

The Post-Mortem Vindication of Jesus in the Sayings Gospel Q

**A Thesis submitted to the Faculty of Wycliffe College
and the Biblical Department of the Toronto School of Theology**

**In partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy in Theology
awarded by the University of St. Michael's College**

Daniel Alan Smith

**Toronto, Ontario, Canada
2001**

© 2001 Daniel A. Smith



National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services

385 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Acquisitions et
services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

The author has granted a non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of this thesis in microform, paper or electronic formats.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de cette thèse sous la forme de microfiche/film, de reproduction sur papier ou sur format électronique.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

0-612-64784-6

Canada

“The Post-Mortem Vindication of Jesus in the Sayings Gospel Q”

Daniel Alan Smith

Ph.D Dissertation, University of St. Michael's College

Toronto, 2001

ABSTRACT

The Sayings Gospel Q, which is conspicuously silent on the issues of Jesus' death and resurrection, nonetheless shows evidence of a knowledge of Jesus' death and of a strategy for accounting for Jesus' vindication. The dissertation argues that Q thinks of Jesus' end as an assumption, a bodily removal from earth to heaven, as happened to figures such as Enoch and Elijah in Jewish tradition. Q 13:34-35, the Jerusalem Lament (Matt 23:37-39 par. Luke 13:34-35), is the central text examined. In this saying, Jesus predicts that “You will not see me until you say, ‘Blessed is the Coming One in the name of the Lord’” (Q 13:35b). The language of “not seeing” or disappearance was a consistent feature in Hellenistic assumption narratives, and in Jewish tradition a special eschatological function was typically accorded to those taken away by God in this way. The connection between assumption and eschatological function is seen in Q not only in the reference to the “Coming One” in Q 13:35 (a citation of Ps 118:26), but also in the redactional connections made by Q between materials dealing with an absent master and a suddenly returning Son of man (Q 12:39-40, 12:42b-46; Q 17 *passim* and Q 19). Since Q apparently knows about Jesus' death, yet contains no hint of resurrection theology, the possibility arises that assumption, not resurrection, was how the Q people understood Jesus' vindication by God after his death.

The thesis evaluates scholarship on related issues, the death of Jesus in Q and the possibility of an “Easter faith” in Q (Chapter One), and discusses the most significant contributions to the understanding of the Jerusalem Lament as a piece of Q material (Chapter Two). Chapter Three surveys assumption theology in Greco-Roman, Jewish, and early Christian sources. Chapter Four discusses in detail the presence of assumption theology in Q 13:34-35, and Chapter Five investigates the implications of the central thesis for Q as a whole. Finally, other early Christian texts which might betray a similar perspective on Jesus’ post-mortem vindication are discussed (Chapter Six).

Table of Contents

Acknowledgments	viii
Introduction	1
Chapter One: The Death of Jesus and Easter Faith in Q	6
1.1. Q and the Death of Jesus	7
1.1.1. A Passion Narrative in Q?	8
1.1.2. Why Q Lacks a Passion Narrative	13
1.1.2.1. The Nature and Function of Q	13
1.1.2.2. The Genre of Q	20
1.1.2.3. The Deuteronomistic Theme and the Wisdom Theology of Q	22
1.1.3. Q's Knowledge of the Death of Jesus	26
1.1.4. Implications	37
1.2. Q, Easter, and the Son of Man	39
1.2.1. Q, Easter, and the Belief in Jesus as the Coming Son of Man	41
1.2.2. Q, Easter, and the Legitimation of Jesus' Teachings	46
1.2.3. Implications	49
Chapter Two: Q 13:34-35: The Lament over Jerusalem	51
2.1. Major Contributions to the Interpretation of Q 13:34-35	54
2.1.1. Q 13:34-35 as a Quotation from an Apocryphal Document	54
2.1.2. Q 13:34-35 and the Matthean Sequence of the Q Material	56
2.1.3. Q 13:34-35 and the Wisdom Myth	58
2.1.4. The Historical Perspective of Q 13:34-35	59
2.1.5. Q 13:35b as a Conditional Prophecy	61
2.1.6. Q 13:34-35 and the Deuteronomistic Tradition	65
2.1.7. Q 13:34-35 and Wisdom Christology	68
2.1.8. Q 13:34-35 and the Rejection of Jesus	70
2.1.9. Q 13:35b, the Assumption of Jesus, and his Return as Son of Man	75
2.1.10. Q 13:34-35 and the Matthean Sequence, Again	78
2.2. Implications	81

Chapter Three: Assumption in Antiquity	85
3.1. The Ancient Near East Antecedents of Assumption	93
3.1.1. Enoch and the Mesopotamian King Lists	93
3.1.2. The Myths of Adapa and Utuabzu, the Seventh Sage	96
3.1.3. Mesopotamian Flood Heroes	98
3.1.4. Egyptian Sources	100
3.2. Assumption in Greco-Roman Literature	103
3.2.1. Overview: Terminology and Motifs	103
3.2.2. The Assumption of Romulus	107
3.2.3. Post-Mortem Assumptions	110
3.3. Assumption in Jewish Literature	119
3.3.1. Overview: Terminology and Motifs	120
3.3.2. Enoch	122
3.3.3. Elijah	131
3.3.4. The "Righteous One" in the Wisdom of Solomon	134
3.3.5. Moses	144
3.3.6. The Eschatological Return of Assumed Figures	146
3.3.7. Ezra, Baruch, Phinehas, and Melchizedek	151
3.4. Assumption in Early Christian Literature	154
3.4.1. Lazarus	154
3.4.2. The Male Child of Revelation 12	156
3.4.3. Zechariah	157
3.4.4. Later Assumption Legends	159
3.5. The Dormition and Assumption of Mary	162
3.5.1. Narrative Sources	164
3.5.1.1. Coptic	164
3.5.1.2. Greek	166
3.5.1.3. Syriac	168
3.5.1.4. Latin	169
3.5.2. Homiletical Sources	170
3.6. Implications	173

Chapter Four: The Assumption of Jesus in Q 13:34-35	175
4.1. Reconstruction	176
4.2. The Rejection of Jesus and the Abandonment of Jerusalem	186
4.3. λέγω ὑμῖν: “I tell you ...”	192
Table 4A: λέγω ὑμῖν in Q	195
Table 4B: λέγω ὑμῖν in Q Contexts	196
4.4. The Assumption of Jesus: Post-Mortem Vindication, Exaltation, and Parousia	199
4.4.1. Assumption and Divine Favour	202
4.4.2. Assumption and Heavenly Exaltation	203
4.4.3. Assumption and Special Eschatological Function	206
4.4.4. Implications	212
4.4.4.1. The Structure of the Jerusalem Lament	212
4.4.4.2. The Deuteronomistic Framework in Q 13:34-35	212
Table 4C: The Deuteronomistic Structure of Q 13:34-35	214
4.4.4.3. The Christology of Q	215
<i>Excursus: The Post-Mortem Assumption of Jesus and Body-Soul Dualism in Q</i>	218
4.5. Tradition-historical Observations	221
Chapter Five: Implications of an Assumption Christology in Q	224
5.1. Absence, Invisibility, and Return in Q	225
5.1.1 The Absent and Returning Master	226
5.1.2 The Suddenly Appearing Son of Man	231
5.1.3 Implications	236
5.2. A Christological Basis for Corporate Vindication in Q	238
5.2.1 Representative Figures in Jewish Literature	242
5.2.2 Q 6:22-23a: Great is Your Reward in Heaven	247
5.2.3 Q 12:8-9: Confessing Jesus Publicly	250
5.2.4 Q 22:28,30: Judging the Twelve Tribes	257
5.3. Q 10:21-22, Q 13:34-35, and Q’s Eschatological Instruction	263

5.4. Q 11:29-30: The Sign of Jonah	277
5.4.1 Repentance and the Proclamation of Judgment	283
5.4.2 The Piety and Repentance of Gentiles as Condemnatory to Israel	286
5.4.3 Rescue from Death?	287
5.5. Implications	291
 Chapter Six: The Assumption of Jesus in Q and Early Christianity	 293
6.1. An Assumption of Jesus from the Cross?	298
6.2. Mark's "Empty Tomb" Narrative (Mark 16:1-8)	305
6.3. Stephen's Vision of the Son of Man (Acts 7:55-56)	317
6.4. Implications	324
 Conclusion	 325
 Bibliography	 329

Acknowledgments

First and foremost, I express my thanks and admiration to Prof. John S. Kloppenborg Verbin, without whose initial encouragement and continuing support and advice this dissertation would never have been written. It has been a privilege to work with someone with his command of the methods and literatures of biblical studies.

I would also like to thank the members of my examination committee: Prof. Dale C. Allison, Jr. (Pittsburgh Theological Seminary), Prof. Terence L. Donaldson (Wycliffe College), Prof. Leif E. Vaage (Emmanuel College), and Prof. Michael Steinhauser (Toronto School of Theology). Their careful reading of the dissertation, insightful suggestions for its improvement, and probing questions at the defense have been greatly appreciated.

Prof. Michael Kolarcik, S.J. (Regis College) and Prof. Andrew T. Lincoln (Cheltenham & Gloucester College) have also directed me to ways of improving this study, for which I am grateful. Others at TST have also contributed to this work, albeit less directly, by enriching my learning in other areas: in particular I mention the late Prof. John P. Egan, S.J. (Regis College) and Prof. Richard N. Longenecker (Wycliffe College, emeritus).

In addition, numerous scholars have been gracious with their time and with their own work, providing me with invaluable advice and with either difficult to find or unpublished materials: Alan Kirk, John Kloppenborg, Andy Reimer, James M. Robinson, Risto Uro, Dieter Zeller, and the members of the International Q Project. I also thank my friend and neighbour Hannu Aalto, who prepared for me an English translation of a Finnish essay by Risto Uro.

Finally, for her patience, encouragement, and constant support, I thank my wife, Patricia, to whom, along with our two children Matthew and James, this work is dedicated with love.

In abbreviations and matters of style, this work follows for the most part P. H. Alexander, et al., eds., *The SBL Handbook of Style: For Ancient Near Eastern, Biblical, and Early Christian Studies* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1999). English citations from the Hebrew Bible, the Apocrypha and the New Testament are taken from the *New Revised Standard Version*, though sometimes I have adapted the translation where necessary. English citations from the Sayings Gospel Q are taken from J. M. Robinson, P. Hoffmann, and J. S. Kloppenborg, eds., *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 1; Minneapolis: Fortress; Leuven: Leuven University Press and Peeters, 2000), again sometimes with slight adaptations.

Introduction

For the past hundred or more years, one of the pivotal issues in the ongoing discussion of Q's place in early Christianity has been its relationship to those circles for which the death and resurrection of Jesus were of fundamental kerygmatic significance. Some scholars have maintained that Q presumes a kerygmatic interpretation of Jesus' death and a belief in his resurrection. Taking this approach may enable Q to be fixed in relationship to other early Christian groups about which we have a more direct knowledge, but it also requires some explanation as to Q's apparent silence on these matters. On the other hand, others have argued that Q originated in a community which was interested in Jesus not as a dying and rising saviour, but rather as a sage whose sayings had soteriological importance. This approach offers an interpretation of Q's silence on the death and resurrection of Jesus but, without resurrection, has no means of explaining Q's understanding of the non-earthly Jesus, whose renewed presence as the "Coming One" or the "Son of man" apparently was expected by the community. Chapter One below begins with an assessment of previous scholarship on these and related issues, including the question of whether Q shows evidence of a knowledge of Jesus' death at all.

This dissertation takes as its starting point the view that Q could not have been ignorant of Jesus' death by crucifixion in Jerusalem. Numerous Q texts may be read with his death in view, though none of them explicitly refers to the death of *Jesus*. However, there appears to be evidence in Q's polemic against "this generation" that the rejection of Jesus was understood deuteronomistically by Q, that is, as an instance—perhaps even the paradigmatic instance—of the characteristic mistreatment and murder of prophets by Israel. If Q has an understanding of Jesus as a rejected and murdered prophet or emissary of God, but does not show evidence of a belief in his resurrection, then the problem of his post-mortem legitimation becomes more acute:

does Q have a theological expression of Jesus' post-mortem vindication and exaltation as the heavenly or eschatological Son of man? Chapter Two surveys scholarship on Q's "Jerusalem Lament" saying (Q 13:34-35¹ = Matt 23:37-39 par. Luke 13:34-35), because many of these issues converge in this pivotal text.

The main hypothesis of this dissertation is that a vestige of assumption theology is present in Q 13:34-35. This possibility was first noted in a 1985 essay by Dieter Zeller,² and has subsequently been taken up by a few others,³ but the implications of assumption theology in Q have not as yet been fully investigated. In the Jerusalem Lament, Jesus foretells his own disappearance or invisibility: "You will not see me until ..." (v. 35b), and the language used is similar to that of Hellenistic assumption accounts in both the Greco-Roman and Jewish traditions. The fact that this disappearance is only of a limited duration, ending when the acclamation "Blessed is the Coming One in the name of the Lord" is given, is suggestive of the correlation typical in ancient Judaism between assumption and eschatological function. Assumption, however, was usually considered a bodily removal of a person from earth to heaven while still alive. How, then, can assumption be considered a possible means of vindication for the *post-mortem* Jesus? There is a good deal of evidence from both Greco-Roman and Jewish sources that assumption language could be applied to someone who had died, as Chapter Three below argues. Possibly the most significant, though not the only, instance of such an application in the Jewish tradition, it will be argued, is the case of the righteous man (*dikaios*) in Wisdom of

¹ It is conventional to cite texts from Q according to their Lukan chapter and verse (i.e., Q 13:34-35 refers to the Q material used as the source for Matt 23:37-39 and Luke 13:34-35). This convention does not necessarily imply that Luke preserves the original wording or order of Q.

² D. Zeller, "Entrückung zur Ankunft als Menschensohn (Lk 13, 34f.; 11, 29f.)," in *À Cause de l'Évangile: Études sur les Synoptiques et les Actes offertes au P. Jacques Dupont, O.S.B. à l'occasion de son 70e anniversaire* (LD 123; Paris: Saint-André/Cerf, 1985), 513-30.

³ For literature, see below, pp. 83-4.

Solomon 2–5. Chapter Four offers a discussion of the implications of seeing a vestige of assumption theology in Q 13:35b for the saying as a whole.

The dissertation also argues, in Chapter Five, that three particular aspects of Q's Christology are made clearer with reference to assumption theology. First, Q's descriptions of an absent and returning master, or of an unseen and suddenly visible Son of man, can be re-evaluated in light of the correlation between assumption and the Parousia in Q 13:34–35. Second, the way in which Q understands the basis of the future vindication of the community can also be reconsidered, particularly given significant parallels between the non-earthly Jesus of Q and heavenly representative figures in Second Temple Jewish literature. Third, Q's depiction of Jesus as a recipient of revelation (Q 10:21–22) who apparently has foreknowledge of his assumption (Q 13:35b) has some interesting parallels in Jewish apocalyptic literature. In some writings, the seer receives divine revelation, including a foreknowledge of his assumption, and is told to use the intervening time to instruct the people of God. These parallels contribute to a reinterpretation of the eschatological and esoteric instruction of Q.

Finally, in order to offer some corroboration of the hypothesis that Q uses assumption theology, rather than resurrection theology, to express its belief in a vindicated and returning post-mortem Jesus, other texts from early Christianity suggestive of a similar view will also be investigated (Chapter Six). Some New Testament materials clearly conceive of Jesus' death and exaltation without explicit mention of the resurrection, and some apocryphal materials apparently speak of a departure, having limited similarities with assumption, of Jesus from the cross. However, the clearest text is Mark's "Empty Tomb" story (Mark 16:1–8), which describes the absence of Jesus' body from the tomb but narrates no appearances of the risen one. This raises

the possibility that the use of assumption to theologize the post-mortem vindication of Jesus, particularly in reference to his Parousia, had currency in a group other than the Q community.

Two major presuppositions of this study must be clarified here. First, regarding Q: it almost goes without saying that the present study proceeds from the supposition that the Two-Document Hypothesis (Mark and Q) offers the best account of the relationships among the Synoptic Gospels. Q is to be regarded as a lost documentary collection of the sayings of Jesus which was used independently by the authors of Matthew and Luke in the writing of their gospels.⁴ Q represents in some way the theological activity of a community whose relationship to other groups within early Christianity cannot be taken for granted, and at least in a limited sense should be understood as a "gospel" in its own right.⁵ Finally, although recent studies of the compositional history of Q have much to commend them,⁶ the present study will deal Q in its final form, that is, as far as it can be reconstructed from Matthew and Luke.⁷ The benefit of this approach lies chiefly in the fact that it affirms that the final form of Q is the result of intentional redactional work: this allows the crucial texts to stand in relationship to the whole document, so that even if materials such as Q 13:34-35 came to Q at a relatively late stage in its compositional

⁴ For a thorough discussion, see Christopher M. Tuckett, *Q and the History of Early Christianity: Studies on Q* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1996), 1-39; J. S. Kloppenborg Verbin, *Excavating Q: The History and Social Setting of the Sayings Gospel* (Minneapolis: Fortress; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 2000), 11-111.

⁵ See, for instance, J. S. Kloppenborg, "'Easter Faith' and the Sayings Gospel Q," in *The Apocryphal Jesus and Christian Origins* (ed. R. Cameron; Semeia 49; Atlanta: Scholars, 1990), 71-99, esp. 71; A. D. Jacobson, *The First Gospel: An Introduction to Q* (FFNT; Sonoma, Calif.: Polebridge, 1992), 19-32, esp. 30-32; F. Neirynck, "Q: From Source to Gospel," *ETL* 71 (1995): 421-30.

⁶ The most influential have been those of J. S. Kloppenborg, *The Formation of Q: Trajectories in Ancient Wisdom Collections* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987); M. Sato, *Q und Prophetie: Studien zur Gattungs- und Traditions-geschichte der Quelle Q* (WUNT 2/29; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1988).

⁷ In this work, issues related to the reconstruction of Q take as their starting point J. M. Robinson, P. Hoffmann, and J. S. Kloppenborg, eds., *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 1; Minneapolis: Fortress; Leuven: Leuven University Press and Peeters, 2000).

history, their influence in providing new contexts and even new interpretations to compositionally older materials may be fully appreciated. Issues of compositional history and the relative age of different Q materials will only be broached when important for interpretive reasons.

Second, with respect to Christian origins, models which allow for diversity at the point of origin are to be affirmed, rather than models which presume a unitary early Christian community or *Urgemeinde* back to which all developments may be traced. The literary evidence which survives seems to suggest that many of the various early Christian movements existed independently or in some degree of isolation from one another.⁸ Nevertheless, the possibility of contact and mutual influence will not be ruled out, either, for the evidence also suggests that shared perspectives and traditions were also in existence.

⁸ See first of all H. Koester, "ΤΝΩΜΑΙ ΔΙΑΦΟΡΟΙ: The Origin and Nature of Diversification in the History of Early Christianity," in J. M. Robinson and H. Koester, *Trajectories through Early Christianity* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1971), 114-57.

Chapter One: The Death of Jesus and Easter Faith in Q

A number of issues of great importance to the study of Q seem to converge in the proposed re-reading of Q 13:34-35, the “Jerusalem Lament.” First, since the saying has to do with the rejected appeals of God’s messengers to Jerusalem, the question of the death of Jesus—and Q’s knowledge and interpretation of it—is engaged. There are also ramifications for our understanding of Q’s relationship (or lack thereof) to those circles of early Christianity for which Jesus’ death and resurrection were of fundamental significance to both their origin and their ongoing mission and proclamation. The first section of this chapter therefore deals with the questions related to Q and the death of Jesus, and argues that Q is clearly different from what may be called “kerygmatic Christianity” in how it interprets Jesus’ death. Second, since the Jerusalem Lament and other Q materials look ahead to the return of Jesus as the “Coming One” or the “Son of man,” the question arises of how Q envisioned or theologized Jesus’ post-mortem or non-earthly existence. The second section treats the issue of Q and Easter, and demonstrates that in the absence of any clear indication that Q knew or presupposed resurrection theology, other ways of accounting for the belief in Jesus as the coming Son of man and for the ongoing legitimacy of his sayings must be entertained.

1.1: Q and the Death of Jesus

Practically since Q first came to be recognized as a document in its own right,¹ a major topic of discussion has been the relationship between Q and those spheres of early Christianity for which the death and resurrection of Jesus were of primary importance. Because the double tradition material does not extend to the Synoptic passion narratives, it has generally been agreed that Q did not contain such a narrative, although some have argued otherwise. Without any compelling reason to assign passion material to Q, scholars have still felt the need to account for the absence of such material, especially because Q on this basis would have the appearance of an anomaly at the point of Christianity's origins. In order to eliminate the problem of an anomalous Q, some argued that the document originally had a supplementary purpose, in which case its framers presumed the main tenets of kerygmatic Christianity but did not refer explicitly to them. Others argued that the absence of passion material in Q resulted from the document's chronologically, or geographically, or generically limited scope.

With the rise of redaction criticism, however, there came the possibility that Q in fact represented a distinct sphere of early Christianity, possibly one with a completely unique understanding of the significance of Jesus. Thus there is widespread agreement that Q does not contain, or even presume, a salvific understanding of Jesus' death. Nevertheless, for some the temptation has remained to see the idea of the death of Jesus, or even his resurrection, lurking in the background of Q—whether the death of Jesus is presupposed in Q's understanding of

¹ Up until the the early years of this century Q was treated "more as a convenient postulate which facilitated certain explanations of the Synoptic problem than as a monument attesting to a particular moment or moments in the history of early Christianity" (J. S. Kloppenborg and L. E. Vaage, "Early Christianity, Q and Jesus: The Sayings Gospel and Method in the Study of Christian Origins," in *Early Christianity, Q and Jesus* [ed. J. S. Kloppenborg with L. E. Vaage: Semeia 55; Atlanta: Scholars, 1991], 1-14: quotation from 3).

persecution and failure of mission, or his resurrection as an implicit christological cognition. For others, however, Q represents a Jesus-movement entirely independent of other movements in early Christianity, a movement whose interest lay entirely in Jesus' teachings and for which the death of Jesus was neither theologoumenon nor problem.² This section deals with the question of Q's knowledge and interpretation of the death of Jesus; the closely related question of whether Q presumes or shows evidence of any kind of resurrection faith will be treated in the following section on "Q, Easter, and the Son of Man."

1.1.1. A Passion Narrative in Q?

The earliest discussions of the contents of Q either recognized the fact that the document contained no passion narrative, or sought some reason why, if it had contained passion material, it had left no trace in the passion narratives of Matthew and Luke. In either case the central issue was the distinctiveness of Q—whether or not it was a "gospel." Early on (1889), Bernhard Weiß could observe that Q's lack of a passion narrative was a result of its peculiar character as a document: "a history of the passion ... could not possibly be given without a continuous historical narrative, such as our source neither offered nor was intended to offer."³ Weiß went on to argue that there would be no point in the "oldest source" (as he called Q) giving the events of Jesus' trial and death, since those facts were "universally known." The oldest source fixed the recollections of the primitive apostles in a written form, and was "practically intended for

² The most recent and thorough survey of the question is that of Kloppenborg, *Excavating Q*, 353-79.

³ B. Weiß, *A Manual of Introduction to the New Testament* (trans. A. J. K. Davidson; 2 vol.; New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1887-89), 2.238.

purposes of instruction and edification.”⁴ Thus Weiß saw Q as originating in the primitive Christian community and having a supplemental place alongside the facts of Jesus’ passion. This was to become a common explanation for Q’s lack of passion material.

The earliest attempts to argue that Q did contain passion material or a passion narrative came as responses to the possibility that such an early source could not be considered a “gospel,” that is, a biographical narrative with a Christological emphasis on Jesus’ suffering, death and resurrection. Adolf Jülicher concluded (1904) that Q was not a “complete Gospel like that of Mark,” since “there appears no trace of it in the stories of the Passion and Resurrection.” Ruled out as a gospel, then, Q was viewed by Jülicher as a sayings collection “composed without any exercise of conscious art,” except that the sayings had been joined at times on the basis of internal connections.⁵

Similarly for F. C. Burkitt (1906), the question of a Q passion narrative was “practically equivalent to asking whether Q was a ‘Gospel,’ ... or a mere collection of sayings.”⁶ Unlike Jülicher, however, Burkitt seemed intent on recovering gospel status for Q. He argued that after the Last Supper, Luke no longer uses Mark as the basis of his narrative, and asked “whether this narrative of the Passion may not have been derived from the same source as most of Luke’s non-Markan material, *i.e.* from Q itself.”⁷ Burkitt provided as evidence material found in Luke 22:15-16; 24-32; 35-38.⁸ But Luke 22:15-16, 35-38 is *Sondergut*, and 22:24-27 depends upon Mark. George Castor (1912) pointed out that the *Sondergut* appealed to here “is much more closely

⁴ Ibid., 2.239.

⁵ A. Jülicher, *An Introduction to the New Testament* (trans. J. P. Ward; London: Smith, Elder, 1904), 356.

⁶ F. C. Burkitt, *The Gospel History and Its Transmission* (2nd ed.; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1907), 132.

⁷ Ibid., 134. See also Burkitt, *The Earliest Sources of the Life of Jesus* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1910), 110.

⁸ Burkitt, *Earliest Sources*, 113 n.1. See also *Gospel History*, 135.

related to the narratives peculiar to Luke that have preceded than to the common material of Q.”⁹ Furthermore, as Wilhelm Bussmann noted, what remains is not directly related to the death or resurrection of Jesus: it is merely found in a passion context in Luke.¹⁰

Most other attempts to argue for a Q passion narrative also concentrated attention on *Sondergut*. J. Vernon Bartlet, for instance, argued (1911) that in the trial before the Sanhedrin (Mark 14:53-65; Matt 26:57-68; Luke 22:54-71), both Matthew and Luke “show traces of partial independence from Mark,” which Bartlet suggested is evidence of the influence of Q.¹¹ Bartlet’s arguments show a marked preference for assigning even unique departures from Mark in Matthew and Luke to the Q source, in particular Matthew’s use of the historic present, which typically he avoids when working from Mark.¹² And since Matthew and Luke’s individual variations from Mark seemed to Bartlet to show a kind of coherence, he concluded that “if Q contained any part of the Passion story, it must have contained it all in outline, seeing that it hangs together.”¹³ Bartlet also held that Q in its earliest (“basal”) form was oral tradition which influenced, through apostolic mediation, all three Synoptic evangelists.¹⁴

⁹ G. D. Castor, *Matthew’s Sayings of Jesus: The Non-Markan Common Source of Matthew and Luke* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1918), 159. (Castor’s book was completed in 1912 but published post-humously in 1918.)

¹⁰ “Aber gleichviel, wenn es auch und die oben genannten Stücke alle in R [Q] gestanden haben, sie lass sich alle sehr gut denken als vor der Zeit der Passion gesprochen und haben nichts mit ihr zu tun” (Bussmann, *Zur Redenquelle*. Vol. 2 of *Synoptische Studien* [Halle: Waisenhaus, 1929], 116-7). Bussmann is referring to the work of B. Weiß. See also Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 85-6.

¹¹ J. V. Bartlet, “The Sources of St. Luke’s Gospel,” in *Studies in the Synoptic Problem by Members of the University of Oxford* (ed. W. Sanday; Oxford: Clarendon, 1911), 314-63; here, 332.

¹² *Ibid.*, 332-3.

¹³ *Ibid.*, 333.

¹⁴ See Bartlet’s diagram (*ibid.*, 363).

In 1941, Emanuel Hirsch made a more concerted argument for a Q passion narrative: he adduced more material from Luke 22 (and the parallels in Matthew) in support of his view.¹⁵ In Hirsch's view the agreements of Matthew and Luke against Mark in this chapter—in Matt 27:75 par. Luke 22:62, Matt 26:68 par. Luke 22:64, and Matt 26:64 par. Luke 22:69 (Matthew ἅπ' ἄρτι, Luke ἀπο τοῦ νῦν)—provide a somewhat stronger basis for a Q passion. According to John Kloppenborg, however, "since this is rather meager evidence upon which to build a continuous narrative, Hirsch was obliged to suppose that in other respects the Q passion account resembled that of Mark."¹⁶

Walter Bundy suggested (1955) that Luke used a written source for his non-Markan passion material, and that "there is evidence to support the conjecture" that Luke used "the Q version of the death drama."¹⁷ Q contained materials from the beginning of the story of Jesus, so "it must also have included what was much more important, the passion story." Like others Bundy understood this as evidence that "Q was much more of a Gospel than is generally supposed." As a possible argument against a Q passion narrative, Bundy noted that Matthew has in his passion narrative no non-Markan material in common with Luke. In reply Bundy asserted that Matthew "may simply have preferred Mark to Q in the death drama."¹⁸ The expansion of the Last Supper scene (Luke 22:24-38) contains clear traces of Q, in particular 22:25-27, 28-30, 35-36—the same materials Burkitt thought belonged to the Q passion narrative.

¹⁵ E. Hirsch, *Die Frühgeschichte des Evangeliums II: Die Vorlagen des Lukas und das Sondergut des Matthäus* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1941), 245-8: Hirsch saw the influence of a Q passion narrative in Luke 22:48, 62, 64, 69-70; 24:47.

¹⁶ Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 86. See Hirsch, *Frühgeschichte*, 2:248.

¹⁷ W. E. Bundy, *Jesus and the First Three Gospels* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1955), 481.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*

Recently, the possibility of a passion narrative in Q has been taken up again in an essay by Eric Franklin (1998).¹⁹ For the most part, Franklin's discussion focusses on the minor agreements—and narrative agreements—between Matthew and Luke, and upon Lukan *Sondergut*, in order to build a case that Luke's passion narrative is in fact that of Q. Though he approaches the question in a manner similar to the studies of Burkitt and the others just discussed, Franklin is not oblivious to the advances made recently in Q scholarship. For instance, he appears to agree that passion *kerygma* is absent from Q, but insists that this is not a problem for his argument, since the kind of kerygmatic statements about the soteriological significance of Jesus' death and resurrection are absent as well from Luke's passion narrative.²⁰

Such views have been the minority, however: it has been almost unanimously thought that Q contained no passion narrative,²¹ although some have found its absence in Q to be reason for doubting the existence of Q as a document,²² and a few scholars are reluctant to rule out the

¹⁹ E. Franklin, "A Passion Narrative for Q?," in *Understanding, Studying and Reading: New Testament Essays in Honour of John Ashton* (ed. C. Rowland and C. Fletcher-Louis; JSNTSup 153; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1998), 30–47.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 43.

²¹ So, for instance, B. H. Streeter: "That the original Q contained an account of the Passion so rich in details not in Mark as this, and that Matthew simply neglects it, is in view of Matthew's careful mosaic method of working, and his few omissions from Mark, incredible" ("The Original Extent of Q," in *Studies in the Synoptic Problem*, 184–208, quotation from 203; also B. H. Streeter, *The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins* [London: MacMillan, 1924], 292). See also V. H. Stanton, *The Gospels as Historical Documents*, Vol. 2: *The Synoptic Gospels* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1909), 105.

²² W. L. Knox, for instance, taking the absence of passion material as reason for doubting the existence of Q as a document, preferred instead to think of Q as a "chance conflation of shorter tracts" which were originally independent (W. L. Knox, *The Sources of the Synoptic Gospels*, Vol. 2: *St. Luke and St. Matthew* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1957], 3–5, quotation from 5).

Proponents of source theories other than the Two Document Hypothesis have shared a similar view. See A. M. Farrer, "On Dispensing with Q," in *Studies in the Gospels: Essays in Memory of R. H. Lightfoot* (ed. D. E. Nineham; Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1955), 55–88, and W. R. Farmer, *The Gospel of Jesus: The Pastoral Relevance of the Synoptic Problem* (Louisville KY: Westminster/John Knox, 1994). Farrer thought it unlikely that a document that began biographically should end without a passion narrative ("Dispensing with Q," 59–60). Farmer, on the other hand, saw recent interest in Q as somewhat more insidious: "The effort [investigation of Q's theology] has far-reaching consequences when Q is parlayed with Gnostic sources like *Thomas* into fanciful reconstructions, that imply the existence of a primitive apostolic community for which the death and resurrection of Jesus was (contrary to the New Testament) of little or no importance" (*Gospel of Jesus*, 169).

possibility of a Q passion narrative altogether.²³ The discussion has therefore by and large focussed on a few central issues. First, why did Q contain no passion narrative? Solutions have been sought, generally speaking, either in the nature or purpose of Q as a document or in the beliefs or the theology of the community responsible for Q. Closely related is a second issue, whether or not Q shows evidence of a knowledge of or interest in Jesus' death. Q materials that describe the suffering or persecution associated with discipleship or with the rejection of God's envoys imply, according to some scholars, a knowledge of the fact and means of Jesus' death.

1.1.2. Why Q Lacks a Passion Narrative

1.1.2.1 The Nature and Function of Q

Adolf von Harnack argued against a Q passion narrative in his monograph *Sprüche und Reden Jesu* (1907 [1908]). "The Passion and all references to the Passion are absent from Q," he wrote, and concluded that since this "main theme" of the Synoptic Gospels was not present in Q, it "was not a gospel at all in the sense that the Synoptics are."²⁴ This lack of passion material meant that Q was a document without any historical climax or continuity at all: "Thus Q in the main could only have been a compilation of sayings and discourses of varied content."²⁵ In fact, the lack of any reference to the passion—and the fact that Jerusalem is only mentioned once (Q 13:34)—meant for Harnack that the document's "horizon" was "absolutely bounded by

²³ For instance, N. T. Wright insists that the possibility that Q contained a passion narrative cannot be dismissed, and yet leans towards Luke's use of Matthew to explain the double tradition material (N. T. Wright, *The New Testament and the People of God* [Christian Origins and the Question of God I: Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992], 441).

²⁴ A. Harnack, *The Sayings of Jesus: The Second Source of St. Matthew and St. Luke* (New York: Putnam; London: Williams & Norgate, 1908), 170.

²⁵ *Ibid.*

Galilee.”²⁶ Harnack seems to have concluded from its lack of passion material that Q did not have any “clearly discernible bias, whether apologetic, didactic, ecclesiastical, national, or anti-national.”²⁷ Its only purpose could have been to give “the main features of our Lord’s relationship with his environment.”²⁸

In *Luke the Physician* (1908), W. M. Ramsay responded to Harnack by arguing that Q lacks passion material because it was written during the life of Jesus. According to Ramsay, Harnack rightly reconstructed Q only from that material which is common to Matthew and Luke.²⁹ Harnack was also correct that “the teaching of Q is inconsistent with the idea that ... the death of Jesus [is] the fundamental fact in the Gospel.”³⁰ But, said Ramsay, this is inconsistent with what we know of early Christianity: “The central and determining factor which makes the Christian religion is wanting, and the want of it is not felt by the author.” Therefore, Q could not have been written after Pentecost. “when the disciples ... began to understand the true nature of the Gospel,” so that Q must be “a document practically contemporary with the facts,” before those facts “had begun to be properly understood by even the most intelligent eyewitnesses.”³¹

²⁶ J. C. Hawkins likewise thought it probable that “there was an intention of limiting the collection of sayings in Q to those which were spoken during the period of the Galilean and itinerant Ministry of Jesus, as distinct from the period described in the Passion-narratives” (“Probabilities as to the So-Called Double Tradition of St. Matthew and St. Luke,” in *Studies in the Synoptic Problem*, 95-138, quotation from 129).

²⁷ Harnack, *Sayings of Jesus*, 171. He also concluded—without substantial argument—that the “extraordinary circumstance” that Q lacks any mention of the death and resurrection of Jesus “proves at all events that we have to do with a very ancient compilation” (ibid., 233).

²⁸ Ibid., 171-2. Edward P. Meadors is a more recent proponent of a similar perspective: he thinks that Q is comprised of authentic material from Jesus’ Galilean ministry. “If the *Sitz im Leben Jesu* of the Q material was early or midway into Jesus’ ministry, we would hardly expect it to include passion terminology, if its transmitters were conservative redactors, as we believe they were.” Thus, passion materials including “interpretative statements about Jesus’ death are absent in Q possibly because Jesus did not emphasize his own death until relatively late in his ministry” (E. P. Meadors, *Jesus the Messianic Herald of Salvation* [WUNT 2/72; Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1995], 314).

²⁹ W. M. Ramsay, *Luke the Physician, and Other Studies in the History of Religion* (London: Hodder, 1908), 84.

³⁰ Ibid., 85-6.

³¹ Ibid., 89. See also P. Pokorný, *The Genesis of Christology* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1987), 90: “The beginnings of the collection of the sayings of Jesus reach back to the time before Easter. ... [T]he consciousness that the words

Like Ramsay, B. H. Streeter (1911) argued on the basis of its lack of passion material that Q was written at an early date (though not during the life of Jesus). According to Streeter, Q contains no passion material since “[a]t that period and in that non-literary society of Palestinian peasants *only that was written down which one would be likely to forget*,” and no one was likely to forget the death and resurrection of Jesus. These events “Q presupposes as a matter of common knowledge.” Thus Q was written soon after Jesus’ death, in order “to supplement the living tradition of a generation which had known Christ.”³² Julius Wellhausen, however, argued (1911) that a later date for Q was the reason for its lack of passion material—though like others he believed Q’s purpose was supplemental. Fundamental to Wellhausen’s position was his view that Q was dependent on Mark, so that the former presupposed the narrative material of the latter, including the passion material. As a “didactic” source, “it omits the narrative intentionally. ... Thus it is not out of the question that it presupposes and attempts to elaborate on Mark.”³³

This view of Q as a supplementary sayings collection that presupposed the basic elements of kerygmatic Christianity would be, at least until the work of Heinz E. Tödt,³⁴ and sometimes even since then, the standard reason given for Q’s lack of passion material or narrative.

of the earthly Jesus operated as a certain norm for further tradition was kept alive.” For this reason, in Pokorný’s view, “typical post-Easter themes—such as baptism, the breaking of bread, the forgiveness of sins, the suffering and death of Jesus” are absent from Q (ibid.). The same view is also espoused by Athanasius Polag (“The Theological Center of the Sayings Source,” in *The Gospel and the Gospels* [ed. P. Stuhlmacher; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1991], 97-105, esp. 102) and Martin Hengel (“Jesus as Messianic Teacher of Wisdom and the Beginnings of Christology,” in *Studies in Early Christology* [Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1995], 73-117, esp. 76).

³² B. H. Streeter, “The Literary Evolution of the Gospels,” in *Studies in the Synoptic Problem*, 209-27, citation from 215; emphasis original. See also Streeter, *Four Gospels*, 292: “The Passion and its redemptive significance could readily be taught in oral tradition. But ethical teaching implies detailed instruction which sooner or later necessitates a written document. Such a document is found in the Didache, which obviously presupposes a general knowledge of the central facts of the Christian story. Similarly Q was probably written to *supplement* an oral tradition.”

³³ J. Wellhausen, *Einleitung in die ersten drei Evangelien* (2nd rev. ed.; Berlin: Georg Reimer, 1911), 159-60 (cited in translation in Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 14).

³⁴ H. E. Tödt, *Der Menschensohn in der synoptischen Überlieferungen* (Gütersloh: G. Mohn, 1959, 1963²); ET *The Son of Man in the Synoptic Tradition* (London: SCM Press, 1965).

Typically, assumptions were made from the contents or limits of the Q material concerning the function the document could have had within the early Christian community; but such a function would always be understood as supplementary alongside the proclamation of Jesus' salvific death and resurrection, which was presumed to have been of fundamental significance for the early Christian community.³⁵

The work of three scholars—B. H. Streeter, Martin Dibelius, and T. W. Manson—may be considered representative of this view.³⁶ In a later work (1924) Streeter argued that Q was compiled as an ethical supplement to an oral passion kerygma. Fundamental to this view was Streeter's distinction between the teachings of Jesus and the proclamation about his death and resurrection: while the latter were easily transmitted orally, the former specifically required *literary* preservation since they did not admit of oral transmission as easily as kerygmata did.³⁷ Yet because he insisted that Q was a supplementary document that presupposed the passion kerygma, and also that for Q the Parousia was central and not the passion,³⁸ Streeter's presentation involved a certain tension: "Q had an understanding of soteriology which was at variance with the passion kerygma, the alleged centre of Christian theology. In what sense, then, can it be regarded as a supplement to the kerygma?"³⁹

Martin Dibelius associated the compilation of Q with the ethical crisis occasioned by the delay of the Parousia. Q was in his view a paraenetic (or halakhic) supplement to the basic

³⁵ See the discussion in Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 14-22.

³⁶ Tödt, *Son of Man*, 238-46; see also Kloppenborg, "Easter Faith," 71-2.

³⁷ Streeter, *Four Gospels*, 292.

³⁸ *Ibid.*

³⁹ Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 22.

kerygma.⁴⁰ The purpose of the Q material “is not to deal with the life of Jesus, but to give his words in order that they may be followed and in order that they may instruct.”⁴¹ Dibelius also considered that Q’s silence on the passion was a function of its non-narrative character. Kerygma and passion necessarily go together in a narrative-biographical framework, and Q is “little else than speeches, mostly indeed isolated, i.e., sayings without context.”⁴²

T. W. Manson took a similar view: he thought that four motives could be suggested for the compilation of the sayings material in Q, the chief of which was “the pastoral care of the churches.” Not surprisingly he suggested that “there is no Passion-story [in Q] because none is required, Q being a book of instruction for people who are already Christians and know the story of the Cross by heart.”⁴³ Like Streeter, however, Manson apparently sensed that Q was at odds with other early Christian writings for which the passion kerygma was central. Two streams of tradition were in existence, which eventually came together in Matthew and Luke: first, that tradition which held the passion and resurrection of Jesus to be central, and which was expressed in a biographical format (the gospel of Mark); and second, that tradition for which the sayings of an authoritative teacher were fundamental (Q).⁴⁴ In Tödt’s view, Manson presents a problematic description of Q “because from this point of view it cannot clearly be discerned how Q and the passion kerygma are related to each other.”⁴⁵

⁴⁰ M. Dibelius, *From Tradition to Gospel* (trans. B. L. Woolf; New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1935), 28, 238.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 245.

⁴² *Ibid.*, 244.

⁴³ T. W. Manson, *The Sayings of Jesus: As recorded in the Gospels according to St. Matthew and St. Luke arranged with Introduction and Commentary* (London: SCM, 1937), 16.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 11. Interestingly, Manson alluded to Mark 1:22,27 in his description of Q: “the record of the sayings of a Teacher who astonished the multitudes because He taught with authority and not as their Scribes” (*ibid.*)

⁴⁵ Tödt, *Son of Man*, 244.

Tödt, however, arrived at the following conclusion: "... the primary motive to preserve and collect this material appears not to have been a need of exhortation and to have been by no means dependent on the passion kerygma."⁴⁶ This was because the Q material both formally and conceptually was oriented not to the passion kerygma, as an ethical or paraenetic supplement, but to the ongoing proclamation of the kingdom announced by Jesus. Thus Tödt imagined Q to represent a community whose proclamation was not passion and resurrection but the teachings of Jesus. His famous conclusion:

There are two spheres of tradition, distinguished both by their concepts and by their history. The centre of the one sphere is the passion kerygma; the centre of the other is the intention to take up again the teaching of what Jesus had taught. The Q material belongs to the second sphere.⁴⁷

Besides differing in what they proclaimed, the two spheres also differ more fundamentally in the nature of their christological cognitions. The first sphere's Christology was, obviously, oriented to the passion and resurrection, but Q's is a Son of man Christology in which Jesus' pre-Easter authority (and of course his own proclamation) is validated through the post-Easter identification of Jesus and the Son of man.⁴⁸ This is what permitted the Q community to take up Jesus' proclamation as their own.

However, the two spheres appear to orbit the same sun, as it were, for the passion and resurrection must have had foundational significance for Q as well: "Without recognizing this foundation [viz., the events of the passion and resurrection] a community would not have been established at all."⁴⁹ In fact, precisely because it is the *resurrection* that confirms Jesus as the

⁴⁶ Ibid., 247.

⁴⁷ Ibid., 268.

⁴⁸ Ibid., 252-3.

⁴⁹ Ibid., 250.

coming Son of man and establishes the authority of his sayings, “as understood by this community, the passion and resurrection were not what had to be preached but what had enabled them to preach.”⁵⁰ The work of Tödt must be considered a ground-breaking achievement for the study of Q, for it established that the document, and the community and theology it represents, is of independent interest for the study of Christian origins. Nevertheless, in Tödt’s work Q remains within the orbit of kerygmatic Christianity.⁵¹

Taking their cue from the mission instructions in Q 10:2-12, Ernst Käsemann⁵² and Odil H. Steck⁵³ viewed Q as originating in a specifically mission-oriented *Sitz im Leben* within a community which knew and presumed the passion and resurrection traditions.⁵⁴ Steck saw Q as containing many different types of material all of which had some kind of use with respect to mission: instruction and exhortation for the missionaries, paraenesis for their converts, and woes

⁵⁰ Ibid.

⁵¹ See the criticisms of Jacobson, *First Gospel*, 28-30. In particular Jacobson focusses on Tödt’s assumption of a monolithic early Christian movement: “it has become increasingly clear that we have to reckon with a multiplicity of independent movements in the emergence of both Judaism and Christianity” (ibid., 29). In Jacobson’s view it is this assumption which—in spite of Tödt’s affirmations concerning Q as a “second sphere”—forced Tödt to “[bring] passion and resurrection in through the back door” (ibid., 28).

Ulrich Wilckens took a similar approach to that of Tödt. In Wilckens’ view, the Q material derived from the Jerusalem community which took up Jesus’ proclamation as their own but which also knew Jesus’ death and resurrection as the founding event of their community. The Jerusalem community used the sayings tradition halakhically and a pre-Synoptic passion narrative liturgically (Wilckens, “Jesusüberlieferung und Christuskerygma: zwei Wege urchristlicher Überlieferungsgeschichte,” *Theologia Viatorum* 10 [1965-66]: 310-39 = “The Tradition-History of the Resurrection of Jesus,” in *The Significance of the Resurrection for Faith in Jesus Christ* [ed. C. F. D. Moule; SBT 2/8; London: SCM, 1968], 51-76, esp. 72-3). See Kloppenborg, “Easter Faith,” 73.

⁵² E. Käsemann, “On the Subject of Primitive Christian Apocalyptic,” in *New Testament Questions of Today* (London: SCM, 1969), 108-37, esp. 119.

⁵³ O. H. Steck, *Israel und das gewaltsame Geschick der Propheten: Untersuchungen zur Überlieferung des deuteronomischen Geschichtsbildes im Alten Testament, Spätjudentum und Urchristentum* (WMANT 23; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1967), 288.

⁵⁴ See Kloppenborg, “Easter Faith,” 73-4.

and threats for those who rejected the message.⁵⁵ However, Kloppenborg has shown that the materials which precede and follow Q's mission instructions "reflect a broader ecclesial *Sitz*," and serve a legitimating function for the community as a whole (and not just its missionary endeavours).⁵⁶ Efforts to place Q within the locus of kerygmatic Christianity have by and large not been able to account fully for the document's shape and theology, and appeals to the kerygma as the supposed foundational moment of the Q community remain assumptions. For this reason, Kloppenborg could speak of earlier scholarship's "subordination" of Q to the kerygma,⁵⁷ and Arland Hultgren could warn against "the habit of measuring all forms of proclamation in light of the Pauline kerygma."⁵⁸

1.1.2.2. The Genre of Q

A few scholars have sought a reason for Q's silence on the death and resurrection of Jesus not in its function or purpose but in its genre. Migaku Sato, who argued for a prophetic rather than a sapiential genre for Q, suggested that accordingly Q as a prophetic book would not have described Jesus' death.

In fact, the narration of a prophet's death does not belong to the macro-genre of the prophetic book. *The Source Q*, which was deliberately arranged in analogy with the prophetic book, *thus probably contained no passion narrative because it was a prophetic book*.⁵⁹

⁵⁵ Steck, *Israel*, 288.

⁵⁶ Kloppenborg, "Easter Faith," 75.

⁵⁷ Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 14-22. See also R. A. Edwards, *A Theology of Q: Eschatology, Prophecy and Wisdom* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1976), 149: against those who presume the priority of the kerygma with respect to Q Edwards states, "Such a monolithic understanding of early Christian theology is in error."

⁵⁸ A. Hultgren, *The Rise of Normative Christianity* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1994), 38. Hultgren insists however that although Q does not "[reflect] on the meaning of [Jesus'] death and resurrection along Pauline lines," the community owed its very existence to the "events that had taken place—the ministry, death and resurrection of Jesus, followed by the Spirit's coming and vitality among its members."

⁵⁹ "Tatsache ist aber, daß die Erzählung des Todes des Propheten nicht zur Makrogattung "Prophetenbuch" gehört. Die Quelle Q, die wohl bewußt in Analogie zum Prophetenbuch gestaltet worden ist, hat also wahrscheinlich

But for Sato this means that Q need not be understood as representing “ein bestimmter urchristlicher Kreis.” In fact, “der Q-Kreis mehr gewußt haben muß als er in der Quelle Q gesammelt hat. Ja, alle engeren Jünger Jesu *müssen* etwas davon zu erzählen imstande gewesen sein, wie Jesus starb und was danach geschah.”⁶⁰ Sato’s observation is apt, but more will be said below on the argument that the document Q cannot contain everything its framers knew or believed.

In his 1990 article “‘Easter Faith’ and the Sayings Gospel Q,” Kloppenborg suggested that it would be “tempting” to try to explain the absence of passion theology in Q on the basis of its sapiential genre: “Sapiential collections normally do not concern themselves with the death of a teacher.”⁶¹ However, Q is unlike most other sapiential collections in its “biographical cast,” and furthermore, since its temporal frame stretches from the ministry of John to the missionary activity of the disciples, “Q’s narrative world embraces the temporal range within which Jesus’ death could be placed.”⁶² The answer, argued Kloppenborg, is to be found not in the genre of Q but in its view of persecution, which is governed by deuteronomistic theology. “To put matters a bit baldly, Q democratizes Jesus’ death by means of deuteronomistic theology, or, more accurately, Q has not yet particularized that death by emplotting it and interpreting it apologetically with motifs drawn from the psalms of lament.”⁶³

deswegen keine Passionerzählung enthalten, weil sie ein Prophetenbuch sein wollte” (Sato, *Q und Prophetie*, 383: emphasis original).

⁶⁰ Ibid.

⁶¹ Kloppenborg, “Easter Faith,” 82.

⁶² Ibid.

⁶³ Ibid.

1.1.2.3. The Deuteronomistic Theme and the Wisdom Theology of Q

Others before Kloppenborg had argued that Q's lack of explicit reference to the death of Jesus resulted from its interpretation of his death within the framework of the deuteronomistic theme of the rejection of prophets. The view is widely held.⁶⁴ James Robinson, for instance, following Steck's view concerning the convergence of wisdom and deuteronomistic traditions in Q 11:49-51 and 13:34-35,⁶⁵ related Q 13:35 to the death of Jesus. Robinson argued that "the theme that Wisdom is so regularly rejected on earth she finally returns to heaven,"⁶⁶ under the influence of the deuteronomistic view of history appropriated in Q's "judgmental apocalyptic context," becomes the view that Jesus' death was "only the culminating instance of the rejection of God's spokesmen by Israel."⁶⁷ Similarly, Arland Jacobson thinks "the absence of a passion narrative in Q becomes understandable because, in the deuteronomistic tradition, Jesus' death

⁶⁴ For instance, Steck, *Israel*, 288-9; P. Hoffmann, *Studien zur Theologie der Logienquelle* (3rd ed.; NTAbh 8; Münster: Aschendorff, 1982), 170-1; S. Schulz, *Q: Die Spruchquelle der Evangelisten* (Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1972), 343; A. D. Jacobson, "The Literary Unity of Q," *JBL* 101 (1982): 365-89, esp. 386; R. J. Miller, "The Rejection of the Prophets in Q," *JBL* 107 (1988): 225-40; D. Lührmann, "The Gospel of Mark and the Sayings Collection Q," *JBL* 108 (1989): 51-71, esp. 64.

For a counter-example, see Meadors, *Messianic Herald*, 296-307. Meadors hesitates because he seems to think that the deuteronomistic argument is advanced in order to be able to claim that "Jesus' death within Q has the same significance as that of the OT prophets who died before him—and no more" (ibid., 297), or that "Jesus is on par ontologically" with other rejected/murdered prophets (ibid., 300). Against Meadors it must be affirmed that the problem is Q's lack of a kerygmatic interpretation of Jesus' death; it is most certainly not a question of the divinity of Christ. With respect to the view that the deuteronomistic perspective is the basis of a non-kerygmatic approach to the death of Jesus, Meadors asks whether Q contradicts "the early church's proclamation that Jesus died as an atoning sacrifice for the forgiveness of sins" (ibid., 303). For more on the issue of the argumentative role of the silence of Q, see below, pp. 26-8.

⁶⁵ Steck, *Israel*, 226-7, 232. Steck thought that the convergence occurred in the pre-Christian *Vorlage* of these sayings; Tuckett, on the other hand, thinks that Q is responsible for this "new combination" (Q, 170). Steck did not think the Jerusalem Lament was in Q; for a summary of his appraisal of Q 13:34-35 see below, pp. 65-7.

⁶⁶ See *1 En.* 42:1-2.

⁶⁷ J. M. Robinson, "Jesus as Sophos and Sophia: Wisdom Tradition and the Gospels," in *Aspects of Wisdom in Judaism and Early Christianity* (ed. R. L. Wilken; South Bend, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1975), 1-16; here, 12-3.

was understood not as a salvific act but as evidence of Israel's continuing impenitence."⁶⁸

Hermann von Lips, emphasizing the wisdom theme, thinks that Jesus' death comes to signify the nearness of salvation for the Q community, for as the disappearance of Wisdom (Q 13:35b) it inaugurates the final events of history which culminate in the Parousia.⁶⁹

Where some of these treatments begin to differ from one another, however, is in the extent to which the death of Jesus is understood as the (implied) "culminating instance." Kloppenborg said that because of the corporate view of persecution in Q, "Jesus' fate evidently was not yet an issue which required special comment."⁷⁰ Certainly there is no explicit "special comment" in Q to the effect that Jesus' rejection is decisive, but many have made such an inference. Most notable is Paul Hoffmann, who thought that in and of itself the deuteronomistic approach to Jesus' death means that for Q "Jesu Geschick lag vielmehr auf einer Linie mit dem Geschick *aller* Boten der Weisheit. ... Deswegen spricht Q von seiner Ablehnung nur in Zusammenhang mit dem Geschick der anderen."⁷¹ However, under the influence of the "Menschensohn-Bekenntnis," "Q qualifizierte schon den 'Boten' Jesus in einmaliger, unvergleichlicher Weise, indem sie ihn mit dem Menschensohn identifizierte."⁷² In fact, when the rejected one is identified with the Coming One (Q 13:35b), "the traditional deuteronomistic

⁶⁸ Jacobson, "Literary Unity," 386; *First Gospel*, 74. See also Schulz, *Spruchquelle*, 354; H. Kessler, *Die theologische Bedeutung des Todes Jesu: Eine traditionsgehistorische Untersuchung* (Themen und Thesen der Theologie; Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1970), 238-9.

⁶⁹ H. von Lips, *Weisheitliche Traditionen im Neuen Testament* (WMANT 64; München: Neukirchener, 1990), 278: "Mit dem Tod Jesu (als letztem und entscheidendem Boten) ist die Weisheit verschwunden, die Zeit der Endereignisse hat begonnen, dann kommt der Menschensohn (oder Messias) zum Gericht. ... Dann aber könnte für die Q-Gemeinde der Tod Jesu auch Hinweis auf die Nähe des kommenden Heils sein, ohne als Tod selbst Heilsbedeutung zu haben."

⁷⁰ Kloppenborg, "Easter Faith," 81. But see now his *Excavating Q*, 373: "... it seems plausible that Q understands Jesus' death as an instance of the 'typical'—*perhaps climactic*—prophetic death" (emphasis added).

⁷¹ Hoffmann, *Studien*, 188; emphasis original.

⁷² *Ibid.*, 189. See also P. Hoffmann, "Jesusverkündigung in der Logienquelle," in *Jesus in den Evangelien* (ed. W. Pesch; SBS 45; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1970), 50-70, esp. 65.

framework is blown apart under the influence of the expectation of the return of Jesus ... who for [the redaction of *Q*] is the decisive representative of God's end-time action."⁷³

Others who see the rejection of Jesus as the culminating instance of Israel's rejection of the prophets include Elisabeth Sevenich-Bax and Christopher Tuckett.⁷⁴ The problem arises, however, of the connection of Jesus' rejection with the ongoing mission of the *Q*-community: Tuckett adds the "proviso" that *Q* re-presents to "this generation" the message of Jesus as a last opportunity for repentance.⁷⁵ The implication is that Jesus' rejection, though decisive, still stands in the deuteronomistic view within a continuum of rejection that stretches from the beginning of the sending of prophets to *Q*'s ongoing prophetic ministry.⁷⁶ Thus if *Q* sees Jesus' death as decisive, the deuteronomistic perspective—especially given the fact that *Q* sees its own members as standing within the continuum—demands that this point not be pressed too far.

It is generally held that there is in *Q*'s deuteronomistic perspective an early attempt at a theological interpretation of Jesus' death, and one which does not show the influence of the Pauline salvific/expiatory view.⁷⁷ Hoffmann has suggested that the kerygmatic view developed quickly from the deuteronomistic view,⁷⁸ but given the vagaries of the evidence it is probably not

⁷³ P. Hoffmann, "QR und der Menschensohn: Eine vorläufige Skizze," in *The Four Gospels 1992: Festschrift Frans Neirynck* (ed. C. M. Tuckett et. al.; BETL 100; Leuven: Leuven University Press and Peeters, 1992), 421–456 = "The Redaction of *Q* and the Son of Man: A Preliminary Sketch," in *The Gospel Behind the Gospels: Current Studies on *Q** (ed. Ronald A. Piper; NovTSup 75; Leiden: New York: E. J. Brill, 1995), 159–198, citation from 192.

⁷⁴ E. Sevenich-Bax, *Israels Konfrontation mit den letzten Boten der Weisheit: Form, Funktion und Interdependenz der Weisheitselemente in der Logienquelle* (MThA 21; Altenberge: Oros, 1993), 362; see also von Lips, *Weisheitliche Traditionen*, 278. Tuckett suggests that "in one way [the sufferings of Jesus] are qualitatively the same as the sufferings of the prophets of the past, and their uniqueness seems to lie more in the fact that the rejection of Jesus and his message is being presented as the final definitive rejection of God" (Tuckett, *Q*, 221).

⁷⁵ Tuckett, *Q*, 221 n. 41.

⁷⁶ See especially Lührmann, "Mark and *Q*," 64: "So in *Q* Jesus' death is seen in accordance with what has happened to *all* the prophets; and this will also be the fate of his followers" (emphasis original).

⁷⁷ See, for instance, Hoffmann, "Jesusverkündigung," 64–5; *Studien*, 188–9; Schulz, *Spruchquelle*, 354; Jacobson, *First Gospel*, 260; Tuckett, *Q*, 220–1 ("a relatively 'low' view"); Kloppenborg, *Excavating *Q**, 374.

⁷⁸ Hoffmann, *Studien*, 189–90.

prudent to posit any kind of chronological or developmental priority for Q's view. The reverse must also be true, for if a kerygmatic interpretation of Jesus' death was a presumed belief of the framers of Q, we would expect it to have left some kind of trace in Q. Kloppenborg has convincingly argued that "at precisely the points at which Q might have borrowed motifs from a putative pre-Markan passion account ... Q does not."⁷⁹ Hence most scholars would rightly hesitate to posit any kind of relationship at all.⁸⁰

⁷⁹ Kloppenborg, "Easter Faith," 77-81: citation from 81. Kloppenborg has in mind "the motifs of God's vindication of Jesus as the righteous sufferer, the establishment of a temple 'not built with hands' and the apologetic use of Psalms 22, 41, 69 and 109" (ibid.).

⁸⁰ See, for instance, Jacobson, *First Gospel*, 260; B. L. Mack, *The Lost Gospel: The Book of Q and Christian Origins* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 1993), 4-5.

1.1.3. *Q*'s Knowledge of the Death of Jesus

Naturally, the view that even within the deuteronomistic framework Jesus' death takes on decisive significance presumes an answer to the prior question of whether a knowledge of Jesus' death can be properly be inferred from *Q*. It must be emphasized, however, that by and large those who infer such a knowledge do not necessarily see any kind of kerygmatic influence on *Q*, or suggest a knowledge of any kind of narrative passion tradition.⁸¹ Two different approaches have been attempted. The first takes materials which might be taken to imply a knowledge of Jesus' death as isolated passion reminiscences in *Q*. The second approach is to argue from *Q*'s polemical material, or its material about persecution, back to a knowledge of Jesus' death. Both approaches may be strengthened if coupled with the *a priori* observation that it is highly unlikely that the framers of *Q* were unaware that Jesus had met a violent end.

This has been most cogently argued by Arland Hultgren, who also raises some interesting issues with respect to *Q*'s function as evidence for the theological outlook of its community. He begins with a review of materials that might indicate "that the *Q* community had some acquaintance with the accounts of Jesus' death and resurrection," and then, given a positive outcome on that issue, asks how *Q*'s silence might reasonably be understood.⁸² The results of the first part of Hultgren's inquiry will be discussed below.

Taking his cue from Kloppenborg's article on "Easter Faith," Hultgren first observes that while the genre of a document might offer some constraints as to its contents, it is problematic to press the point too far.

⁸¹ This much should be clear from the foregoing discussion, but see, for example, Hoffmann, *Studien*, 187-90; D. Zeller, *Kommentar zur Logienquelle* (SKKNT 21; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1984), 97; Kloppenborg, *Excavating Q*, 369-74.

⁸² Hultgren, *Normative Christianity*, 33.

Although Q is a sayings collection that presents Jesus as representative of Wisdom, can one say that that exhausts the significance of Jesus for the Q community? It is one thing to describe the theology of Q as a document; it is another to declare that the community's theology as a whole is fairly represented by it; and it is still another to say that its theology is fully contained within it.⁸³

Or, to put it another way, the possibility that Q functioned as "gospel," that is, the "guiding theological statement" of the community that framed it,⁸⁴ should not be taken mean that the document exhausts all theological possibilities for the community.⁸⁵ Hultgren illustrates his point with an analogy: the lack of any reference to the cross and resurrection of Jesus in the collected works of Martin Luther King, Jr., does not necessarily indicate that King, his congregation, or members of the civil rights movement did not hold them to be soteriologically significant.

Hultgren also observes that the "argument from silence" criticism can cut both ways: "to claim that the Q community had other sources, traditions, and theological emphases is to argue from silence no less than it is to say that Q contains all that the community thought significant about Jesus."⁸⁶ The question is ultimately one of literary evidence. In Hultgren's view, the literary evidence pulls one in the direction of emerging "normative Christianity."

There are allusions in Q to Jesus' rejection, death, resurrection, and coming again—the main points of the common Christian kerygma! ... [So] it would seem that the Q community could easily have made common cause with other communities of the "kerygmatic" type, either existing alongside them or being assimilated into one or more of them over time.⁸⁷

The literary evidence (or, to be precise, the lack of literary evidence) draws Kloppenborg to another conclusion. Because Q "consistently fails" to make use of traditions and motifs integral

⁸³ Ibid., 37; see now Kloppenborg's response in *Excavating Q*, 375-6.

⁸⁴ Kloppenborg, "Easter Faith," 72.

⁸⁵ J. S. Kloppenborg, "Literary Convention, Self-Evidence and the Social History of the Q People," in *Early Christianity, Q and Jesus*, 77-102, esp. 79.

⁸⁶ Hultgren, *Normative Christianity*, 38.

⁸⁷ Ibid., 39, 41; emphasis original.

to kerygmatic Christianity—in particular the individualized wisdom tale, the reworked psalms of lament, and the salvific view of Jesus' death—there is no reason to suppose that Q knew such traditions and studiously avoided them. “It would be hard to imagine that this silence is a matter of Q consciously rejecting these construals. Rather, the only plausible solution is that Q simply does not know them.”⁸⁸ Nevertheless, not to put too fine a point on the issue, it seems possible to maintain both that Q was not unaware of other developments in early Christianity and yet developed its own distinctive Christology and soteriology—without making unsubstantiated recourse to passion or resurrection theology as the tacit motivation for such development.

The view that Q contains materials which imply a knowledge of Jesus' death, or which would have been read or heard with Jesus' death in mind, has long been held out as an alternative to the view that Q contained a passion narrative. Sometimes this approach has been used to reinforce an understanding of Q as having an origin within kerygmatic Christianity. In 1921 F. Herbert Stead, for instance, suggested that Matthew-Luke agreements against Mark in the three passion predictions (Mark 8:31-33; 9:30-32; 10:32-34) resulted from the influence of a Q version or versions of the predictions.⁸⁹ Stead concluded that “the drastic and far-reaching results of such a conclusion are too obvious to need pointing out here.”⁹⁰ Apparently he had Harnack's work in mind.⁹¹ A few years later Bussmann considered it an indication of the contradictory (“zweispältig”) character of Q that it could contain sayings that hinted at the necessity of Jesus' suffering (Q 14:27, for instance, and Luke 13:31-33, which he thought

⁸⁸ Kloppenborg, *Excavating Q*, 374; see also “Easter Faith,” 76-82.

⁸⁹ F. H. Stead, “Does the Original Collection of Logia (‘Q’) Contain Prediction of Our Lord's Resurrection?” *Expositor* 8/22 (1921): 397-400. Stead does not entertain the possibility of credal or liturgical influence on Matthew and Luke.

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, 400.

⁹¹ *Ibid.*, 397.

belonged to Q) without offering traditions about the passion itself.⁹² Q is “zweispältig” because it had an awareness of, but apparently no narrative interest in, Jesus’ suffering and death; thus Q “kein vollständiges Evangelium sein wollte.”⁹³ In a 1973 dissertation Peter Wolf asked, “Liegt in den Logien von der ‘Todestaufer’ (Mk 10:38f., Lk 12:49f.) eine Spur des Todesverständnisses Jesu vor?”⁹⁴ Ultimately Wolf was more concerned about the dominical origin of the saying Luke 12:49-50 than its presence in Q.⁹⁵ He argued that Jesus interpreted his death as a sign of judgment, a view which Wolf thought was developmentally prior to a redemptive interpretation.⁹⁶

Other authors have found isolated reminiscences of Jesus’ fate in Q without seeing them as dependent upon the passion kerygma. Certainly the view that the deuteronomistic perspective includes the rejection and death of Jesus would fall under this description. The present discussion will be limited to the major contributions of David Seeley (1991, 1992) and Hultgren (1994).⁹⁷

⁹² Busmann, *Synoptische Studien* 2, 117.

⁹³ Ibid., 116.

⁹⁴ P. Wolf, “Liegt in den Logien von der ‘Todestaufer’ (Mk 10:38f., Lk 12:49f.) eine Spur des Todesverständnisses Jesu vor?” (Ph.D. diss., Albert-Ludwig-Universität, 1973).

⁹⁵ Ibid., 153-6; and 108-10, 114-9, 125 (respectively). Wolf’s arguments for the inclusion of the material in question in Q may now be conveniently accessed in A. Garsky and C. Heil, “Q 12: [[49]], 50, 51, 52, 53: Children Against Parents,” in *Q 12:49-59: Children Against Parents; Judging the Time; Settling out of Court* (Documenta Q; ed. S. Carruth; Leuven: Peeters, 1997), 1-157, esp. 6-7, 46-48. The database authors and general editors were divided on whether Luke 12:49 was in Q, but voted unanimously that 12:50 was not in Q at a {B} rating of certainty (ibid., 22-35: 60-1). See also Robinson, et al., *Critical Edition*, 376-9.

⁹⁶ Wolf, “‘Todestaufer’,” 217-25, 250-63.

⁹⁷ Mention may be made here of Petros Vassiliadis’s recently published essay on “Eucharist and Q,” in *ΛΟΓΟΙ ΙΗΣΟΥ: Studies in Q* (International Studies in Formative Christianity and Judaism; Atlanta: Scholars Press [for the University of South Florida], 1999), 117-29. Vassiliadis hesitates to suggest that Q’s structure parallels the early church’s eucharistic practice, but sees some kind of connection between Q and eucharist on the level of eschatological *koinonia*: on the one hand, “the center of gravity in Q’s theology is the eschatological dimension of the Christian movement” (ibid., 127), and on the other, the Eucharist was “the living expression of the ecclesiological identity of the early Christian community as the *koinonia* of the eschata” (128). Thus, there could be “some connection between the most eschatologically oriented document of the N.T. tradition (Q) and the most eschatological act of the Christian community (Eucharist)” (129).

Seeley thought Q contains a “handful of passages (6:22-23; 7:31-35; 11:47-51; 13:34-35; 14:27) which treat the subjects of persecution and death in a way that could readily have been applied to [Jesus’] demise,” although none of the passages mention Jesus explicitly.⁹⁸ Seeley argued that the Cross Saying (Q 14:27) does not show any evidence of the deuteronomistic perspective’s influence. On the contrary, in Seeley’s opinion, Q 14:27 “does match Cynic-Stoic views on the nature of a teacher’s death and its relationship to disciples’ deaths.”⁹⁹ Seeley tried to establish the compositional priority of 14:27 over against the other references that display the deuteronomistic perspective.¹⁰⁰ and suggested that the addition Q 6:23c (the prophets’ fates as analogous to the fate of Jesus’ disciples) adapted “the characteristically Greco-Roman mimetic pattern [evident in 6:22ab.23ab] ... [in order to] accommodate a more Jewish topic: prophets.”¹⁰¹ Thus Q 6:23c serves as a “bridge” between the mimetic and deuteronomistic interpretations.¹⁰² In fact, Seeley tried to fix all the deuteronomistic references on a continuum from Q 14:27 (which displays no deuteronomistic influence) through to Q 13:34-35 (which displays a softening of the earlier, more harshly polemical perspective of Q 11:47-51).

While it is possible to take issue with the details of Seeley’s study—in particular the methodological problem of tracing an incremental development from these texts¹⁰³—he made a number of positive contributions. First, he drew attention to the fact that Q 14:27 “deals specifically with Jesus and his followers’ relationship to him,” and that “could hardly be cited

⁹⁸ D. Seeley, “Blessings and Boundaries: Interpretations of Jesus’ Death in Q,” in *Early Christianity, Q and Jesus*, 131-46; here, 131. See also D. Seeley, “Jesus’ Death in Q,” *NTS* 38 (1992): 222-34.

⁹⁹ Seeley, “Jesus’ Death,” 224-34, citation from 234; also “Blessings and Boundaries,” 132-4.

¹⁰⁰ Seeley, “Blessings and Boundaries,” 134-8.

¹⁰¹ *Ibid.*, 138.

¹⁰² *Ibid.*, 138-9.

¹⁰³ See Tuckett, *Q*, 220 n. 39; *idem*, “On the Stratification of Q: A Response,” in *Early Christianity, Q and Jesus*, 213-22, esp. 217-8.

without calling to mind Jesus' death." Seeley used the *a priori* argument that although the Q people may seem to be "uninterested" in Jesus' death, "it is difficult to believe that they were unaware that he had suffered crucifixion."¹⁰⁴ Second, whether or not Seeley is correct that because Q 14:27 does not mention the prophets the alternative Cynic-Stoic model is to be preferred, he correctly identified the feature common to both models: the possible deaths of Jesus' followers are explicitly linked with his own. Within the polemical use of the deuteronomistic perspective in Q, the community faces the same threat of rejection and death—whether actually, potentially, or even metaphorically¹⁰⁵—as Jesus and the prophets before him actually experienced. Although the Q community may have taken up the deuteronomistic model because it made sense of their own situation, the fact that Q 14:27 connects their (expected or potential) persecution with Jesus' death makes possible a similar connection where the deuteronomistic model is used more strongly.

A similar approach was taken by Hultgren. The two main texts he refers to are the Cross Saying and the Jerusalem Lament (Q 13:34-35). The theme of Q 14:27—taking one's cross and following Jesus in order to be a disciple—"presupposes the cross of Jesus and recalls the carrying of Jesus' cross," either by Jesus or by Simon the Cyrene (Mark 15:21 *par.*).¹⁰⁶ Moreover, suggests Hultgren, the metaphor of bearing the cross as a description of the cost of discipleship "makes sense only within a context where the cross is a symbol of giving oneself over sacrificially, and therefore it most certainly echoes the passion."¹⁰⁷ A reference to Simon is

¹⁰⁴ Seeley, "Jesus' Death," 226.

¹⁰⁵ Tuckett (*Q*, 320-2) thinks it unlikely that the Q community was actually facing violent persecution: "when we press the details, it seems hard to see the persecution as involving anything systematic" beyond a failure of "this generation" to repent (*ibid.*, 322).

¹⁰⁶ Hultgren, *Normative Christianity*, 33.

¹⁰⁷ *Ibid.*

highly unlikely. But more importantly, while it is likely that the Cross Saying would have been read or heard with Jesus' own death in mind, it does not seem to require a "sacrificial" context to make sense of its emphasis on submitting oneself to discipleship regardless of the cost.

Hultgren's discussion of the Jerusalem Lament focusses on its citation of Ps 118:26: since there is no evidence for a messianic use of the psalm in early Judaism. "the first such usage must have been in connection with the account of Jesus' entry into Jerusalem. where it is unmistakably messianic."¹⁰⁸ Even though the verse is used in its Q context as a prediction of the Parousia. "the Q saying echoes the acclamation of the crowds" in Mark 11:9 par. and John 12:13; moreover, the association of Ps 118:26 with the entry into Jerusalem in both Mark and John "speaks in favor of its place in the Jerusalem entry tradition from very early times." Thus, in Hultgren's view, Q knows of the passion tradition concerning Jesus' entry into Jerusalem. It will be seen below that there are probably better grounds than this for seeing a reference to Jesus' end in the Jerusalem Lament.

Other Q passages which in Hultgren's opinion "show evidence of acquaintance with the passion, death, and resurrection of Jesus" include the Parable of the Talents (Q 19:12-13, 15b-26) and the saying on the homelessness of the Son of man (Q 9:58).¹⁰⁹ He also suggests, quite rightly, that the Twelve Thrones saying (Q 22:28, 30) and other Son of man sayings (Q 12:40, 17:26-30) presuppose an vindicated and exalted post-mortem Jesus; however, Hultgren thinks that such a status can be granted to Jesus "only on the basis of his resurrection."¹¹⁰ In particular this study will take issue with the final point; however, in general Hultgren's observation is

¹⁰⁸ Ibid., 34.

¹⁰⁹ Ibid.

¹¹⁰ Ibid.

correct that given an almost certain knowledge of the fact and means of Jesus' death, there are a number of texts in *Q* which would have evoked such a memory—even if *Q*'s direct knowledge of the specific traditions that appear elsewhere in early Christian literature cannot be demonstrated with certainty.

Although *Q* makes no explicit reference to Jesus' death, it is possible to argue that *Q* presents a rhetorical or polemical strategy in response to Jesus' death as a problem. Recently Alan Kirk has argued that "the arrangement of *Q* 11 replicates the course of status-degradation ritual [which] begins with the public labelling and denunciation of Jesus as a witch and culminates in the death of Jesus alluded to in 11:49-51."¹¹¹ Furthermore, "Q's rhetoric within this sequence transforms Jesus' status-degradation into status-elevation, while counter-stigmatizing Jesus' persecutors as themselves deviant, impure, and murderers."¹¹² According to Kirk, *Q* 11 displays two attempts on the part of Jesus' opponents to stigmatize him: first, by accusing him of collusion with Satan (11:14-20,23), and second, by demanding from him a sign (11:29-32). Jesus' responses "counter-stigmatize" the opponents by accusing them of demonic possession (11:24-26) and murder (11:49-51; 13:34¹¹³).¹¹⁴ Finally, "Q 13:35 reinterprets Jesus' violent, bloody expulsion as being, in reality, the *voluntary withdrawal of Sophia*. This reversal simultaneously transforms Jesus' status degradation into a breath-taking status-elevation."¹¹⁵

¹¹¹ A. Kirk, "Is *Q* Without Passion?" (paper presented at the annual meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature, Orlando, Fla., November 1998), 1.

¹¹² Ibid.

¹¹³ Kirk thinks *Q* 13:34-35 originally followed 11:49-51 (ibid., 8 n. 40); see also idem, *The Composition of the Sayings Source: Genre, Synchrony, and Wisdom Redaction in Q* (NovTSup 91; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 241-4.

¹¹⁴ Kirk, "Without Passion?", 4-5, 6-7.

¹¹⁵ Ibid., 9: emphasis original.

Because Q 13:35b coordinates the withdrawal of Sophia to the return of the Son of man, Jesus' rejection is entirely reversed: it culminates in his exaltation.¹¹⁶

Kirk's conclusions are two-fold. First, he argues that this is the same rhetorical strategy employed in Mark's passion narrative, as identified by Bruce Malina and Jerome Neyrey.¹¹⁷

Both Mark and Q attempt to overcome the stigma of Jesus' death "by means of an intense rhetoric of status-reversal and status-transformation."¹¹⁸ Kirk has made a strong case for the view that Q 11 is concerned with the legitimization of Jesus, but it is not clear that the texts in question are oriented to the stigma of Jesus' *death*. Probably the fact that the polemic of Q 11 escalates to the reference to the murdered prophets in 11:49-51 (and perhaps 13:34) should not be pressed too far. Nevertheless, Kirk is probably right to suggest that some strategy of legitimization would be necessary for Q given that Jesus was executed.

Second, Kirk argues that the identical strategy appears in Mark and Q, and that in both sources Jesus' status-degradation is reversed in his exaltation. On this basis, the correlation of Jesus' exaltation to his rejection

is not a later christological development juxtaposed to a supposedly "primitive" view of Jesus' death as that of a martyr and prophet; rather, it is part and parcel of a single rhetorical movement, a necessary correlate of the rhetorical initiative to overcome immediately the stigma of Jesus' crucifixion through a rhetoric of radical status-reversal, responding to a radical status-degradation with an equally radical status-exaltation.¹¹⁹

¹¹⁶ Ibid., 9-10.

¹¹⁷ Ibid., 3. Kirk refers to Bruce J. Malina and Jerome H. Neyrey, *Calling Jesus Names: The Social Value of Labels in Matthew* (Sonoma, Calif.: Polebridge, 1988); Bruce J. Malina and Jerome H. Neyrey, "Conflict in Luke-Acts: Labelling and Deviance Theory," in *The Social World of Luke-Acts: Models for Interpretation* (ed. J. H. Neyrey: Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1991), 97-122, esp. 116-18.

¹¹⁸ Kirk, "Without Passion?", 10.

¹¹⁹ Ibid.

Here Kirk takes issue with the prevalent opinion, discussed above, that Q's deuteronomistic view of the death of Jesus as a rejected prophet is a "primitive" or "low" approach to the problem.¹²⁰

Another possible approach arises as an implication of Q's deuteronomistic emphasis on the death of the prophets, in connection with its polemic against "this generation." The texts Q 7:31-35, 11:49-51, and 13:34-35 all deal with the theme of the rejection of Wisdom's emissaries and, taken together, imply a relationship between "this generation"'s rejection of John and Jesus (7:33-35) and the violent fate suffered by the prophets (11:49-51, 13:34-35a). It may also be argued that the Jerusalem Lament has in view a relationship between those killed and stoned by Jerusalem and Jesus himself.¹²¹ For even if Wisdom were the speaker in 13:34-35a, λέγω ὑμῖν in verse 35b would signify a shift to Jesus as speaker, so that his disappearance ("I tell you, you will not see me ...") is connected with the murder of prophets.¹²²

This connection is much more explicit when Q 7:31-35 is read in conjunction with 11:49-51. Wisdom is named in both passages. In the former her vindication finds expression in John and Jesus. As Tuckett puts it, "Jesus and John constitute part of the series of Wisdom's messengers, though their specifically 'prophetic' status is not spelt out here."¹²³ In the latter Wisdom sends the prophets. Thus both the prophets sent through the history of God's relationship with his people (προφήτας καὶ ἀποστόλους, 11:49; Abel through Zechariah, 11:50) and John and Jesus (7:33-34; Jesus as "Son of man") are associated with Wisdom. John and Jesus are therefore understood as standing in continuity with the prophets who suffer rejection.

¹²⁰ See above, pp. 24-5.

¹²¹ So, for instance, Schulz, *Spruchquelle*, 354.

¹²² For a fuller discussion of the function of λέγω ὑμῖν here and elsewhere in Q, see below, pp. 192-8.

¹²³ Tuckett, *Q*, 178.

Likewise, both passages also coordinate the rejection of these emissaries of Wisdom with “this generation.” The introduction to the parable of the children in the marketplace begins with the rhetorical question, “To what shall I compare this generation?” (7:31). Similarly in Q 11:51 it is said that “this generation” will be called to account for the blood of the prophets shed from Abel to Zechariah (Luke also reads, “from the foundation of the world until this generation.” Q 11:50). On this basis, then, it seems likely that Q has Jesus in mind as one of the rejected and murdered prophets for whose blood “this generation” will have to give account. But who does Q have in mind? The epithet “this generation” is probably best understood as referring to the object of Q’s preaching, but sharing similarities with those who through history—from the beginning until the ministry of Jesus, and on into the mission of the Q community—have characteristically rejected the entreaties of God.¹²⁴ Thus, those who reject the proclamation of the Q community now identify themselves by this means with the specific people who rejected John and Jesus and with all the others who through history rejected God’s emissaries; but this does not mean that one can “extend this to ‘all Israel’ *simpliciter*.”¹²⁵ This view of the historical kinship of those who reject God and the prophets is consistent with the application elsewhere of the deuteronomistic paradigm (see, for instance, Acts 7:52).

¹²⁴ For discussion, see Tuckett, *Q*, 196–201.

¹²⁵ *Ibid.*, 201.

1.1.4. Implications

By now the following implications should be fairly clear. First, there is no basis for supposing that *Q* contained a passion narrative, or that *Q* knew and presupposed a kerygmatic interpretation of Jesus' death and resurrection as its fundamental belief. In dealing with *Q* we are constrained by the limits of the document: and, as Hultgren has pointed out, it is methodologically problematic to assert too much one way or the other on the basis of *Q*'s silence. Nevertheless, in spite of *Q*'s silence about the death of Jesus *per se*, Sato and Hultgren are correct to observe that *Q* must have known more than it speaks of explicitly. This, however, should not be taken to imply a knowledge of a narrative passion tradition: this is only to affirm *that* *Q* must have known that Jesus died in Jerusalem by crucifixion. Kloppenborg is probably right to insist that knowledge of a passion tradition such as that which comes to full expression in Mark cannot be inferred for *Q* if *Q* fails to make use of it where it might profitably have done so.

Second, there are, on this basis, fairly strong grounds for the view that *Q*, having a knowledge at least of Jesus' death, sought to interpret it in some way (though certainly not sacrificially or redemptively). To be more specific, if we presume that the framers of *Q* would not likely have been ignorant of the fact and means of Jesus' death, there are a number of texts which would almost certainly would have called his death to mind. It also seems likely that *Q* understood Jesus as among those prophets persecuted "from Abel to Zechariah" (11:49) and murdered by Jerusalem (13:34), particularly because of how the deuteronomistic statements about the prophets come to full expression in the polemic against "this generation" (11:49-51), elsewhere castigated for rejecting both John and Jesus (7:31-35). Therefore, given that *Q* relates Jesus to the rejected prophets, albeit indirectly, within the polemic against "this generation," it seems clear that *Q* at certain points is dealing with the death of Jesus as a problem, one likely

related to the legitimacy of the community's proclamation vis-à-vis its relationship to its founder figure.

Thus the major question for this study is: if Q knows of Jesus' death, and has offered some kind of interpretation of it, even implicitly, does Q have a corresponding view of his vindication? In particular, a problem arises in view of Jesus' death if Q shows evidence of a belief in Jesus as the Coming One or the Son of man as an exalted or eschatological figure, and/or as one "functionally equivalent" to Wisdom.¹²⁶ How can we account for Q's exalted view of Jesus, especially in view of the shame of crucifixion, if—as we shall show in the following section—we cannot justifiably presume that resurrection was the theological impetus?

¹²⁶ Kloppenborg, "Easter Faith," 88, 90-91: The thanksgiving in Q 10:21-22 "borrows the sapiential motifs of the intimate relation of Sophia and God and of Sophia's exclusive mediation of heavenly secrets and applies them to the Father-Son relationship. Q 10:21-22 makes Jesus functionally equivalent to Sophia" (ibid., 88).

1.2: Q, Easter, and the Son of Man

It should first of all be noted that Q makes no explicit reference to the resurrection of Jesus. In a way, this is not surprising: if Q did not contain a passion narrative, why should it mention Jesus' resurrection? But the gospels for which resurrection theology is of paramount importance also make reference to Jesus' resurrection during their accounts of his ministry.¹ Nevertheless, resurrection *per se* is not outside the scope of Q, for a general resurrection is mentioned in Q 11:31-32 as the forum of the final judgment: the Queen of the South will be raised (ἐγερθήσεται) at the judgment in order to condemn "this generation," and likewise the people of Nineveh will also arise (ἀναστήσονται). The fact that both technical terms for resurrection occur here means that resurrection—as opposed to standing in accusation—is in view.² But Jesus' resurrection as an individualizing means of his post-mortem vindication and exaltation does not figure in Q at all.

At this point the silence of Q becomes highly significant. In his "Easter Faith" article, Kloppenborg stated:

The significance of Q's silence cannot be dismissed with the simple observation that, as a wisdom document, there is no point at which the resurrection could be thematized. As we have seen, Q projects a narrative world which encompasses the so-called events of Easter. On the other hand, it is hardly imaginable that "Easter" has made no impact on Q, or at least, that the hermeneutic of Q is not determined by some equivalent of what other streams of tradition call "Easter."³

¹ See the passion predictions (Mark 8:31, 9:31, 10:34 par.) and Jesus' words to his disciples after the Transfiguration (Mark 9:9 par. Matt 17:9).

² See R. Uro, "Apocalyptic Symbolism and Social Identity in Q," in *Symbols and Strata: Essays on the Sayings Gospel Q* (ed. R. Uro; Publications of the Finnish Exegetical Society 65; Helsinki: Finnish Exegetical Society; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996), 67-118, esp. 92; Kloppenborg, *Excavating Q*, 378.

³ Kloppenborg, "Easter Faith," 83.

The foregoing discussion will have made it clear that it is fruitless to claim either that Q could not have known about the resurrection or that a resurrection faith was presupposed (but not mentioned or appealed to) by its tradents. On the one hand, as noted above, it is mistaken to insist that Q could have functioned as an exhaustive compendium of the community's theological views. But if, on the other hand, the resurrection of Jesus is not mentioned or appealed to where it might have been useful to Q, then it is equally problematic to suppose that resurrection is a theological presupposition lurking behind other aspects of Q. Either approach takes us beyond the limits of the literary evidence. Rather, the question should more properly be how Q deals with issues which elsewhere in early Christianity are managed with reference to Jesus' resurrection. But where and how could resurrection have played a role in Q?

It can almost go without saying that Jesus' resurrection has manifold functions elsewhere in early Christian literature. In Luke-Acts, for instance, the resurrection functions as the answer to some key problems which apparently would also have been pressing ones for Q: first and foremost it serves to reverse Jesus' wrongful death (see, for instance, Acts 2:23-24); second, it vindicates Jesus in view of his rejection (Acts 4:10-11); and third, it functions as the means of his exaltation (Acts 2:32-33). Issues such as these are not beyond the interest of Q, although it should be noted that the deuteronomistic view seems to provide for Q a sufficient context in which to interpret Jesus' wrongful death.⁴

The following section will give a brief account of how "Easter" has functioned in Q scholarship as a supplied "given" in order explain the theology of Q with respect to the second

⁴ If however it can be maintained that Q sees Jesus' violent fate as a prophet as a decisive or culminating instance of the phenomenon, it may be that a special vindication would be necessary. Cf. Kloppenborg, "Easter Faith," 84: "If Q's interpretation of persecution and vindication is thoroughly *corporate*, it seems incongruous to balance this with a post-mortem exaltation of an individual" (emphasis original).

and third issues just described—although to a certain extent the division of the discussion is artificial, since (as will become apparent) some scholars see the legitimization of Jesus' sayings for Q and Q's identification of him as the Son of man as coming together in the same christological perspective. The discussion will focus on work since the time of Tödt, and particularly on the work of those scholars for whom an origin for Q within kerygmatic Christianity is not a presupposition. It will become clear that if Q does not make explicit recourse to resurrection theology in service of these issues, then in the absence of resurrection theology some other account must be given. The evidence may, obviously, demand that more than one answer is given for either of these issues.

1.2.1. Q, Easter, and the Belief in Jesus as the Coming Son of Man

As seen above, Tödt was the first to insist that Q originated in a non-kerygmatic "sphere" of Christianity, even though he supposed that the death and resurrection of Jesus were of fundamental significance to the beginnings of the community. He argued that the community could take up Jesus' proclamation as their own since the resurrection had confirmed Jesus' authority.⁵ The resurrection enabled the renewal of the "fellowship" which was characteristic of Jesus' earthly relationship with his followers, and which would one day be confirmed in full by the Son of man at the Parousia. For Tödt, then, the resurrection is both the means whereby the community identified Jesus with the coming Son of man *and* "the affirmation of his *exousia*."⁶ Thus the resurrection allows the community to re-proclaim Jesus' message, since it is confirmed

⁵ Tödt, *Son of Man*, 250–3. See also the discussion in Kloppenborg, "Easter Faith," 83–4.

⁶ Tödt, *Son of Man*, 253.

as the proclamation of the Son of man. Tödt also thought that the *Q* community originated the tradition which identified Jesus with the coming Son of man.⁷

This view relies on not only a presumption of resurrection faith,⁸ but also a certain interpretation of it—based upon the Johannine and Lukan resurrection appearances⁹—as “restored fellowship.” In addition, Tödt depends upon Acts 2:22-24 for the schema in which Jesus’ “authorization” is rejected by the authorities—most decisively in his execution—and yet is confirmed by God through the resurrection.¹⁰ Again, while *Q*’s deuteronomistic perspective likely demonstrates a knowledge of Jesus’ rejection and death, it is to go beyond the evidence to suggest that *Q* has in mind the same schema as evident in Acts, particularly since the resurrection is not explicitly mentioned in *Q*. Nevertheless, according to Kloppenborg, Tödt’s view that Jesus’ sayings are legitimated through his resurrection-based exaltation as Son of man has been “the most widely repeated” view, and has found expression in the work of Norman Perrin, Richard Edwards, and Eugene Boring.¹¹

Perrin’s work in particular deserves our attention since it presumes a different exegetical schema than the one suggested by Tödt. Perrin argued that “the expectation of the coming of Jesus as apocalyptic Son of man is a product of [that] exegetical process” which first interpreted the resurrection of Jesus in light of Psalm 110, and then interpreted the resulting “*mar-*

⁷ Ibid., 231.

⁸ Ibid.: “Thanks to the impetus given by the Easter event, the earliest beginnings of Christology [that is, the identification of Jesus with the coming Son of man] thus sprang up from soteriology [that is, the promise of the Son of man’s heavenly acknowledgement of those faithful to Jesus, *Q* 12:8-9].”

⁹ Ibid., 250-1; following K. Rengstorff, *Die Auferstehung Jesu: Form, Art und Sinn der urchristlichen Osterbotschaft* (Witten-Ruhr: Luther, 1952), 53.

¹⁰ Tödt, *Son of Man*, 251-2.

¹¹ Kloppenborg, “Easter Faith,” 83-4, referring to N. Perrin, “The Son of Man in the Synoptic Tradition,” *BR* 13 (1968): 3-25; R. A. Edwards, *The Sign of Jonah in the Teaching of the Evangelists and Q* (London: SCM, 1971), 85; and M. E. Boring, *Sayings of the Risen Jesus: Christian Prophecy in the Synoptic Tradition* (SNTSMS 46; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), 182, 244-5.

Christology” in light of Zech 12:10 and Dan 7:13.¹² Boring took the same view.¹³ The exegetical process Perrin argued for finds support in Mark 14:62 but has left no trace whatsoever in Q.¹⁴ which cannot at this point be dependent upon Mark.

In his *Studien zur Theologie der Logienquelle*, Hoffmann argued that Son of man Christology is a dominant feature of the Q material.¹⁵ Although he did not rely on the resurrection exegesis of Psalm 110 and Dan 7:13 supposed by Perrin, he understood Q’s confession of Jesus as the Son of man (“Menschensohn-Bekenntnis”) as originating in the “apocalypsis of the Son” (Q 10:21-22), which in Hoffmann’s view is essentially an Easter experience.¹⁶ Hoffmann noted that Q does not contain any Easter stories, nor any reference to the kind of Easter kerygma preserved in 1 Cor 15:3-5. But other streams of tradition in early Christianity connected the Easter experience (described as a “revelation” of Jesus’ post-Easter exaltation) with the commissioning for ministry (Matt 28:16; Gal 1:15-16), so it is not surprising that Q would use similar language:

Within the conceptual framework of the Q group, the Easter event is of primary significance: Jesus has been given all power and has been exalted as the Son of man. In the terminology of their environment—for how else would they express things?—they described this insight, which exceeded all human experience, as the “revelation of the Son.”¹⁷

¹² Perrin, “Son of Man,” 3-4, 11; citation from 4.

