



ARTICLE

Matthew, Luke, and... James? The Reconstruction of Q and the Epistle of James

Christina Gousopoulos 

Department for the Study of Religion, University of Toronto, Ontario, Canada
Email: christina.gousopoulos@mail.utoronto.ca

Abstract

Recognition of the parallels between Q material and the Epistle of James has developed in recent years, and has convincingly attested to James' literary dependence upon Q. If James does constitute an independent witness to the Sayings Gospel, there indeed may be some merit to a limited deployment of the Jacobean epistle in studies of the Synoptic Problem. The present contribution considers the reconstruction of Q through comparison with several of its Jacobean parallels, surveying the extent to which James can be fruitfully deployed. While scholars should certainly exercise caution in using James to reconstruct Q, selective comparison may offer us some new insights, particularly in adjudicating discrepancies between Matthew and Luke. Although the Epistle's utility is limited because of its lack of verbatim citation of Q, James may be particularly helpful in the contentious debate about the inclusion of the Lucan woes (Q/Luke 6.24–6) into Q and offers some force to the minority position that the woes constituted an original component of Q's Beatitudes.

Keywords: Epistle of James; Q; reconstruction of Q; Synoptic problem; Two-Source Hypothesis

1. Introduction

Accounting for the relationship between the Synoptics — not to mention, their correspondence with Johannine tradition — continues to inspire lively debate.¹ Yet amidst many conversations about the Synoptic Problem in recent years, recognition of the parallels between Q material and the Epistle of James has simultaneously developed, ushering the previously neglected 'epistle of straw'² into the foreground. Although the text is framed as a Judean diaspora letter, contains only one unambiguous reference to Christ in its incipit

¹ See, for instance, William R. Farmer, *The Gospel of Jesus: The Pastoral Relevance of the Synoptic Problem* (Louisville: Westminster, 1994); Mark Goodacre, *The Case Against Q: Studies in Markan Priority and the Synoptic Problem* (Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 2002); *The Synoptic Problem: Four Views* (ed. Stanley E. Porter and Bryan R. Dyer; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2016); *Gospel Interpretation and the Q-Hypothesis* (ed. Mogens Müller and Heike Omerzu; London/New York: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2018); *Theological and Theoretical Issues in the Synoptic Problem: Issues in 19th and 20th Century Research* (ed. John S. Kloppenborg and Joseph Verheyden; London/New York: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2020).

² Martin Luther, *Preface to the New Testament* (1522): WADB 6:10; LW 35:362.

(1.1)³ and never cites any sayings of Jesus verbatim, there is now widespread agreement that the author of James alludes to the Jesus tradition in Q on several occasions, with sufficient knowledge of Q's Sermon on the Mount/Plain.⁴

James' lack of verbatim agreement with Q is, of course, unsurprising. Consistent with his treatment of the Hebrew Bible, Kloppenborg has demonstrated that James rather engages in rhetorical paraphrase (*aemulatio*) of the Jesus tradition and offers allusions to Q sayings while considerably reworking and adapting them for his own purposes.⁵ If James does constitute an independent witness to the Sayings Gospel, there indeed may be some merit to a *limited* deployment of the Jacobean epistle in studies of the Synoptic Problem.

This is precisely the kind of thought experiment this essay conducts. To introduce another methodological challenge within a continuum of methodological challenges with Q, the present contribution considers the reconstruction of Q through comparison with several of its Jacobean parallels, surveying the extent to which James can be fruitfully deployed. I argue that while scholars should certainly exercise caution in using James to reconstruct Q, selective comparison may offer us some new insights, particularly in adjudicating discrepancies between Matthew and Luke. Although the epistle's utility is limited because of its lack of verbatim citation of Q, which is typical of *aemulatio*, I will argue that James may be particularly helpful in the contentious debate about the inclusion of the Lucan woes (Q/Luke 6.24–6) into Q and offers some force to the minority position that the woes constituted an original component of Q's Beatitudes.

2. *Aemulatio* and the 'Adaptive Reuse' of the Jesus Tradition in James

Few today maintain James' dependence on the Synoptics. Despite his clear knowledge of the Jesus tradition, James neither displays familiarity with Matthean or Lucan redactional features nor any explicit knowledge of Markan material, which has effectively disqualified the Synoptics as probable sources.⁶ The case for Q underlying the fabric of James, on the other hand, has become quite persuasive: while Jas 2.5 does not take the form of a macarism, it has now formed a scholarly consensus that James paraphrases Q 6.20b, especially since these passages contain the sole instances of pairing βασιλεία and πτωχοί in the

³ On the case for the later interpolation of Jesus into 2.1, see especially Dale C. Allison, 'The Fiction of James and its Sitz im Leben', *Revue Biblique* 108.4 (2001) 540–5; Ryan Donald Wettlaufer, *No Longer Written: The Use of Conjectural Emendation in the Restoration of the Text of the New Testament, the Epistle of James as a Case Study* (New Testament Tools, Studies and Documents 44; Leiden: Brill, 2013) 159–84.

