and the allegorical explanations of the parable of the sower in each of the Gospels have generally been attributed to post-easter tradition not the lips of the pre-Easter Jesus, and so have not been of much interest to historical Jesus centered sayings scholarship (since Jeremias, *Parables*, 77-79).

tradition of Isaiah 6, primarily to prevent the understanding of the masses, in accordance with divine plan? Or, were they intended foremost as a blessing for the few to whom they were explained? Or, again, were they meant to be heard and understood by anyone, as part of an open mission based in part on clear, and not obscure, communication? As shall be seen in the study below, the variants of Jesus’ “explaining the parable(s)” saying attest to the fact that, even in the first century, the social memory of Jesus’ parables and their role in his mission was diverse and included each of these understandings.

Table 2.1: Variants of the “Explaining the Parable(s)” Cluster ⁸

| Source | Variant Citation | Variant |
|---------|------------------|---|
| Matthew | 13:11-13 | ... ὅτι ὑμῖν δέδοται γινῶναι τὰ μυστήρια τῆς βασιλείας τῶν οὐρανῶν, ἐκείνοις δὲ οὐ δέδοται. ὅστις γὰρ ἔχει, δοθήσεται αὐτῷ καὶ περισσευθήσεται ὅστις δὲ οὐκ ἔχει, καὶ ὃ ἔχει ἀρθήσεται ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ. διὰ τοῦτο ἐν παραβολαῖς αὐτοῖς λαλῶ, ὅτι βλέποντες οὐ βλέπουσιν καὶ ἀκούοντες οὐκ ἀκούουσιν οὐδὲ συνίουσιν, |
| | | ...Because, to you has been given to know the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven, yet to those [it] has not been given [to know]. For, whoever has, it will be given to him and it will be made abundant. But whoever does not have, even what he has will be taken from him. This is why I speak to them in parables, because seeing they do not see, and hearing they do not hear, nor do they understand. |
| Mark | 4:11-12 | ... ὑμῖν τὸ μυστήριον δέδοται τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ ἐκείνοις δὲ τοῖς ἔξω ἐν παραβολαῖς τὰ πάντα γίνεται, ἵνα βλέποντες βλέπωσιν καὶ μὴ ἴδωσιν, καὶ ἀκούοντες ἀκούωσιν καὶ μὴ συνιῶσιν, μήποτε ἐπιστρέψωσιν καὶ ἀφεθῇ αὐτοῖς. |
| | | ...To you the mystery has been given, that of the kingdom of God, but to those outside everything comes in parables, in order that seeing they see and do not perceive, and hearing they hear and do not understand, lest they turn and be forgiven. |
| Luke | 8:10 | ... ὑμῖν δέδοται γινῶναι τὰ μυστήρια τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ, τοῖς δὲ λοιποῖς ἐν παραβολαῖς, ἵνα βλέποντες μὴ βλέπωσιν καὶ ἀκούοντες μὴ συνιῶσιν. |
| | | ...To you has been given to know the mysteries of the kingdom of God, but to the others [it has been given (to know)] in parables, in order that seeing they do not see and hearing they do not understand. |

⁸ Original language texts and textual variants were taken from *Novum Testamentum Graece*, Nestle-Aland, 28th ed. All English translations are my own. For the purpose of this study, individual manuscript witnesses are not treated as separate sources. Text critical variance will be considered as it is significant to the present project. A catalog of individual elements of the variants’ content and context can be found at the end of the chapter in Tables 2.2 (content) and 2.3 (context).

By considering each variant as a recorded instance of social memory, a variant-conscious approach exposes and highlights those differences, but it does not ignore the commonality between the variants that defines them as part of this cluster. Each, for example, depicts Jesus' explaining why and to whom he spoke ἐν παραβολαῖς; each contrasts the idea of παραβολάι with that of μυστήριον/α; incorporates a paraphrase and/or citation of Isaiah 6:9-10; and each distinguishes between the immediate narrative audience, referred to in the second person plural, and another group of people, referred to with various descriptors in the third person plural. In this case, where the variants belong to the so-called triple tradition, these similarities are explained by the fact that Mark's Gospel, and its variant of this cluster, was part of the received social memory of both Matthew and Luke. Each of the variants, however, is evidence for the profoundly social character of its author's experience of memory regarding the saying—the memory that he received, the way he internalized that memory via his own socially-engaged experience and understanding, and his new and distinctive performance of the saying which itself becomes a part of the continuing social memory around and after him. The similarities between the three variants point to the common thread between what is received and what is produced, the fact that memory is never wholly independent of the past; while their differences point to the fact that neither is memory simply a reproduction of the past. Taken all together, these variants reflect the diversity of the social memory concerning the role of parables in the teaching of Jesus and in the formation of early Christian communities circulating already in the first century.

2.1 A Variant-Conscious Presentation of the “Explaining the Parable(s)” Cluster

Mark 4:11-12⁹

...ὁμῖν τὸ μυστήριον δέδοται τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ· ἐκεῖνοις δὲ τοῖς ἔξω¹⁰ ἐν
ἐξῶθεν

παραβολαῖς τὰ¹¹ πάντα γίνεται¹², ἵνα βλέποντες βλέπωσιν καὶ μὴ ἴδωσιν,
|omit| λεγεται

καὶ ἀκούοντες ἀκούωσιν καὶ μὴ συνιῶσιν, μήποτε ἐπιστρέψωσιν καὶ ἀφεθῆ¹³
αφεθισομαι
αφησω
αφεθησεται

αὐτοῖς¹⁴.
τα αμαρτηματα
τα αμαρτηματα αυτων

⁹ For each variant of this cluster, the base text, highlighted in light grey, and critical apparatus concerning the manuscript witnesses are taken from Nestle-Aland²⁸.

The presentation of variants and their manuscript witnesses is adapted from the model proposed by Eldon Epp in his sample of a variant-conscious edition of a text (Epp, *It’s All About Variants: A Variant-conscious Approach to New Testament Textual Criticism*,” *HTR* 100 [2007]: 275-308).

¹⁰ ἐξῶθεν B 1424; ἐξῶθεν is attested elsewhere in Mark only in 7:15 and 18, describing that which cannot defile a person, an illustration also punctuated by Jesus’ questioning in private the disciples’ ability to understand (cf. Mark 4:13).

¹¹ Omit τὰ ⱼ D K W Θ 28. 565. 1424. 2542; include τὰ A B C L Δ *f*^{1.13} 33. 579. 700. 892. 1241 𐞧 bo

¹² λεγεται D Θ 28. 565. 1424. 2542 it *vg*^{ms} (sa). This handful of manuscripts preserve a more precise (but still passive) verb λέγεται, a form otherwise unattested in Mark, in place of the more common but also more generic γίνεται (cf. Mark 2:15, 21; 4:19, 32, 37; 11:23)

¹³ αφεθισομαι D(original); αφησω D(corrector) it ; αφεθησεται A K 565. There is this slight disparity among the manuscript witnesses concerning the appropriate person, tense, voice, and mood of the final verb of the Isaianic allusion, though all witnesses attest to a form of ἀφίημι, a verb of forgiving like that of the Targum, rather than one of healing (ἰάομαι) as found in the Greek translations of Isaiah.

¹⁴ Include τα αμαρτηματα after αὐτοῖς: A D K Δ Θ *f*¹³ 28(corrector). 33. 565. 579. 700. 892 (corrector). 1241. 1424 𐞧 lat sy; τα αμαρτηματα αυτων Δ 700. 1241 sy^h; ending at αὐτοῖς ⱼ B C L W *f*¹ 28(original). 892(original). 2542 b co. The inclusion of these variant accusative objects of ἀφίημι clarify the sense of the verb and close the verse.

Whatever elements of social memory concerning individual parables or their explanation Mark may have initially received, in his performance of the variant Mark brings together a number of elements that set the pattern for Matthew and Luke. For example, he includes this variant as part of a conversation following Jesus' sharing publicly a parable concerning a sower who sowed seed across multiple kinds of soil (Mark 4:3-8; Matt 13:3-9; Luke 8:5-8). The conversation also includes an element-by-element allegorical explanation of that parable (Mark 4:14-20; Matt 13:18-23; Luke 8:11-15), as well as several images and aphorisms that add further explanatory gloss on the parable(s) or their interpretation. Mark and Matthew follow this with multiple other parables, whereas Luke does not. Luke's allusion to Isaiah, however, follows Mark's more closely than does Matthew's. While Matthew and Luke both take over much of their Markan source material, Mark's distinctive performance of this variant as a parable theory for the Gospel as a whole, defining Jesus' use of parables as characteristic of his ministry in general, underscores a particular concern for both boundaries and mystery.

In Mark, this variant comes as part of Jesus' response to a question when he is alone with those around him, including the twelve.¹⁵ Just a few verses earlier Jesus had been surrounded by such a large crowd that he got into a boat to teach them "many things in parables" (4:1-2). With this smaller group, however, he takes and responds to a question about the parables, creating not only a teaching moment but also an explanation-of-teaching moment for those closest to him.¹⁶ Through the change in audience and

¹⁵ Several textual witnesses describe the asking group as, exclusively, μαθηται αυτου (D W Θ f¹³ 28. 565. 2542 it sy^s; [Or^{lat}]), which may be the result of harmonization with Matt 13:10 or Luke 8:9.

¹⁶ Mark emphasizes the contrast between these two groups by describing the former as an ὄχλος πλείστος, while in the latter, Jesus is said to be μόνος, even as οἱ περὶ αὐτὸν σὺν τοῖς δώδεκα are also there. This is the first of several examples in Mark where

scene, Mark establishes a distinction between those who are in—both in the boat and in the know—and those who are not, a distinction that is reinforced by the variant itself, and is defining for Mark’s explanation of Jesus’ use of parables.

The variant appears in the midst of the most densely parabolic section of the Gospel, in which Mark appears to have assembled previous parabolic tradition into a distinctly Markan parable discourse.¹⁷ In the preceding public scene, Jesus shared with the crowd a brief narrative concerning a sower sowing seed across multiple kinds of

the evangelist describes Jesus consulting privately with his disciples and/or others around him concerning a prior public performance or announcement (cf. Mark 7:14-23; 9:14-29; 10:1-12; and 13:1-37). These, and in particular the present example, fit the pattern of a) teaching, b) change of scene or audience, c) question, d) reproach, and e) interpretation or clarification that Eugene E. Lemcio has identified as characteristic also of instances of teaching within the Hebrew Bible and rabbinic literature (Eugene E. Lemcio, “External Evidence for the Structure and Function of Mark iv. 1-20, vii. 13-23, and viii. 14-21,” *JTS* 29 [1978]: 323-338)

¹⁷ Adela Yarbro Collins considers the proposed literary histories concerning this passage, and identifies two sources: an oral or written source containing seed and kingdom parables (a version of 4:3-8, 26-33), and another source containing a saying, request, and explanation interaction between Jesus and his followers (a version of 4:3-8 and 9-12; 4:13-20, 34) (Adela Yarbro Collins, *Mark: A Commentary*, Hermeneia; ed. Harold W. Attridge [Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007] 239-240). In this reconstruction, Collins draws on the work of Heikki Räisänen, *The ‘Messianic Secret’ in Mark*, SNTW (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1990), 85-101; and Philip Sellew, “Oral and Written Sources in Mark 4.1-34,” *NTS* 36 (1990): 234-267. Helmut Koester, similarly, identifies a “clearly recognizable” written collection of parables behind 4:1-34 but does not further specify its composition (Helmut Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels: Their History and Development* [Philadelphia: Trinity Press International, 1990], 287).

Whatever the pre-Markan history of this material may have been, Mark has intentionally brought the pieces together in this performance context as a declaration of, and part of the evidence for, the distinctive “parable theory” of his Gospel (see, e.g., Joel Marcus, *The Mystery of the Kingdom of God*, SBLDS 90 [Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986], 74; Collins, *Mark*, 240-242; and idem, “The Discourse in Parables in Mark 4,” in *Hermeneutik der Gleichnisse Jesu: Methodische Neuansätze zum Verstehen urchristlicher Parabeltexte*, 2nd ed., ed. Ruben Zimmermann, WUNT 231 [Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011], 521-538). That is, Mark’s explanation of the parables casts them as not only typical but definitive of Jesus’ teaching (and action) within this Gospel, a teaching that is intentionally opaque to those outside the community and requires explanation even for those inside (Marcus, *Mystery of the Kingdom*, esp. 73-123).

soil.¹⁸ Later, he offers two more seed parables, those concerning the surprising growth of seeds in general and of the mustard seed in particular. Both of these, like the parable of the seeds and the soils, suggest an inherent arbitrariness and unknowability of the kingdom, being communicated in the parables. The evangelist goes so far as to claim that when speaking to “them,” that is the crowds, Jesus spoke exclusively in parables (Mark 4:34), as is the case here (4:3-9, 26-29, 30-32).¹⁹ Sandwiched between these instances of public parabolic teaching, however, Mark describes a scene in which Jesus is alone with his inner circle.²⁰

¹⁸ This narrative is implied to have been understood as a parable by Mark’s introductory statements, both that introducing the initial telling (Mark 4:2) and that introducing its subsequent explanation (4:11). As recorded in 4:3-9 this metaphorical narrative told in the past tense, lacks the second element of comparison typical of a parable. As Collins has suggested, however, that the rhetorical purpose of the implied comparison would presumably have been understood (Collins, *Mark*, 242).

¹⁹ This statement in 4:34 (χωρίς δὲ παραβολῆς οὐκ ἐλάλει αὐτοῖς), which aligns with that in 4:11 (ἐκείνοις δὲ τοῖς ἔξω ἐν παραβολαῖς τὰ πάντα γίνεται), appears to be a case of exaggeration meant to emphasize the essential nature of this parable model for Mark. If it is an exaggeration, it is only a slight one according to the Markan narrative, since Mark describes much of Jesus’ teaching as parabolic (e.g., 3:23-30; 7:14-23; and 12:1-12). Though Mark’s Jesus does engage groups and individuals from among the Pharisees, scribes, chief priests, elders, Herodians, and Sadducees on the proper interpretation of Scripture and his own authority without the use of parables (e.g., 7:1-13; 10:2-9; 11:17, 27-33; 12:13-17, 18-27, 28-34, and 12:35-40), the only time Mark reports Jesus’ having taught a crowd (independent of a miracle) without parables is to instruct them on how to become a follower of him (8:34-9:1). The point is not necessarily that Jesus never spoke to those outside his immediate followers without parables, but that this was typical of his practice and telling of his intention.

Marcus follows others who extend or “stretch” the idea of ἐν παραβολαῖς to include all of Jesus public teaching and actions including his death and resurrection, which were heard and seen but not truly perceived or understood by those outside (Marcus, *Mystery*, 109-111). This fits with 4:11 but requires a metaphorical reading of 4:33-34, which describe Jesus specifically as speaking (λαλέω) in parables. At the very least, the parables, for Mark, seem to be part of a pattern in which most observers do not properly understand Jesus of Nazareth, and even those closest to him require repeated explanation.

²⁰ James R. Edwards has described 4:1-20 as a case of Markan intercalation, with the explanation of the purpose of the parables (4:10-13) inserted between the parable of

When they are alone, those around Jesus ask him about τὰς παραβολάς.²¹ His private response to them comes in multiple parts: the explaining the parables variant (4:11-12), the interpretation of the preceding parable in particular (4:13-20), and two further explanatory figures²² (4:21-25). It begins, however, with the Markan Jesus

the sower and its particular allegorical explanation (James R. Edwards, “Markan Sandwiches: The Significance of Interpolations in Markan Narratives,” *NovT* 31, 3 [1989]: 193-216). Edwards notes his own surprise at the rare consideration even of this portion of the passage as a “sandwich” (idem, 213-215).

²¹ Mark does not provide the question as direct speech, but narrates that: ἡρώτων αὐτὸν οἱ περὶ αὐτὸν σὺν τοῖς δώδεκα τὰς παραβολάς.

In place of τὰς παραβολάς, textual variants include τὴν παραβολὴν and τις ἡ παραβολὴ αὐτῆ, which may reflect scribal attempts to reconcile the group’s question with the second part of Jesus’ response (Mark 4:13-20), or to harmonize Mark’s version of the question with Luke’s (τίς αὕτη εἴη ἡ παραβολή; Luke 8:9).

They ask about τὰς παραβολάς, plural, despite the fact that, according to the evangelist’s narration this is the first of Jesus’ parables to which the disciples were explicitly witnesses. Jesus had spoken ἐν παραβολαῖς once before, concerning Satan and a metaphorical kingdom or house, to a group consisting of scribes from Jerusalem, as well as his family and another large crowd in the scene just prior to this one (Mark 3:20-27). Though Jesus had appointed the twelve just prior to this incident (3:13-19), they are not named as present for this first instance of parabolic teaching. The disciples in Mark are rarely perceptive concerning things they have witnessed, let alone those that they as yet have not. This tension between their question and their experience according to the narrative, therefore, supports the idea that the private explanatory conversation should be understood as an out-of-narrative or composite instance concerning Jesus’ private teaching (4:10-25), including the present variant, rather than in line with its surrounding narrative sequence. This adds to the nature of the variant as part of an overarching parable theory for the evangelist.

²² In the first, Mark’s Jesus makes the case, via the image of a lamp, that what is hidden is meant to be revealed. Though the vocabulary is different (κρυπτὸν and ἀπόκρυφον rather than μυστήριον), the evangelist connects this image to the above mystery of the kingdom. This mystery has been given, but its meaning is still being brought to light. In the second, the intimate audience, addressed again in the second person (4:24), is promised that something will be measured out to them and even more will be added. They hear the gnomic saying of verse 25, then, already with the assurance that they are among those who have and will, therefore, be given (δίδωμι) even more. After all, they have already been given (δίδωμι) the mystery of the kingdom.

addressing directly those around him, who posed the question, as ὑμῖν²³: “To you (ὑμῖν) the mystery has been given, that of the kingdom of God” (Mark 4:11-12).²⁴ This group, later identified as “the disciples” (4:34), is an exclusive group, though not exclusive to

²³ In 4:11 both clauses name the dative plural indirect objects (ὑμῖν, ἐκείνοις δὲ τοῖς ἔξω; with the adversative δὲ in the second clause) first, emphasizing the contrast between the two phrases and the two groups.

²⁴ The arrangement of this clause (ὑμῖν τὸ μυστήριον δέδοται τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ) with the τὸ μυστήριον immediately following ὑμῖν, and the verb separating the subject from its genitive modifier, adds to the variant’s emphasis on the mystery.

The phrase τὸ μυστήριον δέδοται τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ is used only here within the New Testament (the Matthean and Lukan variants of this saying remember the plural τὰ μυστήρια, among other differences), and its meaning has proven to be something of a mystery among scholars. Through his study of “mystery” in Jewish apocalyptic literature Raymond Brown determined that “the real parallel to the Synoptic usage...is where divine providence and its workings in reference to man’s salvation are referred to as mysteries” (Raymond E. Brown, “The Semitic Background of the Term *Mysterion*,” *Bib* 39 [1958]: 426-448, 430). Furthermore, that this mystery would be revealed to some and not to others, Brown claims is to be expected, according to parallels in, e.g., Num 12:8 (OG); 2 Bar 48:2-3; 4 Ez 12:36-37; 1QS 4:6; 9:17. Others since Brown have largely followed his lead in considering primarily the Jewish sense of the word and avoided suggestions of an intentional or direct reference to Greco-Roman mystery cults.

Even keeping the influence of Jewish Scriptures and thought in mind, scholars have continued to wrestle with what is meant by this “mystery” in Mark. Hypotheses have tended to center on the narrative present (and/or future) reality of the kingdom of God (e.g., Werner Kelber, *The Kingdom in Mark: A New Place and a New Time* [Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974]; Dan O. Via, *The Ethics of Mark’s Gospel: In the Middle of Time* [Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 1985]), the sacrificial reality and future glory of Jesus as the Son of Man (James G. Williams, *Gospel against Parable: Mark’s Language of Mystery*, BLS 12 [Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1987]), or a combination of both (Donahue, *The Gospel in Parable*, 44-46; Douglas S. McComiskey, “Exile and the Purpose of Jesus’ Parables (Mark 4:10-12; Matt 13:10-17; Luke 8:9-10),” *JETS* 51 [2008]: 59-85, 79; and Marcus, *Mystery of the Kingdom*).

In its Markan context this “mystery” is not itself something to be known or understood (cf. the inclusion of γινῶναι in Matt 13:11 and Luke 8:10), but an experience of participation in this community and the opportunity to be privy to the explanatory teaching, the fellowship with Jesus, and ultimately the salvation that is made available there.

the Twelve alone (4:10),²⁵ with exclusive access to the mystery of the kingdom. Their access, however, is not indicative of their independent understanding. Jesus implies that, on their own, this same group, understands neither the parable of the soils in particular nor the parables in general (4:13). But these are the ones to whom Jesus explains everything in private (4:34).

To those outside (ἐκείνοις... τοῖς ἕξω), by contrast, everything comes in parables (4:11b).²⁶ If one follows the logic of the preceding parable of the seed and the soils, they receive the word (even if only in parables), but in them, it is prevented from putting down good roots and flourishing (4:4-7, 14-19). Whereas the parable's allegorical interpretation blames this unfruitfulness on the adversary, or the people's own earthly limitations and concerns, within this variant Mark appeals to Scriptural evidence to suggest that humans can reject God's word only when and because God wills that rejection.²⁷ Mark invokes the words of the prophet, not as justification for Jesus' use of parables, but as the voice of divine intention, which needs no justification. Though he takes broad liberty in his appropriation of the passage from Isaiah, Mark does not mitigate its message of God's

²⁵ οἱ περὶ αὐτὸν σὺν τοῖς δώδεκα (Mark 4:10, emphasis added). In 4:34 the same group is described all together as τοῖς ἰδίους μαθηταῖς. Mark used οἱ μαθηταὶ to describe the group of Jesus' followers even before he has called the Twelve 2:15-16, 18, 23; 3:7, 9, thus suggesting that for Mark, this descriptor is not necessarily limited to a designated group of twelve.

²⁶ This is the only example of ἕξω being used in this articulated way in any of the canonical Gospels. Even in their parallel variants, Matthew and Luke use other descriptors for those to whom everything comes in parables.

²⁷ Mark paraphrases the text of Isaiah 6:9-10, but does so without any introductory formula or other indication of its Scriptural status. This is in contrast to other instances of Scriptural citation in Mark where the evangelist cites a "prophet," Isaiah, Moses, David or that which is "written" as the originating authority for a passage or idea (e.g., 1:2; 7:6-7, 10; 9:12; 10:2-9; 11:17; 12:10-11, 26, and 36). This is also in contrast to the Matthean variant within this cluster, which includes an example of that evangelist's fulfillment citations, in this case attributed to the prophecy of Isaiah (Matt 13:14).

supreme sovereignty.²⁸ Adapting the words of the prophet, Mark's Jesus states that, to this group, everything comes in parables in order that (ἵνα), despite their earnest looking and listening, they will neither perceive nor understand, lest (μήποτε) they should turn back and be forgiven.²⁹

²⁸ It is not obvious what version or translation of Isaiah 6:9-10 Mark may have known. The Markan variant abbreviates the verses, omitting most of verse 10, and reverses the order of the verbs of verse 9. Several of the key vocabulary words and phrases are common to the OG (e.g. βλέπω [with a repeated cognate root, participle and finite verb, in both], μὴ ὀράω, ἀκούω/ἀκοή [with a repeated cognate root, but of different forms, in both], μὴ συνήμι, μήποτε, and ἐπιστρέφω), but the Markan paraphrase also shares several similarities in phrasing with the Targum (e.g. both variants of Isa 6:9 are rendered in the third person indicative; the inclusion of “forgive” rather than “heal” language in the variant of 6:10; and both the Targum of Isaiah and Mark specify that those who neither perceive nor understand are distinguished from others who do). Based on these latter similarities Jeremias argued that Mark drew from the Targum for the present paraphrase (Jeremias, *Parables*, 14-15; Jeremias depended for this point in part on the prior analysis of the passage by T.W. Manson, *The Teaching of Jesus*, rev. ed. [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1948], 77). Evans provides further bibliographic evidence for this, as if it were a near-consensus position (Evans, *To See and Not Perceive: Isaiah 6:9-10 in Early Jewish and Christian Interpretation*, JSOTSup 64 [Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989], 92 n. 4). Evans and Manson use Mark's apparent similarity to the targumic tradition as evidence of the antiquity of Targum Isaiah 6:9-10, a position supported also by Bruce D. Chilton (*A Galilean Rabbi and his Bible: Jesus' Use of the Interpreted Scripture of His Time* [Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier Inc., 1984], 91; for more on Chilton's hypothesis concerning the redactional layers of the targumic tradition, see also, Chilton, “Two in One: Renderings of the Book of Isaiah in Targum Jonathan,” in *Writing and Reading the Scroll of Isaiah*, vol. 2, ed. Craig Broyles and Craig Evans [Leiden: Brill, 1997], 547-562).

Donahue, to the contrary, follows the analysis of Étan Levine to argue convincingly that, because of the complex and compound history of the targumic tradition, a precise *terminus ad quo* remains impossible to determine and, therefore, the Targum cannot be considered as a source for Mark (Donahue, *Gospel in Parable*, 41; Étan Levine, *The Aramaic Version of the Bible: Contents and Context*, BZAW 174 [Berlin: de Gruyter, 1988], 21-31).

The notion of God's sovereignty (or God's sovereignty enacted via Jesus) is reinforced in the passive constructions of Mark 4:11; neither Jesus' immediate audience nor those outside acted to receive the mystery or the parables, rather the mystery was given and the parables came to/for them (...ὁμῖν τὸ μυστήριον δέδοται...ἐκείνοις δὲ τοῖς ἔξω ἐν παραβολαῖς τὰ πάντα γίνεται).

²⁹ The conjunctions ἵνα and μήποτε are at the center of much of the debate over the proper interpretation of this passage, because the most straight-forward translation

Clearly for Mark, though the latter group is described as those outside, the distinction is not only a literal, spatial one. Rather, the outsider and (implied) insider labels map onto groups defined primarily by their access to and experience of the mystery of the kingdom. For the Markan Jesus' audience, the line is drawn between "you" who are gathered and listening, who are inside the community, and "those outside," that is outside the community. The audience around Jesus has been given a mystery, which they may not yet understand, but it is theirs to experience and participate in, with Jesus interpreting its significance and meaning to them in private. Those outside hear the same parables, but to them the parables remain inscrutable, and they—as outsiders—are prevented from turning and being saved. For Mark, the line between inside and outside is established on the basis of mystery, translated via parables, according to God's intention.

suggests an uncomfortable theological notion: that the parables were intended to keep some people from understanding so that they neither could nor would turn and be forgiven. A number of alternative translations try either to avoid that interpretation or at least avoid attributing it to Jesus. In the former category, e.g., T.A. Burkill and C.F.D. Moule both read ἵνα as indicating cause ("because") rather than purpose or result, thus shifting responsibility onto those outside, a move made even more explicit in Matthew's variant, which preserves ὅτι (T.A. Burkill, *Mysterious Revelation: An Examination of the Philosophy of St. Mark's Gospel* [Ithaca, NY: Cornell, 1963], 112; C.F.D. Moule, "Mark 4.1-20 Yet Once More," *Neotestamentica et Semitica: Studies in Honor of Matthew Black*, ed. Edward Earle Ellis and Max E. Wilcox [Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1969], 95-112). This not only stretches the usual semantic range of ἵνα but leaves the use of μήποτε somewhat unresolved as well. In the latter category, Jülicher was among the first to argue that the saying represents not the words of Jesus but later Christian belief from a time when parables had become obscure (Jülicher, *Die Gleichnisreden Jesu*, vol. 1, 118-150). Vincent Taylor claims that "Mark has given an unauthentic version of a genuine saying" (Vincent Taylor, *The Gospel according to St. Mark*, 2nd ed. [London: Macmillan, 1966], 257). Manson similarly admits that, as it stands, the text insists that the purpose of the parables was to "prevent insight, understanding, repentance, and forgiveness," but contends that Mark must have misunderstood or mistranslated Jesus' own use of the relative particle ἃ, mistakenly turning Jesus' Targum-like relative clause into a purpose clause (Manson, *The Teaching*, 74-81).

This study is concerned only with what Mark presents, which, despite any theological unease it might cause, is most easily read as saying that the purpose of the parables was to prevent some people from understanding, repenting, and being forgiven.

Mark has remembered Jesus' saying into an explanation, not just of his parables, but of his mission as a whole. That mission, according to this performance, was defined by broad but opaque public proclamation meant to exclude most people, coupled with limited and mysterious revelation intended only for a select few. That is, Mark's memory of Jesus' explanation of the parables is that parables are the defining characteristic of Jesus' public teaching, but they cannot be understood apart from explanation. This explanation is accessible exclusively through the divine mystery of participation with Jesus and inclusion in the community around him. For those outside that community, their lack of access to divine explanation amplifies the inherently obscure nature of the parables in order to fulfill a divine prerogative; that is, to prevent their perception, their understanding, and ultimately their forgiveness. Presented as a parable theory at the heart of Jesus' teaching, this variant fits and contributes to the oppositional rhetoric of the Markan parables, and the motifs of secrecy and misunderstanding that characterize the memory of Jesus and his mission in this Gospel.

2.1.2 Matt 13:11-13

...ὅτι ὑμῖν δέδοται γινῶναι τὰ μυστήρια τῆς βασιλείας τῶν οὐρανῶν, ἐκείνοις δὲ οὐ δέδοται. ὅστις γὰρ ἔχει, δοθήσεται αὐτῷ καὶ περισσευθήσεται. ὅστις δὲ οὐκ ἔχει, καὶ ὃ ἔχει ἀρθήσεται ἀπ' αὐτοῦ. διὰ τοῦτο ἐν παραβολαῖς αὐτοῖς λαλῶ³⁰,
 λαλω αυτοις
 λαλω
 (ε)λαλει αυτοις

ὅτι βλέποντες οὐ βλέπουσιν καὶ ἀκούοντες οὐκ ἀκούουσιν οὐδὲ συνίουσιν,³¹
 ἵνα βλέποντες μὴ βλέπωσιν καὶ ἀκουόντες μὴ ἀκουσῶσιν μηδὲ συνῶσιν
 ἵνα βλέποντες μὴ βλέπωσιν καὶ ἀκουόντες μὴ ἀκου(σ)ῶσιν καὶ μὴ συν(ι)ῶσιν μηποτε...
 επιστρεψῶσιν

³⁰ λαλω αυτοις N Θ f^{1.13} 33. 565. 1424; λαλω L c; λαλει (ελαλει D¹) αυτοις D. Only Codex Bezae takes this verse out of the reported speech of Jesus and turns it into an

Matthew's memory of the variant and its context remains in many ways quite close to his Markan source material. Matthew's performance, however, puts that received memory into conversation with Jewish Scripture in a more expansive way than Mark's had. Additionally, Matthew may have had other received memory in common with Luke, whether in the form of a version of Q that included triple tradition or an alternative source of saying or parable tradition, that would explain the minor agreements between the two.³² Whatever memory he received, Matthew's performance of this variant repeats much of Mark's language but expands and recasts it to emphasize in particular the blessings coming to those to whom have been given to know the secrets of the kingdom.

Matthew, like Mark, remembers parables as characteristic of Jesus' public teaching an idea reinforced by its explicit mention (Matt 13:3, 34) and the inclusion of multiple parables in this scene (13:3-9, 24-30, 31-32, and 33).³³ Two of the parables in this section are similar to those surrounding the Markan variant: the parable concerning seed sown in multiple kinds of soil (13:2-9) and the parable of the mustard seed (13:31-

explicitly editorial comment on why Jesus speaks, or spoke (a corrector amended the verb to an imperfect) in parables (cf. Matt 13:34).

³¹ *ἵνα βλέποντες μη βλέπωσιν και ακουοντες μη ακουωσιν μηδε συνωσιν* 1424 ff¹ *sa mae; ἵνα βλέποντες μη βλέπωσιν και ακουοντες μη ακουωσιν (ακουωσιν D) και μη συνιωσιν (συνωσιν D) μηποτε επιστρεψωσιν D Θ f^{1.13} it; (Eus)*. Here a handful of variants harmonize the subordinate conjunction to that of Mark 4:12 (*ἵνα*).

³² In addition to the common triple tradition, Matt 13:11, with Luke 8:10, contains an instance of "minor agreement" in the double tradition (*ὑμῖν δέδοται γνῶναι τὰ μυστήρια τῆς βασιλείας...*), in which these two agree in word order, the inclusion of the infinitive *γνῶναι*, and the use of the plural *τὰ μυστήρια*, against Mark.

³³ Matthew's parables continue in a reprise of the parable conversation from 13:10-33 in 13:36-53, in which the disciples again come to Jesus away from the crowds to ask for the explanation of a parable heard publicly earlier. In this case the parable about which they inquire is the parable of the wheat and the weeds (13:24-30). Jesus' explanation of that parable is followed by another series of other parables (13:44, 45-46, 47-50) and another culminating word on their purpose (13:52), thus making a literary doublet as the performative context.

32). Matthew, however, also includes a parable concerning a woman leavening dough (13:33) and exchanges Mark's parable of the mysterious growth of the seed (Mark 4:26-29) for a parable concerning wheat and weeds of the field (Matt 13:24-30). In the latter, the field owner and his slaves observe the weeds growing alongside the wheat. Whereas the slaves do not know whence the bad seeds came but offer to gather the weeds together, the owner identifies their source, an enemy. He advises the weeds be left to grow along with the wheat, lest in pulling the weeds the slaves should accidentally uproot any of the wheat as well (Matt 13:24-30). Both Mark's parable of the growing seed and Matthew's of the wheat and the weeds involve mysterious actions and growth, and both include an eventual harvest. Rather than emphasizing their mysterious nature, however, Matthew's reinforces a distinction between groups, here likened to good and bad seeds, and the ultimate intention of a positive outcome for the good. The good seeds grow into wheat to be harvested, while the bad seeds grow into weeds to be collected and burned. But, this will not happen until the time of the harvest, for the sake of the good wheat. Matthew's "explaining the parables" variant, likewise, makes a distinction between good and bad groups, and concerns itself primarily with the fate of and promises made to the good.

As in Mark, Matthew's narration of Jesus' public parabolic teaching in the present section is interrupted by an aside-like question, which serves as the ostensible occasion for the variant's response. Matthew, however, does not indicate a change in time or scene, only that the disciples—here, identified explicitly as such—came and asked Jesus a question.³⁴ Furthermore, whereas Mark indirectly reports that the gathered group asked

³⁴ Once the disciples approach Jesus with their question, Matthew makes no further mention of their being on a boat (Ulrich Luz, *Matthew 8-20: A Commentary*, Hermeneia, trans. James E. Crouch [Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001], 244). Curiously, however, Matthew does not forget the crowd, whom Jesus leaves in 13:36 to go inside a house and respond to another question from the disciples concerning a parable.

about the parables, Matthew reports the disciples' collective direct speech: ““Why do you speak to them (αὐτοῖς) in parables?”” (Matt 13:10).³⁵ The disciples, in this case, want to know the specific purpose of the parables, a purpose they assume is for some other group, αὐτοῖς, not they themselves.

To a certain extent, Jesus' response echoes the disciples' assumption and reinforces the perspective of us—or ὑμεῖς, to Jesus—versus them (αὐτοῖς), but he begins with ὑμῖν (Matt 13:11).³⁶ The question pointed the attention away, toward those not present, but Jesus' response begins by pointing attention back toward those who are present, his disciple audience. Furthermore, Jesus says, the mysteries (μυστήρια) of the kingdom of heaven (τῆς βασιλείας τῶν οὐρανῶν) have not merely been given to the

³⁵ W. D. Davies and Dale C. Allison observe that avoiding an unqualified reference to “the twelve” is typical of Matthean redaction (e.g., Mark 6:7 [par. Matt 10:1]; 10:32 [par. Matt 20:17]; and 14:17 [Matt 26:20]; *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to Saint Matthew, Vol. 1: Introduction and Commentary on Matthew I-VII*, ICC [Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1988], 387). In this instance, however, neither Mark nor Matthew describes the group as exclusively “the twelve [disciples],” so that Matthew's οἱ μαθηταί, like Mark's (Mark 4:34), may be a permeable category, though he does avoid Mark's rather awkward οἱ περὶ αὐτὸν σὺν τοῖς δώδεκα.

Mark's phrase ἡρώτων αὐτὸν... τὰς παραβολάς is ambiguous as to whether the group wants to know the interpretation of the parables—specifically the preceding parable concerning the seed that falls in different soils—or the purpose of the parables in general. Matthew's redaction specifies the latter, while Luke opts for the former (Luke 8:9). In each case, however, Jesus answers *both* questions.

³⁶ As Davies and Allison note concerning the importance of this initial address to ὑμῖν, “One aspect of Mt 13.10ff. should not be missed. In their preoccupation with wondering how God can justly give knowledge to only a select group, some commentators have failed to see that the emphasis of the text lies not on privation but on God's gift” (Davies and Allison, *Matthew, Vol 1*, 389).

The present translation takes the ὅτι with which Matthew opens Jesus' direct speech as a causal conjunction, directly answering the disciples' question *διὰ τί...?* rather than a *ὅτι recitativum*. Though it would not have to be so, this translation is consistent that of the ὅτι in, e.g., Matt 4:13.

disciples, but have been given to them to know (δέδοται γνῶναι).³⁷ Matthew's Jesus emphasizes the disciples' God-given potential for knowing.³⁸ These are the ones who already have, and to whom more will be given, so that they will have in abundance (Matt 13:12). Jesus offers this persistently positive assessment of his disciples and their received ability to perceive in pointed contrast to that of those to whom Jesus speaks exclusively in parables.

Yet, "...to those (ἐκείνοις)," Matthew's Jesus continues his reply, to know these mysteries "has not been given" (Matt 13:11). Though he does not call them outsiders, Matthew piles on the justifications for the exclusion of those from the disciple group, beginning with the fact that it has not been given to them to know the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven.³⁹ Matthew's Jesus makes this point explicit. He then foregrounds a variant of a logion concerning the haves and the have-nots, which, in this context serves as an explanation that makes clear through parallelism that the disciples are the haves while those about whom they inquired are the have-nots.⁴⁰ Finally, Matthew resumes the

³⁷ Both Matthew and Luke include the plural, μυστήρια, but without an apparent difference in meaning from Mark's singular.

Matthew also employs his own preferred circumlocution for Mark's "kingdom of God" without an apparent difference in meaning.

³⁸ Matthew, like Mark, employs the divine passive δέδοται, but Matthew follows it with the infinitive γνῶναι, thus making a point of the disciples' knowing. Matthew also omits any Markan reproach toward the disciples (Mark 4:13), thus breaking the traditional pattern employed by Mark (a. teaching...d. reproach [Lemcio, "External Evidence," 323-338; see note 16, above]) and casting the disciples in a somewhat more consistently positive light.

³⁹ Cf. Mark 4:11.

⁴⁰ Mark includes a similar variant of a saying concerning those who do and do not have, but places it later in the section at the end of Jesus' private instruction (Mark 4:25). Matthew fronts the saying, and employs a relatively parallel structure between verses 11 and 12, contrasting a positive group (those to whom the mysteries have been given to

Markan line (Mark 4:11) and provides his own version of a scriptural explanation concerning Jesus' use of parables.

“This is why (διὰ τοῦτο) I speak to them in parables,” Matthew’s Jesus continues, finally addressing the actual question at hand, “because (ὅτι) seeing they do not see, and hearing they do not hear, nor do they understand” (Matt 13:13). Matthew here paraphrases Isaiah 6:9—possibly via Mark—and Jeremiah 5:21, both of which he will pick up again separately in the next few verses in order to prove his own point concerning those to whom the parables are addressed.⁴¹ Notably in his adaptation, Matthew replaces Mark’s ἵνα with ὅτι, thus shifting the responsibility for Jesus’ use of parables onto the people for whom they are intended. The parables become the effect of the people’s unseeing and unhearing posture, rather than its cause. The Matthean Jesus goes on to reiterate this message with a direct citation of the text of the Old Greek of Isaiah 6:9, invoking the prophet’s harsh words against those who have shut their eyes to his

know//those who have) with a negative group (those to whom it has not been given//those who do not have).

Matthew uses another similar (but distinctive) variant of a saying concerning those who do or do not have again in 25:29 as part of an explanatory addendum to the parable of the servant’s various “investment”—or not—of their master’s talents.

“Thus it is explained why the parables hide and reveal at the same time. Their effect—illumination or darkness—depends on the status of the hearer. Knowledge is rewarded with knowledge, ignorance with ignorance. Like begets like” (Davies and Allison, *Matthew, Vol. 1*, 391).

⁴¹ Matt 13:13 matches the negativized verbs of Jeremiah (Jer 5:21 [OG]: ... ὀφθαλμοὶ αὐτοῖς καὶ οὐ βλέπουσιν, ὅτι αὐτοῖς καὶ οὐκ ἀκούουσιν), but his use of repeated cognate roots bears similarity to the language of Isaiah (Isa 6:9 [OG]: ... **Ἀκοῆ ἄκούσετε καὶ οὐ μὴ συνῆτε καὶ βλέποντες βλέψετε καὶ οὐ μὴ ἴδητε**). Matthew’s language may also offer a paraphrase of Mark 4:12 (Evans, *To See*, 107). Even if it were primarily a paraphrase of Mark, though, Matthew elsewhere demonstrates an independent knowledge of Isaiah 6:9 (OG) and Jeremiah 5:21 (OG), and so has paraphrased his synoptic source with full knowledge of a Greek translation of these Jewish Scriptures.

mysteries, and who now might neither look nor listen nor turn to be healed.⁴² Jesus' use of parables, according to this memory, merely reinforces what is already true about these people: that they listen without understanding and look without perception. They are the ones, according to the interpretation of the sower parable, who hear "the word of the kingdom and [do] not understand it..." (Matt 13:19). According to Matthew, neither God nor the parables are to blame; rather, those, of whom the disciples asked and Jesus replied, have sealed their own fate by their obduracy. They are not, however, Jesus' primary concern.

Rather, after offering an extended version of the Isaianic condemnation, Matthew turns the attention back to Jesus' positive assessment of his own disciples. The Matthean Jesus uniquely affirms the disciple audience by offering a reversal of the Jeremiah passage to which he alluded previously: "But blessed are your eyes because they do see, and your ears because they do hear" (Matt 13:16). Unlike Mark's generally deprecatory attitude toward the disciples, Matthew considers them blessed beyond even the prophets and righteous people of Israel's past (13:17). When Jesus asks the disciples "Have you understood all this?" Matthew omits any reproach and reports only that the disciples respond with a resounding and unquestioned "Yes" (Matt 13:51).⁴³

⁴² Matthew introduces the citation with a fulfillment formula—a typically Matthean addition—still spoken by Jesus: "Indeed, in them the prophecy of Isaiah is fulfilled..." This is the only example in which the evangelist directs such a citation toward a group of people. The fulfillment citations in general tend to underline God's organization and intention in history, whether for apologetic or didactic purposes. In this case, the appeal to Jewish scriptures as affirmation of the exclusion of "Israel," strikes a particularly harsh and condemnatory chord against those to whom the parables are addressed.

⁴³ The latter question and response come near the end of Matthew's "reprise" of the extended parable with private explanation (Matt 13:24-51).

Cf. Matt 15:15; 16:9-12

This positive assessment of the disciples corresponds with Matthew’s more inviting interpretation of the function of parables in general. Despite having taken over much of Mark’s language, Matthew’s interpretation and expansion of the source material suggest that, by his account, though there are those for whom the parables may remain opaque, that is the hearers’ doing, not the parables’, and not God’s. Even when Jesus addresses the parables to the crowd, Matthew verifies via another scriptural allusion, he does so not to conceal his message but to “proclaim what has been hidden from the foundation of the world” (Matt 13:35). In Matthew’s experience, the parables have the capacity to proclaim hidden truths, to be heard and to yield abundant fruit in their hearers (Matt 13:23), but only those who have not dulled their own hearts will hear and understand.

2.1.3 Luke 8:10

...ὁμῖν δέδοται γνῶναι τὰ μυστήρια τῆς βασιλείας⁴⁴ τοῦ θεοῦ, τοῖς δὲ λοιποῖς
|-----omit-----|

ἐν παραβολαῖς, ἵνα βλέποντες μὴ βλέπωσιν⁴⁵ καὶ ἀκούοντες μὴ συνιῶσιν.
ιδῶσιν

In both content and context the Lukan variant has much in common with the performances of its Synoptic counterparts, reflective of its mostly shared received memory. Nevertheless, its differences represent a significantly altered memory of the meaning of this saying. Most significantly, the Lukan performance of this variant

⁴⁴ Omit τῆς βασιλείας W 579 ff². This omission leaves the mysteries given to the disciples as simply the mysteries of God, rather than of God’s kingdom, possibly as a harmonization—intentional or not—to another New Testament writing (cf. 1 Cor 2:1, 7; 4:1; Col 2:2; and Rev 10:7).

⁴⁵ ιδῶσιν D L W Ξ 1. 700. 2542; cf. Matt 13:15 and Isa 6:10 (OG). Isa 6:9 (OG) also contains a negativized aorist active subjunctive form of ὁράω but in the second person rather than the third as in 6:10 and the present textual variant of Luke 8:10.

expands the narrative audience that is privy to Jesus' explanation and mitigates the effect of the parables for those who are not.

To start, Luke sets a somewhat different scene. Luke's Jesus has been traveling from city to city and village to village (κατὰ πόλιν καὶ κώμην) around Galilee, proclaiming a message concerning the kingdom of God (Luke 8:1), so that now a crowd has gathered and the people of these cities (κατὰ πόλιν) have come to him to hear him do more of the same (8:4). By describing the people who have come to Jesus with the same language as he uses to relate Jesus' travels, Luke connects the present teaching to the initial success of Jesus' progressing mission.⁴⁶ In addition to this description, verses 2-3 offer a distinctly Lukan memory concerning the presence and beneficence of various women in the group traveling with Jesus. As a prelude to the forthcoming teaching, these women, several of whom are reported to have been healed of sickness or possession by evil spirits (8:2), are evidence both of the efficacy and the inclusivity of Jesus' message. The women, the twelve (8:1), and the people of the various towns, are all part of the group that has come to him (πρὸς αὐτὸν), and Luke's Jesus does not separate himself from them.⁴⁷

Luke does not narrate a change of scene (cf. Mark 4:10) as Jesus speaks to the whole group through a parable, and even when the disciples ask him about the parable after. Nor does he indicate that the disciples would differentiate themselves from the rest

⁴⁶ Furthermore, the present participle (Συνιόντος) and genitive absolute (τῶν ... ἐπιπορευομένων) describing the crowd and people respectively indicate the ongoing growth of Jesus' audience (8:4) (Joseph Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke I-IX*, AB 28 [Garden City: Doubleday, 1985], 702).

⁴⁷ Unlike Mark and Matthew, Luke does not describe Jesus as having to get into a boat on account of the size of the crowd (cf. Mark 4:1; Matt 13:2). Luke does remember that happening, but not as the context of this variant (Luke 5:2-3).

of the audience (cf. Matt 13:10). Luke reports that the disciples ask, within earshot and on behalf of everyone, what this parable might be. And, Luke implies that all the people who have gathered are included when, in his reply, Jesus addresses the entire narrative audience in the second person plural (ὕμῖν; Luke 8:10). To all of them has been given to know the mysteries of the kingdom (Luke 8:10); indeed, that is why they are there (8:1). Whereas Matthew and Mark emphasize the privacy and exclusivity of Jesus' explanatory teaching, Luke suggests its openness.⁴⁸

That is not to say that in Luke's experience everyone gets to know the mysteries. The second half of the Lukan variant follows the Synoptic pattern in dealing with those who do not. Luke's Jesus describes this group to his audience as οἱ λοιποὶ, a set of people who are presumably real but are not present. To these others, the Lukan Jesus explains, the mysteries are given by means of parables,⁴⁹ so that (ἴνα) despite their seeing and listening they might not actually see, nor understand. Luke keeps Mark's introductory ἴνα, but his paraphrase of Isaiah, removes much of the Markan version's bite.⁵⁰ Without the emphatic use of cognate verbs, the people's seeing and listening feel less intensely earnest, making their failure to see or understand feel less unjust. Furthermore, Luke cuts off the scriptural paraphrase before the μήποτε clause, thereby removing any notion that,

⁴⁸ Richard Longenecker has suggested that, by lessening the private versus public distinction in this scene, Luke intentionally breaks with Jewish rhetorical convention to make it more palatable to a Gentile audience (Richard N. Longenecker, "Luke's Parables of the Kingdom (Luke 8:4-15; 13:18-21)," in *The Challenge of Jesus' Parables*, ed. Richard N. Longenecker [Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2017], 125-147); cf. Mark's emphasis on the privacy of Jesus' conversation with those around him (see n. 16 above).