¹³ Boring, *Sayings of Jesus*, 244-5. Boring associated Q’s identification of Jesus with the exalted Son of man with its emergent Wisdom Christology: “the community conceived the exaltation of Jesus after his death in terms not only of identification with the coming Son of man but also (in a manner not neatly worked out conceptually) in terms of an identification with the transcendent Wisdom who had inspired all the prophets and who now speaks through the Q prophets.” Boring clearly thinks of “Easter” as a defining moment (*ibid.*, 171).

¹⁴ See L. E. Vaage, “The Son of Man Sayings in Q: Stratigraphical Location and Significance,” in *Early Christianity, Q and Jesus*, 103-29, esp. 127.

¹⁵ See A. D. Jacobson, “Apocalyptic and the Sayings Source Q,” in *The Four Gospels 1992*, 403-19, esp. 407.

¹⁶ Hoffmann, *Studien*, 139-42.

¹⁷ “Im Vorstellungshorizont der Q-Gruppe besagte das Osterereignis primär: Jesus ist alle Macht übergeben, er ist zum Menschensohn erhöht. In der Sprache ihrer Umwelt—wie sollten sie anders reden?—beschreiben sie die alle menschliche Erfahrung übersteigende Einsicht als ‘Apokalypsis des Sohnes’” (*ibid.*, 141).

Thus for Hoffmann Q shows evidence of an experience of the exalted post-Easter Jesus, and this was what occasioned the confession of Jesus as the Son of man.

Hoffmann argued that this christological cognition was in fact the motivation for the composition of Q:

We may note the proximity of Q 10:21-22 to the early Christian testimonies about Easter: for here, in the revelation of Jesus “the Son,” is found the origin of the group’s confession and the basis for the origin of the collection of Jesus’ sayings. By means of the revelation of Easter, it became clear to Jesus’ disciples that Jesus’ claim, and also his message, had not been annulled in his death, but rather had received validation in a startling way.¹⁸

Q’s contents receive an entirely eschatological orientation, for as the instructions of the Son of man they are the standard to be used in the judgment.¹⁹ Thus for Hoffmann, as for Tödt, Easter faith is both the origin of Q’s belief in Jesus as the coming Son of man and the foundation for the legitimation of his proclamation.²⁰

Hoffmann’s view of Q 10:21-22 as originating in an “Ostererfahrung” relies on the similarities it shows with other expressions of Easter faith as mission-legitimizing revelations. While the experiences claimed in Matthew 28 and Galatians 1 may serve the same legitimating function as Q 10:21-22, this does not necessarily mean that resurrection theology *per se* lies behind the latter text’s rather high Christology. Hoffmann thus presumed, rather than proved, resurrection theology as the common theological origin of these texts.

¹⁸ “Wir konnten ihre [Q 10:21-22’s] Nähe zu den urchristlichen Osteraussagen feststellen, fanden hier in der Apokalypsis des “Sohnes” Jesus den Ursprungsort des Bekenntnisses der Gruppe und den Grund für die Entstehung der Sammlung der Logia Jesu: Durch die österliche Apokalypsis wurde den Anhängern Jesu deutlich, daß der Anspruch Jesu und damit auch seine Botschaft mit seinem Tode nicht vergangen sind, sondern in einer ungeahnten Weise Gültigkeit bekamen” (ibid., 142).

¹⁹ Ibid., 189: “Seine Weisung wird als Predigt des ‘Menschensohnes’ Jesus zum Maßstab im Gericht.”

²⁰ It is not entirely clear to me how this view—particularly the aspect of it which connects the origin of Q as a collection of Jesus’ sayings to the (Easter) “apokalypsis”—relates to Hoffmann’s more recent views on the Son of man expectation as characteristic of the Q redaction (“Redaction of Q”).

In more recent discussions of the Son of man material in Q, the christological issue does not seem to come to the fore; rather, stratigraphical and compositional questions are the primary focus.²¹ In some treatments of the question, the Son of man sayings are assigned to the formative stage,²² while in others they are of decisive importance for the Q redaction(s).²³ Probably the most significant development arising from the intensive study devoted to the question is that most scholars now—in contrast with earlier scholars such as Tödt and Perrin—do not think that the references to the Son of man as an exalted or coming figure were traditional (that is, dominical) references eventually associated with Jesus later in the developing tradition.²⁴ This results, in part at least, from a widespread consensus that there was no clearly defined “Son of man” myth or figure in pre-Christian apocalyptic literature to which the Synoptic Son of man material was attracted.²⁵

²¹ See the surveys of C. M. Tuckett, “The Son of Man in Q,” in *From Jesus to John: Essays on Jesus and New Testament Christology in Honour of Marinus de Jonge* (ed. M. C. de Boer: JSNTSup 84; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993), 196–215 (now reprinted with additional material in Tuckett, *Q*, 239–82); Hoffmann, “Redaction of Q”; J. M. Robinson, “The Son of Man in the Sayings Gospel Q,” *Tradition und Translation: Zum Problem der interkulturellen Übersetzbarkeit religiöser Phänomene. Festschrift für Carsten Colpe zum 65. Geburtstag* (ed. C. Elsas; Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1994), 315–35; and Uro, “Apocalyptic Symbolism,” esp. 98–101.

²² See, for instance, D. Lührmann, *Die Redaktion der Logienquelle* (WMANT 33; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1969), 40–1. Both Adela Yarbro Collins and Christopher Tuckett find Son of man sayings in every layer of the Q tradition (A. Y. Collins, “The Son of Man Sayings in the Sayings Source,” in *To Touch the Text: Biblical and Related Studies in Honor of Joseph A. Fitzmyer, S.J.* [ed. P. J. Kobelski, M. P. Morgan; New York: Crossroad, 1989], 369–89, esp. 389; Tuckett, “Son of Man,” 215).

²³ See Polag, *Christologie*; Kloppenborg, *Formation*; Hoffmann, “Redaction of Q”; Vaage, “Son of Man Sayings.” H. Schürmann assigns the Son of man sayings to an intermediate stage. See Schürmann, “Beobachtungen zum Menschensohn-Titel in der Redequelle,” in *Jesus und der Menschensohn: Für Anton Vögtle* (ed. R. Schnackenburg R. Pesch; Freiburg (Breisgau); Basel; Vienna: Herder, 1975), 124–47 = “Observations on the Son of Man Title in the Speech Source,” in *The Shape of Q: Signal Essays on the Sayings Gospel* (ed. J. S. Kloppenborg; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1994), 74–97.

²⁴ Robinson’s depiction of the developing use of the Son of man title is helpful: “Q tends to indicate the initial stages of the christological development from a non-titular, non-apocalyptic idiom of a generic meaning, that by implication could have especially the speaker in mind, as used by Jesus. When the Q community then ascribed to him a decisive role at the judgment, the idiom characteristic of his speech was put on his tongue in apocalyptic sayings” (“Son of Man,” 335). This, however, leaves unanswered the fundamental christological issue: on what basis did Q come to ascribe to Jesus a decisive role at the judgment?

²⁵ The view is practically ubiquitous, but see for instance: M. Casey, *Son of Man: The Interpretation and Influence of Daniel 7* (London: SPCK, 1980), 139; B. Lindars, *Jesus Son of Man: A Fresh Examination of the Son of Man*

1.2.2. Q, Easter, and the Legitimation of Jesus' Teachings

It has already been noted how Tödt and Hoffmann related the legitimation of Jesus' teachings as authoritative to the (Easter-based) christological cognition that Jesus was the coming Son of man. In his 1981 Presidential Address to the Society of Biblical Literature,²⁶ Robinson also connected the legitimation of the sayings of Jesus in Q to "Easter." Robinson's own views occasioned responses which have contributed significantly to the question of Q's strategies for legitimating the proclamation of Jesus. While the death of Jesus does not have great significance in any of the treatments discussed here, it may be stressed again that the problem of legitimating Jesus' sayings becomes more acute in the face of his rejection and execution.

Robinson argued that because Q and the *Gospel of Thomas* lack any reference to either the cross or resurrection, they also lack a clear reference point for distinguishing—from the perspective of the works themselves—between pre-Easter and post-Easter traditions. Even Q 10:21-22, which may be reminiscent of the authorization of Easter (see Matt 28:18), and which falls "in the middle of Q," cannot imply any kind of chronological referent. "Easter does not fall here, ... or anywhere else in Q. Q has the timelessness of eternal truth, or at least of wisdom

Sayings in the Gospels in the Light of Recent Research (London: SPCK, 1983), 1-16; D. R. A. Hare, *The Son of Man Tradition* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990), 10. However, more recently John J. Collins has argued convincingly that while a fixed concept or myth associated with the expression "Son of man" cannot be maintained, the use of the expression would have evoked a fairly well-established exegetical tradition based on Dan 7 ("The Son of Man in First-Century Judaism," *NTS* 38 [1992]: 448-66; J. J. Collins, *The Scepter and the Star: The Messiahs of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Ancient Literature* [ABRL; New York: Doubleday, 1995], 175).

In addition, in the words of Robinson, the "usual appeal to the *Similitudes of Enoch* [viz., as the alleged source of the "apocalyptic" Son of man concept] has gradually had to give ground" because of the late date now assigned to the *Similitudes* ("Son of Man," 330). But cf. Hoffmann, "Redaction of Q," 194: the *Similitudes of Enoch*, though composed later than Q, "would offer correspondence to the secondary connection between deuteronomistically influenced traditions and the SM concept."

²⁶ J. M. Robinson, "Jesus—From Easter to Valentinus (or to the Apostles' Creed)," *JBL* 101 (1982): 5-37, esp. 22.

literature.”²⁷ Robinson did suggest, however, that Q seems to presume “a priority of the Holy Spirit after Easter to Jesus prior to Easter.”²⁸

What this means for Q and the legitimation of its content is that “Jesus rose, as the revalidation of his word, into the Holy Spirit.”²⁹

Easter is then not a point in time in Q, but rather permeates Q as the reality of Jesus’ word being valid now. Or at least so it might seem especially for those who understood the resurrected Christ as Spirit.³⁰

Apparently Robinson meant “Easter” as an “event” which occasioned a shift in the community’s Christology, and not merely as a change in hermeneutical perspective. This occasioned responses from Burton Mack and Kloppenborg.

In response to Robinson, Mack took issue with the twin assumptions of (1) a common Easter faith for all forms of the early Jesus movements, and (2) an apocalyptic mentality as the common denominator for both sayings-oriented and kerygmatically-oriented circles in early Christianity. Mack called this “the apocalyptic-kerygmatic hypothesis of Christian origins.”³¹ Mack rightly insisted that “Easter” is “rooted specifically in the kerygma.”³² which shows no evidence as having been of formative importance for the Q community. Mack then went on to

²⁷ Ibid., 23.

²⁸ Ibid., 24.

²⁹ Ibid.

³⁰ Ibid. Robinson’s views on this point apparently have not changed, as his recent address to the Colloquium Biblicum Lovaniense shows. In his words, “The Q community, in its central mission of proclaiming the sayings of Jesus, was practicing their faith in his resurrection, even though resurrection language is not theirs, but ours” (Robinson, “The Critical Edition of Q and the Study of Jesus” [unpublished paper presented to the Colloquium Biblicum Lovaniense, Leuven, July 2000], 5).

³¹ B. L. Mack, “Lord of the Logia: Savior or Sage?,” *Gospel Origins and Christian Beginnings: In Honor of James M. Robinson* (ed. C. W. Hedrick et. al.; Forum Fascicles 1; Sonoma, Calif.: Polebridge, 1990), 3-18; here, 5.

³² Ibid., 6.

ask whether any other model besides resurrection theology could account for Q material such as Q 10:21-22 in particular and the legitimation of Jesus' sayings in Q in general.

Wisdom theology could offer the basis for such aspects of Q, which in Mack's view was at the second stage of its composition moving towards a re-appropriation of Jesus as an "epic-apocalyptic" founder figure in support of Q's polemic against its detractors, all the while retaining his chief significance as the originator of the teachings to which the community was primarily oriented.³³ This re-appropriation has implications for both the Son of man material and the legitimation of Jesus' sayings as a whole.³⁴ But specifically "the mythology of personified wisdom" attributes epic perspective to Jesus: "This means that Jesus could easily become a revealer figure without any appeal to an 'Easter' mythologem, should the dispensation of special knowledge be of interest to the Q tradents."³⁵

A similar approach was taken by Kloppenborg, although more than Mack he appealed to features related to the sapiential genre of Q as fundamental to the legitimation of Jesus' sayings. "Legitimation of wisdom sayings ... was a requirement common to virtually all sapiential collections," and this was accomplished either through appeals to the sage's reputation or to transcendental authority.³⁶ Where Q differs from other sapiential collections is in its belief in Jesus as the "exclusive mediator of wisdom": "Q ... associates the acquisition of saving knowledge specifically with attachment to Jesus and his words."³⁷ For Q this does not result

³³ See also Mack, *Lost Gospel*.

³⁴ Mack, "Lord of the Logia," 10.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, 10-11.

³⁶ Kloppenborg, "Easter Faith," 87.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, 88.

from an implied resurrection theology but from an implied “functional identification of Jesus and Sophia.”³⁸ In fact, said Kloppenborg,

If one wishes to speak about Easter at all, one must say that what the Markan and post-Markan Easter traditions localize and particularize by narration. *Q* assumes to have always been a characteristic of Jesus’ words as the words of Sophia. [...] The soteriological intensification of Jesus’ sayings and the authority that accrued to them are not grounded in an event at the end of his life, but instead arise out of the character of his words as words of, and ultimately guaranteed by, Sophia.³⁹

Thus in Kloppenborg’s view, “Easter” for *Q* is not an event but a hermeneutical perspective.⁴⁰

The insights of Mack and Kloppenborg tell against the supposition that resurrection theology lies at the basis of the legitimation of Jesus’ sayings in *Q*, but the assimilation of Jesus the sage to Sophia raises another question: how can we account for *Q*’s exalted view of Jesus—whether as the coming Son of man, or as Wisdom’s messenger in whose words lay salvation, or even as Wisdom herself—especially in view of the shame of crucifixion, if we cannot justifiably presume that resurrection was the theological impetus?

1.2.3. Implications

For our present purposes, two implications need to be highlighted. The first relates to the compositional history of *Q* vis-à-vis the Son of man material. If our main concern is with the final shape of *Q*, and what may be deduced from that shape concerning *Q*’s Christology, then to a certain extent we can avoid engaging the questions of the tradition, composition, and stratigraphy of the Son of man material in *Q*. In fact, this approach can even be justified from a

³⁸ Ibid., 90.

³⁹ Ibid., 91, 92.

⁴⁰ Ibid., 92.

redaction-critical perspective: compositionally later materials will give new interpretations and orientations to compositionally earlier materials, and this can justify a wholistic approach to the Son of man material in Q.

The second implication has to do, obviously, with the presumption of resurrection as a theological category of fundamental or original significance in Q: if it cannot reasonably be inferred from Q that resurrection theology lies at the heart of the belief in Jesus as the coming Son of man, then some other approach to the issue must be found. While Q may have known about the resurrection appearances or traditions, and may give indications (at some point in the community's history) of an experience of some kind of formative or foundational christological "event," and may even imply a validation of the message of Jesus (or those speaking in his name) as stemming from some kind of post-mortem vindication, Q does not use "resurrection" as a central theological axiom in the same way as the Synoptics and Paul did. In this study, we will try to show that Q gives evidence of a theological category—other than resurrection theology—which may in fact have functioned more appropriately in Q to bring to expression to the related issues of vindication, exaltation, and Parousia.

Chapter Two: Q 13:34-35: The Lament over Jerusalem

According to the reconstruction of the International Q Project, the “Lament over Jerusalem” saying (Q 13:34-35) reads as follows:

^{34a} Ἰερουσαλὴμ Ἰερουσαλὴμ, ἡ ἀποκτείνουσα τοὺς προφῆτας καὶ
λιθοβολοῦσα τοὺς ἀποσταλμένους πρὸς αὐτήν,
^{34b} ποσάκις ἠθέλησα ἐπισυναγαγεῖν τὰ τέκνα σου, ὥν τρόπον ὄρνις
ἐπισυνάγει τ[ῆς] νοσσιᾶ αὐτῆς ὑπὸ τὰς πτέρυγας, καὶ οὐκ ἠθέλησατε.
^{35a} ἰδοὺ ἀφίεται ὁ οἶκος ὑμῶν.
^{35b} λέγω .. ὑμῖν, οὐ μὴ ἴδητέ με ἕως [ἥξει ὅτε] εἴπητε· εὐλογημένος ὁ
ἐρχόμενος ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου.

^{34a} Jerusalem Jerusalem, who kills the prophets and stones those sent to her!
^{34b} How often I wanted to gather your children together, as a hen gathers her
nestlings under her wings, but you were not willing!
^{35a} Look, your house is forsaken!
^{35b} .. I tell you, you will not see me until [«the time» comes when] you say:
Blessed is the one who comes in the name of the Lord!¹

There is a high degree of verbal similarity between Matthew and Luke in Q 13:34-35, although they disagree on the placement of the saying. Matt 23:37-39 follows Q 11:49-51² (Matt 23:34-36), while Luke 13:34-35 puts the saying after Q 13:28-30. As the following survey will show, the question of the original order of Q with respect to 13:34-35 is still debated. In addition, many

¹ Robinson et al., *Critical Edition*, 420-23. See also, with some minor differences, M. C. Moreland and J. R. Robinson, “The International Q Project: Work Sessions 23-27 May, 22-26 August, 17-18 November 1994,” *JBL* 114 (1995): 475-85; text from 482-83. The verse divisions are typical of most treatments of the Lament.

Concerning the sigla: “Double square brackets are used in the reconstructed text of Q to enclose reconstructions that are probable but uncertain. {C}” (*Critical Edition*, lxxxii). “Two dots indicate that there is some text here that cannot be reconstituted, though even this remains uncertain” (ibid., lxxxvii). “Angle brackets embrace an emendation in the text” (ibid.). “In the translations, guillemets [double angle brackets] embrace a gist or flow of thought, or the most probable terms, which may well be rather clear, even though the Greek text could not be reconstructed,” or “words needed for a smooth rendering in the modern language, even though there is no explicit equivalent in the Greek text behind the translation” (ibid.).

² Most scholars, in particular those who prefer Matthew’s placement of the Jerusalem Lament, think that Q 11:52 (the Woe against those who prevent entry) did not originally follow Q 11:49-51. Most hesitate to assign it a definite place within the Wo es section (11:39b-44,46-52). Kloppenborg calls it a “dangling saying [that] cannot be placed with certainty” (J. S. Kloppenborg, *Q Parallels: Synopsis, Critical Notes & Concordance* [Sonoma, Calif.: Polebridge Press, 1988], 112).

consider that the λέγω ὑμῖν sentence is a late or redactional addition to the saying, and others think that the whole complex was a late addition to the Q document. The origin of the saying has also been the subject of debate, with many (but not all) scholars arguing that in whole or in part it was originally a Jewish judgment saying taken over by Q. Most scholars agree, however, about how the Lament should be assessed form-critically: it is a “minatory saying” or a “prophetic oracle of judgment.”³

The interpretation of the saying is fraught with problems, and there appears to be little consensus on the individual details. For example, if Matthew’s positioning of the Lament is original, the question arises of the saying’s relationship to the Wisdom saying Q 11:49-51. Did the Lament continue the Wisdom quotation? If so, two further issues emerge: the origin of the saying(s), and the significance of the λέγω ὑμῖν clause in 13:35b. Furthermore, whether or not Q 11:49-51 and 13:34-35 originally belonged together in Q, the similarity in theme—the rejection and murder of God’s prophets and emissaries—raises again the question of the death of Jesus in Q.

Q 13:35b itself poses two particularly difficult problems. First, the clause “You will not see me until you say ...” has generated a number of different interpretations. This line could be understood as a reference to the departure of Wisdom, as in Prov 1:24-28 and *I Enoch* 42:2. The difficulty with this view was noted by Rudolf Bultmann: the reference to the Coming One hints at some kind of return, and there is no Jewish evidence for Wisdom departing and returning.⁴ Some understand “you will not see me ...” to refer to the death of Jesus and see the reference to

³ See, for instance, R. Bultmann, *The History of the Synoptic Tradition* (rev. ed.; Oxford: Blackwell; New York: Harper, 1968), 111-18, esp. 114-5; Steck, *Israel*, 58-9; Schulz, *Spruchquelle*, 3522-3; Boring, *Sayings*, 171; Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 229.

⁴ Bultmann, *History*, 115; so also many others, including Zeller, “Entrückung,” 514-5, and Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 228, for example.

the Coming One as a prophecy of his return to judgment on those who rejected him.⁵ Others see in Q 13:35b a reference to a hidden, absent, or unseen Son of man, particularly in relation to other Q material such as Q 17:22 where many will long to see the Son of man but will not.⁶ or Q 17:23-24 where the coming of the Son of man will be as plain as lightning in the sky.⁷ Thus one issue that has perplexed interpreters of the Jerusalem Lament has been the significance of the speaker's absence.

The second problematic issue is the reference to Ps 117:26 LXX. For some scholars, the citation has a strikingly optimistic note, holding out a positive alternative to the forsakenness of the house declared in 13:35a.⁸ Some have made sense of the ἔως-clause by taking it as a conditional prophecy: "Q 13:35b then means not, when the Messiah comes, his people will bless him, but rather, when his people bless him, the Messiah will come."⁹ Others believe the Coming One comes in judgment, since ὁ ἐρχόμενος appears in the preaching of John as a figure of judgment (Q 3:16b-17).¹⁰ A few see a reference to the Synoptic Triumphal Entry.¹¹

⁵ Paul Hoffmann, for instance, sees an implicit reference to the death of Jesus in Jerusalem's unwillingness to heed the appeals of the speaker in Q 13:34 and in the absence of the speaker in 13:35. "Daß dieses 'ihr aber wolltet nicht' für Q die Tötung Jesu einschloß, beweist Lk 11:35b [sic], wo auf das Fernsein Jesu Bezug genommen wird" (Hoffmann, *Studien*, 188; see also "Jesusverkündigung," 64). See also Kloppenborg, *Excavating Q*, 370: "it is a reasonable conjecture that Jesus is included among those 'prophets and messengers' killed and is the one who is specifically vindicated with the coming of the Son of Man."

⁶ D. C. Allison, *The Jesus Tradition in Q* (Harrisburg, Penn.: Trinity Press International, 1997), 203: "In both places [Q 13:35b and 17:22] the present is marked by the Son of man's absence." Luke 17:22 is *Sondergut*, however, and scholars are divided on whether it was in Q.

⁷ D. R. Catchpole, *The Quest for Q* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1993), 274: "The one who has gone away (cf. Q 19:12) and who will come (Q 12:43; 19:15) is the Son of man."

⁸ Allison, *Jesus Tradition*, 192-204; R. Uro, *Sheep Among the Wolves: A Study of the Mission Instructions of Q* (Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae Dissertationes Humanarum Litterarum 47; Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedakatemia, 1987), 237-40; Tuckett, *Q*, 174, 204-7.

⁹ Allison, *Jesus Tradition*, 196-201, quotation from 201. See first of all H. van der Kwaak, "Die Klage über Jerusalem (Matth. XXIII 37-39)," *NovT* 8 (1966): 156-70, esp. 165-70; see also Allison, "Matt. 23:39 = Luke 13:35b as a Conditional Prophecy," *JSNT* 18 (1983): 75-84.

¹⁰ So Bultmann, *History*, 115; Hoffmann, *Studien*, 175-78; Zeller, "Entrückung," 519.

¹¹ Hultgren, *Normative Christianity*, 33-34; Meadors, *Jesus the Messianic Herald*, 305.

2.1. Major Contributions to the Interpretation of Q 13:34-35

The following survey evaluates major contributions to the interpretation of the Jerusalem Lament as a saying of Q. It will become clear that issues of both reconstruction and interpretation are still unresolved, and require closer analysis.

2.1.1. Q 13:34-35 as a Quotation from an Apocryphal Jewish Document

The original wording of the saying, in the view of Adolf von Harnack (1907), has been faithfully preserved by Matthew. According to Harnack, the Lament originally followed Q 11:49-51 in Q; as already suggested, this view has had a wide following.¹ On the basis of his

¹ Harnack, *Sayings of Jesus*, 168-9, 179. J. Hugh Michael ("The Lament over Jerusalem," *American Journal of Theology* 22 [1918]: 101-13, esp. 102 n. 3) noted that, although this idea became associated with Harnack (see, for example, B. H. Streeter, "On the Original Order of Q," in *Studies in the Synoptic Problem*, 140-164, esp. 162-3), it likely originated with D. F. Strauss (*A New Life of Jesus* [2nd ed.; 2 vol.; London: Williams and Norgate, 1879], 1.341-2) and was taken up by Paul W. Schmiedel (*Das vierte Evangelium gegenüber den drei ersten Johannesschriften des Neuen Testaments* [Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1906], 451).

Other proponents of the Matthean placement include: Michael, "Lament over Jerusalem," 103-7; B. W. Bacon, *Studies in Matthew* (London: Henry Holt & Company, 1930), 247-8; Bultmann, *History*, 115; Lührmann, *Redaktion*, 48; M. J. Suggs, *Wisdom, Christology, and Law in Matthew's Gospel* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1970), 64-6; F. Neirynck, "Recent Developments in the Study of Q," in *Logia: Les Paroles de Jésus—The Sayings of Jesus. Memorial Joseph Coppens* (ed. J. Delobel; BETL 59; Leuven: Leuven University Press and Peeters, 1982), 29-75, esp. 66-67; R. A. Piper, *Wisdom in the Q Tradition: The Aphoristic Teaching of Jesus* (SNTSMS 61; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 165; Catchpole, *Quest*, 257-8 (with other adjustments); J. M. Robinson, "Building Blocks in the Social History of Q," in *Reimagining Christian Origins: A Colloquium Honoring Burton L. Mack* (ed. H. Taussig, E. A. Castelli; Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press International, 1996), 87-112; see also idem, "The Sequence of Q: The Lament over Jerusalem," in *Von Jesus zum Christus: Christologische Studien. Festgabe für Paul Hoffmann zum 65. Geburtstag* (ed. U. Busse, R. Hoppe; BZNW 93; Berlin: New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1998), 225-60, esp. 253-60; Kirk, *Composition*, 241-4.

Proponents of the Lukan placement include: Streeter, *Four Gospels*, 254; Manson, *Sayings*, 126, 394; Hirsch, *Frühgeschichte*, 2.132-3; E. Haenchen, "Matthäus 23," *ZTK* 48 (1951): 38-63, esp. 56-7; P. Vassiliadis, "The Original Order of Q: Some Residual Cases," in *Logia*, 379-87, esp. 382, 387; Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 227-9 ("whatever the case"); Jacobson, *First Gospel*, 209-10 ("though the matter is far from certain"). Others including Steck (*Israel*, 231) offer arguments against the Matthean placement of the saying.

Finally, Christopher Tuckett (*Q*, 173-4) notes that either placement of the Lament could be seen as redactional. He also suggests that "it may be that the issue is unimportant in the long run," because in his view the Jerusalem Lament, since it ends on a positive note, "may introduce a certain corrective to the harsh polemic" of either Q 11:49-51 (in Matthew's order) or Q 13:28-30 (in Luke's). Nonetheless, Tuckett says he is "inclined to ... accept the

view of the order of Q, Harnack took Q 13:34-35 to be a Wisdom saying,² a quotation from a now lost Jewish apocryphal work.³ Harnack suggested that the quotation formula διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ἡ σοφία τοῦ θεοῦ εἶπεν, found only in Luke 11:49, was original to Q: “the dislike to represent our Lord as quoting from an apocryphal book, or some other motive, led St Matthew to erase the quotation formula.”⁴ In addition, Harnack thought that the λέγω ὑμῖν sentence (13:35b), which refers to the speaker’s disappearance, signifies a shift to Jesus as speaker.⁵ Many others later took a similar view, holding that v. 35b is a Christian expansion of an originally pre-Christian saying.⁶ Harnack’s assessment of this saying clearly set the agenda for later scholarship.

separation of the two sayings in Luke as reflecting a separation of the sayings in Q” (ibid., 174 n. 2). So also F. Christ, *Jesus Sophia: Die Sophia-Christologie bei den Synoptikern* (Zürich: Zwingli Verlag, 1970), 136-7; Hoffmann, *Studien*, 172; D. E. Garland, *The Intention of Matthew 23* (NovTSup 52; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1979), 197.

² Not all who understand Wisdom to be the speaker in Q 13:34-35 hold to the Matthean placement, which would—if the introductory formula in Luke 11:49 is original to Q—allow 13:34-35 to be the continuation of the Wisdom saying 11:49-51. The preponderance of wisdom themes and motifs in 13:34-35, and the fact that the speaker’s perspective appears to be “supra-historical” (Bultmann, *History*, 114), for many scholars suggest such an identification. For the following scholars, Wisdom is the speaker of at least 13:34-35a: Haenchen, “Matthäus 23,” 56-7; Steck, *Israel*, 230-1; Suggs, *Wisdom*, 67; Christ, *Jesus Sophia*, 145 (but Jesus is identified with Sophia); Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 228; Piper, *Wisdom*, 164-5; Jacobson, *First Gospel*, 213; Tuckett, *Q*, 174-5.

The following, with the variations noted, see Jesus as the speaker: Hoffmann, *Studien*, 173-5 (Jesus speaking not as a supra-historical entity, but describing his own experience of rejection); Boring, *Sayings*, 171-3 (the risen Jesus speaking through the Q prophets; so also Miller, “Rejection,” 235-7); Uro, *Sheep*, 236-7 (Jesus speaking “as a superhuman, divine authority”).

³ Although the idea that the Lament was originally part of a lost Jewish apocryphal document has fallen out of favour, many since Harnack have seen the Jerusalem Lament as a Jewish tradition or saying taken up by Q. See, for instance, Bultmann, *History*, 114-5; Haenchen, “Matthäus 23,” 56-7; Van der Kwaak, “Klage,” 157; Steck, *Israel*, 238-9 (though for Steck the saying was not in Q); Christ, *Jesus Sophia*, 138-40; Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 228. Others see the saying as originating in its entirety in the Q community: first of all Schulz, *Spruchquelle*, 348-9; Boring, *Sayings*, 171; Jacobson, *First Gospel*, 213; Miller, “Rejection,” 238.

⁴ Harnack, *Sayings of Jesus*, 103.

⁵ Ibid., 169.

⁶ So Bultmann, *History*, 115 (though he is uncertain how much of 13:35b is an expansion); Haenchen, “Matthäus 23,” 57; Suggs, *Wisdom*, 69-70; Hoffmann, *Studien*, 176-7; Neirynck, “Recent Developments,” 66; Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 228; Catchpole, *Quest for Q*, 273-4; Tuckett, *Q*, 175.

Others (for varying reasons) hold that 13:34-35 was an originally unitary piece of tradition: Van der Kwaak, “Klage,” 164; Steck, *Israel*, 227, 235; Jacobson, *First Gospel*, 211 (discerning a chiasmic structure); Miller, “Rejection,” 234 n. 36. For a handy table covering major treatments of the compositional history of Q, see J. S. Kloppenborg, “Comparative Stratigraphy of Q,” Appendix B in idem, “The Sayings Gospel Q: Literary and Stratigraphic Problems,” in *Symbols and Strata*, 1-66, esp. 65.

Although he suggested a pre-Christian origin for the saying, Harnack did not investigate this further; in fact, he had very little to say about the interpretation of the Lament at all. He noted that it presumes a Jerusalem setting; however, this does not necessarily in his view disprove his thesis that Q's "geographical horizon ... is bounded by Galilee," because as a quotation from an apocryphal book the Lament could not be dominical.⁷ Harnack did however think that the "you will not see me" clause could be understood as referring to Jesus' fate in an obscure way. In a footnote he bemoaned the possibility that skeptics could be driven to such "absurdities" as claiming, given the absence of passion material from the oldest source for the life of Jesus, that "from Q we can only conclude that Jesus suddenly vanished in a more or less mysterious way. This is indeed hinted at by the words of Q (St. Matt. 23:39), '*Ye shall not see me henceforth* until ye shall say, Blessed is He that cometh in the name of the Lord.'⁸" This view, which Harnack obviously did not consider a serious option, would appear in a 1985 essay by Dieter Zeller.⁹

2.1.2. Q 13:34-35 and the Matthean Sequence of the Q Material

J. Hugh Michael's 1918 article in *The American Journal of Theology*¹⁰ took up Harnack's view that Q 13:34-35 originally followed Q 11:49-51 (Matthew's order) rather than Q 13:28-30 (Luke's order). Michael defended this view against B. H. Streeter's five arguments for the Lukan order as the more original.¹¹ Streeter's third argument, which Michael called "perhaps the most

⁷ Harnack, *Sayings of Jesus*, 168-70.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 233-4 n. 1; emphasis original.

⁹ Zeller, "Entrückung."

¹⁰ Michael, "Lament over Jerusalem."

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 104-6; Streeter, "Original Order," 162-3.

cogent of the five,” states that the meaning of Q 13:35b (λέγω ὑμῖν, οὐ μὴ ἴδητέ με κτλ) is extremely obscure if it be understood as a direct saying of Jesus at the end of the Wisdom saying Q 11:49-51 + Q 13:34-35a.¹² Michael remarked that the saying is no less obscure if Jesus is thought to be the speaker throughout Q 13:34-35.¹³

Two possible interpretations were dismissed by Michael: first, the saying cannot refer to Jesus’ entry into Jerusalem, because the solemnity does not fit with such a brief absence; and second, it cannot refer to a future conversion of Israel, because “if this was what Jesus meant to say, he would have expressed his meaning more clearly.”¹⁴ Michael insisted that the words are eschatological and can make no sense in their present context, so he proposed that “the words λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι [sic] οὐ μὴ ἴδητέ με κτλ are not part of the Jerusalem Lament at all. Only by sheer accident have they become associated with it.”¹⁵ The saying originally belonged to the following section of Q and has been wrongly attached to the Lament by both Matthew and Luke.

The Q material that follows the Lament in Matthew (Matt 24:26-28 = Q 17:23-24) is a more likely candidate for the original context of Q 13:35b than that which follows according to Luke (Luke 14:26-27 = Q 14:26-27).¹⁶ Michael therefore suggested that Q’s apocalyptic discourse, directed at the disciples, originally began with the “You will not see me” saying, indicating that “a period of separation [was] imminent and that when [the disciples] would next

¹² “Our Lord remarks that the book called the ‘Wisdom of God’ truly foretells vengeance while it laments at the same time the frequent blindness of Jerusalem and consequent desolation of her house, and then adds as his own comment, ‘For I say unto you, Ye shall not see *me* henceforth until ye say, Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord.’ The connection of thought is not obvious” (ibid., 163).

¹³ Michael, “Lament over Jerusalem,” 107.

¹⁴ Ibid., 108-9.

¹⁵ Ibid., 109.

¹⁶ Ibid., 111. Michael avoids the question of Q 14:16-24, the parable of the great supper, which would be the next block of Q material to be found in Luke after 13:35b, by saying that “not one of the first twenty-five verses of Luke, chap. 14, that is by universal consent assigned to Q” (ibid.). Making reference to this Q material would not have hurt his case, however.

see him they would welcome him in his messianic glory.”¹⁷ Michael’s argument is problematic for at least two reasons: it depends upon Matthew retaining the original order of Q from the Woes to the end of the Double Tradition material, and upon Matthew and Luke independently agreeing in the (mistaken) association of Q 13:35b with the Lament instead of the “apocalyptic discourse.” In addition, later scholars would detect numerous reasons why 13:35b, either as a redactional addition or as an integral part of the original saying, makes perfect sense in its present location.¹⁸

2.1.3. Q 13:34-35 and the Wisdom Myth

Like Harnack and Michael, Rudolf Bultmann argued (1931) that the Lament continues the quotation begun in Q 11:49; thus he thought it “actually highly probable that Matthew has here preserved the order of sections in Q,” whereas Luke displaced it from its original Q context, on the basis of the catchword “Jerusalem,” to immediately after the warning to Herod (Luke 13:31-33).¹⁹ Bultmann also expanded Harnack’s observation that Jesus himself could neither have sent prophets nor offered often to gather the children of Jerusalem: in Bultmann’s words, “the one making this statement must be a supra-historical entity, namely Wisdom.”²⁰ He suggested that like 11:49-51, the Lament was “also originally a Jewish prophecy, whether Jesus

¹⁷ Ibid., 112. For a similar conjecture, see Uro, “Apocalyptic Symbolism,” 97, 114.

¹⁸ See, for instance, Steck, *Israel*, 227-32; Christ, *Jesus Sophia*, 141-2; Zeller, “Entrückung,” 519; Jacobson, *First Gospel*, 211.

¹⁹ Bultmann, *History*, 114-5.

²⁰ Harnack, *Sayings of Jesus*, 168-9; Bultmann, *History*, 114.

himself quoted it or whether the Church ascribed it to him.” Bultmann wondered whether verse 35b as a whole or only the material prior to the εἰς-clause was a Christian addition.²¹

Thus both Q 11:49-51 and 13:34-35 must be understood in light of the wisdom myth. It is a well-established component of the myth that Wisdom comes to the earth, offers invitation to humanity in vain, and departs (see, for instance, *I Enoch* 42). Bultmann took both 13:35a (the forsaken house, which—relying on Mandaean parallels—he took to mean the world) and 13:35b (“you will not see me ...”) to refer to Wisdom’s departure. Accordingly, then, the λέγω ὑμῖν sentence is a continuation of the Wisdom quotation; no change of speaker is in view here. Further, Wisdom will “remain hidden until the coming of the Messiah ... the one ἐρχόμενος ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου.”²² Bultmann admitted that no surviving Jewish wisdom texts show evidence of the view that “Wisdom, on her departure, referred to her (or her representatives) coming to judgment, but it is quite intelligible in the context of the myth.”²³ What Bultmann left unclear, however, was precisely how the coming of the Messiah was to be understood as the reappearance of Wisdom.

2.1.4. The Historical Perspective of Q 13:34-35

Ernst Haenchen’s 1951 article on “Matthäus 23” contained only a very brief discussion of the Jerusalem Lament, but it made important contributions on at least two issues. First, Haenchen offered a counter-argument to the view that Q 11:49-51 and 13:34-35 originally belonged

²¹ Ibid., 115. According to this latter suggestion, Q 13:35 would read, “Behold, your house is [= will remain] forsaken until you say, Blessed is the Coming One in the name of the Lord.” Bultmann did not attempt to make sense of the motive for the addition of λέγω ὑμῖν οὐ μὴ ἴδῃτέ με. To my knowledge this suggestion has not been taken up by anyone since Bultmann.

²² Ibid.

²³ Ibid.

together “in der Weisheitsschrift”: they present different “historical” perspectives on the rejection of the prophets. “Im ‘Weisheits-Wort’ blickt die ‘Weisheit Gottes’ prophetisch auf die zukünftige Sendung der Propheten usw.; im ‘Jerusalem-Wort’ dagegen schaut sie auf die Sendung der Propheten usw. als etwas Vergangenes zurück.”²⁴ However, in the view of Jack Suggs, “in keeping with its form the doom oracle almost requires a future tense, while the dirge form of the lament equally requires the past.”²⁵ More to the point is Robinson’s objection that the forward-looking perspective of 11:49-51 “is simply a device to present [the occurrences of history] once they have occurred as fulfillments of God’s plan.”²⁶ Furthermore, the participle ἐκκεχυμένον has a present and not a pre-historical perspective, “looking back through all of history (as biblically revealed—hence Abel to Zechariah), even back to its very beginning, to present as culpable all of history (as far as it goes in biblical terms: to 2 Chronicles).”²⁷

Haenchen also argued that originally the pre-Christian saying ended at 13:35a: thus, the λέγω ὑμῖν sentence “ist kein Zitat aus der Weisheitsschrift, sondern bereits ein christlicher Zusatz in ‘Q’.”²⁸ His main argument attempted to show the unlikelihood of Bultmann’s position that the verse refers to Wisdom remaining hidden until her return with the Messiah. In Haenchen’s view, “die Weisheit war ja in der bisherigen Zeit gar nicht in persona gegenwärtig und anwesend in Jerusalem”: therefore, it would be nonsensical to have this verse refer to Wisdom’s disappearance and return. The disjunction thus indicates the presence of a Christian

²⁴ Haenchen, “Matthäus 23,” 56. So also Jacobson, *First Gospel*, 209.

²⁵ Suggs, *Wisdom*, 65.

²⁶ Robinson, “Sequence of Q,” 244.

²⁷ Ibid. It should be noted that Luke 11:50 gives the perfect participle and reads “from the foundation of the world,” while Matt 23:35 gives the present participle and reads “upon the earth.” Matthew thus might see the “innocent blood” extending beyond Zechariah into the present.

²⁸ Haenchen, “Matthäus 23,” 57.

addition.²⁹ Though Haenchen's contention that Wisdom never dwelt "in persona" in Jerusalem never would become one of the standard arguments, many interpreters would agree that Q 13:35b—either because it introduces some other inconsistency with the saying's wisdom perspective, or because of the formulaic λέγω ὑμῖν—is a redactional addition.³⁰

2.1.5. Q 13:35b as a Conditional Prophecy

H. van der Kwaak's main interest in his 1966 article on "Die Klage über Jerusalem" was the interpretation of the saying as it stands in Matthew—in particular whether Matt 23:39 should be interpreted as referring to a future conversion of Israel. Thus, he did not offer much insight into the Q version of the Lament. Following Bultmann, van der Kwaak thought that the saying originally was the continuation of "eine jüdische Weissagung" (Q 11:49-51), either quoted by Jesus or attributed to him by the community.³¹ Van der Kwaak also contested the view that Matt 23:39 (Q 13:35b) was a Christian addition in Q to the original Jewish saying: "mit dem gleichen Recht könnte man behaupten, daß Vers 39 als der ursprüngliche Abschluß des Verses 37f. zu beurteilen wäre."³²

Van der Kwaak's more important contribution was his suggestion that Matthew's ἕως-
clause should be understood as a condition. To begin with, he argued that the greeting εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου has an inherently positive meaning. The line cannot be understood as referring to the coming of Jesus as judge. "Es liegt denn auch ... kein

²⁹ Ibid.

³⁰ See above, p. 55 n. 6.

³¹ Van der Kwaak, "Klage," 157.

³² Ibid., 164.

Grund vor, hier an zitterndes Begrüssen des Herrn, der zum Gerichte kommt, zu denken Das εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου deutet ohne Zweifel auf eine lobende Begrüssung Jesu als des Messias hin.”³³ Yet van der Kwaak also ruled out the view that the saying refers to a certain future conversion of Israel at the Parousia, for three reasons: first, there is no evidence of such an expectation elsewhere in Matthew; second, in Matthew’s view a new phase in the relationship between God and Israel has begun; and third, such an absolutely positive statement could scarcely come as the conclusion of Matthew 23.³⁴

Instead, van der Kwaak proposed that Matthew’s clause ἕως ἂν εἴπητε (in contrast with ἕως ἡξει ὅτε εἴπητε, attested by D in Luke 13:35b³⁵) should be taken not as a temporal statement—which would imply that the speaker’s absence would end *when* the greeting is uttered—but as a condition.³⁶ The gist of the sentence then would become: “Die Trennung wird erst aufgehoben werden wenn ihr mich als den Messias anerkennen werdet.”³⁷ The greeting εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος then signifies an acknowledgement of Jesus as the one who would

³³ Ibid., 166. The more dominant view has been that 13:35b refers to Jerusalem’s condemnation at the final judgment: Jerusalem’s recognition of the Coming One will be too late. See Manson, *Sayings*, 128; Steck, *Israel*, 237; Hoffmann, *Studien*, 178; Schulz, *Spruchquelle*, 358-9 (strenuously); Polag, *Christologie*, 94; Garland, *Intention*, 207 (in Matthew, at least); Zeller, “Entrückung,” 517.

Others have taken 13:35b, because of a more positive reading of the Psalm 118 quotation, to signify a more hopeful prospect for Jerusalem: Uro, *Sheep*, 237-8; Catchpole, *Quest*, 271, 273-4; Tuckett, *Q*, 174, 204-7. Sevenich-Bax (*Israel’s Konfrontation*, 362) sees evidence here that the confession of Jesus as Son of man was considered redemptive (apparently even for Jerusalem, potentially at least). Jacobson understands the Psalm 118 quotation, in connection with its use in *Did.* 12:1, as referring to a welcoming attitude toward prophetic messengers (*First Gospel*, 211).

³⁴ Van der Kwaak, “Klage,” 168.

³⁵ Van der Kwaak admitted that this formulation at least should be taken temporally (ibid., 169), and suggested that Matthew opted for ἕως ἂν instead of the temporal formulation that appears in Luke (ibid., 170). This might be taken as a suggestion that ἕως ἡξει ὅτε εἴπητε was the original reading in Q, though van der Kwaak does not spell this out.

³⁶ Van der Kwaak supplied evidence for a conditional reading from classical Greek and the papyri: in addition, he claimed, ἕως ἂν appears to be used this way in Matt 5:26 and possibly Matt 2:13, 12:20 and 24:34 (ibid., 169-70).

³⁷ Ibid., 168.

come after John, rather than an acknowledgement of him at the Parousia. The saying then is an invitation to conversion (“eine Aufforderung zur Bekehrung”), through which the punishment so emphatically described in Matt 23:37-39a is removed.³⁸ As will be seen below, this reading of the “until you say” clause has been argued by others, most prominently Dale Allison.³⁹

Unfortunately, van der Kwaak offered little insight into the significance of the “you will not see me” clause. Because he understood the reference to the “Coming One” non-eschatologically, Jerusalem’s “not seeing” is some kind of estrangement (“Trennung”) from the speaker which is alleviated by their recognition or acknowledgement (“Anerkennung”) of Jesus as the Coming Messiah announced by John.⁴⁰ In fact, he shifts the emphasis from the actual apodosis of the conditional sentence—which, in his view, speaks of the speaker’s disappearance as the result of not fulfilling the condition of acknowledgement—to the punishment (“Strafe”) which is emphasized in Q 13:34-35a. Thus, in van der Kwaak’s reading of the Jerusalem Lament, there is an invitation to alleviate Jerusalem’s punishment, but the disappearance of the speaker remains something of a mystery.

Van der Kwaak’s argument for a conditional reading of Q 13:35b has been taken up more recently by Dale Allison (1983, 1997). The most significant difference between their positions lies in the fact that Allison understands the citation of Ps 118:26 eschatologically. In his 1983 article, he stated that “the conditional interpretation commends itself by finding a middle ground

³⁸ Ibid., 170.

³⁹ Allison, “Matt. 23:39 = Luke 13:35b”; idem, *Jesus Tradition in Q*, 192-204. See also Catchpole, *Quest.* 274. It should also be noted that Boring adopts a similar conditional reading, although he fixes the saying firmly within the Christian-prophetic context he suggests for the saying. “The saying would have then meant in the prophetic Q-community: ‘You who reject the exalted Lord who now speaks to you through his prophets, will never “see” [= be accepted by, experience the blessed presence of] me *until and unless* you say: Blessed is the prophetic messenger of the risen Lord”’ (*Sayings*, 172; emphasis added).

⁴⁰ Van der Kwaak, “Klage über Jerusalem,” 168.

that avoids the pitfalls of the other alternatives,” namely, interpretations that see Q 13:35b as an announcement of either unqualified judgment or unqualified salvation.⁴¹ Allison offered four arguments in favour of this position: first, it was commonly held in late Jewish sources that the time of the final redemption was contingent on some other event or events; second, ἔως can indicate a contingent state in Greek sentences; third, the structure of Q 13:35b appears to follow a formula that was standard in rabbinic literature (negative statement about the messianic advent: conditional particle ἄν; condition to be met); and fourth, as already noted, the conditional interpretation finds a satisfying “middle ground.”⁴² The linguistic evidence marshalled by Allison makes his contribution a significant advance to van der Kwaak’s position.⁴³

In Allison’s view, “‘You will not see’ recalls Q 17:22, according to which people will long to see one of the days of the Son of man but will not see it. In both places the present is marked by the Son of man’s absence. But that absence will become a presence when unbelief gives way to belief.”⁴⁴ He also suggests that “Jesus’ absence may be interpreted as a punishment.”⁴⁵ Allison thinks that the speaker’s absence is characteristic of the time before the condition (Jerusalem’s repentance) is met and the Parousia of Jesus the Son of man occurs. This view would be strengthened if the connection between absence and Parousia were accounted for more clearly.

⁴¹ Allison, “Matt. 23:39 = Luke 13:35b,” 80.

⁴² Ibid., 77-81.

⁴³ In his 1997 book, *The Jesus Tradition in Q*, Allison reprints his 1983 article with the significant additions of (1) linguistic evidence for a conditional use of ἔως (ibid., 198-9), and (2) a discussion of the placement of Q 13:34-35 in Q (ibid., 201-3).

⁴⁴ Ibid., 203.

⁴⁵ Ibid., 203 n. 51.

2.1.6. Q 13:34-35 and the Deuteronomistic Tradition

Steck's monumental study of the development and use, in Judaism and early Christianity, of the deuteronomistic motif of the violent fate of prophets was extremely important for the study of Q.⁴⁶ Most, if not all, scholars of Q now see the deuteronomistic tradition as decisive for both the theology of Q and its composition history.⁴⁷ Steck's interpretation of Q 13:34-35 with reference to the wisdom and deuteronomistic traditions was an important and influential contribution.⁴⁸

Steck believed that Jewish judgment-sayings have been preserved in both Q 11:49-50 (verse 51 being a later Christian addition that developed ideas already present in the original saying⁴⁹) and 13:34-35; although the two sayings were not actually joined before Matthew's gospel, they nonetheless arose from the same circle in Palestinian Judaism and, because they share the same *Gattung* ("des prophetischen Gerichtswortes"), they share a number of common features.⁵⁰ In both, personified Wisdom is the implied speaker, although the sayings differ in historical perspective. Both also develop the deuteronomistic theme of the violent rejection of prophets to include those sent (11:49, ἀποστόλους; 13:34, τοὺς ἀποσταλμένους) to Israel after

⁴⁶ Steck, *Israel*.

⁴⁷ See in particular Jacobson, *First Gospel*, 70-6. "Thus the organizing principle which gives literary unity to Q and provides coherence to its various characteristics is to be found in an understanding of Israel and the mission to her of John and Jesus, an understanding shaped by the deuteronomistic and wisdom traditions as they were mediated by the hasidic movement" (ibid., 75-6).

⁴⁸ It must be noted, however, that Steck viewed the saying as having originated in a setting characterized by a fear of an imminent destruction of Jerusalem (c. 66-70; *Israel*, 237-9), and thus was dated too late for inclusion in Q (ibid., 283 n. 1). See Robinson, "Sequence of Q," 248.

⁴⁹ Steck, *Israel*, 223.

⁵⁰ Ibid., 231-2, 239.

the biblical period.⁵¹ Most importantly for Steck, the two sayings represent a unique combination of the deuteronomistic and wisdom traditions.

Q 11:49-50, which Steck dated at somewhere between 150 BCE and the composition of Q,⁵² displays an important result of the convergence of the deuteronomistic and wisdom traditions: here Wisdom, as the one who sends the prophets, stands in the place of God as speaker and judge in the deuteronomistic statement about the prophets. In Steck's analysis, this is possible because whereas the deuteronomistic tradition has God issuing a call to obedience through his prophets, in the wisdom tradition it is Wisdom who issues such an invitation.⁵³ A further development is apparent in Q 13:34-35: Wisdom, who in an earlier tradition was scorned by the nations but found a home in Jerusalem (Sir 24:11), now is scorned by Israel in the rejection of her prophetic appeals and withdraws from the people.⁵⁴

According to Steck, Wisdom therefore must be the speaker throughout Q 13:34-35; he saw no evidence of any Christian addition or interference in this "jüdische Traditionsstück."⁵⁵ The supra-historical speaker of Q 13:34 cannot be God because of the divine passive ἀφίεται in verse 35a; thus the speaker must be the personified Wisdom. The λέγω ὑμῖν signifies no change in speaker, since Wisdom speaks in 13:34-35a and withdraws from Jerusalem in verse 35b.⁵⁶ In

⁵¹ Ibid., 223, 231-2.

⁵² Ibid., 226.

⁵³ Ibid., 225-6. Tuckett relates the convergence of the deuteronomistic and wisdom traditions in Q 11:49-51 to the rejection of Wisdom in her emissaries the prophets, that is, the Q missionaries: "Q thus seems to have introduced a new combination of traditions in interpreting the rejection of its own messengers as in a line of continuity with the rejected prophets of the deuteronomistic tradition and with the figure of rejected Wisdom" (Q, 170).

⁵⁴ Steck, *Israel*, 232.

⁵⁵ Ibid., 227, 235.

⁵⁶ Ibid., 230-2.

particular, verse 35b is a statement “worin sich das V. 35a angekündigte Gericht im Blick auf die Beziehung der Angeredeten zur Weisheit auswirken wird.”⁵⁷

For Steck, the “You will not see me ...” clause represented a time without salvation (“heillose Zeit”): God’s judgment comes in the destruction of Jerusalem and the withdrawal of Wisdom from the people’s midst, so that “als Frist zu Umkehr und Gehorsam kann diese Folgezeit also nicht verstanden werden.”⁵⁸ But the ἔως-clause signifies that “nun ist diese heillose Folgezeit im Jerusalemwort allerdings befristet.” It looks ahead to an eschatological time when Jerusalem would once again see Wisdom.⁵⁹

Steck was aware that no surviving wisdom text describes a return of the withdrawn Wisdom. Thus he took Q 13:35b to refer to the Son of man who is greeted by the people when he comes to take up his office as judge. How is it then that Wisdom—which Steck viewed as the speaker throughout 13:34-35—returns? Wisdom, said Steck, is seen again as the wisdom of the Son of man: “Dann wird das Volk die jetzt wegziehende Weisheit wiedersehen, aber im Rahmen des Wirkens des Menschensohns, der richtet und verurteilt.”⁶⁰ Wisdom reappears after her withdrawal as an inherent characteristic of the judging office of the Son of man. This is an odd expedient—odd because another figure, the Son of man, intrudes into the framework of the wisdom myth—which Steck required because he insisted upon one speaker in Q 13:34-35.⁶¹

⁵⁷ Ibid., 235.

⁵⁸ Ibid. Steck saw the Jerusalem Lament as a fairly late Jewish tradition, composed and used when the threat of Jerusalem’s destruction was very real—between 66 and 70 (ibid., 237-9).

⁵⁹ Ibid., 236.

⁶⁰ Ibid., 237. Steck referred to *I En.* 49:3-4, 51:3.

⁶¹ Hoffmann also noted this difficulty: “Gerade die letzte Vorstellung [i.e., Wisdom reappearing with the advent of the Son of man] läßt sich jedoch schlecht mit dem Vorhergehenden vereinbaren und findet auch in der apokalyptischen Tradition keine ausreichende Stütze” (*Studien*, 176). Yet the notion of Wisdom returning with the Son of man was still maintained by Schulz (*Spruchquelle*, 359).

2.1.7. Q 13:34-35 and Wisdom Christology

The Jerusalem Lament was discussed in two monographs on wisdom Christology that appeared in 1970: Felix Christ's *Jesus Sophia* and Jack Suggs' *Wisdom, Christology and Law in Matthew's Gospel*. Christ's analysis of the Lament was largely influenced by Steck. Christ accepted Steck's conclusions concerning the saying's genre, its tradition history, and the converging influences of the deuteronomistic and wisdom traditions. In fact, the mythical framework that Steck sees in the saying was suggested by Christ as well, right down to the intrusion of the Son of man: "Dem entspricht die Weisheitstradition, nach der die als *Schekina* in *Jerusalem* wohnende Weisheit als *Gesetz* durch *Boten* um *Israel* wirbt, jedoch von den *Juden* *abgelehnt* wird, sich *zurückzieht*, bis sie zum *Gericht* als *Menschensohn* *wiederkommt*."⁶²

Christ's main contribution was that he allowed the saying to stand in its relationship to Jesus: "Im christlich adaptierten Jerusalemwort ist nun *Jesus* der Sprecher des Sophia-Logions: als 'Träger der Weisheit' spricht nun *er* das Wort."⁶³ Thus Jesus, as identified with Sophia ("Jesus Sophia"), dwells as Shekina in Jerusalem, works through the prophets and sent ones, makes appeals as the Law, is rejected, disappears, and returns as the Son of man.⁶⁴ Because Christ saw an identification of Jesus and Wisdom as the context of the saying's use in Christian circles (Christ does not say Q⁶⁵), the withdrawal of Wisdom which Steck (and Bultmann and

⁶² Christ, *Jesus Sophia*, 142-3; emphasis original.

⁶³ Ibid., 145; emphasis original. Christ cites W. Grundmann, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas* (2. Aufl.: THKNT 3: Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1961), 289.

⁶⁴ Ibid., 145-8.

⁶⁵ "Ob die Wehklage über Jerusalem schon in Q stand, bleibt offen, da der Kontext bei Mt und Lk verschieden ist" (ibid., 136).

others before him) perceived in Q 13:35b now refers to Jesus' disappearance through his death, resurrection and ascension:

In the Jerusalem saying, therefore, Jesus' death and resurrection were interpreted in terms of the Wisdom tradition (and especially the Sophia myth that stood behind that tradition): *Jesus' death and resurrection appear as the single event of the departure of Wisdom*, who found no place on earth to lay down her head, and who returned to her place. Jesus' ascension is therefore nothing other than the disappearance of Wisdom. It proves that Jesus is identified with Wisdom.⁶⁶

In addition, since Wisdom's departure was considered an eschatological sign (Christ cites Prov 1:28, *1 En.* 93:8, 94:5, and other texts), so was Jesus' disappearance.⁶⁷ Thus Christ anticipated, in a limited way, the arguments of Dieter Zeller, who (as will be seen below) tried to show that the speaker's disappearance in Q 13:35b was a reference to Jesus' assumption, and that the "Sign of Jonah" was actually "das Zeichen der zur Ankunft als Menschensohn entrückte."⁶⁸

Like Christ, Suggs sought to interpret the Jerusalem Lament from the perspective of wisdom Christology. He assumed "that the speaker in this pericope was, in Q, Sophia." But "it can properly be attributed to Jesus *only* when the step is taken which Matthew makes in the preceding pericope, that is, when Wisdom and Jesus are identified."⁶⁹ In Suggs' view, then, such a step had not yet been taken by Q. Suggs also considered that while the final sentence of Q 13:35 might be a Christian addition, Sophia is the speaker of the whole saying: "The lament is a lament of Sophia and the final sentence is to be so interpreted (even if it is a Christian

⁶⁶ "Im Jerusalemwort werden also Jesu Tod und Auferstehung von der Weisheitstradition (und speziell von dem dahinterstehenden Sophia-Mythos) her gedeutet: *Tod und Auferstehung erscheinen als ein und dasselbe Ereignis des Aufstiegs der Weisheit*, die auf Erden nicht hat, wo sie ihr Haupt hinlege, und an ihren Ort zurückkehrt. *Jesu Himmelfahrt* ist nichts anderes als das Entschwinden der Weisheit. Die Auffahrt Jesu weist Jesus als die Weisheit aus" (ibid., 147; emphasis original).

⁶⁷ Ibid., 146-7.

⁶⁸ Zeller, "Entrückung," 514-6, 522-5.

⁶⁹ Suggs, *Wisdom*, 67.

addition).⁷⁰ Yet because the return of Wisdom is not attested in Jewish wisdom materials, ὁ ἐρχόμενος must be someone other than the speaker, namely, the Messiah (and not the Son of man). Thus, said Suggs, “Bultmann is correct in his opinion that ‘Wisdom foretells that she will remain hidden until the coming of the Messiah.’”⁷¹ Like Bultmann, Suggs left unexplained how the coming of the Messiah is to be understood as the reappearance of Wisdom.

2.1.8. Q 13:34-35 and the Rejection of Jesus

Hoffmann’s view, as seen above, is that Q 13:34-35 makes explicit the fact that Jesus’ own fate is included in the violent fate of the prophets: the Jerusalem Lament makes unequivocal (“eindeutig”) reference to the rejection and death of Jesus, particularly in the “you will not see me ...” line.⁷² In his 1970 essay, “Jesusverkündigung in der Logienquelle,” Hoffmann interpreted Q 13:34 as arising from Jesus’ own rejected appeals to the children of Jerusalem. “In dem interpretierenden Zusatz 13:35 [sic],” Q makes reference to both Jesus’ death and the coming judge, so that Jesus the rejected one is identified with the Coming One. “Die Bemerkung ‘von nun an werdet ihr mich nicht mehr sehen’ weist auf den Tod Jesu hin. Außerdem spricht Q nicht nur vom drohenden Gericht, sondern vom kommenden Richter; dabei wird deutlich, daß der Abgelehnte mit dem Kommenden identisch ist.”⁷³

For Hoffmann, this convergence was decisive. As we saw above, he connected the belief in Jesus as the coming Son of man (“Menschensohn-Bekenntnis”) with the view that the

⁷⁰ Ibid., 70 n. 22.

⁷¹ Ibid., 70: Suggs cites Bultmann, *History*, 115.

⁷² Hoffmann, *Studien*, 187-8.

⁷³ Hoffmann, “Jesusverkündigung,” 64.

rejection and death of Jesus was, for Q, the decisive rejection of God's (or Wisdom's) appeal to the people of Israel through the prophets. "Hiermit bahnt sich eine folgenschwere Entwicklung an. Durch die Identifizierung des Abgelehnten mit dem kommenden Richter wird verständlicherweise die Ablehnung Jesu immer mehr als die *entscheidende* Ablehnung erkannt."⁷⁴

Hoffmann clarified and expanded this position in his later work *Studien zur Theologie der Logienquelle* (1972; third edition, 1982). A good deal of his discussion takes issue with the analysis of Steck. In Hoffmann's view, little can be determined concerning the original position of the Lament in Q, for the two sayings Q 11:49-51 and 13:34-35 were first joined by Matthew.⁷⁵ Whatever their original relationship either in Q or before Q, the two sayings did not originally stand together; from this it followed for Hoffmann that while 11:49-51 is given by Q as a saying of Wisdom, "das Jerusalemwort dagegen ist bei Lukas und bei Matthäus als ein Wort Jesu wiedergegeben."⁷⁶ This is significant, for Hoffmann went on to argue against the prevailing view that the speaker of Q 13:34-35 must have been a supra-historical entity.

Since Wisdom is not the speaker here, there is no reason to assume that the speaker is the one who sends τοὺς προφῆτας καὶ ... τοὺς ἀποσταλμένους, as is the case in Q 11:49. Hoffmann argued that whereas the present participles in the address to Jerusalem (ἀποκτείνουσα, λιθοβολοῦσα) have in view a general historical characteristic of the city,⁷⁷ the change in tense to aorist in the speaker's statement (ἤθελῃσα) refers to the speaker's own

⁷⁴ Ibid., 64-5; *Studien* 187-90. See also Sevenich-Bax, *Israel's Konfrontation*, 362.

⁷⁵ Hoffmann, *Studien*, 172.

⁷⁶ Ibid., 173.

⁷⁷ So also Manson, *Sayings*, 127.

experience in Jerusalem.⁷⁸ Hoffmann also saw the forms of address as illustrating this point: “Jerusalem” (verse 34a) refers to the whole history of the city, whereas “your children” indicates the speaker’s contemporaries. Thus the adverb *ποσάκις* indicates the speaker’s repeated appeals in Jerusalem, and not all the prophetic appeals down through the ages. The speaker aligns himself, however, with the prophets rejected by Jerusalem and expects his own rejection: “er sein Geschick in Analogie zu dem der Propheten und Gesandten versteht.”⁷⁹ The prophetic threat (*ἰδοὺ ἀφίεται ὁ οἶκος ὑμῶν*, 13:35a), which refers to the destruction of Jerusalem, was in Hoffmann’s view probably suggested by the general mood of the time, but “vielmehr hat die Redeweise ihren Grund in der Ablehnung, die den Sprecher, also Jesus, traf.”⁸⁰

Hoffmann took issue with Steck’s opinion that, Wisdom being the speaker throughout Q 13:34-35, there is no Christian addition at verse 35b. With respect to his own view that Jesus is the speaker in 13:34-35, Hoffmann declared that “Vers 35b kann kaum vom irdischen Jesus formuliert sein.”⁸¹ But Steck’s view leads to unnecessary complications because, as noted above, it requires that Wisdom reappears in the advent of the Son of man. In fact, so Hoffmann thought, Steck’s whole treatment requires that diverse elements of the wisdom myth be combined “ohne ausreichende Grundlage im Text.”⁸²

⁷⁸ Cf. Robinson, “The Sequence of Q,” 244: “The Lament ... can begin in the present tense, reproaching Jerusalem for killing (present participles) the emissaries, with Sophia (originally the implied subject, if the Lament followed directly upon Sophia’s Saying) having wished (aorist indicative) to gather the Jerusalemites under her wings, but they refused (aorist indicative).”

⁷⁹ Hoffmann, *Studien*, 173-4; citation from 174.

⁸⁰ Ibid., 175. Hoffmann says in his 1992 article “QR und Menschensohn” that while the saying concentrates on the speaker’s experiences of rejection in Jerusalem, the general prophetic statement itself remains somewhat in the background. This indicates, in Hoffmann’s view, that (against Steck) the saying originated as a Christian adaptation of the formally established *Prophetenaussage* (“Redaction of Q,” 191).

⁸¹ Ibid., 176. Since for Hoffmann Jesus is the speaker throughout the Jerusalem Lament, does not signal a change in speaker but only the importance of the saying’s conclusion (ibid., 177).

⁸² Ibid.

Because the line “you will not see me ...” does not refer to the withdrawal of Wisdom, Hoffmann argued that it should not be associated with the judgment (the abandonment of the house) in 13:35a. The use of the first person suggests that the theme of 13:34b—the rejection of the speaker—has been taken up again. Thus the redactional addition 13:35b looks back on the death of Jesus; when the Lament is understood this way, said Hoffmann, it becomes clear why it is directed at Jerusalem. “Das Wort richtet sich gegen die Stadt, in der man Jesus den Prozeß gemacht hat.”⁸³ In Jesus’ absence, the Q group took up his proclamation, but understood the intermediate period as oriented specifically towards the coming of Jesus the Son of man.⁸⁴

Finally, Hoffmann argued that an eschatological interpretation of Ps 118:26 may be deduced from other references to the “Coming One” in Q (Q 7:18-23, Matt 3:11 = Q), where the expression is a description for the Son of man identified with Jesus. The saying thus looks ahead to a time when the Son of man will be revealed (Luke 17:30 = Q). Hoffmann referred to *1 En.* 62:5-6, where in his view the Son of man who has been concealed is met with the praise of sinners.

Therefore, on the basis of this parallel and the wording of the saying itself, in which [the greeting from Psalm 118] can only be spoken to the one who judges Jerusalem, the saying looks ahead to the greeting of the Son of man who comes as the judge who will condemn Jerusalem. At that time, they will and must recognize and acknowledge Jesus as the Son of man. But it will be too late for their redemption.⁸⁵

⁸³ Ibid., 178-80; citation from 180.

⁸⁴ Ibid., 178.

⁸⁵ “Aufgrund dieser Parallele und der Aussage des Logions selbst, in dem nur vom Gericht über Jerusalem gesprochen wird, ist also an die Begrüßung des zum Gericht kommenden Menschensohnes gedacht, der Jerusalem verurteilen wird. Dann werden sie Jesus als den Menschensohn erkennen und anerkennen müssen. Doch für ihre Rettung wird es zu spät sein” (ibid).

Hoffmann reached the same conclusion as Steck, that the speaker who announced the looming destruction of Jerusalem also foresaw its final and irreversible eschatological condemnation.⁸⁶

In a later work, the essay "QR und der Menschensohn: Eine vorläufige Skizze" (1992 [1995]), Hoffmann refers to the views he argued earlier, but also goes on to associate Q's use of the deuteronomistic tradition and its identification of Jesus with the Son of man with the final redaction of Q. This association signifies a departure from his *Studien* in which he treated Q in a more unitary fashion.⁸⁷ In particular, he suggests that "the proclamation of the imminent judgment concerning this generation (cf. Q 11:49-51 with the redactional emphasis in v. 51) turns into the proclamation of the eschatological 'executor of judgment' Jesus, who for QR is the decisive representative of God's end-time action."⁸⁸

There are a few aspects of Hoffmann's treatment of the Lament saying which are somewhat problematic. First, his view that the final judgment of the Coming One will be an occasion of condemnation for Jerusalem causes difficulties. Although, as Hoffmann pointed out, such a belief on the part of the Q group could possibly have been occasioned by their own rejection, it would be difficult to understand on this basis how Q could have held out any further invitation to repentance. Second, it seems that "you will not see me ..." is a rather cryptic reference to Jesus' own rejection and death, particularly since in Hoffmann's view Q aligns Jesus' fate with the (more explicitly described in 13:34a) rejection of the prophets sent to Jerusalem. On the other hand, Tuckett is correct to note (in a similar connection) that "Q chooses

⁸⁶ See Steck, *Israel*, 237.

⁸⁷ See Hoffmann, *Studien*, 2-3, where he suggested that the redactional tendency in Q is toward an identification with tradition, making it difficult to distinguish between tradition and redaction. Cf. Hoffmann, "Redaction of Q," 159: "My present occupation with redactional history is at the same time an attempt to repair a deficit in my *Habilitationsschrift*."

⁸⁸ Hoffmann, "Redaction of Q," 192.

to present its message in the form of the preaching of Jesus himself and one cannot have a pre-Easter Jesus referring to his own death in the past.”⁸⁹ Nevertheless, it may be that a more satisfactory solution can be found, even one that takes Jesus’ death into account. Third, and most importantly, a difficulty arises from the fact that Hoffmann’s link between the “you will not see me ...” reference to Jesus’ rejection and death and the reference to the Parousia is the “Menschensohn-Bekenntnis.”⁹⁰ In Hoffmann’s view the Lament moves directly from Jesus’ death to his return, in order to emphasize the vindication of the rejected one, but this relies on the missing middle step of the “apocalypse” as the basis of Q’s understanding of Jesus’ exaltation. In other words, the theological presupposition that allows the identification of the rejected one with the Coming One is a Son of man-confession that, as we have seen above, presumes Easter faith.⁹¹

2.1.9. Q 13:35b, the Assumption of Jesus, and his Return as Son of Man

Zeller began his 1985 essay “Entrückung zur Ankunft als Menschensohn” with some reservations about the common view that the Jerusalem Lament was originally a continuation of the Wisdom saying of Q 11:49-51: “Es handle sich lediglich um zwei verwandte Worte, die auch in Q nicht aufeinander folgten.”⁹² He also noted that many authors understand 13:35b as a Christian addition to the quotation, because the wisdom tradition offers no parallel for Wisdom’s

⁸⁹ Tuckett, *Q*, 313 n. 86.

⁹⁰ See Hoffmann, “Jesusverkündigung,” 64-5; *Studien*, 187-90.

⁹¹ Hoffmann, *Studien*, 139-42.

⁹² Zeller, “Entrückung,” 514.

“personale Wiederkehr im Messias oder als Menschensohn.”⁹³ Thus he offered assumption as a better clarification of the “you will not see me” clause.⁹⁴

Zeller suggested that “‘nicht mehr sehen’ eine bezeichnende Umschreibung für Entrückung ist (2 Kg 2:12 u.a.),” and noted its proximity to disappearance language, which is more conventional assumption terminology.⁹⁵ If Q 13:35b contains a reference to the speaker’s assumption, argued Zeller, there is here “eine Überschneidung mit dem Sophia-Mythos, insofern man auch die Weisheit sucht und nicht findet.” The main difference, however, is that Jesus’ disappearance is an act of God, whereas when Wisdom leaves humanity, she departs to her rightful place.⁹⁶ Zeller further noted that the reappearance of Jesus in this context is not surprising; in fact, eschatological function is a correlate to assumption.⁹⁷ In both Jewish and Christian literature it is commonly held “daß sich Entrückung und eschatologische Funktion entsprechen.”⁹⁸ In Zeller’s view, the “Coming One” is Jesus, who by his assumption is installed as the Son of man; an analogy is to be found in the *Similitudes of Enoch* (1 Enoch 70), where the assumed Enoch is identified with the Son of man. His return is “einem schrecklichen Wieder-Sehen,” which results in the acclamation of blessing.⁹⁹

⁹³ Ibid., 515.

⁹⁴ Zeller noted that “es wird in der Exegese kaum beachtet” that “you will not see me” might be a reference to Jesus’ assumption. Casual references to the possibility can, according to Zeller, be found in W. G. Kümmel, *Verheissung und Erfüllung: Untersuchung zur eschatologischen Verkündigung Jesu* (2. Aufl.; ATANT 6; Basel: Heinrich Majer, 1953), 74; E. Gräßer, *Die Naherwartung Jesu* (SBS 61; Stuttgart: Katholische Bibelwerk, 1973), 110.

⁹⁵ Zeller, “Entrückung,” 515. See below, pp. 103-6 on Greco-Roman assumption terminology and motifs.

⁹⁶ Ibid., 515-6.

⁹⁷ See G. Haufe, “Entrückung und eschatologische Funktion im Spätjudentum,” *ZRGG* 13 (1961): 105-113.

⁹⁸ Zeller, “Entrückung,” 516-7. See below, pp. 120-1 on Jewish assumption terminology and motifs and pp. 146-51 on the eschatological return of assumed figures.

⁹⁹ Ibid., 517.

How does this interpretation contribute to the understanding of the Jerusalem Lament as a whole? First, Zeller stated that on this basis the omission of Jesus' death from Q 13:34 is comprehensible, since assumption is typically understood as an escape from death. Jesus' death is probably implied, but is intentionally skipped over. The idea of assumption can be used of historical persons "die eines plötzlichen Todes starben oder unter ungeklärten Umständen verschwanden. Sie negiert dann, daß es mit ihnen ein Ende hat."¹⁰⁰ Second, assumption fits well with the deuteronomistic understanding of history, evident in Q 13:34's emphasis on the violent fate of the prophets. According to Zeller, the *Animal Apocalypse* (*1 Enoch* 85-90) made explicit a connection between attempts on Elijah's life and his assumption (*1 En.* 89:51-52: see *1 Kgs* 19:14, *2 Kgs* 2:1-18).¹⁰¹

With respect to the origin of the Lament, Zeller offered that while Jesus himself may have understood his own rejection deuteronomistically, and thus could have spoken Q 13:34-35a during his final days in Jerusalem, verse 35b is likely a post-Easter addition. The analogy Zeller found in *1 Enoch* 71 led him to conclude that "erst die Anhänger Jesu so die eschatologische Bedeutsamkeit des ihnen durch den Tod entrissenen Meisters betont haben. Mindestens v. 35b dürfte also eine christliche Erweiterung sein."¹⁰² Although the conclusion of the saying fits very well with the rest of it, the reference to Jesus' assumption could only be have arisen after Easter.

¹⁰⁰ Ibid., 518. Recently Zeller restated his views about Q 13:34-35 in a paper presented the Louvain Colloquium. In particular he emphasizes (a) that the reference to Jesus' assumption bypasses the problem of his death, and (b) that the saying in no way offers the possibility of a positive outcome for Jerusalem. "Ich würde paraphrasieren: 'So gewiß ihr mich nicht mehr sehen werdet'—der als Entrückung verschleierte Tod Jesu was ja für die Q-Leute ein Faktum—'so gewiß werdet ihr mich als Wiederkommenden anerkennen müssen.' Die Unheilsankündigung wird also durch den Bis-Satz in keiner Weise relativiert" (Zeller, "Jesus, Q und die Zukunft Israels" [unpublished paper presented to the Colloquium Biblicum Lovaniense, Leuven, July 2000], 5).

¹⁰¹ Zeller, "Entrückung," 518.

¹⁰² Ibid., 519.

Much of the essay attempts to apply this insight drawn from the Jerusalem Lament to the enigmatic Sign of Jonah saying (Q 11:29-32). In particular, Zeller argued that the “sign of Jonah” (τὸ σημεῖον Ἰωνᾶ) must be understood as a realistic, future sign, consisting in the Son of man himself; furthermore, “das Zeichen, das Jesus legitimiert, bedeutet für das ‘böse Geschlecht’ Gericht.”¹⁰³ Zeller argued that the “sign of Jonah” is “das Zeichen der zur Ankunft als Menschensohn entrückte.”¹⁰⁴ The essay concludes with some implications for an understanding of Jesus’ fate in Q.¹⁰⁵

2.1.10. Q 13:34-35 and the Matthean Sequence, Again

Although he has written extensively on such topics as wisdom theology and “Easter faith” in Q, Robinson’s most important contribution to the study of the Jerusalem Lament is probably his 1996 essay “Building Blocks in the Social History of Q.”¹⁰⁶ In this essay Robinson takes issue with Mack’s treatment of three key deuteronomistic texts (Q 6:23c; 11:49-51; 13:34-35). These texts were the evidence offered by Steck for the deuteronomistic view in primitive Christianity,¹⁰⁷ and were also fundamental in Dieter Lührmann’s identification of a deuteronomistic redaction in Q.¹⁰⁸ Robinson thinks the “basic documentation for defining Q² as Deuteronomistic is ... eliminated by Mack” when he assigns two of the three fundamental texts

¹⁰³ Ibid., 520-1.

¹⁰⁴ Ibid., 522-5. For a more detailed discussion, see below pp. 277-90 on Zeller’s view of the sign of Jonah as the assumption of the Son of man.

¹⁰⁵ Ibid., 527-30.

¹⁰⁶ Robinson, “Building Blocks”: see also his “Sequence of Q.”

¹⁰⁷ Steck, *Israel*.

¹⁰⁸ Lührmann, *Redaktion*; see also Jacobson, *First Gospel*, and Kloppenborg, *Formation*.

(Q 6:23c and 13:34-35) to the third stratum.¹⁰⁹ Part of Mack's logic involves separating, on chronological grounds, 13:34-35 from 11:49-51. In Mack's view, "the people of Q used the myth of wisdom's envoys to express the horror of the war [Q 11:49-51], then the myth of wisdom's quest for a home to express sorrow in its aftermath [Q 13:34-35]."¹¹⁰

Robinson himself considers that the two sayings originally formed a unit: they form "one of the better instances in Q of a continuous train of thought, rather than of disconnected sayings."¹¹¹ Thus Robinson's view is that Matthew retains the original order of Q with respect to 13:34-35. Luke's placement of the Lament is redactional: he has moved the saying out of a context it would not fit (the meal in the Pharisee's house, Luke 11:37,53) to the narrative travelogue in Chapter 13 (see Luke 13:22,31-33).¹¹² But for evidence that Matthew's placement follows the Q order, Robinson goes back to 2 Chron 24:19-23, a "classic text" for the deuteronomistic view and the source upon which both Q 11:49-51 and 13:34-35 depend.¹¹³ That text describes the martyrdom of the prophet Zechariah (LXX: Azarias), who was stoned in the temple, and the following fall of Jerusalem to the Syrians; Robinson offers several parallels between both Q texts and 2 Chron 24:19-23. In order to explain the non-septuagintal name Zechariah, Robinson suggests that exegetical work in the Q redaction worked from other textual traditions than just the Septuagint, and he cites Q 7:27 as an example of the same phenomenon.

¹⁰⁹ Robinson, "Building Blocks," 100; see Mack, *Lost Gospel*, 83, 93, 98. Actually, Mack does not assign Q 6:23c to Q³, but Robinson suggests such an assignment is necessary if the rest of the beatitude (6:22-23ab) is assigned to Q², for the addition is clearly secondary ("Building Blocks," 100).

¹¹⁰ Mack, *Lost Gospel*, 175. A post-war setting for the final redaction of Q, including Q 13:34-35, has also been argued by Matti Myllykoski ("The Social History of Q and the Jewish War," in *Symbols and Strata*, 146-99, esp. 197-9 on 13:34-35).

¹¹¹ Robinson, "Building Blocks," 102.

¹¹² *Ibid.*, 103-4. In fact, since Robinson believes Luke has also re-ordered the Woes, the Lukan redaction is responsible for the two halves of what he calls the "Wisdom collection" (that is, Q 11:49-51 + 13:34-35) occurring in Luke after references to murdered prophets (Luke 11:47-48 [Q] and 13:31-33 [LkS]).

¹¹³ *Ibid.*, 104-6. See also Robinson, "Sequence of Q," 255-9.

In Robinson's view, Matthew apparently missed the references to the 2 Chronicles passage, for he identified the Zechariah with the son of Barachiah (Zech 1:1). If Matthew missed this connection, "one cannot then assume he secondarily brought together the two parts of the section dependent on 2 Chron 24:19-23 ..., if they had in fact been separated in Q. Matthew here has simply followed the Q order."¹¹⁴

While Robinson's argument for the allusions in Q 11:49-51 and 13:34-35 to 2 Chron 24:19-23 are compelling, his conclusion does not follow directly from the evidence he assembles. For even apart from the supposed relationship to 2 Chronicles, the Wisdom saying and the Jerusalem Lament have enough features in common to suggest to Matthew a secondary joining. Therefore, although Robinson's observations might give greater weight to the view that Matthew, not Luke, retains the original order of Q vis-à-vis these two sayings, such a view would have to be established on other grounds. As something of a follow-up, Robinson's 1998 essay "The Sequence of Q: The Lament over Jerusalem" presents a comprehensive review and assessment of the contributions of earlier scholars to the problem of the placement of the Lament in Q, and offers some suggestions concerning the redactional history of the Lament together with the whole Woes complex.¹¹⁵

¹¹⁴ Robinson, "Building Blocks," 106.

¹¹⁵ Robinson, "Sequence of Q," 253-5.

2.2. Implications

There are several fundamental issues whose closer analysis will be of importance to this study of Jesus' post-mortem vindication in Q. These include (1) the tradition-historical origin of the Jerusalem Lament, in particular the addition Q 13:35b, (2) its placement in Q, and (3) its relationship to its literary and theological contexts within the Q document. The main issue, however, concerns Zeller's insight that Q 13:35b contains a reference to Jesus' assumption as the means whereby his departure comes to be correlated with his return as the Son of man. Even if we agree with Zeller that discerning a reference to the assumption of Jesus makes the best sense of the disappearance-reappearance prospect in 13:35b, on a number of points it becomes apparent that further efforts with assumption in Q will be fruitful.

One weakness in Zeller's argument lies in the purpose he suggested for assumption theology in Q 13:35. Whereas resurrection imagery had the *religionsgeschichtliche* function of compensating for the problem of martyrdom, assumption has in mind the (eschatological) completion of the ministry, cut short by untimely death, of a righteous person now exalted. Thus, argued Zeller, the purposes of assumption theology in Q 13:35 are (1) to account for Jesus' exaltation, which (he claimed) the resurrection motif was unable to do, and (2) to legitimate the continuation of Jesus' mission in his absence.¹ But as shown above, Q 13:34-35, in particular when seen in conjunction with 11:49-51 and the polemic against "this generation," displays a deuteronomistic perspective, and probably hints at Jesus' own rejection and death. Thus Jesus' martyrdom as a prophet and his exaltation through assumption come together in the Jerusalem Lament. As noted above, Zeller argued that the Lament bypasses a specific reference to Jesus'

¹ Zeller, "Entrückung," 528-29.

death, because assumption was usually considered to be a divine rescue from death. Did Zeller correctly suppose that martyrdom requires the specific vindication of resurrection? If not, then what is the relationship between the Lament's focus on martyrdom and its interest in assumption/exaltation and Parousia? Chapter Three, a survey of assumption theology, will explore in part the question of how assumption can be used as an expression of divine intervention on behalf of people whose death was known.

In addition, it must be stressed that Zeller's reasoning was complicated by his view that Q did not develop in isolation from the apostolic community envisioned in 1 Cor 15, and therefore must have known the resurrection kerygma.² In fact, Zeller argued that the idea of assumption in Q 13:35b could only have arisen "nach Ostern," so that Q's use of assumption presumes a prior resurrection-faith.³ As we have seen above, such an presumption is problematic. If Q (in its final form) bears witness to a belief in Jesus' post-mortem rescue, vindication and exaltation, this does not prove that Q knew the resurrection kerygma.

The document's theological interests lay elsewhere. If Q at its final stages understood Jesus' post-mortem vindication in terms of assumption, rather than resurrection, the connection between assumption and Q's view of Jesus' ongoing presence or existence must be explored. This will be examined in Chapter Four, on assumption theology in Q 13:34-35. Certainly, if Q 13:34-35 (or at least the pivotal verse 35b) came into the document at a late or final stage in its compositional history, it cannot be suggested that the death of Jesus (or his post-mortem vindication or exaltation) was a pressing problem for the Q community from its beginning. Nevertheless, a late redactional addition can signal a fundamental shift. Perhaps the influence of

² Ibid., 528.

³ Ibid., 519.

assumption theology can also be discerned in other Q materials; and furthermore, it must be considered whether the presence of assumption theology in the Jerusalem Lament would require other (possibly earlier, from a compositional perspective) components of Q to be read in a different light. These issues will be considered in Chapter Five, which will attempt to read certain elements of “Final Q” in light of the assumption theology discerned in the Jerusalem Lament.

It should be noted, finally, that a few scholars have taken up Zeller’s observation that Q 13:35b refers to Jesus’ assumption.⁴ John Nolland, for instance, thinks that Zeller is “probably right to appeal to Jewish traditions of figures translated to heaven in preparation for a future role ... Jesus will be snatched away (through death in his case) to heaven until it is time for his eschatological role.”⁵ Kloppenborg likewise sees a connection between assumption and Jesus’ eschatological function in Q, suggesting that “this accounts for the fact that Q accords Jesus’ death no special salvific significance, but jumps immediately to Jesus’ return as the Son of Man.”⁶ Risto Uro similarly thinks that “such parallels [as Zeller suggests] may be helpful for the understanding of what kind of exaltation traditions Q may presuppose.”⁷ Uro also thinks that Jesus’ withdrawal in Q 13:35b has affinities with the “absent Lord” theology evident in the

⁴ Edwards entertained the possibility that either resurrection or assumption “led to the christological cognition on which is the foundation of the Q community,” but nowhere clarifies how or why “assumption” may have entered the picture as an alternative vindication scenario (*Sign of Jonah*, 84). Apparently he arrived at “assumption” as a means of exaltation (*ibid.*, 84 n. 15). On assumption and exaltation without resurrection, see below, pp. 293-7.

⁵ J. Nolland, *Luke 9:21–18:34* (WBC 35B; Dallas: Word, 1993), 742.

⁶ “To understand Q 13:35b on the analogy of these assumption texts suggests that the Q people may have regarded Jesus’ death as the death of a just man or a prophet whom God had assumed, pending some future eschatological function” (Kloppenborg, *Excavating Q*, 378). See also Kirk, *Composition*, 314-15.

⁷ Uro, “Apocalyptic Symbolism,” 111 n. 127.

Markan empty tomb narrative (16:1-8).⁸ Uro thus raises the issue of the implications of assumption theology in Q for an understanding of Christian origins. Chapter Six will explore the possibility of related traditions about the assumption of Jesus, examining (1) extracanonical materials concerning an assumption of Jesus from the cross, (2) Mark's "Empty Tomb" story (Mark 16:1-8), and (3) Stephen's vision of the Son of man (Acts 7:51-56).

⁸ See R. Uro, "Jeesus-liike ja ylösnousemus," in *Jeesus-liikkeestä kristinuskoksi* (Helsinki: Yliopistopaino, 1995), 93-111, esp. 110-1. An English translation of this essay ("The Jesus Movement and the Resurrection") was prepared for me by Hannu Aalto, with corrections by Risto Uro.

Chapter Three: Assumption in Antiquity

The idea of human beings journeying from earth to heavenly or otherworldly realms was practically ubiquitous in the ancient world, and as a result has been the subject of great scholarly interest.¹ The aim of this chapter is to trace as far as possible the logic—that is, the associations of terminology, mode, and motif—of assumption, one very specific type of otherworldly journey, in order to determine the background of assumption theology against which the cryptic note in Q 13:34-35 may be understood. In particular, those traditions which seem to combine death and assumption will be closely examined since, with the addition of 13:35, the final framer(s) of Q may have combined assumption theology with the (implicit) knowledge of the fact and means of Jesus' death.

Some preliminary discussion of definitions is necessary. Alan Segal has argued that two types of transmundane journey existed in the Hellenistic world, *anabasis* and *katabasis*, each being a formal transformation of the other. In the first an earthly figure travels to heaven, and in the second, a heavenly figure descends to earth.² In both cases the purpose, generally, is a mediation of some kind.³ Many types of heavenly journey may be described under the heading of

¹ See W. Bousset, "Die Himmelsreise der Seele," *ARW* 4 (1901): 136-69; 228-73; G. Lohfink, *Die Himmelfahrt Jesu: Untersuchungen zu den Himmelfahrts- und Erhöhungstexten bei Lukas* (SANT 26; München: Kosel Verlag, 1971), esp. 32-79; A. Schmitt, *Entrückung—Aufnahme—Himmelfahrt: Untersuchungen zu einem Vorstellungsbereich im Alten Testament* (2. Aufl.; FB 10; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1976); A. F. Segal, "Heavenly Ascent in Hellenistic Judaism, Early Christianity and their Environment," *ANRW* 23.2:1333-94; M. Dean-Otting, *Heavenly Journeys: A Study of the Motif in Hellenistic Jewish Literature* (Judentum und Umwelt 8; Frankfurt and New York: Peter Lang, 1984); M. Himmelfarb, *Ascent to Heaven in Jewish and Christian Apocalypses* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993). Brief surveys may be found in J. D. Tabor, *Things Unutterable: Paul's Ascent to Heaven in Its Greco-Roman, Judaic, and Early Christian Contexts* (Studies in Judaism; Lanham, Md.: University Press of America, 1986); A. W. Zwiep, *The Ascension of the Messiah in Lukan Christology* (NovTSup 87; Leiden, New York, and Köln: Brill, 1997).

² Segal, "Heavenly Ascent," 1337-40.

³ But see D. J. Halperin, "Ascension or Invasion: Implications of the Heavenly Journey in Ancient Judaism," *Religion* 18 (1988): 47-67.

anabasis, or ascent, and these must be carefully distinguished. Probably the clearest and most complete attempt to categorize the different types of ascent is found in Gerhard Lohfink's monumental study of the Lukan ascension narratives, *Die Himmelfahrt Jesu* (1971).⁴ The following definitions are loosely based on his work.

The otherworldly journey, called "Himmelsreise" or "Himmelfahrt" by Lohfink, is a broad category which for sake of clarity may be subdivided according to the end result of the journey. Many of the heavenly journeys described in ancient literature were clearly temporary in nature, while others meant the end of the earthly life of the individual in question. All temporary otherworldly journeys will be given the blanket designation "ascent," while the final journeys will be more precisely categorized. Although the present survey will not focus primarily on the temporary heavenly journeys, it is still necessary to define some of the issues involved.

Some ascents or temporary journeys could be described as ecstatic or mystical in nature, since the subject of the journey is the soul or spirit, quite apart from the body: often such journeys take place within the context of a dream.⁵ Other ascents were more clearly thought of as bodily experiences.⁶ In Paul's description of an ascent (probably his own) to heaven, he professes ignorance of the mode of the journey ("whether in the body or out of the body I do not

⁴ See above, p. 85 n. 1.

⁵ Lohfink, *Himmelfahrt Jesu*, 32-4.

⁶ The shorter recension of the *Testament of Abraham* contains what is probably the clearest example of a bodily ascent. Abraham requests that Michael take him up bodily (*T. Ab.* [short] 7:19) into heaven in order that he might see "the things of creation", and God grants his request. According to F. Schmidt, *Le Testament grec d'Abraham: Introduction, édition critique des deux recensions grecques, traduction* (TSAJ 11: Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1986), there are two manuscript families in the shorter recension. They do not entirely agree on the wording of Abraham's request or the ensuing discussion between Michael and God (8:2-3), but "bodily" language is prominent: *σωματικῶς* and *σώματι* (*T. Ab.* [short] 8:2-3, MSS E and ACDHI); and *ἐν σώματι* (*T. Ab.* [short] 7:19, 8:2, MSS BFG). The longer recension also reports Abraham's request and the subsequent journey but does not stress the bodily nature of the ascent in the same way: bodily language occurs only in the request (*T. Abr.* [long] 9:6). Lohfink was not surprised by this emphasis, but supposed that "Man muß wohl von dem Prinzip ausgehen, daß überall, wo nicht ausdrücklich das Gegenteil gesagt wird, die Reise ἐν σώματι geschieht" (Lohfink, *Himmelfahrt Jesu*, 53).

know, but God knows," 2 Cor 12:2-3), but at least he allows that both were possible. What Paul emphasizes here—the fact that this ascent was an act of divine and not human initiative—has been found by Martha Himmelfarb to be characteristic of most of the ascents described in Jewish and Christian literature.⁷ While techniques for initiating ascent are not unknown,⁸ they appear to be rare, and according to Himmelfarb the actions of the individual before an ascent (mourning or ascetic practice in apocalyptic literature, for instance) do not initiate it, but serve only to prepare the person to experience the ascent, which comes as an act of God.⁹

We turn our attention now to those ascents which concluded the earthly career of the individual. In one type of final heavenly journey, the soul is thought of as ascending out of the body at the time of death. The soul makes its ascent either on its own, that is, on the basis of its own quasi-divine nature,¹⁰ or with the help of an intermediary.¹¹ In his discussion of Greco-Roman materials, Lohfink treated this final journey of the soul together with non-corporeal temporary ascents, but he noted that in Jewish literature "bildet der Aufstieg der Seele nach dem

⁷ M. Himmelfarb, "The Practice of Ascent in the Ancient Mediterranean World," in *Death, Ecstasy, and Other Worldly Journeys* (ed. J. J. Collins and M. Fishbane; Albany, N.Y.: State University of New York Press, 1995), 121-137, esp. 128-33.