⁴ For James' dependence on the Jesus 'tradition' in Q, see especially Dean B. Deppe, 'The Sayings of Jesus in the Epistle of James' (Free University of Amsterdam, 1989); Patrick J. Hartin, *James and the Q Sayings of Jesus* (JSNTSup 47; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991). The author's dependence on the Jesus 'tradition' altogether was famously challenged by L. Massebieau, 'L'Épître de Jacques est-elle l'oeuvre d'un chrétien?', *Revue de l'histoire des religions* 32 (1895) 249–83; Friedrich Spitta, *Zur Geschichte und Litteratur des Urchristentums* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1896), who held that the text was in fact a Jewish document which had been superficially and secondarily Christianised through the interpolations of Jesus into 1.1 and 2.1. Arnold Meyer, *Das Rätsel des Jacobusbriefes*, (BZNW 10; Giessen: Töpelmann, 1930) similarly argued that James was a Jewish letter and was modelled after Jacob in his farewell address to his sons in Gen 49.

⁵ John S. Kloppenborg, 'The Reception of the Jesus Tradition in James', *The Catholic Epistles and the Tradition*, (ed. J. Schlosser; BETL 176; Leuven: Peeters, 2004) 93–139; John S. Kloppenborg, *James* (New Testament Guides; London: T&T Clark, 2022) 61–5, 71–9; also see Richard Bauckham, 'The Wisdom of James and the Wisdom of Jesus', *The Catholic Epistles and the Tradition* (ed. J. Schlosser; BETL 176; Leuven: Peeters, 2004) 73–92 who finds a similar emulation of (or 'inspiration' from, in Bauckham's terms) Proverbs in Sirach.

⁶ See the treatment of this issue in Hartin, *James*. In recent years, Dale C. Allison, 'The Audience of James and the Sayings of Jesus', *James, 1 & 2 Peter, and Early Jesus Traditions* (ed. Alicia J. Batten and John S. Kloppenborg; LNTS 478; London/New York: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2014) 58–77 has remained agnostic on the matter, but has admitted to now entertain the possibility that James knows Matthew and has performed his own emulation of Matt 5.33–7 in Jas 5.12.

Jesus tradition and elsewhere.⁷ There is, however, little consensus concerning how many points of contact exist between the two texts. In a survey of the nearly two hundred possible allusions identified in Jacobean scholarship, Deppe concluded that there were likely eight 'conscious allusions' to Synoptic tradition in James: Jas 1.5, 4.2c–3 (Matt 7.7/Luke 11.9); 2.5 (Matt 5.3/Luke 6.20b); 5.2–3a (Matt 6.19–20/Luke 12.33b); 4.9 (Luke 6.21, 25b); 5.1 (Luke 6.24); 5.12 (Matt 5.33–7); 4.10 (Matt 23.12/Luke 14.11, 18.14b).⁸ Apart from the saying on oaths (Jas 5.12; cf. Matt 5.33–7), which does not betray any features of Matthean redaction, all of these allusions are either undisputed or disputed Q material. To these parallels, we might also add the likely allusions of Jas 4.4 (Q 16.13), 5.9 (Q 6.37–8), 5.10 (Q 6.22–3) and 5.19–20 (Q 17.3b).⁹

Although Foster has expressed some reticence due to the lack of verbatim agreements between Q and James,¹⁰ Kloppenborg's emphasis upon the rhetorical practice of *aemulatio* has rather persuasively demonstrated that we should not expect James to have reproduced his sources verbatim, nor explicitly cited his sources.¹¹ Learning to paraphrase was a component of advanced rhetorical training,¹² prompting seasoned pupils to imagine themselves in a competition for excellence with their literary predecessors. The younger Pliny advocated for such an imagined rivalry to improve one's prose:

When you have read an author sufficiently to master his subject and treatment, it will do you no harm to try and rival him, as it were, and write your version out, and then compare it with the book, carefully considering where the original is better expressed than your copy, and vice versa. You may justly congratulate yourself if yours is the superior in a few places, and you may be heartily ashamed of yourself if his beats yours at every point. Occasionally, you may with profit select some very well-known passages and try to improve even on them.¹³

This kind of exercise, he maintained, would eventually enable oneself to surpass the facilities of many talented authors and orators of the past, composing text which, as Quintilian described, could 'rival and vie with the original in the expression of the same thought'.¹⁴ Just as Philo could freely paraphrase the Decalogue with little to no verbatim

⁷ Deppe, 'Sayings of Jesus', 141; Paul Foster, 'Q and James: A Source-Critical Conundrum', *James, 1 & 2 Peter and the Early Jesus Tradition* (ed. Alicia J. Batten and John S. Kloppenborg; LNTS 478; London/New York: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2014) 26–7; Wesley Hiram Wachob, *The Voice of Jesus in the Social Rhetoric of James* (SNTSMS 106; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000) 149; Kloppenborg, 'Reception', 134–41; Alicia J. Batten, 'The Jesus Tradition and the Letter of James', *Review and Expositor* 108 (2011) 383.