⁴⁹ Luke omits both the subject and verb of this second clause (... τοῖς δὲ λοιποῖς ἐν παραβολαῖς [8:10]). This ellipsis is most readily completed by repeating the first clause, so that Luke's meaning would be: τοῖς δὲ λοιποῖς [δέδοται γνῶναι τὰ μυστήρια τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ] ἐν παραβολαῖς.

⁵⁰ Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders, *Luke and Scripture: The Function of Sacred Tradition in Luke-Acts* (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 1993), 177.

on account of this present failure, these people would be prevented from future turning toward understanding or forgiveness (cf. Mark 4:12). With no μήποτε, even the ἵνα sounds less like a purpose conjunction connoting divine intent and more like a result conjunction admitting the real but unfortunate circumstance of those who do not see or understand.⁵¹ For these others, there is, if not more hope, at least less reason to despair, according to the Lukan variant.⁵²

This fits with Luke's diminished sense of the variant's scope and significance in the Gospel overall. For Mark, the variant gave Jesus' voice to an overarching theory concerning the purpose of all the parables in that Gospel: that they were intentionally opaque so as to keep those outside from understanding. This is not the case for Luke. At this point in the narrative, Luke has established Jesus as one who regularly uses figurative speech in his teaching, but the evangelist does not remember this pedagogical strategy as having obscured Jesus' message.⁵³ Luke has used the term παραβολή to describe figurative speech as well as proverb-like sayings, cited explicitly within the text as familiar to, and understood by, Jesus' audience.⁵⁴ On multiple occasions Luke has described individuals both in and outside the disciple-community as understanding

⁵¹ Cf. Fitzmyer, *Luke I-IX*, 708-709.

⁵² Later in the Gospel, Luke's Jesus uses another parable to reprimand some members of his audience for believing that they were righteous while others (τοὺς λοιποὺς) were contemptible (Luke 18:9-14). In both cases, Luke uses the voice of Jesus to take an at least somewhat charitable stance toward "others."

⁵³ E.g., Luke 4:23; 5:10; 5:31, 34-35, 36-39; 6:38, 39, 41-42, 43-44, 47-49; 7:31-35, and 40-43

⁵⁴ Particularly in Luke 4:23, Luke's Jesus anticipates that his audience will quote to him a presumably well-known parable or proverb concerning a physician healing himself (πάντως ἐρεῖτέ μοι τὴν παραβολὴν ταύτην ἰατρέ, θεράπευσον σεαυτόν). See also the familiar wisdom quality of the "parables" concerning wine and wineskins (5:36) and the futility of a blind person leading another blind person (6:39).

clearly the meaning of Jesus' figurative or comparative lessons.⁵⁵ Jesus' teaching has occasionally been divisive for his narrative audiences, but that divisiveness generally has been the result of the audiences' proper understanding of his message, not their confusion.⁵⁶ Unlike Mark's parable theory, for Luke, Jesus' use of parables tends to be transparent, and his performance of the variant aligns with that.

Luke remembers the variant as part of a conversation in which Jesus shares and explains only one parable, that of the seed sown in various soils.⁵⁷ Luke is familiar with collection(s) of parables attributed to Jesus, including Mark's.⁵⁸ By situating this variant apart from a parable collection, and in response to a question about one parable in particular, however, he reduces its impact as a commentary on parables in general. According to Luke, the parables did not usually require special explanation, so the variant would not fit in this Gospel as a generalized Lukan parable theory. Unlike Mark's

⁵⁵ E.g., Luke 4:23-40; 7:40-43

⁵⁶ See, especially, the crowd's response in Luke 4:23-40.

⁵⁷ Luke introduces the scene by reporting that Jesus spoke to the crowd through a parable (διὰ παραβολῆς; Luke 8:4; cf. Mark 4:2, Matt 13:3), singular, which he then does (Luke 8:5-8). The disciples inquire about this same parable, singular (αὕτη... ἡ παραβολή; Luke 8:9; cf. Mark 4:13, Matt 13:10).

Each of the Synoptic variants contains a tension of numbers between the question posed and Jesus' two—or more—part answer. Luke is the only one to opt for the singular (παραβολή) in the question, but the tension in his text reflects the disparity between his source material and redaction (Francois Bovon, *Luke 1: A Commentary on the Gospel of Luke 1:1-9:50*, Hermeneia, trans. Christine M. Thomas [Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2002], 312).

The illustrative pericope of the lamp on the lampstand (Luke 8:16), versions of which are found in the same section as the Markan variant, as well as Matthew, and elsewhere in Luke (Mark 4:21; Matt 5:15; and Luke 11:33), is part of the explanation concerning parables and the preaching of the reign of God but is not a parable in itself, since it contains neither the word parable nor any explicit comparison.

⁵⁸ See, e.g., Luke 13:18-19 (par. Mark 4:30-32; Matt 13:31-32), Luke 13:20-21 (par. Matt 13:33); Luke 15:3-7, 8-10, 11-32; 18:1-5 and 9-14.

assertion that Jesus would speak in parables to one group but explain them privately to his own disciples (cf. Mark 4:33-34), this is part of the only instance in which Luke's Jesus follows up a parable with an extended interpretation of it at all (Luke 8:10-15).⁵⁹ Thus for Luke, the variant is not a theory concerning nor a commentary on the parables in general but is rather a commentary on the interpretation of this parable in particular, assuring Jesus' audience that if they are listening, they have been given what they need to know concerning the mysteries of the kingdom.

In both the parable and its interpretation, Luke draws unique attention to the seed, which is the word of God (Luke 8:5, 11), as well as the unqualifiedly positive results of its falling on good soil (8:8, 15). For Luke, when the seed falls on good soil, the beautiful and good hearts of those who hear the word, it only ever produces maximum yields (8:15).⁶⁰ There is no prerequisite of acceptance or understanding, simply hearing and holding fast, with the implication that anyone could do that.⁶¹ This is supported by Luke's reporting that, at the end of the initial parable, Jesus calls out (ἐφώνει), "Let anyone with ears to hear, hear!" (8:8), so that anyone—indeed everyone—could hear. The Lukan variant reinforces this same optimism and openness.

⁵⁹ Luke remembers brief explanatory comments on individual parables, addressed to the same audience as the parables themselves, in, e.g.: Luke 15:7, 10; 18:6-8, and 18:14.

⁶⁰ Cf., Mark 4:8, 20; Matt 13:8, 23.

Because of this positive emphasis, Eduard Schweizer titled this parable in Luke, "The Parable of Those Who Hear the Word" (Eduard Schweizer, *The Good News according to Luke*, trans. D. E. Green [Atlanta: John Knox, 1984], 143).

⁶¹ Cf. παραδέχομαι (Mark 4:20); συνίημι (Mat 13:23)

2.2 Conclusions Concerning the “Explaining the Parables” Cluster

These variants are evidence for variation in the memories of the voice of Jesus already at play in the first century, as well as variation in the memories of Jesus’ own understanding of his multiple audiences and the intentions of his teachings for them. Mark’s variant preserves a memory of Jesus’ speaking with divine authority and judgment to a small group around him. The Markan Jesus describes the parables as though they are a microcosm of his teaching and mission, emphasizing the mystery and exclusivity of the kingdom, such that even his own disciples’ status as insiders is the inexplicable product of God’s will and not their own knowledge or understanding. Matthew’s variant maintains a similar emphasis on the exclusivity of the disciple community, which makes up its narrative audience. Matthew, however, suggests that human agency and capacity for understanding are qualifying factors for either inclusion or exclusion in that community, and emphasizes the great benefit of being included among the disciples. Luke remembers a more diverse and inclusive narrative audience for his variant, which deemphasizes the role of the parables in preventing individuals from understanding the message of the kingdom or joining the community. Though each of these authors remembers Jesus as having spoken in parables, the variants of their explanations as to *why* point beyond their notions of the parables themselves to disparate memories of the role of secrecy and exclusive teaching or understanding in the formation of Jesus’ own community. But these memories, furthermore, point beyond their performance contexts to those of the communities in which they were recalled and recorded.

These disparate memories are, at least in part, the natural result of the process of remembering, which always filters the representation of past words or events through the

present circumstance and understanding of the one or ones doing the remembering. In this case, the variants—memories of Jesus’ response concerning the parables—filter the already-remembered accounts of Jesus’ words through the three evangelists’ present and distinctive circumstances, their own experience of the function of parables, secrecy, and exclusivity in community identity during the late first century. In this way, the variants serve as evidence for their own discursive contexts and are part of a broader inter-community debate within the early Jesus movement over what was meant by and required for inclusion within the community. Communities with competing ideas, experiences, and concerns remembered the voice of Jesus through (and therefore speaking to) their present needs; and they used those memories of Jesus’ voice to support their own positions. Mark and Matthew, each in their own way remembered Jesus as having intentionally employed a cryptic pattern of speech as a means of keeping outsiders out, of his community and theirs. Luke was not. Others would weigh in, using Jesus’ own voice to argue that the cryptic nature of his teaching was meant to spur the individual’s search for deeper knowledge, or that the teaching that had been cryptic for Jesus’ disciples could be understood plainly by his followers after the resurrection, or could be interpreted rightly only by an elite few. In each case, the author remembers the voice of Jesus through his own experience. When considered as meaningful variants, the sayings of this cluster support a developing understanding of this type of debate, already active in the first century, and the ways memories of the voice of Jesus contributed to the competition.

Table 2.2: “Explaining the Parable(s)” Cluster, Variants’ Contents

| Variant | “To you...” | | | | | | | | |
|------------------|-------------|------|--------------|-------------|---------|-------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|-------------|
| | ὅτι | Whom | | | What | | | | Why |
| | | ὕμιν | τὸ μυστήριον | τὰ μυστήρια | δέδοται | (δέδοται) γινῶναι | τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ | τῆς βασιλείας τῶν οὐρανῶν | |
| 1. Mark 4:11-12 | | X | X | | X | | X | | X (v.25) |
| 2. Matt 13:11-13 | X | X | | X | X | X | | X | X |
| 3. Luke 8:10 | | X | | X | X | X | X | | X (v.18) |

| Variant | “...but to X...” | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|----------|-------------|---------------------|--------------|-------------|---------------|------------------|-------------|---|-----------------|-----|----------------------------------|----------|--|
| | δέ | Whom | | | | What | | | | Why | | | | | |
| | | ἐκείνοις | αὐτοῖς | (ἐκείνοις) τοῖς ἔξω | τοῖς λοιποῖς | οὐ δέδοται | ἐν παραβολαῖς | τὰ πάντα γίνεται | λαλῶ | “... but from the one who does not have...” | διὰ τοῦτο...ὅτι | ἵνα | Scripture Cit./ Paraph./Allusion | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | Isa 6:9-10 | Jer 5:21 | |
| βλέποντες... neg. ...ἀκούοντες... neg. μήποτε... | οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ ὅτι βλέπουσιν... τὰ ὄρα ... ὅτι ἀκούουσιν | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Mark 4:11-12 | X | X | | X | | X | X | | X (v.25) | | X | X | | | |
| 2. Matt 13:11-13 | X | X | X (v.13) | | X | X (v.13) | | X (v.13) | X | X | | X | X (v.15) | X | |
| 3. Luke 8:10 | X | | | X | | X | | X | X (v.18) | | X | X | | | |

Table 2.3: “Explaining the Parable(s)” Cluster, Variants’ Contexts

| Variant’s Context | Opening Scene | | | | | | Jesus’ teaching | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------|-------------------------------|---|------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|--|-------------------------|---------|------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|-------------------------------|-------------|
| | Scene | | Audience | | Scene | | Initial parable | | | | Scene | Question | | Jesus’ Response | |
| | Jesus teaching beside the sea | Unspecified (traveling through κατὰ πόντιν καὶ κόμητιν) | Crowd(s) (great/large) | ...and those κατὰ πόντιν | Crowd: on land/beach; Jesus in boat | | Jesus teaching/telling many things in parables | Jesus said in a parable | Ἀκούετε | ἰδοὺ | A sower went out to sow (his seed)... | Let anyone with ears to hear, hear | When he (Jesus) was alone... | And the disciples came... | Questioners |
| Mark 4:1-34 | X | | X | | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | | οἱ περὶ αὐτὸν σὺν τοῖς δώδεκα | ἠρώτων αὐτὸν... τίς παραβολάς | X |
| Matt 13:1-35 | X | | X | | X | | X | X | X | | X | οἱ μαθηταὶ | εἶπαν αὐτῷ διὰ τί ἐν παραβολαῖς λαλεῖς αὐτοῖς; | X | |
| Luke 8:4-18 | | X | X | X | | X | | | X | | | οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ | Ἐπηρώτων δὲ αὐτὸν ... τίς αὕτη εἴη ἡ παραβολή | X | |

Table 2.3: Variants' Contexts (continued)

| Variant's Context | Jesus' Response (continued) | | | | | | | | | | | | | Evangelist's Closing Remark(s) | | | |
|-------------------|--------------------------------|--|---|------------------------|--|----------------------------------|---|-------------------------|---|--|---|---------------------|--------------|--------------------------------|---|----------------|---|
| | Scriptural explanation | | Explanation of Parable | | | Further illustration/explanation | | | | Kingdom Parables | | | | | | | |
| | Fulfillment Citation (Isa 6:9) | "But blessed are your eyes ... and your ears... many prophets and righteous ..." | Intro to explanation | Explanation of parable | Primary element in explanation | Illustration: lamp on lampstand | Explanation: nothing hidden, except to be disclosed | βλέπετε τί/πὸς ἀκούετε. | Explanation: the measure by which you measure ... | Explanation: to the one who has... but from the one who does not have... | Seed grows; the one who throws is does not know how | Wheat and the Weeds | Mustard Seed | | | Yeast in flour | |
| Mark 4:1-34 | | | | X | ὁ σπείρων τὸν λόγον σπείρει | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | | |
| Matt 13:1-35 | X | X | Ἵμεῖς οὖν ἀκούσατε τὴν παραβολὴν τοῦ σπείραντος | X | παντὸς ἀκούοντος τὸν λόγον τῆς βασιλείας | X | | | | (X) | | X | X | X | X | | X |
| Luke 8:4-18 | | | Ἔστιν δὲ αὕτη ἡ παραβολή | X | ὁ σπόρος ἐστὶν ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ | X | X | X | | X | | | | | | | |

Chapter 3: The “Asking, Seeking, and/or Knocking” Sayings Cluster

The previous case study considered instances of the social memory of a saying of Jesus from the first century CE, but the sayings of Jesus tradition continued to proliferate in the social memory of early Christians throughout and well beyond the first century. This second case study, therefore, considers a cluster of Jesus sayings, on asking, seeking, and knocking, variants of which are found in at least ten texts from across the first three centuries, and the ideas of which have long provoked great interest and debate. Perhaps the best known of this cluster is the saying as it appears in Matthew and Luke: “Ask, and it will be given to you; seek and you will find; knock, and will be opened to you...” (Matt 7:7; Luke 11:9). But at the turn of the third century CE, Tertullian and others with whose teaching he was familiar knew a variant, “Seek, and you will find.”¹ In fact, in his *Prescription against Heretics*, Tertullian complained about these others’ misinterpretation of this variant. They would, he claimed, fraternize with magicians, astrologers, and philosophers and devote themselves to curious questions, all under the banner of this teaching of Jesus. Notably, Tertullian does not dispute his opponents’ memory of the wording of the saying (despite the fact that this form, with “seek” alone, is not found in any of the now-canonical sources), but implicit in his accusation that these seekers were devoid of truth, wisdom, and even God, was the charge that they had somehow misremembered Jesus’ meaning in this saying. Nevertheless, what Tertullian considered the deficient or even heretical memory of his opponents, presumably was for them their authentic memory of Jesus’ saying and its sense.² The variants of this cluster

¹ Tertullian, *Praescr.* 43.1, trans. Peter Holmes (*ANF*, 3.264).

² The point, in this case, is not whether or to what extent Tertullian can be understood as accurately representing the particulars of his opponents’ memory. The usefulness of heresiological writings for reconstructions of history, particularly

are evidence that others, too, differed in their memory, of the saying itself and its meaning, each holding theirs to be the authentic memory of Jesus' words and intention.

Variants related to this cluster—concerning in particular the elements of seeking and finding—predate Tertullian's or his opponents' memories, as well as that of Jesus himself. Similar sayings had been common in Jewish and Greco-Roman proverbial wisdom for centuries. The Wisdom of Solomon, for example, instructs its audience concerning wisdom, that she "is found by those who seek her" (Wis 6:12), while other Jewish sources describe wisdom, truth, or occasionally Godself, as the ideal objects of one's seeking.³ In the Greek philosophical tradition, too, seeking and finding had become a trope of sorts, describing the philosophical process itself as in opposition to base skepticism or unreflectiveness.⁴ Whether Jesus of Nazareth spoke on asking, seeking, or knocking, or whether a common proverb at some point drifted into the sayings of Jesus tradition is immaterial, as the variants considered in this cluster were remembered as

concerning their opponents, has long been recognized as severely limited and problematic (e.g., Walter Bauer, *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity*, ed. Robert A. Kraft and Gerhard Kroedel, trans. Philadelphia Seminar on Christian Origins [Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971]; Averil Cameron, "How to Read Heresiology," *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies*, 33 [2003]: 471-492; Karen King, "The Social and Theological Effects of Heresiological Discourse," in *Heresy and Identity in Late Antiquity*, ed. Eduard Iricisnschi and Holger M. Zellentin [Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008], 28-49; and Todd S. Berzon, *Classifying Christians: Ethnography, Heresiology, and the Limits of Knowledge* [Oakland, CA: University of California Press, 2016]). Rather, the point here is that, in a dispute over competing memories of Jesus' meaning, both sides would have believed their memory to be authentic.

³ Hans Dieter Betz provides a list of examples in Jewish literature, including Philo of Alexandria's *Gig.*, *Deus*; Deut 4:29; 1 Chr 16:10-11; 28:9; Job 8:5; Pss 22:27; 27:8; Prov. 1:28; Wis 6:12, 14; 13:6-7; and Sir 6:27 (Hans Dieter Betz, *The Sermon on the Mount*, Hermeneia [Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995], 501-502).

⁴ E.g., Plato's *Gorg.*; Epictetus's *Diatr.* (Betz, *Sermon on the Mount*, 501-502).

Jesus tradition.⁵ Both Matthew and Luke, for example, likely drawing on Q or a common source of some sort, remember Jesus as saying to his audience: “Ask, and it will be given you; seek, and you will find; knock, and it will be opened to you. For everyone who asks receives, and everyone who seeks finds, and to everyone who knocks, it will be opened” (Matt 7:7-8; Luke 11:9-10). Other variants concerning asking, seeking, and/or knocking are found in the manuscripts of all four canonical Gospels, the canonical epistles of James and 1 John, and outside the New Testament canon in the Gospel of Thomas, the Dialogue of the Savior, the Apocryphon of James, and the Miscellanies of Clement of Alexandria.

The variants in this cluster are more diverse—in terms of their wording, their narrative or performance contexts, and the socio-historical contexts of their authoring and reception—than those of the previous case study, but the premise that each preserves a distinct instance of memory is the same here as there. Each of the authors received one or several pieces of the social memory concerning a saying on asking, seeking, and/or knocking, internalized it through his own socially-formed frameworks, and performed it anew to his own socially-engaged audience, thereby contributing again to its existence in the social memory. What we have in each variant is the record of the performance, which is at once evidence of the memory received and the internalized, socially-engaged processing of that memory that led to its present performance. A saying within this cluster was remembered in some socially-engaged contexts as assuring the audience of

⁵ The possibility that a saying might predate Jesus in the wisdom sayings tradition would pose a problem to scholars applying a criteria approach to the Jesus sayings, because it would mean a saying could not be authenticated as originating with Jesus. Under the variant-conscious approach, however, no such problem exists. Whether any of the authors in this cluster received a memory of this saying as a proverb or as a saying of Jesus, each in his performance of his memory presents it as a part of the Jesus sayings tradition.

God's and the community's beneficent provision; while in other contexts it was remembered as encouraging inward self-discovery and self-actualization—a memory that might have been received and remembered again by Tertullian's opponents. Several of these variants point beyond just these dramatic differences in meaning to differences in their authors' understandings of their own roles in the "remembering" processes and their authority as those either preserving or interpreting Jesus' words.

3.1 Defining the "Ask, Seek, and/or Knock" Variant Cluster

The unifying themes of this variant cluster are the actions of and reactions to asking, seeking, and/or knocking. Each of the variants included in this cluster contains at least one of these elements.⁶ In most cases, each of the variants preserves an explicit saying attributed to Jesus either by an introductory formula or general context. In a few cases, however, variants that are not attributed as such but that seem to be drawing self-consciously on known Jesus tradition have been included as evidence of how these sayings were thoroughly incorporated by those who were making the voice of Jesus their own (or vice versa). The criteria that a variant must be (1) an instance of saying of Jesus tradition (2) describing a cause-and-effect scenario predicated on (3) asking, seeking, and/or knocking have produced a cluster of eighteen variants, in eleven sources, which extend into the third century.

⁶ For this particular cluster, the variants specify neither for what the agent is to ask, seek, or knock, nor what, specifically, s/he can expect in return. This cluster excludes, then, many sayings that specify the object, or ideal object, of one's asking, seeking, or knocking; cf. e.g., Mark 8:12; Matt 6:33; Luke 11:29; 12:31; 17:33; John 7:34; or James 1:5, which have all been excluded from the cluster because they specify the object in question, whether it be the "kingdom of God," "wisdom," or Jesus himself.

Table 3.1: Variants of the “Ask, Seek, and/or Knock” Cluster⁷

| Source | Variant Citation | Variant |
|--------|------------------|---|
| Matt | 7:7-8 | Αἰτεῖτε καὶ δοθήσεται ὑμῖν, ζητεῖτε καὶ εὕρήσετε, κρούετε καὶ ἀνοιγήσεται ὑμῖν· πᾶς γὰρ ὁ αἰτῶν λαμβάνει καὶ ὁ ζητῶν εὕρισκει καὶ τῷ κρούοντι ἀνοιγήσεται. |
| | | “... Ask, and it will be given you; seek, and you will find; knock, and it will be opened to you. For everyone who asks receives, and everyone who seeks finds, and to everyone who knocks, it will be opened...” |
| | 21:22 | καὶ πάντα ὅσα ἂν αἰτήσητε ἐν τῇ προσευχῇ πιστεύοντες λήμψεσθε. |
| | | “... Whatever [everything whatsoever] you ask for in prayer, trusting, you will receive.” |
| Mark | 11:24 | διὰ τοῦτο λέγω ὑμῖν, πάντα ὅσα προσεύχεσθε καὶ αἰτεῖσθε, πιστεύετε ὅτι ἐλάβετε, καὶ ἔσται ὑμῖν. |
| | | “... Therefore I tell you, whatever [everything whatsoever] you pray and ask for, trust that you have received it, and it will be yours...” |
| Luke | 11:9-10 | Κἀγὼ ὑμῖν λέγω, αἰτεῖτε καὶ δοθήσεται ὑμῖν, ζητεῖτε καὶ εὕρήσετε, κρούετε καὶ ἀνοιγήσεται ὑμῖν· πᾶς γὰρ ὁ αἰτῶν λαμβάνει καὶ ὁ ζητῶν εὕρισκει καὶ τῷ κρούοντι ἀνογι[ήσ]εται. |

⁷ Units included in the cluster were identified and selected from those parallel texts suggested in *Novum Testamentum Graece*, Nestle-Aland, 28th ed.; James M. Robinson, Paul Hoffmann, and John S. Kloppenborg, eds., *The Critical Edition of Q*; Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2000), 214-21 [Q 11:9-13]; John Dominic Crossan, ed., *Sayings Parallels: A Workbook for the Jesus Tradition*, Foundations and Facets (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986); Francis E. Williams, “The Apocryphon of James,” in *Nag Hammadi Codex I (The Jung Codex): Introductions, Texts, Translations, Notes*, ed. Harold W. Attridge, 2 vols., NHS 22-3 (Leiden: Brill, 1985); April D. DeConick, *The Original Gospel of Thomas in Translation: With a Commentary and New English Translation of the Complete Gospel*, LNTS 287 (London: T&T Clark, 2006); and my own analysis. Unless otherwise indicated, original language texts and textual variants were taken from the following: NA²⁸; Bentley Layton, ed., *Nag Hammadi Codex II, 2-7 together with XIII, 2**, *Brit. Lib. Or.4926(1) and P.Oxy. 1, 654, 655*, vol. 1, NHS XX (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1989); Otto Stählin, ed., *Clemens Alexandrinus II*, GCS (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs’sche Buchhandlung, 1905); A. F. J. Klijn, *Jewish-Christian Gospel Tradition*, VC Supp 17 (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1992); and Stephen Emmel, ed., *Nag Hammadi Codex III, 5: The Dialogue of the Savior*, NHS XXVI (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1984). All translations are my own.

As mentioned above, for the purpose of this study, I have not treated individual manuscript witnesses as separate sources, and text critical variance will be considered only as it is significant to the present research. In addition, though the variant units recorded in Matt 7:7-8 and Luke 11:9-10 have often been attributed to the single source, Q, given the nature of the present project and its shift of focus away from what is presumed to be behind the extant sources and toward those sources themselves, I here consider each as its own variant unit.

| Source | Variant Citation | Variant |
|-----------------------|------------------|--|
| | | "...So I say to you, Ask, and it will be given you; seek, and you will find; knock, and it will be opened to you. For everyone who asks receives, and everyone who seeks finds, and to everyone who knocks, it will be opened..." |
| John | 14:13-14 | καὶ ὅ τι ἂν αἰτήσητε ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου τοῦτο ποιήσω, ἵνα δοξασθῇ ὁ πατήρ ἐν τῷ υἱῷ. ἐάν τι αἰτήσητέ με ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου ἐγὼ ποιήσω. "I will do whatever you ask in my name, so that the Father may be glorified in the Son. If you ask me for anything in my name, I will do it." |
| | 15:7 | ἐὰν μείνητε ἐν ἐμοὶ καὶ τὰ ῥήματά μου ἐν ὑμῖν μείνη, ὁ ἐὰν θέλητε αἰτήσασθε, καὶ γενήσεται ὑμῖν. "If you abide in me, and my words abide in you, ask for whatever you wish, and it will be done for you." |
| | 15:16b | ...ἵνα ὅ τι ἂν αἰτήσητε τὸν πατέρα ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου δῶ ὑμῖν. "...so that the Father will give you whatever you ask him in my name." |
| | 16:23-24 | Καὶ ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐμὲ οὐκ ἐρωτήσετε οὐδέν. ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ἂν τι αἰτήσητε τὸν πατέρα ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου δώσει ὑμῖν. ἕως ἄρτι οὐκ ἠτήσατε οὐδέν ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου· αἰτεῖτε καὶ λήμψεσθε, ἵνα ἡ χαρὰ ὑμῶν ᾖ πεπληρωμένη. "On that day you will request nothing from me. Truly truly, I say to you, if you ask the Father anything in my name, he will give it to you. Until now you have not asked anything in my name. Ask and you will receive, so that your joy may be complete." |
| 1 John | 3:22b | καὶ ὁ ἐὰν αἰτῶμεν, λαμβάνομεν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ, ὅτι τὰς ἐντολὰς αὐτοῦ τηροῦμεν καὶ τὰ ἀρεστὰ ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ ποιοῦμεν. ...and whatever we ask, we receive from him, because we keep his commandments and do what is pleasing before him |
| | 5:14-15 | καὶ αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ παρρησία ἣν ἔχομεν πρὸς αὐτόν, ὅτι ἐάν τι αἰτῶμεθα κατὰ τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ ἀκούει ἡμῶν. καὶ ἐὰν οἶδαμεν ὅτι ἀκούει ἡμῶν ὁ ἐὰν αἰτῶμεθα, οἶδαμεν ὅτι ἔχομεν τὰ αἰτήματα ἃ ἠτήκαμεν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ. And this is the confidence we have in him, that if we ask anything according to his will, he hears us. And if we know that he hears us in whatever we ask, we know that we have obtained the requests that we asked of him |
| James | 4:2b-3 | ...οὐκ ἔχετε διὰ τὸ μὴ αἰτεῖσθαι ὑμᾶς, αἰτεῖτε καὶ οὐ λαμβάνετε, διότι κακῶς αἰτεῖσθε, ἵνα ἐν ταῖς ἡδοναῖς ὑμῶν δαπανήσητε. ...you do not have, because you do not ask; you ask and you do not receive, because you ask wrongly, in order to spend it on your passions. |
| P. Oxy. 654 | 5-9 | [λέγει Ἰη(σοῦ)ς] μὴ παυσάσθω ὁ ζη[τῶν τοῦ ζητεῖν ἕως ἂν] ἔυρη, καὶ ὅταν ἔυρη [θαμβηθήσεται, καὶ θαμ]βηθεὶς βασιλεύσῃ, κα[ὶ] βασιλεύσας ἐπαναπα[ύ]σεται. "[Jesus said], The one who seeks should not cease [seeking until] they find. And when they find, [they will marvel. And when they mar]vel, they will reign. And [once they reign,] they will rest" |
| Gos. Thom. (NHC II,2) | 2 | πεχε ἰϛ χε ωἰνε αγω τετναςἰνε. εφωδανἰνε ρνα' ωτρητρ' αγω εφωδαν' ωτορητρ' ρναρ' ωρηρε αγω ρναρ' ρρο εχῆ πτηρη Jesus said, "The one who seeks should not cease seeking until they find. And when they find, they will be troubled. And when they are troubled, they will be amazed, and they will reign over all." |
| | 92 | πεχε ἰϛ χε ωἰνε αγω τετναςἰνε. ἀλλὰ νετατετῆχνογει ερωογ ἡνιροογ εἰπιχοογ νητην ἡφοογ ετῆναγ τενογ ερναῖ εχοογ αγω τετῆωἰνε αν' ἡσωογ Jesus said, "Seek and you will find. Yet, the things that you asked me about in those days and that I did not tell you at that time, now I do desire to say them, but you do not seek them." |

| Source | Variant Citation | Variant |
|---|------------------|---|
| | 94 | [πεχ.]ε̄ τ̄ς̄ πετω̄ινε̄ φ̄νᾱσινε̄. [πεττω̄ρ̄η̄ ε̄]ζ̄ογ̄ιν̄ σ̄ε̄νᾱδο̄γων̄ η̄ᾱφ̄ Jesus [said], “The one who seeks will find, and [the one who knocks,] to them it will be opened.” |
| <i>Strom.</i> (Clem. of Alex.) (Gos. Heb.?) | 5.14.96.3 | ἴσον γὰρ τούτοις ἐκεῖνα δύναται οὐ παύσεται ὁ ζητῶν, ἕως ἂν εὕρῃ εὐρὸν δὲ θαμβηθήσεται, θαμβησεῖς δὲ βασιλεύσει, βασιλεύσας δὲ ἐπαναπαήσεται “For similar to those the following is possible: The one who seeks will not cease until they find, and having found, they will marvel, and having marveled they will rule, and having ruled, they will rest.” |
| Dial. Sav. | 129:14b-16a | ᾱγω̄ πετ̄σο̄ [...η̄ᾱ]ρε̄φ̄ω̄ινε̄ ἡ̄φ̄σινε̄ ἡ̄φ̄ρᾱ[ω̄ε̄] “...And [let] the one who [...] seek and find and [rejoice]” |
| Ap. Jas. | 10:32-34 | ε̄ρῑ πᾱρᾱκᾱλεῑ ἡ̄πῑω̄τ̄ τ̄ω̄β̄ε̄ ἡ̄πῑνο̄γ̄τε̄ ἡ̄ρᾱε̄ ἡ̄σᾱπ̄ ᾱγω̄ φ̄νᾱ† η̄η̄τ̄η̄ “...Invoke the Father, ask (pray to) God often, and he will give to you...” |

In order to organize these variants the cluster is divided into three primary sub-groups of variants: those that include all three elements (“Asking, Seeking, Knocking”), those that primarily emphasize asking (“Asking...”), and those that primarily emphasize seeking (“Seeking...”). The latter two sub-groups have been further divided, according to other common characteristics within them. For the asking variants, there are those that add no qualification to the idea of asking (“Asking: Unqualified”), while there are others that link proper asking to “trust” (“Asking: Qualified (Trust)”), or to asking “in Jesus’ name” or in some other particular way (“Asking: Qualified (Other)”). For the seeking variants, there are some that describe simply seeking and finding (“Seeking (and Knocking): Unqualified”), and others that describe seeking as the first in a chain of causes and their effects (“Seeking: Unqualified (Seeking, plus)”). Finally, those that are not directly attributed to Jesus are treated separately (“Asking and/or Seeking: Not Attributed to Jesus”). These sub-divisions are meant to highlight similarities between variants, not to suggest genealogical relationships between them.⁸

⁸ Table 3.2 at the end of this chapter offers a table comparing these and other common elements of the variants.

3.2 A Variant-Conscious Presentation of the “Ask, Seek, and/or Knock” Cluster

3.2.1 Asking, Seeking, Knocking

1. Matthew 7:7-8⁹

Αἰτεῖτε καὶ δοθήσεται ὑμῖν, ζητεῖτε καὶ εὕρησете, κρούετε καὶ ἀνοιγήσεται ὑμῖν· πᾶς γὰρ
ὁ αἰτῶν λαμβάνει καὶ ὁ ζητῶν εὕρισκει καὶ τῷ κρούοντι ἀνοιγήσεται.¹⁰
ανοιγεται
ανοιχθησεται

This Matthean variant, which is preserved in a remarkably stable form across all extant manuscript witnesses, contains what might previously have been two independent triple-stich sayings, both of which contain all three elements of the present cluster. If they were divided, the first would be the imperatival set of instructions and promised results concerning asking, seeking, and knocking, and the second, a participial generalization concerning the same.¹¹ When read with the first, the latter offers an explanation or proof for the former by means of a claim to universal truth, however incredible that claim may

⁹ The base text, highlighted here in light grey, and critical apparatus for this and all other extant canonical New Testament witnesses are taken from Nestle-Aland²⁸. As with the previous case study, this presentation of textual variants is based roughly on the model proposed by Eldon Epp in his sample section of a variant-conscious edition (“It’s All About Variants: A Variant-conscious Approach to New Testament Textual Criticism,” *HTR* 100 [2007]: 275-308).

¹⁰ ανοιγεται B; ανοιχθησεται Θ

¹¹ The imperative verbs (Αἰτεῖτε...ζητεῖτε...κρούετε) can be read as conditional imperatives, in which case they are stating the protases on which the apodoses (δοθήσεται ὑμῖν...εὕρησете...ἀνοιγήσεται ὑμῖν) depend. Conditional imperatives are almost always followed by the *καὶ* + *future indicative* structure found here. In this case, the imperatives have not lost their injunctive sense, rather the force of the mood remains (so, “If you ask [and you should]...”). Furthermore, in a volitional clause, the iterative present imperative indicates that the actions are to be done not just once, but repeatedly (“Ask repeatedly, over and over again...”). The sense of the phrase thus becomes “If you keep asking—and you should—you will receive...” (Daniel B. Wallace, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the Greek New Testament* [Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1996], 491-493; 520-521; 721-722). The same is true of the present imperative verbs in Luke 11:9.

seem.¹² In both cases the three elements function synonymously, rather than sequentially or causally. That is, asking is equivalent to seeking, which is equivalent to knocking, so that seeking and knocking are not predicated upon first having asked, but are providing repetition for rhetorical effect.¹³ While the former triad addresses the narrative audience using the second person plural, it does not specify whom this group should ask or for what, nor where they should seek, nor upon whose door they should knock. Neither does it name what they might expect to be given, or to find, or to have opened for them. This open-endedness and broad applicability of the variant is typical of a proverbial saying. The passive verbs following the first and third elements suggest that, though the narrative audience is expected to initiate the asking and knocking, someone else is expected to respond; they don't, however, specify who that third party agent might be.¹⁴ The latter

¹² Ulrich Luz argues that despite its conjunctive *γάρ*, verse 8 merely reiterates the promise of verse 7 (Ulrich Luz, *Matthew 1-7*, Hermeneia, trans. James E. Crouch [Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007], 358). Davies and Allison, however, insist the two verses are not tautological, since the former emphasizes the imperative actions and the latter the expected reactions (W.D. Davies and Dale C. Allison, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to Saint Matthew, Vol. 1: Introduction and Commentary on Matthew I-VII* [ICC; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1988], 680). As presented the verses work together for both instruction and assurance.

¹³ Luz suggests the three-fold phrasing adds a sense of urgency to the saying but does not specify what situation might have occasioned this urgency (Luz, *Matthew 1-7*, 357).

¹⁴ Davies and Allison suggest reading the passive forms in these two verses as divine or theological passives (Davies and Allison, *Matthew, Vol. 1*, 679). With respect to their appearance in "Q," however, Giovanni Bazzana follows Ron Piper in hesitating to accept this interpretation, pointing primarily to its unsatisfactory explanation of the active *λαμβάνει* in the second saying or part of the saying (Ron A. Piper, "Matthew 7:7-11 par. Luke 11:9-13: Evidence of Design and Argument in the Collection of Jesus' Sayings," in *The Shape of Q: Signal Essays on the Sayings Gospel*, ed. John S. Kloppenborg, [Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1994], 131-137; Giovanni Bazzana, "Violence and Human Prayer to God in Q 11," *HTS* 70 [2014], doi: 10.4102/hts.v70i1.2733. Bazzana in particular points to a growing trend to question the once-standard exegetical habit of considering any passive without explicit agent as a divine passive (see, e.g., Benjamin Pascut, "The So-Called *Passivum Divinum* in Mark's Gospel," *NovT* 54 [2012], 313-

triad adds increased, universalizing assurance to the initial claim but no specifics.¹⁵

Together, the two parts of the saying extend a radical, but unspecific, invitation to the narrative audience. The lack of specificity, however, leads to questions as to how this saying was remembered. Namely, did Matthew understand Jesus' promise that whoever asks will receive, etc. to describe the narrative audience's actions of providing for one another and their community?¹⁶ Or, did he have in mind a situation of asking in prayer and expecting divine provision?¹⁷ Matthew's narrative audience and context provide some clues.¹⁸

333). Even without reading them as explicitly *theological* passives, the use of passive voice requires that one's asking and knocking extend outside of oneself, precluding the possibility that what is meant here is some kind of internal philosophical inquiry.

¹⁵ Though the forms of the elements change, the only content difference between the two triads of elements is that the former preserves *δοθήσεται* (Matt 7:7) and the latter *λαμβάνει* (7:8), as the anticipated result of asking.

¹⁶ Betz observes that the variant itself does not address the subject of prayer, but concerns "general life experience," so that the one to be asked is most likely another person and not necessarily God (Betz, *Sermon on the Mount*, 504).

William Arnal argues similarly concerning the memory of this cluster in Q. Arnal builds off of Ronald Piper's work on the rhetorical structure of Q¹ speech clusters in order to make a claim for the expectation of provision by the community implied by the memory of this saying in Q (William Arnal, "The Trouble with Q," *Forum* 2, 1 [2013]: 7-77; see also, Piper, "Matthew 7,7-11 par. Luke 11,9-13"; and idem, *Wisdom in the Q Tradition: The Aphoristic Teaching of Jesus*, SNTS [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989], 14-77).

¹⁷ Luz argues that context (esp. Matt 7:11) makes clear that the "text is about God and not about asking people for something" (Luz, *Matthew 1-7*, 358).

¹⁸ As described in Chapter 1, variance in context, as well as content, is relevant in this variant-conscious approach to the meaningful variants of the sayings. This is a difference from many previous, atomizing, treatments of the sayings of Jesus and a benefit of the present approach. In this situation a consideration of context adds some clarity to Matthew's own memory of the saying and its intent and allows the modern reader to see meaningful variance between the Matthean variant and what would otherwise appear to be its near-identical Lukan counterpart.

Matthew's memory of this saying contextualizes it within the latter portion of the Sermon on the Mount, as part of its discourse on what Jesus was, and what he would have his audience be, about.¹⁹ This is one in a relatively heterogeneous series of aphorisms dealing with the appropriate conduct of daily life within the hearing community.²⁰ Several of these surrounding sayings touch on proper attitudes toward wealth, worry, and neighbors, naming both earthly and heavenly concerns, without necessarily separating the one from the other.²¹ Jesus' instructions to ask, seek, and knock, and his assurance that these actions will be rewarded, are reinforced by the rhetorical questions and exclamation that follow. Their argument is based on the presumed generosity of the audience, and indeed of human beings in general. The Matthean Jesus asks, "Is there any person (ἄνθρωπος) among you who, if his child asks for bread, will give a stone? Or if the child asks for a fish, will give a snake?" (Matt 7:9-10). These questions connect to verses 7-8 through the element of *asking* alone, which reinforces its implied synonymity with seeking and knocking. The subject matter of these rhetorical questions allows for the possibility that this asking might best be understood within the context of familial or communal relationships. That being the case, the variant has its complementary inverse in another saying earlier in the sermon that directs the

¹⁹ Cf., in another variant of this cluster, Matthew's memory of the saying contextualizes it as part of Jesus' teaching the disciples in Jerusalem (21:22).

²⁰ Betz identifies this section of quotidian and community-oriented advice in the Sermon as extending from Matt 6:19-7:12 (Betz, *Sermon on the Mount*, 423). Neil J. McEleney does not disagree, but narrows the focus to argue that Matt 7:1-12, in particular, should be taken as a unit concerning generosity ("The Unity and Theme of Matthew 7:1-12," *CBQ* 56 [1994]: 490-500). According to McEleney, the unit is bookended by sayings concerning generosity, whether of means or of spirit, toward others: "Do not judge, so that you may not be judged" (7:1), and, "In everything do to others as you would have them do to you; for this is the law and the prophets" (7:12).

²¹ See, e.g., Matt 6:19-21, 24, 25-33, 34; 7:1-5, 12.

audience to give to the one who asks (5:42). This context implies that one can reasonably expect to receive that for which one asks, because it is people's nature, and the audience members' responsibility, to provide for one another's needs.

Verse 11, however, shifts attention from the narrative audience's experience as parents to their experience as children, in this case, children of their Father in heaven, turning the previous questions into the setup of a *qal wa-homer* argument.²² The Matthean Jesus continues: "If then you, who are evil, know to give good gifts to your children, how much more will your Father in heaven give good things to those who ask him!"²³ Asking of the heavenly Father connotes prayer, even if neither the variant nor its immediate context name it as such. This would seem to turn the previous interpretation on its head, moving away from expectations of human response to divine, as supported

²² For the characterization of the rhetorical conclusion as both *a minori ad maius* ("from the lesser [argument] to the greater") and, the Jewish equivalent, *qal wa-homer* ("light and heavy"), see, e.g., Betz, *Sermon on the Mount*, 502-503, 506 n. 640 and Francois Bovon, *Luke 2: A Commentary on the Gospel of Luke 9:51-19:27*, Hermeneia, trans. Donald S. Deer (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2013), 106. For further explanation of *qal wa-homer* and the others of Hillel's seven *middot*, see, ²*Abot R. Nat.* 37; Hermann L. Strack and Günter Stemmerger, *Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash*, 2nd ed., trans. Markus Bockmuehl (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1996), 18. Generally speaking, this principle states that what applies in a lighter or less important case will surely then apply also in a more important case; or, in this scenario, whatever generosity can be assumed of humans, who are less important—and even evil—can be assumed all the more so of God, who is more important—and good.

Matthew, clearly familiar with *qal wa-homer* argumentation, uses it elsewhere in the Sermon on the Mount (e.g., Matt 6:25-30). In this set of arguments, humans are said to be even more important to God than other faunal and floral members of creation; so if God cares for those, birds and lilies, how much more so must God care and provide for humans. Both cases assure the narrative audience of God's generous provision.

²³ Both *πατήρ* and *ὁ πατήρ* [ὕμῶν ὁ] ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς) are included in the list of Matthean "formulaic expressions," or "keywords," or preferred vocabulary compiled by Luz, as was *ἄνθρωπος* from 7:9 (*Matthew 1-7*, 25-26, 34-35, 357).

by other sayings within the sermon that implore trust in the provision of the heavenly Father.²⁴

If verses 9-10 and 11 are taken together as a lens through which to understand the present variant's injunctions, then the narrative audience is enjoined to "ask," and "seek" and "knock," because, according to Matthew's memory of the saying and its promise, it is characteristic and expected of *both* their heavenly Father and their fellow neighbors to provide for those who do. The Father's good-gift-giving may surpass even that of the narrative audience, but it is not independent of the community's responsibility and care for one another. The variant's admonition and promise are not either communal *or* spiritual; they are both. The spiritual implications, however, are made much more explicit in other variants.

2. Luke 11:9-10

Κἀγὼ ὑμῖν λέγω, αἰτεῖτε καὶ δοθήσεται ὑμῖν, ζητεῖτε καὶ εὕρησете²⁵, κρούετε καὶ
|-----omit-----|

ἀνοιγήσεται²⁶ ὑμῖν· πᾶς γὰρ ὁ αἰτῶν λαμβάνει καὶ ὁ ζητῶν εὕρισκει καὶ τῷ κρούοντι
ανοιχθήσεται

ἀνοιγ[ήσ]εται²⁷.
ανοιγεται
ανοιχθήσεται

²⁴ See, e.g., Matt 6:8 and 25-33.

Betz has argued that, if the variant were to be interpreted as concerning prayer, it would contradict the Sermon on the Mount's previous treatment of that topic, which suggests that God already knows and will provide what is needed (6:11) and good (7:11) for the audience, without their even having to ask (Betz, *Sermon*, 506-07). Despite the Father's knowing what the audience needs (6:8), however, the Matthean Jesus does not hesitate still to implore them explicitly to pray (6:9-13).

²⁵ Omit ζητεῖτε καὶ εὕρησете sy^c. Syrus Curetonianus, a fifth century, Vetus Syra manuscript of the Gospels, omits the first middle-stich ("seek and you will find") of

The Lukan variant is nearly identical to its Matthean counterpart (Matt 7:7-8), and, like it, remains relatively stable through the manuscript witnesses.²⁸ Like Matthew's, Luke's variant is a doubled three-stich saying, attributed to Jesus, urging the narrative audience to "ask and receive," etc. (Luke 11:9), and supporting the directive with an axiom asserting a universal truth (11:10). In its Lukan context, however, the variant clearly reflects Luke's own memory of the central role of prayer in Jesus' practice and teaching.²⁹

In Luke this saying comes as part of a teaching moment, explicitly addressing the topic of prayer, between Jesus and the disciples while they are on their way to

Luke, presumably on account of accidental scribal error, as ὁ ζητῶν εὕρισκει remains in tact in verse 10.

²⁶ ανοιχθησεται D Γ W 1424 pm

²⁷ ἀνοιγήσεται P⁴⁵ κ C L Θ Ψ f^{1.13} 33. 579. 700. 892. 1241. 2542 pm; ανοιγεται P⁷⁵ B D; ανοιχθησεται A K W Γ Δ 565. 1424 pm.

²⁸ As discussed above, this has led many scholars to attribute the origin of both double-tradition variants to Q.