⁸ Lohfink, *Himmelfahrt Jesu*, 33 cites the famous so-called "Mithras Liturgy" (Paris P. 574) which, whatever its origin or purpose, appears to be a series of incantations intended to produce a mystical ascent into the divine realm. See M. Meyer, *The "Mithras Liturgy"* (SBLTT 10; Graeco-Roman Series 2; Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1976). Himmelfarb argues that the Mithras Liturgy has been wrongly understood as the "tip of the iceberg" of magical materials describing ascent techniques ("The Practice of Ascent," 123-6).

⁹ Himmelfarb, "The Practice of Ascent," 130-2. On the issue of the experiential "reality" of ascent, see D. J. Halperin, "Heavenly Ascension in Ancient Judaism: The Nature of the Experience," in *Society of Biblical Literature 1987 Seminar Papers* (ed. K. H. Richards; SBLSP 26; Atlanta: Scholars, 1987), 218-32.

¹⁰ Here Lohfink cites a Greek epitaph (CIG II 3398; Greek and German in W. Peek, *Griechische Grabgedichte: Griechisch und Deutsch* [Schriften und Quellen der Alten Welt 7; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1960], no. 391). It reads in part: "My soul flees from my heart into the ether like a breeze ... and as I draw near the house of the blessed gods receives me, and I behold in the heavenly dwellings the light of the early-born ..." (ψυχὴ δ' ἐκ κραδῆς δρᾶμι ἐς αἰθέρον εἴκελος ἀῶρη ... καὶ με θεῶν μακάρων κατέχει δόμος ἄσπον ἰόντα, οὐρανίοις τε δόμοισι βλέπω φάος Ἥριγενεῖς [CIG II 3398 ll. 4,6]). Segal notes that the similarity between ecstatic heavenly ascent and the journey of the soul after death displays "the almost universal structure of the ascent myth" ("Heavenly Ascent," 1341). See first Bousset, "Die Himmelsreise der Seele," 136.

¹¹ See, for instance, *T. Ab.* (short) 14:6-8; *T. Ab.* (long) 20:10-14.

Tod eine eigene Erzählform.”¹² For our purposes in the present survey, we will designate the final ascent of the soul, whether in Greco-Roman or Jewish materials, with Lohfink’s term “the ascent of the soul” (“Aufnahme der Seele”). Despite certain affinities with assumption, the apotheosis of the Roman emperor should probably be considered under this category.¹³ The ascent of the soul was thought of, normally, as a reward for a virtuous life, and as such was a spiritualized “assumption” reserved for special cases.¹⁴ This idea is at the root of a tradition in Hellenistic consolation literature which applied assumption language to people who had died early.¹⁵

There were two types of final journey in which the whole person was taken bodily into heaven. First, “assumption” (Lohfink: “Entrückung”) signifies a final, bodily removal of a person from earth into heaven, usually—but, we will try to show, not always—while they are

¹² Lohfink, *Himmelfahrt Jesu*, 53.

¹³ Lohfink suggested that the *consecratio* of the emperor, the imperial funeral rite, was based upon assumption theology (*Himmelfahrt Jesu*, 41), because of the way it evoked the deification of Romulus (ibid., 34-35). Yet he also says that it was a “fictive” assumption (ibid., 46); furthermore, “die römische Kaiserapotheose, dieses seltsame Gemisch aus politischem Kalkül, Sakralrecht, Totenkult und Entrückungsglauben, wurde oft als Seelenaufstieg uminterpretiert,” that is, reinterpreted as such by those tending to spiritualize such ideas (ibid., 49-50). Yet the primary criterion for assumption must be its bodily nature (so also Lohfink, *Himmelfahrt Jesu*, 39), and it does not seem to be the case that the apotheosis of the emperor was perceived as a bodily ascent—although, admittedly, it is impossible to know what sort of beliefs were present in ancient folk religion (so Lohfink, *Himmelfahrt Jesu*, 50).

For the view that the soul of the emperor ascended and was deified, see Ovid, *Metam.* 15.1243-1254 (Julius Caesar); Cassius Dio 56.42 (Augustus); Dio 75.4-5 (Pertinax); Herodian 4.2 (Septimus Severus). See also Segal, “Heavenly Ascent,” 1348-9; S. G. MacCormack, *Art and Ceremony in Late Antiquity* (Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 1981), 102-5; and S. R. F. Price, “From Noble Funerals to Divine Cult: The Consecration of Roman Emperors,” in *Rituals of Royalty: Power and Ceremonial in Traditional Societies* (ed. S. Price, D. Cannadine; Past and Present Publications; Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 56-105, esp. 76. Cf. E. Bickermann, “Die römische Kaiserapotheose,” *ARW* 27 (1929): 1-31 = A. Wlosok, ed., *Römischer Kaiserkult* (WF 372; Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1978), 82-121, esp. 92-100; Bickermann thought that the point of burning the wax effigy was to cause the disappearance of the “body” without mortal remains (as happened to Herakles in some accounts). The lack of remains would lead to the conclusion of a bodily assumption (ibid., 99-100).

¹⁴ See Peter G. Bolt, “‘Do You Not Care That We Are Perishing?’ Jesus’ Defeat of Death and Mark’s Early Readers” (Ph.D. diss., King’s College, London, 1997), 257, citing, e.g., Cicero, *Resp.* 2.17.

¹⁵ See below, pp. 135-40.

still alive.¹⁶ In previous scholarly efforts, assumption has usually been defined as a final bodily ascent to heaven which *necessarily* implies an escape from death.¹⁷ In this survey we will attempt to demonstrate that assumption language and theology sometimes came to be applied to people who had clearly died. In other words, the literary evidence may require a certain amount of flexibility in our definitions. Additionally, assumption will not be taken to include the kind of sudden “translation” from one place to another (such as Philip’s experience in Acts 8:39) which obviously did not mean the end of a person’s earthly life, even though in the primary sources the language used is often the same.

Second, “ascension” will be used for the taking up of individuals after they have been raised from the dead, or for the taking up of divine or heavenly figures at the conclusion of a visionary appearance.¹⁸ Although Lohfink determined that, formally speaking, “Die Himmelfahrt Jesu bei Lukas ist eine Entrückung,”¹⁹ he also noted that something different was involved when the sequence “Tod—Auferweckung—Entrückung” is observed (see also Rev 11:12). For this reason a distinction should be made between assumption and ascension.²⁰

¹⁶ Lohfink, *Himmelfahrt Jesu*, 34-50, 55-70. Lohfink also emphasized the bodily nature of assumption in antiquity (*ibid.*, 39). In his recent study of the Lukan ascension narratives, A. W. Zwiep uses the term “rapture-preservation” which, though somewhat unwieldy, quite rightly connotes the ideas of suddenness and blessing that are intrinsic to assumption (Zwiep, *Ascension*).

¹⁷ According to Lohfink, “Wer entrückt wird, braucht den Tod nicht zu schmecken. Umgekehrt gilt: Wer wirklich stirbt, kann nicht entrückt werden” (*Himmelfahrt Jesu*, 74). See also Schmitt, *Entrückung—Aufnahme—Himmelfahrt*, 2; A. Schmitt, “Zum Thema ‘Entrückung’ im Alten Testament,” *BZ* 26 (1982): 34-49, esp. 34. For the contrary view see already E. Bickermann, “Das leere Grab,” *ZNW* 23 (1924): 281-92 = P. Hoffmann, ed., *Zur neutestamentlichen Überlieferung von der Auferstehung Jesu* (WF 522; Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1988), 271-84. Bickermann argued that in some instances the death of a person was no impediment to a belief in their assumption: “die Todesvorstellung spielte bei dieser Auffassung keine Rolle” (“Das leere Grab,” 290 [original publication]). Bickermann’s principal example, of course, is the Markan empty tomb narrative (Mark 16:1-8).

¹⁸ Lohfink called this “Himmelfahrt als Abschluß einer Erscheinung” (Lohfink, *Himmelfahrt Jesu*, 70-2).

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 75.

²⁰ See J. Plevnik, “The Taking Up of the Faithful and the Resurrection of the Dead in I Thessalonians 4:13-18,” *CBQ* 46 (1984): 274-83, esp. 278 n. 16.

One final definition must be made at this point. George Nickelsburg defines resurrection as “the eschatological act by which God the judge raises the dead in order to recompense them for their deeds.” Furthermore, “resurrection and its equivalents function variously as recompense for the lack of divine justice in this world, as reward and punishment for one’s deeds, or, in special cases, to exalt and glorify the persecuted leaders of the community.”²¹ Nickelsburg has shown that late Jewish thought, though far from consistent in its understanding of resurrection, tended to associate a future eschatological resurrection with the vindication of the righteous, whether on an individual basis or in the context of a universal judgment.²² Although sometimes the vindication in question is individual in nature, resurrection is typically a corporate phenomenon.²³ The application of the resurrection idea to an individual, Jesus, appears to be a departure from the corporate understanding,²⁴ though obviously the associations with vindication are retained in this instance. In the various texts that show evidence of a belief in a future eschatological resurrection, the precise fate of the body is not always understood in terms of its revivification.²⁵

²¹ G. Nickelsburg, “Resurrection: Early Judaism and Christianity,” *ABD* 5.684-91; citation from 684.

²² G. Nickelsburg, *Resurrection, Immortality and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism* (HTS 26; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1972).

²³ Compare 2 Maccabees 7 with other texts that associate a universal judgment with the general resurrection. See Nickelsburg, *Resurrection, Immortality and Eternal Life*, 94-5; 131-43. H. C. C. Cavallin found that one consistent anthropological idea in Jewish resurrection thought was that “the personality survives death in that which constitutes the personal identity,” probably to ensure recompense at the judgment. Cavallin, *Life After Death: Paul’s Argument for the Resurrection of the Dead in 1 Cor 15. Part I: An Enquiry into the Jewish Background* (ConBNT 7/1; Lund: Gleerup, 1974), 212.

²⁴ The connection between Jesus’ resurrection (individual) and a future eschatological resurrection (corporate) is of course defended at length by Paul in 1 Corinthians 15.

²⁵ Compare, for instance, Dan 12:2-3 (which suggests astral immortality) and *1 En.* 103:3-4 (which suggests a spiritual resurrection) with 2 Maccabees 7 (which suggests physical resurrection). See the survey of material in Cavallin, *Life After Death*, 197-9. Adela Collins suggests that similarly disparate views of the fate of the body may be found in materials on the resurrection of Jesus: see A. Yarbro Collins, “The Empty Tomb and Resurrection according to Mark,” in *The Beginning of the Gospel: Probing of Mark in Context* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992), 119-48, esp. 123-7, 143-6.

In this thesis it will be argued that assumption theology in Q deals with the problem of Jesus' post-mortem vindication differently than resurrection theology appears to have functioned in other circles. Since the present concern, then, is the vindication of Jesus, "resurrection" will be understood to connote Jesus' permanent post-mortem return to life.²⁶ The standard terminology includes the verbs ἀνίστημι and ἐγείρω, and the noun ἀνάστασις.²⁷ The differences between assumption and resurrection, as they apply to the case of Jesus, may be spelled out in tentative fashion here, though admittedly this is to anticipate somewhat the results of this chapter's survey of the primary sources. Assumption and resurrection differ with respect to the fate of the body and their theological associations. Assumption involves the disappearance of the body, although it will be seen that in some instances assumption language and theology is used almost euphemistically (as opposed to realistically) for someone who had died.²⁸ Resurrection as an individual mode of post-mortem vindication, whether or not the body itself is thought of as being revived, involves an appearance of the resurrected person, rather than the disappearance of the body.²⁹ Assumption, as will be seen, is associated typically with divine favour and status elevation, and consistently, in Jewish thought, with special eschatological function. With

²⁶ Here a distinction is made between "resurrection" and non-permanent raisings of the dead. Robert Martin-Achard writes of the three instances in Kings (1 Kgs 17:17-24; 2 Kgs 4:31-37; 13:20-21) that "nowhere is there any mention of a definitive victory over death: the resurrection effected by the prophet consisted in the restoration to health of a patient" ("Resurrection: Old Testament," *ABD* 5.680-4; citation from 681).

²⁷ See the discussion of vocabulary in C. F. Evans, *Resurrection and the New Testament* (SBT 2/12; London: SCM, 1970), 20-7.

²⁸ See below, pp. 134-43 on the *dikaïos* in Wisdom 2-5 and the parallels in Hellenistic consolation literature. In such uses disappearance language does not occur (since the body does not disappear), though other assumption terminology—particularly rapture (ἀρπάζω and cognates) or taking up (ἀναλαμβάνω) language—does occur.

²⁹ See 1 Cor 15:5-8, the appearance narratives in Matthew, Luke, and John, and *Gos. Pet.* 10.

resurrection, such ideas—particularly exaltation—are sometimes present, but only indirectly and often with special exegetical rationale.³⁰ Luke distinguished between resurrection and assumption, and this is good grounds for our distinction between these two categories.³¹

The following survey will trace the idea of assumption beginning from the Ancient Near East antecedents of the Enoch traditions. Relevant material from Greco-Roman, biblical, Hellenistic Jewish, and early Christian sources will also be discussed. Of particular interest are the terminology, means, and end result of assumption. Closer attention will be paid to materials that appear to represent important developments in the logic of assumption—for example, the application of assumption language and theology to the dead righteous person in Wisdom of Solomon 4–5. The survey will conclude with a section on the assumption of Mary. This material is of special interest because, despite its late date and the obvious influence of the veneration of Mary on the development of the narrative tradition, the framers of the traditions about Mary's end clearly saw their belief in her post-mortem assumption as consistent with the idea as it usually occurred in antiquity.

³⁰ Compare, for instance, Rom 1:3–4 (which seems to associate Jesus' resurrection with his exaltation as Son of God) and Rom 8:34; Acts 2:31–36 (which add the explicit rationale of session or enthronement theology, based on Psalm 2). Nickelsburg says that the resurrection "*facilitates* Jesus' exaltation as Lord and Judge" ("Resurrection," 688; emphasis added).

³¹ Compare Acts 2:23–24; 4:10 (resurrection as post-mortem vindication) with Acts 2:31–35 (assumption as exaltation) and Acts 1:11 (assumption as expressive of eschatological significance). See further the brief discussions below, pp. 154, 310.

Some commentators discern a blurring of categories between resurrection and assumption, in both Christian and Jewish sources. See, for instance, Cavallin, *Life After Death*, 205–6. Cavallin appears to have in mind not resurrection *per se* but post-mortem preservation in a more general sense. Cf. Evans, *Resurrection and the New Testament*, 137–8 (cited below, p. 296). See also J. Holleman, *Resurrection and Parousia: A Traditio-Historical Study of Paul's Eschatology in 1 Corinthians 15* (NovTSup 84; Leiden: Brill, 1996), 144–57, who rightly distinguishes between "martyrological resurrection" and "the heavenly vindication of the martyr" depending on whether post-mortem preservation is expressed specifically in resurrection terms or not.

3.1: The Ancient Near East Antecedents of Assumption

There are numerous examples of ascent or assumption in the literature of the Ancient Near East, although in some cases it is not always clear whether the ascent is permanent or temporary. In the instances examined here, several predominant themes emerge. First, ascent to the divine realm is reserved for humans of unique merit. Second, divine blessing or knowledge, or even divine or immortal nature, is bestowed on those who ascend. Third, in some instances the idea of assumption is closely approached, particularly when the individual(s) are made to dwell permanently in a distant paradisaic land. The texts examined in this section are thought by some to have exerted some influence, direct or indirect, on the earliest Enochic traditions.

3.1.1. Enoch and the Mesopotamian King Lists

The influence of Mesopotamian mythology—in particular, the Mesopotamian lists of antediluvian kings and their cities of rule—is commonly discerned by scholars in the note regarding Enoch in Gen 5:21-24. H. Zimmern (1902) was the first to note the close parallels between Genesis 5 and the king list from Berossos's *Babyloniaca* (c. 275 BCE).¹ Enoch is the seventh of ten antediluvian patriarchs in Genesis 5, and the seventh of ten kings in the Berossos list is Euedorankhos of Pautibiblon. Subsequent cuneiform discoveries have substantiated Zimmern's thesis. The Mesopotamian cuneiform lists, which name anywhere from seven to ten

¹ H. Zimmern, "Urkönige und Uroffenbarung," in *Die Keilschriften und das Alte Testament* (ed. E. Schrader; Berlin: Ruether, 1902), 530-43; see the discussion in H. S. Kvanig, *Roots of Apocalyptic: The Mesopotamian Background of the Enoch Figure of the Son of Man* (WMANT 61; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1988), 24-5. On the Berossos antediluvian king list, see G. P. Verbrugghe and J. M. Wickersham, *Berossos and Manetho, Introduced and Translated: Native Traditions in Ancient Mesopotamia and Egypt* (Ann Arbor, Mich.: The University of Michigan Press, 1996), 46-9, 70. *Babyloniaca* is preserved in citations from Eusebius, *Chronicon* and Syncellus, *Ecloga Chronographica*.

antediluvian kings, do not agree on the number, names, or order of the kings and the cities where they ruled.² Enmeduranki (or Enmeduranna) of Sippar appears in the sixth, seventh, or eighth position in the cuneiform lists. One very early text, dated at 1817 BCE, gives Enmeduranna of Sippar as the seventh king.³ Furthermore, since in such lists Enmeduranki is usually associated with Sippar, the city of the sun god, several scholars interpret Enoch's life-span of 365 years (Gen 5:23) as a hint, however muted, of the solar associations of Enmeduranki.⁴

It is not chiefly in the king lists but in other texts that similarities between Enmeduranki and Enoch appear. In 1967, W. G. Lambert published a reconstructed Akkadian cuneiform text (dated at before 1100 BCE), found in Nineveh, which records the tradition that Enmeduranki was given peculiar honour by the gods Šamaš and Adad: they brought him into their assembly, set him on a large throne of gold, and revealed to him the mysteries of divination.⁵ The apparent purpose is to legitimate divinatory practice by attributing to the diviner direct descent from the antediluvian king.⁶ A second tablet, a late Babylonian bilingual reconstructed by Lambert and Rykle Borger, claims that Nebuchadnezzar I (1125-1104 BCE) likewise was a direct descendent

² See J. VanderKam, *Enoch and the Growth of an Apocalyptic Tradition* (CBQMS 16; Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1984), 33-8 and Kvanig, *Roots of Apocalyptic*, 160-72. The tablets in question range in date from the end of the third millennium BCE to one (W 20 030.7, found at Uruk) whose scribe dated it to the reign of Antiochus IV (165 BCE).

³ WB 444. See T. Jacobsen, *The Sumerian King List* (Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago Assyriological Studies 11; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1939), 70-7.

⁴ See, for instance, J. C. VanderKam, *Enoch: A Man for All Generations* (Studies and Personalities of the Old Testament; Columbia, S.C.: University of South Carolina Press, 1995), 7; Kvanig, *Roots of Apocalyptic*, 51-3. Cf. Schmitt, *Entrückung—Aufnahme—Himmelfahrt*, 171-3; C. Westermann, *Genesis 1-11: A Commentary* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1984), 358.

⁵ W. G. Lambert, "Enmeduranki and Related Matters," *JCS* 21 (1967): 126-38, esp. 132-3. The text in question incorporates the fragments K 2486 + 3646 + 4364; K 3357 + 9941; K 13307.

⁶ Kvanig, *Roots of Apocalyptic*, 186-7.

of Enmeduranki.⁷ There are significant parallels with the first text described above: Enmeduranki enjoys a close association with Šamaš and Adad, and the mention of “the pure bowl” and “the cedar rod.”⁸

Enmeduranki’s presence with the gods is similar to the close relationship with God attributed to Enoch in Genesis 5.⁹ Nevertheless, according to Borger, “the material was, indeed, insufficient to afford indisputable identification” of Enmeduranki as the prototype of the biblical Enoch.¹⁰ What was lacking, says Borger, was mention of Enmeduranki being taken up into heaven—despite his presence in the assembly of Šamaš and Adad. Helge Kvanig, on the other hand, is more certain that in Mesopotamian myth Enmeduranki “went to heaven and distinguished himself with divine wisdom.”¹¹

Borger argues that whereas the origin of Enoch’s reputation, in apocalyptic literature, as a predictor of the future might be traced to Enmeduranki traditions, “the mythological conception of Enoch’s ascension to heaven derives, however, from Enmeduranki’s counselor, the seventh antediluvian sage, named Utuabzu!”¹² The thesis of a composite origin for the biblical and pseudepigraphical figure of Enoch is not new, however. Others before Borger argued that the

⁷ Lambert, “Enmeduranki,” 130, 132; R. Borger, “The Incantation Series *Bīt Mēseri* and Enoch’s Ascension to Heaven,” in *“I Studied Inscriptions from before the Flood”: Ancient Near Eastern, Literary, and Linguistic Approaches to Genesis 1–11* (ed. D. T. Tsumura, R. S. Hess; Sources for Biblical and Theological Study 4; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1994), 224–233, esp. 226. See also the discussion in VanderKam, *Enoch and the Growth*, 38–45.

⁸ According to Lambert these items were used in divinatory ritual (“Enmeduranki,” 127).

⁹ VanderKam argued that “[P] seems to have rendered the traditional motif of the seventh king’s entry into the society of the gods by employing *hā ’elōhim* to mean ‘the angels’... P uses *hā ’elōhim* to mean ‘the angels’ in distinction from the anarthrous *’elōhim* at the end of v 24 which refers to God himself” (*Enoch and the Growth*, 44; see also VanderKam, *Enoch: A Man for All Generations*, 13).

¹⁰ Borger, “*Bīt Mēseri*,” 228.

¹¹ Kvanig, *Roots of Apocalyptic*, 204. “Enmeduranki was brought to the assembly of the gods. [...] The gods were located in different places in Mesopotamian mythology, but the general idea seems to be that the assembly of the gods took place in heaven” (ibid., 187).

¹² Borger, “*Bīt Mēseri*,” 232 (emphasis original).

tradition of Enoch's removal had a Mesopotamian background. Wilhelm Bousset and Hugo Gressmann saw three figures behind Enoch: Enmeduranki, who knew the secrets of the heavens and the earth; the Babylonian god Nabu, as a heavenly scribe; and the Babylonian hero of the flood, who was removed to Paradise.¹³ Similarly, Pierre Grelot traced the origin of the Enochic assumption tradition to the Mesopotamian flood hero Ziusudra (or Xisouthros, or Utnapishtim).¹⁴ The traditions concerning Utuabzu and the flood heroes will be considered in turn.

3.1.2. The Myths of Adapa and Utuabzu, the Seventh Sage

According to the oldest version of the Akkadian story of Adapa (14 C BCE), the protagonist was taken up to heaven by a messenger of the god Anu: "He made him take the road to heaven, and to heaven he went up. When he had ascended to heaven and approached the gate of Anu, Tammuz and Gizzida were standing at the gate of Anu" (recension B, ll. 37-9).¹⁵ When offered the bread and water of life by Anu, however, Adapa does not accept it, because he had misunderstood the advice of Ea, his father (ll. 28-34: 61-5). As a result, Anu commands, "Take him away and return him to his earth" (l. 70).

Anu initially summons Adapa to heaven because he cursed the south wind and broke its wing. While in heaven, however, it becomes clear to Anu that Adapa has been the recipient of Ea's knowledge about the heaven and the earth: "'Why did Ea to a *worthless* human of the heaven and of the earth the plan disclose, rendering him *distinguished* and making a name for

¹³ W. Bousset and H. Gressmann, *Die Religion des Judentums im spathellenistischen Zeitalter* (3. Aufl.: HNT 21; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1926), 490-1. See the discussion in Kvanvig, *Roots of Apocalyptic*, 28.

¹⁴ P. Grelot, "La légende d'Hénoch dans les Apocryphes et dans la Bible: Origine et signification," *RSR* 46 (1958) 5-26: 181-210. See Kvanvig, *Roots of Apocalyptic*, 30-1.

¹⁵ "Adapa," translated by E. A. Speiser (*ANET*, 101-3, here, 101). The citations which follow are also taken from Speiser's translation. Italicized words in citations from *ANET* indicate a doubtful translation of a known text.

him?" (ll. 58-9). Because he has received this knowledge, presumably, Adapa is offered the gift of immortality. Thus two motifs associated with ascent or assumption are apparent even in this early text: first, only humans of exceptional character or wisdom are taken up into heaven, whether temporarily or permanently; and second, the purpose of ascent to the divine realm is typically the bestowal of divine knowledge or characteristics, even though immortality is not granted to Adapa here.¹⁶

Kvanig has suggested that the myth of Adapa had its origin in traditions about the *apkallūs*.¹⁷ antediluvian fish-sages who "revealed the fundamental elements of human culture during the primeval period."¹⁸ Some of the Mesopotamian king lists name *apkallūs* in association with the antediluvian kings; in both the Berossos and Uruk lists (c. 275 and 165 BCE. respectively), Utuabzu appears in the seventh position in conjunction with Enmeduranki.¹⁹ In a much earlier cuneiform text, the incantation series *Bīt Mēseri*²⁰ ("House of Confinement"), the ascension of Utuabzu is mentioned. This text gives "Utuabzu, who ascended to heaven" once as the seventh fish-sage (*apkallū*) in an incantation (tablet III, ll. 250-90), and once as the sixth (ll. 324-31). This text also once mentions "Utuabba, who descended from heaven" (ll. 334-7) as the seventh figure in an incantation.²¹

¹⁶ The myth of Etana is also sometimes cited as an example of ascent in the Mesopotamian literature (Borger, "*Bīt Mēseri*," 228), because "Etana, a shepherd, the one who to heaven ascended," is given in a Sumerian king list (Jacobsen, *Sumerian King List*, 80-1). In the myth itself, the protagonist enlists the aid of an eagle to fly to heaven in order to bring down the plant of birth ("Etana," translated by E. A. Speiser [*ANET*, 114-18]).

¹⁷ Kvanig, *Roots of Apocalyptic*, 207: the composer of the myth of Adapa "used stories about extraordinary events associated with the apkallus and out of these composed the myth with its special scope."

¹⁸ VanderKam, *Enoch and the Growth*, 45.

¹⁹ The Uruk list only gives seven kings and seven sages; other much earlier texts give ten or eight antediluvian figures (Borger, "*Bīt Mēseri*," 225-6).

²⁰ According to Borger, the exact dating of this particular text is not important since the incantation series itself is based on very ancient Sumerian traditions (*ibid.*, 233).

²¹ *Ibid.*, 230-1.

Such references appear to be allusions to a tradition that has not otherwise survived. As a result it is unclear, as James VanderKam remarks, “from the *bīt mēseri* evidence whether an ascension to heaven was the final event in Utuabzu’s life or merely an interlude in his earthly career.”²² If, however, Kvanig is correct in arguing that “Utuabzu/Utaabba in *Bīt Mēseri* is the same as Adapa of the myth,” there may be room for the tentative suggestion that the ascent was only a temporary one.²³ Whether or not any connection between Utuabzu, the seventh sage, and Adapa can be maintained, the ascent of Adapa is instructive for our understanding of the concept in the Ancient Near East.

3.1.3. Mesopotamian Flood Heroes

In Tablet 11 of the Akkadian Epic of Gilgamesh,²⁴ the flood-hero, Utnapishtim, and his wife are granted divinity and a new place of residence after the flood by the god Enlil:

“Hitherto Utnapishtim has been but human.
Henceforth Utnapishtim and his wife shall be like unto us gods.
Utnapishtim shall reside far away, at the mouth of the rivers!” (11.193-5)²⁵

After this notice the hero is called “Utnapishtim the Faraway” (11.205, for instance). From this text it cannot be certain whether anything like assumption is in view, but a clearer picture emerges from the (much earlier) Sumerian flood story.²⁶ As was the case with Utnapishtim, in

²² VanderKam, *Enoch and the Growth*, 50.

²³ Kvanig, *Roots of Apocalyptic*, 202-4. Kvanig does not argue that Utuabzu and Adapa experienced the same type of heavenly journey, so an apkallu tradition of ascent associated with Utuabzu, whether temporary or final, could have been the origin of the Adapa myth, where the ascent is clearly temporary.

²⁴ According to Kvanig, the tablets are dated at c. 750 BCE, but the myth itself may have originated as early as 1200–1000 (ibid., 175).

²⁵ “The Epic of Gilgamesh,” translated by E. A. Speiser (*ANET*, 72-99; here, 95).

²⁶ The documentary evidence dates from around 1600 BCE (Kvanig, *Roots of Apocalyptic*, 173).

the Sumerian version Ziusudra, the hero, is after the deluge granted divine status and a special dwelling place in Dilmun. The text reads as follows:

Ziusudra, the king,
Prostrated himself before Anu (and) Enlil.
Anu (and) Enlil cherished Ziusudra,
Life like (that of) a god they give him,
Breath eternal like (that of) a god they *bring down* for him.
Then, Ziusudra the king,
The *preserver of the name of vegetation (and)* of the seed of humankind.
In the land *of crossing*, the land of Dilmun, the place where the sun rises, they
caused to dwell.²⁷

Though nothing is said about Dilmun in this context, the place is known from the Sumerian poem “Enki and Ninhursag,”²⁸ where it “seems to be a land without death, violence and illness.”²⁹ The language used here is not specifically that of ascent or assumption, but the ideas—in particular, the gift of divinity and being “caused to dwell” in a Paradise-like distant land—are certainly proximate. Additionally, it may be inferred that Ziusudra is made to dwell in Dilmun without dying, since he receives divine life and eternal breath. We therefore have here a very early example of assumption, that is, a permanent removal to heaven (or some place like paradise) apart from death.

In the Hellenistic version of this tale, Berossos makes assumption the means whereby the hero, here called Xisouthros, was made like one of the gods. After disembarking, Xisouthros makes sacrifice to the gods.

After this, he disappeared together with those who had left the ship with him (γενέσθαι μετὰ τῶν ἐκβάντων τοῦ πλοίου ἀφανῆ). Those who remained on the ship and had not gone out with Xisouthros, when he and those with him had disembarked, searched for him and called out for him by name all about. But

²⁷ “Sumerian Myths and Epic Tales,” translated by S. N. Kramer (*ANET*, 37-59; here, 44).

²⁸ *Ibid.*, 37-41. The documentary evidence dates from the first half of the second millennium BCE.

²⁹ Kvanvig, *Roots of Apocalyptic*, 177.

Xisouthros from then on was seen no more (τὸν δὲ Ξίσουθρον αὐτὸν μὲν αὐτοῖς οὐκ ἔτι ὀφθῆναι), and then the sound of a voice that came from the air gave the instruction that it was their duty to honour the gods and Xisouthros, because of the great honour he had shown the gods, had gone to the dwelling place of the gods and that his wife and daughter and the steersman had enjoyed the same honour.³⁰

Kvanig is fairly reserved about this: he says, "That Xisouthros 'had gone to live with the gods' may imply that he was taken up to heaven."³¹ However, as we will see below, the narrative makes use of motifs that are characteristic of assumption: a sudden disappearance; an unfruitful search for the missing person; a voice from heaven confirming the assumption; and subsequent veneration of the one assumed.

3.1.4. Egyptian Sources

Although assumption as an escape from death does not occur in ancient Egyptian writings, the death of the Egyptian Pharaoh is depicted in the Pyramid Texts of the Old Kingdom (c. 2780–2250 BCE) as a final heavenly journey which was bodily in nature.³² One of these texts (Pyramid Text 604 e-f) reads, "Grasp [the king] by his hand and take [him] to the sky that he may not die on earth among men."³³ A final post-mortem ascent is also mentioned in the story of Si-Nuhe (19 C BCE), which deals with the death of Amen-em-het I.

³⁰ Greek text from Syncellus, *Ecloga Chronographica* 55, in *FGH* 3C.1 380. Translation from Verbrughe and Wickersham, *Berosos and Manetho*, 50.

³¹ Kvanig, *Roots of Apocalyptic*, 178.

³² See S. Morenz, *Egyptian Religion* (trans. A. Keep; Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1973), 204-6; Schmitt, *Entrückung—Aufnahme—Himmelfahrt*, 37, 43. See also C. Jacq, *Le Voyage dans l'autre monde selon l'Égypte ancienne* (Monaco: Éditions du Rocher, 1986).

³³ S. A. B. Mercer, *The Pyramid Texts in Translation and Commentary* (4 vols.; New York: Longmans Green & Co., 1952), 1.122.

The god ascended to his horizon; the King of Upper and Lower Egypt: Sehetep-ib-Re was taken up to heaven and united with the sun disc. The body of the god merged with him who made him.³⁴

According to Siegfried Morenz, in some texts the physical preservation of the body in the tomb seems to be a prerequisite for the final ascent. Morenz further suggested that the language of ascent is a means of denying the death of the Pharaoh: the motif of assumption is used to interpret the death of the king, affirming either his return to divinity or his ongoing mortality.³⁵

In his study of assumption in the Hebrew Bible, Armin Schmitt argued that “dieses Phänomen der Himmelfahrt des ägyptischen Königs läßt sich nicht unter ‘Entrückung’ subsumieren,” for two reasons.³⁶ First, the final journey of the Pharaoh was a post-mortem ascent, and according to Schmitt’s definition, “‘Entrückung’ bedeutet ... den leiblichen Übergang eines menschlichen Wesens aus diesem Leben in die jenseitige Welt, ohne daß der Tod dazwischentritt.”³⁷ Second, Schmitt used the designation “Himmelfahrt” for the return of divine beings to heaven to heaven from earth. “Auch der Aufstieg des Pharaos, des Sohnes des Sonnengottes, zum Himmel nach seinem Tod fällt unter ‘Himmelfahrt’, da hierin die Rückkehr eines Gottes zu seinem Ursprung zu sehen ist.”³⁸ It may be that Schmitt’s definition needs some refining, particularly if it appears that the primary sources can be somewhat flexible on the question of death while retaining other aspects of the logic, terminology, or motifs normally associated with assumption in antiquity. For our purposes at present, however, it may be noted

³⁴ “Egyptian Myths, Tales, and Mortuary Texts,” translated by J. A. Wilson (*ANET*, 3-36; here, 18). “Sehetep-ib-Re,” which means “Son of Re,” is an epithet for the king.

³⁵ Morenz, *Egyptian Religion*, 204-6. In the First Intermediate Period (c. 2250–2040 BCE) these ideas were applied to private persons in the Coffin Texts. See also Schmitt, *Entrückung—Aufnahme—Himmelfahrt*, 39-40.

³⁶ Schmitt, *Entrückung—Aufnahme—Himmelfahrt*, 36; see also Zwiep, *Ascension*, 37 n. 1.

³⁷ Schmitt, “Zum Thema ‘Entrückung’,” 34; see also Schmitt, *Entrückung—Aufnahme—Himmelfahrt*, 2-3.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, 3.

that the post-mortem return of the Egyptian king to the divine realm was depicted using a motif having some limited similarities with assumption.

3.2: Assumption in Greco-Roman Literature

The following survey will treat two main issues. First, in order to demonstrate the characteristic motifs associated with assumption in Greco-Roman literature, the assumption of Romulus will be taken as a case study. Its many variants display together most of the typical ideas in the Greek tradition. Second, the question of assumption and death will be investigated: there seems to have been less hesitation in the Greco-Roman tradition than in the Jewish tradition in applying the idea of assumption, normally a pre-mortem category, to people who had died. The survey begins with an overview of terminology and motifs based on the work of Lohfink.

3.2.1. Overview: Terminology and Motifs

Lohfink noted several characteristics of assumption narratives ("Entrückungs-erzählungen") in Greco-Roman literature:¹

1. Assumption narratives tend to focus not on the journey itself, but on its origin and destination: "Der Betreffende wird *aus der Menschenvelt* weggenommen und *zu den Göttern* entrückt."²
2. An assumption is always narrated from the perspective of an earthly observer,³ so that the idea of disappearance (and related terminology) is practically a *sine qua non* for assumption.⁴

¹ Lohfink, *Himmelfahrt Jesu*, 37-41.

² Ibid., 37 (emphasis original).

³ Exceptions may be found: Ovid emphasizes the divine drama behind the assumption of Romulus, to the point where the earthly perspective is entirely lacking (*Metam.* 14.805-51; *Fast.* 2.475-512); in some Enochic literature, Enoch narrates his own assumption (*1 En.* 87:3-4 [*Animal Apocalypse*]; *1 Enoch* 70-71 [*Similitudes*]; *3 Enoch* 6-7).

⁴ "Wir haben hier [in disappearance] also ein Vorstellungsschema, das sich in ganz verschiedenen Kulturkreisen und über ganz verschiedene Epochen mit erstaunlicher Konsistenz durchgehalten hat" (ibid., 55). See also A. S. Pease, "Some Aspects of Invisibility," *HSCP* 53 (1942): 1-36, esp. 12-21.

3. The scene of the assumption is usually described in great detail, with an emphasis on the reactions of the witnesses.
4. Assumption is a bodily removal, so assumption traditions cannot coexist with grave traditions.
5. Assumption requires an unusual divine intervention. Divine agency is expressed through either the use of the passive voice or the explicit naming of the god.
6. In Greco-Roman literature assumption is an exclusive process, reported only of special individuals.⁵

Charles Talbert has shown that assumption is a frequent feature in literature about heroes or immortals, deities who according to legend were originally mortal (but usually of divine parentage) and who were transformed at the end of their career, usually through assumption, so that they received the same honours as the eternal deities.⁶ Or, as Lohfink put it, "Daß er in Wirklichkeit kein Mensch, sondern ein Gott war, zeigt sich bei der Entrückung am Ende seines Lebens."⁷ Thus it should be noted that in Greco-Roman literature assumption can be understood as either the occasion of a human being's deification or the proof of a person's divine or semi-divine status.⁸ In fact, the literature attests many examples of persons who deliberately sought to effect their own bodily and permanent disappearance in order to ensure their post-mortem veneration as gods.⁹ We might call this latter phenomenon "apochoresis," as opposed to

⁵ See also the tables on terminology and motifs in M. C. Parsons, *The Departure of Jesus in Luke-Acts: The Ascension Narratives in Context* (JSNTSup 21; Sheffield: JSOT, 1987), 136-8.

⁶ C. H. Talbert, "The Concept of Immortals in Mediterranean Antiquity," *JBL* 94 (1975): 419-36; examples, 422-3.

⁷ Lohfink, *Himmelfahrt Jesu*, 48.

⁸ Both scenarios are described of Romulus. For his assumption as proof of deification, see Plutarch, *Rom.* 27; as proof of divinity, see Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Ant. rom.* 2.56.2, 6; 2.63.4.

⁹ The cases of Empedocles (who according to rumour threw himself into a volcano: Diogenes Laertius, 7.66-68) and Alexander (who contrived to throw himself into a river: Arrian, *Anab.* 7.27.3) are noteworthy. Others contrived to disappear temporarily in order to make their reappearance seem like a post-assumption epiphany (for example, the case of Zamolxis, reported by Herodotus, 4.95). See Pease, "Invisibility," 18-21.

apotheosis, since apparently there was no fixed terminology in use. Although the word ἀποχωρήσις was not commonly used for a “return to the divinity,”¹⁰ it is used in this sense in Arrian, *Anab.* 7.27.3, and Josephus uses a related term for the same idea.¹¹

With respect to terminology, Lohfink showed that expressions of disappearance occur most frequently in Greco-Roman assumption traditions (ἀφανίζω, ἀφανίζομαι, ἀφανής γίγνομαι and ἄφαντος γίγνομαι).¹² A second group of verbs is comprised of ἀρπάζω (“der älteste griechische Entrückungsterminus”) and its composite forms ἀναρπάζω, ἐξαρπάζω and συναρπάζω. Less frequent is the verb μεθίστημι.¹³ In his recent study of the Lukan ascension narratives, A. W. Zwiép also notes the regularity of apotheosis terminology in Greco-Roman assumption narratives (in particular ἐκθειάζω, θεοποιέω, and θεός γίγνομαι).¹⁴

Lohfink also noted, besides deification (which he discussed under the heading “Nachfolgende Verehrung und Einrichtung eines Kults”¹⁵), several other motifs and narrative elements common in Greco-Roman assumption stories.¹⁶ Some of these motifs relate to the environment of the assumption (mountains and funeral pyres) or accompanying phenomena (lightning, thunder, voices from heaven), while others deal more directly with the means

¹⁰ According to Liddell and Scott, the usual meanings of ἀποχωρήσις are “retreat,” “place of safety,” or “death” (LSJ, ad loc.).

¹¹ Arrian, *Anab.* 7.27.3 says that Alexander contrived to throw himself into a river to dispose of his body so that people would think that his origin was divine and that his return was to the divinity (ὅτι ἐκ θεοῦ τε αὐτῷ ἡ γένεσις ξυνέβη καὶ παρὰ θεοῦς ἡ ἀποχώρησις). Josephus uses the verb ἀναχωρέω with the prepositional phrase πρὸς τὸ θεῖον to describe the assumptions of Enoch and Moses. See J. D. Tabor, “‘Returning to the Divinity’: Josephus’s Portrayal of the Disappearances of Enoch, Elijah, and Moses,” *JBL* 108 (1989): 225-38, esp. 227.

¹² Bickermann, “Das leere Grab,” 285, on Chariton, *Chaer.* 3.3: “Die Episode setzt aber den Glauben an die Entrückung voraus und nimmt an, daß diese durch das nicht erklärbare Verschwinden des Körpers unfehlbar bezeichnet sei.” For a more detailed discussion of Chariton’s empty tomb scene, see below, pp. 114-17.

¹³ Lohfink, *Himmelfahrt Jesu*, 41-2.

¹⁴ Zwiép, *Ascension*, 39 and n. 1.

¹⁵ Lohfink, *Himmelfahrt Jesu*, 46.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 42-9.

whereby the person is assumed (windstorms, chariots, eagles, or clouds, which sometimes convey the person to heaven but often serve only to obscure the assumption from the view of the spectators). One final important motif is that of confirmation: the assumption can be confirmed either through an unsuccessful search after the disappearance,¹⁷ or through a subsequent epiphany (either of the person who was assumed or of some other heavenly figure).

It should also be noted that some of our sources display a certain distaste for the idea of assumption. Lucian of Samosata satirized the idea of funeral pyre assumption in his work *de Morte Peregrini* in much the same way that Seneca satirized emperor apotheosis in his *Apolocyntosis*.¹⁸ Plutarch gives a clear exposition of the abhorrence of assumption to the sensible: it contrary to reason to “[ascribe] divinity to the mortal features in human nature, as well as to the divine” (παρὰ τὸ εἰκὸς ἐκθειάζοντες τὰ θνητὰ τῆς φύσεως ἅμα τοῖς θείοις, *Rom.* 28.6). A little further he says it is “contrary to nature” (παρὰ φύσιν) to “[send] the bodies of good men with their souls to heaven” (*Rom.* 28.8). Peter Bolt suggests that “these translation stories were a thing of the mythological past based upon a psychology that had been largely superseded.”¹⁹ In Bolt’s view, because assumption is an escape from death in early writings such as those of Homer, post-assumption immortality was conceived of as bodily; but for later authors, who held to Platonic views on the soul and body, it is incredible that the body could have a role in the afterlife.²⁰ Thus there is a tendency among some authors to offer some kind of spiritualizing account or rationalizing explanation of the assumption story in question.²¹

¹⁷ See also Bickermann, “Das leere Grab,” 289: “‘Man fand ihn nicht’ ist darum ein ständiges Motiv der Entrückungsgeschichten.”

¹⁸ Lohfink, *Himmelfahrt Jesu*, 50.

¹⁹ Bolt, “Do You Not Care,” 255.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 256-8.

²¹ Lohfink, *Himmelfahrt Jesu*, 49.

3.2.2. The Assumption of Romulus

The assumption of Romulus, which is described in many sources, will serve well to illustrate the results of Lohfink's study.²² As A. S. Pease noted in his study of invisibility in the ancient world, "The deification of Romulus ... forms a very typical case."²³ The earliest mentions of the assumption of Romulus are found in Ennius (2 C BCE) and Cicero (106-43 BCE).²⁴ Most sources are somewhat skeptical about the legendary reports, but as Lohfink rightly insisted, even skeptical or satirical assumption reports follow the patterns of *Entrückungserzählungen*, although rationalizing or spiritualizing explanations are often preferred.²⁵

The language used for the assumption of Romulus emphasizes his sudden disappearance. The Greek sources consulted—Plutarch and Dionysius of Halicarnassus—favour ἀφανίζω, ἀφανής γίγνομαι and ἀφανισμός, and Ovid uses the verb *evanesco*.²⁶ Related ideas are also found: Plutarch says that no part of his body or his garments could be seen (οὔτε μέρος ὤφθη σώματος οὔτε λείψανον ἐσθῆτος); Livy reports that Romulus was no longer on the earth ("nec deinde in terris Romulus fuit"), and that his throne was empty.²⁷ Assumption or translation language also occurs (ἀναρπάζω and ἀναφέρω in the passive voice: μεταλλάσσω; *rapio: tollo*:

²² See also Berossos' account of the assumption of Xisouthros, discussed above, pp. 99-100.

²³ Pease, "Invisibility," 15.

²⁴ Ennius, *Ann.* 1.54-55; 1.106-111; Cicero, *Resp.* 1.16. In the opinion of Otto Skutsch, "Romulus apparently was not a god before Ennius made him one" (O. Skutsch, ed. *The Annals of Q. Ennius* [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985], 205). The citations of Ennius, *Annales* follow Skutsch's spelling and enumeration.

The other major sources discussed here are Livy, 1.16; Ovid, *Metam.* 14.805-51; *Fast.* 2.475-512; Dion. Hal., *Ant. rom.* 2.56, 2.63; Plutarch, *Rom.* 27-8; *Num.* 2.1-3. See also Pease, "Invisibility," 15-16 for further literature.

²⁵ Lohfink, *Himmelfahrt Jesu*, 49-50.

²⁶ ἀφανής and cognates appear three times in Plutarch, *Rom.* 27-8, once in *Num.* 2.1-3, and three times in Dion. Hal., *Ant. rom.* 2.56, 2.63. For *evanesco*, see Ovid, *Fast.* 2.509.

²⁷ Plutarch, *Rom.* 27.5; Livy, 1.16.1-2.

aufero), whether for the assumption itself or for Romulus' ascent into heaven after his epiphany.²⁸

According to Plutarch, the time and place of the assumption of Romulus was the subject of some disagreement. Some said that he was in the temple of Vulcan when he disappeared, and others that he was holding an assembly of the people outside the city.²⁹ Dionysius of Halicarnassus says that he was addressing his men in the camp.³⁰ Strange meteorological phenomena are associated with Romulus' disappearance: the darkness of an eclipse, sudden thunder, lightning and rain, a cloud that hid the king from sight.³¹ In most accounts the people flee the scene, leaving open the suggestion that Romulus had really been murdered by the senators and his body disposed of in pieces.³² Ovid calls this a false charge, and Dionysius of Halicarnassus seems more inclined to believe what he calls the more fabulous version, because the heavenly portents at Romulus' birth and disappearance give it more credence.³³ Further, in some sources the people search for Romulus when they return to the scene, but to no avail.³⁴

The rumour that Romulus was murdered is squelched when a noted citizen, Julius Proculus, reports that he met Romulus after the disappearance outside the city.³⁵ Julius gives a

²⁸ ἀναρπάζω: Dion. Hal., *Ant. rom.* 2.56.2; Plutarch, *Rom.* 27.7. ἀναφέρω: Plutarch, *Num.* 2.3. μεταλλάσσω: Plutarch, *Rom.* 27.5. *rapio*: Livy, 1.16.2. *tollo*: Ennius, *Ann.* 1.54-5; Ovid, *Metam.* 8.814; *Fast.* 2.487; Cicero, *Resp.* 1.16. *aufero*: Ovid, *Metam.* 8.824.

²⁹ Plutarch, *Rom.* 27.5-6; *Num.* 2.1-2.

³⁰ *Ant. rom.* 2.56.2; so also Livy, 1.16.1.

³¹ Cicero, *Resp.* 1.16; Livy, 1.16.1; Ovid, *Metam.* 14.816-17; *Fast.* 2.493-5; Dion. Hal., *Ant. rom.* 2.56, 2.63; Plutarch, *Rom.* 27-8; *Num.* 2.1-3.

³² Livy, 1.16.4; Dion. Hal., *Ant. rom.* 2.56.3-5; Plutarch, *Rom.* 27.5; *Num.* 2.2.

³³ Ovid, *Fast.* 2.497; Dion. Hal., *Ant. rom.* 2.56.6.

³⁴ Plutarch, *Rom.* 27.7.

³⁵ In his study of the Markan empty tomb narrative (Mark 16:1-8), Bickermann suggested that assumption and epiphany never occur together in the same narrative, since the latter is formally a proof of resurrection, not assumption. For this reason he argued that versions of the Romulus story that contain both his disappearance and his subsequent epiphany are conflation of two independent narratives (Bickermann, "Das leere Grab," 289).

message from the assumed king. Dionysius of Halicarnassus emphasizes the irreproachable (ἀνεπίληπτος) character of the witness of the epiphany: “he would never have told an untruth for his private advantage.”³⁶ In a few sources, Julius says that he saw Romulus descend, and then ascend after their conversation.³⁷ In the epiphany, Romulus is dressed in full battle regalia and reveals that his name is Quirinus. Most reports of the epiphany also have Romulus stress the fact that he is returning to the gods.³⁸

This idea, that the assumption of Romulus was more a return to the divine realm than the deification of a mortal, appears to have originated with Ennius: “Romulus in caelo cum dis genitalibus aeuom degit.”³⁹ The idea comes to expression in various ways. Dionysius has Romulus say that his δαίμων is taking him to the gods, now that his mortal life has ended: με ὁ λαχὼν ὅτ’ ἐγενόμην δαίμων εἰς θεοὺς ἄγεται τὸν θνητὸν ἐκπληρώσαντα αἰῶνα.⁴⁰ A higher view is found in Ovid: Mars reminds Jupiter of his promise that one of the twins would be exalted to the divine realm. In both the *Metamorphoses* and in *Fasti* Ovid quotes Ennius: “Vnus erit quem to tolles in caerula caeli templa.”⁴¹ Jupiter nods. Gradivus descends in his chariot, and Romulus is caught up from the earth. On the way, his mortal body dissolves.⁴² Ovid’s story of

³⁶ *Ant. rom.* 2.63.3 (Cary, LCL); also Plutarch, *Rom.* 28.1-3. Plutarch has Julius swear an oath.

³⁷ Livy, 1.16.6-7; Plutarch, *Num.* 2.3.

³⁸ See, for example, Plutarch, *Rom.* 28.2; Dion. Hal., *Ant. rom.* 2.63.4. Compare Cicero, who says that according to the common view it was Romulus’ virtue that caused his assumption (*Resp.* 1.16), and Livy, who only says that Romulus was venerated as a god (1.16.3).

³⁹ *Ann.* 1.110-11; also *Ann.* 1.106-109.

⁴⁰ *Ant. rom.* 2.63.4.

⁴¹ Ovid, *Metam.* 8.814; *Fast.* 2.487; Ennius, *Ann.* 1.54-5.

⁴² Ovid, *Metam.* 8.816-28.

the deification of Hersilia, wife of Romulus, is probably also based on Ennius, who reported that the Romans worshipped Quirinus along with Hora his consort.⁴³

3.2.3. Post-Mortem Assumptions

In Greco-Roman literature, a final and bodily journey to the divine realm need not circumvent death. The disappearance of a person's body from a tomb or funeral pyre apparently could give rise to belief in that person's deification, just as though a pre-mortem assumption had taken place. As Lohfink said, "Für uns ist von besonderem Interesse, daß dieser Entrückungstyp [viz., from a funeral pyre] offensichtlich den Tod des Betreffenden voraussetzt. Es gibt also nicht nur die Entrückung aus den Lebenden."⁴⁴

In many versions of the end of Herakles, the hero's disappearance—and his deification—takes place from his funeral pyre. The earliest evidence for this is found in Athenian vase-painting from around 460 BCE, although even earlier materials depict him in the company of the gods.⁴⁵ Sophocles is the first author to report Herakles' death on the pyre on Mount Oeta, but he does not narrate the apotheosis.⁴⁶ According to Apollodorus, Herakles climbs onto the pyre, which is then lit; and while the pyre is burning, a cloud passes under Herakles and takes him to heaven in a peal of thunder. After this Herakles is immortal.⁴⁷ According to Diodorus Siculus,

⁴³ Ovid, *Metam.* 8.829-51; Ennius, *Ann.* 1.100.

⁴⁴ Lohfink, *Himmelfahrt Jesu*, 43.

⁴⁵ M. W. Padilla, *The Myths of Herakles in Ancient Greece: Survey and Profile* (Lanham, Md.: University Press of America, 1998), 15.

⁴⁶ *Trach.* 1181-1274.

⁴⁷ Apollodorus, *Bibl.* 2.7.7: "While the pyre was burning, it is said that a cloud passed under Hercules and with a peal of thunder wafted him up (ἀναπέμψαι) to heaven. Thereafter he obtained immortality (ἐκεῖθεν δὲ τυχὼν ἀθανασίας) ..." (trans. J. G. Fraser, LCL). H. A. Shapiro suggests that the myth of Herakles' apotheosis on Mount Oeta was contrived in order to explain cult practices, at the same location (6 C BCE) and elsewhere, which honoured

Apollo tells Heracles through the oracle to build a pyre on Mount Oeta; the rest would be up to Zeus.⁴⁸ Then, the pyre is consumed by a bolt of lightning, but afterwards the friends of Heracles, finding no bones, suppose that he had been translated to the gods, as the words of the oracle had suggested.⁴⁹ Afterwards Heracles is honoured both as a hero (ὡς ἥρωα) and as a god (ὡς θεὸν).⁵⁰

In his commentary on Virgil's *Aeneid*, Servius gives a rationalized explanation for the disappearance of Heracles: he says that Heracles contrived to keep his remains hidden.⁵¹ Ovid spiritualizes the legend, saying that Heracles' mortal body was consumed on the pyre, but after "putting off his mortal frame, he gained new vigour in his better part, began to seem of more heroic size, and to become awful in his godlike dignity."⁵² This "better part" of Heracles was taken by Jupiter to be with the gods. Ovid compares this process to a snake shedding its skin.⁵³ Because the details of the myth vary widely among the sources, it cannot be said that the assumption of Heracles was uniformly thought of as being either bodily or post-mortem. In some sources the gods intervene and take him to heaven in order to spare him the pain of death.⁵⁴

Heracles not as a hero but as a god (H. A. Shapiro, "*Hērōs Theos*: The Death and Apotheosis of Herakles," *CW* 77 (1983): 7-18; here, 15-17). See also M. Nilsson, "Der Flammentod des Herakles auf dem Oite," *ARW* 22 (1922): 310-16.

⁴⁸ Diodorus Siculus, *Bibl. Hist.* 4.38.3: περί δὲ τῶν λοιπῶν ἔφησε Διὶ μελήσειν.

⁴⁹ *Bibl. Hist.* 4.38.4: καὶ μηδὲν ὄλως ὅστοῦν εὐρόντες, [the companions of Iolaüs] ὑπέλαβον τὸν Ἡρακλέα τοῖς χρησμοῖς ἀκολούθως ἐξ ἀνθρώπων εἰς θεοὺς μεθεστάσθαι.

⁵⁰ *Bibl. Hist.* 4.39.1.

⁵¹ Servius, *Aen.* 3.402: "quem Hercules, cum hominem in Oeta monte deponeret ..., petit, ne alicui sui corporis reliquias indicaret."

⁵² Ovid, *Metam.* 9.268-71 (trans. F. J. Miller, LCL); see also *Metam.* 9.418-33. Note the similarity to Ovid's account of Romulus' assumption: there, as here, the mortal part is consumed. According to H. A. Shapiro, this idea may go back to the origins of the myth of Heracles' death and apotheosis ("*Hērōs Theos*," 16).

⁵³ Ovid, *Metam.* 9.266-7.

⁵⁴ Pausanias reports two depictions of Heracles being taken away by Athena to dwell with the gods (*Descr.* 3.18.11; 3.19.5).

Lucian of Samosata mocks this kind of funeral pyre assumption in his work *The Passing of Peregrinus*. Proteus kindles his own pyre, with the help of his followers; then he climbs up and disappears in the flames (ταῦτα εἰπὼν ἐπήδησεν ἐς τὸ πῦρ, οὐ μὴν ἑωρᾶτό γε ...). The narrator, present at the scene, encourages the onlookers to leave the gruesome spectacle, but later embellishes his account for the sake of the foolish, saying that “when the pyre was kindled and Proteus flung himself bodily in, a great earthquake first took place, followed by a bellowing of the ground, and then a vulture, flying up out of the midst of the flames, went off to heaven, saying in human speech with a loud voice, ‘I am through with the earth; to Olympus I fare.’”⁵⁵ The reference to the vulture satirizes the Roman practice of releasing an eagle from the pyre of the emperor. Later the narrator meets a dignified-looking man who claims to have seen Proteus in white raiment. This is reminiscent of the post-assumption appearance of Romulus.⁵⁶ In spite of the satirical bent of this source, it illustrates that the strong association between disappearance and deification in the popular imagination need not be hindered by the fact that the assumed person had died.

Erwin Rohde noted a couple of instances from the *Aithiopis*, a continuation of the *Iliad* that survives only in citation, in which dead persons are translated to otherworldly abodes and to immortality. Memnon, who is killed by Achilles, is taken by his mother (with Zeus’s permission) to the ends of the earth where he is granted immortality. Later the body of the dead Achilles is

⁵⁵ Lucian, *Peregr.* 39 (trans. Harmon, LCL).

⁵⁶ Dion. Hal., *Rom. ant.* 2.63.4; Plutarch, *Rom.* 28.

taken from the funeral pyre by his mother, presumably to a similar end.⁵⁷ Similar traditions about Hyakinthos and Asklepios were apparently in existence.⁵⁸

Dionysius of Halicarnassus connects a rumoured post-mortem assumption with subsequent hero-veneration. After a severe battle, the body of Aeneas had disappeared: some said that the body had been translated to the gods, while others said that it had been lost in the river (τὸ δὲ Αἰνείου σῶμα φανερόν οὐδαμῇ γεγόμενον οἱ μὲν εἰς θεοὺς μεταστῆναι εἰκαζον, οἱ δ' ἐν τῷ ποταμῷ, παρ' ὃν ἡ μέχρη ἐγένετο, διαφθαρήναι). The Latins, according to Dionysius, built a hero-shrine (ἡρώον) to Aeneas with the inscription "To the father and god of this place (πατρός θεοῦ χθονίου), who presides over the waters of the river Numicius." Apparently not everyone agreed that the shrine had been erected to Aeneas, but the important issue here is that some made a connection between the disappearance of his corpse and his subsequent veneration as a hero or chthonic deity.⁵⁹

Plutarch gives evidence that belief in assumption did not need to be deterred by the death of the person in question. In his life of Romulus, he cites several legends like that of the end of Romulus, in order to show the improbability of deifying the mortal features of human nature. Two of the examples he gives are post-mortem assumptions. Aristeas of Proconessus died in a fuller's shop, but his body could not be found by his friends; later, travellers reported having seen him on the road to Croton. In the version reported by Herodotus, the fuller closed up shop right after Aristeas died, but some in town disputed the fuller's report, having seen Aristeas on

⁵⁷ E. Rohde, *Psyche: The Cult of Souls and Belief in Immortality Among the Greeks* (trans. W. B. Willis; London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1925), 64-5.

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, 99-100.

⁵⁹ Dion. Hal., *Rom. ant.* 1.64.4 (Cary, LCL). It should also be noted that according to legend Aeneas was the son of Venus (Ovid, *Metam.* 14.588); see Talbert, "Immortals," 423. According to Servius, Ennius says that both Aeneas and Romulus were reckoned with the gods ("secundum Ennium, referetur [Romulus] inter deos cum Aenea": Servius, *Aen.* 6.777).

the road to Cyzicus. When the relatives came to collect the body, the fuller opened the shop to find it empty. Aristeas appeared in his home town seven years later, and then vanished again.⁶⁰ Neither Herodotus nor Plutarch gives any indication that Aristeas became immortal according to legend, although there is an air of the marvelous about the subsequent appearance.

Plutarch also relates the story of how the corpse of Alcmena, mother of Herakles, disappeared as she was being carried out to be buried; a stone was found on the bier in place of the dead body (*Rom.* 28.6). The purpose of this example is to discourage belief in assumption, not because it is a fantastic idea, but, as seen above, because it requires belief in the deification of the mortal body. The story of Alcmena's end can only serve this end for Plutarch if the disappearance of her body was being understood as proof of her assumption and subsequent apotheosis.⁶¹ In the version of the story given by Antoninus Liberalis, Zeus orders Hermes to steal (ἐκκλέψαι) the body and take (ἀπενεγκεῖν) it to the Isles of the Blest, where she would become the wife of Rhadamanthus (*Ant. Lib., Metam.* 33.3). Alcmena's hero-shrine came to be associated with the grove where the stone was set up (33.4).⁶²

One of the clearest examples of belief in post-mortem assumption in Greek literature is found in Chariton's novel *Chaereas and Callirhoe* (dated at 25 BCE–50 CE).⁶³ In fact, the heroine

⁶⁰ Herodotus, *Hist.* 4.14.1-3.

⁶¹ According to Pausanias, "Alcmena has no tomb. It is said that on her death she was turned from human form to a stone, but the Theban account does not agree with the Megarian. The Greek legends generally have for the most part different versions" (*Descr.* 9.16.7; Jones, LCL). Pausanias refers elsewhere to the latter account, according to which Alcmena dies and is buried in Megara; he gives the location of her tomb (*Descr.* 1.41.1).

⁶² See F. Celoria, *The Metamorphoses of Antoninus Liberalis: A Translation with a Commentary* (London and New York: Routledge, 1992). For the Greek, see I. Cazzaniga, ed., *Antoninus Liberalis: Metamorphoseon Synagoge* (Milano and Varese: Istituto Editoriale Cisalpino, 1962).

⁶³ G. P. Goold argues for this dating on the basis of Chariton's non-Atticizing *koinē*. Chariton, *Callirhoe* (ed. and trans. G. P. Goold; LCL; Cambridge, Mass. and London: Harvard University Press, 1995), 1-2. Compare A. Papanikolaou, *Chariton-Studien: Untersuchungen zur Sprache und Chronologie der griechischen romane* (Hypomnemata 37; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1973), 161-3, who argues a somewhat earlier date from the same phenomenon. Elias Bickermann much earlier saw a parallel between Chariton's novel and Mark's empty

is not really dead: early in the tale, the new husband Chaereas is tricked by jilted suitors into a jealous rage, and kicks Callirhoe brutally; with the wind knocked out of her she appears to be dead (*Chaer.* 1.4-5). Her condition persists and she is buried, but while in the tomb she revives and receives a rescue of sorts from the tomb robber Theron. Later, Chaereas visits the tomb at dawn, intending to commit suicide, and finds the stones moved aside and the tomb empty (3.3). Upon searching the tomb he finds nothing (ἐρευνῶν δὲ τὸν τάφον οὐδὲν εὑρεῖν ἠδύνατο).

The crowd that gathers thinks that tomb robbers are responsible for the missing treasure but cannot think of a reason for the missing corpse. Chaereas looks to the heavens and wonders,

“Which of the gods has become my rival and carried off (ἄπενήνοχε) Callirhoe and now keeps her with him, against her will but compelled by a mightier fate? ... Or can it be that I had a goddess as my wife and did not know it, and she was above our human lot? But even so she should not have disappeared (ἄλλ’ οὐκ ἔδει ... ἀπελθεῖν) from the world so quickly or for such a reason.” (*Chariton. Chaer.* 3.3)⁶⁴

The grief stricken Chaereas vows to search for his love over land and sea, even rising to the sky if necessary (καὶν εἰς αὐτὸν ἀναβῆναι τὸν ἀέρα δύνωμαι).⁶⁵ He soon discovers, when Theron is captured several weeks later, that Callirhoe is still alive (3.4).

Although the reader knows that Callirhoe is not dead, the reaction of Chaereas is telling. For, thinking her dead, he wonders whether she had been assumed from the tomb. In fact, as Sjeff

tomb narrative (Mark 16:1-8), but because he dated Chariton much later than Goold does, he suggested that Chariton was influenced by the Gospels (Bickermann, “Das leere Grab,” 284-5). Recently Andy Reimer surveyed recent attempts to date Chariton and concluded “that using an early dawn discovery of an empty tomb in which the stone has been rolled away from the entrance is simply too similar not to suggest narrative dependence,” that is, of Chariton upon the Christian empty tomb stories (A. Reimer, “The Empty Tomb: A Biography of a Motif” [paper presented at the SBL Annual Meeting, Nashville, Tenn., November 2000], esp. 12-15; citation from 14). Given the fact that other empty tomb stories were in existence earlier than the writing of the Gospels, the similarities between Chariton and the Gospels should probably be put down to narrative exigencies. In Chariton, the robbers had to leave the tomb open in order for the story to continue; otherwise, the grieving Chaereas would have committed suicide at the grave.

⁶⁴ Trans. Goold, LCL.

⁶⁵ Bickermann sees a tension between Chaereas’ explanations of Callirhoe’s disappearance and his immediate departure to search for her (“Das leere Grab,” 284-5).

van Tilborg and Patrick Chatelion Counet have recently observed, because the ruminations of Chaereas at the empty tomb do not serve to advance the plot, his remarks are incidental: thus, this “is a text which prototypically determines how ... the disappearance of a body from a grave was interpreted religiously.”⁶⁶ Chaereas actually suggests two fairly different assumption scenarios. His first suggestion—that she has been taken by the gods—implies that he thinks Callirhoe was also deified. Chaereas gives two examples from the past: “So did Dionysus once steal Ariadne from Theseus and Zeus Semele from Actaeon.” According to B. P. Reardon, the usual stories of these characters did not run exactly as Chariton describes. They are mentioned here because they were mortals who were deified.⁶⁷

Chaereas also suggests that Callirhoe’s corpse may have disappeared because she was really a goddess who had returned to her rightful home in the divine realm. As already noted, the idea that divine beings apparently mortal are proven immortal when they disappear from earth appears quite frequently in connection with assumption.⁶⁸ Here Chaereas mentions Peleus, husband of the immortal Thetis, daughter of Nereus. Peleus and Thetis had a son (Achilles) before she returned to her undersea abode.⁶⁹ Thus Chariton distinguishes between assumption as

⁶⁶ S. van Tilborg and P. Chatelion Counet, *Jesus’ Appearances and Disappearances in Luke 24* (Biblical Interpretation Series 45; Leiden: Brill, 2000), 194.

⁶⁷ B. P. Reardon, ed. and trans., “Chariton, Chaereas and Callirhoe,” in *Collected Greek Novels* (ed. B. P. Reardon; Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 1989), 17-124; here, 53 n. 51. According to Homer, Ariadne was killed by Artemis (*Od.* 11.321-5); Plutarch reports several other versions of her demise (*Thes.* 20.1), but Apollodorus says that Dionysus stole (ἥρπασε) her away (*Bibl.* e.1.9; see also Pausanias, *Descr.* 1.20.3, 10.29.4). About the second couple, Apollodorus says that Semele was made pregnant with Dionysus by Zeus, who later inadvertently frightened her to death; and by some accounts Zeus caused Actaeon, who reportedly wooed Semele, to be eaten by his own dogs (*Bibl.* 3.4.3-4). Dionysus later rescued his mother Semele from Hades and ascended (ἀνῆλθεν) to heaven with her (*Bibl.* 3.5.3).

⁶⁸ See Lohfink, *Himmelfahrt Jesu*, 47-8; Talbert, “Immortals,” 421-5. See, for instance, Arrian, *Anab.* 7.27.3 (Alexander) and Dion. Hal., *Ant. rom.* 2.63 (Romulus).

⁶⁹ See Homer, *Il.* 18.83-8; 18.432; Apollodorus, *Bibl.* 3.13.5-6.

the moment of deification, and assumption as the return of a divine being to the divine realm: or, as we might put it, he distinguished between apotheosis and “apochoresis.”

A number of post-mortem assumptions are also narrated in the *Metamorphoses* of Antoninus Liberalis (2–3 C CE).⁷⁰ Antoninus favours disappearance language generally in connection with metamorphosis.⁷¹ In the several cases where he narrates the character’s death before the disappearance of the body, it is clear from subsequent veneration or ritual that an apotheosis has taken place. Besides the story of Alcmena (Ant. Lib., *Metam.* 33), already mentioned above, Antoninus also narrates the post-mortem disappearances of Ctesulla (1.5), the beast known as Lamia (or Sybaris) (8.7), Aspalis (13.6), and Metioche and Menippe (25.4). One story describes the post-mortem disappearance of an entire community, the Dorians (37.5), and their subsequent metamorphosis into birds. All these stories use either the (divine) passive of ἀφανίζω or ἀφανής γίγνομαι for the disappearance of the body or bodies. The story of Aspalis also contains the motif of unsuccessful search (οὐκ ἠδυνήθησαν εὐρεῖν [τὸ σῶμα τὸ τῆς Ἀσπαλίδος], 13.6).

In the stories where a post-mortem disappearance occurs, Antoninus seems to associate a person’s metamorphosis with the disappearance of his or her body in such a way that the dead body is transformed into the new thing. This is the case with Aspalis: her corpse’s disappearance coincides with her statue’s appearance in a temple, next to the statue of Artemis (Ant. Lib., *Metam.* 13.6).⁷² A similar logic obtains in the stories of Ctesulla (1.5) and Alcmena (33.3–4). But in another story, a different anthropology of metamorphosis is expressed.

⁷⁰ See Celoria, *Metamorphoses*, 2. The work is known from a single ninth century manuscript.

⁷¹ Ἀφανίζω and cognate forms occur 22 times in the forty-one short narratives of these *Metamorphoses*.

⁷² So also with Britomartis (Ant. Lib., *Metam.* 40.4), who after her disappearance is venerated by the name Ἀφαία.

After the death of Daunius, the barbarian Illyrians coveted their [i.e., the Dorians,⁷³] lands and plotted against them. They appeared suddenly on the island and the Illyrians slaughtered all the Dorians as they were sacrificing victims. By the will of Zeus the bodies of the Greeks disappeared and their souls were changed into birds (Διὸς δὲ βουλῇ τὰ σώματα μὲν ἠφανίσθη τῶν Ἑλλήνων, αἱ δὲ ψυχαὶ δὲ μετέβαλον εἰς ὄρνιθας). (Ant. Lib., *Metam.* 37.5)⁷⁴

It is difficult to see why Antoninus would introduce this idea, especially if the post-mortem transformation of corpses seemed appropriate in other instances. It could be conjectured that it arises from a combination of (1) the traditional meaning of assumption, which involved the translation of the whole person alive to another place, and subsequent immortality in the body, with (2) the implication of the standard body-soul dualism that death separates the soul from the body.⁷⁵ In this case, the bodies of the Greeks are transported to the divine presence, but their souls are turned into birds. A similarly odd scenario arises in some of the materials describing the assumption of Mary. As will be seen below, because Mary's death was not denied, most narrative sources describe both the ascent of her soul into heaven and the subsequent assumption of her corpse (because it could not suffer corruption in the grave).⁷⁶ These two Marys (as it were) could not be thought of as existing independently of each other in heaven, so that several texts, including most of the Greek narrative sources⁷⁷ and at least one Syriac source,⁷⁸ actually describe a reunion of Mary's body and soul in heaven.

⁷³ This story has it that Diomedes took a share of Daunian lands in return for helping Daunius in his war against the Messapians; the followers of Diomedes are called "the Dorians" and settled on an island which they called Diomedea (Ant. Lib., *Metam.* 37.2-4).

⁷⁴ Citation from Celoria, *Metamorphoses*.

⁷⁵ See the discussion in Bolt, "Perishing," 256-8.

⁷⁶ See the summary below, pp. 162-3.

⁷⁷ For instance, Vatican Gr. 1982; for text, translation and commentary, see F. Manns, *Le récit de la Dormition de Marie (Vatican grec 1982): contribution à l'étude des origines de l'exégèse chrétienne* (Collectio maior / Studium Biblicum Franciscanum 33; Jerusalem: Franciscan, 1989). See further below, p. 166-7.

⁷⁸ The fragmentary Syriac "Obsequies"; see W. Wright, *Contributions to the Apocryphal Literature of the New Testament* (London: Williams and Norgate, 1865); translation, 42-51. See further below, p. 168.

3.3: Assumption in Jewish Literature

A. W. Zwiep notes that whereas assumption reports were “innumerable” in antiquity in general, the number of assumptions in Jewish literature is much more modest. He cites the list given in the Talmudic writing *Derek Eres Zuta*, which fixes the number at nine or maybe ten:

There were nine who entered the Garden of Eden alive, viz.: Enoch the son of Yered, Elijah, the Messiah, Eliezer the servant of Abraham, Hiram, king of Tyre, Ebed-melech the Cushite, Jabez the son of R. Juda the Prince, Bithiah the daughter of Pharaoh, and Serach, the daughter of Asher. Some say: Also R. Joshua b. Levi.¹

Most of the traditions implied in this list cannot be reconstructed, but the list demonstrates the conservative nature of the Jewish assumption tradition. Quite possibly, this results from a reluctance to attribute to no more than a few exceptional individuals the kind of exalted (or even deified) post-mortem status that was usually associated with assumption in antiquity. For, as shown above, assumption in both the Ancient Near East and in the Greco-Roman world seems generally to imply either (a) the deification of a mortal person, or (b) the return of an immortal person to the divine realm. Whatever the case, the nature of the Jewish assumption traditions limits the following survey to this select group of individuals: Enoch, Elijah, Moses, the Book of Wisdom's righteous one (Wisdom of Solomon 2–5), Ezra and Baruch, and a few others.²

¹ *Der. Er. Zut.* 1:18; translation from A. Cohen, ed. and trans., *The Minor Tractates of the Talmud: Massektoth ketannoth* (2 vols.: London: Soncino, 1965). See Zwiep, *Ascension*, 76.

² A few minor (and late) assumption traditions will not be discussed in detail here: those concerning Jeremiah (Victorinus of Pettau, *Comm. in Apoc.* 11.3; see K. Berger, *Die Auferstehung des Propheten und die Erhöhung des Menschensohnes* [SUNT 13; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1976], 256–7 n. 72), Jonah (*Midr. Ps.* 26.7; see Zeller, “Entrückung,” 524–5), and the prophet like Moses (according to the Dositheans; see Zwiep, *Ascension*, 64 n. 1). In addition, we will not consider the possibility that assumption (or a heavenly journey?) was attributed to the Qumran Teacher of Righteousness, because of the slender textual evidence (4Q491 11 i 13). See M. Smith, “Two Ascended to Heaven—Jesus and the Author of 4Q491,” in *Jesus and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. J. Charlesworth; ABRL; New York: Doubleday, 1992), 290–301; Collins, *The Scepter and the Star*, 136–53; M. G. Abegg, Jr., “Who Ascended to Heaven? 4Q491, 4Q427, and the Teacher of Righteousness,” in *Eschatology, Messianism and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. P. W. Flint, C. A. Evans; Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature; Grand Rapids, Mich. and Cambridge, U.K.: Eerdmans, 1997), 61–73.

3.3.1. Overview: Terminology and Motifs

There are only a few particulars of terminology and motif in which Jewish assumption narratives differ from those found in Greco-Roman literature, and these will become clear from the material discussed in this survey. A few preliminary remarks are necessary, however. First, as Lohfink noted, the technical term for assumption in Hebrew is *קבל*. In the Septuagint this verb is translated with *μετατίθημι* (Gen 5:24) and *ἀναλαμβάνω* (2 Kgs 2:9.10.11), so that these two verbs become the usual terms for assumption in Hellenistic Jewish writings.³ *Ἀρπάζω* and its related forms are extremely uncommon in the Jewish assumption tradition. Language that denies the death of the individual is also popular, emphasizing again the fact that generally assumption is viewed as an escape from death. Again, to cite Lohfink, “Wer entrückt wird, braucht den Tod nicht zu schmecken. Umgekehrt gilt: Wer wirklich stirbt, kann nicht entrückt werden.”⁴ Otherwise, the same basic terminology and motifs are found in Jewish as in Greco-Roman assumption narratives.⁵

A few important differences should be mentioned, however. Obviously, the apotheosis or deification of an assumed person is not an option in the Jewish tradition. Instead of venerating the assumed person as a god or establishing some kind of cultic worship, the witnesses often are depicted as praising God.⁶ This is not to say that post-assumption heavenly exaltation is ruled out entirely, however. In fact, Günter Haufe has shown that there is a nearly inevitable connection in

³ Lohfink, *Himmelfahrt Jesu*, 73.

⁴ Ibid., 74. Plevnik rightly notes that this concern requires Paul to clarify to the Thessalonians that the resurrection of the faithful would precede their assumption at the time of the Parousia (1 Thess 4:16-17; Plevnik, “Taking Up,” 281).

⁵ See the tables on terminology and motifs in Parsons, *Departure of Jesus*, 139-40.

⁶ Lohfink, *Himmelfahrt Jesu*, 73. See, for instance, Luke 24:52-53; 2 En. 67:3, 68:5.

Jewish thought between assumption and eschatological function. He wrote that “für spätjüdisches Denken können nur solche historische Personen eine eschatologische Sonderfunktion erhalten, die auf dem Wege der leiblichen Entrückung in die himmlische Welt eingegangen sind.”⁷ Typically the person is thought of as being reserved in heaven for their future eschatological role, and, as will become apparent, such a role almost inevitably involves a return to earth. As we shall see, this tendency could also work in the opposite direction: that is, sometimes figures who were accorded a prominent eschatological role came to have bodily assumption (and therefore heavenly preservation) attributed to them.

One other important feature found in some Jewish assumption narratives was noted by Lohfink. In some sources, the person about to be assumed receives, through divine agency, foreknowledge of the assumption. This idea is met already in the assumption of Elijah, where he, Elisha, and the “sons of the prophets” all know what is about to happen (2 Kgs 2:1-12), although exactly how they have received this knowledge is not made clear. In later sources, however, the time that intervenes between the reception of this revelation and the assumption itself is meant explicitly as a period in which the sage can instruct the people of God, whether directly or by making a written record, about the end.⁸

⁷ Haufe, “Entrückung und eschatologische Funktion,” 105.

⁸ Lohfink calls this narrative pattern “ein festes Schema”: “A. Offenbarungsempfang; B. Zwischenzeit von vierzig Tagen; C. Entrückung” (*Himmelfahrt Jesu*, 60-1). The principal sources that display this pattern are *1 En.* 81:5-6, *4 Ezra* 14, *2 Bar.* 76, and *2 Enoch*, whose whole structure is patterned after this motif. According to Lohfink, the reception of revelation occurs in *2 En.* 3-38; the rest of the book is the intervening time in which Enoch instructs his children, and his assumption occurs in *2 En.* 67. Here the intervening period is thirty, not forty days (*2 En.* 36:1-2); in the Book of Heavenly Luminaries (*1 En.* 72-82) the period is one year (*1 En.* 81:6).

3.3.2. Enoch⁹

In the massive body of literature that grew up around the figure of Enoch, a greater emphasis is placed on the temporary heavenly journeys he experienced, and the wisdom and knowledge he received on these journeys, than on his final assumption. The earliest reference to Enoch's assumption is found in the Sethite genealogy of Genesis 5, and all other references are in one way or another expansions of this very brief note. Interestingly, Enoch is not mentioned elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible, except in another genealogy (1 Chr 1:3).

Enoch appears in the seventh position in this genealogy (Gen 5:21-24), and in marked contrast with the other figures listed there, it is not explicitly said that he died (וימת). Instead, it is said twice that Enoch walked with God (את־האלהים): in verse 24, "Enoch walked with God and then was no more, for God took him" (ואינו כִּי־לָקַח אֹתוֹ אֱלֹהִים). Here already the motif of absence or disappearance, suggestive of assumption, can be seen.

It is not certain whether Enoch's walking with God is to be understood as the reason for his assumption, although later texts which emphasize Enoch's piety or righteousness appear to understand it in this way. For instance, the Septuagint, which normally offers a fairly literal translation of the Hebrew text of Genesis, replaces this expression with εὐηρέσθησεν Ἐνώχ τῷ θεῷ, "Enoch pleased God." VanderKam thinks that the walking with God idea connotes an

⁹ VanderKam provides a fairly comprehensive survey of Enochic literature and allusions in his *Enoch: A Man for All Generations*. See also J. C. VanderKam, "Enoch Traditions in Jubilees and Other Second-Century Sources," in *Society of Biblical Literature 1978 Seminar Papers* (ed. P. J. Achtemeier; Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1978), 1.229-51; R. A. Kraft, "Philo (Josephus, Sirach and Wisdom of Solomon) on Enoch," in *SBLSP* (1978), 1.253-7; M. Himmelfarb, "A Report on Enoch in Rabbinic Literature," in *SBLSP* (1978), 1.259-69; W. Adler, "Enoch in Early Christian Literature," in *SBLSP* (1978), 1.271-5. See also J. J. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature* (2nd ed.; Grand Rapids, Mich. and Cambridge U.K.: Eerdmans, 1998). For surveys of materials dealing specifically with the assumption of Enoch, see Haufe, "Entrückung und eschatologische Funktion," 105-8; Lohfink, *Himmelfahrt Jesu*, 55-7; Schmitt, *Entrückung—Aufnahme—Himmelfahrt*, 152-92; and Zwiep, *Ascension*, 41-58.

association with angels: he sees the definite **הַאֱלֹהִים** as a clue that Enoch enjoyed an ongoing fellowship with angels, the *'elohim*. This is an important recurring theme in the Enochic literature and in other sources (such as *Jub.* 4:21-22). According to VanderKam, the author of the genealogy meant to distinguish those with whom Enoch walked, **הַאֱלֹהִים**, from the deity who took him—God, **אֱלֹהִים** without the definite article.¹⁰ The linguistic grounds are perhaps somewhat tenuous,¹¹ but if VanderKam and those who have examined the Mesopotamian background of the Hebrew Enoch traditions are correct, the reference to Enoch in Gen 5:21-24 may in fact be an early conflation of ideas about Enmeduranki, who received divine revelation, and about the flood hero, who was assumed.¹² Thus both traditions about Enoch—that he received divine revelation during his lifetime and that he was assumed at its conclusion—may be present *in nuce* in Genesis 5.

As already noted, the Septuagint departs somewhat significantly from the Hebrew here. Schmitt has shown the dependence here on Greek assumption terminology.¹³ A clearer connection is made between Enoch's piety and his assumption: **καὶ εὐηρέστησεν Ἐνώχ τῷ θεῷ καὶ οὐχ ἠύρισκετο ὅτι μετέθηκεν αὐτὸν ὁ θεός**. Further, as Zwiep has noted, "the motive of absence is replaced by the (more powerful!) motif of unsuccessful search (οὐχ ἠύρισκετο), a typical *topos* of Hellenistic rapture stories."¹⁴ A number of later texts echo the Septuagint rendering of the Enoch note, usually with slight modifications or additions.

¹⁰ VanderKam, *Enoch: A Man for All Generations*, 13-4.

¹¹ Zwiep concludes that "whatever the precise reference is, Enoch is marked by his contact with the heavenly world" (*Ascension*, 42 n. 1).

¹² See above, pp. 93-6 and 98-100.

¹³ A. Schmitt, "Die Angaben über Henoch Gen 5. 21-24 in der LXX," in *Wort, Lied und Gottesspruch: Beiträge zur Septuaginta. Festschrift für Joseph Ziegler* (ed. J. Schreiner; FB 1; Würzburg: Echter, 1972), 161-69.

¹⁴ Zwiep, *Ascension*, 43 (emphasis original).

For instance, the Greek translation of Sirach is marginally more expansive than its Hebrew (and Gen 5:24 LXX) on the subject of Enoch's assumption. Enoch is mentioned twice in Sirach. Sir 44:16 LXX states, following, that "Enoch pleased the Lord and was taken up," adding the phrase "an example of repentance to all generations" (ὁπόδειγμα μετανοίας ταῖς γενεαῖς). The Hebrew reads "a sign for the knowledge of future generations."¹⁵ The Greek translation here was likely influenced by traditions which associated Enoch with repentance.¹⁶ The Hebrew and the Greek of Sir 49:14 also differ from each other. Where the Septuagint says only that he was taken up "from the earth," the Hebrew seems to have the goal of his assumption in mind: "Few on earth have been such as Enoch; he too was taken up within," that is, into the divine presence.¹⁷ Oddly, Sir 49:14 LXX uses the verb ἀναλαμβάνω to describe the assumption of Enoch instead of μετατίθημι. Since ἀναλαμβάνω is used for the assumption of Elijah (2 Kgs 2:9.10.11; Sir 48:9 LXX), the translation of this reference to Enoch probably has a comparison with Elijah in mind.

Another later use of the Greek Enoch tradition may be found in the Book of Wisdom, which uses language drawn from Gen 5:24 LXX to describe the righteous one who dies early.¹⁸ Heb 11:5-6 likewise echoes the Septuagint version of the Genesis Enoch note, adding the remark

¹⁵ So P. W. Skehan and A. A. Di Lella, *The Wisdom of Ben Sira: A New Translation with Notes* (AB 39; New York: Doubleday, 1987), 498. Skehan notes that this verse appears in neither the Masada fragment of Sirach nor in the Syriac version (ibid., 499). According to Zwiep, this verse indicates that Sirach considers Enoch "an initiate into the divine mysteries of the universe and the course of human history, whose encyclopaedic knowledge marked him as a very pious person who was rewarded appropriately with a heavenly assumption" (Zwiep, *Ascension*, 44).

¹⁶ The theme of repentance is also evident in *Gen. Rab.* 1. See D. Lührmann, "Enoch und die Metanoia," *ZVW* 66 (1975): 103-16.

¹⁷ So Skehan, *Wisdom of Ben Sira*, 541, 542.

¹⁸ See below, pp. 134-43.

that Enoch did not see death as a result of his assumption (τοῦ μὴ ἰδεῖν θάνατον). Here the antediluvian is an example of the faith that pleases God.¹⁹

Philo of Alexandria (c. 20 BCE–45 CE) uses the language of the Septuagint to describe Enoch's assumption as well, although he takes the assumption language metaphorically.²⁰ In one allusion to the Septuagint version of Gen 5:24, Philo interprets "he was not found" to mean that while Enoch existed on earth, he was imperceptible to the wicked because of his goodness, and he takes "he was translated" to mean that he journeyed from the mortal life to the immortal (*Mut.* 34-38). In his treatise on Abraham he quotes Gen 5:24 LXX directly (*Abr.* 17-19). Here, however, Philo interprets μετατιθῆμι as indicating a kind of repentance brought about by God:

We are told of [Enoch] that he proved "to be pleasing to God and was not found because God transferred him" (μετέθηκεν αὐτὸν ὁ θεός), for transference implies turning and changing (ἡ γὰρ μετάθεσις τροπὴν ἐμφαίνει καὶ μεταβολήν), and the change is to the better because it is brought about by the forethought of God. (*Abr.* 17-18)²¹

Philo also says that the Scriptures do well to say that Enoch was not found, "either because the old reprehensible life is blotted out and disappears (ἡφανισθαι) and is no more found, ... or because he who is thus transferred and takes his place in the better class is naturally hard to find" (*Abr.* 19).²² Though Philo does not give a literal reading of the bodily assumption of Enoch in these sources, he elsewhere echoes traditions about his assumption without death.²³

¹⁹ See also *L.A.B.* 1:16, *I Clem.* 9:3.

²⁰ Josephus is relatively silent on the assumption of Enoch, saying only that because he had returned to the divinity (ἀναχώρησε πρὸς τὸ θεῖον) there was no record of his death (*Ant.* 1.3.4; see also 9.28).

²¹ Trans. Colson, LCL.

²² Trans. Colson, LCL.

²³ See P. Borgen, "Heavenly Ascent in Philo: An Examination of Selected Passages," in *The Pseudepigrapha and Early Biblical Interpretation* (ed. C. A. Evans, J. H. Charlesworth; JSPSup 14; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993), 246-68, esp. 249.

In his *Questions and Answers on Genesis*, Philo seems to have bodily assumption in mind when he says that “the end of worthy and holy men is not death but translation and approaching another place,” and when he goes on to talk about Enoch’s becoming invisible (*QG* 1.86). But even here there is some tension, for Philo also insists upon the idea that Enoch’s assumption transferred him to an incorporeal mode of existence: “When he was sought, he was invisible, not merely rapt from their eyes. For the translation to another place is nothing else than another position; but he is said (to have moved) from a sensible and visible place to an incorporeal and intelligible form.”²⁴ Further, in answer to the question “Why, after Enoch’s end, does Scripture add, ‘He was pleasing to God’?” he writes that this “demonstrates that souls are immortal, since when they become incorporeal, they again become pleasing” (*QG* 1.85). Philo seems here to hold that Enoch disappeared from bodily life but was transferred (or assumed) to incorporeal existence. The same goes for Elijah and Moses who are mentioned with Enoch in *QG* 1.86.

The assumption of Enoch receives more extensive treatment in Enochic texts such as the Book of Heavenly Luminaries and the Dream Visions (now part of Ethiopic Enoch, *1 En.* 72-82 and 83-90 respectively), and in the Book of Jubilees, writings that date from the third and second centuries BCE. In the Book of Heavenly Luminaries, we read not of Enoch’s assumption but of the seven holy ones giving him advance warning of it, admonishing him to use the intervening time to instruct his children: “We shall let you stay with your son for one year, so that you may teach your children another law and write it down for them and give all of them a warning; and in the second year, you shall be taken away from all of them” (*1 En.* 81:6).²⁵ According to *Jub.* 4:21, Enoch was with the angels of God for three hundred years, during which time he wrote and

²⁴ *QG* 1.86 (Marcus, LCL).

²⁵ Citations from *1 (Ethiopic) Enoch* are taken from E. Isaac, “1 (Ethiopic Apocalypse of) Enoch,” in *OTP*, 1.5-89.

bore witness against the Watchers (4:22). Then, Enoch “was taken from among the children of men, and [the angels] led him to the garden of Eden for greatness and honour. And behold, he is there writing condemnation and judgment of the world, and all of the evils of the children of men” (4:23).²⁶ Here is apparently the earliest suggestion that Enoch’s assumption is connected with his presence and activity elsewhere.²⁷ In the allegorical *Animal Apocalypse*, part of the Enochic *Dream Visions*, Enoch narrates his own assumption. He is taken from the generations of the earth, set on a high tower, and ordered to stay and document the fate of all the different animals (1 *En.* 87:3-4).

A fully-formed assumption narrative, however, does not appear for Enoch until 2 (*Slavonic*) *Enoch*, which according to Christfried Böttrich probably contains much material from before 70 CE.²⁸ At the conclusion of the book the assumption of Enoch is described (2 *En.* 67:1-3) in language and with motifs strikingly similar to the Greco-Roman assumption narratives or, as Zwiep has shown, the Lukan ascension stories.²⁹

While Enoch was talking to his people, the Lord sent darkness onto the earth, and it became dark and covered the men who were standing with Enoch. And the angels hurried and (the angels) grasped Enoch and carried him up to the highest heaven, and the Lord received him and made him stand in front of his face for eternity. And the darkness departed from the earth, and it became light. And the people looked, and they understood how Enoch had been taken away. And they glorified God. And they went away into their homes. (2 *En.* 67:1-3, rec. A)³⁰

²⁶ Citations from *Jubilees* are taken from O. S. Wintermute, “Jubilees,” in *OTP*, 2.35-142.

²⁷ See also *Genesis Apocryphon* 2 and 1 *Enoch* 106-107, where Methuselah visits “Parwain” (Paradise) to inquire of Enoch whether the son of Lamech is legitimate or not. See Zwiep, *Ascension*, 47-8.

²⁸ C. Böttrich, “Recent Studies in the *Slavonic Book of Enoch*,” *JSPE* 9 (1991): 35-42; see also Zwiep, *Ascension*, 49.

²⁹ Zwiep enumerates the similarities between 2 *En.* 67:1-3 A and the Lukan ascension narratives (*Ascension*, 49-50). He concludes that “they probably represent two independent rapture traditions,” traditions which nevertheless are patterned on “an already well established narration scheme” (*ibid.*, 50-1).

³⁰ Citations from 2 (*Slavonic*) *Enoch* are taken from F. I. Andersen, “2 (*Slavonic Apocalypse of*) *Enoch*,” in *OTP* 1.91-213.