⁸ Deppe, 'Sayings of Jesus', 150–66, 231–50.

⁹ Alicia J. Batten, 'The Urbanization of Jesus Traditions in James', *James, 1 & 2 Peter and the Early Jesus Tradition* (ed. Alicia J. Batten and John S. Kloppenborg; LNTS 478; London/New York: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2014) 90–2; Hartin, *James*, 141–2; John S. Kloppenborg, 'The Emulation of the Jesus Tradition in the Letter of James', *Reading James with New Eyes: Methodological Reassessments of the Letter of James* (LNTS 342; London: T&T Clark, 2007) 148–50.

¹⁰ Foster, 'Q and James: A Source-Critical Conundrum', 33–4 remarks, on the one hand, that 'it seems necessary to assert that some connection between James and the material that forms the Q sermon does exist', yet concludes with a caveat to this proposed literary dependence since 'the vast majority of the parallels between James and the Jesus sayings share limited verbal agreements'. This obstacle is rectified, however, by the theory of Jacobean *aemulatio* as advocated by Kloppenborg, 'Reception', reviewed above.

¹¹ Kloppenborg, 'Emulation of the Jesus Tradition', 133. Also see Kloppenborg, 'Reception'; John S. Kloppenborg, 'James 1:2–15 and Hellenistic Psychology', *NovT* 52.1 (2010) 37–71.

¹² Raffaella Cribiore, *Writing, Teachers, and Students in Graeco-Roman Egypt* (American Studies in Papyrology 36; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996) 129; *Progymnasmata: Greek Textbooks of Prose Composition and Rhetoric* (ed. George A. Kennedy; Leiden: Brill, 2003) 70–1.

¹³ Pliny, *Ep.* 7.9.3.

¹⁴ Quintilian, *Inst.* 10.5.5, also see 10.2.10, 27.

agreement with the Septuagint,¹⁵ the fifth-century poet Nonnus of Panopolis took no issue in producing a paraphrastic account of the Gospel of John with considerable elaboration of key pericopes and sayings.¹⁶ Nonnus could take, for instance, the simple saying ἐγὼ οὐκ εἰμι ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου τούτου (John 8.23) and greatly expand to: ξείνος ἔφυν κόσμοιο καὶ οὐ βροτὸν οἶδα τοκῆα· ξείνος ἐγὼ κόσμοιο καὶ αἰθέρος εἰμι πολίτης,¹⁷ retaining only the original reference to the κόσμος.

Nor should we expect James to have always transmitted his sources verbatim. While James cites biblical texts verbatim on four occasions – probably to rival Paul’s citation of the same texts – the author is certainly capable of paraphrasing the Hebrew Bible and seems to adopt this same rhetorical praxis towards the Jesus tradition he receives in Q.¹⁸ Jas 1.5–8 and 4.2c–3, for instance, are likely emulations of the ‘ask and you shall receive’ aphorism of Q 11.9–13, wherein the author deploys Q’s pairing of αἰτεῖται–δοθήσεται in his own insistence upon petitioning God with the correct mental disposition.¹⁹ With instances of rhetorical paraphrase located plentifully within the works of Josephus,²⁰ Origen,²¹ Clement,²² Apuleius,²³ Sirach²⁴ and Seneca,²⁵ to name a few, verbatim reproduction of one’s source was not a prevailing virtue or goal. Rather, performing an *aemulatio* of one’s predecessors would simultaneously enable one’s audience to recognise the echoes of the parent text and offer the author the opportunity to innovate, develop and extend the argument for their own purposes.

To borrow the architectural concept of ‘adaptive reuse’, like how a developer can revitalise and reuse a heritage building for novel purposes, James’ emulation of Q material performs an adaptive reuse of the Jesus tradition. By emulating and embedding several allusions to Jesus’ sayings throughout his epistle, the author revitalises, extends and promotes continuity with older ‘heritage’ traditions, bringing the relevancy of Jesus’ sayings into new contexts and for his own interests. For Kloppenborg, James emends and

¹⁵ One can compare, for instance, Exod 20.12 τίμα τὸν πατέρα σου καὶ τὴν μητέρα ἵνα εὖ σοι γένηται καὶ ἵνα μακροχρόνιος γένη ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς τῆς ἀγαθῆς ἧς κύριος ὁ θεός σου δίδωσίν σοι with Philo’s elaboration: Μετὰ δὲ τὰ περὶ τῆς ἐβδόμης παραγγέλλει πέμπτον παράγγελμα τὸ περὶ γονέων τιμῆς τᾶξιν αὐτῶ δούς τὴν μεθόριον τῶν δυοῖν πεντάδων (*Decal.* 22.106 *et seq.*), wherein the only lexical similarity is his reference to τιμῆς, while Exod 20.12 deploys the imperative τίμα. For a larger treatment of Philo’s *aemulatio* of scripture, see H.E. Ryle, *Philo and Holy Scripture, or, The Quotations of Philo from the Books of the Old Testament* (London/New York: Macmillan and Co., 1895).