There is similar slippage of the verb tense and spelling of ἀνοίγω as in the Matthean variant, though in the Lukan instance, even the editors of the Nestle-Aland²⁸ remain undecided as to the "earliest attainable" form for the verb in v. 10.

²⁹ Prayer has long been recognized as of particular interest for Luke, informing his memory concerning Jesus' practice and his teaching, as well as those of the apostles in Acts. This is seen especially in the distinctive Lukan uses of προσεύχομαι, including in several cases where parallel Synoptic texts do not mention prayer e.g., Luke 3:21 [cf. Matt 3:13 and Mark 1:9]; 5:16; 6:12 [cf. Matt 10:1, Mark 3:13]; 9:18 [cf. Matt 16:13, Mark 8:27]; 9:28 [cf. Matt 17:1, Mark 9:2]; 11:1 [cf. Matt 6:9, which does include instructions on prayer, but not Jesus' having been praying]; 18:1, 10, 11; 23:34, and 23:46 [these last two describe Jesus' speaking directly to the Father, but do not use the verb προσεύχομαι]; and Acts 1:24; 6:6; 8:15; 9:11, 40; 10:9, 30; 11:5; 12:12; 13:3; 14:23; 16:25; 20:36; 21:5; 22:17; and 28:8). Geir Otto Holmås provides a useful review of the scholarship on this topic. He then reconsiders the theme and significance of prayer as part of Luke's narrative strategy to assure his audience of God's continued faithfulness in prayer by demonstrating God's past vindication (Geir Otto Holmås, *Prayer and Vindication in Luke-Acts: The Theme of Prayer within the Context of the Legitimizing and Edifying Objective of the Lukan Narrative*, LNTS 433 (London: T & T Clark, 2011).

Jerusalem.³⁰ Jesus himself has just finished praying privately when one of the disciples urges him to teach them also to pray (11:1). The Lukan Jesus offers his reply in four parts: 1) a five-point outline of an appropriate prayer (11:2-4), 2) a hypothetical narrative concerning the request of a persistent friend (11:5-8),³¹ 3) the present variant (11:9-10) and finally, 4) a *qal wa-homer* argument for the heavenly Father's provision that is nearly identical to that found in Matthew (11:11-13).³² Though drawing on much of the same

³⁰ The Lukan travel account (9:51-19:44) includes many instances of Jesus' instructing those around him (e.g., 9:57-62; 10:2-16, 18-20, 23-24, 25-37, 41-42; 11:1-13, 17-26, 28, 29-36, 39-52; 12:1-12, 14-21, 22-53, 54-59; 13: 2-5, 6-9, 15-6, 18-21, 24-30, 32-35; etc.). Often, as is the case in the present variant, Jesus' words are in response to a question or request from someone around him, in this case one of the disciples.

³¹ Though it lacks any introductory comparison or explicit conclusion or application, most commentators classify this story as a "parable," known in the New Testament only in the Gospel of Luke though likely "drawn from Palestinian folk-traditions about a person who is surprised at midnight by the arrival of an unexpected friend and who finds that he does not have the wherewithal to show him hospitality" (Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel according to Luke X-XXIV*, AB28a [Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1985], 910). The question remains, however, which friend is meant to be the focus of the parable, the one roused or the one doing the rousing. That is, is the parable one meant to urge persistence in prayer? Or is it one meant to assure the reader of God's provision for those who are counted as "friends"? The parable itself (11:5-7) seems to imply something like the *a minori ad maius* argument of 11:11-13: If the you, being evil and unmoved merely by friendship, would still wake up to take care of your friend on account of her/his persistence, how much more so will God provide for the needs of those who ask? Indeed, Joachim Jeremias, distinguishes what he takes to be the original parable (11:5-7), the theme of which is the expectation of hospitality in the ancient Near East (a rhetorical question: can you imagine such a thing? With the implied answer: no, that would be unthinkable!), from the parable as it stands in its Lukan context (11:5-8, with 9-13 as further discussion of the same), which makes it "an exhortation to unwearied prayer" (Joachim Jeremias, *The Parables of Jesus*, trans. Samuel Henry Hooke, 2nd rev. ed. [Upper Saddle River, NJ: SCM Press, Ltd., 1972], 157-58). In this extant version the parable stresses persistence in human prayer, a theme taken up again in another exclusively Lukan parable, "The parable of the Unjust Judge and the Insistent Widow (18:1-8)" (Bovon, *Luke 2*, 528). In any case, however, commentators agree that the parable here continues the theme of Luke 11:1-4: prayer.

³² Concerning the final portion of this four-part response, while the overall impact of these three verses and their relation to the variant in question are very similar to those of the parallel verses in Matthew (7:9-11), there are several differences. 1) Luke's Jesus specifies τίνα δὲ ἐξ ὑμῶν τὸν πατέρα, whereas Matthew uses τίς ἐστὶν ἐξ ὑμῶν ἄνθρωπος.

material as Matthew (with the exception of verses 5-8), Luke has brought the received elements of the tradition together into his own memory of Jesus' particular interest in prayer as a tightly-knit mini-discourse on the topic. Verses 9-10, for example, are introduced by the uncommon first-person phrase, *Κἀγὼ ὑμῖν λέγω*,³³ the conjunctive function of which connects the variant to the preceding story of the persistent friend, particularly the story's moral concerning the efficacy of persistence in asking, introduced

As mentioned above, ἄνθρωπος is a preferred Matthean vocabulary word, according to Luz. Luke, however, may have used πατήρ to emphasize the comparison to ὁ πατήρ [ὁ] ἐξ οὐρανοῦ (Luke 11:13). 2) Matthew lists the pairings bread-stone and fish-snake, while the Lukan manuscript witnesses preserve variously: fish-snake and egg-scorpion, fish-snake and bread-scorpion, or bread-stone and fish-snake and egg-scorpion. The Lukan addition of σκορπιος may reflect local concerns, or a Lukan emphasis on the danger rather than mere uselessness of the undesirable gifts (Bovon, *Luke 2*, 105). Though Matthew and Luke agree that “you...are evil,” they disagree on the participle to describe that existence. Matthew has ὄντες, while most manuscript witnesses to Luke preserve the typically Hellenistic—and Lukan—υπαρχοντες (ὄντες N, D, K, 1424, and 2542). Bovon, however, cautions against overinterpretation of this word choice to suggest that Luke intentionally modified the verb to insist “on the ontological character of human malice,” (Bovon, *Luke 2*, 106 n. 62). 4) Lukan manuscript witnesses vary on the qualifying phrase with ὁ πατήρ in verse 13, while the Matthean witnesses agree on ὁ πατήρ ὑμῶν ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς (Matt 7:10). Attested Lukan variants include ...ἐξ οὐρανοῦ, ...ὑμῶν, ...ὁ οὐράνιος, ...ἡμῶν ὁ ἐξ οὐρανοῦ, and ...ὑμῶν ὁ ἐξ οὐρανοῦ. 5) Finally, whereas Matthew attests to “your Father” giving ἀγαθὰ to those who ask him, the majority of Lukan witnesses have πνεῦμα ἅγιον as the direct object there, in keeping with an overall heightened emphasis on the role of the Holy Spirit in Luke-Acts. Other attested variants include: πνευμα ἀγαθον, ἀγαθον δομα, and δοματα ἀγαθα. For more on the significance of the Holy Spirit as a uniquely Lukan redaction, see, e.g. Ju Hur, *A Dynamic Reading of the Holy Spirit in Luke-Acts*, JSNTSup 211 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), who draws heavily on the work of John Darr on the motivating and authorizing roles of the Holy Spirit in the Gospel of Luke (Darr, *On Character Building: The Reader and the Rhetoric of Characterization in Luke-Acts* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1992). Regardless of its role in the rest of the Gospel, the introduction of the Holy Spirit here reinforces that, for Luke, what is to be asked for in prayer and expected in response extends beyond what the community alone could provide.

³³ Within the New Testament, this exact phrase is known only here, though Luke 16:9 remembers an un-elided *Καὶ ἐγὼ ὑμῖν λέγω...* and Matt 21:24 a *κἀγὼ ὑμῖν ἐρῶ*.

Joseph Fitzmyer, argues that this phrase must have come from Q, and attributes the disparity in the double-tradition to Matthean omission rather than Lukan addition (Fitzmyer, *Luke X-XXIV*, 913).

by λέγω ὑμῖν in verse 8.³⁴ In verse 11, Luke’s Jesus begins his question, “What *father* among you...” thus connecting the following rhetorical questions to both the hypothetical father of verse 5-8 and the heavenly Father addressed in verse 2. Furthermore, in his reconstruction of “Luke’s” verses 11-12, Francois Bovon opts for the threefold pattern of things asked and not-given: bread-stone, fish-snake, and egg-scorpion form, which is well attested in the textual witnesses (cf. NA^{27,28} and UBS⁴).³⁵ The inclusion of ἀρτος brings these verses in line with the threefold pattern of the previous two sections (thus making a triple-triple-stich aphorism) as well as with the discourse’s initial example of prayer in 11:1-4 and the explanatory narrative of verses 5-8, both of which advise concerning requests for “bread.”³⁶ Even aside from this reconstruction, the overall lesson of verses 2-13 covers what to say when praying, with what attitude or frequency to make petitions, and what to expect in response. This section has been edited together as a distinctive memory of Jesus’ own prayer and his response to the disciple’s request for instruction in prayer. Whether the three imperatives, ask, seek, and knock, should be understood as synonymous with *pray* was implicit but ambiguous in the Matthean account, but is all but explicit here on account of the Lukan variant’s narrative context.

³⁴ Contra Fitzmyer and I. Howard Marshall, who both separate 11:5-8 from 11:9-13 (Fitzmyer, *Luke X-XXIV*, 909-16; Howard Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, NIGTC [Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1978], 462-70), this reading aligns with that of Francois Bovon, who suggests that the present narrative unit extends from verses 5-13, and that Κἀγὼ ὑμῖν λέγω in verse 9 introduces a second phase, in which Jesus speaks up again to make a further point on the matter of prayer and its granting (Bovon, *Luke 2*, 99).

³⁵ Manuscripts that attest to this reading include: ⋈ A C D L W Θ *f*^{1.13} 33 ℳ lat sy^{c.p.h} bo.

Fitzmyer preferred the shorter reading (Ɀ^{45.75} B, 1241, etc.), pointing out the possibility that this added pair might instead be the product of scribal harmonization with Matt 7:9-10.

³⁶ Bovon, *Luke 2*, 105

The absolute confidence in the appropriateness and power of prayer, and God’s ability and desire to respond to it, whether on God’s own or through the means of the community, is defining of these first two variants but is contested by others.

3.2.2 Asking: Unqualified

3. Apocryphon of James 10:32-34

επι παρακαλει³⁷ μηπωτ τωβε̅ μηπιουτε νεδαε̅ νεσαπ αυω φνα† νητην³⁸

The Apocryphon of James was written around the turn of the third century, but presents its variant as part of a post-resurrection discourse between the risen Jesus and two leaders of the first-century Jesus movement community, Peter and James.³⁹ Over the course of the dialogue, the author of Ap. Jas. narrates the Lord’s providing a wide range of instructions and exhortations, encouragement and rebuke, even wisdom and wit, drawing regularly from the author’s received memory concerning sayings tradition and

³⁷ This first verb is the Greco-coptic παρακαλει, which can mean “to beseech, entreat, pray,” while the second is the Coptic τωβε̅, “to pray, ask.” Notably, neither is the more common Coptic “asking” verb, χνοϋ. Just a few lines later, Jesus uses another Coptic “asking” verb, σοπσι (though in this case with the Subachmimic variant spelling, σαπσι; W.E. Crum, “σοπσι,” *A Coptic Dictionary*, Ancient Language Resources [Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2005], 352), when he offers to ask or intercede with the Father on his audience’s behalf (11:4-6).

³⁸ Ap. Jas. is extant only in the Coptic translation included in one of the codices buried in the fourth century near Nag Hammadi, and so has no textual variants. The text printed here is taken from Williams, “Apocryphon of James,” in *Nag Hammadi Codex I*, 44.

³⁹ This discourse makes up the bulk of the text (Ap. Jas. 2:39-15:5) but is set within a narrative concerning authority and the writing of texts in the apostolic era (2:7-39; 15:5-16:11), all of which, in the extant redaction, is framed by a letter claiming to be from James, the brother of Jesus, to the exclusive audience that requested this particular *apocryphon* (1:1-2:7; 16:12-30). The dialogue itself is largely a monologue by Jesus but with occasional interjections from or exchanges with James and Peter. The discourse is not without theological claims, but its content is primarily paraenetic rather than cosmological or doctrinal (cf. other texts in the same codex, e.g., Gos. Truth, Treat. Res., and Tri. Trac.).

re-presenting it often in surprising, even subversive ways. The narrator, James, along with Peter, is repeatedly perplexed and even perturbed by Jesus' often-cryptic words and seemingly mercurial attitude toward them. The narrator describes the disorienting effect this discourse has on himself and his companion, but it poses a challenge to modern interpreters as well.

In its variant, Ap. Jas. makes clear the sense of the saying as having to do with praying, both through its use of the verb τῶβῆ, and its naming the one to be asked as both “God” and “Father” (πνογτε, [ε]ιωτ 10:32-33). The immediate narrative context of this saying suggests that the expected prayers might concern revelation, forgiveness, or salvation, rather than material provisions (10:27-32, 34-38; 11:1-6). If it were isolated from the rest of the text this variant would read very much like the previous Matthean and Lukan examples or other similar versions with which its author seems to have been familiar. That is, on its own it appears to be Jesus' relatively straightforward and unqualified invitation to the narrative audience to ask God, even to ask God often, and to expect God to provide. But, this reading is difficult to reconcile with the following interaction between Jesus and his dialogic audience. The Lord continues, telling James and Peter to rejoice and be glad (10:39) and affirming his intercessions on their behalf (11:5). When he pauses, however, the narrator remarks, “...when we heard these words, we became glad, for we had been grieved at the words we have just mentioned before” (Ap. Jas. 11:6-10), only to be immediately rebuked by the Lord with a series of woes (11:11-29), accused of misunderstanding (11:20-12:17), and thrown once again into even greater grief (12:18-19).⁴⁰

⁴⁰ In the former case, the word translated as grieve is the Coptic ωκῆ, “to be gloomy, sad,” while in the latter it is λγπῆ (12:18)/λγπῆι (12:19), a Greco-Coptic

Attending to these seemingly strange and volatile turns, Benjamin Dunning finds a trickster-like tone in Jesus' directives and descriptions at this point in the narrative, part of Ap. Jas.'s use of irony as a demonstration of its subversive attitude toward other Christian theologies.⁴¹ After all, though his narrative audience rejoices in response to this command and its surrounding sayings, Jesus responds to their joy with a rebuke: "Woe to you (pl.) who lack an advocate! Woe to you, who stand in need of grace! Blessed will they be who have spoken out and obtained grace for themselves..." (11:11-17). The soteriology of Ap. Jas. is one of self-discovery and self-actualization, independent of any advocate, so that Jesus' offers in the previous section should be read as sarcastic, luring the audience into a falsely-placed joy, when in fact, it is apparently wrong to assume that the Father "bears with one who asks," as God already "knows the desire and also what the flesh needs" (11:34-36). Rather than an invitation to ask anything of God, the present variant is evidence for the opposite. Only those who have misunderstood Jesus, through readings like those in the above Synoptic examples, and are not able to find salvation within themselves, would think they actually would need to invoke or pray to the Father. This reading makes the Ap. Jas. variant something of an outlier within the cluster, and an important witness to the shifting memory of Jesus' sayings and the ways they could be used to counter or correct previous memories of the same.

loanword from λυπέω, "to distress or grieve," suggesting the increasing severity of their situation.

⁴¹ Benjamin Dunning, "Strangers and Soteriology in the *Apocryphon of James*," in *Aliens and Sojourners: Self as Other in Early Christianity* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2009), 91-102.

3.2.3 Asking: Qualified (Trust)

4. Mark 11:24

διὰ τοῦτο λέγω ὑμῖν, πάντα ὅσα προσεύχεσθε καὶ αἰτεῖσθε, πιστεύετε ὅτι ἐλάβετε⁴², καὶ
λαμβάνετε
λη(μ)ψεσθε

ἔσται ὑμῖν.

This variant from Mark and the second from Matthew (21:22, below) contain only one element of the cluster (asking), but both represent Jesus as clarifying and qualifying what is meant by the invitation to the narrative audiences to ask and receive. Both present this variant as part of a conversation between Jesus and the disciples on their way into Jerusalem, in which Jesus explains the seemingly inexplicable withering of a fig tree and uses it as an object lesson on the power of *προσευχή* and *πίστις* (Mark 11:12-14, 20-25; Matt 21:18-22).⁴³ To ask is to ask in prayer, each makes explicit; but in order to receive, one must trust.⁴⁴

⁴² ἐλάβετε x B C L W Δ Ψ 892. 2427 *pc* sa^{mss} bo^{mss}; λαμβανετε A f¹³ 33 m;
λη(μ)ψεσθε D Θ f¹ 565. 700 *pc* latt, parallel Matt 21:22

⁴³ John Dominic Crossan suggests that only these variants situate the saying in a truly *narrative* context, whereas the aphorism proliferates in discourse contexts, because, while a narrative setting inhibits further and diverse interpretations, a discursive setting leaves all interpretive paths open (John Dominic Crossan, “Aphorism in Discourse and Narrative,” *Semeia* 43 [1988]: 121-140, 122-123). This explanation makes intuitive sense and seems to fit the present case. Its form-critical attention to de-contextualized sayings, however, assumes a model where an individual aphorism is like the seed scattered on different soils (in the narrative soil it withered rather quickly, while in the discourse soil it flourished).

⁴⁴ Both variants of this sub-group remember Jesus’ qualifying the invitation to ask with a form of the verb *πιστεύω*. Rather than trusting or having faith in a soteriological sense, the context of these memories of *πιστεύω* suggest that one must trust, or have confidence in the process of asking in prayer and receiving.

Sharyn Echols Dowd has identified this variant as belonging to one of only two “prayer” passages in Mark (11:22-25 and 14:32-42), both of which work together, by Dowd’s assessment, to encourage persistence in prayer within the Markan community, based on a belief in God’s ability to perform miracles, even in the face of challenges and

Mark presents the variant as part of the closing to a “sandwich” in which Jesus’ violent judgment against improper practices at the Temple and the perversion of what was intended as a house of prayer (οἶκος προσευχῆς, Mark 11:15-19) is buttressed on either side by the story of his violent judgment against a fruitless fig tree and a demonstration of the efficacy of his own prayer (11:12-14, 20-21).⁴⁵ When the disciples

suffering that might raise doubts (Sharyn Echols Dowd, *Prayer, Power, and the Problem of Suffering: Mark 11:22–25 in the Context of Markan Theology*, SBLDS 105 [Atlanta, GA: Scholars, 1988]).

⁴⁵ Though neither the fig tree nor the Temple cult is performing the way the Markan Jesus desires, Mark notes that the fruitlessness of the fig tree was *not* a matter of improper function, because it was not the season for figs (11:13). This note offers agricultural verisimilitude to the Markan narrative but renders Jesus’ reaction to the tree’s fruitlessness that much more jarring and difficult to decipher. Inscrutability and shock-value have their place in the Markan memory of Jesus and his words (see, e.g., the previous chapter’s discussion of Mark’s memory concerning the purpose for Jesus’ parabolic speech). Here, however, Jesus’ interaction with the fig tree underlines that he perceives more than meets his audience’s eyes. The tree seemed to have been working, just as the Temple presumably seemed to have been working, but neither was working in the way Jesus required. The two episodes of Jesus’ anger and its effect may be shocking but are not inexplicable.

The connection between these two narrative lines (the fig tree and the Temple) is made clear through Mark’s use of intercalation (otherwise known as interpolations, insertions, framing, *Schiebungen*, *Ineinanderschachtelungen*, A-B-A literary convention, or “sandwiches”), a device that has been interpreted as signaling both literary and theological connection between the inner and outer components (James R. Edwards, “Markan Sandwiches: The Significance of Interpolations in Markan Narratives,” *NovT* 31, 3 [1989]: 193-216). In addition to the link concerning Jesus’ perception—as other than his audience’s—both lines touch on the theme of prayer, underscoring its significance to the whole section.

Gerald Downing adds that Mark may have learned his use of intercalation from contemporary storytelling and theatric practices, and suggests he may have employed the device for its dramatic effect (F. Gerald Downing, “Markan Intercalation in Cultural Context,” in *Doing Things with Words in the First Christian Century*, JSNTSup 200 [Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000], 118-132). This makes sense for the present case, since the intervening time allows for the withering of the tree (cf., Matthew remembers the tree as withering immediately [*παραχρῆμα*, 21:19]). Mark signals the connection and adds to the dramatic impact of the framing pieces concerning the tree by concluding the former with “and his disciples heard it” (Mark 11:14b) and opening the latter with “...and Peter remembered” (11:21a).

see the withered tree, Peter remembers Jesus' previous curse and observes its effect (Mark 11:21). While one might expect a response to explain more directly how or why the once fruitless fig tree has now been rendered permanently fruitless, the Markan Jesus instead uses the tree as an object lesson concerning the overwhelming power of trust and prayer.⁴⁶

In this context the variant is the second piece of Jesus' explanation as to why his audience should "Have trust in God" (Mark 11:22),⁴⁷ both of which emphasize God's miraculous power. If, for example, one were to trust, without doubting, they could speak to a mountain and it would be thrown into the sea for him, Jesus explains in the first

Dowd argued that Mark's close connection between Jesus' teaching on prayer and the events at the Temple are meant to reaffirm the efficacy of prayer for the Markan community, particularly in the face of Mark's anti-temple stance (Dowd, *Prayer*, 37-66).

⁴⁶ The seeming *non sequitur* ("Have trust in God..." [Mark 11:22]) provides the lens through which Mark would have his own audience understand Jesus' actions (cursing the tree and "cleansing" the Temple)—that they were grounded in Jesus' own trust in God's responsiveness to prayer. Adela Yarbro Collins argues for the literary logic of verse 22 as a response to verse 21 and a transition to what follows (Adela Yarbro Collins, *Mark: A Commentary*, Hermeneia, ed. Harold W. Attridge [Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007], 534, 536).

⁴⁷ ...ἔχετε πίστιν θεοῦ (Mark 11:22). Some manuscripts (e.g., \aleph , D, Θ , f^{13}) insert the conjunction εἰ before this phrase, connecting it more clearly as a condition for the promises in verses 23-24. Without the conjunction, the imperative in verse 22 does not follow the structure one would expect of a conditional imperative and stands on its own, with verses 23 and 24 offering supporting arguments for why one should have trust in God.

If the whole response were broken down into four segments, the variant would be third, acting as a connection or transition between this theme of trust (πίστις/ πιστεύω, Mark 11:22, 23, 24) and that of praying (προσεύχομαι, Mark 11:24, 25).

Here and elsewhere I translate πιστεύειν (and its cognate noun πίστις) as *trust* in order to distinguish this praying-πιστεύειν, or having "confidence in the power of God to do the impossible on behalf of the community," from a salvation-oriented-πιστεύειν, "which is constitutive of Christian existence" (Dowd, *Prayer*, 113; though, Dowd makes this distinction concerning πίστις while still translating both senses as "faith").

(11:23).⁴⁸ The ὅς ἄν construction of the subject in this saying gives the claim a generic and universalizing tone. Since this is true for *whoever* (ὅς ἄν) might trust without doubting, then (διὰ τοῦτο), the Markan Jesus continues by connecting the second piece to the first, how much more so will this be true of his own disciples.⁴⁹ In fact, *whatever* (πάντα ὅσα) the disciple audience, addressed in the second person, pray and ask for will be theirs, provided they trust that they will receive it (11:24).

⁴⁸ Mark incorporates a variant of another apparently known Jesus saying concerning the moving of mountains (cf. 1 Cor 13:2; *Gos. Thom.* 48, 106:2). Narrative context suggests the Markan Jesus and his audience may have had the Temple Mount in view, which would connect this saying to the intercalated action at the Temple. Despite this topographical reality, mountain-moving is likely intended as a synecdochic reference to miracle-working in general and not a particular action toward the Temple Mount.

This verse and the next conclude by turning the subjects into the direct object recipients of the action (...ἔσται αὐτῷ [Mark 11:23]/...καὶ ἔσται ὑμῖν [11:24]), thus reinforcing that the action comes from outside of themselves. Their trust must be placed in God (11:22), because *God* is the one who makes mountains throw themselves into the sea and makes whatever the disciples ask come about.

Dowd considers the Hellenistic and Jewish context for an understanding of πίστις as a matter of believing in the omnipotence of gods and their ability to do the impossible (Dowd, *Prayer*, 78-102), and emphasizes in this case that the miraculous power continues to belong to God, so that the Markan Jesus is not suggesting the community can perform miracles but that they can and should pray for miracles to be enacted by God on their behalf (*idem*, 121).

⁴⁹ There is no explicit comparative construction to signal a *qal wa-homer* style argument between these verses, but the Markan διὰ τοῦτο construction implies that the truth of the general claim made in verse 23 is the basis for the truth of the claim now addressed “to you,” and concerning “you” specifically as indicated by the use of second person verbs and pronouns (11:24).

The two sayings are further connected by their similar λέγω ὑμῖν introductions (ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, 11:23; διὰ τοῦτο λέγω ὑμῖν, 11:24), a phrase Mark remembers Jesus’ using to introduce explanations (cf. Mark 3:28; 8:12; 9:1, 13; 10:15, 29; 12:43; 13:30; and 14:9).

Collins suggests the inconsistency in person throughout this section (second person 11:22, 23a, 24; third person 23b) is likely reflective of the incorporation of a pre-Markan source (Collins, *Mark*, 536, n. 123). This may be true, but does not diminish the role the change in person now plays in the Markan Jesus’ argument.

In this variant, to “pray” and “ask” are placed side by side, reinforcing their synonymous meaning.⁵⁰ For the disciple audience, whatever they pray is the same as whatever they ask, and, whatever it may be, it will be theirs, if they trust that they will receive it. With the conditional imperative construction (πιστεύετε...καὶ + fut) in the middle of this variant Mark presents a qualification on the promise. The use of the proleptic aorist (ἐλάβετε) stresses the certainty with which one must trust, as if having already received.⁵¹ Though the benefactor remains unnamed, one assumes the divine identity of a subject who has the capacity to hear and respond to prayers, even curses against fig trees. The connection to prayer extends to verse 25, in which Jesus clarifies that, along with trust, forgiveness, too, is a necessary component for effective prayer, but it also reaches backward to the incident at the Temple, the intended house of prayer (11:17). In Mark’s performance of it, the variant is part of Jesus’ explanation of the power of trusting prayer, demonstrated by his own actions against the fig tree. It is meant to correct the debasement of prayer that Mark has associated with the Temple, and by its conditional clause, it also anticipates and opposes any memory that might represent prayer as an unqualified blank check.

⁵⁰ The phrasing, προσεύχεσθε καὶ αἰτεῖσθε, can be interpreted as a hendiadys, a figure in which two individual words are coordinated, in this case by the conjunction καὶ, so as to express a complex idea involving the subordination of one word to the other (Max Zerwick, S.J. and Mary Grosvenor, *A Grammatical Analysis of the Greek New Testament*, 5th ed. [Rome: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1996], XX, 145). This would allow for a reading closer to that in Matt 21:22, αἰτήσητε ἐν τῇ προσευχῇ, but with little effect on the sense of the phrase.

⁵¹ The reading preferred by the editors of NA²⁸ for the verb “receive” or “obtain” (λαμβάνω) is the aorist ἐλάβετε. An aorist following a future condition, even, as in this case, an implied future condition, “is, to a certain extent futuristic” (BDF §333 [2]). Other manuscript witnesses read the present (λαμβάνετε) or even future λή[μ]ψεσθε tense, presumably trying, as have modern scholars, to make the verb form match the logic of the sentence.

5. Matt 21:22

καὶ πάντα ὅσα ἂν⁵² αἰτήσητε ἐν τῇ προσευχῇ πιστεύοντες λήμψεσθε.
εαν
|omit|

This Matthean variant shows minimal variation across manuscript witnesses, and shares a great deal in common with the above Markan variant, including its general location in the narrative, most of its vocabulary (πάντα ὅσα, αἰτέω, προσεύχη/προσεύχομαι, πιστεύω, and λαμβάνω), and its premise that asking in prayer must be done with trust in order to be effective.⁵³

In Matthew's account, Jesus has already entered Jerusalem and spoken out against the practices taking place at the Temple (21:1-17) when he comes across the fruitless fig tree for the first time.⁵⁴ Finding the tree devoid of fruit, Jesus curses it, and the fig tree withers instantly (ἐξηράνθη παραχρῆμα ἡ συκῆ) (Matt 21:19).⁵⁵ The disciples, amazed,

⁵² εαν C K L W Δ 579. 700 pm; omit D

⁵³ There is greater similarity between the present variant and that in Mark (11:24) than between this variant and the other found in the same Gospel (Matt 7:7-8). By way of explanation, Crossan affirms Matthew's dependence upon Mark for his version of the saying, but also asserts a pre-Markan tradition, independent of the three-stich tradition of Q (Matt 7:7-8; Luke 11:9-10) (John Dominic Crossan, *In Fragments: The Aphorisms of Jesus* [San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1983], 95-96).

⁵⁴ Matthew does not reproduce Mark's intercalation of the incident at the Temple (Mark 11:15-19). According to Edwards's count, Matthew only follows Mark's A-B-A narrative patterns about 50% of the time (i.e., Mark 4:1-20//Matt 13:1-23; Mark 5:21-43//Matt 9:18-26; Mark 14:1-11//Matt 26:1-16; Mark 14:17-31//Matt 26:20-35; Mark 14:53-72//Matt 26:57-75), and even then Matthew does not necessarily preserve the literary or theological significance of the original intercalation (Edwards, "Markan Sandwiches"). It is not literarily surprising, then, that Matthew has collapsed the fig tree storyline into one incident, but it is narratively interesting that Jesus' performance against the tree is no longer directly connected via intercalation to his performance against the Temple.

⁵⁵ Luz and other commentators have noted that, among other redactional changes, Matthew omits Mark's explanation concerning figs being out-of-season (Mark 11:13), but suggests that questions concerning the historicity of fig season and Jesus'

ask collectively how this has happened. Their question repeats the narrator's description: *πῶς παραχρῆμα ἐξηράνθη ἡ συκῆ*; (21:20, emphasis added). Matthew joins Jesus' curse immediately to its effect (cf. Mark 11:14, 20) and doubly emphasizes its instantaneous impact, thus by comparison magnifying the type of power the disciples can expect in response to their own requests.⁵⁶

Matthew's version of Jesus' reply makes the connection between his action and the disciples' future actions explicit (οὐ μόνον τὸ τῆς συκῆς ποιήσετε, ἀλλὰ κἄν...), albeit predicated once again on πίστις (Matt 21:21). The Matthean Jesus does not compare the potential power of the disciples' prayers to others', but to his own.⁵⁷ If they trust and do not doubt, they will be able to ask and expect God to perform even greater feats than that which they have just witnessed, for example including ordering a mountain to be thrown into the sea.⁵⁸ The variant follows, and, in this context, fortifies the claim concerning the extraordinary potential of the disciples' trust and prayer. To "pray" is

horticultural knowledge or expectations seem to be primarily modern concerns (Ulrich Luz, *Matthew 21-28: A Commentary*, Hermeneia, trans. James E. Crouch [Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2005], 21-23). If omitting the note allows the possibility of Jesus' having reasonably expected there to be figs, his action is still remembered as being impressively violent but somewhat less capricious.

⁵⁶ The symbolic connection between the fig tree and the Jerusalem Temple (Matt 21:12-13), the latter of which for Matthew and his audience was known to have been violently destroyed and left in ruins, amplifies rather than diminishes the effective power of Jesus' action and the promise of that power to the disciples. Dowd has observed the pervasiveness of the ancient idea that temples—or proximity to them—were what made prayers efficacious (Dowd, *Prayer*, 45-54); the Matthean variant affirms the continued efficacy of prayer apart from the temple.

⁵⁷ In Matt 21:21-22 Jesus consistently addresses the narrative audience (the disciples) in the second person plural (cf. the third person singular construction of Mark 11:23-24, the difference of which is obscured by the NRSV's translation).

⁵⁸ As Dowd has argued concerning the Markan variant above, the promise in this and other miraculous prayer variants is not about what the disciples will be able to do but what God is able to do for them (Dowd, *Prayer*, 121).

remembered as the means by which one asks, and “trusting” is the condition that must be met for one’s asking to be efficacious.⁵⁹ The predictive future (λήμψεσθε) underscores the certainty of the claim. Matthew does not explicitly specify from whom the audience can expect to receive, nor does he put parameters on what they may request. In this variant, as in the previous Markan example, successful asking is presented as contingent upon trusting, in the Father’s power and beneficence to respond to prayers. Even as such qualification might rein in the unqualified sense of the promise, these variants also amplify its force by offering it as an explanation of Jesus’ own miracle-working power.

3.2.4 Asking: Qualified (Other)

6. John 14:13-14

| | | | |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|-----------------------|
| καὶ ὅτι ἂν ⁶⁰ | αιτήσητε ⁶¹ | ⁶² ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου τοῦτο ποιήσω ⁶³ , | ἵνα δοξασθῇ ὁ |
| εἰ | αἰτήτε | τον πατερα | |
| | | | |
| πατήρ ἐν τῷ υἱῷ. | εἰάν τι αιτήσητέ με ⁶⁴ | ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου ἐγὼ ⁶⁵ | ποιήσω. ⁶⁶ |
| | omit | τουτο | |
| | | τουτο εγω | |
| | -----omit----- | | |

⁵⁹ The dative of means (ἐν τῇ προσευχῇ) and conditional participle (πιστεύοντες) both modify αιτήσητε. The whole phrase ἐν τῇ προσευχῇ occurs only one other time in the canonical Gospels (Luke 6:12) and nowhere else in the present cluster.

The inclusion of the particle ἂν (πάντα ὅσα ἂν) followed by the subjunctive (αιτήσητε) creates an indefinite relative clause as the subject of the sentence, as if to say “anything, whatever it may be [that] you ask [for]...”

⁶⁰ εἰαν \mathfrak{P}^{66} 1. 565 *pc*

Here (ὅτι) ἂν is followed by the subjunctive, creating an indefinite relative clause, and the accusative subject of the subjunctive verb is resumed by the pleonastic τοῦτο (cf., John 15:16 in *f*¹³).

⁶¹ αιτητε $\mathfrak{P}^{75\text{vid}}$ B Q *pc*

⁶² Include τον πατερα 33 *pc* *vg*^{cl} *et*

⁶³ Insert all v. 14 after ποιησω 1010

There are at least four variants on the theme of asking in the Gospel of John, three of which present Jesus' qualifying this asking with the phrase, ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου (John 14:13-14; 15:16b; 16:23-24), and all of which are found in the Johannine Jesus' Farewell Discourse (John 13:31-16:33). In their current discourse context, they are all presented as sayings addressed by Jesus exclusively to the narrative audience of his disciples, in which he invites them to consider their experience of him and anticipates their future after his death and resurrection.⁶⁷ Manuscript witnesses to these variants occasionally suggest some degree of harmonization across verses. The variants cohere with one another, but the distinctions between them illuminate how the author's memory of this saying and its meaning is informed by his own understanding of a timeline, which extends from the narrative present, through his own present (the narrative's imminent future), to a yet-anticipated eschatological future.

John 14:13-14 might be divided into two variants, but, due to the close proximity and relatedness of the pieces, they are treated here as two parts of one saying, in which

⁶⁴ Omit με A D K L Q Ψ 1241. 1424. l 844 pm it vg^{mss} co

⁶⁵ τουτο Ϝ⁷⁵ A B L Γ Ψ 060. 33 al c r¹ vg sa ac² bo; τουτο εγω Ϝ^{66c} 1241

⁶⁶ Omit v. 14 X f¹ 565 pc b vg^{ms} sy^s

⁶⁷ The exclusive nature of this narrative audience applies to each of the Johannine variants. In a more public setting earlier in the Gospel, John has Jesus play with the expectations of seeking and finding, making *himself* the object and affirming the former while denying its expected corollary: "You will search for me, but you will not find me, for where I am, you cannot come" (John 7:34). Though John repeats a similar phrase as part of Jesus' discourse with the disciples in 13:33, in that case he drops, "but you will not find me." John has in this way remembered that saying as a matter of Christological interpretation, and its promises as contingent upon ongoing connection to Jesus himself (Helmut Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels: Their History and Development* [Philadelphia: Trinity Press International, 1990], 264 n. 2).

the second piece reiterates the message of the first.⁶⁸ This variant appears in the main body of the first section of the discourse (13:31-14:31). It highlights several of the prominent themes of this section including the intimacy between Jesus and the Father and glorification of both, as well as what the disciples should expect and what will be expected of them in both the near and eschatological future.⁶⁹ Jesus' words, even his works, he explains, are not his own, but are the result of the indwelling of the Father (14:10). Jesus assures the audience that whoever trusts in him will do even greater works than these (14:12). That these Johannine promises are intended for the disciples' future, albeit their near-future, is made clear both by the use of the future tense (ποιήσει) and the fact that they require Jesus' having first been reunited with the Father (ὅτι ἐγὼ πρὸς τὸν πατέρα πορεύομαι). For the disciples within the Johannine narrative world, this condition is imminent but not yet actualized.

The discourse continues with a further, related promise in the form of the first Johannine variant. In this variant, Jesus assures the audience that he himself will do whatever the disciples ask so that the Father may be glorified in him, the Son; he reassures them that if they ask anything, then he will do it. In both parts, he adds the stipulation that those who would ask must do so in Jesus' name (ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου).⁷⁰

⁶⁸ A handful of manuscript witnesses (*Xf*¹ 565 *pc* *b* *vg*^{ms} *sy*^s) omit 14:14 all together, likely on purpose, to avoid redundancy; though, given that redundancy, not just of ideas but also of vocabulary and phrasing, between the two verses, some of these instances of omission may also be the result of accidental haplography.

⁶⁹ Though these motifs have appeared elsewhere in the Gospel, they come to the fore in this section. On the subjects of the unity and glorification of Jesus and the Father, see, e.g., John 13:31, 32; 14:1, 6-7, and 14:8-11. On the subjects of the future expectations of and for the disciples, see, e.g., John 13:33-34, 37-38; 14:1-4, 7, 12-14, 15-16, 18-21, 23-24, 26, and 14:29.

⁷⁰ The idea that Jesus' name (ὄνομα) would possess power such that it might be believed in or invoked to effect prophecy, exorcisms, mighty deeds, even community, is

Asking in Jesus' name most likely describes a sort of authorizing token for asking as Jesus' representative, someone entrusted to continue *his* business even in his absence, just as Jesus has done for the Father.⁷¹ This aligns with previous verses' calls to trust (e.g., 14:11, 12) and the following verse's imploring obedience to Jesus' commandments (14:15). Effective asking must be grounded internally in trust based on prior relationship and externally in behavior reflective of that relationship. Though the offer is that Jesus will do whatever (ὅ τι ἄν) they ask, the expectation is clear that their asking should align with his will.

Jesus instructs the disciples to direct their asking toward Jesus himself. In the context of the discourse, Jesus' words anticipate a near-future time when he will be reunited with the Father—indeed he has assured his audience that he is going to the Father (14:12) and predicts the arrival of the Paraclete in his stead (14:16-17)—and so will be with the Father to hear their prayers. This prayer is to be directed to Jesus and in Jesus' name, and Jesus assures the audience that in response he himself will do (ποιήσω)

well attested in the Gospel of John (e.g., John 1:12; 2:23; 3:18 20:31) as well as the other three canonical Gospels (e.g., Matt 7:7; 18:5, 20; 19:29; 28:19; Mark 9:37, 38-39, 41; [16:17]; Luke 9:48, 49; 10:17; 24:47). This is related to, though never directly equated with, the Jewish idea of the sacred power and efficacy of the divine name for which there is also evidence in the Gospels (e.g., Matt 6:9; 21:9; 23:29; 28:19; Mark 11:9; Luke 1:49; 11:12; 13:35; 19:36; John 5:43; 10:25; 12:13; 12:28; 17:6, 11-12, 26).

Craig Keener has looked extensively at the act of asking *in X's name* in Jewish and Greco-Roman literature, and determined the best comparison is likely that of the role of a broker, or someone who could procure favor(s) in the name of their patron. Comparing these Johannine references to related descriptions in the book of Acts (of prayer made in and acts performed in the name of Jesus), Keener concludes that praying in Jesus' name connotes asking as a representative of Jesus who is doing *his* business (Craig S. Keener, *The Gospel of John: A Commentary*, 2 vols. [Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2003], II:947-950). The text does not describe what, practically, that may have looked (or sounded) like, suggesting the practice was well known to the author and his audience.

⁷¹ Keener, *Gospel of John*, II:947-950.

anything they ask, whatever that may be. This is in order that the Father may be glorified in the Son, on account of the disciples' faithful continuation of his works.

7. John 15:7

ἐὰν μείνητε ἐν ἐμοὶ καὶ τὰ ῥήματά μου ἐν ὑμῖν μείνη⁷², ὃ ἐὰν θέλητε⁷³ αἰτήσασθε⁷⁴, καὶ
 μενει
 αιτησεσθε
 αιτησεσθαι
 αιτησασθαι

γενήσεται ὑμῖν⁷⁵.
 |omit|

This variant comes in a section of the discourse devoted primarily to describing the relationship between Jesus and the disciples, which mirrors the relationship between Jesus and the Father. Though the disciples have witnessed and experienced these relationships already in the narrative present, they are being instructed to maintain a similarly intimate connection to Jesus, even as their relationship will change in light of his imminent departure from them. The intimacy and interdependence that characterize these relationships are illustrated through the imagery of a vine, its vine-grower, and its branches (John 15:1-8). Particularly in the case of the branches, it is clear that their existence depends on their being connected to and nourished by the vine itself. Likewise, the disciples' spiritual existence depends on their being connected to and taught by Jesus,

⁷² \mathfrak{P}^{66*} L 579 *pc*

⁷³ The phrase ὃ ἐὰν θέλητε, used to describe whatever the disciples might ask for, is otherwise unattested among the variants of this cluster, as is the use of γενήσεται to describe the fulfillment of their request.

⁷⁴ αἰτησασθε B L *f*¹³ 1. 565 *al it*; αιτησεσθε κ Θ Ψ 0250. 33 \aleph *vg*; αιτησεσθαι Δ Θ 579 *al*; αιτησασθαι A D Γ *al a c f*

⁷⁵ Omit ὑμῖν \mathfrak{P}^{66} D* e

and they are to maintain that relationship, even in Jesus' apparent absence, by abiding or remaining in (μένειν ἐν) him, his words and his love, as he will in them.⁷⁶

Remaining, for this variant, is the prerequisite condition on which successful asking and receiving depend.⁷⁷ Successful asking is, even more explicitly than in John 14:13-14, based upon the relationship of discipleship cultivated between Jesus and his followers, here described as a matter of μένειν. For this relationship, the disciples have Jesus, and his intimate connection with the Father, as a model.⁷⁸ The outward expression of their remaining in this discipleship relationship will be their obedience to the Father's commandments (τὰς ἐντολὰς τοῦ πατρὸς μου), particularly the command to love (John 15:9-10). If they remain in him and if his word—understood as his teaching and commandments, including the command to love one another—remains in them,⁷⁹ Jesus

⁷⁶ See, e.g., John 15:4-7, 9-10; cf. the use of μένω in 14:25 to describe the present circumstance of Jesus' remaining with the disciples (παρ' ὑμῖν μένων).

The verb μένω appears fourteen times within the farewell discourse, including twice in the present variant. In most of these cases, it connotes the continuation of John's "theology of immanence," even after Jesus' return to his Father (Raymond E. Brown, *The Gospel according to John*, 2 vols., AB 29-29A [New York: Doubleday, 1966-1970], I:510; see further I:510-512). According to Brown, μένω can refer either to remaining in *something* (e.g., μείνατε ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ τῇ ἐμῇ; John 15:9) or being intimately united with *someone* (e.g., μείνατε ἐν ἐμοί, κἀγὼ ἐν ὑμῖν; 15:4).

⁷⁷ The variant contains two conditional ἐὰν + subjunctive clauses: ἐὰν μείνητε... μείνη ("if you remain...[if] they remain") and ὃ ἐὰν θέλητε ("if you wish [for] whatever..." or "...whatever you wish"). A handful of manuscripts change μείνη to the indicative, which would seem to take it as the result of ἐὰν μείνητε, and leave ὃ ἐὰν θέλητε αἰτήσασθε... as a separate sentence entirely.

⁷⁸ According to Brown, the relationship between the Father and Son is not just a model for the disciples, but is in a sense the Father's prototype for his impending relationship with the Jesus-movement community, as if the Father and Son's love were being "transferred through the Son to the Christian" (Brown, *John*, I:511).

⁷⁹ That Jesus' words should *remain* or *abide* in them (καὶ τὰ ῥήματά μου ἐν ὑμῖν μείνη; cf. ἂν ὑμεῖς μείνητε ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τῷ ἐμῷ; John 8:31) is a curious variation on the theme of μένειν. For both Jesus' and John's audiences, to abide in Jesus' words despite his absence would seem to be a matter of taking them and their significance to heart. It is

assures them that whatever they want, it will happen for them. At this point in the discourse, it can safely be assumed that the implied agent responding to their asking is to be the ascended Jesus, who along with the Father will be glorified by the disciples' fruitfulness.⁸⁰ The fruitfulness that is promised in verse 8 is the product of both their remaining in relationship with Jesus and their requesting freely whatever they want, because their will is to align with that of Jesus.⁸¹ Like asking in Jesus' name, asking while remaining in Jesus indicates broad requirements of ongoing relationship and observant behavior. The result of asking is not simply the fulfillment of one's desire, but the glorification of the Father (15:8), and the completed joy of both Jesus and the disciples (15:11)

8. John 15:16b

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------|---|----|----|------------------------|-----|--------|----|----|---------|-----|-------|----------------------|
| ...ἵνα ⁸² | ὃ | τι | ἂν | αἰτήσητε ⁸³ | τὸν | πατέρα | ἐν | τῷ | ὀνόματί | μου | δώσει | ὑμῖν ⁸⁴ . |
| καὶ | | | | αἰτήτε | | | | | | | δώσει | ὑμῖν |
| omit | | | | | | | | | | | τουτο | ποιησω, ἵνα |
| | | | | | | | | | | | πατηρ | εν |
| | | | | | | | | | | | τω | νω |

possible, however, that by the time John and his imagined community were recalling this and other ῥήματα of the Lord, abiding in these words described a practiced familiarity with a predetermined corpus of Jesus sayings. Memorization of these sayings (with the help of the Paraclete; 14:26) seems likely to have been for this community how one became authorized to ask—or speak, in general—in Jesus' name and to continue to “remember” his words and his will, as his representative. If one were truly abiding in Jesus' words, might their voice even be perceived as his voice? Cf. the Johannine Jesus' description of his own words as, in reality, the Father's (14:10).

⁸⁰ That is not to say that the glorification of the Father and Jesus is dependent upon the disciples' continued behavior (cf. John 12:28-30), but the disciples are invited to participate in this glorification.

⁸¹ Haenchen describes the good life as a matter of subordination of ego in order to remain bound “in word and will to Jesus.” This is the basis of effective asking (Ernst Haenchen, *A Commentary on the Gospel of John*, trans. Robert W. Funk, 2 vols. [Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984], II:132).

⁸² καὶ f¹³ 1; omit ἵνα κ* et

⁸³ αἰτήτε B L Ψ pc

In the portion of the Farewell Discourse as the previous in which this variant appears the Johannine Jesus clarifies that the relationship of discipleship is primarily a matter of obedience in love. Jesus says to his disciples that they are his friends, his beloveds, *if* they do what he commands, that is love one another and follow his example of love (15:12, 14, 17). As in the previous variants, here context makes clear that the promise depends upon the ongoing relationship between Jesus and his disciples and their living that out through their attitude and behavior.