Noteworthy here is the fact that the place of Enoch's exaltation is the presence of the Lord, reminiscent of the ambiguous note in the Hebrew of Sir 49:14 that he was "taken up within." In other early sources his post-assumption place of residence is Eden (*Jub.* 4:23-26; compare *1 En.* 60:23), Parwaim or Paradise (*1 Qap Gen^{ae}* 2), or among the angels at the end of the earth (*1 En.* 106:7-8). In addition, there might be some tension in *2 Enoch* about the bodily nature of the assumption: in Chapter 67, Enoch apparently disappears from the view of the witnesses, but *2 En.* 22:8 (rec. J), in which the Lord commands Michael to extract Enoch from his earthly clothing, may have in view a transference from the body.³¹

More highly developed forms of this scenario in which Enoch is exalted to the presence of God are found in the *Similitudes of Enoch* (*1 Enoch* 37-71) and especially in *3 (Hebrew) Enoch*. In the latter text, Enoch is transformed, after his assumption, into an enormous angel named Metatron and sits on a heavenly throne. *3 Enoch* 6-10. Enoch (Metatron) is also called "Prince of the Divine Presence" (*3 En.* 1:9, 3:1, etc.) and even Lesser Yahweh (12:5).³² Of greater interest are the *Similitudes*, which were likely composed in the first century CE (or somewhat earlier).³³ In the book's most notoriously difficult passage (*1 Enoch* 70-71), the final assumption of Enoch is narrated—three times, actually, at *1 En.* 70:1-2, 71:1 and 71:5. These descriptions are unusual because they narrate the assumption from Enoch's point of view.³⁴

³¹ See Borgen, "Heavenly Ascent in Philo," 250.

³² See S. Liebermann, "Metatron: The Meaning of His Name and His Functions," in *Apocalyptic and Merkabah Mysticism* (ed. I. Gruenwald; AGJU 14; Leiden: Brill, 1980), 235-41. Zwiep suggests that the identification of Enoch with Metatron cannot be dated earlier than *Tg. Ps.-J. Gen* 5:26 (c. 450 CE; Zwiep, *Ascension*, 51-2).

³³ For discussion, see M. Black, "The Messianism of the Parables of Enoch: Their Date and Contribution to Christological Origins," in *The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity* (ed. J. Charlesworth; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1982), 145-68; Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination*, 177-8.

³⁴ Cf. Lohfink, *Himmelfahrt Jesu*, 38.

But the crucial issue is Enoch's post-assumption status in the *Similitudes*. "That Son of man," the exalted heavenly being who figures prominently throughout the *Similitudes* (also called by the names Chosen One and, less frequently, Righteous One and Messiah), is apparently identified in these closing chapters as Enoch himself. This identification is problematic, since it seems unlikely that it was intended throughout the rest of the book, and since the possibility that Enoch is some kind of earthly manifestation of the (probably preexistent³⁵) Son of man is not hinted at elsewhere.³⁶ The distinction remains clear until *I En.* 71:14, where Enoch is told, "You, son of man, who art born in righteousness and upon whom righteousness has dwelt, the righteousness of the Antecedent of Time will not forsake you."³⁷

A number of solutions to the problem of the identification of Enoch with the Son of man have been posed. Some have suggested that no identification is meant by the expression: it is used here as it is used in the book of Ezekiel, as a form of address with no eschatological content.³⁸ The phrase is used in this way of Enoch at *I En.* 60:10. Others have suggested that Chapter 71 is a redactional addition.³⁹ This would have the benefit of explaining the multiple

³⁵ On the preexistence of the Son of man of the *Similitudes*, see *I En.* 48:2,6 and 62:7. See also J. VanderKam, "Righteous One, Messiah, Chosen One, and Son of Man in 1 Enoch 37-71," in *The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity* (ed. J. H. Charlesworth; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992), 169-91, esp. 179-82; Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination*, 188-9.

³⁶ For discussion, see VanderKam, "Righteous One," 182-5, who concludes that "the identification of Enoch with the son of man in 71:14 is not inconsistent with the rest of the composition" (*ibid.*, 185); cf. Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination*, 187-91, who thinks Chapter 71 is redactional.

³⁷ A textual problem at *I En.* 70:1 should be noted: one manuscript omits the Ethiopic word "in the presence of" (*betabaxu*), giving the reading "the name of that Son of man was raised aloft ... to the Lord of Spirits." In this case an identification between Enoch and the Son of man is already implied at the beginning of *I Enoch* 70. See M. Casey, "The Use of the Term 'Son of Man' in the Similitudes of Enoch," *JSJ* 7 (1976): 1-29, esp. 25-6.

³⁸ See, for instance, Isaac, *OTP* 1.50 note s. Isaac's reticence is evident in his translation of *I En.* 71:14 (cited above).

³⁹ See, for instance, C. C. Caragounis, *The Son of Man* (WUNT 2/38; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1986), 93-4, 110-2 n.121. Zwiep wonders whether "the present (post-Christian!) Ethiopic text is a faithful reproduction of its (Semitic) *Vorlage*" (*Ascension*, 54; emphasis original).

references to Enoch's assumption, but would leave the question of how the identification of Enoch with "that Son of man" happened in the first place. It is clear from later sources—*3 Enoch* and *Tg. Ps.-J. Gen 5:26*—that the identification came to be made.

VanderKam has provocatively argued that the identification arises from the fact that the Son of man in the *Similitudes* stood for the community of the righteous as its heavenly counterpart. Thus Enoch, as the prototype of righteousness, in *1 Enoch* 71 becomes one with his heavenly counterpart when he is assumed to heavenly glory. VanderKam views the Enochic Son of man figure as an amalgam of other biblical figures susceptible of messianic interpretation, in particular the Servant of 2 Isaiah and the "son of man" from Daniel 7. He therefore sees a hint of the identification between Enoch and the Son of man already in the Book of the Watchers (*1 Enoch* 14), where Enoch is described in terms reminiscent of Daniel 7.⁴⁰ John Collins argues similarly, but more tentatively, that Enoch, as the preeminent righteous person and as one who shares the Son of man's role as revealer, takes his place *with* (not *as*) the Son of man in the heavenly resting places, as the first to receive the destiny of all of God's righteous (see *1 En.* 62:14).⁴¹ Whether or not it can be maintained that Enoch is identified with the Son of man in the *Similitudes*, at the very least Enoch at his assumption becomes exalted to the presence of the Son of man and the Lord of the Spirits (*1 En.* 70:1) and becomes the heavenly paradigm and destiny of the righteous on earth:

"Everyone that will come to exist and walk shall (follow) your path, since righteousness never forsakes you. Together with you shall be their dwelling places; and together with you shall be their portion. They shall not be separated from you forever and ever and ever." (*1 En.* 71:16)

⁴⁰ VanderKam, "Righteous One," 182-3.

⁴¹ Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination*, 190-1.

The verse which follows re-emphasizes the connection between Enoch and the Son of man, but the shift to the third person may indicate that it is a later addition. *1 Enoch* 70-71 is probably the most striking example in early Jewish literature of the connection between assumption and exaltation or eschatological function.⁴²

3.3.3. Elijah

The assumption of Elijah (2 Kgs 2:1-18) is the only assumption narrative in the Hebrew Bible. Many of the features found by Lohfink to be characteristic of assumption narratives occur here: the assumption is narrated from the perspective of an onlooker (Elisha); the element of foreknowledge is present (2:3,5,9); the medium of the assumption is given—a whirlwind and a chariot and horses of fire carry Elijah away (2:11); the resulting disappearance is expressed in the fact that Elisha could see him no more (καὶ οὐκ εἶδεν αὐτὸν ἔτι, 2:12); and the assumption is verified by means of an unsuccessful search (2:16-18).⁴³ In the Hebrew, the verb for Elijah's assumption is קָבַל (2:9-10), as in Gen 5:24. The Septuagint, as already noted, translates קָבַל here with ἀναλαμβάνω (2:9,10,11). Zwiep notes the apparent reluctance of the Septuagint, apparent in the translation ὥς εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν (2 Kgs 2:1,11 LXX), to express the view that Elijah was in heaven after his assumption.⁴⁴

⁴² *1 Enoch* 70-71 was particularly important to Zeller as an analogy for the installation as Son of man of someone who had been assumed into heaven ("Entrückung," 517).

⁴³ See Lohfink, *Himmelfahrt Jesu*, 57-9. For a comprehensive analysis, see Schmitt, *Entrückung—Aufnahme—Himmelfahrt*, 47-151.

⁴⁴ Zwiep, *Ascension*, 60.

Some later sources also appear reticent to make explicit the location of the post-assumption Elijah.⁴⁵ Josephus says only that Elijah disappeared (ἀφανίσθη, *Ant.* 9.2.2), and likens the end of Elijah to that of Enoch: they both became invisible (γεγόνασιν ἀφανείς). James Tabor argues that Josephus is reluctant to use his favoured terminology for assumption (the verb ἀναχωρέω, to return to the divinity⁴⁶) in the case of Elijah since the Bible does not narrate such a return on the part of Moses: “The founder of the nation, Moses, would appear to be of less stature than a later prophet, Elijah.”⁴⁷ Tabor suggests that Josephus is deliberately evasive in his use of disappearance language with respect to Elijah (*Ant.* 9.2.2). Christopher Begg, however, rightly notes that such terminology as ἀφανίζω and ἀφανής γίνομαι would signal his assumption to “a cultivated pagan reader.”⁴⁸

Philo mentions Elijah’s assumption only in the context of his discussion of Enoch—Elijah, along with Enoch and “the protoprophet” (viz., Moses), had been taken up to God without dying⁴⁹—but Philo says nothing about Elijah’s presence in heaven except that he followed Enoch “on high from earth to heaven at the appearance of the divine countenance” (*QG* 1.86).⁵⁰ As noted above, the Hebrew of Sir 49:14—“Few on earth have been such as Enoch: he too was taken up within”—might as an implicit reference to Elijah indicate that Ben Sira thought Elijah had been taken into heaven.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 61, 63 n. 4.

⁴⁶ See *Ant.* 1.3.4 (Enoch); 3.5.7 and 8.48 (Moses).

⁴⁷ Tabor, “Returning to the Divinity,” 228-9.

⁴⁸ C. Begg, “‘Josephus’s Portrayal of the Disappearances of Enoch, Elijah, and Moses’: Some Observations,” *JBL* 109 (1990): 691-93.

⁴⁹ See Borgen, “Heavenly Ascent in Philo,” 249.

⁵⁰ *QG* 1.86 (Marcus, LCL).

It was, however, the conviction that Elijah had been assumed and was being kept in heaven that gave rise to the belief that he would return. Although most scholars hold it to be an addition to the original form of the book of Malachi, the earliest expression of this belief is still Mal 3:23-24: God will send the prophet Elijah to perform a reconciling role “before the great and terrible day of the LORD.” Sir 48:9-10 makes an explicit connection between Elijah’s assumption and his future eschatological role:

You were taken up by a whirlwind of fire,
 in a chariot with horses of fire.
 At the appointed time, it is written, you are destined
 to calm the wrath of God before it breaks out in fury,
 to turn the hearts of the parents to their children,
 and to restore the tribes of Jacob.

A few apocalyptic sources refer to the assumption of Elijah, in conjunction with Enoch and in the context of a future eschatological role. The *Animal Apocalypse* describes in allegorical language how of all the prophets who are chosen and sent, and then killed by Israel, one—presumably Elijah—escapes because “the Lord of the sheep ... caused him to ascend to me [Enoch] and settle down” (1 En. 89:53). Elijah is likely also the ram who appears with Enoch before the judgment (90:31). 4 Ezra 6:26 has Elijah in mind as being among “the men who were taken up, who from their birth have not tasted death.” These people are seen by those who remain after the end of the age, but it is not certain what kind of eschatological role, if any, the author of 4 Ezra envisioned for them. It may be that this is a muted reference to the tradition that Enoch and Elijah would return together to do battle with the eschatological adversary.⁵¹

⁵¹ See below, pp. 147-9.

3.3.4. The “Righteous One” in the Wisdom of Solomon

The Book of Wisdom uses language drawn from the reference to Enoch in Genesis 5 LXX to describe the “righteous one” in Wisd 4:10,14. The two points of linguistic contact between this passage and the Greek tradition concerning the assumption of Enoch are the verbs εὐαρεστέω and μετατίθημι. As seen above, Gen 5:21-24 LXX uses the verb εὐαρεστέω twice: εὐηρέστησεν Ἐνὼχ τῷ θεῷ, “Enoch pleased God.” The adjective εὐάρεστος occurs in Wis 4:10, and ἀρεστός in v. 14. Μετατίθημι is also used in both Gen 5:24 LXX and Wis 4:10. This combination of terminology makes it certain that the author of the Book of Wisdom alludes to the Greek-language tradition concerning Enoch’s assumption.⁵²

The language does not refer to Enoch, however, but to the “righteous one.”⁵³ Wis 1:16–5:23 contains, interspersed with wisdom materials, the story of a righteous man (*dikaios*) who dies as the victim of a conspiracy of the ungodly (*asebeis*), and appears in a post-mortem judgment.⁵⁴ The line εὐάρεστος θεῷ γενόμενος ἠγαπήθη καὶ ζῶν μεταξὺ ἀμαρτωλῶν μετετέθη, “being well-pleasing to God, he was loved, and while living among sinners he was translated” (Wis 4:10), refers back to the *dikaios* who according to verse 7 dies early.⁵⁵ The intervening material (vv. 8 and 9) advances the argument that true maturity is to be measured by the advancement not of years but of understanding and blamelessness.⁵⁶ but there is no evidence

⁵² M. Kolarcik, *The Ambiguity of Death in the Book of Wisdom 1-6: A Study of Literary Structure and Interpretation* (AnBib 127; Rome: Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1991), 96.

⁵³ See, for instance, Schmitt, *Entrückung—Aufnahme—Himmelfahrt*, 184; Kolarcik, *Ambiguity of Death*, 96.

⁵⁴ As David Seeley puts it, this section of Wisdom is “an ambivalent sort of text: part narrative, part philosophical tract” (“Narrative, the Righteous Man and the Philosopher: An Analysis of the Story of the *Dikaios* in Wisdom 1–5, *JSP* 7 [1990]: 55–78; here, 63).

⁵⁵ Thus ζῶν μεταξὺ ἀμαρτωλῶν μετετέθη signifies that the *dikaios* is taken while living *among sinners*, and does not refer to an assumption as an escape from death.

⁵⁶ See also [Plutarch], *Cons. Apoll.* 17.

that the subject changes from verse 7 to verse 10.⁵⁷ The *dikaïos* is the only clear antecedent to the third person singular verbs and masculine singular adjectives and participles which occur in Wis 4:10-11.13-14. The righteous one is mentioned explicitly again in 4:16 as δίκαιος καμῶν, the righteous one who has died.⁵⁸ The reader would recall the acceleration of the murderous conspiracy of the ungodly against the *dikaïos* in the first part of the story, Wis 2:10-20 (especially vv. 17-20). Finally, the *dikaïos* is mentioned explicitly again in Wis 5:1, standing before his onetime oppressors with great boldness.

But the author of the Book of Wisdom also uses an expression for assumption that is atypical in Hellenistic Jewish materials: the verb ἀρπάζω (4:11). As Lohfink found, this is a technical term for assumption in classical literature, but ἀρπάζω is used typically in the Septuagint to describe the violent work of robbers or wild animals; the only instance in which it could connote assumption is Wis 4:11.⁵⁹ In addition, the author makes use of other motifs which properly belong to the theme of early death—the ideas of being loved by God (4:10) and being preserved from evil (4:11-14), and the verb σπεύδω to signify the soul's hastening from earth (4:14). A few scholars have noted, therefore, that ἀρπάζω and these ideas just mentioned appear in Greek epitaphs dedicated to people who died before their time, and in other materials that may

⁵⁷ The NRSV is misleading here: it separates Wis 4:9 from 4:10 and offers the translation, "There were some who pleased God"

⁵⁸ In Nickelsburg's opinion, "the [singular] is generic in 4:7; 4:16," but he does not explain his reasoning (*Resurrection, Immortality and Eternal Life*, 61 n. 40).

⁵⁹ As noted above, the usual verbs for assumption in Hellenistic Jewish writings are μετατίθημι and ἀναλαμβάνω, since the Septuagint translates אָרָב in Gen 5:24 with the former and in 2 Kings 2:9-10 with the latter (*Himmelfahrt Jesu*, 73). Ἀρπάζω is used for assumption or removal five times in the NT: Acts 8:39 (removal to another location); 2 Cor 12:2,4 (visionary experience, "whether in the body or not, I do not know"); 1 Thess 4:17 (the assumption of the saints); Rev 12:5 (the assumption of the male child).

be classed as consolation literature.⁶⁰ The similarity in language and theme between certain epitaphs and Wis 4:10-11 is striking.

In this first example, ἀρπάζω and the theme of divine love appear.

Πέντε σε καὶ δέκ' ἐτῶν ὁ βαρὺς μίτος ἤρπασε Μοιρῶν,
 Ἄτταλε, σεμνοτάτης μητρὸς ἄγαλμα Τύχης,
 τὸν σοφίαν ἀσκοῦντα καὶ εἰς καλὰ πάντα - -
 Ἄτταλον εὐμοίρῳ χρησάμενον βιότῳ·
 τοιγάρ μὴ λυπεῖσθε λίαν· ἦ γὰρ νέον, ὥς τινες εἶπον,
 εἰ φίλον ἐστὶ θεοῖς, ὅζυν ἔχει θάνατον.⁶¹

At fifteen years, the cruel thread of the Fates [Moiras] snatched you away,
 Attalos, the delight of [your] most noble mother, Tyche,
 you who practice wisdom and [...] into all good things.
 Attalos, whose life was well-blessed by Fate:
 Do not be overly sorrowful: for though you are young, as some people say,
 if one is befriended by the gods, death comes swiftly.

There are a number of features worthy of note here. First, the last line of this stanza expresses the same sentiment as the famous line of Menander, "The one whom the gods love dies young."⁶² Many commentators have noted the presence of a similar sentiment in Wis 4:10 in the passive verb ἡγαπήθη.⁶³ Second, here as elsewhere, ἀρπάζω is used in a stereotypical way: often it is Hades or the Fates who snatch away a child, and the plundering entity is usually described with

⁶⁰ See, for instance, D. Winston, *The Wisdom of Solomon* (AB 43; Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1979), 140; Schmitt, *Entrückung—Aufnahme—Himmelfahrt*, 188. For this reason, Schmitt classifies Wis 4:7-19 as consolation literature (ibid., 191; idem, "Der frühe Tod des Gerechten nach Weish 4.7-19: Ein Psalmthema in weisheitlicher Fassung," in *Freude an der Weisung des Herrn: Beiträge zur Theologie der Psalmen. Festgabe zum 70. Geburtstag von Heinrich Gross* [ed. F.-L. Hossfeld E. Haag; SBB 13; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1986], 325-47).

⁶¹ IG 5, I.1186. A.-M. Vèrilhac, *ΠΑΙΔΕΣ ΑΩΡΟΙ: Poésie funéraire* (2 vol.: ΠΡΑΓΜΑΤΕΙΑΙ ΤΗΣ ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑΣ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ 41; ΑΘΗΝΑΙ: ΓΡΑΦΕΙΟΝ ΔΗΜΟΣΙΕΥΜΑΤΩΝ ΤΗΣ ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑΣ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ, 1978), no. 62.A.1-6 (Gythium, c. 75 BCE). The translations are my own. Ἀρπάζω is used twice more in the same epitaph, stanzas C and D: Ἄτταλον [...] ἤρπασεν ἡ ταχινὴ Μοῖρα πρὸς ἀθανάτους (C.1-2); Ἄτταλος, ὃν δαίμων ἤρπασε καὶ κατέχει (D.2).

⁶² Plutarch, *Cons. Apoll.*, 34: ὃν οἱ θεοὶ φιλοῦσιν ἀποθνήσκει νέος.

⁶³ See, for example, Winston, *The Wisdom of Solomon*, 140-41; A. Schmitt, *Das Buch der Weisheit: Ein Kommentar* (Würzburg: Echter, 1986), 66-7; Kolarcik, *Ambiguity of Death*, 96 n. 43.

some negative epithet.⁶⁴ In this example it is the “cruel thread of the Fates”; later the same epitaph castigates Moira for her hastiness in stealing Attalos away. Notice also that while the epitaph blames the Fates for the early death of Attalos, the boy is described as “living a life well-blessed by Fate” (εὐμοίρῳι χρησάμενον βιότῳι, *l.* 4). It is a remarkable (but not atypical) contradiction that the themes of divine love and divine malice come together as they have here.⁶⁵

Ἀρπάζω has a negative connotation whenever it is used for early death, whether the verb is used in the active voice with a plundering deity as the subject, or in the passive with a divine agent implied. In the *Letter of Condolence to Apollonius*, attributed to Plutarch, ἀρπάζω is used chiefly to describe the grieving complaints of parents whose children die too young. For example, he writes, “We must regard as vain and foolish such exclamations as these: ‘But he ought not to have been snatched away while young!’” (ἀλλ’ οὐκ ἔδει νέον ὄντα ἀναρπαγῆναι).⁶⁶ The author disparages such expressions, advocating instead an acquiescence to destiny; nevertheless, because the passive voice in these instances implies an unstated agent, the cry of grief echoes the accusatory tone noted in the epitaphs.

The idea of an over-eager deity is at work in the next two examples. Here, as in Wisdom 4, ἀρπάζω and σπεύδω appear together.

Τί σπεύσας, Ἀΐδη, τὸν νήπιον ἥρπασας ἡμῶν,
τὸν γλυκερόν τε Σόλωνα κατήγαγες οὐκ ἐλεήσας,
τὸ βρέφος ἐξ μηνῶν, τὸ καλὸν βρέφος; ὡς πικρὸν ἄλγος
δειλαιόις γονέεσσι, Πεπρωμένη, ἐξετέλεσσας.⁶⁷

⁶⁴ For a very early example, see Peek, *Griechische Grabgedichte*, no. 149 (ὁ βάσκανος ἄρπασεν Ἀτίδας Τυρῶ: Polyrheneia, Crete, 2 C BCE).

⁶⁵ Vêrilhac, *ΠΑΙΔΕΣ ΑΩΡΟΙ*, 2.226.

⁶⁶ *Cons. Apoll.* 18 (Babbitt, LCL). See also *Cons. Apoll.* 30.

⁶⁷ *IG* 2, 12629; Vêrilhac, *ΠΑΙΔΕΣ ΑΩΡΟΙ*, no. 151 (Athens, c. 150 CE). See also Vêrilhac, *ΠΑΙΔΕΣ ΑΩΡΟΙ*, nos. 148-150, 152 for ἀρπάζω and σπεύδω together.

Why did you hasten, Hades, and snatch our baby away,
sweet Solon, whom you have taken down without pity,
our beautiful baby, six months old? What bitter anguish
you have caused, Destiny [Peptomene], to these sorrowful parents!

In a similar way, the following terse example castigates an “insatiable Hades” with a line that is repeated almost verbatim in several epitaphs of similar age and provenance.

Ἄπληρωτ' Αἴδη, τί με νήπιον ἥρπασες ἄφνω;
τί σπεύδεις; οὐ σοὶ πάντες ὀφειλόμεθα;⁶⁸

Insatiable Hades, why did you snatch my child away so suddenly?
Why did you hasten? Are we all not owed to you?

In these examples, both ἥρπάζω and σπεύδω are used in an accusatory manner. The divine agent blamed for the early death is accused of both robbery and undue haste.⁶⁹

The idea of haste in an early death was not limited to the deities at fault, however. The one who died early was often thought of as fleeing the evils of the world. Consider the following example, where the soul hastens to the divinity:

ἡίθεον Καλόκαιρον ἔχει τόδε σῆμα, λιπούσης
ψυχῆς ἀθανάτου σῶμα νέοιο κόρου·
σπεύδεν ὁδὸν θείην γὰρ ἀποπρολιποῦσα μερίμνας
πευκεδανοῖο βίου, ὡς ἀνίη καθαρή.⁷⁰

This tomb contains the unmarried Kalokairos, because [his] immortal soul
left the body of the young boy:
for it hurried on its way to the divinity, leaving behind the anxieties
of this bitter life, going up as a pure spirit.

Thus the one who dies early, who speeds from this mortal world, avoids not only potential

⁶⁸ CIG 3, 6227; Vêrilhac, *ΠΑΙΔΕΣ ΑΩΡΟΙ*, no. 148 (Rome, 2–3 C CE). For the same expressions, see also nos. 149 and 150.

⁶⁹ See Vêrilhac, *ΠΑΙΔΕΣ ΑΩΡΟΙ*, 2.191–5.

⁷⁰ Peek, *Griechische Grabgedichte*, no. 296 (Rome, 3 C CE). Cited in Schmitt, *Entrückung—Aufnahme—Himmelfahrt*, 188–9.

troubles and sorrows, but also the pollution of good character.⁷¹ This is the sense in which *σπεύδω* occurs in Wis 4:14a: “For his soul was pleasing to the Lord, therefore it hastened from the midst of evil” (ἀρεστὴ γὰρ ἦν κυρίῳ ἡ ψυχὴ αὐτοῦ, διὰ τοῦτο ἔσπευσεν ἐκ μέσου πονηρίας). The author reprises the idea, seen already in verses 11 and 12, that the Lord removes the *dikaios* in order to prevent his pollution and to preserve his righteousness.⁷²

The combination of themes from both the Jewish assumption tradition and the Hellenistic consolation materials appears to be consistent with the compositional method of the author of the Book of Wisdom. Seeley has recently argued that “Pseudo-Solomon combines a number of narrative patterns from both the Hebraic and Hellenistic vectors of his syncretistic culture.”⁷³ In particular, Seeley demonstrates that the author of Wisdom used *topoi* from Hellenistic moral philosophy. For example, the curious and sudden movement of the *asebeis* from hedonism to the oppression of the *dikaios* (Wis 2:9-10) is to be explained on the basis of “an apparent *topos* in Greco-Roman moral philosophy which associates the pursuit of pleasure with aggressive wrongdoing.”⁷⁴

Here the author of the Book of Wisdom makes use of *topoi* from consolation literature on the one hand and the Jewish assumption tradition on the other. The lynchpin is the verb ἀρπάζω: since it is used commonly for both early death and assumption, an overlap of themes is exploited

⁷¹ See also *Cons. Apoll.* 34: The one who dies early is not only “spared many evils,” but also avoids “any grossness of conduct as is wont to be the concomitant of a long old age.”

⁷² Compare Isa 57:1-2, where the righteous one (הַצַּדִּיק, LXX ὁ δίκαιος) is taken away from unrighteousness (כִּי מִפְּנֵי הָרָעָה נֶאֱכָף הַצַּדִּיק, LXX ἀπὸ γὰρ προφώπου ἀδικίας ἤρται ὁ δίκαιος). See Zwiep, *Ascension*, 44, who sees the parallel as evidence that the assumption language in Wisdom 4 refers not to Enoch but to the righteous one.

⁷³ Seeley, “Narrative, the Righteous Man and the Philosopher,” 76.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, 68. Another *topos* from moral philosophy, “according to which a pious or godly figure preaches at the ungodly (who fail to see the divine behind the phenomena around them) and with surprising speed is confronted by active hostility,” explains the movement in Wisdom 2 from “a conflict over essentially philosophical issues to the act of homicide” (*ibid.*, 71-2).

in a remarkable way. Although ἀρπάζω in the epitaphs and consolation literature is only used negatively, in Jewish thought assumption was understood only in terms of divine blessing. Hence, when the Book of Wisdom uses ἀρπάζω to connote the divine purposes behind the early death of the *dikaïos*, the accusatory tone usually directed at the deity in such cases is completely absent, since the focus in Wisd 4 is the good purposes of God. By combining themes and terminology from consolation materials, the author is able to apply assumption language, normally reserved for the living righteous taken up bodily into heaven, to the dead righteous one. Because the *dikaïos* was pleasing to God, his early death is equated with the divine blessing of assumption.⁷⁵

At least one example from a roughly contemporary Jewish source can be cited. In the *Testament of Job* (1 C BCE or CE),⁷⁶ Sitis, Job's wife, implores Eliphaz to search through the ruins of their house in order to recover the bones of the children killed when Satan caused it to collapse (*T. Job* 39:8-11). As Eliphaz's men leave to dig through the ruins, Job forbids them, saying,

Μὴ κάμῃτε εἰκῆ, οὐ γὰρ εὐρήσετε τὰ παῖδιά μου, ἐπειδὴ ἀνελήφθησαν εἰς οὐρανοὺς ὑπὸ τοῦ δημιουργοῦ αὐτῶν τοῦ βασιλέως.

"Do not trouble yourself in vain. For you will not find my children, since they were taken up into heaven by the Creator their King." (*T. Job* 39:11-12)⁷⁷

⁷⁵ See D. Georgi, "Der vorpaulinische Hymnus Phil 2.6-11," in *Zeit und Geschichte: Dankesgabe an Rudolf Bultmann zum 80. Geburtstag* (ed. E. Dinkler; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1964), 263-93, esp. 274. See also Lohfink, *Himmelfahrt Jesu*, 55 n. 161 (though he thought this referred to the righteous "im allgemeinen"); Kolarcik, *Ambiguity of Death*, 95.

⁷⁶ According to R. P. Spittler ("Testament of Job," *OTP* 1.829-68), the text cannot be dated with more certainty than this (*ibid.*, 833-4).

⁷⁷ Greek text from S. P. Brock, ed., *Testamentum Iobi*; J.-C. Picard, ed., *Apocalypsis Baruchi graece* (PVTG 2; Leiden: Brill, 1967); translation from Spittler, "Testament of Job."

Those standing by express disbelief (39:13). Then Job tells Sitis to look to the east, and she sees a vision of their children “crowned with the splendour of the heavenly one” (40:3). Consoled by this vision, Sitis herself dies, either “content” (εὐθυμήσασα), or possibly “exhausted” or “without malice” (ἀθυμήσασα)—the manuscripts differ.⁷⁸

Although ἀναλαμβάνω can connote soul ascent, the attendant motifs of unsuccessful search—especially since Job says that their bones would not be found—and exalted heavenly status suggest that ἀναλαμβάνω here can only signify assumption. There is no indication as to why God would bestow such a special honour on the children of Job, particularly since Job’s own death is narrated as an ascent of the soul (*T. Job* 52). R. P. Spittler suggests that if the post-mortem assumption of the children is inconsistent with other beliefs in the afterlife suggested in the *Testament of Job*, “it is only because *T. Job* reflects a stage in the development of Jewish eschatology where considerable diversity appeared.”⁷⁹ This is hardly satisfying, especially since Jewish tradition is extremely hesitant to apply assumption language to any but the most worthy candidates. It is tempting to suggest that the assumption of Job’s children has something to do with their early and untimely death, especially since the vision appears to have a consolatory function.

Besides the consolatory function of assumption language in *Wisdom 4*, another issue is at work in the story of the *dikaïos*: the immortality of the soul, as Robert J. Miller has recently argued.⁸⁰ In spite of the presence of non-narrative wisdom material, the story may be counted among the so-called “Wisdom Tales,” stories that “dramatically demonstrate the ultimate validity

⁷⁸ See Brock, *Testamentum Iobi*, 50.

⁷⁹ Spittler, “Testament of Job,” 859 note e.

⁸⁰ R. J. Miller, “Immortality and Religious Identity in *Wisdom 2–5*,” in *Reimagining Christian Origins*, 199–213.

of wisdom/righteousness by narrating the vindication of righteous sages caught in seemingly hopeless situations, victims of the schemes of evil opponents."⁸¹ In stories where the sage is killed, says Miller, the only vindication possible is a post-mortem one.⁸² Thus, in his view, "the immortality of the soul in Wisdom 2–5 is a wisdom tale solution to the problem of martyrdom."⁸³ However, the idea of the soul's immortality can scarcely account for the elevated status and role of the *dikaïos* in Wis 5:1–5.

There are at least two indications that the *dikaïos* appears after his death as an exalted figure. First, there is the affirmation of the ungodly that the righteous one is now one of the sons of God, one of the holy ones (5:5). At the very least, this salvation is an unexpected paradox for his onetime oppressors (5:2). Some, however, have suggested that the expressions "sons of God" and "holy ones" signify angelic beings.⁸⁴ A second and clearer indication that the *dikaïos* has received an exalted heavenly status is found in his appearance at the judgment of the *asebeis*. Apparently, this judgment is not a final or universal one, for the only ones present in 5:1–14 are the *dikaïos* and his persecutors. The scene is remarkable, however, because no divine judge appears to be present: the ungodly quake with miserable fear before the righteous one himself. His silent presence and proven vindication are accusation enough, and he stands "with great boldness before those who oppressed him" (5:1).

The ungodly quake because the *dikaïos* has been exalted to an important forensic role in the heavenly court. Wis 3:8 and 4:16–17 predict such a role. The latter text reads, κατακρίνεται δὲ

⁸¹ Ibid., 209.

⁸² So also Nickelsburg, *Resurrection, Immortality and Eternal Life*, 66.

⁸³ Miller, "Immortality and Religious Identity," 209. Earlier, George Nickelsburg wrote that "since immortality is already the possession of the righteous man [in Wisdom 2–5], his death is viewed as his assumption" (*Resurrection, Immortality and Eternal Life*, 88).

⁸⁴ See Nickelsburg, *Resurrection, Immortality and Eternal Life*, 60–1 and n. 37.

δίκαιος καμὼν τοὺς ζῶντας ἀσεβεῖς. It could be argued that the condemnation here involves the *dikaïos* only in a passive way. In this case, it is simply his vindicated heavenly presence that accuses and condemns the ungodly, for their false reasoning is found out. But the dead righteous one who condemns appears to validate the expectation, found in Wis 3:8, that the righteous (plural) will judge the nations as the viceregents of the Lord: κρινούσιν ἔθνη καὶ κρατήσουσιν λαῶν, καὶ βασιλεύσει αὐτῶν κύριος εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας. The *dikaïos* has been exalted to an active role in judgment.

One important issue remains: Was the exaltation typically found in Jewish assumption traditions the basis of the post-mortem vindication of the *dikaïos*? Wis 4:16-17 explicitly connects the death of the *dikaïos* with his forensic role: “the righteous one who has died will condemn the ungodly who are alive, and youth that has quickly met its end will condemn the old age of the unjust.” The removal of the *dikaïos*—described as an assumption—is a divine safeguard directly connected with his role in judgment. It may be concluded that his post-mortem exaltation is based upon the logic which connected assumption and special eschatological function.⁸⁵

⁸⁵ So Georgi, “Vorpaulinische Hymnus,” 274: “Der Gerechte ist also nicht gestorben, sondern das, was als sein Tod erscheint, ist in Wirklichkeit seine Entrückung, und seine Entrückung ist gleichbedeutend mit seiner Erhöhung in richterliche und königliche Würde und Funktion.”

3.3.5. Moses⁸⁶

In spite of the fairly clear narrative of his death in Deut 34:1-8, there apparently arose traditions that Moses was assumed, presumably because of the mystery surrounding his death and burial (Deut 34:5).⁸⁷ The document known as the *Assumptio Mosis* (the *Testament of Moses*) is of little help, for its ending is missing,⁸⁸ and fragmentary citations indicate that it narrated an ascent of Moses' soul, not the assumption of his body and soul into heaven.⁸⁹ For the most part, therefore, any tradition concerning the assumption of Moses can only be inferred from sources which are ambivalent, vague, or late,⁹⁰ or from other sources that suggest a future return of Moses.⁹¹

Philo is probably the earliest writer to hint at an awareness of an assumption tradition for Moses.⁹² In his *Life of Moses* he states unequivocally that Moses died and was buried by immortal powers (*Mos.* 2.291), but in the *Questions and Answers on Genesis* he names Moses

⁸⁶ It should be noted that Jewish tradition understood Moses' ascent of Mount Sinai as a heavenly ascent which resulted in a (properly qualified) deification (e.g., Philo, *Mos.* 1.158). See W. A. Meeks, *The Prophet-King: Moses Traditions and the Johannine Christology* (NovTSup 14; Leiden: Brill, 1967); M. Himmelfarb, *Ascent to Heaven*; P. Borgen, "Moses, Jesus, and the Roman Emperor: Observations in Philo's Writings and the Revelation of John," *NovT* 38 (1996): 145-59.

⁸⁷ As Lohfink put it, "Denn wenn von einem außergewöhnlichen Menschen gesagt wurde, daß sein Grab unbekannt oder nicht vorhanden sei, so bedeutete das ja im Grunde schon seine Entrückung" (*Himmelfahrt Jesu.* 62).

⁸⁸ On the lost ending, see J. Tromp, *The Assumption of Moses: A Critical Edition with Commentary* (SVTP 10; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1993), 270-85.

⁸⁹ Two important citations lead to this conclusion: (1) the reference in Jude to the dispute between Michael and the devil over the body of Moses (Jude 9); and (2) Clement of Alexandria's reference to the "double Moses" (*Strom.* 6.132.2). The latter text reads, "Joshua, the son of Nun, saw a double Moses being taken away [ἀναλαμβάνόμενον], one who (went) with the angels, and the other who was deemed worthy to be buried in the ravines" (Tromp, *Assumption of Moses*, 283). According to Lohfink, the terms ἀνάληψις and *assumptio* were normally used for soul ascent as well as assumption (*Himmelfahrt Jesu.* 61-9).

⁹⁰ On later sources such as *Memar Marqah* and rabbinic texts, see K. Haacker and P. Schäfer, "Nachbiblische Traditionen vom Tod des Moses," in *Josephus-Studien: Festschrift O. Michel* (ed. O. Betz et. al.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1974), 147-74, esp. 160-4, 170-4.

⁹¹ See the brief discussion below, pp. 147-8.

⁹² Cf. Zwiep, *Ascension*, 67.

(the “protoprophet”) with Enoch and Elijah as those who experienced assumption (*QG* 1.86).

Elsewhere (*Sac.* 3.8) he appears to repeat this view:

[W]hen Moses was about to die we do not hear of him “leaving” or “being added” like those others. No room in him for adding or taking away. But through the Word of the Supreme Cause he is translated (μετανίσταται), even through that Word by which also the whole universe was formed.⁹³

Peder Borgen suggests that on these two points Philo refers to two different traditions.⁹⁴

A clearer reference to an assumption tradition for Moses is found in Josephus’ *Jewish Antiquities* 4.326, although even this report is ambivalent. Many have noted the affinities of Josephus’ description of the end of Moses with Greco-Roman assumption narratives,⁹⁵ but the description is ambiguous enough to make it unclear whether Josephus himself thought the narrative credible.

And while he bade farewell to Eleazar and Joshua and was yet communing with them, a cloud of a sudden (αἰφνίδιον) descended upon him and he disappeared in a ravine (ἀφανίζεται κατὰ τινος φάραγγος). But he has written of himself in the sacred books that he died, for fear lest they should venture to say that by reason of his surpassing virtue he had gone back to the Deity (πρὸς τὸ θεῖον αὐτὸν ἀναχωρῆσαι).⁹⁶

The issue is how to read the line that “he has written of himself that he died” (γέγραφε δ’ αὐτὸν ἐν ταῖς ἱεραῖς βίβλοις τεθνεῶτα). Tabor, for instance, thinks that Josephus is reporting a tradition he is not inclined to take seriously, and suggests that “we take his line about Moses not ‘returning to the divinity’ ... as a conscious resistance to such contemporary evaluations of other

⁹³ *Sac.* 3.8 (Colson and Whitaker, LCL). The verb here is μετανίστημι, which Liddell and Scott define as “remove from his or their country” (LSJ, ad loc.). See Borgen, “Heavenly Ascent in Philo,” 251.

⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, 249–51. Borgen cites *Midrash Hag-Gadol* 1 (*ibid.*, 249 n. 12) as a close parallel to the view given in *QG* 1.86.

⁹⁵ Lohfink, *Himmelfahrt Jesu*, 62–4; Tabor, “Returning to the Divinity,” 226–30, 237–8; Begg, “Some Observations”; Zwiep, *Ascension*, 67–9.

⁹⁶ Josephus, *Ant.* 4.326 (Thackeray, LCL). See also 4.323: “On his advancing thence toward the place where he was destined to disappear (οὐ ἐμελλεν ἀφανισθῆσθαι), they all followed him bathed in tears.”

extraordinary figures, whether that of Philo of Moses, the Christians of Jesus or Dionysius of Aeneas and Romulus.”⁹⁷ In Begg’s opinion, on the other hand, Josephus believes that “Moses actually did undergo an *Entrückung*” but emphasizes Moses’s characteristic humility: he would sooner write that he died than have anyone venerate him as a deity.⁹⁸ The latter view seems more likely, especially since Josephus writes earlier in the narrative that Moses was about to disappear (*Ant.* 4.323). Either way, as Zwiep notes, “the existence of a tradition of Moses’ bodily rapture is brought back at least to the end of the first century AD.”⁹⁹

3.3.6. The Eschatological Return of Assumed Figures

A number of sources refer to the eschatological return of figures who presumably have been reserved in heaven after their assumption for just such occasions. Although generally these traditions have in mind the principal characters Enoch and Elijah, and sometimes Moses, some secondary figures, Ezra and Phinehas for instance, are told that they would join a group of assumed people who would return at the appointed time. Ezra learns that his time in the company of those who had been assumed like him would be limited “until the times are ended” (4 *Ezra* 14:9). This is suggestive of a future return of those who had been assumed, foretold earlier in 4 *Ezra* (late 1 C CE).

⁹⁷ Tabor, “Returning to the Divinity,” 237. See also Haacker and Schäfer, “Nachbiblische Traditionen,” 150: “... der Tod Moses für Josephus außer Frage steht und in seiner Tragweite im Lichte von Dtn 34.10 gesehen wird.” Talbert (“Immortals,” 425, 430) thinks that while Josephus and Philo both find the *theios anēr* concept relevant with respect to Moses’ virtue, both also balk at the idea of his assumption because it would suggest his becoming an immortal.

⁹⁸ Begg, “Some Observations,” 692; similarly Zwiep, *Ascension*, 69. See also A. Yarbro Collins, “Apotheosis and Resurrection,” in *The New Testament and Hellenistic Judaism* (ed. P. Borgen, S. Giversen; Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1997), 88–100, esp. 95 and n. 36.

⁹⁹ Zwiep, *Ascension*, 69.

“It shall be that whoever remains after all that I have foretold to you shall be saved and shall see my salvation and the end of my world. And they shall see the men who were taken up, who from their birth have not tasted death; and the heart of the earth’s inhabitants shall be changed and converted to a different spirit.” (4 Ezra 6:25-26)

Here they return, apparently, to restore and convert the world.

Phinehas the son of Eleazar the priest is told, according to the *Liber antiquitatum biblicarum* (1 C CE), that he will join those who before him were lifted up; God says that at a future time he will make them all come, presumably back to earth, where they will taste death (*L.A.B.* 48:1). As Zwiep notes, the plural here might imply Enoch and Moses if the “before you” phrase is taken as strictly chronological.¹⁰⁰ The reference to the death of those who had been assumed after their future appearance is unusual, and may have in mind the tradition(s), reflected in Rev 11:3-13 and other sources, about the murdered witnesses.¹⁰¹

There is really nothing in Rev 11:3-13 that suggests that the two witnesses have come from heaven: they appear as out of nowhere. Yet because several of their characteristics allow them to be identified as Moses (turning the waters to blood and striking the earth with plagues, Rev 11:6) and Elijah (destroying with fire and shutting the heavens, vv. 5 and 6),¹⁰² their appearance to do battle against the Beast should probably be understood as a post-assumption return. The expectation of an eschatological return of Elijah is well known,¹⁰³ but there are a few

¹⁰⁰ Ibid., 75.

¹⁰¹ See M. Black, “The ‘Two Witnesses’ of Rev 11:3f in Jewish and Christian Apocalyptic Tradition,” in *Donum Gentilicium: New Testament Studies in Honour of D. Daube* (ed. W. D. Davies, C. K. Barrett; Oxford: Clarendon, 1978), 227-37, esp. 232.

¹⁰² See R. H. Charles, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Revelation of St. John* (2 vols.; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1920), 1.281-2; Black, “The ‘Two Witnesses’,” 227; D. E. Aune, *Revelation 6-16* (WBC 52B; Dallas: Word; Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1998), 600, 613-6.

¹⁰³ See Mal 4:5; Sir 48:10; Mark 9:11.

texts that look ahead to a return of Moses (or a prophet like Moses¹⁰⁴) together with Elijah. The clearest is *Deut. Rab.* 3.17:

[God] added: "Moses, I swear to you, as you devoted your life to their service in this world, so too in the time to come when I bring Elijah, the prophet, unto them, the two of you shall come together."¹⁰⁵

Such a tradition may lie behind the appearance of Moses together with Elijah at the Transfiguration (Mark 9:4 par. Matt 17:3, Luke 9:30). David Aune suggests that the author of this unit in Revelation 11 adapted an existing tradition about Enoch and Elijah, and avoided naming the witnesses, since "parallel texts regularly name Enoch and Elijah as the two eschatological prophets who will return at the end of the age."¹⁰⁶

Probably the earliest reference to Enoch and Elijah returning together is in the Enochic *Animal Apocalypse*: the angels who had caused Enoch to ascend set him and the ram holding onto him (Elijah) in the midst of the sheep prior to the judgment (*1 En.* 90:31).¹⁰⁷ Their function here, not made explicit, appears to be as witnesses to the judgment.¹⁰⁸ The *Coptic Apocalypse of Elijah*, a document of uncertain date (2 to 4 C CE) which may at points be based upon much earlier Jewish materials,¹⁰⁹ describes a return of Enoch and Elijah (*Apoc. El. (C)* 4:7-19) that is

¹⁰⁴ Zwiep correctly notes that the question of the origin of an expectation of Moses' eschatological return is complicated by the fact that the expectation of a prophet like Moses may have seemed like an interchangeable idea (*Ascension*, 70-1).

¹⁰⁵ Translation from J. Rabbinowitz, *Midrash Rabbah: Deuteronomy* (ed. H. Freedman and M. Simon; London: Soncino, 1974). See also *Sifre* 355; *Tg. Ps.-J.* Deut 33:21; *'Ag. Ber.* 67; *Midr. Tann. Deut.* 219 (cited by Zwiep, *Ascension*, 70 n. 4).

¹⁰⁶ Aune, *Revelation*, 2.610. Black remarks that Rev 11:3-13 is "almost certainly a Christianized version of a still older Jewish Antichrist myth" ("The 'Two Witnesses'." 226).

¹⁰⁷ So Charles, *Revelation*, 1.281; Black, "The 'Two Witnesses'." 227-9.

¹⁰⁸ Charles notes that this reference may be a later addition (R. H. Charles, *The Book of Enoch* [Oxford: Clarendon, 1893], 215).

¹⁰⁹ See O. S. Wintermute, "Apocalypse of Elijah," *OTP* 2.721-53, esp. 729-30; also J.-M. Rosenstiehl, *L'Apocalypse d'Élie* (Textes et études pour servir à l'histoire du judaïsme intertestamentaire 1; Paris: P. Guethner, 1972), 75-6.

strikingly similar to the appearance of the unnamed witnesses in Revelation 11.¹¹⁰ A similar form of the two witnesses tradition is also found in the writings of Lactantius, who describes the return of a single (unnamed) figure, a “great prophet” having all the powers described in Rev 11:5-6 (*Div. Inst.* 7.17).¹¹¹ However the traditions may be related, and whatever their origin might be, they all describe the appearance (from heaven, *Apoc. El. (C)* 4:7) of a figure or figures who would fight against the eschatological adversary, be killed, go unburied, and then rise from the dead and ascend into heaven.¹¹²

The *Coptic Apocalypse of Elijah* is remarkable for two reasons: first of all, because it describes a second return of Enoch and Elijah.

After these things [viz., the judgment of the sheep (5:30-31)¹¹³], Elijah and Enoch will come down. They will lay down the flesh of the world, and they will receive their spiritual flesh. They will pursue the son of lawlessness and kill him since he is not able to speak. (*Apoc. El. (C)* 5:32).

The exchange of physical bodies for spiritual ones might imply the idea that Enoch and Elijah take the bodily nature of the general resurrection (see 1 Cor 15:44). Jeremias suggested that this final return and the destruction of the Antichrist was the final conclusion of the original tradition, even though it does not survive elsewhere. Tertullian, however, does suggest that Enoch and

¹¹⁰ See the synoptic summary in Aune, *Revelation*, 2.588-9, who says that the only clear instance of “dependence of *Apoc. Elijah* 4:6-19 on Rev 11:3-13” is the murder (and lack of burial) of the witnesses. Aune thinks “this similarity is based on a later Christian revision of a Jewish source” (ibid., 2.589). See first of all W. Bousset, *The Antichrist Legend: A Chapter in Christian and Jewish Folklore* (London: Hutchinson & Co., 1896), 203-11; J. M. Nützel, “Zum Schicksal der eschatologischen Propheten,” *BZ* 20 (1976): 59-94; R. J. Bauckham, “Enoch and Elijah in the Coptic Apocalypse of Elijah,” in *Studia Patristica* 16/2 (ed. E. A. Livingstone: TU 129; Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1985), 69-76.

¹¹¹ Aune, *Revelation*, 2.591-2.

¹¹² *Apoc. El. (C)* 4:19 does not explicitly describe their ascension, but says that “On that day they will shout up to heaven as they shine while all the people and all the world see them.”

¹¹³ See *1 En.* 90:20-27 (*Animal Apocalypse*), where the judgment of the sheep is also the context for the return of Enoch and Elijah. Black, “The ‘Two Witnesses’,” 229.

Elijah will destroy Antichrist by means of their martyrdom.¹¹⁴ Also remarkable here is the appearance of a third witness, Tabitha, before Enoch and Elijah appear (*Apoc. El. (C)* 4:1-6). Tabitha reproves the Shameless One, chasing him to Jerusalem, where he kills her and sucks her blood. She rises from the dead and rebukes her foe again. This Tabitha can only be the woman raised from the dead by Peter in Acts 9:36.

Birger Pearson has drawn attention to an obscure text that shows some affinities to the tradition(s) behind the two witnesses in Rev 11:3-13 and in the *Coptic Apocalypse of Elijah*. A Coptic Enoch apocryphon, known only from one manuscript,¹¹⁵ mentions Tabitha as being among those assumed. In this text, a young Enoch enquires of his sister Sibyl, a prophetess, whether he will be the only one who will experience assumption, and Sibyl names Elijah and Tabitha.¹¹⁶ Pearson suggests that both this Enoch apocryphon and the Arabic version of the *History of Joseph the Carpenter*¹¹⁷ (which names Tabitha and Sibyl as witnesses with Enoch and Elijah against the Antichrist) represent expansions of the tradition that Tabitha was to be an opponent of the Shameless One. Presumably because of her important role alongside Enoch and Elijah in the *Coptic Apocalypse of Elijah*, she later came to be thought of as having been taken

¹¹⁴ "Enoch no doubt was translated, and so was Elijah; nor did they experience death: it was postponed, and only postponed, most certainly: they are reserved for the suffering of death, that by their blood they may extinguish Antichrist" (*De anima* 50 [ANF 3:227]).

¹¹⁵ B. A. Pearson, "The Pierpont Morgan Fragments of a Coptic Enoch Apocryphon," in *Studies on the Testament of Abraham* (ed. G. W. E. Nickelsburg; Septuagint and Cognate Studies 6; Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1976), 227-83.

¹¹⁶ Pierpont Morgan Library Coptic Theological Texts 3, fol. 9v (ibid., 235, 271).

¹¹⁷ See the summary of the Arabic in J. K. Elliott, *The Apocryphal New Testament: A Collection of Apocryphal Christian Literature in an English Translation* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1993), 114-5. After the death of Joseph, the disciples inquire of Jesus why he was not spared death like Enoch and Elijah; in his answer Jesus refers to the death of the witnesses at the hand of Antichrist (*Hist. Jos. Carp.* 30-32; for a complete translation of the Coptic text see S. Morenz, *Die Geschichte von Joseph dem Zimmermann* [TU 56; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1951]).

The Coptic text (from which it appears the Arabic was translated) does not contain the references to Sibyl and Tabitha. See also F. Robinson, *Coptic Apocryphal Gospels* (Texts and Studies 4.2; Cambridge: 1896), 229.

into heaven, "since her subsequent death is not recorded in Acts."¹¹⁸ Here, then, is an example of an assumption legend growing out of a tradition about someone's eschatological role, rather than the other way round.

3.3.7. Ezra, Baruch, Phinehas, and Melchizedek

Earlier examples of this phenomenon occur in *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch*, where both apocalyptic seers receive foreknowledge of their assumptions. In the seventh vision of *4 Ezra*, God tells Ezra to make preparations for the end, and reveals his fate to him:

"Lay up in your heart the signs that I have shown you, the dreams that you have seen, and the interpretations you have heard; for you shall be taken up from among men, and henceforth you shall live with my Son and with those who are like you, until the times are ended. ... Now, therefore set your house in order, and reprove your people: comfort the lowly among them, and instruct those that are wise." (*4 Ezra* 14:8-9,13)¹¹⁹

It is important to note that the author of *4 Ezra* considers this seer to be worthy of equal dignity to Enoch and Elijah ("those who are like you"), being kept in the presence of the Messiah ("my Son") until the end of time. Ezra asks permission to write down the revelations he has received, and God tells him to write for forty days. Both Lohfink and Zwiep see in this pattern a significant analogy to the Lukan ascension stories (see Acts 1:3).¹²⁰ Ezra's assumption is narrated in an ending to *4 Ezra* 14 found in the Syriac, Ethiopic, Armenian, and Arabic versions. Probably this ending was omitted from the Latin when the Christian Chapters 15 and 16 (so-

¹¹⁸ Pearson, "Pierpont Morgan Fragments," 242.

¹¹⁹ Translation from B. M. Metzger, "The Fourth Book of Ezra," *OTP* 1.516-59.

¹²⁰ Lohfink, *Himmelfahrt Jesu*, 183; Zwiep, *Ascension*, 72.

called 5 *Ezra*) were added.¹²¹ The ending reads: "At that time Ezra was caught up, and taken to the place of those who are like him, after he had written all these things. And he was called the Scribe of the knowledge of the Most High for ever and ever."¹²² As already noted, it is also likely that 4 *Ezra* 4:10 ("until the times are ended") implies an eschatological return for Ezra, because his time in heaven is limited.¹²³

Similarly, 2 *Baruch* (c. 100 CE) envisions the assumption of its seer. As Zwiep writes, "the fact that both books claim an assumption for its main character is significant in itself, as it demonstrates the tendency to 'conventionalise' the rapture-preservation scheme."¹²⁴ In 2 *Bar.* 76:1-5, Baruch learns of his impending assumption, and his task of instructing the people in the intervening time, from the interpreting angel: "For you will surely depart from this world, nevertheless not to death but to be kept unto the end of times" (76:2; see also 48:30). Baruch also is given forty days to "instruct the people ... so that they may learn lest they die in the last times" (76:5). Other passages in 2 *Baruch* foresee his role as witness in the eschatological judgment (13:3, 25:1).

Brief mention may also be made here of a similar tradition concerning Phinehas, son of Eleazar the priest. In the *Liber antiquitatum biblicarum*, which in this context gives an expanded account of the events of Judges 19-20, Phinehas, apparently at the end of an exceedingly long career (see Exod 6:25; Num 25:1-13; Judg 20:28), receives advance news of his assumption. God

¹²¹ See M. E. Stone, *Fourth Ezra: A Commentary on the Book of Fourth Ezra* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990), 442: "In our opinion, the textual evidence is adequate to show that the conclusion of the chapter is part of the original text."

¹²² Metzger, *OTP* I.555 note p. Cf. *Gk. Apoc. Ezra* 6-7, which describes Ezra's death.

¹²³ See M. E. Stone, "Coherence and Inconsistency in the Apocalypses: The Case of 'The End' in 4 Ezra," *JBL* 102 (1983): 229-43, esp. 240.

¹²⁴ Zwiep, *Ascension*, 74.

tells him that he will be fed by his eagle on the mountain in Daneben, and that he will be able to shut the heavens with a word. Then, “afterward you will be lifted up into the place where those who were before you were lifted up, and you will be there until I remember the world. Then I will make you all come, and you will taste what is death” (*L.A.B.* 48:1).¹²⁵ The similarities between Phinehas and Elijah are striking, and although later tradition apparently identified the two, it is unclear whether this identification is already at work here.¹²⁶

2 Enoch 71-72 describes the bizarre circumstances surrounding the birth and removal of Melchizedek. The child, nephew of Noah, is translated to Eden in order to be spared from the flood (*2 Enoch* 72, both recensions). Although a number of familiar themes occur here—a period of forty days, a divine removal, and preservation for a future role (as a priest: *2 En.* 71:29.37, both recensions)—there is no indication that an *eschatological* role is foreseen for Melchizedek.¹²⁷

¹²⁵ Citations from the *Liber antiquitatum biblicarum* are from D. J. Harrington, “Pseudo-Philo,” *OTP* 1:297-377.

¹²⁶ So Zwiep, *Ascension*, 74. See for example Origen, *in loh.* 6.7; see also R. Hayward, “Phinehas—The Same is Elijah: The Origin of a Rabbinic Tradition,” *JJS* 29 (1978): 22-38. For the view that the assumption of Phinehas had its origins in “Judaean-Samaritan polemics” about the legitimation of priesthood, see A. Spiro, “The Ascension of Phinehas,” *PAAJR* 22 (1953): 91-114.

¹²⁷ Cf. Zwiep, *Ascension*, 76.

3.4: Assumption in Early Christian Literature

Besides early Christian treatments of those figures who according to Jewish tradition were assumed, there are very few examples of assumption in early Christian literature. In spite of their formal similarities to assumption narratives, the Lukan ascension narratives¹ will not be discussed in the present survey, since they appear to suggest a different theology of vindication than assumption does. For the author of Luke-Acts, that is, resurrection supplies the vindication of Jesus' wrongful death, and his ascension (assumption) accounts for his exaltation and future eschatological role.² The view that in some circles Jesus' post-mortem vindication was expressed in terms of assumption-exaltation rather than resurrection-exaltation will be discussed in the Chapter Six. This leaves just a few texts for brief analysis here.

3.4.1. Lazarus

In Luke's parable of Lazarus and the rich man (Luke 16:19-31), the rich man died and was buried, but Lazarus died and was carried off into heaven by angels (ἀπενεχθῆναι αὐτὸν ὑπὸ τῶν ἀγγέλων, verse 23). Does ἀποφέρω³ suggest a post-mortem assumption? It is unclear

¹ For the view that the Lukan ascension narratives are assumption narratives, see Lohfink, *Himmelfahrt Jesu*, and Zwiep, *Ascension*.

² Lohfink argued, on the basis of Acts 2:33 and 5:31, that there is a distinction for Luke between resurrection and exaltation (*Himmelfahrt Jesu*, 272). As van Tilborg and Counet suggest, it is possible to take the distinction chronologically: "first there was the resurrection and then the elevation," the latter being identified with the ascension (*Appearances and Disappearances*, 186-7). Compare Zwiep, *Ascension*, 147-66, who thinks that for Luke Jesus' exaltation coincides with the resurrection.

³ Lohfink noted the semantic proximity of φέρω and its composite forms to other assumption terminology. "φέρω und seine Komposita im Griechischen sehr beliebt sind und das Wort bei einer Entrückung naheliegt" (*Himmelfahrt Jesu*, 42). For ἀποφέρω in a (supposed) post-mortem assumption scenario, see Chariton, *Chaer.* 3.3. Luke uses ἀναφέρω (Luke 24:51) to describes Jesus' ascension, along with ἀναλαμβάνω (Acts 1:2, 11.22) and ἀνάληψις (Luke 9:51).

exactly what sort of removal is in view here. John Nolland argues that “we should think in terms not of the normal fate of the righteous, but of a special translation to heaven, somewhat in the tradition of that of Enoch ... and Elijah.” Nolland does not argue on the basis of terminology but from a lack of clear parallel to this kind of post-mortem activity of angels.⁴ Further, he seems to consider that Abraham’s presence in the post-mortem scene requires that an assumption tradition for Abraham is also lurking in the background. No such tradition survives.⁵

The idea of angels carrying off someone bodily would be unusual in literature about assumptions. Joseph Fitzmyer suggests that since Lazarus was “left unburied by human beings, he was carried off by heavenly beings,” and cites some possible parallels (Herm. *Vis.* 2.2.7; Herm. *Sim.* 9.27.3; *T. Ash.* 6:4-5).⁶ These sources refer only to the idea of angelic escort into the afterlife, and remain ambiguous as to what part of the person receives such an escort (aside from *T. Ash.* 6:4-5, where it is explicitly the soul that is taken by the angels). Some see a parallel with Luke 12:20, where God says to the rich fool that “they demand your soul from you,” τὴν ψυχὴν σου ἀπαιτοῦσιν ἀπὸ σοῦ.⁷ The impersonal verb here has been thought to imply angelic escort of the soul at the time of death,⁸ but it is more likely that the third person plural is a substitute for the passive voice.⁹ Grobel, in his investigation of Egyptian parallels to this passage, suggested that “[t]he angels’ are an instrumentality substituted (surely in the Jewish stage of [the folk-

⁴ Nolland, *Luke 9:21-18:34*, 82.

⁵ The *Testament of Abraham* narrates a pre-mortem heavenly journey (*T. Abr.* 8-12), but Abraham’s death is depicted as an ascent of the soul (*T. Abr.* 14:7-8).

⁶ J. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel according to Luke* (AB 28-28A; New York: Doubleday, 1981-1985), 2.1132. An angelic escort is also found in other testamentary materials, where it is clearly the soul which ascends in the company of angels (*T. Abr.* 20:10-12 [A]; *T. Job* 52).

⁷ See, for instance, M. D. Goulder, *Luke: A New Paradigm* (JSNTSup 20; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989), 636.

⁸ See Grundmann, *Lukas*, 258; I. H. Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1978), 524.

⁹ Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 2.974; see also BDF §130.2.

tale's] transmission) for some other, perhaps Horus or the falcon of Horus ... or simply the bark of death," but this adds little to the sense of the reference in the present context.¹⁰

Although it is not clear one way or the other whether the body of Lazarus is carried up into heaven, the issue might be clarified with reference to the Wisdom 4–5, where assumption language is applied to the dead righteous one. In both sources a contrast between the different fates of the characters hinges on the use of assumption language. In Wis 4:10–19, assumption language is used of the *dikaïos* while the corpses of the *asebeis* are dishonoured, whereas in Luke's parable the rich man's body receives the normal treatment of burial while Lazarus receives the special honour of being carried off into heaven by the angels. Further, in the post-mortem scene, the one who was oppressed remains silent, so that the blessed state of Lazarus shames the wrongdoer, just as in Wis 5:1–5. Yet in Wisdom 4–5 there is no indication that assumption is understood realistically as the removal of the body.

3.4.2. The Male Child of Revelation 12

Rev 12:1–6, 13–17 describes a conflict between a woman and a dragon who appear in heaven. The woman is pregnant and gives birth to a son¹¹ who is "snatched away (ἡρπάσθη) to God and to his throne" before the dragon can devour him. Messianic language drawn from Psalm 2 (Rev 12:5b) is used of the child, although there is nothing specifically Christian about the description of the child or the mother. The text does show some similarity to a rabbinic tradition

¹⁰ K. Grobel, "'... Whose Name was Neves'," *NTS* 10 (1964): 373–82; here, 378.

¹¹ The birth of a male child as a harbinger of salvation is a common theme in Jewish literature (e.g., Isa 66:7, IQH 3:7–12). See Aune, *Revelation*, 2.670.

about the assumption of the Messiah as a child (*m. Ber.* 2:5a).¹² If the text as it stands should be read as referring to the ascension of Jesus, it is unusual that nothing is mentioned of his life or death and, moreover, that the assumption appears motivated by the threat of the dragon.¹³ It is also remarkable that the rest of the tale does not describe a return of the messianic child, although presumably his rule of the nations (12:5) is thought of as a future office. It is likely, therefore, as some commentators have suggested, that the author of Revelation incorporates a Jewish tradition to which he gives his own Christian interpretation—one which does not, however, remove all anomalies from this version of the tale.¹⁴

3.4.3. Zechariah

In two early Christian texts, the body of the murdered Zechariah disappears in a post-mortem assumption. This Zechariah, the father of John the Baptist, appears to be confused or conflated with another Zechariah who was murdered in the temple (2 Chr 24:20-22, Q 11:51). In the *Protevangelium of James* (late 2 C CE),¹⁵ Zechariah is murdered at Herod's behest because John and Elisabeth had escaped the slaughter of the innocents (*Prot. Jas.* 23:1-9). The other priests enter the sanctuary and find Zechariah's blood, which had turned to stone, but they do not find his corpse: καὶ τὸ πτώμα αὐτοῦ οὐχ εὔρον (24:9). Ronald Hock suggests that this could

¹² See Lohfink, *Himmelfahrt Jesu*, 69-70. Lohfink discusses a possibly related idea in 2 Bar. 30:1, but the text is difficult and its meaning unclear (see also Zwiep, *Ascension*, 77 n. 2).

¹³ As noted above, preservation from evil is a theme associated with the use of assumption language—particularly ἀπαύζω, as here—for those who suffer an untimely death, but this child does not die.

¹⁴ See, for instance, Charles, *Revelation*, 1.321; Aune, *Revelation*, 2.688.

¹⁵ R. F. Hock, *The Infancy Gospels of James and Thomas* (The Scholars' Bible 2; Santa Rosa, Calif.: Polebridge, 1995), 11-12.

mean that “the murderers had carried away his body and buried it in an unmarked grave,”¹⁶ but it is noteworthy that the text itself does not attempt any rationalizing explanation, as some Greco-Roman assumption reports do.¹⁷ As noted above, οὐχ εὐρίσκω is the language of an assumption-related disappearance.¹⁸

The removal of Zechariah’s body is clearer in the *Apocalypse of Paul* (c. 385 CE?).¹⁹ In a concluding scene which only survives in the Coptic version, Paul meets John the Baptist, his father Zechariah, and Abel.²⁰ Zechariah says to Paul:

“I am he whom they killed while I was presenting the offering to God; and when the angels came for the offering, they carried up my body to God, and no one found where my body was taken.”²¹

The fact that this emphasizes Zechariah’s post-mortem disappearance—his body was not found—makes it likely that this text is dependent on the *Protevangelium of James*, although the mention of the angels who convey Zechariah to God makes assumption explicit where it was only implicit in the earlier source. Angels are rarely seen in Jewish literature in connection with assumption—most commonly they are associated with the ascent of the soul²²—, but they appear more commonly in Christian literature, especially the later material on the assumption of Mary (see also Luke 16:23). In neither source, however, is the reason for the removal of Zechariah’s

¹⁶ Ibid., 77. See also H. Smid, *Protevangelium Jacobi: A Commentary* (Apocrypha Novi Testamenti I; Assen: Van Gorcum, 1965), 165.

¹⁷ See, for instance, Plutarch on the assumption of Romulus (*Rom.* 27.5; *Num.* 2.2), and Servius on the assumption of Herakles (*Aen.* 3.402).

¹⁸ See Gen 5:24 LXX, 2 Kgs 2:17 LXX; *T. Job* 39:12; Chariton, *Chaer.* 3.3.

¹⁹ Elliott, *Apocryphal New Testament*, 644.

²⁰ The murdered Abel, also mentioned in Q 11:51, apparently receives an eschatological function according to *T. Abr.* 12-13, although the text makes no explicit mention of assumption.

²¹ Ibid., 644.

²² See, for instance, *T. Abr.* 20:10-12 [A]; *T. Job* 52.

body made clear, nor is his post-mortem status made specific, although in the *Apocalypse of Paul* he is numbered among the saints who greet Paul in Paradise.

3.4.4. Later Assumption Legends

According to some version of the *Acts of John*, the apostle John experienced a post-mortem assumption. This legend grew out of the reference to a rumour that the beloved disciple would not die (John 21:20-23). In most versions of the account of John's death, called the *Metastasis*, his disciples dig his grave; he climbs in, removes his garments and lays them down as if they were bedding, and prays some words of farewell and then lies down and gives up his spirit (*Acts John* 111-115). In later expansions of the *Metastasis*, however, the disciples find the next morning (or after three days) that John's body has disappeared, though his sandals remain behind.²³ According to Knut Schäferdiek, there were two conflicting traditions concerning the grave of John in later Christian literature: one held that the grave was found empty because his body had been assumed, and the other—apparently in circulation already by the turn of the fifth century—that a holy dust or manna capable of miraculous effects poured out of the grave, apparently disturbed by the breathing of the slumbering apostle.²⁴

The seventh century *Life of Symeon the Fool* by Leontius of Neapolis narrates an empty grave scenario as well. After Symeon dies, his body is discovered in his hut, and he is carried off by friends to be buried without ceremony in the strangers' cemetery (as he was not a resident of Emesa, where he had been living). On the way, those carrying him pass the house of an unnamed

²³ See K. Schäferdiek, "The Acts of John," in *New Testament Apocrypha* (ed. E. Hennecke, W. Schneemelcher; rev. ed.; 2 vols.; Louisville, Kent.: Westminster John Knox, 1991, 1993), 2:152-209, esp. 204-5.

²⁴ Ibid.; see also J. D. Kaestli, "Le rôle des textes bibliques dans la genèse et le développement des légendes apocryphes: le cas du sort final de l'apôtre Jean," *Aug* 23 (1983): 319-36.

Jew who, under Symeon's preaching, had converted to Christianity. This man hears heavenly music, "such as human lips could not sing, and a crowd such as all humanity could not gather" (PG 93:1744d-1745a).²⁵ But when he looked out he saw only the two men carrying Symeon's body. He then says, "Blessed are you, Fool. that while you do not have humans singing psalms for you, you have the heavenly powers honouring you with hymns." and goes and buries Symeon himself. When Symeon's protégé, John the deacon, hears about the angels' songs, he runs, with many others, to the grave, in order to exhume the body and give it a more fitting burial (1745a). The grave was empty.

But when they opened the grave, they did not find him. For the Lord had glorified him and translated him (ὡς οὖν ἡνοιξάν τον τάφον, οὐχ εὕρον αὐτόν. μετετέθηκεν γὰρ αὐτόν δοξάσας ὁ κύριος).²⁶ (1745a-b)

Then all the townspeople awaken to Symeon's true nature and glorify God, telling one another all the miracles Symeon had done in their midst. Two additional features of this story are also worthy of note. First, Symeon appears to have a foreknowledge of his death and glorification (1744b). Second, the narrator tells that after he died, Symeon was exalted in heaven: "and when he received confidence, he placed himself at the insufferable throne of the God and Father of lights, and he honoured him with unceasing hymns with all the heavenly powers" (1748a). This shows that the disappearance of his body is an assumption: Lennart Rydén notes "daß Symeons Körper (wie der Jesu) aus dem Grab verschwunden, d.h. in den Himmel aufgenommen worden ist."²⁷

²⁵ English translation from D. Krueger, *Symeon the Holy Fool: Leontius's Life and the Late Antique City* (Transformation of the Classical Heritage 25; Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 1996). Since the work has no chapter divisions, I cite it according to J.-P. Migne's pagination.

²⁶ Greek text from L. Rydén, *Das Leben des heiligen Narren Symeon von Leontios von Neapolis* (Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis, Studia Graeca Upsaliensia 4; Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1963).

²⁷ L. Rydén, *Bemerkungen zum Leben des heiligen Narren Symeon von Leontios von Neapolis* (Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis, Studia Graeca Upsaliensia 6; Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1970), 138.

Finally, according to some late writings, the penitent malefactor with whom Jesus was crucified (Luke 23:39-43) apparently also experienced a post-mortem assumption. In the *Descent into Hell* text associated with the *Gospel of Nicodemus* (5-6 C), the unnamed thief enters Paradise, carrying his cross on his shoulder, and joins Enoch and Elijah to await the entry of all other righteous ones (*Desc. Chr. ad Inf.* 10.26).²⁸ This legend grew out Jesus' words, "This day you will be with me in Paradise." Paradise, that is, the Garden of Eden, seems here to be home only to those who according to the Hebrew Bible had been assumed; because the thief is the only one there besides Enoch and Elijah, it can be inferred that he also has experienced the ultimate divine favour—presumably, after he died on the cross. In the *Narrative of Joseph of Arimathea* (a medieval legend: the earliest manuscript is 12 C Greek), the story is told from the earthly perspective, and the post-mortem assumption is made explicit. Joseph, collecting the body of Jesus, finds that the body of the unrepentant thief had the appearance of a dragon, but the body of the other—here he is called Demas—could not be found (*Narr. Jos.* 4).²⁹

²⁸ Elliott, *Apocryphal New Testament*. 189-90, 196.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, 221.

3.5: The Dormition and Assumption of Mary

The sources that deal with the dormition (κοίμησις) or passing (*transitus*) of Mary are quite late, and early authors have very little to say on the subject of Mary's end.¹ Ambrose of Milan indicates that Luke 2:35 ("a sword will pierce your soul") had sometimes been interpreted as a reference to martyrdom, but this is a tradition that did not survive.² The general tendency in the first few centuries of the common era was towards ambivalence (or even pious ignorance), and some held this position even after traditions about Mary's assumption began to appear. Epiphanius of Salamis (315-403) took this view in his work *Against the Heresies*,³ and the Gelasian decree (c. 500) lists a Latin *Transitus* document among apocryphal writings.⁴

In the wake of the Nestorian controversy of the fifth century, however, the veneration of Mary flourished, and accounts of her assumption began to appear in both narrative (from about the fifth century) and homiletical form (from about the seventh century).⁵ The documentary history of these traditions is extremely complex, and the sources vary widely in detail and

¹ For the view that belief in the assumption of Mary is implicit in early materials, see J. E. Bruns, *Traces of Faith in the Assumption among the Eastern Fathers of the First Six Centuries* (Romae: Officium Libri Catholici, 1951). Bruns infers knowledge of an assumption tradition from materials which might imply that Mary's body did not suffer corruption, or from materials which compare Mary to others who had been assumed (Elijah in particular).

² Ambrose, *Expositio in evangelium S. Lucae*. Cited in R. L. P. Milburn, *Early Christian Interpretations of History* (London: A. and C. Black, 1954), 161.

³ Ibid., 161-2; B. E. Daley, *On the Dormition of Mary: Early Patristic Homilies* (Crestwood, N.Y.: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1998), 5-6. Daley notes that the caution displayed by Epiphanius, by refusing to say whether Mary had died or remained alive in some way, "suggests at least that the question had become an open one in late fourth-century Palestine" (ibid., 6).

⁴ Elliott, *The Apocryphal New Testament*, xxiii-iv; Milburn, *Early Christian Interpretations*, 171. See S. Mimouni, "Les Transitus Mariae sont-ils vraiment des apocryphes?," in *Studia Patristica* 25 (ed. E. A. Livingstone: Leuven: Peeters, 1993), 122-28.

⁵ See Daley, *Dormition*, 7-8, 12.

perspective.⁶ Generally, however, the legend follows this pattern. As Mary's death approaches, she is attended by the apostles. Shortly before her death the exalted Christ appears and consoles her. When her soul leaves the body, it is borne away by Christ, Michael, or the angels.⁷ A great host of angels and patriarchs often witness the scene. The journey to the tomb with the body usually involves a confrontation with some Jewish opponents. A very common part of the legend has a Jewish opponent taking hold of the bier only to have his arms miraculously severed (he later repents and is healed).

The fate of the body of Mary is imagined in a variety of different ways: the post-mortem disappearance or assumption of the body is a common motif, but body and soul are sometimes reunited in a quasi-resurrection scenario. The concern appears to be that her body should not suffer corruption, but should receive a fate more fitting to the bearer of God, as suggested by the *Transitus* document attributed to Melito of Sardis, examined below. The following discussion avoids questions of date and dependence, instead surveying relevant materials in order to illustrate that the legend of Mary's assumption makes use of assumption motifs already current for centuries. Of particular interest is the fact that the assumption of Mary is typically post-mortem, and results in her heavenly exaltation. Given the frequent references to Enoch and Elijah, it appears that those who gave literary expression to this belief saw their view of Mary's end as being in continuity with traditional assumption theology.

⁶ The documentary tradition has been closely studied by Michel van Esbroeck. He has catalogued the narrative sources and groups them into two families on the basis of their dominant motifs. See van Esbroeck, "Les textes littéraires sur l'Assomption avant le Xe siècle," in *Les actes apocryphes des apôtres: christianisme et monde païen* (ed. F. Bovon et. al.; Geneva: Labor et Fides, 1981), 265-85 = idem, *Aux origines de la Dormition de la Vierge: études historiques sur les traditions orientales* (Collected Studies 472; Brookfield, Vt.: Variorum, 1995), Part I; see also S. C. Mimouni, *Dormition et assomption de Marie: histoire des traditions anciennes* (Théologie historique 98; Paris: Beauchesne, 1995). The following discussion uses van Esbroeck's designations for the different sources.

⁷ This treatment of the soul of Mary is reminiscent of "Aufnahme der Seele" scenes in testamentary literature. See *T. Abr.* 20:10-12 (rec. A); *T. Isaac* 7:1; *T. Jac.* 5:13 (the Bohairic); and also *Apoc. Paul* 29.

3.5.1. Narrative Sources

3.5.1.1. Coptic

In 1946, Arnold van Lantschoot surveyed twenty-four Coptic texts and showed that in the Coptic tradition, Mary's death is a real death, where her soul leaves the body and is taken away to heaven. The fate of the body is generally not narrated directly, but described in a dialogue between Jesus and his mother before she dies. On this point the Coptic sources are in broad disagreement: in some the body is entrusted to angels, or borne away to heaven or some other-worldly paradise, and in others it is hidden in the earth.⁸ One feature unique to the Coptic tradition is a long interval between Mary's death and her corporeal assumption.⁹

In a text attributed to Cyril of Jerusalem (the *Twentieth Discourse*: C2 according to the designations of Michel van Esbroeck),¹⁰ the risen Jesus appears to Mary and tells her, "I will hide your body in the earth, and I will make my angels to keep it in the earth always, and no one whatsoever shall find your body in the earth in the place wherein I shall place it, until the day wherein I shall raise it up incorruptible."¹¹ Mary's soul departs with Jesus, and the apostles take the body to the valley of Jehoshaphat, where, pursued by the Jews, they drop the bier and flee. No body is found, and a voice from heaven says, "Let no one take the trouble to seek the body of the Virgin until the great day of the appearing of the Saviour."¹² Because Jesus hides the body

⁸ A. van Lantschoot, "L'Assomption de la Sainte Vierge chez les Coptes," *Greg* 27 (1946): 493-525; here, 520-1.

⁹ Elliott, *The Apocryphal New Testament*, 691.

¹⁰ (Pseudo-) Cyril of Jerusalem's *Twentieth Discourse* is dated 6 or 7 C CE (van Esbroeck, "Textes littéraires," 271).

¹¹ E. A. W. Budge, *Miscellaneous Coptic Texts in the Dialect of Upper Egypt* (Coptic Texts 5; London: The British Museum, 1915), 645.

¹² *Ibid.*, 649.

until his second coming, the disappearance of the corpse cannot imply a post-mortem assumption.

In a Bohairic homily attributed to Evodius of Rome (C3 and C4), however, a different scenario is in view.¹³ Sahidic fragments of this homily, which differ considerably from the Bohairic at important points, also exist. In this version of the legend, Jesus shrouds the body of Mary and entrusts it to the apostles; they are to take it to a new tomb in the valley of Jehoshaphat and to watch it for three and a half days. Jesus ascends to heaven with Mary's soul in the chariot of the cherubim. At the end of the three and a half days, the body cannot be found. At this point in the narrative, the Sahidic adds a paragraph which describes the assumption of Mary's body in the view of many onlookers. The Bohairic continues with a voice from heaven that commands everyone to go home "until the seventh month," for the body will not be found "until I take it up to heaven." Seven months later, on the 16th of Mesore, Mary appears to the apostles seated on the chariot of the cherubim. The Bohairic text concludes, "Such was the death of the Virgin on the 21st of Tobi, and her assumption on the 16th of Mesore."¹⁴

Although there is some inconsistency in this homily—the body disappears after three and a half days but the text maintains that the assumption takes place seven months later—, there is a post-mortem assumption in view here, as the voice from heaven confirms, even without the additional material found in the Sahidic version. There, angels catch away the body, and the bystanders look on until they lose sight of her. As noted above, Lohfink found that this kind of focus on the perspective of the witnesses was a classic motif in assumption narratives.¹⁵

¹³ Van Esbroeck believes this text to be dependent on C2 ("Textes littéraires," 270).

¹⁴ Summary in Elliott, *Apocryphal New Testament*, 695-7. Full English text in Robinson, *Coptic Apocryphal Gospels*, 24-41.

¹⁵ Lohfink, *Himmelfahrt Jesu*, 38-9, 73.

Furthermore, the result of the assumption is the heavenly glorification of Mary, since she reappears borne by the same divine chariot that earlier on brought the exalted Christ from heaven.

Another Sahidic fragment, called by van Esbroeck the “Transitus ordinaire” (C1),¹⁶ picks up the story during the journey with the body to the tomb. On the 16th of Mesore, as in C3 and C4, the apostles and others are gathered at the tomb, and they see lightning, hear trumpets and smell a sweet odour. The door of the tomb opens and Christ descends on the scene in a chariot of fire; he calls Mary out of the tomb and she rises from the dead. The two ascend together in the chariot. This is probably the clearest example of a resurrection/ ascension scenario.

3.5.1.2. Greek

In the document Vatican Gr. 1982 (van Esbroeck’s G1),¹⁷ as in many other texts, the apostles are miraculously transported on clouds to Mary’s side (§ 22). After Mary dies and Christ entrusts her soul to Michael, the body itself cries out, “Remember me, King of Glory!” The apostles bear her body to the tomb and wait for the Saviour there according to his command (§§ 35, 36-45). When he appears (apparently after only a short wait) he is accompanied by Michael and innumerable angels, descending on clouds. At the Lord’s behest, Michael places the body on one of the clouds, and it is borne eastward to Paradise, where, under the Tree of Life, her soul

¹⁶ Summary in Elliott, *Apocryphal New Testament*, 700-1. Van Esbroeck believes this to be the source of C2 (“Textes littéraires,” 270).

¹⁷ Van Esbroeck dates this to 6 or 7 C CE (“Textes littéraires,” 270). It was first edited by A. Wenger, *L’Assomption de la T.S. Vierge dans la tradition Byzantine du VI au X siècle: études et documents* (Archives de l’Orient chrétien 5; Paris: Institut français d’études Byzantines, 1955), but a more recent study is that of Manns, *Le récit de la Dormition*. Manns dates the text much earlier, arguing that third and fourth century rabbinic materials polemicize against views present in G1 (ibid., 204-21). He concludes that if his arguments are well founded, “il est permis d’affirmer que les éléments les plus anciens de la foi en l’assomption de Marie remontent aux premiers siècles de l’Église palestinienne” (224).

and body are reunited. The apostles are similarly taken to the scene and witness the event, and the text ends rather abruptly with no mention of Mary's post-assumption state (§§ 46-48).

A very different Greek source is the *transitus* text attributed to John the evangelist (G2).¹⁸ While most of the Greek sources depict a post-assumption reunion of Mary's soul and body at the Tree of Life, this one does not.¹⁹ The Lord appears to Mary and says, "Behold, henceforth shall your precious body be translated to paradise, and your holy soul shall be in the heavens in the treasures of my Father in surpassing brightness" (§ 39).²⁰ The body is placed in a tomb, accompanied by the singing of angels, and after three days, when the singing stops, the apostles perceive that the body had been translated (§ 48). In a vision, the apostles see various patriarchs and saints worshipping the body in the place to which it had been translated. This post-mortem assumption is accompanied by exaltation and the reception of worship.²¹

Another Greek text, the so-called "Euthymiac History" (G7), survives as an interpolation in a homily of John of Damascus, and is quite a bit later than these other sources. The document is purportedly a fragment of a biography of St Euthymius, but this work is only known from this fragment. Nevertheless, it introduces another variation on the assumption theme: the discovery of an empty tomb. After Mary's body has been in the tomb three days, the apostles return to venerate the body but find only the grave clothes. "They could only draw a single conclusion."

¹⁸ C. von Tischendorf, ed., *Apocalypses apocryphae Mosis, Esdrae, Pauli, Iohannis: item Mariae dormitio, additis Evangeliorum et actuum Apocryphorum supplementis* (Hildesheim: G. Olms, 1866), 95-112; translation in Elliott, *The Apocryphal New Testament*, 701-8.

¹⁹ For this reason, G2 is not grouped by van Esbroeck in his "Palm of the Tree of Life" family of assumption texts; he dates it to the sixth or seventh century ("Textes littéraires," 269-73). He notes that G2, which he calls a "best-seller," is more closely related to the Syriac texts discussed below (*ibid.*, 269).

²⁰ Citation from the translation of Elliott, *Apocryphal New Testament*, 706.

²¹ Translation in Daley, *Dormition*, 224-6.

namely, that the Lord chose “to honour her immaculate and pure body with the gift of incorruptibility, and with a change of state even before the common, universal resurrection.”²²

3.5.1.3. Syriac

The fragmentary “Obsequies of the Holy Virgin”²³ (van Esbroeck’s S1) narrate a scenario very similar to that already seen in G1, so that van Esbroeck argues that G1 used S1 as its main source.²⁴ Most scholars agree that this is the oldest surviving version of the legend of Mary’s assumption: W. Wright dated the text to the second half of the fifth century.²⁵ Here, Jesus puts Mary’s soul in the care of Michael.²⁶ The first principal fragment takes up with a discussion of the apostles at the tomb; Jesus appears with Michael, and angels descend on three clouds. The clouds, at Jesus’ command, bear the body along with the apostles into Paradise, where Mary’s soul and body are reunited.²⁷ Following this, Jesus takes the apostles on a tour of hell.

The more expansive Syriac *Transitus* document (S2) includes an interesting addition.²⁸ Ranks of angels descend upon the tomb, with heavenly chariots coming after them: one bearing Moses, one Enoch, one Elijah, and one the Lord Jesus. Mary’s body is carried away into Paradise, and although a reunion of her body and soul is not mentioned, she is “exalted with glory on which the eye of flesh is not able to gaze.” Christ blesses her and ascends to the right hand of the Father, and the apostles return to the Mount of Olives where they discuss the

²² Ibid., 225.

²³ For translation see Wright, *Contributions*, 42-51.

²⁴ See van Esbroeck, “Textes littéraires,” 270.

²⁵ Wright, *Contributions*, 11. See also Daley, *Dormition*, 9.

²⁶ This is found in one of several smaller fragments summarized by Wright but not translated (*Contributions*, 14).

²⁷ Ibid., 46-7.

²⁸ Translation in Wright, *Contributions*, 18-24.

logistics of commemorating Mary's assumption. Here, as elsewhere, Mary experiences a post-mortem assumption whose result is heavenly glorification. Noteworthy is the association of Mary with the other assumed figures of Moses, Enoch, Elijah and Jesus.

In the so-called "Six Books" (S3),²⁹ from the fifth or sixth century, the soul of Mary departs to the "mansions of the Father" but her body is carried in a chariot of light to the Paradise of Eden. After the apostles leave the scene, Jesus comes to Mary's body and commands her to rise, which she does; he tells her that he has come to show her the glory of the Father's house. Elijah, Enoch, Moses and Peter come and worship them both. (Peter is here, presumably, as the representative of the apostles.) In the heavenly journey that follows, Mary sees among other things the places where Enoch and Elijah used to dwell and pray. The interesting development in this text is an outgrowth of the association between Mary and other assumed figures, in particular Enoch: she, like him, is taken on a heavenly journey and is made to see the mysteries of the heavens.

3.5.1.4. Latin

The only Latin text that will be discussed here is a *Transitus* document attributed to Melito of Sardis (van Esbroeck's L1).³⁰ As in many other sources, when Mary dies, Christ entrusts her soul to Michael. Later, at the tomb, Christ appears and asks the apostles what he should do with her body. Peter and the other apostles say, "It has appeared right to us your

²⁹ Translation in W. Wright, "The Departure of my Lady Mary from the World," *Journal of Sacred Literature* 6 (1865) 417-48; 7 (1865) 110-60; re-edited from an older (and in places more expansive) manuscript by A. Smith Lewis, *Apocrypha Syriaca: The Protevangelium Jacobi and Transitus Mariae* (Studia Sinaitica 11; London: C. J. Clay and Sons, 1902) 12-69.

³⁰ Edited in Tischendorf, *Apocalypses Apocryphae*, 124-36 (his "Transitus B"); translation in Elliott, *Apocryphal New Testament*, 708-14. Van Esbroeck dates it to 5 to 7 C CE ("Textes littéraires," 270) and considers it a somewhat distant relative of G1, one of the Greek texts discussed above.

servants that ... you should raise up the body of your mother and take her with you rejoicing into heaven" (16.3). The apostles' reason for this request is the idea that Mary had been chosen to become the "immaculate chamber" of the Lord, so that no other fate for her body would be fitting. Thus an explicit theological rationale for the belief in Mary's assumption intrudes directly into the narrative, becoming a feature of the plot.³¹ Michael then brings the soul of Mary at Christ's behest, and she rises from the dead and ascends into heaven with Christ (17.1-18.2).

3.5.2. Homiletical Sources

Brian Daley suggests that although some homilies on the assumption of Mary survive from the mid-sixth century, most homiletical sources date from after the early seventh century, "after the official acceptance of the feast [of Mary's dormition] into the calendar of the imperial 'Great' Church."³² Furthermore, van Esbroeck suggests that most of the sources surveyed here are dependent in one way or another on the narrative sources discussed above.³³ For instance, the homily of John of Thessalonica (early 7 C) combines elements from G1 (including the dead body's speech) and G7 (the empty tomb and the discovery of the grave clothes).³⁴

A few details in the homiletical materials are worth noting, however. The "Encomium" of Theoteknos of Livias (early 7 C) is one of the few Greek sources to use the word ἀνάληψις for

³¹ Milburn says of later materials on the assumption of Mary that "use was being made of new arguments, based not on history or pretended history but on what was deemed appropriate, a principle which was later summed up in the Scholastic maxim '*potuit, deuit, ergo fecit*'—God has the power, the action was fitting; therefore he must have done it" (*Early Christian Interpretations*, 192).

³² Daley, *Dormition*, 12.

³³ See van Esbroeck, "Textes littéraires," 270, 273.

³⁴ Daley, *Dormition*, 63, 67.

the passing of Mary.³⁵ Clearly a post-mortem assumption is in view here, for the homilist argues that “even though the God-bearing body of that holy one did taste death, it was not corrupted.” Most of the homiletical sources make an assumption of Mary’s body explicit. John of Damascus (early 8 C) writes, “Your immaculate, completely spotless body was not left on earth, but you have been transported to the royal dwelling-place of heaven as queen ...”³⁶ Andrew of Crete (early 8C), rather than describing an assumption explicitly, prefers to draw such a conclusion from the empty tomb:

Let no one here ask in ridicule how her tomb could have been empty. For I will ask you in return: how has her body disappeared? Why was there no shroud in her sarcophagus, if what was laid in the tomb did not escape corruption—if the treasure was not carried away?³⁷

Additionally, an odd development takes place in a homily of Germanus of Constantinople (early 8 C): the body of Mary disappears as the apostles are placing it in the tomb, and the shroud ascends and disappears.³⁸ Thus, in spite of what Daley calls a “cultivated vagueness” in the homilies, a tendency to avoid explicit language such as “assumption” or “resurrection” to describe Mary’s end, it is clear from the texts themselves that a post-mortem removal of the body is generally in view.³⁹

Further, there is here, as in the narrative tradition, frequent reference to Enoch and Elijah. Theoteknos, for instance, is careful to emphasize Mary’s exaltation “above Enoch and Elijah and all the prophets and apostles.”⁴⁰ Andrew of Crete uses these two figures to prove that Mary’s

³⁵ Ibid., 74.

³⁶ Ibid., 198.

³⁷ Ibid., 110. So also Germanus of Constantinople, early 8 C (ibid., 166).

³⁸ Ibid., 177.

³⁹ Ibid., 27-28.

⁴⁰ Ibid., 74.

body did not suffer corruption, for if theirs did not, neither could hers.⁴¹ This logic presumes that Mary's assumption was the same kind of event as the assumption of Enoch and Elijah. In the homily of Theodore the Studite, early 9 C, Mary prays before her death that she be taken away as Enoch and Elijah were.⁴² Interestingly, none of these authors seems to have difficulty with the fact that Mary had died where Enoch and Elijah were taken away while still alive. These homilists, like the framers of the narrative versions of the legend, apparently considered that their teachings about Mary were not a significant departure from the logic of assumption in biblical and post-biblical sources, even though Mary had died and was deserving of far greater reverence than these other assumed figures.⁴³

⁴¹ Ibid., 109.

⁴² Ibid., 252.

⁴³ See Bruns, *Traces of Faith*, 41-9 on comparisons between Mary and Elijah which emphasize the virginity of Elijah as one aspect of the virtuous life on account of which he was taken by God.

3.6: Implications

A number of results significant for our study of Q 13:35 have arisen during the course of this survey. Some of these are in the category of general motifs pertaining to assumption, such as the idea of pre-assumption reception of revelation, or that of post-assumption deification, exaltation, or eschatological function. Other results, however, are of more direct significance. These may be summarized briefly.