¹⁶ Maria Ypsilanti and Laura Franco, *Nonnus’ Paraphrase between Poetry, Rhetoric, and Theology: Rewriting the Fourth Gospel in the Fifth Century* (Mnemosyne Supplements 436; Leiden: Brill, 2020).

¹⁷ Par. 8.53–4: ‘(I) was born a stranger to the world, and do not know a mortal parent; I am a stranger to the world, and a citizen of the aether’; Ypsilanti and Franco, *Nonnus’ Paraphrase*, 234.

¹⁸ John S. Kloppenborg, ‘Verbatim Citations in James’, *‘To Recover What Has Been Lost’: Essays on Eschatology, Intertextuality, and Reception History in Honor of Dale C. Allison Jr.* (ed. Tucker Ferda, Daniel Frayer-Griggs and Nathan C. Johnson; NovTSup 183; Leiden: Brill, 2020) 254–69; Allison, ‘Audience of James’, 59–63.

¹⁹ Kloppenborg, ‘James 1:2–15 and Hellenistic Psychagogy’, 39–53; Kloppenborg, *James*, 76–8.

²⁰ F. Gerald Downing, ‘Redaction Criticism: Josephus’ Antiquities and the Synoptic Gospels (I)’, *JSNT* 8 (1980) 46–65; F. Gerald Downing, ‘Redaction Criticism: Josephus’ Antiquities and the Synoptic Gospels (II)’, *JSNT* 9 (1980) 29–48; Robert A. Derrenbacker, *Ancient Compositional Practices and the Synoptic Problem* (BETL 186; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2005).

²¹ Anniewies van den Hoek, ‘Philo and Origen: A Descriptive Catalogue of Their Relationship’, *The Studia Philonica Annual: Studies in Hellenistic Judaism* 12 (2000) 44–121; Carl Johan Berglund, *Origen’s References to Heracleon: A Quotation-Analytical Study of the Earliest Known Commentary on the Gospel of John* (WUNT 450; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2020).

²² Anniewies van den Hoek, *Clement of Alexandria and His Use of Philo in the ‘Stromateis’: An Early Christian Reshaping of a Jewish Model* (Vigilae Christianae Supplements; Leiden: Brill, 1988).

²³ Stephen Harrison, ‘Apuleius and Homer: Some Traces of the Iliad in the Metamorphoses’, *Ancient Narrative* 12 (2009) 169–83.

²⁴ Bauckham, ‘The Wisdom of James and the Wisdom of Jesus.’

²⁵ J. J. Gahan, ‘“Imitatio and Aemulatio” in Seneca’s “Phaedra”’, *Latomus* 46.2 (1987) 380–7.

elaborates these traditions to suit his interest in psychagogy and the cultivation of the soul, as he grounds his arguments not solely in appeals to the Hebrew Bible or Hellenistic philosophical thought but in allusions to the Jesus tradition for recognition by the Christ followers in his audience.²⁶

As we now turn to James' potential role in the reconstruction of Q, I do not mean to assert that the author's lack of verbatim agreement with Q should not give us pause. While persuasive in its plentiful (albeit subtle) appeals to the Jesus tradition, James' failure to explicitly attribute these sayings to Jesus or faithfully reproduce any given saying restricts the extent to which the text can be used to reliably establish Q. As it is maintained, however, there is indeed some merit in deploying James as an independent witness to the Q material, particularly in the adjudication of whether the Lucan woes (6.24–6) originated in the Sayings Gospel.

3. A Case Study in James and the Reconstruction of Q: The Woes (Jas 4.9 //Q 6.21, 25b and Jas 5.1, 2–3 //Q 6.24–25b, 12.33b)

It is the minority view today to consider the woes against the rich (οἱ πλούσιοι), those who are satiated (οἱ ἐμπλησμένοι) and those who are laughing (οἱ γελῶντες) as an original component of Q.²⁷ With the woes omitted from the IQP's critical edition, 6.24–6 is usually taken as Lucan *Sondergut*. The traditional challenge against their inclusion is that it is curious for Matthew to have omitted the woes if he had known them, especially since Matthew's extensive woes against the Pharisees (Matt 23.13–36) seemingly demonstrated that he 'was not averse to such sayings'.²⁸ Many scholars who observe the presence of Lucan vocabulary have thus relegated the woes to special L material which must have been independent to the Beatitudes or not known to Matthew in any meaningful capacity.²⁹ There are, nevertheless, compelling reasons for considering the Lucan woes as Q material, without appealing to a hypothetical Q^{Lk} to which Matthew had no access. Some scholars, for instance, have attempted to establish plausible reasons for Matthew's omission, such as a desire to omit the materialistic woes in light of his 'spiritualised' Beatitudes³⁰ or an interest in developing

²⁶ For James' interest in psychagogy, see especially Kloppenborg, 'James 1:2–15 and Hellenistic Psychagogy'.