The disciples' behavior, however, is ultimately dependent upon Jesus' action in initiating their discipleship relationship. He chose and appointed them, so that (ἵνα) they might bear the enduring fruit (ὁ καρπὸς...μένῃ; John 15:16a) that is the result and evidence of their remaining (μεῖνεν) in him as his disciples (15:4-5, 8), and so that (ἵνα) their asking, again in his name, might be effective (15:16b). John emphasizes the contrast between Jesus' role and that of the disciples through emphatic pronouns and contrastive conjunctions in the first clause (οὐχ ὑμεῖς με ἐξελέξασθε, ἀλλ' ἐγὼ ἐξελεξάμην ὑμᾶς... 15:16a, emphasis added), and makes the disciples' successful asking dependent upon his—that is, Jesus'—initiative in the relationship.⁸⁵ That their asking is the product of his invitation and their own behavior reinforces the idea that asking in Jesus' name indicates asking as one whose will aligns with his own and whose requests are a continuation of his business on earth.⁸⁶

⁸⁴ δώσει υμῖν κ* Θ 579 892^s; τουτο ποιησω, ινα δοξασθη ο πατηρ εν τω υιω^{f13} (cf. John 14:13b-14).

⁸⁵ The difference between Jesus and the disciples is presumably categorical, a contrast of kind, a point strengthened by the use of ἀλλά as a contrastive conjunction (Wallace, *Greek Grammar*, 321-22, 671).

⁸⁶ See Keener's discussion of the use of another's name by his broker or representative, described in n. 71 above (Keener, *Gospel of John*, II:947-950).

9. John 16:23-24

Καὶ ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐμὲ οὐκ ἐρωτήσετε οὐδέν. ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ἂν τι⁸⁷ αἰτήσητε
οτι ο (ε)αν
ο τι (οτι?) (ε)αν
οτι οσα (ε)αν

τὸν πατέρα ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου δώσει ὑμῖν⁸⁸. ἕως ἄρτι οὐκ ἠτήσατε οὐδέν ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι
δωσει υμιν εν τω ονοματι μου
|-----omit-----| δωσει υμιν

μου· αἰτεῖτε⁸⁹ καὶ λήμψεσθε, ἵνα ἡ χαρὰ ὑμῶν ᾗ πεπληρωμένη.
αιτησασθε

In the latter portion of the discourse Jesus' predictions to the disciples concerning his imminent departure and their eventual reunion come to the fore. In response to the disciples' confusion over these ideas, Jesus describes a bit more what they should expect in both the near and distant futures. The variant at hand describes the circumstance of Jesus' invitation as changing over time, in what at first seem to be contradictory statements concerning asking and not asking.

As in several other variants, John here includes multiple statements concerning asking together (cf. Matt 7:7-8; Luke 11:9-10; John 14:13-14). Taking them in chronological, rather than narrative sequence, they begin with the Johannine Jesus' observation that up to this point in their narrative present the disciples have not asked (αἰτέω) for anything in his name. This is because, in Johannine thought, the efficacy of Jesus' name is contingent upon his being removed from them to be present and active

⁸⁷ αν τι \mathfrak{P}^5 B C (D*) L (Ψ) pc lat Or; οτι ο (ε)αν κ Θ 33. 1241. l 844 pc; ο τι (οτι?) (ε)αν $\mathfrak{P}^{22\text{vid}}$ A D² (N) W pc; οτι οσα (ε)αν $f^{1.13}$ \mathfrak{M}

⁸⁸ εν τω ονοματι μου δωσει υμιν $\mathfrak{P}^{22\text{vid}}$ A C³ D W Θ Ψ f^{13} 1. (33) \mathfrak{M} lat(t) sy pbo bo; δωσει υμιν εν τω ονοματι μου $\mathfrak{P}^{5\text{vid}}$ κ B C* L Δ l 844 pc sa ac²; δωσει υμιν 118 pc

⁸⁹ αιτησασθε $\mathfrak{P}^{66\text{vid}}$ κ^* W 579 pc

alongside the Father.⁹⁰ It is not surprising or inconsistent that they thus far have not asked anything in his name; they have not needed to, so long as he has been present and active with them. In the near future, however, in light of his imminent departure, they can and should ask (αἰτέω) and expect a response. Yet, there will be a time, “that day,” in the eschatological future, when they are reunited with Jesus and will no longer ask (ἑρωτάω) anything because there will be no need.⁹¹ Even if other authors may have shared this

⁹⁰ Outside of the predictive references in the Farewell Discourse, the Johannine Jesus does not employ or imply the power of his own name, only that of his Father’s (see, e.g., John 3:18; 5:43; 10:25; 12:28; 17:6, 11-12, and 17:26). Jesus has been acting on behalf of his Father, just as the disciples will be acting on his behalf after his departure from them.

See Keener’s discussion of the use of another’s name by his broker or representative, described in n.71 above (Keener, *Gospel of John*, II:947-950).

⁹¹ John describes that anticipated future moment as “that day” (ἐκείνη τῆ ἡμέρᾳ), a common descriptor of eschatological time attributed to Jesus by the evangelists (e.g., Matt 7:22; 24:19 (pl.), 22 (pl.), 50; Mark 2:20; 13:7 (pl.), 24 (pl.); Luke 5:35 (pl.); 12:46; 17:31; 21:23; John 14:20; and 16:26), likely adopted from the Hebrew prophets (e.g., Isa 2:11, 17, 20; 4:2; 24:21; 27:1; Hos 2:16, 18, 21; Joel 3:18; Amos 8:9; 9:11; Zeph 3:16; Zech 14:4; Keener, *Gospel of John*, II:1046 n. 163).

The use of two “asking” verbs (ἑρωτάω; αἰτέω) has led commentators to consider whether John is using the different verbs to describe different kinds of asking in these verses. Andrew Lincoln holds that, if the two were read synonymously, then John 16:23a would conflict with such statements as that 14:14 (not to mention 16:23b) (Andrew T. Lincoln, *The Gospel according to Saint John* [Black’s New Testament Commentary IV; Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2006], 424-425). Such a reading does not distinguish between a near- and an eschatological- future in those two statements. The reading of the intended timeline offered here removes that conflict. Craig Keener acknowledges that in classical usage ἑρωτάω often described inquiring or asking a question, but notes that by the time John was writing in the first century ἑρωτάω was often used synonymously with αἰτέω to describe making a request. He and others note that a synonymous reading makes the most sense in the immediate context of asking, so that Jesus’ statement concerning asking in 16:23b is not a non sequitur (Keener, *Gospel of John*, II:1046-1047; also, Haenchen, *John*, II:145).

chronological perspective, John is unique for having incorporated it into his memory of the variant itself.⁹²

At its core, the variant is similar to other Johannine examples in its focus on the near-future promise of asking and its response. Even within this variant, Jesus repeats the promise twice. In the first case, the Johannine Jesus emphasizes the promise by introducing it with a characteristic ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, unique to this variant within the cluster.⁹³ He continues with a version of the saying that is quite similar to that in John 15:16b, assuring the disciples that whatever they ask in his name the Father will give them (16:23b). The second iteration has more in common, at least in terms of vocabulary with its Synoptic counterparts (αἰτέω, καὶ, λαμβάνω; cf. Matt 7:7-8; 21:22; Mark 11:24; Luke 11:9-10), and is a simple conditional imperative with a future result. Though it carries no explicit qualifications, the ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου of v. 23 might be considered implied here, given that it is followed by a unique result clause that connects this variant to the previous verses' theme of joy and rejoicing (χαρά, χαίρω; cf. John 16:20-22). Together, the two iterations reinforce the idea of asking and receiving known elsewhere

⁹² A similar idea, concerning an anticipated (or realized) time when asking is no longer necessary may inform the perspective in the Ap. Jas. variant (10:32-34)—Jesus is, at that moment, present to rather than removed from Peter and James—but there is no indication in that case that the circumstances have changed over time.

The variant in Gos. Thom. 92 indicates the author's understanding of a change over time in the meaning or process of asking and seeking (possibly, pre- versus post-resurrection), but his perspective is less optimistic than John's concerning the disciples' actually asking.

⁹³ Ἀμὴν ἀμὴν, the Greek transliteration of the Hebrew אָמֵן אָמֵן, was known as a formulaic, and sometimes liturgical, phrase used to affirm and/or strengthen a preceding statement. It has been suggested that doubling may add special emphasis (cf. Num 5:22; Neh 8:6; Pss 41:14; 72:19). While all four canonical Gospels remember Jesus as introducing certain sayings with ἀμὴν, John alone uses the double ἀμὴν formula, frequently in cases where he has adapted a saying known also from one or several Synoptic Gospels (Lincoln, *Saint John*, 122).

throughout this cluster, but in this case that promise is situated as an interim reality, a stopgap measure until Jesus' and the disciples' eschatological reunion.

3.2.5 Seeking (and Knocking): Unqualified

10. Gospel of Thomas 92⁹⁴

...ΩΙΝΕ ΔΥΩ ΤΕΤΝΑΒΙΝΕ ΑΛΛΑ ΝΕΤΑΤΕΤΝΧΝΟΥΕΙ ΕΡΟΟΥ ΝΝΙΖΟΥΥ ΕΜΠΙΧΟΥΥ ΝΗΤΝ

ΜΦΟΥΥ ΕΤΜΜΑΥ ΤΕΝΟΥ ΕΖΝΑΙ ΕΧΟΥΥ ΔΥΩ ΤΕΤΝΩΙΝΕ ΔΝ ΝΩΟΥ

⁹⁴ The Gospel of Thomas (Gos. Thom.) presents several interpretive challenges. Foremost, as a sayings source, it offers little by way of internal narrative contextual clues for the intended interpretation of a given word or saying. To overcome this first challenge, scholars have looked outside the text to “Gnosticism” or other models of early Christianity as lenses through which to interpret its sayings (a problematic undertaking), or inside the text, primarily to keywords or linking ideas between logia, in an attempt to weave together interpretive possibilities from the text itself. Contra early labeling of Gos. Thom. as “gnostic” (U. Bianchi, *Le Origini dello Gnosticismo: Colloquio di Messina 13-18 Aprile 1966, Testi e Discussioni*, SHR 12 [Leiden: Brill, 1967], cited by DeConick, *Original Gospel of Thomas*, 3) or “proto-gnostic” (Bentley Layton, *The Gnostic Scriptures: A New Translation with Annotations* [Garden City, NJ: Doubleday, 1987], 361), majority opinion has recently moved away from this association (DeConick, *Original Gospel of Thomas*, 3). For a lucid discussion of the problems of assuming “Gnosticism” as either an interpretive or historical category and a self-described “middle position” concerning its application in the study of early Christianities, see David Brakke, *The Gnostics: Myth, Ritual, and Diversity in Early Christianity* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2010). Petr Pokorný has helpfully observed that Gos. Thom. does not contain any explicitly “Gnostic” theology or cosmology, but does share with Gnosticism some of the ideals of self-understanding and an ascetic renunciation of the material world (Pokorný, *A Commentary on the Gospel of Thomas: From Interpretations to the Interpreted*, *Jewish and Christian Texts in Contexts and Related Studies* [New York: T&T Clark, 2009], 27-29).

Another challenge of Gos. Thom. is that it does not have the same obvious points of redactional comparison as do, for instance, the Synoptic Gospels. In the face of this challenge Jacques-E. Ménard and numerous others have argued that the Gos. Thom. can best be understood as a redaction and compilation of Synoptic sayings tradition, intended to convey an esoteric message to its own community; therefore they apply redaction criticism to compare common sayings material and identify a presumed Thomasine redactional hand (Ménard, *L'Évangile selon Thomas*, NHS 5 [Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1975] and Boudewijn Dehandschutter, “L'Évangile de Thomas comme collection de parole de

The theme of “seeking and finding” is one of the predominant and unifying themes in the Gospel of Thomas.⁹⁵ The present variant is one of three on this theme from

Jésus,” in *Logia: Les Paroles de Jésus*, ed. J. Delobel, BETL 59 [Leuven: Peeters/Leuven University Press, 1982], 507-515; both of whom rely on the early work of Wolfgang Schrage, *Das Verhältnis des Thomas-Evangeliums zur synoptischen Tradition und zu den koptischen Evangelienübersetzungen. Zugleich ein Beitrag zur gnostischen Synoptikerdeutung*, BZNW 29 [Berlin: Töpelmann, 1964]).

Furthermore, these interpretive issues are compounded by the fact that there is not extant either a complete copy of the text in its original language or a broad range of witnesses from which to reconstruct a critical text (Uwe-Karsten Plisch, *The Gospel of Thomas: Original Text with Commentary*, trans. Gesine Schenke Robinson [Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2008], 12). The Greek fragments of Gos. Thom. that are known often differ from the Coptic (e.g., P. Oxy. 654.5-9 and Gos. Thom 2, considered below), thus showing that sayings collections continued to be malleable, even as they were written down. DeConick has attempted to overcome these obstacles, reconsidering the Greek papyrus fragments anew along with the Coptic witness in order to reconstruct an earliest attainable version of the text (DeConick, *Original Gospel of Thomas*, 9; see also, idem, *Recovering the Original Gospel of Thomas: A History of the Gospel and its Growth* [London: T&T Clark, 2005]). While her work is most impressive for its textual analysis, its goal of retrieving a hypothetical original version of the text runs counter to the present project, which is to consider each extant variant as it exists.

The text of this and all other Gos. Thom. (Coptic and Greek) variants is taken from Layton, ed., *Nag Hammadi Codex II, 2-7*. The Coptic text is reconstructed by Layton, but the Greek fragments are reconstructed by Harold W. Attridge, “The Greek Fragments,” in *NHC II, 2-7*, 113-125.

⁹⁵ As part of efforts to categorize this source, some have compared the prevalence of this theme (seeking and finding) in Gos. Thom. to that in the Wisdom genre more broadly (e.g., Stevan L. Davies, *The Gospel of Thomas and Christian Wisdom* [New York: Seabury Press, 1983], 37; and Harold W. Attridge, “‘Seeking’ and ‘Asking’ in Q, Thomas, and John,” in *From Quest to Q: Festschrift James M. Robinson*, ed. Jon Ma. Asgeirsson, Kristin De Troyer, and Marvin W. Meyer, BETL 146 [Leuven: Peeters, 2000], 295-302, 298). While sapiential traditions are likely to inform the genre and ideology of Gos. Thom., “wisdom” is never named in the text, either as the object of one’s seeking or otherwise.

For evidence of “seeking” as motif in Wisdom literature, see, e.g., Prov 1:20-28; 8:17; Eccl 7:23-29; Sir 6:26-31; 51:13-14 (with “prayer” [ἐν προσευχῇ μου]); Wis Sol 1:1-2; and 6:12-14. In each of these cases, the object of one’s seeking is “wisdom” it/herself.

For “seeking” and “finding” in Gos. Thom., see, e.g., Gos. Thom. 2, 92, 94, 38, and 107; for “finding” alone, see, e.g., Gos. Thom. 1, 27, 49, 58, 76, 80, and 90.

the Coptic Gos. Thom. to be considered as part of this cluster. As preserved, it contains two sayings or parts preserved as a single logion attributed to Jesus.⁹⁶ The first part contains the form, familiar from other variants of this cluster, of an imperative statement with a result clause. The second contains a slightly more complicated statement concerning asking—or not—in both the past and present situations of Jesus and his audience.⁹⁷ The latter piece is connected to the former by the Greco-coptic contrastive conjunction *αλλα*, which suggests a link between the two parts and their meanings.

Simple as its form may be, the first part poses its own interpretive challenge. The semantic range of the infinitive *ωινε* when used intransitively as it is in the initial imperative construction includes both “asking” and “seeking,” opening the question of which is intended here.⁹⁸ In this case *ωινε* is paired with *σινε*, a verb whose range is

⁹⁶ The author makes this attribution explicit, introducing the entire logion, like most in the Gos. Thom., with the formulaic “Jesus said...” (*πεξε; λεγει* Ἰησοῦς in the Greek fragments). Plisch draws on Vergote’s grammar to offer a present tense translation of the “verboid” *πεξε* (Plisch, “Excursus: The introductory formula ‘Jesus says’ (*πεξε* ἰε *ξε*),” in *Gospel of Thomas*, 24-25; citing Jozef Vergote, *Grammaire copte*, 4 vols.: Ia/b; IIa/b [Leuven: Peeters, 1973-1983], IIa, §170). The more conventional translation, however, is that *πεξε* signals direct discourse in past time (Bentley Layton, ed., *A Coptic Grammar: With Chrestomathy and Glossary, Sahidic Dialect*, 2nd ed., PLO 20 [Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2004], §380). A past-tense interpretation need not be taken as detracting from the enduring impact of the sayings that follow these verboids, but neither are they to be taken as atemporal. According to the author of the source, they are sayings that were spoken by the “living” (*ετωνε*) Jesus.

There is no apparent difference in meaning between those logia that do contain the reported discourse marker *ξε* and those that do not (Layton, *Coptic Grammar*, §509).

⁹⁷ This logion, like the vast majority of those in Gos. Thom., does not identify Jesus’ audience, except to indicate that he addresses them in the second person plural and understands himself as having an ongoing relationship with them centered on inquiry and response (or, the desire for inquiry and response). Cf., only Gos. Thom. 6, 12, 13, 18, 20, 21, 22, 24, 37, 43, 51, 52, 53, 60, 61, 99, 114, in which Jesus is said to have addressed the *μαθητης* in general, or one or more of that group in particular (plus *μαριζαμ* [21] and *καλωμη* [61]).

⁹⁸ Crum, “*ωινε*,” *A Coptic Dictionary*, 569-570. The entry includes Sahidic examples of *ωινε* translating *ζητέω* (Matt 7:7) and *ἐκζητέω* (Amos 9:12), as well as

more limited to “finding.” These factors have led commentators to favor “seek” in their translations, but that does not necessarily resolve the interpretive issue, since “seek” also carries a broad range of meanings as well as possible implied objects.⁹⁹ Elsewhere in Gos. Thom., for example, “to seek” (αἶνε) describes searching for the kingdom (Gos. Thom. 76), or, relatedly, for the place where Jesus is (Gos. Thom. 24:1) or a place to rest (Gos. Thom. 60:6). In the second piece of the present logion, however, αἶνε is used alongside and as an apparent synonym to χηοῦ, an “asking” verb. The desired response to this asking is that Jesus would say (χω), rather than give or do, something. In this case, therefore, αἶνε seems to be best understood as a type of asking, but not petitionary asking.¹⁰⁰ It entails seeking information or answers, the type of instruction into the meaning of Jesus’ own words that is meant to reveal the truth of the kingdom inside oneself.

The second segment of the logion differentiates between the audience’s—and Jesus’ own—past and present behaviors (cf. John 16:23-24). Gos. Thom., however, does not have in mind petitionary prayer, but the act of inquiring after answers from Jesus. This, the Thomasine Jesus explains, his audience did in those (past) days.¹⁰¹ Despite their asking, however, he did not tell them at that time, at least not satisfactorily. In the

ἐπερωτάω (Luke 23:6); additionally, πυνθάνομαι (Luke 18:36) and μαντεύομαι (1 Kgs 28:8).

⁹⁹ Plisch translates αἶνε as “seek,” but explains that seeking should be understood here as asking or obtaining instruction (Plisch, *Gospel of Thomas*, 207). Pokorný offers the same translation and explains that one must seek the truth of life as it is contained in Jesus’ words (Pokorný, *Gospel of Thomas*, 135).

¹⁰⁰ Plisch, *Gospel of Thomas*, 207. Cf. Gos. Thom 14:2, which threatens condemnation for those who pray (αληλ).

¹⁰¹ ἄνωγοῦ and ἄφοῦ are common expressions for past time and need not necessarily be intentionally contrastive to John’s eschatological future use of ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ (John 16:23).

present, however, he is willing to tell them these things but they do not seek them.¹⁰² One might compare this statement to that in Gos. Thom. 38 that the audience has often longed to hear the words Jesus is presently speaking to them. In that logion, though the implication is that in the past he did not tell them what they wanted to hear, the Thomasine Jesus claims now to satisfy their longing for his words.¹⁰³ In Gos. Thom. 92:2, however, the incongruity of Jesus' desire and the audience's actions are ongoing.¹⁰⁴ Nevertheless, that state need not be permanent, if the audience recalls and observes the promise of 92:1: seek and you will find.

11. Gos. Thom. 94

...ΠΕΤΩΙΝΕ ΦΝΑΒΙΝΕ [ΠΕΤΤΩΖΜ̄ Ε]ΖΟΥΝ ΣΕΝΔΟΥΩΝ ΝΑϚ¹⁰⁵

Just two logia after Gos. Thom. 92, the first half of which was strikingly similar to the seeking phrase from Matt 7:7 and Luke 11:9, Gos. Thom. 94 preserves a brief

¹⁰² Gos. Thom.'s lack of narrative and other chronological indicators makes it difficult to locate its purported conversation(s) along a timeline, whether of Jesus or the cosmos. Parallels between its sayings and those in the canonical gospels, along with the lack of any reference to the crucifixion or resurrection of Jesus, make it easy to read the sayings as part of a collection from the living Jesus while he was alive ("pre-Easter," if "Easter" were to be considered at all). There is little to suggest otherwise let alone to require that its logia be read as post-resurrection sayings or dialogue, despite the prevalence of the revelation discourse genre in "Gnostic" Christian literature. Plisch identifies only Gos. Thom. 114 as possibly making more sense in a post-resurrection timeframe (Plisch, *Gospel of Thomas*, 31).

¹⁰³ In this same logion (38), the Thomasine Jesus tells his audience that they have no one else from whom to hear the words that he speaks to them. This statement draws the bounds around Jesus' own authority and that of the sayings of this Gospel. The task of seeking the meaning of his words, then, is to be done directly for oneself, not through any intermediary interpreter (Attridge, "'Seeking' and 'Asking,'" 301).

¹⁰⁴ As Plisch puts it, 92:2 weakens the over-eager optimism of 92:1 (Plisch, *Gospel of Thomas*, 207).

¹⁰⁵ This rendering is taken from Layton's text, but commentators (e.g., Plisch and DeConick) agree on this reconstruction of the logion.

aphoristic statement on seeking *and* knocking, of a form that resembles Matt 7:8 and Luke 11:10. The saying includes these two elements of the cluster, ⲩⲓⲛⲉ (“to seek”) and ⲧⲱⲗⲙ̅ (“to knock”), both in articulated attributive clause constructions (ⲡⲉⲧⲩⲱⲛⲉ, ⲡⲉⲧⲧⲱⲗⲙ̅), here used as the Coptic equivalent of Greek nominative participles.¹⁰⁶ Each of these precedes the typical expected future result, Ⲅⲓⲛⲉ (“to find”) and ⲟⲩⲱⲛ ⲛⲁ- (“to have open to”), respectively.¹⁰⁷ Like those of their Synoptic counterparts, the two sets of action and result are meant to be understood here as synonymous, adding rhetorical effect but not difference in meaning.

This variant bears a striking resemblance in vocabulary (ⲩⲓⲛⲉ, -ⲛⲁ-Ⲅⲓⲛⲉ) and message to Gos. Thom. 92:1. That two variants from the same saying cluster would both be recorded in Gos. Thom. is not particularly surprising, but that they would be preserved so near and yet not immediately consecutive to one another has given some commentators pause.¹⁰⁸ Given that the intervening logion between these two variants cautions against giving what is holy to dogs or throwing pearls to swine (Gos. Thom. 93), some have noted the similarity between this three-logia collection and the arrangement of

¹⁰⁶ Layton, *Coptic Grammar*, §411.

¹⁰⁷ In the latter case, the articulated attributive clause has actually been reconstructed to match the extant future result clause.

Both future predicates are formed with the future auxiliary ⲛⲁ. In the case of ⲩⲛⲁⲄⲓⲛⲉ, it is a simple third person singular prefix attached to the future auxiliary and the infinitive. In the case of Ⲅⲛⲁⲟⲩⲱⲛ, it is a third person plural prefix, attached to the future auxiliary and the infinitive followed by the dative preposition ⲛⲁ with the third singular suffix, creating a dynamic passive construction, literally, “they will open to him.”

¹⁰⁸ Plisch, for example, describes their proximity as “irritating,” despite the compositional leniency of Gos. Thom. (Plisch, *Gospel of Thomas*, 210).

Cf. e.g., *Gos. Thom.* 5, 6 and 108 all have to do with revealing that which was hidden; the first two instances occur back to back while the latter is significantly separated.

parallel sayings in close proximity to one another in Matt (7:6-8) but without a conclusive explanation as to why that would be the case.¹⁰⁹ Whatever its origin, the present organization encourages the reading or hearing audience to consider these logia together, like a non-narrative version of the Markan sandwich. In this way, the holy things or pearls become the information or answers that the audience seeks—or should seek.¹¹⁰ The truth that they find is not to be wasted, either by them or him (cf. Gos. Thom 92.2a), on those who might toss it into the proverbial manure pile.

3.2.6 Seeking: Unqualified (Seeking, plus)

12. Gos. Thom. 2

... μῆτρειλο ἄσι πετωῖνε εἰωῖνε ὠαντεῖβῖνε ἀγὼ ζοταν εἰωανῖνε
 φναωτῖρῖρ ἀγὼ εἰωανωτορῖρ φναῖρ ὠπῖρε ἀγὼ φναῖρ ῖρο εἰμῖ πτηρῖ

This variant preserves only the “seek” (ωῖνε) element of the cluster, but in this case seeking is the first in a chain of actions and reactions, ending in the subject reigning over all. In order to be successful in this course of action, the Thomasine Jesus explains, the one who seeks ought not stop until he finds.¹¹¹ When he finds, he will be troubled,

¹⁰⁹ See, e.g., Plisch, *Gospel of Thomas*, 206-210, who discusses, though ultimately disagrees with, the possibility that the correspondence can be explained by Gos. Thom.’s dependence on the Synoptics; also, DeConick, *Original Gospel of Thomas*, 262-66.

¹¹⁰ Interestingly, though the act of asking is described as a matter of asking “me [Jesus],” and expecting Jesus’ response (Gos. Thom. 92:2), when it comes to seeking and finding, the audience is consistently expected to act alone. This further confirms that Thomas does not have “prayer” in mind in his use of ωῖνε.

¹¹¹ The main verb clause in this case, interrupted by the postponed subject with ἄσι, begins with the Subachmimic variant of the negative jussive conjugation base with a third singular suffix and the verb λο (μῆτρειλο) and is completed by the preposition ε with the third person singular ς, and the complementary verb ωῖνε. The subordinate verb clause is determined by the limitative subordinate clause conjugation base with the infinitive (ὠαντεῖβῖνε).

then amazed, and then will reign.¹¹² An unnamed third person singular subject (𐌺𐌳𐌹 𐌱𐌺𐌲𐌺𐌹¹¹³) gives the variant an aphoristic and universal quality compared to imperative or other second person constructions. No agent is named except the one who seeks, who is apparently on his own to find that which he seeks. No object of seeking is named, only the objective of finding and its consequent actions. The variant describes seeking as the beginning of a solo and progressive path through a multi-stage development process, culminating in the agent's, presumably metaphorical, reigning over all.

This variant is connected to the logia immediately before and after it through common themes and vocabulary, and these logia help to clarify the beginning and ending of this process. The following logion incorporates the root 𐌸𐌱𐌹, common to both “reigning” and “reign” or “kingdom.” In it, Jesus corrects misconceptions concerning the reign (𐌺𐌳𐌹𐌸𐌱𐌹) of the Father. It is not, as some—even some leaders—might think, in the sky or the sea (3:1-2). Rather, it is both inside and outside oneself, and it is accessible primarily through a process of self-discovery leading to the knowledge of one's identity as a child of the living Father (3:3-4). That process is described in the variant (Gos. Thom. 2), but its goal is described here. To reign (𐌸𐌱𐌹) is to recognize the reign

¹¹² Though not represented in this paraphrase, the progression of these actions follows the pattern of repeating the previous verb before adding the next until the last two segments ([A]AB, BC, CD, E): One who *seeks* (𐌺𐌳𐌹) should not cease *seeking* (𐌺𐌳𐌹) until he *finds* (𐌺𐌳𐌹). And when he *finds* (𐌺𐌳𐌹), he will *be troubled* (𐌺𐌳𐌹𐌸𐌱𐌹). And when he *is troubled* (𐌺𐌳𐌹𐌸𐌱𐌹), he will *be amazed* (𐌸𐌱𐌹), and he will *reign* (𐌸𐌱𐌹) over all.

Cf. Wis 6:12-21, concerning σοφία, which in several verses, assures the reader that “she” is found (εὐρίσκω) by those who seek (ζητέω) her, and that obeying her laws ensures immortality and nearness to God, so that the desire for wisdom results in a kingdom (βασιλεία).

¹¹³ The postponed subject of the sentence is formulated by an articulated attributive clause construction, 𐌱𐌺𐌲𐌲𐌹 (Layton, *Coptic Grammar*, §87).

(μῆντερο) of the Father all around and within oneself, and to understand oneself fully as his child.

The logion that precedes the variant, meanwhile, helps to illumine the beginning of the process that leads to reigning; that is, finding.¹¹⁴ According to Gos. Thom. 1, finding is a matter of interpreting or finding the meaning of Jesus' words. The author explains that the words themselves have been hidden (Gos. Thom. 1:1), and are presumably not accessible to everyone. Their proper interpretation (ἑρμηνεία) is likely even less accessible, but is said, for the one who finds it, to allow him to evade death (1:2). Read together with the next two logia, the living Jesus (ἰϥ εἶονη; 1:1) promises eternal life to those who seek until they find, so that by finding the meaning of his words they might know themselves. The process may be troubling and even amazing, but the promise is sure, if the one who seeks does not cease seeking, he will find in himself the reign of God.

13. P. Oxy. 654.5-9

... μὴ παυσάσθω ὁ ζη[τῶν τοῦ ζητεῖν ἕως ἄν] εὔρη, καὶ ὅταν εὔρη

[θαμβηθήσεται, καὶ θαμ]βηθεὶς βασιλεύσει, κα[ὶ βασιλεύσας ἐπαναπα]ήσεται.¹¹⁵

¹¹⁴ Though, the two logia use two different vocabulary to express the idea of “to find.” The verb is *ze e-* in the case of Gos. Thom. 1, from an infinitive variant that literally means “to fall,” with the preposition takes on a meaning “to find” or “discover.” In the case of Gos. Thom. 2, the verb is *siwe*, which has been seen in other Coptic variants and can similarly be translated as “to find” or “discover.” Gos. Thom. 92:1 and 94:1 both use *siwe*.

¹¹⁵ According to April D. DeConick, the final lacuna does not allow space for *ἐπαναπαήσεται*, and the text should be reconstructed as *ἀναπαήσεται* (cf. *Strom.* V XIV 96 3, which has the longer prefixed form; though the partial parallel in *Strom.* II IX 45 5 preserves the shorter form) (DeConick, *Original Gospel of Thomas*, 48).

This variant is one of the seven logia preserved on P. Oxy. 654, which is itself one of three papyrus fragments found at Oxyrhynchus containing Greek versions of logia known also from the Nag Hammadi copy of Gos. Thom (also, P. Oxy. 1 and 655).¹¹⁶ Both in its order among the other logia of the fragment and in its general form and idea, the present variant aligns with Gos. Thom. 2. Like it, this variant contains only the “seek” element of the cluster, as the first in a series of consequent actions toward which Jesus urges his audience. In this case, however, when the one who does not cease seeking finds, he will be amazed and will reign, then he will rest (ἐπαναπαύομαι/ἀναπαύω).¹¹⁷ As reconstructed, the variant follows an even more consistent pattern than its Coptic counterpart as it moves through the sequence of verbs, repeating the previous then adding the next.¹¹⁸

The fragmentary nature of this variant’s source makes it even more difficult to interpret. In general, it seems to present the same meaning, read from its own contents and its immediate context, as Gos. Thom 2. In fact, the Greek version makes the

¹¹⁶ P. Oxy. 654 contains logia 1-6 in the same order as NHC II,2. Though, as is the case with the present logion, the two versions are not necessarily each other’s Greek or Coptic equivalent, the similarity in order between the two witnesses further might seem to highlight the intentionality behind other differences.

¹¹⁷ The first clause in this series begins with a negativized third person singular hortatory imperative (μὴ παυσάσθω) followed by the postponed participial subject (ὁ ζη[τῶν]), the complementary articular infinitive ([τοῦ ζητεῖν]), and the temporal conditional clause in the subjunctive ([ἕως ἄν] εὔρη), much of which is lost in lacunae but has been reconstructed according to context and the close Coptic parallel in *Gos. Thom. 2*.

Unlike the Coptic version, the present variant lists only θαμβέω as a verb of emotional reaction; cf., both ⲱⲧⲣⲧⲣ̅/ⲱⲧⲟⲣⲧⲣ̅ and ⲣ̅ ⲱⲡⲏⲣⲉ in *Gos. Thom. 2*.

Commentators disagree on the exact reconstruction of the final verb (ἐπαναπαήσεται [Attridge] or ἀναπαήσεται [DeConick]) but not its root or general meaning.

¹¹⁸ The pattern is (A)AB, BC, CD, DE; cf., *Gos. Thom. 2*.

connection between this logion and the first even more explicit by the use of the same “finding” word (εῦρη) in both. Perhaps the most distinctive feature of this variant is the final element, “rest.” The idea of rest as a goal is common in the Coptic text of Gos. Thom and so may have been part of the initial interpretive context for this variant as well.¹¹⁹ Even considering the fragment alone, (ἐπ)ἀναπαυω adds satisfying closure to the variant since its root (παύω) is the same as that negative imperative that opened the sequence (μὴ παυσάσθω). Having not stopped (παύω) before, the one who sought is now at last able to rest ([ἐπ]ἀναπαύω). Rest indicates not only ease but also completion. This does not undermine the reality of his reign but rather assures the audience of the reign’s surety and steadfastness. The process, of seeking and finding may be challenging, but it is not a matter of unending labor. According to this variant, it ultimately leads to rest.

14. Dial. Sav. 129:14b-16a

ⲁϸⲱ ⲡⲉⲧϸⲟ[...¹²⁰ ⲙⲁ]ⲣⲉϸ¹²¹ ⲟⲩⲛⲉ ⲛ̅ϸⲟⲩⲛⲉ ⲛ̅ϸⲣⲁ[ⲟⲩⲉ]

This variant is preserved in a text known only from a single Coptic copy found in Nag Hammadi Codex III, and identified from its incipit and explicit as the Dialogue of

¹¹⁹ Though, none of the other extant logia of P. Oxy. 654 mention “rest,” it does appear several times in the Coptic *Gos. Thom.* 50, 60, and 90 (ⲁⲛⲁⲡⲁϸϸⲓϸ), also *Gos. Thom.* 61 and 86 (ⲛ̅ⲧⲟⲛ ⲛ̅ⲙⲟ-).

On this theme, see, e.g., Philipp Vielhauer, “ⲁⲛⲁⲡⲁϸϸⲓϸ: zum gnostischen Hintergrund des Thomasevangeliums,” in *Apophoreta: Festschrift für Ernst Haenchen zu seinem siebzigsten Geburtstag am 10 Dezember 1964*, ed. W. Eltester and F.H. Kettler, BZNW 30 (Berlin: Töpelmann, 1964), 281-299.

¹²⁰ Possible reconstructions: ⲟⲩ | [ⲟϸⲛ ⲙⲁ]ⲣⲉϸ or ⲟⲩ | [ⲧⲧⲓ ⲙⲁ]ⲣⲉϸ (Stephen Emmel, “Text and Translation,” in *Nag Hammadi Codex III, 5: The Dialogue of the Savior*, ed. Stephen Emmel, Helmut Koester, and Elaine Pagels, NHS 26 [Leiden: Brill, 1984], 58).

¹²¹ For reconstruction [...ⲙⲁ]ⲣⲉϸ cf. 129.13 (Emmel, “Text and Translation,” 58).

the Savior (Dial. Sav. 120:1; 147:23).¹²² The source presents a dialogue between Jesus and his disciples, most likely remembered as having taken place in the time between the resurrection and the ascension.¹²³ The variant itself comes as part of Jesus' answer to a question from Matthew (129:1-3). Both the question and response are lost, at least in part, to lacunae in the now quite fragmentary text. What remains of Jesus' reply, however, speaks of the audience's hearts and their power to overcome other powers, whether above or below, and concludes with the present variant (129:3-16).

The final lines of this comment preserve one characteristic element from our cluster: "seek" (αἰνε), along with its coordinated result, "find" (βρνε). Here, the two verbs are coordinated by a simple conjunctive conjugation base (ḡ-), as is the final verb, which is reconstructed as "rejoice" (ραωε). This could, but does not necessarily, indicate the sort of sequential or consequential relationship between the actions that the other variants of this sub-group remember. Furthermore, unlike those variants (Gos. Thom. 2 and P. Oxy. 654.5-9), the subject in this case is not identified as "the one who seeks." Though a lacuna obscures part of the extraposed subject, reconstructions suggest either πετσοογν ("the one who knows...") or πετσοτπ ("the one who is chosen...") is the one

¹²² In both cases, πδιδλογος ἡπρωτηρ. The primary interlocutor is alternatively referred to as πρωτηρ/πḥḥḥ or πχοεις, but never explicitly as Jesus or Jesus Christ in this text.

Though this is the only Nag Hammadi text to identify itself as a "dialogue," but the genre is well known within early Christian literature, most often set as revelatory dialogues.

¹²³ Pheme Perkins, *Gnostic Dialogue: The Early Church and the Crisis of Gnosticism*, Theological Inquiries (New York: Paulist Press, 1980), 100. Helmut Koester and Elaine Pagels, however, remain ambivalent on the topic (Helmut Koester and Elaine Pagels, "Introduction," in *Dialogue of the Savior*, 1).

being called upon to seek, and is the only active agent of the variant.¹²⁴ Though it does not place any qualification on how one must seek, therefore, it does qualify *who* can seek.¹²⁵ If the construction is read as consequential, the final result is the joy or rejoicing of this qualified subject. Though unique within the subgroup, this climactic rejoicing aligns with the theme of joy found elsewhere in this same text (Dial. Sav. 133:16; 129:15), as well as elsewhere in the cluster (cf. John 16:23-24) and elsewhere in the literary history of “seeking” sayings (e.g., Sir 6:27-28).¹²⁶ The variant provides little substance for interpretation, but its distinctive memory does affirm the flexibility of the tradition.

3.2.7 Asking and/or Seeking: Not Attributed to Jesus

The following variants from 1 John, the Epistle of James, and the *Miscellanies* of Clement of Alexandria preserve variations on the themes of asking and receiving, and

¹²⁴ The reconstruction continues with the jussive conjugation base attached to the extant third person singular suffix ([μα]ρεϛ) (Emmel, Koester and Pagels, eds., *Dialogue of the Savior*, 58).

In Dial. Sav. 120:25-26 Jesus identifies “the ones who are elect” (ἡσῶντι) and alone, as those whom he had taught about a path they would have to travel, which could corroborate that reconstruction in the present variant. That reference, like the variant, is part of a commentary by Jesus concerning “rest” (τῆσιν ἀπαύσει; 120:5-7), so it is more likely that other vocabulary could overlap as well. In the same section the elect are also described as being “those who have known the Father” (ἡτῶν ἡσῶντι), but this is a less direct parallel so adds little to the case for a περσοῦν reconstruction in the present variant.

¹²⁵ Cf. another conversation between Jesus and the disciples on the topic of *who* it is who seeks (Dial. Sav. 126:6-10).

¹²⁶ In Sirach, σοφία is to be the object of one’s seeking (Sir 6:18, 22). Still, this text is particularly striking as a comparison to this variant and others of the “Seeking Plus” sub-group, given that in the span of a handful of verses the author describes that if his audience seeks (ἐξιχνεύω/ ζητέω) wisdom, he will find (εὕρισκω) the rest (ἀνάπαυσις) “she” gives, she will turn into his joy (εὐφροσύνη), and he will wear her like the garb of one who reigns (κόσμος... χρύσεός; κλῶσμα ὑακίνθινον; στολὴν δόξης; and στέφανον), thus touching on many of the thematic ideas if not the exact phrasing of several of these variants.

seeking and finding. They are not, however, preserved as *sayings* per se, let alone sayings of Jesus. That is, none of them is attributed to Jesus either explicitly or implicitly as part of a dialogue or quotation. Nevertheless, these variants are included in the present cluster on account of their sources' arguably intentional incorporation of known Jesus tradition. Each of their authors demonstrates knowledge and incorporation of previous tradition, whether from a written gospel similar to any of those we now know or other circulating material.¹²⁷ In these cases, it is as if the author is not merely preserving the voice of Jesus, but is embodying that voice, incorporating Jesus' sayings as his own, or as needing no attribution, as he represents them to his audience. On account of this assimilation of Jesus material, I have included the final examples within this cluster of variants.

¹²⁷ On the relationship between the Johannine epistles and previous tradition, including the Gospel of John, see, e.g., Raymond Brown, *The Epistles of John*, AB 30 (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1982); and both the article and bibliography of R. Alan Culpepper, "The Relationship between the Gospel of John and 1 John," in *Communities in Dispute: Current Scholarship on the Johannine Epistles*, ed. R. Alan Culpepper and Paul N. Anderson, ECL 13 (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2014), 95-121.

On the relationship between James and previous Jesus tradition, see, e.g., D. B. Deppe, *The Sayings of Jesus in the Epistle of James* (Chelsea, MI: Bookcrafters, 1989); Patrick J. Hartin, *James and the Q Sayings of Jesus*, JSNTSup 47 (Sheffield: JSOT, 1991); Manabu Tsuji, *Glaube zwischen Vollkommenheit und Verweltlichung: Eine Untersuchung zur literarischen Gestalt und zur inhaltlichen Kohärenz des Jakobusbriefes*, WUNT 93 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997); and Dale C. Allison, Jr., *James: A Critical and Exegetical Commentary*, ICC (New York: Bloomsbury, 2013), esp. 51-70. Though they may disagree as to why, these authors agree that though none of Jesus' teachings are given explicit attribution in James, they are included by way of allusive incorporation into James's general paraenesis. For further thoughts on the intention of these allusions, namely that they are meant appeal to those Jews of the diaspora who did not yet follow Jesus, see Dale C. Allison, Jr., "The Audience of James and the Sayings of Jesus," 58-77 in *James, 1 & 2 Peter, and Early Jesus Traditions*, ed. Alicia J. Batten and John S. Kloppenborg (London: Bloomsbury, 2014).

15. 1 John 3:22b

καὶ ὁ ἐὰν αἰτῶμεν, λαμβάνομεν ἀπ¹²⁸ αὐτοῦ, ὅτι τὰς ἐντολάς αὐτοῦ τηροῦμεν¹²⁹ καὶ τὰ
παρ τηρωμεν
ἀρεστὰ ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ ποιοῦμεν.

The author of 1 John claims to bear witness to a tradition that has been shared from the beginning, concerning the word of life (περὶ τοῦ λόγου τῆς ζωῆς; 1 John 1:1-3). In his letter, he encourages and exhorts his audience and warns them against the threat of dissidents. In a section concerning the well-founded hope that the community has in Christ, the author comments upon a confidence in God that is grounded both in one's own obedience to God's commandments and in the gifts of the Spirit.¹³⁰ According to the variant, it is this confidence, grounded in obedience, that is the prerequisite for God's promises concerning asking and receiving. Though not in the voice of Jesus, in fact without mentioning Jesus at all, the author uses the first person plural as he reaffirms a presumably familiar promise of God's benefaction toward the community. At the same time, however, he also raises the standards "we" must meet in order to access that promise.¹³¹ The primary commandment demanding obedience, according to the adjacent verse, is to trust in Jesus' name and to love one another (3:23). Furthermore, the author describes this obedience as a matter of the audience's abiding in him, Jesus, and he in

¹²⁸ παρ' K L 049. 69. 2298 𐞃

¹²⁹ τηρωμεν 8 K Ψ 1881. 2464 *al* vg^{ms}

¹³⁰ Georg Strecker, *The Johannine Letters: A Commentary on 1, 2, and 3 John*, Hermeneia, trans. Linda M. Maloney (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1996), 120-130.

¹³¹ On the rhetorical or socio-rhetorical use of the first person plural by the author, see Judith M. Lieu, "Us or You? Persuasion and Identity in 1 John," *JBL* 127 (2008): 805-819.

them, by the Spirit.¹³² Though a posture of παρρησία in prayer is presumably rooted in God’s magnanimity and Christ’s abiding presence through the Spirit, it is also here contingent upon the keeping of these commandments.¹³³ Only if the audience is obedient will they be able to have hearts that do not condemn them and boldness before God, the necessary state in which to ask and receive. In these ways the author of this epistle makes even more explicit the restrictions placed on this promise, perhaps to restrain his community’s overeager expectations concerning the idea of asking and receiving whatever one wants.

16. 1 John 5:14-15

καὶ αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ παρρησία ἣν ἔχομεν¹³⁴ πρὸς αὐτόν, ὅτι ἐάν τι¹³⁵ αἰτώμεθα κατὰ τὸ
 εχωμεν ο εαν
 εαν
 α

θέλημα¹³⁶ αὐτοῦ ἀκούει ἡμῶν. καὶ ἐὰν οἶδαμεν ὅτι ἀκούει ἡμῶν ὁ ἐὰν αἰτώμεθα, οἶδαμεν
 ονομα

ὅτι ἔχομεν τὰ αἰτήματα ἃ ἠτήκαμεν¹³⁷ ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ¹³⁸.
 ητησαμεν παρ αυτου
 αυτω

¹³² Unsurprisingly, both in its ideas and its vocabulary (e.g., ἐντολή, πιστεύω, ὄνομα, ἀγαπάω, μένω, πνεύματος) this variant from one of the Epistles of John shares a great deal in common with those remembered in the Gospel of John.

¹³³ Cf. 1 John 2:28; 5:14-15; Rudolf Bultmann, *The Johannine Epistles: A Commentary on the Johannine Epistles*, Hermeneia, trans. James E. Crouch (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1973), 58.

¹³⁴ εχωμεν A 642*^{vid.} 1243 vg^{mss}

¹³⁵ ο εαν 33. 81. 436. 2344 latt; εαν A 442; α 1735

¹³⁶ ονομα A

¹³⁷ ητησαμεν 1739. 1881

¹³⁸ παρ αυτου A P Ψ 307. 642. 1175. 1448. 1611. 1735. 1739. 1881. 2344 Byz; αυτω 442; txt 8 B 5. 33. 81. 436. 1243. 1852

This variant affirms for the audience the confidence that they should have, grounded in the assurance that what they ask they will receive—or, indeed, that they already have. Like the other variant in 1 John, this one qualifies this assurance. Whereas the qualification in 3:22 was based on the ethical behavior of the audience and their compliance with God’s commandments, in this case, in order to be effective, the request itself must be in keeping with the will of the Son of God.¹³⁹ In this instance the author includes an intermediary step between asking and receiving; that is, that the Son of God must hear the request. The entire variant is, in a sense, offering the definition or explanation of the initial confidence (ἡ παρησία) that the community is said to have in the Son, because their will aligns with his.¹⁴⁰ The conditional statements unpack both the constraints and the content of that confidence. And, whether in contrast or complement to 3:22, according to this variant, such confidence is rooted in relation to the Son of God. Despite the restrictions of 3:23, this variant restores the audience’s confidence in the promise and its efficacy, so long as their prayers reflect Jesus’ will.

¹³⁹ The referent of the masculine singular pronouns is not given within the variants but is drawn from 1 John 5:13.

Concerning the *will* (θέλημα) of the Son of God, Codex Alexandrinus alone attests to a variant on this idea, reading rather that the request must be made according to his *name* (κατὰ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ). This particular construction brings the variant more closely in line with those seen in the Gospel of John (14:13-14; 15:16b; 16:23-24).

