Many points of detail would of course need to be addressed for a conclusive judgment to be possible concerning the literary genesis of the sayings source Q and its position in the history of early Christianity. If these were put aside, current discussion could be focused on three main problem areas. These concern the genre of Q—"wisdom collection" (so also J. M. Robinson, and most recently J. S. Kloppenborg), or "prophetic book" (M. Sato)—secondly its redactional history and finally—somewhat by the way—the old question of the relationship between Mark and Q.

My present occupation with redactional history is at the same time an attempt to repair a deficit in my Habilitationsschrift, *Studien zur Theologie der Logienquelle.* In my view, the redaction-critical problems are very closely connected with a matter that is not only of central importance for Q, but also for the history of early Christian christology as a whole: the question of the Son of Man (SM). This connection is not a new one for redaction-critical discussion, since no construction can avoid settling the matter of the tradition-historical position of the SM sayings in Q. It seems to me, however, that by linking these two questions in a more focused way—taking account of progress that has been made in the SM...
discussion—progress will also be possible in our appreciation of the nature and tradition-historical classification of the redaction of Q (QR). For this purpose I have elected to proceed via a review of the history of scholarship, but restricting myself—for reasons of space for one thing—to what I consider to be the essential stops en route, marked out by the work of H. E. Tödt, O. H. Steck, D. Lührmann, A. D. Jacobson and M. Sato, with sideways glances at studies that are less illuminating for my question. In this manner not only may the premises which motivated discussion to date be clarified, but also those premises which established the discussion; and perhaps the latter may be overcome.

1. The Basis of Recent Discussion

The most incisive and significant contribution to the study of the sayings source, and also the foundation and impetus for recent discussion, is the exegetical dissertation of the Heidelberg ethicist Heinz Eduard Tödt, entitled Der Menschensohn in der synoptischen Überlieferung.5 Whereas earlier research (P. Wemle, A. von Harnack) initially found Q to be a catechetical collection of sayings and then, under the influence of J. Wellhausen and form criticism, saw it as a less significant complement to the (passion) kerygma as represented by Paul—in their view the real centre of the early Christian proclamation (R. Bultmann, M. Dibelius, etc.)—Tödt showed that the tradition of the Jesus sayings in Q presupposes an independent “kerygmatic programme”.

5 The dissertation was presented to the Faculty of Protestant Theology of the University of Heidelberg in 1956 with the title, “Hoheits- und Niedrigkeitsvorstellungen in den synoptischen Menschensohn sprüchen”; it was published in 1959.

6 Tödt’s teacher, G. Bornkamm, also emphasizes the distinctive “theological conception” of Q in his article “Evangelien” in RGG II (3rd edn: 1958) col. 759. Tödt’s perspective has clear points of contact with R. Bultmann’s characterization of the early Palestinian proclamation of the message of Jesus, which the latter, however—unlike Tödt—sees as still adherent to Judaism and qualitatively distinct from the Pauline kerygma (Theologie des Neuen Testaments [2nd ed; Tübingen 1954] 34, 37).

 Already T. W. Manson (The Sayings of Jesus [London: 1937]) assessed Q as an independent early Christian strand of tradition at the centre of which stands Jesus as the teacher, and showed the eschatological character of Q in its concern with the idea of judgment, which determines the beginning and the end of the collection (p. 16), but at the same time saw Q as of less importance than the passion kerygma (p. 9).