²⁷ Proponents of the inclusion of the Lucan woes include: James M. Robinson, Paul Hoffmann and John S. Kloppenborg, *The Critical Edition of Q: A Synopsis, Including the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, Mark and Thomas, with English, German and French Translations of Q and Thomas* (Hermeneia Supplements; Leuven: Peeters, 2000) 54–5; John Caesar Hawkins, 'St. Luke's Passion Narrative Considered with Reference to the Synoptic Problem', *Studies in the Synoptic Problem* (ed. W. Sanday; Oxford: Clarendon, 1911) 133; B. H. Streeter, *The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins* (London: Macmillan and Co., 1924) 252; Hubert Frankemölle, 'Die Makarismen (Mt 5,1–12; Lk 6,20–23). Motive und Umfang der redaktionellen Komposition', *Biblische Zeitschrift* 15 (1971) 64; Christopher M. Tuckett, 'The Beatitudes: A Source Critical Study', *NovT* 25 (1983) 195–7; John S. Kloppenborg, *Q Parallels: Synopsis, Critical Notes & Concordance* (Sonoma: Polebridge, 1988) 26; John S. Kloppenborg, *Excavating Q: The History and Setting of the Sayings Gospel* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2000) 100; Dennis R. MacDonald, *Synopses of Epic, Tragedy, and the Gospels. Volume 1: A Mimetic Synopsis of Four Synoptic Gospels (Q+, Mark, Matthew, and Luke)* (Claremont: Mimesis, 2022) 120.

²⁸ William Manson, *The Gospel of Luke* (The Moffat New Testament Commentary; New York/London: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1930) 66.

²⁹ Jacques Dupont, *Les Béatitudes: Le problème littéraire—Les deux versions du Sermon sur la montagne et des Béatitudes* (Leuven: Nauwelaerts, 1958) 299–342; A.M. Honoré, 'A Statistical Study of the Synoptic Problem', *NovT* 10.2/3 (1968) 140; Hedley F.D. Sparks, 'The Partiality of Luke for "Three", and Its Bearing on the Original of Q', *Journal of Theological Studies* 37.146 (1936) 142 n.2; Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke I–IX: Introduction, Translation, and Notes* (The Anchor Bible Series 28; Garden City: Doubleday, 1981) 627, 636–7; Burton Scott Easton, *The Gospel According to St. Luke: A Critical and Exegetical Commentary* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1926) 84–6; Jan Lambrecht, *The Sermon on the Mount: Proclamation & Exhortation* (Good News Bible Studies 14; Wilmington: Michael Glazier, 1985) 51–2; Manson, *The Gospel of Luke*, 66.

³⁰ David R. Catchpole, *The Quest For Q* (Biblical Studies: Gospel Narrative; London: Bloomsbury, 1993) 87.

the positive theme of righteousness for the disciples.³¹ Others have noted that Q 6.24–6 is not solely the case where pairs of blessings and woes appear in Jewish thought (Ps 1.1–16, 146.5–9; Prov 8.34–6, 28.14; Ecclus 10.16–17; Wis 3.13–15), and have asserted that it is quite telling that several sets of woes are located in Q (10.13–15, 11.739a?–44, 46b–52, 17.1), but never within L material.³²

Schürmann, however, has usefully tackled the question from a different angle.³³ Noting that both Matthew and Luke bear vestigial presences or ‘linguistic reminiscences’ (*sprachliche Reminiszenzen*) of their sources even when they omit Q or Markan material, he remarks that Matthew may have inherited and omitted the woes as a component of Q since there are verbal reminiscences of the tradition throughout his Sermon. We can note, for instance, that one of Matthew’s additions to the Beatitudes μακάριοι οἱ πενθοῦντες, ὅτι αὐτοὶ παρακληθήσονται (5.4) bears lexical similarities with the woes in its address to πενθοῦντες (cf. Luke 6.25 ὅτι πενθήσετε καὶ κλαύσετε) and promised reward παρακληθήσονται (cf. Luke 6.24 ὅτι ἀπέχετε τὴν παράκλησιν ὑμῶν). The ψευδοπροφήται of Luke 6.26 also parallels the Matthean Beatitude for those who have fallen victim to individuals who εἴπωσιν πᾶν πονηρὸν καθ’ ὑμῶν ψευδόμενοι ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ (5.11). Frankemölle has even suggested that Matthew’s threefold didactic prayer in 6.2, 5, 16 may be influenced by the threefold structure of the woes, particularly, since they are structurally founded upon the verb ἀπέχω (cf. Luke 6.24).³⁴ The close parallelism between the Beatitudes and woes has also led Tuckett to conclude that the woes were likely an original component of Q as antitheses to the Beatitudes, having had no independent existence apart from them.³⁵