¹⁴⁰ This variant does not contain the common Johannine reference to asking in Jesus’ name (cf. Codex Alexandrinus), but here κατὰ τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ seems to describe a similar proxy-effect considered as the meaning or intention behind those other references (see n. 71 above).

17. James 4:2b-3

...οὐκ ἔχετε¹⁴¹ διὰ τὸ μὴ αἰτεῖσθαι ὑμᾶς, αἰτεῖτε¹⁴² καὶ οὐ λαμβάνετε, διότι κακῶς
καὶ οὐκ εχετε δε
οὐκ εχετε δε

αἰτεῖσθε, ἵνα ἐν ταῖς ἡδοναῖς ὑμῶν δαπανήσητε.

In the Epistle of James the author exhorts and encourages his audience to persevere in their faith, with joy, even in the face of trials (James 1:1-2). If they do so, the eventual result will be that they lack in nothing (1:4).¹⁴³ Later in the letter the author addresses specifically the topic of asking, but he does so as a matter of explanation concerning unanswered asking. The variant occurs in a group of sayings explaining the roots of contentiousness and admonishing those who succumb to it (James 3:13-4:12). According to the author, God desires from the audience an attitude and behavior that are rooted in heavenly wisdom, but they act instead according to an earthly and even demonic “wisdom” (3:15-17).¹⁴⁴ Their passions are disordered and at war within their

¹⁴¹ καὶ οὐκ εχετε X P Ψ 5. 307. 436. 442. 1175. 1243. 1448. 1611. 1735. 1852. 2492 ff vg^{cl} sy bo; οὐκ εχετε δε 1739; txt Ɔ¹⁰⁰ A B 33. 81. 642. 2344 Byz vg^{st.ww} sa. Because of this evidence, Dibelius goes against the editors of NA²⁸ to prefer the reading that includes a conjunctive καὶ (Martin Dibelius, *A Commentary on the Epistle of James*, Hermeneia, rev. by Heinrich Greeven, trans. James E. Crouch [Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1976], 218).

¹⁴² Insert δε Ɔ^{74vid} P Ψ 5. 81. 436. 642. 1175. 1243. 1735. 1739

¹⁴³ Dibelius, *Commentary on the Epistle of James*, 207.

¹⁴⁴ Cf. the author’s previous comments on asking for and receiving wisdom: “But if someone among you lacks wisdom, let him ask from God—who gives to all without hesitation and without grumbling—, and so it will be given to him. But let him ask in faith, not doubting in any way; for the doubter is like the surging sea driven and tossed by the wind. But let such a person...certainly not expect to receive anything from the Lord” (James 1:5-7). The author connects this idea to that which preceded it through the common theme of *lacking*. James 1:4 ended with the assurance that the audience would eventually be “lacking in nothing.” Note the presumably contrastive δέ at the beginning of 1:5: “[But for now,] If any of you...” This passage provides useful comparison but is

members. And in light of this, he observes that they do not have because they do not ask.¹⁴⁵ Or, if they do ask, they still do not receive because their asking is wrongly motivated, driven by their passions rather than God's will (4:2-3). Here the author reflects on and responds to the reality, likely true in his own experience or that of his audience, that the one who asks often does not receive. His reproach of the community's hedonism and improper asking serves as a theological explanation for why some requests go unanswered. That is, it is not God's fault, but humans'.

18. Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* 5.14.96.3

ἴσον γὰρ τούτοις ἐκεῖνα δύναται οὐ παύσεται ὁ ζητῶν, ἕως ἂν εὕρη εὐρὸν δὲ
θαμβηθήσεται, θαμβηθεὶς δὲ βασιλεύσει, βασιλεύσας δὲ ἐπαναπαήσεται

This variant is preserved in the *Miscellanies* of Clement of Alexandria, in a section devoted to Greek philosophy's plagiarism of the Jews, their scripture and theology. In the immediate context, the author describes the ways in which humanity, in both Jewish and Greek tradition, is understood to be similar to God, and the attendant understandings of human self-actualization. Having cited Hebrew Scripture (e.g., Gen 1:27; Deut 13:4) and Greek philosophical schools and philosophers (e.g., Zeno and the Stoics in general, Plato, and Socrates), the author offers the present variant as expressing

not included in the cluster because it specifies that for which the audience is to ask: σοφία. Interestingly, however, one does find here further reflections from the author on both the appropriate posture for asking (“...in faith, not doubting in any way...”) and God's character as one who provides (“...who gives to all without hesitation and without grumbling...”). As with the variant in question, here, too, the author makes clear that if one does not receive what s/he asks, God is certainly not to blame.

¹⁴⁵ The present middle infinitive αἰτεῖσθαι is read as the somewhat rare retrospective causal infinitive (Wallace, *Greek Grammar*, 596-597); here, in the middle voice, αἰτέω can carry the force to petition or pray.

an idea similar to those.¹⁴⁶ This variant itself is strikingly similar to other climactic sequential or consequential “seek” sayings, particularly the variant in *P. Oxy.* 654. This variant follows the repetitive sequence pattern precisely, without any apparent omissions or redundancies, moving through the verbs “seek,” “find,” “marvel,” “rule,” and “rest.”¹⁴⁷

Nothing in the immediate context makes explicit that the idea ought to be understood as Jesus’. In fact, on its own, this variant might not even seem to meet the cluster’s criterion of a saying or saying-like variant that seems, in some conscious way, to be preserving or producing sayings tradition. Earlier in the *Miscellanies*, however, Clement provides a similar but abridged version of the same saying, and, in that case, attributes the citation to the Gospel of the Hebrews.¹⁴⁸ Clement offers this citation in support of the idea that to marvel is the foundation of all knowledge, and knowledge perfects all other virtues. The fact that it offers a partial parallel to the present variant suggests the probability that both were drawn from a now-lost Jewish Christian Gospel, and were known as sayings of Jesus there and likely recognized as such even without their source being named in the present instance.¹⁴⁹ Though it is a known saying, likely

¹⁴⁶ The immediately preceding reference is a citation from Plato, *Tim.*, 90.

¹⁴⁷ The pattern in this case is AB, BC, CD, DE.

¹⁴⁸ ἢ κὰν τῶ καθ’Ἑβραίους εὐαγγελίῳ ὁ θαυμάσας βασιλεύσει γέγραπται καὶ ὁ βασιλεύσας ἀναπαήσεται (*Strom.* 2.9.45.5).

For more on the saying’s context within *Gos. Heb.* and that work’s possible influence on our understanding of a segment of early Christianity, see, e.g., A. F. J. Klijn, *Jewish-Christian Gospel Tradition*, Supplements to *VC* 17 (Leiden: Brill, 1992); Petri Luomanen, *Recovering Jewish-Christian Sects and Gospels*, Supplements to *VC* 110 (Leiden: Brill, 2011), esp. 120-144, 200-205; and PHEME PERKINS, “Jewish Christian Gospels: Primitive Tradition Imagined,” in *The Apocryphal Gospels within the Context of Early Christianity*, ed. Jens Schröter, BETL 260 (Leuven: Peeters, 2013), 197-248.

¹⁴⁹ In fact, whereas the author offers sources for other citations or allusions, the fact that he does not in the case of the variant may reinforce the idea that its attribution was well known.

from the Gospel of the Hebrews, the author capitalizes upon rather than minimizes its commonality to other Jewish and especially Greek thinking, in order to explain how various traditions understand what it means for humans to be made in or develop themselves into God's image.

3.3 Conclusions Concerning the “Ask, Seek, and/or Knock” Cluster

Whatever the origin or original form of this cluster may have been, it endured and proliferated within the early Christian sayings tradition in part because it was both memorable and malleable. Given the predominance of its elements in various Wisdom traditions, all or part of the cluster's ideas may already have been familiar to Jesus or the many audiences who would remember him, but each of the eleven authors who recorded these eighteen variants over the first three centuries remembered and inscribed his own variant(s), which themselves contributed to the sayings tradition. Each of those memories is a product of the actual past as filtered through the author's own context and experience. The evidence of the diversity of these contexts and the impact of that diversity upon the authors' memories of Jesus' saying is the variance between variants themselves.¹⁵⁰ The Synoptic variants, for example, show variation between themselves but all seem to circulate around a memory of Jesus' invitation to “ask,” concerning a promise of miraculous provision or works of power, brought about by God—possibly with the help

¹⁵⁰ These include variations in the elements themselves, the vocabulary, tenses, moods, and persons used to describe these elements and their results, and the literary and narrative settings in which they are found, as outlined above. Only one pair (Matt 7:7-8 and Luke 11:9-10) shows verbatim agreement of an entire phrase or more, and even they remember variance in meaning through their markedly different narrative contexts. This same pair alone contains all three “ask,” “seek,” and “knock” elements. Most other variants contain only one of these elements (cf. Gos. Thom. 92), and “knock” appears in only one other variant at most (Gos. Thom. 94, as reconstructed).

of the community—in response to community members’ prayers.¹⁵¹ Variants in James and the later Ap. Jas., however, explain or even correct this same notion, denying either its scope or its veracity, in order to respond to the theological problem of apparently unanswered prayers.¹⁵² Variants in the Gosple of John reflect a memory of the saying within an eschatological timeline in which prayer has become explicitly intercessory prayer, understood as part of the experience of communion with Jesus and the continuation of his will, even in his absence, rather than a means of material goods.¹⁵³ Variants in the manuscript evidence for Gos. Thom., Dial. Sav., and Clement of Alexandria’s *Strom.*, however, remember the saying otherwise entirely, as promising not provision from any outside agent whether human or divine, but a process of self-discovery, which is itself participation in the reign of God.¹⁵⁴ In a sense, each of these variants reflects and contributes to a memory of Jesus as promising his audience their needs will be met, but each shares a different memory of what those needs are and whose responsibility it is to attend to them.

This is perhaps the most fundamental point of variance in the cluster: the apparent difference between “asking” an external divine agent and “seeking” on one’s own, even within oneself. This difference points, in some cases at least, beyond the immediate context of the cluster to a greater disparity in thinking concerning the ongoing authority

¹⁵¹ E.g., Matt 7:7-8, Luke 11:9-10, Mark 11:24, and Matt 21:22.

¹⁵² Mark 11:24 and Matt 21:22 might be considered in this category, since each adds a *πιστεύω* phrase as a qualifier on the promise. James 4:2b-3 and Ap. Jas. 10:32-34 make the critique of this mindset even more explicit, each in its own way.

¹⁵³ John 14:13-14; 15:7, 16b; 16:23-24; 1 John 3:22b; and 5:14-15.

¹⁵⁴ Gos. Thom 2; 92; 94; P. Oxy. 654:5-9; Dial. Sav. 129:14b-16a; and *Strom.* 5.14.96.3.

of Jesus and his words. This disparity comes into particularly high relief, for example, when comparing the variants remembered in the Gospel of John to those in the Gospel of Thomas. Thomas, on the one hand, remembers his variants as calling for individuals to seek and find the interpretation of the words within the Gospel, and to do so on their own, because that is the means to their recognizing their identity as participants in the kingdom. There is not, as the Thomasine Jesus tells them, anyone else from whom the community may hear his words (Gos. Thom. 38:1). John, rather, remembers his variants into a Christological context in which asking is an interim measure, the efficacy of which is ensured by Jesus himself, the community, and, uniquely, the Paraclete. As primary intercessor to the Father, the Johannine Jesus assures the community of his ongoing presence among them. They, in turn, are to abide in him and his words as his representatives on earth and to hold one another accountable to those words in his absence. The Paraclete, meanwhile, will help them remember these words, not find their hidden meaning because their meaning has already been made plain (John 16:25, 29), but remember them with and for one another, and will teach them everything else they might need to know (John 14:26; 16:12-13).

These variants, then, become evidence not only for various memories of this particular saying but of *how* individuals or communities were remembering Jesus' words and were understanding their participation in that process, conceiving of those memories as means of ongoing revelation, whether it comes through finding the hidden sense of the words that have already been written, or whether words of the Lord are still coming via the Paraclete speaking through community members. They are also evidence of how these individuals or communities understood the authority behind the systems by which sayings of Jesus were remembered and shared.

Table 3.2: “Ask, Seek, and/or Knock” Cluster, Variants’ Contents and Contexts

| Variant | Ask | Seek | Knock | Attributed to Jesus | | 1 st Person (ask, seek, or knock) | 2 nd Person (ask, seek, or knock) | 3 rd Person (ask, seek, or knock) | Qualified | Promise | Punishment | Consequence | Sequence | Agent of result (giving, finding, etc.) | | | |
|--------------------------|-----|------|-------|---------------------|-------------------|--|--|--|------------|---------|------------|----------------------|---|---|------------------|-------------------------|---|
| | | | | Pre-resurrection | Post-resurrection | | | | | | | | | God/Father | Jesus/Son of God | Unnamed/asker or seeker | |
| Matt 7:7-8 | X | X | X | X | | | v. 7 | v. 8 | | X | | | | | | | X |
| Luke 11:9-10 | X | X | X | X | | | v. 9 | v. 10 | | X | | | | | | | X |
| Ap. Jas. 10:32-34 | X | | | | X | | X | | often | X | | | | | X | | |
| Mark 11:24 | X | | | X | | | X | | trust | X | | | | | | | X |
| Matt 21:22 | X | | | X | | | X | | trust | X | | | | | | | X |
| John 14:13-14 | X | | | X | | | X | | in my name | X | | Father... glorified | | | | X ¹ | |
| John 15:16b | X | | | X | | | X | | in my name | X | | ² | | | X | | |
| John 16:23-24 | X | | | X | | | X | | in my name | X | | your joy... complete | | | v. 23 | | X |
| John 15:7 | X | | | X | | | X | | abide | X | | | | | | | X |
| Gos. Thom. 92 | X | X | | X | | | X | | | X | | | | | | X | X |
| Gos. Thom. 94 | | X | X | X | | | | X | | X | | | | | | | X |
| P. Oxy. 654 5-9 | | X | | X | | | | X | | X | | | Let him who seeks... find...become amazed...rule ... attain rest | | | | X |
| Gos. Thom. 2 | | X | | X | | | | X | | X | | | Let him who seeks... find... become troubled... be astonished... rule | | | | X |
| <i>Strom.</i> V XIV 96 3 | | X | | | | | | X | | X | | | He who seeks... finds... marvel... rule... rest. | | | | X |

¹ Some manuscript witnesses, attest to God as actor.

² Some manuscript witnesses attest to the inclusion of ἵνα δοξασθῆ ὁ πατήρ ἐν τῷ υἱῷ at the end of the verse.

| Variant | Ask | Seek | Knock | Attributed to Jesus | | 1 st Person (ask, seek, or knock) | 2 nd Person (ask, seek, or knock) | 3 rd Person (ask, seek, or knock) | Qualified | Promise | Punishment | Consequence | Sequence | Agent of result (giving, finding, etc.) | | |
|-------------------------|-----|------|-------|---------------------|-------------------|--|--|--|------------------------------------|---------|------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|---|------------------|-------------------------|
| | | | | Pre-resurrection | Post-resurrection | | | | | | | | | God/Father | Jesus/Son of God | Unnamed/asker or seeker |
| Dial. Sav. 129: 14b-16a | | X | | | X? | | | X | | | | | ...seek...find...rejoice | | | X |
| 1 John 3:22 | X | | | | | X | | | obey | X | | | | X | | |
| 1 John 5:14-15 | X | | | | | X | | | According to his will ³ | X | | | | | X | |
| James 4:2b-3 | X | | | | | | X | | wrongly | | X | spend on your pleasures | | | | X |

³ One manuscript variant attests to “according to his name”

Chapter 4: Remembering the Sayings Tradition in the Apocryphon of James

The previous case studies have considered two clusters of variants within the social memory of Jesus' sayings. The authors responsible for the preservation of these variants have been described as in each case "remembering" a saying of Jesus. That is, again, to say that each has received some memory of a saying, internalized it, and then performed the saying anew, thereby participating in and contributing to the dynamic and ongoing process of social memory. This, according to the models put forward by social memory theorists, is how memory works, and how it might broadly be understood as contributing to a fluid and expanding sayings of Jesus tradition. The question remains, however, as to how any individual author, as a rememberer of Jesus sayings, might have understood their participation in this process. Presumably, despite what we now understand as the "constructed" nature of all memory, not all memories—or rememberers—of Jesus' sayings, would have been considered as of the same status. Neither would one author, or their recipient community, necessarily describe their participation in this process in the same terms as another. This study, then, provides a probe of a single text, the Apocryphon of James (Ap. Jas.), as an exploration of how its author and his intended audience might have understood his participation in the process of remembering the voice of Jesus.

Ap. Jas. is an ideal locus of exploration for two related reasons. First, at its core, Ap. Jas. presents its own embodiment of the memory of Jesus' sayings and voice through a collection of sayings attributed to him, presented as part of a post-resurrection discourse. This discourse contains what appear to be original sayings alongside variants of sayings with which the author and his ideal audience were likely familiar from having come across them as part of the received social memory, for example, the Ap. Jas. variant

in the “Ask, Seek, and/or Knock” cluster considered above. As demonstrated by that case, however, the implied author’s memory of a variant within the performance context of this discourse can sometimes alter, even invert, its meaning from that which was likely received. Indeed, throughout Ap. Jas.’s memory of received tradition—whether familiar sayings, tropes, or even soteriological ideas—it often recasts them in ironic or subversive ways so as to delegitimize their previous meaning.

Secondly, throughout the text the implied author of Ap. Jas. offers multiple, seemingly self-conscious, reflections on the process of the production of memory and sayings tradition, both his own and others’ of which he is apparently aware. On the one hand, the text presents as an artifact of apostolic era memory, an epistle from James the brother of the Lord, who worked alongside the disciples to remember and record Jesus’ sayings, and then added to them those he received as a matter of direct revelation from the risen Lord. On the other hand, however, these elements are all matters of memorial fiction, tropes with which the implied author is familiar as means of authorizing other Christian teaching, and which he has employed intentionally because they are well known in Christian circles. His use of them, however, appears actually to be meant to undermine their legitimacy, as part of his argument that superior authority is to be found through one’s own intellectual engagement with the tradition, not through appeals to apostolicity, or revelation, let alone a fictionalized account of eyewitness memory.

Ap. Jas. is an artifact of memory, but not the apostolic era memory it imitates. Rather, it is the product of someone who considers himself a Christian intellectual elite. Its implied author signals his own trained process of memory, wherein strict memorization authorizes the interpretation and expansion of received tradition, as preferable to all alternatives. Fittingly, this superior means of authorization is used to

support what the author understands to be a superior soteriological model, under which the implied audience is enjoined to fill themselves with understanding surpassing that of the apostles, of the narrator James, even of Jesus. This case study considers the text of Ap. Jas. as evidence of one author's understanding of his own participation in and contribution to the social memory of the sayings of Jesus, as he has described it for his ideal audience, an esoteric Christian reading community. By exploring this particular example, which reflects on both its own and others' means of authorizing an expanding sayings tradition, this study contributes to an understanding of Christian diversity in thinking about the sayings in the first three centuries.

4.1 The Apocryphon of James's Text and Theology

Ap. Jas. was composed in Greek, likely in the early third century CE, but is extant only as a subachmimic Coptic translation preserved in Nag Hammadi Codex I.¹ This is

¹ For the *editio princeps* see Michel Malinine et al, eds., *Epistula Iacobi Apocrypha, Codex Jung F. I'-F VIII'* (pp. 1-16) (Zurich: Rascher Verlag, 1968). Also consulted: Donald Rouleau and Louise Roy, eds., *L'épître apocryphe de Jacques: (NH I, 2)* (Quebec, Canada: Presses de l'Université Laval, 1987); Dankwart Kirchner, *Epistula Iacobi Apocrypha: Die zweite Schrift aus Nag-Hammadi-Codex I* (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1989); and, Francis E. Williams "The Apocryphon of James," in *Nag Hammadi Codex I (The Jung Codex): Introductions, Texts, Translations, Notes*, ed. Harold W. Attridge, NHS 22 (Leiden: Brill, 1985), 28-53, with notes in Williams, "The Apocryphon of James," in *Nag Hammadi Codex I (The Jung Codex): Notes*, ed. Harold W. Attridge, NHS 23 (Leiden: Brill, 1985), 7-37; Judith Hartenstein and Uwe-Karsten Plisch, "Der Brief des Jakobus (NHC I,2)," in *Antike christliche Apokryphen in deutscher Übersetzung*, ed. Christoph Marksches and Jens Schröter (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012), 1.2.1093-1106; and idem, "'Der Brief des Jakobus' (NHC I,2)," in *Nag Hammadi Deutsch: Studienausgabe. NHC I-XIII, Codex Berolinensis 1 und 4, Codex Tchacos 3 und 4*, ed. Hans-Martin Schenke, Ursula Ulrike Kaiser, and Hans-Gebhard Bethge (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2013). All Coptic text, including reconstructions, is taken from Williams (NHS XXII), unless otherwise noted.

A date around the late second or early third century has achieved consensus approval, with individual scholars moving it earlier or later in that spectrum often based on their interpretation of its relation to canonical or oral tradition (other factors include the attitude toward martyrdom, prophecy, Christology, etc.). On the early end, see, e.g., Willem Cornelis Van Unnik's proposed dating in the early second century, based on an

the only recognized extant evidence of its use or reception history. As with many others of the Nag Hammadi texts, scholarly interest in Ap. Jas. initially focused on its potential as a witness to a stream of Jesus tradition either independent from or related to those preserved in the canonical Gospels.² The present study benefits from the analysis that these treatments and those that have followed them offer concerning Ap. Jas.'s relation to other known traditions, as well as their consideration of this text as a representative of one otherwise unknown side in the "conversations" of early third century Christianity.

assumption that the author had exclusively oral knowledge of any sayings tradition (Van Unnik, *Evangelien aus dem Nilsand* [Frankfurt am Main: Scheffer, 1960], 93-101). Against this, Perkins has argued for an intentionally allusive use of written scripture or sayings traditions and a date in the early third century (Pheme Perkins, "Johannine Traditions in Ap. Jas. (NHC I,2)," *JBL* 101 (1982): 403-14). Similarly concerning the matter of provenance, Van Unnik and, tentatively, Williams suggest Egypt, while Perkins proposes Asia Minor or Western Syria. David Brakke persuasively compares the community of Ap. Jas. to the Christian study circles of Clement or Origen in late second or early third century Alexandria (David Brakke, "Parables and Plain Speech in the Fourth Gospel and the *Apocryphon of James*," *JECS* 7 [1999]: 187-218.).

² See, e.g., the monograph by Ron Cameron, whose form-critical approach followed Helmut Koester's concerning the Dialogue of the Savior to argue that the discourse and dialogue of the risen Lord at the heart of the tractate was a sayings of Jesus tradition, independent of those otherwise extant (Ron Cameron, *Sayings Traditions in the Apocryphon of James*, HTS 34 [Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984]). Others, however, have argued variously for Ap. Jas.'s interrelation with constellations of known sayings traditions, see, e.g., the argument for dependence upon the canonical Gospels, and especially John in Boudewijn Dehandschutter, "L'Epistula Jacobi apocrypha de Nag Hammadi (CG 1: 2) comme apocryphe néotestamentaire," (*ANRW* 2.25.6 [1988], 4529-50); the discussion of this text's incorporation of Johannine allusions, particularly in comparison to the use of the fourth gospel by Irenaeus in *Adversus Haereses*, by Perkins, "Johannine Traditions," 413-414; or the summary and analysis of Johannine as well as Synoptic connections in Ap. Jas., ultimately resulting in a similar conclusion to that of Cameron, offered by Helmut Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels: Their History and Development* (Philadelphia: Trinity Press International, 1990), 187-200; Koester also mentions the record of Ap. Jas.'s frequent citations of other traditional sayings offered by Dankwart Kirchner, "Brief des Jakobus," in *Neutestamentlichen Apokryphen in deutscher Übersetzung, I* (ed. Edgar Hennecke and Wilhelm Schneemelcher; Tübingen, 1959), 234-44, 237.

Ap. Jas. has, on a number of grounds, been particularly difficult to classify. In terms of genre, it is an eclectic or composite text.³ Its core is a discourse of Jesus with James and Peter (2:39-15:5). This is set within a narrative of an appearance and ascension of the risen Lord (2:7-39; 15:5-16:11), which is framed by an epistolary introduction and terse postscript (1:1-2:7; 16:12-30).⁴ Externally, as mentioned above, Ap. Jas. is otherwise unattested within the extant literature; while, internally, too, it offers little by way of concrete social or historical anchors. Lacunae obscure even the purported author

³ “With the caution that the Apocryphon is not an easy document to understand, and that other schematizations are possible,” Williams follows an outline similar to that of Cameron, but emphasizes the implied connection between the contents of the tractate and the *apocryphon* identified and promised in 1:8-18, by grouping all of 2:7-16:11 as “Apocryphon,” before further separating not only the narrative layers but also various topics or discourses within the body of the dialogue: “Discourse on the importance of the definitive revelation” (2:39-4:22), “Martyrdom and related topics” (4:22-7:16; further divided into a “Call to voluntary martyrdom” and a “Rejection of prophecy as an incentive to martyrdom”), “Discourse on earnestness and understanding” (7:17- 11:5), “Invective against the sinful and flesh-oriented” (11:6-12:17), “Assurance that the invective’s purpose is benevolent; appropriate exhortations” (12:17-13:25), “Concluding assurance of salvation” (13:25-14:19). Of these, Williams speculates that perhaps, given their distinct use of Greek cognates as well as other technical or uncharacteristic terms or ideas (e.g., προαίρεσις [“free choice”], προνοία [“providence”], τῆν ἰστίαν τοῦ θεοῦ [“Kingdom of God”], etc.), the exhortation to martyrdom and the subsequent treatment of prophecy may have been inserted into an otherwise unified discourse. Despite this suggested hypothesis, Williams treats the text “tentatively as a literary unity,” (Williams, “Apocryphon of James,” NHS XXII, 19). For further hypotheses concerning the incorporation of a preexisting apocalyptic text, see the treatments of both Kurt Rudolph and Scott Kent Brown (Rudolph, “Gnosis und Gnostizismus, ein Forschungsbericht,” *TR* 34 [1969]: 169-75; Brown, “James: A Religio-Historical Study of the Relations between Jewish, Gnostic and Catholic Christianity in the Early Period through an Investigation of the Traditions about the Lord’s brother,” [Ph.D. diss.; Brown University, 1972]; as cited by Williams, “Apocryphon of James,” NHS XXII, 17-18). The present study follows Williams in treating the text—however tentatively—as a literary unity. The author undoubtedly drew on pre-existing texts or traditions of one sort or another, but created from them and from his own memory a new and unique Jesus text.

⁴ These divisions follow roughly Ron Cameron’s form-critical analysis of *Ap. Jas.* and the resulting outline of its constituent literary forms, while highlighting the connection between both the narrative and “epistolary” bookends. Cameron further separates the prescript (1:1-8) from the proem (1:8-2:7) in the epistolary introduction (Cameron, *Sayings Traditions*, 3).

and his intended audience as identified in the epistolary prescript (1:1-2). Its relationship to any particular theological tradition has also proven somewhat difficult to assess, leaving it by most assessments in the category of “unclassified Christian apocrypha.”⁵

Ap. Jas.’s theology is presented primarily through its dialogue and emphasizes individuals’ attaining their own salvation, with little to no comment on other matters of early Christian theological debate (e.g., cosmology or ecclesiology). It acknowledges theologies of the cross, but challenges the idea of salvation as the result of any effective work by Jesus.⁶ Its soteriology instead presents salvation as a matter of self-actualization via understanding that must not be compelled by the Lord.⁷ From Jesus’ first interaction

⁵ Brakke, “Parables and Plain Speech,” 203.

The dominant conversation on this point has been its association—or not—with some form of “Gnosticism.” According to Williams introduction, “Despite its general theological conservatism and its points of contact with Christian orthodoxy, most interpreters have seen our tractate as Gnostic” (Williams, “Apocryphon of James,” *NHS* XXII, 21; Williams also provides a reasonable summary of the then-available evidence and interpretations on this point). But it is worth noting that most of the treatments of this text were written before the twenty-first century move within scholarship to offer a more nuanced view and restricted application of “gnosticism” (see, e.g., Michael Allen Williams, *Rethinking “Gnosticism”: An Argument for Dismantling a Dubious Category* [Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1996]; and Karen L. King, *What Is Gnosticism?* [Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2003]). Though various evidence may be offered in one direction or another, it seems Perkins’ analysis still stands: “Ap Jas has been notoriously difficult to locate within the spectrum of early Christianity,” (Perkins, “Johannine Traditions,” 403).

⁶ Concerning the efficacy of the cross, for example, the Lord adjures his audience to “Remember (ἀρι μᾶεγε) my cross and my death, and you will live (5:33-35) and “believe in my cross” (πιστ[εγε] ἀπαστ[αγ]ρος...; 6:4), the former of which in particular is familiar to early creedal formulae and would likely have been “heard” as traditional soteriology. But in this case this remembrance and belief is meant not to focus the audience’s attention on an atoning sacrifice on Jesus’ part, but to exhort them in their own suffering, exceeding even that of the Lord (6:5-9). According to Karen King, neither Jesus’ nor his audience’s suffering and death should be understood as inherently good, but rather as the “necessary consequences of teaching the gospel” (King, *What is Gnosticism?*, 210).

⁷ J. van der Vliet interprets: “whether or not [the disciples] will enter the Kingdom of Heavens does not depend on an order from [Jesus’] part, but on their own inner

with James, Peter, and the other disciples with them, for example, he explains: "...no one will ever enter the kingdom of heaven if I command them, but rather because you yourselves are full" (Ap. Jas. 2:29-33).⁸ This initial explanation is followed, however, by Jesus' commanding the others to leave James and Peter to him so that he might fill them (Ap. Jas 2:33-35), which sets a tone of irony and reversal of expectations that defines much of the discourse.⁹ Ap. Jas. plays with the notion of Jesus as teacher primarily to insist that the teaching, rather than the teacher, is the true means of salvation.¹⁰ Furthermore, the Lord repeatedly states that for one to achieve salvation they must surpass even him, whether in persecution and suffering, martyrdom, or entry into the kingdom.¹¹ In the epistolary closing the narrator James, in turn, insists that the faith and

preparation alone" (J. van der Vliet, "Spirit and Prophecy in the Epistula Iacobi Apocrypha (NHC I,2)," *VC* 44 [1990]: 25-53, 26).

⁸ See, also, 4:31-5:6; 7:10-13, 22-35; 8:10-14, 23-27; 9:32-35; 11:14-17; 12:14-16, 20-30; 14:8-12:14-18.

The related ideas of *filling* or *fullness* or being *full* (here, μαλ, a subachmic variant of μελ) indicate the realization of the kingdom and salvation for Ap. Jas (e.g., 3:8-4:22; 12:28-30) and also Gos. Phil. 85:31-32; 86:13-14. Elsewhere, too, one finds particular instances of *fullness* with knowledge, the spirit, light, joy or grace: Gos. Truth 25:32-35; 26:8-13; Zost. 23:26-24, 1; Gos. Thom. 61:84; Paraph. Shem 37, 46, 72; Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.13.2.

⁹ See, e.g., the series of woes and blessings (Ap. Jas. 3:8-38) or the discourse on fullness and want (3:38-4:22), both of play with the expectations of both the narrative audience and the implied audience.

¹⁰ The epistolary proem introduces the idea of salvation via faith in the contents of this word or discourse (ΔΕ ἸΜΑΚΑΡΙΟΣ ἸΒΙ ΝΕΤΝΑΟΥΧΕΒΙ ΖΡΗΙ ΖἸ ΤΠΙΣΤΙΣ ΜΠΙΛΟΓΟΣ; Ap. Jas. 1:26-28, emphasis added). See also, 8:10-27.

Benjamin H. Dunning has noted the paradox in Ap. Jas.'s using the voice of Jesus to teach that one must not rely on Jesus, even to denigrate those who would listen to the Son of Man (e.g., Ap. Jas. 3:11-25; Dunning, *Aliens and Sojourners: Self as Other in Early Christianity* [Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2009], 94).

¹¹ Ap. Jas. 4:38-5:6; 6:19-20; 7:10-16

enlightenment of the reader must exceed his own (16:12-19). Ap. Jas.'s soteriology invokes familiar proto-orthodox ideas but destabilizes or reinterprets them in favor of its alternative model, which must proceed from one's own will and surpass all precedents. This superior understanding of salvation, then, requires a similarly superior means of legitimization.

4.2 Appeals to Apostolic-Era Memory and Authority

As mentioned above, Ap. Jas. can be understood as a product of and contributor to the social memory of Jesus and his sayings in the third century CE. It draws on memories of the sayings tradition, along with other Jesus traditions, that had been shaped and reshaped over the preceding two centuries, and reinscribes them as part of its own performance of Jesus' voice. It does not, however, present itself as a product of third century social memory concerning Jesus, a commentary or treatise or anything of the sort. Instead the implied author has historicized his own memory into a first century setting, as the purported product of the firsthand recollection of the narrator James, an eyewitness to the Jesus event and to an exclusive instance of post-resurrection revelation.¹² He adopts this narratorial voice and its authority through the form of an epistle of James, a narrative scene of apostolic remembering and writing, and the revelation discourse itself. Each of these elements of purported apostolic-era memory were familiar from other Christian literature and so might appear to be part of the text's

For more on the soteriological model of Ap. Jas., see, Dunning, *Aliens and Sojourners*, esp. 94-98, and Brakke, "Parables and Plain Speech," 214-216.

¹² The idea of historicizing comes from Brian Stock, *Listening for the Text: On the Uses of the Past* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1990), cited by David Brakke, "Parables and Plain Speech," 212, 217.

intended claim to legitimacy.¹³ The following consideration of each of these elements identifies the ways the implied author employs these familiar forms only, ultimately, to undermine their legitimacy.

4.2.1 The Letter: An Apostolic Era Epistle of “James”

It is in the epistolary introduction that the implied author first establishes his eyewitness naratorial persona as James. As mentioned above, the identity of both sender and recipient named in the initial greeting of the letter are lost to lacunae (Ap. Jas. 1:1-2). The intended identity of the former has been reconstructed from the last line on the same page, wherein the letter-writer identifies himself in the first person as ἰακωβος (1:35), the receiver of revelation from the Savior and the sender of this and a previous apocryphon.¹⁴ Lacking any further epithet or clarifying detail, the question of which early Christian “James” may have been intended remains ambiguous.¹⁵ While James the son of Zebedee is a candidate on account of the narrator’s association with the twelve disciples (e.g.,

¹³ Wolf B. Oerter, e.g., makes this claim specifically concerning the intention behind Ap. Jas.’s epistolary frame—as imitating the familiar and accepted authoritative form of an apostolic epistle (Oerter, “Form as a Vehicle of Authority? Some Remarks on the Apocryphon of James,” in *The Process of Authority: The Dynamics in Transmission and Reception of Canonical Texts*, ed. Jan Dušek and Jan Roskovec, DCLS 27 [Berlin: De Gruyter, 2016], 197-207).

¹⁴ Williams and Kasser reconstruct [ἰακκωβος]; *ed. pr.* [ἰακωβος] (Williams, “Apocryphon of James,” NHS XXII, 28).

¹⁵ Several persons are named James in early Christian tradition; e.g., in the New Testament alone, one finds: the paternal [adoptive] grandfather of Jesus (Matt 1:16), the son of Zebedee (Matt 4:21; Mark 1:19; Luke 5:10), the father of Jude (Luke 6:16), and, with some potential overlap, the son of Alphaeus (Matt 10:3, Mark 3:18; Luke 6:15; Acts 1:13), the son of a Mary (Mark 15:40; Mark 16:1; Matt 27:56), and the brother of Jesus (Matt 13:55; Mark 6:3; Gal 1:19).

Regarding the apparent confusion over whether or not the narrator counts himself among the twelve disciples (Ap. Jas. 1:24-25; 2:7-16), it is possible that this is an example of a third century author’s confusion over or conflation of the multiple Jameses of Christian origins.

1:24-25; cf. 2:8), it seems more probable, in this case, that the intended James is the brother of Jesus. The narrator claims, for instance, to have been a co-recipient of revelation from the Lord along with the disciple Peter. James the brother of Jesus and Peter were often depicted as complementary—or occasionally competitive—leaders and authorities from the church’s origins in Jerusalem.¹⁶ The sender also claims to have written the text in the Hebrew alphabet (χῆ χενεζεει μμηῆτρεβραιοις; Ap. Jas. 1:15-16), which adds to the text’s cryptic character as well as its association with James. Appealing to a language that a third century audience outside of Palestine would likely identify with the apostolic era in Jerusalem, of which James was a known leader and whither the narrator himself claims to return alone at the end of the narrative (16:8-9), adds a level of verisimilitude to the letter.¹⁷ Along with the internal evidence that points to the brother of the Lord as the most likely James, PHEME PERKINS has also noted this character’s appeal among those early Christians “who required a source of tradition going back to the Lord outside the circles of ‘the twelve,’” for example those responsible for the First and

¹⁶ See, e.g., Acts 15; Gal 1:19-20, 2:9; Gos. Thom. 12-13; 1 Apoc. Jas. 24:10-14; 2 Apoc. Jas. 57:4-10; Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 2.1.4.

¹⁷ Cameron supports this conclusion with a comparison to Papias’s statement about the Gospel of Matthew (Cameron, *Sayings Traditions*, 121-22; Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 3.39.16).

“James the brother of the Lord” was widely remembered as having been a leader of the church in Jerusalem until his execution in that same city (e.g., Acts 15:13- 21; Josephus, *Ant.* 20.197-203; and Clement of Alexandria according to Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 2.1.3-4), and the general association of that James with Jerusalem (and, presumably, with its Jewish culture and language) is well-attested in early Christian literature (e.g., Prot. Jas. 25:1; 1 Apoc. Jas. 25, 43-44, 2 Apoc. Jas. 44:11-16; 61:15-63:32).

For further treatment of the reception and use of the character of the Lord’s brother, see Brown, “James”; John Painter, *Just James: The Brother of Jesus in History and Tradition* (Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 1997); and Bruce Chilton, “James in Relation to Peter, Paul, and the Remembrance of Jesus,” in *The Brother of Jesus: James the Just and His Mission*, ed., Chilton and Jacob Neusner, (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001), 138-160

Second Apocalypses of James.¹⁸ This was, therefore, a persona well suited to the needs of the present implied author.

Under the name and authority of James, the narrator frames the text and its message with familiar epistolary topoi in order to evoke the status of an apostolic era letter (1:1-2:7; 16:12-30).¹⁹ He, for example, opens with a greeting that identifies both sender and recipient in the third person and then switches to first person in the body of the letter.²⁰ He describes the occasion of his writing as in response to an apparently insistent and persistent request from his recipient, whom he lauds as a minister of the

¹⁸ Perkins, “Johannine Traditions,” 403; see also the discussion of the James dialogues in idem, *The Gnostic Dialogue* (New York: Paulist Press, 1980), 132-133, 141-156.

Association with a known apostolic-era character was obviously a commonplace within early Christian literature. Kari Syreeni has recently catalogued and considered the particular legitimating effect of first-person appeals to eyewitness memory. Though her research deals specifically with early Christian gospels, at least two of her observations are equally relevant to Ap. Jas. First, she observes that fictional eyewitness testimony in the form of first-person narration, becomes more of a literary commonplace as such claims become less historically plausible. Second, gospels’ or texts’ “legitimation required a man of authority, more precisely, ‘our’ man—not the first best man from the list of the twelve or eleven apostles but a representative of the . . . group,” who could act as the champion of one position over against others” (Kari Syreeni, “Eyewitness Testimony, First-Person Narration and Authorial Presence as Means of Legitimation in Early Gospel Literature,” in *Social Memory and Social Identity in the Study of Early Judaism and Early Christianity*, ed. Samuel Byrskog, Raimo Hakola, and Jutta Maria Jokiranta, NTOA/SUNT 116 [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2016], 89-110, 109). James appears to have been this man for the author of Ap. Jas., who was writing well after the period of historical plausibility for his eyewitness claims.

¹⁹ Hans-Josef Klauck has compiled a list of these common epistolary topoi (*Ancient Letters and the New Testament: A Guide to Context and Exegesis* [Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2006], 188-193).

²⁰ Concerning this classic epistolary transition from third to first person, Judith Lieu has observed that while the epistolary greeting formula, which names both sender and recipient in the third person, puts both on the same conversational plane, the first person language in the body of letters creates an intimately personal, shared dialogic space (Judith M. Lieu, “Letters and the Topography of Early Christianity,” *NTS* 62 [2016]: 167-182, 175)

salvation of the holy ones. These, James prays for, exhorts, and encourages, finally building him and them up as “those for whom the proclamation was made, those whom the Lord has made his children” (Ap. Jas. 16:28-30), all of which are elements suggestive of a letter. It is possible that these elements are part of the reality of a text that was in fact composed and sent as a letter, albeit in the third century, only to be received as if lost in the mail for the hundred and fifty years. It seems more probable, however, that the author crafted an epistolary fiction to evoke the idea of a letter, a genre familiar from the beginnings of Christianity and one that would augment the personality-based authority of James as narrator.²¹

The epistolary framework further builds the narrator James’s credibility by referring to his history with and confidence in the recipient. It claims that the present letter is written only at the insistence of the recipient, despite the implied reluctance of the sender (Ap. Jas. 1:8-14), indicating their prior relationship. In a similar vein, it is said

²¹ That is, as it exists Ap. Jas. has the form of a letter, but it never functioned as actual correspondence between the purported sending and receiving parties. Patricia Rosenmeyer has helpfully surveyed the phenomenon of epistolary fictions and also fictive letters. This includes “letters” that have been cited or alluded to in the course of a story or history but never existed as independent correspondence (e.g., *Iliad* 6.167-170; 2 Sam 11:14-17; Herodotus, *Hist.* 1.123, 3.40-43, 3.127-128, 6.4) as well as those stand-alone letters or collections of letters, penned in the name of famous historical figures or philosophers, or under invented pseudonyms. Rosenmeyer observed in these fictive letters a standard incorporation of familiar epistolary topoi, as well as the incorporation of technical details concerning the material reality of the letter, its writing and sending, and historical or personal details concerning the autobiography of the purported sender. These features work together to build up a sense of verisimilitude—concerning both the letter and its implied author (Patricia A. Rosenmeyer, *Ancient Epistolary Fictions: The Letter in Greek Literature* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001], esp. 37-130).

On the form of a letter as part of the text’s appeal to “New Testament” authority, see Oerter, “Form as a Vehicle,” 201-204.

to follow a previous letter, sent ten months prior (1:28-31).²² The contents of both are described as having been revealed to James, in this case along with Peter, by the Savior (1:28-35), and each is identified as an apocryphon (ογαποκρυφο[ν]; 1:10, 30-31).²³ The implied author builds on the motif of secrecy, by having James specify, emphatically even, that he is entrusting the present apocryphon to a single recipient alone (1:17-18).²⁴ That recipient, identified as a minister of the salvation of the holy ones, should in turn

²² Kirchner draws an analogy here to the Letter of Pseudo-Aristeas (*Ep. Arist.* 6), which mentions a prior letter from the sender to the recipient. Williams suggests that “the citation of imaginary sources is by no means rare in esoteric religious literature” but does not offer specific examples as evidence (Williams, “Apocryphon of James,” *NHS* XXII, 20).

²³ Concerning the meaning connoted by *apocryphon*, Williams notes that despite modern usage: “The sense ‘uncanonical document’ is impossible here,” (“Apocryphon,” *NHS* XXIII, 7). By the early third century the idea of a generally-approved or widely-accepted body of Christian literature had begun to coalesce, but was not yet identified as “canon,” so neither could something identified as apocryphon indicate its being outside of a canon. It is worth considering, then, what the author might have intended by referring to both texts as apocrypha. Mark and Luke both used the Greek adjective ἀπόκρυφος in their variants of an aphorism by Jesus concerning those things that are hidden, but which will be revealed (Mark 4:22; Luke 8:17), connecting the term positively to to-be-revealed teaching of Jesus in the first century. By the second century, however, the word picked up a polemical connotation within heresiological discourse. Irenaeus accused the Marcosians of creating ἀποκρύφων καὶ νόθων γραφῶν (“apocryphal and spurious writings”) to deceive the ignorant (*Haer.* 1.20.1). Whether spurring or responding to this type of accusation, texts like *Ap. Jas.* and the Apocryphon of John adopted the noun ἀποκρυφον as part of their self-description, tapping into an apparent idea of “secrecy construed as an emblem of apostolic truth,” a trope known from *Gos. Thom.* as well, though it uses the Coptic ʒḥṛ rather than the Greco-Coptic (Annette Yoshiko Reed, “The Afterlives of New Testament Apocrypha,” *JBL* 133 (2015): 401-425, 407; also Antti Marjanen, “Sethian Books of the Nag Hammadi Library as Secret Books,” in *Mystery and Secrecy in the Nag Hammadi Collection and Other Ancient Literature: Ideas and Practices, Studies for Einar Thomassen*, ed. Christian H. Bull, Liv Ingeborg Lied, and John D. Turner, *NHMS* 76 [Leiden: Brill, 2012], 87-106).

In *Ap. Jas.* ἀποκρυφον appears to function primarily as descriptive concerning the contents of these two letters as secret or hidden, both because they were delivered only to James and Peter, and because they are now not to be shared widely. The implied author employs this designation as part of a rhetorical strategy to identify his own teaching as exclusive apostolic—or apostolic-era—truth, distinct from and superior to others.

²⁴ ἀγῖτῆν ἀλοῦγ κἄκ κἄκ μὲν οὐαεετῆ (Ap. Jas. 1:17-18).

take vigilant care not to share the contents of the book—that which the Savior did not wish even for all of his own disciples to hear—with many (1:18-25).²⁵ James ends his opening epistolary remarks with a word of benediction concerning those few to whom the recipient will communicate its contents, promising that they will be saved through faith in this word or discourse (Ap. Jas. 1:26-28). The author extends salvation, like the letter itself, as an exclusive offer to his recipient, and the few to whom he in turn entrusts it. The invented history between sender and recipient, and the confidence it suggests, amplifies familiar tropes of exclusivity and secrecy.

4.2.2 The Narrative: An Apostolic Era Experience of “James”

Adding to the personality-based authority of a letter written by the apostle affiliate James, the implied author continues in the same narrative voice to describe a firsthand experience among the apostles. The narrative opens with “the twelve disciples [...] all sitting together and remembering those things that the Savior had said to each one, whether secretly or openly, and putting them in books,” (Ap. Jas. 2:8-15).²⁶ The narrator claims that he, too, was present with the group and was writing those words of the Lord

²⁵ As is to be expected concerning the inherent orality/aurality of written texts, the author here adjures the recipient not to speak the text to many (ἀτῆχου ἡπιχόμε ἀραρ, Ap. Jas. 1:21-22).

²⁶ The *ed. pr.* suggest that these these books (χόμε), including that of the author-narrator, may be gospels, with “open” referring to canonical gospels and “secret” to “Gnostic Gospels” (Malinine, *Epistula*, 39). While “canonical” and “noncanonical” labels may be somewhat anachronistic for the early third century, the idea of the books being understood as gospels is plausible. Given the description of their contents, if these books were to be considered gospels, they might be of the sort of Gos. Thom. (or Q); that is, collections of Jesus’ sayings, taken either from his pre- or post-resurrection discourses with his disciples, as they remember them. Given the explicit association with “remembering,” such books might be understood as written memory-aids, penned as tools to facilitate the careful memorization of a set corpus of sayings of Jesus.

that were to go in his own book.²⁷ This act of remembering and recording is described as both individual and communal. Though the individual memories were held by each (ποῦεν ποῦεν), and though some of their contents had initially been shared only in secret (ἄπετῶν), the presence of the community now is meant to provide an open and collective check on the common tradition.²⁸ Though some treatments have described these books (ἄωωμῆ) as gospels, the text itself mentions only that they contained

²⁷ Ap, Jas. 2:15 has been reconstructed with the extraposed first person singular subject ἀ[νακ] followed by the conjunction [ἄε], but this need not be read as emphatic or adversative and does not necessarily indicate that his book is of a different sort from those of the apostles. Absent further evidence, the contents of the book James is writing within the narrative are presumably that which the Savior had spoken to him, whether privately or openly.