First, with respect to language and motif, it has been noted that disappearance (or invisibility) is an almost ubiquitous correlate to assumption in both the Greco-Roman and in the Jewish traditions. A number of sources used the same language as that found in Q 13:35 (οὐ μὴ ἴδῃτέ με): 2 Kgs 2:12 LXX (καὶ οὐκ εἶδεν αὐτὸν ἔτι); Berossos (οὐκ ἔτι ὀφθῆναι); Plutarch (οὔτε μέρος ὤφθη σώματος *Rom.* 27.5); Lucian (οὐ μὴν ἑωρᾶτό γε. *Peregr.* 39). In addition, “seeing” language was used to describe the exalted status of an assumed figure (ἰδόντες, Wis 5:2; see also Wis 2:17-20), and to connote the eschatological return of figures who had experienced assumption (*cf.* *Ezra* 6:25-26). This is significant because, as the temporal ἕως-clause indicates, the disappearance or absence of Jesus in Q 13:35 looks ahead to a reappearance or return.

Second, instances of post-mortem assumption were highlighted in the Greco-Roman, Jewish, and later Christian traditions. This is significant in order for Q’s assumption theology to function as the means of Jesus’ post-mortem vindication. In Greek thought, the disappearance of a corpse (Aeneas, Memnon, Aristeas of Proconessus, Alcmena), especially from a tomb or funeral pyre (Herakles, Proteus, Achilles, Callirhoe), signified assumption. The person in question was accorded honour as befitting a hero or an immortal. In Jewish tradition the idea of post-mortem assumption is unusual but not impossible. In particular, assumption language is

applied to the Book of Wisdom's murdered and exalted *dikaïos*, as the author applied *topoi* from Greek consolation literature and Jewish eschatological thought to the case of the righteous one who died untimely. A similar strategy may have been at work in *T. Job* 39:11-12, although there it is not clear exactly why Job's dead children were taken up bodily into heaven. In later Christian literature, post-mortem assumptions were narrated of Zechariah, Mary, John the evangelist, and the penitent thief.

A final important result of this survey has to do with the development of assumption traditions in apocalyptic literature. In a few instances it was noted that figures accorded a special role in eschatological thought, whether as judge, witness, or as recipient of heavenly knowledge, sometimes came to be the subject of assumption speculation. Thus Günter Haufe's thesis that assumption is a *sine qua non* for eschatological function works both ways in the development of tradition: those for whom assumption traditions were in circulation came to have a prominent place in eschatological speculations (Enoch, Elijah, Moses), and vice versa (Ezra, Baruch, Tabitha). Phinehas is a special instance since it was probably because of his association with Elijah that traditions of his assumption and his (shared) eschatological role came into existence. This is of great significance for Q because if, as some have suggested, Q 13:34-35 came into the document at a relatively late stage in its composition, it may be that the assumption tradition it represents arose as a correlate to the belief, evident elsewhere in Q, that Jesus would return as the Son of man or Coming One.

Chapter Four: The Assumption of Jesus in Q 13:34-35

In this chapter the following points will be argued concerning the Jerusalem Lament (Q 13:34-35). First, the saying has the rejection of Jesus and a withdrawal of divine protection in view. Second, the sentence which begins "I tell you ..." (λέγω ὑμῖν) introduces an element of reversal; this appears to be consistent with the use of the λέγω ὑμῖν formula in Q. Third, as a reference to Jesus' assumption, verse 35b suggests three different aspects of Jesus' vindication: an emphasis on divine favour, a suggestion of heavenly exaltation, and a reference to special eschatological function. This observation has important ramifications for the interpretation of the saying and for the Christology of Q. The chapter concludes with some tradition-historical observations about the origin and setting of the saying, and begins with a discussion of its reconstruction.

4.1: Q 13:34-35: Reconstruction

There is a handful of differences between the Matthean and Lukan versions of the Jerusalem Lament, as shown here. Not many of the differences (noted below in underlined text)¹ amount to anything of significance for the interpretation of the saying. Generally, Luke's version is to be preferred, although in some instances the grounds for deciding between Matthew and Luke are quite slim.

Matt 23:37-39

³⁷ Ἰερουσαλήμ Ἰερουσαλήμ,
ἡ ἀποκτείνουσα τοὺς προφῆτας
καὶ λιθοβολοῦσα τοὺς
ἀποσταλμένους πρὸς αὐτήν.
ποσάκις ἠθέλησα ἐπισυναγαγεῖν
τὰ τέκνα σου, ὃν τρόπον ὄρνις
ἐπισυνάγει τὰ νοσσία αὐτῆς
ὕπὸ τὰς πτέρυγας, καὶ οὐκ ἠθελήσατε.
³⁸ ἰδοὺ ἀφίεται ὁ οἶκος ὑμῶν
ἔρημος.
³⁹ λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν, οὐ μὴ με ἴδῃτε
ἀπ' ἄρτι ἕως ἄν εἴπητε·
εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος
ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου.

Luke 13:34-35

³⁴ Ἰερουσαλήμ Ἰερουσαλήμ,
ἡ ἀποκτείνουσα τοὺς προφῆτας
καὶ λιθοβολοῦσα τοὺς
ἀποσταλμένους πρὸς αὐτήν.
ποσάκις ἠθέλησα ἐπισυνάξαι
τὰ τέκνα σου, ὃν τρόπον ὄρνις
_____ τὴν ἑαυτῆς νοσσίαν
ὕπὸ τὰς πτέρυγας, καὶ οὐκ ἠθελήσατε.
^{35a} ἰδοὺ ἀφίεται ὁ οἶκος ὑμῶν.

^{35b} λέγω [δέ] ὑμῖν, οὐ μὴ ἴδῃτέ με
_____ ἕως [ἥξει ὅτε] εἴπητε·
εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος
ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου.

In Q 13:34, Matthew gives the second aorist infinitive of ἐπισυνάγω, while Luke gives the first aorist form. Likely Matthew's verb is an assimilation of Q's more common *koinē* form to the Attic form. F. D. Weinert showed that the Septuagint uses first aorist passive but second aorist active forms of this verb and συνάγω; according to Weinert, this usage is reflected in Luke and throughout the New Testament, so it would be difficult to see why Luke would have altered

¹ The bracketed words in the Lukan version are textually uncertain.

a second aorist form had it appeared in his source.² Matthew repeats the verb in the present tense (ἐπισυνάγει) in order to fill out an ellipsis in the metaphor.³ Another minor difference may in fact have arisen because of a scribal error on the part of either evangelist: Matthew reads the neuter plural νοσσία (“nestlings”) where Luke gives the feminine singular νοσιάν (“nest”). Steck thought that Luke gives the original reading, because “nest” is more suited to the wisdom context of the saying—since Sir 1:15 LXX states that Wisdom built her nest among human beings⁴—and Hoffmann was probably correct to say that Steck made too much of this distinction.⁵ But still, as Siegfried Schulz argued, Matthew’s plural could be a secondary adjustment to the plural τὰ τέκνα.⁶ Finally, in light of the Lukan preference for ἐαυτοῦ.⁷ Matthew’s possessive pronoun may reflect the original Q wording, though this is of little significance for the interpretation of the verse.

In Q 13:35, two differences between Matthew and Luke are most probably due to Matthean redaction: the addition of ἔρημος (verse 35a) and ἀπ’ ἄρτι (verse 35b). There is some

² F. D. Weinert, “Luke, the Temple and Jesus’ Saying about Jerusalem’s Abandoned House (Luke 13:34-35),” *CBQ* 44 (1982) 68-76, esp. 72; see also Christ, *Jesus Sophia*, 137, and Hoffmann, *Studien*, 171. Cf. Steck, *Israel*, 48; Garland, *Intention*, 187 n. 81.

³ Steck, *Israel*, 48-9.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 234. Sir 1:15 LXX: μετὰ ἀνθρώπων θεμέλιον αἰῶνος ἐνόσσευσεν ...

⁵ Hoffmann, *Studien*, 172: “Das Bild soll ... vielmehr die Fürsorge des Sprechers veranschaulichen, die ihn veranlaßte, sich wiederholt um die Angesprochenen zu bemühen. Die Streit, ob sich die Jungen noch im Nest oder schon außerhalb desselben befinden, ist daher für das Verständnis des Wortes unergiebig.” Schulz agreed (*Spruchquelle*, 356 and n. 229).

⁶ Schulz, *Spruchquelle*, 346.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 346 and n. 173; Weinert, “Abandoned House,” 72; H. Fleddermann, “The Cross and Discipleship in Q,” in *Society of Biblical Literature 1988 Seminar Papers* (ed. D. J. Lull; SBLSP 27; Atlanta: Scholars, 1988), 472-82, esp. 474 n. 9. It should also be noted that Q may demonstrate a similar preference for ἐαυτοῦ: so S. R. Johnson, “SS2: Q 13:34-35” (database presented, with evaluations by J. M. Robinson and P. Hoffmann, at the International Q Project Work Sessions, 1994), 35. Robinson’s views on the reconstruction of Q 13:34-35 have been published, in part, in his essays “Building Blocks in the Social History of Q” and “The Sequence of Q: The Lament over Jerusalem”: Hoffmann’s remain unpublished (“Q 13:34-35: Second Response” [unpublished appendix to database of S. R. Johnson, International Q Project work sessions, 1994]).

textual uncertainty regarding ἔρημος in Luke 13:35, but the manuscript evidence is strong for its absence.⁸ Its presence in a large number of manuscripts⁹ is likely due to a harmonization to Matt 23:38. Matthew likely added it in allusion to Jer 22:5.¹⁰ ἀπ' ἄρτι is a Matthean term,¹¹ added here and in Matt 26:26,64 to heighten the sense of the eschatological future.¹² Matthean redaction also explains the γὰρ connecting Matt 23:38,39,¹³ but it is not entirely clear that Luke's δὲ was originally in Q either, for it is not even certain that it was originally in Luke.¹⁴ The formula λέγω ὑμῖν in Q is not fixed with δὲ,¹⁵ so there is no reason for supposing that δὲ was original in Q. Matthew and Luke also disagree on the placement of the direct object με in relation to the verb ἴδητε; Luke might preserve Q's word order, but this is far from certain. Finally, in verse 35b, Matthew has ἕως ἂν εἴπητε, and Luke has the more awkward ἕως ἡξεί ὅτε εἴπητε. There is textual uncertainty here with respect to Luke: only D preserves this reading (and some Old Latin and Syriac versions with the addition ἡ ἡμέρα), but if original it would explain more easily than the other readings how the bewildering array of variants arose.¹⁶ If original in Luke, ἡξεί ὅτε is

⁸ P^{45vid.75} ⲛ A B K L R W Γ J¹ 565 1010 pm lat sy³ sa.

⁹ D N Δ Θ Ψ J¹³ 28 33 700 892 1241 1424 pm it vg^{cl} sy² p^h

¹⁰ Jer 22:5b LXX: εἰς ἐρήμωσιν ἔσται ὁ οἶκος οὗτος. So Bussmann, *Zur Redenquelle*, 76; Christ, *Jesus Sophia*, 137; R. H. Gundry, *Matthew: A Commentary on His Literary and Theological Art* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982), 473. However, Suggs takes this as evidence for the originality of ἔρημος, since the word stresses the "captivity" theme present in other accounts of Wisdom's rejection (*Wisdom*, 68 n. 16). Hoffmann (*Studien*, 172) thinks the word is a post-Matthean gloss, since some manuscripts omit it from Matthew as well.

¹¹ So J. C. Hawkins, *Horae Synopticae: Contributions to the Study of the Synoptic Problem*, (2nd ed.: Oxford: Clarendon, 1909), 4.

¹² See van der Kwaak, "Klage," 164; Steck, *Israel*, 50; Hoffmann, *Studien*, 172; Garland, *Intention*, 205; Allison, "Matt. 23:39 = Luke 13:35b," 81 n. 1.

¹³ See Haenchen, "Matthäus 23," 56; van der Kwaak, "Klage," 163; Steck, *Israel*, 50; Hoffmann, *Studien*, 172; Garland, *Intention*, 207.

¹⁴ P⁴⁵ ⲛ* L pc it sy^c read λέγω ὑμῖν: P⁷⁵ ⲛ² A B D R W Θ Ψ J^{1,13} B² lat sy^r read λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν.

¹⁵ See below, pp. 192-8 on λέγω ὑμῖν in Q.

¹⁶ See B. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* (2nd ed.: Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft; New York: United Bible Societies, 1994), 138.

most likely Q's wording as well, because Luke never uses an expression like this with a temporal condition, and the verb ἤκω is hardly a Lukan favourite.¹⁷ Matthew's version is to be regarded as a stylistic improvement; further, the future prospect implied by ἥξει ὅτε would have been made redundant by the Matthean addition ἀπ' ἄρτι.

The original Q wording of the Jerusalem Lament was probably something like the following:

Q 13:34

Ἰερουσαλὴμ Ἰερουσαλὴμ, ἡ ἀποκτείνουσα τοὺς
προφῆτας καὶ λιθοβολοῦσα τοὺς ἀποσταλμένους
πρὸς αὐτήν, ποσάκις ἠθέλησα ἐπισυνάξαι τὰ τέκνα
σου, ὃν τρόπον ὄρνις τὴν νοσσιὰν αὐτῆς ὑπὸ τὰς
πτέρυγας, καὶ οὐκ ἠθελήσατε.

Q 13:35a

ἰδοὺ ἀφίεται ὁ οἶκος ὑμῶν.

Q 13:35b

λέγω ὑμῖν. οὐ μὴ ἴδητέ με ἕως ἥξει ὅτε εἴπητε·
εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου.¹⁸

A more difficult question concerns the original position of the Jerusalem saying in Q. This question has already been discussed in general terms in Chapter Two: here, however, it must be approached again in order to weigh the various arguments. It has commonly been suggested that Matthew retains the saying in its original position. Earlier proponents of this view thought that Q 11:49-51 and 13:34-35 originally stood together in a lost Wisdom document from

¹⁷ It occurs five times in the Gospel (12:46 [Q]; 13:29 [Q]; 13:35 [Q?]; 15:27 [LkS]; 19:43 [LkS]) and not at all in Acts.

¹⁸ This reconstruction is not substantially different from that of the *Critical Edition of Q*, except that it offers the second aorist infinitive of ἐπισυνάγω and the neuter plural τὰ νοσσία (with the neuter plural article bracketed as uncertain). The *Critical Edition* also brackets ἥξει ὅτε as uncertain (Robinson et al., *Critical Edition*, 420-23).

which, according to Q, Jesus is quoting (Luke 11:49 = Q: διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ἡ σοφία τοῦ θεοῦ εἶπεν). If both 11:49-51 and 13:34-35 were derived (together or separately) from a pre-Christian *Vorlage*, this is essentially indemonstrable. More important for our purposes are the two arguments upon which was based the supposition of a unitary origin in a common source. First, both sayings have a “supra-historical” perspective, and so the speaker must be divine Wisdom in both cases.¹⁹ Second, the common deuteronomistic theme of rejected and persecuted prophets means that the two sayings must have been originally joined.²⁰ These two arguments will be discussed in turn.

The first argument presents several difficulties. It should be noted at the outset that an original separation of the two sayings in Q is not disqualified by their similar perspective. On the other hand, Haenchen’s concern about the sayings’ different “historical” perspectives²¹ does not amount to a strong argument against their original unity; for as Robinson correctly argued, the future-oriented view of 11:49 (ἀποστελῶ, Luke 11:49 = Q) is a device used to depict past events as fulfillments of the divine plan.²² Whether or not a “supra-historical subject” is required by the ποσάκις ἠθέλησα in 13:34, the fact remains that the λέγω ὑμῖν formula, which is characteristic of Jesus’ speech in Q²³ (and throughout the gospel tradition), would at least signal a shift to Jesus as speaker in 11:51b. So, if the sayings had stood together in Q, Jesus is already speaking by the end of the Wisdom saying; therefore, it does not follow that the speaker of 13:34-35 is *necessarily* Wisdom, in spite of the saying’s obvious wisdom themes. The Jerusalem Lament.

¹⁹ So most influentially Bultmann, *History*, 114-5.

²⁰ So most forcefully Robinson, “Building Blocks,” 102-6; “Sequence of Q,” 250-5.

²¹ Haenchen, “Matthäus 23,” 56; see also Jacobson, *First Gospel*, 209.

²² Robinson, “Sequence of Q,” 244.

²³ Exceptions are Q 3:8b (where John is speaking), and possibly Q 19:26 [Luke] (the master in the Parable of the Talents) and Q 14:24 [LkS] (the master in the Parable of the Great Supper).

additionally, has Jesus as speaker throughout; it will be argued below that λέγω ὑμῖν in 13:35b appears to have an adversative function. Granted, seeing Jesus as the speaker of the Lament raises problems of its own—particularly if the saying’s wisdom motifs are taken seriously—but these will be dealt with below.

As we have already seen, Robinson has recently reformulated the second argument concerning the common deuteronomistic theme in Q 11:49-51 and 13:34-35. In his view, both sayings draw heavily from the deuteronomistic passage 2 Chr 24:19-23, and the allusions are fairly clear.²⁴ The allusions, however, were apparently not clear to Matthew, who mistakes Zechariah (the Septuagint reads Azarias), whose stoning is described in 2 Chr 24:20-22, for Zechariah, son of Barachiah (Zech 1:1). Robinson argues that if Matthew did not see the allusion to 2 Chronicles 24, then it is highly unlikely that he would join together the two passages that depend so heavily upon that text.²⁵ However, as noted above, the Wisdom saying and the Jerusalem Lament have enough features in common to suggest to Matthew—quite apart from his lack of awareness of the texts’ specific allusions—a secondary joining if they had originally been separate sayings in Q. Or, as Hoffmann has put it, the correspondences noted by Robinson between 2 Chronicles 24 and Q 11:49-51 and 13:34-35 “zeigen nur, daß beide Texte aus dem gleichen Reservoir deuteronomistischer Prophetentradition schöpfen.”²⁶

Therefore, arguments for the original connectedness of the sayings which rely on similarity of theme or perspective are not decisive. On the other hand, there is evidence of redactional work on the context of Q 13:34-35 in both Matthew and Luke.²⁷ Matthew has placed

²⁴ Robinson, “Building Blocks,” 104-6; “Sequence of Q,” 250-3.

²⁵ Robinson, “Building Blocks,” 106; “Sequence of Q,” 252.

²⁶ Hoffmann, “Q 13:34-35: Second Response,” 3.

²⁷ See Christ, *Jesus Sophia*, 136-7; Garland, *Intention*, 197; Tuckett, *Q*, 173-4.

the Woes as a whole—with the Jerusalem Lament as their conclusion—in such a way that they become Jesus' final public speech (see Matt 23:1), and in order that the abandonment of the house is first announced to the crowds (Matt 23:39 = Q 13:35b) and then described to the disciples (Matt 24:1-2). Luke does not have Jesus speak the Lament in Jerusalem: rather, he associates it with Jesus' journey to Jerusalem (Luke 9:51; 13:22,31-33). Some have suggested that the catchword "Jerusalem" (13:33) is the reason for Luke's re-location of the saying,²⁸ since it would have made little sense in the Lukan context of the Woes, the meal at the Pharisee's house (Luke 11:37,53). But this raises the question of why Luke would have moved the Lament to this location, particularly given that his redactional travelogue comments could have been inserted practically anywhere.²⁹ It therefore may be suggested that Luke added 13:22,31-33 in order to make sense of the original Q location of the saying (that is, after Q 13:24,26-27,28-30), which he did not want to disturb.³⁰

The question must be answered on the grounds of Q itself. In which location would the saying have made better sense? Robinson notes that "Q 12:2-12, having to do with anxiety over being killed because of one's witness to Jesus, originally flowed equally well" out of either Q 11:49-51 or 13:34-35, or even 11:47-48, the final Woe, because all three have to do with the same theme, the killing of prophets.³¹ Hoffmann argues that Q 12:2-12, with its contemporary

²⁸ See, for instance, Bultmann, *History*, 115; Haenchen, "Matthäus 23," 47. Robinson suggests that Luke's interpolation of 13:31-33 "attempts to recreate the equivalent of the fitting Matthean context" ("Sequence of Q," 259).

²⁹ As Robinson puts it, "one has [in Luke 13:31-33] an instance of Luke redactionally creating an otherwise non-existent setting to which he can transfer the Lament" ("Sequence of Q," 258).

³⁰ Hoffmann, "Q 13:34-35: Second Response," 5-6. So also Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 228; Jacobson, *First Gospel*, 210.

³¹ Robinson, "Sequence of Q," 253-4. Robinson's interest is in showing that the Woes, the Wisdom saying, and the Lament (Q 11:39b-44,46-48,52 + 11:49-51 + 13:34-35) together comprise "the central text for the Q redaction, as it superimposed the deuteronomistic view of history onto the Q tradition" (ibid., 254).

concern being the danger faced by Jesus' followers, flows out of the Wisdom saying best of all because its redactional additions (11:50b,51b) contemporize the saying vis-à-vis the situation of the Q community, by means of the polemic against "this generation."³² Q 13:34-35, in Hoffmann's view, has Jesus as its speaker and emphasizes his rejection in connection with the vindication expected at the coming of the Son of man. This christologizing tendency would have interrupted the flow had the Lament originally followed immediately after the Wisdom saying.³³

Furthermore, the Lament also fits well within the Lukan order of Q: the exclusion faced by those who reject Q's message (Q 13:24-29) finds concrete expression in the Jerusalem Lament, as Hoffmann notes,³⁴ and is also paralleled in the parable of the Great Supper, where those invited refuse to participate in the eschatological banquet. Reclining with the patriarchs (Q 13:28) seems to have the eschatological banquet in view; and bringing in those not originally invited (Q 14:21-23) has similarity to the inclusion of Gentiles in the kingdom (Q 13:29). Thus, Q 13:34-35 stands in the middle as a prophecy of the Coming One's judgment, although, as we shall see, it appears that the invitation to Jerusalem was still standing. There is, therefore, good thematic cohesion between Q 13:24-29 + 13:34-35 + 14:16-24. It seems unlikely, had Q 13:34-35 originally followed 11:49-51, that Luke would have inserted Q 13:34-35 precisely where he does, creating between pieces of Q material new connections which would not have been apparent to his readers because of the other redactional work done in Luke 13-14. Given these observations, it seems more likely that Luke, and not Matthew, has retained the Lament in its

³² Hoffmann, "Q 13:34-35: Second Response," 5.

³³ *Ibid.*, 3-4.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, 5.

original Q context: that is to say, Q 13:34-35 originally followed Q 13:24-29 and preceded 14:11, 16-24.³⁵

An observation concerning Luke's redaction of Q 13:29,28, on Gentiles in the kingdom, corroborates this conclusion. Most scholars suggest that Matthew, in general, preserves better the original order and wording of Q 13:29,28.³⁶ The *Critical Edition of Q* reconstructs it as follows:

[[καὶ πολλοὶ]] ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν καὶ δυσμῶν ἥξουσιν καὶ ἀνακλιθήσονται μετὰ Ἀβραάμ καὶ Ἰσαάκ καὶ Ἰακώβ ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ, [[ὕμ<εῖ>ς]] δὲ ἐκβλη[θηήσ<εσθε> εἰς τὸ σκότος τὸ] ἐξώ[[τερον]]· ἐκεῖ ἔσται ὁ κλαυσμὸς καὶ ὁ βρυγμὸς τῶν ὀδόντων.

[[And many]] shall come from Sunrise and Sunset and recline with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob in the kingdom of God, but [[you will be]] thrown out [[into the]] out[[er darkness]], where there will be wailing and grinding of teeth.³⁷

Luke, therefore, likely made two significant additions to Q 13:28—a reference to the future “seeing” of exclusion from the kingdom, and a reference to “all the prophets”—so that his version reads:

ἐκεῖ ἔσται ὁ κλαυσμὸς καὶ ὁ βρυγμὸς τῶν ὀδόντων ὅταν ὀψησθε Ἀβραάμ καὶ Ἰσαάκ καὶ Ἰακώβ καὶ πάντας τοὺς προφῆτας ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ, ὑμᾶς δὲ ἐκβαλλομένους ἔξω.

There will be weeping and gnashing of teeth when you see Abraham and Isaac and Jacob and all the prophets in the kingdom of God, and you yourselves thrown out. (Luke 13:28)

³⁵ The presence of Luke 14:11 par. Matt 23:12 is disputed, often because of the ease with which such proverbial expressions find their way into the tradition (see Kloppenborg, *Q Parallels*, 162). The *Critical Edition* includes it at a {C} rating (Robinson, et al., *Critical Edition*, 430-1). If 14:11 was originally part of Q, its affirmation of the exaltation of the humble, and the humility of the exalted, would fit well between 13:34-35 and 14:16-24. Both these passages deal with appeals that meet with rejection by those in exalted positions (if, in fact, 13:34-35 is directed against the elite of Jerusalem, as some suspect [see, for instance, Kloppenborg, *Excavating Q*, 118]).

³⁶ See, for instance, Schulz, *Spruchquelle*, 323; Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 226.

³⁷ Robinson et al., *Critical Edition*, 414-17. See also J. M. Robinson, “The International Q Project Work Session 16 November 1990,” *JBL* 110 (1991): 494-8; esp. 497.

These additions (shown here in underlined text) are significant, particularly when compared with Q 13:34-35. The language of Luke's additions here is also found in the Jerusalem saying (τοὺς προφῆτας, a future form of ὁράω). In contrast with the Lament, which focusses on the rejection and murder of prophets (Q 13:34) and which looks ahead to a future seeing (after a time of invisibility) of the speaker, who presumably comes in judgment, Luke 13:28 forecasts a time when the hearers would see themselves excluded from the kingdom and the prophets vindicated in the presence of the patriarchs. It is likely that Luke, looking ahead to Q 13:34-35, redacted Q 13:28 in order to coordinate the themes of the two sayings more closely. The presence of the future of ἴκω in both Q 13:29 and 13:35b may have suggested this redactional assimilation, which would be very remarkable indeed if Q 13:34-35 had originally followed Q 11:49-51.³⁸

³⁸ Incidentally, it also suggests that Luke understood Q 13:34-35—as apparently also Matthew did—to refer to a future time of judgment at the Parousia, but reoriented it, with the redactional references to Jerusalem and to prophetic martyrdom in Luke 13:31-33, in order to have it refer to Jesus' entry into Jerusalem and passion.

4.2: The Rejection of Jesus and the Abandonment of Jerusalem

The most significant implication of deciding in favour of Luke's placement of the Jerusalem Lament is the fact that Jesus, and not Wisdom personified, must be the speaker of the saying, although, as noted above, even the Matthean position of the saying does not completely rule this out either. Certainly Matthew and Luke agree on Jesus as the speaker of the saying. This presents some difficulties, particularly with reference to the repeated appeals mentioned in Q 13:34, but it also presents some important implications for our understanding of Q's interpretation of the fate of Jesus.

The first question to be answered is raised by the reference to Jerusalem. It actually matters little whether or not the saying originally had some other use or circulation before its use in Q. The significance of the reference for Q is the more pressing concern, especially given the fact that Q only mentions Jerusalem here and in the temptation narrative (Q 4:9: Matthew εἰς τὴν ἁγίαν πόλιν, Luke εἰς Ἱερουσαλὴμ), and otherwise seems to imply a Galilean context (see Q 10:13-15). Given the saying's deuteronomistic background, Jerusalem particularly as ἡ λιθοβολοῦσα τοὺς ἀποσταλμένους πρὸς αὐτήν was probably suggested, as Robinson has argued, by the stoning of Zechariah in 2 Chron 24:21 (καὶ ἐλιθοβόλησαν αὐτὸν [LXX]; see also Q 11:51).¹ But Jerusalem as the murderer of prophets is unusual in the deuteronomistic tradition: Steck observed that "bleibt diese Apostrophierung Jerusalems als Täter auffallend: Jerusalem ist in spätjüdischer Tradition sonst nicht Subjekt des Ungehorsams und auch mit dem gewaltsamen Prophetengeschick nie betont verbunden."² Steck argued that the imminent

¹ Robinson, "Building Blocks," 104-6; "Sequence of Q," 250-3.

² Steck, *Israel*, 227-8.

destruction of Jerusalem in the time before 70 CE may have suggested a focus on Jerusalem in particular (yet symbolizing all of Israel) as the perpetrator.³ But in Steck's view the Jerusalem Lament was not in Q and, obviously, did not have Jesus as its speaker.

Steck did show, however, that the framework of the wisdom myth provides a clue to the significance of the Jerusalem reference in Q 13:34. Since Jerusalem, and particularly the Temple, was considered the special place of residence for Wisdom (or the Shekina), it is also the place abandoned in Wisdom's return to heaven. Sir 24:10-12 is the classic text for the view that Wisdom dwells among the people of God, in particular in Zion, and in Jerusalem, the "beloved city" (Sir 24:11).⁴ Further, Wisdom builds her nest among human beings (Sir 11:15), and the divine presence offers protection to Israel (see *1 En.* 89:56; *2 Bar.* 8:1-2; *Pss. Sol.* 7:1-2), as the mother-bird simile of Q 13:34b suggests.⁵ Thus, when Wisdom departs, as in *1 En.* 42:1-2, the people in general, Jerusalem in particular, and most especially the Temple, are abandoned. This is expressed in Q 13:35a: ἰδοὺ ἀφίεται ὁ οἶκος ὑμῶν. As the withdrawal of Wisdom is focussed upon Jerusalem, so also is the removal of the divine protection which according to the deuteronomistic tradition was the result of Israel's disobedience (see *2 Chron* 24:20,23-24). Thus Jerusalem in particular is singled out as typifying Israel's violent rejection of prophets and emissaries.

³ Ibid., 229. Hoffmann remarked, "Diese [Steck's] Erklärung mag für die Entstehung der deuteronomistischen Prophetenaussage zutreffen; denn diese entstand ja im Rückblick auf die Verstörung Jerusalems und suchte die Katastrophe, die das Volk traf, aus der Geschichte seines Ungehorsams abzuleiten. Fraglich ist jedoch, ob diese Entwicklung für Q ausreicht" (*Studien*, 179).

⁴ There seems to be a progression in the depiction of Wisdom's dwelling amongst the people in Sir 24:10-12: she is described as having a home in the tabernacle, then Zion (v.10), then Jerusalem "the beloved city" (v. 11), and finally "I took root in an honoured people, in the portion of the Lord" (v.12). The progression seems to suggest concentric spheres of presence or influence.

⁵ For the imagery of a mother bird gathering her young, see *Deut* 32:11; *Ps* 17:8, 36:7; *Ruth* 2:12; *2 Bar.* 41:3-4; *4 Ezra* 1:30. For Wisdom in particular, see Sir 1:15, 14:26(?); *Prov* 16:16 LXX. A detailed discussion may be found in Steck, *Israel*, 48-50.

This helps, but adds little to an interpretation which views Jesus as the speaker here. A more helpful scenario with respect to Q—particularly given our view that Q knew of and had interpreted the death of Jesus—was proposed by Hoffmann, who, as noted above, also argued that Jesus is the speaker in Q 13:34-35. In his view, the speaker is not necessarily the one who sends the prophets and emissaries, but instead is depicted as standing in continuity with other rejected messengers of God.⁶ The Jerusalem Lament has its *Sitz im Leben* “in der Ablehnung ... des Boten Jesus, auf die Q zurückblickt.”⁷ Q may have picked up the deuteronomistic tradition as a way of theologizing the rejection of the Q missionaries (see especially Q 11:49-51, noting the contemporizing 11:51b!),⁸ but Q 13:34-35 has Jesus in view, and not the Q messengers. Jerusalem figures in the saying because Q considers the speaker himself as one of those sent to, and rejected by, that city. The fact that Jesus was executed there, a fact of which the Q community could scarcely have been ignorant, provides the basis for the reference to Jerusalem.

A problem, however, arises with respect to the principal clause of Q 13:34: ποσάκις ἠθέλησα ἐπισυνάξαι τὰ τέκνα σου. Many commentators, most influentially Bultmann, see ποσάκις ἠθέλησα as requiring a “supra-historical” subject. On this basis, then, the participles ἀποκτείνουσα and λιθοβολοῦσα refer deuteronomistically to the whole history of Jerusalem’s (Israel’s) treatment of prophets. If the whole history of Israel is in view, then ποσάκις ἠθέλησα cannot have Jesus as its speaker. Hoffmann found his way around this dilemma by proposing that whereas the participles might refer to the whole history of Jerusalem, the often sought-for gathering of her children (τὰ τέκνα σου) “vielmehr bezeichnet es die wiederholten

⁶ Hoffmann, *Studien*, 174.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 179-80.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 179.

Versuche des Sprechers in der Gegenwart um die ‘Kinder Jerusalems.’”⁹ This is difficult to reconcile with the (probable) historical fact that Jesus only made one journey to Jerusalem.

Again, the wisdom tradition offers some enlightenment. While Q 7:35 sees Jesus and John as emissaries of Wisdom, other Q materials demonstrate a rather elevated wisdom Christology: this is seen most strongly in Q 10:21-22, where Jesus is practically identified with Wisdom as the mediator of revelation, but also in Q 11:49, where Jesus voices the speech of Wisdom as the one who sends the prophets (ἀποστελῶ ... προφήτας καὶ [ἀποστόλους]; see also Q 10:3, ἰδοὺ ἀποστέλλω ὑμᾶς ...). Here in Q 13:34 Jesus speaks as Wisdom, reflecting the many appeals made (ποσάκις ἠθέλησα) by Wisdom through her emissaries and rejected (οὐκ ἠθέλησατε) by Israel but especially by the children of Jerusalem as the perpetrators of his own rejection and death. Thus, Jesus does speak as a “supra-historical” subject, and yet one whose own final experiences are implicit in the rejection of Wisdom by Jerusalem. It may also be noted in this connection that the combination of the deuteronomistic tradition with the wisdom myth finds an extraordinary development in Q 13:34: in Q 11:49 Jesus speaks on behalf of Wisdom, the one who sends the prophets; but here he speaks *as* Wisdom, in particular as the emissary of Wisdom *par excellence* whose rejection signifies the final withdrawal of Wisdom from her abode in Jerusalem.¹⁰

⁹ Ibid., 174.

¹⁰ Cf. Suggs, *Wisdom*, 67, in whose view however Q has not made the identification between Jesus and Wisdom (although Matthew has). The identification of Jesus with Wisdom we suggest here is not without analogy: J. Z. Smith has argued that a mystical interpretation of Sir 24:8 “would read that Sophia became incarnate in the Patriarch, Jacob-Israel,” and that this idea may have come to a unique expression in the *Prayer of Joseph*, where it is “the heavenly Israel who becomes incarnate in his earthly counterpart, the Patriarch Jacob.” See Smith, “The Prayer of Joseph,” in *Religions in Antiquity: Essays in Memory of Erwin Ramsdell Goodenough* (ed. J. Neusner; Leiden: Brill, 1968), 253-94 = idem, *Map is Not Territory: Studies in the History of Religion* (Leiden: Brill, 1978), 24-66; citations from 56-7.

The deuteronomic connection between the rejection of prophets and the withdrawal of divine protection has already been mentioned, but a few remarks may be made here regarding Q 13:35a, ἰδοὺ ἀφίεται ὁ οἶκος ὑμῶν. The use of the passive shows that a divine act of judgment results from Jerusalem's continued impenitence and rejection of Wisdom's entreaties. As Robinson has noted, a similar scenario is in view in 2 Chron 24:20: there Zechariah says, "Because you have forsaken the Lord, he also will forsake you" (LXX: ἐγκατελίπετε. ἐγκαταλείψει).¹¹ In that passage, the Temple is also referred to as "house" (2 Chron 24:21: see also Ps 117:26b LXX), as it is in Q 13:35a (see also Q 11:51 [Luke]); ὁ οἶκος ὑμῶν is suggestive of Jerusalem's temple as the locus of divine presence in Israel. The fact that Q 13:35a begins with ἰδοὺ is significant. Not only is it the typical introduction to a prophetic threat, but the word is used uniformly in Q to suggest a present state.¹² Thus, ἰδοὺ ἀφίεται ὁ οἶκος ὑμῶν signals Jerusalem's present situation of being abandoned by God to destruction,¹³ which would have been understood as a significant eschatological event by the framers of the saying.¹⁴ However, as many have argued, this does not necessitate a post-70 setting for the saying. (Such a setting is, however, clear from Matthew's addition of ἔρημος.) Instead, it may only reflect the turbulent times before 70, or indeed even earlier, when the destruction of Jerusalem may have

¹¹ Robinson, "Building Blocks," 105.

¹² ἰδοὺ is used in this way attested by both evangelists in the following texts: Q 7:35 ("Behold, those who wear luxurious clothing are in palaces"); 7:34 ("Behold, a glutton and a drunk"); 10:3 ("Behold, I send you ..."); 11:31-32 ("Behold, something greater ... is here"); 13:35 ("Behold, your house is forsaken"); 17:23 (twice: "Behold, [the Son of man] is there/ here"); 19:20 ("Behold, [here's your money]"; Matt 25:25, ἴδε). It is also used to connote a present state in the following Q passages, attested by either Matthew or Luke: Q 11:41 (Luke); 6:42 (Matthew); 11:49 (Matthew); 14:17 (Matthew); 19:16 (Matthew); 19:18 (Matthew). Q 6:23 (ἰδοὺ attested by Luke), in which ἰδοὺ introduces a statement about the hearers' reward in heaven, might also fall into this category.

¹³ So Steck, *Israel*, 228-9; Schulz, *Spruchquelle*, 356-7.

¹⁴ So Hoffmann, *Studien*, 175; Schulz, *Spruchquelle*, 357.

seemed imminent.¹⁵ This setting for Q 13:34-35 as a whole is confirmed by a close examination of verse 35b, which presents a remarkable reversal not only of Jesus' rejection and death (by means of assumption theology), but also of Jerusalem's present situation of abandonment (by means of a hoped-for restoration).

¹⁵ So Steck, *Israel*, 227-9; cf. Schulz, *Spruchquelle*, 357.

4.3: λέγω ὑμῖν: “I tell you ...”

It has already been seen that Q 13:35b, for a number of reasons, has been considered a turning point in the saying. Advocates of a thoroughly sapiential interpretation of the Jerusalem Lament had to acknowledge that something anomalous to the Wisdom myth is introduced in verse 35b, when the one who disappears returns again at the acclamation of Jerusalem. Furthermore, the stark declaration concerning the abandoned house (v. 35a) finds, according to some scholars, a positive counterbalance in the possibility of a restored relationship between the people of Jerusalem and their God when they finally say, “Blessed is the Coming One in the name of the Lord.” Finally, the presence of the formula λέγω ὑμῖν at the beginning of the verse is a clue of some kind of shift, perhaps even to the hand of the Q redactor (see also Q 11:51b).

A good starting point for our study of verse 35b, therefore, is an examination of the use of the λέγω ὑμῖν formula in Q. It occurs in Q material (with Matthew and Luke in agreement) fourteen times, and in Q settings in one or the other Gospel at least eighteen times. Thus, however the compositional history of Q may be understood, the formula appears in all compositional strata of Q; this is not surprising, given how common it is in the Jesus traditions.¹ The formula also occurs, where Matthew and Luke agree, with a variety of conjunctions, adverbs, or prepositional phrases. Matthew is fond of reformulating its Q occurrences according

¹ For a discussion of the λέγω ὑμῖν formula in Q, particularly with reference to the redaction-critical question of the formula's origin where it occurs in Q material in only one of the two evangelists, see Neirynck, “Recent Developments,” 56-69. Neirynck's conclusion: “it appears that in most instances where the λέγω ὑμῖν formula is peculiar to Matthew or Luke it can be assigned to Matthean or Lukan redaction. Q redaction is probable in 6.27 (?); 10.12; 11.51; 12.22. Other instances in Q are more likely traditional” (ibid., 69). Neirynck apparently omitted Q 13:35b from this short list (cf. ibid., 66).

to his customary ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, which is also frequent in Mark.² Luke's use seems somewhat more restrained.

What is most significant about the formula is the fact that there seems to be a consistency in its application in Q. Obviously, the formula is characteristic of Jesus' speech, and so it is used in the context of an asseverative or pronouncement of Jesus. Schulz argued that the formula was typical of the later Q material and that its function was to introduce not independent sayings but rather interpretive comments.³ In his study of the formula, Sato saw a prophetic origin and application of λέγω ὑμῖν.⁴ Klaus Berger noted that it never appears in a paraenetic context.⁵ Schulz also noted that a strictly introductory use of the formula in Q is rare. All these observations are apt. Yet it appears, to be somewhat more specific with respect to the application of the formula in Q, that λέγω ὑμῖν very frequently precedes a statement that either injects an element of the marvelous or a reversal of some aspect of the context. A few examples will suffice.

The first appearance of λέγω ὑμῖν in Q occurs on the lips not of Jesus but of John. He says, "Do not [begin] to say to yourselves, 'We have Abraham as our father,' for I tell you that God is able to raise up children for Abraham from these stones" (Q 3:8). John reverses the hearers' claim on ancestral privilege with the shocking statement that such privilege could be extended, God willing, to rocks and stones. Jesus' statement about the faith of the centurion (Q 7:9) also contains an aspect of the marvelous (ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐθαύμασεν) and a reversal of the

² Matthew 31 times; Mark 14 times; Luke 6 times.

³ Schulz, *Spruchquelle*, 51.

⁴ Sato, *Q und Prophetie*, 231-46.

⁵ K. Berger, *Die Amen-Worte Jesu: Eine Untersuchung zum Problem der Legitimation in apokalyptischer Rede* (BZNW 39; Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1970), 90.

expected: "I tell you, I have not found such faith in Israel." Similarly, Q 6:27 also signals a reversal: the Beatitudes close with an emphasis on persecution (6:22-23, even apart from what might be a later deuteronomistic addition in 6:23c), but the following section on non-retaliation (6:27-33,35c) begins with Jesus saying, "But I tell you [...], love your enemies ..." (6:27).

Statements of the marvelous or surprising often make use of comparative forms or figures of speech: "I tell you, among those born of women none [is greater] than John; yet the least in the kingdom of [God] is greater than he" (Q 7:28); "I tell you, it will be more tolerable on that day [...] for Sodom [...] than for that city" (Q 10:12; see also Q 10:14, Matt 11:24); "But I tell you, not even Solomon in all his glory was arrayed like one of these" (Q 12:27); "I tell you, there is more joy" over the one than over the ninety-nine (Q 15:7).

The use of λέγω ὑμῖν may be classified according to the way in which the statement it introduces is related to the preceding context. In the cases where the formula occurs within a major textual unit, or to use Schulz's terminology, where it introduces an interpretive statement, λέγω ὑμῖν has a function analogous to that of a conjunction, either adversative/ disjunctive or coordinating/ copulative. It has an adversative use where it introduces a statement which reverses some aspect of the preceding context, and a coordinating use where it introduces a statement which builds upon some aspect of the preceding context. In other instances, the contextual function of λέγω ὑμῖν is better defined as introductory, where the formula begins a major textual unit, or as parenthetical, where it interrupts the flow of a sentence. For example, λέγω ὑμῖν signals a shift from one type of material to another in Q 12:22 (if Luke 12:16-21 was in Q); but in Q 7:26 ("Yes, I tell you, and more than a prophet") and 11:51b ("[Yes/Amen], I tell you, it will be [required] of that generation"), λέγω ὑμῖν introduces a parenthetical statement which emphasizes or reiterates some aspect of the previous context. Nevertheless, it seems a

characteristic of the material introduced by the λέγω ὑμῖν formula that it contains some surprising or unbelievable remark. As the following tables show, many of the uses of λέγω ὑμῖν in Q—even some of those attested by only one of the evangelists—are adversative, introducing a statement of reversal, and most of its uses serve to highlight something unexpected or marvellous, often using comparative forms or figures of speech.

Table 4A below shows the fourteen certain uses of λέγω ὑμῖν in Q, and Table 4B the other eighteen uses in Q material, along with the additions of Matthew and Luke and a classification of the contextual function of the formula (adversative, coordinating, introductory, reiterative, reorienting). The last column in each table gives a designation of the contents of the pronouncement which follows the formula: whether it contains a reversal (R), a marvellous or astounding statement (M), or a comparative form or figure (C).

Table 4A: λέγω ὑμῖν in Q

	Matthew	Luke	Contextual Function	Contents of Saying
Q 3:8b	3:9b γάρ	3:8b γάρ	adversative	R M
Q 6:27	5:44 ἐγὼ δέ	6:27 ἀλλὰ	adversative/introductory	R
Q 7:9b	8:10b ἀμὴν	7:9b	adversative	R M C
Q 7:26b	11:9 ναὶ	7:26 ναὶ	parenthetical	C
Q 7:28a	11:11a ἀμὴν	7:28a	introductory	R M C
Q 10:12	10:15 ἀμὴν	10:12	coordinating	M C
Q 10:24	13:17 ἀμὴν γάρ	10:24 γάρ	coordinating	M C
Q 11:51b	23:36 ἀμὴν	11:51b ναὶ	parenthetical	M
Q 12:22	6:25 διὰ τοῦτο	12:22 διὰ τοῦτο	introductory	M
Q 12:27	6:29 δέ	12:27 δέ	adversative	R M C
Q 12:44	24:47 ἀμὴν	12:44 ἀληθῶς	coordinating	M
Q 12:59	5:26 ἀμὴν λέγω σοι	12:59 σοι	coordinating	M
Q 13:35b	23:29 γάρ	13:35b [δέ]	adversative	R M
Q 15:7	18:13 ἀμὴν	15:7	coordinating	M C

It is immediately apparent, given the variety of additions to the formula, that the saying was not fixed in Q, but could be adapted to the needs of the context with whatever conjunction, adverb, or prepositional phrase was most suitable. In four instances (those marked in boldface type)

Matthew and Luke agree in preserving Q's exact wording (λέγω ὑμῖν with additions). It will also be noted that in six of fourteen cases, λέγω ὑμῖν introduces a statement which reverses some aspect of the previous context, and most of these reversals contain some element which could be considered surprising or marvellous. Of the other cases, most contain either a marvellous element (seven of eight) a comparative form or figure (four of eight), or both (three of eight). A similar picture emerges from the Q material where only one evangelist has the formula, one which at least might corroborate our assessment of the core fourteen.

Table 4B: λέγω ὑμῖν in Q Contexts⁶

	Matthew	Luke	Contextual Function	Contents of Saying
Q 10:14	11:22 πλην	10:14	coordinating	M C
Matt 11:24	11:24 πλην	— (cf. Q 10:12,14)	coordinating (M)	M C
Luke 11:9	—	καγω	introductory (L)	[formal shift]
Q 12:4	10:28	12:4 δε τοις φιλοις μου	introductory	[formal shift]
Q 12:5	10:28	12:5 ναι	parenthetical	[reiteration]
Q 12:8	10:32	12:8 δε	introductory	[topical shift]
Matt 12:31	12:31 δια τουτο	— (cf. Q 12:10)	coordinating (M)	[topical shift]
Q 12:51b	10:34 ουκ ... αλλα	12:51b ουχι αλλα	adversative	R M
Q 13:24	7:13	13:24	parenthetical/adversative	R M
Q 13:29	8:11 δε	13:29	introductory (Q 7:9/10)	[reiteration]
Luke 14:24	—	Luke 14:24 γαρ	coordinating	[reiteration]
Luke 15:10	—	Luke 15:10	coordinating	[formal shift]
Q 16:17	5:18 αμην γαρ	16:17	coordinating (M)	[cf. MtR antitheses]
Q 17:4	18:22 σοι	17:4	introductory (M)	[shift in speaker]
Q 17:6	17:20b αμην γαρ	17:6	coordinating (M)	[reiteration]
Q 17:34	24:40	17:34	coordinating (L)	[reiteration]
Q 19:26	25:29	19:26	adversative	R M C
Matt 19:28	αμην	— (cf. Luke 22:24-30)	introductory	[formal shift]

⁶ In the column "Contextual Function," the letters M and L whether the function of λέγω ὑμῖν has been assessed in its Matthean or Lukan context. Those not marked have been assessed in the Q context. In the column "Contents of Saying," the designations "[formal shift]" and "[topical shift]" indicate uses of the formula to mark a shift either from one type of material to another (e.g., in Luke 11:9, from parable to paraenesis), or from one topic to another (e.g., in Q 12:8 [Luke], from a discussion appropriate fear to one of confessing/denying the Son of man). The designation "[reiteration]" indicates a use to reiterate (often with expansion) some aspect of the previous context.

It is not surprising that a far less consistent picture develops here, for where the formula is only attested by one of the evangelists, its addition is quite likely.⁷ A few tentative observations may still be made, however, in instances where there could be grounds for supposing that the formula was original to Q. In Q 10:14 (Matt 11:22), for instance, λέγω ὑμῖν may have been in Q;⁸ its use here is to introduce a comparative (not to mention astounding!) statement is consistent with the Q usage demonstrated from the core fourteen uses. An adversative use of the formula ("No, [I tell you], but division") might have been present in Q 12:51 [Luke], although the formula is typically not used in Q as an interjection, as it is here. Similarly, Q 19:26 [Luke] concludes the parable of the talents with the shocking saying, "[I tell you that] every one who has will be given more; but from the one who has not, even what he has will be taken away," although the presence of λέγω ὑμῖν in Q here is not certain.

This brief examination demonstrates a relatively consistent use of the λέγω ὑμῖν formula where its presence in Q is certain. It should be noted that the formula does not typically introduce a change in speaker—with the exception, possibly, of its use in the Wisdom saying (Q 11:51b). It almost always, on the other hand, signals that the following asseverative contains either some reversal of a situation in the immediately previous context, or a statement of the marvelous or shocking, often (though not always) with a comparative. This is of great significance for Q 13:35b, for we now have more to say about the precise nature of the formula's use than only that it introduces a concluding comment on previous material.⁹ λέγω ὑμῖν in 13:35b can be

⁷ So Neirynck, "Recent Developments," 69.

⁸ This because Q 10:12 also contains λέγω ὑμῖν in conjunction with a parallel structure (dative of indirect object – ἐν [τῇ] ἡμέρᾳ [κρίσεως] + ἀνεκτότερον ἔσται + comparative particle ἢ + dative of comparison). Luke may have omitted the formula here. Matt 10:23b-24 seems to be redactional, assimilating Q 10:12 to Q 10:13-14.

⁹ So Schulz, *Spruchquelle*, 348-9.

reasonably expected to introduce a statement of reversal, or of something marvelous, or both.

This does indeed seem to be the case, if, as we will consider in the next section, it is correct to see in verse 35b a reflection of assumption theology as the logic of Jesus' post-mortem vindication and exaltation to his future eschatological role as the Son of man.

4.4: The Assumption of Jesus: Post-Mortem Vindication, Exaltation, and Parousia

Given the prominence of wisdom themes in Q 13:34-35, it is not surprising that Steck found that Sir 15:7 offered a close parallel to the “you will not see me” sentence in verse 35b.¹ That verse reads, “The foolish will not obtain her [Wisdom], and sinners will not see her” (LXX: ἄνδρες ἁμαρτωλοὶ οὐ μὴ ἴδωσιν αὐτήν). The parallel is almost exact. What is most striking is the use of οὐ μὴ with the aorist subjunctive of ὁράω to convey an emphatic negative future: “you/they will never see” The close verbal parallel with Sir 15:7 confirmed for Steck that Wisdom is the speaker throughout the Jerusalem Lament and that verse 35b was not a Christian addition to the saying. In his opinion, it is a statement “worin sich das V.35a angekündigte Gericht im Blick auf die Beziehung der Angeredeten zur Weisheit auswirken wird.”² Thus the judgment announced in verse 35a—ἰδοὺ ἀφίεται ὁ οἶκος ὑμῶν—is connected with the “Ascensus-Moment” of the wisdom myth and expressed explicitly in verse 35b: “besteht das Gericht darin, daß es keinesfalls mehr möglich ist, die Weisheit zu sehen.”³

To a certain extent, the view argued above that Q 13:35a refers to the withdrawal of Wisdom—and thus to the deuteronomistic view of the removal of the divine protection without which Jerusalem (and Israel) would be open to divine punishment meted out by her enemies—depends upon a similar view of Q 13:35b. For if Jesus is speaking as Wisdom in the Jerusalem Lament, then his disappearance is the disappearance of Wisdom, as seen in *1 Enoch* 42.

¹ Steck, *Israel*, 235.

² Ibid.

³ Ibid.

However, to limit the reading of the line οὐ μὴ ἴδῃτέ με ἕως [ἤξει ὅτε] εἴπητε to a strictly wisdom-oriented interpretation would, as we saw above, leave us without an explanation for the return of the speaker in (or with?) the person of the “Coming One.” Further, it would require—as it did for Steck—understanding verse 35b as a reiteration of the judgment implied in verse 35a, which in turn would create problems for the interpretation of the acclamation of blessing in the Ps 117:26 LXX citation.

Despite the linguistic similarity, there is one important difference between Sir 15:7 and Q 13:35b. Within their respective contexts, the two texts refer to very different scenarios. Sir 15:7 stresses the inability of the foolish (verse 7a), the sinful (7b), the arrogant (8a), and the untruthful (8b) to obtain wisdom. Thus οὐ μὴ ἴδωσιν αὐτήν expresses the imperceptibility of Wisdom to the wicked: they cannot see her now, and never will. To a certain extent a similar emphasis is also present in Q 13:34–35, where the references to the murdered prophets and the repeated rejection of Wisdom’s (Jesus’) appeals stress Jerusalem’s impenitence. However, since presumably the speaker is still visible while the Lament is being uttered, οὐ μὴ ἴδῃτέ με κτλ reflects not the imperceptibility of Jesus, but rather his disappearance: that is to say, “you (the children of Jerusalem) can see me now, but at some future point in time you will not see me, until you say, ‘Blessed is the Coming One in the name of the Lord.’”

It will be recalled that several of the assumption narratives discussed in Chapter Three made use of language of “not-seeing” to describe the disappearance of the subject. To be specific, the same language as found in Q 13:35b (a negated form of ὁράω) also appears in assumption narratives about Elijah (2 Kgs 2:12 LXX: καὶ οὐκ εἶδεν αὐτὸν ἔτι⁴). Xisouthros

⁴ 2 Kgs 2:10 LXX also contains an expression very similar to that found in Q 13:35b: εἰς ἡμέρας με ἀναλαμβάνόμενον.

(Berossos: οὐκ ἔτι ὀφθῆναι), Romulus (Plutarch, *Rom.* 27.5: οὔτε μέρος ὤφθη σώματος ...), and Proteus (Lucian, *Peregr.* 39: οὐ μὴν ἑωρᾶτό γε). Such language functions synonymously with the more typical ἀφαν- disappearance language.

Furthermore, the reversal signalled by the introductory λέγω ὑμῖν in Q 13:35b is a post-mortem assumption, because the rejection of Jesus in Jerusalem (Q 13:34) culminated in his death. It was also seen in Chapter Three that post-mortem assumption was not unheard of in either Greco-Roman or in Jewish materials, even though assumption was typically considered an escape from death. In Greek literature, post-mortem assumptions—the disappearance or removal of corpses, even from tombs or funeral pyres—were usually connected with the subsequent veneration of the assumed individual as an immortal. In Jewish literature, as seen in the striking examples from *Wisdom* 2–5 and *Testament of Job* 39, assumption language was applied to individuals who had clearly died. *Wis* 4:10–11 uses language drawn from the Enoch assumption note in *Gen* 5:22,24 LXX (εὐάρεστος and μετατίθημι), and also ἀρπάζω, uncommon in the Jewish assumption tradition. The author of the Book of Wisdom apparently combined *topoi* from Greco-Roman consolation literature and the Jewish assumption tradition in order to express the post-mortem vindication and exaltation of the *dikaïos*. *T. Job* 39:11 uses language from the Elijah narrative: the common assumption verb ἀναλαμβάνω, along with the motif of unsuccessful search (compare *2 Kgs* 2:9,10,11; 2:16–18 LXX). In both these cases, a post-mortem assumption reversed the injustice of an untimely death and installed the individual(s) in some sort of exalted position in heaven (*Wis* 5:1–5; *T. Job* 40:3). The disappearance language in Q 13:35b would therefore imply an assumption-related vindication for Jesus, and there appear to be three interrelated aspects to this vindication: assumption is a sign of divine favour; it is a means of heavenly exaltation; and it results in special eschatological function.

4.4.1. Assumption and Divine Favour

First of all, throughout the Jewish tradition (and even elsewhere in ancient literature) assumption is always understood as a sign of divine favour. As seen above in Chapter Three, Anu and Enlil “cherished” Ziusudra in the Sumerian flood story; Enoch was “pleasing” to God in Gen 5:22,24 LXX; according to Josephus (*Ant.* 4.326), Moses strove to prohibit the speculation that he was assumed because of his “surpassing virtue”; and the *dikaïos* was “beloved” of God (Wis 4:11). But in particular, in the Greco-Roman consolation tradition and in Wis 4:10-14, assumption language is used in conjunction with the theme of divine love in order to console those mourning the loss of a young person. For this reason, Jesus’ assumption, hinted at in Q 13:35b, would have been considered a sign of special divine favour or blessing, and would have provided a significant reversal of the shame of his death by crucifixion, implied in the immediately previous material about his rejection in Jerusalem (13:34). Or, to put it in more biblical language, assumption theology would have the effect of vindicating Jesus by reversing the curse of crucifixion.

At this point we may return to Zeller’s objection that resurrection, and not assumption, would have been the most appropriate divine vindication of the crucified Jesus, with the result that the assumption reference in Q 13:35b intentionally omits any reference to the death of Jesus.⁵ It has already been seen that the death of an individual was not an impediment to the use of assumption language to express divine intervention. More to the point, however, it appears that assumption would have been just as suitable a vindication as resurrection, especially given the way assumption language and the theme of divine love come together in the Greco-Roman

⁵ Zeller, “Entrückung,” 529, 518.

consolation tradition and especially in Wisdom 4–5. In fact, assumption may even have provided a more suitable a vindication than resurrection: whereas resurrection has the effect of reversing, by divine initiative, Jesus' wrongful death, the emphasis on divine favour in the assumption traditions has the effect of reversing the curse associated with crucifixion (see Deut 21:22-23; Gal 3:13). In addition, assumption theology also has the benefit of supplying the logic for Q's belief in an exalted post-mortem Jesus and for its expectation of his return as the Son of man.

4.4.2. Assumption and Heavenly Exaltation

The second aspect, then, of Jesus' vindication, expressed with reference to assumption theology, is a belief in his exaltation. The exalted post-assumption status of the assumed person is a constant theme throughout ancient assumption materials. In Q 13:35b, Jesus as speaker identifies himself with the Coming One (ὁ ἐρχόμενος). Naturally, the very title expresses a belief in Jesus' return, but this is to anticipate the third aspect, to be discussed below, of Jesus' vindication in Q 13:35b. Yet exaltation and eschatological function seem to go hand in hand in the Jewish tradition as results of assumption, particularly because those who had been assumed and were expected to return either as eschatological ruler or judge were thought of as being reserved in heaven until the proper time. The exalted state of the *dikaïos* in Wis 5:1-5 is unusual because his function is in the heavenly court, so that his role is not specifically eschatological. This seems to be a development from the more common view that the heavenly exaltation of the assumed was specifically connected with a future eschatological function.

Thus, assumption theology is able to express a belief in Jesus' exalted post-mortem state in a manner quite different from resurrection theology. In Zeller's words, "Wenn Jesus dadurch [viz., by means of resurrection] zu besonderer Würde gelangt, so weil sich damit früh ... die

Überzeugung von seiner Inthronisation zum Sohn Gottes (vgl Röm 1.3f) und zum Kyrios verband.”⁶ With resurrection theology, therefore, some intermediate step is required in order to express the view that the risen Jesus is also the exalted Christ: normally, the enthronement imagery of Psalm 2 is either expressed or taken for granted (see, for example, Acts 2:31-36; Rom 8:34).⁷ In Luke, Jesus’ ascension—which is really a post-resurrection assumption, as Lohfink and Zwiep have argued so convincingly⁸—accomplishes the same purpose (Acts 2:33; 5:31).⁹ With assumption theology, on the other hand, because according to Jewish belief the one who was assumed was also expected to play some sort of special role in the eschaton, that person was considered to be waiting in heaven, in an exalted state, for that role to be inaugurated.

As Haufe put it, “Tod und Auferstehung bilden nicht die Brücke zu einer himmlisch-eschatologischen Sonderfunktion.”¹⁰ Barnabas Lindars took note of this fact, and tried to argue that assumption, not resurrection, was the theological impetus behind the early Christian belief in Jesus’ post-mortem exaltation and Parousia. In his view, assumption was not technically necessary to Jesus’ exaltation, for “the death of a supremely righteous man could be interpreted as the transition from earthly life to a position in heaven appropriate to God’s designated agent of

⁶ Ibid., 529.

⁷ See B. Lindars, “The Apocalyptic Myth and the Death of Christ,” *BJRL* 57 (1975): 366-87, esp. 379-80, who argues that “the resurrection was understood in terms of exaltation from the very first,” and that the typical (so Haufe, “Entrückung”) connection between assumption and exaltation/eschatological function was the primary impetus behind this kind of understanding (Lindars, “Apocalyptic Myth,” 375-8, 380-1).

⁸ Lohfink, *Himmelfahrt Jesu*, 74-9 and *passim*; Zwiep, *Ascension*, 80-117, insisting “that the biblical-Jewish rapture-preservation paradigm provides a much more systematic resemblance to the ascension of Jesus than the Graeco-Roman rapture stories” (ibid., 116). Cf. van Tilborg & Counet, *Appearances and Disappearances*, 198-200, who argue for the importance of the Greco-Roman assumption tradition to the “readerly possibilities” of the Lukan ascension stories (ibid., 199).

⁹ See Lohfink, *Himmelfahrt Jesu*, 272.

¹⁰ Haufe, “Entrückung,” 109.

judgment.”¹¹ Lindars also argued that resurrection in the NT typically has this kind of exaltation scenario in view: “the language is that of resurrection, but the meaning is exaltation.”¹² What Lindars was missing, however, was a textual basis for the assumption of Jesus,¹³ and clear examples of the use of assumption as a post-mortem divine rescue.¹⁴

At this point the question arises of the relevance to Q 13:35b of the assumption of Enoch and his identification with “that Son of man” in the *Similitudes* (*1 Enoch* 70–71), an exalted (but not apparently “returning”) figure. In Zeller’s view, “Daß ein Entrückter zum Menschensohn eingesetzt wird, hat im äthHen 70f. eine Analogie.”¹⁵ It was shown above in Chapter Three that while numerous problems attend the issue of Enoch’s identification with the Son of man in *1 Enoch* 71—textual uncertainties, the possibility that the final chapter is a late addition, and the notorious difficulty in dating the *Similitudes* with any certainty—it seems clear that the identification was in fact made, or at the very least that later texts understood that *1 Enoch* 71 had made the identification (*3 Enoch*, *Tg. Ps.-J.* Gen 5:26). In any case, Zeller is correct to speak only in terms of an analogy. For even if *1 En.* 71:14 is excluded on one count or another, there are other texts which confirm the consistency of the correlation between assumption and exalted heavenly status and future eschatological function.¹⁶

¹¹ Lindars, “Apocalyptic Myth,” 380.

¹² Ibid.

¹³ Ibid., 369.

¹⁴ Ibid., 378. Lindars argued, not implausibly, that since Sheol is not outside God’s power, “the exaltation to the heavenly realm does not depend on avoidance of death,” particularly given the belief that “the souls of the righteous are commonly represented [he cites Wis 2:23–3:9 and 4 Maccabees, Mark 12:18–27, and Luke 16:19–31] as waiting in a state of comparative bliss until the general resurrection” (ibid).

¹⁵ Zeller, “Entrückung,” 517.

¹⁶ The possibility is examined below, pp. 238–62, that Jesus’ post-mortem exalted status in Q may be seen in relation to the representative status accorded to heavenly figures, particularly those like the *dikaioi* in Wisdom 2–5 and, as VanderKam (“Righteous One,” 182–3) has argued, the Chosen One/ Son of man in the *Similitudes of Enoch* (with whom the assumed Enoch, in VanderKam’s view, has been identified—in the sense of incorporation).

4.4.3. Assumption and Special Eschatological Function

The third aspect of Jesus' vindication in Q 13:35b is reflected in the expectation of his return. As noted in Chapter Three, there existed a fairly consistent connection in the Jewish tradition between assumption and special eschatological function. Here in Q 13:35b, the assumed Jesus is expected to return as "the Coming One" (ὁ ἐρχόμενος). The title "Coming One" is used three times in Q as a designation of Jesus, with particular emphasis on his eschatological role, but also with reference to his earthly career as demonstrative of his future capacity.¹⁷ However, in spite of the relative infrequency of the title in Q, it has still been understood as one of great significance to Q's eschatological expectation. Kloppenborg, for instance, understood the use of ὁ ἐρχόμενος as occurring in a logical progression,¹⁸ and Allison has seen it as a significant marker of a unified compositional strategy in Q.¹⁹

First, ὁ ἐρχόμενος is the one announced by John (Q 3:16). Q 3:16-17 presents several difficulties: it has a close Markan parallel (Mark 1:7; see also John 1:26-27, 33b and Acts 13:24-25), its original unity in Q is the subject of debate, and Matthew and Luke do not agree in the using ὁ ἐρχόμενος.²⁰ Nevertheless, because of the parallel use on the lips of John in Q 7:19, the

¹⁷ On ὁ ἐρχόμενος as a title in Q, see R. Laufen, *Die Doppelüberlieferungen der Logienquelle und des Markusevangeliums* (BBB 54; Königstein and Bonn: Hanstein, 1980), 407-9; Kloppenborg, *Excavating Q*, 370.

¹⁸ Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 94: "This particular logical progression begins and ends in the idiom of apocalypticism, but makes a theological detour in which the motif of the presence of the eschaton in Jesus' activity comes to the fore."

¹⁹ Allison, *Jesus Tradition*, 6-7. Allison sees four stages of "development" in Q with respect to Jesus as the Coming One: "(1) John prophesies one who is to come (3:16-17); (2) Jesus implicitly associates himself with Isaiah 61 (6:20-23); (3) Jesus, in answer to a question about the coming one, associates himself with Isaiah 61 and other texts (7:18-23); (4) Jesus calls himself 'the one who comes' (13:35)" (*ibid.*, 7; enumeration added). He concludes, "Surely this christological sequence is due to deliberate design, and it is natural to assign the four texts to the same redactional stage" (*ibid.*).

²⁰ For discussion see Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 106-7; H. Fleddermann, "John and the Coming One (Matt 3:11-12 // Luke 3:16-17)," in *Society of Biblical Literature 1984 Seminar Papers* (ed. K. H. Richards; SBLSP 23; Chico, Calif.: Scholars, 1984), 377-84, esp. 378-9; Jacobson, *First Gospel*, 83-5; Tuckett, *Q*, 116-25.

title here is likely original to Q.²¹ Here, the figure is one of future judgment,²² whose task it is to separate the wheat (for the granary) from the chaff (for the fire, Q 3:17). Q does not make explicit the idea that Jesus is the future eschatological figure here, although—even if Matthew's ὀπίσω μου was not original to Q 3:16—the elevated view of Jesus in the temptation (Q 4:1-13: εἰ υἱὸς εἶ τοῦ θεοῦ, 4:3.9b) might point in that direction. The two other uses of the title (Q 7:20, 13:35b) make it clear that Jesus is the Coming One.

The second use of the title occurs in connection with John's attempt to secure proof of Jesus' identity as the Coming One: his disciples ask, σὺ εἶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἢ [ἄλλον] προσδοκῶμεν; (Q 7:19).²³ Jesus' answer is not straightforward, but alludes to various themes that evoke Psalm 146 and Isaiah (Isa 26:19; 29:18-19; 35:5-6; 42:6-7; 61:1) in a manner closely paralleled by the Qumran text 4Q521.²⁴ The effect of the answer is to shift the focus from a (future) eschatological figure—since, after all, John's question arises from an implied comparison between Jesus and the figure announced in Q 3:16-17—to Jesus' present (eschatological) ministry. The fact that Q has Jesus implying an affirmative, though reorienting, answer to John's question is confirmed in the concluding macarism: καὶ μακάριός ἐστιν ὃς ἐὰν μὴ σκανδαλισθῇ ἐν ἐμοί (Q 7:23).

²¹ Matt 3:11 reads ὁ δὲ ὀπίσω μου ἐρχόμενος ἰσχυρότερός μου, while Luke 3:16 does not use the expression ὁ ἐρχόμενος. Luke was likely influenced by Mark 1:7 (ἐρχεται δὲ ὁ ἰσχυρότερός μου).

²² The only finite verb in Q 3:17 is future: κατακαύσει. The verb βαπτισεῖ (Q 3:16) was likely also in Q, despite the Markan parallel (Mark 1:8).

²³ The question has been duplicated in Luke 7:20.

²⁴ See the discussion in Collins, *Scepter and Star*, 117-22, esp. 121-2. Collins concludes that "it is quite possible that the author of the Sayings Source knew 4Q521; at the least he drew on a common tradition," since the fact that both texts mention the resurrection of the dead cannot be put down to coincidence. See also Kloppenborg, *Excavating Q*, 405 n. 72: "It would appear [on the basis of 4Q521] that a synthesis of Isaian texts was *already* in circulation by the time of the composition of Q ... and that Q 7:22 reflects this exegetical development."

The third use of the title occurs here in Q 13:35b. Most scholars, as already seen, identify the Coming One here with the Son of man; this is quite justifiable, not only because Q evidently refers to Jesus with both titles, but also because the future Son of man sayings in Q look ahead to his coming (Q 12:40; see also Matt 10:23) or his day (Luke) or parousia (Matt) (Q 17:24,26,30).²⁵ But given the fact that the title ὁ ἐρχόμενος is quite rare in Q, in comparison with the expression “Son of man,” the question arises why Q should express a belief in Jesus’ assumption as the means of his post-mortem exaltation to await his future eschatological role with ὁ ἐρχόμενος instead of ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου. It could be that the redactor was constrained by the wording of Ps 117:26 LXX, which perhaps had suggested itself on other grounds: the positive associations in the context of a coming judgment, or maybe the lack of blessing coming from Jerusalem’s house (compare Q 13:35a with Ps 117:26b LXX).²⁶ On the other hand, it may also be that Q 13:35b uses assumption theology together with Ps 118:26 in order to solidify the claim that Jesus was the “Coming One” announced by John, if the first use of the title was traditional.²⁷

Another possibility is that the Ps 117:26 LXX citation was used here because of distant resonances it had with other materials, particularly those with affinities to Hab 2:3–4 LXX, a text in which ἐρχόμενος and ὁ δίκαιος occur in close proximity:

³ διότι ἔτι ὄρασις εἰς καιρὸν καὶ ἀνατελεῖ εἰς πέρας καὶ οὐκ εἰς κενόν·
ἐὰν ὑστερήσῃ ὑπόμεινον αὐτόν ὅτι ἐρχόμενος ἥξει καὶ οὐ μὴ χρονίσῃ.
⁴ ἐὰν ὑποστείλῃται, οὐκ εὐδοκεῖ ἡ ψυχὴ μου ἐν αὐτῷ· ὁ δὲ δίκαιος ἐκ
πίστεως μου ζήσεται.

²⁵ Another factor is probably the (adverbial/periphrastic) use of ἐρχόμενος in conjunction with the “son of man” expression in Dan 7:13 LXX: καὶ ἰδοὺ μετὰ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ὡς υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ἐρχόμενος ἦν (cf. Mark 14:64).

²⁶ See Allison, *Jesus Tradition*, 194.

²⁷ See Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 104–5, 116.

³ Because there is still a vision for the appointed time; it will arise at the end and it will not be in vain; if it should come late, wait for it, because it will surely come and it will not delay.

⁴ If he should draw back in fear, my soul would not be pleased with him; but the righteous one will live by my faithfulness.

Several aspects of Hab 2:3 LXX recommend the text as a parallel to Q 13:35b: the reference to a timely vision (ἔτι ὁρασις εἰς καιρὸν, reversed in Q 13:35b's negative use of ὁράω for the disappearance of Jesus), the use of ἐρχόμενος, and the use of ἥξει in close proximity to οὐ μὴ with the aorist subjunctive for an emphatic negative future (οὐ μὴ χρονίση). It should also be noted that ἐπισυνάγω occurs in both Q 13:34 (ἐπισυνάξει) and in Hab 2:5 LXX (ἐπισυνάξει ἐπ' αὐτὸν πάντα τὰ ἔθνη).

While the original referent of ἐρχόμενος in Hab 2:3 seems to have been a coming vision (as opposed to a coming figure), later uses of the text take it to refer to the "Coming One" (see Heb 10:37-38²⁸; Acts 7:52²⁹). Richard Hays has suggested that "Stephen's reference to the *eleusis* of the Righteous One [in Acts 7:52] may echo a well-established tradition of reading Hab 2:3-4 as a messianic prophecy."³⁰ Both August Strobel and Hays supposed that Hab 2:3 is the source of the use of ἐρχόμενος in Q 7:19, though neither had much to say about its use in the context of Q 13:35b.³¹ However, Hays thought that "once *ho erchomenos* came to be understood

²⁸ The author of Hebrews added the definite article: ἐρχόμενος ἥξει καὶ οὐ μὴ χρονίση (Hab 2:3); ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἥξει καὶ οὐ μὴ χρονίση (Heb 10:37).

²⁹ This latter text, which uses the title δίκαιος for the unjustly killed Jesus, at least alludes to Hab 2:3-4, since both texts could be taken to refer to the "coming" of a "righteous one" (Hab 2:3-4: ἐρχόμενος ... δίκαιος; Acts 7:52: περὶ τῆς ἐλευσεως τοῦ δικαίου ...). For more on Acts 7, see pp. 317-23 below, on Stephen's vision of the exalted Son of man.

³⁰ R. B. Hays, "'The Righteous One' as Eschatological Deliverer: A Case Study in Paul's Apocalyptic Hermeneutics," in *Apocalyptic and the New Testament: Essays in Honor of J. Louis Martyn* (ed. J. Marcus and M. L. Soards; JSNTSup 24; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989), quotation from 195. See also A. Strobel, *Untersuchungen zum eschatologischen Verzögerungsproblem: auf Grund der spätjüdisch-urchristlichen Geschichte von Habakuk 2,2ff* (NovTSup 2; Leiden/Köln: Brill, 1961), esp. 47-56; D.-A. Koch, "Der Text von Hab 2.4b in der Septuaginta und im Neuen Testament," *ZNW* 76 (1985): 68-85, esp. 73 n. 25.

³¹ Strobel, *Verzögerungsproblem*, 265-77; Hays, "'Righteous One'," 196.

as a messianic title, a midrashic link between the Psalm text and Hab 2:3 would have been in any case virtually inevitable.”³²

Hab 2:3-4 was an important text in early Christian literature, especially in the writings of Paul, but other sources, as is well known, use similar language to that of Hab 2:3-4 in their descriptions of exalted figures.³³ Most striking, of course, are Wisdom 2-5, where the “righteous one” experiences post-mortem exaltation, and the *Similitudes of Enoch*, where the Chosen One (“that Son of man”) also goes by the designation Righteous One.³⁴ Both these figures (as it turns out) experience assumption and subsequent exaltation. Importantly, in the passage where it becomes clear that the assumed Enoch has been identified as or with “that Son of man,” it is that figure’s righteousness which is emphasized: as the angel tells Enoch, “You, Son of man, who art born in righteousness and upon whom righteousness has dwelt, the righteousness of the Antecedent of Time will not forsake you” (*I En.* 71:14).³⁵ It would be tempting to suggest that it was on the basis of exegetical connections such as those presupposed in Wisdom 2-5 and the *Similitudes of Enoch*—particularly because both these texts deal with the assumption and exaltation of their principal figures—that Ps 117:26 LXX, interpreted as referring to an eschatological figure, presented itself as an apt description of the future appearance of the assumed Jesus. Unfortunately, several key pieces of the puzzle are missing: neither the Book of

³² Hays, “‘Righteous One’,” 213 n. 15.

³³ Ibid., 193-206 (non-Pauline texts); 206-11 (Paul).

³⁴ The connection with Hab 2:3-4 is clearest in *I En.* 39:6, where the figure is called “the Elect One of righteousness and of faith.”

³⁵ In addition, see *I En.* 46:3 and especially 71:16-17, where it is stressed that those who follow the path of the Son of man (now Enoch) are “the righteous.”

Wisdom nor the *Similitudes of Enoch* refer to the “coming” of the Righteous One, and whereas ὁ ἐρχόμενος is an important title in Q, all language of righteousness is conspicuously absent.³⁶

A few final remarks may be made concerning the positive note struck by the use of Ps 117:26 LXX. As noted above in Chapter Two, many scholars have insisted that the acclamation of blessing will come “too late”³⁷ for the salvation of Jerusalem. Usually reference is made to texts such as *I En.* 62:3-14 where it is said that, in the judgment, the wicked will recognize the Elect One (62:3-5) and then (try to) bless “that Son of man” (vv. 6,9) but will instead be annihilated (vv. 10-14).³⁸ However, the positive tone of the acclamation makes it more likely that Q 13:35b does not refer to an inevitable condemnation for Jerusalem at the judgment of the Coming One. In addition, a number of Q texts seem designed to elicit repentance; probably the most significant is Q 3:17, where the Coming One comes to separate the wheat from the chaff. At least the possibility would still exist that those to whom the saying was directed could align themselves with “the wheat.” Therefore, it seems likely that, as with other deuteronomic materials, the themes of rejected prophetic appeals and threatened judgment in the Jerusalem saying were meant to elicit a positive response of repentance and acceptance of the Q message—although it is also possible that the saying’s primary use in Q was to console the community with the hope that those who rejected their appeals would be dealt with severely at the judgment.

³⁶ With the exception of ἐδικαιώθη (Q 7:35). Matthew uses δικαίος in the context of the Woes (Q 11:44,47,50,51) and other Q material (Matt 5:45 [cf. Q 6:35]; Q 10:24); Luke uses the adjective twice in Q contexts (Luke 12:57; 15:7). The most significant uses are in the Wisdom saying, where Matthew’s version emphasizes the innocence of the murdered righteous (Q 11:50-51)—but the fact that Luke does not suggests that the adjective was not present in Q, particularly because Luke seems to have no aversion to the use of *for the murdered innocent* (see Luke 23:47; Acts 3:14-15; 7:52).

³⁷ So Manson, *Sayings*, 128; Steck, *Israel*, 237; Hoffmann, *Studien*, 178; Schulz, *Spruchquelle*, 358-9 (strenuously); Polag, *Christologie*, 94; Garland, *Intention*, 207 (in Matthew, at least); Zeller, “Entrückung,” 517.

³⁸ See, for instance, Hoffmann, *Studien*, 177-8; Zeller refers to *I En.* 48:5, where however it is the Lord of the Spirits (and not the Elect One/Son of man) who is blessed and praised by all human beings (“Entrückung,” 517).

4.4.4. Implications

At this point we may make some observations about the immediate implications of seeing assumption theology as the means of Jesus' post-mortem vindication in Q 13:35b.

4.4.4.1. The Structure of the Jerusalem Lament

The first observation concerns how the whole of verse 35b—as signalled by the introductory λέγω ὑμῖν—provides a reversal for the situations present in verses 34 and 35a. To be specific: verse 34 refers, albeit obliquely, to the rejection of Jesus in Jerusalem, and verse 35a, to the consequent abandonment of the “house,” signifying the withdrawal of divine protection. But verse 35b refers to the assumption of Jesus as the means of his vindication, and also hints—by means of the Ps 117:26 LXX citation, which can scarcely refer to an unqualified condemnation at the coming of the Son of man—at the possible restoration of Jerusalem (Israel) to divine favour. This first implication, because of the insight it provides into the relationship between Q 13:34-35a and 13:35b, is of great significance for our understanding of the tradition-history of the Jerusalem saying. This will be discussed in greater detail below.

4.4.4.2. The Deuteronomistic Framework in Q 13:34-35

The second implication arises out of the view that the acclamation of blessing signifies a possibility for the final repentance and restoration of Jerusalem, and has to do with the way assumption theology functions within the deuteronomistic framework of the saying. Zeller argued that the assumption language in verse 35b fits well with the deuteronomistic themes present in the rest of the Jerusalem saying. “Durch Entrückung bewahrt Gott nicht nur Menschen vor ihrer Ansteckung (Weish 4,11; syr Bar 48.29-30) und entzieht sie der endzeitlichen

Katastrophe (4 *Esr* 14,15).³⁹ By this Zeller meant that assumption, as an escape from death and preservation from harm, counterbalances the deuteronomistic ideas of prophetic murder and the final destruction of Jerusalem present in Q 13:34-35a.

However, if the reference to the Coming One is not understood as a prediction of unqualified condemnation for Jerusalem, the saying also fits very well within Steck's framework of the deuteronomistic "Prophetenaussage"—in fact, better than Steck himself thought. Steck, as is well known, discerned a seven-fold structure in the deuteronomistic statements about the prophets:

- A. The whole history of Israel is depicted as one of persistent disobedience.
- B. Therefore, God makes repeated appeals to Israel, through the prophets, in order to bring them to repentance.
- C. These appeals are met with persistent rejection, usually meaning the persecution or death of the prophets.
- D. Therefore, God has punished or will punish Israel.
- E. Now a new call for repentance is being offered.
- F1. A final restoration is expected for Israel.
- F2. The enemies of Israel and the unfaithful will be judged.⁴⁰

It is clear from Steck's discussion of the "Scheltwort," or scolding saying, that elements A, B, and C come together in 13:34.⁴¹ In addition, the desire of the speaker to gather together Jerusalem's children signifies that at one point in time, there was a call for repentance and a possibility of restoration (F1).⁴² The "Drohwort," or threatening saying (verse 35a), predicts the abandonment of Jerusalem and the imminent destruction of the city. According to Steck, neither element D nor E appear here: there is no recollection of God's past efforts to correct his people.

³⁹ Zeller, "Entrückung," 518.

⁴⁰ See Steck, *Israel, passim*. See also Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 105; Jacobson, *First Gospel*, 73. According to Steck, in the Jerusalem saying F2 appears "als definitives Gericht," that is, of Jerusalem's children (*Israel*, 236).

⁴¹ Steck, *Israel*, 232-3.

⁴² *Ibid.*, 233.

nor any present call for repentance. Instead, verse 35 as a whole expresses element F2, the definitive and final judgment of Israel.⁴³

However, on our reading of Q 13:34-35, there is a greater conformity to the deuteronomic framework, as the following table shows.

Table 4C: The Deuteronomic Structure of Q 13:34-35

A: disobedience	- ἡ ἀποκτείνουσα τοὺς προφῆτας καὶ λιθοβολοῦσα τοὺς ἀποσταλμένους - ποσάκις ἠθέλησα ... καὶ οὐκ ἠθελήσατε
B: prophetic appeals	- τοὺς προφῆτας καὶ ... τοὺς ἀποσταλμένους - ποσάκις ἠθέλησα
C: rejected appeals	- ποσάκις ἠθέλησα ... καὶ οὐκ ἠθελήσατε
D: punishment	- ἰδοὺ ἀφίεται ὁ οἶκος ὑμῶν - οὐ μὴ ἴδητέ με ἕως κτλ
E: call for repentance	- implicit in the use of the saying in the Q <i>Sitz im Leben</i>
F1: restoration?	- εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου
F2: final judgment?	- εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου

Up until Element D, this structure is basically the same as Steck's appraisal. The punishment for Jerusalem's persistent rejection of the appeals of God, both through history and in Jesus, the emissary of Wisdom *par excellence*, is the abandonment of the city to destruction and the disappearance of Jesus from their midst. Yet because verse 35b represents a wholesale reversal of the situation in verse 34 and 35a, as argued above, the appearance of the Coming One—and the acclamation of blessing—means that both Elements F1 and F2 (restoration and judgment) are implied in the temporal/conditional clause. Element E, the present call for repentance, is implicit

⁴³ Ibid., 235-6.

in the fact that the saying is being used in Q (or in the Q preaching), presumably in order to provoke repentance while there is still time.⁴⁴

4.4.4.3. The Christology of Q

The third and final implication has to do with the Christology of Q. It was argued above that Q 13:34-35, with Jesus as its speaker in Q, presents an advanced Wisdom Christology along the same lines as Q 10:21-22. It also appears that the Jerusalem Lament is the high point of Q's deuteronomistic theology, since it understands Jerusalem's rejection of Jesus as the culminating instance of impenitence, whose result is the abandonment of Jerusalem to destruction. However, it also appears that Q 13:35b makes use of assumption theology—on the basis of the typical association between assumption and eschatological function—in order to assimilate the Wisdom Christology prominent in the Lament (and elsewhere in Q) to the Son of man Christology also prominent in Q. To find all these themes coming together in one saying—fairly seamlessly, it might be added—is remarkable.

But what does the presence of assumption theology tell us about the origin of Q's christological expression? The fact that other sources show evidence of the subsequent application of assumption theology to figures who were expected to have a special heavenly or eschatological status indicates that the same may have happened in Q. In other words, it could be that assumption theology "arrived" in Q subsequent to the belief in Jesus as the Coming Son of man, so that assumption theology is the means whereby this belief is expressed or legitimated.

⁴⁴ Allison also has seen all seven deuteronomistic elements present in Q (*Jesus Tradition*, 203 n. 53). In particular, Allison believes Q to contain the one deuteronomistic element that Jacobson (*First Gospel*, 73) thought was lacking: "If Israel repents, Yahweh will restore her, gathering those scattered among the nations." Allison reads Q 13:29, 28 as referring to the return of diaspora Jews and 13:35b as referring to Israel's repentance as the precondition for the Parousia (*Jesus Tradition*, 203).

To a certain extent, however, a definitive answer to the question of the original christological impetus in Q is attendant upon other issues, most particularly that of the document's redaction or composition history.

To be sure, the presence of assumption theology as an alternative (using that term advisedly) mode of post-mortem vindication means that "Easter" *per se*—as an originating experience or expression of resurrection theology—is not to be regarded as the formative christological moment for Q. This corroborates the view, argued above, that there are no grounds for assuming that resurrection is the theological impetus for Q's belief in an exalted or returning Jesus. On the other hand, the possibility that assumption theology is being used as a means of expressing or legitimating the belief in Jesus as the Coming Son of man—as noted above, maybe even arriving in Q subsequent to that belief—does not allow much to be said about the kind of formative experience or expression the Q community had. On the other hand, if some formative christological expression is to be imagined, assumption theology is at least a prime candidate.

The use of assumption theology in the Jerusalem Lament indicates the level of theological creativity the Q community was engaged in. With reference to the deuteronomistic tradition, the rejection of Jesus (and the community's proclamation) was given theological expression (Q 6:23c; 11:49-51; 13:34-35), and the prophetic power of Q's repentance preaching was heightened. Working in another direction, Q also elevated Jesus' status from that of Wisdom's emissary to the point where he speaks, as (or on behalf of) Sophia, as the mediator of revelation (Q 10:21-22) and as the origin of prophetic appeals (13:34-35). Finally, Q forged a correlation between the community's soteriological hope in Jesus' words and deeds as the locus of the kingdom (Q 6:46-49; 11:20) and their eschatological hope in his return as the Coming One (Q 3:16-17; 13:34-35) who would, as the Son of man, execute judgment on the basis of faithful

allegiance to Jesus (Q 12:8-10, 39-40, 42-46). All these christological streams converge in Q 13:34-35 and find expression by means of assumption theology: the rejected and crucified Jesus is vindicated by assumption as a sign of divine favour, and Wisdom's departure is depicted as the removal, and preservation for a future role, of Jesus the Coming One.

Excursus: The Post-Mortem Assumption of Jesus and Body-Soul Dualism in Q

It seems fairly clear from Q 12:4-5 that Q has a typically Hellenistic body-soul anthropology: this text distinguishes between those who are able only to kill the body and God who is able to destroy both soul and body in Gehenna.

καὶ μὴ φοβεῖσθε ἀπὸ τῶν ἀποκτε[[ν]]όντων τὸ σῶμα, τὴν δὲ ψυχὴν μὴ
δυναμένων ἀποκτεῖναι· φοβεῖσθε δὲ .. τὸν δυνάμενον καὶ ψυχὴν καὶ σῶμα
ἀπολέσαι ἐν τ<ῇ> γεέννῃ.

And do not be afraid of those who kill the body, but cannot kill the soul. But fear .. the one who is able to destroy both the soul and body in Gehenna.⁴⁵

Though Q 12:5 suggests a destruction of both body and soul in Gehenna, it is clear from verse 4 that death is understood as a separation of body and soul, since it presumes an ongoing life for the soul after the death of the body.

In some of the sources investigated in Chapter Three above, problems arose when death, viewed in this way, was followed by the disappearance of the corpse. As seen above, Antoninus Liberalis normally seems to think that it is the body of the metamorphosized person that experiences the change, even after death; but in one of his *Metamorphoses* at least, he thought that bodies and souls could share different fates in such situations. The bodies of the massacred Dorians disappeared, but their souls were changed into birds (Ant. Lib., *Metam.* 37.5). A similarly odd scenario was also seen in some of the narratives of Mary's assumption: some texts described both the ascent of Mary's soul and the subsequent assumption of her body, which led to the necessity of reuniting soul and body in heaven (for instance, Vat. Gr. 1982).

⁴⁵ Robinson, et al., *Critical Edition*, 296-9. The preference of Matthew's wording, which alone retains the references to the soul (Matt 10:28), is generally accepted. See Schulz, *Spruchquelle*, 157-8; Piper, *Wisdom*, 52-3 and 221 n. 209; Tuckett, *Q*, 315.

However, such difficulties are not encountered in some sources that use assumption language for dead people, because assumption in those cases was not understood realistically as the removal of the body. The Greco-Roman consolation materials, for instance, were able to use assumption language almost euphemistically for early death; the traditional association of assumption with a divine agent allowed the grieving to use such language in order to blame the deity or entity thought responsible. As Anne-Marie Vérilhac commented, “La mort prématurée est un rapt.”⁴⁶ It is difficult to guess precisely how assumption language is used in Wis 4:10-11. There is an emphasis on the immortality of the soul (3:1-4), and because the bodies of the ungodly suffer dishonour (4:19), the post-mortem encounter in Wisdom 5 cannot be a bodily experience for them. There is no reason to think otherwise with the righteous man, despite the “standing” language in Wis 5:1 (τότε στήσεται ἐν παρρησίᾳ πολλῇ ὁ δίκαιος ...). Therefore our conclusion above would appear to be confirmed, that here early death is equated with the divine blessing of assumption; this is a possibility at least because assumption is alluded to rather than narrated.

This brings us to an admittedly conjectural problem concerning Q: how would Q have understood Jesus’ assumption? At one level at least it is no problem at all, because Q makes no attempt to narrativize its assumption theology. For Q, the most important aspects of assumption theology are those spelled out above—divine favour, heavenly exaltation, and eschatological function—and the fate of the body of Jesus is entirely beside the point. This would put Q’s use of assumption theology somewhere in the neighbourhood of the ideas seen in the consolation materials and in the Wisdom of Solomon.

⁴⁶ Vérilhac, *ΠΑΙΔΕΣ ΑΩΡΟΙ*, 2.173.

However, “I tell you, you will not see me” seems to be a vivid expression that suggests more than a euphemistic meaning. Additionally, there may be evidence that a belief in the assumption or disappearance of Jesus had come to narrative expression in other early Christian writings. This will be discussed in Chapter Six below. If Q’s understanding of the assumption of Jesus was not euphemistic, there is no reason to think that it would have sought to account for the fate of Jesus’ soul at the point of death. This, after all, is what led to the awkwardness perceived in some of the Mary traditions and in Antoninus’ description of the metamorphosis of the Dorians; but some of the writings examined in Chapter Three seemed able to allow death and assumption to coexist without questioning the anthropological details (for instance, Chariton, *Chaer.* 3.3; Plutarch, *Rom.* 28.6 and *Ant. Lib., Metam.* 33.3–4; *T. Job* 39:8–40:3; *Prot. Jas.* 23:1–9). It seems best to conjecture that Q would have thought of Jesus’ post-mortem assumption in a similar way, thinking realistically of a millenium-old religious motif without letting contemporary anthropology get in the way.

4.5: Tradition-historical Observations

The view that Q 13:34-35 was originally a Jewish judgment saying taken up by Q had its origins, as we have seen, in the supposition that as the conclusion of the Wisdom saying (Q 11:49-51) it too was a quotation from an apocryphal wisdom text. Bultmann took this view over from his predecessors; and Steck, who insisted upon a pre-70 (but post-Q!) setting for the Jerusalem Lament, had no other recourse for the saying's origin than to Jewish tradition. While it would be impossible to supply categorical proof against a pre-Q, Jewish origin for the saying, if we are correct about the significance of the various elements of the Jerusalem saying, the following points become clear.

First, verse 35a—"Behold, your house is forsaken"—probably reflects a setting when the removal of divine protection seemed likely: before the First Revolt, although the necessary political conditions for such a view were present earlier than that. On the other hand, verse 35b also must reflect a setting in which it still seemed that the destruction of Jerusalem could be avoided, if Jerusalem repented before the Coming One came. This arises from the necessity that the Psalm 118 citation be interpreted with at least the potential of a positive outcome for Jerusalem (since the temporal clause reads, "until *you* say ...").¹

Such an observation allows an evaluation of the view that verse 35b is either a Christian addition to a Jewish, pre-Q Lament saying, or an addition by the Q redactor. Taking the latter possibility as the more likely of the two, it seems that if Q13:35b is a redactional addition, the

¹ As might be guessed, Q 13:34-35 is a decisive text for the dating of Q, but the conditions that the Jerusalem Lament suggests are not agreed upon. Some recent discussions include: Hoffmann, "Redaction of Q," 191 (dating Q 13:34-35 during or towards the end of the First Revolt); Myllykoski, "Social History," 198 (just after 70); Tuckett, *Q*, 362 ("some time before the Jewish revolt"); Kloppenborg, *Excavating Q*, 80-7 (during Q's second redaction, late 50s or early 60s); Zeller, "Zukunft Israels," 6 (the beginning of the War).

settings of the addition and the saying to which it has been appended are almost indistinguishable. In fact, seeing verse 35b as a redactional addition requires understanding λέγω ὑμῖν as “unnecessary” and “introductory,” the result of a redactional seam, particularly if Jesus is, as we have argued, the speaker throughout the saying.² While we have deliberately avoided the question of the relationship of the λέγω ὑμῖν formula to the redaction of Q, our examination of the formula’s contextual function has led to the conclusion that a purely “introductory” use of λέγω ὑμῖν in Q is much more rare than the uses we have termed “adversative” and “coordinating.”