How might James help us in this contentious issue? We begin in Jas 4.9, the verse which immediately precedes our first case study (Jas 4.10). Nearing the conclusion of his indictment of envy, James has just instructed the ἀμαρτωλοὶ and δίψυχοι to purify their hearts and hands, and now directs them to humble themselves through the following behaviour: ταλαιπωρήσατε καὶ πενήθησατε καὶ κλαύσατε· ὁ γέλως ὑμῶν εἰς πένθος μετατραπήτω καὶ ἡ χαρὰ εἰς κατήφειαν (Jas 4.9). It is through this humility, he declares, that they will become exalted by the Lord (4.10). Interestingly, it is within James’ command in 4.9 for his audience to exchange their present laughter for lamentation, mourning and weeping that forms a compelling correspondence between James and the second woe in Luke 6.25b:

Jas 4.9

ταλαιπωρήσατε καὶ πενθήσατε καὶ κλαύσατε·
ὁ γέλως ὑμῶν εἰς πένθος μετατραπήτω καὶ ἡ
χαρὰ εἰς κατήφειαν

Luke 6.25b

οὐαί, οἱ γελῶντες νῦν, ὅτι πενθήσετε
καὶ κλαύσετε

Both the woe against ‘those who laugh’ (6.25b οἱ γελῶντες) and Jas 4.9 are directives in the second-person plural with a largely similar polemic toward worldly individuals. James, on the one hand, has rebuked arrogant and double-minded folk who have been enslaved to envy, selfish ambition and their pleasures (Jas 3.14–4.3), while Jesus similarly reviles the ‘haves’ of society, who are currently rich, satiated and laughing (Luke 6.24–6). Yet perhaps what is most striking here is the close lexical triad concerning laughter, mourning and weeping in both texts, since the woe of 6.25b and Jas 4.9 are the *sole* instances of the

³¹ Tuckett, ‘The Beatitudes: A Source Critical Study’, 197.

³² Catchpole, *The Quest For Q*, 88.

³³ Heinz Schürmann, ‘Sprachliche Reminiszenzen an abgeänderte oder ausgelassene Bestandteile der Redequelle im Lukas- und Matthäusevangelium’, *NTS* 6 (1959) 193–210.

³⁴ See especially Frankemölle, ‘Die Makarismen (Mt 5,1–12; Lk 6,20–23)’.

³⁵ Tuckett, ‘The Beatitudes: A Source Critical Study’, 195; Alfred M. Perry, ‘“Proto-Luke” and the “Chicago Theory” of the Synoptic Problem’, *JBL* 47.1/2 (1928) 98.

terminology of laughter (γελάω/γέλως) in the New Testament.³⁶ It is thus difficult to attribute the reference of οἱ γελῶντες to Lucan redactional interests due to the absence of any other reference to laughing in Luke-Acts or elsewhere.

Yet how can one be sure that James inherited the woes from Q if he fails to cite them verbatim? Through the theory of *aemulatio* or rhetorical paraphrase, if James had inherited the woes tradition, the excision of the οὐαί formulation, eschatological undertones and addition of καὶ ὁ χαρὰ εἰς κατήφεια are still perfectly sensible. Authors who engaged in rhetorical paraphrase were free to innovatively epitomise, extend or expand their predecessor texts as it fit their current purpose. Take, for instance, Nonnus of Panopolis' paraphrase of the rather simple saying of Jn 15.4 μείνατε ἐν ἐμοὶ κἀγὼ ἐν ὑμῖν ('abide in me as I abide in you') into the following:

μίμνετε συμπεφυῶτες ἐμῷ παλιναυξέει θάμνω, μίμνετε συμπεφυῶτες ἐμοί, βλαστήματα κόσμου.

Stay, growing together into one, on my ever-growing plant; stay, growing together into one with me, off-shoots for the world.³⁷

The structure of the phrase has been dramatically transformed: the laconic expression of unity between Jesus and his disciples has doubled in length; John's μένω has been altered to the closely related μίμνω ('stay, abide'); the reciprocal κἀγὼ ἐν ὑμῖν has been excised; and there is a conspicuous addition of horticultural language (συμφύω, θάμνος, βλαστήματα) which nods to the viticultural language of Jesus as the 'true vine' in Jn 15.1–11. Nonnus, however, still retains the notion of Jesus' embeddedness within the disciples through the interconnectedness implied in the verb συμφύω and the repetition of the imperative μίμνετε in the secondary clause, twice deploying the pronouns ἐμῷ/ἐμοί to replace the Johannine κἀγὼ ἐν ὑμῖν. Such an editorial process is indeed entirely possible for James, who is evidently quite capable of reworking and extending his inherited sources, as his allusions to the Hebrew Bible have demonstrated. In fact, Jas 4.9 is closer to the woe of 6.25b than Nonnus' paraphrastic adaptation of Jn 15.4, with significant lexical and contextual parallels such as the triad of laughter–mourning–weeping.

This is not all; in a passage with echoes of 4.9, Jas 5.1, 2–3 seems to betray further knowledge of Q and the woes. Compare, for instance, James' denunciation of the wealthy (οἱ πλούσιοι) in Jas 5.1 with the woe against οἱ πλούσιοι in Q/Luke 6.24–5.