²⁸ Curiously, the so-called Muratorian “canon” fragment of the mid-second century paints a somewhat similar scene for the writing of the Gospel of John, except in that case, only John was responsible for writing, while the other disciples offered to review his work (lines 9-16; Bruce M. Metzger, *The Canon of the New Testament: Its Origin, Development, and Significance* [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987], 306).

James D. G. Dunn imagines a similar role of oral communities as a means of assurance of continuity within remembered tradition (and also alleged prophetic activity) (*Jesus Remembered*, vol. 1 of *Christianity in the Making* [Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2003], 177-192; also *ibid*, “Social Memory and the Oral Jesus Tradition,” in *Memory in the Bible and Antiquity*, ed. Loren Stuckenbruck, Stephen C. Barton, and Benjamin G. Wold, WUNT 212 [Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 2007], 179-194, 180. See also Michael F. Bird, “The Purpose and Preservation of the Jesus Tradition: Moderate Evidence for a Conserving Force in Its Transmission,” *BBR* 15 (2005): 161-185. Both of these scholars lean toward the idea that memory should be understood as generally reliable, in part on account of the presumed conservative effect of communities. In this case, however, the author of Ap. Jas. seems to be playing off an idea of conservatism or corroboration in the community of the twelve, claiming that he was present with the group, while also distinguishing his own recorded remembrances from theirs. By his telling, the group adds nothing to his account.

According to Cameron’s analysis of the fragments of Papias, *1 Clement*, and the book of Acts, “the formulaic employment of [the term ‘remembering’] to introduce collections of sayings of Jesus is a practice which began with the relatively free production of saying tradition and which continued, despite the existence of written gospels, without restriction to the gospels of the NT,” (Cameron, *Sayings Tradition*, chapter 3, here 112). See also Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels*, 70; cf. Dunn, *Jesus Remembered*, 179.

remembered sayings of the Lord. This description would seem most readily to suggest that these books were in fact sayings collections, possibly meant to help with future remembering.²⁹ The narrator includes himself in this narrative, as a participant along with the apostles in the remembering and recording of the sayings tradition, but also distinguishes himself from them as the primary custodian of a superior tradition.³⁰

4.2.3 The Dialogue: A Revelation to “James”

According to the narrator James, the communal act of remembering and recording by the apostles and James, said to take place five hundred and fifty days after the Lord had risen from the dead, and some time after his ascension, was interrupted by his reappearance among them (Ap. Jas. 2:17-21).³¹ The disciples as a collective group

²⁹ See, e.g., the description of the use of Q as a memory aid for missionaries and itinerant preachers by Heinrich Kasting, adopted also by Dale Allison (Kasting, *Die Anfänge der urchristlichen Mission: Eine historische Untersuchung* [Munich: Kaiser 1969], 97; Allison, *The Jesus Tradition in Q* [Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 1997]).

³⁰ After James and Peter receive the revelation from the Lord, they inform the disciples concerning what they have learned (Ap. Jas. 15:34-16:2). James narrates the petulance of the other apostles and the fact that he sends them off, each to his own place (αρχιδυ μοπουρει πουρει ακεμα [16:2-8, here 7-8]; cf. the Savior’s bidding each return to that which he had been about [2:27-39; 2:10-15]), and he alone travels to Jerusalem to obtain a portion among the beloved (16:8-11).

³¹ Concerning the particular significance of 550 days, see, e.g., Rouleau, *L’Épître Apocryphe de Jacques*, 99; and PHEME PERKINS, “What is a Gnostic Gospel?” *CBQ* 71 (2009): 104-124, 116 n. 75.

Perkins adds to Rouleau’s suggestion of a connection between this number and the 540 day (eighteen month) period mentioned in Ascen. Isa. 9.16, the possibility that this number might “have originated in speculation about the chronology of Paul’s vision.” As supporting evidence of this latter explanation in the reception history of Ap. Jas., Perkins notes the post-inscription inclusion of “The Prayer of the Apostle Paul” on the flyleaf of NHC I (ibid.).

Concerning the narrator’s witness, he was present with the disciples at this previous ascension (2:18-19); he and Peter alone will witness, and he alone will report on the Lord’s ascension later in this text (15:5-6, 34-39).

exchanged only a few, misguided, words with the Savior before he called James and Peter so that he might fill them, and bade the others to “occupy themselves with that which they were about,” that is, to return to their tasks of remembering and recording already known sayings tradition (2:21-39). What follows is the revelatory discourse that comprises the bulk of the text and is directed exclusively toward James and Peter.³² Concerning post-resurrection dialogues in general, Perkins has observed that authors like that of Ap. Jas. used this setting and genre as a means of grounding their own theological authority in the true revealed intentions of Jesus.³³ The implied author is utilizing the familiar form of a revelation discourse to support the content of his own teaching, voiced as sayings of Jesus.

The revelatory dialogue contains only occasional comments from Peter or James when they interrupt or respond to the Lord. Neither fares particularly well in this conversation, though James occasionally distinguishes himself as the somewhat less dense of the two. As Williams puts it, “When the document calls for the voicing of a gauche or inappropriate idea, the tendency is to assign this to Peter.”³⁴ In one instance, for example, Peter grumbles, “sometimes you persuade and draw us to faith and promise us life, and then again you cast us forth from the kingdom of heaven” (Ap. Jas. 13:31-36). The Lord responds to the two together, but includes a comment to James alone: “I have

³² This is what the narrator described in the epistolary introduction as the content of the *apocryphon* “revealed to me and Peter by the Lord” (Ap. Jas. 1:10-12).

³³ Perkins, *Gnostic Dialogues*, 25.

³⁴ Williams, “Apocryphon of James,” *NHS* XXII, 21; e.g., Ap. Jas. 3:38-4:2; 13:26-36). While this is perhaps an ungenerous singling out of the character of Peter, as there is no lack of evidence for James also—or, more often, the two together—being reproved by the Lord (5:35-6:1; 6:21-34; 11:6-14; 13:3-17; 14:2-17), James does elicit somewhat less hostility from the Lord and comes across as, however slightly, more competent and ultimately the one in charge.

given you (pl.) faith many times. And more [than that] I have revealed myself to you (sing.), James, and you (pl.) have not known me” (13:37-14:2). Though the Lord’s attention is not always positive,³⁵ James receives more of it, and on this and at least one other occasion he is said to have been the sole recipient of previous revelation from the Lord, thus emphasizing his particular significance as appointed by the Lord.³⁶ The inclusion of Peter alongside James as a co-participant in the revelation is apparently not meant to elevate the character of Peter, but to lend credibility to the narrator-James, and to make him look better by comparison.

The discourse itself contains frequent allusions to other familiar sayings tradition, including that of the four canonical Gospels, which were already part of the familiar or “open” tradition in the third century.³⁷ Such allusions are not only unsurprising but to be expected. Irenaeus, for example, warns concerning esoteric, or in particular, gnostic,

³⁵ Elsewhere the Lord repeatedly speaks words of woe directed at Peter and James (3:8-38; 11:10-14), points out their lack of understanding (6:28-7:10; 13:36-14:19), accuses them of delaying his ascent for the sake of the parables (7:35-8:4), even describes them as wretched and unfortunate (9:24-35).

³⁶ In addition to 13:36-14:1, the Lord elsewhere indicated private interactions between himself and James: “On many occasions I have said to you all together—and to you alone, James, I have said—‘Be saved!’ and I have commanded you (sing.) to follow me...” (8:30-34). One or both of these instances may refer to the same occasion of revelation mentioned in the introduction as having been received only by James and contained in the previous apocryphon (1:28-35). Additionally, the Lord addresses James in particular by name in 2:33-34.

³⁷ See, e.g., possible allusions to John 1:16; 7:33-34; 8:14, 21-22; 13:33-38; 14:3-7, etc. in Ap. Jas. 2:21-35; to John 20:24-29 in Ap. Jas. 3:16-25; to Matt 19:27 (par.: Mark 10:28; Luke 18:28); and Matt 6:13 (par. Did. 8:2) in Ap. Jas. 4:23-30; to John 16:25-28 in Ap. Jas. 6:5 (see chapter 3, above); to Matt 7:7-8 (par. Luke 11:9-10) in Ap. Jas. 10:32-34 (see chapter 3, above). See also the chart of Johannine allusions in Ap. Jas. (Perkins, “Johannine Traditions,” 408-409). According to Perkins, Ap. Jas. alludes to all four of the canonical Gospels as well as, possibly, the Gos. Thom., but seems to have a primarily oral sensibility concerning the traditions as opposed to the text-based, canonical proof-texting, interest in written materials that one sees, for instance, in the writings of Irenaeus (“Johannine Traditions,” 406, 412-413).

groups that they tend to use the very same language as other Christians, a point that the implied author of Ap. Jas. would be unlikely to dispute.³⁸ Such allusions serve as, to use Perkins’s description, “‘canonical’ warrant” on the text, assuring its implied audience through its use of familiar Jesus language and ideas that its contents are not a dangerous break from but rather a continuation of known tradition.

The narrated revelation concludes with an account of a brief ascension experience of James and Peter (Ap. Jas. 15:6-29), following that of Jesus. The narrator describes his and Peter’s having sent their hearts (πᾶξητ) and then their minds (πᾶνογς) upward to the heavens (15:8, 16), but he also repeats that they heard with their ears and saw with their eyes (15:17-19, 27-28), suggesting a physically-perceived if not actual experience of translation. The narrator describes what they saw and heard first as sounds of trumpets and turmoil, then further upward as hymns, and angelic benedictions and rejoicing. Ascension accounts, often with liturgical or angelic components, were familiar entities in various Christian circles, lending theological legitimacy via heavenly experience or enlightenment to those taken up.³⁹ Except, in this case, the ascent is thwarted.⁴⁰ Even as

³⁸ *Adv. Haer.* III 16, 8.

Perkins has argued that readers or hearers of a text like Ap. Jas. would even “perceive themselves to be in agreement [with Irenaeus] on what is essential and to have ‘canonical’ warrant for their view of salvation in the symbolic language of the Johannine tradition” (Perkins, “Johannine Traditions,” 413).

³⁹ Heavenly ascent narratives were already common within Jewish—and especially Jewish apocalyptic—literature (e.g., 1 En. 1-37, T. Levi, 2 En., 1 En. 37-71, Apoc. Zeph., Apoc. Ab., Ascen. Isa., and 3 Bar.; Martha Himmelfarb, *Ascent to Heaven in Jewish and Christian Apocalypses* [New York: Oxford University Press, 1993]), as well as Greco-Roman literature (e.g., Parmenides’ *proemium*; Cicero’s “Dream of Scipio Africanus, *Republic* 6.9-26). Ascents were of several different kinds, but those to receive revelation, to achieve immortal life, or to gain a foretaste of the heavenly world had come to be most common as the idea of heavenly ascents was picked up and adapted into Christian tradition. Paul describes a certain “person in Christ,” often presumed to be the apostle himself, and their experience of being caught up to the third heaven, though

James and Peter allow their spirit (πνεῦμα) to continue upward to the Majesty, the eleven disciples, who had been left behind during the revelation and ascension, call to them to inquire of them what they have heard and seen, and thus prevent them from seeing or hearing anything further (15:23-34). What at first, then, seems to be further affirmation of the narrator's revelatory, perhaps even prophetic, credentialing is, rather, cut off.

4.3 Invoking and Inverting Apostolic-Era Memory and Authority

The thwarted ascension is part of a pattern in Ap. Jas. The implied author repeatedly invokes familiar forms or themes that would lend legitimacy to the narrator as an authoritative source of Jesus' teaching and sayings tradition on account of his

whether in the body or out of the body, he claims not to know (2 Cor 12:2-4). That ascent, like James and Peter's in Ap. Jas., only goes so far as a third level (on the 2 Cor incident as a failed ascent, see, e.g., Paula R. Gooder, *Only the Third Heaven? 2 Corinthians 12.1-10 and Heavenly Ascent*, LNTS 313 [London: T&T Clark, 2006]). Various noncanonical texts, too, include heavenly ascent as part of a process of mental or spiritual enlightenment (e.g., Zost., Allogenes, Steles Seth, Marsanes, Paraph. Shem, Greek Apoc. Paul, Coptic Apoc. Paul, 1 Apoc. Jas.). On this literature, its relation to Jewish tradition and its use in Christian circles, see, e.g., Francis Fallon, "The Gnostic Apocalypses" *Semeia* 14 (1979): 123–58; David Frankfurter, "The Legacy of Jewish Apocalypses in Early Christianity: Regional Trajectories," in *The Jewish Apocalyptic Heritage in Early Christianity*, ed. James C. VanderKam and William Adler, CRINT [Assen: Van Gorcum; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1996], 129-200; and Harold W. Attridge, "Valentinian and Sethian Apocalyptic Traditions," *J ECS* 8 (2000): 173-211). *Pistis Sophia* and the *Book of Jeu* offer later and more complicated versions of these ascent formulae and narratives.

Attridge has described the ascent trope as a "matter of literary form, used to cloak a "Gnostic" teaching" (Attridge, "Valentinian and Sethian," 197).

⁴⁰ Gooder has argued that the ascent described by Paul in 2 Cor is also a failed ascent, and that this failure is part of the weakness in which Paul boasts (2 Cor 12:1-10). James Buchanan Wallace, however, reads a break at 12:5-7a, such that the experience of ascent would according to Paul be worthy of an actual boast (James Buchanan Wallace, *Snatched into Paradise (2 Cor 12:1-10): Paul's Heavenly Journey in the Context of Early Christian Experience* [Berlin: DeGruyter, 2011], 17-19). It is not obvious whether or how the implied author of Ap. Jas. had in mind this letter or tradition of Paul when describing the narrator's own thwarted ascent, but in this case there is little ambiguity as to the ascent's having been cut short.

firsthand apostolic-era experience and eyewitness memory concerning the risen Lord and revelation. At first glance these appeals to James's authority are the means by which the implied author establishes this text's credibility. When considered more closely, however, none of these elements makes the case for credibility quite as convincingly as might be expected. And some, like the ascension, are overtly undermined or reversed.

The claim to be James, the brother of the Lord and leader of the earliest church in Jerusalem, and in that character to be writing a secret letter meant only for one recipient and those with whom he entrusted it, is the first and foundational assertion of the text's authoritative status. Yet, outside of naming himself as such twice, there is little to associate the narrator or the text with the character James or the tradition about him. Purporting to have written in the Hebrew alphabet, for example, is presumably intended as a realistic James detail, though one that would be surprising for the actual James to have thought to mention, and one that is made all the less compelling by the fact that no part of the text is written in Hebrew or even as a transcription of Hebrew letters. A passing reference to Jerusalem in the closing of the text, and the ongoing association with Peter do little to anchor the text in its purported James context. Unlike the prologue of the Apocryphon of John, for example, which sets its scene at the Temple, an established apostolic locale, the implied author of Ap. Jas. sets his narrator in the midst of an otherwise unknown scene of remembering and writing (2:7-17). Furthermore, the content of the text bears little resemblance to other "James" tradition.

The evidence for this text having been a letter, or a convincing epistolary fiction, is similarly sparse. Most significantly, it lacks any words of farewell. Also absent is any reference to the mechanics of its writing or sending or any expression of desire to be

present with the recipient.⁴¹ While its thin appeals to apostolic era authority may have been effective for prospective proselytes or novitiates within the implied audience, the superficiality of these claims in Ap. Jas. suggests they may not have convinced a more astute reader. In fact, these elements may not have been intended to convince its ideal, elite readers.⁴²

The idea that the authority of James the brother of the Lord is not meant as the ultimate source of authority for the text is supported by James's own tenuous status within it. He may be the primary interlocutor for the Lord throughout the discourse, but that role earns him little esteem from the revealer. In fact, the discourse opens with the Lord negating the benefit of direct contact with himself. Immediately after telling James and Peter to remember that they have personally seen and spoken with and listened to the Son of Man, he pronounces woe on those who have seen him and blessing and life for those who have neither seen nor consorted nor spoken with nor listened to him (3:11-

⁴¹ On the use of epistolary topoi to authenticate epistolary fictions, see Rosenmeyer, *Ancient Epistolary Fictions*, 37-130.

⁴² According to Bart Ehrman's taxonomy of pseudepigraphy, this would leave Ap. Jas. straddling the line between literary fiction and true forgery. In forgery an author deceitfully depicts her/himself as someone else, whereas in a literary fiction an author takes on the literary persona of someone else but without the intention to deceive. (Bart D. Ehrman, *Forgery and Counterforgery: The Use of Literary Deceit in Early Christian Polemics* [New York: Oxford University Press, 2012], esp. 29-67). David Brakke has responded to and commended Ehrman's work as well as helpfully reviewed the *status quaestionis* of early Christian pseudepigraphy, including work on the literary, psychological, and philosophical understanding of pseudonymity and authorship in his article "Early Christian Lies and the Lying Liars Who Wrote Them: Bart Ehrman's Forgery and Counterforgery," *JR* 96 (2016): 378-390.

The line between forgery and fiction is admittedly difficult to draw, especially from the perspective of a modern critic. Ehrman holds that the Epistles of Paul and Seneca may be the only example of true literary fiction in the early Christian corpus, and it was accepted as authentic by Jerome just a few decades later (Ehrman, *Forgery and Counterforgery*, 520-527). According to the present reading of Ap. Jas., however, it might be added to that list, at least as a possible example of the category.

25).⁴³ Then again, after telling them to know that he is the one who healed them when they were ill, the Lord speaks woe against those who have found relief from illness and promises blessing and the kingdom to those who have never been ill (3:25-34). Ap. Jas. repeatedly affirms James's and Peter's direct contact with Jesus only to devalue that experience.⁴⁴

Ap. Jas.'s use of the familiar authority of canonical Jesus sayings and discourses demonstrates a similar tension. Allusions to the canonical gospels are sprinkled throughout the text, but the validity of their teaching is consistently questioned.⁴⁵ Shortly after the above incidents, for example, James claims that he and Peter have forsaken their families and other relationships to follow Jesus,⁴⁶ and then asks that they not be tempted by the devil, the evil one, both references to interactions between Jesus and the disciples

⁴³ Ap. Jas. here might allude to Jesus' interaction with Thomas in John 20:29: "Have you believed because you have seen me? Blessed are those who have not seen and yet have come to believe." But Ap. Jas. twists this Jesus saying even more harshly against those who might claim authority via direct connection to Jesus.

Cf. Ap. Jas. 12:38-13:2, in which the Lord again, after having said of James and Peter that when he was with them they did not know him, announces blessings on those who have known him and have not seen but believed (and woe on those who have heard but not believed).

⁴⁴ As mentioned above, the text includes multiple instances of Jesus' belittling or admonishing James and/or Peter, e.g.: 6:28-7:10; 7:35-8:4; 9:24-35; 10:9-21; 11:10-15; 13:8-17; and 13:36-14:19.

⁴⁵ As seen, for example, in the Ap. Jas. variant of the "Ask, Seek, and/or Knock" cluster, considered in Chapter 3.

Dunning has observed a similar phenomenon concerning Ap. Jas.'s employing what he describes as an *alien topos*, that is the idea that Christians should become like strangers, known positively elsewhere in early Christian literature (e.g., 1 Peter, Hebrews, Diognetus, Shepherd of Hermas). Ap. Jas. incorporates this familiar language—*αἰμίαι*, a foreigner, stranger, or alien—but re-appropriates it to serve his own purposes, to affirm his and his community's status not as aliens but as insiders to the Jesus tradition (Dunning, *Aliens and Sojourners*, 91-102).

⁴⁶ Cf. Mark 10:28-31; Matt 19:27-30; and Luke 18:28-30.

in the canonical Gospels.⁴⁷ The Lord dismisses his request by responding that only through suffering and temptation and persecution from Satan will they earn the Father's love and equality with him (Ap. Jas. 4:23-5:20). Again, after Jesus urges the two to remember his cross and death, James protests, suggesting a connection to the canonical Peter. Jesus not only corrects James's misunderstanding, he then redefines the role of the cross, entreating his audience to seek their own deaths in order to become better than him (5:33-6:20).⁴⁸

As discussed above concerning the theology of Ap. Jas., its soteriological model, by which one must do one's own work of salvation, exceeding even that of Jesus, makes a model of authorization that invokes and then inverts other previous or familiar means of authorizing all the more appropriate. Dunning has observed that in Ap. Jas. Jesus' teaching follows a pattern of correction and consolation, meant to spur his students on not only to surpass their teacher but ultimately to spurn his teaching and even his rebuke (14:10-12).⁴⁹ The implied author has created a textual world in which the authority of Jesus is diminished in relation to James, whose authority is in turn diminished in relation to those who come after him, including the implied author. In the final words to the recipient, James invites him to endeavor earnestly to make himself like those who will be enlightened through him and through another who will exceed him, for whose sakes he and Peter did not fully ascend (16:15-26). In this world, it is the authority of the implied

⁴⁷ Cf. Matt 6:13.

⁴⁸ Cf. Mark 8:31-38; Matt 16:21-26.

In this and the previous instance James's lines allude to those that the canonical Gospels assign to Peter and Jesus (Ap. Jas. 4:23-30; 5:35-6:1), thus keeping with the pattern of underscoring his significance within the text while simultaneously diminishing his authority.

⁴⁹ Dunning, *Aliens and Sojourners*, 94-98.

author, rather than any otherwise known authorities, that rises to the top, while leaving room for the intention that his ideal reader(s) will surpass even him.

4.4 Appeals to the Author's Memory and Authority

Throughout Ap. Jas. the implied author has repurposed familiar ideas and forms, even sayings tradition, into a work of epistolary and memorial fiction concerning Jesus' revelatory teaching of James, and James's sharing that teaching with his reader. The authority by which this third century author considered himself a reliable tradent and inventor of sayings tradition, however, is obviously not based in his personification of James or fictional portrayal of the Lord's brother's remembrance and writing. Rather, he appeals to his own third century memory as legitimizing his composition.⁵⁰ Interested in portraying himself as a Christian literary elite, the implied author signals his own memory, that is memory-training, to his ideal audience. In a literary world in which rote memorization of a set corpus of tradition was the test by which one was authorized to interpret and expand upon that tradition, or even draw upon it to compose his own work, the implied author leaves evidence of what he perceives as his own credentials in the text he has composed.

⁵⁰ Cicero, Quintilian and others discussed at length the methods and usefulness of the various arts or sciences of memory (*ars memoriae*) in literacy and rhetorical training (e.g., Cicero's *De or.* II, 350-354; Quintilian's *Inst.* I, X, and XI; and the anonymous *Rhet. Her.* III, 16-24). Quintilian in particular describes a general pedagogical pattern, whereby one must first memorize verbatim others' works, in order to then be qualified to interpret other's works, and eventually compose one's own. Mary Carruthers has observed evidence of this three-tiered—memorize, interpret, compose—process of memory from antiquity through the medieval period (Mary Carruthers, *The Book of Memory: A Study of Memory in Medieval Culture*, Cambridge Studies in Medieval Literature 10 [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990]).

For more on the role of memory and memory training in compositional literacy in antiquity, see the Excursus: Memory and the *Ars Memoriae* on pages 56-61.

Along with various sayings concerning the call and demands of the faith, in its central discourse Ap. Jas. includes three otherwise unattested parables concerning the kingdom and the word (Ap. Jas. 7:24-28; 8:16-23; and 12:22-27).⁵¹ Each is voiced by the risen Lord. Each follows a general pattern, common in parables, of: X (theological concept) is like Y (concrete phenomenon), followed by a brief narrative concerning Y as it applies to X.⁵² In each of these three cases X is either the Kingdom of Heaven (ΤΜΗΝΤΡΟ ΝΗΠΗΓΕ⁵³) or the word (πλογος), and Y is an agricultural or natural, albeit still possibly surprising, phenomenon.⁵⁴ Though they follow a similar form and contain

⁵¹ Cameron discusses these “similes,” as he describes them, as the first of his considered forms. He notes “that a ‘simile’ (*Gleichnis*, also translated ‘similitude’) is to be distinguished form-critically from a ‘parable’ (*Parabel*), which portrays in a narrative a specific, unique, metaphorical situation that is both imaginative and transparent to the realities of human existence,” (Cameron, *Sayings Traditions*, 8; citing Adolf Jülicher, *Die Gleichnisreden Jesu*, rev. ed. [Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1969], I:69, 80, 98, 101 and passim; followed by Rudolf Bultmann, *The History of the Synoptic Tradition*, trans. J. Marsh [Oxford: Blackwell, 1963], 170, 174; and Philip Vielhauer, *Geschichte der urchristlichen Literatur* [Berlin: De Gruyter, 1975], 295). The current treatment, however, does not require such a narrow technical distinction and will use “parable” as a general term for which these three are examples of the category.

⁵² For a similar definition, see, e.g., Arland Hultgren, *The Parables of Jesus: A Commentary* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2000), 3; Bernard Branson Scott, *Hear Then the Parable: A Commentary on the Parables of Jesus* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1989), 73; or Joachim Jeremias, *The Parables of Jesus*, 2nd ed., trans. S.H. Hooke (Upper Saddle River, NJ: SCM Press, Ltd., 1972), 115. Though Ap. Jas. does use the Greek loanword παραβολή to describe Jesus’ previous teaching and his own person or ministry (this, too, being an example of the text’s cryptic use of metaphor; Ap. Jas. 6:34-7:10), it does not label any of the “X is like Y” parables as ΠΑΡΑΒΟΛΗ.

⁵³ Or, the variant spelling: ΤΜΗΤΕΡΟ...ΝΗΠΗΓΕ (Ap. Jas. 12:22)

⁵⁴ Many have noted the recurring natural or agricultural elements of the parables attributed to Jesus by the Synoptic Gospels, but also a characteristic element of surprise, in which something may happen contrary to one’s common experience or expectation, even outside of nature; see, e.g., Hultgren, *Parables*, 10-11; C. H. Dodd, *The Parables of the Kingdom* (London: Nisbet, 1936); Pheme Perkins, *Hearing the Parables of Jesus* (New York: Paulist Press, 1981); Jacobus Liebenburg, *The Language of the Kingdom and Jesus: Parable, Aphorism, and Metaphor in the Sayings Material Common to the*

similar content to other parables attributed to Jesus that are known, for example, from the Synoptic Gospels, none of these has an identifiable parallel in any extant source, so would seem to be the invention of this author. David Brakke has described the function of these parables as part of an intentionally cryptic insiders-only language, typical of an esoteric community like the one presumed to have been on both the producing and receiving end of this apocryphon.⁵⁵ Though each is unique, neither the existence, nor the form, nor the general content of these parables is particularly remarkable on its own. That changes, however, with a list that at first appears to be an interruption in the Lord's discourse.

Sandwiched between the first two of these otherwise-unattested parables stands a list of seven familiar, parables, identified by the Lord only by titles or keywords.⁵⁶ "It was enough for some," he says, "to listen to the teaching and understand 'The Shepherds' and 'The Seed' and 'The Building' and 'The Lamps of the Virgins' and 'The Wage of the Workers' and 'The Silver Coins and the Woman'" (8:4-10).⁵⁷ This is not, as it might

Synoptic Tradition and the Gospel of Thomas, BZNT 102 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2001), 355.

⁵⁵ David Brakke, "Parables and Plain Speech," 215-216.

⁵⁶ Carruthers outlines evidence for the common use of keywords and titles as a means of gathering great quantities of memorized material into informationally-rich units that would serve as memory aids or triggers (Carruthers, *Book of Memory*, 80-85, 101-108, 244-247).

⁵⁷ ⲛⲉⲥⲣⲱⲉ ⲡⲉ ⲛⲉⲣⲛⲱⲙⲉ ⲗⲉⲧⲣⲟⲩⲱⲧⲙⲓ ⲛⲥⲗ ⲧⲥⲉⲱⲟ ⲗⲩⲱ ⲛⲥⲉⲣ̅ ⲛⲟⲓ̅ ⲛ̅ⲛ̅ⲱⲓⲟⲥ ⲗⲩⲱ ⲡⲗⲟ ⲗⲩⲱ ⲡⲕⲱⲧ ⲗⲩⲱ ⲛⲉⲣ̅ⲃⲥ ⲛ̅ⲙ̅ⲡⲁⲣⲑⲎⲟⲥ ⲗⲩⲱ ⲡⲱⲉⲕⲉ ⲛ̅ⲛⲉⲣⲑⲁⲧⲏⲥ ⲗⲩⲱ ⲛⲉⲕⲉⲓⲁⲧ ⲗⲩⲱ ⲧⲥⲑⲓⲙⲉ (*Ap. Jas.* 8:4-10). For "The Shepherds," cf. Matt 18:12-14; Luke 15:4-7; or John 10:11-17; as well as Gos. Tr. 31.36-32.37, which appears to combine the Matthean and Johannine variants. For "The Seed," cf., e.g., Matt 13:3-9; Matt 13:24-30; Matt 13:31-32; Mark 4:4-9; Mark 4:26-29; Mark 4:30-32; Luke 8:4-8; Luke 13:18-19; or Gos. Thom. 20. For "The Building," cf. Matt 7:24-27; Luke 6:47-49; or Luke 14:28-30. For "The Lamps of the Virgins," cf. Matt 25:1-13. For "The Wage of the Workers," cf. Matt 20:1-16; Williams further notes the Valentinian reinterpretation of this parable reported by Epiphanius (*Pan.* 31.10.15; Williams, "Apocryphon of James," NHS XXIII, 21). For

appear, a digression in the discourse. Rather, it is a clue as to the implied author's sense of his own memory training and, thus, his own credentials as author, as well as to his perceptions of the relative literacy levels of his in- and out-group peers.

On the one hand, the implied author is giving a nod to his own knowledge of a presumably familiar, even standard, corpus of Jesus sayings. Young pupils of teachers like Quintilian were required to master a set of aphorisms and *chriae* and, later, full

“The Silver Coins and the Woman,” cf. Luke 15:8-10. While the present treatment follows the *ed. pr.* in counting these as one title, Williams divides this final unit into two separate titles: “‘The Didrachmae’ and ‘The Woman’” (Williams, “Apocryphon of James,” NHS XXII, 41; contra *ed. pr.*, 58). Given that Coptic lacks an Oxford comma, and this is a list of nouns connected by the conjunction $\alpha\gamma\omega$, there is no certain division on the basis of grammar. In favor of separating the two items is the fact that earlier in the same list the author used the unambiguous possessive genitive-like (\bar{n} + noun) construction to specify the lamps *of* the virgins and the wage *of* the workers, but uses no such construction here. Nevertheless, concerning the sense, if each of these titles refers to a parable known from outside this text but within presumably familiar Jesus tradition, the referents for “The Silver Coins,” and “The Woman” individually are less obvious than that for “The Silver Coins and the Woman” together; Williams, in fact, offers Luke 15:8-10 still as a referent for “The Didrachmae,” and expresses more than usual qualification over the referent for “The Woman,” but points to Matt 13:33 or Gos. Thom 97 as possibilities (Williams, “Apocryphon of James,” NHS XXIII, 21). The alternative makes little difference to the present interpretation of the overall sense of this passage, though its referent(s) would presumably have been intended as unambiguous by the implied author with his ideal readers in mind. To dwell on this final point for a moment, it is possible that the author had other referents (other, that is, than the familiar parables listed above) in mind for any or all of the above parable titles. It is also possible that he and his ideal audience knew these parables from a source or multiple sources other than those known to us—a florilegium or Q-like collection of parables attributed to Jesus, perhaps. The significance here, however, is that they would all have known the intended referents, and they would have recognized them as familiar, even proto-orthodox teaching and, as such, a nod to the implied author's self-assessed advancement within standard Christian education.

Cf. a comparable list of references, by key phrases or titles, to presumably familiar parables or stories in Dial. Sav. 139:8-13 (Stephen Emmel, Helmut Koester, and Elaine Pagels, eds., *Nag Hammadi Codex III, 5: The Dialogue of the Savior*, NHS XXVI [Leiden: Brill, 1984]). In this case Mary is the one to share the list of three titles, and afterwards the narrator describes her as speaking “like a woman who knew everything/the All” ($\pi\tau\tau\eta\rho\varsigma$), a note that might very well be intended to indicate her familiarity with a corpus of Jesus sayings, rather than her engagement with the Divine.

speeches. In a similar vein, the implied author of Ap. Jas. claims to have memorized familiarity with the sayings—specifically, though presumably not exclusively, parables—of Jesus. Already by the time of writing there must have existed some acknowledged and authoritative collection of sayings and parables attributed to Jesus. Such collections might even have stood behind the description of the disciples’ remembering and recording sayings in the books of those gathered at the beginning of the text (Ap. Jas. 2:8-16).⁵⁸ If one were to set about to compose his own collection of sayings also to be attributed to Jesus, whether pre- or post-Easter, he must show the credentials of memorization as a means of authorizing his composition. In this case, the list of seven keywords or titles provides a collection of informationally-rich units, grouped together according to the natural limits of memory.⁵⁹ By naming them in this way, the implied author is

⁵⁸ The description of this group as the twelve disciples, who were remembering in the first century that which the Savior had said to each of them, is obviously part of the literary fiction crafted by the implied author. That later Christian disciples participated in learning communities in which they recalled and recorded prescribed sayings of Jesus—some of which may even have been transmitted as secret or hidden (see, e.g., Gos. Thom. 1; Ap. Jas. 2:12-13)—however, would have been part of that author’s third century knowledge and experience of Christian education.

⁵⁹ The law of “seven plus-or-minus two,” that is, that the human mind can only focus on between five and nine discrete units of information at a time, and, therefore, larger bodies of material should be broken down into approximately seven sections, was likely recognized in the ancient world and has been affirmed in the modern. Carruthers points to Quintilian’s notes on *divisio* in general (Quintilian, *Inst.* XI, 2, 32-37; Carruthers, *Book of Memory*, 74, 85-86, 98, 116, 205, 243, 310 n. 20), but also the specific comments of Hugh of St. Victor, a theologian of the middle ages, on grouping material into the most informationally-rich units possible for the sake of efficiency in recollection. As Carruthers describes Hugh’s analogy: “if my purse holds only six coins I can carry six pennies or six dimes; similarly it is as easy to memorize a list containing a lot of information coded into ‘rich’ units as it is to memorize one containing ‘poor’ units, for the limiting factor is the number, not the nature of each item” (Carruthers, *Book of Memory*, 84). Psychologist George Miller affirmed this understanding of the natural capacity of memory—or memory’s attention—through empirical study in the mid-twentieth century (George A. Miller, “Information and Memory,” *Scientific American* [August 1963]: 42-46; cited by Carruthers, *Book of Memory*, 84 n. 15, 16, 19). Miller also described a process of “chunking,” akin to Quintilian’s *divisio*.

demonstrating his own familiarity with a corpus of known parables of Jesus, and is thus legitimating himself as someone qualified both to interpret and to compose sayings attributed to Jesus. Put in terms of memory, he is establishing himself as a credentialed keeper of and contributor to the remembered tradition of Jesus. He is, in any case, abiding by the expected practices of memory and composition.

Beyond the self-validating impact of the list, however, the author uses the Lord's comment here to distinguish between the Ap. Jas. community and others, via a distinction between the Lord's conversation partners and "some [other] people" (ἄλλοι; Ap. Jas. 8:5). The section begins with the Lord asking why James and Peter hold him back despite his eagerness to depart. Indeed, he claims, it was "for the sake of the parables," that they compelled him to stay (8:3-4). Meanwhile, there are others, "some people," for whom merely listening to and understanding a prescribed set of parables would be enough (8:4-10). It was enough for some people, but not for the Lords' audience and not for the author; neither should it be enough for the author's audience. Though the implied author did listen to and understand—and even memorize—the list in question, he did not stop there, but capitalized upon his training in order to distinguish himself as an authoritative interpreter and composer of such sayings. Some, however, show no greater depth of insight or creativity than one merely memorizing and reciting a list of buyers at an auction, or prescribed parables of the Lord.⁶⁰ The memorization and recitation of short

⁶⁰ Quintilian offered the example of an auctioneer, who might be required to remember what objects were sold to each buyer, as one of the paltry cases of someone who might be well-served by the mnemotechnique of *loci*, invented by Simonides and preached by Cicero and other contemporaries (*Inst.* XI, 2, 23-24). He, however, preferred ruminating on the material, chewing it to a state of liquefaction to aid its thorough digestion into one's own consciousness (*Inst.* X, 1, 19). However one chose to memorize, one was not meant to stop at that step. For more on ancient understandings of memory and its cultivation through the *ars memoriae*, see the Excursus: Memory and the *Ars Memoriae* on pages 56-61.

aphorisms and moral stories, after all, was the task of the youngest and most novice pupils, not those who had advanced in their education and development of memory through interpretation and expansion. While the list affirms the implied author's own credentials for composition, this line all but dismisses others' lower levels of engagement with the tradition.⁶¹

Interestingly, despite the apparent distinction being drawn, with the Lord placing "some people" on the losing side, neither does he quite applaud his audience for their deeper engagement. Rather he questions their actions or motives in trying to retain him for the sake of the parables and expresses his own eagerness to depart from them (Ap. Jas. 7:37-8:4). Though interpretation and expansion of the parables and other sayings material is expected, the Lord himself is no longer to be its source. Neither, it is worth noting, is prophecy; since, as the author has established in a rather crude reference to John the Baptist in a previous section, "the head of prophecy was cut off..." (Ap. Jas. 7:30).⁶² Those for whom it was not enough merely to listen and understand, a group in

⁶¹ Such a juxtaposition is similar to the rabbis' simultaneous touting of their own elite abilities and derision of those whose training fell short of their own (see, e.g., b. Sot. 22a and b. Meg. 26b).

⁶² The author may be remembering and re-performing a saying like those found in Luke 16:16 and Matt 11:13.

Following Bultmann's early claim, scholars have occasionally invoked "prophecy," as the source of the ongoing voice of the risen Lord and the resulting proliferation of sayings attributed to him (Bultmann, *History*, 127-28; see the Excursus: Christian Prophecy and the Sayings Tradition on pages 41-42).

The implied author of Ap. Jas. seems to acknowledge that this model is at work in other communities (whether with an extreme case like the Montanists or some other groups in mind), but he rejects such a model in his own time and for his own audience. When the narrator-James asks, "Lord, how shall we be able to prophesy to those who request us to prophesy to them? For there are many who ask us, and look to us to hear an oracle from us." The Lord answered and said, "Do you not know that the head of prophecy was cut off with John?" (Ap. Jas. 6:27-32). It is likely that this graphic word play responds to the understanding and use of prophecy in other interpretive groups,

which the implied author would include himself and his ideal reader, know better even than the narrative's Peter and James that they cannot limit or contain the sayings tradition but are themselves responsible for its ongoing interpretation and expansion.⁶³

The parables on either side of the list affirm this idea. The former urges the audience to be vigilant concerning the kingdom of heaven, which, like the shoot of a date palm, the fruit of which reproduces the plant and bears even more fruit, lives on through these new plants. Just prior to this parable, the Lord has exhorted the audience to seek their own salvation apart from, even ahead of, him: "Hasten to be saved without being urged. But motivate yourself, and, if it is possible, precede even me" (Ap. Jas. 7:10-15). Through this lens, the parable itself reinforces the audience's responsibility, like the fruit of the date palm, to be productive for the growth of the kingdom, despite no longer being connected to the single original root (7:30-31), Jesus of the actual past.

While the former parable is concerned with the viability of the kingdom and the audience's self-determined salvation, the latter takes on "the word." The Lord urges the hearers, both those in the narrative and those in the apocryphon's audience, to:

Become eager concerning the word! ...For the word is like a kernel of wheat: when someone has sown it, he trusted in it; and when it sprouted, he loved it because he saw many kernels in place of one. And when he worked, he was saved because he had prepared it for food. Again he left some to sow. In the same way, it is possible for you receive the kingdom of heaven. Unless you receive this through knowledge, you will not be able to find it. (Ap. Jas. 8:10-11, 16-27)

perhaps even as a source of the ongoing voice of the risen Lord; but for this author and community prophecy has ceased to be a source of legitimate authority.

⁶³ This aligns with the soteriology of Ap. Jas., described above and discussed in greater detail in e.g. Dunning, *Aliens and Sojourners*, esp. 94-98, and Brakke, "Parables and Plain Speech," 214-216.

The model of salvific self-reliance, exceeding even the Lord, parallels the implied author's understanding of his responsibility for the preservation and production of sayings of Jesus; he is no longer relying on the Lord but is taking the sayings tradition into his own hands.

Unlike similar familiar agricultural “word” parables, the growth and production of the wheat here is not the result of mystery.⁶⁴ The kernel flourishes, rather, according to the attitude and action of the one who is eager concerning the word. Only through an intentional, human-driven, three-stage process of development—not unlike the progressive stages of memorization, interpretation, and expansion—is the sower able to provide for both his own and others’ ongoing sustenance, by means of the word.⁶⁵ The final of the three parables, this one comparing the kingdom of heaven to an ear of grain, similarly emphasizes the re-planting of the seeds to produce again another year (12:20-30), suggesting an expectation of continued productivity within the community, and culminating with the application for the second person plural audience: “You also, hurry to reap a living spike of wheat for yourselves that you may be filled with the kingdom” (12:27-31).⁶⁶ Elsewhere, too, Jesus urges a similar three-fold process concerning hearkening, understanding, and loving the word.⁶⁷ The text thus reiterates that only through one’s own continued effort and work is one able to reap the full benefits of the

⁶⁴ Cf., e.g., Matt 13:3-9; 18-23 (and parallels); or similarly the situations of the seeds in comparison to the Kingdom of Heaven in both Matthew 13:24-30 and 13:31-32 (and parallels).

⁶⁵ The point is not that there is necessarily a direct or intentional correlation between the particular stages of the sowers’ work and the particular stages of the author’s training so much as that there is understood, in both cases, a general progressively-staged process.

⁶⁶ The attributive construction $\bar{\eta}\omega\bar{\nu}\bar{\epsilon}$, here translated as *living*, could also be translated as *of life* (see, e.g., Williams, “Apocryphon of James,” NHS XXII, 47). The adjectival form is used here so as to keep the application more closely in line with the parable. The parable compares the kingdom of heaven to the ongoing productivity of a spike or ear of wheat, as it ripens, scatters fruit, and reproduces itself year after year. If one is to be filled with the kingdom of heaven, therefore, she should choose for herself a living, that is still-productive, ear.

⁶⁷ “Listen to the word; understand knowledge; love life...” (Ap. Jas. 9:18-20)

word and prepare it to be digested and transmitted by oneself and others. And through knowledge—not the superficial knowledge that comes only from hearing or rote memorization but the depth of knowledge that comes from careful attention and creative composition—will one find the kingdom of heaven.

4.5 Conclusions Concerning Memory and the Sayings Tradition in the Apocryphon of James

Ap. Jas. engages with and contributes to the sayings tradition to produce a new and distinctive variant of the voice of Jesus in the third century CE. Through its composition, the implied author makes the case for both his compositional literacy and his legitimacy as someone able to interpret and expand the sayings tradition. It is not his manufactured testimony, but rather his actual memory-based education, both his literacy training in general and his memorizing proficiency concerning a corpus of Jesus sayings in particular, that he perceives as giving him the authority to produce new material attributed to the voice of Jesus. Throughout the work he alternates between demonstrating his familiarity with known Jesus material and putting forward his own. The former acts as the authorizing stamp on the latter. With this authority, he promotes an elite, self-reliant form of Christianity, for which both instruction and salvation are grounded in one's own agency rather than that of the figure Jesus; and he is dismissive of those who lack his credentials or who would look to other means of instruction or salvation. Furthermore, he expects his audience, the rest of the Ap. Jas. community, to accept his authority and to strive similarly toward self-reliance and an engagement with the Christian corpus that goes beyond mere memorization and parroting of prescribed Jesus sayings.

This reading of the Ap. Jas. and the memory-based elitism of its author fits within a model of its community as an esoteric, textual learning community, with the means to support both the educational and material demands of regular reading. The text's vague and obscure language seems designed for an intellectually-elect Christian study circle, devoted to and steeped in a soteriological culture of reading, exegesis, and self enlightenment. Within the discursive context of early third century Christian communities concerned over their identity in relation to burgeoning orthodoxy, this group does not see itself outside or even at the periphery of Christianity, but at its very heart. While it may have been enough for some merely to listen and understand, or even to sit around memorizing things Jesus once said, the author of the Ap. Jas. authorizes himself and defines his ideal audience as those for whom those things are not enough. Rather, by their full application of memory, they are the ones who are able to remember into existence the continuing voice of Jesus.

Conclusion

On the first day of a course on the Gospels, Jesus, and Christian Origins, I gave my students a quiz titled, “Did Jesus say it?” Options ranged from the Synoptic to the apocryphal to the hymnic: “Blessed are the poor...” “...it is movement and repose...” “God works in mysterious ways.” After their deliberations and, eventually, my disclosure of the source or sources for each of the quotations, I pressed the students further: “If we know where it came from, do we know, ‘Did Jesus say it?’” Working to find the “right” answers, the students were quick to develop and debate their own makeshift criteria of authenticity—canonicity, antiquity, multiple attestation, even something like coherence (“Does it sound like something Jesus would say?”)—to aid their determinations. This continued until one student, catching on to the objective of the exercise, questioned the premise of the quiz and asked, “Can we ever know what Jesus actually said?”

Similarly, sayings scholarship since the twentieth century has, on the whole, been occupied with this question of whether we can know what Jesus actually said, and, if so, how. As a result, the field has largely been divided between those who would answer “yes” and those who would answer “no,” and the sayings tradition, and the individual sayings and variants within it, have been divided into “authentic” and “inauthentic” piles. This dissertation has attempted to demonstrate the need for and benefits of a middle-way between those divisions. Taking social memory theory as its hermeneutical lens, it has proposed and applied what it has described as a variant-conscious approach to the sayings tradition. Its aim has been to shift attention onto the individual variants within the sayings tradition as pieces of evidence, not for what Jesus of Nazareth may or may not have said, but for what communities over the course of the first three centuries CE remembered him to have said, and how and why.

Most foundationally to this aim, the dissertation began by considering how an application of social memory theory demands a reframing of previous approaches to the sayings tradition, and how that demand might be satisfied by the particular variant-conscious approach proposed here. The survey of scholarship in Chapter 1 brought to the fore the intertwining of sayings scholarship and the quest(s) for the historical Jesus. Across various methods and approaches to the sayings tradition, few of which actually set out with the initial goal of identifying Jesus' words, scholarship concerning the sayings attributed to Jesus kept gravitating toward the question: "did Jesus say it?" Source criticism, which began with efforts to sort out the literary relationships between the Gospels and their sources, turned to Q as the potentially earliest and most reliable collection of Jesus' sayings. Form criticism's attention to the pre-literary origins of the sayings tradition in the early Christian church was shifted further back in time to the possible origins of the sayings tradition with Jesus himself. Even memory, which was introduced as a category through which to understand the work of tradents in preserving the sayings tradition, came to be evaluated as either a reliable or unreliable link to Jesus. In each of these shifts toward the Jesus layer, sayings scholarship has limited its perspective on the sayings tradition, to those sayings that might be determined to be most-proximate to Jesus himself and therefore most plausibly something he actually said. This focus has been based on various premises that have led scholars to believe the received sayings tradition can be sorted into more- and less-genuine Jesus parts. Underlying these has been an understanding, whether explicit or implied, of human memory as capable of accurately preserving kernels of the actual past. Though these kernels—in the case of the sayings tradition, the actual words, or at least voice, of Jesus—may have been edited along the way to fit the needs of a particular social or

literary context, the assumption is that they still exist as representations of the actual past, there to be retrieved or reconstructed from the appropriate sources and by the appropriate method.