Second, it has been argued above that Q 13:34-35 on two counts shows a relatively unified structure: first, because verse 35b contains a parallel reversal of the situation in 13:34-35a; and second, because of its overall consistency with the framework of the deuteronomistic statements about the prophets. If these observations are apt, it appears that if 13:35b were a redactional addition, it would have the effect of reorienting the first part of the Jerusalem saying (13:34-35a), but in a practically seamless way. All this suggests that the saying was a unified composition. To take this point one step further, it could be added that since Jerusalem is not usually given as a perpetrator in deuteronomistic materials, “Jerusalem” per se may have been suggested by the specific case of Jesus, the rejected envoy of Wisdom *par excellence*, to whose case were applied themes and allusions drawn from the one text where Jerusalem is singled out as perpetrator—2 Chron 24:17-24.³ This text has, as Robinson has noted, numerous other affinities with Q 13:34-35. All this points to a Q composition for the saying, with the primary

² So Tuckett, *Q*, 175.

³ “And wrath came upon Judah and Jerusalem for this guilt of theirs” (v. 18); “They [the army of Aram] came to Judah and Jerusalem, and destroyed all the officials of the people from among them ...” (v. 23).

purpose of (1) expressing a belief in Jesus' post-mortem vindication as the reversal of his rejection by Jerusalem, but also with the secondary purposes of (2) announcing the coming judgment on those who rejected Jesus, and (3) eliciting a response of repentance in view of the hastening end.

This leads to a third point, one already argued above. If it is correct that assumption theology supplies the "logic" of Jesus' post-mortem vindication and exaltation—as the theologization of the belief in him as the coming Son of man—, it seems possible that assumption theology may have arrived in Q subsequent to the Son of man belief. To put it differently, it is possible that assumption theology is the legitimization of the conviction about Jesus' post-mortem exaltation and future return as judge, rather than the origin of such a belief. The parallels from later apocalyptic literature confirm that assumption could be credited to figures who on other grounds were already being expected as eschatological figures, in order both to elevate such figures and to account (in retrospect) for the origin of belief in their special eschatological status. It does not seem out of the question, given the preponderance of Son of man material in Q (and the relative dearth of assumption theology), that this is what has happened in Q 13:34-35. On this basis, then, it could be concluded that Q 13:34-35 as a whole was a relatively late composition by the Q redactor. That being said, however, it remains to be seen to what extent assumption theology or its implications are present elsewhere in Q.

Chapter Five: Implications of an Assumption Christology in Q

The observation that Q 13:35b alludes to the assumption of Jesus has broader implications for the study of Q. In this chapter, four issues will be investigated. First, if Q shows evidence in a belief in Jesus' assumption, then the possibility arises that Q materials which describe an absent and returning master, or an invisible and suddenly appearing Son of man, could be understood in relationship to the assumption of Jesus. Second, some Q texts appear to presume an exalted post-mortem Jesus, and others suggest that heavenly or eschatological vindication for the community is received as a reward for earthly allegiance to Jesus. These views invite a comparison between the post-mortem Jesus in Q and other exalted figures in ancient Judaism, particularly because such figures appear to have represented in their exalted state the future blessedness of the communities that identified with them.¹ Third, in Q Jesus both refers to a reception of divine revelation (Q 10:21-22) and shows evidence of foreknowledge of his assumption (Q 13:35b). In certain apocalyptic texts, such as *1 Enoch*, *4 Ezra*, *2 Baruch*, and *2 Enoch*, God reveals to the seer that he will be taken up into heaven, and that in the time remaining to him on earth he should instruct the people of God.² Certain formal and thematic similarities with Q will be discussed. Finally, the fourth section will investigate Zeller's suggestion that the Sign of Jonah saying (Q 11:29-30) may be re-interpreted in light of the assumption belief in Q.³

¹ See Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination*, 106.

² See Lohfink, *Himmelfahrt Jesu*, 60-1.

³ Zeller, "Entrückung," 519-27.

5.1: Absence, Invisibility, and Return in Q

In a 1976 essay Crossan suggested that Mark created the “Empty Tomb” tradition (Mark 16:1-8) in opposition to the “Apparition tradition” (which appeared as a credal statement in 1 Cor 15:3-7, and as credal stories in the narratives of the canonical Gospels).¹ Crossan used the phrase “Absent Lord” to express the idea that according to Mark 16:1-8, “on earth there are no apparitions but only the harsh negative of the [Empty Tomb] and the Lord who ‘is not here.’”² More recently, Uro has argued that “Jesus’ withdrawal [in Q 13:34-35] may represent a similar ‘absent Jesus’ theology as that found in the Empty Tomb story known to Mark.”³ and thus raises the possibility of a comparison between Q and Mark on the issue of Jesus’ post-mortem fate. This possibility will be discussed in Chapter Six below. For the present, however, our inquiry will be confined to those texts in Q which are suggestive of an absent master, or an unseen or absent Son of man, particularly because they may be interpreted in light of the assumption of Jesus. In Q, an assumption-related absence is not so much the “harsh negative” which Crossan saw in Mark as a necessary implication of Jesus’ post-mortem presence elsewhere until the time of his eschatological role. Thus, it will become apparent that the materials in Q that display themes like absence or invisibility have to do with the coming of the Son of man.

¹ J. D. Crossan, “Empty Tomb and Absent Lord (Mark 16:1-8),” in *The Passion in Mark: Studies on Mark 14-16* (ed. W. H. Kelber; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1976), 135-52, esp. 152. Crossan calls the Empty Tomb an “anti-tradition.”

² *Ibid.*, 152.

³ “Jeesuksen vetäytyminen voi edellyttää samanlaisen ‘poissaolevan Jeesuksen’ teologian kuin Markuksen tuntema kertomus tyhjästä haudasta” (Uro, “Jeesus-liike ja ylösnousemus,” 111). In this essay Uro suggests that Q 13:35b expresses something like the withdrawal of Wisdom. In a later essay, he seems to follow Zeller in allowing for the possibility that it expresses something more like assumption as an “exaltation tradition” (“Apocalyptic Symbolism,” 111 n. 127).

It has been argued above that Q made use of assumption theology in order to express a belief in Jesus' post-mortem vindication, and to provide the theological rationale for a belief in his return as the Son of man. As already noted, Q 13:35b, as an assumption prediction, suggests a scenario of disappearance—absence—return: "I tell you, you will not see me until [the time] comes when you say, 'Blessed is the Coming One in the name of the Lord!'" Other texts in Q, which use the image of an absent and then returning master (Q 12:42-46 and Q 19:12-13,15-24,26), or which refer to the invisibility and sudden appearance of the Son of man (Q 12:39-40, Q? 17:22, and Q 17:23-24), may be re-examined in light of this result. Either absence or invisibility suggests a removal, a becoming absent, one way or another. The fact that both these sets of texts describe an expected coming or appearance of the master or the Son of man, after a period of absence, suggests that the twofold belief in assumption and parousia may be lurking in the background. Such texts may be considered circumstantial evidence for a belief in the assumption and Parousia of Jesus the Son of man.

5.1.1. The Absent and Returning Master

Two Q parables use the imagery of an absent and returning master: the Parable of the Faithful and Unfaithful Slaves (Q 12:42-46), and the Parable of the Entrusted Money (Q 19:12-13,15-24,26). Aside from the differences between Luke 12:42 and Matt 24:45,⁴ the former parable's reconstruction is not problematic. On the other hand, as Kloppenborg notes, "the substantial disagreements between Matthew and Luke [in Q 19], as well as the somewhat

⁴ See Robinson, et al., *Critical Edition*, 366-7.

different narrative lines, account for serious source critical disputes.”⁵ Because of these difficulties, Q 12:42-46 will be the more important text to be examined here. That said, there is no substantial disagreement between Matthew and Luke with respect to the master’s departure and return in Q 19, despite the different vocabulary used. It will be assumed that Q 19 contained a parable which made use of the theme of an absent and returning master, but the examination of the Parable of the Entrusted Money will be limited here to more general observations and to contextual considerations.

In Q 12:42-46, there is no direct reference to the departure of the master (ὁ κύριος),⁶ but his absence is clear, for he appoints (καθίστημι, 12:42; also v. 44) beforehand one of his slaves to feed the household in a timely fashion (12:42). Furthermore, the fact that the master’s coming is referred to in the following verses (12:43.45.46) makes it clear that he has been absent. During that absence, the behaviour of the appointed slave during the delay is the focal point: either it will establish him as blessed (μακάριος, 12:43) and deserving of greater responsibility (12:44), or it will prove him faithless (τὸ μέρος αὐτοῦ μετὰ τῶν ἀπίστων) and deserving of a gruesome punishment (διχοτομήσει αὐτόν, 12:46). Judgment is rendered at the master’s coming (12:43,46).

The vocabulary of the coming of the master is strikingly similar to that of the coming of the Son of man or the Coming One elsewhere in Q. In particular, there are important echoes with the language used in Q 13:35b for the post-assumption return of the Coming One, as argued

⁵ Kloppenborg, *Q Parallels*, 200. Some have doubted its presence in Q, including Harnack, *Sayings of Jesus*, 122-6; Manson, *Sayings*, 245; P. Vassiliadis, “The Nature and Extent of the Q Document,” *NovT* 20 (1978): 49-73, esp. 69; Jacobson, *First Gospel*, 244.

⁶ κύριος occurs four times in this parable.

above. Q 12:42-46 uses both ἔρχομαι (12:43, ἐλθὼν ὁ κύριος αὐτοῦ⁷) and ἦκω (ἦξει ὁ κύριος τοῦ δούλου ἐκείνου, 12:46) to describe the coming of the master. It is not remarkable, of course, that Q uses ἔρχομαι for the master's return, but two observations may be made with respect to its use elsewhere in Q. First, as argued above, the pivotal text Q 13:35b uses ὁ ἐρχόμενος as the title of Jesus who returns after a period of absence that begins with assumption. Second, in the preceding pericope, the coming of the Son of man is likened to the coming of a thief (ὁ κλέπτης ἔρχεται, Q 12:39; ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἔρχεται, 12:40), emphasizing unexpectedness. Clearly Q 12:42-46 functions as an interpretive addition to 12:39-40, and the master of the parable should be identified with the Son of man of verse 40.⁸ If this is correct, it must be pointed out that, on Kloppenborg's construal of the composition of Q at least, this parable about an absent master was composed as part of the same redactional stratum as Q 13:34-35.⁹

It is also striking that the verb ἦκω appears here. It is used three times in Q, in the future tense all three times: Q 12:46, 13:29, and 13:35b.¹⁰ Here in 12:46, the future verb refers to the coming of the master to find the unfaithful slave. In Q 13:29-28, "many will come (ἔξουσιν) from east and west and recline with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob in the kingdom of God." Q

⁷ Luke 12:45 adds the complementary infinitive ἔρχεσθαι to clarify that it is the master's coming which is delayed: χρονίζει ὁ κύριός μου ἔρχεσθαι (Luke 12:45). Similar additions, but with the aorist infinitive ἐλθεῖν, may be found in variant readings of Matt 24:48 (ὁ κύριός μου ἐλθεῖν, W 0133 ™ f^{(1), 13} latt sy mae bo^{ms}: μου ὁ κύριος ἐλθεῖν, C D L Θ 067 1010 1424 *al*).

⁸ See Kloppenborg, "Jesus and the Parables of Jesus in Q," in *The Gospel Behind the Gospels: Current Studies on Q* (ed. R. Piper; NovTSup 75; Leiden: Brill, 1995), 275-319; here, 293-4.

⁹ Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 150-1, 229. See also D. C. Allison, Jr., *The Intertextual Jesus: Scripture in Q* (Harrisburg, Penn.: Trinity Press International, 2000), 87-92 for the view that Q 12:42-46 is dependent upon the story of Joseph in Genesis 39.

¹⁰ The *Critical Edition of Q* gives the following reading for Q 13:35b: οὐ μὴ ἴδῃτέ με ἕως [ἦξει ὅτε] εἴπητε (Robinson et al., *Critical Edition*, 422). The double brackets signify a reconstruction at {C}. The reconstruction of Q 13:34-35 given in Chapter Four above included the words ἦξει ὅτε.

13:35b reads, “I tell you, you will not see me until [the time] will come (ἔξει) when you say, ‘Blessed is the Coming One in the name of the Lord!’” Although the verb ἔκω appears relatively infrequently in Q, its use is consistently limited to references to the eschatological future. The expression “*eschatological future*” seems to apply equally to Q 12:46. For the preceding context (Q 12:39-40) refers to the unexpected coming of the Son of man;¹¹ furthermore, within the confines of the parable itself, the coming of the master represents both judgment and the dispensation of reward or punishment appropriate to the behaviour of the slave (12:43,46). The eschatological significance of the parable is quite clear.¹²

The Parable of the Entrusted Money (Q 19:12-13,15-24,26) deals with similar themes. Although in Q 19 the differences between Matthew and Luke make a detailed study of the Q parable impossible,¹³ a few observations may be made. A certain person, called “Master” later in the parable by the slaves (Q 19:16,18,20; also v. 15), goes away on a journey,¹⁴ and calling his slaves entrusts money to them (19:12-13). After a prolonged absence—which is not as decisive an issue as in Q 12:42-46—he returns and settles accounts with them (19:15).¹⁵ As the accounts are settled, the slaves are either rewarded (19:17,19) or castigated (19:22-24) for how they handled the responsibility.

As with Q 12:42-46, the context makes the eschatological significance of the parable clear. The Q 19 parable comes between the material in Q 17 about the coming of the Son of man

¹¹ See Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 150.

¹² In Uro’s opinion, this interpretation is “inescapable” (Uro, “Apocalyptic Symbolism,” 94).

¹³ See Robinson et al., *Critical Edition*, 524-57.

¹⁴ The *Critical Edition* reconstructs 19:12 as follows, adopting the wording of Matt 25:14a: .. ἄνθρωπος τις ἀποδημῶν (ibid., 524).

¹⁵ The *Critical Edition* adopts the wording of Matt 25:19: .. [μετά] .. [πολὺν χρόνον] ἔρχεται ὁ κύριος τῶν δούλων ἐκείνων καὶ συναίρει λόγον μετ’ αὐτῶν (ibid., 532).

and the promise in Q 22:28,30 that Jesus' followers would be assigned the task of "judging the twelve tribes." The material in Q 17 on the day of the Son of man, which will be discussed in somewhat more detail below, has in view a sudden appearance of the Son of man after a time of invisibility or absence (Q 17:23-24,37b,26-30,34-35). The coming of the Son of man is a time of "eschatological separation" (17:34-35),¹⁶ just as the coming of the master in the Parable of the Entrusted Money is a time of the settling of accounts and the dispensation of reward or chastisement to either the good (ἀγαθός, Q 19:17,19?) or the wicked (πονηρός, 19:22) slaves.

In Luke's version of the parable, the master (who goes away in order to receive a kingdom, Luke 19:12.15) puts in charge of cities the slaves who did well with the money (vv. 17,19); in Matthew's version, the master gives them more responsibility (ἐπὶ πολλῶν σε καταστήσω, Matt 24:21.23). Either way,¹⁷ the reward for faithfulness to the absent master is the same as in Q 12:44, and this is particularly significant in light of the following pericope on Judging the Twelve Tribes of Israel. The fact that those who follow Jesus are granted the authority to sit on thrones and judge the twelve tribes adds further eschatological weight to the reward theme in Q 19.¹⁸ So again, as with Q 12:42-46, this parable evokes the idea of the absence and return—in order to dispense judgment, reward, and punishment—of the Son of man.

¹⁶ Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 163 (with literature, n. 274).

¹⁷ The *Critical Edition* opts for Matthew's wording here: ἐπὶ πολλῶν σε καταστήσω, Q 19:17,19 (Robinson et al., *Critical Edition*, 536, 540).

¹⁸ See Kirk, *Composition*, 297-8.

5.1.2. The Suddenly Appearing Son of Man

Q 12:39-40 likens the coming of the Son of man to the arrival of a thief to break into a house. As Heinz Schürmann noted, “the discrepancy between the metaphor, which portrays a calamitous event, and its application to the coming Son of Man probably points to a secondary expansion.”¹⁹ It is also likely, as Schürmann went on to suggest, that “the composition in Q 12:35-40 continued to grow secondarily” through the addition of 12:42-46.²⁰ As argued above, this puts 12:42-46—a parable which, by means of its contextual placement, likens the coming of the Son of man to the return of an absent master to administer judgment—in the same redactional vicinity as Q 13:34-35, which predicts the absence of Jesus.

Despite the probable redaction history of Q 12:39-40, there still appears to be a way to read this unit in such a way as to have verse 40 a reasonable interpretation of verse 39. Verse 39 states that one way to prevent a robbery (that is, the misfortune of an unforeseen break-in) is for the householder to know the time at which the robber will come. It seems to be implied here, additionally, that a second way to prevent a robbery is not to leave the house unguarded (οὐκ ἂν εἴασεν διορυχθῆναι τὸν οἶκον.²¹ 12:39)—that is, to stay home and stay watchful at all times. Obviously, it is impossible to know the time of a thief’s coming. The interpretation of the parable (12:40) seizes upon this, and warns that because the time of the Son of man’s coming is unknowable, those expecting his coming should be ready (ἔτοιμοι) always. This also has

¹⁹ Schürmann, “Son of Man Title,” 87-8. See also Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 149, who argues that the two halves of the sayings demonstrate an inconsistency in logic: the parable advocates watchfulness in order to prevent a theft, while the interpretation suggests that the coming of the Son of man can be neither foreseen nor prevented. Cf. Schulz, *Spruchquelle*, 268; Lührmann, *Redaktion*, 70.

²⁰ Schürmann, “Son of Man Title,” 88.

²¹ Reconstructed according to Robinson, et al., *Critical Edition*, 360-1. Either εἴασεν (Matt 24:43) or ἀγῆκεν (Luke 12:39) could mean “leave alone” or “allow” the house to be dug into.

implications for the following parable (12:42-46): the choice is between being faithful always (that is, ready to be “found so doing”), or being unfaithful (and caught unawares). The wicked slave’s undoing was his presumption about the timing of the master’s return: had he known when the master would return, he would not have begun his misbehaviour (12:45). The admonitory point of both 12:39-40 and 12:42-46 is, “Since the time is unknowable, be ready at *all* times.” In any case, our interest in Q 12:39-40 has to do with the idea that the Son of man’s absence becomes presence at his coming.

The idea of the absence of the Son of man is clearer in Luke 17:22, a text that has sometimes been assigned to Q. Allison has suggested that the reference to the invisibility of Jesus in Q 13:35b “recalls Q 17:22, according to which people will long to see one of the days of the Son of man but will not see it. In both places the present is marked by the Son of man’s absence.”²² The “not-seeing” language is certainly similar: οὐ μὴ ἴδῃτέ με (13:35b); ἐπιθυμήσετε ... ἰδεῖν καὶ οὐκ ὄψεσθε (17:22). It would be tempting to find a parallel between these two texts, since both refer to a pre-parousia absence of the Coming One/ Son of man, and both use the “not-seeing” language typical of assumption reports.²³ However, there are insufficient grounds for assigning this verse, which appears only in Luke, to Q.²⁴ On the other hand, the idea of absence or invisibility is present also in Q material which follows in Luke (Q 17:23-24); perhaps this prompted Luke to make the addition here.

²² Allison, *Jesus Tradition*, 203.

²³ “Luke 17:22 ... could be a reminiscence of Q 13:35” (Uro, “Apocalyptic Symbolism,” 97 n. 83).

²⁴ Kloppenborg argues that “linguistic features, as well as the presence of the Lucan agenda of explaining that the contemporaries of Jesus will not witness the Parousia, identify Luke 17:22 as a Lucan addition” (*Formation*, 155). See also Schulz, *Spruchquelle*, 278 n. 90; Robinson, et al., *Critical Edition*, 500-01. Allison gives no rationale for his inclusion of Luke 17:22 in Q (*Jesus Tradition*, 203).

Q 17:23-24 warns against following false announcements of the coming of the Son of man.²⁵ In contrast with Q 12:39-40, which stresses that the Son of man's coming will be unforeseeable, these verses stress its sudden and public nature. Originally, verses 23 and 24 probably did not belong together, for the former refers to the problem of messianic pretenders and the latter to the problem of eschatological speculation concerning the Son of man.²⁶ Kloppenborg suggests that placing the two sayings together results in something like, "Do not attend to earthly messianic figures; the Son of man will come as a heavenly figure!"²⁷ However, as they stand together now in Q (γάρ, 17:24), the effect is that those who say "Behold" claim to have knowledge of the location of the Son of man (ἰδοὺ ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ ἐστίν, ... ἰδοὺ ἐν τοῖς ταμείοις,²⁸ 17:23). Those making such pronouncements will be mistaken, for the Son of man's coming will not take place imperceptibly:²⁹ it will happen "as the lightning streaks from the east and flashes as far as the west" (17:24). The implication of the prohibitions is that following after such pronouncements will be fruitless: the Son of man will not be there; he will still be absent. Those who know how the Son of man will appear will not be misled. Thus, Uro is correct that "Q 17:23 reflects the idea of the absence of Jesus," rather than the idea of false prophets.³⁰

²⁵ It is likely that Luke 17:20-21, on the presence of the kingdom, is not Q material. But if it is, the possibility arises that the indirect ἰδοὺ statements refer to the presence not of Son of man but of the kingdom. However, given the fact that the following correlative has to do with the Son of man, it seems best to take the false announcements as referring to that figure rather than the kingdom.

²⁶ Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 159-60.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, 161; emphasis original.

²⁸ The reconstruction is that of Robinson, et al., *Critical Edition*, 502-3.

²⁹ Schulz, *Spruchquelle*, 283; Piper, *Wisdom*, 141.

³⁰ Uro, "Apocalyptic Symbolism," 114 n. 134.

“Spatial rather than temporal language” dominates the description of the coming of the Son of man in Q 17:23-24.³¹ Q 17:37 (“Wherever the corpse is, there the vultures will gather”), which likely originally followed 17:23-24,³² also describes a visible sign of the Son of man’s coming. It has sometimes been suggested that a shift in emphasis occurs at this point in Q 17, “from geographical to temporal concerns,”³³ because of the theme of the suddenness of the Son of man’s appearance which dominates Q 17. Both the Noah saying (17:26-27) and the Lot saying (vv. 28-29)³⁴ emphasize the sudden intrusion of the Son of man’s coming into everyday life. A distinct shift between perspectives on the Son of man’s appearance does not seem to be present in Q 17, however. For although the idea of suddenness is not present in the “Behold” pronouncements in 17:23, it is certainly suggested by the lightning metaphor in 17:24, and the eschatological separation described in 17:34-35 has more to do with the decisive, even catastrophic, results of the Son of man’s coming than with its suddenness.

Nevertheless, the spatial aspects of these descriptions are of particular interest here, because the consequence of the sudden appearing of the Son of man is that onetime absence becomes presence, unexpectedly and undeniably. In Uro’s words, “It is obvious that both 13:35b and 17:23ff express the same conviction of the author. Jesus remains unseen until the day of his public manifestation.”³⁵ The theme of open revelation is also present in Q 12:2-3, which perhaps

³¹ Ibid., 114.

³² So Robinson, et al., *Critical Edition*, 508-13; for literature, see Kloppenborg, *Q Parallels*, 194.

³³ So Tuckett, *Q*, 159; see also Catchpole, *Quest.*, 254; Piper, *Wisdom*, 141; Uro, “Apocalyptic Symbolism,” 114.

³⁴ This could be Q material: see the discussion in Kloppenborg, *Q Parallels*, 192-4; see also Catchpole, *Quest.*, 248; Tuckett, *Q*, 159. The *Critical Edition* is undecided (Robinson, et al., *Critical Edition*, 516-17). Lührmann showed that references to Noah and Lot often came together in announcements of judgment (*Redaktion*, 75-83), and Kloppenborg points out that because Luke’s redactional themes appear in vv. 31-32, and not vv. 28-29, there probably was “a reference to Genesis 19 in his source” (Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 157). See also Allison, *Intertextual Jesus*, 95-8.

³⁵ Uro, “Apocalyptic Symbolism,” 115.

looks ahead to a future time of revelation and knowledge of hidden things (ἀποκαλυφθήσεται, γνωσθήσεται).³⁶ In light of the following context, however, 12:3 likely refers to a coming judgment (rather than the revelation of the Son of man at his coming): what follows in Q serves to admonish the community to faithfulness and fearlessness, with a view to a future vindication and reward.³⁷ In Q 17:23-24, public manifestation of the Son of man is the point of juxtaposing the warnings against those who say ἰδοὺ (v. 23) with the comparison of the Son of man's coming with lightning (v. 24). This kind of manifestation is what Q expected to mark the end of Jesus' assumption-related absence, as the acclamation of the Coming One in 13:35b suggests. Uro conjectures, hesitantly but apparently on the basis of these thematic similarities alone, that Q 13:34-35 may have originally served as the introduction to the Q 17 material.³⁸ Catchpole thinks similarly, but also holds to an original connection of the Lament with the Woes, and a placement of Q 12:39-46 after the Q 17 material, giving an order "Q 11:37-52; 13:34-35; 17:22-37; 12:39-46."³⁹ As discussed above, a similar position was held by Michael, who thought however that only verse 35b originally belonged to the Q section on the day of the Son of man as its introduction.⁴⁰ Thematic proximity need not require contextual proximity, however.

³⁶ In 12:3, the *Critical Edition* prefers Matthew's imperatives to Luke's future passives (Robinson, et al., *Critical Edition*, 292-3). Recently Scot McKnight has argued persuasively that Matthew's missionary context for these sayings is secondary, so that it is more likely that the saying originally looked ahead to a final judgment (McKnight, "Public Declaration or Final Judgment? Matthew 10:26-27 = Luke 12:2-3 as a Case of Creative Redaction," *Authenticating the Words of Jesus* [ed. B. Chilton and C. Evans; NTTS 28/1; Leiden: Brill, 1999], 363-83, esp. 372-7; reconstruction, 377).

³⁷ The pericopae that follow deal with appropriate fear of divine judgment (Q 12:4-5), divine knowledge of the elect (12:6-7), celestial acknowledgment of earthly allegiance to Jesus (12:8-9), and trial before earthly courts (12:10-12).

³⁸ Uro, "Apocalyptic Symbolism," 97, 114.

³⁹ Catchpole, *Quest*, 259.

⁴⁰ Michael, "Lament over Jerusalem," 109-12.

5.1.3. Implications

To sum up, it appears that there are both linguistic connections (ἐρχομαι, ἦκω) and similarities in motif (disappearance/ departure—invisibility/ absence—appearance/ presence) between the assumption and Parousia prediction in Q 13:35b and other Q material concerning an absent and suddenly returning master or Son of man. What is to be made of this? In other streams of early Christianity, the ideas of the absence and sudden appearance or return of Jesus are not wanting. For instance, 1 Thess 1:10, our earliest source, speaks of waiting for the Lord Jesus (to appear) from heaven, seems to presume a scenario of resurrection (ὃν ἡγείρεν ἐκ [τῶν] νεκρῶν) followed by heavenly enthronement or exaltation (ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν). The author of Luke-Acts makes this explicit, and goes a step further, using assumption (Luke 24:50-53; Acts 1:9-10) and its theological baggage in order to explain both Jesus' enthronement and exaltation (Acts 2:33-34) and his being reserved in heaven until his eschatological appearance (interestingly, described as the reverse of an assumption in Acts 1:11). However, a scenario of resurrection—exaltation—parousia is, as argued above, lacking in Q.

Since in Q the expression “Son of man”—whatever its origin or history—is consistently a way of referring to Jesus, those materials which refer to a coming Son of man have Jesus, apart from his earthly career, in mind. Even though “disappearance” or “invisibility,” which as seen in Chapter Three above often expresses the idea of assumption, is lacking in most of these texts (the possible exception being Luke 17:22, which likely was not in Q), a period the physical absence of Jesus the Son of man is always presumed. In the absence of any other theological rationale for the identification of the post-mortem Jesus with the heavenly or eschatological Son of man, it can only be concluded that the idea of assumption—particularly because of its typical connection with special eschatological function—lies behind these texts as the christological basis for the

expectation that the absent Jesus would return as the Son of man. Additionally, it is important that the parable Q 12:42-46 was likely appended to 12:39-40, on the coming of the Son of man, as an interpretive addition during the same redactional phase in which Q 13:34-35 was composed. This suggests that the emphasis on the absence of Jesus as coordinated to his return as the Son of man was part of the redactor's program in not one but two instances.

5.2: A Christological Basis for Corporate Vindication in Q

In his 1990 article on “Easter Faith” and Q, Kloppenborg suggested that the main themes isolated by Nickelsburg in his study of the “wisdom tale”¹ are also present in Q: trial, ordeal, condemnation, divine assistance, vindication, exaltation, acclamation, and the punishment of persecutors.² Kloppenborg noted that these elements are “[deployed] in relation to the *collective* experience of the community.”³ His observations concerning the corporate vindication, exaltation, and acclamation expected by the Q community are worth citing in their entirety.

Vindication is expressed variously: the persecuted are, paradoxically, blessed (6:22-23b) and are included in the company of God’s prophets (6:23c; 11:49-51; 13:34-35). In spite of opposition, they speak with the voice of Jesus and ultimately, God (10:16), and are the ones who may claim knowledge of God (10:21-22). Both the promise of “reward in heaven” (6:22b; cf. 6:35b) and the promise that Jesus’ followers will sit on thrones, judging Israel imply vindication and *exaltation* (22:28-30; cf. 13:28-29). Various *acclamations* are present: Jesus and John are identified as Sophia’s children (7:35); Jesus’ followers are set above the sages because of their superior grasp of revelation (10:21-22); and they are pronounced more blessed than prophets and kings because of what they have witnessed (10:23-24).⁴

Kloppenborg’s point, drawn out with reference to Nickelsburg’s application of his “wisdom tale” findings to the Markan passion narrative,⁵ was that although the individual elements of the story of Jesus’ rejection, death, and vindication are present in Q, they come to expression neither in narrative fashion nor individualized with respect to Jesus.⁶ The question of the theological (or christological) basis of the Q community’s hope for vindication or reward in heaven did not

¹ Nickelsburg, *Resurrection, Immortality and Eternal Life*.

² Kloppenborg, “Easter Faith,” 79.

³ *Ibid.*, emphasis original.

⁴ *Ibid.*, emphasis original.

⁵ G. W. E. Nickelsburg, “The Genre and Function of the Markan Passion Narrative,” *HTR* 73 (1980): 153-84.

⁶ Kloppenborg, “Easter Faith,” 81-2.

come into the picture. Following Kloppenborg, John Dominic Crossan recently wrote that “the *Q Gospel* forces us to imagine such an alternative theology, one in which Jesus, however exalted, is never isolated,”⁷ but again the question of the hope of corporate exaltation or its rationale is not entertained. It is worth pointing out that in Q the hope in corporate vindication is always predicated upon identification with Jesus. This observation, especially when considered in light of the fact that Q had, in assumption, a theological rationale for Jesus’ own post-mortem vindication, suggests the possibility that the vindicated and exalted Jesus for Q served to symbolize or represent the community’s hope in a future vindication of their allegiance to Jesus.

A number of exalted figures in the literature of ancient Judaism appear to have played such a representative function vis-à-vis the community of the faithful. Two such figures have already been discussed here, because of the role which assumption played as the basis of their exaltation: the δίκαιος of Wisdom 2–5, and the exalted figure in the *Similitudes of Enoch* (“that Son of man,” who is identified as the assumed Enoch). To be sure, it cannot be said of all protagonists in assumption narratives, or even of all eschatological figures who were thought to have experienced assumption, that they had the function of representing a (hoped-for) communal destiny. Furthermore, even if Q expresses a belief in Jesus’ post-mortem vindication and exaltation in terms of assumption, the document nowhere depicts Jesus as a figure exalted in heaven. Nevertheless, there are a number of things which suggest that a correlation between Jesus’ post-mortem vindication and exaltation and the expectations of the Q community may find an illustrative analogy in the representative function of other exalted figures in ancient Judaism.

⁷ J. D. Crossan, *The Birth of Christianity: Discovering What Happened in the Years Immediately After the Execution of Jesus* (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1998), 503.

Such a comparison is suggested first of all by the corporate view of persecution in Q. As argued above, the Q people understood their own rejection, along with the rejection of John and Jesus, within the deuteronomistic paradigm; it appears, moreover, that they also saw the rejection and death of Jesus as the culminating instance of prophetic persecution, precisely because Jesus represented for them the emissary of Wisdom *par excellence*. Q had in view a continuum of prophetic persecution which stretched from the prophets of biblical times to their own day, and which included not only John and Jesus but their own missionaries. In addition, discipleship and mission in Q are understood as identification with Jesus (Q 14:27; 10:16). Therefore, the possibility that the Q people also understood their own vindication and exaltation as being encapsulated in the vindication and exaltation of Jesus should be investigated. The apocalyptic tenor of Jesus' post-mortem vindication in Q 13:35b (assumption and parousia) invites a comparison between Q's post-mortem Jesus and the exalted figures in apocalyptic literature. For because in Jewish literature one who is assumed typically awaits an eschatological role in an exalted state in heaven, it seems likely that Q's expectation of a heavenly reward is predicated on Jesus' post-mortem exaltation.

This becomes clear when it is observed that the main texts predicting heavenly or eschatological vindication or exaltation for the Q community connect such vindication with this-worldly identification with Jesus/ the Son of man. Conversely, Q texts that predict other-worldly or eschatological punishment suggest that such punishment is meted out because of non-repentance or because of the rejection of God's messengers.⁸ The notion of heavenly vindication

⁸ The idea of eschatological or other-worldly punishment is a common theme in Q, expressed in terms of destruction by burning (Q 3:7-9, 16-17; by allusion to the Lot story, 17:34-35), consignment to Hades (10:15) or Gehenna (12:5), heavenly denial (12:9), or exclusion from entry (13:27) or from the eschatological banquet (13:28). The criteria for such recompense are not always stated, but non-repentance figures at least twice (3:8-9; 10:13).

is present not only in the macarism Q 6:22-23a, as Kloppenborg noted, but also elsewhere in Q. In Q 10:15, Jesus declares that Capernaum “will be brought down to Hades” (ἕως τοῦ ᾗδου καταβήσῃ). The immediate context suggests, first of all, that as with Chorazin and Bethsaida, the issue is non-repentance despite miraculous signs (10:13-14); in addition, however, the text implies that repentance would have resulted in heavenly exaltation (μὴ ἕως οὐρανοῦ ὑψωθῇσῃ;). Q 12:33-34 advises the hearer to “store up treasures in heaven,” but it is not clear from the context what precisely that entails. Q 14:11, whose presence in Q is disputed,⁹ refers (somewhat obliquely) to the exaltation of the humble, and the humiliation of the exalted. Q 17:33 speaks of “saving” and “losing” one’s life; in what is probably its original context, between 14:26-27 and 14:34-35,¹⁰ it clearly has to do with the costs and rewards of associating oneself with Jesus.¹¹

Other Q materials make it clearer that identification with Jesus/ the Son of man is the criterion for heavenly or eschatological reward. First, Q 6:22-23a connects a great heavenly reward with suffering revilement and persecution “because of the Son of man” (ἐνεκεν τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου). Second, in Q 12:8-9 there is a correlation between the earthly acknowledgement of Jesus by the faithful and the heavenly acknowledgement of the faithful by Jesus, the Son of man. Third, the hope of eschatological vindication for the community is present

⁹ See Kloppenborg, *Q Parallels*, 162.

¹⁰ Robinson, et al., *Critical Edition*, 456-7.

¹¹ Two other texts may be noted: First, Q 6:35b (“so that you may become sons of your Father”), which Kloppenborg noted as a text predicting heavenly reward (“Easter Faith,” 79), seems rather to suggest only similarity in character between the Father, who sends sun and rain on both good and bad people, and the hearers, who should love their enemies (Q 6:27).

Second, it has sometimes been suggested that the eschatological separation of the elect in Q 17:34-35 means an expectation of an assumption of the faithful as in 1 Thess 4:13-18 (so Plevnik, “Taking Up,” 281). It seems likely, however, that the use of παραλαμβάνω in Q 17:34-35 signifies not the taking away of the faithful but the sweeping away of the rest as in Genesis 19. For discussion, see Kloppenborg, “Symbolic Eschatology and the Apocalypticism of Q,” *HTR* 80 (1987): 287-306, esp. 302-3.

both in the expectation of salvation on the day of the Son of man (Q 17 *passim*) and, more specifically, in the promise to disciples of a forensic or governing role over Israel (Q 22:28,30), where, again, allegiance to Jesus is the decisive factor.

5.2.1. Representative Figures in Jewish Literature

Exalted figures in antiquity often served to represent the nations or communities which owed them allegiance. Whether patron deities, kings, or redeemer figures, such exalted representatives embodied the fate (or the hopes) of the people. Scholars such as Nickelsburg and John J. Collins have shown persuasively that the exalted figures in several late Jewish texts—Wisdom 2–5, Daniel 7, the *Similitudes of Enoch*, and *4 Ezra*—play such a role as mythological expressions of communal hopes.¹² Collins in particular has emphasized, with reference both to Daniel and to the *Similitudes of Enoch*, the priority in ancient thought of the heavenly world to the earthly, both in terms of reality and permanence.¹³ Yet there is a “homology” between these worlds: as with the patron deities of Near Eastern nations in ancient times, there is on the one hand a representative unity and on the other a real distinction between the exalted figure and the community.¹⁴ In the Book of Daniel this is clearest in Chapter 10, “where the struggle between Jews and Greeks is viewed as a battle between their angelic patrons.”¹⁵ A comparison between Dan 7:18, where the “holy ones” receive the kingdom, and Dan 7:27, where “the people of the

¹² Collins also suggests that “Melchizedek in 11QMelch, ... the man from the sea in *4 Ezra* 13, and the Son of Man in the New Testament” all function as heavenly saviour figures who represent the righteous community on the supernatural level (Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination*, 106).

¹³ *Ibid.*, 105–6, 187.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 186.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 105–6.

holy ones” receive the kingdom, uncovers a similar idea.¹⁶ Collins sees the homology between the earthly and heavenly worlds in the *Similitudes of Enoch* as coming to expression chiefly in the “Son of man” figure, whom he calls the “heavenly *Doppelgänger*” of the righteous community.¹⁷

In Wisdom 2–5, and also in the *Similitudes*, the parallel names for the exalted figure and the community substantiate the representative relationship. In the Book of Wisdom, the righteous man (ὁ δίκαιος) who suffers injustice and murder, whose ignominious and untimely death is reversed through divine favour, and who stands as an exalted figure in the heavenly court, is apparently the representative and archetype of the righteous community (οἱ δίκαιοι).¹⁸ Dieter Georgi thought, in fact, that the character of the righteous one has lost all the traits which may have distinguished him as an individual, so that “es ist nicht mehr eine bestimmte Person, sondern es ist der Typ des Gerechten.”¹⁹

Probably the clearest point of contact between the fate of the *dikaïos* and the hope of the *dikaioi* has to do with a role in the judgment. The *dikaïos* who has died will condemn the ungodly who are alive (κατακρινεῖ δὲ δίκαιος καμῶν τοὺς ζῶντας ἀσεβεῖς, Wis 4:16), and although the precise nature of his exalted role in Wisdom 5 is not clear, his presence has the effect of condemnation at the reckoning (ἐν συλλογισμῷ ἀμαρτημάτων αὐτῶν, 4:20) of his

¹⁶ Ibid., 106.

¹⁷ Ibid., 187.

¹⁸ The *dikaïos* is explicitly named in Wis 2:10, 12, 18; 3:10; 4:7, 16; 5:1. The *dikaioi* are named in 2:16; 3:1 (but are clearly in view in 3:1–9); 5:15.

¹⁹ Georgi, “Vorpaulinische Hymnus,” 272; Nickelsburg also called the *dikaïos* a “type” of the righteous (*Resurrection, Immortality and Eternal Life*, 61).

onetime oppressors, since they are confronted with their own lawlessness (4:20–5:5).²⁰ An eternal role in judgment is also expressed as a hope of the *dikaioi*: although as the viceregents of the Lord their role seems less forensic than judicial (κρινούσιν ἔθνη καὶ κρατήσουσιν λαῶν καὶ βασιλεύσει αὐτῶν κύριος εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, 3:8), a judicial role might imply the dispensing of justice anyway. A similar correlation between an exalted figure and a community, in terms of a governing role, is probably present in Daniel 7; there, the one like a son of man receives dominion and glory and kingship (Dan 7:14), and the “holy ones of the Most High” likewise come to possess the kingdom (7:18,22,27).²¹

The hope of the *dikaioi* in immortality also appears to be paralleled in the rescue of the *dikaïos* from death (or, more precisely, *after* death). With both the community and the individual, death is an apparent undoing of their hope in God. Concerning the righteous community, Wis 3:2-4 says that in the view of the foolish, their death seems to be a disaster (ἐλογίσθη κάκωσις ἡ ἔξοδος αὐτῶν), their destruction (ἡ ἀφ’ ἡμῶν πορεία σύντριμμα), and divine punishment (ἐν ὧν ἀνθρώπων ἐὰν κολασθῶσιν). Yet their death is only seeming (ἔδοξαν ... τεθνάναι, 3:2), for their souls are in God’s hands (δικαίων δὲ ψυχαὶ ἐν χειρὶ θεοῦ, 3:1) and their hope is immortality (ἡ ἐλπίς αὐτῶν ἀθανασίας πλήρης, 3:4). Similarly with the *dikaïos*, the apparent stigma of early death is reversed by assumption. The unrighteous see his end and have contempt for him, but do not understand that the *dikaïos* was the recipient of divine preservation (4:15-18). It should also be noted that the refrain, “God’s grace and mercy are with his elect / and he watches over his holy ones” (χάρις καὶ ἔλεος τοῖς ἐκλεκτοῖς, καὶ ἐπισκοπὴ ἐν τοῖς ὁσίοις

²⁰ Georgi thought that the role of the *dikaïos* in Wisdom 5 is to judge the ungodly, and drew attention to the parallel expectation that the righteous would also have a role in judgment—“wenngleich in deutlicher Subordination unter den Kyrios” (“Vorpaulinische Hymnus,” 274).

²¹ So Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination*, 106. See also Sir 4:15, where it says that “those who obey her [Wisdom] will judge the nations,” although this reference is probably not eschatological.

αὐτοῦ) is applied to both the righteous community and the righteous man (3:9; 4:15), though the presence of the second line in Wisd 3:9 is textually uncertain.

Something similar is at work in the *Similitudes of Enoch*, where the exalted figure (sometimes called "Righteous One" or "Anointed One," but more frequently "that Son of man" or "Chosen One"²²) appears to embody the defining characteristic of the community, namely, righteousness (or, depending upon the context, holiness or election). In his 1980 essay on "The Heavenly Representative,"²³ Collins noted that the titles "Righteous One and Chosen One are used in association with the broader categories of 'the righteous' and 'the chosen.'"²⁴ In contrast with the Book of Wisdom, in the *Similitudes* there is a complex set of associations between the earthly and the heavenly worlds.²⁵ Collins argued that the close connection between the exalted figure and the righteous community should be understood not in terms of "corporate personality,"²⁶ but rather, as Sigmund Mowinckel described the relationship between the king and the people, "representative unity."²⁷ In addition, because "that Son of man" is a heavenly figure, the relationship in Collins' opinion finds a closer analogy in patron deities in Ancient Near Eastern mythology than in the ancient conception of the king as a representative figure.²⁸

²² VanderKam ("Righteous One") has demonstrated the interchangeability and contextual function of the four epithets for the exalted figure in the *Similitudes*. See also J. J. Collins, "The Heavenly Representative: The 'Son of Man' in the *Similitudes of Enoch*," in *Ideal Figures in Ancient Judaism: Profiles and Paradigms* (ed. J. Collins and G. Nickelsburg; SBLSCS 12; Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1980), 111-33, esp. 113.

²³ The article also appears (in an adapted form) in Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination*, 177-93.

²⁴ Collins, "Heavenly Representative," 113.

²⁵ For example, Collins suggested that the "holy" and the "chosen" on earth have heavenly counterparts (the angelic host whom one day they will join, *1 En.* 39:5; 51:4; 61:4), as well as a heavenly representative in the "Son of man" figure ("Heavenly Representative," 113).

²⁶ Such an idea rests on outdated, discredited anthropological theories, says Collins (*ibid.*, 113-14); he cites, among others, T. W. Manson, "The Son of Man in Daniel, Enoch, and the Gospels," *BJRL* 32 (1949-1950): 171-93 = *Studies in the Gospels and the Epistles* (Manchester: Manchester University, 1962), 123-45.

²⁷ S. Mowinckel, *He That Cometh* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1955), 381.

²⁸ Collins, "Heavenly Representative," 114.

But the connection between the Chosen One and the community does not consist entirely in their shared qualities: Collins also argued that “his entire function is defined in relation to the human righteous ones” (see *1 En.* 48:4-5; 62:14).²⁹ There is also a parallelism of action or, in the words of Gerd Theissen, a “structural homologue”³⁰ between the earthly and heavenly counterparts, especially with respect to the hiddenness and revelation of both the Chosen One and the community.³¹ The important distinction, however, is the power and exalted status of “that Son of man.”

Although he does not share their suffering, the pattern of hiddenness and revelation is common to both. The fact that he is preserved from their sufferings makes him a figure of pure power and glory and an ideal embodiment of the hopes of the persecuted righteous. The efficaciousness of the “Son of Man” figure requires that he be conceived as other than the community, since he must possess the power and exaltation which they lack.³²

This description of the function of the “Son of man” figure in *1 Enoch* is strikingly similar to the scenario we find in Q: the community sees itself as undergoing suffering or persecution—whatever form that may actually have taken—, but Jesus has experienced, by means of his assumption, vindication and exaltation which will soon be made manifest at his coming as Son of man. The community’s hope to share in this vindication and exaltation is predicated on their continued allegiance to Jesus. Q does not often depict Jesus as an exalted heavenly figure, however, but a hint of a belief in him as such a figure appears in Q 12:8-9, and possibly Q

²⁹ Ibid., 113.

³⁰ G. Theissen, *Sociology of Early Palestinian Christianity* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1978), 121; cited by Collins, “Heavenly Representative,” 115.

³¹ Collins, “Heavenly Representative,” 115.

³² Ibid., 115-16; Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination*, 187.

17:24.³³ In addition, the acclamation of the Coming One (Q 13:35b) may indicate a belief in Jesus returning as a celestial figure. If it is correct that Q uses assumption in order to express its belief in Jesus' post-mortem vindication and Parousia, there are grounds at least for seeing the post-mortem Jesus in Q as the locus (or even archetype) of the soteriological hope of the Q community, in analogy with the function of the representative exalted figures in materials such as Wisdom 2–5 and the *Similitudes of Enoch*.

As already noted, there are three main texts in Q which correlate heavenly or eschatological reward for the community with earthly allegiance to Jesus/ the Son of man: Q 6:22–23a, 12:8–9, and 22:28–30. These will be discussed in turn.

5.2.2. Q 6:22–23a: Great is Your Reward in Heaven

The Q Sermon's fourth macarism, despite the difficulties in reconstructing the original wording, clearly connects allegiance to Jesus (the Son of man), as shown by being persecuted for his sake, with a heavenly reward. Q 6:22–23 reads as follows in the *Critical Edition of Q*:

μακάριοι ἐστε ὅταν ὀνειδίσωσιν ὑμᾶς καὶ [[διώξ]]ωσιν καὶ [[εἰπ]]ωσιν
[[πάν]] πονηρὸν [[καθ]] ὑμῶν ἕνεκεν τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.
χαίρετε καὶ [[ἀγαλλιᾶσθε]], ὅτι ὁ μισθὸς ὑμῶν πολὺς ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ·
οὕτως γὰρ [[ἐδίωξαν]] τοὺς προφῆτας τοὺς πρὸ ὑμῶν.

³³ See D. R. Catchpole, "The Angelic Son of Man in Luke 12:8," *NovT* 24 (1982): 255–65 for a discussion of "Son of man" in 12:8–9 as a designation of a heavenly figure, whom however in Catchpole's view the saying—and the Q 17 material—distinguishes from Jesus (ibid., 261). Uro thinks 12:8–9 refers to Jesus as an exalted heavenly figure, and adds that the lightning imagery used to describe the Son of man's coming in Q 17:24 confirms that "Son of man language seems to be the major way to express Jesus as a celestial figure" ("Apocalyptic Symbolism," 103). The difference is apparently one of perspective: a distinction between Jesus and the Son of man in 12:8–9 may be supportable in a tradition-historical discussion of the saying, but the distinction disappears when the saying's function in the context of final Q is the goal of the investigation.

Blessed are you when they insult and [[persecute]] you, and [[say every kind of]] evil [[against]] you because of the son of humanity.
 Be glad and [[exult]], for vast is your reward in heaven.
 For this is how they [[persecuted]] the prophets who were before you.³⁴

Although Matthew and Luke differ on the verbs for the exact kinds of ostracism or persecution to be expected, in the minimal text of Q 6:22, Jesus announces the blessedness of the hearers “whenever they reproach you ...” (ὅταν ὑμᾶς ὀνειδίσωσιν ...). The community of Q also expected to be anathematized, though again Matthew and Luke do not agree in wording beyond the adjective πονηρός. Ostracism, persecution, and anathematization were expected “on account of” (ἐνεκεν) the Son of man. The reference to the Son of man is probably original to Q because Luke tends not to add the expression where it was not found in his sources, and Matthew sometimes will change “Son of man” to a first person pronoun.³⁵

Q 6:23a continues with an exhortation to rejoice, which hearkens back to the first line of the macarism, and a reason: “because your reward is great in heaven” (ὅτι ὁ μισθὸς ὑμῶν πολὺς ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ). The effect of the ὅτι is to connect the idea of heavenly reward with earthly suffering for the sake of the Son of man. The use of “Son of man” here indicates that Jesus is central to the dispensation of the reward, either as criterion or actual giver. The former possibility is more probable in 6:22—since suffering ostracism and persecution for the sake of the coming Son of man would make no sense—, although the latter view, that an exalted Son of man dispenses heavenly reward, seems to be in evidence in other texts, especially 12:8-9.³⁶ That

³⁴ Robinson, et al., *Critical Edition*, 50-3.

³⁵ See Schulz, *Spruchquelle*, 453; J. S. Kloppenborg, “Blessing and Marginality: The ‘Persecution Beatitude’ in Q, Thomas, and Early Christianity,” *Forum* 2 (1986): 36-56, esp. 41; H. Fleddermann, “The Q Saying on Confessing and Denying,” *Society of Biblical Literature 1987 Seminar Papers* (ed. D. J. Lull; SBLSP 26; Atlanta: Scholars, 1988), 606-16, esp. 610; Tuckett, *Q*, 180 n. 50.

³⁶ In addition, the “day” or the “coming” of the Son of man is, in Q, the occasion of judgment and the dispensation of reward and punishment (12:39-40, 42-46; Q 17 *passim*; Q 19 *passim*).

text coordinates heavenly or eschatological reward with allegiance to the earthly Jesus, with the result that “Son of man” in 6:22 should not be taken to refer to the heavenly or coming Son of man (the same is true of Q 7:34; 9:58; 11:30, probably; 12:10, possibly). Yet its use here is not insignificant if other texts in Q associate “Son of man” with coming judgment and the dispensation of other-worldly recompense.

Many scholars consider that the reference to the historical mistreatment of prophets constitutes a deuteronomic addition.³⁷ It is often asked why the reference to prophets was added precisely here, since verse 23b “already provides an adequate motive clause for v. 23a.”³⁸ Likely it was prompted by the reference to persecution in 6:22, but there may be another dimension to the redactional addition. If—and this is to anticipate somewhat the results of the investigation of these three texts—it is correct that the hope of corporate vindication in Q is based on a conviction about Jesus’ vindication, the addition was perhaps prompted by the fact that both persecution (as the deuteronomic materials suggest) and vindication were understood corporately by those who framed Q. Or, to put it differently, Q understood there to be a direct correlation between Jesus’ twin fate of rejection and vindication, and a similar fate for the community.

³⁷ See Steck, *Israel*, 257-60; Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 173; Jacobson, *First Gospel*, 100-1; Tuckett, *Q*, 180.

³⁸ Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 173.

5.2.3. Q 12:8-9: Confessing Jesus Publicly

This difficult text has generated a great deal of discussion. The *Critical Edition* reconstructs it as follows:

πᾶς ὃς [[ἂν]] ὁμολογήσ[[η]] ἐν ἐμοὶ ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ἀνθρώπων, κα[[ὶ]] ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου]] ὁμολογήσ[[ει]] ἐν αὐτῷ ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ἀγγέλων ..
ὃς δ' ἂν ἀρνήσῃται με ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ἀρνη[[θήσεται]] ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ἀγγέλων ..

Anyone who [[may]] speak out for me in public, [[the son of humanity]] will also speak out for him before the angels ..

But whoever may deny me in public [[will be]] den[[ied]] before the angels ..³⁹

Again, as with Q 6:22, the Son of man expression is lacking in Matthew, but there appear to be good grounds for considering that it was in Q. Probably the most significant is the apparent distinction between Jesus ("me") and the "Son of man."⁴⁰ In addition, the expression also occurs in the overlap text Mark 8:38, which may be shown on other grounds to be independent of the Q version of the saying.⁴¹ Furthermore, Matthew's tendency to substitute the first person pronoun for "Son of man" has already been noted,⁴² but other Matthean redactional work on the saying

³⁹ Robinson, et al., *Critical Edition*, 304-7. The fact that the *Critical Edition* brackets ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου as "probable but uncertain, {C}" (ibid., lxxxii) owes at least in part to the views of Paul Hoffmann (ibid., 304-7), who argues for the Matthean wording. See also P. Hoffmann, "Jesus versus Menschensohn: Matthäus 10.32f und die synoptische Menschensohn-überlieferung," in *Salz der Erde—Licht der Welt: Exegetische Studien zum Matthäusevangelium. Festschrift für A. Vögtle* (ed. P. Fiedler and L. Oberlinner; Stuttgart: 1991), 165-202; P. Hoffmann, with J. E. Amon, U. Brauner, and T. Hieke, "Confessing or Denying," in *Q 12:8-12: Confessing or Denying; Speaking against the Holy Spirit; Hearings before Synagogues* (ed. C. Heil; Documenta Q; Leuven: Peeters, 1997), 1-425, esp. 210-38; P. Hoffmann, "Der Menschensohn in Lukas 12:8," *NTS* 44 (1998): 357-79, esp. 366-70. However, Robinson voted for the Lukan wording at {C} (Robinson, "Evaluation," in Hoffmann, et al., "Confessing or Denying," 200-10, 238-47).

⁴⁰ So Catchpole, "Angelic Son of Man," 255.

⁴¹ See in particular H. J. de Jonge, "The Sayings on Confessing and Denying Jesus in Q 12:8-9 and Mark 8:38," in *Sayings of Jesus: Canonical and Non-canonical. Essays in Honour of Tjitze Baarda* (ed. W. L. Petersen et al.; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 105-21, esp. 115-17; pace J. Lambrecht, "Q-Influence on Mark 8.34-9.1," in *Logia: Les paroles de Jésus—The Sayings of Jesus* (ed. J. Delobel; BETL 59; Leuven: Leuven University Press and Peeters, 1982), 277-304, esp. 285-8. See also H. Fleddermann, *Mark and Q: A Study of the Overlap Texts. With an Assessment by F. Neirynck* (BETL 122; Leuven: Leuven University Press and Peeters, 1995), esp. 145-51.

⁴² See Fleddermann, "Confessing and Denying," 610.

would probably have prompted the removal of the expression. As Robinson puts it, "Once he decided to replace the angels with his standard circumlocution for God, 'my father in heaven,' the third person syntax of 'the son of man' no longer fitted the first person syntax, and so was replaced with 'I'."⁴³ Also, as David Catchpole remarks, "a reference to the Father of the Son of man overloads the saying and is conceptually odd."⁴⁴

Even more complex than the question of the originality of the expression in Q 12:8 is that of its meaning. The traditional interpretation presumed a widely disseminated idea about an exalted "Son of man" figure,⁴⁵ to which Jesus himself referred. The authenticity of this particular saying is shown in the distinction between Jesus and the "Son of man."⁴⁶ As discussed above, scholars such as Tödt maintained that this "Son of man" came to be identified with Jesus on the basis of the Easter experience of the early Christian community.⁴⁷ This line of interpretation has rightly fallen out of favour, with most discussions of the "Son of man" question nowadays beginning not from a presumed religious-historical background for the expression, but rather from idiomatic Aramaic usage.⁴⁸ However, Collins has argued persuasively that whereas there may not have been an established and widely disseminated Son of man "idea" in circulation before or by the turn of the era, there are indications that by the first century C.E. there were "common assumptions" about the meaning of the "one like a son of man" in Daniel 7.⁴⁹

⁴³ Robinson, "Evaluation," in Hoffmann, et al., "Confessing or Denying," 210.

⁴⁴ Catchpole, "Angelic Son of Man," 256.

⁴⁵ See the brief discussion in Collins, *Scepter and Star*, 173-5. Robinson suggests that Carsten Colpe's 1969 article in the *Theologische Wörterbuch* ("ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου" TWNT 8.403-81) marked the end of such a view (Robinson, "Son of Man," 325).

⁴⁶ See Bultmann, *History*, 112, 128, 151-2.

⁴⁷ Tödt, *Son of Man*, 56-7 (with reference to Q 12:8-9), 252-3 (generally). See the discussion in Robinson, "Son of Man," 325-7.

⁴⁸ See Hare, *Son of Man Tradition*, 256-9.

⁴⁹ Collins, *Scepter and Star*, 175.

Perhaps the saying did mean to distinguish between Jesus and the Son of man at an early stage in its tradition history, whether or not it is an authentic saying. Jacobson, for instance, suggests that in both 12:8-9 and 12:10 the Son of man "is simply the heavenly prosecutor who argues the case before the divine judge. But neither in Q 12:8-9 nor 12:10 is Jesus identified with this heavenly prosecutor figure."⁵⁰ For Jacobson, this distinction is evidence that these verses are "relatively early" in comparison with other Q materials that make the identification.⁵¹ Similarly, Catchpole sees the distinction between Jesus and the Son of man as evidence for the saying's primitivity (even authenticity).⁵² While tradition-historically it may be apt to observe such a distinction, the fact that for (final) Q Jesus *is* the Son of man alters the way the saying must be interpreted, from our perspective at least. How can an identification between Jesus and the Son of man of Q 12:8-9 be understood?

For Robinson, who sees no distinction at all between the speaker and the Son of man in Q 12:8-9, the self-referential use of the "son of man" expression in Q is critical. He thinks that the expression is used self-referentially here as in other Q sayings (Q 6:22; 7:34; 9:58; 11:30; even 12:10). In his view,

Those who confess the "human," understood as a familiar reference to Jesus perhaps going back to Jesus himself, will find him there at the judgment as their character witness, whereas those who deny him will be denounced by him at the judgment (as in Q 13:25-27). This role of the "son of man," Jesus, engendered

⁵⁰ Jacobson, *First Gospel*, 188. The distinction between Jesus and the Son of man which Jacobson perceives here, coupled with the fact that he sees the Son of man figure as taking a subordinate role in the heavenly judgment, allows Jacobson to make sense of the subordination of the Son of man to the Holy Spirit in 12:10: "the point seems to be that the holy spirit is constitutive for the community in a way that the heavenly prosecutor, the son of man (12:8-9), is not" (ibid.).

⁵¹ Ibid., 189.

⁵² Catchpole, "Angelic Son of Man," 259-60.

other “son of man” sayings associated with the eschatological judgment, ... the eschatological or prophetic [correlatives] (Q 17:24,26,30).⁵³

While this might (arguably!) suffice to explain the development of the eschatological Son of man sayings in Q, such a view of the Son of man in 12:8-9—not as judge but as character witness—does not make sense, given the fact that elsewhere in Q the coming of the Son of man brings judgment (including Q 12:39-40,42-46; 17:24,26,30; and possibly, with Jesus as ὁ ἐρχόμενος, 13:35). As Douglas Hare insists, “There is ... no basis for the suggestion that this saying ‘demotes’ Jesus to the role of an ordinary witness,” although his assumption that the tradents of this saying must have acknowledged “the risen Jesus as the Christ, the eschatological king” does not, in our view, apply to Q.⁵⁴ Nevertheless, since materials such as Q 12:39-40,42-46 and Q 17 and 19 seem to ascribe a role in judgment to Jesus the Son of man, Hare’s conclusion is justified even if his rationale is not.

It seems fairly clear that in Q 12:8-9 the Son of man is some kind of heavenly figure, given the presence of angels as those before whom he would confess or deny.⁵⁵ How then is the relationship between the “Son of man” and “me” to be understood? Here Q 6:22 offers some help. There, “Son of man” refers to Jesus as an earthly figure, allegiance to whom in the face of persecution was the criterion for heavenly reward. In Q 12:8-9, there is a similar correlation

⁵³ Robinson, “Evaluation,” in Hoffmann, et al., “Confessing or Denying,” 209. Robinson seems particularly convinced by the fact that Matthew flexibly replaces “Son of man” in Mark or Q with a direct reference to Jesus, or vice versa, so that he clearly understands the expression—including its use in Q 12:8-9—“idiomatically” (Robinson, “Son of Man,” 331-2). Robinson’s understanding of “Son of man” in Q 12:8-9 does have a certain economy: its decisive advantage is that it can eliminate the problem of the seemingly low view of the Son of man in Q 12:10 (blasphemy against the Son of man [= me], but not against the Holy Spirit, will be forgiven).

⁵⁴ Hare, *Son of Man Tradition*, 223.

⁵⁵ So Uro, “Apocalyptic Symbolism,” 103.

between allegiance⁵⁶ to the earthly figure (“me”), and reward which comes by means of the heavenly figure (“Son of man”), whether as judge or advocate. Thus the distinction need not be between Jesus and the Son of man as two different persons, whether or not such a distinction was ever made during the tradition history of the saying, but rather between different functions or phases of Jesus’ existence.⁵⁷

In a 1982 article, Catchpole offered an interesting suggestion concerning the nature of the celestial status of the Son of man in Q 12:8-9. Investigating the saying’s meaning at the most primitive level of its tradition history, rather than its meaning in its Q context, he presumed a distinction between Jesus and the Son of man. Catchpole suggested that the Son of man figure in this saying is the “heavenly guarantor” of the earthly Jesus, an angelic being acting as the heavenly counterpart or sponsor; this idea is present, he argued, in texts such as Tob 12:15, *1 En.* 104:1, and Luke 1:19, and represents “an individualising of the old idea of an angelic ruler for each nation (cf. Dan 10:12; 12:1; Sir 17:17).”⁵⁸ Catchpole considers that Daniel 7 and Matt 18:10

⁵⁶ Catchpole seems justified in his insistence that the vocabulary of confessing and denying implies “open verbal acknowledgement of fundamental religious truth” rather than a legal setting for the community’s allegiance, even though that seems to be the case with Q 12:11-12. Thus discipleship is the fundamental issue (Catchpole, “Angelic Son of Man,” 257-9; citation from 258).

⁵⁷ So A. Polag, *Die Christologie der Logienquelle* (WMANT 45; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1977), 114; Schulz, *Spruchquelle*, 68; Hoffmann, *Studien*, 155-6; see Catchpole, “Angelic Son of Man,” 255-6 and nn. 5-6; see also de Jonge, “Confessing and Denying,” 118.

⁵⁸ Catchpole, “Angelic Son of Man,” 260. Catchpole gives six reasons (*ibid.*, 260-2) why this interpretation of the relationship between Jesus and the Son of man commends itself: (1) it makes the saying comprehensible on the lips of Jesus; (2) “confessing” and “denying” signify community awareness, and it has been suspected that “some kind of community dimension is involved in the Son of man concept” (*ibid.*, 261); (3) it correctly maintains soteriology, not Christology, as the thrust of the saying; (4) it fits with the use of the “Son of man” expression to connote a celestial figure distinct from Jesus elsewhere in the Q material (again, Catchpole is working at the most primitive level of the tradition); (5) the attempt in Q to identify Jesus with the Coming One requires the supposition that “some earlier tradition(s),” which made no such identification, called forth such an effort; and (6) the function of the “one like a son of man” in Daniel 7, as a heavenly counterpart for the earthly community, at least one background passage supports the interpretation.

both suggest this kind of relationship between angelic figures and human beings or communities.⁵⁹

It is impossible to engage here Catchpole's arguments concerning the question of authenticity, and the saying's meaning at this stage of its tradition history; they fall outside the scope of the present investigation.⁶⁰ The suggestion about the Son of man's function as a representative figure here is not without merit, although some adjustments of Catchpole's perspective are necessary for the suggestion to do justice to the saying's meaning in Q. Two adjustments must be made: first, concerning the distinction between Jesus and the Son of man in Q 12:8-9; and second, concerning the function of the Son of man in the saying.

The first point need not be belaboured. It has already been argued that Q considers Jesus as both earthly teacher and heavenly figure, and uses "Son of man" freely for both phases of his existence. The second point requires some clarification, even apart from this observation. Catchpole suggested, relying mainly on Matt 18:10, that the representative relationship is between Jesus and the Son of man as his heavenly counterpart or sponsor, and that this relationship is extended to the "confessing group who together [with Jesus] constitute the community for whose interests and security the Son of man vouches in heaven."⁶¹ Matt 18:10 does indeed appear to be evidence for a belief in angelic representatives for individual humans.⁶²

⁵⁹ Ibid., 261-2, 264, and 260, respectively.

⁶⁰ This is, of course, Catchpole's concern (ibid., 259-60).

⁶¹ Ibid., 261.

⁶² See the discussion in W. D. Davies and D. C. Allison, *The Gospel According to Saint Matthew* (3 vols.; ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1988-1997), 2.770-2.

However, the other main text adduced by Catchpole is Daniel 7, where the “one like a son of man” is representative of a group, “the holy ones of the Most High.”⁶³

The question here is thus whether Matt 18:10 or Daniel 7 is the more apt text for the comparison: is the Son of man’s function in confessing and denying directed towards Jesus or the community? As Catchpole rightly argues, “the ὁμολογεῖν/ ἄρνεῖσθαι complex of ideas ... frequently included a community awareness.”⁶⁴ In addition, he notes that the point of the saying is soteriological, with response to Jesus being the key issue, and that this conforms well with other Q materials, especially Houses Built On Rock or Sand (6:47-49).⁶⁵ The saying, then, is about community salvation at the judgment, and the criterion is allegiance to Jesus, expressed by means of confession, likely in some kind of public forum (Q 12:11-12). Because of the community emphasis in Q 12:8-9, seeing the Son of man as “the angelic counterpart of Jesus and, by extension, of those attached to him in discipleship,”⁶⁶ makes for an odd arrangement. It either introduces a mediary into the usual relationship between representative figure and community, if the Daniel 7 model is preferred, or it adds a community aspect not consistent with the idea of a personal heavenly representative, if the Matt 18:10 model is preferred. Even though, on Catchpole’s construal of Q 12:8-9, earthly confession of Jesus is the criterion for the heavenly acknowledgement of the community by the Son of man, it is still not clear why the Son of man is

⁶³ On the relationship between the “one like a son of man” and the “holy ones” in Daniel 7, see Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination*, 101-7; idem, *Daniel: A Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993), 304-10, 313-17. Collins argues that the “one like a son of man” is less a corporate symbol than a realistic mythic figure who apparently was thought to exist outside the vision, and whose “exaltation ... represents in some way the triumph of the Jewish people” (Collins, *Daniel*, 305, 309-10; citation from 309). Catchpole thinks similarly that “the ‘one like a son of man’ is most likely an angelic figure and a heavenly counterpart of the earthly community” (“Angelic Son of Man, 261).

⁶⁴ Catchpole, “Angelic Son of Man,” 260-1.

⁶⁵ Ibid., 261. As already noted, several other Q texts show that allegiance to Jesus is the criterion for salvation (or condemnation): Q 6:22-23a; 10:13-15; 14:26-27, 17:33; 13:34-35.

⁶⁶ Ibid., 265.

the heavenly representative of Jesus. The function of representative figures in the texts discussed above is to provide an otherworldly foundation for the hopes of the community, and there does not seem to be anything in Q which suggests that an analogous relationship between Jesus and the Son of man is assumed in Q 12:8-9. These observations, coupled with the fact that for Q Jesus *is* the heavenly or coming Son of man, point us in the direction of taking the Son of man as the heavenly figure who represents the community whose allegiance to (the earthly) Jesus is being tested (Q 12:2-12). The representative function of Jesus the Son of man is clearest, however, in the concluding saying of Q. Because the disciples are promised an important role in judging Israel, here the "parallelism of action" Collins saw as a characteristic of the relationship between the representative figure and the community becomes apparent.

5.2.4. Q 22:28,30: Judging the Twelve Tribes

The presence of this pericope in Q has sometimes been questioned,⁶⁷ as has its location,⁶⁸ though most scholars believe it to have been the concluding saying.⁶⁹ Matthew and Luke differ considerably in both wording and context. The *Critical Edition* reconstructs the saying as follows:

ὕμεῖς .. οἱ ἀκολουθήσαντές μοι
 .. καθήσεσθε ἐπὶ θρόν[ους] κρίνοντες τὰς δώδεκα φυλὰς τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ.

⁶⁷ For survey of scholarship and discussion see P. Hoffmann, with S. H. Brandenburger, U. Brauner, and T. Hieke, *Q 22:28,30: You Will Judge the Twelve Tribes of Israel* (ed. C. Heil; Documenta Q; Leuven: Peeters, 1998), 4-68.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, 69-141. Jacobson thinks the saying's location in Q cannot be determined (*First Gospel*, 245).

⁶⁹ See, for instance, Lührmann, *Redaktion*, 75; Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 95; H. Fleddermann, "The End of Q," *Society of Biblical Literature 1990 Seminar Papers* (ed. D. J. Lull; SBLSP 29; Atlanta: Scholars, 1990), 1-10; Kirk, *Composition*, 294-5; Zeller, "Zukunft Israels," 9.

.. You who have followed me
will sit .. on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel.⁷⁰

Matthew and Luke agree on the words καθήσεσθε ἐπὶ θρόν[ους] κρίνοντες τὰς δώδεκα φυλὰς τοῦ Ἰσραήλ. There are, however, many questions concerning this text's reconstruction, most of which lie outside the purview of the present investigation. One of the central issues is whether Q originally contained the "Son of man" expression (so Matt 19:28b). The presence of a Matthean doublet, which similarly describes the Son of man sitting "upon the throne of his glory" (25:31), has led most scholars to think that Matthean redaction is responsible for 19:28b.⁷¹ Yet because the two other texts under investigation here, Q 6:22-23a and 12:8-9, both use the "Son of man" expression in conjunction with the idea of a future or otherworldly corporate vindication of the community's allegiance to Jesus, Matthew's addition of "Son of man" here, if it is indeed an addition, is certainly apt. Many scholars also think that Luke, who uses the saying in his Last Supper account (Luke 22:14-38), is also responsible for the reference to "eating and drinking in my kingdom."⁷² Matthew and Luke contain the preposition ἐν, and although the objects are different (Matthew: τῇ παλιγγενεσίᾳ; Luke: τῇ βασιλείᾳ μου), both use the ἐν-phrase to give the context in which the judging would take place. However, it cannot be determined with certainty whether this is the result of coincidental redactional activity or the presence of a prepositional phrase in Q.⁷³

For the present purposes, however, the condition for receiving the judging role (Q 22:28) is of the most importance. The question here is whether the wording of Matthew (ὁμεῖς οἱ

⁷⁰ Robinson, et al., *Critical Edition*, 558-61.

⁷¹ See the discussion in Hoffmann, et. al., *Q 22:28,30*, 336-79.

⁷² But see Kirk, *Composition*, 290-4, who mounts a convincing argument against the commonly held view that eating and judging are dissonant motifs.

⁷³ See the discussion in Hoffmann, et al., *Q 22:28,30*, 324-35.

ἀκολουθήσαντές μοι) or Luke (ὅμεῖς δὲ ἐστε οἱ διαμεμενηκότες μετ' ἐμοῦ ἐν τοῖς πειρασμοῖς μου) is closer to that of Q.⁷⁴ Issues of vocabulary suggest that Luke's version is redactional;⁷⁵ further, as Harry Fleddermann suggests, "something like ἀκολουθήσαντές μοι must have stood in Q because Luke's διαμεμενηκότες μετ' ἐμοῦ expresses more or less the same idea."⁷⁶ If Matthew's wording is to be preferred, Q 22:28,30, like Q 6:22-23 and 12:8-9, also considers vindication for the community to be a reward for unwavering allegiance to Jesus.

One point of uncertainty is the meaning of the verb κρίνω in Q 22:30. Most have argued for the usual sense of determining guilt at the final judgment.⁷⁷ though some have suggested that "governing" is more apt here.⁷⁸ In favour of the latter solution are materials such as *Pss. Sol.* 17:26, which looks ahead the Messiah restoring and judging (that is, ruling) the tribes of the people. Jacobson also suggests that texts predicting a similar role for the faithful (Rev 3:21; Dan 7:13-14, 18, 22; *I En.* 62:1, 14; and others) focus "on a ruling function rather than the administration of justice."⁷⁹ In addition, some think that "thrones"—not to mention whatever stood as the object in 22:28—suggests the establishment of a kingdom, rather than a judgment

⁷⁴ Ibid., 154-95.

⁷⁵ See Fleddermann, "End of Q," 2-3. Fleddermann notes Luke's preference for μένω and its compounds, and for compounds formed with διά: πειρασμοῖς is also Lukan.

⁷⁶ Ibid., 3. See also Hoffmann, "Evaluation," in Q 22:28,30, 191-5.

⁷⁷ Boring, *Sayings*, 178; Fleddermann, "End of Q," 8; P. Hoffmann, "Herrscher oder Richter über Israel?," in *Ja und Nein: Christliche Theologie im Angesicht Israels. FS W. Schröge* (ed. G. Sass and K. Wengst; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1998), 253-64, esp. 263; Kloppenborg, *Excavating Q*, 192; Zeller ("Zukunft Israels," 9) seems to prefer the meaning "condemn."

⁷⁸ See in particular Jacobson, *First Gospel*, 248; R. Horsley, "Social Conflict in the Synoptic Sayings Source Q," in *Conflict and Invention: Literary, Rhetorical and Social Studies on the Sayings Gospel Q* (ed. J. S. Kloppenborg; Valley Forge, Pa.: Trinity Press International, 1995), 37-52, esp. 44-51.

⁷⁹ Jacobson, *First Gospel*, 248. Contrary to Jacobson's view here, *I Enoch* 62 deals with the condemnation of the wicked rulers and their annihilation (*I En.* 62:11-13); references to the exaltation of the "righteous and elect" (vv. 14-16) clearly do not have a ruling function in view.

scenario.⁸⁰ Two important factors make this interpretation difficult, however. First, nowhere else in the New Testament is the verb κρίνω or its cognates used in this sense,⁸¹ and κριτής is always used in Q in a context where there is a negative outcome for the one(s) being judged.⁸² Second, Fleddermann is correct to note that the “ruling” or “governing” interpretation of κρίνοντες requires a “reconstituted Israel,” a concept that appears to be foreign to Q.⁸³ Although we have argued above that Q’s use of deuteronomistic themes may have been intended to inspire repentance before the coming of the Son of man, there appear to be no grounds in Q for the view that in the eschaton Israel would be restored. Thus, it seems best to view the reference to the twelve tribes as synonymous for all Israel as those coming under the judgment of the followers of Jesus, whose earthly allegiance to Jesus was tested in the synagogues (Q 12:11-12).

The theme of eschatological reversal, which some scholars see as the central idea of the kingdom language in Q,⁸⁴ would appear to confirm this view, and also offers a clue to the significance of the Thrones saying as the concluding pericope of Q. Fleddermann rightly pointed to three themes which come together in Q 22:28,30: judgment, identification of Jesus with the disciples, and eschatological reversal. “Before the end time the disciples must not judge (Q 6:37), and they are subject to judgment in the court of their adversaries (Q 12:11-12),⁸⁵ but in the

⁸⁰ Jacobson, *First Gospel*, 248.

⁸¹ So J. Dupont, “Le Logion de douze trônes (Mt 19,28; Lc 22,28-30),” *Bib* 45 (1964): 355-92, esp. 372; Kloppenborg, *Excavating Q*, 192. See Q 6:37; 12:57; 11:31-32.

⁸² Zeller, “Zukunft Israels,” 9. See Q 11:19; 12:58.

⁸³ Fleddermann, “End of Q,” 8; Zeller, “Zukunft Israels,” *passim*.

⁸⁴ Kloppenborg, *Excavating Q*, 387: “[Q] assumes the coming of God’s reign, which will transform and invert the current order of things (Q 6:20b-23) and in which Jesus’ followers will assume positions of privilege (Q 22:28-30).” See also Tuckett, *Q*, 141-2 (on the Q beatitudes); Fleddermann, “End of Q,” 10.

⁸⁵ Zeller rightly notes the possibility that ἐκβάλλω in Luke 6:22 is a Q reference to expulsion from the synagogues, which presumably would involve judicial action, “hängt von der hier besonders schwierigen Textrekonstruktion ab” (“Zukunft Israels,” 10).

end time the disciples will judge the twelve tribes of Israel, sharing in the judging role of Jesus.”⁸⁶ Kirk also sees eschatological reversal as the prominent theme of the major compositional unit he identifies as Q’s “Eschatological Discourse” (Q 12–22).⁸⁷ Kloppenborg also emphasized the eschatological reversal suggested by Q 22:28.30: the saying predicts that “the followers of Jesus will themselves dispense the judgment which Jesus and John threatened over Israel.”⁸⁸ If we are correct to understand *κρίνω* in 22:30 as meaning “judge,” rather than “govern,” then the characteristic that Collins discerned in the relationship between exalted figures and the communities whose fates they represent—“parallelism of action”⁸⁹—is also present in Q. in the parallel judging roles expected for Jesus the Son of man and the community. Something similar is expected in the *Similitudes* for the community of the righteous (*1 Enoch* 38). There, the judgment of sinners is connected with the appearance of the righteous and the Righteous One (38:1-2: judgment is declared by the Righteous One but executed by the righteous (38:3-6).

In Q, however, the “parallelism of action” between Jesus and the community goes beyond a shared role in judgment. To cite Kloppenborg again, Q 22:28.30 and Q 10:16 “establish a continuity between the activity of Jesus and that of his followers.” To take this observation a few steps further, this continuity begins in mission (Q 10:16), and includes not only persecution and rejection (Q 6:22-23; 10:10-11, 16; 11:49-51; 12:2-3, 11-12; 13:34-35), but also revelation

⁸⁶ Fleddermann, “End of Q,” 10.

⁸⁷ Kirk, *Composition*, 289-308.

⁸⁸ Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 95.

⁸⁹ Collins, “Heavenly Representative,” 115.

(10:21-22, 23-24) and heavenly or eschatological vindication (6:22; 12:8-9; 22:28,30).⁹⁰ Thus, though we do not have in Q the same kind of parallel designations for the exalted figure and the community as are present in Wisdom 2-5 or the *Similitudes of Enoch*, the parallels in earthly activity and otherworldly vindication between Jesus and the Q community are clear. The exaltation and vindication which the Q people hoped for as the reward for their earthly allegiance to Jesus would be impossible without his own exaltation and vindication, as both its precedent and its christological basis; and this we have already found in the decisive text, the Jerusalem Lament (Q 13:34-35).

⁹⁰ Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 95. Fleddermann has a similar view: "Q works continuously to clarify the relationships between Jesus, the disciples, and Israel. With the theme of discipleship Q identifies the disciple closely with Jesus both in his present homelessness and suffering and in his eschatological triumph" ("End of Q," 10).

5.3: Q 10:21-22, Q 13:34-35, and Q's Eschatological Instruction

It was noted above in Chapter Three that Lohfink, in his study of assumption in Jewish literature, isolated in several texts what he called "ein festes Schema," according to which the sage would receive divine revelation ("Offenbarungsempfang") concerning both the events of the end and his own assumption, and would make use of the intervening time ("Zwischenzeit") between the reception of revelation and his assumption ("Entrückung") to instruct the people of God.¹ According to Lohfink, the sources displaying this pattern are *1 En.* 81:5-6, *4 Ezra* 14, *2 Baruch* 76, and *2 Enoch*.² There may be a literary relationship between *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch*,³ whether direct or indirect; nevertheless, because these two writings differ considerably in their use of the schema, we still appear to have four independent sources that make use of this pattern.

The schema likely originated in the view, seen earliest and most clearly in *2 Kings* 2, that people who are to be assumed sometimes receive foreknowledge of their end. Elijah knows, and so do all the other characters in the story of his assumption, that he will be taken into heaven (*2 Kgs* 2:3,5,10), although how he received this knowledge is not explained. The natural conclusion would be that the sage received foreknowledge of his assumption from God, and it would be a small step from this conclusion to the view that God would at the same time reveal a great deal more to the sage. In addition, as Lohfink suggests, the schema may have been derived from later treatments of Moses' time on Mount Sinai, and his subsequent revelation of divine things to the

¹ Lohfink, *Himmelfahrt Jesu*, 60-1.

² *Ibid.*

³ See A. F. J. Klijn, "2 (Syriac Apocalypse of) Baruch," in *OTP*, 1.615-52, esp. 620: "The parallels with 4 Ezra are attributed by many scholars to a dependence by 2 Baruch on 4 Ezra; but since the theological ideas of the two writings differ widely, a common source is also more likely here." See also A. F. J. Klijn, "The Sources and the Redaction of the Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch," *JJS* 1 (1970): 65-76.

Israelites.⁴ This connection is made explicit in *4 Ezra* 14, where God speaks to Ezra from a bush (14:2), describes to him the revelation to Moses (vv. 3-6), and allows Ezra forty days to write down this revelation (vv. 23-26, 37-48). Ezra becomes a new Moses, receiving revelation and writing books, some for public consumption and others remaining secret wisdom.⁵

The purpose of the schema may be to emphasize that, or to explain how, the community of the elect has come into the possession of divinely revealed secrets, passed on to them by a sage who has a direct relationship to them. In the parts of *1 Enoch* discussed below, and in *2 Enoch*, this relationship between the sage and the people is, as is typical for testamentary literature, mediated by means of the sage's own children. A different literary device is used to the same end in *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch*, where the sages write down the revelation (*4 Ezra* 14:19-22, 37-48, in which Ezra writes down both the twenty-four books of the Hebrew Bible and seventy books of secret things; *2 Baruch* 77-87, Baruch's letters to the exiles and to the nine and a half tribes).⁶

The most important of these texts is *1 En.* 81:5-6, because it probably is the oldest. It is part of what appears to be a testamentary addition (*1 En.* 81:1-82:3) to the *Book of Heavenly Luminaries* (*1 Enoch* 72-82).⁷ Nickelsburg suggests that this addition, along with *1 Enoch* 91, was composed at about the same time as the *Epistle of Enoch* (chs. 91-105). *Jub.* 4:18-19 seems

⁴ Lohfink, *Himmelfahrt Jesu*, 61: "Vorbild war letzten Endes die Mosesgeschichte, der zufolge Moses auf dem Berg die göttlichen Offenbarungen empfing und dann hinunterstieg, um sie dem Volke mitzuteilen. Sein langes Weilen auf dem Berg wurde von der Apokalyptik auf den Empfang geheimer Offenbarungen gedeutet, aus seinem Aufstieg auf den Offenbarungsberg wurde ein Art Himmelsreise."

⁵ See Stone, *Fourth Ezra*, 417.

⁶ On the ninety-four books in *4 Ezra* 14, see Stone, *Fourth Ezra*, 441. Enoch also does some writing in *2 Enoch*, but before he returns to earth to instruct his children (*2 En.* 22:11; 23:3-6).

⁷ See G. Nickelsburg, "Enoch, First Book of," in *Anchor Bible Dictionary* (ed. D. Freedman; 6 vols.; New York: Doubleday, 1992), 2.508-16; here, 509, 511. At *1 En.* 82:4 the topic returns to calendrical concerns.

to allude to *1 En.* 81:1–82:3, and the *Apocalypse of Weeks* (*1 En.* 93 + 91:12–17), on which grounds Nickelsburg dates the testamentary addition to the early second century BCE.⁸

In *1 Enoch* 81, Enoch is told (presumably by Uriel; see *1 En.* 80:1) to examine the tablets of heaven, on which are written “all the deeds of humanity and all the children of the flesh upon the earth” (*1 En.* 81:2). Then the seven holy ones deposit Enoch back on earth at his house, and say,

“Make everything known to your son, Methuseleh, and show to all your children that no one of the flesh can be just before the Lord; for they are merely his own creation. We shall let you stay with your own son for one year, so that you may teach your children another law and write it down for them and give all of them a warning; and in the second year, you shall be taken away from (among) all of them. (*1 En.* 81:5–6)

What Enoch begins to recount, however, in the *Book of Dreams* (*1 Enoch* 83–90), are two visions, one of the Flood (chs. 83–84) and the other, the *Animal Apocalypse* (chs. 85–90). The testamentary-style address to Enoch’s children resumes in *1 Enoch* 91, the beginning of the *Epistle of Enoch*. *1 En.* 91:12–17, the conclusion of the *Apocalypse of Weeks*, apparently interrupts Enoch’s address to his children, and Chapter 92 seems to have been composed as the introduction to the *Epistle of Enoch*, but apparently does not belong where it has been put by the compiler. If this is correct, then the following forms part of Enoch’s introduction to the *Apocalypse of Weeks*:

“Now I shall speak to you, my children, and show you the ways of righteousness and the ways of wickedness. Moreover, I shall make a revelation to you so that you may know what is going to take place.” (*1 En.* 91:18)

⁸ Ibid., 512.

Because of the problems in deciphering the relationships among these various parts of *1 Enoch*, it is not entirely clear to what extent the “Offenbarungsempfang—Zwischenzeit—Entrückung” schema has had any effect on the organization or depiction of the material which follows.

However, the introductory function of the direct address of Enoch to his children in *1 En.* 81:1–82:3; 91:1–10.18–19; 93:1–3 seems to suggest that the instruction commanded by the “seven holy ones” might include the Flood Vision, the *Animal Apocalypse*, and the *Apocalypse of Weeks*, along with the other materials (as Nickelsburg has shown,⁹ woes, admonitions, and eschatological predictions) that comprise the *Epistle of Enoch*. The material in the *Epistle* is the most like the kind of instruction Enoch is commanded to give: “teach your children another law and write it down for them and give all of them a warning” (*1 En.* 81:6). Only the *Apocalypse of Weeks*, however, is introduced as revelation Enoch received by reading the heavenly tablets (*1 En.* 91:1–3; recall 81:1–2). The important points here, however, are (1) that Enoch is able to give eschatological instruction to his children because he has received heavenly revelation (81:1–2), (2) that he discloses these things to them because he has been commanded to do so by the “seven holy ones” (81:5–6), and (3) that the instruction itself is of a rather disparate nature, containing material from apocalyptic timetables to paraenesis, but all clearly conditioned by the imminent expectation of the end.¹⁰ A cursory examination of *4 Ezra*, *2 Baruch*, and *2 Enoch* confirms that these three points apply there as well.

Although *4 Ezra* and *2 Baruch* both use the revelation—instruction—assumption schema, only the latter includes (for the reader/ hearer) any significant amount of instruction in what follows the reception of revelation. In *4 Ezra* 14, as just mentioned, Ezra in the intervening time

⁹ G. W. E. Nickelsburg, “The Apocalyptic Message of *1 Enoch* 92–105,” *CBQ* 39 (1977): 309–28.

¹⁰ The *Epistle of Enoch* does not contain a narration of Enoch’s assumption as the conclusion of the intervening time for instruction.

between God's revelation and his assumption (narrated only in the conclusions of the non-Latin versions of the writing) writes down the contents of the revelation. God warns Ezra of his coming assumption (*1 Ezra* 14:9), and of the imminence of the end (vv. 10-12, 14-18), and commands him to reprove his people, to comfort the lowly, and to instruct the wise (v. 13). After asking God's permission, and receiving special instructions, Ezra writes down everything revealed to him; and, as with Moses before him, some of the books—the Scriptures—are designated for public consumption, while others are set aside as secrets for the wise (*1 Ezra* 14:19-26, 37-48; on Moses, vv. 3-6). The only direct instruction to the people of God is the address of Ezra in 14:27-36, in which he admonishes them to rule their minds and discipline their hearts, so that after death they may obtain mercy at the judgment (vv. 34-35).

A significantly greater amount of instruction is found after Baruch's reception of revelation in *2 Baruch*. After forty days, Baruch is told by the Lord, he will be taken to the top of a mountain, from which he will see what he is leaving behind and where he is going. "For you will surely depart this world," the Lord tells him, "nevertheless not to death but to be kept until the end of times" (*2 Bar.* 76:2-4). The purpose of Baruch's instruction to the people is so that they "may learn so that they may live in the last times" (v. 5). As Ezra also did, Baruch addresses the whole assembly of the people, warning them to make straight their ways (77:1-10).¹¹ At their request, he writes "a letter of doctrine and a roll of hope" (77:12) to send to those in exile and to the lost nine and a half tribes. The letter (*2 Baruch* 78-86) serves mainly to console the people with the thought that an eschatological reversal is near (for example, *2 Bar.* 81-82; 83:9-23;

¹¹ Though the purpose of the instruction is ostensibly for the survival of God's people in the end times (*2 Bar.* 76:5), the motive for the people turning to righteousness is not (ostensibly, at least) eschatological. Because of the fictive setting of *2 Baruch*—the time of the exile—Baruch says that if the people make straight their ways, the other tribes will return.

85:10-15) and to warn them of the necessity of being ready, not forsaking the commandments (83:8; 84:1-11; 85:4,9,11) because they will be subject to judgment as well (83:4-8; 85:9).¹² So, because of the letter, the instruction of Baruch to the people survives for the benefit of the reader/hearer.

The schema "Offenbarungsempfang—Zwischenzeit—Entrückung" comes to a compositional expression in *2 (Slavonic) Enoch*, whose whole structure is patterned after this motif. According to Lohfink, the reception of revelation occurs in *2 Enoch* 3–38; the rest of the book is the intervening time in which Enoch instructs his children, and his assumption occurs in *2 Enoch* 67.¹³ Enoch describes to his children the scope of the revelation he has received: "I know everything" (*2 En.* 40:1.2).¹⁴ The instruction delivered by Enoch to his children is of a truly disparate nature, some of it describing visions of celestial phenomena (40:1-12) or heaven and hell (40:13–42:2), and some dealing with predictions of a final judgment (49:1–50:1) or the eschatological blessedness of the righteous (65:6-11). Much of it, however, is ethical instruction of various types, including macarisms and woes (42:6-14; 52:1-14) and admonitions (53:1-4), all of which looks ahead to the final judgment (see especially 50:2–51:5; 62:1–63:4; 66:1-8).¹⁵

A number of results having implications for Q arise from this brief survey. First, these writings make an explicit connection between foreknowledge of assumption and special divine revelation for the eschatological instruction of the people of God. Second, because of the

¹² The letter of Baruch also describes, in typical deuteronomic fashion, how the fall of Jerusalem and the Babylonian exile were caused by the sin of the people (*2 Baruch* 78–80; 84:2-5).

¹³ Lohfink, *Himmelfahrt Jesu*, 61. The concluding chapters describe revelation to Methuseleh, the episode concerning the infant Melchizedek, and the flood (chapters 68–70; 71–72; 73).

¹⁴ The citations used here are general and apply to both the shorter and the longer recensions. It is the opinion of Bötttrich that there are grounds for considering the longer recension of *2 Enoch* the more original, and the shorter the result of editing done at a later stage in the Slavonic textual tradition (Bötttrich, "Recent Studies," 40).

¹⁵ For instance, *2 En.* 50:5 [J]: "Let each one of you put up with the loss of [his] gold and silver on account of a brother, so that he may receive a full treasury in that age."

significant moment of revelation, the instruction which the sage gives to the people is often characterized as "revelation" or "wisdom" or "secret," or as of divine origin.¹⁶ Third, the instruction which is offered to the people of God in the intervening period is usually of eschatological significance, but is comprised of a variety of formally disparate materials, including apocalyptic timetables, admonitions to right conduct in view of the coming judgment, and macarisms and woes. Fourth, there may have occurred something of a development in the use of the schema: *1 Enoch* and *4 Ezra* apparently use it to explain the publication of esoteric wisdom, or to reinforce paraenesis by creating a sense of urgency, but appear to make no use of the schema as an organizing principle; *2 Baruch* introduces the literary device of an open letter to convey eschatological teaching and paraenesis; and, if Lohfink was correct, the later *2 Enoch* apparently uses the schema to shape the entire book.