Jas 5.1

ἄγε νῦν οἱ πλούσιοι, κλαύσατε ὀλολύζοντες ἐπὶ ταῖς
ταλαιπωρίαις ὑμῶν ταῖς ἐπερχομέναις

Luke 6.24–25

24 πλὴν οὐαὶ ὑμῖν τοῖς πλουσίοις, ὅτι ἀπέχετε
τὴν παράκλησιν ὑμῶν
25 οὐαὶ ὑμῖν, οἱ ἐμπεπλησμένοι νῦν, ὅτι
πεινάσατε. οὐαὶ, οἱ γελῶντες νῦν, ὅτι
πενθήσατε καὶ κλαύσατε

For James, the use of both κλαίω and ταλαιπωρία offer a link to Jas 4.9, with the former also promoting continuity with the woe of 6.25b ὅτι πενήθησατε καὶ κλαύσατε. James may have dispensed with the 'woe' prefix in favour of the Homeric ἄγε νῦν (cf. 4.13), but his reference to the wealthy's imminent ταλαιπωρία preserves the overtly negative sense of the woes. Indeed, James' vocabulary and construction of the phrase actually comes quite close to that of a woe. Not only are the terms οὐαὶ and ταλαιπωρία linked

³⁶ Deppe, 'Sayings of Jesus', 109.

³⁷ Par. 15.8–9; Ypsilanti and Franco, *Nonnus' Paraphrase*, 64–5.

elsewhere such as in Jer 4.13 οὐαὶ ἡμῖν ὅτι ταλαιπωροῦμεν, they are interchangeable in *GThom* 87 and 112, and the woes pronounced over Babylon in Rev 18.10–11,15–16,19 are also strongly associated with those who weep (κλαίοντες) and mourn (πενθοῦντες).³⁸ Like other authors who engaged in rhetorical paraphrasing, James extends and develops the woe as he has received it in Q to fit his present purposes. Just as the rich have already received their comfort in the woe (6.24b), Jas 5.5 specifies the kinds of comforts they have enjoyed thus far which will soon be reversed: ἐτρυφήσατε ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς καὶ ἐσπαταλήσατε, ἐθρέψατε τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ σφαγῆς. In addition to the reference to laughter, it is important to note that the present woe and Jas 5.1–6 are the *sole* instances of the direct condemnation of the rich in the second-person plural within the New Testament, and James here connects the two passages (4.9, 5.1) through lexical parallels. This correspondence seems best explained if we hold that James is emulating a text wherein those who are rich and those who are laughing are condemned; the most likely source is certainly the woes and even more likely, it seems that James has found the woes as a *component of Q*.

We may take this probable dependence even further. The rationale for Jas 5.1 in the succeeding two verses seems to have been composed with another Q text in mind:

Jas 5.2–3

² ὁ πλοῦτος ὑμῶν σέσηπεν καὶ τὰ ἱμάτια ὑμῶν σητόβρωτα γέγονεν, ³ ὁ χρυσὸς ὑμῶν καὶ ὁ ἄργυρος κατίωται, καὶ ὁ ἰὸς αὐτῶν εἰς μαρτύριον ὑμῖν ἔσται καὶ φάγεται τὰς σάρκας ὑμῶν ὡς πῦρ· ἐθησαυρίσατε ἐν ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις

Q 12.33

«μὴ θησαυρίζετε ὑμῖν θησαυροὺς ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, ὅπου σὴς καὶ βρῶσις ἀφανίζει, καὶ ὅπου κλέπται διορύσσουσιν καὶ κλέπτουσιν»
θησαυρίζετε δὲ ὑμῖν θησαυρο... ἐν οὐρανῷ], ὅπου οὔτε σὴς οὔτε βρῶσις ἀφανίζει, καὶ ὅπου κλέπται οὐ διορύσσουσιν οὐδὲ κλέπτουσιν

In one of James' closest parallels to the Jesus tradition, there are immediate convergences between the two texts. Rather than concentrating on the personal fate of the wealthy, Q 12.33 and Jas 5.2–3 are interested in the negative fate of their *wealth*, which is castigated by both as transitory and susceptible to decay.³⁹ In fact, James and Q mirror one another in their similar remarks about the dangers of material wealth – while Q 12.33 notes that one's possessions are vulnerable to deface through moths (σὴς) and rust (βρῶσις), James instead notes that the rich's clothing have become σητόβρωτα ('moth-eaten'), thereby combining both words and elevating the terminology as we might expect for someone conducting a rhetorical paraphrase.⁴⁰ Moreover, the reference in Jas 5.3 to the wealthy having 'laid up treasure in the last days' (ἐθησαυρίσατε ἐν ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις) using the term θησαυρός recalls Q's admonition μὴ θησαυρίζετε ὑμῖν θησαυροὺς ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, with both texts emphasising an eschatological need not to collect material wealth, but rather treasures in heaven.⁴¹ The allusion to Q material here aligns well with James' thematic interests throughout the epistle, as he has already condemned the practice of patronage (2.1–13) and treated the wealthy with incessantly negative terms as individuals who will inevitably wither away (1.9–11; 5.1–6).