Social memory theory controverts this premise and, therefore, requires a revised approach to the sayings tradition. As Chris Keith has described it, the base assertion of the collection of sociological approaches to memory that have come to be known as social memory theory is that “All memory is inextricably bound to the social frameworks of the present that enable the articulation and conceptualization of the past.”¹ Such a perspective does not dismiss the impact of the past but brings to the fore the social and present, always-interpretive reality of memory. In that, it challenges the idea that human memory ever preserves an unmediated representation of the actual past that could be recovered out of its interpretive context. This undermines those prior approaches that would assume tradition—here, sayings tradition—could be broken down into discrete units to be further disassembled and sorted into piles of authentic memories and inauthentic interpretation. But, to move beyond simply disproving the efficacy of previous treatments, a new approach is needed.²

This dissertation has proposed a variant-conscious approach to the sayings tradition as a means of answering this need and taking into account social memory theory’s claims concerning the tradition’s social construction. To identify the objects of this study as variants is to highlight their connection, as recorded instances of social

¹ Chris Keith, “Social Memory Theory and Gospels Research: The First Decade (Part Two),” *Early Christianity* 6 (2015): 517–542, 526.

² As Keith has observed, “social memory theory is not so much a historiographical method as it is a theory of the social construction of the past that enables responsible historiography” (Chris Keith, “Social Memory Theory and Gospels Research: The First Decade (Part One),” *Early Christianity* 6 [2015]: 354-376).

memory, to both the remembered past and their own present. Each variant—as variant—witnesses to the impact of the actual past, a presumed originating, no longer accessible saying attributed to Jesus. But each variant—as variant—also witnesses to the impact of its own distinctive present, the particular socially-engaged contexts of its author and performance. Variants can be grouped into clusters based on their connection to one another via a common presumed originating saying (even though the author of any given variant would only have known that presumed originating saying through another received performance of it in the social memory). To consider any one variant, then, is to observe what has previously been described as an artifact of social memory, but might also be thought of as a sample from social memory’s continually-flowing stream.³ Each represents its own moment and location in the dynamic process of the memory of a saying. To consider a cluster of variants is to observe the variance between these samples as representative of the diversity of early Christian memory concerning the voice of Jesus, which is itself a reflection of the diversity of early Christian thinking and identity more broadly. Chapters 2 and 3 each applied this approach via a case study of one cluster of variants, the “Explaining the Parable(s)” and the “Ask, Seek, and/or Knock” saying cluster, respectively. Both studies had the broad objective to employ a variant-conscious

³ I had used the language of “artifact” of memory in an early draft of part of this dissertation, only to later find it also in the work of Alan Kirk and Tom Thatcher (“Jesus Tradition as Social Memory,” in *Memory, Tradition, and Text: Uses of the Past in Early Christianity*, ed. Kirk and Thatcher, *SemeiaSt* 52 [Atlanta: SBL, 2005], 25-42, 41). I find this metaphor particularly useful because it cues the reader to consider each variant as a product of and evidence for an ancient past moment in time, one which must be interpreted, preferably *in situ*, in order to be made meaningful. The “stream sample” metaphor, rather, means to highlight the unique locus (in time, space, and social context) of each variant, as well as the continuing dynamic nature of the processes of social memory surrounding each.

approach and explore its implications for an understanding of a particular cluster, its constituent variants, and the sayings tradition in general.

Chapter 2 took on one of the most widely-held characteristic features of Jesus' speech: parables. Rather than considering any one parable cluster in particular, however, this study examined a cluster of sayings in which Jesus explains his use of parables. A handful of texts from the first three centuries include and even reflect on Jesus' use of parables or other figurative speech; the cluster considered here, however, included only three Synoptic variants, all representing relatively early and closely connected—even interdependent—memories of Jesus' response to a question concerning the parable(s). These three variants exhibit some verbal parallels and overall similarity in their sayings, owing in part to Mark's being part of Matthew and Luke's received memory. But each also exhibits its own distinctive memory, not only of this saying but of the actual purpose of Jesus' parables in communicating inclusion in or exclusion from its implied audience community. Mark remembered this saying as a "parable theory" for his Gospel, so that the parables became a metonym for all Jesus' public words and deeds, which were open but intentionally opaque to "those outside." It interpreted this insider versus outsider dynamic, through a paraphrase of a passage from Isaiah, as a matter of divine prejudice, underscoring the inscrutability of the mystery of the Kingdom. Matthew, who had this Markan performance as part of his received memory, similarly remembered Jesus as having drawn from the prophets of Israel, both Isaiah and Jeremiah, to explain why his parables were incomprehensible for those not included among the disciples. But Matthew's performance focuses Jesus' attention primarily on the blessing for the disciples, who have been given the means to know and understand these and other mysteries. Though Mark's performance was also a part of Luke's received memory of

this variant, the latter's performance expanded the audience for Jesus' saying as part of Luke's memory of the parables as not only open but accessible. They were for Luke part of a mission of teaching that was meant to include rather than exclude. Luke's close verbal parallels but stark difference in message when compared to its Synoptic counterparts demonstrates a benefit of this approach's attention to the literary context of each variant as part of its remembered meaning, as opposed to the criteria approach's at times misleadingly atomistic treatment of variants.

The differences between these variants cannot be flattened into a single version of the saying. Rather, read as diverse samples from the stream of social memory concerning Jesus' use of parables, these variants reflect their authors' received memories but also the present social contexts that inform their frameworks of processing and performing those memories. It is in these three distinct social contexts that the question of whether Jesus' parables were meant primarily to exclude or to include was apparently being worked out, with differing results and, therefore, differing social memories. As contributions to (as well as products of) the ongoing stream of social memory on this subject, these variants became part of a debate over the essentially esoteric or exoteric nature of Jesus' message, which would persist to and through the third century in texts like the Apocryphon of James. Because an application of social memory theory allows for this longer view on the continuing impact of a given saying, the second case study took on a cluster that highlighted that aspect of the variant-conscious approach more directly.

Chapter 3 drew the boundaries around its cluster somewhat more loosely in order to allow for greater inclusion and variance in the cluster, so as to represent the broad spectrum of ways the memory of a saying might shift in the diverse social contexts of early Christianity. This wide sample additionally demonstrates a benefit of a variant-

conscious approach over Jesus-focused approaches to the sayings tradition in that it is not limited only to those first or second century variants deemed relevant to the Quest. That is not to say that it claims the variant cited in Clement's *Miscellanies* has the same historiographical value with regard to Jesus as the variant in the Gospel of Mark, but that, Clement's variant does have historiographical value with regard to his own social context in late second century Alexandria. The case study observed a cluster of eighteen variants extant in eleven sources from the first through the early third centuries that included any or all of three elements: asking, seeking, or knocking.⁴

While each individual variant again presented its own distinctive sample of social memory, in this case the variants also fell into two broad categories: those emphasizing asking and receiving, and those emphasizing seeking and finding. On the one hand, the variants that emphasized asking all remembered Jesus' saying as involving an essential promise concerning the efficacy of prayer, as a matter of asking and expecting to receive from an agent outside oneself. Some qualified this promise, specifying that one's asking must be defined by trust or by an aligning of their purpose with that of Jesus himself. Others used this idea of qualifications to explain why some asking is not met with the desired response. But all of these asking variants remembered Jesus' pointing his audience outside themselves for the fulfillment of the expectation laid out by this saying. The variants that emphasized seeking, on the other hand, all remembered Jesus' enjoining his audience to seek and find on their own. The variants differed somewhat in defining

⁴ If David Parker's observations concerning textual variants of Jesus' sayings transfer to the present approach, one could reason that this wide representation and variance are the result of the enduring import of this saying, which would require continued re-remembering, as opposed to carelessness or fallibility in the transmission process (David C. Parker, *The Living Text of the Gospels* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997], passim, esp. 75, 198).

(or not) the progression and loci of seeking, but they were united in their memory that Jesus taught that seeking is something one does for oneself, without outside intervention. Variants from the Gospel of John, which emphasize asking, stand in particularly stark contrast to those in the Gospel of Thomas, which emphasize seeking. Viewed together within the context of each Gospel, these variants became evidence for two contrary memories, not only concerning Jesus' saying, but concerning the continuation of authoritative tradition, as the product either of inspired asking and receiving, or seeking and finding meaning within the already-extant sayings. The author of the Apocryphon of James, later, was aware of both of these streams of memory and played them off of each other in an ironic reversal of an asking saying, which fit into his own socially-formed memory of Jesus' relationship to continuing sayings tradition, explored further in Chapter 4. This and the previous case study demonstrated that by attending to the variants of a saying as evidence of the processes of social memory concerning that saying, one finds a diversity of remembered sayings and a diversity of social contexts in which the sayings were remembered, both of which are missed if the sayings are treated primarily as evidence for a historical Jesus.

In the first two studies, a variant-conscious approach brought attention to the difference, evident in the variants, in how early Christians were conceiving of their own access to either open or hidden tradition as constitutive to their identity, as well as the difference in how they were understanding continuing sources of authority and revelation. Both suggested that, though at one level these variants can all be explained as products of social memory concerning the sayings, the people responsible for each of them would have understood their participation in that process differently. The third case study, therefore, took a different turn from the previous two in order to consider how one

author of one text, a text that could be understood as a product of and contribution to social memory concerning the sayings tradition, signals his own understanding of his participation in the social memory process. This last case study is an important move made to ensure that a variant-conscious reading of variants as all artifacts of “social memory” is not misunderstood as suggesting a homogenous picture of how that memory process would have looked or been understood throughout early Christianity.

The text and author considered in this case were those of the Apocryphon of James, which not only presents the author’s own memories of the sayings tradition as part of a revelation discourse but also narrates a scene of apostolic-era remembering and recording sayings tradition. My interest in this particular text began on account of the latter, its unique and seemingly self-conscious depiction of memory and writing as closely connected social processes tied to apostolic authority, particularly as that was juxtaposed with the narrator’s reported experience of newly revealed sayings tradition. Closer attention to the author’s own relationship to memory and remembered tradition, however, revealed a complicated interplay between the text’s appeals to the authority of first-century memory via the purported witness of the narrator “James,” on the one hand, and its subtler appeal to the authority of the implied author’s own third-century experience of memory of the Jesus and sayings traditions, on the other. The implied author repeatedly invokes familiar devices to build up the authority of “James’s” remembered witness—framing the text as a secret apostolic-era epistle, describing James’s participation in a revelation dialogue directly with the Lord, incorporating received sayings tradition, even narrating James and Peter’s attempted heavenly ascent—but he also questions or undermines their authorizing effect. The text’s performance of sayings tradition and parable tradition in particular, which always exists at a nexus of

exoteric and esoteric teaching, pivots between the two, the familiar and the unfamiliar. The implied author points to his own memory-based training—that is his memorization of a particular corpus of sayings material, which authorizes his interpretation and expansion of the sayings tradition—as the singular source of continued superior Christian teaching, through the voice of Jesus. And, in a move that parallels his distinctive soteriology, he enjoins his implied audience to follow, and even exceed, his lead. For this author and his ideal elite reading community, Jesus is no more the source of salvation than he is the source of continued revelation; rather, both must be found through one’s own work and process of remembering the teaching. This text can rightly be identified as a product of and contribution to the social memory of the sayings tradition, but its author’s unique understanding of “memory” and his relation to it points to the reality that the processes of social memory are as diverse as the social contexts in which they take place.

These case studies have demonstrated how a variant-conscious approach brings the insights of social memory theory to bear on the sayings tradition, considering each variant as a unique product of its own received past and its socially-engaged present. This project participates in—and contributes to—a growing movement of similar work that is redefining how the fields of New Testament and early Christianity approach their sources, what has been described as a new historiography.⁵ In particular it follows those who would shift attention away from a prioritization of Jesus of Nazareth as the singular

⁵ Keith, “Social Memory Theory... (Part Two),” 527; with reference primarily to the work of Jens Schröter, “The Criteria of Authenticity in Jesus Research and Historiographical Method,” in *Jesus, Criteria, and the Demise of Authenticity*, ed. Chris Keith and Anthony Le Donne (London: T & T Clark, 2012), 49-70; and idem, *From Jesus to the New Testament: Early Christian Theology and the Origin of the New Testament Canon*, trans. Wayne Coppins, Baylor-Mohr Siebeck Studies in Early Christianity (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2013), esp. 9-48.

focal point in the study of Christian origins. This is a shift worth amplifying, especially concerning the sayings tradition, precisely because that tradition has historically garnered so much Jesus-centered attention. Future work, then, might apply a variant-conscious approach to other sayings variant clusters, following the model of the first two case studies to observe how the performed memories of a Jesus saying reflect the varying social contexts in which they are remembered and performed. Or, following the third case study, another project might consider another source of sayings tradition for how its author signals their own understanding of or interaction with the processes of social memory. Additionally, given the variant-conscious approach's debt to New Testament text criticism, the present work or future studies of this sort might naturally be extended to attend more expansively to manuscript variants of the sayings. Expansions of the scope of this work in any of these directions would contribute further evidence for the diverse ways social context influenced the memory of the sayings and voice of Jesus.

Reconsidering the sayings tradition as evidence for early Christian diversity, rather than as evidence for a single originating saying whether Jesus' or otherwise, disrupts the persistent focus on Jesus that has defined contemporary discourse concerning the sayings tradition and is the primary contribution of this work and its underlying approach. Social memory theory has demonstrated that approaches to the sayings tradition that focus primarily on recovering or reconstructing the authentic voice of Jesus are historiographically flawed. Furthermore, in representing early Christian history, such approaches falsely limit the diversity apparent in the abundant sources for and variants within the sayings tradition. To the extent that the goal of these approaches is a single voice of Jesus, which is further prioritized as the most real and the most authoritative, even equated with the voice of real Christian origins and therefore Christianity, these

approaches also become theologically distortive. They reduce the many memories of Jesus' voice, each of which was real for those who wrote and read them, to one construct. Even putting aside the problematic extent to which Jesus scholars have tended to form that construct in their own image—or voice—as a teacher of early Christianity and the sayings tradition within it, I feel an ethical responsibility, in the classroom and for the church, to shift attention onto the diversity that characterized Christianity from its origins. To this end, this dissertation and in particular its case studies demonstrate how a variant-conscious approach brings the insights of social memory theory to bear on the sayings tradition in a way that highlights the diversity and even competition within early Christianity, as that diversity is given voice through the various memories of the voice of Jesus, which cannot be reduced to a singular *vox Jesu*.

Bibliography

- Achtemeier, Paul J. *Mark*. 2nd ed. Proclamation Commentary Series. Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1986.
- Adorno, Theodore W. *The Jargon of Authenticity*. Translated by Kurt Tarnowski and Frederic Will. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1973.
- Aland, Kurt. "The Problem of Anonymity and Pseudonymity in Christian Literature of the First Two Centuries." *JTS* 12 (1961): 39–49.
- Aland, Kurt and Barbara Aland. *The Text of the New Testament: an Introduction to the Critical Editions and to the Theory and Practice of Modern Textual Criticism*. Translated by Erroll F. Rhodes. 2nd ed. Leiden: Brill, 1989.
- Allison, Dale C., Jr. "The Audience of James and the Sayings of Jesus." Pages 58-77 in *James, 1 & 2 Peter, and Early Jesus Traditions*. Edited by Alicia J. Batten and John S. Kloppenborg. London: Bloomsbury, 2014.
- . *Constructing Jesus: Memory, Imagination, and History*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2010.
- . "The Historians' Jesus and the Church." Pages 79-95 in *Seeking the Identity of Jesus: A Pilgrimage*. Edited by Beverly Roberts Gaventa and Richard B. Hays. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2008.
- . *James: A Critical and Exegetical Commentary*. ICC. New York: Bloomsbury, 2013.
- . "It Don't Come Easy: A History of Disillusionment." Pages 186-199 in *Jesus, Criteria, and the Demise of Authenticity*. Edited by Chris Keith and Anthony Le Donne. London: T & T Clark, 2012.
- . *The Jesus Tradition in Q*. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 1997.
- Aristotle. *On the Soul, Parva Naturalia, On Breath*. Translated by W.S. Hett. LCL. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1957.
- Arnal, William E. *Jesus and the Village Scribes: Galilean Conflicts and the Setting of Q*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001.
- . "The Trouble with Q," *Forum* 2,1 (2013): 7-77.
- Assmann, Jan. *Cultural Memory and Early Civilization: Writing, Remembrance, and Political Imagination*. Translated by Jan Assmann. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- . *Moses the Egyptian: The Memory of Egypt in Western Monotheism*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1998.
- . *Religion and Cultural Memory: Ten Studies*. Translated by Rodney Livingstone. Cultural Memory in the Present. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2006.

- Attridge, Harold W., ed. *Nag Hammadi Codex I (The Jung Codex): Introductions, Texts, Translations, Notes*. NHS 22. Leiden: Brill, 1985.
- , ed. *Nag Hammadi Codex I (The Jung Codex): Notes*. NHS 23. Leiden: Brill, 1985.
- . “‘Seeking’ and ‘Asking’ in Q, Thomas, and John.” Pages 295-302 in *From Quest to Q: Festschrift James M. Robinson*. Edited by Jon Ma. Asgeirsson, Kristin De Troyer, and Marvin W. Meyer. BETL 146. Leuven: Peeters, 2000.
- . “Valentinian and Sethian Apocalyptic Traditions.” *JECS* 8 (2000): 173-211
- Aune, David E. “Oral Tradition and the Aphorisms of Jesus.” Pages 211-265 in *Jesus and the Oral Gospel Tradition*. Edited by Henry Wansbrough. JSNTSup 64. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991.
- . *Prophecy in Early Christianity and the Ancient Mediterranean World*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1983.
- Bailey, Kenneth. “Informal Controlled Oral Tradition and the Synoptic Gospels.” *AJT* 5 (1991): 34-54. Repr. *Themelios* 20.2 (1995): 4-11.
- Barbour, Robin. *Traditio-Historical Criticism of the Gospels*. Studies in Creative Criticism 4. London: SPCK, 1972.
- Barton, Stephen C. “Memory and Remembrance in Paul.” Pages 321–339 in *Memory in the Bible and Antiquity*. Edited by Loren Stuckenbruck, Stephen C. Barton, and Benjamin G. Wold. WUNT 212. Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 2007.
- Bauckham, Richard. *Jesus and the Eyewitnesses: The Gospels as Eyewitness Testimony*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2006.
- Bauer, Walter. *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity*. Edited by Robert A. Kraft and Gerhard Kroedel. Translated by Philadelphia Seminar on Christian Origins. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971.
- Bazzana, Giovanni. “Violence and Human Prayer to God in Q 11.” *HTS* 70 (2014): doi: 10.4102/hts.v70i1.2733
- Beavis, Mary Ann. *The Lost Coin: Parables of Women, Work and Wisdom*. BibSem 86. London: Continuum International, 2002.
- . “Parable and Fable.” *CBQ* 52 (1990): 473-498.
- Becker, Jürgen. *Jesus of Nazareth*. Translated by James E. Crouch. New York: de Gruyter, 1998.
- Berger, Peter L. and Thomas Luckmann. *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge*. Garden City, NY: Anchor Books, 1966.
- Berzon, Todd S. *Classifying Christians: Ethnography, Heresiology, and the Limits of Knowledge*. Oakland, CA: University of California Press, 2016.

- Betz, Hans Dieter. *The Sermon on the Mount*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995.
- Bianchi, U. *Le Origini dello Gnosticismo: Colloquio di Messina 13-18 Aprile 1966, Testi e Discussioni*. SHR 12. Leiden: Brill, 1967.
- Bird, Michael F. *The Gospel of the Lord: How the Early Church Wrote the Story of Jesus*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2014.
- . “The Purpose and Preservation of the Jesus Tradition: Moderate Evidence for a Conserving Force in Its Transmission.” *BBR* 15 (2005): 161-185.
- Blanton, Ward. *Displacing Christian Origins: Philosophy, Secularity and the New Testament*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2007.
- Blass, Friedrich, Albert Debrunner, and Robert W. Funk. *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961.
- Blomberg, Craig L. *Interpreting the Parables*. 2nd ed. Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2012.
- Bockmuehl, Markus. *The Remembered Peter: Peter in Ancient Reception and Modern Debate*. WUNT 262. Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 2010.
- . *Seeing the Word: Refocusing New Testament Studies*. STI. Grand Rapids, MI, 2006.
- . *Simon Peter in Scripture and Memory: The New Testament Apostle in the Early Church*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2012.
- Boismard, Marie-Émile. “Théorie des niveaux multiples.” Pages 231-243 in *The Interrelations of the Gospels: A Symposium Led by M.-É. Boismard – W. R. Farmer – F. Neiryck: Jerusalem 1984*. Edited by D. L. Dungan. BETL 95. Leuven: Peeters, 1990.
- Boring, M. Eugene. “Christian Prophecy and the Sayings of Jesus: The State of the Question.” *NTS* 29 (1983): 104.
- . *The Continuing Voice of Jesus: Christian Prophecy and the Gospel Tradition*. Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1991.
- . “The Historical-Critical Method’s ‘Criteria of Authenticity’: The Beatitudes in Q and Thomas as a Test Case.” *Semeia* 44 (1988): 9-44.
- . *Sayings of the Risen Jesus: Christian Prophecy in the Synoptic Tradition*. SNTSMS 46. London: Cambridge University Press, 1982.
- Bornkamm, Gunther. *Überlieferung und Auslegung im Matthäusevangelium*. WMANT 1. Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1961.
- Bovon, Francois. *Luke 1: A Commentary on the Gospel of Luke 1:1-9:50*. Hermeneia. Translated by Christine M. Thomas. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2002.

- . *Luke 2: A Commentary on the Gospel of Luke 9:51-19:27*. Hermeneia. Translated by Donald S. Deer. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2013.
- Brakke, David. "Early Christian Lies and the Lying Liars Who Wrote Them: Bart Ehrman's Forgery and Counterforgery." *JR* 96 (2016): 378-390.
- . *The Gnostics: Myth, Ritual, and Diversity in Early Christianity*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2010.
- . "Parables and Plain Speech in the Fourth Gospel and the *Apocryphon of James*." *J ECS* 7 (1999): 187-218.
- Braun, Willi. "The Schooling of a Galilean Jesus Association (The Sayings Gospel Q)." Pages 43-65 in *Redescribing Christian Origins*. Edited by Ronald Dean Cameron and Merrill P. Miller. SBLSymS 28. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- Breech, James. *The Silence of Jesus: The Authentic Voice of the Authentic Man*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1980.
- Brown, Raymond E. *The Epistles of John*. AB 30. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1982.
- . *The Gospel according to John*. 2 vols. AB 29-29A. New York: Doubleday, 1966-1970.
- . "The Semitic Background of the Term *Mysterion*," *Bib* 39 (1958): 426-448.
- Brown, Scott Kent. "James: A Religio-Historical Study of the Relations between Jewish, Gnostic and Catholic Christianity in the Early Period through an Investigation of the Traditions about the Lord's brother." Ph.D. diss. Brown University, 1972.
- Bultmann, Rudolf. *Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition*. FRLANT 29. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1921.
- . *The History of the Synoptic Tradition*. Translated by J. Marsh. Oxford: Blackwell, 1963.
- . *Jesus and the Word*. Translated by Louise P. Smith and Erminie H. Lantero. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1934. Translated from *Jesus*. Berlin: Deutsche Bibliothek, 1926.
- . *The Johannine Epistles: A Commentary on the Johannine Epistles*. Hermeneia. Translated by James E. Crouch. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1973.
- . *Kerygma and Myth: A Theological Debate*. Edited by Hans Werner Bartsch. Translated by Reginald H. Fuller. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1961.
- . "The Study of the Synoptic Gospels." Pages 7-76 in *Form Criticism: Two Essays on New Testament Research*. Revised edition. Translated by Frederick C. Grant. New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1962.
- Burkill, T.A. *Mysterious Revelation: An Examination of the Philosophy of St. Mark's Gospel*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell, 1963.

- Burns, Dylan M. "Sethian Crowns, Sethian Martyrs? Jewish Apocalypses and Christian Martyrs in a Gnostic Literary Tradition." *Numen*, 61, (2014): 552-568.
- Butler, B. C. *The Originality of St. Matthew: A Critique of the Two Document Hypothesis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1951.
- Byrskog, Samuel. *Jesus the Only Teacher: Didactic Authority and Transmission in Ancient Israel, Ancient Judaism and the Matthean Community*. ConBNT 24. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1994.
- . "A New Perspective on the Jesus Tradition: Reflections on James D.G. Dunn's *Jesus Remembered*." *JSNT* 26.4 (2004): 459-471.
- . *Story as History—History as Story: The Gospel Tradition in the Context of Ancient Oral History*. WUNT 123. Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 2000.
- Byrskog, Samuel, Raimo Hakola, and Jutta Maria Jokiranta, eds. *Social Memory and Social Identity in the Study of Early Judaism and Early Christianity*. NTOA/SUNT 116. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2016.
- Calvert, D. G. A. "An Examination of the Criteria for Distinguishing the Authentic Words of Jesus." *NTS* 18 (1972): 209-219.
- Cameron, Averil. "How to Read Heresiology." *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies*. 33 (2003): 471-492
- Cameron, Ron, ed. *The Other Gospels: Non-Canonical Gospel Texts*. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1982.
- . *Sayings Traditions in the Apocryphon of James*. Harvard Theological Studies 34. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984.
- Carr, David McLain. *Writing on the Tablet of the Heart: Origins of Scripture and Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- Carruthers, Mary. *The Book of Memory: A Study of Memory in Medieval Culture*. Cambridge Studies in Medieval Literature 10. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- Carter, Matthew, and John Paul Heil. *Matthew's Parables: Audience-Oriented Perspectives*. CBQMS 30. Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association, 1998.
- Casey, Maurice. *An Aramaic Approach to Q: Sources for the Gospels of Matthew and Luke*. SNTSMS 12. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Catchpole, David R. "Source, Form and Redaction Criticism of the New Testament." Pages 167-188 in *Handbook to Exegesis of the New Testament*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- Charlesworth, James H., ed. *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. 2 vols. ABRL. New York: Doubleday, 1983-1985.

- Chilton, Bruce D. *A Galilean Rabbi and His Bible: Jesus' Use of the Interpreted Scripture of His Time*. Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier Inc., 1984.
- . “James in Relation to Peter, Paul, and the Remembrance of Jesus.” Pages 138-160 in *The Brother of Jesus: James the Just and His Mission*. Edited by Bruce D. Chilton and Jacob Neusner. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2001.
- . “Two in One: Renderings of the Book of Isaiah in Targum Jonathan.” Pages 547-562 in *Writing and Reading the Scroll of Isaiah*. Vol. 2. Edited by Craig Broyles and Craig Evans. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- Cicero. *On the Orator: Books 1-2*. Translated by E.W. Sutton and H. Rackham. LCL. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1942.
- [Cicero.] *Rhetorica ad Herennium*. Translated by Harry Caplan. LCL. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1954.
- Clement of Alexandria, *Miscellanies: The Greek Text with Introduction, Translation, Notes, Dissertations and Indices*. Edited by Fenton John Anthony Hort and Joseph Bickersteth Mayor. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- Collingwood, Robert G. *The Idea of History*. Revised edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994.
- Collins, Adela Yarbro. “The Discourse in Parables in Mark 4.” Pages 521-538 in *Hermeneutik der Gleichnisse Jesu: Methodische Neuansätze zum Verstehen urchristlicher Parabeltexte*. Edited by Ruben Zimmermann. 2nd ed. WUNT 231. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011.
- . *Mark: A Commentary*. Hermeneia. Edited by Harold W. Attridge. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007.
- Collins, John J. “Wisdom, Apocalypticism, and Generic Compatibility.” Pages 165-185 in *In Search of Wisdom: Essays in Memory of John G. Gammie*. Edited by Leo G. Perdue, Bernard B. Scott, and William J. Wiseman. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 1993.
- Conzelmann, Hans. *Die Mitte der Zeit: Studien zur Theologie des Lukas*. BHT 17. Tübingen: Mohr, 1964.
- Coxe, A. Cleveland. *Latin Christianity: Its Founder, Tertullian. I. Apologetic; II. Anti-Marcion; III. Ethical*. Vol. 3 of *Ante-Nicene Fathers*. Edited by Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson. New York: Christian Literature Publishing Co., 1885.
<http://oll.libertyfund.org/titles/1971>.
- Criboire, Rafaella. *Gymnastics of the Mind: Greek Education in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001.
- . *Writing, Teachers, and Students in Graeco-Roman Egypt*. ASP 36. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996.

- Crook, Zeba. "Collective Memory Distortion and the Quest for the Historical Jesus." *JSHJ* 11 (2013): 53-76.
- . "Gratitude and Comments to Le Donne." *JSHJ* 11 (2013): 98-105.
- . "Memory Theory and the Evolution to a No Quest." Paper presented at the Society of Biblical Literature Annual Meeting. Baltimore. 25 November 2013.
- Crossan, John Dominic. "Aphorism in Discourse and Narrative." *Semeia* 43 (1988): 121-140.
- . *The Historical Jesus: The Life of a Mediterranean Jewish Peasant*. San Francisco: Harper San Francisco, 1991.
- . *In Fragments: The Aphorisms of Jesus*. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1983.
- . *In Parables: The Challenge of the Historical Jesus*. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1973.
- , ed. *Sayings Parallels: A Workbook for the Jesus Tradition*. Foundations and Facets. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986.
- Crossley, James G. "Writing about the Historical Jesus: Historical Explanation and 'the Big Why Questions', or Antiquarian Empiricism and Victorian Tomes?" *JSHJ* 7 (2009): 63-90.
- Crum, W.E. *A Coptic Dictionary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1939. Repr., Ancient Language Resources. Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2005.
- Culpepper, R. Alan. "The Relationship between the Gospel of John and 1 John." Pages 95-121 in *Communities in Dispute: Current Scholarship on the Johannine Epistles*. Edited by R. Alan Culpepper and Paul N. Anderson. ECL 13. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2014.
- Dahl, Nils Ahlstrup. *Jesus in the Memory of the Early Church: Essays*. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1976.
- . "The Problem of the Historical Jesus." Pages 81-111 in *Jesus the Christ: The Historical Origins of Christological Doctrine*. Edited by D.J. Jeul. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1991.
- Danto, Arthur. *Analytical Philosophy of History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965.
- Darr, John A. "'Be Not Anxious': Reading Martha and Mary (Lk. 10.38-42) Within Luke's Overall Discourse on Anxiety." Pages 76-92 in *Reading Ideologies: Essays in Honor of Mary Ann Tolbert*. Edited by Tat-siong Benny Liew. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2011.
- . *On Character Building: The Reader and the Rhetoric of Characterization in Luke-Acts*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1992.
- Dart, John. *The Jesus of Heresy and History: The Discovery and Meaning of the Nag Hammadi Gnostic Library*. San Francisco: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1988.

- Davies, W.D. *The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1966.
- Davies, W.D. and Dale C. Allison. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to Saint Matthew, Vol. 1: Introduction and Commentary on Matthew I-VII*. ICC. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1988.
- Davies, Stevan L. *The Gospel of Thomas and Christian Wisdom*. New York: Seabury Press, 1983.
- DeConick, April D. "Human Memory and the Sayings of Jesus: Contemporary Exercises in the Transmission of Jesus Tradition." Pages 135-179 in *Jesus, the Voice and the Text: Beyond the Oral and the Written Gospel*. Edited by Tom Thatcher. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2008.
- . *The Original Gospel of Thomas in Translation: With a Commentary and New English Translation of the Complete Gospel*. Early Christianity in Context published under LNTS 287. London: T&& Clark, 2006.
- . "Reading the Gospel of Thomas as a Repository of Early Christian Communal Memory." Pages 207-220 in *Memory, Tradition, and Text: Uses of the Past in Early Christianity*. Edited by Alan Kirk and Tom Thatcher. SemeiaSt 52. Atlanta: SBL, 2005.
- . *Seek to See Him: Ascent and Vision Mysticism in the Gospel of Thomas*. Leiden: Brill, 1996.
- . *Recovering the Original Gospel of Thomas: A History of the Gospel and its Growth*. London: T&T Clark, 2005.
- Dehandschutter, Boudewijn. "L'Épistula Jacobi apocrypha de Nag Hammadi (CG 1, 2) comme apocryphe néotestamentaire." ANRW 2.25.6 (1988), 4529-50.
- . "L'Évangile de Thomas comme collection de parole de Jésus." Pages 507-515 in *Logia: Les Paroles de Jésus*. Edited by J. Delobel. BETL 59. Leuven: Peeters/Leuven University Press, 1982.
- Deppe, D. B. *The Sayings of Jesus in the Epistle of James*. Chelsea, MI: Bookcrafters, 1989.
- Derico, T.M. *Oral Tradition and Synoptic Verbal Agreement: Evaluating the Empirical Evidence for Literary Dependence*. Eugene, OR: Pickwick Publications, 2016.
- Dibelius, Martin. *A Commentary on the Epistle of James*. Hermeneia. Translated by James E. Crouch. Revised by Heinrich Greeven. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1976.
- . *Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums*. 2nd ed. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1933. http://www.archive.org/details/MN41397ucmf_0.
- . *From Tradition to Gospel*. Translated by Bertram Lee Woolf and Martin Dibelius. London: Nicholson and Watson, 1934.

- Dio Chrysostom. *Discourses 31-36*. Translated by J. W. Cohoon and H. Lamar Crosby. LCL. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1940.
- Dodd, C. H. *The Parables of the Kingdom*. London: Nisbet, 1936.
- Donahue, John. *The Gospel in Parable: Metaphor, Narrative and Theology in the Synoptic Gospels*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988.
- Dowd, Sharyn Echols. *Prayer, Power, and the Problem of Suffering: Mark 11:22–25 in the Context of Markan Theology*. SBLDS 105. Atlanta, GA: Scholars, 1988.
- Downing, F. Gerald. *Doing Things with Words in the First Christian Century*. JSNTSup 200. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000.
- Droysen, Gustav. *Outline of the Principles of History*. Translated by E. Benjamin Andrews. New York: Howard Fertig, 1893.
- Dunn, James D.G. “Jesus in Oral Memory: The Initial Stages of the Jesus Tradition.” Pages 84-145 in *Jesus: A Colloquium in the Holy Land*. Edited by D. Donnelly. New York: Continuum, 2001.
- . *Jesus Remembered*. Vol. 1 of *Christianity in the Making*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2003.
- . “Kenneth Bailey’s Theory of Oral Tradition: Critiquing Theodore Weeden’s Critique.” *JSHJ* 7 (2009): 44-62.
- . *The New Perspective on Jesus: What the Quest for the Historical Jesus Missed*. London: SPCK, 2005.
- . “On History, Memory and Eyewitnesses: In Response to Bengt Holmberg and Samuel Byrskog.” *JSNT* 26 (2004): 473-487.
- . *The Oral Gospel Tradition*. Grand Rapids, MI.: Eerdmans, 2013.
- . “Prophetic ‘I’-Sayings and the Jesus Tradition: The Importance of Testing Prophetic Utterances within Early Christianity.” *NTS* 24 (1978): 175-198
- . “Q¹ as Oral Tradition.” Pages 80-108 in *The Oral Gospel Tradition*. Edited by James D.G. Dunn. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2013.
- . “Social Memory and the Oral Jesus Tradition.” Pages 179-194 in *Memory in the Bible and Antiquity*. Edited by Loren Stuckenbruck, Stephen C. Barton, and Benjamin G. Wold. WUNT 212. Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 2007.
- Dunning, Benjamin H. *Aliens and Sojourners: Self as Other in Early Christianity*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2009.
- Eck, Ernest van. “Memory and Historical Jesus Studies: Formgeschichte in a New Dress?” *HTS Theologese Studies/Theological Studies* 71 (2015). doi: 10.4102/hts.v71i1.2837.

- Eddy, Paul Rhodes and Greg A. Boyd. *The Jesus Legend: A Case for the Historical Reliability of the Synoptic Tradition*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2007.
- Edwards, James R. "Markan Sandwiches: The Significance of Interpolations in Markan Narratives." *NovT* 31, 3 (1989): 193-216.
- Ehrman, Bart D., ed. *The Apostolic Fathers*. 2 vols. Translated by Bart D. Ehrman. LCL. Cambridge: MA: Harvard University Press, 2003.
- . *Forgery and Counterforgery: The Use of Literary Deceit in Early Christian Polemics*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- . *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture: The Effect of Early Christological Controversies on the Text of the New Testament*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- . "The Text as Window: New Testament Manuscripts and the Social History of Early Christianity." Pages 361-379 in *The New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the Status Quaestionis*. Edited by Bart D. Ehrman and Michael W. Holmes. SD 46. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1995.
- Eichhorn, Johann Gottfried "Über die drey ersten Evangelien: Einige Beyträge zu ihrer künftigen kritischen Behandlung." Pages 761-996 in vol. 5 of *Allgemeine Bibliothek der biblischen Literatur*. Leipzig: Weidmann, 1794.
- Elder, Nicholas A. "New Testament Media Criticism," *CurBR* 15 (2017): 315-337.
- Emmel, Stephen, Helmut Koester, and Elaine Pagels, eds. *Nag Hammadi Codex III, 5: The Dialogue of the Savior*. NHS XXVI. Leiden: Brill, 1984.
- Epictetus. *Discourses, Books 1-2*. Translated by W.A. Oldfather. LCL. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1925.
- Epp, Eldon (Jay). "It's All About Variants: A Variant-conscious Approach to New Testament Textual Criticism." *HTR* 100 (2007): 275-308.
- . "The Jews and the Jewish Community in Oxyrhynchus: Socio-Religious Context for the New Testament Papyri." Pages 13-52 in *New Testament Manuscripts: Their Texts and Their World*. Edited by Thomas J. Kraus and Tobias Nicklas. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- . "Textual Criticism." Pages 97-100 in *The New Testament and Its Modern Interpreters*. Edited by Eldon Jay Epp and George W. MacRae. SBL The Bible and Its Modern Interpreters 3. Philadelphia: Fortress Press; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989.
- . "Textual Criticism and New Testament Interpretation." Pages 79-105 in *Method and Meaning: Essays on New Testament Interpretation in Honor of Harold W. Attridge*. Edited by Andrew B. McGowan and Kent Harold Richards. SBL Resources for Biblical Study 67. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011.
- Esler, Philip F. *Community and Gospel: The Social and Political Motivations of Lucan Theology*. SNTSMS 57. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.

- . *Conflict and Identity in Romans: The Social Setting of Paul's Letter*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2003.
- Eusebius. *Ecclesiastical History*. 2 vols. Translated by Kirsopp Lake and J.E.L. Oulton. LCL. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1926-1932.
- Evans, Craig A., ed. *Encyclopedia of the Historical Jesus*. New York: Routledge, 2010.
- . *Jesus and His Contemporaries: Comparative Studies*. AGJU 25. Leiden: Brill, 1995.
- . *To See and Not Perceive: Isaiah 6:9-10 in Early Jewish and Christian Interpretation*. JSOTSup 64. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989.
- Evans, Craig A. and James A. Sanders. *Luke and Scripture: The Function of Sacred Tradition in Luke-Acts*. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 1993.
- Eve, Eric. *Behind the Gospels: Understanding the Oral Tradition*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2014.
- Fallon, Francis. "The Gnostic Apocalypses." *Semeia* 14 (1979): 123–58.
- Farmer, William R. "The Present State of the Synoptic Problem." Pages 11-36 in *Literary Studies in Luke-Acts: Essays in Honor of Joseph B. Tyson*. Edited by Richard P. Thompson and Thomas E. Phillips. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1998.
- . *The Synoptic Problem: A Critical Analysis*. Dillsboro, NC: Western North Carolina Press, 1976.
- Farrer, Austin. "On Dispensing with Q." Pages 55-88 in *Studies in the Gospels: Essays in Memory of R. H. Lightfoot*. Edited by D. E. Nineham. Oxford: Blackwell, 1955.
- Findlay, William and S. D. F. Salmond, eds. *The Sermon on the Mount Expounded and the Harmony of the Gospels*. Vol 8 of *The Works of Aurelius Augustine: Bishop of Hippo*. Translated by William Findlay and S.D.F. Salmond. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1873.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A. *The Gospel According to Luke I-IX*. AB 28. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1985.
- . *The Gospel according to Luke X-XXIV*. AB 28a. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1985.
- . Review of *Memory and Manuscript*, by Birger Gerhardsson. *TS* 23 (1962): 442-457.
- Fleddermann, Harry T. *Q: A Reconstruction and Commentary*. Biblical Tools and Studies 1. Leuven: Peeters, 2005.
- Flusser, David. *Jesus*. 2nd ed. Magnes Press: Jerusalem, 1998.
- . *Die rabbinischen Gleichnisse und der Gleichniserzähler Jesus*. JudChr. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1981.

- Forbes, Christopher. *Prophecy and Inspired Speech in Early Christianity and its Hellenistic Environment*. WUNT 75. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1995.
- Foster, Paul. "Memory, Orality, and the Fourth Gospel: Three Dead-Ends in Historical Jesus Research." *JSHJ* 10 (2012): 191–227.
- Fox, Robin Lane. "Literacy and Power in Early Christianity." Pages 126-148 in *Literacy and Power in the Ancient World*. Edited by Alan K. Bowman and Greg Woolfe. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Fraade, Steven. "Interpretive Authority in the Studying Community at Qumran." *JJS* 44 (1993): 46-69.
- Frankfurter, David. "The Legacy of Jewish Apocalypses in Early Christianity: Regional Trajectories." Pages 129-200 in *The Jewish Apocalyptic Heritage in Early Christianity*. Edited by James C. VanderKam and William Adler. CRINT. Assen: Van Gorcum. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1996.
- Franzmann, Majella. *Jesus in the Nag Hammadi Writings*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark Ltd., 1996.
- Funk, Robert W. "The Issue of Jesus." *Foundations & Facets Forum* 1 (March 1985): 7-12.
- Funk, Robert W., Roy W. Hoover, and the Jesus Seminar. *The Five Gospels: The Search for the Authentic Words of Jesus*. Sonoma, CA: Polebridge Press, 1993.
- Beverly Roberts Gaventa and Richard B. Hays, eds. *Seeking the Identity of Jesus: A Pilgrimage*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2008.
- Gerhardsson, Birger. *Memory and Manuscript: Oral Tradition and Written Transmission in Rabbinic Judaism and Early Christianity*. Translated by Eric J. Sharpe. ASNU 22. Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1961.
- . *Memory and Manuscript: Oral Tradition and Written Transmission in Rabbinic Judaism and Early Christianity with Tradition and Transmission in Early Christianity*. Rev. ed. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998.
- . *Tradition and Transmission in Early Christianity*. ConBNT 20. Translated by Eric J. Sharpe. Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1964.
- Goff, Matthew J. "Discerning Trajectories: 4QInstruction and the Sapiential Background of the Sayings Source Q." *JBL* 124 (2005): 657-673.
- Goldhill, Simon. "The Anecdote: Exploring the Boundaries between Oral and Literate Performance in the Second Sophistic." Pages 96-113 in *Ancient Literacies: The Culture of Reading in Greece and Rome*. Edited by William A. Johnson and Holt N. Parker. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.
- Goodacre, Mark. *The Case against Q: Studies in Markan Priority and the Synoptic Problem*. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 2002.

- . *Goulder and the Gospels: An Examination of a New Paradigm*. JSNTSup 133. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996.
- . “Criticizing the Criterion of Multiple Attestation: The Historical Jesus and the Question of Sources.” Pages 152-169 in *Jesus, Criteria, and the Demise of Authenticity*. Edited by Chris Keith and Anthony Le Donne. London: T & T Clark, 2012.
- Gooder, Paula R. *Only the Third Heaven? 2 Corinthians 12.1-10 and Heavenly Ascent*. LNTS 313. London: T&T Clark, 2006.
- Goulder, Michael. “Is Q a Juggernaut?” *JBL* 115 (1996): 667-81.
- Gowler, David B. *The Parables after Jesus: Their Imaginative Receptions across Two Millennia*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2017.
- Grant, F. C. *The Gospels: Their Origin and Growth*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1957.
- Grant, Robert M. and David Noel Freedman. *The Secret Sayings of Jesus according to the Gospel of Thomas*. London: Fontana Books, 1960.
- Gregory, Andrew, “Memory as Method: Some Observations on Two Recent Accounts,” *JSHJ* 16 (2018): 52-61.
- Grenfell, B.P., and A.S. Hunt, *Logia Iesou: Sayings of Our Lord*. London: Egypt Exploration Fund, 1897.
- . *New Sayings of Jesus and Fragment of a Lost Gospel from Oxyrhynchus*. London: Egypt Exploration Fund, 1903.
- . *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri, Part IV*. London: Egypt Exploration Fund, 1904.
- Guillaumont, Antoine, Henri Charles Puech, Gilles Quispel, Walter Till and Yassah ‘Abd Al Masih, eds. *The Gospel According to Thomas*. Leiden: Brill, 1959.
- Gunkel, Hermann. *Genesis*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1901.
- . *Reden und Aufsätze*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1913.
- Haenchen, Ernst. *A Commentary on the Gospel of John*, 2 vols. Translated by Robert W. Funk. Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984.
- Halbwachs, Maurice. *Les cadres sociaux de la mémoire*. Revised edition. Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1952.
- . *The Collective Memory*. Translated by F.J. Ditter, Jr. and V.Y. Ditter. New York: Harper & Row, 1980.
- . *La Mémoire Collective*. 2nd edition. Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1950.

- . *On Collective Memory*. Edited and translated by Lewis Coser. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992.
- . *La topographie légendaire des Evangiles en Terre sainte: Etude de mémoire collective*. Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1941.
- Hall, David R. *The Gospel Framework: Fiction or Fact?* Carlisle, PA: Paternoster Press, 1998.
- Harnack, Adolf von. *The Sayings of Jesus: The Second Source of St. Matthew and St. Luke*. Translated by John Richard Wilkinson. New Testament Studies 2. London: Williams & Norgate, 1908.
- . *Sprüche und Reden Jesu: Die zweite Quelle des Matthäus und Lukas*. Beiträge zur Einleitung in das Neue Testament 2. Leipzig: J.C. Heinrichs, 1907.
<https://archive.org/details/newtestamentstu04harngoog>.
- Harris, William V. *Ancient Literacy*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1989.
- Hartenstein, Judith. *Die Zweite Lehre: Erscheinungen des Auferstandenen als Rahmenerzählungen Frühchristlicher Dialoge*. TUGAL 146. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2000.
- Hartenstein, Judith and Uwe-Karsten Plisch. “Der Brief des Jakobus (NHC I,2).” Pages 1093-1106 in vol. 1, part 2 of *Antike christliche Apokryphen in deutscher Übersetzung*. Edited by Christoph Marksches and Jens Schröter. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012.
- . “‘Der Brief des Jakobus’ (NHC I,2).” Pages 10-17 in *Nag Hammadi Deutsch: Studienausgabe. NHC I-XIII, Codex Bezae Cantabrigiae 1 und 4, Codex Tchacos 3 und 4*. Edited by Hans-Martin Schenke, Ursula Ulrike Kaiser, and Hans-Gebhard Bethge. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2013.
- Hartin, Patrick J. *James and the Q Sayings of Jesus*. JSNTSup 47. Sheffield: JSOT, 1991.
- Hedrick, Charles W. *Many Things in Parables: Jesus and His Modern Critics*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2004.
- Helmer, Christine. “Schleiermacher’s Exegetical Theology and the New Testament.” Pages 229-248 in *The Cambridge Companion to Friedrich Schleiermacher*. Edited by Jacqueline Mariña. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Hengel, Martin. *The Charismatic Leader and His Followers*. Translated by James Grieg. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1968. Repr., Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2005.
- . *The Four Gospels and the One Gospel of Jesus Christ*. London: SCM, 2000.
- . *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in Their Encounter in Palestine during the Early Hellenistic Period*. Translated by John Bowden. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2003.
Translation of *Judentum und Hellenismus, Studien zu ihrer Begegnung unter besonderer Berücksichtigung Palästinas*. 2nd ed. WUNT 10. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1973.