There appear to be limited similarities between Q and these writings, because they all describe a scenario in which a seer with foreknowledge of his assumption is also the recipient of special revelation for the instruction of the community. Given that Q uses assumption theology in order to express beliefs about Jesus' post-mortem vindication and return, Q clearly thought that he had received foreknowledge of his assumption, since it is predicted in the Jerusalem Lament (Q 13:34-35). In addition, in Q 10:21-22 Jesus describes himself, in exclusive terms, as both recipient and mediator of divine revelation.

In Q 10:21-22, Matthew and Luke display very close verbal agreement, so that very few details of reconstruction are posed to the interpreter.

¹⁶ *1 En.* 82:1-3; 91:18; *4 Ezra* 14:26,40,45-48; *2 En.* 39:2-3

ἐν ... εἶπεν· ἐξομολογοῦσαί σοι, πάτερ, κύριε τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ τῆς γῆς, ὅτι
ἔκρυψας ταῦτα ἀπὸ σοφῶν καὶ συνετῶν καὶ ἀπεκάλυψας αὐτὰ νηπίοις·
ναὶ ὁ πατήρ, ὅτι οὕτως εὐδοκία ἐγένετο ἔμπροσθέν σου.

πάντα μοι παρεδόθη ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρός μου, καὶ οὐδεὶς γινώσκει τὸν υἱὸν εἰ
μὴ ὁ πατήρ, οὐδὲ τὸν πατέρα [[τις γινώσκει]] εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱὸς καὶ ὃ βούληται ὁ
υἱὸς ἀποκαλύψει.

At «that time» he said: I thank you, Father. Lord of heaven and earth. for you hid
these things from sages and the learned, and disclosed them to children. Yes,
Father, for that is what it has pleased you to do.

Everything has been entrusted to me by my Father, and no one knows the Son
except the Father, nor [[does anyone know]] the Father except the Son, and to
whomever the Son chooses to reveal him.¹⁷

Likely these sayings did not originate together, because they differ formally, and because “v. 22
shifts from being an address to God to being a self-recommendation of the revealer and discusses
the mediation of revelation.”¹⁸ The verbal similarities between the two sayings (πατήρ/ υἱός;
ἀποκαλύπτω: ταῦτα/ αὐτὰ/ πάντα) suggest that 10:22 was composed as a christological
comment on verse 21.¹⁹

One issue which has attracted the attention of commentators is the wisdom Christology of
Q 10:21-22. Does Q 10:21-22 identify Jesus with Wisdom? Such an identification cannot be
presumed facilely.²⁰ The idea that the Father hands all things over to the Son has, as many have
noted, closer parallels to apocalyptic literature (Dan 7:14, for example) than to wisdom

¹⁷ Robinson, et al., *Critical Edition*, 190-3. For discussions of the reconstruction see Schulz, *Spruchquelle*, 213-14; J. S. Kloppenborg, “Wisdom Christology in Q,” *LTP* 34 (1978): 129-47, esp. 132-5; Hoffmann, *Studien*, 104-6; A. Denaux, “The Q-Logion Mt 11.27 / Lk 10.22 and the Gospel of John,” in *John and the Synoptics* (ed. A. Denaux; BETL 101; Leuven: Leuven University Press and Peeters, 1992), 163-99, esp. 168.

¹⁸ Tuckett, *Q*, 277. See also Bultmann, *History*, 159-60; Schulz, *Spruchquelle*, 215; Kloppenborg, “Wisdom Christology,” 137; Hoffmann, *Studien*, 109; Jacobson, *First Gospel*, 150; Denaux, “Q-Logion,” 170.

¹⁹ Schulz, *Spruchquelle*, 215; Kloppenborg, “Wisdom Christology,” 137; Hoffmann, *Studien*, 109; Tuckett, *Q*, 277.

²⁰ Christ, *Jesus Sophia*, 88-9.

materials.²¹ However, the fact that the Son here is the unique mediator of the Father's revelation is suggestive of the role of divine Wisdom, at least.²² In addition, while some Q materials clearly designate Jesus as an emissary of Wisdom (Q 7:35), others go much further in associating Jesus and Wisdom: as argued in the previous chapter, Q 11:49 and 13:34 appear to have Jesus speaking on Wisdom's behalf, and 13:35 appears to equate his assumption with the withdrawal of Wisdom's presence (and of divine protection for the people of God). As the sole mediator of the revelation of the Father, Jesus is perhaps "functionally equivalent with Sophia,"²³ but remains an earthly figure,²⁴ like the other sages whose revelation-mediating relationships with their communities continued until their assumption.

Jacobson suggested that Q 10:21-22 is anomalous in Q because it seems to avoid making those who rejected Jesus' message responsible for their actions. This is inconsistent with the deuteronomistic view, and with the "bitter denunciations" of Q 10:13-15.²⁵ However, the fact that "these things" have been hidden from the wise and revealed to infants (10:21) suggests, as Catchpole observes, "an implicit rebuke, which in turn must imply a degree of culpability."²⁶ Catchpole also notes that "the language of the hiddenness of revelation is found also in apocalyptic traditions where the withdrawal of Wisdom before unrighteous men is a sign of the eschatological age (cf. *4 Ezra* 5:9-10; *I Enoch* 42)."²⁷

²¹ Schulz, *Spruchquelle*, 222; Kloppenborg, "Wisdom Christology," 141-2; Hoffmann, *Studien*, 121-2; Uro, *Sheep*, 226; Tuckett, *Q*, 279.

²² For literature see Kloppenborg, "Wisdom Christology," 144.

²³ Kloppenborg, "Easter Faith," 88.

²⁴ Pace Hoffmann, *Studien*, 140-1, who sees Q 10:21-22 as presuming a scenario similar to Matt 28:16.

²⁵ Jacobson, *First Gospel*, 149. In Jacobson's view this signals "a reinterpretation of the failure of the mission," because "we now have the view that God intended this failure, that the light was deliberately withheld from all but the little fellowship of babes" (ibid.). See also Uro, *Sheep*, 229, 232.

²⁶ Catchpole, *Wisdom*, 171; see also Tuckett, *Q*, 277.

²⁷ Catchpole, *Wisdom*, 171.

Q 10:21-22 differs significantly from the accounts of revelation found in the writings that make use of the revelation—instruction—assumption schema because it does not explicitly connect this divine revelation with a foreknowledge of assumption. There are, however, some important aspects relating Q 10:21-22 and 13:35b which may suggest such a connection. As suggested in Chapter Four above, Jesus' disappearance in Q 13:35b may be equated with the withdrawal of Wisdom, because Jesus is associated with divine Wisdom in Q as her emissary *par excellence*.²⁸ In addition, the Jerusalem Lament also rebukes those who should have been receptive to the appeals of Wisdom. Both Q 10:21-22 and 13:34-35, which may identify Jesus with divine Wisdom, suggest that Jesus is the mediator of revelation whose rejection has caused direct access to revelation first to be restricted, and finally brought to an end. Yet this is not unequivocal: revelation remains present in those who receive the Son's revelation of the Father. As recipients of Jesus' revelation, the community members themselves are its bearers, as Q 10:22 suggests (ὃ βούληται ὁ υἱὸς ἀποκαλύψει [τὸν πατέρα]) and as the community's self-identification with Jesus and John as emissaries of Wisdom confirms. Revelation is still accessible to those who adopt the attitude of acceptance typified by the "infants,"²⁹ those who by their response to Jesus show themselves to be children of Wisdom (Q 7:35).³⁰

What of the content of this revelation? Admittedly, Q 10:21-22 is somewhat vague: "these things" (ταῦτα/ αὐτά) have been hidden from the wise and learned and revealed to children (10:21); "all things" (πάντα) have been handed over to the Son by the Father, and the Son reveals the Father to whomever he chooses (v. 22). A number of different suggestions

²⁸ Catchpole guesses at "some parallelism of thought ... with Lk 13:35 par." (ibid., 265 n. 85).

²⁹ Ibid., 178.

³⁰ Uro, *Sheep*, 233-4.

concerning the meaning of ταῦτα have been entertained by scholars,³¹ including eschatological knowledge.³² The πάντα in 10:22 seems not to refer to the content of revelation as to the fullness of authority delegated to Jesus by the Father, particularly the authority to communicate revelation.³³ This is implied in the mutual and exclusive knowledge of the Father and Son in 10:22b. It is, however, unclear how the revelation of the Father in verse 22 is related to the “things” hidden and revealed in verse 21, at least in terms of content. Nevertheless, the fact that this revelation receives limited mediation by Jesus suggests that this revelation consists in his instruction to the community (rather than his public proclamation).

There may be a distinction here, as there was in *4 Ezra*, between those things meant for public knowledge and those meant for the community alone. The hiddenness of “these things” from the wise in Q 10:21 implies a rejection of Jesus’ proclamation by the wise and learned; conversely, the revelation to infants implies acceptance, as other uses of νήπιος suggest (see Wisd 10:21; Sir 3:19).³⁴ The contrast between the wise and the infants turns on the issue of the acceptance or rejection of Jesus; this is confirmed by the preceding context: “Whoever receives you receives me, and whoever receives me receives the one who sent me” (Q 10:16; compare 10:13-15). Thus, whether one is qualified to receive the revelation of “these things” apparently depends, as other things do in Q, on one’s response to Jesus.

This distinction appears to apply to the contents of Q after 10:21-22. The material before Q 10:21-22 deals with the ministry of Jesus *per se*—its nature and context (Q 3-4, 7), and the

³¹ Bultmann thought the pronouns refer to a lost antecedent in the immediately preceding context: “I also think it possible that it comes from a lost Jewish writing; it seems to be torn out of some context (to what does ταῦτα refer?)” (*History*, 160). Lührmann thought it was meant only in a general way (*Redaktion*, 65).

³² Schulz, *Spruchquelle*, 217-18; Kloppenborg, “Wisdom Christology,” 136.

³³ So Denaux, “Q-Logion,” 174.

³⁴ Compare Uro, *Sheep*, 232-3.

contents of his proclamation (Q 6)—and with reactions to him and his emissaries (Q 7, 10). The material after 10:21-22 may be divided between ethical and admonitory instruction for the community and condemnatory proclamation aimed at outsiders. Q 10:21-22, with its dichotomy between those qualified for the reception of revelation through Jesus and those unqualified for such revelation, serves on the one hand to highlight the revelatory nature of the community instruction that follows, and on the other to rationalize the failure of the mission and to reinforce the polemic against those who reject Q's message.

This can be clarified by means of a brief overview of the contents of the second half of Q. Most of this material is directed to the community, but what is ostensibly addressed to a broader audience is sharply condemnatory. Immediately following Q 10:21-22 is a macarism blessing the eyewitnesses of "these things" (10:23-24). The repeated neuter relative pronoun (ὃ, three times in 10:23-24) seems to refer to the revelation designated in the previous pericope only by ταῦτα and αὐτὰ (Q 10:21). This repeats the theme of esoteric knowledge and the privileged position of those who receive it, and reinforces the boundary between those within and those without: the prophets and kings neither saw nor heard the things seen and heard by the community (10:23). It also parallels 10:21 in a reversal of status, since just as the wise and learned do not receive revelation, prophets and kings do not see what they long for. Other materials admonish the community to remain loyal to Jesus, with both threats of punishment and promises of reward (Q 12:2-12, 33-34, 39-40, 42-46).

Material directed at outsiders includes the controversy material of Q 11. As Kirk has shown, the Beelzebul accusation (11:14-23) and the request for a sign (11:16, 29-32) begin as "public stigmatization attempts," but end in Q's "counter-stigmatization" of Jesus' opponents.³⁵

³⁵ Kirk, "Without Passion?", 4-5.

The Woes against the Pharisees (11:39-52) escalate to a condemnation of “this generation”—elsewhere in Q criticized for its rejection of John and Jesus (7:31-35)—for its murder of prophets. The Beelzebul pericope closes with a saying which divides people on the basis of their allegiance to Jesus, just as 10:21-22 and 10:23-24 do: “Whoever is not with me is against me, and whoever does not gather with me scatters” (11:23). This theme of division is repeated in 12:51-53. The mustard and leaven parables (13:18-21) combine with the following material on exclusion from the kingdom (13:24-27, 29-28) to emphasize the hiddenness or imperceptibility of the kingdom and the woeful consequences for those who find themselves excluded from it.

A new emphasis in community instruction appears with the Jerusalem Lament (Q 13:34-35), which appears to be directed to outsiders because of its condemnation of those who reject Jesus. The predicted assumption draws to a close the time for the instruction of the community: in some of the writings examined above, the seer refers to his impending assumption as the conclusion of his instruction to the people (see especially *2 En.* 55:1-3; compare *2 Bar.* 78:5; 84:1³⁶). The assumption prediction in Q 13:35b may have been used to a similar effect. The material which follows the Jerusalem Lament receives a certain urgency, and patently eschatological issues come to the fore.

Another reference to the division of humanity appears immediately following the Lament: “All who exalt themselves will be humbled, and all who humble themselves will be exalted” (14:11). Again, those who accept Jesus’ message experience a status reversal, for just as the infants receive revelation, the humble receive exaltation. The following parable of the supper

³⁶ These texts and others in *2 Baruch* refer to the seer’s death (see also *2 Bar.* 44:2 and 46:1, which however uses language of “taking away”). Other texts refer to his being “preserved until the end of times” (13:3; 25:1; 76:2). But note that the former texts occur in the public instruction of Baruch, and that according to *2 Bar.* 46:7, Baruch kept the foreknowledge of his assumption secret (“But with regard to that word that I shall be taken up, I did not let it be known to them at that time, not even to my son”).

shows that acceptance of Jesus is the issue, for those who refuse the host's invitation will be excluded from the supper (14:16-24; compare 13:29-28). The remaining material is community instruction whose eschatological emphasis becomes more clear as Q comes to a close.

Admonitions to loyal discipleship are found in the following section (14:26-27, 17:33, 14:34-35) and in 16:13. The final three sections—the material on the day of the Son of man (Q 17:23-37 *passim*), the parable of the entrusted money (Q 19), and the promise that Jesus' followers would judge the twelve tribes (22:28.30)—combine to warn the community of the nearness of the end and to encourage them in their faithfulness with a promise of reward.

As Kirk has recently pointed out, scholars have sometimes been at a loss—or even unwilling—to account for the organization of the second half of the Q document.³⁷ Lohfink's schema does not apply directly to Q, and so does not shed any new light on its final shape: however, in light of the observation that Q contains both a description of Jesus as the recipient and sole mediator of divine revelation and a prediction of Jesus' assumption, certain thematic emphases of Q's community instruction and polemical materials come into focus.

³⁷ Kirk, *Composition*, 289, citing H. Schürmann, "Das Zeugnis der Redenquelle für die Basileia-Verkündigung Jesu," in *Logia: Les Paroles de Jésus—The Sayings of Jesus*, 121-200, esp. 160; Zeller, *Kommentar*, 15; R. Horsley, "Q and Jesus: Assumptions, Approaches, and Analyses," in *Early Christianity, Q and Jesus*, 175-209, esp. 195; Jacobson, *First Gospel*, 184; Sato, *Q und Prophetie*, 43; Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 148-9, 153, 220 n. 201; C.-P. März, "... laßt eure Lampen brennen!" *Studien zur Q-Vorlage von Lk 12,35–14,24* (ETS 20; Leipzig: St Benno, 1991), 81.

Kirk himself provides extensive argumentation for the compositional strategies at work in what he calls the "Eschatological Discourse" (Q 12:2–22:30) and the "Controversy Discourse" (Q 10:23–11:52 + 13:34–35) (*Composition*, 289–308 and 309–36, respectively).

5.4: Q 11:29-30: The Sign of Jonah

In his 1985 essay “Entrückung zur Ankunft als Menschensohn,” Zeller suggested some connections between the Sign of Jonah saying (Q 11:29-30) and the Jerusalem Lament. The article, in fact, devoted more space to Q 11:29-30 than to Q 13:34-35. In this section we will examine his proposal, according to which the “Sign of Jonah” refers to both rescue from death and coming judgment, although he tried to show that assumption, rather than resurrection, is the point of the comparison between Jonah and the Son of man. As reconstructed in the *Critical Edition*, the Sign of Jonah saying reads as follows:

[[ὅ]] δὲ .. [[εἶπεν]] .. ἡ γενεὰ αὕτη γενεὰ πονηρὰ .. ἐστὶν σημεῖον ζητεῖ. καὶ σημεῖον οὐ δοθήσεται αὐτῇ εἰ μὴ τὸ σημεῖον Ἰωνᾶ.
[[καθ]ὼς γὰρ ἐγένετο Ἰωνᾶς τοῖς Νινευίταις σημεῖον, οὕτως ἔσται [[καὶ]] ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου τῇ γενεᾷ ταύτῃ.

But .. [[he said]] .. This generation is an evil .. generation: it demands a sign, but a sign will not be given to it—except the sign of Jonah!
For as Jonah became to the Ninevites a sign, so [[also]] will the son of humanity be to this generation.¹

The saying is notoriously difficult to interpret, and has given rise to a large body of secondary literature.² Tradition historical questions also exacerbate the issue, with widely diverging opinions concerning the original form of the saying and the order in which interpretive additions were made.³ Most discussions of the saying in Q tend to go one of two ways. Some see the “Son of man” reference as present, and the future verbs in 11:29,30 as logical or gnomic futures. On

¹ Robinson et al., *Critical Edition*, 248-251.

² For surveys of scholarship, see A. Vögtle, “Der Spruch vom Jonaszeichen,” in *Das Evangelium und die Evangelien* (Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1971), 103-36; Edwards, *Sign of Jonah*, 6-24; S. Chow, *The Sign of Jonah Reconsidered: A Study of Its Meaning in the Gospel Traditions* (ConBNT 27; Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1995).

³ See Lührmann, *Redaktion*, 34-43; Schürmann, “Son of Man Title,” 83-84; Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 133; Tuckett, *Q*, 260 (who thinks in the final analysis that “any fine distinctions between tradition and redaction are otiose” [ibid.]).

the basis of Q 11:32 ([ἄνδρες Νινευῖται] μετενόησαν εἰς τὸ κήρυγμα Ἰωνᾶ) it is often suggested that repentance proclamation,⁴ or at least judgment proclamation,⁵ is the *tertium comparationis*. Others think both the future verbs and the reference to the Son of man are eschatological, looking ahead to the Parousia and judgment.⁶ The “sign of Jonah” is the Son of man coming in judgment.⁷ In 1971, for instance, Richard Edwards argued for an eschatological interpretation and suggested that a “sign of Jonah” made sense to Q because of three similarities between Jonah and Jesus (resurrection, preaching, and judgment).⁸

In his 1985 essay, Zeller took as his starting point a few direct observations concerning the text. First, he noted that the saying does not amount to a complete refusal of a sign, but in fact promises a sign given by God.⁹ Zeller insisted that the sign was to be “ein wirkliches Zeichen”; as a result, he ruled out those solutions which have the sign, on the basis of 11:32 (“they repented at the preaching of Jonah”), consisting in Jesus’ repentance-preaching. Zeller also insisted that the future verbs in 11:29-30 (δοθήσεται, ἔσται) must be taken as temporal.

⁴ So, for instance, Tuckett, *Q*, 266.

⁵ See Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 132-4; Jacobson, *First Gospel*, 165.

⁶ Lührmann, *Redaktion*, 40; Sato, *Q und Prophetie*, 283; Catchpole, *Quest*, 246 take the verbs as strict (eschatological) futures.

⁷ Bultmann thought the point of the comparison was the distance that Jonah and the Son of man would come: “Just as Jonah came to the Ninevites from a distant country, so will the Son of Man come to this generation from heaven; i.e. the sign asked for the preaching of Jesus is the Son of Man himself, when he comes to judgment” (*History*, 118). See also Tödt, *Son of Man*, 270-1; Lührmann, *Redaktion*, 40-2; Hoffmann, *Studien*, 157, 181.

⁸ Edwards, *Sign of Jonah*, 57. “Resurrection” appears here primarily because Edwards followed Tödt in considering the resurrection as the origin of the confession of Jesus as the coming Son of man (ibid., 54-5; Tödt, *Son of Man*, 231 and elsewhere). See similarly Schürmann, “Son of Man Title,” 83. More recent scholarship, however, has rightly avoided interpretations which understand Q 11:29-30 as comparing Jonah’s experience with the “great fish” to the resurrection of Jesus: see in particular Chow, *Sign of Jonah Reconsidered*, 167-74, who sees the Sign of Jonah in Q as referring to the Parousia of Jesus the Son of man, but avoids “rescue from death” (and thus the question of resurrection theology in Q) as the grounds of the comparison.

⁹ Zeller, “Entrückung,” 520. Compare Catchpole, *Quest*, 245-7, who thinks that since Jonah could not have personally been a “sign” (as Isaiah, for example, was in Isa 20:3), the “sign of Jonah” amounts to a refusal of a sign to warn “this generation” in advance of the Son of man’s coming (ibid., 247).

rather than as gnomic or logical. Thus “es muß sich also um ein künftiges Zeichen handeln.”¹⁰ Although he noted correctly that the saying does promise a divine sign, Zeller’s views about the nature of the sign do not appear to be substantiated by the text. There is no reason why the sign must be “wirklich”; in addition, what Zeller seems to see as an implication of this—the future verbs must be taken eschatologically—would need to be shown on other grounds.

Edwards also argued that the future verbs in Q 11:29-30 should be taken eschatologically. on the basis of the “eschatological correlative” form¹¹ he identified as “a specific Q community creation.”¹² In his view, the eschatological correlative in Q “compares the coming of the Son of man with the judgment which fell upon the contemporaries of Noah, Lot and Jonah In every case, the coming of the Son of man is proclaimed because of the judgment to be expected on his arrival.”¹³ Subsequent work by Daryl Schmidt,¹⁴ however, confirmed that the correlative form occurs frequently in the Septuagint; furthermore, the future verbs in the correlatives isolated by Schmidt do not all refer to action in the distant or eschatological future, as appears to be the case in Q 17:24,26,30.¹⁵ In addition, the sense seems to be different in Q 17: H. F. Bayer pointed out that whereas the Noah and Lot correlatives have the emphasis on finality, the Jonah correlative has an emphasis on urgency.¹⁶ Kloppenborg is probably correct that here in Q 11:29-30, “the

¹⁰ Zeller, “Entrückung,” 520.

¹¹ “In summary form, the eschatological correlative is: Protasis: καθὼς (ὥσπερ, ὡς)—verb in past or present tense; Apodosis: οὕτως (κατὰ τὰ αὐτὰ)—ἔσται—ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου” (Edwards, *Sign of Jonah*, 49).

¹² *Ibid.*, 55.

¹³ *Ibid.*, 53.

¹⁴ D. Schmidt, “The LXX Gattung ‘Prophetic Correlative,’” *JBL* 96 (1977): 517-22.

¹⁵ Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 132; so also Tuckett, *Q*, 261.

¹⁶ H. F. Bayer, *Jesus’ Predictions of Vindication and Resurrection* (WUNT 2/20, Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1986), 123.

immediate context suggests [that] the future in 11:30 is parallel to οὐ δοθήσεται in 11:29, which means ‘God will give you no sign, now or later.’”¹⁷

Second, Zeller argued that the genitive construction τὸ σημεῖον Ἰωνᾶ in 11:29 is appositional, so that the sign is Jonah himself, and not some sign given by Jonah to the Ninevites.¹⁸ This is probably correct, given that 11:30 indicates that Jonah became (ἐγένετο), rather than gave (compare οὐ δοθήσεται, 11:29), a sign to the Ninevites. On this basis, the following verse correlates the Son of man to the sign of (that is, consisting in) Jonah: οὕτως ἔσται καὶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου τῇ γενεᾷ ταύτῃ. Thus, “dieses Zeichen wird der Menschensohn selber sein.”¹⁹

Third, Zeller observed that verse 29 is formulated as a judgment saying, with both an accusation (*Anklage*) and a threat (*Drohung*); the threat is developed in verse 30. It is odd that “this generation” is criticized for demanding a sign, and then told it would be given one as an exception. On this basis, then, Zeller argued that “das Zeichen, das Jesus legitimiert, bedeutet für das ‘böse Geschlecht’ Gericht.”²⁰ The sign, then, is the Son of man coming in eschatological judgment. Jacobson similarly observed that the sign of Jonah is a punitive response to the demand for a legitimating sign, but concluded that the formulation of the saying as a word of judgment means that the sign given will not legitimate Jesus, but will condemn “this generation.”²¹ The form-critical observation is valid, but the judgment-saying formulation may be explained on a reading which holds that Jonah and Jesus both proclaimed an imminent

¹⁷ Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 132.

¹⁸ Zeller, “Entrückung,” 520; so also Schürmann, “Son of Man Title,” 83 n. 49.

¹⁹ Zeller, “Entrückung,” 520.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 521.

²¹ Jacobson, *First Gospel*, 165.

judgment. Thus, Zeller's view does not necessarily follow that the sign promised will occur at the final judgment; this depends upon an eschatological understanding of the future verb ἔσται (v. 30).

In order to claim that the Sign of Jonah is “das Zeichen der zur Ankunft als Menschensohn entrückte,”²² that is, that the assumed Jesus would become—as the Son of man who comes in judgment—the sign of this generation's condemnation. Zeller first establishes that the assumed Enoch in *Jubilees* 4 and elsewhere is depicted as a sign related to judgment. If, as Zeller suggests, the Son of man is a sign of judgment in Q 11:29-30, the assumption of Jesus and his installation as an exalted and eschatological figure may be lurking in the background.

The Son of man in the Sayings Source is more of a witness in the judgment: his word is the basis of decision in the heavenly court. But if he should become to “this generation” a sign with the power to convict, the example of Enoch leads us to suppose that Jesus reaches this office by means of his assumption.²³

There is no question that in certain traditions Enoch was held to signify judgment in some respect. The problem with Zeller's reading is this: “Warum verweist das Wort dann aber nicht gleich auf das ‘Zeichen Henochs’?”²⁴

Zeller suggests that elements in the late Jewish traditions about Jonah, which express the prophet's rescue from the sea as an ascent (Jon 2:7²⁵), or which held that he entered the Garden of Eden alive (*Midr. Ps.* 26.7²⁶), explain why Jonah, not Enoch, is the figure to whom the Son of

²² Zeller, “Entrückung,” 522-5.

²³ Ibid., 524: “Der Menschensohn der Logienquelle ist mehr als Gerichtszeuge: sein Wort gibt vor dem himmlischen Forum den Ausschlag. Aber wenn er diesem Geschlecht ein überführendes Zeichen sein soll, läßt das Beispiel Henochs vermuten, daß Jesus durch Entrückung in dieses Amt gelangt ist.”

²⁴ Ibid.

²⁵ MT: וַתַּעַל מִשְׁחַת הַיָּם יְהוֹנָתָן אֱלֹהֵי LXX: ἀναβήτω φθορά ζωῆς μου. κύριε ὁ θεός μου.

²⁶ “The son of the widow of Zarephath, that is to say, Jonah the son of Amittai, was a completely righteous man. He was tried when the fish swallowed him and was tried again in the depths of the sea, but he did not die: The Lord spoke unto the fish, and it vomited Jonah upon the dry land (Jonah 2:11), so that Jonah, while still alive, entered into

man is compared. The evidence is slender; but even if Zeller's evidence were sufficient, the insurmountable difficulty is the fact that nowhere is Jonah depicted as an eschatological figure of judgment as is the Son of man/ Coming One of Q.²⁷ As Tuckett says,

The structure of v. 30 as a whole asserts that there is a close parallel between the way in which Jonah was a sign to the Ninevites and the way in which the SM will be (a sign) to this generation. If the latter is a reference to the SM coming in judgement at the Eschaton, there is no real comparison. Jonah's preaching was intended to avert judgement; the SM will bring judgement.²⁸

The fact that both Jesus and Jonah announced judgment—and invited repentance to avert it—does not suffice for Zeller's understanding of the comparison. for he insisted that the future verbs be taken eschatologically. As seen above, this position causes other difficulties. On Zeller's reading, Enoch would indeed be the more apt figure to be compared to the Son of man. The sign of Jonah cannot be "das Zeichen der zur Ankunft als Menschensohn entrückte."²⁹

The results of this brief discussion of Zeller's position are four. First, it seems likely that the sign of Jonah *is* the Son of man, as opposed to some sign given by him. Second, the sign of Jonah need not be eschatological (at least, the text does not seem to press us in that direction). Third, the saying is formulated as an announcement of judgment. Fourth, there does not seem to be strong evidentiary grounds for supposing that assumption as the grounds for eschatological function is the *tertium comparationis* between Jonah and the Son of man.

his glory, into the Garden of Eden" (trans. W. G. Braude, *The Midrash on Psalms* [2 vol.: New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1959], 1.363). The context compares the Shunammite's son, raised twice by Elisha (2 Kgs 4:18-20; 13:21), with Jonah, raised once by the great fish (Jon 2:7) and a second time by Elijah (1 Kgs 17:17-24; the tradition identifying Jonah and the Zarephathite's son is fairly common, as seen below, p. 289); the former eventually died and stayed dead because he was a sinner, but not so with Jonah.

²⁷ So Tuckett, *Q*, 264 n. 86.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, 263.

²⁹ Zeller, "Entrückung," 522. See the objections raised by Tuckett (*Q*, 263-4 n. 86).

Of these four results, the first is probably the most significant: the Son of man will be a sign to this generation as Jonah became a sign to the Ninevites. Interpretive proposals which focus on one point of similarity, to the exclusion of other possible reverberances between Jonah and Q's Jesus, may in fact limit the breadth of the signficatory significance of Jonah for Q without due cause. For this reason it is possible that multiple aspects of the careers of Jonah and Q's Jesus/ Son of man may be taken up in the idea of the "sign of Jonah." Perhaps the best way forward is to compare what we know about Q's view of Jesus, with the traditions about Jonah. Of particular interest will be those traditions which refer to Jonah or to his experiences as signficatory, although it will not always be possible to judge how widely diffused some of the Jonah traditions were.³⁰ Three obvious points of contact between Jonah and Q's Jesus become apparent: both proclaim judgment, which provokes repentance; both see the positive response of Gentiles; and both, apparently, experienced rescue(s) from death.

5.4.1. Repentance and the Proclamation of Judgment

Most discussions of the Sign of Jonah saying focus on repentance proclamation as the common ground between these two figures, and certainly Q itself presses the interpreter in this direction. Q 11:32 refers to "the proclamation of Jonah" (τὸ κήρυγμα Ἰωνᾶ), which provoked the repentance of Nineveh (μετενόησαν); "this generation" will be condemned at the judgment because "something greater than Jonah is here" (καὶ ἰδοὺ πλεῖον Ἰωνᾶ ὧδε). As noted above, Zeller excluded this option as a possibility because he insisted that the "sign" be "künftig."³¹ Q

³⁰ For a detailed discussion of Jonah in Jewish traditions, see Chow, *Sign of Jonah Reconsidered*, 27-44; see especially his summary remarks on Jonah as "sign," 43.

³¹ Zeller, "Entrückung," 520.

11:32 has been considered a subsequent addition to the saying,³² but even understood as an addition its significance as a redactional interpretation of 11:29-30 cannot be underestimated. It suggests a parallel between the proclamation of Jonah and that of Jesus, and draws a contrast between the response of the Ninevites and “this generation’s” failure to respond. The contrast between the Ninevites and “this generation” will be discussed in greater detail below.

It must be emphasized, however, that neither Jonah nor the Jesus of Q preach repentance *per se*; rather, both preach coming judgment. In both cases it is left to the hearers to understand that repentance is the appropriate response. Jonah’s message in Nineveh was quite terse: “Forty days more, and Nineveh shall be overthrown” (LXX: ἔτι τρεῖς ἡμέραι καὶ Νινευη καταστραφήσεται)” (Jon 3:4). Other Jewish sources that refer to Jonah’s proclamation in Nineveh similarly suggest that the coming destruction or overthrow of Nineveh comprised his whole message (Jos. *Ant.* 9.214; *de Jona* 103-4³³; *Liv. Pro.* 10:3³⁴). Similarly, in Q, Jesus does very little outright repentance preaching. In fact, the vocabulary of repentance (μετανοέω, μετάνοια) is rather infrequently used in Q. In material that may safely be ascribed to Q, it appears only in the preaching of John (Q 3:8), and in two sayings that suggest that Gentiles would have responded properly to Jesus’ message by repenting (Q 11:32 offers the Ninevites as a biblical example, and Q 10:13 offers Tyre and Sidon hypothetically). A good deal of the

³² See Catchpole, *Quest.* 244.

³³ This Hellenistic Jewish homily survives only in Armenian; it probably was written around the turn of the era. See F. Siegert, *Drei hellenistisch-jüdische Predigten* (WUNT 20; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1980), 2. In *De Jona* 103-4, Jonah does not invite repentance, though he does counsel the Ninevites to put away luxurious things (“Zieht den Bräutigamen (ihren) Feststaat aus, werft (allen) Schmuck weg! Beklagt keine Toten, sondern Lebende!”) before he offers the news of impending doom (“Dies Stadt hat (noch) drei Tage!”).

³⁴ Here Jonah bemoans his prophecy against Nineveh as having been false, so that his message must have been one of impending doom only.

sayings material directed (ostensibly, at least) to outsiders takes the form either of woes or of judgment sayings, as is the case here in Q 11:29-30.

This is not to suggest, however, that the repentance of “this generation” (however these opponents are envisaged) was not desired; as outlined above, the use of the deuteronomistic themes of the rejection and murder of prophets in Q, as in other materials, was probably intended to provoke repentance. Nevertheless, it must be affirmed that Jesus is not depicted in Q as a preacher who invited repentance, as John is; and the same is true with the biblical materials and Jewish traditions about Jonah.

Q’s Jesus and Jonah of the biblical traditions both foretold the destruction of cities. According to our reading of Q 13:34-35, Jesus announces in Q the pending destruction of Jerusalem; and Jonah of course announced the destruction of Nineveh. A tradition survives, interestingly, concerning an omen given by Jonah against Jerusalem some time after his preaching in Nineveh. In the chapter of the *Lives of the Prophets* devoted to the life of Jonah, he gives a sign or wonder (τέρας) concerning the destruction of Jerusalem:

And he gave a portent concerning Jerusalem (καὶ ἔδωκε τέρας ἐπὶ Ἱερουσαλήμ) and the whole land, that whenever they should see a stone crying out piteously the end was at hand. And whenever they should see all the Gentiles in Jerusalem, the entire city would be razed to the ground. (*Liv. Pro.* 10:10-11)³⁵

A similar tradition also appears in the proem to *Lamentations Rabbah*.³⁶ In 1978 G. Schmitt suggested that this is the common ground between Jesus and Jonah necessary for the sign of Jonah to make sense: both gave an oracle against Jerusalem.³⁷ Given the likely date of the *Lives*

³⁵ Translation from D. Hare, “The Lives of the Prophets,” in *OTP*, 2:379-99. Greek text from C. C. Torrey, *The Lives of the Prophets: Greek Text and Translation* (SBLMS 1; Philadelphia: Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis, 1946).

³⁶ Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 133.

³⁷ In Schmitt’s view, Q refers to this sign given by Jonah (G. Schmitt, “Das Zeichen des Jona.” *ZNW* 69 [1978]: 123-9).

of the *Prophets* (first century CE),³⁸ this is an intriguing possibility. One difficulty remains, however: as suggested above, the “sign of Jonah” appears not to refer to a sign *given* by the prophet, but to the prophet *as* sign.

5.4.2. The Piety and Repentance of Gentiles as Condemnatory to Israel

The material which follows the Sign of Jonah saying in Q draws attention, with reference to the Queen of the South (Q 11:31) as well as the Ninevites (11:32), to the fact that the ministries of Jonah and Jesus both resulted in Gentiles responding positively to God. According to Jon 3:10, God saw how the Ninevites had “turned from their wicked ways” (LXX: ἀπέστρεψαν ἀπὸ τῶν ὁδῶν αὐτῶν τῶν πονηρῶν), so that he “repented” (καὶ μετενόησεν ὁ θεός) from the catastrophe he had planned to bring upon the city. Jonah’s reaction in both biblical and non-biblical materials is less than joyful, however: Jonah 4 tells of the prophet’s anger at God’s relenting, and how God reproves him: in the *Lives of the Prophets* Jonah thinks he has given a false prophecy and goes into exile (*Liv. Pro.* 10:2-3); and in *de Jona* the prophet complains to God that the city was not destroyed (*de Jona* 157-81; God’s answer. 182-96). Nevertheless, the central message of the book of Jonah, and a theme reflected in early exegesis and rewritings of the story, is that God’s mercy extends to both Jew and non-Jew.

The same message is also present in Q in several sayings besides Q 11:31-32. Concerning the centurion, Jesus says, “I tell you, not even in Israel have I found such faith” (Q 7:9).³⁹ As noted above, Q 10:13-14 raises Tyre and Sidon as a positive (though hypothetical) example of

³⁸ So Hare, “Lives of the Prophets,” 380.

³⁹ Robinson et al., *Critical Edition*, 114.

how Gentiles would have repented in view of the “wonders performed” in the Galilean towns. Q 13:28-29 foresees the inclusion of Gentiles and the exclusion of Jews from the kingdom.⁴⁰ The theme of the positive response of Gentiles in Q seems intended to inspire the repentance of Jewish hearers of Q’s message. This is apparent in the fact that the texts which introduce this theme consistently do so by way of contrast with the non-response of the Jewish hearers. According to Kloppenborg, moreover, “early Jewish exegesis ... interpreted Nineveh’s repentance as an *Unheilszeichen* for Israel.”⁴¹

5.4.3. Rescue from Death?

In his recent study of the Sign of Jonah saying, Simon Chow concludes with respect to the meaning of the saying in Q as follows:

Thus, there are reasons to assume that the sign of Jonah in Q refers to Jesus’ death and resurrection, which is taken as a confirmation of his messiahship and a judgment on his opponents. The greatest difficulty with this interpretation is the fact that the resurrection of Jesus is not found in the proclamation of Q. The Son of Man and the resurrection of Jesus are never connected.⁴²

The “reasons” Chow refers to are mainly traditions from early Jewish sources that focussed on Jonah’s escape from the fish as divine intervention, as a rescue from Sheol, and as a sign of regeneration (*de Jona* 95); such traditions “[strengthen] the possibility that Q would have

⁴⁰ For the view that the “many” who come from East and West are diaspora Jews, see Horsley, “Social Conflict,” 38, and Allison, *Jesus Tradition*, 176-91.

⁴¹ Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 133 (referring to *Lam. Rab.* Proem 31; *Mek. Pisha* 1.80-2, 103-5, 112-12; *y. Sanh.* 11.5 2a).

⁴² Chow, *Sign of Jonah Reconsidered*, 163. Chow thinks the sign of Jonah in Q refers to “Jesus, as the Son of Man, coming in the *parousia*. It is a sign of the coming destruction” (*ibid.*, 167, with argumentation and implications 167-74).

associated death and resurrection with the sign of Jonah.”⁴³ Chow’s reticence with respect to Q and resurrection theology is, of course, justified; but the presence of assumption theology in Q at least allows for the possibility that, in addition to suggesting a correlation between their ministries and proclamations, the Sign of Jonah saying may also have suggested a common ground between Jonah and Jesus in terms of their rescue from death.

The materials Chow discusses may be briefly reviewed here. First, and this was also noted by Zeller, Jonah’s rescue by the fish is a rescue from Sheol (Jon 2:2; *Tg. Neof.* Deut 30:12-13). In the homily *de Jona*, a relatively early Hellenistic Jewish work which survives only in an Armenian version,⁴⁴ Jonah likens his time in the belly of the fish to being in a tomb (*de Jona* 71), or in the womb (63, 98), so that when he finally comes out, he is said to have been reborn (99). *De Jona* also calls the deliverance from the fish “sign of regeneration” (95):

I must be regarded as a witness to all this: I was taken out of sleep as a symbol [Wahrzeichen] of rebirth, so that I have become to everyone a guarantor of their own lives. The sign [Sinnbild] of truth will be understood, and even if it is only perceived in part, people will believe in you wholly.⁴⁵

Presumably the “sleep” Jonah refers to here is the sleep of death. As a rescue from physical death, Jonah’s deliverance from the fish is symbolic of the spiritual rebirth or regeneration of the Ninevites (184).⁴⁶

⁴³ Ibid., 162-3. Chow actually enumerates this argument into five “reasons,” adding that the future verb ἔσται may be understood as looking ahead to Jesus’ death and resurrection.

⁴⁴ See Siegert, *Drei hellenistisch-jüdische Predigten*.

⁴⁵ “Als Zeugen für (all) dies (braucht man nur) mich anzusehen: Ich, der ich aus dem Schlaf zum Wahrzeichen der Wiedergeburt herausgeholt wurde, werde (jedem) ein Bürge sein für sein eigenes Leben. Man wird das Sinnbild der Wahrzeit verstehen und, auch wenn man nur einen Teil sieht, in allem an dich glauben” (Siegert, *Drei hellenistisch-jüdische Predigten*, 25). See also Chow, *Sign of Jonah Reconsidered*, 36, who likewise gives an English translation of Siegert’s German.

⁴⁶ See the discussion in Chow, *Sign of Jonah Reconsidered*, 36.

Second, a fairly widespread tradition about Jonah was that he was the widow's son raised by Elijah (1 Kgs 17:17-24),⁴⁷ although it is impossible to guess whether such a tradition could have been known to Q. According to *Liv. Pro.* 10:2-6, Jonah after his mission to Nineveh went into exile amongst the Gentiles with his mother: Elijah in his flight came to stay with them, for he could not stay with Gentiles. When the widow's son died, "God raised him from the dead again (πάλιν ἡγειρεν ἐκ νεκρῶν ὁ θεός) through Elijah, for he wanted to show him that it is not possible to run away from God" (10:6).⁴⁸ Interestingly, from our perspective, the *Lives of the Prophets* includes the raising of the widow's son (*Liv. Pro.* 21:7) among the "signs" done by Elijah (τὰ δὲ σημεῖα ἃ ἐποίησεν, 21:4⁴⁹), although this passage does not identify the widow's son with Jonah.

However these traditions may be judged, it may be safely concluded that Jonah would have been widely considered to be someone who had been rescued from death (at least once, and possibly twice). In addition, if Q understood Jesus' post-mortem vindication in terms of assumption—normally seen as an escape from death, and, if it is not exactly viewed as an escape in Q, at least it is viewed as a reversal of sorts—, this allows for the possibility of this third point of contact between Jonah and the Jesus of Q. On this possibility, the sense of the sign of Jonah would be as follows: the sign that condemns this generation is the Son of man whose post-

⁴⁷ *Liv. Pro.* 10:2-6; *Gen. Rab.* 98.11; *Midr. Ps.* 26:7; *Pirqe R. El.* 33.

⁴⁸ Some manuscripts adjust the story so that the raising of the boy occurs before Jonah's time in Nineveh (Torrey, *Lives of the Prophets*, 27 n. 44).

⁴⁹ See D. Satran, *Biblical Prophets in Byzantine Palestine: Reassessing the Lives of the Prophets*. (SVTP 11; Leiden: Brill, 1995), 65. This section (21:4-15) is only preserved in the MS Q (Codex Marchalianus, Vat. Gr. 2125). Torrey's Greek edition does not include this section, since the most reliable manuscripts (D, E¹, E²) do not contain this material (Torrey, *Lives of the Prophets*, 8, 32). Hare suggests that "Torrey is probably correct in regarding this material as secondary," and considers it possible even that the whole Elijah section is "a later addition, since it does not conform to the document's general purpose of encouraging veneration of the prophets' graves" (Hare, "Lives of the Prophets," 396 n. g). Satran also suggests that the terminology (σημεῖα) of this section and the one on Elisha is unusual for the *Lives of the Prophets*, which prefers τέρατα; in addition, the material in this section recounts not prophetic omens (as elsewhere in the *Lives*) but biblical narrative (*Biblical Prophets in Byzantine Palestine*, 65).

mortem exaltation vindicates and demonstrates him as the emissary of God. It would be wise not to press this too far and suggest, as Zeller did, that “Son of man” here refers to Jesus as the assumed and returning judge, particularly since Q itself seems to think of “Son of man” here as Jesus the emissary of God whose proclamation should inspire repentance (11:32).

A practically insurmountable difficulty with this possibility, however, is the fact that the Ninevites were not witnesses to Jonah’s rescue from the fish, so that it is unclear how Jonah’s rescue from death would be a sign *to the Ninevites* (Q 11:30).⁵⁰ It may be concluded, then, that although the Q community may have understood Jesus as having been rescued from death, and although the reference to Jonah in Q 11:29-30 may have evoked images of the prophet’s experience with the fish, an interpretation with rescue from death as the *tertium comparationis* should probably be excluded because of the wording of the saying itself.

⁵⁰ Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 131-2; Tuckett, *Q*, 264 n. 86.

5.5: Implications

The results of the investigations in this chapter may now be summarized briefly. First, and most significant, Q contains two parables about an absent and returning master (Q 12:42–46; 19 *passim*), both of which occur in close proximity to material about a suddenly returning Son of man (12:39–40; 17:23–37 *passim*, respectively). All this material is suggestive of the absence or invisibility normally associated with assumption in Hellenistic literature, and also of the eschatological role (here, forensic) usually credited to assumed figures in Jewish writings. What is more, the final shape of this material is likely the work of the same redactional effort which composed the Jerusalem Lament (13:34–35), which, of course, we have argued contains a reference to assumption theology. This provides important substantiation of our main thesis. Second, Q seems to consider the exalted post-mortem Jesus as the paradigm or locus of community hopes of heavenly or eschatological vindication much the same way as some post-biblical Jewish writings connected community hopes to exalted figures. The hope of corporate vindication and exaltation, which in Q is based upon allegiance to Jesus/ the Son of man (Q 6:22–23; 12:8–9; 22:28,30), would be impossible unless Q had some kind of strategy for understanding Jesus’ own vindication and exaltation. Third, some limited similarities of a thematic but not necessarily structural nature were seen between Q and certain Jewish apocalyptic writings, those in which Lohfink perceived a schema of revelation—instruction—assumption. While Q considered Jesus as a special recipient (and mediator) of divine revelation—which included a foreknowledge of his assumption—Lohfink’s schema does not apply directly to Q. However, a brief consideration of relevant texts showed that certain instructional themes, in particular an emphasis on the esoteric nature of community instruction, are evident in both Q and the apocalyptic writings discussed. Finally, the “Sign of Jonah” saying, which Zeller thought showed

evidence of Q's assumption theology, was investigated briefly. In the final analysis, it was decided that although Jesus and Jonah were likely both understood by the Q people as having been rescued from death, assumption was probably not the *tertium comparationis* of the saying.

Chapter Six: The Assumption of Jesus in Q and Early Christianity

Although resurrection is the usual New Testament category for understanding the post-mortem vindication and exaltation of Jesus, certain materials rather conspicuously refer to Jesus' death and exaltation without explicitly mentioning the resurrection. In not all cases is it appropriate to argue that the resurrection is assumed but not stated. For instance, the pre-Pauline hymn that appears in Phil 2:6-11 moves directly from Jesus' death to his exaltation:

ἐταπείνωσεν ἑαυτὸν γένόμενος ὑπῆκοος μέχρι θανάτου, θανάτου δὲ σταυροῦ. διὸ καὶ ὁ θεὸς αὐτὸν ὑπερύψωσεν

... he humbled himself, becoming obedient unto death, the death of the cross. Therefore God has highly exalted him (Phil 2:8-9)

Of course, for Paul the resurrection is the means of Christ's exaltation (see Rom 8:34, for instance), but some have presumed a similar view for the original context of the hymn. Ernst Lohmeyer, for instance, saw here a primitive, non-Pauline way of interpreting the "fact" of the resurrection.¹ On the other hand, Georgi thought assumption may have been the mode of exaltation at work in the pre-pauline hymn.²

¹ "So tritt uns hier eine ererbte, nichtpaulinische Deutung der Auferstehungstatsache entgegen" (E. Lohmeyer, *Kyrios Jesus: Eine Untersuchung zu Phil. 2,5-11* [2. Aufl.; Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1961], 49). See also R. P. Martin, *A Hymn of Christ: Philippians 2:5-11 in Recent Interpretation & in the Setting of Early Christian Worship* (3rd ed.; Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 1997), 239: "the act of Resurrection is included, but passed over in favour of a full emphasis upon the victory of Christ and his installation in the seat of power and might."

² "Das Auferstehungsmotiv, das für Paulus selbstverständlich ist und zur Zeit der Abfassung seiner Briefe wohl auch ziemlich zur Allgemeingeltung gelangt ist, fehlt in Phil 2.8. Statt dessen findet sich das Erhöhungsmotiv, das in der Vorlage des Textes mit dem Entrückungsmotiv konform geht. Die Entrückungsvorstellung dürfte aber älteste christologische Tradition sein, und zwar nicht in Ergänzung der Auferstehungsvorstellung, sondern an ihrer Stelle und vor ihr" (Georgi, "Vorpaulinische Hymnus," 292). Georgi based this view on his argument that Wisd 2-5 was the inspiration for the hymn. But Lohfink thought his conclusion unjustified: "Georgi ... kann für Phil 2.6-11 die Existenz des Entrückungsschemas nur auf Umweg über Weish 2-5 behaupten" (*Himmelfahrt Jesu*, 97 n. 46); "für den Entrückungsgedanken gibt es im Text auch nicht den kleinsten Anhaltspunkt" (*ibid.*, 85 n. 12).

To cite another early Christian example, the letter to the Hebrews avoids resurrection language altogether, preferring instead to move right from Jesus' death to his exaltation. Heb 1:3, for instance, says of Christ that "having brought about purification for sins, he sat at the right hand of majesty in the highest," and in Heb 2:9 "we see Jesus, crowned with glory and honour because of his suffering unto death." The author of Hebrews does refer to the resurrection once, in the final doxology (13:20), but even there explicit resurrection language is avoided: God is described as

ὁ ἀναγαγὼν ἐκ νεκρῶν τὸν ποιμένα τῶν προβάτων τὸν μέγαν ἐν αἵματι
διαθήκης αἰωνίου, τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν

the one who led up from the dead the great shepherd of the sheep in the blood of
the eternal covenant, our Lord Jesus

The use of ἀνάγω here is interesting, since the verb is reminiscent of ascent. Harold Attridge suggests that the avoidance of the verb ἐγείρω here "is no doubt deliberate. It conforms to the tendency of Hebrews, which has so consistently used language of exaltation not resurrection for the act whereby Jesus' sacrifice is consummated and he himself 'perfected.'"³

So, if it is possible for some early Christian writings to avoid explicit mention of resurrection while affirming Jesus' post-mortem exaltation,⁴ is it likely that assumption is the presumed christological tenet? Certainly it would be tendentious to assume either assumption or resurrection where neither is explicitly stated. But it has long been suspected, by some scholars at least, that a belief in Jesus' assumption was contemporary with, or even chronologically or theologically prior to, belief in his resurrection. Elias Bickermann, for instance, in his 1924 article on Mark's "Empty Tomb" narrative (Mark 16:1-8), thought that Mark made use of an

³ H. W. Attridge, *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1989), 406.

⁴ See also 1 Tim 3:16.

early tradition about Jesus' assumption from the grave, a tradition which originated in the *Urgemeinde* and which was quickly supplanted by the dominant resurrection theology of the Hellenistic Christians.⁵ The dominant feature of Mark's Empty Tomb story is the absence of Jesus' body, rather than an appearance of the risen Jesus; clearly, for the later evangelists the empty tomb signified Jesus' resurrection, but because Mark's story—whatever its origin or pre-history—has formal similarities with Hellenistic assumption reports, it deserves careful consideration as a possible parallel to the belief in Jesus' assumption which we have argued for in Q.

A few years after Bickermann wrote his essay on the Empty Tomb, Georg Bertram argued that a belief in Jesus' immediate ascension from the cross (see *Gos. Pet.* 5.19) was the origin of more developed beliefs such as resurrection, assumption from the grave, post-resurrection ascension, and so forth.⁶ Traces of this view, argued Bertram, are still evident in some New Testament writings, particularly in those texts which move directly from Jesus' death to his exaltation, such as Phil 2:8-9 and Heb 1:3, discussed briefly above. The texts to which Bertram referred—except for, possibly, *Gos. Pet.* 5.19—refer not to ascension or assumption but simply to exaltation.⁷ The texts which may be taken to describe an assumption of Jesus from the cross are for the most part fairly late, and actually, as will be argued below, narrate either the ascent of Jesus' soul at the point of death (*Gos. Pet.* 5.19; an insertion at Mark 16:4 in Codex

⁵ Bickermann, "Das leere Grab," 290, 292. See also Haufe, "Entrückung und eschatologische Funktion," 113: "Daß die synoptische Überlieferung im übrigen keine positiven Belege bietet, läßt sich aus der Situation des nachösterlichen Gemeindeglaubens sehr leicht erklären."

⁶ G. Bertram, "Die Himmelfahrt Jesu vom Kreuz an und der Glaube an seine Auferstehung," in *Festgabe für Adolf Deissmann zum 60. Geburtstag* (ed. K. L. Schmidt; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1927), 187-217. See the brief discussion in Zwiep, *Ascension*, 7.

⁷ See Lohmeyer, *Kyrios Jesus*, 48 n. 2.

Bobbiensis) or a temporary journey, possibly bodily, from the cross (*Acts John* 97–102; *Ques. Barth.* 1.6–7).

Similarly, Barnabas Lindars thought that “the resurrection was understood in terms of exaltation from the very first.” Moreover, the belief in Jesus’ exaltation could have originated “without the experience of the resurrection as an historical event,” since it was possible for “the death of a supremely righteous man [to] be interpreted as the transition from earthly life to a position in heaven appropriate to God’s designated agent of the judgment.”⁸ The point here is the theological and/ or chronological priority of one model of post-mortem vindication over another. As C. F. Evans wrote in 1970,

The question is whether death-exaltation was always simply a synonym for, or an extension to its furthest point of death-resurrection, or was a parallel, independent and alternative conception in its own right. The question could also be raised whether it was not in certain respects the prior conception in being responsible, in a way the resurrection by itself is not likely to have been, for the belief in the imminent return of the exalted Lord⁹

Evans made an important point, and it is directly applicable to Q, which “jumps immediately to Jesus’ return as the Son of man.”¹⁰ But it seems risky to argue, as Bickermann and these other scholars did, that assumption was the prior (or even original) model.¹¹ It is safer to argue that assumption was more theologically appropriate than resurrection in some circles, quite apart from the question of whether resurrection traditions were known to such circles or not.

In this final chapter, texts will be examined that suggest that assumption was a model for theologizing Jesus’ post-mortem vindication and exaltation beyond the Q community. The

⁸ Lindars, “Apocalyptic Myth,” 380.

⁹ Evans, *Resurrection and the New Testament*, 137–8.

¹⁰ Kloppenborg, *Excavating Q*, 378.

¹¹ See also Georgi, “Vorpaulinische Hymnus,” 292 (cited in quotation above, p. 293 n. 2).

sections below, it must be emphasized, only sketch out in rough outline issues which should properly be pursued elsewhere in greater detail. The purpose is to provide some corroboration, in reference to other circles in early Christianity, of the view that Q was not alone in thinking of the post-mortem Jesus using the category of assumption. In particular, this chapter will briefly consider, as already noted, (1) texts which seem to describe an assumption of Jesus from the cross, (2) Mark's Empty Tomb story. A final text to be examined is (3) Stephen's vision of the Son of man (Acts 7:55-56), which describes an exalted Jesus in close proximity to a deuteronomistic interpretation of his death, yet without explicit mention of the resurrection. This text, which may or may not derive from traditional material, shows a convergence of themes strikingly similar to those seen already in Q 13:34-35.

6.1: An Assumption of Jesus from the Cross?

Four extracanonical texts appear to describe an assumption or a disappearance of Jesus from the cross. Though most of them are of a much later date than Q, they must be examined here because they use assumption language for a crucified, though not yet dead, Jesus. Probably, such later legendary developments in the tradition about the crucifixion would not have been possible had there not already been in existence the view that the post-mortem Jesus had experienced assumption rather than resurrection. Two of these texts, *Gos. Pet.* 5.19 and an insertion after Mark 16:4 in the Old Latin, appear to describe an assumption of Jesus from the cross. The two others, *Acts of John* 97–102 and *Ques. Barth.* 1.6–7, describe heavenly journeys, perhaps bodily, from the cross and back again. *Gos. Pet.* 5.19, first of all, uses standard assumption language (the aorist passive ἀνελήφθη) where one would expect a reference to the death of Jesus. The text reads:

Καὶ ὁ κύριος ἀνεβόησε λεγὼν· Ἡ δύναμις μου, ἡ δύναμις, κατέλειψάς με· καὶ εἰπὼν ἀνελήφθη.

And the Lord cried out saying: My power, [my] power, you abandoned me; and having said [this] he was taken up.¹

This passage has been a *crux interpretum* on two counts.² First, does the unusual cry of dereliction indicate a docetic view according to which the impassible “Christ” leaves the human Jesus at the moment of death? Second, should ἀνελήφθη be interpreted as referring to such a view, to an ascent of the soul, or, taken euphemistically, to Jesus’ death?

¹ Greek text from M. G. Mara, *Évangile de Pierre: Introduction, texte critique, traduction, commentaire et index* (SC 201; Paris: Cerf, 1973).

² See Mara, *Évangile de Pierre*, 132–40; J. W. McCant, “The Gospel of Peter: Docetism Reconsidered,” *NTS* 30 (1984): 258–73, esp. 262–7; P. M. Head, “On the Christology of the Gospel of Peter,” *VC* 46 (1992): 209–24, esp. 213–15.

Our interest is in how ἀνελήφθη is being used here. D. W. Palmer suggested that it “may be taken to denote assumption rather than death,” although he seemed to confuse “assumption” with the naïve view “of the person departing from his body at death.”³ For Palmer’s main source, the citation from the *Assumptio Mosis* preserved by Clement (*Strom.* 6.132.2), refers to soul ascent, not assumption.⁴ The two categories could use similar language, but the chief distinction lies in the fact that with assumption, whether pre- or post-mortem, the body disappears. *Gos. Pet.* 5.19 cannot refer to a bodily assumption of Jesus from the cross, because the narrative continues, describing in great detail the removal of the body from the cross and its burial (6.21-24). It seems best to understand ἀνελήφθη here as referring to the ascent of Jesus’ soul. Although the verb ἀναλαμβάνω was sometimes used euphemistically for “dying,”⁵ it was also commonly used to describe the ascent of the soul.⁶ The latter meaning is to be preferred because other descriptions of the death of Jesus—leaving aside the question of their relationship to the *Gospel of Peter*⁷—also seem to suggest a departure of Jesus’ soul from the body. Mark 15:37 and Luke 23:46 read ἐξέπνευσεν; Matt 27:50 reads ἀφῆκεν τὸ πνεῦμα; John 19:30. παρέδωκεν τὸ πνεῦμα. In addition, there is nothing to suggest that *Gos. Pet.* 5.19 refers to the departure from Jesus of a

³ D. W. Palmer, “Origin, Form, and Purpose of Mark 16:4 in Codex Bobbiensis,” *JTS* 27 (1976): 113-22; citation from 119. Palmer uses the word naïve to describe Origen’s view that Jesus departed from his body at the time of his death (ibid.: Origen, in *Matt.* 138).

⁴ See above, p. 144 n. 89.

⁵ BAGD, 56. See also the “later evidence” cited by Head (“Christology,” 214 and 223 n. 47).

⁶ According to Lohfink, the terms ἀνάληψις and *assumptio* were normally used for soul ascent as well as assumption (*Himmelfahrt Jesu*, 61-9). Compare the citation from the *Assumptio Mosis* preserved by Clement of Alexandria: “Joshua, the son of Nun, saw a double Moses being taken away (ἀναλαμβανόμενον), one who [went] with the angels, and the other who was deemed worthy to be buried in the ravines” (*Strom.* 6.132.2; Tromp, *Assumption of Moses*, 283).

⁷ For a survey of recent opinion, and assessments of the evidence, see A. Kirk, “Examining Priorities: Another Look at the Gospel of Peter’s Relationship to the New Testament Gospels,” *NTS* 40 (1994): 572-95.

distinct spiritual entity (whether the “Christ” or the “Word”), as apparently certain of Irenaeus’s opponents believed (see, for example, *Haer.* 3.16.6; 3.17.4).⁸

In the *Acts of John*, the apostle flees the scene of the crucifixion and takes refuge on the Mount of Olives. After the onset of darkness, Jesus appears to John suddenly—though the text does not narrate the departure from the cross—and gives him a special revelation in the time during which darkness covered the land (*Acts of John* 97–102). Jesus says, “John, to the multitude down below in Jerusalem I am being crucified ... but to you I am speaking, and pay attention to what I say” (*Acts John* 97). The end of the vision is described as an assumption:

When he had spoken to me these things and others which I know not how to say as he would have me, he was taken up, without any of the multitude having seen him (ἀνελήφθη μηδενὸς αὐτὸν θεασαμένου τῶν ὄχλων). And when I went down I laughed them all to scorn (*Acts John* 102)⁹

The removal of Jesus at the conclusion of the encounter takes him back to the cross, and the crowd’s ignorance of Jesus’ absence (if in fact the text supposes he was absent from the cross in body) appears to be attributed to their spiritual blindness.¹⁰

The *Questions of Bartholomew*, dated on theological grounds to around the fifth century,¹¹ describes unambiguously a disappearance of the body of Jesus from the cross. After

⁸ See McCant, “Docetism,” 262–5. Maria Mara suggested that the subject of ἀνελήφθη is δύναμις μου, and claimed good support for an interpretation of the verb “comme se rapportant non à la mort, mais à la gloire qui résulte pour le κύριος de l’ascension de la δύναμις” (*Évangile de Pierre*, 139). Mara saw ἀνελήφθη in *Gos. Pet.* 5.19 as multivalent, referring to the death, resurrection, and ascension of Jesus all at the same time, much as Luke 9:51 and John 12:32 appear to do. This let the door open for subsequent Gnostic interpretations of an ascension from the cross of the divine Christ: “Il est clair ... que le texte se prête à une interprétation gnostique à cause de la synthèse elle-même qu’il présente” (ibid., 140; see also Head, “Christology,” 215). Mara’s view is complicated, and certainly later views need not be contained *in nuce* in *Gos. Pet.* 5.19 in order for them to make use of such language as ἀνελήφθη.

⁹ Translation from Elliott, *Apocryphal New Testament*, 320–1. Greek text from E. Junod and J.-D. Kaestli, *Acta Iohannis: Textus alii—Commentarius—Indices* (2 vols.; CCSA 2; Turnhout: Brepols, 1983), 1.215.

¹⁰ “Il est donc préférable de rattacher le ἀνελήφθη à la scène de la crucifixion et de rapprocher la remarque sur la foule qui ne voit rien du motif de l’aveuglement des hommes et des puissances qui croient mettre Jésus à mort et ne voient pas qu’il leur a échappé” (Junod and Kaestli, *Acta Iohannis*, 2.676).

¹¹ According to Jean-Daniel Kaestli, the *Questions of Bartholomew* contains material on the descent into Hades which was current in the second century, but expressions related to the veneration of Mary which are not attested

the resurrection, Bartholomew says to Jesus,

“Lord, when you went to be hanged on the cross, I followed you afar off and saw you hung upon the cross, and the angels coming down from heaven and worshipping you. And when there came darkness, I looked and I saw that you vanished away from the cross (εἶδόν σε ἀφανῆ γεγονότα ἀπὸ τοῦ σταυροῦ), and I heard only a voice in the parts under the earth, and great wailing and gnashing of teeth all of a sudden. Tell me, Lord, where did you go to from the cross?” (*Ques. Barth.* 1.6-7)¹²

The text goes on to give Jesus' answer: he left the cross in order to bring Adam and the patriarchs up from Hades (1.8-9). The manuscripts describe differently this otherworldly journey, but all agree on a return of Jesus to the cross, still under cover of darkness (1.20). Apparently all these things were visible only to Bartholomew. As in the *Acts of John*, Jesus makes a temporary departure, perceptible only to a chosen disciple, from the cross, under cover of darkness.¹³

Although *Ques. Barth.* 1.7 does not describe an assumption, it is of interest because it presents a combination of motifs—a bodily disappearance of Jesus from the cross, during the time of universal darkness, accompanied by an angelic escort—similar to that found in another source, the interpolation after Mark 16:3 in the Old Latin Codex Bobbiensis (k). In a 1976 article, D. W. Palmer argued that the interpolation “seems to be an account of the assumption of Jesus from the cross, which was transposed to its present position at the time of the Latin translation of Mark, in order to give the impression of a visible resurrection from the tomb.”¹⁴

before Epiphanius of Salaminus. Thus, in his view, “il peut être tentant de supposer que l'ouvrage actuel est le produit d'une composition par étapes, qui aurait trouvé son aboutissement à la fin du IV^e siècle” (J.-D. Kaestli and P. Cherix, *L'évangile de Barthélemy d'après deux écrits apocryphes* [Turnhout: Brepols, 1993], 94). See also J.-D. Kaestli, “Où en est l'étude de l'Évangile de Barthélemy?,” *RB* 95 (1988): 5-33, esp. 21: “Les savants qui se sont risqués à proposer une datation se comptent sur les doigts d'une main.”

¹² Translation from Elliott, *Apocryphal New Testament*, 655. The writing survives in Greek, Latin, and Slavonic. The Greek text here cited is from Hierosl. sabaiticus 13 (H); see A. Wilmart and E. Tisserant, “Fragments Grecs et Latins de l'Évangile de Barthélemy,” *RB* 10 (1913): 161-90; 321-68; citation from 183.

¹³ On points of contact between the *Questions of Bartholomew* and the *Acts of John*, see Kaestli, “L'étude,” 25-7.

¹⁴ Palmer, “Mark XVI.4,” 122. See also Lohfink, *Himmelfahrt Jesu*, 128-9; Parsons, *Departure of Jesus*, 146-7; Zwiep, *Ascension*, 190. Neither Parsons nor Zwiep refer to Palmer's article.

Palmer reproduced the text of Bobbiensis opposite the Greek text of Mark 16:1-4 as shown here.¹⁵

Mark 16:2-4, Codex Bobbiensis	Mark 16:2-4
² et venerunt prima sabbati mane,	² καὶ λίαν πρωὶ τῇ μιᾷ τῶν σαββάτων ἔρχονται ἐπὶ τὸ μνήμα ἀνατείλαντος τοῦ ἡλιοῦ.
³ dicentes: Quis nobis revolvat lapidem ab osteo?	³ καὶ ἔλεγον πρὸς ἑαυτάς, Τίς ἀποκυλίσει ἡμῖν τὸν λίθον ἐκ τῆς θύρας τοῦ μνημείου;
⁴ Subito autem ad horam tertiam tenebrae diei factae sunt per totum orbem terrae et descenderunt de caelis angeli et surgent ¹⁶ in claritate vivi Dei; simul ascenderunt cum eo et continuo lux facta est. Tunc illae accesserunt ad monumentum et vident revolutum lapidem. fuit enim magnus nimis.	⁴ καὶ ἀναβλέψασαι θεωροῦσιν ὅτι ἀνακεκύλισται ὁ λίθος· ἦν γὰρ μέγας σφόδρα.

Palmer suggested several reasons why the interpolation seems not to have been originally composed for its present context. First, the time description (“ad horam tertium”) is not consistent with a dawn visit to the tomb. The omission, unique to Bobbiensis in the Old Latin.¹⁷ of something corresponding to ἀνατείλαντος τοῦ ἡλιοῦ (Mark 16:2) is unusual, and given the time discrepancy, Palmer said that “it is hard to believe that the omission is accidental.”¹⁸ Second, the reference to universal darkness does not fit with Mark’s empty tomb account either.

¹⁵ The Latin text here is cited from A. Jülicher, ed., *Itala: Das neue Testament in altlateinischer Überlieferung. II. Marcusevangelium* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1940).

¹⁶ Palmer surveyed the various emendations suggested by other scholars, and suggested “surgebant” here, because it makes the best sense and because “the omission of a syllable in the middle of a word” is a common scribal error in Bobbiensis. In addition, he understood *surgere* according to its more usual meaning of “getting up,” rather than “rising from the dead” (“Mark XVI.4,” 114-15).

¹⁷ See Jülicher, *Itala*, 2.157.

¹⁸ Palmer, “Mark XVI.4,” 115.

It does, however, fit a crucifixion context, especially given the fact that numerous early Christian sources, including Mark 15:33, suggest a three-hour-long period of darkness. So Palmer argued that “ad tertiam horam” originally referred to the end of the darkness, and that the interpolation’s original context was the crucifixion.¹⁹ Palmer also decided that the fragment proper extended from “ad horam tertiam” to “lux facta est,” with the rest of the interpolation being editorial adjustments to make the fragment fit.²⁰ Given these adjustments it is not surprising that the interpolation contains no explicit mention of the cross.

What we are left with, according to Palmer, is a fragmentary account of events at the crucifixion which has parallels both with other Christian passion accounts²¹ and, importantly, with assumption narratives such as the one in *2 En.* 67:1-3, where he discerned the same formal pattern: (1) coming of darkness; (2) descent of angels; (3) ascent; (4) return of light. Lohfink found that darkness, or clouds which similarly served to obscure the actual assumption, was sometimes found in Greco-Roman and Jewish assumption narratives.²² The idea of an angelic escort at an assumption seems to be rare.²³ The appearance of this motif in *2 En.* 67:2 shows some similarities to soul ascent narratives (such as *T. Abr.* 20:10-12 [A]; *T. Job* 52), but may be due to the association of Enoch’s journeys with angelic guides.²⁴

¹⁹ Ibid., 116; Palmer suggests that in its original context “ad” meant “until” instead of “at,” which it clearly means in its present context.

²⁰ Ibid., 115, 122.

²¹ Palmer (ibid., 117-18) mentions: angelic escort (*Ques. Barn.* 1.6); events occurring during the three hours of darkness (*Gos. Pet.* 5.15–6.21); return of light (*Gos. Pet.* 6.22; *Did. Apost.* 5.14).

²² Lohfink, *Himmelfahrt Jesu*, 44-5; 73.

²³ As suggested above (pp. 154-6), exactly what is going on at the death of Lazarus in Luke 16:23 is unclear.

²⁴ *1 En.* 81:5-6 hints that the “seven holy ones” who deposit Enoch back at his house will return for his final assumption after his year of instruction to his family. To my knowledge, all other descriptions of Enoch’s final assumption do not suggest he was accompanied or led by angels.

Palmer's suggestion is interesting, and at least his observations on the nature, extent, and original context of the interpolation seem well-founded. The main difficulties with the view that the interpolation refers to an assumption of Jesus from the cross are (1) the vagueness of the expression *ascenderunt cum eo*,²⁵ given that the usual depiction of Jesus' death is as a soul ascent, and (2) the fact that angelic escorts are more common in such scenarios than in descriptions of bodily assumptions. So, his interpretation of the fragment as referring to an "assumption" from the cross is open to question. If originally a fragment from an account of the crucifixion, the Bobbiensis interpolation probably describes not a bodily assumption but the ascent of Jesus' soul, two categories which Palmer seemed to confuse in his discussion of *Gos. Pet.* 5.19.²⁶ If we may hazard a guess, it seems that if Q would ever have come to offer a narrative account of the kind of assumption theology we suggest—namely, a post-mortem bodily disappearance—then it likely would have described an empty tomb scenario such as the one found in Mark 16:1-8, to which our attention now turns.²⁷

²⁵ *Ascendere* is not among the usual verbs for assumption, according to Lohfink (*Himmelfahrt Jesu*, 41-2).

²⁶ Palmer, "Mark XVI.4," 119-20. Lohfink also suggested (*Himmelfahrt Jesu*, 129) an affinity between the Bobbiensis interpolation and the *Gospel of Peter*, but for him the similarity consisted in the way both texts connect resurrection and immediate ascension (cf. *Gos. Pet.* 10.39-40, which Lohfink thought narrated an ascension: *ibid.*, 127). Palmer did not refer to Lohfink in his article.

²⁷ It must be stressed, however, that an "Empty Tomb" narrative in Q would be disruptive to its present shape. As Q stands, its final sections look ahead to the coming of the Son of man (Q 17 and 19) and to the establishment of the kingdom (22:28,30). Franklin thinks that Q's Passion Narrative, which in his opinion was the source of Luke's, could not have ended with something like an Empty Tomb story, since "it would have meant that the movement to exaltation would have ended in something like bathos" ("A Passion Narrative for Q?," 46). Franklin seems to understand Goulder's arguments for Luke's use of Matthew in the Easter accounts as suggestive of a Q Empty Tomb account (*ibid.*: cf. Goulder, *Luke*, 774-9). Franklin does not consider the possibility that an Empty Tomb story, as a disappearance or assumption narrative, could suggest immediate exaltation.

6.2: Mark's "Empty Tomb" Narrative (Mark 16:1-8)

Several features of Mark's "Empty Tomb" narrative (Mark 16:1-8) suggest the possibility that it could have been understood as an assumption story, particularly in view of the fact that Mark describes no appearance of the risen Jesus. Most significant is the absence of the body: as seen above in Chapter Three, it often took no more than disappearance for the conclusion to be reached that an assumption had taken place. Besides, a missing corpse suggests not resurrection but assumption (so Chariton, *Chaer.* 3.3). The absence of Jesus' body, typically, is emphasized by the reference to the women's search for Jesus.

καὶ εἰσελθοῦσαι εἰς τὸ μνημεῖον εἶδον νεανίσκον καθήμενον ἐν τοῖς δεξιοῖς περιβεβλημένον στολὴν λευκὴν, καὶ ἐξεθαμβήθησαν. ὁ δὲ λέγει αὐταῖς, Μὴ ἐκθαμβεῖσθε· Ἰησοῦν ζητεῖτε τὸν Ναζαρηνὸν τὸν ἐσταυρωμένον· ἠγέρθη, οὐκ ἔστιν ὧδε· ἴδε ὁ τόπος ὅπου ἔθηκαν αὐτόν.

And when they entered the tomb, they saw a young man seated on the right side, dressed in a white robe, and they were alarmed. And he said to them, "Do not be alarmed: you seek Jesus the Nazarene, who was crucified; he has been raised, he is not here; look, there is the place where they laid him." (Mark 16:5-6)

The testimony of a witness confirming the disappearance is also an important feature of assumption narratives, as Lohfink observed.¹ Whether the νεανίσκος here is a young man (see Mark 14:51-52) or an angel does not matter, because both heavenly and earthly figures may authenticate assumptions. A final element consistent with assumption stories in antiquity is the reference to the appearance in Galilee (16:7; compare 14:28). Admittedly, the announcement of an appearance especially to Peter (εἶπατε τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ καὶ τῷ Πέτρῳ) could also be understood in light of the appearance tradition as found in 1 Cor 15:5, though this need mean no more than that Mark knew of a tradition involving appearances of the risen Jesus to Peter and the

¹ Lohfink, *Himmelfahrt Jesu*, 45-6.

Twelve.² But a reference to a christophany not necessarily problematic, since epiphanies, sometimes occurring at quite a distance from the place of the assumption, also could confirm that an assumption had taken place.³ On the other hand, the most important element of Mark's Empty Tomb story that is not consistent with assumption narratives is the word ἡγέρθη. "he has been raised."

Scholars who have noticed the similarities between Mark 16:1-8 and assumption stories have attempted, in various ways, to account for the inconsistency which ἡγέρθη represents. Elias Bickermann, the first (1924) to suggest that Mark's Empty Tomb story is an assumption narrative, made the observation that a resurrection may only be proved by narrating either the process or an encounter with the risen person. Mark 16:1-8 describes neither the resurrection proper nor any subsequent appearance of the risen Jesus.⁴ The empty tomb would have been understood as a proof of Jesus' assumption, not resurrection.⁵ Bickermann therefore argued that Mark had altered an "Urbericht" about the assumption of Jesus from the tomb to fit his needs.⁶

² Uro, "Jeesus-liike ja ylösnousemus," 102.

³ Lohfink, *Himmelfahrt Jesu*, 45-6; Bickermann, "Das leere Grab," 290-1. Rudolf Pesch thinks that Mark 16:1-8 shows "Kontakt mit der Gattung von Erzählungen, welche die Suche nach und die Nichtauffindbarkeit von entrückten bzw. auferweckten Personen inszenieren"; he calls the appearance referred to in 16:7 a "Bestätigungsvision" (R. Pesch, *Das Markusevangelium* [2 vols.; 2nd ed.; HTKNT 2; Freiburg: Herder, 1980], 2.525, 534-5; citation from 2.522).

⁴ Bickermann, "Das leere Grab," 281-2. In fact, later adjustments to the end of Mark attempted to furnish one proof or the other: the longer ending (vv. 9-20) narrates several appearances of Jesus, and, as seen above, the interpolation in Codex Bobbiensis appears to describe a visible resurrection (ibid., 282).

⁵ "Das leere Grab beweist die Entrückung. Die Auferstehung wird dagegen niemals durch das Verschwinden des Leichnams bezeichnet oder erwiesen, sondern ausschließlich durch das Erscheinen des Wiederbelebten" (ibid., 286-7).

⁶ "Gerade weil dem Mc der Auferstehungsgedanke selbstverständlich erschien, durfte Easter die ganz anders Grabesgeschichte ruhig übernehmen und für seine Auffassung benutzen" (ibid., 290). In Bickermann's view this is consistent with Mark's method of violently ("gewaltsam") inserting "Palestinian" tradition into the framework of his own Hellenistic theology (ibid.). As evidence of Mark's adaptation of the "Urbericht," Bickermann noted: (1) the promise of an appearance in Galilee, since in Bickermann's view assumption and epiphany do not go together (ibid., 289; cf. Lohfink, *Himmelfahrt Jesu*, 45-6); and (2) the command to the women, only a "connecting link" between the assumption account and the appearance traditions (Bickermann, "Das leere Grab," 289).

This accounts for the intrusive nature of ἡγέρθη. Resurrection theology was "selbstverständlich" to Mark, and since early Christian tradition could sometimes substitute the idea of exaltation—after all, the end result of assumption—for the idea of resurrection, Mark was not troubled by using this early assumption account.⁷ Bickermann suggested that the assumption story used by Mark originated in a circle—actually, the "Urgemeinde"—that believed that Jesus was exalted immediately after his death.⁸ This understanding of Jesus' fate was quickly overshadowed by resurrection theology, which was more at home in the Hellenistic groups which knew of the dying and rising figures of the mystery religions. Thus, according to Bickermann, "eroberte die neue Auffassung nicht nur die neue Welt, sondern auch die alte der Urgemeinde."⁹

Bickermann's view was taken up by Neill Hamilton (1965),¹⁰ who likewise found the Empty Tomb story as being at odds with resurrection theology. Hamilton argued that the Empty Tomb narrative was created by Mark¹¹ primarily in reaction to traditions of the appearances of

⁷ Texts such as Luke 1:33; Acts 5:31; John 3:10; 12:32-34; Phil 2:10 "gebrauchen auch gelegentlich ohne Bedenken das Wort 'Erhöhung' anstatt der 'Auferstehung'" (Bickermann, "Das leere Grab," 290).

⁸ Ibid., 290.

⁹ Ibid., 292. For an early reaction to Bickermann's thesis, see Bultmann, *History*, 290 n. 3, who seems to agree with Bickermann's assessment of the religious background of the Empty Tomb story but disagreed with the classification of it as an assumption story. Others cite Bickermann or his views with approval: see P. Hoffmann, "Auferstehung Jesu Christi (Neues Testament)," *TRE* 4 (1979): 478-513, esp. 499 ("Diese Elemente weisen, als erster Bickermann aufzeigte, auf einen Zusammenhang mit antiken Entrückungserzählungen hin"); Pesch, *Markusevangelium*, 2.522-7; H. Merklein, "Mk 16.1-8 als Epilog des Markusevangeliums," in *The Synoptic Gospels: Source Criticism and the New Literary Criticism* (ed. C. Focant; BETL 110; Leuven: Leuven University Press and Peeters, 1993), 209-38, esp. 218-19; G. Lüdemann, *The Resurrection of Jesus: History, Experience, Theology* (London: SCM, 1994), 119-21 (with reservations because assumption is normally an escape from death); Uro, "Jeesus-liike ja ylösousemus," 101-2. Lührmann sees some similarity between Mark 16:1-8 and traditions about the exaltation of the righteous, but does not refer to Bickermann or use the term "Entrückung": "Wie nämlich Mose, Henoch oder Elia direkt zu Gott aufgenommen sind, so ist es auch dem Gerechten verheißen, daß er bei Gott sein wird (Weish 5.1 ff) zum Erschrecken für seine Gegner" (D. Lührmann, *Das Markusevangelium* [HNT 3; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1987], 268). Interestingly, Haufe made no reference to Bickermann, even though he was anxious to prove the presence of assumption theology particularly in Mark ("Entrückung und eschatologische Funktion," 112-13).

¹⁰ N. Q. Hamilton, "Resurrection Tradition and the Composition of Mark," *JBL* 84 (1965): 415-21.

¹¹ Hamilton, "Resurrection Tradition," 417. Hamilton suggested that the fact that "the women did not tell anyone shows that Mark is apologizing for a story which no one knew until he created and published it to the church. The reference to Peter in 16:7 shows that he is aware of the tradition of 1 Cor 15:3-5 and that feels he ought to make Peter the first witness of Jesus' resurrection" (ibid.).

the risen Jesus; he called the Empty Tomb story "an antiresurrection story," because "it avoids displaying the resurrected Jesus."¹² But Hamilton did not attempt to explain the presence of ἡγέρθη in Mark 16:5. Mark's purpose in composing the Empty Tomb narrative was to draw attention away from the resurrection appearances to the absence of Jesus, in order to highlight the Parousia. According to Hamilton, Mark's identification of John and Elijah (Mark 9:13) amounts to a creation of a "double career" for the biblical prophet. Elijah's assumption allows the transition between the two careers.¹³ This provides the framework for understanding Jesus as the Son of man: the first career of the Son of man is the ministry of Jesus (see Mark 2:10; 2:28; 9:12), and the second would be an earthly rule beginning after the Parousia.¹⁴ Thus, "Mark's special contribution to the eschatological crisis after 70 is his conviction that the resurrected Lord should be replaced by a translated and returning Son of man."¹⁵

A similar view has been propounded more recently by Adela Yarbro Collins (1992).¹⁶ Collins deals with the problem of ἡγέρθη by suggesting that, in Mark's understanding, Jesus was resurrected; Mark makes use of the narrative pattern of assumption because it was "a culturally

¹² Ibid., 420; cf. Crossan, "Empty Tomb," 152, who calls Mark's Empty Tomb story an "anti-tradition."

¹³ Hamilton, "Resurrection Tradition," 420.

¹⁴ Hamilton thought that "Mark's interest in working out eschatology on earth is so strong that he even has a theory about the geography of fulfillment." The prediction of a Galilean appearance is a clue that, due to the destruction of Jerusalem, Galilee would be the place of the Son of man's second career. Hamilton goes so far as to say that Mark "created the Galilean ministry to support his conclusion," apparently not aware of Q's interest in Galilee as the place of Jesus' ministry (ibid., 421).

¹⁵ Ibid., 420. For a similar view, see B. Mack, *A Myth of Innocence: Mark and Christian Origins* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988), 308: "Were a cosmic presence to be inferred [from the resurrection appearances], the apocalyptic concerns for vindications, judgments, and the eventual manifestation of the kingdom of God in human social history would be threatened."

¹⁶ A. Yarbro Collins, "The Empty Tomb and Resurrection according to Mark," in idem, *Beginning*, 119–48; see also idem, "The Empty Tomb in the Gospel According to Mark," in *Hermes and Athena: Biblical Exegesis and Philosophical Theology* (ed. T. Flint and E. Stump; University of Notre Dame Studies in the Philosophy of Religion; Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1993), 107–40 and idem, "Apotheosis and Resurrection," with minor modifications.

defined way for an author living in the first century to narrate the resurrection of Jesus."¹⁷ For Mark, Jesus' resurrection is physical, so the body is not in the tomb; but because Jesus does not make an appearance in Mark. Collins suggests that "the alternative is that he ascended to heaven immediately."¹⁸ The affirmation that an individual, Jesus, had been raised from the dead "seemed quite similar to the claim ... that Enoch had been taken up into heaven and to the claims made ... regarding the translation or apotheosis of heroes, rulers, and emperors."¹⁹ As with Hamilton, the effect, or perhaps the purpose, of assumption in Mark 16:1-8 is "to place the accent on the absence of Jesus," an accent related to the apocalyptic expectation of Mark.²⁰

To sum up briefly, then, Bickermann saw a formal distinction between assumption narratives and resurrection narratives, which led him to think that Mark was reworking an older tradition about the assumption of Jesus; Hamilton thought Mark's composition of the Empty Tomb story as an assumption narrative was polemically motivated, and that Mark intended to correct a mistaken emphasis on the resurrection appearances; and Collins thinks that Mark was simply describing Jesus' resurrection and immediate exaltation as an assumption, given that this was a conventional way of telling such a story. These three correctly distinguish between resurrection and assumption, for although (as argued above with respect to assumption) both types are used to account for the vindication of Jesus, they describe different phenomena.²¹

¹⁷ Collins, *Beginning*, 147.

¹⁸ Ibid., 146.

¹⁹ Ibid., 146-7.

²⁰ Ibid., 148.

²¹ Compare Pesch, *Markusevangelium*, 2.522-7. Pesch describes at great length the sources which describe the disappearance and the not-finding ("Nichtauffindbarkeit") of bodies, yet consistently equates assumption and resurrection ("Entrückung bzw. Auferweckung") as the beliefs substantiated by such phenomena. For Pesch the most important text proving the connection between assumption and resurrection is *Testament of Job* 39-40 (ibid., 2.525-6), apparently because the bodies of Job's children disappear and they experience heavenly glorification, as the vision confirms. But Pesch presumes, rather than explains or proves, the connection between resurrection and assumption.

Resurrection has more to do with the reversal of death, and assumption, typically at least, has to do with an escape from death, although as we have seen death was not an impediment in some instances. Seen only as a reversal of death, resurrection on its own cannot account directly for Jesus' exaltation and eschatological significance in the same way that assumption can²²—although admittedly the resurrection, understood as a sign of divine favour and vindication, would perhaps have suggested the kind of enthronement theology seen in the allusion to Ps 110:1 in Rom 8:34, for instance. Also, a connection between resurrection and eschatological function can already be seen in 1 Thess 1:9-10. But the fact that resurrection and assumption are different categories probably accounts for Luke's combination of the two.²³ For Luke, the resurrection reverses Jesus' wrongful death (Acts 2:23-24; 4:10), and his ascension explains his exaltation (Acts 2:31-35) and eschatological significance (Acts 1:11).²⁴

If resurrection and assumption are different, the question arises as to their combination in Mark 16:1-8. Bickermann, of course, was correct to say that resurrection theology was "selbstverständlich" to Mark²⁵ (see Mark 8:31; 9:9-10; 9:31; 10:34; 14:28). It may be that Mark used a pre-existing story about the disappearance of Jesus' body from the tomb, and adapted it

²² See Evans, *Resurrection*, 137-8, cited above, p. 296; see also Haufe, "Entrückung und eschatologische Funktion," 112: "Die Entrückung wird dem Einmaligen in der Person Jesu gerecht und paßt außerdem mühelos in den eschatologischen Rahmen seiner Verkündigung, während die vorzeitige Auferstehung eines einzelnen vor der allgemeinen eschatologischen Totenauferstehung in Rahmen der jüdischen Eschatologie schlechterdings keinen Platz hat."

²³ In the opinion of van Tilborg and Counet, "the combination of burial, disappearance and the belief in resurrection is at right angles to another combination which plays an important role in classical antiquity: namely the observation of the body's disappearance (before or after death) and the belief in assumption" (*Appearances and Disappearances*, 193). What is more, "Luke's texts show a strange mixture of the resurrection tradition and the assumption tradition" (ibid., 195). Van Tilborg and Counet also interpret the question of whether Luke had any traditional sources for his ascension narratives as the question whether Luke was the first to combine the resurrection tradition and the assumption tradition (ibid., 195 n. 8; cf. Lohfink, *Himmelfahrt*, 111-46; Parsons, *Departure of Jesus*, 140-9; Zwiep, *Ascension*, 185-92).

²⁴ See Lohfink, *Himmelfahrt Jesu*, 272; van Tilborg and Counet, *Appearances and Disappearances*, 186-7; cf. Zwiep, *Ascension*, 147-66.

²⁵ Bickermann, "Das leere Grab," 290.

by adding his characteristic resurrection theology. Verse 7 probably is Markan, given the fact that Jesus gives precisely the same message to the Twelve at the Last Supper (καθὼς εἶπεν ὑμῖν; see Mark 14:28). Scholars generally agree that both 14:28 and 16:7 are redactional insertions, given the way they both interrupt their neighbouring contexts.²⁶ Without verse 7, the νεανίσκος shows the women the place where Jesus' body had been, and they flee, telling no one; thus, there is no inconsistency between the explicit command "Tell (εἰπατε, v. 7)" and the failure to tell (καὶ οὐδενὶ οὐδὲν εἶπαν, v. 8).²⁷ The fact that the command names "the disciples and Peter" (εἰπατε τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ καὶ τῷ Πέτρῳ) shows that it is a rather transparent attempt at a rapprochement to the appearance traditions as in 1 Cor 15:3-8, especially because Mark 16:7 includes the verb ὤψεσθε (compare ὤφθη, 1 Cor 15:5-7), which is not in Mark 14:28.²⁸ In addition, ἡγέρθη in 16:6 and μετὰ τὸ ἐγερθῆναι με in 14:28 are closely similar, and are suggestive of the pre-pauline tradition in 1 Cor 15:4 (ἐγήγερται). If Mark composed the Empty Tomb story in order to subvert the appearance tradition, as Hamilton and Crossan have argued,²⁹ why has he included this reference to the appearances to Peter and the other disciples?³⁰ It seems more likely that Mark is adapting a pre-Markan story with the kerygmatic appearance traditions in mind. If Mark did not narrate any appearances because his source did

²⁶ See, for instance, L. Schenke, *Auferstehungsverkündigung und leeres Grab: eine traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung von Mk 16, 1-8* (SB 33; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1968), 43-6; W. Marxsen, *Mark the Evangelist: Studies on the Redaction History of the Gospel* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1969), 75-81; R. H. Stein, "A Short Note on Mark XIV.28 and XVI.7," *NTS* 20 (1974): 445-52, esp. 445; H. Paulsen, "Mk XVI 1-8," *NovT* 22 (1980): 138-75 = Hoffmann, ed., *Überlieferung*, 377-415, esp. 388-93.

²⁷ See Bultmann, *History*, 285; Collins, *Beginning*, 133.

²⁸ Lüdemann, *Resurrection*, 118: "Note that v. 7 has been inserted by Mark into the tradition, but earlier knowledge seems to have been preserved in the redaction." See also Uro, "Jeesus-liike ja ylösousemus," 104-5.

²⁹ Hamilton, "Resurrection Tradition," 420; Crossan, "Empty Tomb," 152.

³⁰ The view that ὤψεσθε in Mark 16:7 refers to a Galilean Parousia is untenable. See, first of all, E. Lohmeyer, *Galiläa und Jerusalem* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1936), 10-11; see also Marxsen, *Mark the Evangelist*, 75-95; Hamilton, "Resurrection Tradition," 419-21. Cf. Stein, "Mark XIV.28 and XVI.7," 446-52.

not contain any, the Empty Tomb story was from the beginning a disappearance story. On this basis, it could also be suggested that ἡγέρθη, "he has been raised" (v. 6) is a Markan addition meant to bring a disappearance story in line with Mark's own resurrection theology.

This is all highly conjectural, however, and a detailed analysis of Mark 16:1-8 is impossible here.³¹ But if it can be argued that Mark adapts a tradition about Jesus' assumption from the grave, then it would appear that the Q community was not alone in imagining Jesus' post-mortem vindication and exaltation along such lines. Such a similarity may even be the result of shared ideas or traditions. This would mean that the claims of some scholars about the origin of a pre-Markan Empty Tomb story would have to be re-evaluated. For instance, Lüdemann thinks that "those who handed down these traditions 'concluded' from the message [of the kerygma] that the crucified one had risen that the tomb of Jesus was empty. The present story is as it were the product of a conclusion or a postulate."³² An "empty tomb" story does not necessarily presuppose *resurrection* faith. Obviously, for Mark and the other evangelists the empty tomb signifies the resurrection of Jesus, but given the contemporary view that the disappearance of a body signifies assumption, it is not out of the question that an earlier group or groups could have understood a story about Jesus' empty tomb differently—particularly if we are correct about assumption theology in Q.

It may be, however, that the question of a pre-Markan disappearance story is moot, because in its present shape—for which Mark of course is responsible—the Empty Tomb

³¹ For bibliography, see Merklein, "Epilog," 233-8. Some argue for a pre-Markan version of the story: for instance, Schenke, *Auferstehungsverkündigung*, 30-55, esp. 53-5; R. Pesch, "Der Schluß der vormarkinischen Passionsgeschichte und des Markusevangeliums: Mk 15,42-16,8," in *L'Évangile selon Marc: Tradition et rédaction* (ed. M. Sabbe; BETL 34; Leuven: Leuven University Press and Peeters, 1974), 365-410; see also Merklein, "Epilog," 226-33; Lüdemann, *Resurrection*, 111-18. Others suggest it to be entirely Markan composition: so Crossan, "Empty Tomb," 145-9; Collins, *Beginning*, 129-38.