Where does this all leave us with James and the reconstruction of Q? Since there is no positive indication of James' direct dependence on Luke (or Matthew, for that matter), it is quite plausible and probable that he knows Q, particularly in the Sermon material but additionally in several other sections of the Sayings Gospel. There are also good reasons, I

³⁸ Deppe, 'Sayings of Jesus', 110.

³⁹ Kloppenborg, 'Emulation of the Jesus Tradition', 138.

⁴⁰ For the 'urbanization' of Q 12.33 in James, see especially Kloppenborg, 'Emulation of the Jesus Tradition', 139–40.

⁴¹ Hartin, *James*, 180.

quoted a version of this maxim and have respectively positioned it after their citation of Prov 3.34:

Jas 4.6,10

⁶ μείζονα δὲ δίδωσιν χάριν· διὸ λέγει, ὁ θεὸς ὑπερηφάνοις ἀντιτάσσεται, ταπεινοῖς δὲ δίδωσιν χάριν...

¹⁰ ταπεινώθητε ἐνώπιον κυρίου, καὶ ὑψώσει ὑμᾶς

1 Pet 5.5–6

⁵ ὁμοίως, νεώτεροι, ὑποτάγητε πρεσβυτέροις. πάντες δὲ ἀλλήλοις τὴν ταπεινοφροσύνην ἐγκομβώσασθε, ὅτι **[ὁ] θεὸς ὑπερηφάνοις ἀντιτάσσεται, ταπεινοῖς δὲ δίδωσιν χάριν.**

⁶ ταπεινώθητε οὖν ὑπὸ τὴν κραταιὰν χεῖρα τοῦ θεοῦ, ἵνα ὑμᾶς ὑψώσῃ ἐν καιρῷ....

Prov 3.34–5 might have inspired the humility–exaltation maxim in 1 Pet 5.5–6, and by extension Jas 4.10, since the dyad of ταπεινῶ–ὑψῶ appears in Prov 3.35 directly after its quoted portion of v. 34 in both texts. Here, however, ὑψῶ is deployed there in a negative sense concerning the fate of the impious: δόξαν σοφοὶ κληρονομήσουσιν οἱ δὲ ἀσεβεῖς ὑψώσαν ἀτιμίαν (Prov 3.35). Considering these limitations, although Jas 4.10 may closely resemble Q 14.11/18.14?, it does not make a convincing case for the text’s inclusion into the Sayings Gospel, unlike the case of the woes treated here.

We might caution, however, that the inclusion of the woes still imparts the methodological challenge of reconstructing their original form, a matter with which James cannot offer much help. It is likely that the earliest form of the woes displayed ‘precise symmetry’ and parallelism with the Beatitudes,⁴⁷ and elements of potential Lucan redaction can even be posited in his addition of παράκλησις in 6.24b (cf. Luke 2.25; Acts 4.36, 9.31, 13.15, 15.31), οἱ ἄνθρωποι (6.26, cf. 6.22), and the dual use of οὖν in 6.25.⁴⁸ Should we accept that the woes originated in Q, their proposed parallelism with the Beatitudes evinces a compositional technique not unlike the symmetry in its gendered couplets⁴⁹ or the balancing of fates for the two builders (6.47–9). The text’s familiarity and stylistic preference for balanced rhetoric further implicates sub-elite village scribes as its authors, who would have been routinely exposed to this practice in legal and administrative documents.⁵⁰ Nevertheless, it is precisely James’ knowledge of the woes which can helpfully buttress the stance that the woes constituted an original component of Q’s Beatitudes. Perhaps the once-neglected ‘epistle of straw’ bears some merit in studies of the Synoptic Problem.

Competing interests. The author declares none.

⁴⁷ Catchpole, *The Quest For Q*, 89.

⁴⁸ Tuckett, ‘The Beatitudes: A Source Critical Study’, 196.

⁴⁹ For instance, see Q 11.31–2, 13.18–21, 15.4–10, 17.27, 34–5; William E. Arnal, ‘Gendered Couplets in Q and Legal Formulations: From the Rhetoric to Social History’, *JBL* 116.1 (1997) 75–94.

⁵⁰ See especially Kloppenborg, *Excavating Q*, 200; William E. Arnal, *Jesus and the Village Scribes: Galilean Conflicts and the Setting of Q* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001); Giovanni B. Bazzana, *Kingdom of Bureaucracy: The Political Theology of Village Scribes in the Sayings Gospel Q* (BETL 274; Leuven: Peeters, 2015); Sarah E. Rollens, *Framing Social Criticism in the Jesus Movement: The Ideological Project in the Sayings Gospel Q* (WUNT 374; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014).

Cite this article: Gousopoulos C (2024). Matthew, Luke, and... James? The Reconstruction of Q and the Epistle of James. *New Testament Studies* 70, 425–434. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S002868852400002X>