- Herodotus. *The Persian Wars, Volume 1, Books 1-2*. Translated by A.D. Godley. LCL. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1920.
- Herzog, William R., II. *Parables as Subversive Speech: Jesus as Pedagogue of the Oppressed*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 1994.
- Hezser, Catherine. *Jewish Literacy in Roman Palestine*. TSAJ 81. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001.
- Hilgenfeld, Adolf J. B. *Das Markus-evangelium, nach seiner Composition, seiner Stellung in der Evangelien-literatur, seinem Ursprung und Charakter*. Leipzig: Breitkopf und Härtel, 1850.
- Hill, David. *New Testament Prophecy*. New Foundations Theological Library. Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1979.
- . “On the Evidence for the Creative Role of Christian Prophets.” *NTS* 20 (1974): 262-274.
- Himmelfarb, Martha. *Ascent to Heaven in Jewish and Christian Apocalypses*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- Holmås, Geir Otto. *Prayer and Vindication in Luke-Acts: The Theme of Prayer within the Context of the Legitimizing and Edifying Objective of the Lukan Narrative*. LNTS 433. London: T & T Clark, 2011.
- Holmén, Tom and Stanley E. Porter, eds. *Handbook for the Study of the Historical Jesus*. 4 vols. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- Holmes, Michael W., ed. *The Apostolic Fathers: Greek Texts and English Translations*. 3rd ed. Grand Rapids, MI.: Baker Academic, 2007.
- Holtzmann, Heinrich. *Lehrbuch der historisch-kritischen Einleitung in das Neue Testament*. Revised and enlarged edition. Freiburg im Breisgau: J. C. B. Mohr, 1886.
- . *Die synoptischen Evangelien: Ihr Ursprung und geschichtlicher Charakter*. Leipzig: Wilhelm Engelmann, 1863.
- Homer. *Iliad*. 2 vols. Translated by A.T. Murray. LCL. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1924-1925.
- Hooker, Morna D. “Christology and Methodology.” *NTS* 17 (1970): 480-487.
- . “Foreword: Forty Years on” Pages xiii-xvi in *Jesus, Criteria, and the Demise of Authenticity*. Edited by Chris Keith and Anthony Le Donne. London: T & T Clark, 2012.
- . “On Using the Wrong Tool.” *Theology* 75 (1972): 570-581.
- Horsley, Richard, ed. *Oral Performance, Popular Tradition, and Hidden Transcript in Q*. Semeia Studies 60. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006.

- Horsley, Richard, and Jonathan A. Draper, eds., *Whoever Hears You Hears Me: Prophets, Performance, and Tradition in Q*. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity, 1999.
- Horsley, Richard A., Jonathan A. Draper, and John Miles Foley, eds. *Performing the Gospel: Orality, Memory, and Mark: Essays Dedicated to Werner Kelber*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2006.
- Hübenthal, Sandra. "Social and Cultural Memory in Biblical Exegesis: The Quest for an Adequate Application." Pages 191-216 in *Cultural Memory in Biblical Exegesis*. Edited by Pernille Carstens, Trine Bjørnung Hasselbalch, and Niels Peter Lemche. PHSC 17. Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press, 2012.
- Hultgren, Arland. *The Parables of Jesus: A Commentary*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2000.
- Hur, Ju. *A Dynamic Reading of the Holy Spirit in Luke-Acts*. JSNTSup 211. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001.
- Hurtado, Larry W. *Lord Jesus Christ: Devotion to Jesus in Earliest Christianity*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2003.
- Hvidt, Niels Christian. *Christian Prophecy: The Post-Biblical Tradition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Irenaeus. *Against Heresies*. In vol. 1 of *The Ante-Nicene Fathers: The Writings of the Fathers down to A.D. 325*. Edited by A. Cleveland Cox, Sir James Donaldson, and Alexander Roberts. 1885-1887. 10 vols. Repr., Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1994.
- Jaffee, Martin S. *Torah in the Mouth: Writing and Oral Tradition in Palestinian Judaism, 200-400 CE*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- Jeremias, Joachim. *Die Bergpredigt*. Calwer Hefte 27. Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1959.
- . *New Testament Theology: The Proclamation of Jesus*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1971.
- . *The Parables of Jesus*. 2nd ed. Translated by S.H. Hooke. Upper Saddle River, NJ: SCM Press, Ltd., 1972.
- . *Das Problem des historischen Jesus*. Calwer Hefte 32. Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1960.
- . *Unbekannte Jesusworte*. ATANT 16. Zurich: Zwingli Verlag, 1948.
- Johnson-DeBaufre, Melanie. *Jesus among Her Children: Q, Eschatology, and the Construction of Christian Origins*. HTS 55. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2005.
- Joseph, Simon J. "The Quest for the 'Community' of Q: Mapping Q Within the Social, Scribal, and Textual Landscape(s) of Second Temple Judaism." *HTR* 111 (2018): 90-114.
- Jülicher, Adolf. *Die Gleichnisreden Jesu*. Freiburg: J.C.B. Mohr (Siebeck), 1888.

- Kähler, Martin. *The So-Called Historical Jesus and the Historic Biblical Christ*. Translated and edited by Carl E. Braaten. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1964. Translation of *Der sogenannte historische Jesus und der geschichtliche, biblische Christus*. Leipzig: A. Deichert, 1896.
- Käsemann, Ernst. "Das Problem des historischen Jesus." *ZTK* 51 (1954):125-153. Reprinted pages 313-325 in *Jesusforschung in Vier Jahrhunderten: Texte von den Anfängen historischer Kritik bis zur 'dritten Frage' nach dem historischen Jesus*. Edited by Werner Zager. Berlin: DeGruyter, 2014.
- . "Is the Gospel Objective?" Pages 48-62 in *Essays on New Testament Themes*. Edited by Ernst Käsemann. SBT 41. London: SCM, 1964.
- . Review of *Memory and Manuscript*, by Birger Gerhardsson. *VuF* 8 (1963): 85-87.
- Kasting, Heinrich. *Die Anfänge der urchristlichen Mission: Eine historische Untersuchung*. Munich: Kaiser 1969.
- Keener, Craig S. *The Gospel of John: A Commentary*. 2 vols. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2003.
- . *The Historical Jesus of the Gospels*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2009.
- Keith, Chris. "The Fall of the Quest for an Authentic Jesus: Concluding Remarks." Pages 200-205 in *Jesus, Criteria, and the Demise of Authenticity*. Edited by Chris Keith and Anthony LeDonne. London: T&T Clark, 2012.
- . "The Indebtedness of the Criteria Approach to Form Criticism and Recent Attempts to Rehabilitate the Search for an Authentic Jesus." Pages 25–70 in *Jesus, Criteria, and the Demise of Authenticity*. Edited by Chris Keith and Anthony Le Donne. London: T&T Clark, 2012.
- . *Jesus against the Scribal Elite: The Origins of the Conflict*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2014.
- . *Jesus' Literacy: Scribal Culture and the Teacher from Galilee*. LNTS 413. London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2011.
- . "Memory and Authenticity: Jesus Tradition and What Really Happened." *ZNW* 102 (2011): 155-177.
- . *The Pericope Adulterae, the Gospel of John, and the Literacy of Jesus*. NTT 38. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- . "Social Memory Theory and Gospels Research: The First Decade (Part One)." *Early Christianity* 6 (2015): 354-376.
- . "Social Memory Theory and Gospels Research: The First Decade (Part Two)." *Early Christianity* 6 (2015): 517–542.
- Keith, Chris, and Anthony Le Donne, eds. *Jesus, Criteria, and the Demise of Authenticity*. London: T & T Clark, 2012.

- Kelber, Werner H. *The Kingdom in Mark: A New Place and a New Time*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974.
- . *The Oral and Written Gospel: The Hermeneutics of Speaking and Writing in the Synoptic Tradition, Mark, Paul, and Q*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1983.
- Kelber, Werner and Samuel S. Byrskog, eds. *Jesus in Memory: Traditions in Oral and Scribal Perspectives*. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2009.
- Kennedy, George. *Quintilian*. New York: Twayne Publishers, Inc., 1969.
- King, Karen L. “Factions, Variety, Diversity, Multiplicity: Representing Early Christian Differences for the 21st Century.” *Method and Theory for the Study of Religion*. 23 (2011): 216-237.
- . “The Social and Theological Effects of Heresiological Discourse.” Pages 28-49 in *Heresy and Identity in Late Antiquity*. Edited by Eduard Iricisnschi and Holger M. Zellentin. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.
- . *What Is Gnosticism?* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2003.
- Kingsbury, Jack Dean. *The Parables of Jesus in Matthew 13*. 3rd ed. London: SPCK, 1976.
- Kirchner, Dankwart. “Brief des Jakobus.” Pages 234-244 in *Neutestamentlichen Apokryphen in deutscher Übersetzung, I*. Edited by Edgar Hennecke and Wilhelm Schneemelcher. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1959.
- . *Epistula Jacobi Apocrypha: Die zweite Schrift aus Nag-Hammadi-Codex I*. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1989.
- Kirk, Alan. *The Composition of the Sayings Source: Genre, Synchrony and Wisdom Redaction in Q*. Leiden: Brill, 1998.
- . “Manuscript Tradition as a *Tertium Quid*: Orality and Memory in Scribal Practices.” Pages 215-34 in *Jesus, the Voice and the Text: Beyond the Oral and the Written Gospel*, Edited by Tom Thatcher. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2008.
- . *Memory and the Jesus Tradition*. Volume 2 of *The Reception of Jesus in the First Three Centuries*. Edited by Chris Keith, Helen K. Bond, and Jens Schröter. London: Bloomsbury, 2018.
- . “Memory Theory and Jesus Research.” Pages 809-842 in vol. 1 of *Handbook for the Study of the Historical Jesus*. Edited by Tom Holmén and Stanley E. Porter. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- . *Q in Matthew: Ancient Media, Memory, and Early Scribal Transmission of the Jesus Tradition*. LNTS 564. London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2017.
- Kirk, Alan and Tom Thatcher, eds. *Memory, Tradition, and Text: Uses of the Past in Early Christianity*. SemeiaSt 52. Atlanta: SBL, 2005.

- Klauck, Hans-Josef. *Ancient Letters and the New Testament: A Guide to Context and Exegesis*. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2006.
- Klijn, A. F. J. *Jewish-Christian Gospel Tradition*. Supplements to VC 17. Leiden: Brill, 1992.
- Kloppenborg (Verbin), John S., ed. *Conflict and Invention: Literary, Rhetorical and Social Studies on the Sayings Gospel Q*. Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press, 2004.
- . “Discursive Practices in the Sayings Gospel Q and the Quest of the Historical Jesus.” Pages 149-190 in *The Sayings Source Q and the Historical Jesus*. Edited by A. Lindemann. BETL 158. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2001.
- . “A Dog among the Pigeons: The ‘Cynic Hypothesis’ as a Theological Problem.” Pages 73-117 in *From Quest to Q: Festschrift James M. Robinson*. Edited by Jon Ma. Asgeirsson, Kristin de Troyer, and Marvin W. Meyer. BETL 146. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2000.
- . *Excavating Q: The History and Setting of the Sayings Gospel*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2000.
- . *The Formation of Q: Trajectories in Ancient Wisdom Collections*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987.
- . “Jesus and the Parables of Jesus in Q.” Pages 275-319 in *The Gospel behind the Gospels: Current Studies on Q*. Edited by Ronald A. Piper. NovTSup 75. Leiden: Brill, 1995.
- . “Memory, Performance, and the Sayings of Jesus.” *JSHJ* 10 (2012): 97-132.
- . *Q Parallels: Synopsis, Critical Notes, & Concordance*. Sonoma, CA: Polebridge Press, 1988.
- . “The Sayings Gospel Q and the Quest of the Historical Jesus.” *HTR* 89 (1996): 323-324.
- Koester, Helmut. *Ancient Christian Gospels: Their History and Development*. Philadelphia: Trinity Press International, 1990.
- . *From Jesus to the Gospels: Interpreting the New Testament in Its Context*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007.
- . “GNOMAI DIAPHORAI: The Origin and Nature of Diversification in the History of Early Christianity.” Pages 114-157 in *Trajectories through Early Christianity*. Edited by Helmut Koester and James M. Robinson. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971.
- . “One Jesus and Four Primitive Gospels.” Pages 158-204 in *Trajectories through Early Christianity*. Edited by Helmut Koester and James M. Robinson. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971.
- . *Synoptische Überlieferung bei den Apostolischen Vätern*. TU 65. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1957.

- . “Written Gospels or Oral Tradition?” *JBL* 113 (1994): 293-297.
- Krause, Martin. “Christlich-Gnostische Texte als Quellen für die Auseinandersetzung von Gnosis und Christentum,” Pages 47-65 in *Gnosis and Gnosticism: Papers Read at the Eighth International Conference on Patristic Studies*. Edited by Martin Krause. NHS XVII. Leiden: Brill, 1981.
- Lachmann, Karl. “De ordine narrationum in evageliis synopticis.” *TSK* (1835).
- Layton, Bentley, ed. *A Coptic Grammar: With Chrestomathy and Glossary, Sahidic Dialect*. 2nd ed. PLO 20. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2004.
- . *The Gnostic Scriptures: A New Translation with Annotations*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1987.
- , ed. *Nag Hammadi Codex II, 2-7 together with XIII, 2*, Brit. Lib. Or.4926(1) and P.Oxy. I, 654, 655*. Vol. 1. NHS XX. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1989.
- Le Donne, Anthony. “The Criterion of Coherence: Its Development, Inevitability, and Historiographical Limitations.” Pages 95-114 in *Jesus, Criteria, and the Demise of Authenticity*. Edited by Chris Keith and Anthony Le Donne. London: T & T Clark, 2012.
- . *The Historical Jesus: What Can We Know and How Can We Know It?* Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2011.
- . *The Historiographical Jesus: Memory, Typology, and the Son of David*. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2009.
- . “The Problem of Selectivity in Memory Research: A Response to Zeba Crook.” *JSHJ* 11 (2013): 77-97.
- Lee, Dorothy A. “Abiding in the Fourth Gospel.” *Pacifica* 10 (1997): 123-136.
- Lemcio, Eugene E. “External Evidence for the Structure and Function of Mark iv. 1-20, vii. 13-23, and viii. 14-21.” *JTS* 29 (1978): 323-338.
- Lessing, Gotthold Ephraim. “New Hypothesis Concerning the Evangelists Regarded as Merely Human Historians.” Pages 45-72 in *Lessing’s Theological Writings: Selections in Translation*. Translated and edited by Henry Chadwick. Library of Modern Religious Thought. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1957.
- Levine, A.J. *Short Stories by Jesus: The Enigmatic Parables of a Controversial Rabbi*. New York: HarperOne, 2014.
- Levine, Étan. *The Aramaic Version of the Bible: Contents and Context*. BZAW 174. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1988.
- Liebenburg, Jacobus. *The Language of the Kingdom and Jesus: Parable, Aphorism, and Metaphor in the Sayings Material Common to the Synoptic Tradition and the Gospel of Thomas*. BZNW 102. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2001.

- Lieu, Judith M. "Letters and the Topography of Early Christianity." *NTS* 62 (2016): 167-182.
- . "Us or You? Persuasion and Identity in 1 John." *JBL* 127 (2008): 805-819.
- Lincoln, Andrew T. *The Gospel according to Saint John*. Black's New Testament Commentary IV. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2006.
- Longenecker, Richard N. *The Challenge of Jesus' Parables*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1999.
- Lührmann, Dieter. "Die Logienquelle und die Leben-Jesu-Forschung." Pages 191-206 in *The Sayings Source Q and the Historical Jesus*. Edited by Anders Lindemann. BETL 158. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2001.
- . "Q: Sayings of Jesus or Logia?" Pages 97-116 in *The Gospel behind the Gospels: Current Studies on Q*. Edited by Ronald Allen Piper. NovTSup 75. Leiden: Brill, 1995.
- . *Die Redaktion der Logienquelle*. WMANT 33. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1969.
- Luomanen, Petri. *Recovering Jewish-Christian Sects and Gospels*. Supplements to *VC* 110. Leiden: Brill, 2011.
- . "The Sociology of Knowledge, the Social Identity Approach and the Cognitive Science of Religion." Pages 199-229 in *Explaining Christian Origins and Early Judaism: Contributions from Cognitive and Social Science*. Edited by Petri Luomanen, Ilkka Pyysiäinen and Risto Uro. *BibInt* 89. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- Luz, Ulrich. *Matthew 1-7: A Commentary*. Hermeneia. Translated by James E. Crouch. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007.
- . *Matthew 8-20: A Commentary*. Hermeneia. Translated by James E. Crouch. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001.
- . *Matthew 21-28: A Commentary*. Hermeneia. Translated by James E. Crouch. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2005.
- Lyons, W.J. "A Prophet Is Rejected in His Home Town (Mark 6.4 and Parallels): A Study in the Methodological (In)Consistency of the Jesus Seminar." *JSHJ* 6 (2008): 59-84.
- MacDonald, Dennis R. *Two Shipwrecked Gospels: The Logoi of Jesus and Papias's Exposition of Logia about the Lord*. ECL 8. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2012.
- Mack, Burton. *The Lost Gospel: The Book of Q and Christian Origins*. San Francisco: HarperOne, 1993.
- Malinine, Michel, Henri-Charles Puech, Gilles Quispel, Walter C. Till, and Rodolphe Kasser, eds. *Epistula Iacobi Apocrypha, Codex Jung F. I'-F VIII' (pp. 1-16)*. Zurich: Rascher Verlag, 1968.

- Manson, T.W. *The Teaching of Jesus*. Revised edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1948.
- Marcus, Joel. *The Mystery of the Kingdom of God*. SBLDS 90. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986.
- Marjanen, Antti. "Sethian Books of the Nag Hammadi Library as Secret Books." Pages 87-106 in *Mystery and Secrecy in the Nag Hammadi Collection and Other Ancient Literature: Ideas and Practices, Studies for Einar Thomassen*. Edited by Christian H. Bull, Liv Ingeborg Lied, and John D. Turner. NHMS 76. Leiden: Brill, 2012.
- Marsh, Herbert. *A Dissertation on the Origin of Our Three Canonical Gospels*. Cambridge: John Burges and F & C Rivington, 1801.
- Marshall, Howard. *The Gospel of Luke*. NIGTC. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1978.
- Marxsen, Willi. *Der Evangelist Markus: Studien zur Redaktionsgeschichte des Evangeliums*. FRLANT. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1959.
- McComiskey, Douglas S. "Exile and the Purpose of Jesus' Parables (Mark 4:10-12; Matt 13:10-17; Luke 8:9-10)." *JETS* 51 (2008): 59-85.
- McEleney, Neil J. "Authenticating Criteria and Mark 7:1-23." *CBQ* 34 (1972): 431-460.
- . "The Unity and Theme of Matthew 7:1-12." *CBQ* 56 (1994): 490-500
- McGowan, Andrew B. and Kent Harold Richards. "Many Methods: The Diversity of New Testament Scholarship." Pages 1-4 in *Method and Meaning: Essays on New Testament Interpretation in Honor of Harold W. Attridge*. Edited by Andrew B. McGowan and Kent Harold Richards. RBS 67. Atlanta: SBL, 2011.
- McIver, Robert K. *Memory, Jesus, and the Synoptic Gospels*. RBS 59. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011.
- McIver, Robert K. and Marie Carroll, "Experiments to Develop Criteria for Determining the Existence of Written Sources, and Their Potential Implications for the Synoptic Problem." *JBL* 121 (2002): 667-687.
- McNicol, Allan, David L. Dungan, and David B. Peabody, eds. *Beyond the Q Impasse: Luke's Use of Matthew: A Demonstration by the Research Team of the International Institute for Gospel Studies*. Philadelphia: Trinity Press International, 1996.
- Meier, John P. *A Marginal Jew: Rethinking The Historical Jesus*. 5 vols. Volumes 1-3 ABRL. New York: Doubleday. Volumes 4-5 AYBRL. New Haven: Yale University Press. 1991-2016.
- Ménard, Jacques-E. *L'Évangile selon Thomas*. NHS 5. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1975.
- Metzger, Bruce M. *The Canon of the New Testament: Its Origin, Development, and Significance*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987.

- . *The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration*. 3rd ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 1992.
- Meyer, Marvin W., Stephen J. Patterson, and Michael G. Steinhauser, eds. *Q Thomas Reader*. Sonoma, CA: Polebridge Press, 1990.
- Miller, George A. “Information and Memory.” *Scientific American* (August 1963): 42-46.
- Moule, C.F.D. “Mark 4.1-20 Yet Once More.” Pages 95-112 in *Neotestamentica et Semitica: Studies in Honor of Matthew Black*. Edited by Edward Earle Ellis and Max E. Wilcox. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1969.
- Mournet, Terence C. “The Jesus Tradition as Oral Tradition.” Pages 39-61 in *Jesus in Memory: Traditions in Oral and Scribal Perspective*. Edited by Werner H. Kelber and Samuel Byrskog. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2009.
- . *Oral Tradition and Literary Dependency: Variability and Stability in the Synoptic Tradition and Q*. WUNT 195. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005.
- Neirynek, Frans. “Note on the Siglum Q.” Page 474 in *Evangelica II: 1982-1991*. BETL 99. Leuven: Peeters, 1991.
- . *Q-Synopsis: The Double Tradition Passages in Greek*. SNTA 13. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1988.
- . “The Symbol Q (=Quelle).” *ETL* 54 (1978): 119-125.
- Neufebauer, Fritz. “Geistsprüche und Jesuslogien.” *ZNW* 53 (1962): 218-28.
- Oerter, Wolf B. “Form as a Vehicle of Authority? Some Remarks on the Apocryphon of James.” Pages 197-207 in *The Process of Authority: The Dynamics in Transmission and Reception of Canonical Texts*. Edited by Jan Dušek and Jan Roskovec. Berlin: DeGruyter, 2016.
- Olick, Jeffrey K., Vered Vinitzky-Seroussi, and Daniel Levy, eds. *The Collective Memory Reader*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Ong, Walter J. *Orality and Literacy: The Technologizing of the Word*. London: Methuen, 1982.
- Orchard, Bernard, and Thomas R.W. Longstaff, eds. *J.J. Griesbach: Synoptic and Text-Critical Studies 1776-1976*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978.
- Painter, John. *Just James: The Brother of Jesus in History and Tradition*. Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 1997.
- Palmer, N. Humphrey. “Lachmann’s Argument.” *NTS* 13 (1967): 368-78.
- Parker, David C. *The Living Text of the Gospels*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

- Parker, Holt N. "Books and Reading Latin Poetry." Pages 186-229 in *Ancient Literacies: The Culture of Reading in Greece and Rome*. Edited by William A. Johnson and Holt N. Parker. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.
- Pascut, Benjamin "The So-Called *Passivum Divinum* in Mark's Gospel." *NovT* 54 (2012): 313-333.
- Patterson, Stephen J. *The Gospel of Thomas and Jesus*. FF. Sonoma, CA: Polebridge Press, 1993.
- Peabody, David B. "Augustine and the Augustinian Hypothesis: A Reexamination of Augustine's Thought in 'De Consensu Euangelistarum.'" Pages 37-64 in *New Synoptic Studies: The Cambridge Gospel Conference and beyond*. Edited by William R. Farmer. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1983.
- Peabody, David B., Allan James McNicol, and Lamar Cope, eds. *One Gospel from Two: Mark's Use of Matthew and Luke*. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 2002.
- Perkins, PHEME. *The Gnostic Dialogue*. New York: Paulist Press, 1980.
- . *Hearing the Parables of Jesus*. New York: Paulist Press, 1981.
- . "Jewish Christian Gospels: Primitive Tradition Imagined." Pages 197-248 in *The Apocryphal Gospels within the Context of Early Christianity*. Edited by Jens Schröter. BETL 260. Leuven: Peeters, 2013.
- . "Johannine Traditions in *Ap. Jas.* (NHC I,2)." *JBL* 101 (1982): 403-14.
- . "What is a Gnostic Gospel?" *CBQ* 71 (2009): 104-124.
- Perrin, Norman. *Jesus and the Language of the Kingdom: Symbol and Metaphor in New Testament Interpretation*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1976.
- . *Rediscovering the Teaching of Jesus*. New York: Harper & Row, 1967.
- Philo*. Translated by F.H. Colson and Ralph Marcus. 12 vols. LCL. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1929-1962.
- Philostratus. *Lives of the Sophists*. (With Eunapius. *Lives of the Philosophers and Sophists*.) Translated by Wilmer C. Wright. LCL. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1921.
- Piper, Ron A. "Matthew 7:7-11 par. Luke 11:9-13: Evidence of Design and Argument in the Collection of Jesus' Sayings." Pages 131-137 in *The Shape of Q: Signal Essays on the Sayings Gospel*. Edited by John S. Kloppenborg. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1994.
- . *Wisdom in the Q Tradition: The Aphoristic Teaching of Jesus*. SNTS. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- Plato. *Lysis, Symposium, Gogias*. Translated by W.R.M. Lamb. LCL. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1925.

- . *Theaetetus, Sophist*. Translated by Harold North Fowler. LCL. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1921.
- Plisch, Uwe-Karsten. *The Gospel of Thomas: Original Text with Commentary*. Translated by Gesine Schenke Robinson. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2008.
- Pokorný, Petr. *A Commentary on the Gospel of Thomas: From Interpretations to the Interpreted*. Jewish and Christian Texts in Contexts and Related Studies. New York: T&T Clark, 2009.
- . *From the Gospel to the Gospels: History, Theology and Impact of the Biblical Term 'Euangelion'*. BZNW 195. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2013.
- Polag, Athanasius. *Fragmenta Q: Textheft zur Logienquelle*. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1979.
- Polkow, Dennis. "Method and Criteria for Historical Jesus Research." Pages 336-356 in *Society of Biblical Literature 1987 Seminar Papers*. Edited by Kent H. Richards. SBLSP 26. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987.
- Porter, Stanley E. *The Criteria for Authenticity in Historical-Jesus Research: Previous Discussion and New Proposals*. JSNTSup 191. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000.
- Porter, Stanley E. and Dennis L. Stamps, eds. *Rhetorical Criticism and the Bible*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 195. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002.
- Powell, Mark Allan. *Jesus as a Figure in History: How Modern Historians View the Man from Galilee*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1998.
- Quintilian. *The Orator's Education*. Translated by Donald A. Russell. 5 vols. LCL. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2002.
- Räisänen, Heikki. *The 'Messianic Secret' in Mark*. SNTW. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1990.
- Reed, Jonathan L. *Archaeology and the Galilean Jesus: A Re-Examination of the Evidence*. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 2000.
- . "The Social Map of Q." Pages 17-36 in *Conflict and Invention: Literary, Rhetorical and Social Studies on the Sayings Gospel Q*. Edited by John S. Kloppenborg (Verbin). Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press, 2004.
- Reimarus, Hermann Samuel. *Ur-gospel: Fragmente des Wolfenbütteleischen Ungenannten*. Edited by Gotthold E. Lessing. 4th ed. Berlin: Sandersche Buchhandlung (C.M. Eichhoff), 1835. <https://archive.org/details/fragmentedeswol00lessgoog>.
- Riesenfeld, Harald. *The Gospel Tradition and Its Beginnings: A Study in the Limits of Formgeschichte*. 2nd ed. London: A.R. Mowbray, 1961.

- . “The Gospel Tradition and Its Beginnings.” Pages 1-29 in *The Gospel Tradition: Essays*. Edited by Harald Riesenfeld. Translated by E. Margaret Rowley and Robert A. Kraft. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1970.
- . “Observations on the Question of the Self-Consciousness of Jesus.” *SEÅ* 25 (1960): 23-36.
- Riesner, Rainer. *Jesus als Lehrer: Eine Untersuchung zum Ursprung der Evangelien-Überlieferung*. 4th ed. WUNT 2.7. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1994.
- . “Jesus as Preacher and Teacher.” Pages 185-210 in *Jesus and the Oral Gospel Tradition*. Edited by Henry Wansbrough. JSNTSup 64. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1991.
- . “Jüdische Elementarbildung und Evangelienüberlieferung.” Pages 209-23 in *Gospel Perspectives: Studies of History and Tradition in the Four Gospels*. Vol. 1. Edited by R. T. France and David Wenham. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1980.
- Robinson, James M. “ΛΟΓΟΙ ΣΟΦΩΝ: Zur Gattung der Spruchquelle Q.” Pages 71-113 in *Trajectories through Early Christianity*. Edited by Helmut Koester and James M. Robinson. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971.
- Robinson, James M., John S. Kloppenborg, and Paul Hoffmann, eds. *The Critical Edition of Q*. Hermeneia Supplements 1. Minneapolis: Fortress Press and Leuven: Peeters, 2000.
- . *The Sayings Gospel Q in Greek and English with Parallels from the Gospels of Mark and Thomas*. CBET 30. Leuven: Peeters, 2001.
- Robinson, James M., and Helmut Koester. *Trajectories through Early Christianity*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971.
- Rodgers, Peter R. *Text and Story: Narrative Studies in New Testament Textual Criticism*. Eugene, OR: Pickwick Publications, 2011.
- Rodríguez, Rafael. “The Embarrassing Truth about Jesus: The Criterion of Embarrassment and the Failure of Historical Authenticity.” Pages 132-151 in *Jesus, Criteria, and the Demise of Authenticity*. Edited by Chris Keith and Anthony Le Donne. London: T & T Clark, 2012.
- . *Structuring Early Christian Memory: Jesus in Tradition, Performance and Text*. LNTS 407. London: T&T Clark, 2010.
- Rosenmeyer, Patricia A. *Ancient Epistolary Fictions: The Letter in Greek Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- Rouleau, Donald, and Louise Roy, eds. *L'épître apocryphe de Jacques: (NHI, 2)*. Quebec, Canada: Presses de l'Université Laval, 1987.
- Rudolph, Kurt. “Gnosis und Gnostizismus, ein Forschungsbericht.” *TR* 34 (1969): 169-75.

- Russell, Donald A., ed. *The Orator's Education, Volume V: Books 11-12*. LCL 494. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2002.
- Sanders, E.P. *Jesus and Judaism*. London: SCM, 1985.
- Sato, Migaku. *Q und Prophetie: Studien zur Gattungs- und Traditions-geschichte der Quelle Q*. WUNT 2, 29. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1988.
- Schenk, Wolfgang. *Synopse zur Redenquelle der Evangelien: Q-Synopse und Rekonstruktion in deutscher Übersetzung*. Düsseldorf: Parnos Verlag, 1981.
- Schleiermacher, Friedrich. *Das Leben Jesu: Vorlesungen an der Universität zu Berlin im Jahr 1832*. Edited by K. A. Rütenik. Berlin: Georg Reimer, 1864.
- . *The Life of Jesus*. Translated by S. Maclean Gilmour. Edited by Jack C. Verheyden; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975.
- . “Über die Zeugnisse des Papias von unsern beiden ersten Evangelien.” Pages 227-254 in *Exegetische Schriften*. Vol. 1 of *Die Kritische Schleiermacher-Gesamtausgabe*. Edited by Hermann Patsch and Dirk Schmid. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2001.
- Schmidt, Karl Ludwig. *Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu: Literarkritische Untersuchungen zur ältesten Jesusüberlieferung*. Berlin: Trowitzsch & Sohn, 1919.
<http://hdl.handle.net/2027/njp.32101055431157>.
- . *Die Kirche des Urchristentums: Eine lexicographische und biblisch-theologische Studie*. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1927.
- . *The Place of the Gospels in the General History of Literature*. Translated by B.R. McCane. Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 2002.
- Schneemelcher, Wilhelm, ed. *New Testament Apocrypha*. 2 vols. Rev. ed. Eng. trans. ed. R. McL. Wilson. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2003.
- Schottroff, Luise. *The Parables of Jesus*. Translated by L.M. Maloney. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2006.
- Schrage, Wolfgang. *Das Verhältnis des Thomas-Evangeliums zur synoptischen Tradition und zu den koptischen Evangelienübersetzungen. Zugleich ein Beitrag zur gnostischen Synoptikerdeutung*. BZNW 29. Berlin: Töpelmann, 1964.
- Schröter, Jens. “The Criteria of Authenticity in Jesus Research and Historiographical Method.” Pages 49-70 in *Jesus, Criteria, and the Demise of Authenticity*. Edited by Chris Keith and Anthony Le Donne. London: T & T Clark, 2012.
- . *Erinnerung an Jesu Worte: Studien zur Rezeption der Logienüberlieferung in Markus, Q und Thomas*. WMANT 76. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1997.

- . *From Jesus to the New Testament: Early Christian Theology and the Origin of the New Testament Canon*. Translated by Wayne Coppins. Baylor-Mohr Siebeck Studies in Early Christianity. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2013.
- . “The Historical Jesus and the Sayings Tradition: Comments on Current Research.” *Neotestamentica* 30 (1996): 151-168.
- . “Jesus and Memory: The Memory Approach in Current Jesus Research.” *Early Christianity* 6 (2015): 277–284.
- . “Nicht nur eine Erinnerung, sondern eine narrative Vergegenwärtigung: Erwägungen zur Hermeneutik der Evangelien-schreibung.” *ZTK* 108 (2011): 119-137.
- Schüssler Fiorenza, Elizabeth. “Jesus and the Politics of Interpretation.” *Harvard Theological Review* 90 (1997): 343-58.
- Schwartz, Barry. “Harvest.” Pages 313-337 in *Memory and Identity in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity: A Conversation with Barry Schwartz*. Edited by Tom Thatcher. Atlanta: SBL, 2014.
- . “Jesus in First-Century Memory—A Response,” Pages 249-262 in *Memory, Tradition, and Text: Uses of the Past in Early Christianity*. Edited by Alan Kirk and Tom Thatcher. SemeiaSt 52. Atlanta: SBL, 2005.
- . “Rethinking the Concept of Collective Memory.” Pages 9-21 in *Routledge International Handbook of Memory Studies*. Edited by Anna Lisa Tota and Trever Hagen. New York: Routledge, 2016.
- . “Where There’s Smoke, There’s Fire: Memory and History.” Pages 7-37 in *Memory and Identity in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity: A Conversation with Barry Schwartz*. Edited by Tom Thatcher. Atlanta: SBL, 2014.
- Schweitzer, Albert. *Das Messianitäts- und Leidensgeheimnis: eine Skizze des Lebens Jesu*. Vol. 2 of *Das Abendmahl im Zusammenhang mit dem Leben Jesu und der Geschichte des Urchristentums*. Tübingen and Leipzig: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1901.
- . *The Quest of the Historical Jesus: A Critical Study of Its Progress from Reimarus to Wrede*. Translated by W. Montgomery. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1950.
- . *Von Reimarus zu Wrede: eine Geschichte der Leben-Jesu-Forschung*. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1906.
- Schweizer, Eduard. *The Good News according to Luke*. Translated by D. E. Green. Atlanta: John Knox, 1984.
- Scott, Bernard Branson. *Hear Then the Parable: A Commentary on the Parables of Jesus*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1989.
- Seeligman, Isaac Leo. *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah and Cognate Studies*. Edited by Robert Hanhart and Hermann Spieckermann. FAT 40. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004.

- Segal, Alan. "Heavenly Ascent in Hellenistic Judaism, Early Christianity, and Their Environment." *ANRW* II.23.2 (1980): 1333–94.
- Sellew, Philip. "Oral and Written Sources in Mark 4.1-34." *NTS* 36 (1990): 234-267.
- Seneca the Elder. *Declamations*. Translated by Michael Winterbottom. 2 vols. LCL. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1974.
- Simons, Eduard. *Hat der dritte Evangelist den kanonischen Matthäus benutzt?* Bonn: Universitäts-Buchdruckerei von Carl Georgi, 1880.
- Smith, Morton. "A Comparison of Early Christian and Early Rabbinic Tradition." *JBL* 82 (1963): 169-176.
- . Review of *Memory and Manuscript*, by Birger Gerhardsson. *JBL* 82 (1963): 169-176.
- Snodgrass, Klyne. "Are the Parables Still the Bedrock of the Jesus Tradition?" *JSHJ* 15 (2017): 131-146.
- . *Stories with Intent: A Comprehensive Guide to the Parables of Jesus*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2007.
- Soden, Hermann von. *Das Interesse des apostolischen Zeitalters an der evangelischen Geschichte*. Tübingen: Mohr, 1892.
- Speyer, Wolfgang. *Die literarische Fälschung im heidnischen und christlichen Altertum: Ein Versuch ihrer Deutung*. Munich: C.H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1971.
- Stählin, Otto, ed. *Clemens Alexandrinus II*. GCS. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1905.
- Stein, Robert H. "The 'Criteria' for Authenticity," Pages 225-263 in *Gospel Perspectives: Studies of History and Tradition in the Four Gospels*. Vol. 1. Edited by R. T. France and David Wenham. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1980.
- Stern, David. *Parables and Midrash: Narrative and Exegesis in Rabbinic Literature*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1991.
- Stern, Frank. *A Rabbi Looks at Jesus' Parables*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2006.
- Stock, Brian. *Listening for the Text: On the Uses of the Past*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1990.
- Stoker, William D. *Extracanonial Sayings of Jesus*. SBLSPS 18. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989.
- Storr, Christiann Gottlob. *Über den Zweck der evangelischen Geschichte und der Briefe Johannes*. Tübingen: Jacob Friedrich Heerbrandt, 1786. <http://books.google.com>.
- Stowe, Harriet Beecher. *The Annotated Uncle Tom's Cabin*. Edited by Henry Louis Gates, Jr. and Hollis Robbin. New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 2007.

- Strack, Hermann L. and Günter Stemberger. *Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash*. 2nd ed. Translated by Markus Bockmuehl. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1996.
- Friedrich Strauss, David. *The Life of Jesus Critically Examined*. 3 vols. Translated by George Eliot. New York: Gloger Family Books, 1993.
- Strecker, Georg. *The Johannine Letters: A Commentary on 1, 2, and 3 John*. Hermeneia. Translated by Linda M. Maloney. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1996.
- Streeter, B.H. *The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins, Treating of the Manuscript Tradition, Sources, Authorship, and Dates*. London: Macmillan & Co., 1924.
- Stroker, William D. *Extracanonial Sayings of Jesus*. SBLRBS 18. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989.
- Stuckenbruck, Loren T. "The Teacher of Righteousness Remembered: From Fragmentary Sources to Collective Memory in the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 75-94 in *Memory in the Bible and Antiquity*. Edited by Loren Stuckenbruck, Stephen C. Barton, and Benjamin G. Wold. WUNT 212. Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 2007.
- Syreeni, Kari. "Eyewitness Testimony, First-Person Narration and Authorial Presence as Means of Legitimation in Early Gospel Literature." Pages 89-110 in *Social Memory and Social Identity in the Study of Early Judaism and Early Christianity*. Edited by Samuel Byrskog, Raimo Hakola, and Jutta Maria Jokiranta. NTOA/SUNT 116. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2016.
- Tannehill, Robert C., ed. *Pronouncement Stories*. Semeia 20. Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1981.
- Taylor, Vincent. *The Formation of the Gospel Tradition: Eight Lectures*. London: Macmillan & Co. Ltd., 1933. https://archive.org/details/MN41444ucmf_3
- . *The Gospel according to St. Mark*. 2nd ed. London: Macmillan, 1966.
- Teeple, H. M. "The Oral Tradition That Never Existed." *JBL* 89 (1970): 56-68.
- Tertullian. *The Prescription against Heretics*. In vol. 3 of *The Ante-Nicene Fathers: The Writings of the Fathers down to A.D. 325*. Edited by A. Cleveland Cox, Sir James Donaldson, and Alexander Roberts. 1885-1887. 10 vols. Repr., Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1994.
- Thatcher, Tom. *Jesus the Riddler: The Power of Ambiguity in the Gospels*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2006.
- Thatcher, Tom, ed. *Jesus, the Voice, and the Text: Beyond the Oral and Written Gospel*. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2008.
- , ed. *Memory and Identity in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity: A Conversation with Barry Schwartz*. Atlanta: SBL, 2014.
- . *Why John Wrote a Gospel: Jesus, Memory, History*. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2006.

- Theissen, Gerd and Annette Merz. *The Historical Jesus: A Comprehensive Guide*. Translated by John Bowden. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1998.
- Theissen, Gerd, and Dagmar Winter, eds. *The Quest for the Plausible Jesus: The Question of Criteria*. Translated by M. Eugene Boring. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2002.
- Thoma, Clemens, and Michael Wyschogrod, eds., *Parable and Story in Judaism and Christianity*. SJC. Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 1989.
- Tischendorf, Constantin von. *Novum Testamentum Graece*. 7th ed. Leipzig, 1859.
- Tolbert, Mary Ann. *Perspectives on Parables: An Approach to Multiple Interpretations*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979.
- . *Sowing the Gospel: Mark's World in Literary-Historical Perspective*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1989.
- Tsuji, Manabu. *Glaube zwischen Volkommenheit und Verweltlichung: Eine Untersuchung zur literarischen Gestalt und zur inhaltlichen Kohärenz des Jakobusbriefes*. WUNT 93. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1997.
- Tucker, J. Brian, and Coleman A. Baker, eds. *T&T Clark Handbook to Social Identity in the New Testament*. London: Bloomsbury, 2014.
- Tucker, Jeffrey T. *Example Stories: Perspectives on Four Parables in the Gospel of Luke*. JSNTSup 162. Sheffield: Academic Press, 1998.
- Tuckett, Christopher M. "Form Criticism." Pages 21-38 in *Jesus in Memory: Traditions in Oral and Scribal Perspectives*. Edited by Werner Kelber and Samuel S. Byrskog. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2009.
- . *Revival of the Griesbach Hypothesis: An Analysis and Appraisal*. SNTSMS 44. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.
- Turner, John. "The Gnostic Threefold Path to Enlightenment: The Ascent of Mind and the Descent of Wisdom." *NT 22* (1980): 324–51.
- . "Sethian Gnosticism: A Literary History." Pages 55-86 in *Nag Hammadi, Gnosticism, and Early Christianity*. Edited by Charles W. Hedrick and Robert Hodgson. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1986.
- Tyrell, George. *Christianity at the Crossroads*. London: George Allen & Unwin, 1909.
- Unnik, Willem Cornelis Van. *Evangelien aus dem Nilsand*. Frankfurt am Main: Scheffer, 1960.
- Uro, Risto. "Cognitive Science in the Study of Early Christianity: Why It Is Helpful – and How?" *NTS 63* (2017): 516-533.
- . "Ritual, Memory and Writing in Early Christianity" *Temenos 47* (2011): 159-182.

- Valantasis, Richard. *The New Q: A Fresh Translation with Commentary*. London: T&T Clark, 2005.
- Vergote, Jozef. *Grammaire copte*. 4 vols. Leuven: Peeters, 1973-1983.
- Vermes, Geza. *Jesus the Jew: A Historian's Reading of the Gospels*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1973.
- Via, Dan O. *The Ethics of Mark's Gospel: In the Middle of Time*. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 1985
- . *The Parables: Their Literary and Existential Dimension*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1967.
- Vielhauer, Philip. “ $\Delta\text{Ν}\Delta\text{Π}\Delta\text{Υ}\text{C}\text{Ι}\text{C}$: zum gnostischen Hintergrund des Thomasevangeliums.” Pages 281-299 in *Apophoreta: Festschrift für Ernst Haenchen zu seinem siebzigsten Geburtstag am 10 Dezember 1964*. Edited by W. Eltester and F.H. Kettler. BZNW 30. Berlin: Töpelmann, 1964.
- . *Geschichte der urchristlichen Literatur*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1975.
- Vliet, J. van der. “Spirit and Prophecy in the Epistula Iacobi Apocrypha (NHC I,2).” *VC* 44 (1990): 25-53.
- Walker, William O. “The Quest for the Historical Jesus: A Discussion of Methodology.” *ATR* 51 (1969): 38-56.
- Wallace, Daniel B. *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the Greek New Testament*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1996.
- , ed. *Revisiting the Corruption of the New Testament: Manuscript, Patristic, and Apocryphal Evidence*. Grand Rapids: Kregel Publications, 2011.
- Wallace, James Buchanan. *Snatched into Paradise (2 Cor 12:1-1): Paul's Heavenly Journey in the Context of Early Christian Experience*. Berlin: DeGruyter, 2011.
- Watson, Francis. *Gospel Writing: A Canonical Perspective*. Grand Rapids, MI.: Eerdmans, 2013.
- Wedderburn, Alexander J.M. *Jesus and the Historians*. WUNT 269. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010.
- Weeden, Theodore. “Kenneth Bailey's Theory of Oral Tradition: A Theory Contested by its Evidence.” *JSHJ* 7 (2009): 3-43.
- Weiss, Johannes. “Die Verteidigung Jesu gegen den Vorwurf des Bündnisses mit Beelzebul.” *TSK* 63 (1890): 557. <https://archive.org/stream/einleitungindie00unkngoog>.
- Weisse, Christian Hermann. *Die evangelische Geschichte: Kritisch und philosophisch bearbeitet*. 2 vols. Leipzig: Breitkopf und Härtel, 1838. <https://archive.org/details/dieevangelische03weisgoog>.

- Wellhausen, Julius. *Einleitung in der drei ersten Evangelien*. Berlin: Georg Reimer, 1905.
- West, Martin Litchfield. "Rhapsodes." *Oxford Classical Dictionary*. 3rd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996. 1311-1312.
- Wilder, Amos N. *Jesus' Parables and the War of Myths*. Edited by James Breech. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1982.
- Williams, Francis E. "The Apocryphon of James." Pages 28-53 in *Nag Hammadi Codex I (The Jung Codex): Introductions, Texts, Translations, Notes*. Edited by Harold W. Attridge. NHS 22. Leiden: Brill, 1985.
- . "The Apocryphon of James." Pages 7-37 in *Nag Hammadi Codex I (The Jung Codex): Notes*. NHS 23. Edited by Harold. W. Attridge. NHS 23. Leiden: Brill, 1985.
- Williams, James G. *Gospel against Parable: Mark's Language of Mystery*. BLS 12. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1987.
- Williams, Michael Allen. *Rethinking "Gnosticism": An Argument for Dismantling a Dubious Category*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1996.
- Williams, Ritva. "Social Memory." *BTB* 41 (2011): 189-200.
- Winter, Dagmar. "Saving the Quest for Authenticity from the Criterion of Dissimilarity: History and Plausibility." Pages 25-48 in *Jesus, Criteria, and the Demise of Authenticity*. Edited by Chris Keith and Anthony Le Donne. London: T & T Clark, 2012.
- Witherington, Ben, III. *The Jesus Quest: The Third Search for the Jew of Nazareth*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1997.
- Wrede, William. *Das Messiasgeheimnis in den Evangelien: zugleich ein Beitrag zum Verständnis des Markusevangeliums*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1901.
- Wright, N.T. *The New Testament and the People of God*. Vol. 1 of *Christian Origins and the Question of God*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992.
- Wünsch, Dietrich. *Evangelienharmonien im Reformationszeitalter: ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Leben-Jesu-Darstellung*. Arbeiten zur Kirchengeschichte 52. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1983.
- Xenophon. *Memorabilia, Oeconomicus, Symposium, Apology*. Translated by E.C. Marchant and O.J. Todd. Revised by Jeffrey Henderson. LCL. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2013.
- Yates, Frances A. *The Art of Memory*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1966.
- Yoshiko Reed, Annette. "The Afterlives of New Testament Apocrypha." *JBL* 133 (2015): 401-425.

Young, Stephen E. *Jesus Tradition in the Apostolic Fathers: Their Explicit Appeals to the Words of Jesus in Light of Orality Studies*. WUNT 311. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011.

Zerwick, Max, S.J., and Mary Grosvenor. *A Grammatical Analysis of the Greek New Testament*. 5th ed. Rome: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1996.

Zimmermann, Ruben. "Are there Parables in John? It is Time to Revisit the Question." *JSHJ* 9 (2011): 243-276.

———, ed. *Hermeneutik der Gleichnisse Jesu: Methodische Neuansätze zum Verstehen urchristlicher Parabletexte*. WUNT 231; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.

———. *Puzzling the Parables of Jesus: Methods and Interpretation*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2015.