³² Lüdemann, *Resurrection*, 121.

narrative still is more like an assumption story than a resurrection story. Even Mark 16:7 is not entirely out of place here because, as already mentioned, an epiphany often serves to confirm that an assumption has taken place. Two options follow: first, to suggest, as Collins does, that Mark's narrative in its present form presumes a resurrection but describes an assumption;³³ or second, to suppose, as Bickermann did, that for Mark the two categories were not irreconcilable because of their common emphasis on exaltation.³⁴ The latter seems more likely, but either way, it is striking that Mark and Q—two apparently independent gospel sources—should consider assumption an appropriate way to think about Jesus' post-mortem existence. At this point the observations of Hamilton and Collins, according to which an assumption-related absence of the post-mortem Jesus is oriented in Mark to the Parousia, apply to Q as well as to Mark. For in both instances, whether Mark chose not to relate resurrection appearances or because the limits of his source material prevented him from so doing, the result of an assumption-related absence is an emphasis on the future presence of the assumed Jesus in the coming of the Son of man. This was evident not only in Q 13:34-35, but also in Q 12:39-40; 12:42-46; 17:23; 19 *passim*.

Another issue has to do with the socio-religious function of Mark's Empty Tomb story when compared with the appearance traditions as preserved in 1 Cor 15:5-8. This tradition, and Paul's addendum to it, apparently serves to legitimate authority, as Ulrich Wilckens argued.³⁵

³³ Collins, *Beginning*, 145-8.

³⁴ Bickermann, "Das leere Grab," 290.

³⁵ U. Wilckens, "Der Ursprung der Überlieferung der Erscheinungen des Auferstandenen: Zur traditions-geschichtlichen Analyse von 1 Co 15:1-11," in *Dogma und Denkstrukturen* (ed. W. Joest and W. Pannenberg; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1963), 56-95 = Hoffmann, ed., *Überlieferung*, 139-93. See also R. Pesch, "Zur Entstehung des Glaubens an die Auferstehung Jesu," *TQ* 153 (1973): 201-228, esp. 209-18; J. Galvin, "Resurrection as *Theologia Crucis*: The Foundational Christology of Rudolf Pesch," *TS* 38 (1977): 513-25, esp. 514-15; Pesch, "Zur Entstehung des Glaubens an die Auferstehung Jesu: Ein neuer Versuch," *FZPhTh* 30 (1983): 73-98 = Hoffmann, ed., *Überlieferung*, 228-55; J. Plevnik, "Paul's Appeals to His Damascus Experience and 1 Cor 15:5-7: Are They Legitimations?" *TJT* 4 (1988): 101-11; Lüdemann, *Resurrection*, 36-7; Uro, "Jeesus-liike ja ylõsnousemus," 97-8.

This is evident from the way Paul becomes distracted from the main issue in the chapter—the assuredness of the general resurrection as confirmed by the resurrection of Christ—to an ongoing concern in his relationship with the Corinthians, that of his apostolic authority (1 Cor 15:9-11). This is obviously not Mark's concern: the reference (probably redactional) to the appearance to Peter is probably a concession to such legitimating traditions, but it remains that the only witnesses of the empty tomb are the terrified women, and that what they witness is in fact Jesus' absence. A disappearance story would have evoked ideas about Jesus' exaltation and coming role in the eschatological drama, and the emphasis on the failure of the disciples to apprehend the mystery of Jesus' post-mortem vindication would have pressed Mark's readers to examine the authenticity of their own discipleship, rather than focus on the privileged experiences of the early Christian leaders.³⁶

It remains only to ask how an early reader of Mark 16:1-8 might have understood the significance of an assumption story as the conclusion of the Gospel. Both Hamilton and Collins pointed to the association between assumption and apotheosis or "heroification" in Greco-Roman thought.³⁷ Recently Bolt expressed reservations about comparisons of Mark's Empty Tomb narrative with Greco-Roman assumption materials, particularly because of the association with apotheosis or hero-veneration.³⁸ Bolt's objections in some cases are well-founded, at least where evidential issues are concerned.³⁹ Yet he also argues that Mark would have found an assumption story ill-suited to his Gospel presentation. For in the first place, assumption is an

³⁶ See Crossan, "Empty Tomb," 152.

³⁷ Hamilton, "Resurrection Tradition," 419; Collins, *Beginning*, 140-2.

³⁸ P. G. Bolt, "Mark 16:1-8: The Empty Tomb of a Hero?," *TynBul* 47 (1996): 27-37.

³⁹ In particular, Bolt shows Hamilton's confusion of assumption with hero-veneration, which is always associated with the grave-site of the hero, or at least a surrogate grave-site, the cenotaph (*ibid.*, 30-3).

escape from death, and Jesus has clearly died in Mark; and in the second place, assumption in the Greek view results in apotheosis, and "according to Mark's presentation, Jesus has already refused the opportunity of an apotheosis (along the more normal lines), when he came down from the mountain of transfiguration (Mark 9:2-13)."⁴⁰

However, to associate assumption only with apotheosis is to overlook the fact that it could also signify the return to the divine realm—or "apochoresis"—of a person of divine origin or status. As argued above, the double significance of assumption is brought to expression in Chariton, when Chaereas is confronted with another empty tomb: "Which of the gods has become my rival and carried off Callirhoe and now keeps her with him, against her will but compelled by a mightier fate? ... Or can it be that I had a goddess as my wife and did not know it, and she was above our human lot?" (Chariton, *Chaer.* 3.3). The attentive reader of Mark would not have interpreted the disappearance of Jesus' body from the tomb as an apotheosis, but as an "apochoresis," a return to the divinity, not least because of Mark's emphasis on Jesus' divine sonship (1:11; 1:24; 5:7; 9:7; 13:32), but also because of the events of the preceding narrative. "Now when the centurion who was standing opposite him saw that he breathed his last in this way, he said, 'Truly this man was [a/ the] son of God'" (Mark 15:39). As Hamilton suggested, then, one motive for Mark's use of assumption motifs in the Empty Tomb story may have been "to satisfy Graeco-Roman expectations aroused by the Son of God Christology."⁴¹

It is tempting to wonder whether Q may have made a similar connection between the assumption of Jesus and his divine status. This might not be out of the question, particularly given Q's relatively high Christology and the fact that, in its final form at least, the title "Son of

⁴⁰ Ibid., 37.

⁴¹ Hamilton, "Resurrection Tradition," 419.

God" is applied to Jesus (Q 4:3,9; compare 10:21-22). However, Jesus' assumption appears to be understood by Q more as a removal to an exalted state in order to await an eschatological office than a return of a divine person to the divine realm (although the two ideas do not seem to be mutually exclusive). A similar perspective, and a confluence of ideas similar to those found in Q 13:34-35, is apparent in Stephen's vision of the Son of man in Acts 7.

6.3: Stephen's Vision of the Son of Man (Acts 7:55-56)

The Son of man vision that Stephen reports as he is being stoned (Acts 7:55-56) is remarkable on a number of counts.¹ First, it is the only "Son of man" saying in the New Testament which does not occur on the lips of Jesus. Second, the posture of the Son of man is also noteworthy: in contrast with Mark 14:62 and parallels, Stephen sees the Son of man standing—not sitting—at the right hand of God (ἐκ δεξιῶν ἐστῶτα τοῦ θεοῦ, Acts 7:56). Third, and most significant from our perspective, the immediate context of the vision contains several themes which also converge, as argued above, in Q 13:34-35: (1) a deuteronomic understanding of Jesus' death; (2) a reference to his "coming" (here, ἔλευσις); and (3) a perspective on his exalted post-mortem existence. What makes this convergence of themes so striking in comparison with Q 13:34-35 is the lack of any reference to Jesus' resurrection.

Luke seems to prefer describing Jesus' death as the wrongful death of a prophet (Luke 4:24.28-30; 13:33; Acts 7:52); in fact, he tends to avoid wherever he can an interpretation of Jesus' death as atoning for sins (Mark 10:45 is omitted by Luke, for instance).² Typically, however, any reference to Jesus' death in Acts is accompanied by a reference to the resurrection, which for Luke is the reversal of Jesus' murder and a sign of divine favour (Acts 2:23-24; 3:14-

¹ The vision of Stephen has generated a great deal of scholarly literature. To begin with, see R. Pesch, *Die Vision des Stephanus: Apg 7,55-56 im Rahmen der Apostelgeschichte* (SBB 12; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1966); M. Gourgues, *À la droite de Dieu: Résurrection de Jésus et actualisation du Ps 110,1 dans le Nouveau Testament* (EB; Paris: Gabalda, 1978), esp. 178-94; M. Sabbe, "The Son of Man Saying in Acts 7.56," in *Les Actes des Apôtres: Traditions, rédaction, théologie* (ed. J. Kremer; BETL 48; Gembloux: Ducolot; Leuven: Leuven University Press and Peeters, 1979), 241-79; J. D. M. Derrett, "The Son of Man Standing (Acts 7:55-56)," *BeO* 30 (1988): 71-84; C. Focant, "Du Fils de l'Homme assis (Lc 22.69) au Fils de l'Homme debout (Ac 7.56): Enjeux théologique et littéraire d'un changement sémantique," in *The Unity of Luke-Acts* (ed. J. Verheyden; BETL 142; Leuven: Leuven University Press and Peeters, 1999), 563-76.

² One would suspect that Luke was bound by the constraints of eucharistic tradition in Luke 22:19-20. For Luke it is the resurrection which results in forgiveness of sins (Luke 24:46-47; Acts 5:30-31).

15; 4:10; 5:30; 10:39-41; 13:27-31; see also 25:19); the resurrection of Jesus was also a central tenet of the apostolic proclamation (Acts 4:33; 25:19). In addition, any reference to the post-mortem exaltation of Jesus is likewise connected by Luke, typically, to the resurrection (Acts 2:31-35; 5:30-31). The fact that the conclusion of Stephen's speech, along with his vision of the Son of man, refer to both Jesus' death and exaltation without reference to the resurrection invites the suspicion that Luke is relying on traditional material here. Otherwise, some explanation must be given as to why Luke does not have Stephen refer to the resurrection as the vital connection between Jesus' death and exaltation.

Looking at the whole of the speech, it seems odd that the bulk of it—and it is the longest speech in Acts—does not seem to fit the context of an inquiry before the Sanhedrin. On the other hand, as Lüdemann has remarked, “vv. 51-53, unlike the preceding verses, relate to the accusation” (compare Acts 6:13-14).³ It must be noted that besides a reference to the Israelites rejecting Moses (7:35,39-42), the deuteronomistic theme of 7:52-53 is completely absent from the speech itself. These observations, along with the conspicuous absence of any reference to Jesus' resurrection, suggest that Luke may have used traditional material which included the deuteronomistic accusation and the Son of man vision. However, we must proceed with caution, because evidence of Luke's redactional work in the narrative of Stephen's death is in abundance.

Numerous scholars have drawn attention to the way in which Luke patterns the death of Stephen after the death of Jesus.⁴ If we may begin by presuming that Luke uses traditional

³ G. Lüdemann, *Early Christianity According to the Traditions in Acts* (London: SCM, 1989), 89.

⁴ See, for example, Gourgues, *À la droite*, 186; Sabbe, “Son of Man Saying,” 252-3; C. H. Talbert, *Reading Acts: A Literary and Theological Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles* (New York: Crossroad, 1997), 81; Focant, “Fils de l'Homme,” 571.

material at least for the conclusion of Stephen's speech⁵ and the vision of the Son of man, then anything that shows evidence of this redactional plan should be eliminated as Lukan. For instance, Stephen's committal of his spirit to Jesus (7:59), the kneeling (v. 60), and the prayer for forgiveness (v. 60) are certainly redactional on these grounds. Also Lukan are the references to the Holy Spirit (vv. 51 and 55), the verb ἀτενίζω (v. 55; compare 6:15), and probably the whole explanatory doublet of the vision (v. 55). In particular the way in which verse 55 assimilates the direct report of the Son of man vision to Luke 22:69 (ἐκ δεξιῶν τῆς δυνάμεως τοῦ θεοῦ), and then applies it to Jesus suggests that it is redactional.⁶ In verse 56 the Lukan verbs θεωρέω and διανοίγω are redactional; thus it may be that the introductory elements of the vision proper have been changed by Luke.

On the other hand, although Luke is certainly not averse to using materials with a deuteronomistic theme—after all, he has taken over Q 6:23b; 11:49-52; 13:34-35—it does not seem to be a favourite compositional emphasis of his. It might be suggested that the deuteronomistic accusation in 7:52, with its explicit connection to the death of Jesus, is traditional.⁷ Its use by Luke here may have been suggested by the stoning of Stephen: Q 13:34, of course, refers to Jerusalem as one who kills prophets and stones emissaries (λιθοβολοῦσα

⁵ Scholarly opinion is divided on the question of the origin of Stephen's speech. Compare, for instance, U. Wilckens, *Die Missionsreden der Apostelgeschichte: Form- und traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen* (3rd ed.; WMANT 5; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1974), 208-24; Lüdemann, *Early Christianity*, 86-9. See also the discussion in Sabbe, "Son of Man Saying," 245-9.

⁶ See Sabbe, "Son of Man Saying," 242-3 for a brief review of the options taken by scholars on the relationship between Acts 7:55 and 7:56.

⁷ Steck, *Israel*, 266-7, thought that the deuteronomistic material here was the original conclusion of a pre-Lukan "Vorlage der Stephanusrede," and that a deuteronomistic interpretation of the death of Jesus was current in Jewish Christianity: "Es hat im hellenistischen Judentum an Israel gerichtete Verkündigung gegeben, die die Tradition der dtrPA [deuteronomistic prophetic formula] aufgegriffen hat, um die Tötung Jesu in die Geschichte der von Mose über die Propheten bis in die Gegenwart permanenten Halsstarrigkeit des Gottesvolkes zu stellen" (ibid., 267).

τοὺς ἀπεσταλμένους πρὸς αὐτήν), and Acts 7:58-59 emphatically depicts the stoning of Stephen (λιθοβολέω occurs twice) outside the city (ἐκβαλόντες ἔξω τῆς πόλεως ἐλιθοβόλουν, v. 58). The noun ἔλευσις (v. 52) is a *hapax legomenon* in the New Testament, and thus is not characteristically Lukan redactional vocabulary. It could be traditional. The substantival use of δίκαιος as a title for Jesus is not typically Lukan, though it does appear three times in Acts (3:15; 7:52; 22:14) and, redactionally, in the words of the centurion at the crucifixion, where Luke has a confession of innocence rather than divine sonship (Luke 23:47; compare Mark 15:39). The first three uses of δίκαιος focus on the wrongful death of Jesus (Luke 23:47; Acts 3:15; 7:52), but its final use in Acts—significantly, perhaps, only after Jesus the δίκαιος is identified with the exalted Son of man in 7:55-56—refers to Paul's vision of the exalted Christ.

We are on less firm ground here than with Mark's Empty Tomb narrative, for there at least there are formal narrative features suggestive of assumption or disappearance, quite apart from the question of any pre-Markan form of the Empty Tomb story. Here, with Stephen's vision, we have suggested—on the slim but remarkable grounds of the non-appearance of resurrection language where Luke typically would have used it—that Luke may have used traditional material that connected a deuteronomistic accusation concerning Jesus' death with a visionary assertion of his exalted status as the Son of man. We may at least allow for this possibility. Given the thematic similarity to Q 13:34-35, it might be suggested that assumption, not resurrection, is behind the exaltation language in Acts 7:56. At least the fact that the Son of man is standing, not sitting, implies that the correlation between resurrection and exaltation based on Psalm 110 is not the christological presupposition here.

Joachim Jeremias suspected that assumption theology was present in Acts 7:56, although he did not infer this from the direct movement from death in verse 52 to exaltation in verse 56.

He based his argument on a development he perceived in the Son of man sayings.⁸ In Jeremias's view, the original idea of the exaltation of the Son of man, as seen for example in Dan 7:13, in one in which "the *movement* is thought of as being *from below upwards*."⁹ Moreover, the idea of the Parousia of the Son of man is "again and again redactional," and there is no early Son of man saying that speaks clearly of a descent. Decisive here is the Son of man saying in Luke 22:69, which mentions session but not parousia: it is independent from Mark 14:62 (deriving from Luke's special source) and "has still not been influenced by the early Christian christological pattern of exaltation and parousia."¹⁰ Luke 22:69 "seems to presuppose that the manifestation of the glory of the Son of man consists in his assumption to God (cf. Eth. Enoch 71)."¹¹ Acts 7:56 displays the same understanding, but is another early and independent Son of man tradition, because of the unusual ἐστῶτα.¹² Jeremias's arguments for the primitive nature of Luke 22:69 and Acts 7:56 are no less shaky than ours, but his view that parousia is a later christological development than assumption is problematic given that eschatological function was a common correlate of assumption.¹³

Two texts, already discussed in Chapter Three above, present themselves as possible parallels to the scenario of rejection and death followed by post-mortem heavenly exaltation which may be present in Acts 7:52-56. The first is Wisdom 2-5. There, of course, the δίκαιος is put to death by the ungodly (Wisd 2:12-20), but in a post-mortem scene stands and faces his

⁸ J. Jeremias, *New Testament Theology* (London: SCM, 1971), 273-4.

⁹ *Ibid.*, 273, emphasis original. Jeremias also cited *1 En.* 14:8; 71:5; *4 Ezra* 13:3; *Midr. Ps.* 21.5.

¹⁰ *Ibid.* The influence is "the Easter experience" (*ibid.*, 274).

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 273.

¹² *Ibid.*

¹³ So Haufe, "Entrückung und eschatologische Funktion."

former oppressors (5:1-5). In Acts 7, a similar pattern is present. In Wisdom 4–5, the traditional association of assumption language—here, probably under the influence of the Hellenistic consolation tradition, applied to one who has died young (4:10-15)—with exaltation accounts for the exalted post-mortem appearance of the δίκαιος before the ungodly.

If, in fact, Luke is using here a traditional source that presumed assumption rather than resurrection as the means by which the dead Jesus is exalted as the Son of man, one problem which has troubled interpreters—ἐστῶτα instead of καθήμενος—may find resolution here.¹⁴ The Son of man stands, rather than sits, in the vision of Stephen, just as the δίκαιος stands before his onetime oppressors. In Acts 7:52, Jesus is described as the δίκαιος announced beforehand by the prophets, and he has met the same fate they did. As the exalted Son of man he stands to make accusation against his oppressors. As Talbert recently acknowledged, “It is difficult not to hear the echo of Wisd 4:16–5:16.”¹⁵ If assumption is in both instances the link between the suffering of the righteous one and his post-mortem exaltation, the case is strengthened for the view that the Son of man stands in accusation against those who rejected him. A similar idea may be present (without reference to posture) in Q 12:8-9.¹⁶

The other parallel text is *Testament of Job* 39-40. There, Job and the others see a vision of the children “crowned with the splendour of the heavenly one” (40:3). The vision serves to console Sitis by providing confirmation that God’s care and favour has been extended to the dead children. In Acts 7:56 the vision of the exalted Son of man probably serves the same purpose, although given the nature of Jesus’ death (v. 52) as described in the immediate context.

¹⁴ For lists of different interpretations, see Pesch, *Vision*, 13-36; Sabbe, “Son of Man Saying,” 267-77; Derrett, “Son of Man Standing,” 75-7; Focant, “Fils de l’Homme,” 564-70.

¹⁵ Talbert, *Reading Acts*, 79.

¹⁶ So Gourgues, *À la droite*, 183.

the point of the vision is more about Jesus' vindication. In the case of Job and his children, it is God's care which has been called into question (*T. Job* 37:1-7). In Acts 7 the issue is Jesus' status as the emissary of God, for as verse 52 states, "the coming of the righteous one" was met with hostility. Thus the vision of the Son of man serves to confirm God's vindication of Jesus in view of his death at the hands of the unrepentant. As argued above, a similar strategy may be perceived in the Jerusalem Lament.

Given the vagaries involved here, this discussion has remained tentative. Nevertheless, if it can be argued that Luke has made use of some traditional material—whatever its relationship to the speech of Stephen itself—that interpreted Jesus' death within the deuteronomistic schema and which affirmed his post-mortem exaltation as the Son of man without reference to the resurrection, the existence of such a tradition suggests the possibility that a view similar to one we have argued for in Q 13:34-35 was in wider circulation in early Christianity.

6.4: Implications

The implications of this chapter for the main thesis should be clear. It is obvious from some New Testament texts that the exaltation of Jesus could be expressed, or even conceived of, without explicit reference to the resurrection. In some of these cases, it is inappropriate to presume either assumption or resurrection as the christological category lurking behind the exaltation language. However, the reticence of the author of Hebrews, for instance, to use what had likely become traditional language for the resurrection of Jesus should not be taken lightly, for it may offer some insight into how widespread or how universally held was resurrection as *the* model for understanding Jesus' post-mortem vindication and exaltation.

The texts which appear to describe an assumption of Jesus directly from the cross have little to do with his post-mortem exaltation, unfortunately. The description of Stephen's vision of the Son of man in Acts 7:55-56 was enticing, on the one hand, because of the way that deuteronomistic themes came together with ideas about Jesus' exaltation without resurrection. But because the arguments for the traditional origin of this material are somewhat uncertain, it had to be left undecided whether Stephen's vision could stand as corroborative evidence for the existence of a death—assumption—exaltation scenario in a circle other than the Q community. The strongest piece of evidence for this remains Mark's Empty Tomb story which, regardless of its origin, has definite formal similarities with Hellenistic disappearance or assumption stories. As a result, whether the story of the absence of Jesus' body originated in some pre-Markan community, or was composed by Mark according to cultural conventions, the fact remains that the post-mortem assumption of Jesus was not the sole property of the Q community as a model for expressing a belief in his vindication and exaltation, with a particular emphasis on the Parousia.

Conclusion

It has been argued here that Q 13:34-35, the Jerusalem Lament, contains a vestige of assumption theology: “You will not see me until [the time] comes when you say, ‘Blessed is the Coming One in the name of the Lord’” (οὐ μὴ ἴδῃτέ με ἕως ἥξει ὅτε εἴπητε· εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου). The expression “you will not see me” is strikingly similar to descriptions of assumption-related disappearance in Hellenistic assumption stories, and functions synonymously with the more common ἄφαν- disappearance language: Elijah (2 Kgs 2:12 LXX: καὶ οὐκ εἶδεν αὐτὸν ἔτι), Xisouthros (Berossos: οὐκ ἔτι ὁφθῆναι), Romulus (Plutarch, *Rom.* 27.5: οὔτε μέρος ὤφθη σώματος ...), and Proteus (Lucian, *Peregr.* 39: οὐ μὴν ἐωρᾶτό γε). In addition, Q 13:35b limits the duration of Jesus’ disappearance by means of the “until” clause that introduces the acclamation from Ps 118:26 LXX. This connection between disappearance and return is the same as that made in the Jewish traditions about the assumption of the righteous: there is a uniform correlation of assumption and special eschatological function, as Haufe showed in his 1961 article.

Q 13:34-35 is an expression of both the rejection of Jesus in Jerusalem and his divine vindication by means of assumption. Q, then, had a strategy for dealing with the death of Jesus and the problem of legitimation it caused. The fact that Q knew Jesus to have died is not an insurmountable difficulty for the main thesis: Greco-Roman traditions were able to describe post-mortem assumptions, and in the Jewish tradition there seems to have been a development (as seen in *Wisd* 2–5 and *T. Job* 39–40) in the direction of applying assumption language to people who had died. Furthermore, the use of assumption in later Christian writings to account for the post-mortem glorification of Mary’s body would not have been possible unless

assumption was known to have had broader application than just the bodily removal of the living to heaven.

There are some important implications for our view of the christological interests of the Q redaction. It was argued that Q 13:34-35, with Jesus as its speaker, presents an advanced Wisdom Christology along the same lines as Q 10:21-22. In addition, it appears that the Jerusalem Lament is the high point of Q's deuteronomistic theology, since it understands Jerusalem's rejection of Jesus as the culminating instance of impenitence. The result, in true deuteronomistic fashion, is the abandonment of Jerusalem to destruction. However, it also appears that Q 13:35b uses assumption theology, on the basis of the typical association between assumption and eschatological function, to assimilate the Wisdom Christology in the Lament (and prominent elsewhere in Q) to the Son of man Christology also prominent in Q.

The precise implications of the thesis for understanding how the Christology of Q developed, however, remain somewhat unclear for two important reasons. First, it seems likely that assumption theology came to literary expression in a later redactional phase than did the belief in Jesus as the coming Son of man. As seen in Chapter Three, some writings came to credit assumption to individuals who on other grounds were the object of eschatological interest: this raises the possibility that in Q as well assumption theology was an expression or legitimation of the belief in Jesus' return as the Son of man, rather than the christological origin of that belief. Second, as an implication of this, the literary function of assumption theology does not offer any certain insight into the kind of originating christological experience or expression the Q community may have had. That said, however, it may still have been the case that a belief in Jesus' assumption as the grounds of Jesus' post-mortem vindication may have been present in

the community alongside, for example, a conviction about the soteriological importance of Jesus' teachings.

This possibility of assumption theology in Q finds some confirmation, we argued, particularly in the Q material about an absent and returning master and about an unseen and suddenly appearing Son of man. Most importantly, Q 12:42-46, as an addition to the complex which originally concluded with 12:39-40, elucidates the coming of the Son of man by means of the parable of the absent master who returns unannounced to administer judgment and to dispense reward and punishment. If we follow Kloppenborg's compositional profile of Q, this redactional addition was made during the same redaction which produced Q 13:34-35 as an expression of the divine vindication of Jesus' rejection by the children of Jerusalem. Additionally, assumption theology in Q has the benefit of explaining how, in the absence of resurrection theology, Q has come to view the non-earthly Jesus as the locus or paradigm of the soteriological hopes of the community, with the exalted Jesus functioning in much the same way as exalted representative figures in certain Jewish writings. Finally, there also appear to be some similarities between Q and those Jewish apocalyptic texts which coordinate the reception of revelation, including a foreknowledge of assumption, with the instruction of the community before the removal of the sage by God.

One broader implication of seeing assumption theology in Q may also be reiterated here. It appears likely that Q was not the only community to have expressed a belief in Jesus' post-mortem vindication by means of assumption theology. However Mark's Empty Tomb story originated—at some stage of the pre-Markan tradition, as we are inclined to believe, or at the hand of Mark himself—it appears to presume or express the same view (or tradition!), since Mark 16:1-8 refers to the disappearance of Jesus' body without any resurrection appearances.

Although earlier scholars had been inclined to reckon assumption as a more primitive expression of Jesus' vindication and exaltation than resurrection, it seems more reasonable, particularly in view of the primitive formulation of resurrection theology preserved by Paul in 1 Cor 15:3-8, to suggest that assumption and resurrection may have coexisted in an isolated fashion in different circles in primitive Christianity. Having said that, however, assumption theology may account for the belief in Jesus' heavenly exaltation and future Parousia in a way that resurrection theology alone (that is, without ascension or session language) cannot.

Bibliography

1. Ancient Sources: Texts and Translations

a. Biblical Writings

Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia: Editio funditus renovata. Edited by K. Elliger, et al. 2nd ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1984.

Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum auctoritate Academiae Litterarum Göttingensis editum. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966–.

The Greek New Testament. Edited by B. Aland, et al. 4th rev. ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft; London: United Bible Societies, 1993.

Itala: Das neue Testament in altlateinischer Überlieferung. II. Marcusevangelium. Edited by A. Jülicher. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1940.

The Holy Bible, Containing the Old and New Testaments: New Revised Standard Version. National Council of Churches of Christ in the U.S.A. Toronto: Canadian Bible Society, 1989, 1993.

Kloppenborg, J. S. *Q Parallels: Synopsis, Critical Notes & Concordance.* Foundations and Facets. Sonoma, Calif.: Polebridge Press, 1988.

Robinson, J. M., P. Hoffmann, and J. S. Kloppenborg, eds. *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 1. Minneapolis: Fortress; Leuven: Leuven University Press and Peeters, 2000.

b. Other Ancient Sources: Individual Texts and Translations

The Acts of John. E. Junod and J.-D. Kaestli, ed. and trans. *Acta Iohannis: Textus alii—Commentarius—Indices.* 2 vol. Corpus Christianorum: Series Apocryphorum 2. Turnhout: Brepols, 1983; K. Schäferdiek, trans. "The Acts of John." Pages 152-209 in Vol. 2 of *New Testament Apocrypha*. Edited by E. Hennecke and W. Schneemelcher. 2nd ed. 2 vols. Louisville, Kent.: Westminster John Knox, 1991-1993.

"Adapa." Translated by E. A. Speiser. Pages 101-3 in *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*. Edited by J. Pritchard. 3rd ed. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1969.

The Ante-Nicene Fathers. Edited by A. Roberts and J. Donaldson. 10 vols. Repr. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1994 [1885-1887].

Antoninus Liberalis. *Metamorphoses.* I. Cazzaniga, ed. *Antoninus Liberalis: Metamorphoseon Synagoge.* Milano and Varese: Istituto Editoriale Cisalpino, 1962; F. Celoria, trans. *The Metamorphoses of Antoninus Liberalis: A Translation with a Commentary.* London and New York: Routledge, 1992.

Apollodorus of Athens. *The Library.* Translated by J. G. Frazer. 2 vols. Loeb Classical Library. London: Heinemann; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1921.

The Questions of Bartholomew. A. Wilmart and E. Tisserant, eds. "Fragments Grecs et Latins de l'Évangile de Barthélemy." *Revue biblique* 10 (1913): 161-90; 321-68; J.-D. Kaestli and P. Cherix, trans. *L'évangile de Barthélemy d'après deux écrits apocryphes.* Turnhout: Brepols, 1993.

"2 (Syriac Apocalypse of) Baruch." Translated by A. F. J. Klijn. Pages 615-52 in Vol. 1 of *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. Edited by J. H. Charlesworth. 2 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1983.

Berosos, *Babyloniaca.* G. P. Verbrugghe and J. M. Wickersham, trans. *Berosos and Manetho, Introduced and Translated: Native Traditions in Ancient Mesopotamia and Egypt.* Ann Arbor, Mich.: The University of Michigan Press, 1996.

- Chariton, *Callirhoe*. Translated by G. P. Goold. Loeb Classical Library. London: Heinemann; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1995; B. P. Reardon, trans. "Chariton, Chaereas and Callirhoe." Pages 17-124 in *Collected Greek Novels*. Edited by B. P. Reardon. Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 1989.
- Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *The Roman Antiquities*. Translated by E. Cary. 7 vols. Loeb Classical Library. London: Heinemann; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1937-1950.
- "Egyptian Myths, Tales, and Mortuary Texts." Translated by J. A. Wilson. Pages 3-36 in *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*. Edited by J. Pritchard. 3rd ed. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1969.
- Apocalypse of Elijah*. J.-M. Rosenstiehl, ed. and trans. *L'Apocalypse d'Élie*. Textes et études pour servir à l'histoire du judaïsme intertestamentaire I. Paris: P. Guethner, 1972; O. S. Wintermute, trans. "Apocalypse of Elijah." Pages 721-53 in Vol. 2 of *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. Edited by J. H. Charlesworth. 2 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1983.
- Ennius, *The Annals*. O. Skutsch, ed. *The Annals of Q. Ennius*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1985; E. H. Warmington, ed. and trans. *Remains of Old Latin*. 4 vols. Loeb Classical Library. London: Heinemann; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1935-1940.
- The Book of Enoch*. Edited and translated by R. H. Charles. Oxford: Clarendon, 1893.
- "1 (Ethiopic Apocalypse of) Enoch." Translated by E. Isaac. Pages 5-89 in Vol. 1 of *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. Edited by J. H. Charlesworth. 2 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1983.
- "2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch." Translated by F. I. Anderson. Pages 91-213 in Vol. 1 of *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. Edited by J. H. Charlesworth. 2 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1983.
- "The Epic of Gilgamesh." Translated by E. A. Speiser. Pages 72-99 in *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*. Edited by J. Pritchard. 3rd ed. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1969.
- "Etana." Translated by E. A. Speiser. Pages 114-18 in *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*. Edited by J. Pritchard. 3rd ed. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1969.
- "The Fourth Book of Ezra." Translated by B. M. Metzger. Pages 516-69 in Vol. 1 of *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. Edited by J. H. Charlesworth. 2 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1983.
- Josephus*. Translated by H. St. J. Thackeray, et al. 10 vols. Loeb Classical Library. London: Heinemann; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1926-1965.
- "Jubilees." Translated by O. S. Wintermute. Pages 35-142 in Vol. 2 of *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. Edited by J. H. Charlesworth. 2 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1983.
- Leontius of Neapolis, *Life of Symeon*. L. Rydén, ed. *Das Leben des heiligen Narren Symeon von Leontios von Neapolis*. Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis. Studia Graeca Upsaliensia 4. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1963; D. Krueger, trans. *Symeon the Holy Fool: Leontius's Life and the Late Antique City*. Transformation of the Classical Heritage 25. Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 1996.
- The Lives of the Prophets*. C. C. Torrey, ed. and trans. *The Lives of the Prophets: Greek Text and Translation*. Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series 1. Philadelphia: Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis, 1946; D. R. A. Hare, trans. "The Lives of the Prophets." Pages 379-99 in Vol. 2 of *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. Edited by J. H. Charlesworth. 2 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1983.
- Lucian of Samosata*. Translated by A. M. Harmon, et al. 8 vols. Loeb Classical Library. London: Heinemann; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1913-1967.
- The Minor Tractates of the Talmud: Massektoth ketannoth*. Edited and translated by A. Cohen. 2 vols. London: Soncino, 1965.
- The Midrash on Psalms*. Edited and translated by W. G. Braude. 2 vols. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1959.
- Midrash Rabbah: Deuteronomy*. Translated by J. Rabbinowitz. Edited by H. Freedman and M. Simon. London: Soncino, 1974.

- Tromp, J. *The Assumption of Moses: A Critical Edition with Commentary*. Studia in Veteris Testamenti pseudepigraphica 10. Leiden: Brill, 1993.
- Obsequies of the Holy Virgin*. W. Wright, ed. and trans. "The Departure of My Lady Mary from the World." *Journal of Sacred Literature* 6 (1865): 417-48; 7 (1865): 110-60.
- Ovid, *Metamorphoses*. Translated by F. J. Miller. 3rd ed. Revised by G. P. Goold. 2 vols. Loeb Classical Library. London: Heinemann; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1984.
- Pausanias, *Description of Greece*. Translated by W. H. S. Jones. 5 vols. Loeb Classical Library. London: Heinemann; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1918-1935.
- Philo of Alexandria*. Translated by F. H. Colson, et al. 10 vols., with 2 suppl. Loeb Classical Library. London: Heinemann; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1929-1962.
- [Philo], *Liber antiquitatum biblicarum*. "Pseudo-Philo." Translated by D. J. Harrington. Pages 297-377 in Vol. 1 of *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. Edited by J. H. Charlesworth. 2 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1983.
- [Philo], *De Jona*. F. Siegert, trans. *Drei hellenistisch-jüdische Predigten*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 20. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1980.
- Pierpont Morgan Library Coptic Theological Texts* 3. B. A. Pearson, ed. and trans. "The Pierpont Morgan Fragments of a Coptic Enoch Apocryphon." Pages 227-83 in *Studies on the Testament of Abraham*. Edited by G. W. E. Nickelsburg. Septuagint and Cognate Studies 6. Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1976.
- Plutarch, *Lives*. Translated by B. Perrin, et al. 11 vols. Loeb Classical Library. London: Heinemann; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1914-1926.
- Plutarch, *Moralia*. Translated by F. C. Babbitt, et al. 17 vols. Loeb Classical Library. London: Heinemann; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1927-1976.
- Mercer, S. A. B., trans. *The Pyramid Texts in Translation and Commentary*. 4 vols. New York: Longmans Green & Co., 1952.
- "Sumerian Myths and Epic Tales." Translated by S. N. Kramer. Pages 37-59 in *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*. Edited by J. Pritchard. 3rd ed. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1969.
- Testament of Job*. S. P. Brock, ed. *Testamentum Iobi*. J.-C. Picard, ed. *Apocalypsis Baruchi graece*. Pseudepigrapha Veteris Testamenti Graece 2. Leiden: Brill, 1967; "Testament of Job." Translated by R. P. Spittler. Pages 829-68 in Vol. 1 of *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. Edited by J. H. Charlesworth. 2 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1983.
- Testament of Abraham*. F. Schmidt, ed. and trans. *Le Testament grec d'Abraham: Introduction, édition critique des deux recensions grecques, traduction*. Texte und Studien von Antiken Judentum 11. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1986; "Testament of Abraham." Translated by E. P. Sanders. Pages 871-902 in Vol. 1 of *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. Edited by J. H. Charlesworth. 2 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1983.
- Vatican Gr.* 1982. F. Manns, ed. and trans. *Le récit de la Dormition de Marie (Vatican grec 1982): contribution à l'étude des origines de l'exégèse chrétienne*. Collectio maior, Studium Biblicum Franciscanum 33. Jerusalem: Franciscan, 1989.

c. Other Ancient Sources: Collected Material

- Budge, E. A. W. *Miscellaneous Coptic Texts in the Dialect of Upper Egypt*. Coptic Texts 5. London: The British Museum, 1915.
- Charlesworth, J. H., ed. *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. 2 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1983.
- Daley, B. E., trans. *On the Dormition of Mary: Early Patristic Homilies*. Crestwood, N.Y.: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1998.
- Elliott, J. K. *The Apocryphal New Testament: A Collection of Apocryphal Christian Literature in an English Translation*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1993.

- Jacoby, F., ed. *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*. 3 vols. in 15. Leiden: Brill, 1954-1964.
- Lewis, A. Smith. *Apocrypha Syriaca: The Protevangelium Jacobi and Transitus Mariae*. Studia Sinaitica 11. London: C. J. Clay and Sons, 1902.
- Peek, W. *Griechische Grabgedichte: Griechisch und Deutsch*. Schriften und Quellen der Alten Welt 7. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1960.
- Pritchard, James B., ed. *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*. 3rd ed. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1969.
- Robinson, F., ed. and trans. *Coptic Apocryphal Gospels*. Texts and Studies 4.2. Cambridge: University Press, 1896.
- Tischendorf, C. von, ed. *Apocalypses apocryphae Mosis, Esdrae, Pauli, Iohannis: item Mariae dormitio, additis Evangeliorum et actuum Apocryphorum supplementis*. Hildesheim: G. Olms, 1866.
- Vérilhac, A.-M. *ΠΑΙΔΕΣ ΑΩΡΟΙ: Poésie funéraire*. 2 vols. ΠΡΑΓΜΑΤΕΙΑΙ ΤΗΣ ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑΣ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ 41. ΑΘΗΝΑΙ: ΓΡΑΦΕΙΟΝ ΔΗΜΟΣΙΕΥΜΑΤΩΝ ΤΗΣ ΑΚΑΔΗΜΙΑΣ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ, 1978.
- Wright, W., ed. and trans. *Contributions to the Apocryphal Literature of the New Testament*. London: Williams and Norgate, 1865.

2. Secondary Sources

- Abegg, M. G. "Who Ascended to Heaven? 4Q491, 4Q427, and the Teacher of Righteousness." Pages 61-73 in *Eschatology, Messianism and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by P. W. Flint and C. A. Evans. Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature. Grand Rapids, Mich., and Cambridge, U.K.: Eerdmans, 1997.
- Adler, W. "Enoch in Early Christian Literature." Pages 271-5 in volume 1 of the *SBL Seminar Papers, 1978*. 2 vols. Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers 15. Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1978.
- Allison, D. C. "Matt. 23:39 = Luke 13:35b as a Conditional Prophecy." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 18 (1983): 75-84.
- . *The Jesus Tradition in Q*. Harrisburg, Penn.: Trinity Press International, 1997.
- . *The Intertextual Jesus: Scripture in Q*. Harrisburg, Penn.: Trinity Press International, 2000.
- Attridge, H. W. *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews*. Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1989.
- Aune, D. E. *Revelation 1-5, 6-16, 17-22*. 3 vols. WBC 52A-C. Dallas: Word; Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1997-1998.
- Bacon, B. W. *Studies in Matthew*. London: Henry Holt & Company, 1930.
- Bartlet, J. V. "The Sources of St. Luke's Gospel." Pages 314-63 in *Studies in the Synoptic Problem by Members of the University of Oxford*. Edited by W. Sanday. Oxford: Clarendon, 1911.
- Bauckham, R. J. "Enoch and Elijah in the Coptic Apocalypse of Elijah." Pages 69-76 in *Studia Patristica 16/2*. Edited by E. A. Livingstone. Texte und Untersuchungen 129. Berlin: Akademie, 1985.
- Bayer, H. F. *Jesus' Predictions of Vindication and Resurrection*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament. Second Series 20. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1986.
- Begg, C. "'Josephus's Portrayal of the Disappearances of Enoch, Elijah, and Moses': Some Observations." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 109 (1990): 691-93.
- Berger, K. *Die Amen-Worte Jesu: Eine Untersuchung zum Problem der Legitimation in apokalyptischer Rede*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 39. Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1970.
- . *Die Auferstehung des Propheten und die Erhöhung des Menschensohnes*. Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments 13. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1976.

- Bertram, G. "Die Himmelfahrt Jesu vom Kreuz an und der Glaube an seine Auferstehung." Pages 187-217 in *Festgabe für Adolf Deissmann zum 60. Geburtstag*. Edited by K. L. Schmidt. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1927.
- Bickermann, E. "Das leere Grab." *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* 23 (1924): 281-92 = Pages 271-84 in *Zur neutestamentlichen Überlieferung von der Auferstehung Jesu*. Edited by P. Hoffmann. Wege der Forschung 522. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1988.
- . "Die römische Kaiserapotheose." *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft* 27 (1929): 1-31 = Pages 82-121 in *Römischer Kaiserkult*. Edited by A. Wlosok. Wege der Forschung 372. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1978.
- Black, M. "The 'Two Witnesses' of Rev 11:3f in Jewish and Christian Apocalyptic Tradition." Pages 227-37 in *Donum Gentilicium: New Testament Studies in Honour of D. Daube*. Edited by W. D. Davies and C. K. Barrett. Oxford: Clarendon, 1978.
- . "The Messianism of the Parables of Enoch: Their Date and Contribution to Christological Origins." Pages 145-68 in *The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity*. Edited by J. Charlesworth. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1982.
- Bolt, P. G. "Mark 16:1-8: The Empty Tomb of a Hero?" *TynBul* 47 (1996): 27-37.
- . "'Do You Not Care That We Are Perishing?' Jesus' Defeat of Death and Mark's Early Readers." Ph.D. diss., King's College, London, 1997.
- Borgen, P. "Heavenly Ascent in Philo: An Examination of Selected Passages." Pages 246-68 in *The Pseudepigrapha and Early Biblical Interpretation*. Edited by C. A. Evans and J. H. Charlesworth. Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha: Supplement Series 14. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993.
- . "Moses, Jesus, and the Roman Emperor: Observations in Philo's Writings and the Revelation of John." *Novum Testamentum* 38 (1996): 145-59.
- Borger, R. "The Incantation Series *Bīr Mēseri* and Enoch's Ascension to Heaven." Pages 224-233 in *'I Studied Inscriptions from before the Flood': Ancient Near Eastern, Literary, and Linguistic Approaches to Genesis 1-11*. Edited by D. T. Tsumura and R. S. Hess. Sources for Biblical and Theological Study 4. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1994.
- Boring, M. E. *Sayings of the Risen Jesus: Christian Prophecy in the Synoptic Tradition*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 46. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.
- Böttrich, C. "Recent Studies in the Slavonic Book of Enoch." *JSPE* 9 (1991): 35-42.
- Bousset, W. *The Antichrist Legend: A Chapter in Christian and Jewish Folklore*. London: Hutchinson, 1896.
- . "Die Himmelsreise der Seele." *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft* 4 (1901): 136-69; 228-73.
- Bousset, W. and H. Gressmann. *Die Religion des Judentums im späthellenistischen Zeitalter*. Handbuch zum Neuen Testament 21. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1926.
- Bruns, J. E. *Traces of Faith in the Assumption among the Eastern Fathers of the First Six Centuries*. Rome: Officium Libri Catholici, 1951.
- Bultmann, R. *The History of the Synoptic Tradition*. Rev. ed. Oxford: Blackwell; New York: Harper, 1968.
- Bundy, W. E. *Jesus and the First Three Gospels*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1955.
- Burkitt, F. C. *The Gospel History and Its Transmission*. 2nd ed. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1907.
- . *The Earliest Sources of the Life of Jesus*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1910.
- Bussmann, W. *Zur Redenquelle*. Vol. 2 of *Synoptische Studien*. Halle: Waisenhaus, 1929.
- Caragounis, C. C. *The Son of Man*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament. Second Series 38. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1986.

- Casey, M. "The Use of the Term 'Son of Man' in the Similitudes of Enoch." *Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic, and Roman Periods* 7 (1976): 1-29.
- . *Son of Man: The Interpretation and Influence of Daniel 7*. London: SPCK, 1980.
- Castor, G. D. *Matthew's Sayings of Jesus: The Non-Markan Common Source of Matthew and Luke*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1918.
- Catchpole, D. R. "The Angelic Son of Man in Luke 12:8." *Novum Testamentum* 24 (1982): 255-65.
- . *The Quest for Q*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1993.
- Cavallin, H. C. C. *Life After Death: Paul's Argument for the Resurrection of the Dead in 1 Cor 15. Part I: An Enquiry into the Jewish Background*. Coniectanea biblica: New Testament Series 7/1. Lund: Gleerup, 1974.
- Charles, R. H. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Revelation of St. John*. 2 vols. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1920.
- Chow, S. *The Sign of Jonah Reconsidered: A Study of Its Meaning in the Gospel Traditions*. Coniectanea biblica: New Testament Series 27. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1995.
- Christ, F. *Jesus Sophia: Die Sophia-Christologie bei den Synoptikern*. Zürich: Zwingli, 1970.
- Collins, A. Yarbro. "The Son of Man Sayings in the Sayings Source." Pages 369-89 in *To Touch the Text: Biblical and Related Studies in Honor of Joseph A. Fitzmyer, S.J.* Edited by P. J. Kobelski and M. P. Morgan. New York: Crossroad, 1989.
- . *The Beginning of the Gospel: Probing of Mark in Context*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992.
- . "The Empty Tomb in the Gospel According to Mark." Pages 107-40 in *Hermes and Athena: Biblical Exegesis and Philosophical Theology*. Edited by T. Flint and E. Stump. University of Notre Dame Studies in the Philosophy of Religion. Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1993.
- . "Apotheosis and Resurrection." Pages 88-100 in *The New Testament and Hellenistic Judaism*. Edited by P. Borgen and S. Giversen. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1997.
- Collins, J. J. "The Heavenly Representative: The 'Son of Man' in the Similitudes of Enoch." Pages 111-33 in *Ideal Figures in Ancient Judaism: Profiles and Paradigms*. Edited by J. Collins and G. Nickelsburg. Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies, 12. Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1980.
- . "The Son of Man in First-Century Judaism." *New Testament Studies* 38 (1992): 448-66.
- . *Daniel: A Commentary on the Book of Daniel*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993.
- . *The Scepter and the Star: The Messiahs of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Ancient Literature*. Anchor Bible Reference Library. New York: Doubleday, 1995.
- . *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids, Mich., and Cambridge, U.K.: Eerdmans, 1998.
- Crossan, J. D. "Empty Tomb and Absent Lord (Mark 16:1-8)." Pages 135-52 in *The Passion in Mark: Studies on Mark 14-16*. Edited by W. H. Kelber. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1976.
- . *The Birth of Christianity: Discovering What Happened in the Years Immediately After the Execution of Jesus*. San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1998.
- Davies, W. D., and D. C. Allison. *The Gospel According to Saint Matthew*. 3 vols. International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1988-1997.
- Dean-Otting, M. *Heavenly Journeys: A Study of the Motif in Hellenistic Jewish Literature*. Judentum und Umwelt 8. Frankfurt and New York: Peter Lang, 1984.
- de Jonge, H. J. "The Sayings on Confessing and Denying Jesus in Q 12:8-9 and Mark 8:38." Pages 105-21 in *Sayings of Jesus: Canonical and Non-canonical. Essays in Honour of Tjitze Baarda*. Edited by W. L. Petersen, et al. Leiden: Brill, 1997.

- Denaux, A. "The Q-Logion Mt 11.27 / Lk 10.22 and the Gospel of John." Pages 163-99 in *John and the Synoptics*. Edited by A. Denaux. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium 101. Leuven: Leuven University Press and Peeters, 1992.
- Derrett, J. D. M. "The Son of Man Standing (Acts 7:55-56)." *Bibbia e oriente* 30 (1988): 71-84.
- Dibelius, M. *From Tradition to Gospel*. Translated by B. L. Woolf. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1935.
- Dupont, J. "Le Logion de douze trônes (Mt 19,28; Lc 22,28-30)." *Biblica* 45 (1964): 355-92.
- Edwards, R. A. *The Sign of Jonah in the Teaching of the Evangelists and Q*. London: SCM, 1971.
- . *A Theology of Q: Eschatology, Prophecy and Wisdom*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1976.
- Esbroeck, M. van. "Les textes littéraires sur l'Assomption avant le Xe siècle." Pages 265-85 in *Les actes apocryphes des apôtres: christianisme et monde païen*. Edited by F. Bovon et al. Geneva: Labor et Fides, 1981.
- . *Aux origines de la Dormition de la Vierge: études historiques sur les traditions orientales*. Collected Studies 472. Brookfield, Vt.: Variorum, 1995.
- Evans, C. F. *Resurrection and the New Testament*. Studies in Biblical Theology. Second Series 12. London: SCM, 1970.
- Farmer, W. R. *The Gospel of Jesus: The Pastoral Relevance of the Synoptic Problem*. Louisville Ky.: Westminster/John Knox, 1994.
- Farrer, A. M. "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: Basil Blackwell, 1955.
- Fitzmyer, J. *The Gospel According to Luke*. Anchor Bible 28-28A. New York: Doubleday, 1981-1985.
- Fleddermann, H. "John and the Coming One (Matt 3:11-12 // Luke 3:16-17)." Pages 377-84 in *SBL Seminar Papers, 1984*. Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers 23. Chico, Calif.: Scholars, 1984.
- . "The Q Saying on Confessing and Denying." Pages 606-16 in *SBL Seminar Papers, 1987*. Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers 26. Atlanta: Scholars, 1987.
- . "The Cross and Discipleship in Q." Pages 472-82 in *SBL Seminar Papers, 1988*. Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers 27. Atlanta: Scholars, 1988.
- . "The End of Q." Pages 1-10 in *SBL Seminar Papers, 1990*. Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers 29. Atlanta: Scholars, 1990.
- . *Mark and Q: A Study of the Overlap Texts. With an Assessment by F. Neirynck*. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium 122. Leuven: Leuven University Press and Peeters, 1995.
- Focant, C. "Du Fils de l'Homme assis (Lc 22,69) au Fils de l'Homme debout (Ac 7,56): Enjeux théologique et littéraire d'un changement sémantique." Pages 563-76 in *The Unity of Luke-Acts*. Edited by J. Verheyden. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium 142. Leuven: Leuven University Press and Peeters, 1999.
- Franklin, E. "A Passion Narrative for Q?" Pages 30-47 in *Understanding, Studying and Reading: New Testament Essays in Honour of John Ashton*. Edited by C. Rowland and C. Fletcher-Louis. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 153. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1998.
- Galvin, J. "Resurrection as *Theologia Crucis*: The Foundational Christology of Rudolf Pesch." *Theological Studies* 38 (1977): 513-25.
- Garland, D. E. *The Intention of Matthew 23*. Novum Testamentum Supplements 52. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1979.
- Garsky, A. and C. Heil. "Q 12:[49], 50, 51, 52, 53: Children Against Parents." Pages 1-157 in *Q 12:49-59: Children Against Parents; Judging the Time; Settling out of Court*. Edited by S. Carruth. Documenta Q. Leuven: Peeters, 1997.
- Georgi, D. "Der vorpaulinische Hymnus Phil 2,6-11." Pages 263-93 in *Zeit und Geschichte: Dankesgabe an Rudolf Bultmann zum 80. Geburtstag*. Edited by E. Dinkler. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1964.

- Goulder, M. D. *Luke: A New Paradigm*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 20. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989.
- Gourgues, M. *À la droite de Dieu: Résurrection de Jésus et actualisation du Ps 110,1 dans le Nouveau Testament*. Etudes bibliques. Paris: Gabalda, 1978.
- Gräßer, E. *Die Naherwartung Jesu*. Stuttgarter Bibelstudien 61. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1973.
- Grelot, P. "La légende d'Hénoch dans les Apocryphes et dans la Bible: Origine et signification." *Recherches de science religieuse* 46 (1958): 5-26; 181-210.
- Grobel, K. "'... Whose Name was Neves.'" *New Testament Studies* 10 (1964): 373-82.
- Grundmann, W. *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*. 2nd ed. Theologischer Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament 3. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1961.
- Gundry, R. H. *Matthew: A Commentary on His Literary and Theological Art*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1982.
- Haacker, K. and P. Schäfer. "Nachbiblische Traditionen vom Tod des Moses." Pages 147-74 in *Josephus-Studien: Festschrift O. Michel*. Edited by O. Betz et al. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1974.
- Haenchen, E. "Matthäus 23." *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 48 (1951): 38-63.
- Halperin, D. J. "Heavenly Ascension in Ancient Judaism: The Nature of the Experience." Pages 218-32 in *SBL Seminar Papers, 1987*. Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers 26. Atlanta: Scholars, 1987.
- . "Ascension or Invasion: Implications of the Heavenly Journey in Ancient Judaism." *Religion* 18 (1988): 47-67.
- Hamilton, N. Q. "Resurrection Tradition and the Composition of Mark." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 84 (1965): 415-21.
- Hare, D. R. A. *The Son of Man Tradition*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990.
- Harnack, A. von. *The Sayings of Jesus: The Second Source of St. Matthew and St. Luke*. Translated by J. R. Wilkinson. New York: Putnam; London: Williams & Norgate, 1908.
- Haufe, G. "Entrückung und eschatologische Funktion im Spätjudentum." *Zeitschrift für Religions- und Geistesgeschichte* 13 (1961): 105-113.
- Hawkins, J. C. *Horae Synopticae: Contributions to the Study of the Synoptic Problem*. 2nd rev. ed. Oxford: Clarendon, 1909.
- . "Probabilities as to the So-Called Double Tradition of St. Matthew and St. Luke." Pages 95-138 in *Studies in the Synoptic Problem by Members of the University of Oxford*. Edited by W. Sanday. Oxford: Clarendon, 1911.
- Hays, R. B. "'The Righteous One' as Eschatological Deliverer: A Case Study in Paul's Apocalyptic Hermeneutics." Pages 191-215 in *Apocalyptic and the New Testament: Essays in Honor of J. Louis Martyn*. Edited by J. Marcus and M. L. Soards. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 24. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989.
- Hayward, R. "Phinehas—the Same is Elijah: The Origin of a Rabbinic Tradition." *Journal of Jewish Studies* 29 (1978): 22-38.
- Head, P. M. "On the Christology of the Gospel of Peter." *Vigiliae christianae* 46 (1992): 209-24.
- Hengel, M. "Jesus as Messianic Teacher of Wisdom and the Beginnings of Christology." Pages 73-117 in *Studies in Early Christology*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1995.
- Himmelfarb, M. "A Report on Enoch in Rabbinic Literature." Pages 259-69 in volume 1 of the *SBL Seminar Papers, 1978*. 2 vols. Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers 15. Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1978.
- . *Ascent to Heaven in Jewish and Christian Apocalypses*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.

- . "The Practice of Ascent in the Ancient Mediterranean World." Pages 121-137 in *Death, Ecstasy, and Other Worldly Journeys*. Edited by J. J. Collins and M. Fishbane. Albany, N.Y.: State University of New York Press, 1995.
- Hirsch, E. *Die Vorlagen des Lukas und das Sondergut des Matthäus*. Vol. 2 of *Die Frühgeschichte des Evangeliums*. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1941.
- Hock, R. F. *The Infancy Gospels of James and Thomas*. The Scholars' Bible 2; Santa Rosa, Calif.: Polebridge, 1995.
- Hoffmann, P. "Jesusverkündigung in der Logienquelle." Pages 50-70 in *Jesus in den Evangelien*. Edited by W. Pesch. Stuttgarter Bibelstudien 45. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1970.
- . "Auferstehung Jesu Christi (Neues Testament)." *Theologische Realenzyklopädie* 4 (1979): 478-513.
- . *Studien zur Theologie der Logienquelle*. 3rd ed. Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen 8. Münster: Aschendorff, 1982.
- , ed. *Zur neutestamentlichen Überlieferung von der Auferstehung Jesu*. Wege zur Forschung 522. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1988.
- . "Jesus versus Menschensohn: Matthäus 10,32f und die synoptische Menschensohnüberlieferung." Pages 165-202 in *Salz der Erde—Licht der Welt: Exegetische Studien zum Matthäusevangelium. Festschrift für A. Vögtle*. Edited by P. Fiedler and L. Oberlinner. Stuttgart: 1991.
- . "QR und der Menschensohn: Eine vorläufige Skizze." Pages 421-456 in *The Four Gospels 1992: Festschrift Frans Neirynck*. Edited by C. M. Tuckett et al. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium 100. Leuven: Leuven University Press and Peeters, 1992 = "The Redaction of Q and the Son of Man: A Preliminary Sketch." Pages 159-198 in *The Gospel Behind the Gospels: Current Studies on Q*. Edited by Ronald A. Piper. Novum Testamentum Supplements 75. Leiden: Brill, 1995.
- . "Q 13:34-35: Second Response." Unpublished appendix to database of S. R. Johnson. International Q Project work sessions, 1994.
- . "Herrscher oder Richter über Israel?" Pages 253-64 in *Ja und Nein: Christliche Theologie im Angesicht Israels. FS W. Schröge*. Edited by G. Sass and K. Wengst. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1998.
- . "Der Menschensohn in Lukas 12:8." *New Testament Studies* 44 (1998): 357-79.
- Hoffmann, P., with J. E. Amon, U. Brauner, and T. Hieke. "Confessing or Denying." Pages 1-425 in *Q 12:8-12: Confessing or Denying: Speaking against the Holy Spirit: Hearings before Synagogues*. Edited by C. Heil. Documenta Q. Leuven: Peeters, 1997.
- Hoffmann, P., with S. H. Brandenburger, U. Brauner, and T. Hieke. *Q 22:28,30: You Will Judge the Twelve Tribes of Israel*. Edited by C. Heil. Documenta Q. Leuven: Peeters, 1998.
- Holleman, J. *Resurrection and Parousia: A Tradition-Historical Study of Paul's Eschatology in 1 Corinthians 15*. Novum Testamentum Supplements 84. Leiden: Brill, 1996.
- Horsley, R. "Q and Jesus: Assumptions, Approaches, and Analyses." Pages 175-209 in *Early Christianity, Q and Jesus*. Edited by J. S. Kloppenborg with L. E. Vaage. Semeia 55. Atlanta: Scholars, 1991.
- . "Social Conflict in the Synoptic Sayings Source Q." Pages 37-52 in *Conflict and Invention: Literary, Rhetorical and Social Studies on the Sayings Gospel Q*. Edited by J. S. Kloppenborg. Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press International, 1995.
- Hultgren, A. *The Rise of Normative Christianity*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1994.
- Jacobsen, T. *The Sumerian King List*. Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago Assyriological Studies 11. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1939.
- Jacobson, A. D. "The Literary Unity of Q." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 101 (1982): 365-89.
- . "Apocalyptic and the Sayings Source Q." Pages 403-19 in *The Four Gospels 1992: Festschrift Frans Neirynck*. Edited by C. M. Tuckett et al. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium 100. Leuven: Leuven University Press and Peeters, 1992.

- . *The First Gospel: An Introduction to Q*. Foundations and Facets. Sonoma, Calif.: Polebridge. 1992.
- Jacq, C. *Le Voyage dans l'autre monde selon l'Égypte ancienne*. Monaco: Éditions du Rocher. 1986.
- Jeremias, J. *New Testament Theology*. London: SCM, 1971.
- Johnson, S. R. "S52: Q 13:34-35." Unpublished database, with appended responses by J. R. Robinson and P. Hoffmann, prepared for the International Q Project Work Sessions, 1994.
- Jülicher, A. *An Introduction to the New Testament*. Translated by J. P. Ward. London: Smith, Elder, 1904.
- Kaestli, J.-D. "Le rôle des textes bibliques dans la genèse et le développement des légendes apocryphes: le cas du sort final de l'apôtre Jean." *Augustinianum* 23 (1983): 319-36.
- . "Où en est l'étude de l'Évangile de Barthélemy?" *Revue biblique* 95 (1988): 5-33.
- Käsemann, E. "On the Subject of Primitive Christian Apocalyptic." Pages 108-37 in *New Testament Questions of Today*. London: SCM, 1969.
- Kessler, H. *Die theologische Bedeutung des Todes Jesu: Eine traditions-geschichtliche Untersuchung*. Themen und Thesen der Theologie. Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1970.
- Kirk, A. "Examining Priorities: Another Look at the Gospel of Peter's Relationship to the New Testament Gospels." *New Testament Studies* 40 (1994): 572-95.
- . *The Composition of the Sayings Source: Genre, Synchrony, and Wisdom Redaction in Q*. Novum Testamentum Supplements 91. Leiden: Brill, 1998.
- . "Is Q Without Passion?" Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature. Orlando, Fla., November 1998.
- Klijn, A. F. J. "The Sources and the Redaction of the Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch." *Journal of Jewish Studies* 1 (1970): 65-76.
- Kloppenborg, J. S. "Wisdom Christology in Q." *Laval théologique et philosophique* 34 (1978): 129-47.
- . "Blessing and Marginality: The 'Persecution Beatitude' in Q, Thomas, and Early Christianity." *Forum* 2 (1986): 36-56.
- . *The Formation of Q: Trajectories in Ancient Wisdom Collections*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987.
- . "Symbolic Eschatology and the Apocalypticism of Q." *Harvard Theological Review* 80 (1987): 287-306.
- . "'Easter Faith' and the Sayings Gospel Q." Pages 71-99 in *The Apocryphal Jesus and Christian Origins*. Edited by R. Cameron. Semeia 49. Atlanta: Scholars, 1990.
- . "Literary Convention, Self-Evidence and the Social History of the Q People." Pages 77-102 in *Early Christianity, Q and Jesus*. Edited by J. S. Kloppenborg with L. E. Vaage. Semeia 55. Atlanta: Scholars, 1991.
- . "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. Novum Testamentum Supplements 75. Leiden: Brill, 1995.
- . "The Sayings Gospel Q: Literary and Stratigraphic Problems." Pages 1-66 in *Symbols and Strata: Essays on the Sayings Gospel Q*. Edited by R. Uro. Helsinki: Finnish Exegetical Society; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996.
- . *Excavating Q: The History and Social Setting of the Sayings Gospel*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2000.
- Kloppenborg, J. S., and L. E. Vaage. "Early Christianity, Q and Jesus: The Sayings Gospel and Method in the Study of Christian Origins." Pages 1-14 in *Early Christianity, Q and Jesus*. Edited by J. S. Kloppenborg with L. E. Vaage. Semeia 55. Atlanta: Scholars, 1991.
- Knox, W. L. *St. Luke and St. Matthew*. Vol. 2 of *The Sources of the Synoptic Gospels*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1957.

- Koch, D.-A. "Der Text von Hab 2.4b in der Septuaginta und im Neuen Testament." *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* 76 (1985): 68-85.
- Koester, H. "ΓΝΩΜΑΙ ΔΙΑΦΟΡΟΙ: The Origin and Nature of Diversification in the History of Early Christianity." Pages 114-57 in J. M. Robinson and H. Koester, *Trajectories through Early Christianity*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1971.
- Kolarcik, M. *The Ambiguity of Death in the Book of Wisdom 1-6: A Study of Literary Structure and Interpretation*. Analecta Biblica 127. Rome: Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1991.
- Kraft, R. A. "Philo (Josephus, Sirach and Wisdom of Solomon) on Enoch." Pages 253-7 in volume 1 of the *SBL Seminar Papers, 1978*. 2 vols. Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers 15. Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1978.
- Krueger, D. *Symeon the Holy Fool: Leontius's Life and the Late Antique City*. Transformation of the Classical Heritage 25. Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 1996.
- Kümmel, W. G. *Verheissung und Erfüllung: Untersuchung zur eschatologischen Verkündigung Jesu*. 2nd ed. Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments 6. Basel: Heinrich Majer, 1953.
- Kvanig, H. S. *Roots of Apocalyptic: The Mesopotamian Background of the Enoch Figure of the Son of Man*. Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament 61. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1988.
- Kwaak, H. van der. "Die Klage über Jerusalem (Matth. XXIII 37-39)." *Novum Testamentum* 8 (1966): 156-70.
- Lantschoot, A. van. "L'Assomption de la Sainte Vierge chez les Coptes." *Gregorianum* 27 (1946): 493-525.
- Lambert, W. G. "Enmeduranki and Related Matters." *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 21 (1967): 126-38.
- Lambrecht, J. "Q-Influence on Mark 8.34-9.1." Pp. 277-304 in *Logia: Les paroles de Jésus—The Sayings of Jesus*. Edited by J. Delobel. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium 59. Leuven: Leuven University Press and Peeters, 1982.
- Laufen, R. *Die Doppelüberlieferungen der Logienquelle und des Markusevangeliums*. Bonner biblische Beiträge 54. Königstein and Bonn: Hanstein, 1980.
- Liebermann, S. "Metatron: The Meaning of His Name and His Functions." Pages 235-41 in *Apocalyptic and Merkabah Mysticism*. Edited by I. Gruenwald. Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums 14. Leiden: Brill, 1980.
- Lindars, B. "The Apocalyptic Myth and the Death of Christ." *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester* 57 (1975): 366-87.
- . *Jesus Son of Man: A Fresh Examination of the Son of Man Sayings in the Gospels in the Light of Recent Research*. London: SPCK, 1983.
- Lips, H. von. *Weisheitliche Traditionen im Neuen Testament*. Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament 64. München: Neukirchener, 1990.
- Lohfink, G. *Die Himmelfahrt Jesu: Untersuchungen zu den Himmelfahrts- und Erhöhungstexten bei Lukas*. Studien zum Alten und Neuen Testaments 26. München: Kosel, 1971.
- Lohmeyer, E. *Galiläa und Jerusalem*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1936.
- . *Kyrios Jesus: Eine Untersuchung zu Phil. 2,5-11*. 2. Aufl. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1961.
- Lüdemann, G. *Early Christianity According to the Traditions in Acts*. London: SCM, 1989.
- . *The Resurrection of Jesus: History, Experience, Theology*. London: SCM, 1994.
- Lührmann, D. *Die Redaktion der Logienquelle*. Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament 33. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1969.

- . "Henoch und die Metanoia." *Zeitschrift für neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* 66 (1975): 103-16.
- . *Das Markusevangelium*. Handbuch zum Neuen Testament 3. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1987.
- . "The Gospel of Mark and the Sayings Collection Q." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 108 (1989): 51-71.
- MacCormack, S. G. *Art and Ceremony in Late Antiquity*. Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 1981.
- Mack, B. L. *A Myth of Innocence: Mark and Christian Origins*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988.
- . "Lord of the Logia: Savior or Sage?" Pages 3-18 in *Gospel Origins and Christian Beginnings: In Honor of James M. Robinson*. Edited by C. W. Hedrick et. al. Forum Fascicles 1. Sonoma, Calif.: Polebridge, 1990.
- . *The Lost Gospel: The Book of Q and Christian Origins*. San Francisco: HarperCollins, 1993.
- Malina, B. J., and J. H. Neyrey. *Calling Jesus Names: The Social Value of Labels in Matthew*. Sonoma, Calif.: Polebridge, 1988.
- . "Conflict in Luke-Acts: Labelling and Deviance Theory." Pages 97-122 in *The Social World of Luke-Acts: Models for Interpretation*. Edited by J. H. Neyrey. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1991.
- Manson, T. W. *The Sayings of Jesus: As recorded in the Gospels according to St. Matthew and St. Luke arranged with Introduction and Commentary*. London: SCM, 1937.
- . "The Son of Man in Daniel, Enoch, and the Gospels." *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester* 32 (1949-1950): 171-93 = Pages 123-45 in *Studies in the Gospels and the Epistles*. Manchester: Manchester University, 1962.
- Mara, M. G. *Évangile de Pierre: Introduction, texte critique, traduction, commentaire et index*. Sources chrétiennes 201. Paris: Cerf, 1973.
- Marshall, I. H. *The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. New International Greek Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1978.
- Martin, R. P. *A Hymn of Christ: Philippians 2:5-11 in Recent Interpretation & in the Setting of Early Christian Worship*. 3rd ed. Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 1997.
- Martin-Achard, R. "Resurrection: Old Testament." Pages 680-4 in Volume 5 of *Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Edited by D. N. Freedman. 6 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
- Marxsen, W. *Mark the Evangelist: Studies on the Redaction History of the Gospel*. Nashville: Abingdon, 1969.
- März, C.-P. "... laßt eure Lampen brennen!" *Studien zur Q-Vorlage von Lk 12,35-14,24*. Erfurter theologische Studien 20. Leipzig: St Benno, 1991.
- McCant, J. W. "The Gospel of Peter: Docetism Reconsidered." *New Testament Studies* 30 (1984): 258-73.
- McKnight, S. "Public Declaration or Final Judgment? Matthew 10:26-27 = Luke 12:2-3 as a Case of Creative Redaction." Pages 363-83 in *Authenticating the Words of Jesus*. Edited by B. Chilton and C. Evans. New Testament Tools and Studies 28/1. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- Meadors, E. P. *Jesus the Messianic Herald of Salvation*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament. Second Series 72. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1995.
- Meeks, W. A. *The Prophet-King: Moses Traditions and the Johannine Christology*. Novum Testamentum Supplements 14. Leiden: Brill, 1967.
- Merklein, H. "Mk 16,1-8 als Epilog des Markusevangeliums." Pages 209-38 in *The Synoptic Gospels: Source Criticism and the New Literary Criticism*. Edited by C. Focant. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium 110. Leuven: Leuven University Press and Peeters, 1993.
- Metzger, B. *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*. 2nd ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft: New York: United Bible Societies, 1994.
- Meyer, M. *The "Mithras Liturgy"*. Society of Biblical Literature Texts and Translations 10: Graeco-Roman Series 2. Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1976.

- Michael, J. H. "The Lament over Jerusalem." *American Journal of Theology* 22 (1918): 101-13.
- Milburn, R. L. P. *Early Christian Interpretations of History*. London: Black, 1954.
- Miller, R. J. "The Rejection of the Prophets in Q." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 107 (1988): 225-40.
- . "Immortality and Religious Identity in Wisdom 2-5," Pages 199-213 in *Reimagining Christian Origins: A Colloquium Honoring Burton L. Mack*. Edited by H. Taussig and E. A. Castelli. Valley Forge, Pa.: Trinity Press International, 1996.
- Mimouni, S. C. "Les Transitus Mariae sont-ils vraiment des apocryphes?" Pages 122-28 in *Studia Patristica* 25. Edited by E. A. Livingstone. Leuven: Peeters, 1993.
- . *Dormition et assomption de Marie: histoire des traditions anciennes*. Théologie historique 98. Paris: Beauchesne, 1995.
- Moreland, M. C. and J. M. Robinson. "The International Q Project: Work Sessions 23-27 May, 22-26 August, 17-18 November 1994." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 114 (1995): 475-85.
- Morenz, S. *Die Geschichte von Joseph dem Zimmermann*. Texte und Untersuchungen 56. Berlin: Akademie, 1951.
- . *Egyptian Religion*. Translated by A. Keep. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1973.
- Mowinckel, S. *He That Cometh*. Nashville: Abingdon, 1955.
- Myllykoski, M. "The Social History of Q and the Jewish War." Pages 146-99 in *Symbols and Strata: Essays on the Sayings Gospel Q*. Edited by R. Uro. Helsinki: Finnish Exegetical Society; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996.
- Neirynck, F. "Recent Developments in the Study of Q." Pages 29-75 in *Logia: Les Paroles de Jésus—The Sayings of Jesus. Mémoires Joseph Coppens*. Edited by J. Delobel. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium 59. Leuven: Leuven University Press and Peeters, 1982.
- . "Q: From Source to Gospel." *Ephemerides theologicae lovanienses* 71 (1995): 421-30.
- Nickelsburg, G. W. E. *Resurrection, Immortality and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism*. Harvard Theological Studies 26. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1972.
- . "The Apocalyptic Message of I Enoch 92-105." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 39 (1977): 309-28.
- . "The Genre and Function of the Markan Passion Narrative." *Harvard Theological Review* 73 (1980): 153-84.
- . "Resurrection: Early Judaism and Christianity." Pages 684-91 in Volume 5 of *Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Edited by D. N. Freedman. 6 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
- Nilsson, M. "Der Flammentod des Herakles auf dem Oite." *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft* 22 (1922): 310-16.
- Nolland, J. *Luke 1:1-9:20, 9:21-18:34, 18:35-24:53*. 3 vols. Word Biblical Commentary 35A-C. Dallas: Word, 1989-1993.
- Nützel, J. M. "Zum Schicksal der eschatologischen Propheten." *Biblische Zeitschrift* 20 (1976): 59-94.
- Padilla, M. W. *The Myths of Herakles in Ancient Greece: Survey and Profile*. Lanham, Md.: University Press of America, 1998.
- Palmer, D. W. "Origin, Form, and Purpose of Mark 16:4 in Codex Bobbiensis." *Journal of Theological Studies* 27 (1976): 113-22.
- Papanikolaou, A. *Chariton-Studien: Untersuchungen zur Sprache und Chronologie der griechischen romane*. Hypomnemata 37. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1973.
- Parsons, M. P. *The Departure of Jesus in Luke-Acts: The Ascension Narratives in Context*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 21. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1987.
- Paulsen, H. "Mk XVI 1-8." *Novum Testamentum* 22 (1980): 138-75 = Pages 377-415 in *Zur neutestamentlichen Überlieferung von der Auferstehung Jesu*. Edited by P. Hoffmann. Wege der Forschung 522. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1988.

- Pease, A. S. "Some Aspects of Invisibility." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 53 (1942): 1-36.
- Perrin, N. "The Son of Man in the Synoptic Tradition." *Biblical Research* 13 (1968): 3-25.
- Pesch, R. *Die Vision des Stephanus: Apg 7,55-56 im Rahmen der Apostelgeschichte*. Stuttgarter biblische Beiträge 12. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1966.
- . "Zur Entstehung des Glaubens an die Auferstehung Jesu." *Theologische Quartalschrift* 153 (1973): 201-228.
- . "Der Schluß der vormarkinischen Passionsgeschichte und des Markusevangeliums: Mk 15,42-16,8." Pages 365-410 in *L'Évangile selon Marc: Tradition et rédaction*. Edited by M. Sabbe. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium 34. Leuven: Leuven University Press and Peeters, 1974.
- . *Das Markusevangelium*. 2 vols. 2nd ed. Herders theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament 2. Freiburg: Herder, 1980.
- . "Zur Entstehung des Glaubens an die Auferstehung Jesu: Ein neuer Versuch." *Freiburger Zeitschrift für Philosophie und Theologie* 30 (1983): 73-98.
- Piper, R. A. *Wisdom in the Q Tradition: The Aphoristic Teaching of Jesus*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 61. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- Plevnik, J. "The Taking Up of the Faithful and the Resurrection of the Dead in I Thessalonians 4:13-18." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 46 (1984): 274-83.
- . "Paul's Appeals to His Damascus Experience and I Cor 15:5-7: Are They Legitimations?" *Toronto Journal of Theology* 4 (1988): 101-11.
- Pokorný, P. *The Genesis of Christology*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1987.
- Polag, A. *Die Christologie der Logienquelle*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 45. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1977.
- . "The Theological Center of the Sayings Source." Pages 97-105 in *The Gospel and the Gospels*. Edited by P. Stuhlmacher. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1991.
- Price, S. R. F. "From Noble Funerals to Divine Cult: The Consecration of Roman Emperors." Pages 56-105 in *Rituals of Royalty: Power and Ceremonial in Traditional Societies*. Edited by S. Price and D. Cannadine. Past and Present Publications. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- Ramsay, W. M. *Luke the Physician, and Other Studies in the History of Religion*. London: Hodder, 1908.
- Reimer, A. "The Empty Tomb: A Biography of a Motif." Paper presented at the SBL Annual Meeting, Nashville, Tenn., November 2000.
- Rengstorff, K. *Die Auferstehung Jesu: Form, Art und Sinn der urchristlichen Osterbotschaft*. Witten-Ruhr: Luther, 1952.
- Robinson, J. M. "Jesus as Sophos and Sophia: Wisdom Tradition and the Gospels." Pages 1-16 in *Aspects of Wisdom in Judaism and Early Christianity*. Edited by R. L. Wilken. South Bend, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1975.
- . "Jesus—From Easter to Valentinus (or to the Apostles' Creed)." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 101 (1982): 5-37.
- . "The International Q Project Work Session 16 November 1990." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 110 (1991): 494-8.
- . "The Son of Man in the Sayings Gospel Q." Pages 315-35 in *Tradition und Translation: Zum Problem der interkulturellen Übersetzbarkeit religiöser Phänomene. Festschrift für Carsten Colpe zum 65. Geburtstag*. Edited by C. Elsas. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1994.
- . "Building Blocks in the Social History of Q." Pages 87-112 in *Reimagining Christian Origins: A Colloquium Honoring Burton L. Mack*. Edited by H. Taussig and E. A. Castelli. Valley Forge, Pa.: Trinity Press International, 1996.

- . "The Sequence of Q: The Lament over Jerusalem." Pages 225-60 in *Von Jesus zum Christus: Christologische Studien. Festgabe für Paul Hoffmann zum 65. Geburtstag*. Edited by U. Busse and R. Hoppe. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 93. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1998.
- . "The Critical Edition of Q and the Study of Jesus." Unpublished paper presented to the Colloquium Biblicum Lovaniense, Leuven, July 2000.
- Rohde, E. *Psyche: The Cult of Souls and Belief in Immortality Among the Greeks*. Translated by W. B. Willis. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1925.
- Rydén, L. *Bemerkungen zum Leben des heiligen Narren Symeon von Leontios von Neapolis*. Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis, Studia Graeca Upsaliensia 6. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1970.
- Sabbe, M. "The Son of Man Saying in Acts 7,56." Pages 241-79 in *Les Actes des Apôtres: Traditions, rédaction, théologie*. Edited by J. Kremer. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium 48. Gembloux: Ducolot; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1979.
- Sato, M. *Q und Prophetie: Studien zur Gattungs- und Traditionsgeschichte der Quelle Q*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament. Second Series 29. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1988.
- Satran, D. *Biblical Prophets in Byzantine Palestine: Reassessing the Lives of the Prophets*. Studia in Veteris Testamenti pseudepigraphica 11. Leiden: Brill, 1995.
- Shapiro, H. A. "Hērōs Theos: The Death and Apotheosis of Herakles." *Classical World* 77 (1983): 7-18.
- Schenke, L. *Auferstehungsverkundigung und leeres Grab: eine traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung von Mk 16,1-8*. Stuttgarter biblische Beiträge 33. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1968.
- Schmiedel, P. W. *Das vierte Evangelium gegenüber den drei ersten Johannesschriften des Neuen Testaments*. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1906.
- Schmidt, D. "The LXX Gattung 'Prophetic Correlative.'" *JBL* 96 (1977): 517-22.
- Schmitt, A. "Die Angaben über Henoch Gen 5, 21-24 in der LXX." Pages 161-69 in *Wort, Lied und Gottesspruch: Beiträge zur Septuaginta. Festschrift für Joseph Ziegler*. Edited by J. Schreiner. Forschung zur Bibel 1. Würzburg: Echter, 1972.
- . *Entrückung—Aufnahme—Himmelfahrt: Untersuchungen zu einem Vorstellungsbereich im Alten Testament*. 2. Aufl. Forschung zur Bibel 10. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1976.
- . "Zum Thema 'Entrückung' im Alten Testament." *Biblische Zeitschrift* 26 (1982): 34-49.
- . *Das Buch der Weisheit: Ein Kommentar*. Würzburg: Echter, 1986.
- . "Der frühe Tod des Gerechten nach Weish 4,7-19: Ein Psalmthema in weisheitlicher Fassung." Pages 325-47 in *Freude an der Weisung des Herrn: Beiträge zur Theologie der Psalmen. Festgabe zum 70. Geburtstag von Heinrich Gross*. Edited by F.-L. Hossfeld and E. Haag. Stuttgarter biblische Beiträge 13. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1986.
- Schmitt, G. "Das Zeichen des Jona." *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* 69 (1978): 123-9.
- Schulz, S. *Q: Die Spruchquelle der Evangelisten*. Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1972.
- Schürmann, H. "Beobachtungen zum Menschensohn-Titel in der Redequelle." Pages 124-47 in *Jesus und der Menschensohn: Für Anton Vögle*. Edited by R. Schnackenburg and R. Pesch. Freiburg (Breisgau), Basel, and Vienna: Herder, 1975 = "Observations on the Son of Man Title in the Speech Source." Pages 74-97 in *The Shape of Q: Signal Essays on the Sayings Gospel*. Edited by J. S. Kloppenborg. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1994.
- . "Das Zeugnis der Redenquelle für die Basileia-Verkündigung Jesu." Pages 121-200 in *Logia: Les Paroles de Jésus—The Sayings of Jesus. Mémorial Joseph Coppens*. Edited by J. Delobel. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium 59. Leuven: Leuven University Press and Peeters, 1982.

- Seeley, D. "Narrative, the Righteous Man and the Philosopher: An Analysis of the Story of the *Dikaios* in Wisdom 1-5." *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 7 (1990): 55-78.
- . "Blessings and Boundaries: Interpretations of Jesus' Death in Q." Pages 131-46 in *Early Christianity, Q and Jesus*. Edited by J. S. Kloppenborg with L. E. Vaage. Semeia 55. Atlanta: Scholars, 1991.
- . "Jesus' Death in Q." *New Testament Studies* 38 (1992): 222-34.
- Segal, A. F. "Heavenly Ascent in Hellenistic Judaism, Early Christianity and their Environment" Pages 1333-94 in Vol. 23.2 of *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, Part 2, *Principat*. Edited by H. Temporini and W. Haase. Berlin and New York: de Gruyter, 1980.
- Sevenich-Bax, E. *Israels Konfrontation mit den letzten Boten der Weisheit: Form, Funktion und Interdependenz der Weisheitselemente in der Logienquelle*. Münsteraner Theologische Abhandlungen 21. Altenberge: Oros, 1993.
- Skehan, P. W. and A. A. Di Lella. *The Wisdom of Ben Siru: A New Translation with Notes*. Anchor Bible 39. New York: Doubleday, 1987.
- Smid, H. *Protevangelium Jacobi: A Commentary*. Apocrypha Novi Testamenti I. Assen: van Gorcum, 1965.
- Smith, D. A. "The 'Assumption' of the Righteous Dead in the Wisdom of Solomon and the Sayings Source Q." *Studies in Religion/ Sciences religieuses* 29 (2001): [forthcoming].
- Smith, J. Z. "The Prayer of Joseph." Pages 253-94 in *Religions in Antiquity: Essays in Memory of Erwin Ramsdell Goodenough*. Edited by J. Neusner. Leiden: Brill, 1968 = Pages 24-66 in Smith, *Map is Not Territory: Studies in the History of Religion*. Leiden: Brill, 1978.
- Smith, M. "Two Ascended to Heaven – Jesus and the Author of 4Q491." Pages 290-301 in *Jesus and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by J. Charlesworth. Anchor Bible Reference Library. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
- Spiro, A. "The Ascension of Phinehas." *Proceedings of the American Academy of Jewish Research* 22 (1953): 91-114.
- Stanton, V. H. *The Synoptic Gospels*. Vol. 2 of *The Gospels as Historical Documents*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1909.
- Stead, F. H. "Does the Original Collection of Logia ('Q') Contain Prediction of Our Lord's Resurrection?" *Expositor* 8/22 (1921): 397-400.
- Steck, O. H. *Israel und das gewaltsame Geschick der Propheten: Untersuchungen zur Überlieferung des deuteronomischen Geschichtsbildes im Alten Testament, Spätjudentum und Urchristentum*. Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament 23. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1967.
- Stein, R. H. "A Short Note on Mark XIV.28 and XVI.7." *New Testament Studies* 20 (1974): 445-52.
- Stone, M. E. "Coherence and Inconsistency in the Apocalypses: The Case of 'The End' in 4 Ezra." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 102 (1983): 229-43.
- . *Fourth Ezra: A Commentary on the Book of Fourth Ezra*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990.
- Strauss, D. F. *A New Life of Jesus*. 2nd ed. London: Williams and Norgate, 1879.
- Streeter, B. H. "On the Original Order of Q." Pages 140-164 in *Studies in the Synoptic Problem by Members of the University of Oxford*. Edited by W. Sanday. Oxford: Clarendon, 1911.
- . "The Original Extent of Q." Pages 184-208 in *Studies in the Synoptic Problem by Members of the University of Oxford*. Edited by W. Sanday. Oxford: Clarendon, 1911.
- . "The Literary Evolution of the Gospels." Pages 209-27 in *Studies in the Synoptic Problem by Members of the University of Oxford*. Edited by W. Sanday. Oxford: Clarendon, 1911.
- . *The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins*. London: MacMillan, 1924.

- Strobel, A. *Untersuchungen zum eschatologischen Verzögerungsproblem: auf Grund der spätjüdisch-urchristlichen Geschichte von Habakuk 2,2ff.* Novum Testamentum Supplements 2. Leiden/Köln: Brill, 1961.
- Suggs, M. J. *Wisdom, Christology, and Law in Matthew's Gospel.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1970.
- Tabor, J. D. *Things Unutterable: Paul's Ascent to Heaven in Its Greco-Roman, Judaic, and Early Christian Contexts.* Studies in Judaism. Lanham, Md.: University Press of America, 1986.
- . "'Returning to the Divinity': Josephus's Portrayal of the Disappearances of Enoch, Elijah, and Moses." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 108 (1989): 225-38.
- Talbert, C. H. "The Concept of Immortals in Mediterranean Antiquity." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 94 (1975): 419-36.
- . *Reading Acts: A Literary and Theological Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles.* New York: Crossroad, 1997.
- Theissen, G. *Sociology of Early Palestinian Christianity.* Philadelphia: Fortress, 1978.
- Tilborg, S. van, and P. Chatelion Counet. *Jesus' Appearances and Disappearances in Luke 24.* Biblical Interpretation Series 45. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- Tödt, H. E. *The Son of Man in the Synoptic Tradition.* London: SCM, 1965.
- Tuckett, C. M. "On the Stratification of Q: A Response." Pages 213-22 in *Early Christianity: Q and Jesus.* Edited by J. S. Kloppenborg with L. E. Vaage. Semeia 55. Atlanta: Scholars, 1991.
- . "The Son of Man in Q." Pages 196-215 in *From Jesus to John: Essays on Jesus and New Testament Christology in Honour of Marinus de Jonge.* Edited by M. C. de Boer. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 84. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993.
- . *Q and the History of Early Christianity: Studies on Q.* Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark; Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1996.
- Uro, R. *Sheep Among the Wolves: A Study of the Mission Instructions of Q.* Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae Dissertationes Humanarum Litterarum 47. Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1987.
- . "Jeesus-liike ja ylösnousemus." Pages 93-111 in *Jeesus-liikkeestä kristinuskoksi.* Helsinki: Yliopistopaino, 1995.
- . "Apocalyptic Symbolism and Social Identity in Q." Pages 67-118 in *Symbols and Strata: Essays on the Sayings Gospel Q.* Edited by R. Uro. Publications of the Finnish Exegetical Society 65. Helsinki: Finnish Exegetical Society; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996.
- Vaage, L. E. "The Son of Man Sayings in Q: Stratigraphical Location and Significance." Pages 103-29 in *Early Christianity: Q and Jesus.* Edited by J. S. Kloppenborg with L. E. Vaage. Semeia 55. Atlanta: Scholars, 1991.
- VanderKam, J. C. "Enoch Traditions in Jubilees and Other Second-Century Sources." Pages 229-51 in volume 1 of the *SBL Seminar Papers, 1978.* 2 vols. Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers 15. Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1978.
- . *Enoch and the Growth of an Apocalyptic Tradition.* Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series 16. Washington, D.C.: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1984.
- . "Righteous One, Messiah, Chosen One, and Son of Man in 1 Enoch 37-71." Pages 169-91 in *The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity.* Edited by J. H. Charlesworth. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992.
- . *Enoch: A Man for All Generations.* Studies and Personalities of the Old Testament. Columbia, S.C.: University of South Carolina Press, 1995.
- Vassiliadis, P. "The Nature and Extent of the Q Document." *Novum Testamentum* 20 (1978): 49-73.

- . "The Original Order of Q: Some Residual Cases." Pages 379-87 in *Logia: Les Paroles de Jésus—The Sayings of Jesus. Méorial Joseph Coppens*. Edited by J. Delobel. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium 59. Leuven: Leuven University Press and Peeters, 1982.
- . "Eucharist and Q." Pages 117-29 in *ΛΟΓΟΙ ΙΗΣΟΥ: Studies in Q*. International Studies in Formative Christianity and Judaism. Atlanta: Scholars Press [for the University of South Florida], 1999.
- Vögtle, A. "Der Spruch vom Jonaszeichen." Pages 103-36 in *Das Evangelium und die Evangelien*. Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1971.
- Weinert, F. D. "Luke, the Temple and Jesus' Saying about Jerusalem's Abandoned House (Luke 13:34-35)." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 44 (1982): 68-76.
- Weiß, B. *A Manual of Introduction to the New Testament*. Translated by A. J. K. Davidson. 2 vols. New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1887-89.
- Wellhausen, J. *Einleitung in die ersten drei Evangelien*. 2nd ed. Berlin: Georg Reimer, 1911.
- Wenger, A. *L'Assomption de la T.S. Vierge dans la tradition Byzantine du VI au X siècle: études et documents*. Archives de l'Orient chrétien 5. Paris: Institut français d'études Byzantines, 1955.
- Westermann, C. *Genesis 1-11: A Commentary*. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1984.
- Wilckens, U. "Der Ursprung der Überlieferung der Erscheinungen des Auferstandenen: Zur traditionsge-schichtlichen Analyse von 1 Co 15,1-11." Pages 56-95 in *Dogma und Denkstrukturen*. Edited by W. Joest and W. Pannenberg. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1963 = Pages 139-93 in *Zur neutestamentlichen Überlieferung von der Auferstehung Jesu*. Edited by P. Hoffmann. Wege der Forschung 522. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1988.
- . "Jesusüberlieferung und Christuskerygma: zwei Wege urchristlicher Überlieferungsgeschichte." *Theologia Viatorum* 10 (1965-66): 310-39.
- . "The Tradition-History of the Resurrection of Jesus." Pages 51-76 in *The Significance of the Resurrection for Faith in Jesus Christ*. Edited by C. F. D. Moule. Studies in Biblical Theology. Second Series 8. London: SCM, 1968.
- . *Die Missionsreden der Apostelgeschichte: Form- und traditionsge-schichtliche Untersuchungen*. 3rd ed. Wissenschaftliche Monografien zum Alten und Neuen Testament 5. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1974.
- Winston, D. *The Wisdom of Solomon*. Anchor Bible 43. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1979.
- Wolf, P. "Liegt in den Logien von der 'Todestaufe' (Mk 10,38f., Lk 12,49f.) eine Spur des Todesverstaendnisses Jesu vor?" Ph.D. dissertation. Albert-Ludwig-Universität, 1973.
- Wright, N. T. *The New Testament and the People of God*. Christian Origins and the Question of God 1. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992.
- Zeller, D. *Kommentar zur Logienquelle*. Stuttgarter kleiner Kommentar, Neues Testament 21. Stuttgart: Katholischess Bibelwerk, 1984.
- . "Entrückung zur Ankunft als Menschensohn (Lk 13, 34f.; 11, 29f.)." Pages 513-30 in *À Cause de l'Évangile: Études sur les Synoptiques et les Actes offertes au P. Jacques Dupont, O.S.B. à l'occasion de son 70e anniversaire*. Lectio Divina 123. Paris: Saint-André/Cerf, 1985.
- . "Jesus, Q und die Zukunft Israels." Unpublished paper presented to the Colloquium Biblicum Lovaniense. Leuven, July 2000.
- Zimmern, H. "Urkönige und Uroffenbarung." Pages 530-43 in *Die Keilschriften und das Alte Testament*. Edited by E. Schrader. Berlin: Ruether, 1902.
- Zwiep, A. W. *The Ascension of the Messiah in Lukan Christology*. Novum Testamentum Supplements 87. Leiden. New York. and Köln: Brill, 1997.